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WELCOMING REMARKS

James E. Alatis
Dean, School of Languages and Linguistics
Georgetown University

Ever since 1950, scholars in linguistics and related disciplines have assembled each year on this campus for the Georgetown University Round Table on Languages and Linguistics. This evening, ladies and gentlemen, it is an honor and a pleasure for me to welcome you, on behalf of the University, to this 29th Round Table.

In May, 1977, at a meeting sponsored by the National Institute of Education on the subject 'Dimensions of Bilingualism', Dr. E. Glyn Lewis pointed out to me that there had never been a conference on the international dimensions of bilingualism, and suggested that this might be a topic for a Georgetown University Round Table on Languages and Linguistics. I agreed with his proposal, asked his help in organizing such a conference, and requested that he be one of the speakers. Thus for the initial inspiration, for the choice of speakers, for the selection and ordering of topics, I am indebted to his wise counsel and help. He also kindly agreed to write an Introduction and Conclusion to the series of papers presented. Consequently, it is no exaggeration to say that this international conference on the International Dimensions of Bilingualism is as much his work as mine.

Of course, bilingual education has been a concern in the United States for many years, and passage of the Title VII Act has emphasized this concern. But many of the issues of bilingual education reach beyond national boundaries, and so it is now important—as Dr. Lewis so wisely foresaw—to consider the interrelationships between national and international needs for bilingual education.

I know that you look forward, as I do, to hearing the more than 40 distinguished speakers who will address the conference on the many vital aspects of this year's Round Table theme, 'International Dimensions in Bilingual Education'. And so once
again I welcome you to Georgetown University, and to the Georgetown University Round Table on Languages and Linguistics 1978. Thank you.
WHAT ARE THE INTERNATIONAL DIMENSIONS OF BILINGUALISM IN EDUCATION?

E. Glyn Lewis

Introduction. It may seem odd that we should be concerned with the international dimensions of bilingual education at a time when even the national dimensions have not been explored thoroughly, if at all in some instances. Nevertheless, just as there is considerable value in international attempts to discover solutions to economic problems even when in individual countries there is no agreement on how to approach their own particular difficulties, so in the field of education we hope that teachers and administrators, as well as scholars researching in the field, may find comfort in comparing the enormity of their difficulties as well as discovering that they can support and help each other in discussing those difficulties. That was the spirit in which the participants of the 1978 Round Table met, and from the formal and informal discussions it is not too optimistic to conclude that the hopes of those at Georgetown University who organised the Conference may have been satisfied.

Demographic and linguistic dimensions. Issues which arise from the existence of or the desire for bilingual education can be regarded from several angles and these will reveal differences as well as common characteristics among multilingual nations. These are what we mean by the 'dimensions' of our subject. There are first of all the numbers of the languages within national systems of education. These may run to hundreds in the USSR, the United States or African and Asian countries, or they may be restricted to no more than two in the case of small countries such as Wales or Ireland. The number of languages within severely localised communities will also vary. Even small village schools, for instance in the North Caucusus, may have students from 20 different language groups. This is certainly the case in densely populated though geographically limited
urban areas. Large cities in the United States and increasingly in the Soviet Union too, are notoriously multilingual communities. But the same is true of rural areas—in Africa, for instance. In the area around Lake Ngami, six different Bantu languages are spoken in addition to two Hottentot languages and several European languages, though the total population is no more than 33,000 (Westphal 1962:205). The numbers speaking the different languages vary, as do the proportions of those who are bilingual or multilingual in different degrees. If we take just one language from the complex of languages spoken in Kenya, namely, Luo (Gusii border) 49% of the sample claim to be monolingual in their native language; 23% are bilingual in Luo and Swahili; 18% in Luo and English; 30% in Luo and another African language other than Swahili; 25% are trilingual in Luo, Swahili, and another African language; 33% are trilingual in Luo, another African language, and English; 28% in Luo, Swahili, and English; and 37% are quadrilingual in Luo, Swahili, another African language, and English (Whitely 1974:39-47, extracted Tables 1.8-1.16).

The distribution of the incidence of bilingualism or multilingualism varies between rural and urban areas and according to the country's historical development. Insofar as particular localities are concerned, the density of the incidence of bilingualism will vary. Moreover, the geographical distribution of the languages (the number speaking a language in any locality expressed as a proportion of the national total speaking the language) often bears little relationship to the density of bilingualism (the number speaking the relevant languages locally, expressed as a proportion of the total local population). These parameters vary within any one country and vary even more internationally.

Furthermore, the linguistic and sociological status of the languages in a multilingual country may differ. In most of them, for instance the USSR, the very large number of languages are at different levels of linguistic development. Some remain clusters of dialects like those of the Pamirs; others are at varying levels of stabilisation; some may be young standard languages, having only recently achieved that status; others may have two standard variants, like Armenian; some of the Paleo-asiatic languages have become written languages without at the same time achieving a significant level of standardization, while others again, like Russian, Georgian, and some nonindigenous Soviet languages are fully standardized literary languages. Some countries have, in addition to historical standard languages (like English or French), a Pidgin or Creole (Ferguson 1966). Looked at in more purely sociological terms, most multilingual countries have at least one major language (defined as being the language of 25% of the population, or alternatively, one million speakers; used in educating more than 50% of the students, and occupying official status). There are also minor languages which need to satisfy less strict criteria, as well as
languages of special status, such as those used widely in religious observances and in literature, etc. One of the most important of the linguistic-sociological dimensions is the direction in which bilingualism is moving, whether it is recessive (moving towards a homogeneous community) or progressive (moving towards greater heterogeneity).

As important as the dimensions we have already mentioned are those of language usage. Taking into account the increasing tendency towards population movement within as well as between multilingual countries, the distribution of the usage of the various languages has to be measured according to where the languages are spoken—whether within or outside the territorial boundaries normally associated with the relevant language groups. Tadzhik in the USSR and Navajo in the United States are both spoken within and outside the associated territories and the degree to which a language is used for any particular purpose will vary according to this dimension. Most multilingual countries have an official language which has an overall national currency in some cases, though in other countries a language may be official within a territory which is strictly limited. This is the case in federated states like the Soviet Union, Yugoslavia, or Nigeria. In some instances the multilingual federated state may promote the use of a lingua franca, like Russian in the Soviet Union. In some cases the lingua franca may not be an indigenous language: it may be a former colonial language, like French or English in some African countries, or a quasi-indigenous language like Swahili. But there is seldom absolute uniformity about the use of a nonindigenous lingua franca: for instance, English may be the only official language, but it may not be widely taught beyond the primary school, or it may be taught though not used as a teaching language except in higher education; and even when it is official, it may be known to no more than 10% of the population, as in Pakistan. Then again, the nonindigenous lingua franca may be official but only in conjunction with another language—usually an indigenous language—as is the case in Ireland, some African countries, and India (Lewis 1962).

The dimension of attitude. Different native languages are associated with different attitudes towards them, the languages with which they are in contact, as well as the institutionalization of that contact in the system of education or in the conventions or rules of the administration of justice. Such attitudes are influenced by several factors—geographical contiguity and ease of communication, migrations of varying kinds (voluntary or enforced), conquest or colonization. The historical dimension of language contact, including the length of time during which the contact has existed, is often important in some countries. In any case, it is just as well to bear the historical dimension in mind, because although historical events may not be repeated in exactly the same way, any theories which lay claim to have a
general relevance must be consistent with past experience to some degree.

It is unfortunate that we have become accustomed to think of bilingual education as an ideal which should determine particular practice and programmes. We speak of 'a bilingual education' and suggest by doing so that if it is to serve its purpose it is or at least should be uniform in structure and aim. It would be an advantage, however, if we could speak of 'the education of bilingual children'. Although the phrase 'bilingual child' begs important questions, the phrase has the advantage of facilitating a flexible approach to existing provisions and encourages a more open mind in judging the relevance of new proposals. For instance, however desirable we may regard the use of the two languages in a bilingual education, it is by no means the case that a programme which fails to use the child's native language is not offering a form of bilingual education. Simply teaching the unmarked language as a second language may be a minimal form of bilingual education, but it has to be included in the category of education with which we are concerned. There are any number of different combinations of variables which can be said to produce a bilingual programme, and from among the large number of possibilities different nations select those which are most appropriate to their needs. Attitudes to the type of programmes provided will differ according to their appropriateness and not according to whether the structure which they exemplify conforms to some ideal concept of bilingual education.

Dimensions of educational aims. However, these considerations are subordinate to how different nations conceive the purposes of education generally, and especially the education of their minorities. In some countries, education is regarded unquestionably as serving the needs of the nation, the ethnic group or tribe, ensuring its maintenance and, if possible, its enrichment. Other countries place the emphasis on the needs of the individual and aim to develop his cognitive and affective characteristics. They, too, aim to enrich the nation but they are happy to enable each individual to make his contribution in his own way and to encourage not simply a conformity to the ideals of the nation but also a critical judgment of the 'idols of the tribe'. Even when there is agreement about the aim of education (for minorities and majorities alike), differences may arise—especially between multilingual societies—according to whether a particular form of education, in this case education in the minority language, is to be claimed as an ethnic/linguistic group right or as the right of an individual only. In the Soviet Union, the right to education in the native language (no matter how large or small the group) can be claimed by any member of the group within or outside the homeland of the language by virtue of his being a member of that group. In the United States and in Britain, there are no such group rights: a claim to a specified form of education is a matter for the individual alone which he
cannot press simply as a member of a particular minority. In the USSR, a case has to be made either by the State or by the parent as to why the native language should not be taught and used. In the United States and Britain, a case has to be made by the parents as to why the native language of the minority child should be taught and used.

Different justifications as a set of dimensions. Individuals or groups use one of several categories of argument to justify a bilingual education for minority groups and it is interesting to note that these arguments are not only represented in all multi-lingual countries having such programmes, but that the several justifications succeed each other in the same order in all countries. At first, it is the need to promote at least minimal literacy which is stressed. This is recognised as being most appropriately provided in the native language, the dominant national language (as it might be English in Africa or America, and Russian in the various Union Republics of the USSR) being taught as a second language. Once such native language literacy together with competence in the second language ensures a national system of communication, the paradigm is modified to include a second justification, namely, cultural homogeneity. Both justifications are based on a conception of assimilation and social mobilization of the total national community. Following linguistic and cultural assimilation, it is to be expected that the second strand in any form of satisfactory education should begin to emerge, so the paradigm is further modified to give expression not only to the needs of the total national community or the several groups within it, but to purely individual considerations --especially individual cognitive growth and personal development.

The first phase of this third paradigm tends to be negative in its understanding of bilingualism, stressing the alleged cognitive and developmental disadvantages which bilingualism entails. The second phase, on the other hand, moves towards the acceptance of the advantages offered by bilingualism and is affirmative in its approach to bilingual education. Just as the first and second paradigms were assimilative (either linguistically or culturally), so the third and fourth paradigms give prominence to the individuality of the elements which were assimilated. The third paradigm, as we have suggested, stresses the cognitive growth and personal development of the individual; the fourth, we suggest, stresses the distinctiveness of the groups which compose the national pattern. It is therefore a pluralistic justification, beginning with stress on cultural pluralism and moving towards political pluralism. These four categories of justification constitute an important set of dimensions for the provision of bilingual education in all nations.
Stages of social development as relevant dimensions. One dimension affects all others in a consideration of bilingual education, namely, the nature of the multilingual society and the level of social development it enjoys. One concept of society gives pride of place to the maintenance of a traditional way of life and to language as a necessary element in that culture. This is well expressed by Thomas Davies towards the end of a truly traditional society in Ireland. He spoke of the language which has grown up with a people as being fitted beyond any other to express their prevalent thoughts in the most natural and efficient way. To impose another language on such a people ... is to cut off the entail of feeling and separate a people from their forefathers by a deep grief—'tis to corrupt their very organs and abridge their power of expression' (Davies 1914:172-173).

Such a view is characteristic of a traditional society and the awareness of it becomes acute only when that society is in a stage of transition. It is not a view which is relevant to a modern or modernizing society and it is that kind of society which is relevant to our consideration of a bilingual education and its international dimensions. Students are educated not for the purpose of living in the past, though that past has much to contribute to their development. Nor are they educated for the present, since in a world which is not only changing rapidly but seeking change with manifest urgency, an education oriented to the present will be outdated and outmoded by the time they come to participate in the conduct of the affairs of their society. Bilingual education is a dynamic phenomenon because it prepares for the future to which Matthew Arnold referred in the middle of the last century when he wrote of one irresistible force which is gradually making way everywhere, removing old conditions and imposing new, altering long fixed habits, undermining venerable institutions, even modifying national character—the modern spirit (Culture and Anarchy:57).

Arnold was thinking of Britain, and of the implications of such a transition for popular education. When we consider this movement as an international influence on bilingual education, many important dimensions have to be borne in mind. Prior to the development of modernized societies, the European socio-political order was characterised by a high degree of congruence between cultural and political identities; a high level of affective and symbolic commitment to the political and cultural centres as well as a close relationship between those centres and the more traditional dimensions of life on the periphery; an emphasis on politically defined collective goals for all members and a relatively autonomous access of broad strata to symbolic activities.
at the centre (Eisenstadt 1966:64). Insofar as aspects of bilingual education reflect changes which are related to these considerations, there are both deep and surface regularities which have to be taken into account. The deep structural regularities—involving economic, demographic, political, and psychological variables—tend to be the same in all modernizing plurilingual societies. They are the universal laws of social change and for that reason modernization must be explained in an international context. Surface regularities reflect the different circumstances of the different countries as they reflect particular response to the deep structural changes. Therefore, while the problems of bilingual education tend to be the same in all modernizing countries, the manner in which the problems arise and the intensity with which they are experienced vary from nation to nation.

Cultural dimensions. Because of the contradictions of a modernizing or modernized society, especially one which is multilingual, there are bound to be tensions within and between the cultures of particular ethnic groups, reflecting the survival of traditional ways of life and thought in conjunction or competition with new aspects of social life. On the socioeconomic level, the various ethnic linguistic groups in a modern society have tended to become less closely knit, less organic and solidary communities. Consequently, the local culture and broad national or ethnic linguistic ties have often separated. On the political level, modernizing societies have tended to politicise their culture—it is no longer simply lived, its uniqueness is used as a political lever. Other social processes, too, possess features which are immediately relevant to bilingual education and these have to be regarded as some of the most important dimensions of such an education in all countries. I have already referred to the mobilization of the total national population implied by modernization, leading to the stress on mass literacy. A modernizing society tends towards increasing industrialization and urbanization, so that the child brought up in a traditional and usually rural society has to adapt to a vastly different social environment. This modern society is characterised by a high degree of geographical (horizontal) and social (vertical) mobility; in a multilingual/multinational society such mobility poses particular problems for linguistic education. Areas which were hitherto ethnically and linguistically homogeneous become densely populated and heterogeneous. Because of population mobility and especially urbanization, there is a tendency towards homogenization and convergence of cultures. Furthermore, the culture which was hitherto the result of a close and organic development of the same community over many centuries, an anthropological culture, is replaced gradually but quite perceptibly by a sociological culture which is the derivative of a much looser combination of group interests, new
technological ways of working and living, and more mobile individuals and groups.

In fact, the one imperative requirement in the analysis of bilingual education internationally is to see it against a background of 'a revolution of sensibility' which began to influence modernizing societies towards the end of the seventeenth century and has continued to do so.

The new knowledge which was thought valuable in modernizing societies tended to be that which could be validated or invalidated. It was also a kind of knowledge which—far from being an extension or elaboration of normal personal experience—was on a different plane, discontinuous from normal experience, abstract in both nature and expression, best exemplified by mathematics and physics. The massive and accelerating accumulation of knowledge, its discontinuity both in substance and expression from normal experience, together with its identification with technological considerations, made it necessary that even young children, limited though their need for scientific knowledge might be, could not be expected to have the necessary grounding without formal instruction in school. In such formal scholastic situations their customary or native language, adequate though it might be for everyday affairs, would have to be adapted to the nature of what they were taught or be replaced by a more flexible language. Modernization meant the differentiation of education as an independent, autonomous, and specialised function no longer adequately fulfilled by the home with its diffused responsibilities. Thus, the ground was prepared for the disassociation of the language of the school from that of the home. All these considerations meant that so far as a modern society was concerned, the language of the school, in principle, was of greater significance than that of the home. The new emphasis on achievement, carrying a new system of social and personal rewards, led to a restructuring or a new stratification of society. The successful individual had his eyes on an environment, inside or outside his own country, which was served by a major—often a world—language.

Associated with the emphasis on the 'rational' attitude toward language and with regard for it as an efficient instrument rather than a hallowed institution, were two other aspects of the modernizing spirit—scientific scepticism and a thrust towards a demystification of hitherto sanctified institutions, including language—together with a tough-mindedness: 'distrust of the intangible behind which one looked for tangible matters on which one relied for understanding' (Polanyi 1958:12). The legitimacy of a tradition and its language was transferred from humanistic values to these new technological guidelines. The capacity of institutions, including language, to engender and maintain a belief that they are the instruments most important and appropriate for that society, which is what is meant by legitimacy, was identified with their aptness to promote efficiency, a sceptical frame of mind, a willingness to reduce the status of tradition
with other intangibles, and a general propensity to toughness. These are aspects of the dimensions of bilingual education which affect all countries today, because they characterize a modern society.
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THE IMPORTATION OF BILINGUAL EDUCATION MODELS

William F. Mackey
Université Laval

Abstract. Reports of the success of bilingual education models in one area have often led educators in other areas to adopt these same models. Before importing a bilingual education model from another area it would seem wise to find out the extent to which both areas are comparable linguistically, ethnically, socially, economically, and in some cases, politically. It seems also important to understand the history and development of the model in the area in which it was developed. This implies a knowledge of the population for whom the model was intended, and not only of what people did with the model but why they did it, not only of the fact that the model was successful, but why it was successful, or why it failed. In order to obtain this information educators must have access to case studies of bilingual education. Because of the number and complexity of variables it would seem that the case-study approach to the training of educators in bilingual education would be the wisest. The theoretical framework in which the cases are studied with a view to selecting the right model for a given community might indeed be an ecological one.

This Georgetown University Round Table is part of a long tradition of meetings on bilingual education which have been taking place with increasing frequency since the turn of the century (Mackey and Andersson:Introduction). Indeed, the tradition goes back for more than a century and has included hundreds of meetings—national, international, and regional in all parts of the globe (Mackey 1978c). The literature on language contact, which totals well over the 20,000 titles listed in the two volumes of the international bibliography, shows a proportionately larger and larger number of studies devoted to the social and educational aspects of bilingualism as opposed to the linguistic and
philological preoccupations of an earlier age (Mackey 1972b).

The international theme of this Round Table is both timely and important as it provides an opportunity to rectify a number of false impressions that have been created in the past decade as a result of the immense investments in bilingual education in Anglophone America (Mackey and Ornstein 1977).

These investments have yielded a number of much-publicized experiments on the use of two languages in education and on schooling in a language other than that of the home. Many of these have attracted the attention of educators from abroad who have come to see this innovative form of education, only to find, after careful study, that they had always considered such schooling as normal. It was an old product under a new label. The purpose of this paper is to reiterate the fact that many of these innovations, although new to twentieth century Anglophone America, are both widespread and of long standing in most other parts of the world. Since bilingual schooling is an adaptation to a particular social need, a second purpose is to point out what is involved in the importation of a bilingual education model from another part of the world.

Bilingual education is indeed of great antiquity, dating back to the third millennium before our era. It seems first to have been a product of literacy. Since the number of languages in which one could become literate were so few, any sort of schooling beyond the borders of the written language was ipso facto bilingual. Yet even in ancient times some populations were schooled in two written languages. Paradoxically, bilingual education and biliteracy seem to have predated even the invention of the alphabet. In 1977, decipherment by Giovanni Pettinato, of the University of Rome, of some of the 16,000 tablets unearthed in the past decade near the city of Aleppo, Syria, indicates that bilingual schooling is at least four to five thousand years old. Many of the tablets are bilingual texts used to teach children to read and write both Eblaite and Sumerian. Education was therefore both bilingual and biliterate, since Eblaite writing had already reached a pre-alphabetic stage of sporadic vowel and consonant representation, while the early Sumerian cuneiform was still largely pictographic (Driver 1954). A millenium and a half after Sumerian had become almost a classical tongue, schooling was still bilingual. In the schools of Babylon, for example, children had to learn to write both in Akkadian and in Sumerian. In would, then, seem safe to say that biliterate education is more than a thousand years older than the invention of the alphabet.

After about 1500 B.C., when people in the Mediterranean port of Ugarit (between modern Turkey and Syria) developed a sequential alphabetic form of writing, bilingual education spread rapidly throughout the ancient world. For this early alphabet was used and propagated by other Canaanites and their successors, the far-ranging Phoenician traders, over a 2,500-mile arc
from its point of origin. One of the most powerful factors of this alphabet was that it could be easily adapted to any language. In the East, it became the Aramaic alphabet which engendered the Persian, Indian, Arabic, and Hebrew scripts. In the West it became the Greek alphabet, which gave rise to the modern Roman and Cyrillic alphabets. In the schools set up throughout the Greek empire, local residents desiring education had to have their children schooled in Greek even though the home language may have been an unrelated tongue. Similarly, with the network of schools which followed the conquest and colonization of the Roman legions in most of Europe and North Africa, the children of cooperative Celtic and Germanic tribesmen were schooled in Latin, while back home, schooling was in Latin and Greek, since boys from Roman aristocratic homes were expected to learn the language of that much-admired Hellenic civilization (Lewis 1977).

That is why in Europe bilingualism through education has long been the rule, ever since formal schooling was expanded by the Romans throughout their Empire, where elite speakers of Celtic, Germanic, and other home languages were schooled in Latin. And even after these Celtic substrata had been replaced by the vernaculars which evolved from the *lingua romana rustica* (French, Spanish, Italian, and others) and those of the Germanic and Slavonic groups—that is, by the modern languages of Europe—education continued to be in a language other than that of the home, namely, in Church Latin. This was so much so, that until a few hundred years ago, children attending schools in England and Germany were forbidden to use their mother tongue in school, since education had become equivalent to the use of Latin. This was considered to be so normal that such a scientifically-minded person as Francis Bacon, witnessing perhaps the effects of the great promotion of public schooling by the early Tudors, was moved to predict in his *Novum Organum*, that when the English had become more educated, the English language would become obsolete. So it came as a shock and was regarded as a most revolutionary idea when in the sixteenth century the French jurist Jean Bodin suggested that the mother tongue could actually be taught in school. With the rise of nationalism, French was introduced in France, English in England, and later Spanish, German, Italian, and other tongues in the schools of their respective countries (Fishman 1972). What was eventually taught, however, was not really the mother tongue or the language of the home, but another abstraction which came to be known as the national language—often as different from the home language as Latin had been from the everyday vernaculars of the early speakers of French, Italian, Spanish, and other Romance languages.

This was so much so that the first move of the cultural arm of the Revolutionary Committee which created the French Republic was to plan for the systematic elimination of home languages by compulsory and exclusive schooling in Standard
French (Grégoire 1794). Through such schooling it became common throughout Europe, and is still widespread today, to have one language or dialect as a home language and to use another standard language for the purpose of schooling. Sometimes, this standard is that of a foreign country, as is the case for school German in Switzerland and Dutch in Belgium, alongside the spoken Allemanic and Flemish dialects of the home. This tradition of differentiating between school language and home language was transplanted by the Europeans who colonized the Americas.

When later Europeans from countries other than those of the colonizing powers emigrated to the New World, they considered it only natural that their children should be educated in their national language, even though it might not really be identical with the language of the home. But provisions also had to be made for the language of their new country—English, Spanish, French, or Portuguese. This double need resulted in the creation of the first bilingual schools in North America. Even colonial America tolerated schooling in languages other than English, and the United States continued to do so well into the twentieth century, when the nationalism and isolationalism which gradually took hold of the public consciousness during the second and third quarter of the century made schooling in a language other than English appear unpatriotic (Kloss 1977).

The antiquity and universality of bilingual education, however, is not limited to Europe and America. Formal schooling in a language other than that of the home has been the rule in Africa ever since the first Koranic schools were created in the early fifteenth century. In the most famous of these, located in Timbuktu and in Jenne, schooling was not in the African mother tongue but in classical Arabic. So it was in the University of Timbuktu—which was flourishing long before Columbus discovered America—in this famous city which had become the cultural capital of the Songhai Empire (Trimingham 1962).

Education in a second language continued throughout colonial times and continues today in most parts of Africa. Colonial education was invariably immersion in English, French, Portuguese, German, Dutch, or Arabic. To presume, therefore, to introduce immersion education in Africa as an innovative contribution from America is to display a profound ignorance of the history and development of African education—if not to risk being accused of neocolonialism.

In many parts of Asia education has long been associated with writing in a script often not available in the mother tongue of the majority—Chinese, Arabic, and Devanagari. In India and the Soviet Union bilingual or trilingual education has been the norm for millions of children. After more than half a century of struggle for a national language policy, English is still a school language in India.

In sum, bilingual education is widespread throughout the world and always has been. Ever since the beginning of formal
education, total or partial schooling in a language other than that of the home has been the rule rather than the exception. For most people educated before the nineteenth century, some or all of their schooling had to be done in a language other than that of the home. In most parts of the world education in a language other than that of the home (in America, called 'immersion') has long been the only type available—even the only sort of education possible.

What is now possible—and this is the new dimension—is universal unilingualism through education in the language of the home or else bilingualism through schooling in both the mother tongue and another tongue.

For the first time in the history of mankind it is now technically possible for everyone on earth to become literate in the language which he speaks at home. Indeed, that possibility was put forward by UNESCO in the 1950s as a fundamental universal right. With a typewriter, a duplicating machine, a productive staff, and, if necessary, a linguist, more material can be written than the primary school child can read in school.

The question for many thousands of smaller language groups is not 'Can we do it?' but 'What should we do?' How much bilingual education is worth how much investment in time and human resources? Other nontechnical considerations therefore now come into play.

Universal literacy in the home language has the following implications: (1) to unilingual education in another language (immersion) is added as an alternative: (a) unilingual education in the home language, (b) bilingual education in the home language and in the other language—either simultaneous or consecutive; (2) the unification of isolated language islands through common media programs in the minority language.

Today, no area of the world is technically immune from contact with any language of the world. In 1969, with the orbiting of Intelsat III over the Indian Ocean, it became technically possible for the first time in history for any two points on earth to intercommunicate within a single communications network. It has therefore also become possible to use satellites to help in the survival of minority languages.

In other words, it is now also technically possible for any ethnic group with the necessary resources to try to maintain its language through its own schools and through its own media. The trouble is that those who need it most can afford it least. Few small isolated language groups can support this advanced technology—that is, unless they are assisted by some central government or federal agency. Canada, for example, is planning to use one of its Canadian Anik satellites to broadcast multilingual educational television and radio programs to isolated language communities spread out over an eighth of the circumference of the globe. It would seem therefore that only the powerful language groups have the means to make possible the survival of the weaker languages. If the means used involve
satellites, bilingual education could conceivably become extra-territorial. This could create a demand for a sort of linguistic foreign aid.

Such aid might be more welcome than the exporting of a model of bilingual schooling as a magic formula for educational success. For the universal magic formula often turns out to be the wrong model. And using the wrong model can be disastrous: like running a university as if it were a factory, or basing the economy of a third-world dependency on that of a modern self-sufficient technological democracy, or applying urban sociolinguistic models to parts of the world where there are no big cities. Abstract or generalized discussion on whether this model is better than that one can be both meaningless and harmful. It is meaningless because what is desirable education for any group depends on the particular context in which its children will have to live and work. It is harmful because any assumption that there is a best and universally applicable model is bound to lead some people to pick the wrong one. Moreover, in trying to make a model operational, even though it be the wrong one, the institution (university or school or class) tends to become a system the purpose of which is to make the system work.

Before importing a model of bilingual education it is important to study its genesis. How did it develop and for whom? It is important to know not only what people did with it, but why they did it; not only that this model succeeded, but why it succeeded; not only that a certain model failed in a certain area, but why it failed. These needs alone seem to justify the publication of case studies of bilingual education (Spolsky and Cooper 1978; Mackey, in progress). For example, immersion education in Canada is understandable within the Canadian context and more particularly within the Montreal context. What was new in Montreal was not that schooling was given in a language other than that of the home—such had long been the norm in many parts of the globe. What was new was that the school language should be one formerly believed to hold a lower status, either at the regional, national, or international level. What parents in Anglophone Montreal decided to do was simply to follow the trend in the growing importance of French in Quebec—and later, in Canada as a whole. One might say that immersion education in Quebec is simply schooling in what is now the national language of Quebec—French.

After investigating the development of an allegedly successful model of bilingual education with a view to importing it from one area to another, it might then be wise to find out the extent to which the situation in the first area is comparable to that of the second, especially as regards such language-related questions as the nature of the languages involved, language policy, educational jurisdiction, educational policy, and social structures.

In considering the nature of the languages involved in the choice of model, it is important to analyze differences in status,
in cultural coverage, in relatedness, and in language admixture. Language status is often a reflexion of educational potential.

First, all languages do not have the same educational potential. If we look at languages from a geolinguistic point of view, we can note important differences. English is not comparable to Basaa, nor is French to Micmac or to any one of the nearby Amerindian languages. Not only in Montreal, nor in Canada, nor in America, but in its own right, English is all but self-sufficient. Geolinguistically, it is a leading international language, having surpassed during the twentieth century, German, French, and other languages as the language of technology, science, and commerce. But within their very large spheres of influence French, Spanish, and German—not to speak of Russian, Chinese, and Japanese—are likewise self-sufficient languages. To replace a self-sufficient home language like English, therefore, by a slightly less self-sufficient language like French, as has been done in the Montreal immersion programs, is not really very much of a gamble. But to invite parents to immerse their children in a language in which there is little need beyond the primary level—even though that language is that of the home—is quite another matter. Only before God and the linguist are all languages equal. Everyone knows that you can go further with some languages than you can with others.

And the choice is not only between the so-called languages of wider communication like English, French, Spanish, and Russian. One cannot put all languages of the world into a few categories for the purpose of bilingual education and proceed as if Amerindian languages like Sioux and Dakota had the same educational potential as Swedish and Dutch, just because someone put them in the same category as minor languages; the feasibility of any language policy in education depends on the potential of the languages involved (Mackey 1976b). Language potential is a matter of degree (Mackey 1973).

The local state and status of the home language is a determining factor in the choice of model. That a certain model suits a population situated at one end of the language boundary does not mean that it will also suit a population situated at the other end—even though the language involved is the same one. For example, the eastern portion of the French-English language boundary in Canada, occupied by the Maritime Acadians, can operate with a model of irredentism (more and more French) where the higher rate of endogamy (over 90 percent) has produced children dominant in French and with a knowledge of that language immediately usable as a medium of instruction. In contrast, the French-speaking population at the southwestern end of the French-English language boundary, where the low rate of endogamy (under 45 percent) has produced children who are bilingual before entering school, with French not always being the dominant language, imposes limits on the use of that language as an exclusive medium of
instruction. This is not because each population inhabits a different political entity—New Brunswick in the East and Ontario in the West—but because of proximity to large concentrations of Anglophones especially in the urban and suburban areas in Southern Ontario (Mackey and Cartwright 1977). But in Northern Ontario (now called Le Nouvel-Ontario on the model of Le Nouveau Québec in Northern Quebec) French-speaking school children come from a large and more isolated concentration of Francophones where the rate of endogamy (over 80 percent) is closer to that of the Acadians. It is unlikely that the same bilingual schooling model therefore would suit all the schools of Ontario, let alone all bilingual schools in Canada. In selecting a model for bilingual education, language boundaries may be more important than political ones.

Secondly, regardless of status, languages also differ in their cultural coverage, that is, in their capacity for use within the changing cultural contexts of formal schooling. Ironically, the home language of illiterate unilingual civilizations may be more adaptable to bilingual schooling than are the vernaculars of peoples with a high degree of literacy in another tongue, especially if it be a colonial language.

In areas where colonial adstarta have produced national creoles, a high degree of literacy may result in a decreolization of the vernacular through the exclusive use in education of the colonial or neocolonial standard. This has been the case in certain parts of the French Antilles (Martinique and Guadeloupe) in contradiction to the more stable creoles of unilingual illiterates in other areas (Haiti, for example). In order to create a standard language base for bilingual (creole/French) education in the bilingual areas, there has been pressure for a necessary re-creolization of the vernacular. This has been especially evident in areas where unilingual education in French had transformed the creole vernacular into a continuum of mutually modifying linguistic practices. Before thinking of importing any sort of bilingual education model in these creole-speaking areas, the educational authorities are faced with the problem of defining and separating the two languages to be used (Makoutou-Mboukou 1977).

Multilingual areas vary greatly in the degree of literacy which can be counted upon as a basis for bilingual education. One can contrast, for example, the relatively high degree of literacy in the multilingual Cameroon—where much of the population is becoming literate in French, English, or in both of these official languages—with the more than 95 percent illiteracy of multilingual Upper Volta—where about 5 percent can speak a European language, in most cases French, and the rest of the population use one of the 60 national languages, a dozen of which have been chosen as a basis for a literacy campaign launched in 1976 (Zalle 1977).

Fitting the vernacular to a medium of instruction may be a long and arduous task. But if the ultimate goal is education in
the mother tongue it is a necessary prerequisite. For the higher the education in the colonial language, the lower the potential of the home language. This is because the special vocabularies which the child and the adolescent would gradually acquire within the context of traditional tribal education are in fact learned only in a second or foreign language and through the process of formal schooling. The very prestige of the second language contributes to the dominance and superior availability of these foreign vocabularies. As literacy and education in this second, or colonial, language becomes widespread, as has been the case in some areas, the special native vocabularies become obsolete within a few generations. At this point, foreign linguists come in and describe the vernacular as lacking the basis for any technical vocabulary. Enter the language planner, who will talk the government into supporting the manufacture of batteries of neologisms cooked up by experts from abroad quite ignorant of the fact that there are wise old men in distant villages that are still the repositories of traditional vocabularies which had been supplanted by European schooling. As a case in point, intensive investigation between 1970 and 1975 into the available vocabularies of two generations in one area of the Cameroons reveal a complete lack of knowledge in the home language of many lexical areas, like that of the building trades. Yet these vocabularies are still part of the language competence of some old people who were unschooled in the colonial language (Njock, forthcoming).

If the policy is to enhance the vernacular language through education, one has to determine the extent to which the traditional language, impoverished as it has been through unilingual education in a foreign tongue, is recuperable through formal schooling. For the same language this is likely to vary from one region to the next (Mackey 1976c). Since materials may eventually have to be based on the vernacular structures and vocabulary available to the school population, surveys of language availability would seem to be justified before a specific bilingual education model is selected (Mackey, Savard, and Ardouin). It is also possible to measure the extent to which languages like French, English, and Spanish, which exist in many varieties throughout the world, have adapted to a particular environment in which bilingual education is contemplated (Mackey, forthcoming). In selecting a model of bilingual education for a plurilingual community, it is important to study the type of community and the distribution of language within it (Zierer 1977).

In addition to their distribution the relatedness of the languages of the community may be a determining factor, especially if some of the languages are interintelligible. If a bilingual education model in one area has been successful because the similarities between the two languages pose no insurmountable barrier to mutual comprehension, it does not hold that the same model will work as well in another area where the languages are
mutually unintelligible. One of the main determinants of mutual intelligibility is the degree of difference between the languages, their interlingual distance; and this, being a matter of degree, is subject to measurement (Mackey 1971 and 1976a).

Fourthly, in taking language differences into account it is necessary to base them not on two or more abstractions such as the English, Spanish, and French as described by linguists, but on the varieties of language actually known and used by the children whose language behavior will form the basis of the bilingual education program (Kwofie 1977). An analysis of the sort of language known and used may bring surprises if the investigation is thorough enough (Mackey 1978b). In areas of language contact it may also pose a serious dilemma. In some cases, the knowledge of the ethnic tongue, even though listed as the home language, may be so limited and the degree of admixture so great as to exclude the possibility of any models of bilingual education; if the educator can succeed in getting one usable language out of the mixture the children can be considered lucky.

So much for the linguistic dimensions of the problem. They are not, however, the only considerations. One has to realize that political ideologies which generate language policies can also determine the type of bilingual education model to be either chosen or imposed. A policy whose objective is the maintenance of a minority language will have little status in a nation dominated by the ideal of achieving unity through uniformity and of integrating all its citizens into the mainstream. Since there are different means to the same end, all ideologies of integration do not generate the same language politics, no more than do policies of linguistic and cultural diversity. Both may foster policies of bilingual education. If integration is the objective, it may be achieved either by completely excluding all other languages or by including another language in the educational process for purposes of gradual transition into the main culture.

On the other hand, if the ideal is linguistic and cultural diversity, the policy may be either one of tolerance or one of promotion. A policy of cultural tolerance may be one of freedom as regards the choice of language in education (a policy of laissez-faire); or it may be formalized into the enactment and application of special language rights, in the form of constitutional guarantees for bilingual ethnic schools such as those existing in Yugoslavia (Mackey and Verdoodt 1975). A policy of cultural diversity through language promotion may be implemented through a program of bilingual maintenance aimed at a stable and permanent bilingualism, or it may be geared to the revival of a national tongue through a policy of irredentism (Mackey 1978d).

Whatever the dominant ideology may be, its implementation will not necessarily be the same throughout any sovereign state. There may be regional and local education policies differing one from the other. Even though the language policy should be the
same, its implementation in the schools may depend on the structure of educational jurisdiction—local, regional, and national. In federations like Canada, for example, the central government may be powerless to implement its language policy through the schools, since education comes under the exclusive jurisdiction of the province—and even the province may have to yield to the pressures of local school boards.

Finally, in the implementation of language policy through the schools there may be considerable local differences in the level and length of bilingual instruction. Dual language instruction may start at any grade and extend anywhere from one term to the entire length of the learner's school career (Savard and Vigneault 1978, Mackey 1976d).

Before importing a model of bilingual education, it is important to understand the nature of the community whose desires the model is allegedly designed to satisfy. It is advisable at the outset to analyze the ultimate educational needs of the population to be served (Titone 1977). These needs may be more than linguistic; they may be permanent or transitory and even uncertain, as have been those of the thousands of guest workers in Western Europe during the past three decades. Even in Sweden, which in the past generation has had to accommodate a regular flow of some three or four thousand immigrant children every year, the problem has become one of considerable complexity (Ekstrand 1978).

Communities may differ in dozens of ways: in addition to their differences in size, location, demography, language diversity, literacy, ethnicity, interethnic contact, cultural facilities and language behavior, each is apt to favor one model of bilingual education as more appropriate than another. Within each community, bilingual education may be intended for a particular ethnic group, for two ethnic groups, or for all ethnic groups. Whether the schools be uni-ethnic as in Montreal, or bi-ethnic as in Miami, each may be either unilingual or bilingual. Each may be designed for a traditional dominant group or for an old or resurgent minority.

In schools which are both bilingual and bicultural (or bi-ethnic), the bilingualism may be either reciprocal or nonreciprocal—reciprocal in the sense that both ethnic groups are schooled in both languages; nonreciprocal in that only one ethnic group is schooled in both languages. Different situations give rise to different educational policies.

Since human environments differ so much, it is not surprising that language education policies should also differ. The language education problems of Europe are not those of Africa, and those of Asia are not those of America. In examining the similarities and differences between areas in view of importing a successful bilingual education model, it is not sufficient to compare these social, economic, and political characteristics of the two areas in relation to the nature of the languages involved. It is also necessary to see how each of these
characteristics relates to the basic variables of bilingual schooling as seen in the model under consideration—that is, the number of languages, their distribution, and their relative importance within the curriculum covered by the number of years of schooling (Mackey 1978d).

In vast areas of the globe, schooling is still done of necessity in two languages and even in three or more—the local or regional language, the national language, and an international language of wider communication. In parts of India, for example, pupils may have to be schooled in a regional Dravidian tongue, in Hindi as the national language, and in English. This may oblige the young pupil to become tri-literate in three different scripts—the regional writing, the national devanagari, and the international Roman alphabet. Yet each of these will not lead the pupil to the same goal, although they all may be maintained for specific purposes. For literary languages vary in their appropriateness for certain social functions—and it seems that this has always been the case (Mackey 1975).

When it comes to bilingual schooling, it will be found that not all languages are equally appropriate for school subjects. One language may be more suitable for cultural studies while the other may be more useful in the study of science. It is therefore important to examine how each language is distributed throughout the curriculum. As the schooling of the pupil progresses through the years and studies become more advanced or more technical, it may become evident that one can go further with one of the languages than with the other. This may result in a rapid or gradual transfer to the language in which most of the secondary or technical schooling will necessarily take place. On the other hand, if the purpose of the bilingual model is to revive a traditional language, the transfer may be in the opposite direction, that is, toward the valorisation of the ancestral tongue.

Contrariwise, the purpose of the model may be to maintain both languages on an equal footing—equal and different, in which case some subjects will be in one language and some in the other; or equal and identical, in which case there will be a time distribution pattern of both languages, covering all subjects (Mackey 1970; 1976a).

The success or failure of a bilingual education model as it adapts to the multiple social, economic, and cultural possibilities and demands of national policy, regional demography, and community resources depends in the last analysis on what happens in the classrooms. Two bilingual schools of the same type may differ widely in the type of bilingual classes they operate (Mackey and Beebe:Appendix B). This is because the basic components of a class—pupils, teachers, and material—can be used and grouped differently. The pupils may all share the same and only home language, or some may come from homes where one home language is used and others from homes using a different language. For example, bicultural schools in some
Florida communities have been populated by large numbers of pupils whose only home language is Cuban Spanish. Some schools have tended to put these pupils in separate classes for all or part of the school day. Others have grouped these Spanish-speaking pupils with students whose only home language is American English, creating bicultural (or bi-ethnic) classes taught in both English and Spanish (Mackey and Beebe 1977). The end result of such grouping may be the creation of a bilingual school population.

Grouping into classes, however, may itself constitute a strategy of bilingualization. By controlling the bi-ethnic balance and the in-class grouping of pupils speaking different home languages, the probability of bilingual interpersonal contact is increased to such an extent that much of the language learning is achieved through pupil interaction. For example, such interaction has resulted in the bilingualization in German and English of a student population of a balanced binational school in Berlin over a period of almost two decades (Mackey 1972a). Circumstances, however, may not permit such symmetrical grouping. Some classes may have to include not only pupils from two different ethnic groups whose languages may be used as media of instruction, but also pupils from homes where neither of these languages is known—children without enough knowledge of either tongue to understand a lesson. With these it may also be necessary to group children from bilingual homes who are already literate in the two languages of instruction. The same class may have to include pupils who know not enough of either language and pupils who know too much of both. The way such children of such different language backgrounds are grouped and the appropriateness of the teaching techniques and materials to the particular type of grouping may be decisive. Because of this, it would seem wise to subject the possible techniques and materials to some sort of preliminary analysis (Mackey 1965).

The materials, of course, may exist in either of the languages, or they may be in both. If the criterion of choice is only pedagogical quality, this may favor one dominant language, thus placing the other language at a serious disadvantage. For example, the attrition of continually changing interim course materials written in a new national language may make a policy counterproductive, as the experience of national primary Swahili education in Tanzania seems to have indicated (Mhina 1977). Success in the production of materials depends on the level of development of the language for the areas of knowledge to be covered by such materials (Bamgbose 1977).

In the final analysis—and this has been repeated so often as to become a cliche—much depends on the teacher. The home language of the teacher may be that of some or of all of the pupils in the class. Or it may be that of none of them. Or the teacher may come from a bilingual home, or be otherwise fluent in both languages. Some bilingual schools have so
structured their schedules as to assure all pupils some daily contact with teachers whose home language is the same as their own (Mackey and Beebe 1977).

The number and stability of these class groupings of pupils, teachers, and materials may vary considerably between two bilingual schools of the same type. They may vary anywhere from a stable grouping for the duration of the school year to hourly changes accommodating different types of groups to different subjects, to different teachers, to different levels, or to different materials (Mackey 1977; Spolsky and Cooper 1977).

One of the dangers of importing a bilingual education model is the great number of differences that one may have to take into account. Expertise in a dozen different disciplines may have to be sought (Mackey 1978a). In addition to this, all these possible differences in class structure, school types, community make-up, educational policy, and language potential seem to suggest the unlikelihood of any two situations being identical (Macnamara 1973). This may seem to indicate that an ecological approach to the problem might sometimes be preferable (Mackey 1974).

One may ask how many of these factors have been considered when evaluating models of bilingual education which had been found favorable enough to suggest that they are suitable for use elsewhere. Should the evaluation be unfavorable, this does not always mean that the model is unsuitable for another area. Quite often bilingual education in one area is evaluated using the education norms of another because those who do the evaluation are trained in unicultural methods of psychometrics and educational measurement operating within a one-sided system of values. Much is made of academic norms and comparative percentiles of subject-matter achievement—as if academic criteria were the only ones. If, for example, the score on mathematics in a bilingual school falls below the norms of either of the corresponding unilingual classes, it is argued that bilingual education is not as good as unilingual education. Credit is not given for the fact that the bilingual group is operating in two languages instead of in one. It is as if one expects all children to be equally good in both languages without any extra effort. What happens is that someone else's objective has been taken as a norm. Should the Naskapis, who have recently come to an agreement with the Canadian government to preserve their culture, turn out to know less mathematics than Anglo-Americans attending unilingual English-speaking schools, it is not for the educators to suggest that, because of this, the Naskapis should be educated exclusively in English or in French, as the case may be. Maybe these hunters and trappers do not want all that mathematics. Perhaps they are more interested in keeping their ancestral language alive than in competing with the urban masses for jobs in a modern industrial society. Of course, one must always admit that some members of the group may indeed
prefer to live in the city. This poses another big problem, that is, the ever-present potentiality of conflict between the right of the group and that of the individual.

If a group achieves enough autonomy and authority, it can force its individual members against their wills to partake in irredental practices in education simply by limiting their options. To assume that all individuals wish to return to the language and ethnicity of their forefathers is as much an affront to their cultural liberties as it is to take for granted the desire of everyone to jump into the ethnic melting pot of some superpower.

Likewise, to impose outside educational norms on any member of a language minority is to deny that person's right to be different. That right must include the option of selecting other norms. On the other hand, to force any adult member of any group to conform to the group's objectives is to deprive that person of his cultural freedom. This opposition has become one of the sorriest dilemmas of our century—the conflict between the right of an ethnic group to cultural survival as opposed to the right of the individual to cultural freedom.

These norms and these options are often never explained to the parents who must allegedly make the choice. It is the duty of those who understand the differences to make them known to parents whose children are to be sent to school. If parents are kept ignorant of the options, how can they be said to enjoy a freedom of choice?

In many parts of the globe and especially in the shadows of moribund empires, thousands of semi-acculturated peoples do not know what direction to choose. Should they let anyone who wishes be willingly assimilated to the stronger civilization, or should they oblige everyone to reintegrate into the ancestral culture? In every quarter of the globe, there are millions of people who are pondering this difficult choice between ethnic survival and cultural freedom. For them, some sort of bilingual education may be their only possible compromise.
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TYPES OF BILINGUAL COMMUNITIES

E. Glyn Lewis

0. Introduction. For practical purposes my discussion will be limited to mass or societal bilingualism as distinct from that which characterizes an individual in an otherwise homogeneous community. Second, though it is advisable to bear in mind the fact that a collection of individuals associated in any one place with a particular institution such as the United Nations or the EEC may be construed to be a community, I shall limit my discussion to historical rather than contrived groups—the bilingualism of the latter is elitist rather than societal. Third, while it is possible to consider bilingual communities on one of two levels—that is, the maximum level of the national community (which may be bilingual without necessarily all the local communities being bilingual), I shall have regard in the main for the minimum level of the local community or cluster of communities. A typology of states like that produced by Falch (1973) according to the types of language policy they pursue in respect of their minorities is useful, but since it does not set out to consider how far such policies are implemented, it has only a limited value for educationists and administrators. The minimum level or microlevel analysis stands at the point of intersection of policy and implementation.

But, it may be asked, why bother about a typology at all? Why not consider each local problem as it arises? The answer is that a typology facilitates comparison and without comparison we cannot generate sufficiently general hypotheses—we remain in the field of ad hoc programs, limited tactics with little value for prediction. Science is based on comparison because science is measurement and classification. Nevertheless, I concede that comparison may be achieved without resorting to the production of a typology. Indeed, one may achieve more sophisticated comparisons by ignoring the name given to a type of community and comparing the operation of a number of selected variables.
irrespective of how they cluster to constitute a type of community. Instead of comparing names (such as segregated or diffused bilingual communities) one may deal with such variables as size, stability, geographic location, indigenousness, length of residence, etc. Such a multivariate approach (cf. Carroll 1975 and Lewis and Massad 1975) would certainly be more incisive than one which relies on a given typology, but from the standpoint of a teacher and administrator it is both time-consuming and uneconomical. A blunt instrument is often more effective than one which is razor sharp. Furthermore, bilingual education in any community is 'structure dependent': the form of education is only one of the institutions which characterize the community. Each of those other institutions is itself a cluster of variables and each institution would have to be taken into account in analyzing the bilingual characteristic of the community.

1. Motivation of the advocacy of bilingual education. At the present level of studies of bilingual education, in attempting to identify types of bilingual communities we have to rely on more or less educated experience rather than hard evidence provided by analytical studies, and all this paper offers is a target for criticism which may enable us to emerge with more satisfactory suggestions. Fundamental to this approach is the belief that the important variables are more often than not historical, and have to do very much with the nonlinguistic sources of heterogeneity within the community. Insofar as we are by definition concerned with bilingual communities, the most salient source of such heterogeneity is obviously linguistic. But consciousness of linguistic differences may be, and very often is, a surrogate for the consciousness of other sources of difference, a symbol of them, or a means of reinforcing consciousness of nonlinguistic differences. I believe that advocacy of bilingual education--valuable and indeed necessary though such an education may be in and for itself--has been used, legitimately, as a means of drawing attention to what in my view are possibly more vital needs. Before bene esse comes esse; before a community can live well, it has first simply to survive. Bilingual education has been advocated ostensibly for entirely pedagogic reasons, while the fundamental rationale for the proposal is to bring about greater political, economic, and social equality. Language is a convenient focal issue because it is a more categorical marker of difference than material deprivation. In any community poor and ill-fed people are to be found in all language groups, majority and minority alike, though the incidence may be greater among the former. Language is a recognizable and unequivocal marker and can therefore fully reflect and reinforce consciousness of the other disparities. This approach to bilingual education is perfectly justifiable because all forms of education are concerned with the redistribution of power or the maintenance of its current distribution. Consequently, to ensure
the possibility of any fruitful outcome a consideration of types of bilingual communities, though it presupposes the existence of linguistic differences, should give at least equal weight to the resolution of associated sources of heterogeneity. Greatly though we may value a particular language, as humanists we do not, in the last resort, aim to teach the language so much as to enable the speakers of that language to develop their full potential as persons.

2. Sources of heterogeneity in bilingual communities: Relevant variables. That being the case, we need to discuss the sources of heterogeneity which may be associated with differences of language in any significant way (Linz and Miguel 1975). First, there are differences in economic development between groups in contact. Declining differences in economic and social levels between the speakers of Welsh and the English has coincided with the decline in linguistic heterogeneity which has been brought about partly and negatively by assimilation, but also affirmatively by the expansion of bilingual education among speakers of English. Another source of heterogeneity is the extent to which a language is regarded as central to the maintenance of its way of life or culture, or as is the case with very many groups simply as one of the traits associated with that culture. Another source of heterogeneity, the degree of political participation, characterizes local communities in Southern Africa, the United States, and the USSR, for instance, though to a lesser extent if at all in the Netherlands (except with immigrant groups), in Switzerland, or Britain. These are only a very few of the sources of heterogeneity which are associated with the historical development of many bilingual communities. They constitute a set of variables which are important primarily because they affect attitudes.

There are other historical or diachronic variables which could be exemplified, but I turn now to variables which simply reflect the current situation of the community. They are synchronic variables. The first of these we may term 'diffusion' variables since they have to do with the openness or the occlusive, closed character of the community. Some communities welcome contact, and members of some ethnic groups in contact are known to have changed their ethnic affiliation or character not once but twice or thrice on account of the fluidity of the group. Other communities, because of authoritarian attitudes, dogmatism, a feeling of self-sufficiency, pride, or indifference, are opposed to contact and are virtually closed communities. Local groups of immigrant communities in Britain are seldom motivated to advocate bilingual programs on the model of those already existing in the traditional minority areas of the country. The replication in the United States of types of programs for Canadian bilingual communities is evidence of the value of an open society. The same was true at one time of the Republic of South Africa,
which was keenly interested in developing educational programs for varying European types of bilingual communities.

Diffusion variables also have to do with the impact of foreign policy on the local communities. In the USSR bilingual education, which is an aspect of 'nationalities policy', has changed direction on more than one occasion, according to the state of the country's foreign relations. When the state is threatened, the rights of minorities are apt to be ignored. Bilingual education affecting German and Asian communities in the United States has been affected by two World Wars. Nor was it only the languages actually spoken by enemy nations that suffered, but the validity of the concept of bilingual education was put at risk. In England the idea of bilingual education for the majority English-speaking children was canvassed as a possibility only with the imminence of British entry into the European Economic Community.

A second set of variables differentiating bilingual communities we may term 'settings', since they concern the present context of contact. The most obvious variable in this class is the indigenousness or nonindigenousness of one or other or both groups. The United States has two such indigenous communities: on the one hand, those which are primordial or autochthonous, the Amerindians; and on the other hand, those which are incorporated by the purchase of their land or by more violent means—Mexican Americans. Of the nonindigenous or immigrant groups, there are also two types: those like the Cubans who are tied by language to indigenous groups, and the 'free-floating' groups like the Scandinavians, Italians, or Germans, who have no such ties with the indigenous. The differences between such groups are not unimportant because the indigenous of either type are historically and closely tied to large and identifiable territories in the United States, the existence of which serves to reinforce attachment to native languages. Territorial bases have always been important for minorities in Europe, including those of the USSR, Yugoslavia, Switzerland, and Belgium. It is the basis of pressure by Quebec.

Another 'setting' type of variable concerns the institutional structure of the community. If we take education as one such institution, we find that two groups in contact may have entirely different views concerning the structural dependence of bilingualism on other institutions. For instance, when two languages are being used in the community, one possibility is that one of them may be ignored institutionally. If both languages are included in the system of education of a particular community, the bilingual system may be entirely independent of the mainstream structure, as tends to be the case with Amerindian Contract Schools. Or the local system may be totally integrated with the mainstream (or unmarked system), as is the case in Wales or Ireland, where few schools are not completely bilingual. Or the local system may be parallel to or exist as an alternative
to the mainstream system, as is the case in the USSR, where
nationality schools may coexist with Russian medium schools in
any part of the country. Or the local system may be pe-
peripheral, a loose adjunct, as is the case in the United States
with very many programs for the Italians, or Greeks, or
French. Or, finally, the form of bilingual education may be
eccentric to, or outside the orbit of, the mainstream system,
as is the case with elitist schools like the United Nations Inter-
national School in New York.

But irrespective of the kind of relationship which exists be-
tween the local community provision and the mainstream system,
the former will invariably be affected by important characteris-
tics of the mainstream. Some of the most important of these
characteristics have to do with the degree to which the main-
stream has catered and continues to cater for the material as-
pirations of the minority without taking language differences
into account. Attitudes to bilingual education were affected in
Wales for a long time by the fact that the nonmarked system,
without acknowledging, to any significant degree, the existence
of the Welsh language, was successful in catering for the up-
ward mobility of speakers of Welsh. This is equally true of the
United States (so far as concerns the earlier immigration groups
especially) and is the case at present in the USSR, where
political as well as economic aspirations are promoted by the
existence of Russian medium schools.

Another way in which the unmarked system may influence the
kind of provision made within the local bilingual community is
the extent to which the mainstream system is characterized by
'status rigidity'. High and low status groups within the same
community may be involved differentially with bilingual educa-
tion. Status may work in opposite directions for different
groups. In the United States low or negative status deter-
mines selection for bilingual education. This is equally true of
the French majority groups but not of the English minority
groups in Quebec. So far as concerns European–Bantu educa-
tion in South Africa, low status is a condition of bilingual edu-
cation; but so far as English–Afrikaans bilingual education is
concerned, status is irrelevant or tends to favor Afrikaans.
Status is relevant to the USSR in the sense that the dominant
group, the Russians, do not favor bilingual education for them-
selves and, in fact, interpret bilingual education exclusively in
terms of learning Russian as a second language. In British
schools status may not be associated or be associated only very
loosely with type of education, selection for it, and retention
within it of the immigrant ethnic group involved in any commu-

On the other hand, in Wales, which is also associated with
the total system of British education, status tends to be corre-
lated with bilingual education of native speakers of English. It
is irrelevant to speakers of Welsh.
3. Types of bilingual communities

3.1 Relatively stable communities. Though I can only touch on some of the relevant variables which tend to distinguish types of bilingual communities, I ought now to embark upon the task of formulating a tentative typology of such communities. The first distinction is between those which consist of relatively stable components, and those with relatively mobile ones. Stability or mobility may be cultural-linguistic or demographic. For instance, a community may be split three ways: two groups which remain fairly distinct from each other, and another which for several reasons is marginal to either or to both. The marginal group may have been produced by assimilation of the minority or, on the other hand, it may have been produced by a system of bilingual education which, though it is oriented to the maintenance of both groups, cannot avoid creating a third culture. I doubt whether most of those who, like myself, have been bred bilingually, realize the extent to which we are the inheritors of a marginal culture and belong to a marginal community for that reason. The tendency has been to attach negative value judgments to the concept of marginality as if it affected only individuals who during their lifetime lose their exclusive contact with this or that language, culture, and community, and are stigmatized as deviant. There exist marginal cultures which have contributed greatly to the enrichment of civilization and their historical development entitles them to be regarded as the equals of so-called exclusive or pure cultures in any community. One of the tasks of bilingual education is to enable young people to take a pride in such cultures and to regard them as natural cultural environments. There is no necessary relationship between maintaining a language and the maintenance of the culture with which it may be associated historically. There are bilingual communities which are relatively homogeneous culturally.

By stable communities what is also meant in this discussion is geographic and demographic stability. Such communities tend to be fairly small, though the example of Switzerland, where the different but large communities have remained fairly stable over many decades, suggests that size alone is not all important. The communities I have in mind are stable because they are isolated for one of four reasons. They may be geographically isolated like those of the North Caucasus, the Irish of the Gaeltacht, the Scots of the Highlands and Islands, and the most thoroughly Welsh-speaking groups of the North and West of the Principality. Some of these geographically isolated communities may exist on the frontiers of a majority language, as is the case with the Celts of Britain, Ireland, and France. Other isolated groups may be 'enclaves' within much larger groups by whose influence they are surrounded. Some enclaves are vestigial remains of much larger linguistic groups: for example, speakers of Turkish introduced into the Crimea...
by the Ottomans; Albanians, Croats, and Greeks in the southern areas of Italy; the Sorbs of Lusatia (Lausitz) within East Germany; and speakers of Rumanian dialects who are bilingual in Serbian, Bulgarian, or Greek in Balkan countries. Other enclavic communities have been created by restrictive language policies, as is the case with the Basques of Southern France and Northern Spain. Other enclaves are the consequence of shifting political boundaries, as is the case of the Danes and the Germans, respectively, south and north of the Schlesvic line, or the Hungarian minorities in Yugoslavia. So far as the United States is concerned, Amerindian communities on reservations constitute important examples of linguistic enclaves.

Some bilingual communities, though they may be geographically isolated on frontiers or within enclaves, are isolated to a large extent because of their own tradition of restricted culture contact. Following Edward Dozier's example, we may term them 'bounded' communities. Dozier refers to the Pueblos, but historically much younger groups like the Amish come within this category. The characteristic of boundedness becomes apparent when we consider other Amerindian communities. Wick Miller speaks of these nonbounded communities, even though they might belong to the same linguistic community, as nonpermanent, 'the largest permanent social unit being the family, larger groupings being temporary and ephemeral'. There was considerable shifting from one group to other groups in contact (Sherzer 1973), especially on account of intermarriage. Barth (1969) and Leach (1954) refer to similar groups in Southern Asia.

Isolation of the kind I have described is not a characteristic of rural communities only. Segregated urban communities, isolated for social and cultural reasons, may also be regarded as bounded. The barrios and ghettos tend to be closed, relatively stable communities, the involuntary product of generations of social, psychological, linguistic, and cultural introversion.

One characteristic which distinguishes the bilingualism of communities which are isolated for whatever reason--geographic enclavism restrictiveness, boundedness, or urban segregation--is its peripheral or local character. Bilingualism exists either in very small pockets or on the boundaries of contact. Such peripheral bilingualism, characteristic of European communities, differentiates itself from the diffused bilingualism of mobile groups of the United States. In Europe, language differences have been associated with distinguishable territories and later with nation states occupying such territories. Because of the identification of territorial or national entities with linguistic integrity, heterogeneity tended to be limited to the frontiers and was for that reason local and peripheral. In Belgium, the problem is to stabilize the boundaries of the two main groups. In Wales, too, it has been a question of attempting to maintain such boundaries. In Yugoslavia, bilingual education is not a
substantial characteristic within any of the major language territories but is fairly well restricted to the frontiers between them and, within some of them, to the immigrant groups or incorporated minorities. In the USSR, peripheral or exclusively minority bilingualism—i.e. bilingualism which involves non-Russians—is far more prevalent than it is in the United States, partly because of the almost total diffusion of the lingua franca (English) in the one compared with the limited diffusion of Russian in the other. Bilingualism involving two minority languages tends to be eroded by the spread of the dominant lingua franca. The other reason for difference between the bilingual communities of the two countries is that while language differences (apart from the indigenous Amerindian and Mexican American) tend not to be associated with territories in any stable fashion in the United States, there is an essential association between language and territory in the USSR, which is within the historical European pattern.

3.2 Mobile populations

3.2.1 Introduction. It must be conceded that the bilingualism of the physically isolated, enclavic, bounded, or segregated communities is quantitatively and possibly qualitatively much less significant than that which has resulted from movement within and across linguistic, ethnic, and national boundaries. Such mobility has taken several forms, although very few studies have been made of the differential effects of those several types of movement on types of language communities (see Kasdan 1970:1).

As an aspect of social and linguistic anthropology the study of kinds of population movement and their differential effect has to be undertaken within a wide context. Migration is a demographic problem; it influences sizes of populations. It is an economic problem because a shift in density of population is often due to or results in imbalances in standards of living. It takes in considerations of social psychology since issues of motivation and attitudes are involved. It is also a sociological problem because migration may influence social structures and cultural systems (Jansen 1969:60; cf. also Volkova 1967:19). Then again, historical factors are involved, for example, in the differential ethnic growth rates which exist in the United States, Canada (Quebec especially), and the USSR, and which help to maintain some bilingual communities like the French in Quebec, or Central Asians in the USSR against the pressure of dominant languages. It is significant and somewhat surprising that hardly any migration studies are concerned with education as a dependent or independent variable.

Among the aspects of population movement which are intimately involved in considerations of language contact and bilingual communities are the functions which mobility fulfills. Zastavskaya (1970) distinguishes three main functions. First
there is an accelerating function, exemplified in Wales and the Soviet Union, where in both cases movement of populations increased the rate at which linguistic contact had been proceeding for centuries. The second function is to redistribute populations, and one of the major differences between the Soviet Union and the United States is that while this redistributive function predominates over all others in the USSR, in the United States, relatively speaking, it is the 'receptive' or accumulative function which is most characteristic in establishing bilingual communities. The final function is selective: there are differences in the age and sex compositions of migrant groups and these differences, important for language, characterize bilingual communities everywhere.

Another aspect of the wider context of the study of migration and its effects on language is the motivation of mobility. Usually, migration has been regarded as exemplifying the results of the push of unfavorable economic conditions at home and the pull of more favorable circumstances elsewhere, which was the view of A. C. Haddon (1912) and Numelin (1937). Duncan (1958:90) saw 'migration as the main mechanism of adjustment to the re-distribution of economic opportunity caused by national resource development and technological change which impinge unequally on industries and areas'. Students of the Soviet Union tend towards the same conclusion (Panning 1972:64).

However, migration and the processes of demographic and linguistic assimilation which may result from it are not simple phenomena. If communities which are initially bilingual become eroded, it may be the product of less material aspirations and motivations. Economic motivations, while they may be sufficient explanations of some migrations, cannot account entirely for the early settlement of the English in the United States, nor of Dutch, German, Swedish, Norwegian, and French attempts at colonization and later immigration. Personal and group freedom, and civic as well as religious freedom counted for as much or more with many of the migrants and helped to make an indelible mark on their communities. The behavior of migrants in their new communities towards their native languages and to the languages of those they met in conflict or otherwise, cannot but have been influenced by the attitudes which impelled them to migrate in the first place.

Furthermore, according to his motivation the migrant does not simply react to his new surroundings—geographical, cultural, or linguistic. A large number possess a 'cognitive model ... as to the nature and goals of migration' (Philpott 1968:474). These goals affect valuations of the areas they leave just as much as of their new social environment. 'The composite memory of things past is a significant variable in any analysis of immigrant experience, yet it has often been ignored or given scant significance' (Jackson 1969:2). For instance, the immigrant may continue to express a lively and practical concern for the
politics of his homeland. This is undoubtedly the case of the Cubans. Lebanese migrants to the United States have been known to have had a similar active interest in their native conflicts (Sweet 1967:180). Whatever their commitments to their areas of origin (and they are far from being exclusively political or even broadly social), there is no doubt that concentrations of immigrants in the United States—Asians in California, Italians in New York, Puerto Ricans in New Jersey—constitute networks of relationships with the homeland, with families and friends whom they assist to migrate and settle, and whom they attract to specific localities, thus reinforcing the original culture and language in strategic 'closed' communities.

Although the degree of their importance varies, such considerations affect most linguistically heterogeneous communities. But there are some considerations which help us to differentiate fundamentally between them. For instance, it is customary to refer to Russian mobility as being almost exclusively territorial, and that of Britain as only partly territorial (affecting the Celts) but oceanic or maritime in respect of emigration to America and other countries, and in respect of current immigration from former colonies. There are other considerations of a political nature with considerable relevance to the study of the linguistic aspects of mobility. The Soviet Union is a confederation of territorially and linguistically distinct and colonized nations and nationalities, while (apart from the indigenous peoples) the United States is not. Unlike the United States and Britain, in the Soviet Union international migration is entirely synonymous with internal mobility. Furthermore, in the Soviet Union there is a closed ethnic and linguistic society: migration results only in their redistribution, whether within or across the frontiers of Soviet nationalities. The United States, Canada, most countries of Europe, and Britain are linguistically open societies; the nature of the frontier in each case is such as to ensure that to a large degree mobility allows for the receptivity of new groups.

Such differences focus on the relative importance of different kinds of frontiers, of which one can distinguish first those that are to all intents and purposes objective. These include those created or sanctioned by history—politically and therefore in most areas ethnically determined, or frontiers which are physically objective, created by seas, rivers, and mountains. Other kinds of frontiers are social and psychological, imposed or acquiesced in for ideological or emotional reasons. Language differences in the USSR tend to be related to objective boundaries (save in the case of the Jews); languages are identified with territories and these territories have geographically or historically determined objective frontiers. This is also the case in Britain so far as the Celts are concerned, but not where new minorities are involved for whom linguistic frontiers ignore territorial boundaries and are more often than not coincidental with social—psychological or attitudinal divisions. This tends to
be the case in the United States also except for the Southwest, and even there, strictly speaking, only in respect of the Amerindian population. In Canada, the provincial status of the French-speaking population approximates to the status of territorially defined nationalities in the USSR. Differences between objective and subjective frontiers are associated with ease or difficulty of linguistic-group mobility. In the United States, what linguistic frontiers there are tend to be impermanent and shifting, corresponding little if at all to administrative boundaries. In the USSR, they have tended to be permanent, determine, and to coincide with national boundaries. Within-group mobility in the USSR is greater than cross-national mobility and so tends to localize bilingual communities.

3.2.2 Type of movement. In studying the factors which affect bilingualism, the first requirement is to identify, distinguish, and define the various types of movement; it is proposed here to consider first within-national mobility in its several forms and to follow this by considering forms of international migration. Because some countries like the Soviet Union, Yugoslavia, and Switzerland are federations of nations and for that reason migration may be simultaneously intranational and international, the distinction is not categorical.

The most primitive form of migration is 'nomadism', which has been misconceived as unplanned or irregular wandering; however, its most salient characteristic is cyclical movement of groups within a limited geographical compass. Soviet nomads, such as Kazakhs and Tatars of the Steppe, followed regular patterns from a winter camp through a spring route to a summer pasture and so back over an autumn passage to the winter camp again. In the United States, the Apache were such a nomadic group. They were without systems of agriculture or permanent habitation but lived in temporary symbiotic relations with the Pueblos (Dozier 1976:3). Although, in a limited fashion, it still persists among some small Indian and Eskimo groups, nomadism is no longer a significant cause of heterogeneity in North America.

Examples of such nomadic peoples still remain in the Soviet Union, and until fairly recently were an important aspect of life in Central Asia and the Far North. So far as the nomads of the Soviet Far North are concerned, this type of movement, while it prevailed as their characteristic mode of life, facilitated the maintenance of their language against the pressure of Russian. A large proportion of them are reindeer herders and remain nomads, visiting settlements only at long intervals. Their grasp of Russian tends, even on an official reckoning, to be relatively low. Only 29 percent of the Yukagirs and 32.5 percent of the Itelmen, for instance, claim to have learned some Russian. In fact, the level of competence of that proportion is low: children of these nomads, when they are placed in boarding schools, need to have intensive preliminary
instruction in 'zero grades' before being allowed into the regular classes. Not only has nomadism been a factor in avoiding the pressures exerted by the presence of any one major language, like Russian; it has also been a powerful force, as was the case with Semitic languages in the Middle East, in promoting the diffusion of a tribal language among those with whom they came into contact (Whatmough 1933:21). Seafaring (a variant of nomadism) has been responsible for the diffusion of Austronesian languages.

Seasonal migration differs from nomadism insofar as the former usually involves the movement of only a very few members of the total group, who tend to be motivated by individual, sometimes idiosyncratic goals rather than by group traditions. Because it involves a small number, such seasonal migration has been thought to lack much significance for language change and bilingualism. Yet the migration of seasonal workers from agricultural Welsh-speaking areas had a profound effect on the maintenance of the Welsh language in new industrial centers during the first phase of industrial development. The Welsh language of the receiving industrial area was reinforced because the temporary workers were themselves Welsh. It was the sending areas from and to which the Welsh-speaking migrants departed and returned cyclically which experienced the eroding influence of migration. They might stabilize the proportion of Welsh to English in the industrial areas but their regularly repeated cycles of migration and return changed the situation of the Welsh language in their original homes. Whether we are concerned with seasonal migration or with nomadism, the effects of such types of migration on language contact, compared with the influence within settled communities, cannot be ignored. So far as the United States is concerned, Voegelin and Voegelin (1973:1107) refer to this in considering the languages of the Great Basin:

The vagueness or indeterminateness in establishing language barriers in the Great Basin may be accounted for in part by seasonal migrations and, more generally, a fondness for moving about in 'wider areas' whether economically motivated or to relieve the isolation of living (otherwise) in contact with none other than members of a few families ... One suspects less vagueness in determining where the language barriers lie in Pueblo societies.

Commuting is a variant of nomadism and seasonal migration, where the cycle of migration is more rapid--daily or weekly rather than seasonal. Partly because of its frequency and regularity, as well as because the commuter tends to be involved with large numbers of speakers of other languages in urban areas, commuting has had and is having significant influences on language maintenance and in promoting bilingualism. In due course the commuter becomes a 'culture broker', an
intermediary between groups, usually at different levels of sociocultural development. Tabouret-Keller (1972) points to situations of the linguistic hinterland of Toulouse. Cooper's studies of the interaction of different linguistic groups in Ethiopian market places point to the same results on the languages of the 'market migrants' (Cooper and Carpenter 1969). The commuting practices of American Indians on the reservations usually involve not only adults who travel to work but also children who travel to school. The effect of such commuting is all the greater because it involves not only differences between languages, e.g. Navajo and English, but the very basis of the language's survival, the way of life of the tribe. The effect of commuting must be considered in its relationship to the individual commuter as well as to the community to which he belongs. Studies of language contact generally have regard for the groups in contact: here is a case where the contact is primarily established by individuals acting outside the group but affecting it nevertheless.

3.3 Permanent migration

3.3.1 Voluntary migration. A more significant population movement is relatively permanent migration—a moving away of a collectivity from one location to another, where it is ultimately dispersed or if it is not, becomes enclavic.

At present, such movements in the USSR may be restricted within the boundaries of an ethnic group, or may proceed across such boundaries without, however, crossing national or administrative frontiers; or they may involve moving into a different national republic. But it is necessary to emphasize that crucial though such migrations are to the promotion of bilingual communities in the Soviet Union, at present the main type of population movement has been local and the main source of urban growth has been the surrounding linguistically homogeneous rural population. Two-thirds of new urban populations come from such rural areas (Perevedentsev 1965:34).

The frequent migrations of Amerindian tribes is well attested historically, and so is the movement of other ethnic groups within the United States—for instance, speakers of Spanish within and from the Southwest.

However, not all such migrations in the United States involve changing the habitat of the rural indigenous Amerindian or Spanish populations. Interstate movements have been a continuing characteristic and such movements involve both native and foreign born, so that the flux which international immigration represents is intensified by subsequent movement. In fact, for more than a century the ratio of stable to migrant population in the United States has not changed significantly, nor has the proportion of the population who have migrated across state boundaries—although after an early reduction at the turn of the first half of the last century, the tendency is
for interstate migration to accelerate slightly each decade, thus reinforcing the diffused (as opposed to the peripheral) character of American bilingual communities.

Such high ratios of migrant to stable population, and the relatively high ratios of foreign-born migrants in the total migrant ratio over such a long period, makes for considerable ethnic and linguistic convergence and is contrary to the experience of the Soviet Union until very recently.

Another feature of migration making for such convergence is second-stage (or urban to suburban) migration of the foreign-born and/or their children in the United States. Such a movement also implies the abandonment of relatively closed urban communities, where the ethnic language is heavily reinforced, for more open or at least more dispersed suburban locations, where that reinforcement is less evident.

3.3.2 Involuntary migration. Deportation, evacuation, forcible resettlement, and slavery are all forms of involuntary migration and their impact on language has been recorded often enough. In some cases communities—sometimes whole nations—may be involved; in others, only individuals. Even when communities or whole ethnic groups are involved they may be resettled as groups or dispersed in very small numbers. The nature of the language contact and the type of bilingual community that ensues depend on the size and cohesiveness of the group relative to the area of settlement and the status of the cultures associated with the languages.

The part played by slaves in the historical progress of bilingualism, while it should not be overestimated, cannot very well be ignored. In some areas their numbers were very large. Philip of Macedon colonized Thrace with Greek and Macedonian slaves—the large settlements bearing such titles as 'the city of slaves' or 'the city of adulterers' (Jones 1937:4). Such colonies tended to be linguistically and ethnically heterogeneous. Intermarriage, involving slaves, facilitated a complete intermixture of races in bilingual communities. They were assimilated, but not before periods of bilingualism. Their influence varied according to their occupations. The proportion of them in domestic service must have been considerable at all times: they were employed in secretarial and managerial posts as bank managers, interpreters, tutors, and teachers (Jones 1956:185). Their impact on bilingual education was significant (Lewis 1976).

So far as concerns the United States, Africans migrated involuntarily to North America to be used as chattel slaves on plantations, in mines, forests, small towns, and cities, on roads and small farms. The Afro-American element of the population of the United States is large and influential. As a dynamic minority, developing its own ideology which reflects its own culture nurtured in Afro-American 'bounded' communities, it has had a great influence on the thinking of linguistic minorities without, I believe, being itself a 'linguistic minority' and
so capable of posing a strictly 'bilingual' as distinct from a 'minority' problem. But their exclusion from the category of linguistic minorities is due not to the 'difficulty posed by forced migration to the preservation of any or all cultural and social continuities' (Mintz 1961:1970). Forced migration of cohesive Indian bands and tribes did not prevent them from maintaining their languages. Nor has the forcible removal of some Soviet nationalities killed off their languages (Lewis 1972). The enslavement of Greeks in Rome produced a rich bilingual society (Lewis 1976). However, the particular circumstances of African slavery did make it virtually impossible for their languages to be maintained and the kind of linguistic heterogeneity characterizing their communities may be regarded as bidialectal rather than bilingual.
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BILINGUALISM IN RETROSPECT-- A PERSONAL VIEW

Einar Haugen
Harvard University

While considering the topic which Dean Alatis assigned me for this Georgetown University Round Table, I began thinking of various alternative titles, such as 'My Way to Bilingualism', or 'The Ghost of Bilingualism, Past, Present, and Future'. But I decided that facetiousness had no place on so solemn an occasion and let the title stand. Instead, my remarks will play with the title of the Round Table itself, the word dimensions. The very fact that a conference can be held on the 'International Dimensions of Bilingual Education' is a measure of how far we have come in bilingual studies since I began working in the field. Another measure is the fact that the word bilingual has penetrated into the popular consciousness, even down to the level of the cartoonists. I noted recently that one of my favorites, Dennis the Menace, was explaining to one of his little girl friends the meaning of what he mispronounced as bi-lingal: 'You see, it means that you say the same thing twice, only one time you understand it, but the other time you don't'. That is as succinct a definition of bilingualism as I know.

The occasion is particularly gratifying to me, since it represents a kind of milestone. It is exactly 40 years since I published my first article in Language, which dealt with a problem of bilingual phonology. In that same year of 1938 I also published a programmatic article on 'Language and Immigration'. In the fall semester I lectured on the subject at the University of Oslo and presented the Academy of Sciences there with a plan for the study of American Norwegian. Most of you were not yet born in 1938, and even the oldsters among you were scarcely at work on bilingualism. So I hope you will forgive me for this excursion into a dim past, antedating our global commitment in World War II and our postwar Sputnik splurge,
not to speak of our most recent revival of ethnic roots. I am happy to have survived long enough to join in this revival meeting, and I shall cry 'hallelujah' with the best of them.

It is one of the privileges of aging, which I define as having become a diachronic rather than a synchronic fact, that one can be garrulous without being thought excessively vain. I shall even begin by confessing that my initial research did not envisage the concept of bilingualism at all. When I subtitled my 1953 book about the Norwegian language in America, 'A Study in Bilingual Behavior', it was strictly speaking an afterthought. I owe that particular expansion of the dimensions of my horizon to Hans Kurath. He was then director of The Dialect Atlas of New England, as well as professor at the University of Michigan and director of the Linguistic Institute.

Himself an immigrant and a bilingual, Kurath was eager to see more and better work done on the non-English languages of the United States. While still at Brown University, he had stimulated doctoral dissertations on Pennsylvania German, and at Michigan he was in a position to do a great deal for the study of immigrant languages in the Midwest. He encouraged me to develop a format for my field work that would be similar to that of the American Dialect Atlas, and he gave me good advice on problems of transcription. More important still, he organized a Conference on Non-English Speech in the United States, which was held at the Linguistic Institute in Ann Arbor in the summer of 1940. It was an exciting occasion, where I met for the first time such elder statesmen as Edgar Sturtevant, Leonard Bloomfield, and George Bolling, as well as young whippersnappers like George Trager and Charles Hockett. Kurath pursued the topic and crowned his contribution by inviting me to give a course on bilingualism at the Linguistic Institute for 1949. As far as I know, it was the first time that the Institute sponsored a course on bilingualism, or for that matter, on any topic involving the social dimensions of language. It is gratifying to be able to record here my personal indebtedness to Hans Kurath, above all for opening my eyes to the wider aspects of the research I had already initiated.

As I take it, this is one of the dimensions of our conference: the widening of perspective, perhaps even the adoption of what is now fashionably called 'paradigms'. One starts with the material immediately at hand. As one digs into it and offers the world one's insights and conclusions, one meets others who have worked on similar topics, and so one learns and teaches in an endless succession of ever-widening perspectives and dimensions. In speaking of my own broadening dimensions, I am therefore only reminding you of experiences you have either shared already or can share as you go on living, learning, and communicating.

My own initial dimensions were modest enough: they comprised my childhood and adolescent experience of growing up...
bilingually in an all-American neighborhood. Millions of American children have had the same experience and thought nothing of it, certainly not becoming interested enough in it to take it up for serious study. My very first stimulus to do so came from an unexpected source, namely H. L. Mencken's The American Language, which I read in its third edition, originally published in 1923. I was led to it by having met Mencken's name as editor of The American Mercury, that free-swinging magazine which was the bible of all us young radicals of the 1920s. But the reward came from reading his appendix, in which he entertainingly summarized the scholarly as well as unscholarly literature on what he called the 'non-English dialects in America'.

Here I learned that university scholars, including the linguist George T. Flom, who would eventually direct my dissertation at the University of Illinois, had found the curiously mixed speech and writing of American immigrants a topic worthy of detailed linguistic analysis. Flom was a pioneer in the study of American Norwegian, born and raised in a Norwegian settlement in southern Wisconsin. When I began teaching at Madison, a few dozen miles away from his birthplace, it was only natural to follow his example and dip my linguistic ladle into the rich materials of living Norwegian speech in communities within easy driving of the campus.

The course on bilingualism in 1949 at Ann Arbor did not attract many students, but they included such later well-known scholars as Herbert Paper and the late Ruth Weir. I was still working on my book The Norwegian Language in America, but that summer enabled me to add the perspective of bilingual problems, not only in the United States, but around the world. Above all, I set the students to work collecting bibliographic references. During the summer I got a letter from a then unknown graduate student named Uriel Weinreich, asking me for a copy of my bibliography for the course. He was then in Switzerland, working on his dissertation on German-Romansh bilingualism. This was the beginning of a personal friendship and a fruitful exchange of ideas, which lasted to the end of his all-too-short life.

In 1949 appeared also the fourth volume of Werner Leopold's classic study of his daughter Hildegarde's German-English bilingualism. In reviewing it I discovered a new dimension of bilingualism: the problem of language acquisition. A further dimension was added as I learned of the work of William Mackey at Laval, who began publishing on bilingualism and education in 1952. He brought to the field the special problems of Quebec; with him we leaped across the border to an area where a population was not yielding to the dominant English despite its subordinate political status. It was a natural step when, some years later, Mackey was to establish the first center for bilingual study, and that this should be located in the heart of French Canada.
My book finally appeared in 1953, the same year as Weinreich's brilliant, theoretical treatise entitled Languages in Contact. His study was based on wide-ranging familiarity with the literature in the field, including my own writings, but his approach was not only original in itself. I think we can safely call it a new paradigm in bilingual studies. His training under Martinet and Jakobson, his own immigrant experience of Yiddish, and his investigation on the scene of an obscure but significant European situation gave him a perspective which widened the dimensions of our field for all time. By applying Prague School linguistic theory, he could launch such concepts as 'languages in contact', 'interference', and the like. But he also drew into his account the psychological and social dimensions of language contact, coining such terms as 'language loyalty', and making the often misunderstood distinction between 'coordinate' and 'compound' bilinguals.

At one time he dreamed of a research project which would involve a comparative bilingual study of all American immigrant groups, but his interests later turned to other things. He did call a small conference at Columbia, where I met him personally for the first time. That was also my first meeting with Wallace Lambert, who had started his career in the field in 1953 by writing a dissertation at North Carolina on the 'Developmental Aspects of Second-Language Acquisition'. Even then he impressed the rest of us by his command of French when ordering meals at New York's French restaurants. But he was to put it to even better use as professor of psychology at McGill University, from where he has poured out a steady stream of studies in the psychology of bilingualism. In recent years he has even acquired a kind of minor sainthood by working on the St. Lambert Project in Bilingual Education with its concept of 'total immersion'.

After 1953, the time had clearly come to put out a survey of the bilingual problems, not just of immigrants, but of all American ethnic groups. As chairman of a committee on 'non-English languages' of the American Dialect Society, I decided to prepare a handbook surveying these problems and providing as complete a bibliography as possible. This is the reason it appeared as a publication of the American Dialect Society, even though it bore the title of Bilingualism in the Americas and was very far from a survey of dialects. Appearing in 1956, it became an eclectic research guide, intended to encourage all aspects of bilingual study, including psychology and sociology, politics and education. Trying, as I did, to cover both North and South America, I had to wade through many dreary studies purporting to show that bilinguals were psychologically handicapped and probably mentally retarded. The evidence was that they were unable to respond as effectively as native Anglo-American speakers on American-made English-language intelligence tests. In addition to the submerged immigrant languages, I included also the even more submerged native American and
Eskimo languages, the creoles and the pidgins, as well as the dominant colonial languages of the European conquistadores. I have been glad to learn that many have made use of my survey, and in volume 10 of *Current Trends of Linguistics* I provided a follow-up for the years 1956 to 1970.

By the late fifties we were, in fact, moving into a new dimension, in which Charles Ferguson became the seminal figure; I remind you that in 1959 he published his well-known article on 'diglossia', and in the same year he gave our studies a new home by founding the Center for Applied Linguistics in Washington. Those of us who had worked on bilingualism had become rather marginal to the concerns of the theoretical linguists, who sloughed us off as concerned not with 'competence', but merely with 'performance'. One answer to this was the thrust that led to the establishment of a field of sociolinguistics. This led on to the 1964 conference at UCLA under William Bright's leadership, and the 1964 seminar on sociolinguistics at the Linguistic Institute in Bloomington under Ferguson's direction. This, in turn, led to the formation of a Committee on Sociolinguistics of the Social Science Research Council.

These developments coincided with the appearance in the field of today's elder statesmen, recruited not only from linguistics, but also from anthropology, social psychology, and sociology. I merely remind you that in 1962 appeared John Gumperz's 'Types of Linguistic Communities', Dell Hymes's massive reader *Language in Culture and Society* in 1964, and Joshua Fishman's *Language Loyalty in the United States* in 1966. There were many others, but I mention these as landmarks in the study of language in its social dimension. By definition bilingualism became an important part of sociolinguistics, especially as defined by William Bright (1966:11) in his introduction to the papers from the UCLA conference: 'Linguistic diversity is precisely the subject matter of sociolinguistics'. Bilingualism (or its larger aspect, multilingualism) is surely the maximum case of diversity, from which we gradually shade down into the diversity of the idiolects.

It has not been my purpose in this talk to write a history of bilingual studies. The smörgåsbord of papers and discussions you will hear at this meeting should bring you all you wish to know and more about the most recent research in this field. We are standing in the midst of the very newest dimension of bilingualism, and one on which it is therefore difficult to gain a perspective. I refer, of course, to the programs in bilingual education which have grown out of the concern of our government and the governments of other countries where a similar situation prevails. Many have embarked on these programs with enthusiasm; a certain degree of opposition and disillusionment has inevitably ensued.

Even in that peaceful corner of Europe which I cultivate as my linguistic garden, the Nordic countries, there is active concern about the educational problems of linguistic minorities. In
Norway a group of Turkish workers recently demonstrated in the town of Drammen, because the schools were not furnishing their children with Turkish-language instruction! The harassed school authorities promised that they would try to remedy this scandalous situation as soon as they could find a teacher of Turkish! During the past year I have taken part in conferences on bilingualism in Lund, Sweden and in Helsinki, Finland. I have lectured on the subject for a term at Uppsala University and have given single lectures at several other Scandinavian universities. Nordic scholars are bandying about such names as Fishman, Ferguson, Gumperz, Hymes, and Labov with an abandon that is both novel and encouraging.

So what for me began as the recording of a dying immigrant language has now come full circle. Now when that same language, Norwegian, is even more moribund than Irish in the Gaeltacht, it is being studied more assiduously in universities and evening classes than ever before. Roots that seemed entirely deep-frozen are being thawed out, and who am I to say it nay? I can only wish that all this had come sooner, and that it were better founded—and funded.

What of the future? I trust and believe that we are on the way to ever newer and wider dimensions. I hear young voices demanding a new kind of 'action' research, one that will lead to our really doing something about the discoveries we have made. Perhaps this thrust can work to protect the lives of 'small' languages. It was only a few years ago that all the energy of idealists went into the promotion of global languages, preferably artificial ones. Today many are looking the other way. We see the steamroller of modern communication as a threat to the ecological health of small communities and to the personal identity of individuals. I hope that all you who work with bilingual education will be in a position not merely to talk about it, but also to do something about it. I shall be on the sidelines cheering you on to victory.
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POSITIVE BILINGUALISM:
SOME OVERLOOKED RATIONALES AND FOREFATHERS

Joshua A. Fishman
Yeshiva University

'Modern' man, and even modern social science (including modern linguistics), has had difficulty conceiving bilingualism positively. The overwhelming majority of references to this phenomenon are in terms of poverty or disharmony or disadvantages and debits of other kinds. The reasons for such a negative view of bilingualism are not hard to find. They derive from monolingual economic, political, cultural, and ideological investments or establishments and from the self-serving world views that they have fostered. Opponents who differ greatly in other respects—e.g. unreconstructed capitalists and equally unreconstructed communists—come together with amazing agreement as to the purported evils of bilingualism, each seeing in it a stumbling block to the image of progress, peace, and plenty that each consciously or subconsciously subscribes to and that each would consciously or subconsciously benefit from.

The mythology of monolingualism. Three sociophilosophical myths or weltanschauungen have fostered monolingualism for as many millenia of Euro-Mediterranean experience: the myth that monolingualism = universalism, the myth that monolingualism = freedom, and the myth that monolingualism = rationalism. Just as some psycho-educationalists have pictured bilingualism as intellectually penalizing and some linguists have characterized it as a carrier of the dread disease known as 'interference', so some social theorists have cast bilingualism as a 'heavy', as a 'baddy', as implicating (and even causing) provincialism/particularism, slavery/oppression and irrationalism/disruption. The counter claims of equally ancient and recent vintages are often lost in the shuffle and the most distinguished spokesmen as well as the most telling arguments for positive bilingualism
are often unknown to and forgotten by those who would most agree with them and who, in ignorance of their own forefathers, are forced to reinvent views that were already formulated a long, long time ago.

**Universalism = monolingualism?** The view that mankind is purportedly headed toward a greater, ultimately all-encompassing sociocultural unity has frequently been associated with a linguistic counterpart: a purported need for and an espousal of a unifying language of mankind. This view—expressed by the Western Empire and by Western Christianity on behalf of Latin, by Western capitalism on behalf of French and, more recently, English, by early communism on behalf of German and, more recently, Russian ('the interlanguage of the Soviet peoples')—slipping easily from an auxiliary to a replacive stance vis-à-vis its own favored language, has too often confused universalism with uniformity. As a result it has simplified and falsified the complexity of human society and has ignored the simultaneity of broader and narrower attachments that so often characterizes social man. Family members, tradition keepers, neighbors, bread winners, political animals, citizens, believers in transcendental truths (and often syncretistically in several such at one and the same time)—these are the roles via which human beings express their many attachments, pursue a variety of goals, and attain both broader and narrower rewards at various times of the day, of the week, of the year, and of their life spans. There is a multi-facetedness to the human experience—including linguistic repertoire variety or breadth—that must not be fluffed off or watered down in the name of universalism, for if this is done, then universalism is converted into its opposite, namely, restrictive parochialism. It is the so-called 'primitive' parochial society in which all are purportedly constrained into a single path and in which all roles coincide and in which only one truth, one vision, and one vehicle of truth can be permitted.

The view that universality is genotypic rather than merely phenotypic, that it pertains to deeply underlying traits and values rather than to surface manifestations, is also an old and proud view, but one that modern man has found increasingly difficult to hang on to. In the Hebraic view this is expressed as a rejection of a monolingual mankind (represented by the effrontery of the Tower of Babel) and by the affirmation of a permanently multiethnic and multilingual mankind (70 peoples and 70 languages being considered fundamental to the God-given order of human life), via which true universality can be perceived and grasped. Universality is viewed as achievable not by vitiating this diversity but by orchestrating it, by harmonizing and orienting it toward a higher and fuller awareness of sanctity. The Eastern Mediterranean provides two other expressions of this same vision: the classic Greek (and Greek Christian) and the early Islamic. In the former, all the
churches are autocephalic and function in their own ethnic tongues. In the latter, 'God sends to each people prophets in its own language so that he can be fully known to them' (Sura, 14, 4). Languages of sanctity, languages of government, languages of trade, and languages of home life differ and co-exist, with the former—the language of sanctity—naturally being more stable than the latter. Populations migrate, lose languages, gain languages, but those peoples who retain their sanctified values, traditions, and missions also maintain their sanctified tongues, at least for the most central, sanctified purposes. The notions of periphery and core behaviors, of behavioral (and linguistic) 'repertoire' (and, therefore, of variety rather than sameness in intergroup and in intragroup life), are fundamental, and it is through these notions that universality is sought as a growing, enriching, broadening appreciation and realization of unity underlying diversity rather than as a uniformizing and stultifying triumph over diversity.

Both the universalism = monolingualism myth and its opposite, the universalism = multilingualism myth, have their blind spots. The pseudo-universalistic myth that multilingualism is divisive (splitting off Christians from Christians, peoples from peoples, proletarians from proletarians) and invidious (leading to or supporting ethnocentrism and racism) overlooks the calumny, hatred, pain, and desolation that would-be universalists have heaped upon those who would not or could not join their ranks (Talmon 1952). Every expanding establishment runs the risk of interpreting its own self-interest as being equivalent to pan-human interest. In addition, they tend to overlook and to hide from public view the internal disharmony, antagonisms, tensions, rivalries, and power grabs that continue, within their own folds, even after the disturbing outsiders have been beaten, trans-ethnified, trans-linguified and (at least temporarily) erased as separate entities. There is a liberal integrationist bias here that equates ethnolinguistic multiplicity with invidiousness and hatred whilst incorporative monolingualism (into one's own language, to be sure) is equated with peace and plenty. This is often nothing but cruel self-aggrandizement, sanctimoniously masquerading as sanity and sanctity. Similarly, the universalism = multilingualism myth often seeks to hide its own self-protective self-interest. In addition, it is often insufficiently aware of the fact that modernization inevitably adds yet an additional range of shared behaviors, preferences, values, and attitudes to the lives of peoples all over the world. These shared manifestations often pose a dire problem for traditionally varied repertoires and often elicit self-protective rejection rather than positive reinterpretations and monitored expansions of indigenous systems. The backlash of small multilingual systems is no more broad-minded nor good-hearted than that of large monolingual ones. How could they be when the dangers to them are greater and when the universalist, integrationist posture seems to deny them the right to exist while claiming to do so on
behalf of humanity and the higher virtues to boot (Sennett 1976, Patterson 1977, 1978).

Efficiency = monolingualism? It should be obvious from the foregoing that monolingualism has received its most spirited defense from conscious and unconscious spokesmen for largescale vested interests. Whether it is General Motors or the American Federation of Teachers or the Interethnic Brotherhood of Deracinated Intellectuals, the pious view is advanced that 'proper' monolingualism is the only sane solution to poverty, backwardness, and powerlessness. If only all those wild little peoples out there would speak English (or French, or Russian, or ...), they could solve all their problems (Epstein 1977). They could build stable and efficient industrial, educational, and political systems—the way we have. They could become decent, hard-working, thrifty, and sober citizens—the way we have. The practical healing power of English (or French, or Russian, or ...) is limitless. Via a Whorfianism that out-Whorfs Whorf by a long shot, it is claimed that English improves the crops, raises the gross national product, avoids drought and earthquakes, and improves television. It is a rational tongue (or as Jesperson (1905:16) assured us: 'a methodical, business-like and sober language that ... cares for logical consistency and is opposed to any attempt to narrow-in life by police regulations ... As the language is, so also is the nation.') Correspondingly, it assures a rational life, a rational society, a rational future. Modernity is the pursuit of rationality in all things. Everything must be known and demystified. There is no mystery of mysteries, no sanctum sanctorum. To know is to control, to regulate, to maximize efficiency. Since modern society is the child of the modern marketplace, that marketplace is viewed as rationality and efficiency enthroned. In order to produce more inexpensively and distribute more widely, the market must be efficient in all things. It must reward good management and good workmanship and place talent where it is needed with minimal delay. It cannot afford to waste time and money on factors that are unrelated to efficient and effective production, distribution, and merchandizing. The assumption that ethnolinguistic differences are contra-indicated on the basis of their purported inefficiency has permeated modern sociology and economics for the past two to three centuries. Their purported inefficiency alone condemns them to oblivion. Gemeinschaft is dead (with all of its 'superstition' and 'parochialism'); long live Gesellschaft (the triumph of impersonal efficiency)! Marxism and capitalism may differ fundamentally as to who should control the producers and the means of production. However, they agree completely that ethnolinguistic differences merely hamper and fractionate that control and, therefore, such differences deserve to be 'eliminated'. Nonpartisan sociology agrees wholeheartedly. Ethnolinguistic differences are irrational and irrelevant to efficient operations.
and, therefore, they, too, will and must disappear. They are meaningless, empty vessels in the basic processes of modern life (Parsons 1975).

However, modernity merely deals with the means of production rather than with its goals or purposes. The assumption that increased productivity is its own reward has come to be increasingly questioned on several grounds: economic, environmental, philosophical. Indeed, there are those who maintain that it is efficiency and productivity themselves—as directionless and value-free pursuits—that are empty and meaningless, rather than the ethnolinguistic diversity that they oppose. There are others who claim that unless efficiency and productivity serve an indigenous value system and are attuned to and controlled by indigenous customs, preferences, priorities, tastes, and beliefs, that they are merely disguises for foreign control and enemies of local self-determination. Surely enough, as middle-level local econopolitical control increases around the world, i.e. as it grows increasingly rational and efficient under the control of local ethnolinguistic establishments (rather than under the control of extralocal establishments) it is attacked in the more industrial West as being irrational, inefficient, partisan, biased, divisive, etc. from the point of view of those who are being displaced.

Obviously, efficiency is as efficiency does. Ethnopolitical collectivities seek economic control for themselves, as a means of maintaining and fostering their own self-interest. As they rationalize their own economic apparatuses they must, invariably, play down certain ethnolinguistic differences within their area of control and play up others, between themselves and those with whom they are in competition. Thus, modern econopolitical establishments around the world have become the major protectors of locally preferred ethnolinguistic diversity and uniformity. There are more such establishments today than ever before—at least at the level of intermediate control, and rationality/efficiency are finally being put to use on behalf of the continuity of smaller languages rather than merely in opposition to them. Thus, today, there are more languages of modern middle technology, education, and government than ever before in modern history at the same time that only a few languages have worldwide currency at the highest levels (Fishman et al. 1977). As a result, it now increasingly behooves the former movers and shakers of monolingual efficiency and rationality to cultivate and foster their own multilingualism if they are to maintain their economic advantages in world markets, just as middle management everywhere must cultivate one or more world languages. The Japanese do not sell worldwide in Japanese. Can Americans insist on doing so in English alone?

The association of bilingualism with enrichment is nowhere more apparent than among the already rich. The fact that English monolingualism is bad for business (and, therefore, obviously inefficient) may be the most telling argument for
bilingualism on the American scene today. Both efficiency and rationality require it, to say nothing of such soft-hearted notions as decency and humanity. Just as universalism can be pursued on a multilingual track, so can efficiency and rationality. In a multilingual world it is obviously more efficient and rational to be multilingual than not—and that truism increasingly applies to the whales as well as to the minnows.

Freedom = monolingualism? There is a long Western tradition of equating ethnicity with heathenness, paganness, uncouthness, wildness, peripherality to the (Christian or Judeo-Christian) mainstream (Fishman 1977). That interpretation is related not only to universalist aspirations vis-à-vis escaping from the confines of 'narrow ethnicity', but to psychodynamic aspirations of escape from any and all ethnicity. Whether ethnicity is related to marginality and lack of civility (which is a widespread mainstream American view), or whether it is interpreted as peopleness-relatedness (i.e. being French, being Italian, being Polish, being X-ish--a widespread Eastern European view), it is, in either case, often viewed by the de-ethnified as a restriction on individual freedom, a blinder on the mind, a limitation on the soul. Little languages--and it is the speakers of little languages that more typically need to be bilingual--are similarly viewed as restrictive and as intrapunitive with respect to cognition, personality, and happiness per se. Thus, the escape from little languages is viewed as liberating, as joyful, as self-fulfilling, as self-actualizing.

The latter view, that equates mainstream monolingualism with freedom, goes one step beyond the former view that merely equates it with greater universality. Universality may still result in a higher order, a broader, a more inclusive ethnicity: all the world will be Roman, Americans all, the united proletariat, internationals unlimited, etc., etc.! However, ultimately, even broader ethnicity can be limiting. Therefore, some opponents of ethnicity and multilingualism hold that each person should strive to be just that: a person, an individual, a free soul, a blithe spirit; untrammelled, unfettered, unbound, unoblighed by stultifying conventions; spontaneous, unrehearsed; true to his/her inner self, inner needs, inner longings, inner creative urges. Were we only flower children, one and all, living naturally, naturalistically, all of our inner talents would develop, our inner goodness would blossom forth, love would triumph in the world, and light would vanquish darkness once and for all.

From Epicurus to Rousseau to Abbie Hoffman to Deveraux (1975), there is a continuous search for tension release, for guilt avoidance, for natural man, natural joys, childish innocence, and blamelessness. And in modern days, as in earlier ones, it plays down language per se (and, of course, language differences and language diversity) as unimportant at best, and as highly undesirable at worst. At most, mankind needs but
one tongue, and even then 'at most' (Baker 1950). The ultimate blessing is that of silence, of phatic communion, of smiles, of kisses, of hugs, of sunsets and sunups, of flowers, and of love. Thus, it is not enough to strive for a world of one universal brotherhood and of one universal tongue. One must push on beyond zebra to a world of free-floating individualists who accept themselves and each other well enough not even to have to talk at all (Baker 1950). Let us shrug, grunt, wink, and sigh our way to freedom!

The myth of monolingual or alingual freedom—of freedom to be unrelated—is counterposed by the myth of freedom to be associated, connected, related. The counterclaim to blissful silence is one that stresses that I am not really 'me', the true me, the real me, the whole me, unless I am free to speak my language whenever I want to, unless I am free to maintain my customs, to raise my children so that they will continue and treasure those ethnolinguistic gifts that I continue and treasure, and in terms of which I define myself, know myself, express myself, and relate myself to my nearest and dearest. If I am a mother tongue speaker of a small language and a native member of a small ethnic collectivity, I may very well have to add other languages and memberships to my repertoire, but unless I am enabled to retain that which is initially and fundamentally mine, my initial language and my initial people, I am not free, not true to myself, but am shut off from the most meaningful and intimate relationship with man and God. What greater good, what greater joy, what greater spontaneity, what greater naturalness, what greater loveliness, than to be amongst one's own, than to express and experience gemeinschaft. If the world beats a path to our door and offers us the stars and the moon, what profit is there in it for us if we have not yet made peace with ourselves, with our origins, with our own kith and kin? 'Behold, thou hast been careful for us with all this care; what is to be done for thee? ... And she answered: "I dwell among mine own people"' (2 Kings, 4:13). And therefore, presumably I am content, I know true happiness; who could ask for anything more?

Obviously, these two longings, the longing 'to be free to be unrelated' and the longing 'to be free to be related', have different implications for bilingualism. Both longings are frequently present together in the same society and, indeed, in the same individual. They can follow each other as the dominant themes or sentiments of successive historical periods. Thus our flower children became roots seekers. These are not necessarily antithetical in that the ethos of small-scale experience permeates them both. They are both defenses against the dehumanization pressures of large-scale government, industry, labor, ideology, warfare, education, communication media (and conferences). However, the difference between them is a vital one. It is only the latter path that leads to
communitas, and therefore only it can foster multilingualism in a way that both protects the core and expands it.

Herder and Whorf: Heroes of multilingualism. I have tried to show that the most common myths on behalf of monolingualism can be and are also used on behalf of multilingualism. Multilingualism is not some outmoded 'hand-me-down' from the poverty pockets of America and of the world at large. Multilingualism can be defended as leading to true universalism. Multilingualism can be viewed as consonant with meaningful efficiency and rationality. Multilingualism can be regarded as a defense of freedom. None of the foregoing benefits need to be surrendered to the monolingual establishment. Let me now attempt a similar rehabilitation for two such overlooked champions of diversity as Herder and Whorf. When fully understood, they can both be regarded as heroes of a positive multilingualism rather than of its opposite, a narrow monolingual chauvinism.

Johann Gottfried Herder (1744-1803) is best remembered as the apostle of German ethnolinguistic self-acceptance in the face of French cultural snobbery, political domination, and economic control. He was tireless in admonishing German princelings, intellectuals, and men of affairs that they would amount to nothing in their own eyes and in the eyes of the world until they accepted themselves and asserted themselves as Germans. Beyond that, Herder was the champion of the still unspoiled Slavs—and the champion, indeed, of any people that had not lost its language and its soul, its authenticity and its uniqueness, in the struggle with modernity. Herder's rhetoric still rings throughout the world today wherever an ethnolinguistic group seeks to become 'the master of its own house', i.e. 'to become modern but in its own X-ish fashion', in its own X-ish language, and with its own X-ish establishment in control. However, if this is all we remember of Herder (and usually it is), then we are likely to misinterpret him as opposing multilingualism and as espousing linguistic discontinuity ad infinitum. Nothing could be further from the truth (Ergang 1931).

Herder is full of admiration for the Jews, the Chinese, and the Hindus, three people who have been conquered, forced to immigrate, and to learn other languages, but who have purportedly never lost themselves or their own languages. In his treatment of the Jews, Herder is particularly insistent that the Western Christian world understand them as they view themselves, as a complete, fully functioning ethnolinguistic entity, rather than as harbingers of some greater unity yet to come under Christian auspices. Via an understanding of the Jews, in their own right, Herder leads to an understanding and appreciation of all small and weak (but still wonderfully creative) peoples. His deepest conviction is that nothing benefits a country more than to treasure the languages and cultures of its various peoples because in doing so, it fosters intergroup understanding and realizes greater dividends in the form of originality,
creativity, and versatility. Herder is, therefore, an advocate of language planning on behalf of shared multilingualism, advising the princelings of his day and age that 'a ruler [should] not only tolerate but honor the various languages of his nation-alities ... [in order] to plant the seeds of well-being for the most distant future' (Herder 1877-1913:vol. 17, 58-59). Thus, Herder holds not only that small and unfortunate peoples may well have to be multilingual, but he urges that strong and dominant peoples should be multilingual as well. Languages that are maintained can be shared. Once they are lost, not only their original speakers but the rest of mankind as well becomes irreparably impoverished. Universal multilingualism is for Herder the only sensible universalism.

Whorf, too, has been understood too narrowly. Of course, he claims—in his strongest stance—that different grammars bring about fundamentally different and inescapable ways of viewing reality (Fishman 1960). But he also claims more than that, and more important (and more valid) things than that. He claims, first of all, that every language must be understood in terms of its own categories, rather than in terms of any purportedly universal but, more likely, Standard Average European (SAE) categories. He claims, secondly, that seeing the world through another grammar is a beneficial, enriching, valuable experience, particularly for intellectuals and scientists associated with powerful establishments since they are most likely to confuse reality with a single set of unconscious, culture-laden biases. This conviction leads one Whorfian to assert that Einstein would have benefited enormously if he had only thought through the theory of relativity in Hopi, a language in which energy and matter are purportedly conceived of jointly or at least differently than in SAE (Chase 1956). Regardless of whether that claim is true or not, we must view it as an attempt to stress that ethnolinguistic communities have their unique ways of viewing the world and that their languages give us systematic clues to what those views are. In that case some Anglos should learn Hopi, even as the Hopi learns English, so that Anglos too can be enriched by another perspective, rather than mistakenly regard their parochialism as God-given universal truth.

Basically, Whorf was arguing against the excessive pride of English monolinguals and of those who would save the world by popularizing English.

[To] restrict thinking to the patterns merely of English, and especially to those patterns that represent the acme of plainness in English, is to lose a power of thought which, once lost, can never be regained. It is the 'plainest' English which contains the greatest number of unconscious assumptions about nature. This is the trouble with schemes like basic English, in which an eviscerated British English, with its concealed premises
working harder than ever, is to be fobbed off on an unsuspecting world as the substance of pure Reason itself. We handle even our plain English with much greater effect if we direct it from the vantage point of a multilingual awareness (my italics: JAF). For this reason I believe that those who envision a future world speaking only one tongue, whether English, German, Russian, or any other, hold a misguided ideal and would do the evolution of the human mind the greatest disservice. Western culture has made, through language, a provisional analysis of reality and, without correctives, holds resolutely to that analysis as final. The only corrective lies in all those other tongues which by aeons of independent evolution have arrived at different but equally logical, provisional analyses (Whorf 1941:268).

Even though we must reject much of Whorf's major premises today (as to grammatical constraints on cognition), I doubt that we can improve on his minor premises. Multilingualism is valuable to society. It does bring man closer to true universalism. It is more rational than monolingualism in the multinational world of today and tomorrow. It is more liberating without being alienating. In this day and age, English speakers need it most.
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BILINGUAL EDUCATION
AND A NATIONAL LANGUAGE POLICY

Shirley Brice Heath
University of Pennsylvania

1. National language policies. Critical to the planning and implementation of any national language policy is the definition of 'national language' either spelled out or assumed by policymakers. The particular definition chosen derives in large part from the historical background of the nation. For those countries once part of a colonial empire, but independent in the nineteenth century, there was a strong tendency to equate national language with the European language of domination. For example, throughout the nineteenth century and well into the twentieth, Peru, Mexico, Bolivia, and Ecuador continued the policy of Castilianization which had been initiated during the colonial period. Nations which gained their independence in the early part of the twentieth century followed this policy also. In the period between the World Wars, the new European nations which resulted from the break-up of empires and realignment of political boundaries chose an indigenous language as their national language in opposition to the language previously imposed on them. Similarly, in post-colonial nations after World War II, there has been a widespread tendency to promote indigenous languages as national languages. The language rights of minority populations have, in the past three decades, become a predominant concern of many nations, and new interpretations of the term 'national language' have resulted.

In Peru, for example, 'national languages' refers to all the indigenous languages of the nation (Peru 1972a, 1972b; Wöck 1972); the General Education Law of 1972 specifically recognizes the indigenous languages of Peru and endorses the concept of bilingual education for its potential in bringing the communities of Peru an opportunity to have access to a meaningful education. Recently, the 'Universal Declaration of Human Rights'
was published in 24 indigenous languages of Peru (La Nueva Crónica 1974). The official declaration that all indigenous tongues are national languages is, however, primarily a symbolic gesture acknowledging the existence of the nation's minority peoples. There is no plan for all these languages to be used in any instrumental sense by the government or any of its agencies (Albo 1977). In Peru, only Quechua is receiving serious attention for use in publications, political and educational; and there is an attempt to determine a supradialectal norm of Quechua which can be spread through education.

Another use of the term 'national language' is that which designates an official language recognized as the norm for governmental, educational, and international relations, political and commercial. The declaration of French as the national language for the Ivory Coast is such an example. In this situation, the official norm is spread to speakers of indigenous languages through the educational system; and accessibility to professional occupations depends in part on knowledge of French.

In the Soviet Union, the term 'national language' is used to refer to any language which has become standardized and is identified with a nationality. Lewis (1972) provides a summary of the extent of linguistic diversity among the national minorities of the Soviet Union which, since the eighteenth century, has created several waves of national language policies. Stalin's approaches are perhaps best known in the Western world (Stalin 1934, 1942).

Yet another use of the term 'national language' is one in which a former colony which has achieved independent status declares one of its indigenous tongues the national language. English or some other European language may or may not remain the official language in use for international affairs and the predominant tongue of business, government, and higher education. The indigenous tongue declared the national language takes on the role of 'lingua franca' for language groups within the country in numerous daily interactions across groups. Swahili in Tanzania is such an example (Whiteley 1969). A related example is the use of the term 'national language' in Morocco, where Classical Arabic is the national (official) language; yet Berber and spoken Moroccan Arabic must be known for participation in internal commercial affairs. French is the language necessary for entrance into the highest social strata.

It follows that national language policy depends in large part on the particular definitions of the term assumed, historical precedent in language decisions, and the diversity and relative socioeconomic resources of the different language groups in a nation. The extent and type of corpus and program planning and implementation vary greatly, as does the process of planning (Rubin et al. 1977). Bilingual education is for some countries only a part of the policy and the process. In some nations, language policy is specifically articulated and subject
to highly specialized planning by groups or institutions charged with this task. The Soviet Union, the Peoples Republic of China, Norway, Malaysia, and Sweden represent the wide range of nations in which language policy, program implementation and maintenance, and materials production are included among the duties of particular divisions of the government and national nongovernmental agencies. In other nations, supra-polity decisions in response to issues or events for which the relevance of language is not considered may, at the local level, be interpreted as pertinent to language. However, at the federal level, implications of the policy for language choice or change may not have been considered at the point of decision making. Economic, political, or educational policies may contain provisions which affect language choice; but language per se need not be a primary area of consideration. Often, in these cases, supra-polity decisions provide a configuration in which local groups recognize the relations to language of the constituent elements; and they reshape higher level decisions to influence local institutions to respond to language issues (Heath 1976a).

Motivations and results of national language policies are also highly varied. In some cases, local-level interpretations of language policy center on particular institutions, such as education or specific industries. The goal of a language policy is usually to spread one particular language or language variety. However, this spread may be either replacive or additive. The goal of replacive programs is to encourage the spread of the official norm over all other varieties in the nation. Programs supporting replacive goals are often termed transitional, since the policy assumes the chosen national language will be used in coordination with other languages for only a generation or so until the national language replaces indigenous tongues. An additive policy is designed to encourage the population to supplement their indigenous language(s) or variety(ies) with the official language or variety. Some additive programs foster the spread of European languages of wider communication; others promote the spread of indigenous languages to new functions associated with higher education, public record-keeping, and vocational opportunities in an industrialized work force. When a language is slated for addition to other codes, the result is usually extension of the linguistic repertoire to include formal and public registers, written and oral. Primary emphasis is most frequently given to extending reading and writing skills in the chosen language or variety. Programs supporting the additive goal in language policy are sometimes interpreted as tolerant, even occasionally supportive, of languages other than the official variety. In some situations, however, if social and economic advancement depend on learning the official code and using it in a wide range of functions, an avowedly additive program may be interpreted by some groups as transitional in the long run.
Bilingual education is usually associated with additive programs. Materials and instructors provide for the use of both indigenous languages and the designated official norm. Additive programs, including those which depend on policies declaring an indigenous tongue as a national language, often enlist cooperation of members of minority groups for participation in bilingual education efforts. In addition, these programs often force the integration of some minority members into government programs. The relatively recent revitalization of minority languages in many nations has created some changes in the composition of decision-makers in institutions such as education, transportation, and the mass media. These movements vary greatly in the intensity of efforts made by minority language speakers to have their language spread across institutions. For example, the Welsh language movement has penetrated not only education—across the curriculum from kindergarten through college—but it has also created changes in public advertising, in TV and radio, in road signs, and in the customer services of some commercial firms.

In some cases, a bilingual education movement may exist without the support of a national language policy. For example, throughout Great Britain in recent decades, the provision of bilingual education or early instruction in the indigenous languages of immigrants derives not from a national language policy, but from educational rulings which guarantee parents that, within the limits of reasonable expenditure, their children may have instruction appropriate to their needs. Other bilingual services or situations permitting use of languages other than English may derive from specific local statutory laws. National laws may not go so far as to place indigenous languages on a footing of equality with the official norm; but they may guarantee specific rights. For example, the Welsh Language Act passed in English Parliament in 1967 granted equal validity to Welsh on any document or declaration in court (Welsh Cymdeithas yr Iaith Gymraeg 1974). Many movements to promote the revival, maintenance, and/or spread of minority languages have no official policy supporting them, but they are instead allowed to grow in democratic countries because there are no laws prohibiting their existence. In addition, many such movements are ways of obtaining recognition of the speakers of a minority language as a viable national culture, and recognition of the language in specific institutional functions is only a minor goal of what is ostensibly billed as a language movement. Examples are to be found in the revival of Scottish Gaelic and Breton, where there are, in the first case, no monolingual speakers of the language, and, in the second case, relatively few. Some young people are learning these languages as second tongues and promoting wide-sweeping rights of these groups to recognition of a viable heritage (Dressler and Wodak-Leodolter 1977).
2. The United States approach. Currently, within the United States, the term 'national language policy' is invoked in response to bilingual education. Those who favor bilingual education argue that such an educational policy is appropriate to the guarantee of equal opportunity and of certain freedoms provided in the Constitution. In effect, groups at the local level interpret the Constitution and statutory laws covering equal educational opportunities as providing a national language policy which supports bilingual education. Those who oppose bilingual education argue that the national language of the United States has always been English, unquestionably, and that federally funded efforts to support bilingual education serve to maintain minority languages and to discourage the young of these groups from learning standard English. This argument also maintains that, given the course of assimilation of minority language groups in United States history, today's minority language groups will also find it necessary to learn English for socioeconomic advancement. In the climate of controversy surrounding bilingual education, other types of linguistic awareness have arisen; and educators, policy-makers, and human services delivery personnel are reassessing uses of language in their professions. New approaches to simplifying public language, clarifying regulations, and improving writing skills are seen as both democratizing and rehabilitative for traditionally valued skills in the use of standard English.

The numerous forces behind these trends recognize the need for political support; thus they often relate their desire for particular linguistic aims to other political or social goals and hope to gain institutional support from existing governmental agencies. These bodies have built-in mechanisms of social change for specific areas of national life, such as education, government printing, and distribution of social services; and language goals can thus be incorporated into other changes in these areas. Seeing multiple weaknesses in this piecemeal approach to language choice and language change, some groups advocate serious consideration of a national language policy. Close attention to the historical background of language decisions in the United States may provide useful information for undertaking such a proposal.

2.1 Historical precedents. The United States approach to language policy must be seen as deriving in large part from traditions and philosophies set by the history of Great Britain. Once English was established over French in the fourteenth century in England, Englishmen did not initiate policies to insure maintenance of English. Language was a matter of individual choice or chance. If born into poor circumstances where one learned another language or a substandard variety of English, one was expected to seek out exposure to the acceptable language variety. Those born in certain geographical or social settings were guaranteed exposure to the proper
language variety. For Englishmen, achievement of the prestige dialect was a matter of concern for socially mobile individuals, not policy-makers. Schoolmen, intellectuals, and artists promoted extension of English; but, in general, policy-makers assumed that individuals would see the merits of adopting the prestige variety and would do so (Heath 1976a).

The colonial and early national philosophies related to language were strongly influenced by the British approach. In spite of diversities of populations and languages variously distributed and aggregated at times and places in the United States, a national language policy was never seriously considered (Heath 1976b). Recognizing any such proposals as a possible constriction of freedoms of choice in linguistic and cultural matters, political and legal leaders often pointed out that governmental support of a standardized official English language norm conflicted with not only democratic ideals, but also the realities of language change. In a geographically and socially mobile nation, the constant interaction of individuals across groups would 'preserve an identity of language throughout the United States', views expressed by John Marshall (Marshall to Webster, January 14, 1831, Noah Webster MSS.). Throughout the first three-quarters of the nineteenth century, popular response and reasoned intellectual leadership recognized the occasional calls for a national language policy as all too frequently deriving from self-interests, political, economic, or social.

Several leaders proposed language(s) as resources in the United States. These voices suggested that bilingualism and bilingual education were consistent with national goals. Perhaps it is most important that support of bilingual education during this period came not from a national language policy, but in response to local community needs. 'Don't lose [sic] your vernacular tongue in which ... you have to make your way one of these days ...' Thus the German-born, but 'thoroughly Americanized', editor of the first edition of Encyclopedia Americana wrote his son in 1842 (Francis Lieber MSS.). Officials of the Philadelphia Public Schools extended this idea in 1852 when they proposed that instruction in both English and German be available, because of the presence of a 'large and increasing German population with whom almost every educated man is at some time thrown into business relations' (Annual report 1853). In 1865, William Harris, superintendent of schools in St. Louis, maintained that retention of one's native language provided a consciousness of the history of one's ancestry and access to influence from the oldest members of the family; these abilities were very potent in giving tone to the individuality of youth (Kluwin forthcoming). This wide variety of responses to language differences was possible because the United States had not endorsed a national language policy.
A similar flexibility existed with respect to defining standard English. In the earliest days of the common school and state mandated compulsory attendance laws, grammar books called for memorization of rules of grammar, but they also stressed flexibility in language uses (Heath forthcoming). The concern of these early American grammarians was that form not take precedence over substance in writing and speaking. During the next decades as common schools and compulsory attendance were becoming more and more widespread in the United States, grammar books increasingly stressed standardization, and flexibility in language use and knowledge of different languages or varieties of language were increasingly downgraded. By the late 1880s, some school systems became intolerant with the emphasis on 'basic skills' and rule recitation. In 1884, for example, the superintendent of the Philadelphia schools called for a change in the course of language study. The change resulted from a belief that the study of grammar as a subject was not appropriate until the high school level. The recommended course was one which required increased use of language in writing, speaking, and reading. Students were to be held accountable for facts supporting generalizations and they were to express their thoughts clearly. A later report from the superintendent condemned earlier practices and explained his own recommendations: 'The application of what the pupils had learned of the principles of language to the elucidation of prose and poetry was rarely practiced. The result was facility in talking about grammar without the ability to use it' (Philadelphia Annual report 1889:24). Other reasons for the curricular change sound strikingly similar to theoretical statements which have recently come out of sociolinguistic approaches to language in education. Annual reports stressed that language was the heart of the curriculum because through language, students learned both knowledge and rules of functioning in classrooms; language study was to be not a single subject of study, but integrated throughout all subjects (Philadelphia Annual reports 1883, 1892, 1895, 1898-99, 1903).

The uses of language, and the need to have variety in language(s) extended to the curriculum of commercial high schools in Philadelphia and other cities such as Cleveland, St. Louis, and San Francisco. The teaching of foreign languages was a central portion of the curriculum in a commercial high school in Philadelphia in 1896. In comparison with business rivals in Europe, American businessmen lacked foreign languages, and commercial high schools stressed knowledge of Spanish, German, and French, as well as practical approaches to the uses of English in business (Philadelphia Annual report 1899).

The emphasis to be made here is that in the face of problems very similar to those generally lumped in consideration of a national language policy for the United States today, policymakers, educators, and business leaders planned and implemented local responses in accordance with local needs. Without
the current reliance on federal funding, and consequently the abundance of statutory laws and regulations coming from the national level, bilingual education, foreign language promotion, and highly varied integrated programs of language skills were planned and maintained at local levels.

2.2 Current issues in bilingual education. Since the middle of the nineteenth century, proponents of bilingual education and flexibility in definitions and approaches to standard English have been countered with arguments for an English-only policy which supported rigid prescriptions of standard English. The two camps fought out their battles at the local level until the xenophobia of the second decade of the twentieth century which led some local groups to support state legislation declaring English the official language of the state (Geffert et al. 1975). The two forces have only recently brought their differences to the national level, and the Bilingual Education Act of 1968 has caused many of the conflicts which formerly occurred at local and state levels to reappear on the national level. Proponents of bilingual education want a national language policy to protect and maintain bilingual education and the rights of minority language speakers. Those who oppose bilingual education want, if not a national policy, at least a national commitment to English monolingualism and to the maintenance of past standards in use of the English language. The push for minimal competency laws at the state level comes from these forces, who wish tests of English usage, particularly composition skills, to determine awarding of a high school diploma.

For these groups, national language embodies a unifying symbol to numerous values. If asked what is the national language of the United States, the man in the street will say English. If asked further questions such as why, when, and how, that person will offer folk notions as historical and social facts: the founding fathers, including Webster, had a hand in the decision; the particular kind of English which is American has been standardized by schools and other public forces; a good citizen’s responsibility includes knowledge of ‘good English’; the man who talks right acts right, is predictable in behavior and conforming as a citizen (Heath forthcoming). Many citizens assume that use of English is somehow official in the United States, and is the result of decisions made at some point in the past. In addition, the term 'national language' carries with it the connotation of not only English, but a particular kind of English, which is standardized and spoken according to norms of usage established by particular groups within the population. English as the national language is seemingly supported by the reliance in public schools on English literature and English history. The notion of standard English is supported by a concern with American English, the Webster tradition, and teachers' and grammar books' adherence to the positive
correlation between successful composition skills and clear, logical thinking. During the 1920s when there were increasingly frequent moves by individual states to mandate English as the official language of the states, there was a simultaneous trend in English grammar books stressing that the writing of good English was one way of illustrating one's character. Correct usage of English was believed to correlate with honesty, dependability, hard work, thrift, and other characteristics of predictable citizens. For many adults in the United States who received their public schooling during the period from the 1920s through the 1940s, the choice of English as the national language was not only a political necessity, but a moral need. There were powerful convictions that proper English predicts proper behavior, and the use of English referred not only to a linguistic choice, but to a selection of values and to ways of behaving. Implicit in this is the view that language is the basis of nationality, a cohesive force, and that control of language choice will and should carry over into control of other types of behaviors.

Those who favor bilingual education are quick to point out that opposition to bilingual education and promotion of English only is often a way not only of proscribing languages other than English, but also ways of behaving which do not conform to mainstream norms. Thus, as long as a monolingual language choice is tacitly sanctioned in national policies which do not center on language per se, but affect language choices at the local level, there is no way of guaranteeing freedom of choice in numerous social and cultural matters. If ballots are available in different languages, so should warrants and warranties be. Carpenters should be allowed to use their native language in tests for licensing. Social services, travel information, financial information, and government regulations and applications should be as accessible to those who speak a language other than English as they are to English speakers. However, since the impact of Civil Rights legislation has been greatest in education, bilingual education is at the heart of proposals for a national language policy. Once the guarantee of bilingual education is as secure as other educational approaches and programs, then proponents of bilingualism will push for acceptance of languages other than English in other programs.

3. The policy and process of bilingual education. Recognizing some of the reasons behind the identification of a national language policy with bilingual education, one is tempted to hypothesize about the processes and outcomes of such a policy. Discussions of policy-making have traditionally emphasized the input stage (e.g. Schneider 1977). The approach suggested here places more emphasis on the expected outcome stage. Expected outcomes here refer to the future policy outputs anticipated by individuals to have an effect on their lives. Individuals pushing for a national language policy are
doing so in partial response to the manner in which they and others have been affected by particular issues in the past. Individuals promoting a national language policy of bilingual education for the United States may pattern their vision of the way it would be carried out according to the ways other policies which have affected their lives have been operationalized.

Political science theorists propose four possible ways of achieving this (Smith 1969): distributive outcomes or policy types (3.1), regulative outcomes (3.2), redistributive function (3.3), and emotive symbolic outcomes (3.4).

3.1 Distributive outcomes or policy types. The orientation here is to expect the government to aid special interest groups in gaining their expectations. Interactions are primarily between government personnel and active individuals representing special interest groups. An example of this type of output is the cooperation between units of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare and social scientists, aided by minority language groups, in the preparation and distribution of curriculum materials. The training centers for bilingual education are another example of the distributive outcome of bilingual education policy—the provision of goods and services expected by recently politicized groups.

3.2 Regulative outcomes. These derive most often from sectors which want the government to intervene and give them preferential treatment by limiting certain activities of other groups or making available to them services formerly made available only to others. This regulative function is the source of the greatest conflict between the Office of Civil Rights (OCR) and bilingual education personnel. Homogeneous grouping frequently leads to conditions in violation of civil rights rulings, yet some degree of homogeneous grouping may, in some settings, be the most efficient and effective way of providing meaningful bilingual education. Bilingual education personnel often want their preferences for program goals to override the fact that the composition of their programs violates OCR rulings. Bilingual education proponents also point out that their program should have available the same considerations of time, money, and realistic expectations of outcome other education programs have had (Fishman 1978), even if such programs now have to be curtailed.

3.3 Redistributive function. This expected outcome is held by individuals who wish government decisions to benefit them as members of classes or broad social groupings at the expense of other classes or social groupings. The demands of Spanish speakers for bilingual services in the public arena are often so interpreted, and politicians are quick to point out that comprehensive provision of public schooling and services is not realistic for all minority language groups, and if these are
distributed to one group, other groups will have to be denied
the same privileges. Direct or indirect requests for retribution
for past injustices in educational and economic opportunities
fall in this category.

3.4 Emotive symbolic outcomes. Often issued only in public
statements and not carried to fruition in specific policies are
symbolic gestures or benefits from the government which will
further specific causes at local levels. Largely ideological and
affective, this benefit often helps local forces gather support
for policies having one or more of the other types of outcome.
A government official making a speech in the Southwest and
mentioning the language rights of Mexican Americans provided
for in the Treaty of Hidalgo fulfills such a function.

The respective impacts of each of these expectations will
differ in terms of the intensity of debate and public response
they engender. They are therefore likely to be fought out in
different political arenas involving different political actors.
Thus far, the major arena for a national language policy has
been the Department of Health, Education and Welfare, but it
is to be expected that if expectations of policy provisions in
this area are met, other areas, such as law, social services,
transportation, and public communication will become arenas
for struggles similar to those which have surrounded bilingual
education. Without a comprehensive national language policy
which would provide federal support for the cultivation, study,
and instruction of language(s), benefitting all sectors—the
general, commercial, aesthetic, and diplomatic—the efforts ap-
plied to bilingual education will have to be applied to each of
these areas separately, and differential responses and outcomes
may be expected.

4. Planning for a language policy. Any language policy is,
in effect, a cultural policy which calls for changes in the qual-
ity of life and cultural developments of specific groups in the
nation. Both minority language groups and mainstream majority
groups are affected. For example, for bilingual education in
the United States, government representatives involved in regu-
lating programs often attempt to speak Spanish in order to
achieve credibility with personnel involved in local programs.
Formerly monolingual majority language speakers are sometimes
learning what they formerly considered a minority tongue in
order to legitimate their political roles and to achieve communi-
cation in a larger network within their own nation. Such
changes involve attitude shifts, as well as alterations in be-
havior patterns.

In some senses, to talk of planning a language/cultural policy
is to contradict many definitions United States citizens have
traditionally held of each of these terms. Language involves
culture, one cannot be separated from the other, and their
structures and functions are in the basic sense determined by
their bearers. Policy, on the other hand, implies system and deliberation. Language and culture are processes that are organized and yet spontaneous, providing patterns within themselves. This is why any language policy must have at its center the notion that culture and language derive in large part from communities which bear them and cannot be planned to yield designated results which may not fit the needs and goals of communities. Therefore, any plans for a language policy must move cautiously, since they have the powerful potential of impinging on the sets of cultural choices open to citizens in their daily living. Within a democratic climate, there is something distasteful about the idea that language and culture should be subjected to the same kind of predictive planning used for economics, politics, and transportation. However, it may sometimes be prudent and efficient to plan aspects of language and culture, if such planning can be shown to benefit the majority of the population or to insure maintenance of constitutional rights to all groups. A national language policy, however, even in those circumstances where such proof is possible, may press together two disparate and often highly incompatible value systems. Individualism clashes with statism, as it did in civil rights issues. Freedom challenges constraint, and creativity resists being pitted against standardization.

Language policy cannot be equated with bilingual education; it must include literacy, the reform of public documents' legalese, renewal of interest and extension of expertise in foreign languages, and provision of rights for maintenance of minority languages. The latter does not necessarily mean government sponsorship for maintenance of the languages of those groups which can and have fostered their language in religious, aesthetic, and even sociocultural affairs. A national language policy would, however, make explicit the rights of these groups to continue to define the limits of uses of their languages within their own communities. A national language policy should also include what we may refer to as 'language building'--making available language resources in the arts, recreation, human services delivery, as well as education.

In the final analysis a national language policy must be an exercise in the orchestration of a new symphony of national language themes. Therefore, major planning for such a policy must include identification of the main themes and contradictions within the country. This has yet to be done in the United States. We cannot posit pluralism, democracy, decentralization, intergovernmental and international cooperation, and equality of educational opportunity as the basic currents of a national language policy, until we know more about how these have developed with relation to language in the United States.
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Introduction. My topic today is comprehensive planning, and I should like to tell you that such a creature exists; and not only that it exists, but bilingual educators have it in captivity; that we are domesticating it, as one would a beast of burden, to carry us wherever we wish to go, and it is eating out of our hands. Unfortunately, in all honesty, I cannot tell you that. Planning exists, yes. We have seen outstanding examples of intelligent, foresighted work in this area; some of it may even be described as coordinated. But is it comprehensive? No, not yet.

How can there be comprehensive planning for this educational approach while a consensus as to what bilingual education is, and what it ought to accomplish, is still lacking, and while federally funded programs--Title this, Title that, Title what you will--are looked upon as ends in themselves, and their regulations, despite obvious shortcomings, are taken as law? We have been all too busy working to establish bilingual education as a reality in the present to allot sufficient thought to where we should take it--or, conversely, where it should take us, in the future. The surest thing one may say about comprehensive planning for bilingual schooling is that it is sorely needed now, not 10 years hence. If it does not evolve soon, the very survival of the bilingual approach will be placed in jeopardy. But before we can even begin to plan for comprehensive planning, we must take a long, hard look at the reasons why, after a decade of programmatic activity, we still do not have it. In doing so, we may be obliged to take a critical view of aspects of an endeavor to which we are all dedicated. This is never popular, and not lightly done, for there will always be those who misinterpret picking at one part of our
activity as an attack on the discipline and its practitioners as a whole. But without constructive self-criticism, it is doubtful that we shall ever reach our goal of ensuring education of the highest quality for all. That, in the final analysis, is what is important, and I ask that you keep this concept in mind throughout the remainder of what I have to say.

How bilingual education is viewed. Insofar as most educational innovations are affected by political factors which are both internal and external to the local school district, many consider bilingual education to be primarily a political maneuver in that it recognizes and legitimizes the variety of cultures in our society (Vázquez 1977). Its greater import, that it confirms the right of every child to a meaningful educational experience, is often overlooked. More than other educational processes, bilingual education operates in a context charged with controversy over the meaning of educational equity, minority group isolation, and whether or not societal institutions—the government and the school system—are legally obligated to foster and serve linguistic and cultural heterogeneity.

Bilingual education has achieved support at the federal level because it has been promoted as a means of assisting the poor of the nation—poor because, being culturally different, they lack what it takes, language skills at the top of the list, to enter the mainstream. Yet because of the situation of other-language groups needing special help, which must be ensured nationally by federal mandate, an image equating their lower per capita income with cultural poverty has formed in the national consciousness.

In 1968, the 92nd Congress took the lead in the formulation of federal policy on bilingual education by providing financial assistance to local educational agencies to develop and carry on 'new and innovative elementary and secondary programs ... to meet the needs of the large numbers of children of limited English (speaking) ability'. Over the past decade, however, public bilingual schooling in the United States has been designed, promoted, and litigated mainly as a measure to correct English language deficiencies. Interpretation of the Congressional mandate as an endorsement of remediation to eliminate linguistic diversity overlooks the potential of maintaining linguistic pluralism for its cultural advantages.

Bilingual education in desegregated schools. Largely because of its established image as remediation, we are confident that bilingual education will once again be authorized by Congress, now that the Act is up for renewal. Yet since what constitutes, or ought to constitute, bilingual schooling is vaguely interpreted and widely understood as a divisive rather than unifying measure, we must ask ourselves: will funding be cut back or remain the same? In either case, how can our programs deal with inflation and expanding constituencies? Will the emphasis
narrow to exclude cultural components? And is there still a chance that what we shall have is a truly bilingual act, and not 'an act against bilingualism' (Fishman 1977)?

Why do questions such as these still plague us? After all, the 1974 revision of the Act clearly recognized the national advantage of setting aside ethnocentrism and xenophobia to allow public school instruction in languages other than English. This was viewed as a major victory in bilingual circles, since Native Americans and Asian Americans, Chicanos and Puerto Ricans, had long battled the intransigent, monolingual establishment, but because of political impotence, had not gotten very far. Now, here it was on paper: an amendment validating the use of these native tongues in the classroom. Unfortunately, much of the victory remained on paper, going no further, for today bilingual education is still debated from the perspective of having Constitutional status as a desegregation measure. To wit: the failure of a school district to respond to the special educational needs of ethnolinguistically different minority-group children is considered a 'federal statutory violation', while unlawful school segregation is a 'Constitutional wrong' (Teitelbaum and Hiller 1977). This interpretation subjugates the Congressional policy on bilingualism to the judiciary mandate for desegregation (Milán 1977), a position which, its questionable legality aside, is still no cause for rejoicing.

Bilingual education's champions. At the federal level, bilingual education benefits from the support of a national constituency to which, to some extent, the government listens. Its principal recognition has come as a civil rights cause, mainly associated with the country's Hispanic population, though other ethnolinguistic groups also benefit from bilingual programmatic activity. Mainly through Title VII, this national constituency has had significant influence in determining bilingual education priorities, in arousing the target constituencies, in stimulating a variety of funding sources, and in developing a cadre of bilingual educational leaders. Though the effect at the national policy-making level has been salutary, the effectiveness at the local level—specifically, within state departments of education and local educational agencies—has been weaker. And this weakness at the local level diminishes the pervasiveness of educational good which stems from the federal mandate.

Whoever pays for bilingual education, determines its nature. Although compliance with the right of every child to be educated is the responsibility of the states, within their own jurisdiction states are echoing federal policy. Of the 19 states which have established either legislative or executive provisions for bilingual education, 17 have indicated explicitly the transitional intent of their programs. In essence, these states are following suit by perpetuating the image of bilingual education as a
temporary measure, an image reinforced by the lead of various federal agencies.

It is principally to attract assistance from the federal government that the states perpetuate the 'special project' status of bilingual education. Not until they cease to depend on the federal dollar will bilingual education begin to be institutionalized. As is now the common practice, most planning for bilingual programs is done in a fragmented fashion, with insufficient attention to the totality and reality of the situation in the local school district.

To date, the great funder of bilingual programs remains the federal government; this accounts for the tremendous weight the guidelines of the various titles carry. Letting Uncle Sam do it is the easiest way; it is also the perfect way to perpetuate the idea that the bilingual approach is less education than welfare.

Legislation vis-a-vis implementation. Social theories and other indicators of societal change become increasingly relevant as the ambiguity of a particular case or piece of legislation must be resolved. When the Commonwealth of Massachusetts enacted the first Bilingual Transitional Act in 1971, its implications were that while the letter of the federal legislation was to provide transitional bilingual education, the spirit of the Massachusetts law was to maintain the bilingualism of the individual but not of the Commonwealth. With this for the starting line, the pace was set in Massachusetts, wherein cities, towns, or school districts with 20 or more children of limited English-speaking ability in the same grade were required to establish three-year 'transitional programs', to compensate for the inability of the aforementioned children to participate effectively in the English monolingual program.

Most states which subsequently passed similar laws also conform to the magic three-year time frame and mandate school districts to conduct annual surveys to determine the number of their children with limited English-speaking ability. It is also widely endorsed that comprehension, speaking, reading, and writing will be developed in both the native language and in English; these in addition to the teaching of the history and culture associated with the native language of the children involved, as well as the history and culture of the United States. This latter aspect aims to give the native language, as well as English, its appropriate recognition, thereby promoting positive attitudes and providing meaningful opportunities for every child to participate in all school activities, curricular and extracurricular.

However idealistic their wording, these statutes for bilingual education are frequently ambiguous, overgeneralized, and misleading. When situations arise in the community which are not specifically mentioned, or which the legislature did not anticipate at the time the statute was passed, it is difficult to
determine how narrow or broad (or literal) the lawmakers' intended interpretation should be. In such cases, the positions taken have generally served to verify that, regardless of a pluralistic stance on the books, states will echo the federal government's call for total assimilation. Were they to do otherwise, Title-allocated funds, earmarked for program demonstration and dispensed on a competitive basis, might not be forthcoming. Federal money has been the barometer for the quantity of bilingual programs within the jurisdiction of any state's education agency (SEA), and of course must be considered in planning; but the precedence it takes seems overwhelming. What is to be the measure of quality?

Since all the states presently receive up to 5 percent of the total funds granted to their local education agencies (LEA), they in turn have created their own 'Title VII' bureaucracies. As an example, New York State has legislated $1.6 million for bilingual transitional programs statewide, while receiving $700,000 from Title VII. If these federal funds were to be discontinued, where would programmatic planning activity be?

At the state education agency level, funding for bilingual programs is not solely derived from Title VII; but it must be understood that these funds are for full program implementation, whereas Title I money is earmarked for program components.

I cite New York as an example since it is the state in which I live and its education agency is the one with which I am most familiar. But outside of Massachusetts, which is the only state to allocate more funds than those from Title VII (up to 5 percent), the situation encountered in New York is prevalent throughout the nation.

Competition fosters duplication of effort. In 1973, the New York State Commissioner of Education, responding to pressure exerted by the Puerto Rican community, called for the formation of an advisory council to revise a five-year plan for bilingual education. As early as 1971, however, New York City had established a citywide Commission on Bilingual Education to advise the Chancellor on matters in this area. From this group came the resolution stating that the Board of Education, in the interest of equal educational opportunity, would encourage '... where feasible, the development of bilingual education programs throughout the city for children whose native language is other than English ...' Moreover, it went on to say, 'The opportunity to study another language or to participate in Bilingual Programs ... should be provided for all pupils at some time in their schooling as a means of enriching their educational and life experience'. The resolution concludes with the Board's commitment that 'The school system will continue its efforts to develop public understanding and appreciation of bilingual education as a vital ingredient in ensuring equality of opportunity,'
fostering academic growth, and developing children's pride and self-esteem' (December, 1977).

It is not merely as an exercise in educational one-upmanship that I bring to your attention the fact that a task force in the city was at work in 1971 on matters which paralleled the state's concerns of two years later. Having chaired the State Commission at its inception, I can attest that even then it was our goal to achieve a unified, and therefore comprehensive, approach to bilingual schooling throughout the state. Unfortunately, what little money there was then—and is now—had to go to direct services, the result being implementation of a certain quantity of programs, without the necessary checks and balances to assure their uniformity of quality.

This let's-get-on-with-it-immediately and plan-as-we-go technique has resulted in at least as much backtracking as it has in progress. The notion that support money must go directly to the area of need in order to help is rather like pouring medicine on the external symptoms of an ailment: sometimes it works, sometimes it does not. In the latter case, perhaps it needs to be taken internally, ingested to permeate the system, in order to effect a cure.

A potentially serious threat to the continuation of bilingual education, nationally as well as locally, is that disappointing outcomes from poorly implemented projects may taint the overall concept of the approach, resulting in its abandonment by policy-makers at all levels. If an educational process is to succeed, be it bilingual or any other, it must receive the same support that is provided for the established educational agenda for all students. When narrow concerns, such as 'Which interest group will be served, and who will get the most money?', take precedence over the broader perspective of 'How can bilingual education serve the community as a whole?', the program is in trouble. Therefore, the link of bilingual education to compensatory education must be broken, and only through coordinated efforts of all involved can this situation be remedied.

Title VII also suffers from all problems endemic to federal programs. There is some irony in the fact that legislation directed to expediting educational change often aggravates the orderly process of that change. Such mandates advance the expectations of constituencies in quantum leaps, and legal avenues are opened through which their expectations can be expressed (court orders, Office of Civil Rights investigations, etc.). The capabilities of districts to implement these mandates usually develop more slowly, with the result that administrators, instead of being able to plot strategies which pace educational change to realistic resource mobilization schedules, may find themselves embroiled in a change process that is actually a series of tactical maneuvers and holding actions.
The Rand Study. The Rand Study (Federal Programs Supporting Educational Change, Volume VI, Summner and Zellman, 1978) examined the implementation process of Title VII bilingual projects throughout the nation, according to a scheme delineating four phases in the life of such projects:

1. Initiation, when decisions were made whether to have a project, and if so, its level of funding, model, and population to be served.

2. Design, when decisions were made about the educational and other design aspects of the project and the implementation strategy to be developed.

3. Operationalization, when the project had to adapt to the realities of its institutional setting, and project plans had to be translated into practice.

4. Continuation, when the project achieved a stable funding state.

In the first and last phases, the common denominator was their political aspect rather than the educational issue:

Initiation: Where should it go in the hierarchy; who is to be the director?

Continuation: (a) The concept of bilingual education may be viewed erroneously as a failure because of implementation problems or because of inefficient design. (b) High recurring program costs may reduce support for bilingual education. (c) Nontarget resistance may increase.

Recommendations. Because we must anticipate these factors, particularly insofar as they affect continuation, obviously the goal of establishing a bilingual program is, in itself, not enough; the decision to initiate a program does not guarantee its viability. Since bilingual education has posed a challenge to the basic goals and outcomes of public education, it is essential that it be looked upon as a means by which better results can be achieved. Bilingualism must be viewed as an organic part of the total effort, not as an appendix that is unessential and easily removed. The same consistent and organized constituency pressures that have been influential at national and regional levels must be continued to ensure that bilingual education will establish and retain a place of priority in regard to budget, staffing, organization, and overall support. Without comprehensive planning, this cannot be accomplished.

As an initial measure, federal, state, and local education agencies must improve their internal and external lines of communication to address four areas of great concern. To avoid conflicts between the programmatic and regulatory spheres, agreement is needed in the following areas: (1) uniformity of guidelines and objectives—common definitions of 'bilingual education', 'limited English language skills', etc.; establishment of minimum criteria for program implementation; development of models, taking into consideration community needs and preference (be it for the transitional or enrichment approach);
determination of appropriate instruments to measure English and native language ability; (2) coordination of leadership, including channels of communication among institutions of higher education offering staff-development programs in bilingual education; (3) development of monitoring systems; and (4) evaluation procedures, so that they are consistent and complementary.

To accomplish these ends, a model utilizing management techniques should be established, with a statewide commission as the body to address the issues and concerns raised by local education agencies. Commission members, appointed by the chief state officer in education, ought to represent all ethno-linguistic groups in the state, including English monolingual, and teacher organizations as well. Once organized, the commission would work closely with the state education agency staff, and it would be advantageous to have four task forces within the commission to concern themselves with the areas of communication, coordination, monitoring, and evaluation.

Conclusion. As I have indicated, at present bilingual education is viewed by its many opponents as an extravagance, and by its advocates as a right. Through comprehensive planning we must also seek means to dispel the negative impression some have of this approach. Outside of presentations such as this, at convocations of people who, for the most part, share our conviction that bilingual education is better education, virtually nothing has been done to convince the monolingual majority that our belief is correct. They have a point in that the mastery of English should be a major goal of every educational program throughout the nation. For the defensibility of the bilingual approach, as well as to assure equal opportunity for culturally different children, bilingual educators should lead the vanguard in demanding the eradication of programs that do not develop English language skills while preserving and enhancing native language ability. Bilingualism is an absolute state of being able to function comfortably and capably in two languages. Anything less is not really bilingualism, and the accomplishment of less, while it may constitute progress for the individual, cannot satisfy our programs' goals.

Recently, I asked a large group of bilingual teachers to define in writing three terms—bilingual, bilingualism, and bilingual education—and the spectrum of their responses was more amazing than enlightening. I found more disconcerting than the fact that there was wide disagreement, the fact that a few of these people, though supposedly involved in the process, were completely unable to find words to describe it. An experience such as this underlines—in red ink—the need to define the terms, to achieve a consensus, to initiate the comprehensive planning that will lead to the development of bilingual education to its fullest potential. As we begin, there is one thing we would do well to keep in mind: the burden of proof is upon
us to convince the monolingual majority that bilinguals have something they want, something their children need as much as ours do, from which they may reap special benefits not available in a monolingual system. I believe we can do it.
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The Federal Bilingual Education Program has required local recipients of grants for instructional projects to provide annual evaluations of the success of their projects and to submit semi-annual objective measurements of project success. Critics have charged that most of this research is inadequate. They are right. But for the wrong reasons.

Among the faults which critics have noted in the design or reporting of project evaluations are the following: inadequate sampling procedures; insufficient sample size; lack of information about the initial achievement of pupils enrolled in the project, against which their subsequent achievement might be compared; inadequate information about the performance of similar children, enrolled in conventional, monolingual programs, against which the attainments of the bilingually schooled children might be compared; failure to control for variables such as socio-economic status, pupils' initial language abilities, and teacher preparation when comparing the attainments of control and experimental groups; failure to describe adequately the project's instructional activities; the use of inadequate or inappropriate measurement instruments; the use of inappropriate tests of statistical significance; and failure to guard against the 'Hawthorne effect'.

While these project evaluations have many technical faults, there is a more fundamental if less obvious objection to this research. Even if the technical faults, correctly pointed out by critics, were remedied, much of the research would still be of little use.

Gap between real and stated program aims. One reason for the lack of usefulness of this research is that the stated goal of the Bilingual Education Program appears not to be its real
goal (see Rubin 1977 for a discussion of the difference between stated and unstated goals in language planning). The Program, approved by the Congress in 1968, was authorized as a research and demonstration program which would test the effectiveness of various bilingual educational approaches to boosting the educational achievement of poor, ethnolinguistic minority children whose English proficiency is limited. It seems likely, however, that the real goal of the Program is to provide bilingual education for those minority groups which, for varying reasons, want it. What evidence is there for a gap between stated and real aims?

One source of evidence comes from a national evaluation, completed by the American Institutes for Research in 1977, of the Program's Spanish-English projects (about two-thirds of all projects in the Program are designed for Spanish-speaking children). According to that study, fewer than 30 percent of the participating children are actually limited in their ability to speak English and about 85 percent of the projects keep children in bilingual programs long after the children's English proficiency would permit them to move into monolingual English-medium classrooms (Herbert 1977). These figures, if correct, would support the notion that whatever the original intent of the legislation, the underlying goal of the Program is to provide bilingual education per se rather than to study the effectiveness of varying bilingual education approaches for improving the English proficiency of ethnolinguistic minority children.

More compelling evidence of the marginal importance of evaluating the effectiveness of competing bilingual education models as a goal of the Program comes from the manner in which the evaluations have been executed. First of all, the evaluations of local projects have been carried out by the projects themselves, although it is in the best interest both of the project evaluator who wants to be rehired and the project director who wants a renewal of his grant to submit evaluations which are as favorable as credibility permits. Second, having allowed local projects to evaluate themselves, the Program has given the projects wide latitude in deciding what to measure, how to measure it, and how to analyze the data which have been collected (General Accounting Office 1976), with the consequence that project-to-project comparisons are extremely difficult to make. Would the Program have carried out its evaluations in such a manner if evaluation had been a primary goal? If the Program had been a serious research and demonstration enterprise, would the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare fiscal year 1974 report on the Bilingual Education Program have been able to state the following? '... the only current source of data concerning the program's impact on children are the annual individual project evaluation reports whose limitations in the data or methodologies prevent them from being used to draw conclusions about overall program effectiveness' (quoted by General Accounting Office 1976:30). It seems hardly
credible that, after the appropriation of half a billion dollars from 1969 through 1977 for the Program, so little would be known about the impact of various bilingual approaches on the attainments of children if the Program had been a serious research and demonstration enterprise. One can only conclude that the Program's real goals lie elsewhere.

It is likely, then, that the Congress passed the Bilingual Education Program and has continued to fund it not so much to determine what types of bilingual education are effective as transitional interventions, but rather in response to the pressures of minority groups who have demanded such education. While it is true that minority group leaders may view bilingual education as a means for improving the education of poor, minority group youngsters (many of whom, in any event, had little to lose inasmuch as their education in conventional monolingual programs can scarcely have been worse), it is also probable that other goals have been more important, particularly the maintenance of ethnic identity, ethnic values, and ethnic languages. Such goals are clearly legitimate, even if unstated for tactical reasons. Indeed, such goals may be far more appropriate ones for bilingual education than transitional remediation. However, if these are the underlying goals of the Program, then research directed towards the relative effectiveness of varying bilingual education approaches for improving the English language skills of pupils seems misdirected.

Difficulties of generalizing from local evaluations. A second reason why much of the research associated with the Bilingual Education Program is not very useful is that even if the Program were being carried out primarily for research and demonstration purposes, evaluations of the effectiveness of individual projects can rarely have more than local significance. There are two bases for this claim.

First, it seems abundantly clear that the sociolinguistic and educational matrix in which the bilingual program is embedded has important (though dimly understood) consequences for the success or failure of the program. Thus, to cite two of the best-known examples, bilingual programs in Ireland appear to have been associated with English mother-tongue children's retardation in problem arithmetic, with no corresponding gain in their Irish language skills (Macnamara 1966), whereas French-English bilingual programs for English mother-tongue children in Montreal appear to have been markedly successful in imparting French language skills, with no ultimate deficits either in subject-matter areas or in English language skills (Lambert and Tucker 1972). Lambert and Tucker's findings are consistent neither with the Irish bilingual experience nor with the failure of poor, ethnolinguistic minority children to achieve well in monolingual English-medium classrooms in the United States. Similarly, Engle's (1975) survey of studies concerned with the relationship between the language employed for teaching beginning
reading and success in reading in a second language suggests that there is no simple answer as to whether schools should use the children's mother tongue to teach them to read, when the ultimate goal is to impart literacy in a second language. The relative socioeconomic position of the children's families, the opportunity and need to communicate in the second language outside the classroom, the attitudes of the children, their parents, and their teachers towards each of the languages involved, the amount of time and curricular emphases accorded each language of instruction, the size and the composition of the class, the training and ability of the teachers, the expectations of the teachers regarding their pupils' ability to succeed, the extent to which adequate materials can be prepared in each language, and the similarity between the backgrounds of teachers and pupils, are all variables which are likely to be related to the success or failure of bilingual programs. Because the success of such programs is the outcome of a complex interaction among many such factors, and because sociolinguistic and educational contexts differ markedly from locale to locale, the generalizability of local studies is quite limited.

One does not need to invoke the comparison between Dublin and Montreal to make this point. The bilingual education contexts in the United States alone are quite diverse. Thus, for example, the Spanish-English programs at the Garfield School in Redwood City (Cohen 1975a) and the Coral Way School in Miami (Gaarder 1967) are different with respect to numerous variables such as the ethnic identity of the Spanish-speaking children, the relative size and social and economic position of the Spanish language community, the proportion of Anglo children enrolled, the number of children per class, and the uses to which English and Spanish are put as media of instruction. Many more such between-project comparisons can be made. Indeed, it is probably not an exaggeration to claim that each of the 400 current local projects of the Bilingual Education Program is unique with respect to the sociolinguistic and educational context in which it operates. Thus, we cannot be sure that a program which works well in one context will work well in another.

A second basis for claiming the doubtfulness of our ability to generalize from the results of local projects lies in the difficulties involved in attempting to carry out controlled research in educational settings. The conflict between the requirements of controlled experimentation and those of administrative convenience and feasibility is well known to anyone who has tried to carry out experimental research with groups of schoolchildren at school. As a practical matter, children often cannot be randomly assigned to experimental and control treatments; where randomization is not feasible, it is often difficult to find control groups which appear to be comparable to the children in the experimental group; where before-and-after measurements are used in lieu of or in addition to comparisons between control and experimental groups, it is sometimes difficult to ensure that
the only variable intervening during the period of the project is the project itself (i.e. that there have not been concomitant changes in the community that might account for any observed changes in educational attainment). In addition to problems involved in making comparisons between experimental and control groups or between pre- and post-test data, there are the problems inherent in the relatively small number of classrooms which are typically involved in the study of a local project. Because the influence of particularly good or particularly poor teachers may be pervasive, one would like to observe the experimental program at work with enough teachers so that the influence of exceptional teachers is minimized, but this is rarely possible. Thus, even were we able to find two sociolinguistically similar bilingual projects, it is likely that we would have difficulties in comparing their results either because of differences in their research designs or because of differences in the implementation of their designs, either type of difference occurring as a result of considerations of practical convenience.

Thus, much of the research associated with the Bilingual Education Program is of doubtful usefulness, not only because it is directed towards goals which, though stated as primary, appear in fact to be marginal, but also because the local nature of the programs and the exigencies of educational research make it difficult to generalize from the results of individual projects.

How should research be redirected? If project evaluations have been misdirected, does it necessarily follow that bilingual education projects ought to abandon the gathering of information about the progress of their pupils? Not at all. Parents have a right to know how well their children are performing, and teachers and administrators need this information as well. However, this is equally true with respect to children in conventional programs. It seems doubtful that an elaborate evaluation design or procedure is required to supply such information. Devices (tests, questionnaires, interviews, rating scales, systematic observation procedures) can be periodically administered to children in bilingual programs as they are in ordinary programs. It might be argued that the measurement devices which are appropriate for monolingual programs may not be appropriate for bilingual programs. This is clearly true with respect to goals of instruction in the bilingual program which are not found in monolingual programs, e.g. skills in languages other than English, knowledge of subject-matter areas connected with ethnic identity, and positive attitudes towards ethnic identity. Thus, bilingual projects may require a certain amount of instrument construction not required by conventional programs, although this need appears to be diminishing because of the growing bank of instruments designed by or for local bilingual education projects (see, for example, Silverman, Noa, and Russell 1976). In any case, elaborate and costly research
designs are not required to give parents, teachers, and administrators information about the progress of individual pupils in bilingual education projects.

One can also argue that elaborate research designs are not required to show whether a given project is 'working', at least with respect to educational goals. It is reasonable to suppose that the average number of absences per child, the drop-out rate, and the percentage of children who are able to read at specified levels in English and in their mother tongue provide good, rough measures of the success of a program from the point of view of educational outcomes (if not from the point of view of outcomes related to ethnic solidarity). Such measures are not particularly difficult to obtain. In fact, one could argue that if it is necessary to resort to elaborate designs and tests of statistical significance in order to demonstrate the success of a project, the project's impact has been marginal.

While elaborate research may not be necessary to document the success of a given project, some experts suggest that detailed studies of individual projects will help us to develop a theory of bilingual education which will account for the contradictory findings emerging from research in bilingual education. This may be true. However, it can be argued that studies of individual projects are more likely to lead to the development of theory when they have been motivated by theory rather than by the need to assess the success of a given program. This is not to claim that valuable theoretical insights cannot flow from research directed towards practical ends, but only that such insights are more likely to be found if the research has been designed to find them. While there is neither a necessary nor a direct practical payoff for theoretically motivated research, such research will, in the long run, be more useful because it helps us to understand the phenomena underlying the solution to practical problems (Kerlinger 1977). A study evaluating a particular bilingual project may convincingly demonstrate the efficiency of that project's approach to solving a particular set of problems. But it is difficult to transfer that experience to a different setting unless we understand why the approach was successful. To understand why an approach works or does not work for particular children in a particular sociolinguistic and educational context, we must understand better than we do today the many ways in which cognitive, emotional, and socio-cultural aspects of learning affect and are affected by the content, context, and language of learning.

What theoretical questions will ultimately lead to better educational practice can be determined only after the event. However, theoretical studies such as the following exemplify sociolinguistic and psycholinguistic research which has some chance to influence educational practice: Gumperz and Hernández' (1972) study of code alternation in classroom interaction; Ervin-Tripp's (1972) comparison of the development of syntactic and morphological features between children learning a second
language and those learning their first; Cohen's (1974, 1975b) studies of the phenomenon of forgetting a second language because of limited exposure to it after the onset of learning; Fillmore's (in press) description of the social and cognitive strategies involved in young schoolchildren's learning the medium of instruction as a second language; and Macnamara's (1967) study of children's problem-solving via first and second languages. Studies such as these are likely to influence educational practice because they are addressed to questions about universal mechanisms. Bilingual education offers one context in which such questions can be investigated. It is these questions, rather than the questions about the extent to which given projects have been successful, which are most likely to help us understand such phenomena as second-language learning, the learning of reading, the formation of complex cognitive structures, language maintenance and language shift, and the formation and maintenance of ethnic identity. If we can improve our understanding of such phenomena, we will be in a better position to recommend sound educational policy and practice.

Recommendations. The arguments presented here lead to the following recommendations for the conduct of research within the context of the Bilingual Education Program.

(1) Give greater attention to the unstated goals which apparently underlie the continuance of the Program, particularly the maintenance of ethnic solidarity, ethnic values, and ethnic languages.

(2) Do not require bilingual education projects to go through the motions of experimental design, including the obtaining of comparative measurements from control groups, unless there is a serious intention to study the relative effectiveness of competing bilingual education models.

(3) If there is a serious intention to study the relative effectiveness of different models, give less responsibility to local projects for their own evaluation and impose greater uniformity (to the extent permitted by variability in local goals) with respect to what is measured, how it is measured, and the ways in which data are presented and analyzed.

(4) Continue to gather local data which will permit parents, teachers, and administrators to assess the performance of individual children.

(5) Give greater support to research which asks general questions, i.e. questions whose answers promise to further the development of behavioral or cognitive theory. Here are some examples of promising questions: (a) Are the psychological processes underlying first and second language learning the same? (b) Why do students fail to solve a complex problem couched in their second language
when they can solve each of its components in that language? (c) What cognitive and social strategies underlie second language learning? (d) How does code-switching convey social information? (e) What are the mechanisms underlying language maintenance and language shift? (f) What role does language maintenance play in the maintenance of ethnic identity? The argument here is not that these questions are necessarily the best ones from the point of view of bilingual education (others might suggest different questions as being ultimately more rewarding) but that we should give greater emphasis to the identification and solution of such problems.

Educational policy decisions, of course, are rarely based on rational considerations alone. Political pressures and constraints usually play an important role as well. Nowhere is this clearer than with respect to bilingual education. Nonetheless, decisions are sound to the extent that the evidence on which they are anchored is sound. With respect to bilingual education, the reorientation of research along the lines suggested here ought, in the long run, to give us a firmer basis for formulating educational policy.

NOTE

Andrew D. Cohen's criticisms of an earlier draft of this paper were very helpful.
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Institutional change—A strategy for advancing bilingual education. Educators and lay citizens recognize that children who do not come from English-speaking homes encounter many academic and social barriers in this nation's schools because bilingual education programs are still scarce. To the extent that comprehensible education is unavailable to these children, their opportunities for quality education are severely diminished. As a result, bilingual education continues to be an important goal in American education in order that these children might develop to their fullest potential.

In the past few years the advancement of bilingual education has been facilitated by five strategies which contribute to education equity in general: legislation, litigation, community involvement, instructional materials and practices, and policy studies.

Legislation. Enabling legislation includes legislation and regulations for the enforcement of programs which provide avenues for examining causes of educational bias toward languages other than English, and developing procedures and practices to eliminate bias. Title VII of the Education Amendments of 1974, the Bilingual Education Act, illustrates that Federal legislation can advance bilingual education. In addition, enabling legislation might include State legislation and regulations which specify State-level efforts for remedying educational bias, and providing educational opportunities for children whose dominant language is not English.

Litigation. Landmark decisions such as Lau cover educational equity issues in bilingual education. As a strategy for achieving a better education for children, litigation focuses on the identification of precedent-setting court decisions related to
education equity. Effective strategies involving litigation frequently relate to the identification and review of issues in litigation and how they might be applied to bilingual education.

Community involvement. A critical ingredient in establishing and maintaining sound bilingual education programs, community efforts are essential in documenting and bringing about change in existing policy and practices. Frequently, community-school advisory groups are mandated both in Federal legislation and by the courts. In many instances, community action by an individual or organized community group has accounted for considerable gains related to instruction in bilingual education and other subject areas.

Instructional materials and practices. Instructional materials and practices represent key strategies when coupled with the documentation of the need for modification of instructional materials, practices, and subject matter content. Prototype efforts to develop supplementary materials and modified subject matter content are also important. This strategy relates to training models for bilingual education which enhance teachers' capabilities to provide education equity.

Policy studies. The examination of policy has contributed to advancing the case of language minority students by providing statements on unequal opportunity.

In this paper, I suggest a sixth strategy—institutional change—as one which holds great potential for mainstreaming multicultural and bilingual education programs. Institutional change focuses on retooling and reorienting teacher-training institutions from monolingual education to multicultural and bilingual education.

A prime opportunity to study the potential of institutional change as a strategy for advancing bilingual education is afforded by the 1979 National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education Revised Standards (NCATE Standards), which the Council adopted in May, 1977, and which will become effective on January 1, 1979. These standards are of great importance in that institutions seeking NCATE accreditation or reaccreditation will be expected to include multicultural education in their institutions' teacher education programs beginning January 1, 1979. The significance of the mention of multicultural education in the revised standards cannot be overemphasized, as this is the first time that an education equity issue has dominated a single standard, Standard 2, Curricula. Furthermore, multicultural education is included in other standards: Standard 3, Faculty; Standard 4, Students; Standard 5, Resources and Facilities; Standard 6, Evaluation, Program Review, and Planning.

For the specialist in bilingual education who is unfamiliar with the accreditation of teacher-training programs in the United States, I am going to summarize pertinent aspects of the accreditation process before outlining the revised Standards and discussing their implications for bilingual education.
First, it is important to know that accreditation in teacher education is voluntary on the part of the institution. While the Council on Postsecondary Accreditation (the body that accredits accrediting agencies) and the Advisory Committee on Eligibility and Agency Evaluation (the U.S. Office of Education division concerned with recognizing accrediting agencies) stand ready to share information on accreditation, their role is not to ensure that every teacher-training facility maintains accreditation. A result of voluntary accreditation is that of the 1,367 schools, colleges, and departments of education (SCDEs) in higher education institutions with state-approved programs in teacher education, about 40 percent or 540 are accredited by NCATE. In considering the impact of the NCATE standards on bilingual education, it is important to note that these 540 or so SCDEs turn out 80-85 percent of all educational personnel in the United States.

The Council on Postsecondary Accreditation (COPA) authorizes NCATE to adopt standards and procedures for accreditation of teacher education programs, and to determine the accreditation status of institutional programs. Consequently, NCATE is responsible for national accreditation of college and university programs, and for the preparation of teachers and other educational personnel involved in both elementary and secondary levels.

NCATE considers SCDEs eligible for accreditation evaluation if their teacher-training programs, or programs for the preparation of professional school personnel, meet the following prerequisites.

The four-year or graduate degree-granting program approved by the State Department of Education is at the same degree levels for which accreditation is requested.

The program is accredited by the regional accrediting association.

The overall institution is in compliance with Federal equal employment opportunity laws.

The program has graduated students from the applicant program in order to evaluate the quality of the preparation.

Once NCATE accepts the institution’s application to be evaluated, the actual evaluation procedures involve an extensive institutional self-study report, in addition to site visits from teams of educators, including classroom teachers. The institutional self-study is based on the Guide for Preparing an Institutional Report, a detailed document that covers every section of the Standards.

The actual standards against which institutions are evaluated have evolved over a number of years. An abbreviated calendar which pinpoints milestones in the development of the revised Standards follows:
1927  Initiation of voluntary accreditation review by the former American Association of Teachers Colleges (AATE)
1952  Founding of the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE)
1954  Transfer of accreditation function from AACTE to NCATE
1957  Approval of NCATE by the National Commission on Accreditation
1970  Adoption of Standards
1975–1977  Revision of the Standards for Accreditation of Teacher Education
1977  Adoption of the revised Standards by NCATE during May
1979  Effective date of the revised Standards on January 1

While educators have not always agreed upon the goals of accreditation and the identification of strategies for their achievement, there are three purposes of national accreditation of teacher education which are cited in the current Standards: assurance to the public that professional school staff meet national standards of quality, advancement of quality in teacher preparation programs, and achievement of quality instructional programs for American students.

Institutions are encouraged not only to support these goals, but to extend them by experimentation and innovation. In recognition of the critical need for developing programs appropriate to wide-ranging teaching settings, schools can develop experimental programs which may be included in the site review by the visiting team. It is within this area of experimentation that bilingual educators could be especially helpful to institutional staff who lack background in bilingual education. Obviously, the challenge is to formulate the total program so that the overall objectives of the program can also meet the needs of bilingual teaching.

To complement the implementation of the Standards and to encourage innovation within their framework, the Constitution of the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (Article VII) provides for continuous monitoring of the NCATE Standards. The Council and its Committee on Standards ensures the participation of representatives from institutions, organizations, and practicing professionals. The Council is responsible for keeping its constituent organizations and all accredited schools informed of its activities. Ultimately, the Council and its Committee are responsible for gathering information regarding adoption, deletion, or any amendment of the Standards. At any time prior to January 1, 1979 (the date on which the revised standards become effective) or after implementation begins, an individual, institution, or association may address inquiries and concerns about the new Standards to The Director of the

The Standards: Part I and Part II. The revised standards offer a great deal of potential for bilingual education because they apply both to basic programs and to advanced programs. Part I, Basic Programs, applies to the initial preparation of teachers (nursery school through secondary school) and includes five-year and MAT programs. The standards in Part I do not cover classroom staff such as paraprofessionals. The phrase 'advanced programs' refers to programs beyond the baccalaureate level for the preparation of classroom teachers and other professional school staff.

Format of the Standards. The standards for both Part I, Basic Programs, and Part II, Advanced Programs, are each preceded by a preamble. For each, the preamble states the rationale for the standard, discusses its meaning, and specifies the terms contained within. In other words, the preambles provide context and discussion of the actual standards and are intended to assist institutions in their interpretation. In the following discussion of the standards, the preambles will be highlighted; however, the standard per se is quoted directly.

Part I: Basic teacher education programs (programs for the initial preparation of teachers through the fifth-year level, including MAT programs).

1. Governance of basic programs. The preamble addresses the issues of program and personnel management within the context of implementing the standards. Qualifications of personnel include classroom experience at the K-12 levels, adequate professional training, and a continuing relationship with the schools at either the elementary or secondary levels. The preamble requires that a single unit be allocated for administering and coordinating all teacher education programs.

Standard: The design, approval, and continuous evaluation and development of teacher education programs are the primary responsibility of an officially designated unit. The membership of this unit is composed of faculty and/or staff who have professional and scholarly preparation; a majority of the membership of this unit are experienced in elementary or secondary teaching and have continuing experience in elementary or secondary schools, are significantly involved and well informed about the preparation of teachers and the problems of the schools, and have experience in, and commitment to, the task of educating teachers who will provide instruction in a multicultural society.
The implications of both the preamble and standard for bilingual education center on provision for a management structure which accommodates multicultural and bilingual education, and staff whose training includes multicultural and bilingual education. They require that the staff continue contact with schools in multicultural and bilingual settings. In other words, multicultural and bilingual education would be integrated into the total management and personnel system—whatever the particular configuration of the organization.

2. Curricula for basic programs. The preamble emphasizes the sort of preparation for teachers which enables them to be effective with diverse cultural groups. Institutions are encouraged to experiment with programs which focus on multicultural skills for teachers and which highlight the unique contributions of various cultural groups.

The purpose of the curriculum standards is not to prescribe a specific program activity, but to assist the institutions in conforming to goals and objectives widely ascribed to by the profession. To allow for discoveries that constantly are occurring in the field of teacher education, the standards provide for experimentation and innovation. The writers of the standards were sensitive to the fact that experimentation in the multicultural area might require special review outside the present organization of the standards. In such cases, the special programs may be presented for review separately from the institution's other programs.

The seven standards under the general category of 'curriculum' address the following:

2.1 Design of curricula
2.1.1 Multicultural education
2.2 The general studies component
2.3 The professional studies component
2.3.1 Content for the teaching speciality
2.3.2 Humanistic and behavioral studies
2.3.3 Teaching and learning theory with laboratory and clinical experience
2.3.4 Practicum

The inclusion of references to multicultural education in the most recent standards is the feature which most distinguishes these from previous standards. The presence of multicultural concerns is clearest under the sets of standards on 'curriculum', where multicultural education constitutes a single standard, 2.1.1 Multicultural education, and is referred to under:

2.1 Design of curriculum
2.2 The general studies component
2.4 Use of guidelines developed by national learned societies and professional associations
2.1 Design of curriculum. The preamble states that multicultural education must be an integral part of the teacher education program. From the perspective of multicultural and bilingual education, the preamble under 2.1.1 Multicultural education is critical, as it is the first standard ever that directly addresses educational equity issues in general and linguistic diversity in particular. It is so important to the specialist in multicultural and bilingual education that all the main points are given here.

(1) Multicultural education is defined as '...preparation for the social, political, and economic realities that individuals experience in culturally diverse and complex human encounters.'

(2) Emphasis is on the individuals' acquisition of multicultural skills.

(3) Multicultural education is regarded as a strategy for increasing the staff's awareness of cultural diversity and, as such, is viewed as permeating every aspect of the teacher preparation programs.

(4) Multicultural skills should enable education personnel to: understand issues around participatory democracy, racism, sexism, and the parity of power; develop values clarification skills and understand better the transmission of values in the community and in the classroom; use knowledge of cultural diversity and learning styles in instructional settings; and understand linguistic diversity and develop skills for teaching children of limited English-speaking backgrounds.

The complete standard is as follows:

Standard: The institution gives evidence of planning for multicultural education in its teacher education curricula including both the general and professional studies components.

The language in the standard and the specific mention of linguistic diversity in the preamble to 2.1, Design of curriculum make it clear that many of the concerns of bilingual education—for instance, cultural awareness—are recognized as being major national issues in teacher preparation. Unfortunately, there is a relatively low number of institutions whose staffs are trained in bilingual education. Without the assistance of bilingual specialists, the awareness, understanding, and development of strategies so necessary for effecting change in attitudes and skills around the education of language minority groups will be many years in development. This time frame can be shortened substantially by institutions utilizing specialists in bilingual
education and by bilingual educators making contact with the 537 or so institutions responsible for implementing the standards.

2.2 The general studies component. This preamble addresses the teacher's role in promoting "...the positive human values of our multicultural society". It also mentions the need for individualized instruction for students in teacher preparation programs. The support for individualized instruction implies that instruction in languages other than English is appropriate to meet the needs of students who seek careers in bilingual classrooms.

2.3 The professional studies component. Standards for 2.3, The professional studies component and 2.3.1, Content for the teaching speciality relate to the subject content to be taught to K-12 pupils. The Standard 2.3.2, Humanistic and behavioral studies deals with the many disciplines (for instance, linguistics, sociology, and anthropology) that contribute to teachers' understanding of their subjects. Complementing the sections on content and discipline, are Standards 2.3.2, Teaching and learning theory with laboratory and clinical experience and 2.3.4, Practicum. Both the laboratory and clinical sections emphasize the application of content and the actual practice of teaching.

Although there is no mention of multicultural education in Standards 2.3, Professional studies component, 2.3.1, Content for the teaching speciality, 2.3.2, Humanistic and behavioral studies, 2.3.3, Teaching and learning theory with laboratory and clinical experience, and 2.3.4, Practicum, they are set in the total context of Standard 2, Curricula for basic programs, which requires multicultural education with further emphasis on linguistic diversity. Despite the lack of specific reference to multicultural education or to linguistic diversity in Standards 2.3.1, 2.3.2, 2.3.3, and 2.3.4, a culturally sensitive approach to these standards is critical. The establishment and development of a comprehensive multicultural program depends to a large extent on the quality of professional studies, substantive content, and the humanities and social sciences, because they provide the empirical basis for multicultural education and its many facets such as bilingual education.

2.4 Use of guidelines developed by national learned societies and professional organizations. This preamble encourages institutions to utilize resources developed by professional associations and national learned societies. For instance, conferences devoted to bilingual education in addition to statements available from professional associations would assist institutions in implementing the revised standards.

The standard gives a tight summary of the preamble:

Standard: In planning and developing curricula for teacher education, the institution studies the
recommendations of national professional associations and learned societies and adopts a rationale for the selection and implementation of pertinent sets of recommendations for each teacher education program.

While this preamble suggests that institutions make contact with professional groups and learned societies regarding their position on teacher preparation, it would accelerate the implementation of the new standards if the bilingual education associations were to initiate a cooperative effort with institutions. There are several major annual and semiannual conferences at the national and state levels which issue resolutions and position papers—many of which could guide teacher preparation. Bilingual educators should not overlook proceedings from conferences in screening appropriate materials for training in curriculum.

2.5 Student participation in program evaluation and development. This standard underscores the requirement for students to participate in decision-making for the program. Given multicultural objectives in the total program, this standard would ensure that all students be included in the decision process.

3. Faculty for basic programs. Of the five preambles and standards under 3, Faculty for basic programs, three are tied directly to multicultural and bilingual education concerns: 3.1, Competence and utilization of faculty; 3.4, Conditions for faculty development; and 3.5, Part-time faculty. For instance, the preamble to 3.1, Competence and utilization of faculty, states that 'The institution's commitment to multicultural education is reflected in its policies for recruiting teacher education faculty'. The standard requires a multicultural faculty.

Standard: An institution engaged in preparing teachers has full-time faculty members in teacher education whose preparation reflects rich and varied backgrounds appropriate to the programs offered. Each has post-master's degree preparation and/or demonstrated scholarly competence and appropriate specializations. Such specializations make possible competent instruction in the humanistic and behavioral studies, in teaching and learning theory, and in the methods of teaching in each of the specialities for which the institution prepares teachers. There are appropriate specializations to ensure competent supervision of laboratory, clinical, and practicum experiences. Institutional policy will reflect a commitment to multicultural education in the recruitment of full-time faculty members.

The preamble under 3.4, Conditions for faculty development, and 3.5, Part-time faculty, clarifies that staff development
opportunities should include all staff, and that the hiring of part-time faculty should be viewed as an opportunity to involve people/staff members from a variety of cultural backgrounds. The standard obligates part-time faculty to meet the requirements for appointment to the full-time faculty and to participate as professionals on the faculty. Bilingual education implies that specialists in the field should be hired and encouraged to participate as professionals even though their status is part-time.

3.2 Faculty involvement with schools and 3.3 Conditions for faculty service. Standards 3.2, Faculty involvement with schools and 3.3, Conditions for faculty service, imply that staff in bilingual education programs would maintain contact with bilingual settings in public schools and that the conditions of faculty service would allow for the bilingual specialist to have appropriate teaching and supervisory loads. Standard 3.3, Conditions for faculty service, is helpful in determining whether bilingual specialists have adequate opportunity to perform primary duties such as teaching. Excessive additional duties such as serving as counselors to large groups of students from minority language backgrounds or acting as liaisons to language minority communities would not allow enough time for dealing with primary duties.

4. Students in basic programs. In addition to the standard on student participation in program evaluation and development (Standard 2.5 under Curriculum for basic programs), there are three standards relating specifically to students under Standard 4: Students in basic programs:

4.1 Admission to basic programs
4.2 Retention of students in basic programs
4.3 Counseling and advising for students in basic programs

4.1 Admission to basic programs and 4.2 Retention of students in basic programs. Preambles to Standards 4.1 and 4.2 focus on the need for objective criteria applied consistently to student admissions and retention. Neither the preambles nor the two Standards 4.1 and 4.2 refer directly to multicultural issues. However, given the orientation of the new standards toward multicultural concerns, we can infer that the processes employed in the admission and retention of students should be examined for fairness to all students. To expand this part of the revised standards, we could include the recruitment of students. In other words, faculty should be sensitive to recruiting students from minority language backgrounds and admitting and retaining them as part of an overall strategy to include students from diverse cultural backgrounds.
4.3 Counseling and advising for students in basic programs. The preamble to Standard 4.3, Counseling and advising for students in basic programs, emphasizes the need for counselors and advisers who are '...sensitive to the multicultural character of society'. Standard 4.3, Counseling and advising for students relates closely to the standards under 3, Faculty for basic programs which require a well-balanced faculty. Clearly, good counseling requires individuals who are skilled in counseling techniques, who are caring in their attitudes toward students, and who are knowledgeable about the students' cultural backgrounds. For instance, it is important that counselors who share the students' linguistic backgrounds be available to students in bilingual education.

5. Resources and facilities for basic programs. An important part of this set of standards pertains to resources and facilities required in basic programs. The preamble addresses those provisions which must be made for a multicultural program, '... resources and facilities to support the development of an understanding of and appreciation for the culturally diverse nature of American society'. The three standards under 5, Resources and facilities for basic programs, highlight:

5.1 Library
5.2 Materials and instructional media centers
5.3 Physical facilities and other resources

5.1 Library. The preamble to Standard 5.1, Library states that 'The acquisition policies should reflect a commitment to multicultural education'. The implications for a teacher-training program focused on bilingual education are that library resources must be adequate to support the curriculum program in multicultural and bilingual education.

5.2 Materials and instructional media centers. Similarly, the preamble to Standard 5.2, Materials and instructional media centers, acknowledges the need for '... appropriate teaching learning materials and instructional media that reflect cultural diversity in American society'. Standard 5.2 makes it clear that resources are required which will support the multicultural and bilingual facets of the program.

5.3 Physical facilities and other resources. The remaining standard under Standard 5, Resources and facilities for basic programs, is Standard 5.3, Physical facilities and other resources. Standard 5.3 covers physical facilities and all types of equipment necessary for implementing the program. In the interests of multicultural and bilingual aspects of the program, it would be expected that the facilities would be allocated fairly.
6. Evaluation, program review, and planning. Of the three preambles and standards in this category, Standards 6.1, Evaluation of graduates, 6.2, Evaluation of results to improve basic programs, and 6.3, Long-range planning, only one, the preamble under Standard 6.3 mentions the multicultural thrust of the new standards. The reference to multiculturalism specifically addresses long-range planning: '... the long-range plan of the institution reflects a commitment to multicultural education'. This preamble requires educators to consider multicultural education a permanent focus of the program. This means that facets of the multicultural program such as bilingual education would cut across all areas of planning.

Although multicultural education is not cited in Standards 6.1, Evaluation of graduates, or 6.2, Evaluation of results to improve basic programs, evaluation of teacher preparation programs according to their strengths in multicultural education is essential for effective implementation of the standards and for institution planning. Because teacher-training programs in bilingual education often are not found in schools, colleges, or departments of education, but are located elsewhere on campus, specialists in bilingual education--regardless of their academic department--can render considerable service by sharing information about developing and managing programs in bilingual education. Participation on the part of faculty experienced in bilingual education, whether or not their administrative base is in the teacher preparation program, is critical to all facets of the standards, and especially in evaluating existing teacher-training programs in bilingual education for their compatibility with the revised standards.

Part II: Advanced programs--Post-baccalaureate programs for the advanced preparation of teachers and the preparation of other professional school personnel.

Part II of the revised Standards pertains to advanced programs at the post-baccalaureate or graduate level. These standards correspond in format to the standards for undergraduate programs. Of importance to bilingual educators is the fact that multicultural education is a major focus in the standards for advanced studies, just as it is in the standards relating to basic education. The numbers of the standards in Part II are prefaced by the letter G to signify standards at the graduate level.

G-1 Governance of advanced programs. As with the baccalaureate level programs, governance comprehends administrative and personnel management. A particular emphasis on governance at the graduate level is the quality of training for off-campus courses, or special seminars and workshops on campus. The preamble to G-1 requires the institution to ensure excellence in the special courses. As an example, all instruction is
... taught by qualified faculty members and supported by essential learning resources'. This requirement responds directly to discussions in bilingual education about the quality of advanced training. Because of the geographic isolation of many individuals seeking advanced programs in bilingual education, availability of quality graduate programs is difficult. For this reason Standard G-1, Governance, can strengthen bilingual education by emphasizing that institutions are responsible for quality instruction whether on- or off-campus.

G-2 Curricula for advanced programs. The term 'Curricula' covers all courses, seminars, readings, laboratory or internship experiences, in addition to research. The standards under this category are the following:

G-2.1 Design and curricula
G-2.1.1 Multicultural education
G-2.2 Content of curricula
G-2.3 Research in advanced curricula
G-2.4 Use of guidelines developed by national learned societies and professional associations
G-2.5 Student participation in program evaluation and development
G-2.6 Individualization of programs of study
G-2.7 Quality controls
G-2.7.1 Graduate credit
G-2.7.2 Graduate level courses
G-2.7.3 Residence study

G-2.1 Design of curricula. The preamble and standard for G-2.1, Design of curricula, relates to the fit between stated objectives of the graduate training and the design of curricula. For instance, if program objectives include skills development in multicultural education, then the design of the curricula is required to support those objectives.

G-2.1.1 Multicultural education. Standard G-2.1.1, Multicultural education, addresses the need for faculty and students to understand cultural diversity in American schools and communities. It states that 'Provision should be made for instruction in multicultural education in advanced programs. Multicultural education should receive attention in courses, seminars, directed readings, laboratory and clinical experiences, practicum, and other types of field experiences'.

As in the corresponding preamble for multicultural education in basic programs, Standard G-2.1.1 includes the following points:

Multicultural education should assist educators in dealing with participatory democracy, racism and sexism, and the parity of power.
Understanding the acquisition and transmission of values is an integral part of developing educational personnel. Awareness of cultural differences and their implications for classrooms is necessary for developing professional education strategies.

The language of Standard G-2.1.1 indicates the commitment of advanced programs to multicultural education.

Standard: The institution gives evidence of planning to provide for multicultural education in its advanced curricula—in the content for the speciality, the humanistic and behavioral studies, the theory relevant to the speciality, with direct and simulated experiences in professional practice, as defined in Standard G-2.2.

The Standard establishes that every aspect of the graduate programs should be infused with multicultural concerns. For institutions which have not initiated training in bilingual education, specialists in bilingual education could provide considerable assistance in establishing a program.

G-2.2 Content of curricula. The preamble and Standard G-2.2, Content of curricula, addresses the requirements for a broad background in content for the student's speciality, relevant training in theory and in laboratory settings, and humanistic and behavioral studies.

For advanced students in bilingual education who seek careers in classroom instruction or in administration, the curricula content would include a background in language acquisition, language testing, general linguistics, and other areas which are necessary for working in the field.

G-2.4 Use of guidelines developed by national learned societies and professional associations. Standard G-2.4 directs the institution to utilize contributions from professional organizations such as the National Association of Bilingual Education and from task sources on bilingual education. The preamble states that professional organizations with special interest in curricula, "... including those in multicultural education for the preparation of school personnel have significant contributions to make to the improvement of advanced programs".

G-2.5 Student participation in program evaluation and development. Standard G-2.5, Student participation in program evaluation and development, and Standard G-2.6, Individualization of programs of study, are important for advanced students who are themselves from language minority communities. The participation of all students is suggested as part of the decision-making process. This approach is to guarantee the broadest
possible base in determining direction and status of the program.

G-2.6 Individualization of programs of study. Standard G-2.6, which deals with the individualization of programs for advanced students, emphasizes the importance of encouraging students in their strengths and in improving in weaker areas. For students who are fluent in languages other than English, individualization of study could include laboratory experiences or internships which provide opportunity to use each of their languages.

G-2.7 Quality controls. Standard G-2.7, Quality controls, concerns the institutions' policies for determining which courses are counted for graduate credit. Other major points center on the policies for offering certain course work, and the requirements for full-time residence study. Multicultural education is not mentioned. However, these areas are most important to education personnel and should not be overlooked. For instance, courses having to do with bilingual education are essential for educational personnel in most school settings, in that many of the nation's schools now have children who can profit from instruction in a language other than English. Owing to the fact that only a limited number of classroom teachers are currently trained in bilingual education, it is critical that school administrators and advanced staff who serve as consultants be able to support teachers in their acquisition of new skills in bilingual classroom settings.

G-2.7.3 Residence study. Standard G-2.7.3, Residence study, advocates full-time study whenever possible. While uninterrupted study and research opportunities offer advantages, many advanced students are unable to devote full-time study because of economic constraints. For a strong program in multicultural education, it is important that all students receive equal opportunity for whatever stipends or loan funds are available.

G-3 Faculty for advanced programs. G-3, Faculty for advanced programs, encompasses five standards:

G-3.1 Preparation of faculty
G-3.2 Composition of faculty for doctoral degrees programs
G-3.3 Conditions for faculty service
G-3.4 Conditions for faculty development
G-3.5 Part-time faculty

G-3.1 Preparation of faculty and G-3.2 Composition of faculty for doctoral degrees programs. Here in Part II of the Standards, 'faculty for advanced programs' denotes the faculty who bear responsibilities for instruction, supervision, and
research in the graduate programs for the advanced preparation of teachers and other professional school personnel for a multicultural society. Standards G-3.1, Preparation of faculty, and G-3.2, Composition of faculty for doctoral degrees programs, address certification to teach at the doctoral level. Doctoral degrees are required, and at least one full-time person who holds the doctorate with specialization in the field in which the degree is offered, is necessary to meet the standards.

G-3.3 Conditions for faculty. The Standards G-3.3, Conditions for faculty service, and G-3.4, Conditions for faculty development, underscore the professional environments in which academic talent flourishes. The standards recognize the many duties of a faculty member—for instance, advisement of students, teaching, participation in school or department management, and other duties usually assigned. Standard G-3.3, Conditions for faculty service, states that the institution will enforce a policy which '... limits faculty teaching load and related assignments to make possible effective performance and time for scheduling development and community service'. The preamble to G-3.4, Conditions for faculty development, provides for research time for faculty. In addition, it encourages faculty participation for inservice education, travel funds, summer leaves, interinstitutional visitation and fellowships.

G-3.4 Conditions for faculty development. The preamble for G-3.4 states that 'The plan (for faculty development) includes opportunities for developing and implementing innovations in multicultural education and for developing new areas of expertise'. The schedule for travel, inservice training, and for other facets of professional development derives from a carefully prepared plan for faculty development.

To free faculty further for their professional tasks and experiences leading to their own career growth, Standard G-3.4 calls for available support services. Clerical help, instructional assistants, research assistants, and project assistants are required in order to allow the faculty time in advanced programs for full-time professional activities.

G-3.5 Part-time faculty. The language in Standard G-3.5, Part-time faculty, cautions against excessive use of part-time faculty in advanced programs. The standard acknowledges that circumstances occasionally warrant part-time staff. Such an instance might be a small class of doctoral students for which a full-time position could not be justified. The administration is required to provide adequate support services for any part-time faculty.

G-4 Students in advanced programs. There are three standards grouped under G-4, Students in advanced programs:
G-4.1 Admission to advanced programs
G-4.2 Retention of students in advanced programs
G-4.3 Planning and supervision of students' programs of study

G-4.1 Admissions to advanced programs. The preamble to G-4.1 on admissions calls for a commitment to multicultural education in the recruitment of graduate students. To achieve the maximum fairness in the selection of students, the institution is required to use both objective and subjective criteria. The standard points out that individuals enrolling for advanced degrees come with a wide range of experience and training. The long-range objective of the graduate study is to assist students in achieving their greatest potential within the structure of the program.

G-4.2 Retention of students. The retention of students is also a critical issue in maintaining quality for advanced programs. Standard G-4.2, Retention of students in advanced programs, supports clearly stated evaluative criteria to guide faculty in shaping decisions about retaining students.

G-4.3 Planning and supervision of students' programs. The main blueprint to the advanced students' course of study is a program of study proposed in Standard G-4.3, Planning and supervision of students' programs of study. The standard allows for highly individualized programs, but emphasizes the need for joint planning between the faculty member and the student. The flexibility in developing a program of study permits new courses of study such as multicultural and bilingual education.

G-5 Resources and facilities for advanced programs. The three sets of standards under the general heading of resources and facilities are the following:

G-5.1 Library
G-5.2 Materials and instructional media centers
G-5.3 Physical facilities and other resources

All three standards point out the necessity of adequate resources to support graduate studies. For specialists in newer fields such as multicultural education and bilingual studies, the issue of resources is particularly critical. Identifying and planning for these resources constitute additional activities where outside specialists in bilingual education could be especially helpful.

G-6 Evaluation, program review, and planning. One of the most important parts of the Standards concerns evaluation and
planning. These standards cover critical issues in the context of advanced programs for graduate students:

G-6.1 Evaluation of graduates
G-6.2 Evaluation of results to improve advanced programs
G-6.3 Long-range planning

G-6.1 Evaluation of graduates and G-6.2 Evaluation of results to improve advanced programs. These standards require thorough evaluations of students and programs which are to be conducted in accordance with the highest levels of technique in evaluation. The faculty is to remain sensitive to the quality of the graduates and changing needs in the profession, so that programs may be adjusted to maintain excellence.

G-6.3 Long-range planning. Under Standard G-6.3, Long-range planning, the institution is responsible for projecting new directions for the programs. The planning and evaluation involve the entire school community in order to respond to the changes in American education and to prepare students for careers well into the future. In addition to careful planning for students' careers and institutional programs, the long-range planning must '... reflect a commitment to multicultural education'.

Infusing facets of multicultural education into the long-range planning is certainly one of the most challenging aspects of the standards because the field is growing rapidly. In order to anticipate major shifts of direction in bilingual education and to provide graduate students with current perspectives in the field, institutions will require assistance from in-house and extramural experts in bilingual education. The very publication of Competencies for University Programs in Bilingual Education suggests an increasing acceptance of core curricula; however, it addresses the content of the courses only in the most general terms. Clear direction relating to which courses are offered will depend upon a collaborative effort between experts in bilingual education and their colleagues.

Conclusion. Enabling legislation, litigation, community action, instructional materials and practice, and policy studies have proved major strategies in advancing education equity for children whose dominant language is not English. It can be shown that contributions within each strategy have permanent effects on the field of bilingual education. Regardless of the significance of legislation, litigation, community action, instructional materials and practice, and policy studies, none of these strategies deals directly with institutional change which is necessary for preparing effective personnel in bilingual education.

Institutional change is critical to ensuring appropriate education for all children, and especially for children from ethnic and linguistic minority homes. Only through changes in teacher-training institutions can we improve governance, curricula,
faculty, resources, evaluation, and planning, as they relate to
deposit and inservice personnel involved in bilingual educa-
tion. Because of the enormous potential for strengthening bi-
lingual programs, institutional change is proposed as a sixth
major strategy.

With the enactment in May, 1977, of the revised NCATE
Accreditation Standards, educators received a powerful tool for
assessing the status of teacher preparation and designing pro-
grams to enhance and extend ongoing efforts. Several dimen-
sions of the standards that contribute to their significance are
the following:

Over 550 institutions are affected by the new standards.
These 550 or so institutions prepare around 85 percent of
the nation's teachers.
The standards comprehend preservice, inservice, and ad-
ministrative training.
The standards apply to both baccalaureate and postgraduate
level courses of study.
The standards affect schools, colleges, and departments of
education throughout every geographic region.
The Standard 2.1.1, Multicultural education, which is a new
standard, serves as a model for other campus units in addition
to the school/departments of education.

For the first time, education equity issues are addressed di-
rectly in a single standard on curricula, and are referenced in
standards on faculty, students, resources, and program review
and evaluation.

Standard 2.1.1, Multicultural education states that multicultu-
ar education should include, but not be limited to, experi-
ences which '... examine the dynamics of diverse cultures and
the implications for developing teaching strategies; and examine
linguistic variations and diverse learning styles as a basis for
the development of appropriate teaching strategies'.

The standards relating to multicultural education cover all
students, not only ethnic and linguistic minorities.
The effective date of the revised standards is January 1,
1979. Whether institutions move immediately to plan for change
depends in part on the extent of staff resources and motivation.
Few campuses in the nation currently possess staff and fiscal
capability to adopt the standards immediately. Change can
occur only through a cooperative effort between extramural
specialists and campus faculty. The very adoption of the new
standards is a conspicuous achievement in American education.
The greater challenge lies ahead—that of breathing life into the
standards so that education equity issues become integrated
into all facets of teacher and administrator preparation.

NOTES

The author is a Senior Research Associate at the National
Institute of Education. The opinions expressed in this paper
do not necessarily reflect the position or policy of the National Institute of Education, or the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. The author thanks George Blanco and Consuelo Nieto for their helpful suggestions regarding bilingual education.

1. An exemplary citizen-community effort in bilingual education is the Jimenez Educational School which serves a large Mexican American community in Fort Worth. In 1975 Mr. Raul Jimenez donated a former corporate headquarters for the bilingual programs. The school is multiethnic; however, the main orientation is toward Mexican American students whose education has been interrupted, or who must combine secondary-level education with work.


3. The attention to multicultural education in the Standards is important to bilingual education because linguistic variations and diverse learning styles are mentioned in Standard 2.1.1, Multicultural education, and as such is subsumed under multicultural education.

4. Because Standard 2.1.1, Multicultural education, is a new standard, whereas many of the standards are revised from earlier sets of standards, educators frequently use the terms 'new' and 'revised' in reference to the standards effective January 1, 1979.

5. These 1,367 institutions constitute about 72 percent of all U.S. four-year institutions of higher education. Counted in the 1,367 institutions are some 93 schools, colleges, and departments of education which have not acquired regional accreditation, and about 827 institutions which are not NCATE accredited.


7. Voluntary accreditation began in 1927 under the aegis of the American Association of Teachers Colleges. It was only in 1954 that accreditation review procedures became the responsibility of NCATE.

8. More detail on the eligibility of an institution for NCATE accreditation is given in the Introduction of the Standards (ii).


10. During the development for the revised Standards, input was provided by: (1) constituent organizations (American Association of Colleges of Teacher Education, Council for
Exceptional Children, Council of Chief State School Officers, National Association of School Psychologists, National Association of State Directors of Teacher Education and Certification, National Council of Teachers of Mathematics, National Education Association, National School Boards Association); (2) associate organizations (American Association of School Administrators, Association for Educational Communications and Technology, Association of Teacher Educators, National Council for the Social Studies); (3) representatives on the Council; (4) all institutions (accredited and nonaccredited); (5) many professional organizations not included in the foregoing list; and individuals not covered in the foregoing categories.

11. The purposes of national accreditation are outlined in the Introduction to the Standards (i).

12. Since teacher education programs are campus based, it is important that SCDEs initiate and maintain contact with community schools. This point is discussed by Robert Acosta and George Blanco, Competencies for University Programs in Bilingual Education, HEW Publication No. (OE) 78-07903, p. 8.

13. A concise summary of assumptions and competencies relating to bilingual education at both the basic and advanced levels is found in Acosta and Blanco.


15. Acosta and Blanco write that during the program years 1977-78, a total of only 101 institutions of higher education received grants for implementing bilingual teacher-training programs. Competencies, p. iii.


17. The multidiscipline nature of bilingual education is emphasized by Acosta and Blanco. 'A bilingual teacher-training program should be a cooperative effort within the institution of higher education and should be implemented in close connection with agencies outside the institution of higher education'. Competencies, p. 5.


25. Standards, p. 11.


29. Standards, p. 16.

30. Standards, p. 16.


33. Competencies.

34. Standards, p. 4.
DECLINE AND SURVIVAL
OF WESTERN PRESTIGE LANGUAGES

Henry and Renée Kahane
University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign

Abstract. Six case histories establish a typology of the rise, recession, and hidden survival of Western prestige languages: Greek in Rome, Latin in Byzantium, Anglo-Norman/Anglo-French, Medieval Latin, Alamode in Germany, the Puristic in Modern Greece. A pattern evolves: The diglossic system of higher and lower levels, which represents a class society, is strangled by the low level; it expands under popular pressures. The elite language declines but it does not disappear altogether; rather it compromises with the vernacular, and with the fusion of both the standard language is born. In short, the languages of the educated are explained as vernaculars refined by the survival of former prestige languages.

The complete text of this paper appears in Language 55.1 (March, 1979). The abstract is given here by permission of the editor of Language.
0. Introduction. In recent years several studies on code-mixing and code-switching have been published which attempt to find answers to questions such as the following, concerning the use of these two linguistic devices as communication strategies: What are the functional motivations for their use? What formal devices are used in 'mixing' languages or dialects? What are the attitudes toward various types of mixing? What constraints are there to mark code-mixing as distinct from what a user of such a language device would term 'odd-mixing'? And, finally, what are the implications of such mixing on language change in a diachronic sense?1

This paper attempts to discuss some of these issues with specific reference to a multilingual dinosaur, India. I consider the linguistic devices of code-mixing and code-switching as two distinct manifestations of language dependency and language manipulation. We notice these manifestations in the way a multilingual or a multidialect user of a language assigns areas of function to each code, and in the development of new mixed codes of communication. We might then say that code-switching and code-mixing mark communicative strategies of two distinct types. In the literature it seems that these two terms are alternately used for one manifestation, generally that of code-switching. In discussing these two linguistic devices one makes two presuppositions: that there is language (or dialect) contact, and that there are functional or pragmatic reasons for the use of code-switching or code-mixing.

1. Distinction between code-switching and code-mixing. These two devices may be separated on the basis of the following distinction. Code-Switching entails the ability to switch
from code A to code B. The alternation of codes is determined by the function, the situation, and the participants. In other words, it refers to categorization of one's verbal repertoire in terms of functions and roles. Consider, for example, Gumperz's study of Khalapur (Gumperz 1964a:137-153), where the 'linguistic bounds' or 'switches' mark the situation and the relationship with the participants. The variants constituting the total verbal repertoire are local dialects on the one extreme, and standard Hindi on the other extreme. The local dialects are further divided into moti boli 'rough dialect' and saf boli 'refined dialect'. These are functionally marked: moti boli is used within the context of the family, and saf boli outside of the immediate family circle. In addition, the verbal repertoire of these villagers includes 'market' and 'oratorial' varieties of Hindi. One can provide case studies of this from the South of India to Kashmir. It seems to be a common phenomenon in India, as in Africa (see Parkin 1974; Whiteley 1974), but has been little studied.

However, in written texts--for example, in creative writing--there is a long tradition of the use of bhasa sanka 'language mixture' in Indian poetry, and code-switching for various types of effects. As a representative sample of such writing, I am going to consider some examples from Rag Darbari, a Hindi novel published in 1968, and an anthology of short stories. In these works, as in everyday life in that part of India, code-switching from standard Hindi may be used to express extreme anger, disapproval, in-group membership, asides, or solidarity. Code-switching in such contexts is a marker of an attitude, intensity of emotions, or various types of identities. Consider, for example, the following, in which the switch is from Hindi to a dialect called Awadhi:

(1) mai sab samajhta hu. tum bhí khanna ki tarah bahas karne lage ho. mai sátvë aur navë ka pharak samajhta hu. [Switch to Awadhi] hamka ab prinspal kare na sikhav bhaiya. jonu hukum hai, tonü cuppe karë aut karo, samjhyo nahi. (p. 31)

I understand everything. You also have started arguing like Khanna. I understand the difference between seven and nine. [Switch to Awadhi] Don't teach me, dear, how to be a principal. Whatever is the order, you carry it out quietly. Do you understand or not?

The above example illustrates code-switching. Code-Mixing, on the other hand, entails transferring linguistic units from one code into another. Such a transfer (mixing) results in developing a new restricted or not so restricted code of linguistic interaction. One may consider code-switching a process which can result in code-mixed varieties. A multilingual or multidialectal person is generally able to associate a function and an effect with various types of language or dialect mixes. The
code-mixed varieties thus provide sociolinguistic indicators of various types. Let us consider the following illustrations.

(2) tum nahī jānti, he is chairman Mr. Mehta's best friend yahā dō cār din kō hī āye haī. maīne socā, I should not miss the opportunity. (HLSK 172)

(3) bhej dō. another fifteen minutes and I am off to the station. lauṅtnē tak kāphī rāt ho saktī hai. khāne ke liye wait maṭ karnā. (HLSK 175)

(4) kisi nē driver kā driving license chīnā, kisi ne registration card, kōī backview mirror khat khatāne lagā, kōī truck kā horn bajāne lagā, kōī brake dekhnē lagā. unhō nē footpath hilā kar dekhā. (RD 14)

(5) tum apne hi mukdame kī jāc kāmyābī se nahī karā sakā tō dūrsē kō kaisē bačāegā? andherā thā to kyā huā? tum kisi kō pahcān nahī pāyā, ō tumkō kisipar śak karne se kaun rōne sakā! (RD 22)

In examples (2)-(5), we find three functional types of mixing. The type of mixing in examples (2) and (3) is now a socially accepted marker of education and what may be termed 'westernization' in India. It also identifies membership in a particular social class. The lexical spread in example (4) is determined by the context. In order to talk about the parts of a truck, one has to use a certain type of lexis such as driver, driving license, registration card, backview mirror, truck, horn, brake, footpath. One might term this register-specific mixing. In example (5), we have a special type of mixing which phonetically and lexically marks a character type by using what is generally termed 'Army Hindustani'. During the colonial days this variety was used by non-Indian army officers and the Anglo-Indians to establish a special identity, to mark authority and to create an effect of power. But later it continued to be used by non-Hindi-speaking army personnel, and sometimes even by the Hindi or Panjabi-speaking army officers. The attitudinal reasons are not different from the ones which motivated its use by the British army. Note the substitution of dental stops for retroflex stops and use of constructions such as rōknē saktā for rōk saktā.

2. Code-mixing, borrowing, and pidgins. One might now ask two questions specifically about code-mixing. First, in what sense is code-mixing distinct from what has traditionally been termed 'borrowing'? Second, in what sense, if any, are code-mixed varieties different from pidgins?

It is possible to consider code-mixing as borrowing if the term is used in an extended sense and not in its restricted sense. Code-mixing entails extended borrowing for three reasons. It
is not used merely for supplementing lexical sets for contexts in which the borrowing language has 'lexical gaps'. The transfer of linguistic items is extended to units higher than single lexical items, e.g. groups, clauses, sentences, collocations, and idioms. Such mixing results in the extension of the register-range and style-range of a language. Also, it provides an extended choice for lexicalization; for example, in Hindi, Kashmiri, Panjabi, and Kannada we find that there are at least three sources for lexicalization, and these three result in three distinct types of code-mixing, namely, Sanskritization, Persianization, and 'Englishization'. The following examples from the Sanskritized, Persianized, and 'Englishized' verb formations in Hindi with the structure V + operator are illustrative.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>'Englishized'</th>
<th>Persianized</th>
<th>Sanskritized</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>anger karnā</td>
<td>gussā karnā</td>
<td>krodh karnā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>love karnā</td>
<td>pyār karnā</td>
<td>prem karnā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>marriage karnā</td>
<td>sadī karnā</td>
<td>vivāh karnā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pity karnā</td>
<td>raham karnā</td>
<td>dayā karnā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>worry karnā</td>
<td>phikir karnā</td>
<td>ċintā karnā</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This is a productive process and 'mixers' seem to extend it to all word classes, resulting in various types of hybridization (Kachru 1975).

The type of code-mixing discussed here is not pidginization as we understand the term. It is generally claimed that pidgins have three characteristics, namely, structural simplicity, inability to express abstract concepts, and restricted functional range. In addition, pidgins are considered as codes of communication between speakers of two mutually unintelligible languages (see, for example, Todd 1974:1-2). These characteristics do not apply to the code-mixed varieties discussed here. However, in attitudinal terms, the code-mixed varieties form a hierarchy in India and each variety expresses a different type of attitude.

Another characteristic of the code-mixed varieties is that in most situations, if widely used, they may be identified with a special name which is generally indicative of their 'mixed' nature. The labels used to identify them may be attitudinally loaded or not so loaded. In the literature we find the use of the following labels among others: Hīnglish (Kachru 1977), Singlish (Fernando 1977), Spanglish (Nash 1977), Englañol (Nash 1977), Tex Mex (Gumperz 1970), Ṭangi Phārsī and Bazār Hindi (Apte 1974). However, not all the mixed varieties are accepted by the users or others in the speech community as desirable mixing. In Texas, for example,
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... such language mixture tends to be disparaged and referred to by pejorative terms such as Tex-Mex. It is rarely reported in the literature and frequently dismissed as abnormal (Gumperz 1970:187).

In India, Bazar Hindi ranks lowest on the cline.

3. Motivations for 'switching' and 'mixing'. These two devices are essentially used as communicative strategies with various motivations. Their areas of function are not necessarily mutually exclusive, though in certain contexts they can be separated.

In discourse, code-switching may be used as a device to mark, among other things, an identity, an aside, or a specific role. The identity function, for example, is served by a switch from Telugu to Dakhni in Andhra Pradesh, or Hindi to Panjabi in Haryana (see Pandit 1978). Code-switching may be used to reveal or to conceal region, class, and religion. In conversation it is used to make an aside, or to indicate non-membership of a person in the inner group. Often both devices are used with a clear effect in mind: for example, in Kashmiri, a professional discussion may be marked by code-mixing with English, and a switch from that may indicate change of context.

One might mention four functions, among others, in which code-mixing is used as a communicative strategy. First, its use for register identification. The formal exponents of register types vary on the basis of the context in which they function. The registral characteristics are realized by various types of lexicalization. For example, in administrative, political, and technological registers, Englishization takes place. On the other hand, in the legal register, especially that of the lower courts, the main lexical source used is Persian. In literary criticism or philosophical writing in Hindi, Sanskritization usually takes place. Second, code-mixing provides formal clues for style identification. In India, there are three distinct styles which may be termed Sanskritized, Persianized, and Englishized. Third, it is used as a device for elucidation and interpretation. This is particularly true of languages in which registers or terminologies have not been stabilized or have not received general acceptance. A person uses two linguistic sources in defining a concept or a term so as to avoid vagueness or ambiguity. Consider the following, for example.

äpekshit ghanatva māne relative density (RD 26).
... yeh thos kārban dāyaksāid (carbon dioxide) arthāt sūkhī baraph (D 7.1.7).

In these constructions, māne and arthāt both mean 'meaning' and are from Persian and Sanskrit, respectively. The mixing with English has been used to redefine in English what has
already been expressed in Hindi or a term in Hindi is used as a
gloss for a term in English. Fourth, there is code-mixing for
neutralization, or what in the Prague School terminology may be
'automatization'. The aim is to code-mix in a language in order
to use lexical items which are attitudinally and contextually neu-
tral. In other words, they do not provide contextual clues and
thus language is used to conceal various types of identities. In
the literature, this aspect has been briefly referred to in Anna-
and Sridhar (1978:116). Annamalai (to appear:6) rightly ob-
serves that in Tamil code-mixing with English is used to "... 
conceal the social and regional identity". In order not to give
away caste identity, a person prefers the English kinship term
brother-in-law to the Tamil maccaan or attimbeer. One might
use rice instead of saadam (Sanskritist) or soorum (purist). In
many contexts, a neutral kinship term like wife is preferred to
menavi or menDaTTi, the first being formal and the second be-
ing colloquial in Tamil. The English word wife has no such
connotations. In Kashmiri, as discussed earlier, Sanskritiza-
tion is generally associated with 'Hindu Kashmiri' and Persiani-
zation with 'Muslim Kashmiri'. The Englishization has no such
religious connotations and cuts across religious boundaries.

One can then claim that in register identification and style
identification, code-mixing has the function of 'foregrounding',
and in neutralization it has the function of 'automatization'.
Therefore, as a marker of 'register' and 'style', code-mixing
is used to attract attention, while in neutralization it is used
for the opposite effect. We might see code-mixing as a con-
textually determined device. There is, therefore, a mutual ex-
pectancy between the type of code-mixing and the contextual
unit in which it functions.

One formal characteristic which marks code-mixed texts as
being separate is their lexis, and lexical cohesion (see Halliday
and Hasan 1976:6-19). By the term 'cohesion' we mean inte-
gration of the units of another code into the system of the
receiving code, and organizing the units from two codes in a
semantic relationship. A user of a code-mixed variety intu-
ively applies the process of the first language to nativize the
linguistic elements of the other code. In Hindi–English code-
mixing, most of the productive grammatical processes of Hindi–
Urdu are applied to English items. Consider, for example, the
following.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number:</th>
<th>Gender:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>agency</td>
<td>ajensiyã (agencies)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>company</td>
<td>kampaniyã (companies)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tie</td>
<td>ţaiyã (ties)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>car</td>
<td>kârë</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>master</td>
<td>mäştarin (f)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inspector</td>
<td>inspekţrin (f)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Abstract nouns:

- doctor: ḍāktārī
daktarī
governor: gavarnarī
gavarnarī
officer: ḍisharī

This also applies to inflection assignment and other grammatical categories (see Bhatia 1967).

There also seems to be a cline in mixing which starts with lexical mixing and then progressively extends to higher units, the maximum being an alternate use of sentences from two codes. The mixing at the lexical level may show a lexical spread which is associated with a register. Consider, for example, the underlined Persian lexical items in the following illustration. This type of Persianized lexical spread is typical of legal register in Indian languages.

mukdame ke liye ise ek purāne phaisle kī nakal cahiye.
uske liye pahle tahsīl mē darkhāst dī thi. darkhāst mē kuch kamī rah gayī, isliye vah khārij hō gayī. ispar usne dūsī darkhāst dī. kuch din hue yeh tahsīlī mē nakal lene gayā. nakalnaśī cīrīmar nikī. (RD 47)

On the other hand, in the following illustration there is almost an alternate use of units of Hindi and English.

'We are very good friends Sir, lekin, lekin you know ... mai official work ko dosti se zyāda mahtva detā hū ... agar āp mān lē, to mai Batra ko khud is point par agree kar lūgā'. Aur vah Batra se jā kar kahegā- 'you were wrong my dear- boss mere point par agree karte hai'. (171)

4. Attitudes to 'mixing'. It would be wrong to claim that in multilingual settings, all the code-mixed varieties evoke identical attitudinal responses. A multilingual person seems to choose code-mixing of various types, deliberately evaluating what it will accomplish for him, pragmatically and attitudinally. The pragmatic reasons for code-mixing have to be seen in the context of situation. Code-mixing seems to be used as a communicative strategy with a clear end in mind.

I briefly discuss here four types of code-mixed varieties used in India, with special reference to their use as communicative strategies. I shall label these 'Englishization', Sanskritization, Persianization, and Pidginization.

Code-mixing with English is pan-South Asian. In attitudinal and functional terms it ranks highest and cuts across language boundaries, religious boundaries, and the caste barriers. It is a marker of modernization, socioeconomic position, and membership in an elite group. In stylistic terms, it marks deliberate style. The widest register-range is associated with code-mixing in English. It continues to be used in those contexts where one would like to demonstrate authority, power, and identity with
the establishment. One finds evidence for this attitude in various social contexts, in parents' language preference for their children, and in choice of preferred language in the colleges. In the following two examples, we find two attitudes toward English. A person in authority switches to English and the immediate response is:

prinsipal ne socā: pradhān ho jāne ke bād sālā angrezī chāt rahā hai, 'case' kahta hai. (RD 408)
'The principal thought: After becoming the head this brother-in-law [curse word] is showing off in English, he says "case"...'

In the second example, it is important to understand the registral function of English. In the classroom a teacher finds it difficult to explain the concept of 'relative density' in Hindi and then says:

science sālā [curse word] angrezī ke binā kaise ā saktā hai. (RD 26)
'How can you understand science sālā [curse word] without English?'

The second type of code-mixing, which again is shared by all Indian languages, results in Sanskritization. In stylistic terms it may mark religion and caste, as we have seen in the case of Kashmiri. It also has developed registers for philosophy, literary criticism, and religious discourse. In other contexts, Sanskrit lexicalization is considered panditāu and thus marks 'pedantic style'. In oratorial style, Sanskritization is associated with rightist, revivalist politics—for example, that of the Rashtrīyā Swayam Sevak Sangh (RSS) and Ārya Samāj. The opposite of this is true in the oratorial style of the Dravida Kazhagam in Tamilnadu, in the South of India, who emphasize desanskritization.

The third type of code-mixing marks Persianization. It spread to all those parts of India which came under the domain of the Muslims during the Muslim period of Indian history. In registral terms it is associated with the legal register, primarily that of the lower courts. In certain parts of India, it is also a marker of religion and occupation.

The attitude toward code-mixing varies from one part of India to another. Let us, for example, consider code-mixing with Persian. In Kashmiri, both the Kashmiri Pandits and Muslims use it in their daily life, in various professions, and in the educational system. In fact, in recent years, this style has received patronage from the state government and Radio Kashmir has adopted it for news broadcasts. In the madhyadeśa, or the so-called Hindi area, code-mixing with Persian was used by the Kāyasthas as a strategy to identify with the Muslim rulers, as was done by the Pandits in Kashmir.
The story of code-mixing with Persian in South of India, however, is different. In Karnataka, where Kannada, a Dravidian language, is spoken, Sridhar (1978) has shown that

... the more educated a person the more he tends to mix elements from English in his Kannada, and the more earthy and 'physical' a person the greater the mixture of Perso-Arabic elements in his Kannada (1978:113).

And he continues that

... the speech of all the educated characters is marked by varying degrees of code-mixing with English, with the language of his Highness, the Heir Apparent, verging on code-switching. The connotation of 'eliteness' carried by the variety of Kannada mixed with English is, no doubt, a reflection of the status of English as an elite language ...


The last type of code-mixing, low on the hierarchy, may be termed pidginization. It is an attempt toward simplification of language used in situations where the participants speak languages which are not mutually intelligible. The result is what is termed 'Bazar Hindi' (see Apte 1974), 'Butler English', or 'Chi Chi English' (see Kachru, to appear).

5. Exponents of 'mixing'. The formal exponents of 'mixing', as stated in Kachru (1978), form a hierarchy. In this hierarchy, mixing of simple lexical items ranks lowest and the mixing of sentences ranks highest. The following illustrations at each rank are illustrative.

1. NP Insertion:

urad and moong fall sharply in Delhi. (TI, July 23, 1977)

2. VP Insertion:

appne career ke liye boss ko impress karna koi dhandhli na hi ... (HLSK 1975)

3. Unit Hybridization:

ap admit hoiye, situation log khud samajh jayega. (HLSK 75)

4. Sentence Insertion:

maa ap ko batati hu, he is a very trusting person, people have exploited him. (D July 3, 1977)
Mr. Shinde se bhī kah denā, kuch alag tārīke se ... don't be a fool, Rashi! kah denā, simply. I don't want to make it public. (HLSK 178-79)

purāṇī hai tō kyā huā, fāin to hai, but I do not like Rajesh Khanna ... (D 27.4.73)

5. Idiom and Collocation Insertion:

aur māi parivartan ghar se šarū karūgā kyūki charity begins at home! (D 29.4.73)

6. Inflection Attachment and Reduplication: This refers to certain productive processes which are typical of South Asian languages but are now extended to borrowed items in the code-mixed varieties of languages, e.g. vālā as in sakuli dīgri vālā 'a person who possesses a school degree'. (D 12.8.73).

This process includes the use of reduplication of English items. In some South Asian languages, reduplication has the function of marking indefinitization, e.g. petro vetrol (D 17.6.73), aktiŋ vektiŋ (SH 29.7.73) (also tāim vaim, kār vār).

6. Code-Mixing vs. Odd-Mixing. In some earlier studies—for example, Kachru (1978; earlier version 1975), Lipski (1977), Pfaff (1976), and Timm (1975)—it has been shown that code-mixing is both functionally and formally a rule-governed phenomenon. It is not an open-ended process, but has various collocational and grammatical constraints. There is a point both in grammar and lexis when a user distinguishes between code-mixing and odd-mixing. The responses to code-mixed items by the users of such varieties seem to vary from 'yes, acceptable' to 'no, unacceptable', 'well, depends,' and 'I don't know'. The types of constraints on code-mixing have yet to be extensively investigated in particular code-mixed languages and across such languages used by various speech communities. In analyzing such texts, one has to distinguish between the types of code-mixing and their linguistic constraints in, for example, (a) formal texts, (b) informal texts, (c) various types of registers, and (d) texts delimited with reference to the status, age, and sex of participants. In other words, various types of parameters have to be used to contextualize a text. In the case of code-mixing in Hindi, Kachru provides the following illustrations of constraints. (For a discussion, see Kachru 1978:39-41.)

(a) Rank-Shift Constraint
1. *voh kitāb which is on the table merī hai.
2. *merā voh amrīkī dost who lives in Chicago āj hamare ghar āyega.
(b) Conjunction Constraint
3. \*NP and NP aye the.
4. \*mai usko akhbar detā but diyā nahī.
5. bhai, khānā khāo and let us go.
7. \*John abhi āya nahī lekin I must wait for him.

(c) Determiner Constraint
8. \*vahā five sundar larkiya parh rahi thi (numeral).
9. \*tum this sundar larki kī bāt kar rahe the? (demonstrative).

d. Complementizer Constraint
10. \*mujhe lagta hai that rām kal āyega.
11. mujhe lagta hai ki rām will come tomorrow.

In sentence 10, we see that given two sentences from one language, in this case Hindi, a complementizer from another language, in this case English, is not used. On the other hand, if sentences are from two languages (e.g. Hindi and English), the tendency is to prefer a complementizer from the language used in the first sentence, as we have seen in example 11.

7. Language mixing and language change. In the literature on 'mixing' and 'switching', the focus has been essentially on the synchronic formal and functional aspects of these communicative devices. The implications of code-mixing or code-switching on language change, especially that of syntactic change, have yet to be undertaken.

We already have evidence to show how code-mixing may result in linguistic divergence. The cumulative effect of 'mixing' may eventually result in distinct varieties of a language. Consider, for example, the religion-based varieties of Kashmiri termed 'Hindu Kashmiri' and 'Muslim Kashmiri' (Kachru 1973:7-11), or those of Bengali (Dil 1972). The divergence may take a more extreme form, as in Hindi and Urdu or in Dakhini. In these varieties the divergence is the result of mixing in phonology, lexis, and grammar. In addition, we might also say that the divergence is the result of identifying with two distinct cultural and literary traditions—in the case of Urdu with Persian and Arabic traditions, and in the case of Hindi with native Sanskrit tradition. There are already several studies which concentrate on the phonological and lexical aspects of Persianization and 'Englishization' of Hindi. The study of the impact of 'mixing' and 'switching' on the syntax of Hindi and other South Asian languages has recently been initiated.

In Kachru (1978) a summary of such research with reference to Hindi has been presented and some of the main points are summarized here. First, there is the change in word order. The preferred word order of Hindi is SOV as opposed to the SVO of English. In creative writing in Hindi, or in the newspaper register, we find examples of SVO, too. This may be due to the influence of an English substratum (Mishra 1963:
175-177) and the practice of fast translation from primarily English texts in journalism and broadcasting. Second, there is the introduction of indirect speech. In Hindi discourse, traditionally no distinction is made between direct and indirect speech. But in modern prose we now have constructions such as 'NP said that he will read' (e.g. rām nē kahā ki voh parhēgā) as against 'NP said that I will read' (e.g. rām nē kahā ki māi parhūgā). Third, there is the use of impersonal constructions. By the term 'impersonal constructions' is meant constructions which translate as 'it is said', 'it has been learnt', or 'it is claimed'. In Hindi newspaper writing, we come across the translation-equivalents of such constructions, for example, kahā jātā hai, suṇā gayā hai. Fourth, in Indo-Aryan languages in general there is a tendency to delete the agent in passive constructions. It is claimed that passive constructions with agent-marking items such as dvārā or zariye may be due to the influence of English, e.g. yah kavitā mīlīn dvārā likhī gayī hai 'This poem was written by Milton'. Fifth, the use of post-head relative clause with jo is also attributed to the influence of English (Tiwari 1966:293), and by some to the influence of Persian (Guru 1962:530-531), for example: vah larkā jo tebal par bhēthā hai mera bhai hai 'That boy who is sitting on the table is my brother'. Finally, one should also mention here the use of parenthetical clauses in Hindi, though there are two views about their development. It has been claimed that parenthetical clauses are the result of English influence. On the other hand, some scholars consider these as typically Indo-Aryan constructions and provide evidence in the texts of the Hindi writer Lallūjī Lāl (1763-1835) (see Tiwari 1966:297-298 and 294-296).

8. Conclusion. The linguistic, sociolinguistic, or psycholinguistic implications of code-mixing or code-switching have not yet been fully investigated in a specific speech community, nor across various speech communities. Therefore, any generalizations, whether language specific or comparative, toward developing typologies in code-mixing are as yet premature. There is, however, enough evidence to show that code-mixing is not a marker of what Haugen calls 'low grade intelligence'. In his classic work discussing this aspect and rejecting it, Haugen further says (1952:70):

The conclusion by some critics that 'mixing' is an expression of snobbish contempt for the native tongue does not agree well with the fact that the very speakers who borrow are the ones who have clung persistently to the Norwegian language and passed it on to their children.

The available studies seem to confirm that in India, and in other multilingual areas, the devices of code-mixing and code-switching are being used as essential communicative strategies with clear functional and stylistic goals in view. The
programmatic studies done in India (e.g. Gumperz 1964b; Kachru 1975, 1978; Sridhar 1978; Verma 1976) or other parts of South Asia (e.g. Fernando 1977) confirm that the motivations and formal manifestations of code-mixing are the same in Western and non-Western multilingual speech communities.

The theoretical implications of these two communicative devices are now being explored and some recent studies have made attempts in this direction (see Annamalai 1971; Bennett and Nall 1977; Lawton 1977; Lipski 1977; and Pfaff 1976). The attitude toward code-mixed languages has not changed much since Haugen (1952; reprinted 1969:70) pointed out in defense of code-mixing that

No native speaker of English feels any esthetic or emotional revulsion over the 'mixed' character of his language which far exceeds that of most immigrant Norwegian speech ...

It is evident that we generally seem to accept code-mixing in its 'fossilized' forms. The classical cases are, among others, English, Hindi, Urdu, and Dakhini. We are, however, hesitant to accept code-mixing as a synchronic linguistic phenomenon, and at most tolerate it as a communicative device without seriously recognizing its functional value. This attitude is clearly indicated in our attitude to code-mixed varieties such as Tex-Mex, as Gumperz has mentioned (Gumperz 1970:187). This attitude is also reflected in the reaction of the 'purists' in India toward 'mixing' of Perso-Arabic or English with Hindi. In the past, linguists have by and large neglected this area of research both in South Asia and elsewhere. One might say that Haugen (1952) and Weinreich (1953) have been exceptions. On the whole in linguistic literature, such phenomena have been treated as linguistic exotica. It is only now that the linguistic and educational ostriches are slowly raising their heads and facing these communicative devices as linguistic realities. After all, this phenomenon has existed in Europe since the Middle Ages, and in Africa and South Asia, to mention two non-Western areas, for centuries. It is, therefore, reassuring that now code-mixing and code-switching are being studied in a functional context, both crosslinguistically and crossculturally. The Indian subcontinent provides substantial data for the study of code-mixing both diachronically and synchronically. This paper has merely touched on this aspect of the Indian multilingual dinosaur.

NOTES

This paper is essentially a report on research on code-mixing and code-switching which was initiated at the University of Illinois, and parts of which have been presented earlier in, for example, Bhatia (to appear), Kachru (1975, revised version 1978), Sridhar (1978), and Warie (1977). I am thankful to the
participants in the Seminar on Sociolinguistics which was devoted to this topic in Spring, 1977. Their comments, criticisms, disagreement, and the wealth of code-mixed data, provided from a variety of languages, was valuable in looking at this topic from a crosscultural, crosslinguistic perspective. I am also grateful to the Research Board of the Graduate College and the Center for International Comparative Studies--both of the University of Illinois--for their support.

1. This body of literature is fast increasing. The following studies may be noted, among others: Abdulaziz-Mkilifi (1972); Annamalai (1971, and to appear); Ansre (1971); Bautista (1977); Bennett and Nall (1977); Bhatia (to appear); Blom and Gumperz (1972); Clyne (1967 and 1969); Diebold (1968); Di Pietro (1977); Dozier (1967); Fallis (1976); Fernando (1977); Gingras (1974); Gumperz (1964a and 1964b); Gumperz and Hernandez-Chavez (1972); Hasselmo (1961, 1966, and 1970); Kachru (1978); Lance (1975); Lawton (1977); Lipski (1977); McClure (1977); McClure and Wentz (1975); Nash (1977); Parkin (1974); Pfaff (1976); Pillai (1967 and 1974); Redlinger (1976); Scotton and Ury (1977); Southworth (1977); Sridhar (1978); Timm (1975 and 1977); Verma (1976); Wakefield et al. (1975); Warie (1977); Weil (1978); Wentz (1977); Whinnom (1971); Whiteley (1974).

2. One can present a large number of examples from Indian literary texts; for example, Amir Khusrau (12th century) in Hindi, and Parmananda (1791-1879) in Kashmiri. For code-mixing in literary texts see, for example, Pillai (1974), Timm (1977).

3. Rāg Darbārī [abbreviated RD] by Srīlāl Shuklā and Hindi Lēkhikāū ki śreśṭh kahāniyā [HLSK] 'Best short stories of women writers in Hindi' edited by Y.K. Lalla and Srikrishna. Other sources are Dharmayug [D], The Times of India [TI], and Sāptāhik Hindustān [SH].
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The subject of Native American bilingual education has particular relevance for an international conference on bilingual education, since the situation of Native Americans is similar in many respects to that of indigenous language groups in many other countries of the world where bilingual education programs are being contemplated or carried out. In the time available I can only undertake to provide a broad overview of this large topic, which I will attempt to do first by putting the subject 'Policies and Programs' with respect to Native American education in the United States into historical perspective, then summarizing some of the effects of changing policies and programs on Native American languages and cultures, and finally, by commenting briefly on the future of policies, programs, and the people. I am using the term 'people' in the sense which best translates the term for 'Indian' in many Native American languages. In Navajo, dine' is how speakers refer to their own group--'the people'; the Yuman word for 'people' is (ə)pai as in Yavapai and Havasupai; and the Tonkawa call themselves titsxán, best glossed as 'the real people'.

We know that the native peoples of the Western Hemisphere gained the name 'Indians' because of Columbus' mistaken belief that he had reached India. Today, 500 years later, we may still not safely presume that we know who or what an 'Indian' is. There are diverse legal definitions for purposes of land claims and census determinations, criteria being various percentages of 'Indian blood' and personal identification, and the same individual may be 'Indian' for one purpose but not for another. And, of course, the criteria may also differ in different countries.
To many—perhaps most—non-Indians, the term 'Indian' brings to mind pictures of Hollywood extras with war bonnets and tomahawks, the Lone Ranger's faithful sidekick Tonto, Red Ryder's Little Beaver, or Dustin Hoffman as Little Big Man, while others may have visions of the First Thanksgiving and Pocahontas. Whatever the image, it is generally both unreal and unrealistic. One of the mistakes this stereotyping leads to is the consideration of Indians as a monolithic entity. Non-Indians often think Indians have a single culture, speak the same language—perhaps even look the same.

The most important aspect of defining 'Indian' for the purposes of educational policies and programs is what being Indian is to an Indian. Perhaps a non-Indian can never really know, but a fairly recent change in publicly expressed attitudes about self- and group-identity is clearly apparent. There is a strong reassertion of pride which is having political and educational impact (although admittedly not enough and not fast enough to satisfy everyone).

Not long ago I met with a group of Native American leaders in Oklahoma—mainly Choctaw and Cherokee—who were asking each other what it means to be an Indian, and what it is meaning to the young people in their tribes. It is relevant that their discussion was being conducted in English, partly because it is the only language they have in common, but also because it is the only language that many of their generation can speak. They expressed strong concern about this fact, for part of being Indian to them is speaking an Indian language. Conversely, losing the language is necessarily losing part of the culture, and part of themselves.

When Columbus first misidentified the 'Indians', they had already inhabited this continent for perhaps 30,000 years, and spoke over 500 different languages. Today, after less than five centuries of European conquest and occupation, only about 200 of the languages spoken north of the Rio Grande still survive, and many of these are in imminent danger of extinction. Forty-nine of the remaining languages, for instance, have fewer than ten speakers each—and all of these were over the age of 50 in 1962, when the estimate was made. A number of other languages are quite viable. This same survey reported 85 languages still with speakers of all ages, including six speech communities of over 10,000 (Leap 1977). Navajo is the only Native American language, however, which did not have fewer young children speaking it in 1970 than in 1960. I am reciting statistics because the life or death of language and culture is central to issues of bilingual education for the Native American.

In the early colonial period, policies and programs for Indian education often made provision for use of the people's native language for instruction. In the first school for Indians established by Spanish Jesuits in 1568, Latin was the principal medium, but education was evidently bilingual. English
colonists, too, recognized the importance of learning through the native languages, and bilingual programs were implemented by Harvard in 1655, the College of William and Mary about 1700, and by several mission schools during this same period (Heath 1976, Morris 1954, and Modiano 1973).

Policy was not always based on altruistic concerns: the strongest motivation of the early settlers for educating the Native Americans to English ways was to save 'heathen' souls, but this was at the same time intended to secure their submission and win their allegiance against other Indian groups or against the French and Spanish. The governor of Virginia from 1710 to 1722 conceived and unsuccessfully urged a novel instrumental use of schools, to keep Indian children as hostages to insure the 'friendliness' of their parents.

The attitudes of Native Americans toward the English educational efforts and toward learning English were not entirely positive. The Iroquois reportedly did not want their children to learn English because 'it has been observed that those who understand English or Dutch are generally the worst people', and the more powerful leaders or tribes refused to speak any language but their own (Heath 1976). Whatever language loss occurred during this early period was due not to linguistic acculturation, but to contact with muskets or smallpox.

After the Revolutionary War, the education of Indian children was the responsibility of missionary schools, and language policy varied from English-only instruction to native language instruction with English taught as a foreign language. Language policy made little difference during this period in any case, because political and economic policies were pushing tribes to the west to accommodate the expansion of the new United States. It was a period of major disruption to traditional culture and traditional education, with Indian policy most accurately characterized as one of 'annihilation'. The only positive aspects of education which can be reported for this period were the development of the Cherokee syllabary by Sequoyah, the tribal control of education which accompanied the relocation of Cherokees to the west, and the significant rise in literacy within the tribe which resulted.

After the 'pacification' of the Indians was completed by the late nineteenth century, the policy toward those who survived became one of forced assimilation. The function of the schools was to obliterate Indian languages and cultures. The use of Indian languages was forbidden and English was ruled the sole medium of instruction.

In the 1880s, the Commissioner of Indian Affairs reported:

The first step to be taken toward civilization, toward teaching the Indian the mischief and folly of continuing in their barbarous practices, is to teach him the English language ... we must remove the stumbling-blocks of hereditary.
customs and manners, and of those language is one of the most important (Berry 1968).

Boarding schools were established far from the children's homes, and children were separated from their parents for years at a time. They were punished, occasionally even brutally, for using any Indian words. As a result, some did assimilate and settle in non-Indian communities; some returned to the reservations, but could not function fully in their native language or culture.

The goal of education during this period was the extinction of those Native American languages and cultures that had survived the physical extinction of war, imprisonment, and relocation. The policy and programs were partially successful, and more languages died.

This assimilationist policy continued through the early twentieth century with mixed results. Many children taken away from family and culture for English-only education did indeed assimilate; many others were caught between languages and cultures, a neither-nor situation of deculturation and shattered morale. Some groups, including most Navajos, rejected education and would not send their children to school. A prominent Navajo educator, who himself attended school under such circumstances, describes his family's decision that he was the most 'expendable' of the children and thus was designated to attend school and placate the authorities. Where such educational policy succeeded, a generation of Indians began to grow up not knowing how to use their ancestral languages.

There were many changes in educational and language policy between World War I and World War II: changes in both official policy and attitudes. Much reading material was developed, at least in Navajo, and some also in Hopi, Tewa, and Sioux. The intent of bilingual programs during the period was essentially to teach English better, but even these programs ceased with the advent of World War II. This was a period of patriotism, of English-only education. Through these years and the period after the war, there was continued English-only instruction for Native Americans, with only rare exceptions, and a continued rate of language and cultural loss. Even fewer children were learning an Indian language at home, in part because the deculturation efforts aimed at their parents' generation had succeeded to some extent, and in part because many parents accepted the dominant view in education at that time, that children would do better in school and get better jobs later on if they spoke only English at home. The sad consequence of this process was that many people lost their ancestral language but gained nothing in return: Indian children continue to score lowest on standardized achievement tests of any minority group in the country and many of them show limited competence in English in spite of having access to no other language than English.
We must wonder at the present vitality of even 85 Native American speech communities when we consider the past policies and programs of pacification, annihilation, and assimilation. The question now is, can the remaining Indian languages and cultures survive bilingual education?

The implementation of this new educational policy has been received skeptically by many Indian parents, and with some justification. The same institutions--even some of the same individuals--who earlier convinced them that the use of English-only was in the best interests of their children are now encouraging the use of the ancestral language, and asking to have their statement that this will lead to improved scholastic achievement accepted largely on faith. I believe, given existing policies and programs, that the prognosis is mixed.

Bilingual education was implemented on the Navajo Reservation in the 1960s, and both the original process and results were very positive indeed. At least some of the teachers spoke the language of the children, or there was a bilingual aide in the classroom. Parents were asked what they thought was important for their children to learn in school, and the curriculum included learning proper terms for the kinship system, what plants are helpful or harmful, the traditional history of the Navajo people, and the rights and responsibilities of present tribal and community leaders. Parents and grandparents came into the classrooms and told stories or demonstrated traditional crafts.

One very important result was that children developed more competence in the Navajo language; even in this tribe which has stubbornly and successfully preserved Navajo as a mother tongue, children leaving the natural language development environment of the home for boarding school had been reaching their teens speaking 'baby Navajo' and unable to express more complex concepts in the language. Another important effect of the bilingual program was that children were able to be promoted from kindergarten to first grade and to reading in their native language, rather than being held back for an extra year of oral English training, which had previously been required. We know from research that holding students back or having them repeat a grade often has a negative correlation with eventual reading achievement and a positive correlation with high drop-out rates (U.S. Commission on Civil Rights 1971).

A thorough evaluation of one of the Navajo bilingual programs, that at Rock Point school, shows fourth and fifth graders now scoring significantly higher in English reading on the Stanford Achievement Test than students in monolingual BIA schools, in addition to being literate in their native language; and the yearly rate of growth of students in the Rock Point bilingual program is almost double that of a BIA sample population. Interestingly, the students are also doing significantly better with a bilingual program than they did previously.
with an ESL program in the same school (Rosier and Farella 1976).

On the Navajo Reservation there has been a concurrent move toward community controlled schools, and strong social support exists outside the schools for the maintenance of Navajo language and culture. There is, for example, a certain amount of Navajo broadcast on radio and television. We have every reason to be optimistic about these programs and about the future of the students they are educating. These students will be bilingual, and have the linguistic and cultural competencies to choose assimilation to the dominant culture if they wish, or maintenance of their Indian identity while still participating successfully in the larger American society.

Even with such positive results from bilingual programs for the Navajo, I must return to the question of whether the remaining Native American languages and cultures can survive the present policies for bilingual education.

Navajo policy is and has been linguistic and cultural maintenance, and the programs which are proving successful are maintenance programs, with the full support of community and educational leaders. Official government policy is still one of assimilation, of transitional bilingual education. The transitional model of bilingual education may be even more pernicious for the survival of Indian languages and cultures than past assimilationist models because by seeming to be more humane, and catering to parental desires for greater access to opportunity for their children, it may in fact prove to be a more efficient way to wipe them out—a form of linguicide.

Furthermore, present policy does not recognize the need and desire of people who have lost their identity to recover it. This desire was expressed very clearly by a Native Alaskan woman I saw shake her finger at a BIA official and say, 'You took our language away. Now give it back!'

I recognize that many regard assimilation as a defensible policy, but transitional bilingual education programs are frequently being implemented in Native American communities with the promise that they will help the community maintain its language and culture. This deception is as immoral as all of the other promises and treaties we have made with Indians for the past 400 years, and must cease. Communities need to be given the facts, so that whatever decision they choose to make, it will be an informed one.

I personally believe strongly that national policy should be for linguistic and cultural pluralism, for allowing our Native American population the right to Indian identity—as people. In programmatic terms, this would require two changes in bilingual education as it is now implemented—and funded—in the United States.
1. Maintenance, not merely transitional/transcultural/translingual education programs should be permitted, and supported.
2. Support for language recovery or revitalization programs, to whatever extent these may be possible or desired, should be provided.

This is the very least that can be done for those communities who have already been deprived of their language, or whose language is now being threatened. While I believe that national policy will eventually shift toward cultural pluralism in regard to the use of language in education, as Civil Rights are increasingly interpreted to include language rights, Native American languages cannot wait. American Greeks, Italians, Germans, and other immigrant groups who have lost their languages by then can always import teachers from abroad and start again, but American Indian languages are a uniquely American resource, to use an ecological metaphor, and once they are depleted, they can never be restored. Like other endangered species, they should be provided with the support and protection needed for their preservation. We are willing to spend millions of dollars to assure the survival of species of plants and animals native to this continent; we should be not less willing to help support the survival of Native American languages.

There is, however, an important difference. Language is part of the cultural and ethnic identity of a people. As the people who speak these languages and for whom they give identity, Native Americans must decide for themselves whether they wish to continue to learn and use their languages, and for what purposes. The decision in the final instance should thus be up to 'the People', but they should have the option to make that decision.
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BILINGUAL EDUCATION AS A PROFESSION

María Medina Swanson
Bilingual Education Service Center
Arlington Heights, Illinois

In his article 'Profession Anyone?', Thelen (1973:178) recalls the story about the two bricklayers. When asked what they were doing, one said, 'I'm laying bricks', and the other replied 'I'm building a cathedral'. One is described as a tradesman; the other, as having the soul of an artist or professional. One stresses the activity itself; the other, the meaning of the activity.

It is not how expertly or skillfully they daub mortar on to each brick, nor the hours of supervised practice they've had, nor how much they know about their job, nor how loyal they are to their boss, nor how much they know about other constructions. It is how they savor and feel about what they are doing, in their sensing relationships between their work and that of others, in their appreciation of potentialities, in their sense of form, in their need for and enjoyment of significance, in their identification of self with civilized aspirations, in their whole outlook on life.

Thelen then draws similar distinctions between teachers who teach school and teachers who educate children, between training programs that produce manpower and those that turn out professionals. The tradesman teacher can follow all sorts of precise instructions and can recall specific examples to emulate. The professional teacher has an 'internalized sense of education' and can spontaneously create appropriate structure in response to specific situations. The one looks for a particular tool to use—the other mobilizes his entire self providing a 'holistic' response to the total situation.
In his description of the 'professional', Thelen has captured the very essence of the bilingual educator. During the past ten years, a growing number of teachers, paraprofessionals, administrators, coordinators, curriculum specialists, psychologists, evaluators, counselors, trainers, professors, and parents have become involved in the implementation of bilingual education. Unlike other professionals, the vast majority of these individuals had very little specialized training designed to prepare them for this work. What they did have was a vision, an understanding of the need to provide a meaningful education to the millions of children in this country who come from homes in which a language other than English is spoken. And so, with an 'internalized sense of bilingual education', they rolled up their sleeves and started building a program, with no experience, no curriculum, no materials, but a great deal of enthusiasm and a sense that they were making a significant contribution towards a final outcome: an educational system that not only would be responsive to the educational needs of children of diverse linguistic and cultural backgrounds, but would view these differences as important reflections of the cultural and linguistic mosaic that characterizes our country, and thus would incorporate the instruction of these languages and the understanding of these cultures into the entire school curriculum--our 'cathedral'.

The steps to the building of our cathedral were many. First, the need had to be established in the community and the building site selected. Second, a detailed plan had to be developed with input and approval of all concerned parties. Third, a permit had to be secured from the school board. Fourth, adequate financing needed to be sought. Fifth, upon funding, a good contractor or project coordinator had to be retained to manage all project activities, purchase necessary materials, and hire appropriate personnel.

As these preliminary steps were taken, bilingual education progressed from a vague concept to a 'semi-concrete' program specifying goals, objectives, curriculum and classroom schedules, in much the same manner as an architect's design develops into a multiplicity of technical diagrams setting forth the foundation, the walls, the wiring, the plumbing, etc. But, however exemplary, well planned, and meticulously outlined, the real challenge was in transposing the plan from the paper to the classroom, the school, and the community.

The first obstacle we encountered was the plan itself. Although there was consensus as to the philosophy of bilingual education, the design and implementation of the program were left up to each district. As a result, many of these local plans set forth unrealistic goals and inadequate provisions to carry them out. Second, there was a tremendous scarcity of bilingual personnel available to carry out these programs. But even the few bilingual teachers and aides that were available had little or no previous experience or training in bilingual
education. Third, the lack of adequate curriculum materials in the target language imposed not only a serious obstacle to pupil progress but a very taxing additional burden on the teacher.

Imagine trying to construct an impressive, majestic brick cathedral without bricks or mortar, with inexperienced workers or skilled carpenters instead of bricklayers, and with nonexistent or very limited resources for training them. Yet, that is how most bilingual programs got off the ground in the late sixties. Our pioneer teachers and aides relied on their instinct and ingenuity, and on extremely hard work to implement meaningful programs for students of limited English proficiency.

Through their efforts, a variety of curriculum designs and program models were developed. In addition, curriculum materials from other countries were collected, examined, and reviewed by teachers and curriculum specialists at the Materials Acquisition Project in order to determine their applicability in our schools. Listings and annotated bibliographies were disseminated throughout the country. Although most of the initial efforts on the part of teachers to create materials resulted in mediocre products of the 'cut-and-paste and mimeograph' variety, some of the more experienced programs, Miami for instance, developed curriculum materials worthy of national dissemination. By the early seventies, these materials and others were being edited, duplicated, and distributed to all programs requesting them by the National Consortium for Bilingual Education and later by the Dissemination Center for Bilingual-Bicultural Education.

The learn-as-you-go approach that most teachers and aides had to espouse as they began bilingual instruction was gradually enhanced by pre- and in-service training at the local level, especially in those districts with university resources. New teachers received practical training from the more experienced, for example, on how to teach reading and other content matter in the native language of the students, how to individualize instruction in order to meet the needs of children of varying language abilities, how to adapt curriculum materials, and how to teach cultural content. These efforts at the local level eventually expanded to the regional, state and, as of the spring of 1972, to the national level when the first National Bilingual Bicultural Education Conference was held in Austin, Texas.

That single event had a considerable impact on bilingual education. For the first time, bilingual educators from all over the United States came together as a professional group to share knowledge, resources, and experiences. For the first time, the few commercial publishers that had ventured to put together materials for bilingual programs became aware of a real and expanding market in bilingual education. The overall spirit of that conference was excitement at the discovery that
our individual efforts to change the traditional educational system were not really isolated but part of a nationwide movement. Furthermore, the federal effort was beginning to have impact at the state level, with a handful of states already implementing bilingual programs on state monies and a growing number following the Massachusetts leadership in establishing mandated programs. The following year in San Diego a second such gathering drew over 5,000 participants, including some representatives from other countries. It was here that the initial steps were taken to form a national professional organization. At the third annual conference in New York, over 4,000 bilingual educators formally adopted the constitution and bylaws of the National Association for Bilingual Education; and in 1975 the first officers of that organization were installed during the Fourth International Bilingual Bilcultural Education Conference in Chicago. In subsequent years the NABE assumed complete responsibility for sponsoring and conducting the annual conference which continues to be a major professional event, attracting an average of 3,000 to 4,000 bilingual educators.

One of the reasons why bilingual programs placed such emphasis on in-service training and professional development via workshops and conferences was the scarcity of programs at the college level. Although a small number of institutions of higher education had begun graduate-level programs in bilingual education, and although some of the strongest supporters and experts we relied upon in the bilingual education movement were college professors, as late as 1973-74 there were virtually no programs to prepare teachers. About that time, things began to change. As states requiring bilingual instruction increased and, consequently, the demands for bilingual teaching certificates, pressure was put on state departments of education, universities, and teacher-training institutions to do something about it. It was easier said than done. The universities encountered practically the same problems that public school bilingual programs had confronted--lack of program models, lack of trained personnel, and lack of materials. But they too rolled up their sleeves, and began a systematic attack on all fronts.

By 1974, task forces and conferences to develop guidelines for teacher preparation and certification had been formed in a few states. During the same year, under a Title V EPDA grant, the Center for Applied Linguistics brought together 15 bilingual education specialists from nine states to develop a document designed to assist teacher certification agencies and educational institutions not only to establish certification standards for bilingual teachers, but also to design and evaluate bilingual teacher education programs. The resulting Guidelines for the Preparation and Certification of Teachers of Bilingual-Bilcultural Education were disseminated throughout the country and served as models or points of departure for many state agencies and institutions of higher education.
The Educational Amendments of 1974 which reauthorized bilingual education and amended the Bilingual Education Act of 1968 (Title VII ESEA) provided much needed 'capacity building' assistance to bilingual education. Specifically, the new provisions emphasized the need to prepare bilingual teachers; to develop bilingual teacher-education programs in universities; to prepare and train bilingual counselors, administrators, and paraprofessionals; to provide for inservice training for teachers and paraprofessionals; and to provide fellowships for individuals seeking advanced degrees in bilingual education. Furthermore, the 1974 Act provided additional support to bilingual programs by establishing a National Network composed of Materials Development Centers to develop instructional and testing materials, Dissemination and Assessment Centers to publish and disseminate these materials; as well as to conduct needs assessments for materials and support services; and Training Resource Centers to provide intensive training to classroom personnel. The new law also authorized a substantial increase in appropriations to fund local education programs and set aside funds for state education agencies to provide technical assistance.

At last, the resources so desperately needed to implement bilingual programs were finally going to be provided. The bricks, the mortar, the bricklayers, the foremen, the engineers, and the architects were on the way! At last, we would be given the skills and tools needed to upgrade our adobe mission.

Although it is probably too soon to realize the full impact of these new resources—especially the much needed bilingual teachers who are now students, the curriculum materials that are still in the development and pilot-testing stage, and the core of bilingual education experts and researchers who are now fellows in graduate programs across the country—bilingual education has made impressive advances.

One of the most obvious is its growth. Since 1974, the number of federally funded projects has more than doubled, the number of state and locally supported programs has increased dramatically, and the number of colleges and universities now offering courses and teacher preparation programs, graduate degrees, and post-doctorate studies in bilingual education is now well into the hundreds.

Another is the increased knowledge, expertise, and level of sophistication of these bilingual professionals. Whereas in the early seventies we were asking how to do it, now we're concerned about how to do it well. Whereas a few years ago we were desperately trying to develop a curriculum, now we are concerned that this curriculum be coordinated with the overall school program. Whereas then we were developing our own materials, now we are more concerned about adapting existing materials to meet the individual needs of our students. Then, we assessed students to determine language dominance, now we
are concerned about determining language proficiency and diagnosing learning problems. From a program designed for students of limited English proficiency, we are now saying that bilingual education should be available to all students.

There is no doubt that, as a profession, we have grown wiser. But, we have also grown a little sadder. Our shining optimism is showing a few tarnished spots here and there. Our soaring enthusiasm has gone through some treacherous air pockets. On more than one occasion we have had to resort to Geritol to help us keep our youthful energy.

The first and last of all our problems is the basic underlying fact that the vast majority of our colleagues, supervisors, school board members, government representatives, friends, relatives, and neighbors do not understand bilingual education. They either feel threatened by it, feel that it just is not necessary, or feel nothing at all. This is further complicated by the present economic difficulties facing federal, state, and local governments. Why should they worry about bilingual education when there are so many 'real' problems to worry about—energy, oil, unemployment, the dollar, inflation, taxes. So we worry about bilingual education! As a result, the bilingual professional must spend unmeasured amounts of time and energy explaining and defending what it is all about.

Bilingual teachers also must cope with job instability. In the majority of cases, districts will not issue a contract to the bilingual staff until the program has been funded. Since invariably they are the last hired, they are first in line to be dismissed, laid off, or not re-hired in times of financial crises. Some districts will hire teachers on a permanent 'temporary' basis thereby avoiding the whole issue of tenure. In far too many cases, bilingual teachers are viewed as 'add-ons' rather than regular members of the school faculty. In some cases efforts by bilingual teachers to remedy this have been defeated by teacher unions.

Finally, the bilingual education profession has been expected to prove that bilingual education works, or else face extinction. This is not an easy threat to live with since so little was known about how to implement a program when we began. In fact, even today there is no body of research to substantiate what program models and approaches work best in given circumstances. Federal bilingual programs were designed to demonstrate effective ways of teaching children of limited English-speaking ability, not to prove that children could get high marks on regular standardized tests. Yet, children in bilingual programs have too often been evaluated by insensitive evaluators with inadequate instruments and improper designs, and these results have been nationally disseminated to show that bilingual education is not doing too well.

But under the circumstances, how could it be expected to do better? There were no resources, no trained personnel, no materials, and no provision for them until the Amendments
of 1974. Without bricks, or tools, or experience, we did our best; we built an adobe mission—not too elegant—but it was full of life, energy, and love. And let us not apologize for our mission—that is how many great cathedrals began.

We have come a long way, but we have longer to go. New challenges are always surfacing—institutionalization of bilingual education, increased research and evaluation, development of adequate diagnostic instruments, among others. Notre Dame took centuries to build. I hope bilingual education, the greatest undertaking in American education during our lifetime, will not take quite so long.
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BILINGUAL EDUCATION
FOR THE ENGLISH-SPEAKING CANADIAN

Merrill Swain
Ontario Institute for Studies in Education

It was just eight years ago that participants of the George-
town University Round Table on Languages and Linguistics
heard Professor Lambert discuss the consequences to English
unilingual children of being instructed during their early
schooling entirely in French (Lambert 1970). Since that time
much has happened: students have progressed through the
program; many similar programs have been initiated and evalu-
ated across Canada; programs beginning the 'immersion' experi-
ence at later grade levels have been planned, implemented,
and evaluated, as have other variations of the immersion for-
mat. The context within which these programs have developed
is a Quebec where French has become the langue de travail,
and a Canada where English-French bilingualism has increas-
ingly been required for employment within the Federal civil
service. The latter is only one aspect of the Federal govern-
ment's attempt to promote bilingualism, the ultimate purpose of
which is to convince Quebec to remain part of the Canadian
confederation.

The purposes of this paper are threefold. The first purpose
is to describe three formats of bilingual education for the
English-speaking Canadian which have emerged from the 'im-
mersion' model. The second purpose is to provide an overview
of the results related to the three programs. Thirdly, based
on these results and several theoretical considerations, some
implications for bilingual education are suggested. Omitted is
a discussion of the political and social forces which underlie
the existence, development, and expansion of bilingual educa-
tion for English-Canadians, and the current economic and
political forces which support or militate against their further
expansion. These issues will be considered elsewhere (Swain,
in preparation).
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1. French immersion education. The first French immersion class in the public sector began in 1965 in St. Lambert, a suburb of Montreal, prompted by a group of English-speaking parents whose primary concern was that the level of French attained by their children in a traditional French-as-a-second-language (FSL) program would not be sufficient to meet their needs in a community and country that was increasingly emphasizing the importance of French as a langue de travail (Lambert and Tucker 1972). They were convinced that if French was used as a medium of communication in school—as a means to an end rather than as an end in itself—second language learning would be enhanced.

1.1 Early total immersion. The program the St. Lambert parents established has come to be known as an early total French immersion program: early because it begins with the first day of schooling; total immersion because all instruction is initially provided through the medium of the second language. Typically, English Language Arts is introduced and taught in English in grades two or three for approximately an hour a day. With each successive year thereafter, a larger proportion of the curriculum is taught in English until an approximately equal balance is reached between the time devoted to instruction in each language. The English and French portions of the day are taught by different teachers.

The term 'immersion' has led to many a misconception of what actually occurs in a French immersion class. Although it is the case that French is the only language used by the teacher, it is not the case that it is the only language used by the children. During much of the first year in an early total French immersion program, the children continue to speak English among themselves and to their teacher, who, although a native speaker of French, is bilingual, and therefore can understand the children when they use their native language. It is not until the second year of the program that the teacher begins to insist that the children attempt to express their ideas in French and, through a gradual transition, French comes to be established as the language of the classroom.

Although the early total immersion program begins as a unilingual one, it is the case that over the students' educational career, instruction occurs in two languages, legitimately placing it within the category of bilingual schooling. Another possible format is that throughout the students' education both languages are used as the medium of instruction. The early partial immersion program is such a program.

1.2 Early partial immersion. The early partial immersion program differs from the early total immersion program mainly in that both French and English are used as languages of instruction in each year of schooling. Typically, instructional
time is divided equally between the two languages, with a different teacher teaching each portion.

The origin of the early partial immersion program in Canada stems from parental and administrative concerns. In some communities a total immersion program was considered and rejected owing to the possible negative effects it might have on the native language skills, especially reading and writing, of their children—a concern, discussed further on in this paper, that appears to be unfounded. School administrators considered that a program in which half the day was taught in one language and half the day taught in the other language was much simpler to schedule and organize than the seemingly unwieldy scheduling involved with the introduction of English for small portions of the day, which necessarily occurs after several years of the total immersion program. In fact, one Board of Education which began in 1969 with a total French immersion program retreated in 1975 to a partial immersion program to eliminate the costly 'overlay' difficulties of the existing scheme and to provide a program which was more acceptable to larger numbers of parents (Moore 1976).

1.3 Late immersion. Whereas the two programs I have described begin when schooling begins, late immersion programs begin some years after the students have entered school. The most common starting point seems to be about grade seven or eight, although programs exist in Canada where the immersion experience begins as early as grade four or as late as grade ten. Typically, the program consists of one to two years of immersion, followed by the possibility of taking several course options each year in French ('postimmersion'). Prior to entering a late immersion program, students have taken at least one year of FSL (20 to 60 minutes a day of formal French instruction), but again this varies considerably, ranging across Canada from one to six years of previous FSL instruction.

These programs are different from the early immersion programs in that teachers in the late immersion programs tend to insist that their students use French, at least during teacher-student interactions, from the first day of the program. Insistence on the initial use of French is considered feasible because students have received previous FSL instruction. Additionally, there is an implicit but largely untested assumption that being denied the possibility of spontaneous expression in their first language will not be as disorienting, emotionally upsetting, or intellectually stultifying for the older student as it has sometimes been argued to be for the younger child just entering school.

Interestingly, the concept of late immersion also originates from the early immersion program. As results of the early immersion program came to be more widely known across Canada, many parents began to believe that their children,
already in the educational system, had missed out on a valuable educational experience (Edwards and Smyth 1976a). Additionally, parents who were concerned that if immersion was introduced too early, native language skills might be impaired, were sympathetic to the notion of late immersion. Administrators, too, were supportive: the program would be less costly because it started later and it would involve less disruption of the total school system (Stanley 1974).

It is important to note that in many instances where an immersion program has been initiated, it has been demanded by parents rather than imposed by administrators. Furthermore, each of the immersion programs I have described is, where offered, optional. Although this does not imply that brighter students will enter the program, it does suggest that students whose home environment is supportive of bilingualism will enter. (See Swain forthcoming b, for a discussion of the implications for program evaluation.)

Total enrollment figures of English-speaking students in French immersion programs in Canada are not known. However, enrollment figures for the Province of Ontario, available from the Ministry of Education, indicate that in 1973 there were approximately 5,000 students enrolled in immersion programs, and in 1976 there were approximately 13,000.

2. Overview of research results. Of the three formats of bilingual education I have discussed, the most extensively researched one is early total immersion, in part because it is the most radical departure from unilingual English education. (For a bibliography of immersion education for the majority child, see Swain 1976).

In many of the studies undertaken, at least two successive cohorts—in some cases, three successive cohorts (Swain 1978) --of students are evaluated as they begin their respective program and proceed through it. This allows one to look at the progress of students over time, as well as to determine to what extent the results from one year are replicated by a new group the following year. The performance of each group of bilingual education students is usually compared with the performance of English-speaking students in the unilingual English program in the same school board, and in some cases with French-speaking students in francophone schools. Because details of the methodology and the statistical results have been discussed extensively in published literature, the discussion of program results is limited to summary statements: this inevitably glosses over the occasional finding for which the summary does not hold true.

2.1 Early total immersion. The English language skills of the early total immersion students have been monitored over the years and across programs using a variety of techniques, ranging from standardized tests measuring vocabulary
knowledge, reading comprehension, punctuation, spelling, and grammar, to the measurement of communicative abilities and sensitivity to the needs of the listener (Genesee, Tucker, and Lambert 1975), to global and detailed scoring of stories written (Swain 1975; Genesee and Stanley 1976) and told (Edwards and Smyth 1976b) by the students.

The results show that the early total immersion students do not do as well as their unilingually educated peers through the end of grade one. This is not particularly surprising as they have had no formal instruction in English. One exception to the inferior performance of the immersion children at this grade level is that they were found to be, in their oral communicative skills, more sensitive to the needs of the listener than were children educated in their native language. Genesee, Tucker, and Lambert (1975:1013) suggest that these findings may be related to the immersion children's experience in school, which 'may have made them more aware of possible difficulties in communicating as well as providing them with some experience in coping with such difficulties'.

Through the end of grade three, the immersion students continue to have some difficulty with such technical skills as spelling, punctuation, and capitalization. But by the end of grade four, the immersion students and their English-educated peers perform equivalently. This appears to be the case even if English is not introduced into the curriculum until grade three, or even grade four. By the end of grade five, the immersion students in some instances out-perform their comparison groups on several aspects of measured English skills, for example, reading comprehension and vocabulary knowledge.

As with English, the French language skills of the early total immersion students have been monitored through a variety of tests and techniques. The results reveal consistently superior performance of the immersion students relative to students following a program of FSL instruction. Furthermore, immersion students perform at least as well as 30 percent of native French-speaking students who served as norming populations for the standardized tests employed. After six or seven years in an immersion program, student performance in the areas of listening and reading approaches native-like levels; whereas in the areas of speaking and writing, many differences between immersion and francophone students still remain (see, for example, Spilka 1976; Harley and Swain 1977).

In a detailed study of the verbal system used by several grade five students, Harley and Swain (1978) concluded that, in general, the immersion children may be said to be operating with simpler and grammatically less redundant verb systems than native speakers of the same age. They tend to lack forms for which grammatically less complex alternative means of conveying the appropriate meaning exist. The forms and rules that they have mastered appear to be those that are the most generalized in the target verb system (for example, the first
conjugation -er verb pattern). In the area of verb syntax, it appears that where French has a more complex system than English (for example, in the form and placement of object pronouns), the immersion children tend to opt for a simpler pattern that approximates the one with which they are already familiar in their mother tongue.

The difference between the speech of the immersion students and their francophone counterparts may in part be accounted for by their lack of interaction with native French-speaking peers. In the French immersion classroom, the students are for the most part exposed, in any one year, to only one native French-speaking model, namely, the teacher. Otherwise the spoken French they hear is largely that of their nonnative French-speaking classmates—all of whom have the same first language—in interaction with the teacher or each other. Once the children have reached a point in their second language development where they can make themselves understood by their teacher and classmates, there is no strong social incentive to develop further towards native speaker norms. This suggests that after several years of an immersion program—once a sufficiently high level of French is attained so that the language of communication can be French—sustained contact with francophone peers may be essential, if the attainment of native-like speaking abilities is to be a program goal.

The learning of content material has been measured over the years through the use of standardized tests in mathematics, and from approximately grade five, through the use of standardized tests in science and social studies as well. It should be noted that the tests of content mastery were written in English, thus potentially handicapping the immersion students who had been taught the subject material in French. Almost without exception, the immersion students perform as well as their unilingually educated counterparts on both computational and problem-solving tasks in mathematics. Additionally, the immersion students demonstrate equivalent performance to their comparison groups in science and social studies (e.g. Tucker 1975; Swain and Barik 1976).

2.2 Early partial immersion. The results reported further on in this section are based on data associated with two programs. One program involves only one class at each grade level in Elgin County, beginning at grade one and now extending to grade eight. (Details of the evaluation through grade six can be found in Barik and Swain 1974; 1976a; 1977; 1978; Lapkin and Stinson 1978.) The second program involves virtually all the students in the Ottawa Roman Catholic Separate School Board (ORCSSB), beginning at kindergarten and now extending to grade three. (Details of the evaluation through grade two can be found in Edwards, Doutriaux, and McCarrey 1976; Edwards et al. 1977.)
Based on standardized tests, the results related to the English language skills of the early partial immersion students relative to their comparison groups are similar to those found for early total immersion; that is, the partial immersion students tend not to do as well as their comparison groups until the end of grade three or grade four, even though one-half of their program has been taught through the medium of English as compared to total immersion groups who began the study of English only in grade two or three for an hour a day. Additionally, whereas the total immersion students perform better than their comparison groups in several aspects of English language skills by the end of grade five or six, this is not the case with the partial immersion students relative to their comparison groups.4

The results related to the French language skills of the early partial immersion students indicate performance that is not as good as that of the total immersion students at the same grade level but which is, for the most part, better than that of students at the same grade level following a program of FSL instruction. Although partial immersion students do not perform as well as total immersion students of the same grade level, they tend to perform as well as total immersion students in lower grade levels who have had similar amounts of contact time with French.5

The learning of content material has been measured by standardized tests of mathematics and science.6 The results reveal that the early partial immersion students tend to perform equivalently or not as well as their English-educated peer groups. One plausible explanation for these findings is derived from Cummins' (1976) threshold hypothesis. According to this hypothesis, learners must attain a 'threshold' level in their second language if they are to profit from instruction in that language. What defines the threshold level is not known. However, by extrapolation, one might argue that the early partial immersion students have not attained it.

Let us consider a concrete example. The grade six early partial immersion students did not perform as well as their English-educated peers in either science or mathematics. It is also the case that their level of French performance more closely approximated grades three and four early total immersion students. It may thus be the case that their level of French was not adequate to deal with the more sophisticated level of mathematical and scientific concepts being presented to them in French in grade six.

2.3 Late immersion. The outcomes of late immersion programs in relation to possible negative effects on the native language, second language learning, and content learning are more difficult to summarize, owing largely to the variation in program formats which have been evaluated. However, from
the results related to specific program formats, it seems possible to draw several general conclusions.

In relation to native language performance, it is sometimes the case that late immersion students score lower at the end of the immersion year than their English-educated comparison group. However, their poorer performance is only temporary in that it disappears by the following year (e.g. Barik and Swain 1976b).

The performance of the late immersion students in all aspects of French language abilities is consistently superior to that of students at the same grade level following an FSL program, and typically, it is at least equivalent to FSL students two to three grade levels above them (e.g. Barik, Swain, and Gaudino 1976; Shapson and Kaufman 1978). When students continue after the immersion year to take course options in French throughout secondary school, their achievement in French appears considerable. For example, on a set of leaving examinations designed for native French-speaking students by the Quebec Department of Education—'expression orale', 'compréhension de texte', poésie et roman', and 'théâtre et essai'—the average scores obtained by grade eleven students who had taken a grade seven late immersion program plus postimmersion courses in French each year were higher than the provincial averages except for 'poésie et roman' (Genesee 1976). Results are less impressive, however, when courses are not offered in French throughout secondary school, or when students do not choose the options taught in French. Under these circumstances, postimmersion students appear to maintain an advantage over FSL students in listening comprehension, but otherwise tend towards performance levels similar to those of FSL students (Swain and Lapkin 1977).

To date, no detailed analyses of the French spoken by the late immersion students have been undertaken. A fascinating area for exploration by those interested in second language acquisition lies in comparisons of the French used by the early and late immersion students.

The results associated with the mastery of content by late immersion students are somewhat inconsistent. In some cases late immersion students do not perform as well on tests of subject achievement taught in French and tested in English as do their English-instructed counterparts. The results appear to be related to the subject, and to the amount of prior FSL instruction that the students have had. Where students have had—as in Montreal and Ottawa—FSL instruction each year through to the immersion year, the level of mastery of content taught in French by the immersion students appears to be comparable to that attained by their English-instructed counterparts (Genesee, Polich, and Stanley 1977; Stern et al. 1976). If the amount of prior FSL instruction is more limited, however, poorer performance in some subject areas (science, but not mathematics) has been noted (Barik and Swain 1976). Here
again, Cummins' threshold hypothesis appears useful in accounting for the different results, with perhaps an additional qualifier that the threshold level will vary according to the nature of the content being considered: the threshold level will be higher, the greater the interdependence between language and the content.

Results from Montréal reveal that, for those late immersion students who have continued to take several course options in French throughout secondary school, average scores obtained on leaving examinations are higher than those obtained by their francophone peers in the rest of Quebec. These examinations include 'histoire', 'géographie', 'mathématique', and 'dactylo'.

3. Implications for bilingual education for the majority language child. Overall, these results suggest that French immersion programs—early or late—are viable alternatives to unilingual education for English-Canadians. The results also suggest that the early total immersion format may be preferable to the early partial immersion format in that the former develops second language proficiency rapidly, enabling the pupils to assimilate knowledge presented in that language without handicap. Development of second language skills in the partial immersion program proceeds more slowly, allowing for the possibility that students will not have sufficient linguistic skills to be able to deal with the subject material being presented to them in French. Furthermore, the additional time initially devoted to the development of English reading and writing skills in the partial immersion program does not, in the long run, appear to lead to achievement which is superior to that attained by total immersion students. This finding reflects, in part, the fact that English and literacy are integral aspects of the environment in which these students live.

The results related to the late immersion programs suggest that if there is sufficient FSL instruction prior to the program and if sufficient additional courses are taken in French following the program, high levels of French proficiency, at no loss to the mastery of content material or native language proficiency, can be attained. Given these findings, it is appropriate to ask: 'Why have early immersion, given the additional resources needed—both in teachers and materials, and the complete disruption it involves of the system?' The answers are tentative, subject to revision should incoming data be contradictory.

First, it is not yet known how the French of the early and late immersion students will compare at the end of schooling. It would be surprising to all concerned, however, if there were not significant differences favoring the early immersion students. One anticipated difference relates to the feelings of the speakers themselves—their feelings of ease, comfort, and naturalness in using the language.
Secondly, there is the matter of student perception of the programs. Late immersion students recognize after the immersion experience (if not before) that learning a second language involves considerable time and effort—time and energy that they may prefer to spend elsewhere. Learning French becomes one of many competing interests, one which may not be perceived as providing sufficient rewards to choose. Course options which are offered in French may not correspond to the students' interests. Even if they do, some students choose to take the subjects in English in order to get a 'better' or an 'easier' grade. Early immersion students, however, enter into the challenge of learning a second language without an awareness of the challenge. It does not compete with other interests, but rather it is an integral part of school activities.

Thirdly, there exists a number of well-controlled studies which suggest that bilingualism, or the process of becoming bilingual, can positively influence aspects of cognitive and linguistic growth (for a review, see Cummins in press). These studies, for the most part, consider individuals who have learned their second language prior to adolescence. It may be that similar results would be found in relation to individuals who have learned their second language as adolescents or adults. However, since the data already reveal positive effects associated with early bilingualism where proficiency in both languages is high, it becomes a missed opportunity to delay second language learning for those individuals whose first language is sufficiently well developed.

These considerations suggest that the early total immersion program makes bilingualism a possibility for a potentially larger number of students to whom cognitive and linguistic benefits may accrue. As bilingual education for English-Canadians continues to expand, these factors may be important to consider.

NOTES

1. Clearly, this immersion setting differs considerably from that of immigrant and/or minority language children who are mixed together in class with children who already know the school language. For descriptions of the differences, see, for example, Burnaby (1976); Cohen and Swain (1976); Paulston (in press); and Swain (in press a).

2. In most parts of Canada the francophone population is a minority, and assimilation into the dominant English majority is occurring (see, for example, Mougeon, Canale, and Bélanger 1978). Therefore, francophones are legitimately concerned about any suggestion to integrate francophone and anglophone students together in the same class, arguing that it will only hasten assimilation by making English the language of communication in school as well as out of school. It is thus essential that if francophones are to accept anglophones
in their schools, the level of proficiency in French of the anglophone children be such that French can be maintained as the language of the school.

3. It is not clear what parents and educators consider to be the goal of immersion programs in relation to the degree of bilingualism to be attained. My own understanding of the situation, based on listening to many parents and educators over the years, is that they are convinced that immersion programs will lead to 'full bilingualism', that is, native-like proficiency in all four skills. Either parents and educators need to be more realistic about their expectations, or schools need to adapt their programs so that they incorporate interaction with French-speaking peers, if disappointment is not to follow.

4. These findings are based on the Elgin County program only. The English language skills of the students in the ORCSSB were measured and compared with those of students who, although labelled as English language program students, received at least an hour a day of social studies and French instruction in French, whereas the Elgin County comparison students received all instruction in English.

5. These comparisons do not include writing, which has not been examined in any evaluation of the partial immersion program to date. Furthermore, they do not include any detailed comparison of language use by the two groups.

6. Again, the results from the ORCSSB are not considered here because in their program, mathematics was taught in English, and science, which was taught in French, was not tested.

7. Grade 11 is the graduating year from secondary school in Quebec, whereas grade 12 or 13 is the graduating year in other Canadian provinces.

8. The author (Genesee 1976:3) points out that interpretation of these results should be made cautiously 'owing to differences in the characteristics of students who comprise the populations. In particular, it must be borne in mind when interpreting the results that ... there is undoubtedly less variation in socioeconomic and academic ability levels among the students from the school samples under consideration than among the populations of students comprising the provincial groups'.

9. It is important in interpreting these comparisons to be aware of two facts. (1) The FSL students in the comparison groups tend to be highly motivated successful learners, others having opted out earlier. This means that the students who have had the immersion year, plus some postimmersion courses, are at least as proficient in French as the few students who 'make it' in the FSL option. (2) In grades 12 and 13 the postimmersion students studied FSL with the grades 12 and 13 FSL students, respectively. This suggests that the similar performance levels observed may be due to equivalent instruction received by both groups.

10. See note 8.
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PROBLEMS OF MULTILINGUALISM
IN SMALL LINGUISTIC COMMUNITIES

Eric P. Hamp
University of Chicago

To the memory of my old friend
John G. Hawthorne

There are small linguistic communities on most of the continents of the earth, and nearly all of them, at least today, are destined to be bi- or multilingual. The study of such situations, both in their social and autonomous linguistic dimensions, offers rich opportunities for linguistic theory, quite apart from the important problems of the practical world presented in these communities. There are many more such communities in North America than most Americans would guess—if they ever thought about it.

In this paper I will be drawing my material from Europe because the cases I speak of are familiar to me in detail. To illustrate, however, that such cases are far from rare or arcane, the Appendix to this article lists the nearly three score languages of the USSR which do not at present serve as administrative or official vehicles of any politically constituted unit. I base my data on M. I. Isayev (1977).

We are dealing here with languages which are very small or miniscule in point of number of speakers.

From Western Eurasia one can mention as comparable minorities the Celtic of Britain and France, Frisian, Basque, Lusatian, Friulian, south-Italian Greek, Aroman, Tsakonian, and the discontinuous speech groups of Judeo-Spanish and Romany. The recognition status and educational opportunities of these have changed enormously in the past two decades, and differ greatly in their development and present standing from region to region. But, as I hope to make clear, the background considerations for each of these, politics and policy aside, are far from equivalent.
There are problems that one is led to reflect upon without having originally intended to. I have long been interested in the phenomena of language contact and diffusion, of bilingualism and areal linguistics, of convergence and its role in diachronic genetic studies. Even these interests emerged somewhat accidentally, as by-products, as it were, of original goals in the traditional fields of historical and comparative linguistics and of dialectology. As an Indo-Europeanist I wished to fill in some of our worst gaps in the study of that family, chiefly in the Celtic and Albanian areas. This led me to the descriptive study of dialects, peripheral varieties, and enclaves, of these languages--a study which I have never really abandoned. As time went on I realized that I had accumulated in the course of my fieldwork an unintended knowledge of contact phenomena for the areas in question. Thus my attention shifted more and more to problems of language interference, a quest with which I have become incurably fascinated. Eventually, I arrived at the view that I have held for some time, and elaborated in my unpublished 1971 presidential address to the Linguistic Society of America, that correct genetic comparative linguistics cannot be practised without constant heed and reference to areal data analysis, and vice versa. As a matter of fact, in recent years I have become increasingly occupied with the possibility of using diachronic areal formulations directly as a means of evolving chronologies for the statement of conventional genetic changes.

Such studies have perforce involved me in the observation of situations of multilingualism where at least one of the languages in question is of small size in relation to the contact language. It is in such situations of interaction that one is privileged to observe conditions of contact that otherwise might not be accessible. The result--originally unintended--is that I have accumulated a dossier of cases of unequal language contact, of situations where a numerically small (un populous) language or dialect abuts a relatively widespread, or highly valued, or institutionally organized language. The result varies enormously in a number of parameters and is instructive for our grasp of language as a social or cultural phenomenon. My purpose in this paper is to outline something of what I have learned from direct field observation. This brief study is in the nature of a casebook contribution.

The impact of unequal language contact can be noted in at least two major ways. One consists in the substantive alterations that can be detected in one or both of the grammars involved; that is to say, certain aspects of one grammar are adjusted in the direction of corresponding aspects of the other grammar. This is the typical case of what has been called 'interference'. But the effect is also visible in what may be regarded as the limiting case of the latter phenomenon: the speed with which the smaller language is given up entirely, i.e. the process of language death. However, it seems to me
that there are senses in which language death is not best viewed as a simple limiting case of interference; this distinction will come out in some of the cases to be reviewed. It is easily possible to find instances of only mild interference, where death rapidly ensues; contrariwise, there are clear cases of a notably long survival of a language with remarkably deep and extensive interference.

There are cases where the effects of interference can be attributed to highly specific social mechanisms. In Mandritsa, in southeast Bulgaria, there is a single village which speaks a dialect of Albanian as its home language; it once formed part of a cluster of about half a dozen such villages, the balance of which have vanished from sight and scholarly record on the other side of the Turkish border. There is also a splinter of Mandritsa surviving in Μάνδρες, near Κιλκίς in Greece, which was resettled at the time of the First Balkan War; until the last war kinfolk used to visit back and forth, and the dialect of Μάνδρες is little different from that of Mandritsa. Mandritsa is a Tosk dialect of Albanian, and has been separated from the main body of the language for perhaps several centuries. The dialect is far from dying out, isolated though it is. However, the grammar is the most divergent of all Albanian dialects I know (which comprise all those in existence save one variety in the Ukraine). It is warped heavily in the direction of Turkish and Bulgarian, and perhaps also of Greek, betraying its long contact with all of these. Now, thanks to the excellent ethnographic work of the Bulgarian linguist Bojka Sokolova, the specific social reasons for this are not far to seek. Mandritsa has traditionally enjoyed a successful and lucrative silk-worm industry; it has therefore not been in a position of inferiority conducive to abandoning its own traditions, such as its home language. Marriages were frequently made outside, as well as inside, the village. However, a man who married into Mandritsa normally moved into his wife's household and ultimately was expected to learn Albanian; yet, of course, a Balkan family is strongly patriarchal. The net effect of this marriage pattern is clear: many authoritarian fathers in Mandritsa have been handing on imperfectly learned Albanian, their least strong language.

Alongside the last case we may place an instance of differential survival which may be traced, at least in part, to the specifics of culture traits. During the present century, the Albanian enclaves of Greece and of Italy are undergoing a highly dissimilar fate. The dialects of what we may conveniently call Arvanitika in Greece are dying out rapidly in our own day. Though there has indeed been a flow of population into the major urban centers, no drastic depopulation has occurred in the Arvanitika areas. In fact, major regions of rural depopulation in Greece (e.g. the mountains of the north) are not Arvanitika, and while one can point to some parts of meager subsistence level (e.g. in Arkadía), most of the
concentrations of Arvanítika lie in well-favoured, more southerly territories (the Pelopóntesos, Attica, Boeotia, Locris, Andros, etc.). Thus Arvanítika is dying by the route of acculturation—transfer to the dominant language. Let us pause here to note a converse case, that of Scottish Gaelic. While all speakers of Scottish Gaelic are today bilingual, the language has not been receding for the past two centuries by a parallel simple acculturation. As a matter of fact, in the north of Scotland (including the northern portion of the Outer Hebrides) there is still a sufficient proportion of Gaelic speakers so that, in the wake of the recent redistricting of British shires, the most northerly one has declared itself as officially Gaelic speaking for purposes of a governmental and legislative first language. Actually, the dramatic drop in Scottish Gaelic over the past two centuries quite simply reflects the massive depopulation of the Highlands; this emigration, forced or otherwise, represents one outcome of the tragic developments which were beginning at the time of Boswell and Johnson's journey through the region.

Quite the reverse of the doom of Arvanítika, most of the enclave villages of Arbëresh in Italy have suffered no such recession of their language, if any at all. Indeed, some of these villages are now witnessing an enthusiastic local revival in the schools, stimulated by the modern-day currents of minority movement sweeping throughout Europe and the world. The reverse trend in survival of these two enclave groups is all the more striking when one recalls their spread and distribution at the beginning of the present century. At that time, the villages of Italy numbered about 45 (with the loss of some four or five Arbërësh villages by the present day), and these are scattered in about a dozen clusters, mostly numbering a few villages or a single village apiece strewn over the southern third of Italy. The Arbërësh are strikingly isolated groups, and many of their dialects are highly unintelligible one to the other; I have played recordings from Barile (Potenza) in Vaccarizzo Albanese (Cosenza), and the hearers could not guess for a half-hour what language it was ... they imagined it was American! Such fragmentation and exposure might lead one to expect the worst.

The geographic distribution of Arvanítika has been completely different. Here, my village list for the past few centuries runs to several hundred names, and at the turn of the century there were a good few hundred surviving Arvanítika villages. It is true that the total population of these, or at least the average per settlement, was nowhere like that of the Italian enclaves; a village of 3,000 is very large for Arvanítika (500 to 1,000 is frequent), but modest or median for Arbëresh. But this is perfectly proportionate; villages of Italy are generally many times more populous than the sparse settlements of Greece. Moreover, the Arvanítika areas comprise sizeable solid clumps of villages: in the Pelopónnesos we have (or had) all of Korinthía, most of the Argolid, much of Akhaía (except for Patras and
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Kalavrita), virtually all of Triphylla, not to mention smaller residues in Lakonia, Arkadia, and Elis. North of there, we find all of Attica except Athens itself, all of Boeotia except Thebes, solid blocks of Euboea and Andros (i.e. the adjacent ends of these two islands). To look at the map, one would think these sturdy and resilient continua, after five to six centuries of survival since the Byzantine collapse.

It is possible to argue that accessibility has had much to do with the differential survival of Arvanitika and Arbëresh. It is true that the Arbëresh villages in the long Italian peninsula lie far to the south of the center, and especially far from the important northern centers; the Arvanitika settlements, on the other hand, somewhat encircle Athens and the older capital area of the Argolid (Náuplion). Yet, I know from personal experience that in many cases, as recently as 20 years ago, the condition of roads and transport did not make these Greek villages, any more readily reached than those of the Mezzogiorno, where Italy's advanced technology (when not blocked by simple poverty) has penetrated for a good century.

It seems apparent, however, as one moves about among these villages that the survival of Arbëresh and the absorption of Arvanitika both depend to a great extent on the natural ground prepared by their different 'distancing' from the surrounding major culture. From the very beginning, when the Arvanites moved south in the peninsula into what is now Greece, their south Tosk culture must have differed little from that of their late Byzantine neighbours the Greeks; their belief system must already have been largely that of Orthodoxy. Since for a long time under the Turks, membership in the Orthodox church was the main feature that defined an ethnic Greek, the Arvanites understandably came to think of themselves as Greeks who merely differed in a detail of speech. That they have long considered themselves Greeks—the unsophisticated villagers were until recently dimly aware that what is now national Albania shares their language—is illustrated by the fact that several of the famous names of the Greek Revolution were in fact Arvanites. By contrast, all the Arbëresh up to a century or two ago, and a fair number up to the present day, preserve a considerable cultural distance from the surrounding Italians. Most noteworthy is their Orthodox religion, but other traits of dress, food, and folklore go along with this. These villages are highly endogamous; I have lived in a village for extended periods where every Calabrese (non-Arbëresh) person in our quarter of town was routinely identified to me as such. In the nineteenth century, a local indigenous (to be sure, Western-influenced) Arbëresh literature grew up before anything comparable arose in Albania itself; nothing of the sort has ever happened among the Arvanites.

Let us quickly note one more case of differentially preservative cultural specifics, this time among the Celts. It seems to me clear that the vanishing current state of the Irish language,
despite the heroic efforts of a century of nationalism, and the present weak and retreating position of Breton, despite recurrent minority efforts grounded in traditional French liberty and factionalism, can be correlated to a certain degree with the Roman Catholicism of these countries. Per contra, Protestant Wales and Scotland (where the Church of England is rejected) show proportionately far more life linguistically. Now, it is a fact that the Catholic Church does not foster independent devotional or family Bible reading; the latter, until a generation ago, constituted the only occupation on Sunday in Scotland after one had trudged home from divine service. Children may have nodded asleep at these ordeals, but the entire process, as well as its values, impressed them. I recall from work on the Scottish Gaelic dialect survey the constant problem of keeping good native speakers from substituting Biblical forms (or their favourite minister's outside dialect pronunciation) for their own; they not only wanted to 'give you the best' (social climbing), but they relished these stylistic variants. In Wales, in addition to such Bible reading and the like, when native literature took a slump for other reasons (as it also did in Ireland), marathon sermons stepped into the breach. These sermons, the dominant form of literature at the time, cultivated all the ornate embellishment and institutionalized style in which Celtic literature has long outstripped the rest of Western Europe. The result of this, oversimplified, is the modern Welsh literary language and the common nondialect spoken form used today equally in the North and South. What linguists have lost in the dialect record of Welsh and Scottish Gaelic has been gained in the survival of these languages alongside the powerful domination of English.

The differential role of cultural exclusionism. Up to now we have been considering the differential effect of selected categories of factors in conserving or depressing minority languages in situations of contact. The factors discussed above are in some cases noncultural (e.g. geography), and in other cases are specific culture traits which have been brought into accidental juxtaposition. But in all these instances there is nothing inherent in the factor that is specifically designed for survival or assimilation, i.e. that has such a result as its overt cultural goal. That is to say, there is nothing about one or the other Christian religion that has literacy as a basic portion of its content; what we observe is simply the accident of a combination of attendant traits.

However, cultures also have as a part of their complex of traits a specific view or policy concerning integrity of the culture and the role of diversity. This in itself has important consequences for language contact, and the more so to a dramatic degree in the case of small communities.

To start with a case which is surely familiar to all of us, French-speaking culture can be ranked high on the scale of
built-in cultural exclusionism. It is the common experience of Americans arriving in France that they not only have trouble segmenting phonetic bursts of French to discover which words they actually don't know, but that the French seem to show no mercy toward their plight. What the American does not realize is that the French are really not being nasty or difficult; a Frenchman simply knows that certain things are eternally true and not subject to debate: French culture (and language) is not merely best—it is there, it is logical, it is French. One does not make concessions to the foreigner, because he also must realize that there is only one way to speak—logically, à la française. Americans also think that the English are sometimes cold (even though here they share the same language for practical purposes); but actually English behaviour that operates as if other languages scarcely exist is not a specimen of the exclusionism just caricatured for French. English culture is simply oblivious, insular—provincial, if you will. I have heard it remarked that the Italians presumably are reduced to eating such filthy oil and drinking that heavy wine because they make such an abominable cup of tea.

Surely the fate of Breton has much to do with the fact of the all-pervading centralized view that French culture fosters—quite apart from the question (which I explicitly ignore here) of whether and at what periods political discouragement has been employed. By comparison, Welsh has fared much better alongside the forgetful English. One meets narrowly educated, nonintellectual Englishmen who can recite a catalogue of institutionalized prejudices against the Welsh, but who feel that Aberystwyth is so far towards Thule and so unpronounceable that it really can't be worth bothering about. The pragmatic English view is that if trade is prospering and if law and government are exercising an orderly noninterference, people like the Welsh and the Nepalis are entitled to their funny little habits. Meanwhile, the Welsh—with their jabbering clanishness, in the English view—practice a considerable degree of structured exclusionism, confident in the sublimity of their morals, poetry, and music. The fact that Europe scarcely knows these is Europe's loss.

Even more striking—indeed, a case of classic contrast—is the interplay of these parameters in the instances of Arvanitika vs. Arbëresh. Greek culture probably exceeds French, if that is possible, in the respect we are considering. In fact, the Greek combines French exclusionism with British oblivion. One highly effective trait which enhances Greek isolation is its solitary possession (like Georgian or Armenian, two other well integrated and insulated cultures) of a distinct alphabet—an object itself of the reverence due only to heirlooms of antiquity. Consider that an average Greek villager would never even recognize the name of Hamlet or Plato if he saw it on a pan-European book cover; I have witnessed the ubiquitous policeman of a village stare at my passport upside-down before handing it back
Gravely to me after an appropriate interval. But beyond the alphabet, Greek culture is exclusionistic, tenacious, proud, retrospective. Arvanitika speakers, who are Greek citizens, unflinchingly and happily accept the axioms that Greek is the oldest culture, Greek literature the first, the benefits of modern civilization Greek inventions with Greek names (democracy, physics, atomic fission—and bombs), and that the Greek language is the oldest, the richest (two or more words for every notion), the hardest (even we make mistakes often!), the only one with a true grammar. Why indeed should they persist with a crude tool that does not even have a grammar!

Now consider Italy. It is a modern nation, but despite the Risorgimento, the attitudes of the old city-states have never completely left. Bolognesi are intensely proud of Bologna, and not only because it is the gastronomic Mecca. Patricians of the city, proud of an erudition that they trace back to Rome, speak a Ciceroonian standard Italian—but carefully preserving vowel qualities and substituting $z/zz$ for standard $c/g$ to betray their origin. This is not provincialism, it is deliberate. The last is demonstrated a fortiori because they also, amongst themselves, write books and deliver learned formal papers in their local dialect. It is simply a fact of Italian culture that localism, including local dialect, is cultivated and highly valued; as foreigners, we note, as a corollary to this, that we are always treated with what we think is politeness and toleration. But, of course, the Italian is not inherently more polite and good-hearted than the Frenchman or Englishman; he simply accounts routinely for what he expects to be our own localism.

Placed in this framework, we see now that the alloglot Arbëresh enclaves fit neatly into Italian culture. These villages are not provincial objects of shame; each has its own honourable home speech—it is a mere detail that genetically the language happens not to be a divergence traced to ImperialLatin. After all, Pugliese is totally opaque to a north Italian. We also see how, in the intensely literary and antiquarian Italian culture of polite letters, a tiny literature (largely of poetry) grew up in the nineteenth century in many of these enclaves. They were simply behaving in a more modest way like their richer Bolognese countrymen.

Finally, from the foregoing we should be able to predict, even if we did not know it, that immigrant Greeks in the United States will cling to their language to the third generation, while Italians in populous neighbourhoods lose theirs and embrace English in a remarkably short time.
APPENDIX

A. LANGUAGES OF THE USSR WHICH DO NOT AT PRESENT SERVE AS ADMINISTRATIVE OR OFFICIAL VEHICLES OF ANY POLITICALLY CONSTITUTED UNIT

From the Iranian family

Talysh
Yaghnobi
Ishkashimi

From the Turkic family

Gagauz (146,000 speakers in the Moldavian SSR)
Crimean Tatar (in the Uzbek SSR)
Karaïm
Urüm (a transfer of Greek to Turkic)
Krymchak

From the Tungusic family

Evenki (12,899)
Nanai or Goldi (6,911)
Even or Lamut (6,736)
Negidal

From the Uralic family

Veps
Izurian
Vod
Livonian
Khanty or Ostyak (14,562)
Mansi or Vogul (4,037)

From the Caucasus group

Zan or Mingrelian
Svan
Bats

Plus about 12 languages from the Avar-Andi-Tsez (Dido) and Lezgin groups

From Luoravetlan

Chukchi (13,597)
Koryak or Nymyllan
Itelmen or Kamchadal
Kerek
Alyutor

Other languages

Siberian Eskimo and Aleut
Nivkh or Gilyak (4,420)
Ket (1,182)
Yukagir (615)

B. LANGUAGES WITH A RECOGNIZED WRITING SYSTEM
(AN ADOPTED ORTHOGRAPHY) [From List A]

Evenki         Nenets
Nanai          Selkup
Even           Chukchi
Khanty         Eskimo
Mansi          Nivkh

and a few of the Caucasus languages
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BILINGUAL SCHOOLING
AND FOREIGN LANGUAGE EDUCATION:
SOME IMPLICATIONS OF CANADIAN EXPERIMENTS
IN FRENCH IMMERSION

H. H. Stern
Ontario Institute for Studies in Education

Introduction. The purpose of this paper is to consider the implications for FL education of Canadian experiments and investigations on the so-called 'French immersion programs'. As was explained in the paper by Merrill Swain, these programs provide bilingual education in French and English for anglophone children in Canada within anglophone school systems. They began in Montreal in a single school in the mid-sixties and have spread since to other school systems, first in Quebec, then in Ontario, and also to other provinces in Canada, constituting an alternative form of schooling on a large scale in Ottawa and Montreal and on a much more restricted scale elsewhere. These programs are offered in several forms, principally as 'early full immersion' in which most of the school instruction is given in French as the language of communication from kindergarten or grade 1. In subsequent years, the time allotted to French is gradually reduced and the schooling becomes bilingual. In a 'late immersion program', French immersion is offered for one or two years at a later grade, e.g. in grades 7 and 8. 'Partial immersion' refers to a program in which only part of the day, e.g. 50% of school time, is spent in French, the rest in English. The term 'extended program' has been used to refer to a program which includes, besides a conventional French language class from 20 to 40 minutes per day, one or two subjects taught in French.

The case I propose to make is that this experiment in bilingual education has important implications for FL teaching in general. First of all, immersion and the studies on it constitute a group of projects comparable in scope and significance to
such other projects as the Pennsylvania Project, the recent Pilot Scheme on Primary French in Britain, or the IBE studies in French and English in various countries. In Section 1, I propose therefore to discuss its implications for research and development in language education. In Section 2, I consider four specific aspects of immersion in relation to FL education: (1) immersion as a form of FL education; (2) immersion and the optimal age question; (3) immersion and the time issue; (4) the formal-functional dimension in immersion teaching and its relevance for FL teaching methodology and curriculum.

1. The immersion experiment and innovation in FL teaching

1.1 The historical context. If we want to locate the immersion experiment in the history of innovation in language pedagogy, Tables 1a and 1b may be helpful. As is widely known, of course, innovation in language pedagogy has a long and rather unhappy history. Decade after decade, battles and debates on methods and other innovations have gone on without basic issues being resolved.

As Table 1 shows, there has been a certain parting of the ways from about the mid-sixties. On one side, there is a continuation of the search for decisive innovations that claim to constitute a major breakthrough in FL teaching. French immersion programs in Canada must be counted among these. In this respect, they can be grouped with other recent inventive approaches such as Individualization, Suggestopaedia, or the Silent Way. On the other side, we observe a trend of development which can be regarded as a break with the global method concept as well as a break in the search for decisive innovations. This new trend began with Mackey's Method Analysis (1965). It also expressed itself in the critical tenor of evaluative studies on the main reform efforts, the audiolingual method (Chastain and Woerdehoff 1968; Smith 1970), the language laboratory (Smith 1970), and FLES (Burstall et al. 1974). It also led to a number of critical studies (e.g. Vaidman 1966) and the exploration of new concepts, which are suggested by the arrangement of Table 1 in approximate chronological order from left to right, ending with the most recent empirical studies on second language learning and teaching. This trend has developed out of a scepticism vis-à-vis radical innovation; it seeks to resolve the FL language learning problem by means of better theory and a focus on issues that have hitherto been neglected, as well as by more systematic empirical research on learning and teaching.

I do not think that virtue and vice lie in one or the other of these two directions. I hardly think we could stop attempts to solve problems of language learning by intuition and inspiration and who would want to do so? On the other hand, I can see a great advantage in recent efforts to develop a more solid research basis and better theory for language pedagogy.
Table 1a. Innovation in language teaching: 1840-1950s.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dates</th>
<th>Developments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>From about:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1840</td>
<td>Grammar Translation method</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1880</td>
<td>'Reform'/'Direct' method</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1920-1940</td>
<td>'Compromise'/'Oral' method</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1940</td>
<td>Reading method</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Audiolingual (USA) and Audiovisual (France/Britain) methods. FLES. The Language Laboratory</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1b. Innovation in language teaching: 1964-1978.

|         |                                                                                |
| 1964-1978 | Critique of innovations/ Breakdown of method concept                           |
|         | Recent Innovations                                                            |
|         | Silent Way (Gattegno 1972)                                                    |
|         | IMMERSION                                                                     |
|         | Individualization (Altman and Politzer 1971)                                  |
|         | Suggestopaedia (Racle 1975)                                                   |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method analysis</th>
<th>Evaluations of FL innovations</th>
<th>Curriculum theory</th>
<th>Language syllabus theory</th>
<th>Strategy concept</th>
<th>Empirical language learning research</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
In this historical development, the immersion experiment is in many ways unique. While the initiative of most language teaching reforms came from outstanding teachers or other professionals, French immersion in Canada was the creation of a group of parents in the early sixties; and parental initiative and support have played a significant part in the spread and subsequent development of this movement throughout Canada during the past decade and a half. These parents were hoping to respond constructively to the Canadian political, social, cultural, and linguistic situation. They made no claim to have worked out all the practical implications of their demand for immersion programs. What they expressed was a wish that schools should play a more decisive role in creating a new generation of anglophone Canadians who are bilingual in English and French. They were influenced by the positive view of bilingualism that resulted from Lambert's work (e.g. Peal and Lambert 1962). For the development of a practical proposal, they based themselves on existing examples of bilingual schooling such as the Toronto French School, and the various international schools that had sprung up in Western Europe after the war. They were also encouraged by Penfield's claim that the early years of life provide unique opportunities for multiple language education and they drew inspiration from experiments in language teaching for younger children (Stern 1963, 1967), reported just at the time when they were formulating their own ideas and presenting them to their school board. Moreover, the idea of an intensive approach to language learning had become familiar through the widely publicized American 'Army Method' of the war years and similar postwar programs.

1.2 Immersion and other FL innovations. As an innovation, immersion began, as many other language teaching innovations do, with an idea, a hunch, an enthusiasm but not too much preparation for implementing this new idea. Immersion, then, was started no more nor less propitiously than many other language teaching innovations. In certain respects, it was less propitious. Compare the British Pilot Scheme with Canadian immersion. As soon as the British Pilot Scheme was planned in 1963, it was supported by a curriculum development project, the Nuffield Foreign Language Teaching Materials Project, and by a teacher in-service training program. Compared to that, the French immersion experiment was much more modest. It had less official backing; and curriculum development was at first a sketchy and improvised affair. Teacher education—at the beginning, at least—was nonexistent. Much depended on the ingenuity and initiative of the immersion teacher and the goodwill and understanding of the school principal.

If immersion did not come to grief in the way many FLES programs or the language labs in many instances did, it is above all due to the robustness of the experiment itself. To a
very considerable extent, immersion really worked. If the results of immersion had been as equivocal as were the results of the British Pilot Scheme or other FLES-type experiments, it is most doubtful whether its growth would have been as spectacular as it has been. Immersion produced a level of second language achievement that is substantially superior to conventional language learning in classroom settings. This was clearly shown in the evaluation studies and was obvious also to casual observers. It is no doubt because of this that the immersion research, although it was not universally accepted, never suffered the kind of angry controversy that surrounded, for example, the Pennsylvania Study, the Gume Project in Sweden, or the recent Primary French in the Balance in Britain.4

1.3 The research approach. Another noteworthy feature of the immersion experiment has been that from the outset it has been accompanied by evaluative research. One of the demands—and an important raison d'être of the two UNESCO studies on early language teaching (Stern 1963; 1969)—had been to urge experimenters in FLES-type programs to make provision for systematic evaluation. To this end, a section contributed by J. B. Carroll to the first UNESCO report had dealt with research questions, and the second report included a guide on research methodology, also prepared by J. B. Carroll at the invitation of UNESCO. In spite of this insistent international demand for research, FLES-type programs have produced very little of it. The British ten-year evaluation of the Primary French experiment is a notable exception (Burstall et al. 1974).

One of the very fortunate features of Canadian immersion programs has been the regular and extensive evaluation that has accompanied it. Here again, the first parents' group in St. Lambert deserves credit for having approached Wallace Lambert and his colleagues, inviting him to undertake an evaluation of the St. Lambert project. From Lambert and Macnamara's first report on immersion in the Journal of Educational Psychology in 1969, the report of the second year in the Georgetown University Round Table on Languages and Linguistics (Lambert, Just, and Segalowitz 1970), down to reports at this meeting, immersion programs across Canada have been fortunate in being systematically evaluated by numerous studies.

In effect, there are three major and a smaller number of minor groups of studies to date. First, there is the original St. Lambert research and a series of other studies carried out in the Montreal area (e.g. Lambert and Tucker 1972). Second, there is a large volume of studies which have come out of the Bilingual Education Project of the Modern Language Centre of the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education (OISE) in Toronto, mainly carried out by Swain and Barik (e.g. 1976). Third, there is a group of studies on immersion and other types of extended French programs, carried out in Ottawa in 1974 and 1975.5 The Ottawa experiments had a threefold scrutiny, one
by three local research teams in the Ottawa region, another by an OISE team which provided the Ontario Ministry of Education with a kind of synthesis and 'meta-evaluation' (Stern, Swain, and McLean 1976; Stern et al. 1976), and finally, a review of the whole group of Ottawa project studies by three international authorities, Drs. Burstall, Carroll, and Rivers (Harley 1976).

In addition, there are a number of studies in other parts of Canada and some on certain special issues. These various evaluations have documented the progress of the project. They have provided the program participants, teachers, parents, administrators, and various research groups with a constant stream of information, evaluation, and discussion. They can be said to have contributed to an increase in sophistication of the quality of the program. Many innovations decline as they lose their early impetus and novelty. Immersion has expanded, has become more diversified, and has enormously strengthened its curriculum base, its teacher potential, and its theoretical foundations. The evaluative research has no doubt played an important part in this.

Fortunately, for the programs, there has been much consensus among research findings; so much so that the funding of the different research studies by various provincial and federal government sources has been interpreted by a few opponents of immersion as a means of pressing immersion upon the school authorities with a weight of pseudoscience. This I consider totally unjust. The Ontario Ministry of Education, for example, with which our team at OISE has dealt most of the time, has almost fallen over backwards to insure objectivity of research and to take into account a wide range of opinion, including views which run counter to the immersion project.

The multiplicity of studies can, in fact, be considered a useful safeguard. Unlike some other innovations, Canadian immersion has been evaluated by several different independent teams. In this way, the program has not been looked at from a single perspective. It is in this respect that I feel the immersion research has an advantage over a comparable study, the British evaluation of the Pilot Scheme. The latter was studied by one team, that of the National Foundation for Educational Research (NFER). In retrospect, much as one can find to admire in this long-term and large-scale study, it might have been better if several research teams had simultaneously investigated language teaching for younger children in Britain. When the NFER report came out, it was criticized for not offering the constructive help that was expected from it. However, the critics had no other data base; all they could do was to reinterpret the findings offered in the NFER report. More recently, a Nuffield Foundation committee had a second look at the early teaching of modern languages in Britain (Nuffield Foundation 1977); but while this study provides a more positive perspective, a short review and questionnaire study post hoc does not have the same weight as a variety of different research studies investigating
the same problems and coming up with a variety of findings, even if they conflict with each other.

1.4 Negative aspects of the research. In retrospect, the Canadian research may be criticized for its too exclusive adherence to the same 'test-and-compare' approach that was initiated by Lambert's team in the St. Lambert study. The diminishing returns of this approach as the major or only research pattern were pointed out in the concluding phases of the Ottawa immersion research (Stern et al. 1976). Moreover, such instantaneous evaluation in the early stages of an innovation is risky from another point of view. It makes no clear distinction between the pilot phase of a curriculum innovation and its establishment as a regular program; in other words, between formative and summative evaluation. In the course of the research it has become increasingly clear that these distinctions should have been made more deliberately and should have been reflected in the organization of the studies (Stern et al. 1976).

1.5 A positive aspect: Research continuity. One final, and in my view important, lesson from the immersion research should be pointed out that distinguishes these studies from other recent research in FL education: that is the value of continuity in research. Although immersion can be described as a reasonably successful innovation, it has not been and is not without problems; it has given rise to a number of questions. For example, is the positive outcome of immersion only applicable as long as immersion appeals to a relatively selected and privileged elite among the population? Is the surprisingly high level of language proficiency that is achieved early maintained later? To what extent does the immersion program help in breaking down social and cultural barriers? Is an early immersion program more effective than a late immersion program? These and other questions that have arisen from immersion could not have been anticipated in the initial stages of the experiment, nor could they have been answered in a single research effort. This has some consequences for the organization of research in bilingual and foreign language education.

Those of us who have been in FL education for some time have welcomed the increase in research since the sixties. However, as I have pointed out, several research projects have given rise to acrimonious debate and they have been quite unpopular with influential sections of the language teaching profession. If we ask ourselves why this should be so, it was, of course, largely because they poured cold water on popular and what seemed promising innovations. But there is more to it than that. An important factor lies in the organization of the research. Most of the language teaching research projects are one-shot affairs, even though they may take quite a long time. They end up with a report, such as Smith (1970) or Burstall (1974). With the report, the commitment of the
research team ends. Once the report has been delivered, it is up to the administrators and teachers to pick up the pieces. This is summative evaluation with a vengeance.

In the case of immersion, the two principal research teams, the Language Research Group at McGill and the Bilingual Education Project at OISE, have developed an ongoing commitment to monitor these experiments, changing the research strategy as certain questions were answered and new questions arose. For example, the McGill Group has focused its attention in recent years on the value of immersion for all children, including children with language and learning disabilities or children from minority groups. At OISE there has been a shift towards a better understanding of the classroom processes in immersion and of long-term second language development among children in these programs. A single research on language education cannot be expected to provide definitive answers to all possible questions. The organization of research must permit the to-and-fro between practical experimentation, evaluation, new issues, and research studies. This also has the advantage that an innovation is constantly reviewed in relation to research findings and modified rather than accepted or condemned in toto. I believe the immersion research provides an interesting (positive and negative) object lesson on the possibilities and problems of such an ongoing and formative approach to research applied to one particular type of innovation in language education.

1.6 Immersion and FL policy. Finally, the French immersion experiment is interesting as an example of the interaction between a language teaching experiment and the development of language teaching policy. Here the experience of the province of Ontario is specially instructive. In 1973, the Ontario Ministry of Education set up a committee on the teaching of French in Ontario, with a view to developing a new policy for French as a second language. This committee, which had a strong research orientation, took into account the immersion experiments and other investigations on language teaching. The report (Ontario 1974) and recommendations of this committee could not have been written without the research evidence from the immersion studies.

The policy on French as a second language which resulted from the committee's recommendations has integrated the immersion alternative into the second language program. It is probably one of the first examples of a second language program anywhere which includes a distinct bilingual education option.

1.7 Conclusion. To sum up, the Canadian experiment in French immersion deserves to be considered as an interesting example of experimentation and research in language education which has moved in ten years from a small-scale pilot study in
one school to an alternative form of schooling in a number of
educational systems across Canada.

The main lessons of this experiment for bilingual and FL edu-
cation generally are fourfold. (1) The studies amply confirm
the need to monitor an innovation by systematic evaluation.
(2) For educational planners and administrators to have at
their disposal the findings from several independent research
teams rather than a single one is of great value; however, the
advantages would have been greater if the teams had more de-
liberately adopted complementary but not necessarily identical
research strategies. (3) An ongoing commitment to the re-
search on the part of two or three research teams has been
valuable because it has enabled these research teams to inter-
act with the experimenters, to respond to the changing demands
of the project, to build up expertise and continuity, and to
develop coherent research strategies. (4) On the negative
side, the danger of a lack of distinction between formative and
summative aspects of the evaluation in some of the studies has
been pointed out.

2. Implications of some characteristic features of immersion
for FL education. In this section I consider the significance of
some aspects of French immersion for FL education. When im-
mersion programs were first proposed and then begun, the con-
cept of 'immersion' was a somewhat vague but picturesque and
optimistic metaphor of 'immersion into a language bath'. A num-er of ideas on FL education came together in this concept con-
cerning bilingualism, age, time, and treatment. Each of these
is dealt with in turn.

2.1 Bilingualism, immersion, and FL education. The immer-
sion experiment began against a background of dissatisfaction
with conventional second language teaching. The parents who
proposed this experiment were in no doubt that they wanted
their children to be bilingual, and they blamed language teach-
ing in the schools for contributing so little to bilingualism. In
many countries, including Canada, language teachers for their
part have tended to argue that it is not possible (or even de-
sirable) within a school context to make children 'bilingual' (in
the popular sense of the term). The common saying, 'You
can't really learn a language in the classroom', is an expres-
sion of resigned abdication which many language teachers them-
selves have accepted. As a consequence, FL education and bi-
lingual education have been treated both theoretically and
practically as entirely different and unrelated. The thesis pro-
posed by Fishman (1966), i.e. that FL education inevitably
creates bilinguals, has not in fact been widely accepted by the
language teaching profession.

The immersion experiment has been a challenge to this con-
ceptual separation of school language teaching from bilingual
schooling. For it has shown that it is possible under school-
conditions to create artificially a high level of bilingual competence in relatively unilingual social settings. The immersion experiment is a bridge between the various forms of bilingual schooling and conventional FL education.

From this point of view, the solution that the Ontario Ministry of Education has proposed for the teaching of French is of particular interest. This proposal has quietly abandoned the old resigned attitude that it is not possible to create bilinguals through the school system; it has argued instead that a school system can and should offer the opportunity to become bilingual, but that not all students would want to or should attempt to do so. In line with this principle, the Ontario educators today propose that schools should offer three second language options of varying intensity: a basic program for a basic command, an extended program for a working knowledge, and an immersion option for the nearest to native-like proficiency. Thus, bilingual schooling and conventional language teaching are seen as a continuum rather than as totally different operations. However, the language teaching profession as a whole—I am speaking here for Canada—is only just beginning to be aware of the fact that the immersion experiment has these far-reaching implications for FL education.

2.2 Immersion and the optimal age issue. Immersion began at a time when the belief in early language teaching was at a peak. The St. Lambert parents consulted with Wilder Penfield and found encouragement in his writings for an early start.

Meanwhile, as is known, there has been much debate on the optimal starting age for foreign language teaching in a conventional teaching setting. The evidence from research on classroom language learning has not supported the expectation of a substantial gain merely on the strength of an early start. If we accept the views of Carroll (1975) or Burstall (1974), it is total length of learning time rather than an early age which accounts for average proficiency levels reached. What does the immersion experiment contribute to this discussion? If early and late immersion are compared, is one more effective than the other? Such comparisons are notoriously difficult to make, especially as children in early and late immersion are at different levels of cognitive maturity and of social and language development. But if children in early and late immersion programs are compared with native speakers of the same age, as Swain has pointed out, the early start seems to have the edge over the later immersion. In short, while for conventionally taught children Burstall and Carroll were led to the conclusion that prima facie later rather than earlier learning has an advantage, under conditions of immersion it may well be the other way round. If this interpretation is correct, we are led to the hypothesis advanced by Tucker (1976) that the type of
treatment that immersion provides may be more effective for younger than older learners. This is, however, and must remain, an interesting speculation until attempts are made to study systematically age or maturity differences in second language learning under different conditions of schooling.

2.3 The time factor. On the time factor the immersion experiment is less controversial. It provides excellent support for Carroll's thesis that the time spent on language learning is the most important ingredient because it provides the opportunity for practice of and contact with the second language. The Ottawa immersion experiments are particularly instructive in that they have tried a whole range of time provisions from small daily amounts, and larger daily amounts of 40, 60, and 90 minutes to half-day, and a full school day of 300 minutes of French immersion. The studies have shown (e.g. Stern et al. 1976) that the measured proficiency of groups of learners under these different conditions increases as the time increases.

The net effect of this experimentation with time variations has been to create an awareness among Canadian language educators of the need to make realistic assessments of total time allowances if certain levels of language proficiency are to be guaranteed within the school systems. The importance of time for language learning has been recognized for some time by linguists elsewhere. For example, in 1960 a table was published in an American book in which time estimates were made for learning different languages to three different levels of proficiency in intensive daily instruction and allowing for differences of learners of lower and higher aptitude. However, these estimates were intended for adult learners taking intensive courses in the U.S. Foreign Service. In Ontario, the Ministry of Education, on the basis of immersion and other experimentation and a thorough review by the ministerial Committee on French, referred to earlier, has made time allowances the key factor in the development of its French programs in schools. I mentioned earlier that three levels of French proficiency are envisaged. For the Basic Level, a minimum of 1,200 hours of 'core program' French of 20 to 40 minutes a day during a student's school career is proposed; for the Middle Level, at least 2,100 hours involving an extended program; and for the Top Level, an immersion program of at least 5,000 hours.

The main implication for FL education of this entire group of studies on various forms of bilingual schooling is that they corroborate other findings in FL education on the importance of sufficient time allowances. The fact that FL education often produces inadequate proficiency levels can be largely accounted for by unrealistically low amounts of time set aside for second language learning.

It is obviously not time alone, but what happens during the time, that matters. Time just provides an opportunity for
language learning to occur. The difficulty under school conditions, of course, is that the timetable does not permit foreign language learning to gobble up large portions of curriculum time. It is here that the treatment factor proposed in the immersion program offers an interesting solution.

2.4 The treatment aspect. I now turn to the third and, in my view, most characteristic feature of the immersion program, i.e. the language as a medium of instruction and communication rather than as a subject, or, in other words, the application of a 'functional' rather than a 'formal' strategy of teaching. Teaching the school curriculum fully or partially through the medium of the second language, as the pioneers of immersion proposed, had three advantages: (1) it simulated to a certain extent the experience of a bilingual home or life in the L2 community; (2) it was a way of providing an adequate amount of contact time with the second language; but (3) by teaching other subject matter in the L2, the second language learning process did not take too much time away from the rest of the school curriculum.

What began in the sixties as a useful expedient has in the seventies turned out to be a theoretically highly interesting aspect of the immersion program; and it is in this respect that it has perhaps the most far-reaching implications for the methodology of FL education and the FL curriculum. This can best be explained if we adopt the point of view that the language teacher has a limited number of pairs of strategies at his disposal. These pairs of strategies can be visualized as continua (Table 2). One of these is the formal-functional dimension (Table 3).

In the formal or linguistic strategy, the focus is on code or language. In the functional or communicative strategy, the focus is away from code or language; it is on communication, activity, and content. Most language teaching is formal in this sense. It is openly concerned with features of the language which are studied or practiced through texts, drills, or other exercises. For the purpose of this discussion it does not matter whether the formal strategy can be described as 'cognitive', 'audiolingual', or anything else. Most language teachers who rely on a formal strategy are aware of the problem that there is often too little transfer from formal training to functional use of the language and that opportunities must be created to provide for communicative experiences. The questions have always been: at what point in the learning process is it advantageous to introduce these? What kind can best be arranged, and which are most effective?

Many language teaching theorists in recent years have dealt with the formal-functional distinction in language teaching and learning, among them, Newmark and Reibel (1968), Savignon (1972), Jakobovits and Gordon (1974), Krashen (1976), and others. Some theorists have gone so far as to question the
Table 2. Principal teaching/learning strategies.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>crosslingual</th>
<th>intralingual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>crosscultural</td>
<td>intracultural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>formal</td>
<td>functional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(linguistic)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(communicative)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>explicit</td>
<td>implicit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(analytical/rational)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(intuitive)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>audiolingual</th>
<th>productive</th>
<th>receptive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>graphic</td>
<td>speaking</td>
<td>listening</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>writing</td>
<td>reading</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>timing:</th>
<th>concentrated</th>
<th>distributed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(massed)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>groupings:</th>
<th>individualized</th>
<th>whole class</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(small group)</td>
<td>(large group)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

theoretical validity of any formal language training. A challenging article by Macnamara (1973) illustrates this position: conventional classroom learning is unsuccessful, he argues, because it undertakes the hopeless task of teaching a language by irrelevant analytical methods. They fail because they do not engage the learner's faculté de langage. The faculty becomes active only in real-life situations of language use which, in the early years, typically occur in the nursery or street. In the language class the teacher must therefore create life-like situations. Macnamara would thus dispense almost entirely with the apparatus of formal language instruction. Other theorists who have also recognized this problem have not taken up such an extreme position of rejection of all formal step-by-step classroom learning. They have argued that a language learned in a formal language lesson does not regularly lead to effective language use; therefore, special steps must be taken to create a transition from the classroom setting to real-life communication. This was, for example, Rivers' plea when she contrasted skill-getting and skill-using techniques (Rivers 1972). With the same issue in mind, language teachers have for many years arranged programs involving the learner in authentic language use through pen-friendships, visits, contact with native speakers of the target language, through
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Formal (linguistic)</th>
<th>Functional (communicative/experiential)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controlled language input arranged in a pedagogical sequence.</td>
<td>Uncontrolled exposure to the language in use as dictated by communicative needs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study and practice. Language class.</td>
<td>Language in the field.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language as a system. Control of language through selection, gradation, presentation and repetition. Classroom techniques. Emphasis on linguistic processes: study and practice of formal properties of sounds, grammar, lexis, discourse, semantic features or sociolinguistic characteristics.</td>
<td>Language in use in its own habitat. Experience approach. L2 as medium of instruction. Residence abroad. 'Immersion'.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
radio, television, and film programs, through exchange schemes, residence and study abroad, and so on.

On this continuum, immersion implies a mainly functional strategy. Of course, the immersion teacher may also choose to teach the language by formal techniques. He may, for example, focus on language features, practice, and correct pronunciation or grammar. There is no strict dichotomy between formal and functional procedures. But if a teacher has the responsibility to teach other subject matter through the medium of the second language, then the language in the classroom must—for some, and probably most of the time—be used with focus on content and communication and not on code. The immersion experience has brought functional language use into the language classroom at a very early stage of language learning, and maintains it as such consistently as an indirect means of language learning. The learner in the immersion class is therefore put into a position which has much in common with first-language acquisition and with learning a second language in a natural environment. It is not so much linguistically ordered, but ordered in terms of classroom activities, the content of teaching, and regular communicative events. The learner has to sort out language in relation to persons and events rather than for its formal properties. Language is directly experienced rather than rehearsed for later use. The language learner is not a spectator or onlooker of a language used by other people, e.g. the characters in an audiovisual program. He himself becomes involved in language use through the learning activities of the school.

What, then, are the implications for general foreign language pedagogy of this experiment in mainly functional language teaching? I believe they are considerable. Let me say straightaway that I do not follow those theorists who completely brush aside any formal strategy as theoretically unjustified and practically useless. On the contrary, I align myself with the kind of position that I see Valdman take on this issue: a linguistic selection and gradation is possible and necessary; it can be made in such a way that it is linguistically sophisticated and also accords with the learner's natural progression (Valdman 1977-78). All language teaching, I contend, can offer a mixture of formal and functional procedures. Programs or stages of language instruction may differ in the amount to which they rely on either formal or functional activities. But having said this, I believe that the lesson we can draw from the immersion experiment for regular FL teaching is that the functional component in language pedagogy could be enormously strengthened.

What does this involve? It means that an FL curriculum should be devised so as to include, besides a linguistic syllabus, content of real substance, authentic communicative activities, and specific language-related experiences. The substance of language programs is often so trivial because the focus is on code and not on content. Macnamara is, of course, right: the
teacher and student in the language class have nothing to say to each other and, therefore, language use is not learned. In immersion classes, on the other hand, they do have something to say to each other; the teacher has a content syllabus to convey which the student has to learn, and the language is acquired through use. If this has a general lesson, the topics or substance or activities associated with a language class do not become the more or less pleasant vehicle of language teaching; they assume importance equivalent to the linguistic subject matter. Consequently, language-related activities, residence abroad, exchange schemes, literature, cultural content, specialist subjects, acquire much greater significance in the planning of a second language curriculum.

The immersion experience suggests that a language curriculum should contain a substantive and experiential syllabus which is not offered as an occasional reward to the language learner but forms an integral part of the curriculum. Through it a language learner is given the opportunity to learn to cope with the language in use which a formal syllabus alone can never provide.

It follows from what has been said about the FL curriculum that the immersion experience has implications also for the development of curriculum materials. At first, the immersion program often simply adopted curriculum materials prepared for native speakers. However, in the course of time it became evident that students who learn a subject through the medium of an L2 cannot always use the same curriculum materials as native speakers do, and new materials for immersion students have begun to be prepared. There is a certain affinity between these and curriculum materials for language programs for special purposes. The former, however, are more subject-oriented, the latter more language-oriented. But both types of materials would be relevant to a new FL curriculum which is designed to have more substantive content than FL curricula have had up until now.

The language teacher's task also receives a new direction. Since the audiolingual revolution, language teachers have become very much drill masters who occasionally make brief excursions into culture and civilization. The new language teacher might well be of a different kind. Thanks to the immersion experience, there is in Canada already a new type of language teacher emerging who is a language teacher as well as a kindergarten, primary grade, or subject specialist able to teach kindergarten, primary grades, mathematics, social studies, and other subjects to anglophone students through the medium of French. Foreign language teachers have, of course, conventionally had one such substantive area--namely, literature--but I think a greater diversity of fields and activities needs to be associated with language, including sports, outdoor activities, art and music, if the functional component of language programs is to be developed.
Another consequence of this emphasis would be that the education of language teachers may have to reflect this association of substantive areas with the language. FL teachers in schools, in any case, often have a second field of specialization; it is therefore a relatively small step for teacher training to make it possible for a future teacher to offer this second area or interest to be available in the FL.

The immersion experience has further implications for languages in universities. Traditionally, university language courses are offered outside substantive areas, or are confined to literature. But a few newer university courses, particularly in Britain, are associated with sociology, government, commerce, or technology. In one Canadian university, the ESL program shadows groups of different disciplines; it has therefore become closely associated with the teaching of content in substantive areas. Some recent experiments in languages for special purposes, which have mainly emanated from Britain (Strevens 1977), and career-oriented courses in the United States have an affinity with the immersion experience in that they relate language learning to subject areas of concern to the group of learners. The Middlebury summer language school has offered for many years a combination of formal language instruction with living in the FL environment in which the language comes into functional use. In British university language programs exchanges or prescribed periods of residence abroad are often a necessary part of the degree course. In the United States, extensive study abroad schemes have been in operation since the fifties. In short, the principle of functional activities has been recognized in FL education for a long time. What immersion has done is (a) to bring the functional component into the language program much earlier, in most instances right from the start, (b) to bring it directly into the school setting, (c) to make it thereby accessible to a large and potentially unselected school population (not merely to selected adult students in university programs), and (d) to make it an integral and central part of the curriculum (not an occasional reward rather late in the program).

Last, the functional approach of an immersion program has some interesting implications for the learner. It requires the training of the student in learning techniques which are somewhat different from the step-by-step learning of formal study and practice. They might be described as field techniques. On the receptive side, the learner has to guess and infer more from the situation and context, and on the productive side, he must be prepared to improvise, to circumlocute, and to take risks with the language. These are qualities that the formal strategy generally does not cultivate, but which in an immersion setting, as much as in real-life situations, are constantly needed. To learn such coping techniques seems to me an essential of all effective language learning. Immersion programs offer at least an opportunity for students to gain...
experience in these techniques. It may be one of the most valuable contributions of a functional teaching strategy. 17

2.5 Conclusion. To sum up, I have examined four implications of the immersion experiment for general FL education. (1) Unlike the majority of American experiences in bilingual education which attempt to provide education for children in a bilingual situation, the Canadian bilingual education through immersion is an attempt to create through bilingual schooling advanced levels of bilingualism in children from unilingual backgrounds. Immersion which has achieved a measure of success in this respect has the potential to close the gap between bilingual schooling and FL education. (2) Immersion has done little to solve the optimal age question. On the contrary, its findings run counter to some conclusions of FL education studies. These contradictions make it appear all the more imperitive to study differences in language learning at different maturity levels and in different settings. (3) The immersion experience amply confirms the dominant current view on the relationship between proficiency in a second language and the amount of total time given to language learning. (4) The immersion experiment suggests that the functional or communicative component, i.e. the use of the language for a real purpose, has to be strengthened in FL teaching. Such a new emphasis would have implications for curriculum, materials, the teacher's role, and ultimately, teacher education and university language courses.

3. Final comment. To sum up, it is clear from the foregoing that it would be a mistake to look upon French immersion in Canada as a purely Canadian response to a specifically Canadian language situation. Admittedly, it has unique features. But the principles and experience involved in research and development and certain characteristic features of the program have application to FL education generally. For these reasons I believe the immersion approach deserves the attention of all language educators, particularly those who seek continuity between bilingual schooling and FL education.

NOTES

1. A national association, Canadian Parents for French, was founded in March, 1977.
2. On this point, see the accounts presented at the UNESCO meeting in Hamburg in 1966 (Stern 1969).
3. For the early development of immersion, see Appendix A in Lambert and Tucker (1972): 'Parents as change agents in education', by O. Melkoff. See also Stern (1977).
4. For a brief summary of references to the debate on the British study, see Stern and Weinrib (1977) and Nuffield Foundation (1977).
5. For a brief bibliographical summary on Canadian developments in the context of language education for younger children, see Stern and Weinrib (1977).

6. For examples, see Mollica (1974), particularly Swain (1974), and Swain and Bruck (1976).

7. For example, in 1974 Ministry officials prepared a list of 44 questions which expressed their concerns and misgivings about immersion, and on which they wished to have answers from researchers (see a discussion of these questions in Stern, Swain, and McLean 1976). Another illustration of the attempt to study the question in all its complexity is that, as soon as the British report by Burstall et al. appeared, the Ministry initiated a week-long discussion with Dr. Burstall in Toronto (see on this Stern, Burstall, and Harley 1975).

8. The recent report on the early teaching of modern languages by the Nuffield Foundation in Britain (1977:25) was advocating this kind of formative approach to research when it made the following comment on the NFER report Primary French in the Balance: '... some regrets may be felt that the researchers confined their conclusions to a "profit and loss" account of the experimental work without producing a specific answer to the School's Council's "chief question" ... which could be rephrased, "What are the conditions of success for primary French?" To have done so would have switched the conclusion from the retrospective to the forward-looking, from the depressing factual statement that certain conditions of success had not been fulfilled, to the more inspiring statement that future success was likely to result from the establishment of identifiable conditions'.

9. Tucker (1976) writes with reference to younger learners: 'A student can more effectively acquire a language when its learning becomes incidental to the task of communicating with someone about an inherently interesting topic'.

10. See Cleveland et al. (1960). The table from this book has been reproduced in an adapted form in Jakobovits (1970) and Ingram (1975), and discussed in some detail by both authors.

11. On this point, see a fascinating short booklet produced by the Ontario Ministry of Education, entitled Teaching and Learning French as a Second Language: A New Program for Ontario Students (1977). This booklet explains the system, illustrates time allowances, and describes a new funding formula which rewards increased time allocations.


13. For a list of materials especially designed for immersion or found useful in immersion programs, see Lapkin and Kamin (1977).

14. See, for example, the Focus Series, published by Oxford University Press, which has such titles as English in
Agriculture, English in Physical Science, English in Social Studies. See also Strevens (1977).

15. This was clearly revealed at the founding meeting of a new association of immersion teachers, the Canadian Association of Immersion Teachers, held in Ottawa in October, 1977, which attracted some 700 participants.


17. The lack of training in this respect in conventional language teaching has been pointed out by Naiman et al. (1978) in a recent study on good language learners.
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TOWARD BILINGUAL EDUCATION FOR PARAGUAY

Joan Rubin
California State University, Northridge

The Paraguayan Ministry of Education has recently been giving increased attention to the language problems of rural monolingual Guarani school children. As cognizance of the role of language skills as an important factor in school repetitions and drop-out grows, consideration of bilingual education as a solution has increased. This paper discusses some of the major issues considered and implicit in implementing such a program. The issues to be discussed include technical, social, and philosophical ones. The relevance of these issues for other multilingual countries, especially in Latin America, is mentioned.

1. Background. In a 1967 paper entitled 'Language and Education in Paraguay', I identified some of the educational problems that seem to arise from the language situation in Paraguay. In contrast to the widely held view there that it is a bilingual country, I noted that it is 'basically a Guarani-speaking nation with a heavy incidence of Spanish-Guarani bilingualism in which each language tends to fulfill distinct functions' (1968a:485-486). This picture is substantiated by the census figures. In 1950, some 95% of the population (three years and older) was reported to know Guarani. Some 52% of the population (three years and older) claimed to be bilingual in Spanish and Guarani. What is noteworthy is that the highest percentage of bilingualism is to be found in the capital, Asuncion, where some 76% claimed to be bilingual. On the other hand, the rural area of Paraguay is largely Guarani-speaking and getting more so. In 1950, 45.7% of the rural area knew only Guarani while according to the 1962 census, some 52.3% knew only Guarani. Despite the high incidence of bilingualism nationally, for most people, Spanish is learned in schools or during employment. It has been estimated that 90%
of rural children begin schools speaking only Guarani. Since for many rural persons their only exposure to Spanish is in the schools, there is a high correspondence between years of school and language ability (Rubin 1968a:483).

Until recently, the Ministry of Education has not really attended to the problem which the language ability of rural school children might present. Until 1973, the policy of the Ministry of Education had been to enforce a rule of Spanish only as the language of the classroom and recreation period. Teachers were given no instruction in how to cope with the problem; indeed, they did not perceive it as one. Even with the inauguration of a new school curriculum in 1973, no differentiation was made in the program for rural children. It is no surprise then that a high correlation between the degree of ruralness and the repetition rate can be observed (Rubin 1968a: 485). Since monolingual rural school children have little opportunity or necessity to use Spanish and since the language of schools has been only Spanish, the school repetition rate seems to reflect, at least in part, student frustration and inability to perform in this second (almost foreign) language. Probably also indicative of the language problem is the fact that it takes 7.3 years to produce a fourth grade finisher. A further problem which prevents school success is that most children do not stay in school very long. The average time a rural student remains in school is 3.2 years, hardly enough to acquire a language which is only used in the school setting in the rural areas.

2. Educational language policy. When I observed in 1960 that language might constitute a problem for rural children, most Paraguayan educators did not seem to see the problem in that way. The teachers I interviewed said that the problem was that the children simply did not want to learn. An outstanding exception in those days was the late Professor Decoud Larrosa, occupant of the chair of Guarani at the University, who frequently lectured to teachers' colleges about the problem of monolingual school children. I understand he had been doing so for many years.

The policy of the Ministry of Education of insisting that Spanish be used as the only language in schools and on the playground was often strictly enforced throughout Paraguayan history and has changed only recently. In 1812, the governmental junta advised schoolteachers to make sure that Spanish was the language of the classroom and to banish Guarani from school usage (Instrucciones ... 1812). Despite governmental regulations, this turned out to be difficult to implement. Thus arose the now famous use of 'rings' to remind students of the need to use Spanish. A description of this bizarre tactic is given in the memoirs of Juan Cristóstomo Centurión:
In school the use of Guarani in class hours was prohibited. To enforce this rule, teachers distributed to monitors bronze rings which were given to anyone found conversing in Guarani ... on Saturday, return of the rings was requested and each one caught with a ring was punished with four or five lashes (translated from Centurión 1894:62).

The period after the Triple Alliance War, from 1870-1932, was one in which Spanish was especially emphasized. This was due in part to the heavy Argentine influence in the country, the Paraguayan loss of the Triple Alliance War and the subsequent occupation, and to a feeling that whatever came from outside was better than anything that was Paraguayan. In the case of education, this meant a heavier emphasis on Spanish and a greater negation of Guarani. Thus in 1894, the head of the Ministry of Education, Manuel Dominguez, referred to Guarani 'as a great enemy of the cultural progress of Paraguay' (Cardozo 1959:81). Whereas Dominguez clearly recognized the problem posed by the monolingual Guarani speakers, he did not recognize the problem caused to monolingual Guarani speakers by the requirement of Spanish-only instruction.

When the incumbent Colorado party came into power in 1948, some basic change in attitudes toward language began to appear. This change may be due to the basic philosophy of the party, which places emphasis on self-reliance, self-sufficiency, and pride in things Paraguayan. Given this philosophy, Guarani began to be given more acceptance in many spheres including, eventually, education. In 1950, a chair of Guarani was created at the university. Further, starting in 1955, classes in Guarani began to be taught at the high school level. In 1967, a new constitution was approved, naming Guarani and Spanish the 'national languages' of Paraguay, with Spanish as the 'official language'. However, there was no immediate change of policy within the Ministry of Education and the 'Spanish only' rule was reiterated until 1973 when, with the inauguration of the New Curriculum (Curriculum Renovado) in the primary schools, the Ministry of Education, for the first time in its history, authorized the use of Guarani in the classroom to facilitate the transition to Spanish.

3. Growth of awareness of the language problem in education. Despite official governmental lack of attention to the language problem until recently, unofficial attempts at resolving it have been made for many years. Teachers, in an effort to help students through the course of studies in Spanish, had recourse to a number of techniques, none of which was too successful. As I indicated in an earlier paper (Rubin 1968a):

In the first few grades, many teachers begin by using a limited amount of Spanish, which is gradually increased as the years progress. Translation into Guarani is the most
frequent technique used to convey the meaning of Spanish. The teacher says the sentence in Spanish, translates it into Guarani, and then asks the student to repeat it into Spanish.

Another technique is the memorization of poems and stories in Spanish. Unfortunately, for many children these exercises remain completely rote during the first months or years of their education.

Another common approach to student language learning was to try to require the rural parents to speak only Spanish to their children, a not too successful technique, given it required a change in rural language usage patterns. More recently, the Ministry of Education has begun to recognize the need to do something about the language problem. In 1962, with USAID funds, a book entitled Enseñanza Inicial del Español was published. The 52-page book offers some only general indications about how to teach language—in particular, use of poems, games, stories, and description of pictures. Nonetheless, the book represents a significant departure from the previous lack of attention to the problem.

In 1964, with funds from UNESCO, a Ministry of Education experimental group worked on techniques and materials to teach Spanish as a second language at a place called Posta Gaona. Two products from this experiment were incorporated into the New Curriculum of 1973: (1) a list of key vocabulary and (2) a set of basic sentence patterns.

Unfortunately, although the New Curriculum, following the constitutional changes of 1967, specifically encourages teachers to use Guarani when and for as long as is deemed necessary, it offers relatively few suggestions on second language teaching techniques. Further, it does not make a distinction between the language problems of rural and urban students.

Another indication of the growing change of attitude and awareness of the language problem can be noted in the teacher training colleges. The 1977 language arts curriculum of ISE, Superior Institute of Education, introduces its students to the bilingual nature of the country and encourages recognition of the value of Guarani.

Most recently, in January, 1976, a new Investigative Unit of the Ministry of Education organized a study of school achievement of first grade students. One of the principal instruments of this research focused on language ability. Early results of the research indicate much lower school performance and language competence in rural areas. The work of this team has heightened the Ministry's interest in investigating the possibilities of bilingual education as a solution.

From Fall, 1976 to the present, the Investigative Unit of the Ministry of Education has explored with USAID and several consultants the possibility of a pilot project in bilingual education. As of this date, the project has not yet received final
approval. Nonetheless, the issues which arose in the process of considering this project are of considerable interest to those concerned with implementing bilingual education projects and to those concerned with both the short- and long-range effects of bilingual education.

4. Issues for bilingual education. In this section, I am going to discuss some issues which arose in the consideration of bilingual education in technical and social terms of reference. This separation is somewhat artificial since each hinges on the other to some extent. Nonetheless, each issue is discussed under the most relevant rubric. I am also going to discuss philosophical issues; although these did not arise in the Paraguayan discussions, they seem implicit in that country as well as in other countries which are considering or implementing bilingual education.

4.1 Technical issues. One of the seemingly burning issues in Paraguay is the question of which orthography to use to write school primers. Guarani has been a written language for several centuries, but through the years a number of orthographies have been created. At the present time, there is a minimum of seven alphabets for the writing of Guarani in Paraguay. Each of these alphabets has its adherents and the choice of the alphabet seems to have taken on a political tone.

Further, since Paraguay is currently thinking about transitional bilingual education, certain technical problems arise, given that the learner will need to move from reading Guarani to reading Spanish. Some of these difficulties were pointed out by Stark in an unpublished paper. In some cases, Stark notes, symbols derived from Spanish are used to represent different sounds in Guarani. For example, in the Guarani alphabet developed by Padre Guasch, the symbol $x$ stands for $/ʃ/$, while in Spanish the same symbol indicates the consonant cluster $/ks/$. On the other hand, the same sound in both languages has often been represented by different graphemes. Thus, in the orthography commonly used by songwriters, the Guarani $j$ and the Spanish $y$ indicate the phoneme $/ʃ/$. The problem is further compounded since $ʃ$ represents the phoneme $/ʃ/$ in Spanish.

The issue is a very emotional one, as alphabets often seem to be, and when I suggested an alphabet that would facilitate the transition, an adherent of one of the alphabets suggested that I wanted to kill Guarani! At the moment, it is difficult to assess how resistant some of the groups might be to what seems to be the technically most appropriate solution, namely, one suited to the transition approach, as Stark has suggested. As always, the technical problems of orthography are complicated by attitudes and values attached to language.

The orthography issue has arisen in other parts of Latin America. The technical problems were especially complex in
the case of Peru (cf. Parker's 1973 discussion of Quechua). Orthography issues are currently under debate in Guatemala. For some Guatemalan languages, two competing orthographies have been created, one written by the Summer Institute of Linguistics and the other by the Proyecto Francisco Marroquín.

A second issue concerns the kind of Guarani to use in school textbooks. Due to the coexistence of the two languages over some 300 years, each has exerted considerable influence on the other. In fact, no one speaks what might be called 'pure Guarani'. A cursory examination of some normal Guarani conversations showed that they could contain between 28 and 54% Spanish loan words (Rubin 1968b). In some cases, Guarani equivalents are still in use but in most, the Spanish borrowing is accepted as being part of Guarani. Some attempts have been made to 'purify' the language, the most notable being that of the late Guarani scholar, Decoud Larrosa, who translated parts of the Bible into as pure a Guarani as he could find or invent. I am told that people have difficulty reading this material. For those concerned with the promotion of Guarani, there is some fear that writing mixed Guarani will lead to a diminution in its value.

However, the issue of the maintenance and elaboration of the purer variety of the vernacular seems even stronger in other countries. A Bolivian bilingual colleague, Pedro Plaza, feels strongly that using a mixed variety of Quechua in schools will kill the language. The strength of Plaza's views reflects the nature of the competition between Spanish and Quechua in Bolivia.

A third and very important technical issue is the identification of the appropriate second language teaching methodology for countries like Paraguay. Something like the immersion method has been used for years unsuccessfully. Given the fact that in the rural area, Guarani is the only language used for communication, the rural student has little or no opportunity to use Spanish outside the classroom. The student rarely observes his/her own parents using the language. Within the classroom, the student never needs to use Spanish to fellow classmates and uses Spanish only to respond to or interpret the teacher's questions or instructions. Thus, despite parental aspirations that children acquire the ability to speak Spanish and the Ministry of Education requirement that the children do so, it would appear that the language has little value for the child. Further complicating the learning problem is the number of years during which the student remains in school, an average of 3.2 years. This figure might be improved if school success were enhanced through bilingual education techniques. But the need to identify adequate methods to improve Spanish language acquisition remains a challenging one, given the limitations of the sociolinguistic setting.

This problem is a common one for many Latin American countries contemplating bilingual education. The more isolated
or rural the area, the fewer the opportunities are for use of Spanish outside the classroom and the more challenging the task is for the classroom teacher.

It is worthwhile to mention that the question of the kind of Spanish to be taught did arise in discussing the bilingual program. The question took two forms. The first was related to the problem mentioned previously, namely, given the high degree of mixture between the two languages, what kind of Spanish ought to be used in school. Most opted for some sort of 'Paraguayan Spanish', although with some reservations. The second question related to the level of Spanish to be taught Guarani-speaking children. In order to ascertain this, it was suggested that a study be made of the sorts of structures used most frequently by children in this age range whose mother tongue was Spanish. To my knowledge, there is only one study of the language development of Latin American Spanish-speaking children in the age range of 5-10 years, an unpublished one by INIDE, Ministry of Education, Peru.

One last technical question which arose was the important one of which mix of skills to teach, given the Paraguayan setting. Two approaches were considered: (1) literacy and subject matter in Guarani while teaching Spanish as a second language, followed by literacy in Spanish, or (2) subject matter in Guarani while teaching Spanish as a second language, followed by literacy in Spanish only. It was deemed desirable to try out both approaches to determine the cost-benefit of each.

4.2 Social issues. One of the more important social issues was the question of parental attitudes toward bilingual education. Given that schooling has been so exclusively associated with Spanish and that one of the major purposes of attending school was to acquire Spanish, the question arose of what parental reactions would be toward a program which used Guarani as a medium of instruction or which taught literacy in Guarani. The Investigative Unit and I did a small survey of parental attitudes toward bilingual education. The study was conducted in 18 schools in the department of Paraguari and questionnaires were administered to some 193 parents whose children had attended school for at least three years. In addition to asking parents what scholastic goals they had for their children after completing three years of school (parents indicated that reading, speaking Spanish, and writing were important in that order), and what skills their children did in fact have, the questionnaire asked about parental attitudes toward bilingual education. Two differently worded questions were asked; parental agreement to bilingual education was 58% on one question and 50% on the other. That is, despite the fact that learning Spanish was a major goal of these parents and despite the heavy emphasis on Spanish only in the schools, more than half the parents were willing to consider bilingual education.
In addition to asking whether the parents approved of bilingual education for their children, we also asked them to indicate their reasons for their responses. The reasons fell generally into the following categories: socioeconomic, pedagogic, identity, identification of Spanish with school, and psychological.

It is interesting to note that the most frequent reason given both for and against bilingual education was socioeconomic. Of those in favor of bilingual education, 59 said it would help socioeconomically. The reasons were expressed as follows:

'So that my child can work in both the countryside and the city'.
'Because my child will use both in daily life'.

Of those against bilingual education in some form, 77 said they felt it would impede the child's socioeconomic progress. They often responded as follows:

'In order to work anywhere in the world'.
'Because here Guarani can be used without difficulty, but in the city and in other countries one suffers a great deal'.
'In order to improve their economic situation'.
'In order to be able to send the child on errands'.

A second reason given by many parents for accepting bilingual education was identity. Only those persons who were for bilingual education gave this kind of reason. The responses indicate the strength of feelings toward Guarani prevalent in the country.

'Because we're Paraguayans'.
'In order to regain the prestige of the language'.
'Because it's ours'.
'As countryfolk'.

Naturally, this sort of reason was not used against bilingual education. However, instead, several parents did object to bilingual education for reasons which seem related to the idea that Spanish is the normal language of school. The responses took the following forms:

'Because the child needs Spanish and it is his/her opportunity to learn it'.
'They ought to begin directly in Spanish'.
'All the books are in Spanish'.
A third reason given both for and against bilingual education can be grouped under the category of pedagogical reason. Of those in favor of bilingual education, the reasons took the following forms:

'Because the child will learn more'.
'Because the child can understand what is taught in school'.
'Because education is more complete'.
'So that the child can develop and understand more'.

Of those against bilingual education, the pedagogical reasons took the following forms:

'Because it will confuse the child's learning of Spanish'.
'Because once the child gets used to using Guarani, it is doubtful he/she will speak Spanish'.
'Because the child won't learn one or the other'.
'Because when the child doesn't know Spanish the teacher has no patience with him/her'.

Only a few parents who were against bilingual education gave a reason which could be classified as psychological. The reason given was because the child had already suffered a great deal with Guarani.

In summary, we can note that the parents have some fairly clear reasons why they think bilingual education would or would not be helpful for their child. Any future project would need to respond to these parental concerns.

A related social issue is need for teacher's acceptance of bilingual education. Most of the rural teachers come from rural areas, all have been educated in schools where Guarani was prohibited (although they themselves may have heard it in the classroom and may have used it in the classrooms themselves) and have many of the same kinds of attitudes as the parents. In addition, they lack training in second language acquisition psychology and methodology. Any methodology would have to take this into account and be well organized or the teachers might return to old methods, given pre-established attitudes toward the educational process. A further complicating factor is the widespread belief that Guarani is hard to read. Given the multiplicity of competing orthographies, most Paraguayans think it is difficult to read Guarani even though they are literate in Spanish. If bilingual education were to be implemented, teachers would need to understand and accept the benefits that bilingual education might bring. They would have to be able to apply any methods used to teach literacy and language. Without their acceptance, the success of any program seems doubtful.

4.3 Philosophical issues. As I have indicated, philosophical issues did not arise in our discussions in Paraguay; however,
they seem implicit there as well as in other countries in Latin America.

One of the most important philosophical issues hinges on the technical question of the ability to find methodologies suited to the particularly difficult language-learning situation of countries like Paraguay. It is relatively easy for a child to acquire a second language, given both opportunity and the social motivation to do so (cf. Wong Fillmore 1976). However, it is an enormous challenge to do so in a classroom setting, given the size and shape of classrooms, the amount of time the children spend in school, and the lack of immediate need to use this language. I am optimistic that with the use of some newer methods, great strides can be made in improving the amount of Spanish now acquired. But I think it is important that ministries and consultants not exaggerate what can be done, before experimentation with these and other methods. Parents in Latin America are relatively philosophical about what they can expect from schools; nonetheless they are always hopeful. It seems important that bilingual education programs not promise too much.

Another philosophical issue which did not arise in Paraguay but which does arise from time to time in Latin America is the question of whether the bilingual program should be a transitional or a maintenance one. In Bolivia, some speakers of Quechua feel that transitional bilingualism will lead to the elimination of Quechua; that the only way to maintain Quechua is to have bilingual education all the way through high school. These fears seem to fit in with the relatively strong social hiatus existing between Quechua and Aymara speakers on the one hand, and those who use Spanish. Coupled with the fact (mentioned further on) that schooling causes rural peasants to move to the city, where Spanish is dominant in Bolivia, the fears seem well founded. This does not seem to be a problem in Paraguay at the moment, largely because of the functional distribution of the two languages and the relatively positive attitudes toward Guarani (Rubin 1968b). There does not seem to be much fear that Guarani will be lost. However, there is some possibility that if effective teaching of Spanish were implemented and if greater skills in Spanish were acquired, usage patterns might change. There is some indication that with greater knowledge of Spanish, there is a trend toward greater use of Spanish in the rural areas in previously Guarani domains (Rubin 1968c). If this trend accelerated, some pro-Guarani persons might become alarmed at the potential for language loss which bilingual education might portend.

A third more complex philosophical issue is the relationship of increased knowledge of Spanish to socioeconomic development. One of the arguments for bilingual education is that students would better acquire the skills which the schools stand for—reading, writing, arithmetic, and Spanish. The philosophical question is what the relationship of improving acquisition of
these school skills is to socioeconomic development. In the case of many Latin American countries, acquisition of Spanish frequently means migration to urban areas. As one Latin American observer said recently, 'La escuela rural es urbanizante' (The rural school urbanizes). Indeed, one of the reasons why parents want their children to learn Spanish is so that they can travel to the city and abroad. On the other hand, making people literate and Spanish-speaking does not automatically enhance socioeconomic development in the rural areas unless these newly acquired skills are used to transmit information which leads to improvement of the rural economy and lifestyle. The fact is that the solution of educational problems must be rationally related to socioeconomic planning.

5. Summary and conclusions. After many years of ignoring the language problem which monolingual Guarani rural school children face when taught through Spanish, the Ministry of Education is now looking at bilingual education as a possible solution to some of the problems which the Spanish-only approach has brought. There are a number of social and technical issues to be resolved—orthography, type of Guarani to use, kind of Spanish to teach, methods of second language teaching, type of teachers and teacher-trainers, in- and pre-service training requirements, promotion of positive responses among parents and teachers, and the proper mix of program. None of these issues seems impossible to resolve—indeed, to a large extent they are relatively simple, given the fact that the language issue is not highly politicized in Paraguay. Nonetheless, if bilingual education is to be of benefit, it is essential that all of these issues be attended to in proper order or the program will not prove useful.

A comparison of the Paraguayan situation with that of other Latin American countries considering bilingual education shows many similarities—many of the same issues arise or will arise. Many of these similarities stem from the fact that use of the vernacular language is associated with rural, more isolated, poorer sectors of the society, whereas use of Spanish is associated with the more urban, less isolated sectors of the society. A major advantage which Paraguay has is that the vernacular language is also associated with and used in the urban areas. Unlike much of Latin America, Guarani does not serve to set apart a culturally unique group which is anxious or concerned about assimilating to the urban culture. Therefore, we do not anticipate much resistance to the use of Guarani as a transitional language, nor does it seem that children have as negative a self-image as some more isolated Indian groups in other Latin American countries. All of these factors make some form of bilingual education seem like the most appropriate solution to the current language problems of the rural areas.
NOTES

The most recent information on Paraguay was gathered while I served as a consultant to a preproject planning period in March and May-June, 1977, under contract with USAID/Paraguay. The interpretations of this information are mine alone and do not represent those of USAID/Paraguay nor the Paraguayan Ministry of Education. The material herein taken from reports to USAID is done with the express permission of USAID/Paraguay.

1. The 1962 census showed that claims to be bilingual increased slightly to 77%.
2. This account of educational language policy is taken from Rubin 1968, Chapter 2.
3. Among these are two proposed by the Academia Guarani, one proposed by Padre Guasch, a 'popular' orthography used in song books, and one proposed by Decoud Larrosa.
4. The questionnaire format and questions were prepared in collaboration with the Investigative Unit of the Paraguayan Ministry of Education. The unit collected all of the data and did all the compilations. Responsibility for the interpretation is mine alone.
5. The reason for the difference can be explained in part by the form of the two questions. In order to be pro-bilingual education, the correct response was positive for the first question and negative for the second. Questions requiring a negative response to be in favor usually require greater comprehension of the question since the automatic reaction is to say yes. This fact makes the 50% affirmative all the stronger a response.
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BILINGUALISM IN MEXICO

Yolanda Lastra de Suárez
Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México

Bilingualism in Mexico, for the purpose of this brief description, means bilingualism in Spanish, the official language of the country, and one of the indigenous languages. I do not discuss bilingualism in Spanish and in a foreign language resulting from either immigration or deliberate learning in a bilingual school, or bilingualism in two indigenous languages. My description is based on census figures and on reports by linguists and anthropologists whose judgment seems reliable. There have not been any systematic studies of bilingualism. There is a systematic study of attitudes (Paulín 1974), based on interviews in two cities, but no community studies of the type showing who speaks what language to whom when. Indigenous bilingualism is not included because all we have is hearsay about Nahuatl-Totonac, Tlapane-Nahuatl, Tzeltal-Tzotzil, Tojolabal-Tzeltal bilingualism, and so on; the reports may represent sporadic cases which are interesting in themselves, no doubt, but not of sociolinguistic consequence. One interesting study was undertaken in a town in the State of Mexico (Albores 1976), where Otomi-Nahuatl-Spanish relations are explored. Very few Otomi speakers learn Nahuatl and there are no cases of speakers of Spanish learning Otomi or Nahuatl, or of Nahuatl speakers learning Otomi.

In Mexico, some 55 Amerindian languages are still spoken. The figure may be larger, perhaps doubled, if one counts the number of languages using the criterion of mutual intelligibility and not criteria of a historical and cultural sort. So, for example, Zapotec is considered one language in census figures but it is really a family of over 20 languages at least.

I begin with some comparative figures which witness to the gradual disappearance of indigenous languages, bilingualism representing a step toward a more homogeneous situation, with the official language playing a still more dominant role.
The demographic estimates for the sixteenth century, at the time of the Spanish Conquest, vary widely. It is certain that the native population decreased considerably. Thereafter, at times the population increased and at times it decreased. It has been increasing steadily in absolute numbers since 1920, but the proportion of speakers of indigenous languages to the total population has been steadily declining as well. The percentage of speakers of Indian languages in 1950 was approximately 20%. The percentage in 1970 was 6%. According to the last census, there were 3,111,415 speakers of indigenous languages in a population of 48,222,238.

Tables 1 and 2 show comparative figures on speakers of indigenous languages and bilinguals for the years 1950, 1960, and 1970. Table 3 shows the figures for monolinguals (Alanis 1946) from 1930 to 1970. The absolute number of speakers has increased in all but two states, and in these two the decline has been slight. The number of bilinguals has increased in all but three states. The number of monolinguals has generally declined, but has increased in Chiapas, Guerrero, Nayarit, and Quintana Roo. The increase of monolinguals in these four states can probably be explained by a general rise in the population, and better health and sanitation conditions, with no simultaneous increase in the learning of the official language.

Table 4 gives 1970 census figures for 30 languages. I selected a number of typical municipalities and compared the figures on bilingualism, Spanish monolingualism, and Indian monolingualism for 1960 and 1970 (Tables 5 and 6). The languages represented in the tables are Zapotec, Huave, Maya, Nahuatl (Aztec), Tarahumara, Cora, Huichol, Tepehuan, and Tarascan. For Zapotec I selected a municipality near Juchitán which is an important city in the area: Ixtlatepec; a fairly isolated community: Ixtenco; one near the capital of the State of Oaxaca: Tlacochahuaya; and the city of Juchitán itself.

For Huave I selected the culturally most conservative group, San Mateo, and one other, San Dionisio.

For Maya, the capital of the State of Yucatán, Mérida, was selected, as well as one municipality not far from Mérida; Tamiec, and one fairly isolated one, Calotmul.

For Nahuatl there are two general areas: Huastec and Central. Xochitepec is an isolated Huastec community in Hidalgo and Orizatlan has fairly good communications. In the central area there are Copalillo, an isolated community in Guerrero; and San José Miahuatlan, Puebla, which has good communications.

For Tarahumara there is only one community, Balleza, Chihuahua. In Nayarit there is one municipality where both Cora and Huichol are spoken, and one where Tepehuan is spoken. For Tarasco I selected Cherán, Michoacan, a community where literacy experimentation was carried out in the thirties.

The results of the comparison are presented in Tables 5 and 6. Table 6 lists municipalities where bilingualism increased, and shows a parallel decrease in the percentage of indigenous-
language monolingualism. That is, in these municipalities monolinguals have learned Spanish and have become bilingual. The table also shows municipalities where bilingualism has decreased, and where indigenous monolingualism has also decreased, with a parallel increase of Spanish monolingualism. What has probably happened here is that children of bilingual homes no longer learned the indigenous language and thus became monolingual in Spanish. The cases of Ixtlatepec, Juchitán, Calotmul, and Orizatlan are clear. Here the native monolingualism and bilingualism decrease while Spanish monolingualism rises. The increase in Spanish monolingualism is the sum of the decrease of native monolingualism and bilingualism. The simplest explanation is that children learn only Spanish. Another possibility is that bilinguals who speak good enough Spanish deny their knowledge of the native language. For practical purposes denying the knowledge of a language and cutting oneself off from a community is the same as being monolingual.

From the study of the census figures and from a general knowledge of the linguistic situation in Mexico, there emerges the possibility of classifying bilingual communities into three types:

(1) Incipient bilingualism. These are communities in transition from a state of total monolingualism in an indigenous language to a state of bilingualism. Some people are beginning to learn Spanish, but there are still large numbers of monolinguals. These are usually isolated communities.

(2) Stable bilingualism. One-third or more of the people are bilingual. Some children continue to learn both languages. The transition to monolingualism in Spanish is gradual.

(3) Partial bilingualism. Children no longer learn the native language and only older people are bilingual. Some younger people have a passive command of the indigenous language, but usually claim that they do not know it at all.

Now I am going to give a brief and anecdotal description of such communities. In the Isthmus of Tehuantepec there are large numbers of speakers of Zapotec; bilingualism is high. Even in large cities like Juchitán one hears the Indian language spoken all around; yet if the people one hears talking Zapotec—for instance, at the market—are addressed in Spanish, they will answer in that language with equal fluency. Zapotec is exported to the northern part of the isthmus, where there are whole colonies of Zapotec speakers. Zapotec is also learned by speakers of other languages, for example, by speakers of Huave. Yucatán is a second example of stable bilingualism. Forty percent of the people of the state are bilingual according to the
census. But probably many more have at least a passive knowledge of Maya. In a city such as Mérida, which is the largest city in the southeastern part of Mexico, Maya is heard constantly in the streets, in buses, at the market, everywhere. There the situation has been stable for many years and will probably continue for many more.

The Huave area is an example of an isolated area which is nevertheless not homogeneous. A few years ago San Mateo was more accessible than San Dionisio (there is a road now), but San Mateo has always been more conservative. San Francisco, another Huave community, was until a few years ago as isolated as San Mateo or even more so, because part of a lagoon had to be crossed in order to reach it. Yet it is now bilingual and there are no monolinguals, meaning that people at least know enough Spanish for the most essential type of communication. Santa María was even more isolated because one had to go through San Mateo in order to get to Santa María. It, too, is bilingual. This shows that isolation alone does not explain conservatism and that there are cultural factors at play which are equally important and deserve study.

In San Dionisio and Santa María, parents deliberately stopped speaking Huave to their children so they would not learn it. They make an effort to speak to them in Spanish, very poor Spanish most of the time, and the children learn a type of Spanish which is full of interferences from Huave, though perhaps with some improvement in the direction of the standard, thanks to the influence of the school, but which is considered nevertheless more useful socially and economically. The children understand Huave since they hear it at home all the time and their parents are more proficient in it than in Spanish. The situation reminds one of that described by Waterhouse (1949) for Chontal, where children are taught Spanish first and postpone their active use of the native language until they begin to take part in community affairs.

In the Huastec area of Nahuatl, Xochiatipan is isolated. There are no roads, one must either walk or ride a mule, and in the rainy season two rivers which have to be crossed present a problem. Half of the population speaks no Spanish; it is surrounded by an area of high monolingualism and the transition toward bilingualism is slow.

Orizatlan is one step further on the road to bilingualism, due mainly to the dirt roads that lead to it. Also, its general location not far from Tamazunchale, which is an important city on the Pan American Highway, explains the increase in bilingualism.

The central Nahuatl area is one where there may be incipient bilingualism in isolated areas such as Copalillo, or a fairly stable situation as in Miahuatlan. In the same area there is Coapan, a town on the outskirts of Tehuacan. It is to some extent an industrial and tourist center, but it provides another instance of the lack of correlation between good communications
and a low index of bilingualism. In Coapan the municipal president spoke Nahuatl and reported that 'everyone here is bilingual'. It is a fact that small children in the center of town speak Nahuatl. However, in the central Nahuatl area, one more often finds partial bilingualism as in the State of Mexico, Tlaxcala, and Morelos. There, only a few communities still have adults who can talk to one another; children no longer learn the language, and often only a handful of old people still recall the language. This area has been studied in detail by Horcasitas and myself in a project on the localization of Nahuatl speakers.

In the Valley of Oaxaca, which is a large Zapotec area, the following situation is found. Each town speaks a somewhat different dialect. People in towns next to each other may understand each other, but they have a difficult time understanding people who live four or five villages away. The Summer Institute of Linguistics has conducted an intelligibility survey and has found eight different varieties in the area. Such dialect fragmentation has not been accompanied by the rise of a standard language and as a result people of different villages use Spanish as a lingua franca. This situation contributes further to the development of bilingualism.

The situation for the Mixtec area is similar to the highly fragmented Zapotec one. In the Mazatec area there are some localities which have a certain prestige—for instance, Huautla de Jimenez, which has a market and is the distribution center for certain goods. People have less trouble understanding the dialect spoken there, so perhaps this indicates the beginning of a certain kind of standard, but it has not developed very much and there are not many centers of this sort. In all of these areas, disputes about land between neighboring villages constitute a barrier in the development of a common language. The disputes occur at the points where there could be mutual intelligibility since the villages are next to each other.

The bilingual situations reported here all refer to an oral type of bilingualism. No community has developed a written form of communication. I am not referring to written literature, which is nonexistent for practical purposes. The native languages are clearly at a disadvantage.

Nowadays there are practically no programs in full-fledged bilingual education. One increasingly finds the oral teaching of Spanish using the native language as a tool during one preschool year. There are also some programs in literacy in the indigenous languages. Full-scale evaluation of the projects of the first type has been carried out in Oaxaca. The second type of programs has seldom been evaluated and reports on the number of people enrolled, numbers made literate, etc. are not available.

In general, teachers and native promotores (the bilingual agents of change employed by several government institutions) are optimistic about the vitality of the indigenous languages,
but many of the Indians themselves are more pragmatic and when asked whether they think their children should be taught the Indian language in school, they answer: 'What for? They already know it'. Yet when some of these Indians go to a big town to live, they organize groups of natives of such-and-such a locality and try to preserve old customs and perhaps the language. This recalls the situation described by Fishman in the United States, where third-generation immigrants become nostalgic. Indians who immigrate to Mexico City, and whose children no longer speak the native language, will also become nostalgic.

The picture, then, is one of increasing bilingualism, decreasing monolingualism in the native languages, and increasing monolingualism in Spanish. If there is an unforeseen nativistic movement, perhaps fostered by nationalism, the trend could be reversed; if not, if one is realistic, bilingualism can be viewed only as a step toward full dominance by the official language.

**APPENDIX**

Table 1. Speakers of indigenous languages in Mexico.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>1950</th>
<th>1960</th>
<th>1970</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Campeche</td>
<td>38,816</td>
<td>36,391</td>
<td>57,032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chiapas</td>
<td>198,087</td>
<td>381,757</td>
<td>287,836</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chihuahua</td>
<td>22,448</td>
<td>41,280</td>
<td>26,309</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distrito Federal</td>
<td>18,812</td>
<td>45,000</td>
<td>68,660</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Durango</td>
<td>2,592</td>
<td>5,741</td>
<td>4,848</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guerrero</td>
<td>124,693</td>
<td>199,378</td>
<td>160,182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hidalgo</td>
<td>179,629</td>
<td>133,339</td>
<td>201,368</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jalisco</td>
<td>5,303</td>
<td>10,100</td>
<td>5,559</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>México</td>
<td>183,051</td>
<td>170,347</td>
<td>200,729</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michoacán</td>
<td>51,273</td>
<td>58,299</td>
<td>62,851</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morelos</td>
<td>11,764</td>
<td>9,270</td>
<td>16,354</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nayarit</td>
<td>3,866</td>
<td>9,549</td>
<td>9,476</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oaxaca</td>
<td>583,853</td>
<td>683,418</td>
<td>677,347</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puebla</td>
<td>297,490</td>
<td>293,357</td>
<td>346,140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Querétaro</td>
<td>13,257</td>
<td>12,099</td>
<td>11,660</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quintana Roo</td>
<td>9,599</td>
<td>24,814</td>
<td>38,529</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Luis Potosí</td>
<td>89,096</td>
<td>117,837</td>
<td>113,898</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sinaloa</td>
<td>8,940</td>
<td>5,871</td>
<td>11,979</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sonora</td>
<td>25,058</td>
<td>22,825</td>
<td>29,116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tabasco</td>
<td>24,486</td>
<td>23,519</td>
<td>34,188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tlaxcala</td>
<td>22,213</td>
<td>18,904</td>
<td>19,886</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veracruz</td>
<td>252,739</td>
<td>182,343</td>
<td>360,309</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yucatán</td>
<td>279,380</td>
<td>425,741</td>
<td>357,270</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2. Bilinguals in Mexico.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>1950</th>
<th>1960</th>
<th>1970</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Campeche</td>
<td>33,465</td>
<td>27,995</td>
<td>51,111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chiapas</td>
<td>93,843</td>
<td>225,913</td>
<td>140,116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chihuahua</td>
<td>12,741</td>
<td>30,307</td>
<td>17,647</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distrito Federal</td>
<td>18,000</td>
<td>45,040</td>
<td>57,213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Durango</td>
<td>2,170</td>
<td>4,230</td>
<td>3,481</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guerrero</td>
<td>65,452</td>
<td>100,378</td>
<td>75,091</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hidalgo</td>
<td>119,228</td>
<td>131,588</td>
<td>123,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jalisco</td>
<td>4,347</td>
<td>7,950</td>
<td>3,462</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>México</td>
<td>143,844</td>
<td>134,685</td>
<td>180,946</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michoacán</td>
<td>39,167</td>
<td>45,867</td>
<td>50,525</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morelos</td>
<td>10,948</td>
<td>8,560</td>
<td>14,858</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nayarit</td>
<td>3,534</td>
<td>4,225</td>
<td>6,360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oaxaca</td>
<td>37,333</td>
<td>388,099</td>
<td>471,024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puebla</td>
<td>178,519</td>
<td>160,736</td>
<td>251,946</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queretaro</td>
<td>7,433</td>
<td>7,662</td>
<td>9,131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quintana Roo</td>
<td>8,264</td>
<td>18,666</td>
<td>30,305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Luis Potosí</td>
<td>61,124</td>
<td>76,750</td>
<td>87,945</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sinaloa</td>
<td>7,986</td>
<td>5,189</td>
<td>11,364</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sonora</td>
<td>25,166</td>
<td>21,000</td>
<td>27,034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tabasco</td>
<td>23,613</td>
<td>21,460</td>
<td>31,988</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tlaxcala</td>
<td>21,778</td>
<td>15,904</td>
<td>18,810</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veracruz</td>
<td>165,421</td>
<td>196,264</td>
<td>270,685</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yucatán</td>
<td>235,859</td>
<td>229,477</td>
<td>300,700</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3. Monolinguals in Mexico (in thousands).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>1930</th>
<th>1940</th>
<th>1950</th>
<th>1960</th>
<th>1970</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Campeche</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chiapas</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chihuahua</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distrito Federal</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Durango</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guerrero</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hidalgo</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jalisco</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>México</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michoacán</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morelos</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nayarit</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oaxaca</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>322</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puebla</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queretaro</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quintana Roo</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Luis Potosí</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sinaloa</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sonora</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tabasco</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tlaxcala</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veracruz</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yucatán</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4. Number of speakers of 30 Indian languages (1970).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Bilinguals</th>
<th>Monolinguals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amuzgo</td>
<td>13,883</td>
<td>5,012</td>
<td>8,871</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chatino</td>
<td>11,773</td>
<td>6,087</td>
<td>5,686</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinantec</td>
<td>54,145</td>
<td>40,232</td>
<td>13,913</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chol</td>
<td>73,253</td>
<td>42,819</td>
<td>30,434</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cora</td>
<td>6,242</td>
<td>3,893</td>
<td>2,249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cuicatec</td>
<td>10,192</td>
<td>8,910</td>
<td>1,222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huastec</td>
<td>66,091</td>
<td>34,183</td>
<td>11,908</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huave</td>
<td>7,442</td>
<td>4,660</td>
<td>2,782</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huichol</td>
<td>6,874</td>
<td>4,480</td>
<td>2,394</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maya</td>
<td>454,675</td>
<td>386,216</td>
<td>68,459</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mayo</td>
<td>27,848</td>
<td>25,734</td>
<td>1,114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mazahua</td>
<td>104,729</td>
<td>92,812</td>
<td>11,917</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mazatec</td>
<td>101,541</td>
<td>47,259</td>
<td>54,282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nahuatl</td>
<td>799,394</td>
<td>571,634</td>
<td>227,757</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixe</td>
<td>54,403</td>
<td>33,147</td>
<td>20,656</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixtec</td>
<td>233,235</td>
<td>153,903</td>
<td>79,332</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Otomi</td>
<td>221,062</td>
<td>183,361</td>
<td>37,701</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Popoloca</td>
<td>27,818</td>
<td>23,060</td>
<td>4,758</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tarahumara</td>
<td>25,479</td>
<td>17,410</td>
<td>8,069</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tarascan</td>
<td>60,411</td>
<td>49,835</td>
<td>10,578</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tepehua</td>
<td>5,545</td>
<td>4,426</td>
<td>1,119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tepehuan</td>
<td>5,617</td>
<td>4,557</td>
<td>1,050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tojolabal</td>
<td>13,303</td>
<td>9,007</td>
<td>4,296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totonac</td>
<td>124,840</td>
<td>82,578</td>
<td>42,262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tlapancan</td>
<td>30,804</td>
<td>13,507</td>
<td>17,297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tzeltal</td>
<td>99,412</td>
<td>42,098</td>
<td>57,314</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tzotzil</td>
<td>95,383</td>
<td>45,054</td>
<td>50,329</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yaqui</td>
<td>7,084</td>
<td>6,443</td>
<td>641</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zapotec</td>
<td>283,345</td>
<td>233,693</td>
<td>49,652</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zoque</td>
<td>27,140</td>
<td>19,580</td>
<td>7,560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>58,452</td>
<td>34,298</td>
<td>24,154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>3,111,415</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,251,561</strong></td>
<td><strong>859,854</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5. Sample comparative percentages on bilingualism.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Town</th>
<th>1960 Total pop.</th>
<th>Indig. pop.</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Sp. mon.</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Ind. mon.</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Bil.</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Zapotec:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ixtlatepec</td>
<td>9,545</td>
<td>9,228</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3,050</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>6,178</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ixtlan</td>
<td>3,806</td>
<td>3,042</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>764</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1,168</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>1,874</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tlacochahuaya</td>
<td>2,910</td>
<td>2,535</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>375</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2,412</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Juchitán</td>
<td>20,238</td>
<td>15,687</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>4,551</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>4,200</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11,487</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Huave:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S. Dionisio</td>
<td>1,485</td>
<td>1,485</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,198</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>287</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S. Mateo</td>
<td>3,983</td>
<td>3,494</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>489</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2,972</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>522</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Maya:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tahmec</td>
<td>2,260</td>
<td>908</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>1,352</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>409</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>499</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Calotmul</td>
<td>2,172</td>
<td>2,084</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>542</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1,542</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mérida</td>
<td>166,985</td>
<td>24,284</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>142,701</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>1,681</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>22,603</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nahuatl:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Huastec:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Xochiatipan</td>
<td>7,538</td>
<td>7,128</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>410</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6,772</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>356</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Orizatlan</td>
<td>14,336</td>
<td>12,979</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>1,350</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7,212</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>5,767</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Central:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Copalillo</td>
<td>4,867</td>
<td>3,646</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>1,221</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>850</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2,796</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Miahuatlan</td>
<td>3,674</td>
<td>2,680</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>994</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>1,334</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>1,346</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tarahumara:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Balleza</td>
<td>11,961</td>
<td>2,554</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>9,407</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>924</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1,630</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cora and Huichol:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nayar</td>
<td>8,041</td>
<td>7,081</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>960</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5,116</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>1,965</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tepehuan:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Huajicori</td>
<td>5,512</td>
<td>519</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4,933</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>504</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tarasco:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cherán</td>
<td>6,117</td>
<td>3,336</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>2,781</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>783</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2,553</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language</td>
<td>Place</td>
<td>1970 Total pop.</td>
<td>Indig. pop.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Sp. mon.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Ind. mon.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Bil.</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zapotec</td>
<td>Ixtlatepec</td>
<td>12,018</td>
<td>7,930</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>4,088</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>733</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5,598</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ixtlan</td>
<td>4,889</td>
<td>2,466</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>2,423</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>688</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1,778</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tlacochahuaya</td>
<td>3,654</td>
<td>2,679</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>975</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2,458</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Juchitán</td>
<td>37,686</td>
<td>20,767</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>16,919</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>4,023</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16,251</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huave</td>
<td>S. Dionisio</td>
<td>2,353</td>
<td>1,236</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>1,117</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,231</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S. Mateo</td>
<td>5,515</td>
<td>4,360</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>1,115</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2,193</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>2,167</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maya</td>
<td>Tahmec</td>
<td>3,418</td>
<td>2,667</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>751</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>283</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2,311</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Calotmul</td>
<td>3,064</td>
<td>2,404</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>660</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>435</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1,969</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mérida</td>
<td>241,964</td>
<td>47,110</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>194,854</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>1,771</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>45,339</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nahuatl:</td>
<td>Huastec</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Xochiatipan</td>
<td>10,745</td>
<td>8,482</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>2,263</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>5,418</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>3,064</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Orizatlan</td>
<td>20,461</td>
<td>9,189</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>11,272</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>4,089</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>4,927</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Central</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Copalillo</td>
<td>7,453</td>
<td>3,670</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>2,783</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>2,034</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>1,636</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Miahuatlan</td>
<td>6,111</td>
<td>4,335</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>1,776</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>1,627</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>2,715</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tarahumara:</td>
<td>Balleza</td>
<td>13,244</td>
<td>2,291</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10,953</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>748</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1,543</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cora and Huichol:</td>
<td>Nayar</td>
<td>11,232</td>
<td>6,016</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>5,116</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>2,695</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>3,321</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tepehuan:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Huajicori</td>
<td>7,088</td>
<td>649</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6,439</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>622</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tarasco:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cherán</td>
<td>10,239</td>
<td>4,092</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>6,147</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>554</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3,538</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5. Continued.
Table 6. Comparative percentages of increase and decrease of bilingualism in sample municipalities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bilinguals</th>
<th>Ind. monolinguals</th>
<th>Spanish monolinguals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bilingualism increases</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maya: Tahmec</td>
<td>22 67</td>
<td>18 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mérida</td>
<td>13 18</td>
<td>1 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nahuatl: Xochiatipan</td>
<td>4 28</td>
<td>89 50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miahuatlan</td>
<td>36 44</td>
<td>33 26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huave: S. Dionisio</td>
<td>19 52</td>
<td>80 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Mateo</td>
<td>13 39</td>
<td>74 39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cora and Huichol: Nayar</td>
<td>24 29</td>
<td>63 23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Bilingualism decreases

| Zapotec: Ixtlan | 49 36 | 29 14 | 20 50 |
| Ixtlatepec      | 64 46 | 17 6  | 3 34  |
| Tlacochahuaya   | 82 67 | 4 6   | 12 26 |
| Juchitán        | 56 43 | 11 10 | 22 44 |
| Maya: Calotmul  | 70 64 | 24 14 | 4 21  |
| Nahuatl: Orizatlan | 40 24 | 50 19 | 9 55  |
| Copalillo       | 57 21 | 17 27 | 25 37 |
| Tarahumara: Balleza | 13 11 | 7 5  | 78 82 |
| Tepehuan: Huajicori | 9 8 | .27 .38 | 90 90 |
| Tarasco: Cherán  | 41 34 | 12 5  | 45 60 |
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SOME COGNITIVE AND SOCIOCULTURAL CONSEQUENCES OF BEING BILINGUAL

Wallace E. Lambert
McGill University

The technical literature on the consequences of becoming bilingual and/or bicultural stretches back to the turn of the century and is still growing. In the early literature (the 1920s and 1930s) one finds a generally pessimistic outlook on the effects of bilingualism, but since the 1960s a much more optimistic picture has been emerging. Bilingualism and biculturalism, as one might expect, generate much emotional and political steam and this often clouds whatever facts are available. Researchers in the early period generally expected to find all sorts of troubles, and they usually did: bilingual children, relative to monolinguals, were behind in school, retarded in measured intelligence, and socially adrift. One trouble with most of the early studies was that little care was taken to check out the essentials before comparing monolingual and bilingual subjects. Thus, such factors as social class background and educational opportunities were not controlled, nor was much attention given to determining how bilingual or monolingual the comparison groups actually were. But even though there were grounds for worrying about the adequacy of many of these studies, there was nonetheless an overwhelming trend in the outcomes: the largest proportion of these investigations concluded that bilingualism has a detrimental effect on intellectual functioning, a smaller number found little or no relation between bilingualism and intelligence, and only two suggested that bilingualism might have favorable consequence on cognition.

With this picture as background, Elizabeth Peal and I started an investigation on the bilingual-monolingual topic in the Canadian setting (Peal and Lambert 1962). We had, of course, strong expectations of finding a bilingual deficit, as the literature suggested, but we wanted to pinpoint what the intellectual
components of that deficit might be in order to develop compensatory strategies. We argued that a large proportion of the world's population is, by the exigencies of life, bound to be bilingual, and it seemed to us appropriate to help them, if possible. Thus we expected troubles, but did not find any.

We were able in our first investigation to improve on most of the shortcomings noted in the earlier research, and this made us feel relatively confident about the results (see Lambert and Anisfeld 1969). What surprised us, though, was that French-English bilingual children in the Montreal setting scored significantly ahead of carefully matched monolinguals on both verbal and nonverbal measures of intelligence. Furthermore, the patterns of test results suggested that the bilinguals had a more diversified structure of intelligence, as measured, and more flexibility in thought.

These results, suggesting the possibility that bilingualism might favorably affect the structure and flexibility of thought, came as a real surprise. But one investigation rarely has enough weight to change the course of events, even though an important follow-up study (Anisfeld 1964) confirmed the 1962 conclusions. What was needed was confirmation from other settings and from studies using different approaches. Fortunately, since then confirmations have started to emerge from carefully conducted research around the world, from Singapore (Torrance et al. 1970), Switzerland (Balkan 1970), South Africa (Ianco-Worrall 1972), Israel and New York (Ben-Zeev 1972), Western Canada (Cummins and Gulustan 1973), and, using a quite different approach, from Montreal (Scott 1973).

All of these studies (and we found no others in the recent literature to contradict them) indicate that bilingual children, relative to monolingual controls, show definite advantages on measures of 'cognitive flexibility', 'creativity', or 'divergent thought'. Ben-Zeev's study (1972), for example, involved Hebrew-English bilingual children in New York and Israel and the results strongly support the conclusion that bilinguals have greater 'cognitive flexibility'. In this case, the term means that bilinguals have greater 'skill at auditory reorganization' of verbal material, a much more 'flexible manipulation of the linguistic code', and greater advance in 'concrete operational thinking', as these were measured in her investigation. Ianco-Worrall's study (1972) involved Afrikaans-English bilingual children in Pretoria, South Africa, and it lends equally strong support for a somewhat different form of cognitive flexibility, an advantage over monolingual controls in separating word meaning from word sound. The conclusion is drawn that the bilinguals were between two and three years advanced in this feature of cognitive development, which Leopold (1949) felt to be so characteristic of the liberated thought of bilinguals. Worrall also found good support for a bilingual precocity in realizing the arbitrary assignment of names to referents, a
feature of thinking which Vygotsky (1962) believed reflected insight and sophistication.

The recent study by Scott (1973) of French-English bilinguals in Montreal is perhaps the most persuasive because it involved a comparison of young children, some of whom were given the chance to become bilingual over a period of years while others were not given the chance. She worked with data collected over a seven-year period from two groups of English-Canadian children; one group had become functionally bilingual in French during the time period because they had attended experimental classes where most of the instruction had been conducted in French, while the other group had followed a conventional English-language education program. At the first-grade level, the two groups had been equated for measured intelligence, socioeconomic background, and parental attitudes towards French people. In fact, had the opportunity been presented to them, it is likely that most of the parents in the control group would have enrolled their children in the experimental French program, but since it was decided in advance to start one experimental class per year only (see Lambert and Tucker 1972), no such opportunity was available.

Scott was interested in the possible effects that becoming bilingual might have on the cognitive development of children—in particular, what effect it would have on children's 'divergent thinking', a special type of cognitive flexibility (see Guilford 1950, 1956). In contrast, convergent thinking is measured by tests that provide a number of pieces of information which the subject must synthesize to arrive at a correct answer; thus, the information provided funnels in or converges on a correct solution. Measures of divergent thinking provide the subject with a starting point for thought—'think of a paper clip'—and ask the subject to generate a whole series of permissible solutions—'and tell me all the things one could do with it'. Some researchers have considered divergent thinking as an index of creativity (e.g. Getzels and Jackson 1962), while others suggest that until more is known, it is best viewed as a distinctive cognitive style reflecting a rich imagination and an ability to scan rapidly a host of possible solutions.

Scott was interested, among other things, in whether bilingualism promotes divergent thinking. Her results, based on a multivariate analysis, show that the group of youngsters who had become functionally bilingual through 'immersion' schooling were substantially higher scorers than the monolingual group with whom they had been equated for IQ and social class background at the first-grade level. Although the numbers of children in each group are small, this study gives strong support for the causal link between bilingualism and flexibility, the former apparently enhancing the latter.

There is, then, an impressive array of evidence accumulating that argues plainly against the common sense notion that becoming bilingual, i.e. having two strings to one's bow or two
linguistic systems within one's brain, naturally divides a person's cognitive resources and reduces his efficiency of thought. Instead, one can now put forth a very persuasive argument that there is a definite cognitive advantage enjoyed by bilingual children in the domain of cognitive flexibility. However, only further research will tell us how this advantage, assuming it is a reliable phenomenon, actually works: whether it is based on a better storage of information by bilinguals, whether the separation of linguistic symbols from their referents or the ability to separate word meaning from word sound is the key factor, whether the bilingual contrasts of linguistic systems aid in the development of general conceptual thought, or whatever. In any case, this new trend in research should give second thoughts to those who have used the bilingual deficit notion as an argument for melting down ethnic groups. Hopefully, too, it will provide a new perspective for members of ethnolinguistic groups who may have been led to believe in the notion of a likely deficit attributable to bilingualism.

Because of its social significance, there is a great need for more research on this topic. An example of research to come is presented by Cummins (1976), who is intrigued by differences in findings of pre- and post-1960 studies. Cummins argues that perhaps because the more recent studies have all examined the degree of skill subjects actually have in the two languages (a neglected matter in the earlier work), there may therefore 'be a threshold level of linguistic competence which a bilingual child must attain both in order to avoid cognitive deficits and to allow the potentially beneficial aspects of becoming bilingual to influence his cognitive functioning'. This would suggest, among other things, that linguistic minority groups need assurance that the home language will be given a strong reading and writing base before or along with the introduction of the national language. It is a potentially productive hypothesis to test.

One feature of the studies just reviewed merits special attention: all the bases reported (those in Singapore, South Africa, Switzerland, Israel, New York, Montreal) dealt with bilinguals for whom the two languages involved have social value and respect in each of the settings. Thus, knowing Afrikaans and English in South Africa, Hebrew and English in New York and Israel, or French as well as English for English-speaking Canadian children, would in each case be adding a second, socially relevant language to one's repertory of skills. In no case would the learning of the second language portend the slow replacement of the first or 'home' language, as would typically be the case, for example, for French Canadians or Spanish Americans developing high-level skills in English. One might refer to the former instances as examples of an 'additive' form of bilingualism and contrast it with a more 'subtractive' form experienced by many ethnic minority groups who, because of national educational policies and social pressures of various sorts, are forced to put aside their ethnic language for
a national language. Their degree of bilinguality at any point in time would likely reflect some stage in the subtraction of the ethnic language and its associated cultural accompaniments, and its replacement with another. The important educational task of the future, it seems to me, is to transform the pressures on ethnic groups so that they can profit from additive forms of bilingualism and biculturalism. I am going to examine an example of an attempt to make such a transformation in the last section of this paper.

Research on the thinking processes of the bilingual person has recently taken a new turn by focusing on the relation of language to brain functioning. Several of us at McGill have become interested in this area of research and we have used as a take-off point our earlier work on the contrasts between compound and coordinate types of bilingualism (see Lambert 1969). Currently, we are exploring the importance of the age of becoming bilingual, by contrasting 'early' versus 'late' bilinguals, that is, those who become bilingual in infancy versus those who become bilingual in the adolescent years.

Our earlier studies had suggested that those who develop their bilinguality early are more able and efficient at processing the meaning of linguistic information, in particular those general aspects of meaning that cut across the two languages. It is not that the two languages are less autonomous as linguistic systems for 'early' bilinguals, for they show no more signs of language mixing or interlanguage interplay than do 'late' bilinguals; but rather that early bilinguals seem to develop relatively more pervasive, superordinate meaning systems which subserve both languages. By way of contrast, the late bilinguals seem to have relatively more compartmentalized semantic systems for each of their languages, and in general their two language systems seem to be more functionally independent. Put in other terms, the early bilinguals have more compounded language systems and the late bilinguals have more coordinated systems.

This difference in degree of semantic distinctiveness that appears to be related to the age of becoming bilingual has been at the core of several of our more recent studies. Let me give two examples. The first was concerned with the 'language processing strategies' of bilinguals and toward this end we compared three groups of young adult bilinguals who had become bilingual in infancy, in childhood, or in adolescence (Genesee, Hamers, Lambert, Mononen, Seitz, and Starck 1978). At the time of testing, all were in their early twenties and all were perfectly balanced in their skills with English and French. The experimental procedure was a simple language recognition task in which the subject had merely to press a reaction-time button to indicate whether each word heard (presented monaurally through earphones) was French or English. At the same time, EEG activity in the left and right hemispheres of the brain was monitored, using the latest electronic equipment.
and the wisdom about these brain matters that one can find in abundance around McGill. Measures were taken of the latencies of EEG reactions. Put technically, Averaged Evoked Reactions were measured, and latencies to N₁, to P₂, and N₁ - P₂ peak to peak amplitudes were calculated. These are commonly accepted indices of the neural activities that accompany the early stages of perceptual processing of incoming information. They are extremely rapid, occurring within 75 to 100 ms. after the presentation of a stimulus, much in advance of the button push which takes from 800-1000 ms.

Briefly, what we found was that these processing latencies were much faster in the left than in the right hemisphere for the 'early' bilinguals (the infant and childhood subgroups), but faster in the right than in the left hemisphere for the adolescent bilinguals. Statistically, this was a very clear difference, indicating a left hemisphere preference for early bilinguals and a right hemisphere preference for late bilinguals, and it held up regardless of the ear of input of the stimulus material and regardless of the language of input. It was also true that the adolescent bilinguals were much faster in their neurological processing than were the early bilinguals. We are inclined to interpret these findings in terms of strategy differences: the early bilinguals seem to have a proclivity for a left-hemisphere-based strategy, one that draws on what we believe to be a more semantic or analytic form of processing, while the adolescent subgroup seems to have a proclivity for a right-hemisphere-based strategy, one relying more on a gestalt-like or melodic form of processing.

To explore one implication of this interpretation, we recalled our subjects and presented them with a somewhat more demanding task: to repeat aloud each word as it appeared monaurally through the earphones. We reasoned that this task would require a deeper level of processing, one closer to a semantic analysis, and thus more likely to involve the left hemisphere. If this were true, the early bilinguals should react more rapidly because of their left hemisphere proclivity, whereas the adolescent subgroup should be at a disadvantage because, for final processing, the stimulus information would have to be transferred from the favored right hemisphere to the left. Using a voice key to register reaction times, these expectations were supported: the vocal reaction times were significantly shorter for the early bilingual subgroups. In summary, then, these findings help relate language learning experiences to cerebral processing styles, and they fit well with other behavioral distinctions already found between early and late bilinguals.

This whole issue of age of becoming bilingual has been carried an important step further in a fascinating recent study conducted by Jyotsna Vaid, one of our graduate students (Vaid 1977; Vaid and Lambert 1978). Put very briefly, the processing strategies of two groups of French-English bilinguals...
were studied in this case by means of an 'auditory Stroop test' designed to evaluate left and right cerebral hemisphere involvement. One group was made up of 'early' bilinguals, the other of 'late' bilinguals. In the procedure, information was directed alternately through left and right ears, and because the contralateral neural connections (e.g. those between left ear and right cerebral hemisphere) are stronger than the ipsilateral, one can make reliable inferences about the relative involvement of each cerebral hemisphere by analyzing how well the information presented to one ear or the other is finally processed.

In this version of the Stroop test, the stimuli presented were the simple words high, low, haute, and basse, but these were uttered one at a time in pitches that were related to word meanings either congruently (as in the word 'high' uttered in a high pitch) or incongruently (the word 'haute' uttered in a low pitch). In one condition, subjects were to differentiate low from high pitches, disregarding meaning, while in a second condition, they were to disregard pitch and respond to word meanings. Measures of field independence (Witkin 1976) were also taken.

Results indicate that both sex of subject and age of bilinguality affect the degree of right and left hemisphere involvement. For example, male early bilinguals tend to process meaning efficiently in both cerebral hemispheres whereas male late bilinguals and female bilinguals, both early and late, process meaning more efficiently in the right cerebral hemisphere. What these findings suggest is that, when comparisons are made with unilingual controls, bilingualism in general tends to engender a greater involvement of the right hemisphere in the encoding and decoding of meaning, with variations in extent of this involvement determined by sex and age of bilinguality. Thus, male unilinguals are more confined to the left hemisphere for the processing of meaning whereas male bilinguals involve both right and left hemispheres if their bilinguality starts in infancy, and mainly the right hemisphere if the bilinguality dates from adolescence. Female unilinguals start with a balanced involvement of both right and left hemispheres, and bilinguality, whether early or late in its origin, shifts the control of meaning mainly to the right hemisphere.

There is much more work to be done here to be sure of this shift-to-the-right with bilingualism and to clarify its significance. Might there be some connection between the symptoms of flexibility of thought among bilinguals, referred to earlier, and greater right hemisphere involvement? Why are there such marked early-late differences in degree of right hemisphere control of meaning among male subjects? And what is the significance of the very pronounced degrees of field independence (in Witkin's sense of the term) found among early bilinguals? These are some of the questions that have us presently thinking in a variety of directions.
Effects on identity. What about the notion that becoming bilingual and bicultural subtracts, through division, from one's sense of personal identity? Here, too, there are signs in the recent literature of interest in this topic, but there are still only a few studies to draw on. Three, however, do bear on the issue of the bilingual's sense of identity, and all three are encouraging in their outcomes.

The first is the study that Robert Gardner and I conducted with French-Americans in communities in New England and Louisiana (Gardner and Lambert 1972). We were interested in their ways of coping with a dual heritage, and we found that some oriented themselves definitely toward their French background and tried to ignore their American roots; others were tugged more toward the American pole at the expense of their Frenchness; and still others apparently tried not to think in ethnic terms, as though they did not consider themselves to be either French or American. These three types of reactions parallel closely those of Italian-American adolescents studied earlier by Child (1943). To me, these ways of coping characterize the anguish of members of ethnic groups when caught up in a subtractive form of bilculturalism, that is, where social pressures (often from within their own group) are exerted on them to give up one aspect of their dual identity for the sake of blending into a national scene.

The important point here is that identities are fragile and they can, through social pressures, be easily tipped off balance. Thus, some of these young people were trying to be one thing or the other, while others were trying to be neither one thing nor the other. Most interesting was our finding of a fourth subgroup of French-American young people who were apparently successful at being both things, French and American. This subgroup was characterized by a realization of the social usefulness of knowing French, which was given strong parental support. The pattern suggested that this familywide orientation toward the value of French helped these young people become relatively more competent in both French and English.

Identities need not be so disturbed, though, as the study of Aellen and Lambert (1969) showed. In this case, we were interested in the adjustments made by adolescent children of English-French mixed marriages in the Montreal setting. We examined the degree and direction of the offsprings' ethnic identifications as well as a selected set of their attitudes, and personality characteristics.

The children of these mixed marriages come in contact with and are usually expected to learn the distinctive social and behavioral characteristics of the two cultures represented in their families. The question is whether the demands made on them necessarily generate conflicts, or whether the experience with two cultures possibly broadens and liberalizes the child, or whether some combination of both outcomes is typical. In addition to the cultural demands made on them, the children of
mixed ethnic marriages may face other difficulties to the extent that their parents, as suggested by Gordon (1966) and Saucier (1965), may have married outside their ethnic group because of personal instability and immaturity. Much of the previous research suggests that persons who intermarry in this way often have relatively strong feelings of alienation, self-hatred, and worthlessness, and are disorganized and demoralized. Mixed ethnic children might well find it difficult to identify with their parents if these characteristics are typical or representative. Still, the offspring could develop understanding and sympathy for parents with such an outlook. On the other hand, people may intermarry in many instances because they have developed essentially healthy attitudes and orientations which are nonetheless inappropriate within their own ethnic group, making intermarriage with a sympathetic outsider particularly attractive. They may have become, like Park's marginal man, 'the individual with the wider horizon, the keener intelligence, the more detached and rational viewpoint ... always relatively the more civilized human being' (Park 1964:376). In that case, their children might be particularly well trained in tolerance and openmindedness, especially since the children themselves are likely to feel that they, unlike their parents, are automatically members of both ethnic groups. The purpose of this investigation was to examine both these possibilities as objectively as possible by comparing groups of adolescent boys of mixed French-English parentage with others of homogeneous background, either French or English. All groups in the comparison were similar as to age, socioeconomic class, intelligence, and number of siblings.

It was found that the profile of characteristics of the boys with mixed ethnic parentage is a healthy one in every respect when comparisons are made with groups from homogeneous ethnic backgrounds; they identify with their parents, especially with their fathers, as well as the comparison groups do; they relate themselves to and identify with both ethnic reference groups, this being particularly so for those in a French academic environment; they show no signs of personality disturbances, social alienation, or anxiety; nor do their self-concepts deviate from those of the comparison subjects; they see their parents as giving them relatively more attention and personal interest, and their attitudes towards parents are as favorable as those of the comparison groups. They seek out distinctively affectionate relationships with peers; their general attitudinal orientations are similar to those of the comparison groups, while their specific attitudes towards both English and French Canadians are relatively unbiased; their values show the influence of both ethnic backgrounds as do their achievement orientations, which are less extreme than those of the comparison groups. Rather than developing a divided allegiance or repressing one or both aspects of their backgrounds, as has been noted among the offspring of certain immigrant groups
(Child, 1943), they apparently have developed a dual allegiance that permits them to identify with both their parents, and to feel that they themselves are wanted as family members. One of the mixed ethnic boys summed up this finding by saying: 'I respect both my parents, and I respect their origins'. One might argue that the concern of the parents of mixed ethnic adolescents to 'include' their children is exaggerated, a symptom of tension and value conflict, but such an interpretation is negated by the apparent success these parents have had in passing on a sense of being wanted. There are, however, many features of this pattern of results that need further study.

This profile sketch is more characteristic of the mixed ethnic subjects who are part of the French-Canadian high school environment. These young people may be more susceptible to the English-Canadian culture than those attending English-Canadian schools would be to French-Canadian culture because of the Canadian cultural tug of war which seems, at least until recently, to be controlled by the more powerful and prestigious English-Canadian communities (see Lambert 1967).

Two general modes of adjustment to a mixed ethnic background became apparent. In one case, these young men incorporate both ethnic streams of influence, which are either modified by the parents before they are passed on to their children, or are tempered by the adolescents themselves, so that they are less extreme than those represented by either of the major reference groups. A tendency to amalgamate both cultural streams of influence is suggested by the contrasts noted between the ethnically mixed groups and the homogeneous groups, e.g. the unbiased ethnic identifications of the former, their perceptions of parents as being inclusive, their favorable attitudes towards both English and French Canadians, and their less extreme achievement values. In the other case, they tend to adapt their views to the predominant features of the academic-cultural environment in which they find themselves. This form of adjustment is suggested by the tendency of the mixed ethnic groups to line up with the respective homogeneous groups with whom they attend high school, e.g. their choices of the values they hope to pass on to their own children, the personality traits they see as desirable, and their judgments of the relative attractiveness of English-Canadian or French-Canadian girls.

This illustration provides hope for biculturality in the sense that offspring of mixed-ethnic marriages appear to profit from the dual cultural influences found in their families. Rather than cultural conflicts, we find well-adjusted young people with broad perspectives who are comfortable in the role of representing both of their cultural backgrounds. We also have here an illustration of the additive form of biculturalism; the boys studied were caught in the flow of two cultural streams and were apparently happy to be part of both streams.
There is a similar type outcome in the investigation conducted by Richard Tucker and myself (Lambert and Tucker 1972) concerning the English-Canadian children who took the majority of their elementary schooling via French, and who after grades 5 and 6 had become functionally bilingual. Here we were able to measure on a yearly basis their self-conceptions and their attitudes towards English-Canadian, French-Canadian, and French-French ways of life. The attitude profiles of the children in the experimental French program indicate that by the fifth grade important affective changes have occurred during the course of the project. The children state that they enjoy the form of education they are receiving and want to stay with it; their feelings toward French people have become decidedly more favorable; and they now think of themselves as being both French- and English-Canadian in personal makeup.

It is this apparent identification with French people—those from Canada and those from Europe—that raises the question of biculturalism. Has the program made the children more bicultural? It is difficult to answer this question because the meaning of bicultural is so vague. It is certain that the children now feel they can be at ease in both French- and English-Canadian social settings, and that they are becoming both French and English in certain regards; but they are not becoming less English as a consequence. It is certain, too, that they have learned that in classes with European-French teachers they should stand when a visitor enters, while they need not stand in classes that are conducted by English-Canadian or French-Canadian teachers. We wonder how much more there is to being bicultural beyond knowing thoroughly the languages involved, feeling personally aligned with both groups, and knowing how to behave in the two atmospheres. Are there any deeper personal aspects to cultural differences? That is, does culture actually affect personality all that much or is it perhaps a thinner and more superficial wrapping than many social scientists have suggested?

The attitudes of the parents at the start of the project were basically friendly and favorable, although marked with very little knowledge about the French-Canadian people around them. These parents wanted their children to learn French for what appear to be integrative reasons—getting to know the other ethnic group and their distinctive ways—but they did not want them to go so far as to think and feel as French Canadians do. In other words, they were guarded and did not want their children to lose their English-Canadian identity. How will they interpret the attitudes of their children who by grade 5 come to think of themselves as being both English- and French-Canadian in disposition and outlook? Some may see this as a worrisome sign of identity loss, and although we are not optimistic we believe they would, if patient, come to view their children's enjoyment in having both English- and French-Canadian friends and both types of outlooks as a valuable
addition, not a subtraction or cancellation of identities. As we see it, the children are acquiring a second social overcoat which seems to increase their interest in dressing up and reduces the monotony of either coat used alone. Our hope is that the children can convince worried parents that the experience is, in fact, enriching and worthwhile, but the pressures against the children doing so are powerful.

These studies suggest to us that there is no basis in reality for the belief that becoming bilingual or bicultural necessarily means a loss or dissolution of identity. We are aware of the possible pressures that can surround members of ethnolinguistic minority groups and make them hesitant to become full-fledged members of two cultural communities. At the same time, though, we see how easy and rewarding it can be for those who are able to capitalize on a nation's dual heritage. The question of most interest, then, is how in modern societies these possibilities can be extended to ethnolinguistic minority groups.

Actually, very little has been done in North America over the years to help ethnolinguistic minority groups maintain respect in their linguistic and cultural heritage so that they could become full-fledged bicultural members of their national societies. Still, there are several recent developments in the American society that hold out a new and exciting type of hope. These developments, in fact, constitute another instance where the United States has an opportunity to set an outstanding example of what can be done for ethnic minority groups. The first development is a new perspective, generated, it seems, by the critical self-analysis of collegiate activists in the sixties, on what it means to be American. It was American collegiates who demanded national respect for minority groups of every variety, including Afro-Americans and American Indians. As a nation, these young people argued, we have no right to wash out distinctive traditions of any minority group since their ways of life, relative to the so-called American way of life, are in many respects admirable.

The second development, which may have stemmed from the first, takes the form of a national willingness to help minority groups. One way this willingness to help manifests itself is in new educational laws that provide extensive schooling in Spanish for Spanish-Americans in America's large centers, in the passage of the Bilingual Education Act, and in new laws passed in states such as Massachusetts which provide schooling in any number of home languages whenever a group of parents request it.

The third development is a new direction in psycholinguistic research which, although only now getting underway, indicates that the hyphenated American can perhaps most easily become fully and comfortably American if the Spanish, the Polish, the Navajo, or the French prefix is given unlimited opportunity to flourish. For example, the research of Padilla and Long...
(1969; see also Long and Padilla 1970) indicates that Spanish-American children and adolescents can learn English better and adjust more comfortably to America if their linguistic and cultural ties with the Spanish-speaking world are kept alive and active from infancy on. Peal and Lambert (1962) came to a similar conclusion when they found that FC young people who are given opportunities to become bilingual (through education in French language schools and through social contacts in English language settings) are more likely than monolinguals to be advanced in their schooling in French schools, to develop a diversified and flexible intelligence, and to develop attitudes that are as charitable towards the other major Canadian cultural group as towards their own. A similar conclusion is drawn from the recent work of Lambert and Tucker (1972), where EC youngsters—whose home and community environments give them a solid and sure base of English language competence—are given most of their elementary training via French. These children too, seem to be advanced, relatively, in their cognitive development, their appreciation for French people and French ways of life, and their own sense of breadth and depth as Canadians.

In view of these sympathetic and supportive new developments, is it now possible to assist the hyphenated American to become fully and comfortably bilingual and bicultural? Is it now possible to counteract and change the reactions of ethnically different children in America so that they will no longer feel different, peculiar, and inferior whenever they take on their Spanish, Portuguese, Polish, Navajo, or French styles of life as temporary replacements for the American style?

My own thinking on this matter is based on the following working hypotheses: that in bilingual communities where differential prestige is accorded to the languages and to the ethnolinguistic groups involved, then attention should be placed by both linguistic groups on the development of skills in the language more likely to be overlooked. Thus; for FCs in Canada, rather than exploring early immersion-in-English programs, the FC community should consolidate and deepen its control of French, and branch into English language training as early as possible, but only as signs appear that full competence in the potentially neglected home language is assured. In this way trends toward subtractive forms of bilingualism or biculturalism can be transformed into additive ones.

An American example of this sort of transformation is the case of French-Americans in northern New England, who have recently been given a chance to be schooled partly in their home language (Dubé and Herbert 1975a and 1975b; Lambert, Giles, and Picard 1975; Lambert, Giles, and Albert 1976). In the northern regions of Maine, some 85% of families have kept French alive as the home language or one of the two home languages, even though traditionally all schooling has been conducted in English. We participated in an experiment wherein
a random selection of schools in the area were permitted to offer about a third of the elementary curriculum in French and where a second sample of schools with children of comparable intelligence scores and socioeconomic backgrounds served as a control or comparison in that all their instruction was in English. After a five-year run, the children in the 'partial French' classes clearly outperformed those in the control classes on various aspects of English language skills and on academic content, such as math, learned partly via French; at the same time French had become for them a much more literate language (in contrast to mainly audio-lingual) because of the reading and writing requirements of the French schooling. In fact, recent reports show that the French-trained children are consistently ahead of the control children in English language achievement test scores as well as in grade placement levels. This means that they may now have a better chance to compete with other American children in enterprises that call for educational abilities; they apparently have been lifted from the typical low standing on scholastic achievement measures that characterizes many ethnolinguistic groups in North America.

An important element in this transformation appears to be a change in the self views of the French-trained youngsters who, our research has shown, begin to reflect a deep pride in being French, and a realization that their language is as important a medium for education as is English (Lambert, Giles, and Picard 1975). Similar community-based studies are underway in the American Southwest, and these, too, are based on the belief that ethnolinguistic minorities need a strong educational experience in their own languages and traditions before they can cope in an 'all-American' society or before they will want to cope in such a society.
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THEORETICAL PERSPECTIVES ON BILINGUAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Christina Bratt Paulston
University of Pittsburgh

What are the important theoretical and programmatic dimensions of bilingual programs, and what are the theoretical dimensions of the communities in which the programs exist? (from: National Institute of Education, Project Abstract, 1977)

For the purposes of this paper, I would like to rephrase this question as follows:

1. What are the key independent variables or causal factors which influence bilingual education programs?¹
2. What are the key dependent variables or outcomes of bilingual education programs?
3. What are some of the major intervening variables or factors modifying such outcomes?

Introduction. The major point of this paper is that there is no single answer to these questions, but rather that the identification of the 'important theoretical dimensions', i.e. the independent variables and the interpretation of outcomes, depend on the worldview of the researcher and the particular theory he employs to explain and predict phenomena. In this paper I will attempt to outline some major theories of social and educational change and to delineate the identification and interpretation of variables of bilingual education within the framework of each particular theory.²

We can probably all agree on the basic phenomena which form the background to Title VII bilingual education programs in the United States and which gave rise to the original legislation of Title VII: there are a number of children from a low
socioeconomic status (SES) background who speak no or poor English and who encounter massive school failure with consequent early school dropout and low integration into the economic life of the nation. It is when we consider why this is so, what treatment these children should be accorded, and what outcomes should follow, that considerable disagreement ensues. Such scholarly disagreement at times becomes public and divisive (see, e.g. the 1976 issues of The Linguistic Reporter and The TESOL Newsletter; or the Linguistic Society of America's as well as the American Anthropological Association's censure of the work of Arthur Jensen).

Although other fields of study have looked at scholarly strife within their disciplines from the notion of Kuhn's paradigm shift (1970), I know of no attempt to understand the dimensions of bilingual education from a conceptual framework of paradigms, by which Kuhn means 'the way a scientific/professional community views a field of study, identifies appropriate problems for study, and specifies legitimate concepts and methods'.

It is only through an examination of the various theoretical frameworks used to explain and predict the phenomena of bilingual education that we can put into perspective the conflicting or at times complementary research questions and the anticipated solutions as they relate to the dimensions of bilingual education.

R. G. Paulston, drawing on the literature of social and educational change, posits two major paradigms: 'the functional or "equilibrium" paradigm and the conflict paradigm (see Appendix A). Theories (which admittedly cross and overlap) that fall within the "equilibrium" paradigm are (A) evolutionary and neoevolutionary, (B) structural-functionalist, and (C) system analysis. Basically, these theories are all concerned with maintaining society in an equilibrium through the harmonious relationship of the social components and they emphasize smooth, cumulative change. Theoretical approaches which fall within the conflict paradigm are (A) group conflict theory, (B) cultural revitalization theory, and (C) an anarchistic-utopian approach. These approaches emphasize the inherent instability of social systems and the conflicts over values, resources, and power that follow as a natural consequence' (R. G. Paulston 1976:7). Major issues are economic conflict, conflicting value and cultural systems, and conflict arising from oppressive institutions and imperfect human nature.

Assuredly, all of these theoretical approaches are not equally represented in the attempts to delimit and comprehend the dimensions of bilingual education. Nevertheless, it is instructive to examine studies typical of each approach for their underlying assumptions, basic questions, and putative solutions in order to illustrate the basic premise of this paper. Even at times when the question remains the same, for example, 'identify the most effective conditions for educating
children of limited English-speaking ability' (Work Statement), the goals and the means to those goals will vary according to the theoretical approach. For the purpose of illustration, I have identified a number of studies which most clearly exemplify a particular approach. Granted, a number of studies incorporate aspects from more than one theoretical framework, and on the whole I have tended to avoid such studies. Furthermore, a very large number of studies on bilingual education are purely descriptive and atheoretical; such studies I have ignored. It is readily seen then that this paper does not intend a review of the literature (for that see Engle 1975; Fishman 1976; C. B. Paulston 1974a) but rather a selective analysis of a few template works.

THE EQUILIBRIUM PARADIGM

A. Evolutionary theory. The only theoretical approaches relating to bilingual education which fall into the evolutionary category are the genetic theories of Jensen (1969), Herrnstein (1971), and others. In short, the geneticists account for the lack of school achievement by students from minority groups, as well as by those from lower SES background, on the ground of their hereditary inferior IQs. Few issues so well illustrate the paradigm clash as the debate over IQ, and to illustrate, I would like to draw at length on Bowles, Gintis, and Meyer's critique (1975-76) written from a group conflict perspective, of both Jensen and his colleagues and of the structural-functionalists' position on this issue.

Bowles, Gintis, and Meyer consider the educational system in the United States as a mechanism for the reproduction of the social division of labor and focus their inquiry on the legitimation of this division and on the process of assigning individuals to its various positions. They examine this legitimation function within what they label technocratic-meritocratic ideology which, as they define it, corresponds fairly closely to the structural-functionalist position.

They argue against the conclusion that Davis and Moore reach in their highly influential 'functional theory of stratification': 'Social inequality is thus an unconsciously evolved device by which societies insure that the most important positions are conscientiously filled by the most qualified persons' (Davis and Moore in Bendix and Lipset 1966), contending that educational tracking based on competitive grading and objective test scores is only tangentially related to social efficiency. Nowhere are the notions of meritocracy seen more clearly, they continue, than in the recent IQ debate between the geneticists and the structural-functionalists where it is assumed that IQ is an important indicator of economic success, an assumption the authors consider faulty.

The authors point out that the major periods of liberal educational reform have been marked by a lack of concern with
genetically inherited characteristics when the major problem rather was perceived to be one of structuring an environment that would promote rather than retard individual growth. 'Yet the demise of each liberal reform movement has been greeted by a genetic backlash: if improving the school environment does not achieve its elevated objectives, there must be something wrong with the kids' (1966:249).

Jensen does in fact argue (1969) that the failure of compensatory education to raise scholastic achievement levels must be due to the hereditability of IQ. 3 The authors conclude by presenting data to support their major proposition: 'the fact that economic success tends to run in the family arises almost completely independently from any inheritance of IQ; genetic or environmental' (p. 258). 'The power and privilege of the capitalist class are often inherited, but not through superior genes' (p. 263). In other words, high SES is transmitted to the children of parents of high SES, and one mechanism of this transmittance is the school system.

We see then, on this particular issue, that although the three approaches—evolutionary (genetic school), structural-functionalist (technico-meritocratic liberals), and group conflict (Bowles, Gintis, and Meyer)—recognize the same basic variables, they perceive a very different relationship between these same variables and, as well, their underlying assumptions vary widely.

B. Structural functional theory. Structural functional theory, as exemplified by Merton (1957), Homans (1950), Parsons (1951), and Larkin (1970), has been the dominant theory of social change in American social sciences and has had a strong influence on the interpretation of educational systems and valid educational reform. I do not think that it is an exaggeration to say that the majority of writings on bilingual education fall under this category, as I shall attempt to illustrate. Indeed, Fishman's paper under consideration (1976) was criticized by Nieves-Squires (1976) for its basically structural-functional orientation. 4 This approach tends to be the position (almost always tacitly assumed) of the ESL proponents in the ESL vs. BE controversy. It is certainly the position of the U.S. Government, as seen in this excerpt from the Bilingual Education Act, in which Congress spells out the measures to be taken in order to cope with the problems of limited English-speaking children from low income families.

The Congress declares it to be the policy of the United States, in order to establish equal educational opportunity for all children (A) to encourage the establishment and operation, where appropriate, of educational programs using bilingual educational practices, techniques, and methods, and (B) ... to provide financial assistance to
... educational agencies ... in order to ... develop and carry out such programs, ... which are designed to meet the educational needs of such children; and of demonstrating effective ways of providing, for children of limited English-speaking ability, instruction designed to enable them, while using their native language, to achieve competence in the English language (Geffert et al. 1975:13).

The assumptions are clearly recognizable: (1) the lack of social and economic success on the part of these minority groups is due (a) to 'unequal opportunity' (cf. Bowles and Gintis) as manifest through different language, different culture, and different learning styles and (b) to a lack of scholastic success as a group because of poor English-speaking ability; (2) with the provision of English skills, merit, and IQ will lead, through scholastic skills gained in a 'meaningful education', to social and economic success.

The immediate objective of bilingual education programs is then given: to equalize opportunity for children from limited English-speaking families by compensatory training in English where such training can be theoretically interpreted as a balancing mechanism to maintain the equilibrium of society. Larkin, writing from a structural-functional perspective, points out that in a technological society such as ours, 'equilibrium is maintained by the educational institution' (1970:113), whose major function is seen as the socialization of youth. According to Larkin, the socialization process is two dimensional. The instrumental aspect is the provision of technical competence: education is to provide the students with salable skills (of which, for our purposes, English language proficiency can be seen as the major skill). The expressive aspect is the facilitation of assimilation into the dominant, mainstream culture. But to the S/F theorists, the value transmission function of the schools serves a wider purpose than just assimilation, namely, that of 'pattern maintenance', in Parsons' terms. The social system must have:

... a sufficient proportion of its component actors adequately motivated to act in accordance with the requirements of its rolesystem, positively in abstention from too much disruptive, i.e., deviant, behavior (Parsons 1959:27).

While this view of the function of schools is reminiscent of Bowles and Gintis' legitimation process, the two approaches differ profoundly in their attitude toward such a process. The S/F proponents see this process as highly functional in ensuring that the most qualified persons fill the most important positions, and they 'contend that inequality is not only inevitable, but necessary and beneficial to all since
individual survival is contingent on the survival and well-being of society’ (R. G. Paulston 1976:13). Parsons no doubt would consider Bowles and Gintis' viewpoint as 'too much disruptive'.

One is reminded of the debate in bilingual education over teacher training and competencies. The major issues, on the surface, seem to be language proficiency in the L1 and L2 and professional educational training in order to meet State requirements for teacher certification. But the question of proficiency masks the real question which concerns ethnic group membership: is the teacher Anglo or member of the L1 ethnic group? Bilingual education proponents typically claim that teachers should be members of the same cultural group as the students and tend to ignore the teachers' proficiency in English as an important qualification. Their position, whether theoretical or not, tends to be one of conflict orientation, frequently tending toward utopian ideology. ESL proponents, on the other hand, typically insist on discussing issues at the level of method and technique, a characteristic of the S/F approach. They see fluency in English and a thorough training in the techniques of ESL as the major requirement amongst the competencies of a teacher of limited English-speaking children. They tend to exemplify Larkin's point that (1) innovation is threatening as it temporarily upsets the equilibrium and (2) any pressure for change will be met by resistance from those office holders who have vested interests.

While the research which R. G. Paulston discusses, whether of equilibrium or conflict theory orientation, is concerned primarily with social or educational change at the national level (Parsons' societal and institutional levels 1961), the majority of research and writing on bilingual education, especially recent work in North America, tends to be at the programmatic-operational level. The research typical of the S/F approach usually treats the bilingual education programs as the independent variable, as the causal factor which accounts for certain subsequent results, for certain behaviors in children. One problem with such research is that these studies carry in and of themselves virtually no generalizability to other programs, as Mackey (1972) and Macnamara (1972) are careful to point out. Nowhere is this problem seen more clearly than in a comparison of the S/F oriented research on the Title VII Bilingual Education programs in the United States with the research on the immersion programs in Canada. Many descriptions and comparisons of these programs exist (Andersson and Boyer 1970; Cohen and Swain 1976; John and Horner 1971; C. B. Paulston 1975a, 1976; Swain 1972; Swain and Bruck 1976; U.S. Commission on Civil Rights 1975, etc.) and need not be repeated here. Basically, the Title VII programs are for lower class children from socially stigmatized ethnic minority groups; the immersion programs are typically
attended by middle class children from the Anglo majority, a group in social and economic power.

On the surface, both sets of studies show great similarity in research designs: both sets treat instruction as the independent variable; both sets tend to recognize IQ, age, and sex as intervening variables and, when feasible, match or control for these variables. Presumably, the researchers also recognize the importance of merit (personality factors such as industry, perseverance, motivation, etc.), but as a formal variable in research design, merit tends to be ignored, and indeed Swain (1976a) laments that the kind of psychometric data these studies collect masks individual achievement. The major dependent variable or program outcome for both sets of studies is scholastic skills, primarily proficiency in the two languages (as measured by standardized tests in language arts) and in mathematics. Other additional dependent variables like cognitive development and self-concept can be found in many studies.

Because of their similarity of research design, of identically labeled variables in the same basic relationship, generalizations are frequently made from the Canadian studies to U.S. children and to other minority group children as well. The Canadian immersion findings are often cited as a rationale against bilingual education for minority group members. It is important, therefore, to examine how these studies differ, even though they share the same basic S/F perspective in their initial motivation, in the selection of relevant assumptions, and in long-range goals. The fact that these issues are rarely made explicit or discussed in these studies can be considered as an S/F characteristic to minimize, if not avoid, intrasystem conflict, as an attempt to seek a balancing mechanism to maintain a 'uniform state' through adaptive change.

Although both the U.S. and the Canadian studies are concerned with language proficiency in the L1 and L2, the interest in L2 acquisition and proficiency stems from a widely disparate motivation. The U.S. studies attempt to demonstrate that children who are first taught to read in the L1 will eventually read better in the L2 than similar children in monolingual English programs, and also that these children will achieve a higher proficiency in the L2 through the medium of their mother tongue than do individual children who go directly into an L2 curriculum. The Canadian studies, on the other hand, undertake to demonstrate that initial reading in the L2 (i.e. initial literacy) will have no negative consequences on either later reading or language arts skills in the L1; they also seek to demonstrate that the L2 proficiency of the children in immersion programs is superior to that found in traditional second language programs.

Not surprisingly, different assumptions motivate the undertaking of the two sets of research studies. The major basic assumption which underlies the U.S. Title VII programs is
that of 'unequal opportunity' and the belief that bilingual education helps equalize such shortcomings of opportunity. By virtue of bilingual education, poor people from traditional ways of life will progress (cf. the evolutionist position) to higher socioeconomic levels through educational improvement. Similar to the unquestioned relationship between IQ and economic success which Bowles and Gintis discuss, I know of no research which investigates whether equal educational opportunity as manifest through bilingual education programs really leads to raised SES. It is a major assumption of bilingual education, but among structural-functional research it remains not only untested but also unquestioned—it is a question outside the paradigm.

The second major assumption is the importance of the culture contact situation in the schools. The very definition of bilingual education\(^1\) acknowledges the importance of the mother tongue culture. From this assumption follows the emphasis that the teacher be from the same ethnic background as the children. Consequently, the ethnic identity of the teacher is occasionally a subvariable under the independent variable 'instruction'.

From this assumption as well follows the interest in what is commonly called cross-cultural communication. Other closely similar areas of interest and investigation include communicative competence (Hymes 1972, C. B. Paulston 1974), sociolinguistic competence (Ervin-Tripp 1973:293), interactional competence (Mehan 1972), and social interaction (Grimshaw 1973), all of which have in common the focus on the social meaning of language, on the social rules of language use.

Although most research on symbolic interaction (Goffman 1959, 1961; Garfinkel 1967; Cicourel 1970) in bilingual programs is written from a conflict perspective, there is found in many S/F studies a concern, though rarely studied systematically, that teachers may misinterpret their minority students' behavior because of contrasting interactional rules as in the use, for example, of space, eye contact, voice level, etc., and in permitted speech acts, like types of questions. There is also the concern voiced that Anglo teachers may allow any kind of aberrant behavior from minority students out of misplaced cultural tolerance because they do not know what the acceptable norms are.

Future research is likely to give increased importance to the area of communicative competence because it not only is of interest to those whose primary concern lies in the interaction between members of different cultures, but also holds significance for theoretical issues in language acquisition. A current assumption about L2 acquisition is that language must be used for purposes of communication if it is to be well learnt, and a number of classroom techniques have been worked out which incorporate social interactional rules of the L2 into classroom

One elusive assumption of U.S. bilingual programs is that one method will eventually be found to be more effective than others, and studies occasionally incorporate 'method' as well as 'medium' under the independent variable 'instruction'. Because of the S/F definition of the problem as one of limited English-speaking ability and of the perceived treatment as one of instruction, there is a pervasive tendency to look for solutions to problems within the programs, and future research is most likely to investigate methods of bilingual instruction more carefully than in the past, where medium of instruction has been the major variable of 'instruction'.

Two less influential assumptions remain. S/F research tends to take for granted that ability and merit influence the attainment of scholastic skills and that once equal opportunity has been provided for by bilingual education, such ability will result in success in school. Research designs therefore tend to neutralize such causal influence on the findings by treating IQ, age, and sex (sex is subsumed under merit as girls are perceived to be more strongly motivated, harder working, etc.) as intervening variables and, where possible, control for such influence by matching groups or by statistical techniques.

The other assumption holds that there is some relationship between language and cognition. Language is believed to be the 'vehicle for complex thinking' (Finocchiaro and King 1966) and the necessity of using the language the children know best then becomes axiomatic (United States Commission on Civil Rights 1975:44). But the section on 'Cognitive and Language Development' (pp. 41-47) is characteristic of other writings on this topic in bilingual education; it contains not one single reference to empirical work on cognitive development of children in bilingual programs. This topic remains poorly explored in these studies.

To sum up, the S/F research on bilingual education in the United States is characterized by two major assumptions, 'unequal opportunity' and 'cultural diversity', and I have attempted to show how these assumptions contribute to give structure to the research studies. Two additional factors which influence the research are (1) the majority of researchers on bilingual education are either educators or social scientists drawing primarily on linguistics, anthropology, and sociology, and (2) the perceived long-range goals are those of harmonious integration into the larger society by equalizing opportunity.

The Canadian immersion programs (see Swain 1976c for a bibliography) are very different from the Title VII programs. The long-range goals of the immersion programs, especially outside of Quebec, as perceived by most parents, are maintenance of the family socioeconomic status quo, and, because of Canadian legislation vis-à-vis language, they see bilingualism
in English/French as a necessary condition for their children to compete successfully in the job market. There were other motivations as well:

Some members of the group had generally more 'instrumental' reasons for wishing their children to be bilingual. They wished the continuing progress and success of their children in a province progressively becoming dominated by the French fact. Others considered bilingualism a personal asset for cultural, intellectual, and social reasons—the so-called 'integrative' motivation. All were concerned with French-English relations in the province, at a time when these were not yet making headlines (Melikoff 1972:221).

The Canadian researchers, the majority of whom are psychologists, have tended to slight social factors in their research and to minimize the potential conflict situation between the English- and French-speaking groups, but they do acknowledge that 'there is no doubt that the language policy at both federal and provincial levels of Canadian government is helping to provide incentive for English-Canadian parents to enroll their children in French immersion programs' (Cohen and Swain 1976:49).

From the difference in long-range goals follows difference in the underlying assumptions. Since the children in the immersion programs come from the socially and economically dominant Anglo group (Lieberson 1970), who have managed perfectly well in the English medium schools, all notions of 'unequal opportunity' become simply irrelevant.

Similarly, the notions of 'cultural diversity' are irrelevant. No one is concerned that Anglo ideo-cultural behavior might become stigmatized and held against the children by their teachers. The Anglo parents, children, and researchers take their own culture for granted, and in the Canadian literature there is no counterpart to the writings on ethnic minority groups' culture and behavior in the schools which we find in the United States (Pialorsi 1974; Turner 1973). Many programs are housed in Anglo schools and, in fact, the children in class function in French with the communicative competence of English; i.e. they are not expected to give up their social interactional ways of speaking, their cultural ways of being. Nor is there any emphasis on the target culture to compare with that which we find in the U.S. The definition of bilingual education in Swain (1972) contrasts clearly with the American in that there is no mention of culture. Nowhere is this perceived irrelevance of 'cultural diversity' seen more clearly than in the teacher variable. As we saw in the Title VII studies, the ethnic membership of the teacher is occasionally included as a variable under 'instruction'; I do not know of a single Canadian study of the immersion programs that investigates teacher ethnicity as a variable. One reason is that there is no
concern about the teacher's cultural background as long as he is a fluent speaker of French; the majority of classrooms I have visited have had nonnative Canadians as teachers: Belgian, Moroccan, French, etc., rather than French Canadians. In fact, the speech of French Canadians is occasionally criticized.

The Anglo-Canadians do expect the children to show enhanced cultural tolerance—understanding for the Franco-Canadians through the increasing knowledge of French, with an emphasis on the harmonious balanced whole.

The formal research primarily seeks to tap the implications which follow from the major assumption underlying the immersion programs: a second language can be learned fluently in the school only if it is used as a medium of instruction, as a means to an end, rather than studied as a subject, as an end in itself. Consequently, the children are taught from the beginning in the L2 in language art skills programs similar to those for native-speaking children. The extensive testing, primarily by means of standardized tests, which is basically what the immersion research consists of, was undertaken to assure parents (the programs are voluntary) and administrators that the immersion programs work.

We see then that although the U.S. and Canadian research studies are similar in that they see 'instruction', especially 'medium of' as the independent variable and scholastic skills as the dependent variable, they vary in the order of introducing medium of instruction so that the Canadian programs reverse the order of the American L1 → L2 to L2 → L1. The Canadian programs eschew the ESL (here FSL) techniques in favor of basic language arts training and consider cultural diversity as an irrelevant variable; consequently, neither 'method' nor 'teacher' appears as a design variable in the Canadian studies.

We also find the familiar assumptions of a relationship between language and (1) cognition and (2) IQ, age, and sex. In my opinion, the Canadian studies are much more interesting than the American in their work on language and cognition, presumably because the researchers are not unduly worried about adverse results. Cummins' work (1976) is especially worth citing. He speculates that the lower level of verbal intelligence by the bilingual subjects in the earlier studies (Darcy 1953) 'may be a reflection of the fact that they are likely to have had less than native-like competence in both their languages' (p. 36). Cummins hypothesizes that 'the level of linguistic competence may mediate the effects of his bilingual learning experience on cognitive growth' (p. 37).

To sum up: although the United States and Canadian research studies frequently identify the same variables from the range of phenomena within bilingual education and see them in similar relationships, these studies illustrate the point that underlying assumptions so strongly influence the research design, the questions, and the findings that one cannot at this
stage of the research extrapolate from the results of one set of studies to the other.

My reservations as far as all these studies go are very simple and probably fairly characteristic of the conflict orientation:

... unless we try in some way to account for the socio-historical, cultural, and economic-political factors which lead to certain forms of bilingual education, we will never understand the consequences of that education. In other words, we need research which looks at bilingual education as the intervening or dependent variable and we don't have it (C. B. Paulston 1975b:370).

C. Systems theory. From the systems perspective, the need for reform arises with evidence of system 'malfunctioning'. Using the example of a stockmarket broker, Bushnell and Rappaport (1971) present an 'information flow model' to provide the structure or network of communication flow between all participants in the school system from students to taxpayers (R. G. Paulston 1976:16); see Figure 1.

Figure 1. A research and development strategy for planned educational change.

```
1. Diagnose Problem
2. Formulate Objectives
3. Identify Constraints
4. Select Potential Solutions
5. Evaluate Alternatives
6. Implement Selected Alternative
```

[Source: Bushnell 1971:10]

The problem of educational change from this perspective is essentially one of 'rationalizing existing education systems through the introduction of innovations that respond both to new social needs and to the need for greater efficiency in ongoing functions' (R. G. Paulston 1976:17), an apt definition of
bilingual education from the viewpoint from which I have so far discussed it. The difficulty with the systems approach is that it sacrifices reality to 'scientific rigor'. There is rarely any attempt to identify and operationalize contextual variables like power relationships, ethnic culture conflicts, disagreements over values and the like, 'which might question the conservative notions of equilibrium and consensus inherent in the functionalist-cum-systems perspective' (R. G. Paulston 1976: 20).

The literature on bilingual education from a systems perspective is remarkably sparse. An ERIC search turned up only one, Prochnow (1973). In the abstract we are told that the report follows the suggested U.S. Office of Education scope:

(1) Introductory and general comments concerning the quality and significance of the final evaluation report; (2) detailed critique of the product and process evaluation conducted for operation and management, based on an assessment of the instruments used, data collection procedures, data analysis techniques, and data analysis presentation; (3) findings and observations as a result of on-site visits and examinations of evaluative data with a summary of consistencies and discrepancies; (4) recommendations for evaluation design revision; and (5) the need for program modification.

Friedman's criticism of an equilibrium model in economics seems equally appropriate to bilingual education:

... the model may be useful for analysis, but it ceases to be pertinent when it is converted into a normative rule for planning. To be meaningful, every social norm must be brought into concrete relation with the historical conditions of collective life. That static equilibrium mode, valid only within a parameter of carefully stated and artificial assumptions, is wholly inappropriate by this standard (1963:72).

Systems theory has not in the past been a viable approach in research in bilingual education. This section could easily have been omitted except that I wanted to point out the shortcomings of this approach so that also in the future it remain not salient to our concerns.

THE EQUILIBRIUM PARADIGM: CONCLUSION

Bilingual education in the United States is necessarily closely tied to concerns of ethnic groups. We have lately experienced a resurgence of ethnic awareness which brings into question the goal of complete assimilation for these ethnic groups. Elazar and Friedman (1976) discuss this new development of
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ethnic affirmation quite perceptively. They point out that ethnic identity has often been seen as a problem that must somehow be overcome. Social scientists have often considered religious and ethnic groups as "vestiges of a primitive past that are destined to disappear" (1976:4) but recent "writers on the "new pluralism" have argued that racial, religious, and ethnic groups are a basic component of our social structure" (p. 5) who affect our institutions and are at times more powerful than economic forces in their influence.

What Elazar and Friedman are discussing in their study of ethnic groups is in fact a paradigm shift from equilibrium theory to a conflict perspective and some recent work on bilingual education reflects that shift. As the S/F framework that Larkin (1970) discusses would predict, there is considerable tension accompanying the implementation of bilingual education. However, equilibrium theory is not designed to deal with such conflict.

THE CONFLICT PARADIGM

R. G. Paulston divides studies using variants of conflict theory into three types: (a) Marxist and group conflict explanations of socioeconomic conflict, (b) cultural revival or revitalization explanations of value conflict, and (c) the somewhat mixed bag of anarchist and anarchist-utopian explanations of institutional conflict and constraints on human development.

A. Group conflict theory

Studies of bilingual education using aspects or variants of conflict theory have increased during the last few years. The definition of the problem from a conflict perspective is no longer unequal opportunity per se but rather one of structured inequity, of "persistence of poverty, intractability of inequality of incomes and inequality of economic and social opportunity" (Bowles et al. 1976:263). Unequal opportunity, the existence of which is most certainly not denied, tends to be seen as a result of a condition of inequity rather than as a cause of school failure.

Consequently, in conflict-oriented studies the solutions to the educational problems of bilingual programs are rarely sought in terms of technocratic efficiency; in fact, they are rarely sought within the programs themselves but rather are seen to lie outside the programs. It is in this context that we need to interpret the significance of Fishman's discussion of social dimensions: "very few (empirical studies) have focused on particular social parameters and explored their relevance to bilingual education across schools and/or across communities" (Fishman 1976:22b). One reason that this is so is that the majority of research on bilingual education has followed the S/F approach, and if one assumes that improved efficiency of
school programs will solve problems of scholastic achievement, then one looks to instruction rather than to social factors for elucidation. On the other hand, if one assumes that formal education cannot cope with the consequences of social injustice or social inequity of which bilingual education in this country is one consequence, then Fishman's statement 'that societal factors are not merely "interesting" or "enlightening" for an understanding of bilingual education but ... represent powerful forces governing the success and failure of such programs' (p. 25) points the major direction for research on bilingual education.

In this connection, a comment on Fishman's discussion of typologies of bilingual education is in order. Basically, the typologies fall into two categories: (1) those which are 'school oriented' and classify by program and program outcomes (Spolsky 1974a; Fishman and Lovas 1970; Fishman 1976) and (2) those which are 'context' oriented and classify by the social factors which contribute to the establishment of bilingual programs (Gaarder n.d.; Schermerhorn 1970; C. B. Paulston 1975b. Spolsky 1974b belongs here too, although not discussed by Fishman; Mackey 1970 combines the two.)

From a conflict perspective, it is the social factors which are seen to influence the 'success or failure' of bilingual education programs, and hence it is clearly the derivation of 'context' oriented typologies which hold the higher priority since they are more likely to help facilitate the identification of salient 'social dimensions'. Also, when revised and improved, 'context' oriented typologies can be seen then to function at a higher level in the ladder of theoretical abstraction (Pelto 1970) than do school-oriented typologies, and this higher level of abstraction accounts for the key weakness of the former: the difficulty of operationalizing key concepts.

The long-range goals of the programs, seen from a conflict perspective, follow the definition of the problem: to maximize equity in the distribution of wealth, goods, and services; hence the emphasis is no longer on efficiency but on equity. This necessarily leads to disagreement over the evaluation of bilingual education programs.

The major assumption which underlies most work written within the conflict paradigm is that bilingual education programs can only be understood in terms of the relationship between the various interest groups and that relationship is seen as basically one of a power conflict.

Lenski's metaphor is suggestive of the difference in world view between the two paradigms: 'where functionalists see human societies as social systems, conflict theorists see them as stages on which struggles for power and privilege take place' (1966:17). This viewpoint is most clearly seen in the militant/utopian writings on bilingualism and bilingual education.

Research designs on bilingual education from this perspective are not likely to consider instruction as the independent
variable nor to consider issues of language as the most salient aspects of bilingual education. There is as yet no generally accepted framework of research on bilingual education from a group conflict perspective, but Schermerhorn (1970) and my own paper (1975b), drawing on Schermerhorn, are increasingly being cited in the literature on bilingualism and bilingual education (Churchill 1976; Cummins 1976; Greenfield 1976; Skutnabb-Kangas 1976; Skutnabb-Kangas and Toukomaa 1976). Since Schermerhorn is the most carefully considered design for research on ethnic relations, I would like to briefly review it here, focusing on the designation of variables and their relationship.

To Schermerhorn, the central question in comparative research in ethnic relations is 'what are the conditions that foster or prevent the integration of ethnic groups into their environing societies?' By 'integration' he does not necessarily mean assimilation but rather an 'active and coordinated compliance with the ongoing activities and objectives of the dominant group in that society' (1970:14); integration can include either assimilation/incorporation on the one hand or cultural pluralism on the other as long as the dominant and subordinate groups agree on the collective goals for the latter.

Schermerhorn sees three major causal factors in determining the nature of the relationship between ethnic groups and the process of integration. He posits as independent variables (1) the origin of the contact situation between 'the subordinate ethnics and dominant groups, such as annexation, migration, and colonization', (2) 'the degree of enclosure (institutional separation or segmentation) of the subordinate group or groups from the society-wide network of institutions and association', and (3) 'the degree of control exercised by dominant groups over access to scarce resources by subordinate groups in a given society' (1970:15).

Intervening or contextual variables which will modify the effects of the independent variables are: (1) whether the dominant and subordinate groups agree on the goals for the latter, (2) whether the groups share common cultural and structural features, and (3) forms of institutional dominance, i.e. polity dominating economy or vice versa.

The major contribution of Schermerhorn's framework to research in bilingual education is to indicate the direction of research, to make clear the futility of continued research which ignores the social and historical factors which lead to the establishment of bilingual education. At this time, the majority of work within the conflict paradigm considers bilingual education programs as the dependent variables; presumably we need to work out a framework which will allow us to consider bilingual education as an intervening variable so the dependent variables to be explained can become both scholastic achievement and social integration. It remains to be demonstrated
that there is no relationship between the latter two variables in bilingual education; there may well be.

Integration, i.e. assimilation or cultural pluralism, as a dependent variable can be operationalized in terms of language maintenance and language shift. Kjolseth's early (1970) work in Title VII bilingual education programs, written from a group conflict perspective, considered 'the social consequences of particular bilingual education strategies upon the changing patterns of community language use' (1972:116). Kjolseth echoes Gaarder's concern that the bilingual programs (because they are more efficient for a number of reasons in teaching the children English) may be a one-way bridge to English and complete language shift, although he looks favorably on bilingualism and cultural pluralism in contrast to Gaarder. The cure for group bilingualism, from Gaarder's view, is not to learn the dominant language, not to learn English. It is an extreme and utopian position, but nevertheless it is against this background of bilingual education and language shift that the controversy regarding transitional vs. maintenance programs is best interpreted.

The proponents of maintenance programs favor cultural pluralism and ethnic diversity and tend to see the world in terms of conflict and competition between interest groups. Recent development has seen mobilization along ethnic boundaries as one strategy in competition for rewards (Elazar and Friedman 1976), and maintenance of the ethnic language becomes a very visible aspect of such mobilization. Language shift remains a phenomenon which is poorly understood (Fishman 1966; Lieberson et al. 1975) and the relationship between bilingual education and language maintenance and shift is no better understood today than when Kjolseth pointed out in 1970 'that there is not a single study planned to determine program effects upon community diglossia' (1972:117). Fishman (1976:21) is right in pointing out the seriousness of Gaarder's argument about the consequences of bilingual education for marked populations; we especially need to investigate the social factors which influence bilingual programs in contributing to language maintenance and shift. As a matter of fact, we do not even know whether bilingual education influences language maintenance or shift in any significant way.

An important question in studies written from a conflict perspective is cui bono?, 'who stands to gain?' (Gramsci 1957), where 'gain' can be operationalized as an indicator of which group benefits in the power struggle. The literature on bilingual education is noticeable for the almost complete absence of such questions. The pious assumption is of course that the children are the ones who stand to gain, with indicators like standardized test scores on school achievement and self-concept.

Other obvious indicators are budget allocations and salary schedules, and particularly competition for scarce jobs. It is against this background that the controversy and discussions
about ESL programs vs. BE programs is best understood. Attempts to carry out those discussions at a programmatic level of language teaching methodology (see the 1976 issues of The TESOL Quarterly and The Linguistic Reporter) only confuse the basic issue. The only studies I know which consider the issue of salaries in bilingual education are those of Spolsky:

The threat of bilingual education is thus a direct economic one to the present teachers and administrators. However much they may sympathize with a bilingual education program, and however they may agree on an intellectual level with its logic and its goals, they cannot for long remain unaware that their own jobs are at stake. In these circumstances, it is not surprising that bilingual programs often face opposition from teachers and administrators (Spolsky 1974b:54).

Hill-Burnett's comment that the key to access to a position lies with 'the answer to the question of who has the authority to judge whether the performance meets the standards' then becomes of crucial interest since it is a given that all groups are self-seeking and define 'performance' in terms of furthering their own interests. There is no research on 'who has the authority' in bilingual education, on the ideology and ethnic identification of administrators who control access to positions. It would seem that who holds control over such 'authority' will have important implications in the definitions of goals, implementations of programs, and evaluation of outcomes, yet it is a question we have not asked. It is true that ethnic groups tend to see the necessity of community control over programs as axiomatic. Nevertheless, it is an issue which remains uninvestigated in formal research and one which is probably of extreme importance in explaining and predicting phenomena in bilingual education.

Whoever else gains from bilingual education, the children certainly do, and the clearest evidence we have in the form of empirical research on language skills comes from the data on children from the Finnish working class migrant population in Sweden. There is no research here which parallels these studies, and to my mind such research is urgent, as findings of this nature constitute compelling arguments for bilingual education to S/F and conflict theorists alike. The Scandinavian data are particularly significant in that both countries are highly developed, industrialized modern societies with school achievement norms both for children in Sweden and Finland. In addition, they are societies where problems of health care, diet, and unemployment--conditions often cited as contributory factors in the lack of school achievement by minority children--are not intervening variables.

In the UNESCO report Skutnabb-Kangas and Toukomaa report on a study in which 687 Finnish students in Swedish
schools, divided among 171 classes, were tested (1976:48).

The purpose of the study was to determine the linguistic level and development in both their mother tongue and Swedish of Finnish migrant children attending Swedish comprehensive school. Above all, attention was paid to the interdependence between skills in the mother tongue and Swedish, i.e. the hypothesis was tested that those who have best preserved their mother tongue are also best in Swedish. Partly related to this question the significance of the age of which the child moved to Sweden was also determined. Do those who received a firm grounding in their mother tongue by attending school in Finland have a better chance of learning Swedish than those who moved to Sweden as preschoolers?

A second important problem is the achievement of Finnish pupils in Swedish language schools. How do Finnish migrant pupils do in theoretical and what might be called practical subjects? Does one's skill in the mother tongue have any effect on the grade given in a Swedish-language school or on other school achievement?

On all nonverbal ability factors the migrant children tested out at normal or slightly above normal level; between verbal and nonverbal factors, however, there is an 'enormous gap'. 'During the first 4-5 years of school the Finnish migrant pupils ... remained at a level which in Finland had fewer than 10% of the poorest pupils judged in verbal tests'. In other words, their Finnish is poor (p. 53) and so is their Swedish where 'the average level Finnish pupil had a test point score in Swedish on a level at which about 10% of the poorest Swedish pupils were placed' (p. 54).

The language development data are supported by findings from a study by Särkälä and Kuusinen (1975) who tested 182 subjects in Sweden with a rural control group in Finland. The migrant children were slightly more above average as measured by the nonverbal Raven intelligence test.

On the other hand, the psycholinguistic ages determined by the ITPA (Illinois Test of Psycholinguistic Abilities) show that in their command of the Finnish language the pupils in Finnish-language classes in Sweden were on average 2.5-3 years behind the normal Finnish level (Skutnabb-Kangas and Toukomaa 1976:55).

In general Skutnabb-Kangas and Toukomaa found that the children's rate of improvement in Swedish was not as fast as the regression in the mother tongue. Although ability factors influenced the learning of Swedish, it is very clear 'that the
better a pupil has preserved his mother tongue, the better are his prerequisites for learning the second language' (p. 78). The evidence from this study strongly supports the theory that mother tongue development facilitates the learning of the second language, and there are serious implications that without such development neither language may be learned well, resulting in semilingualism.

In an examination of the school achievement of the Finnish students, it was found that they did relatively well in mathematics, in the upper level almost as well as their Swedish classmates. But more interestingly,

The Finnish-language skills shown by the test results are fairly closely connected with the grade in mathematics. In the upper level, Finnish seems to be even more important for achievement in mathematics than Swedish—in spite of the fact that mathematics, too, is taught in Swedish. This result supports the concept that the abstraction level of the mother tongue is important for mastering the conceptual operations connected with mathematics ... Subjects such as biology, chemistry, and physics also require conceptual thinking, and in these subjects migrant children with a good mastery of their mother tongue succeeded significantly better than those who knew their mother tongue poorly (Skutnabb-Kangas and Toukomaa 1976:69).

The Canadian data from Manitoba on French-speaking children (Hébert et al. 1976) also support the Finnish data. They also found that the pupils who did better in French, their mother tongue, also did better in English and in other academic courses. Intelligence, socioeconomic level and motivation were controlled for in this study, so they could not be factors which influenced the findings. The evidence for the importance of mother tongue development seems clear, and one would wish for similar research in the United States. Basically structural/functional in research design, the Finnish studies nevertheless are motivated by the same concerns which are typical of a group conflict orientation. Skutnabb-Kangas' argument, based on her data, that it is highly functional within a capitalist system to withhold bilingual education from children who need it, is clearly written from a conflict perspective:

In this way the educational system contributes to ensure the perpetuation of a class society. Educational systems in Western industrial countries function as factors which preserve the social structure of society. As the educational system functions in the interests of the majority, and as the majority even in the future will need workers at the assembly lines, the educational system reproduces
the immigrants' work and social structure, even when the system's official objective is to give the migrant children the same possibilities which the children in the receiver (host) country have. From this point of view one can understand the function of the migrant children's semilingualism as a factor which transfers and increases social inequality (1976:35, my translation).

The Finnish UNESCO report is interesting, then, in that its authors are able to combine the ideology and concerns of group conflict theorists with a research design typical of S/F research. It is in fact one of the few attempts we have of a dialectical orientation in research of bilingual education.

B. Cultural revival and social movement theory

i. Culture change. The literature on culture change applied to bilingual education is sparse, and we do not know what effect bilingual education may have on the culture of ethnic groups. One obvious resource of ethnic groups, which can be used in stressing ethnic awareness and identity of the members, is the mother tongue. With the recent trend toward ethnic mobilization, we see both language maintenance programs and language revival programs in which the mother tongue serves to reinforce the ethnic boundaries of the group (Barth 1969; Spolsky 1974b).

The most extreme form of ethnic mobilization occurs in what Wallace has termed revitalization movements, 'deliberate, organized, conscious efforts by members of a society to construct a more satisfying culture' (1966:265). For Wallace, this process involves a cultural transformation of the group. For the purposes of this paper, I will extend the term to include ethnic revival movements as well (which may not be involved in a cultural transformation) since Wallace's concept of 'revolutionary phase' (1975:22-23) applies to both movements.

Wallace outlines the model of learning priorities as in Figure 2.

Figure 2. Learning priorities in revolutionary, conservative, and reactionary societies.

[Wallace 1975:26]
Wallace assigns very specific meanings to the terms technic, morality, and intellect. By technic he refers to learning as a process of 'reliability increase of action' through stimulus, reinforcement, and motivation; technic is learning 'how to'. Morality, on the other hand, stresses 'what'. Morality concerns one particular kind of socially approved value:

This kind of value is the conception that one's own behavior, as well as the behavior of others, should not merely take into consideration the attitude of the community, but should actively advance, or at least not retard, its welfare (1975:18).

Groups undergoing a revolutionary phase will always stress moral learning, and conflicts are certain to arise when a revitalization movement takes place within a conservative society where technic has the highest learning priority. Language skills in the official language must be seen as an aspect of technic—an aspect of preparation for jobs. The mother tongue, on the other hand, is an aspect of moral learning, reaffirming the solidarity and cultural uniqueness of the ethnic group, underscoring the need to teach the moral values of good and evil, right and wrong, the values of the old gods, in the language in which those values were originally transmitted. Re-affirmation of cultural values is frequently a part of the moral teaching, especially among ethnic groups who prior to the revitalization movement have been taught by the dominant group to have nothing but contempt for their own culture.

The conflict over learning priorities explains the extreme importance of control over local educational institutions, without which the ethnic group will not be able to implement its priorities. I have frequently heard commented among my colleagues that the best bilingual schools are those that are under community control—be it Navajo or Chicano. I am not certain what 'best' means in this connection. In my discussion of the Erickson report (1969) in an earlier paper, I pointed out that 'rhetoric about cultural pluralism accounts for little if the objectives are not implemented' (1975a:25); the community-run Navajo school, as measured by the achievement test batteries from the California Test Bureau, was markedly inferior to the government-run school academically. I was at the time only interested in investigating the learning of English language skills, but even so that statement—and the evaluation itself—shows our typical tendency to assess and evaluate the schooling of groups undergoing a revitalization movement with moral learning as the priority in terms of the standards of the conservative society—the standards of technique.

The function of bilingual education in ethnic revival movements is obviously an important one, but one we know very little about. A group conflict perspective is not helpful in trying to account for culture-change, as this theory focuses...
on conflict between the various groups. Wallace's framework allows us to focus on change within the group as it becomes 'revitalized', but we need to explore the role of language within such revitalization movements, especially the function of language in the mechanism of ethnic boundary maintenance.

ii. Culture conflict. The literature on culture conflict applied to bilingual education at the national level is also exceedingly sparse, but a number of studies exist at the programmatic level. These studies of culture conflict differ from group conflict studies in that the latter tend to focus on conflict which is caused by structured inequality, i.e. they focus on aspects of social structure, of major institutional activities of society, like economic and political life. The studies on culture conflict, on the other hand, tend to be ethnographic in nature and focus on conflict which is caused by an incomplete knowledge and understanding of the other group's culture as its norms and values are expressed in overt behavior. Susan Philips used this framework in her work on the Warm Springs Indian Reservation in accounting for the children's school failure. The children's native ways of speaking and strategies for learning are very different from those of the Anglo schools, and consequently Indian children fail to participate verbally in the classroom interaction because the social conditions for participation to which they have become accustomed in the Indian community are lacking ... Educators cannot assume that because Indian children (or children from other cultural backgrounds than that which is implicit in American classrooms) speak English, or are taught it in school, that they have also assimilated all of the sociolinguistic rules underlying interaction in classrooms and other non-Indian social situations where English is spoken (Philips 1970:95).

Culture conflict or interference in the classroom is a topic of immense importance in teacher training, and much of this literature is directed at the teacher (Aarons et al. 1969; Abrahams and Troike 1972; Burger 1971; Cazden et al. 1972; Spolsky 1972; Turner 1973). The assumption which underlies these studies is that once the teacher understands that the children function with other sociolinguistic rules, with other rules of communicative competence, he will adjust his ways and culture interference in the classroom will be minimized. Philips' comment is unusual in this regard:

The teachers who make these adjustments, and not all do, are sensitive to the inclinations of their students and want to teach them through means to which they most readily adapt. However, by doing so, they are
avoiding teaching the Indian children how to communi-
cate in precisely those contexts in which they are least
able, and most need to learn how to communicate if they
are to do well in school (Philips 1970:88).

She ends her paper by saying that the children must be taught
'the rules for appropriate speech usage', i.e. that they must
be taught the ways of speaking, acceptable to the dominant
culture. This is a troublesome matter and an issue about
which we know virtually nothing. In spite of all the rhetoric
about bilingual/bicultural education I do not know of any re-
search on the Title VII programs which deals with the issue of
bicultural teaching. To the degree that the bicultural com-
ponent of Title VII programs is discussed, this discussion in-
variably deals with aspects of the home culture of the children,
the culture whose sociolinguistic rules the children already
know. I know of no work on attempts to teach the children
Anglo culture, yet Philips holds such teaching crucial for the
scholastic success of the children.

C. Utopian perspectives

Anarchistic and utopian theories of social change share
the Marxian goal of radical social transformation, and the
concern of cultural revival and revitalization movements
for individual renewal. In marked contrast to all other
previously noted theories seeking to explain and predict
educational reform processes, they rarely bother to vali-
date their call to reform with the findings and methods
of social science, or to put their theory to practice.
(Idenberg 1974).

Because of the provocative nature of their work, we are all
familiar with names like Goodman (1960) and Illich (1971), but
neither of these utopian theories has been used in any serious
attempts to understand the phenomena of bilingual education.
However, the literature on bilingual education abounds with its
own utopian statements which tend to fall into three categories:
romantic/utopian, militant/utopian or visionary/utopian.
A very large share of the literature tends to romanticize
what bilingual education is and can do:

The remarkable dispatch with which bilingual educational
projects have been implemented in this country during
the past year bespeaks the altruism and idealism of
teachers and administrators who have activated them.
For in order to institute these programs, it has been
necessary for the teachers themselves to write and
develop their own teaching materials, translate text-
books ... (Byrd 1974:39).
However, Pascual (1976:5) states 'The truth is that the majority of the bilingual programs only limp along' (my translation). The discrepancy between the reality of the 'salones de classe' where the children learn to read from experience charts—'endless charts prepared by aides or teachers who guess at the orthography or rather at times invent it' (p. 6, my translation) and the view of altruistic teachers in pursuit of a new humanism is not very helpful. Bilingual education is not a search for the Holy Grail, and unrealistic expectations only harm its future development.

How helpful the militant/utopian statements on bilingual education are is a question which deserves to be studied in the context of ethnic mobilization. It may be simplistic to write off such statements as 'bellas palabras' and we ought to know something of the process by which voters organize along ethnic boundaries and gain control of local schoolboards. The following citation directed to Mayor Daley and the Chicago City Council is clearly a political document:

Our conference brought together Latinos in Chicago who have fought to establish bilingual-bicultural human service programs that are responsive to and controlled by the Latino community.

These programs were established both through battles with established institutions and by setting up alternative facilities which bypassed irrelevant institutional services. Each of these programs is staffed and controlled by Latino community residents.

These bilingual-bicultural programs are desperately fighting to stem the tide of oppression by Anglo society and institutions as seen in an 80% drop-out rate, poverty, and urban renewal. However, these programs are not enough. We call upon city, state, and federal institutions to:

1. Allocate a fair share of its resources to bilingual-bicultural Latino programs.
2. Insure that these programs are controlled by and responsive to the needs of Latino residents.
3. See to it that Anglo institutions stop pressuring Latinos to become 'Americanized' but recognize that our country can be strengthened by many different languages and cultures.
4. Insure that institutions serving Latinos make significant changes in their programs, resources and staff so that they can more effectively serve our people (Sevilla-Casas et al. 1973).

But we know nothing from any kind of organized research efforts about the effect of this and similar documents. Nor do
we know very much about mainstream tolerance for such cultural 'deviance', but clearly the future of bilingual education in the United States is dependent upon such tolerance. An editorial in the New York Times gave us a recent indication of how far one can expect such tolerance.

In a recent editorial on bilingual education, we expressed concern over a growing tendency to misuse an essentially sound pedagogical tool toward the wrong educational and political ends. Specifically, we argued that the maintenance of non-English speaking enclaves points the road to 'cultural, economic, and political divisiveness' ... There are clearly some who view non-English speaking enclaves as attractive bases from which to enhance their own political power. Whatever short-term political pressures might be gained from such enclaves, those who in the process are denied speedy entry into the English-speaking mainstream are saddled with persistent economic and political disadvantages ... But none of these goals causes us to modify our position that the purpose of bilingual education must be 'to create English-speaking Americans with the least possible delay' (December 17, 1976:A26).

Finally, it should be noted that utopian writings on bilingual education usually are atheoretical in nature and so provide us with data on the course of bilingual education rather than with the means toward further understanding. The issues raised in the Chicago document and in the Times editorial lend themselves best to interpretation from a group conflict perspective. What utopian writings do best is to sketch a vision and to reaffirm good will of decent men as in these words, written in 1912 by the President of the University of New Mexico:

I make no doubt that once the people of this State realize the importance of the [Spanish language] issue and the vast results which may accrue from it, both for State and Nation, a movement could be set on foot which, with representation properly made to the chief executive and the national legislature, would secure for New Mexico a federal appropriation sufficient to fund and endow for many years to come, a Spanish American College for the purpose of developing and utilizing to the utmost the inheritance of our fellow citizens in the Spanish language. While a proposal of this sort, considered as a mere act of tardy justice to a long neglected people, might fail of effect, yet the national advantage secured thereby would assuredly win sympathy and support for the plan (Gray 1912:6).
CONCLUSION

I have attempted in this paper to show that a discussion of the 'theoretical and programmatic dimensions of bilingual education' must first take into account an analysis of the various theoretical frameworks which apply to bilingual education. Not only the formal research design but also the alternative assumptions, goals, and strategies follow from the theoretical perspective. An exploration, then, of the range of various theoretical perspectives on bilingual education will allow:

1. An identification of the world view and ideological orientation which is inherent within each theoretical perspective. Science is not value free, and by being able to recognize the assumptions implicit in work characteristic of specific theoretical orientations, one can better deal with such values.

2. An examination of alternative questions and an understanding of the theoretical implications which the selection of particular questions entails.

3. Finally, which remains to be done, the development of a dialectical research perspective in bilingual education, which would help specify the theoretical approach most likely to be fruitful in answering questions of a specified nature.

NOTES


1. In this paper I use the standard U.S. Office of Education definition of bilingual education: 'Bilingual education is the use of two languages, one of which is English, as mediums of instruction for the same pupil population in a well organized program which encompasses part or all of the curriculum and includes the study of the history and culture associated with the mother tongue. A complete program develops and maintains the children's self-esteem and a legitimate pride in both cultures'. Many of the bilingual education programs in Europe cited by Fishman (1976) fall outside the scope of this definition. For the purposes of this paper I will draw primarily on the research of bilingual education in North America.

2. As is obvious from a reading of the paper, I am much indebted to the thinking and writing of Rolland G. Paulston. I have gained much from our many discussions on the topic and of his conflicting Theories of Social and Educational Change: A Typological Review, and I gratefully acknowledge his influence on my own thoughts.
3. The censure of Jensen's work by the members of the Linguistic Society of America at the annual conference business meeting in St. Louis, 1971, provides us with a perfect example of a paradigm clash. The questions and the findings of Jensen's work were so unpalatable to the linguists that although only a handful of linguists present had actually read 'How Can We Boost IQ and Scholastic Achievement?', the overwhelming majority did not hesitate to condemn his work.

4. It needs to be pointed out that individual scholars cannot be typed according to specific theories, but only individual works can be typed. So Larkin is careful to point out that Homans (1961) 'has moved away from structural functionalism to a more social-psychological point of view as indicated by the content of his book, Social Behavior: Its Elementary Forms' (1970:112). Furthermore, many scholars write from a viewpoint which incorporates elements from both equilibrium and conflict theories; certainly an alternative interpretation of Fishman's paper (1976).

5. For the record, it should be pointed out that the perception of this dichotomy (Greenfield 1976) is a considerable simplification of fact. It would be more correct to say that the immersion programs do not incorporate the ESL techniques that we associate with the audio-lingual method, such as oral drills. But the early classes abound with ESL techniques, from the direct method as well as from a cognitive code approach.

6. I use the term 'intervening variable' in the sense of 'contextual variables that modify the effects of independent variables' (Schermherhorn 1970:15) and which help account for the conditions for and the modes of integration of ethnic groups; intervening variables in this sense are perfectly observable variables, like cultural congruence.

7. Clearly it is possible to discuss ESL and BE programs in terms of language teaching methods and techniques. Rather, my point is that the source of strife and acrimony which accompany these discussions has its origin not in disagreement over methodology, but rather in the vested interests of the two groups, most clearly seen in the struggle for access to jobs and rewards.

8. The discussion of this report is taken in part from C. B. Paulston (1976), and I am grateful to the Center for Applied Linguistics for permission to quote.
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## Appendix A. Relations between theories of social and educational change/reform

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social Change Paradigms</th>
<th>Illustrative Linked Assumptions Concerning Preconditions for Educational Change</th>
<th>Rationales for Educational Change</th>
<th>Scope and Process of Educational Change</th>
<th>Major Outcomes Sought</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Evolutionary</strong></td>
<td>State of evolutionary readiness</td>
<td>Pressure to move to an evolutionary stage</td>
<td>Incremental and adaptive; 'natural history' approach</td>
<td>New stage of institutional evolutionary adaptation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Neo-Evolutionary</strong></td>
<td>Satisfactory completion of earlier stages</td>
<td>Required to support 'national modernization' efforts</td>
<td>'Institution building' using Western models and technical assistance</td>
<td>New 'higher' state of education and social differentiation/specialization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Structural-Functionalist</strong></td>
<td>Altered functional and structural requisites</td>
<td>Social system need provoking an educational response; exogenous threats</td>
<td>Incremental adjustment of existing institutions, occasionally major</td>
<td>Continued 'homeostasis' or 'moving' equilibrium; 'human capital' and national 'development'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Systems</strong></td>
<td>Technical expertise in 'systems management'; 'Rational decision making' and 'needs assessment'</td>
<td>Need for greater efficiency in system's operation and goal achievement; i.e. response to a system 'malfuction'</td>
<td>Innovative 'problem solving' in existing systems: i.e. 'Research and Development approach'</td>
<td>Improved 'efficiency' re: cost benefits; adoption of innovations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paradigms 'Theories'</td>
<td>Illustrative Linked Assumptions Concerning Educational-Change Potentials and Processes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Preconditions for Educational Change</td>
<td>Rationales for Educational Change</td>
<td>Scope and Process of Educational Change</td>
<td>Major Outcomes Sought</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marxian</td>
<td>Elite's awareness of need for change, or shift of power to socialist rulers and educational reformers</td>
<td>To adjust correspondence between social relations of production and social relations of schooling</td>
<td>Adjustive incremental following social mutations or radical restructuring with Marxist predominance</td>
<td>Formation of integrated workers, i.e. the new 'Socialist Man'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Conflict</td>
<td>Increased political power and political awareness of working class</td>
<td>Demands for social justice and social equality</td>
<td>Large-scale national reforms through 'democratic' institutions and processes</td>
<td>Eliminate 'educational privilege' and 'elitism'; create a more egalitarian society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Revitalization</td>
<td>Rise of a collective effort to revive or create a 'new culture'. Social tolerance for 'deviant' normative movements and their educational programs</td>
<td>Rejection of conventional schooling as forced acculturation. Education needed to support advance toward movement goals</td>
<td>Creation of alternative schools or educational settings. If movement captures polity, radical change in national educational ideology and structure</td>
<td>Inculcate new normative system. Meet movement's recruitment, training, and solidarity needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anarchistic Utopian</td>
<td>Creation of supportive settings; growth of critical consciousness; social pluralism</td>
<td>Free man from institutional and social constraints. Enhance creativity need for 'life-long learning'</td>
<td>Isolated 'freeing up' of existing programs and institutions, or create new learning modes and settings, i.e. a 'learning society'</td>
<td>Self-renewal and participation. Local control of resources and community; elimination of exploitation and alienation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Appendix B. A process model suggested for case study analysis/evaluation of national educational-reform efforts

Explicit and implicit research decisions in case analysis:

Reform Stages:

1. Identification of arguments re: need for change in socioeconomic or cultural contexts
2. Diagnosis of implications for change in educational system and in contextual relations
3. Elaboration of 'treatment', i.e. planning alternatives in educational structures
4. Evaluation of normative, structural and behavioral changes sought, and unexpected outcomes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reform Stage</th>
<th>Research Question</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>What values, ideology, i.e. normative premises? Who advocates? Who rejects? etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>What social and educational change theory and biases? Whose expertise? Who attempts to discredit? etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>How determined and justified re: 1 and 2? Who controls implementation? Who obstructs? etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>What criteria? Whose goals? How determined? Who 'wins'? Who 'loses'? Relations to 1 and 2? etc. etc.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[Source: R. G. Paulston 1976:46]
BILINGUAL EDUCATION IN THE UNITED STATES

Bernard Spolsky
University of New Mexico

It would be impractical and immodest to attempt in a brief paper to describe the history, extent, and future of bilingual education in the United States. I can do no more than sketch the complexity of the issue and suggest some of the ways in which we might simplify it and, in so doing, understand its underlying structure. As we move into what we hope will be a time of firm theories and parsimonious models (for which we must thank scholars such as Fishman, Lewis, and Paulston), it is probably still of some use to emphasize the very great variety that is covered up by applying the single label 'bilingual education' to the great multitude of situations that call for a bilingual language education policy, the multiplicity of rationales that are presented for it, the inordinate range of different operations involved in it, and the greatly varying effects these different kinds of bilingual education can have.

In my own attempts to grasp this complexity, I have found it useful to work with a fairly simple model, a single integrated structure onto which one tries to map all the relevant factors in order to explore the lines of interconnection. The model is probably most easily visualized as a multitiered wedding cake, each tier of which has the same circumference. Around the circumference of each tier we place all the factors that may have a bearing on or be affected by the operation of a bilingual program in a particular situation. The sets of factors, which might be visualized as slices cut from the cake, include psychological, sociological, economic, political, religious, cultural, geographical, demographic, historical, and linguistic. In an individual situation, not all of the factors are likely to be equally relevant, but there is heuristic value in allowing for all cases. There are no dividing lines within the figure (the cake has not yet been cut in slices), reminding us of the fact that the various factors overlap and interact with each other in
a manner that cannot be adequately represented without sacrificing simplicity. We locate the educational factors in the center of the circle. This is not done to assert the primacy of these factors. In fact, it turns out that educational considerations are sometimes insignificant, both in the decision as to whether or not to establish a bilingual program and in the evaluation of a program's success in reaching its goals. It would be easy to conceive of a study that might wish to treat political, economic, or even linguistic factors as central. However, as we are concerned with the study of educational activity, it is appropriate to place education in the middle as the focus of the figure, with the other factors circumscribing and shaping it on all sides.

In my model, there are four tiers. The first tier represents the total situation of a community before a bilingual program is introduced. The term 'community' might include any relevant socioeducational entity, ranging from a village or neighborhood through a school district, a geographically focused ethnic group, a province, or a region, to a whole nation. At the situational level, one should be able to describe the whole range of factors that, in an ideal world, would be taken into account in deciding to establish a bilingual program.

The second tier sets out the possible rationales for a bilingual program. Here is where one deals with the explicit or unstated goals of those who have planned or who control the program. The various kinds of rationales are usefully grouped under the same headings used in the first tier. As will be seen later when this model is applied to the United States, it is important to note not just the variety of rationales but the variety of people involved in expressing them. Who are the decision-makers in educational matters? They may be the educational staff of a school district; they may be senior educational bureaucrats of the nation; they may be the political leaders; they may be the political or ethnic groups influencing the political leaders; they may be members of the local community. As will be seen, bilingual education in the United States is marked by the fact that different groups consider different rationales to be the major reason for a bilingual program.

On the third tier, I incorporate those factors that are more or less under the control of the administrators of a bilingual program, or which may be directly influenced by the operation of the program. Central here is the use of more than one language for instruction and the way in which two or more languages are distributed in the school curriculum. This is also the place to note other kinds of operations associated with a bilingual program, such as language development, changes in political structure, and changes in socioeconomic situation.

The first tier, then, represents factors that predate and are independent of a bilingual program, the second deals with the rationales that led to its institution, and the third is concerned with the actual operation of the program. The fourth tier is very
similar to the first, but represents the situation after the program has been in operation for some time. It is used to represent the effects of the program. The time sequence is as follows: in a given situation (first tier) driven by certain rationales (second tier) certain operations (third tier) lead to changes in the situation (fourth tier).

In the light of this model, various kinds of evaluation are possible. One might ask, for example, if the rationales are appropriate to the situation, or how the effects follow from situation, rationales, and operations. In a simple world, logical connections might be expected to be found from one tier to another, following down a single set of factors. For example, a situation of imminent language loss might lead to a rationale of language maintenance, a program of language development, and have an ultimate effect of language maintenance. In actual practice, the relationships are much more complex, so that one finds people in the situation of imminent language loss taking advantage of a national rationale for compensatory education in order to improve the economic position of their ethnic group.

When one looks at bilingual education in the United States in the perspective provided by this model, I think that some order starts to emerge out of the complexity. We are talking, as Professor Paulston has made clear, not about bilingual education as a cause or a result, but as an intervening variable. From that point of view, it is the case here, as so often in other areas of applied linguistics, that factors other than linguistic ones turn out to be dominant. In this case, factors other than educational turn out to play a major role, so that we need to draw on the disciplines that deal with the other factors involved.

A general overview of bilingual education in the United States suggests the following. There was a gradual increase in constraining pressures that, by the 1920s, succeeded in bottling up almost all the forces that would normally tend towards bilingual education. Over the years, these forces continued to build up, and were suddenly released by legislative and judicial action in the late 1960s. If I might mix my metaphor, the Pandora's box that was opened turned out to contain many forces that the legislators and jurists had not anticipated. At the moment then, we are in what some people call the backlash period, which I would characterize rather as some well meaning individuals trying to catch with a butterfly net all the troubles and pressures they saw released when the box was opened. Without a clearer understanding of the multiplicity of forces involved, it is hard to find one's way through the resulting complexity.

Consider first the situation in the late 1960s in which the Pandora's box was opened. Politically, the expectations aroused by the Civil Rights Act had led some people to realize the need to recognize the problems of other minority groups, especially the Spanish-speaking. It was clear to all who looked that this
group not only faced social and economic discrimination, but that education was doing very little to help. The common factor uniting the Mexican-Americans, Puerto Ricans, and Cuban-Americans was their language so that a solution based on language appeared eminently reasonable. As the U.S. Commissioner of Education, Harold Howe II, put it in evidence before a House of Representatives committee in 1967:

Clearly our schools must give greater attention to the special needs of non-English speaking children. The median years of school completed by the Mexican-American in the Southwest is 7.1 years. The median for the Anglo child in the Southwest is 12.1 years. For the non-white child, it is 9.0 years of school completed. These statistics make their own case for special programs for the non-English speaking child. Last year's Equality of Educational Opportunity Survey showed that children who do not speak English at home achieved considerably less than those who do speak English at home. But these differences tend to diminish when children have experiences which improve communications skills (p. 46 of the House Hearings).

In the opening of the Senate hearings on the Bilingual Education Bill, Senator Ralph Yarborough referred not just to the drop-out rate resulting from the language education policy but also to

the psychological damage which such practices render unto millions of children. Even to a layman the injustice and harm of such practices are obvious. Unfortunately, this practice has all too often been the rule rather than the exception in the education of children from Spanish speaking backgrounds (Senate Hearings, p. 1).

The U.S. Office of Education estimated in 1967 that there were about 3,000,000 children in the United States whose mother tongue was a language other than English. Of these, more than 2,000,000 spoke Spanish. The exact figures are necessarily vague, for neither census nor surveys were reasonably accurate in depicting the actual language situation of the various groups.

It is when one looks more closely at the language situation of each of the groups involved that one starts to realize some of the difficulties produced by the overgeneralized descriptions of the late sixties. Essentially at this time, people were concerned about the national picture and very little effort was made to follow up on the exact situation in any area of the country or for any particular community. This can be easily illustrated. In 1969 and 1970, we made a survey of the language ability of Navajo children beginning school. On the basis of this study, it was clear that there were differences.
between boarding schools, where more than 90 percent of the children had virtually no exposure to English before coming to school, and the public schools on the reservation, where about a third of the children had had some experience of English before coming to school.

As we looked more closely, we discovered even finer distinctions. It became clear then that a statement about the language situation on the Navajo reservation would need to go into sufficient detail to look at each community and could not cover the full 130,000 population. Similar contrasts appear when one compares two pueblos no more than 30 miles apart, speaking the same language: in one, very few children still speak the language; in the other, some children are still monolingual and most are bilingual when they come to school. Again, in northern New Mexico there are fewer and fewer children coming to school with Spanish as their dominant language; villages that were previously monolingual are now clearly bilingual, and in cities, for many children, Spanish has become the language that their grandfather speaks to their mother or father. Again, in 1967, it was recognized that there were many languages other than Spanish involved, but there were very few people who realized how complex the language situation was, or who would have expected to see something like the 1977 Chicago Board of Education Functional Language Survey, which deals with some 95 languages. The complexity of the situation with so many languages is problem enough, but it is compounded by the difficulty of characterizing the actual sociolinguistic situation for each of these communities. For some communities, the language other than English still plays a major role in home and institutional life; for others, it is restricted to certain domains of home use; for still others, it retains symbolic ethnic, religious, or cultural importance.

On the political and economic level, there was more uniformity, for it was generally the case that the non-English speakers were in disadvantaged or peripheral positions politically, socially, and economically. This fact clearly dominated the early days of the implementation of the Bilingual Education Act, so that initial proposals called not for data on language, but for data on the poverty level of the community in which it was proposed to start a program.

Given this variability in situation, it is no wonder that there was a great variation in the motives of those who favored bilingual education and in the rationales that they put forward for it. There is, unfortunately, no detailed study of this, apart from some pilot studies by Professor E. Glyn Lewis. One of the difficulties with the study of rationales is to decide whose opinions one wishes to examine. We may look at each of the three branches of federal government and when we do, we should not be too surprised to discover the differences between Congress, the bureaucracy, and the law courts in their attitudes to and arguments for or against bilingual education. Each
of these branches has played its own contributing part and the inconsistency between the parts has placed considerable pressure upon those working in the field. Similar differences show up at the state level so that state legislatures, state departments of education, and local education administrators all turn out to hold inconsistent or competing rationales. The extent of local loyalty was brought home to me once when I heard a state legislator who was terribly bitter to discover that a New Mexico bilingual education program was field-testing materials which were being developed in Miami: we need, he said, New Mexico materials—not Florida materials. Within the school, there are likely to be differences between administration and teachers; between students and the others, and among students; between school and parents, and among parents; and obviously, between the community and the school.

Which of these factors is likely to be the most significant obviously depends on a particular situation. Congressional action with the Bilingual Education Act, and judicial action in such cases as Serna v. Portales and Lau, had a major effect and the various bureaucratic interpretations of these decisions have been a major force on the development of actual bilingual programs. But as both the American Institute for Research and Epstein have complained, the actual programs put into effect in the schools have often ignored the fundamental rationales of the law.

For I believe it is clear to a disinterested reader that the major rationale behind the Bilingual Education Act was to develop compensatory education through transitional bilingual programs, intended to teach English as quickly as possible to the non-English speaker. Rereading the testimony given before the Senate and House Committees, one sees how strong was the stress on this issue. The first aim was to deal with the educational disadvantage of the non-English speaker. The issue was clearly put by Senator Paul Fanning.

Mexican and Puerto Rican students should be encouraged to speak Spanish in schools and to develop fully a bilingual facility. But there is no logical reason why Spanish should be preferred over English, the native tongue of the Americans and the language each of us most (sic) develop fully in order to compete effectively in our modern, highly technical society (Senate Hearings, p. 15).

... we must therefore, it seems to me, develop an educational program that excludes the two extremes of bilingual education: the notion that Spanish speaking children should be forced to speak only English and the equally erroneous belief that they need not develop their English language skills until such time as they are proficient in Spanish. As I previously indicated, these approaches to bilingual education can only hurt our Spanish speaking brothers, those with whom we must share America's commercial and
intellectual prosperity. To accomplish this aim, an aim that each of us shares, schools must conduct more of their classes in Spanish, particularly in the elementary grades when the transition from home to school is most difficult for non-English speaking children. We must encourage these children to develop fully a bilingual ability, an ability that will grow in importance with each passing year. And we must remind ourselves that Spanish speaking Americans, like the rest of us, can make their greatest contribution to themselves, their families, and their country—our country—only when they have acquired the educational skills of most other Americans. They need and want educational opportunities; and we should provide them nothing less (Senate Hearings, p. 16).

Another view, the view that language maintenance is a value in its own right, was eloquently expressed at the hearings by one expert witness, Professor Joshua Fishman. He made clear his point of view that bilingual language maintenance in the United States is desirable, in that the non-English language resources of American minority groups have already helped meet part of our urgent national need for speakers of various non-English languages, and that these resources can be reinforced and developed so as to do so ...

He said further that

Our national genius and our national promise depend upon a more conscious and a better implemented commitment to a permanently culturally pluralistic society (Senate Hearings, p. 123).

Unfortunately, the need to hear another witness prevented a full discussion of Professor Fishman’s testimony at the hearings, although Senator Yarborough pointed out the existence of the conflict.

Dr. Fishman, you have now moved out of the realm of mere academician, if that is mere, into the role of an active protagonist for a broad based bilingual education in all fields. I might say to you there is a difference of opinion in this subcommittee, and the full committee, and the Congress as to whether this Bill should be limited to the Spanish speaking, or a broad based one (Senate Hearings, p. 132).

The discussion is clearly continuing, and this conference is an opportunity to hear the arguments presented again.
While it is somewhat uncomfortable for a linguist to have to admit it, it is nonetheless true that a purely linguistic rationale for bilingual education is quite rare. Some of the programs in Alaska, where one finds languages with no speakers under the age of 60 being taught to some of the younger people under the impetus of the state's Bilingual Education Act, are a striking exception. In the hearings for the Bilingual Education Act, there were others beside Fishman who argued for language maintenance: the Western states' representative for the National Education Association, Monroe Sweetland, made the case quite clearly in his statement.

We now view the historic policy of our schools to eradicate the mother tongues brought us by waves of immigration as an unfortunate mistake. Instead of treating the native languages as a blight to be exterminated as we superimpose English, we now know many techniques of teaching which will conserve the mother tongue and parallel it with effectiveness in English. The modern teacher views a native language as a great national resource to be conserved and developed, to be a great strength to our nation in its role of world leadership, not as a negative influence to be suppressed and eradicated (House Hearings, p. 303).

But it is much more common for the argument to concern maintenance of ethnic or cultural identity rather than language.

A persistent theme in all of the literature which deals with the minority child is the absolute necessity for the school to build on the cultural strengths which the child brings to the classroom. To cultivate in him ancestral pride; to reinforce—not destroy—the language he natively speaks; to capitalize on the bicultural situation; for the Spanish speaking child, and the cultivation of its inherent strength, to plan bilingual instruction in Spanish and English, and to make use of a curriculum to reflect Spanish—and Puerto Rican—as well as American tradition, and to retain as teachers those trained and identified with both cultures. Only through such education can the Spanish speaking child be given the sense of personal identification so essential to his educational maturation (evidence of Dr. Frank Cordasco, House Hearings, p. 266).

Similar evidence was given by Herman Badillo, President of the Borough of the Bronx.

When you are living in a slum area in New York City and you've never been to Puerto Rico you may give a distorted picture. You may grow up with a minority psychology which
is unnecessary and it is one of the serious problems that we have with the Puerto Rican community and for that reason the particular program that the congressman has advocated would be of tremendous importance in making the Puerto Rican child who wasn't born in Puerto Rico recognize that he, too, the Puerto Rican has also made a contribution and is making a contribution today in the world as a whole and that therefore he does not feel that he has any less of a cultural heritage than any other group in the City of New York (House Hearings, p. 250).

The intensity of local loyalty, a desire for national and ethnic identity, and the resulting political pressures are clear from the hearings in general, particularly when the Senate Committee took evidence in Texas, California, and New York.

One other argument that turned up in the hearings with some regularity was the relevance of a bilingual education program to relations with Latin America. It was most clearly stated by William G. Car, Executive Secretary of the National Education Association, who concluded his own testimony with the letter that Thomas Jefferson wrote to one of his nephews.

Bestow great attention on Spanish and endeavor to acquire an accurate knowledge of it. Our future connections with Spain and Spanish America go into that language of valuable acquisition. The ancient history of that part of America, too, is written in that language. I am sending you a dictionary (Senate Hearings, p. 90).

Essentially then, the principal arguments presented in the Congressional hearings for the Bilingual Education Act were those concerned with providing compensatory education for disadvantaged non-English-speaking children, with basic emphasis on learning of the unmarked language. At the same time, it was argued that this approach would lessen the psychological damage to children and would permit the maintenance of ethnic and cultural identity.

In the various court cases that bear on bilingual education, arguments for bilingual education have generally been based either on Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 or on the Equal Protection Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment to the Constitution. In Lau v. Nichols and also in Serna v. Portales Municipal Schools, the courts have avoided the constitutional question but have basically agreed that the absence of a program designed to meet the special linguistic need of non-English-speaking students violates Title VI. The Lau decision does not specify a particular remedy, but argues that special programs, including bilingual education, are required to provide equal opportunity for such children. The legal decisions are thus close to the original congressional rationales, offering bilingual
education as one of the ways to deal with the special problems of disadvantaged non-English speakers.

Theoretically, the officials in the federal government who have been implementing the legislative actions or the court decisions should be assumed to be simply carrying ahead the rationales of the legislative or judicial branch. However, as anybody who has worked with federal government knows, the executive branch has a great number of ways of adding its own particular interpretations to the legislative intent. In 1967, the then Commissioner of Education, Harold Howe, was particularly sensitive to the dangers of a rigid approach.

The educational problems of children from homes in which English is not spoken raise a number of questions in the field of education for which there are no sure answers. I hope that no federal legislation will attempt to stake out a position which might tend to preclude flexible and experimental attacks upon the problem in the future. The program which best meets the needs of Puerto Rican children in New York is not necessarily appropriate for the needs of Mexican-American children in the Southwest or Cuban children in Florida. Programs designed for Spanish speaking children where they constitute a minority of the population may not be the best programs in areas where such children may be in the majority. For these reasons, federal aid programs should be designed to encourage flexibility (House Hearings, p. 49).

Unfortunately, practice in the Office of Education since the passing of the Act has not followed this excellent statement, and many of us in the field have our own list of horror stories of bureaucratic rigidity that failed to recognize the special local needs of a program.

When one looks at the rationales given for local implementation of bilingual education, there continues to be evidence of great variation. I think of two pueblos with the same language: in one, where there is high language maintenance, there is strong opposition to bilingual education because it might bring the school into areas best left to the home and the community; in another, where few of the children speak the language, bilingual education is encouraged because it will teach the native language and thus help to preserve the native religion. Until they can be convinced that a bilingual education program is not just a method of keeping them from economic advancement, many non-English-speaking communities are quite suspicious of it. Opposition to bilingual education from the local community has been widely documented: Trifonovich gives interesting accounts of it in Micronesia in the 1950s. Essentially, the argument goes like this: access to economic success is clearly dependent on knowledge of English; teaching a minority in its own language appears to be lessening the chances of learning
English; it appears to be a method of segregating; therefore, the minority community is most suspicious of the motives of those that would impose bilingual education upon them. We are talking here of the rationale of educational advantage and thus of economic advancement as a rationale for bilingual education. It is essentially the long-term economic rationale: it involves arguments that knowledge of either the marked or unmarked language will be an economic advantage to the student when he or she completes school.

There are more immediate short-term economic rationales that have been playing a very significant role in United States bilingual education. The crucial fact here is that the implementation of bilingual education programs has provided opportunities for employment in the educational system to groups previously underrepresented. This can be dramatically illustrated in the case of Navajo. In 1972, the 53,000 Navajo students in school, 90 percent of whom were Navajo-speaking, were taught by 2,600 teachers, only 100 of whom spoke Navajo. The decision to establish bilingual education, even a transitional variety for the first three grades, implied the need for a thousand Navajo-speaking teachers. Whatever other educational or linguistic rationales might have been presented, it is clear that bilingual education in this situation offered the possibility of jobs within the community for a sizable number of people. A thousand well-paying jobs on the reservation for Navajos would lead to greater income not just for the teachers themselves, but for the community as a whole, and would immediately establish within the community a well-paid middle class whose potential influence on the political development of the Navajo Nation is obvious.

This rationale was clearly stated by one of the witnesses at the 1967 Congressional hearings, Mr. Edward O. Vasquez, Director of Manpower Development of the Morrisania Community Progress Center of the City of New York. Mr. Vasquez argued that one of the basic problems for the Spanish-speaking people was the lack of bilingual elementary and secondary teachers who could meet the qualification requirements of the Board of Education. He complained that the New York City Board of Education did not recognize the Puerto Rican license. His recommendation was that the bill

require of the local agencies to amend or alter their requirements (where such requirements exist) so as to be able to hire bilingual teachers and counsellors that might not have such an excellent pronunciation, but that have the ability to perform in their field of specialty.

He argued that 'the bilingual professionals can identify with the problems and background of the pupils', which he considered to be a major factor in the success of the programs (House Hearings, p. 279).
It was probably this fact that set up a good deal of the counterpressure against bilingual education, as teachers in many systems started to feel threatened by the fact that their formal qualifications were no longer sufficient when they had to compete with members of the minority communities.

One of the essences of this short-term economic rationale for bilingual education is closely tied to the question of social and political control of the school. Bilingual education in the United States has provided a vehicle for increased access to and control of the school by minority communities. On the Navajo Reservation, one is not at all surprised to find that the strongest bilingual programs are those that take place in the community controlled contract schools: the same pressure is involved in wanting control of the school and in wanting to maintain one's own language. In a school I observed in Albuquerque, this political rationale was particularly clear. The school is in a predominantly Chicano neighborhood but few, if any, of the children are dominant in Spanish. An excellent experimental program had been developed in the school, but it paid virtually no attention to the ethnic make-up of the community: none of the teachers were Chicano. A community group called for bilingual education, persuaded some university students to give tests to show the amount of Spanish known, and were successful in having the school principal replaced by a Chicano and several Chicano teachers hired.

One may, therefore, argue that in the United States, one of the rationales for bilingual education has been to give previously underrepresented groups control over the resources of the educational systems that affect their children: it serves thus as part of the general affirmative action movement.

As a final note on the complexity of rationales, one might look at the variation in attitudes expressed by a group of national leaders in the bilingual education movement. Looking over the statements made by the dozen candidates for office in a national bilingual education group, one finds four main rationales expressed: three speak of equal educational opportunity (an argument that is basic to the compensatory transitional model); three speak of the value of bilingual education for international communication (the basis of arguments for elitist bilingualism); two speak of educational alternatives (which is sometimes a cover term for separatist arguments); one is concerned about valid methods (a purely educational motivation); and three express concerns about professional and organizational matters (the political or economic rationale).

Given the complexity of situations and rationales, one would expect to find a great deal of variation in the actual operation of bilingual programs. In fact, the actual implementation of a bilingual education program has often been unrelated to the situation because of the explicit rationales the program has been meant to meet. Unfortunately, the call in 1967 by the Commissioner of Education for flexibility has not been followed
either by federal legislation or by various regulations and actions of the Office of Bilingual Education, which seems to have been doing its best to cram all the complex situations into a single procrustean bed. Guidelines written to fit the national conditions fail to take into account the enormous local variations; notions that might make sense in a California city turn out to be quite unrealistic in the Southwest or in the Midwest; unwillingness to recognize the full implications of pluralism has produced all sorts of paradoxical counterpressures.

Some of the problems faced in the development of Southwestern bilingual education will illustrate these. The greatest pressure is clearly that set up when local agencies attempt to establish programs that emphasize language and cultural maintenance, using the vehicle of a law which is written for compensatory transitional bilingual education. The paradox is one that has been pointed out by GAO, the AIR report, and the Epstein study. If one interprets the law as the AIR report does, one might argue that bilingual education programs should stop as soon as they have been successful in making it possible for the student to give up on his own language. Such an approach is, in the opinion of the large proportion of those involved in running bilingual programs, not just absurd but also immoral.

For the first few years of the bilingual education program, operational emphasis was on developing materials and providing teacher aides, all to be monitored by an enormous bureaucratic jungle of process evaluation. Given the fact that all grants were for one year at a time and that new proposals had to be prepared each year, an inordinate amount of operational activity went into the writing of proposals and of the various reports required by the Office. Initial guidelines called for attention to the economic situation of the community rather than its linguistic situation, so that many programs were set up without any regard for the actual linguistic need of the community. Decisions on allocation of funds appeared to follow political rather than linguistic or educational considerations. Two major changes have taken place in the second five-year phase of the program: a somewhat belated emphasis on teacher-training and an attempt to get some control over the proliferation of material development. In the former area, first attention was given to in-service and LEA-supported teacher-training, and then there was a second emergency thrust to the training of teacher-trainers. In the second area, a complex network of material development and dissemination centers was intended to draw together the energies that had previously been spread throughout each of the individual projects. In all this activity, it is most striking that implementation has preceded experimentation, that development has received a great deal of attention and research virtually none. We have, in other words, handled the whole issue as a crisis, attempting answers before we have defined questions.
What, we might ask, has been the outcome of all these activities? Clearly, the question needs to be asked in each of the various domains that we have been concerned with so far. It is too early to say whether bilingual education in the United States has yet had any effect on language loss or language maintenance. My guess is that the greater recognition of community languages by the school system has provided support to those communities that favor maintenance: on the other hand, I will not be surprised to find that successful transitional programs will encourage more rapid acquisition of English and consequent loss of use of the native language by groups which have no strong internal desire for language maintenance. In other words, I do not think that bilingual education is a causal factor by itself in language loss or maintenance, but plays its part among other factors, depending upon the situation and attitude of the rest of the community.

It is certainly clear that bilingual education has provided some jobs and access to some control over the educational system for communities that were previously excluded. It may well turn out that once these groups have control of the schools, they will no longer be particularly concerned about language maintenance or bilingual education: while this might be regrettable, it would clearly seem preferable that a community have the opportunity to make its own decisions in this area.

The crucial question to which we unfortunately still have no clear answer is the educational outcome of bilingual education. The dominant rationale for the establishment of bilingual education in the United States was that it would play a significant role in improving the education of non-English-speaking children. As everyone knows, a preliminary report commissioned by the Office of Education appears to cast doubt on the claim that this is the case. Unfortunately, the weakness of the design of the study means that it has contributed much less to our understanding than to the noisy debate that surrounds bilingual education. Again, we have been provided with a putative answer before the question has been seriously worded.

The question is surely not whether a bilingual education program, of whatever quality, will have a major effect on the achievement of children within one school year, but rather whether a good bilingual education will, over a reasonable period of time, help previously disadvantaged children overcome the difficulties they face in a school system that does not recognize their linguistic needs.

There is fortunately at least one longitudinal study that gives us some evidence on the question. I refer to the detailed evaluation of the bilingual education at Rock Point Community School. Rock Point is a Navajo community in the midst of the reservation that is strongly traditional, with very little English outside the school. Almost all of the children start school speaking only Navajo. In the late 1960s, the school started to develop a well-structured and carefully thought out English-as-a-
second-language program. In the early 1970s, the school became independent, under the control of a locally elected school board, and also started to implement what is referred to as a coordinate bilingual program. Essentially, the program puts two teachers in each classroom: a Navajo language teacher to introduce new conceptual material in Navajo, and an English language teacher to concentrate on the teaching of English as a second language. The program is carefully structured and involves a great deal of attention to material development and teacher training. In its first few years, the major leader in the classroom was the English language teacher, normally a certified Anglo; the Navajo language teacher was a Navajo-speaking aide just beginning a teacher training program. Now, in most classrooms, both teachers are Navajos, the English language teacher and the Navajo language teacher. Early in the development of the program, the school started to collect longitudinal data on the performance of the students. They have now analyzed and reported on the effect of the program on the children's achievement in English language and in mathematics. In these results, they are looking not at the effect on the marked language, Navajo, but specifically on the effect on the unmarked standard language, English. Initially, the program has little effect except that in English reading the children appear to be somewhat behind the scores achieved by students in an English-as-a-second-language program. By the second year they have caught up, and by the third grade are starting to surpass the achievements of children in a non-bilingual program. Children in the school who have gone through the bilingual program score close to the national norms on these standardized tests when they are in the fourth and fifth grade; this is an enormous improvement over the scores of children in other Navajo schools, including those in strong programs with good ESL components but lacking a bilingual program. We need more careful longitudinal studies like this to answer more accurately the question about the educational effect of bilingual education.

Are there other effects of bilingual education? Probably, if I might switch from being a mere academician to being a protagonist, the most important effect has been to make clear that there is, in fact, an alternative to the otherwise seemingly impossible choice presented to us between modernism and traditionalism. When we are talking about bilingual education, we are not just dealing with a single educational program but with an issue that is one of the central dilemmas of the modern world. Over the last 400 years, there has developed an enormous force of modernization or modernism that has just about succeeded in destroying the last elements of traditional cultures and societies. There seem to be two ways in which traditional peoples have managed to avoid the steamroller of modernism. One group of survivors were those who were left alone for the longest time, the people who lived on small islands, or in
dense jungles or unattractive highlands. Even in these cases, the modern world is now rushing to stake its claim, as the islanders on Bikini Atoll found to their cost when their island was chosen to test the atomic bomb; or as the native people of the Amazon are finding as the highways drive across their jungles; or as the Eskimos discovered when the pipeline opened up their hunting grounds; or as the Navajo people found when the search for coal and uranium suddenly made their wasteland important for exploitation. Until this time, these peoples were generally allowed to follow their traditional ways; attempts were often made to impose educational systems based on the norms of the outside society, but both because of the external imposition and because of the low priority it had, there was seldom success. However, once the isolation was removed, a much more powerful force was let loose—the seeming attractiveness of the social and economic advantages of modern life. For it cannot be denied that there are very real advantages in modern life. One would have to be romantic and naive not to recognize the physical, social, and emotional disadvantages of many traditional ways of life. Poverty, ignorance, rigid social systems, ill health, are all things that it is reasonable to want to change. The real issue is how to change these without taking on the weaknesses also inherent in the modern system: loss of individual and group identity, mass culture, bureaucracy, destruction of the environment.

A second answer to the problems of modernism has been to aim at cultural separatism. There are groups that try to do this. The Pueblo Indians in New Mexico have tried for a long time: they add to their physical separation a strong social drive for maintenance of their own special way of life. In recent years, however, they appear to have allowed into the pueblo many aspects of modern life--school, television, automobiles--with a consequent weakening of their tradition and values. But the strength is still there; just as they have managed for the last few hundred years to keep the Christianity that they practice in the church separate from the native religion that they observe in the kiva, and just as many of them manage to keep distinct their use of English in some contexts from the use of their native language in others, so they seem to be developing some kind of pattern of biculturalism. Separatism is probably much easier when it has a religious basis to it. The Amish in Pennsylvania and the Hasidic Jews in Williamsburg maintain their language, their identity, and their traditional values by rejecting, for religious reasons, many aspects of modern customs and life, and one language and culture, associated with modernism.

The problem that these various societies have faced, and that we are now facing, is whether it is possible to find some kind of synthesis rather than to be forced into the absolute choice of modernism or traditionalism. The issue for the Mexican-American or Chinese-speaking child living in San Francisco is
not whether or not he should learn English, but whether or not he can do this without having to forsake his traditional language and the values that are associated with it. Unfortunately, oversimplified approaches have suggested this false choice: there are those who argue that bilingual education is a threat to the learning of the standard language, just as there are those that argue that its only purpose is to teach the standard language. In reaction to these positions, it is not surprising to find some people who appear to be arguing more for separatism than for genuine pluralism. The most difficult problem we face when two cultures come into contact is how to maintain each in an appropriate relation with the other: assimilation and change are inevitable, but submission of one culture to the other is demeaning to both.

A primary purpose of education must be to give all pupils equal opportunity for access to socioeconomic and human advancement. It is perfectly reasonable, I would argue, to judge a bilingual program by its effectiveness not just in teaching the standard language but also in preparing its pupils to live in the modern world. At the same time, unless such a program is able to preserve the best of ethnic tradition—whether linguistic, social, literary, religious, or cultural—it fails completely in the task of preparing its pupils for the better world that we hope they will inhabit. Our greatest fear of the future should be of a world where everybody is homogenized: where everybody speaks the same standard language, wears the same standard clothes, thinks the same standard thoughts. The story of the Tower of Babel is an excellent parable of these dangers, for it describes a society which could build a city and tower that might rule the universe: the confounding of tongues restored both variety and humility. For whatever reason bilingual education was first supported by the federal government, its greatest promise is in helping to develop the kind of postmodern pluralistic blend that our society needs.
THE USE OF INDIGENOUS LANGUAGES IN EDUCATION IN SUB-SAHARAN AFRICA: PRESUPPOSITIONS, LESSONS, AND PROSPECTS

Gilbert Ansre
University of Ghana

Ever since the study of education in Africa sponsored by the African Education Commission under the auspices of the Phelps-Stokes Fund and the Foreign Mission Societies of North America and Europe, conducted by Thomas Jesse Jones and his team of six in 1921, the subject of the use of language in the education of Africans has never been completely laid to rest. There have been a number of international, subregional, national, and individual discussions. Educationists, linguists, and politicians alike have held forth on which language is best for the education of the African. The most recent international meeting, to my knowledge, took place in Zaire a little more than a year ago, under the joint auspices of the International African Institute and the universities of Zaire; the proceedings are still being processed for publication.

The amount of literature on the use of language for education in Africa is quite impressive. It is not my intention to rehearse the content of these works here. A representative but not exhaustive bibliography is provided at the end of this paper. And I am not going to relate a continuous history of the educational process of the continent. It would be too unrealistic to undertake such a task. What I propose to do is the following: (1) to make a number of observations on the policies and practices adopted in the use of indigenous languages (UIL) in education in the past; (2) to comment on some recent and contemporary policies and projects; (3) to draw a comparison between the projects and activities in Africa, on the one hand, and those outside, including the United States, on the other hand; and (4) to speak to the prospects of UIL in education in Africa in the future. These discussions are limited to sub-Saharan Africa.
Some characteristics and presuppositions. It is not easy to generalise on the use of language in African education for all the 40 or so sub-Saharan countries. The area under discussion is so vast and the specific countries have at different times been under the domain of at least five major European powers, with diverse attitudes and policies. In each country many different forces have influenced the educational objectives and their implementation. However, it seems that a number of useful lessons can be learned from examining the general characteristics and trends which we find in the history of language use in the area. An exercise in identifying the main presuppositions and viewpoints underlying the policies promulgated and practices followed, enables us not only to understand the present state of affairs but also to plan better for the future.

Some of the characteristics to be listed here are common knowledge and may not give us a great deal of new insight. By themselves, they are like simple historical data with no interest. But together with others, they indicate how a combination of apparently insignificant data can yield results of great consequence.

Missionary origins and efforts. In the vast majority of cases, the UIL in formal education in Africa was first advocated, established, and promoted by missionary agencies. Although there are indications that the first European-style schools started around 1529, when King John III of Portugal instructed the Governor of Elmina Castle 'to provide reading, writing, and religious teaching for African children' (Graham 1971), the medium of instruction was specifically to be Portuguese. In the 1740s, during the era of Dutch dominance, the African educator and priest Jacobus Capitein reorganised the schools; and the Lord's Prayer, the Ten Commandments, and parts of the catechism were taught in Fanti, a dialect of Akan and one of the first African languages to be reduced to writing. But real and serious consideration of UIL was begun after 1816 by the Church Missionary Society of Freetown.

By far the strongest advocates of UIL were the Basel and Bremen Missions, which started work in Akwapim and Eweland, in Ghana and Togo, in 1835 and 1847, respectively. By the end of the century they had not only produced an impressive number of readers in Twi and Ewe, but were also teaching at the primary and middle schools, and in training colleges and seminaries, in these languages. Christaller and Schlegel, and later Westermann, had laid a solid foundation by producing grammars and dictionaries. Not only religious education, but most 'secular' subjects, including arithmetic, logic, and world history, were taught in these languages.

Most of the agents of these missionary societies were German or German-speaking Swiss. Obviously, there is a strong relationship between the German emphasis on UIL in Africa and the post-Reformation emphasis on the use of the German language
in church and school in Germany. Other areas of German missionary activity were the Cameroons and Tanganyika. In these countries also, the local languages were vigorously promoted until the agents were forced to withdraw during the First World War. They had clearly specified language policies and ensured their implementation through the provision of books, training, and efficient, if sometimes authoritative, supervision.

Wesleyan, Scottish, and Anglican missionaries also played their part in the promotion of the use of African languages, but not with the same degree of self-application and success. In all, the Protestant missionary bodies laid more stress than did the Roman Catholic missions on formal education and the UIL as a medium of instruction in Africa. It was not until the twentieth century that the colonial governments began to take any serious and active part in formal education. By that time the influence of missionary bodies on the foundations of education, especially in West Africa, had been laid. When the Phelps-Stokes Commission arrived, the tradition of the use of the 'vernaculars' had been established mainly in British colonies and was recommended by the Commission for early primary schools.

Thus, while the colonial powers were not enthusiastic about the UIL of Africa for education, the Christian missionary organisations, especially the Protestant groups, started and actively promoted the practice. This was the case in the Gold Coast (Ghana), Nigeria, the Belgian Congo (Zaire), Uganda, Tanganyika (Tanzania), and South Africa.

Attitude of the colonial authorities. The present-day pattern of UIL in the educational system of specific African countries has been shaped significantly by the attitude of the colonial authority which ruled the particular country (Spencer 1971). We can divide these authorities into two groups, the pro-users and the anti-users, according to whether they allowed some UIL or rejected it. Belgium, Germany, and Great Britain were the pro-users, and Portugal and France were the anti-users. Basically, the attitude of the colonial power was a reflection of its colonial philosophy. The two anti-users believed in the 'assimilation' model of colonialism, in which ability to speak the metropolitan language was an essential aspect of the civilisation they were imparting to the African. The pro-users, to a large extent, were content to have the people retain their language so long as they could develop a cadre of qualified administrative, clerical, and technical African staff who knew enough of the metropolitan language to ensure the smooth running of the colony.

The anti-users refused to accord any position to the indigenous languages in formal education. In 1829, the Governor of Senegal requested that Wolof, which was being used alongside
French in the schools, be dropped and that French be concentrated on.

The Portuguese position crystallised fully in the famous Decree 77, issued by the High Commissioner Senhor Norton de Natos, in Luanda, Angola, in 1921. While the decree dealt mainly with the duties and privileges of missionary organisations, a good portion of it refers to language issues. The Portuguese language was to be compulsorily taught (Article 1.3). No foreign language was to be taught (Article 1.4). The teaching of native languages was not permitted in mission schools (Article 2). The use of 'native languages in written form or of any other language besides Portuguese by means of pamphlets, papers, leaflets or any kind of manuscript is forbidden ... in any relations with the Natives' (Article 3.1). Oral use of indigenous languages was permitted only for beginners and must give way to Portuguese as soon as possible (Article 3.3). The scientific study of languages was permitted, but the government reserved the right to forbid the circulation of such works if it was found to be 'prejudicial to public order and the liberty or the security of the citizens and of the native populations' (Article 4) (see Jones n.d.:232-234 for the full text). What applied in Angola also applied in Portuguese Guinea and Mozambique.

The Germans were concerned quite early on that at least primary education should be undertaken in the indigenous language. German was taught from the beginning as a subject, but the major local languages were actively developed for educational use. In Tanganyika an ironic situation arose. For some time, while the Anglo-Catholic missionaries adopted Swahili, the German Lutheran Mission preferred to use the 'minor' local languages. In the end, Swahili won the day and became the main medium of instruction. Textbooks in the language appeared in an impressive succession: a geography in 1886, a history in 1893. By 1901, a set of new books called Doorway to Knowledge appeared in Swahili and dealt with subjects like astronomy, geology, and philosophy. Of course, this trend suffered a setback when the Germans were driven out of their colonies during the First World War.

In Togo, which started off as a German colony and became mandated to France, a conflict of interest arose as a result of the two opposed attitudes. The Germans had promoted the study and use of Ewe in the elementary schools and also in the seminary. When the French took over, Ewe was completely banned from all government schools. The church schools tenaciously kept on teaching some subjects in Ewe, alongside French, until independence. Since then, UIL has been widely discussed but nothing definite or practical has been done to change the situation in the government schools.

The Belgians in the Congo, while promoting French as the official language, selected four fairly widespread languages out of the very many in the territory as local 'linguae francae'.
These were Swahili, Lingala, Kikongo, and Baluba (Jones n.d.: 252). The missions and university researchers were encouraged to develop these as well as to undertake studies in the other languages. This attitude has resulted in sustained interest in the UIL in Zaire today. But much is yet to be done to increase the use of indigenous languages in education. Recent conferences on the subject at Lumumbashi and Kinshasa enthusiastically embraced the suggestion and practical steps may hopefully be expected.

The official British attitude to UIL has been described by Awoniyi as one of 'benevolent toleration without any systematic planning' (Awoniyi, in Bamgbose 1976:37; see also Spencer 1971b). It must be appreciated that it is this situation in the British colonies which has produced the most encouraging forms of UIL on the continent. In fact, it is not as much 'without systematic planning' as has often been claimed. The British Colonial Office took the Phelps-Stokes Report quite seriously and accepted the three points regarded by it as being the conviction held by the 'representatives of civilisation in Africa'. These are: (1) that native peoples have a fundamental right to be educated as far as possible in 'the vernacular of their tribes'; (2) that there must be a language or languages of exchange with neighbouring tribal groups; and (3) that teachers and leaders must have an opportunity to learn one of the great European languages so that they may have access to the 'wisdom and inspiration of civilisation'.

Between 1924 (when the report was published) and 1951, five important memoranda on education in the colonies in general, and on language in education in particular, were sponsored and accepted by the Colonial Office (Great Britain 1925, 1927, 1935, 1943; Nuffield Foundation 1951). There were other conferences and decisions taken regarding specific countries and situations. Also, institutions like the School of Oriental and African Studies and the internationally constituted but London-based International Institute of African Languages and Cultures (later renamed the International African Institute) greatly influenced British policy, especially between 1930 and 1950.

The multiplicity of opportunities for reviewing the British language policy, and the lack of concerted effort to implement the policies arrived at, are the main reasons for the impression that British colonial language policy was unsystematic. It was certainly not rigid and by the time that political independence arrived, this system offered greater opportunities for developing the UIL than the others. The main point is that the present state of use or nonuse of the indigenous languages in the educational systems of various African countries has been predominantly determined by whether the colonial authority was a pro- or anti-user.

Limited to elementary education and adult literacy efforts. An important but often unstressed characteristic of the UIL is that
except for Tanzania, it has been restricted solely to the first cycle of the educational system and to adult mass literacy programmes throughout the whole of sub-Saharan Africa. Even in Tanzania, where Swahili is the declared and effective national language, its use as a medium of instruction has only recently been extended to the secondary school. (See Isaacs 1970 for discussion of what was done previously to prepare pupils for secondary school.) True, the indigenous languages are studied as a subject in the secondary school and university, but pupils entering secondary schools are expected to use English or French. In Ethiopia, according to Hapte Miriam Marco, Amharic replaced Geez in Grades 1 to 6 after 1957 (Marcos 1970). Even here, it is expected that a European language (English) will become the medium in the secondary schools, training colleges, and universities. In all other countries where the indigenous language is used, there has been no question about UIL at the middle, secondary, and university levels. This is true of even the most modern models and practices in places like Ghana and Nigeria. It is simply assumed that secondary and higher education must be acquired through the medium of a Western language.

When adult literacy programmes were started in sub-Saharan Africa, the local languages were decidedly the medium used. Even in francophone countries, this concession was made and several centres for 'alphabetisation' have been producing materials mainly for adults in the local languages. In some cases it is envisaged that once the adult attains literacy in his own language, he will continue to acquire reading ability in French in order to benefit from the civilisation and technological and cultural advantages bestowed by this language.

Thus, we note that throughout Africa there is no full commitment to the UIL. Its introduction is generally acceptable only in a limited number of countries, mainly for pedagogical reasons and as a stepping-stone to the more 'sophisticated' use of the European languages in the higher levels of education. Discussions on the ultimate use of our indigenous languages at higher levels are very scarce and often proponents of this idea are labelled as unrealistic and unduly nationalistic. The study of these languages in the institutes of higher learning is usually done in the European languages and, at the moment, the ultimate aim is not that they should one day replace these Western languages. Of course, the reasons given seem quite strong. These have been discussed elsewhere (Ansre 1976).

Attitude of the African elite. Many of the African elite do not fully embrace UIL in education. Some see the pedagogical advantage in teaching a child in a language which he already knows well. Others also appreciate that its use enables the pupil to have respect for and pride in his linguistic cultural heritage. But it is not often clear to many that UIL can
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significantly affect the economic and political development of a nation (Ansre 1975).

From the very beginning of formal Western education, Africans have expressed the wish to learn and use the language of the colonial masters. The main reason is that it gives them economic power and social prestige. Parents have been anxious that their children use the European metropolitan language well in order to perform well in school. In almost all African countries the indigenous language does not enjoy similar prestige nor does it give one the same economic advantages as the European languages do. In virtually all former colonies, political independence has not brought about significant linguistic emancipation and the policies of the former rulers have not been radically examined. It is true that a great deal of discussion goes on about the need for cultural--including linguistic--self-realisation. But insofar as language use is concerned, most African educationists and politicians are either not concerned enough, or are afraid to reexamine existing former colonial policies and practices.

Policy compared with practice. Linguists and educationists often charge that governments in Africa do not enunciate clear language policies and that this is the main cause for difficulties in language use in schools. After studying this problem in a number of African countries, it seems clear that the real problem lies in how well any existing language policies are effectively implemented. Virtually all countries in sub-Saharan Africa have a policy on what language to use in education. The policy may be unrealistic and inappropriate in some cases, but the way in which it is put into practice is usually haphazard and ineffective. Some projects which start off very well organised are poorly carried out, especially when the time comes to extend beyond the pilot project stage. The Peak Project in Kenya is reported to have suffered that fate (Tiffen 1975:327ff.). There seems to be clear evidence that it is not only well planned but well supervised and systematically expedited policies which succeed. In some cases, policies are mere token gestures without any commitment evident in actual practice.

Another aspect of the difference between policy and practice is that policies which are unrealistic are bound to be ignored by the school teachers sooner or later. When the Ghana Ministry of Education ordered that English be used as medium of instruction from the very beginning of the child's education, as Mr. Yanka's minority report recommended, this regulation was simply ignored by many Ghanaian teachers, especially in the rural areas. When school inspectors came, a prepared English-medium class was often put on display, and as soon as the inspectors departed, the class reverted to the local language. However, the main point of this section of my paper is to draw attention to the characteristic gap between policy and practice.
in the UIL. The policy must be very carefully drawn up and
must also be systematically expedited.

The foregoing is an attempt to illustrate how a combination of
factors (i.e. missionary efforts, colonial attitude, the level of
education to which UIL is limited, and the attitude of the Afri-
can) have determined the present state of affairs in Africa (see
Barnard 1956). I shall next comment briefly on this state of
affairs and show how a couple of projects in Nigeria and Ghana
are attempting to bring about desired change.

We have in sub-Saharan Africa a whole spectrum of varying
situations of UIL. At the two extremes are (a) the countries
which are fully committed to UIL throughout the primary school
and in adult education programmes, e.g. Tanzania and Ethiopia;
and (b) the countries which are negatively inclined to any con-
sideration for change from the use of the European language to
UIL in schools, but who may accept it for a certain level of
adult education and literacy work, e.g. Upper Volta, Niger,
Mali, Botswana. Between the two extremes there may be at
least three other categories, namely: those countries committed
to UIL up to a point, certainly on paper and, to a large extent
in practice, and currently engaged in programmes to promote it,
e.g. Ghana, Nigeria, and Senegal. Next is the category of
interested but not committed countries, e.g. Togo, Uganda.
Then there is the category of those not negatively inclined,
but favouring English or French. Countries in this latter
group may have had a history of UIL but are currently pursu-
ing programmes which favour the use of English or French
throughout the primary school system. Zambia, Sierra Leone,
and Benin (formerly Dahomey) are examples of this category.

One striking characteristic of the present-day situation is
that the universities have become the focal point of interest in
both the study and use of the indigenous languages. Even in
the countries which are officially negatively inclined toward UIL,
there are people who hold opposite views and occasionally write
to advocate a reversal of the position. With the development of
departments of linguistics and institutes which stress the study
of the indigenous languages, an increasing number of scholars
have become interested in UIL and have been participating in
projects to further it.

In the francophone countries, apart from the long-established
IFAN in Dakar, the practice has been to set up centres for
applied linguistics in the universities. Their main stated func-
tion is to undertake contrastive analysis between local languages
and French; the ultimate objective is to enhance the teaching of
the latter. But a number of sociolinguistic studies are being
undertaken and in some cases interest in the language of educa-
tion in the lower levels is emerging.

In anglophone Eastern Africa, the survey of language use and
language teaching, which covered Ethiopia, Uganda, Kenya,
Tanzania, and Zambia, also generated interest in linguistic
studies in general and the UIL in particular. The country
reports which are still coming out are invaluable source material for what the situation is and what might be done. The universities in these countries are also engaged in discussions on how to improve educational use of the languages.

It appears, though, that two of the most vital projects on UIL are those taking place at the University of Ife, Nigeria (see Afolayan 1976) and in the Language Centre of the University of Ghana.

The Six-Year Primary Project has not only been described in detail elsewhere; it is also physically represented at this Georgetown University Round Table. (See Tiffen 1975:325, for a tabulated presentation of the situation in the Commonwealth.) It would be presumptuous to attempt a description of it. Only four brief comments are made here. First, it is an excellent project, showing how UIL can be promoted rather than proving that it is better to use the indigenous language than English. Secondly, the most useful products of the project have been the core of specially trained teachers participating in it and the collection of teaching materials prepared at the workshops. Thirdly, it is necessary, when the pilot project is giving way to the period of extension referred to as 'proliferation', that at least two things be done: (1) a revision of the whole of the Western state's teacher-training course to reflect the UIL emphasis, and (2) the maintenance of intensive supervision, preferably by a corps of full-time organisers. Fourthly, a great deal of mentality and attitude reformation and reeducation of the general public is necessary to ensure success.

The Language Centre of the University of Ghana was set up in 1970 to enable the University's Faculty of Arts, which was mainly language-oriented, to reach outward. It was specifically directed to apply itself to the clarification and solution of the language problems of Ghana and its neighbours. Special interest was focused on language and education. But other areas also concern us, e.g. language use in politics and the administration of justice, language and religion, language in industry and commerce. Major research interest is in the linguistic demography of Ghana.

In the field of language and education, we have been involved with both English and the Ghanaian languages with an obvious bias towards the latter. Our main interest in English has been to improve proficiency, especially in the university. We therefore have a language and study skills course for undergraduates and a francophone course for French-speaking students from neighbouring countries who come to learn English in order to go back and teach it or use it for further studies.

Our work on the Ghanaian languages involves three aspects: as subjects of study throughout the educational system, as media of instruction in primary school, and as a new language to be taught to nonspeakers—both Ghanaians and non-Ghanaians (i.e. language proficiency).
Subject of study. Ghana has had a fairly long history of the study of a number of its languages. By 1935, Twi, Fante, Ga, and Ewe were examinable Cambridge School Certificate and London Matriculation subjects; soon after, and for almost 20 years, all teachers in training were required to pass one of these subjects with at least 'Credit' in the School Certificate examination. Thus, one of the local languages was an optional subject in secondary school but compulsory in the Teacher Training College. With the introduction of the Accelerated Development Plan in 1951 and the expansion of schools and colleges beyond the traditional linguistic confines, the study of the local languages suffered a setback. Teachers had no preparation in it; the emphasis in the primary school was placed more on English and a steady decline in the quality of performance and prestige of the Ghanaian languages set in. Meanwhile the languages of the northern part of the country, such as Dagbani, Dagaare, and Gurene were never studied—missionary activities among the speakers not having been seriously undertaken before the inception of the First World War.

In 1968, a conference on the study of Ghanaian languages was convened by linguists of the University of Ghana. It brought together educationists, government officials, publishers, and others to consider the best way to improve upon the study of the languages (see Birnie and Ansre 1969). The results had a great effect on the direction of subsequent work. The Language Centre, itself a result of the conference, assisted in setting up a new Association of Teachers of Ghanaian Languages. It has helped in revising the primary and secondary ('O' level) syllabuses and in devising new ones for 'A' level (i.e. pre-university) and teacher training colleges. It persuaded the Ministry of Education to appoint special language organisers for each of the nine administrative regions of the country. These organisers were given intensive training in the Centre. Then the Centre recruited 10 teachers and gave them a course in textbook writing. In many parts of the northern and upper regions of Ghana, the textbooks they produced are those in use in classrooms today. It organised and has overseen various orthography committees and has assisted in setting up the new Specialist Training College at Ajumako for training professional pre-university teachers of the Ghanaian languages. Presently, the Centre gives a post-graduate diploma course in the teaching of Ghanaian languages, aimed at preparing teachers for the Specialist College, sixth forms, and higher positions in the Education Service.

Medium of instruction. Closely associated with the programme of teaching of Ghanaian languages as a subject is their use as media in the primary school. Here, the major preliminary task was one of moulding the attitude of government and educational authorities. Liaison work with several political regimes and ministry officials has been both exciting and frustrating at
different times. However, it seems clearly established that Ghana will use the indigenous languages at least for the first three years of the public school system, and more, if possible. The next problem is the availability of teachers and teaching materials of the quality which will ensure success. It is here that the new series of textbook writing workshops recently instituted by the Language Centre are relevant. As part of its second phase of activities, the Language Centre has decided to produce teaching materials in mathematics, elementary science, and environmental studies in a number of Ghanaian languages. The languages selected are Akan (both Twi and Fante), Dagbani, Ewe, and Ga. These languages together are estimated to account for well over 60 percent of the school-going population of Ghana.

Within the next four years, the project is to produce pupils' books, teachers' manuals, and other ancillary material for each of the three lowest primary school classes. In collaboration with the Ministry of Education, subject specialists and language specialists were brought together for a six-week period. The material was first produced in English and then translated into the four languages. This ensures that the material is original and, at the same time, that the area covered and also the methodology used are more or less standardised. But individual idiosyncrasies are allowed in each language. After the initial period of intensive work together, the language specialists work over their draft and prepare it for final editing. The first-year materials are almost ready for final editing, which hopefully is to take place this coming summer at the second six-week residential workshop. The draft of Class 2 is also to be done during that time. After final editing, mimeographed and prepublication editions will be used for pilot testing in the classroom. Necessary revision will then be done and the material presented to the Ministry of Education or given to a publishing house for publication. The important thing is to produce the material for use.

Collaboration with the government. In all these activities, it has been most useful to confer, plan, and expedite the projects together with the Ministry of Education. In fact, although a substantial portion of the initial financial assistance was obtained from outside Ghana from the Carnegie Corporation in New York and the Ford Foundation, each instance of a grant was requested jointly by the government and the university, and often a matching grant was also elicited from the Ministry. Ministry personnel—especially curriculum, methodology, and testing specialists—have been released to participate in our projects. At the same time, the Ministry often requests the Language Centre to conduct seminars and workshops for teachers during in-service training courses. A member of the Centre staff, for example, was seconded for two years to start and establish the Specialist College at Ajumako. This is, in the opinion of the Centre,
an all-important relationship which has helped both parties immeasurably.

Does the Language Centre have any difficulties? Yes, it has plenty of them, but these will only be touched upon here, owing to lack of space. Among the most serious are inadequate finances, small number of qualified personnel, and a colonialist mentality about our linguistic needs and the resources of our languages. Another kind of problem is the multiplicity of languages spoken in Ghana—approximately 46 in all. What can be done about this situation must be dealt with elsewhere. The Language Centre and people associated with it face these problems with optimism and determination and try to find solutions for them.

Bilingual/bicultural programmes in the United States. The nature, location, and membership of this Round Table demand that some comparison, however brief and inadequate, be made between the UIL in Africa and bilingual and/or bicultural programmes which have developed in the United States. I apologise for any ignorance of the details of these programmes, my introduction to them being limited to barely a fortnight's visit-cum-symposium about a year or so ago.

The programmes we observed and discussed at that time seemed to have one or both of the following objectives: (1) to facilitate the smooth integration of the nonnative speaker of English into United States society by using a language already known to him; (2) to reassert a specific ethnicity through language and cultural studies.

It seemed that while the first objective was more common at the inception of the projects a few years ago, the second objective has been gaining ground quite rapidly. Instead of enhancing easy cultural melting down in your alleged societal 'pot', programmes with the second aim in view are insisting that groups remain distinct cultural ingredients in a 'salad bowl'. Thus, it is clear to an outsider like me that now that the United States has achieved sufficient internal political integration to be no longer threatened by the divisive trends of ethnic differentiation, and sufficient economic affluence to be able to afford it, she is in the process of going full cycle—back to a multi-ethnic nation-state like us in Africa. A fundamental question is: is the U.S. 'going tribe'? If so, should the African nation-states, which consist of many tribes, strive to rid themselves of them? From the experience of some of us, belonging to a 'tribe' with a language without being tribalistic, is a great blessing and we can commend it to you. Do not be in a hurry to help us get rid of our 'tribes' and languages. Moreover, the history of Western Europe and other places reminds us that the forceful elimination of a language results in violent reaction and destruction.
Potentialities and prospects. What are the chances of success of the UIL in Africa? If the potential of the UIL were appreciated and compared with the present state of education, the question would be easy to answer. We have claimed elsewhere that the African countries can achieve maximum development in the field of economy, politics, civil and human rights, and sociopolitical self-realisation only if they use the language which the average person uses. As long as the European languages remain the language of a minority—and poorly mastered at that—they cannot enable us to achieve the highest level, materially or otherwise. It must be admitted that the rate of mastery of these European languages is very slow, especially compared with the rate at which Africans master other and neighbouring languages, provided there is the incentive. Moreover, the dropout and failure rates in our schools, which are the direct or indirect result of poor mastery of the European languages rather than of an inability to learn, is alarmingly high. The long-range potential of the UIL in education, as well as in all other aspects of life in Africa, is immeasurably great. If this is so, the issue is: how soon should one start and how fast should one go? An apparently vague but useful answer is: as soon as possible and as fast as is humanly possible, and without creating more hardships and difficulties than those we seek to remove.

But we must be realistic enough to appreciate the seriousness of the impediments in the path of UIL. Some of these have been mentioned. The most serious are the existence of many languages in any given country and the negative attitude of the educated to the indigenous languages as against the European languages. To deal with these problems, one has to change the linguistic, social, and psychological habits of the people. The less crucial problems include lack of trained personnel and teaching material and the need to communicate with those outside the linguistic group, especially the need to use a major world language to participate in and benefit from the technological and intellectual storehouse of humanity. Once we have succeeded in changing the attitude of decision-makers and financial custodians, it is possible to train the educationists and prepare the teaching materials. As for communication with outsiders, we are not saying that English or French should not be learned. They will be learned very intensively, in fact, but mainly by those who actually need to use them in their work: diplomats, scientists, scholars, international traders, and the like. Also, these languages should be subjects on the timetable and should be taught practically and with the most modern equipment available.

It must be pointed out that the state of development in which many indigenous African languages are today compares quite favourably with the state of English when Latin and French were the respected official languages of the court and education, and before it achieved prominence. Who knows what the future
has in store for some of our languages, too, provided the tokenism exhibited by many educational authorities and politicians is replaced by a committed policy that is fully backed by effective implementation?

Language policies must not be regarded as permanent. They should be adapted to change, especially sociolinguistic and psycholinguistic change. Secondly, there is a lot to be said for at least a two-tier policy: a short-term policy and a longer term one. If we ask what kind of language medium we need for education in the next five to ten years, it should perhaps be different from what is envisaged for 25 or 30 years from now.

Another point is that within multilingual countries, it is relatively easy to select an official language—or two or even three—for an administrative district, region, or state, and to promote their use in those areas. This should be done in conjunction with assistance to the residents in each such area to become proficient in the language selected from another area.

We then need to make it possible for the language or languages we wish to promote to generate some benefit, especially an economic benefit. People enthusiastically learn a language which they know will enhance them economically and in prestige. A committed policy and its implementation should exploit this fact to the full. Public servants who acquire a second language should be rewarded; and it should be used increasingly for economic and social transactions.

In conclusion I would like to reiterate the following: (1) that after about two decades of political independence, Africa is still in the grip of linguistic colonialism and therefore the full potentialities of the UIL are yet to be appreciated by the majority; (2) that some initiative for change has been taken and the main focal points are the universities; (3) that there are many problems which must be studied carefully but positively; (4) that we need realistic and humane policies, and very effective implementation agencies in order to realise the full economic, political, and cultural goals which the UIL can achieve for us; (5) and that the sooner we begin realistic and committed UIL rather than token UIL, the better for ourselves and our nations.

NOTES

1. Muller: Fetu, which was a description of the land and people with a word list of the language. It was produced in the 1600s.

2. We do not have up-to-date data on what the situation is in Guinea, Angola, and Mozambique. We are informed, however, that there is a definite revival of official interest in the indigenous languages. Whether any of these languages is used as a medium of instruction, we do not know.
3. For a detailed study of the subject, see L. A. Boadi, 'Mother Tongue Education in Ghana' in A. Bamgbose.
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The Philippine bilingual education policy. The bilingual education policy presently in effect, which was approved by the National Board of Education (NBE) and formally announced by the Secretary of Education and Culture\(^1\) on June 19, 1974, is substantially as follows:

Bilingual education is defined operationally as the separate use of Pilipino (P) and English (E) as media of instruction (MI) in definite subject areas. Arabic shall be used in the areas where it is necessary. The use of E and P as MI begins in grade I in all schools. The vernacular is an auxiliary medium of instruction in grades I and II. English and Pilipino are taught as subjects in elementary and secondary schools.

Pilipino is MI in social studies/social science, character education, work education, health education, and physical education. English is MI for all other courses.

The schedule of implementation is divided into two phases:

Phase 1. School year 1974-75 through 1977-1978. Transition period in the use of P as MI in the subjects named above. Non-Tagalog speaking areas will develop plans/schemes for either immediate or gradual plan for using Pilipino. Tagalog speaking areas may start immediately.

Phase 2. School year 1978-1979 to 1981-82 (four years). Mandatory use of Pilipino in Tagalog speaking areas in schools that made a shift to Pilipino in the year 1974-75. In all other schools, mandatory use of Pilipino as follows:

Primary (grades 1 to 4) - 1978-1979

---

\(^1\) The Secretary of Education and Culture refers to the official who announced the policy.
Intermediate (grades 5 and 6) - 1979-1980  
First and second year high school - 1980-1981  
Third and fourth year high school - 1981-1982  
The use of English in all other subjects/courses in elementary and secondary schools shall be mandatory.

Tertiary institutions (collegiate and graduate levels) are given discretion to develop their own schedules of implementation, provided that by the school year 1984, all graduates of tertiary curricula should be able to pass examinations in English and/or Pilipino for the practice of their professions.

On November 14, 1975, the Department of Education and Culture issued an order to the effect that 'courses in English and Pilipino shall be offered in tertiary institutions as part of appropriate curricula pursuant to the policy of bilingual education ...', which means the same subject areas enumerated in the first order indicated in the foregoing schedule. The revised order took effect during the 1976-1977 academic year.

The term 'bilingual education' is a very new term in official Philippine educational literature. Prior to June 19, 1974, the term was not in use, not even to describe the use of two languages to educate the Filipino child formally in the schools, as in 1939, when the vernacular was sanctioned to be used as an auxiliary medium of instruction by the Secretary of Education (see Sibayan 1967). Neither was the term used during the time when the National Language based on Tagalog was first taught in the schools in June, 1940, nor when the public school system used the vernacular in the first two grades as a medium of instruction in 1957. The Presidential Commission to Survey Philippine Education (PCSPE) which rendered its report in 1970 and which recommended certain policies and programs for the use of Pilipino, English, and the vernaculars in the schools, used the term bilingualism in Pilipino and English.

The present bilingual education policy represents a convergence of thinking and planning and is set within the larger framework of the Educational Reform Law (see Philippines 1977b), which in turn is one of several thrusts in governmental planning and therefore part of the scenario for the year 2000.

Philippine traditions of bilingualism. As a background to the present bilingual education program, a brief description of the traditions of Philippine bilingualism should prove useful. The Philippines has had three traditions of bilingualism. The first I call bilingualism in ethnic languages or the vernaculars. The first subgroup in this tradition involves the use of the regional lingua franca (RLF) and a language either major or minor which I call dominant-recessive bilingualism, where the speakers of the recessive language (who do not seem to want to nurture their language) learn the dominant, usually RLF, of which
there are three--Ilocano, Tagalog, and Cebuano. The second subgroup in this category is bilingualism in two Philippine languages such as Pampango and Pangasinan. There are variations of this indicated in Table 1.

The second tradition is bilingualism in a foreign language and a Philippine language. The first is in Spanish, which I label a restricted or withheld bilingualism; those who managed to learn it became members of the advantaged group. The second in the foreign bilingualism category is in English, which became open (as compared to restricted) to all—regardless of socioeconomic status. This may be called 'democratic bilingualism'—although it later produced its own elite group.

The third tradition, which is the latest, is nationalistic bilingualism. It has two streams. The first is the building of a national language and the replacement of the English stream. The second is the bilingualism in Pilipino and English, which the PCSPE called 'a fact of Philippine life'. I call this reconciliation bilingualism.

Five stages of bilingual education in Pilipino. I propose to define bilingual education in terms of a wide and a narrow view—the wide view to include that education which takes place inside and outside the formal classroom, and the narrow view to mean that which takes place only under the auspices of the school, mainly in the classroom.

In the following discussion, I divide bilingual education in the Philippines into five stages, namely:

Stage 1 (1565-1898), which covers the colonial period under Spain (wide view).

Stage 2 (1900-1938), the period of formal monolingual education in English during the American regime (wide view).

Stage 3 (1939-1956), the beginnings of bilingual education (narrow view), as defined earlier; the liberation of the vernaculars through their use as the auxiliary medium of instruction (1939); the teaching of the national language based on Tagalog for the first time in 1940.

Stage 4 (1957-1974), the use of the vernaculars as the language of instruction in Grades 1 and 2; permissiveness in the use of Pilipino as a medium of instruction in all levels; beginnings of the 'intellectualization' of Pilipino; official recognition of bilingualism in Pilipino and English as a fact of Philippine life.

Stage 5 (1974-1984), full bilingual education—the use of Pilipino and English as media of instruction in the entire school system on all levels. Pilipino and English theoretically become 'equals'. This period may also be called the years of reconciliation—the abandonment of the notion for total replacement of English.
Table 1. Types of bilingualism in the Philippines.

[Revision of 'Tentative Typological Frame for Philippine Bilingualism' in Sibayan 1977e:29]

I. Primary-Secondary
   A. Primary (two or more Philippine languages learned in their natural setting)
      1. Two Minor (one MT): Kankanaey - Ibaloi
      2. One Minor - One Major (usually Rlf): Kankanaey-Iloko
      3. Two Major: Pampango-Tagalog or Pangasinan-Iloko
   B. Secondary (one learned later, especially in school)
      1. Single Secondary - Philippine Language (MT-) - Foreign SL: Tagalog-English/Spanish
      2. Double Secondary - Philippine Language - Second language (Indigenous) - Second Language (Foreign): Waray-Filipino-English

II. Unrecorded-Recorded
   1. Unrecorded (0) - Partially recorded (1): Kankanaey-Iloko
   2. Unrecorded (0) - Fully recorded (2): Kallasan-English
   3. Partially recorded (1) - Fully recorded (2): Tagalog-English
   4. Unrecorded (0) - Partially recorded (1) - Fully recorded LWC (2,3): Kallasan-Pilipino-English

III. Status Classification
   1. Major Philippine Language (1) - International Language (also LWC) (2,3): Tagalog-English
   3. Minor (0) - Major (1) - National Language (1) - LWC (2,3): Kankanaey-Iloko/Pilipino (SL) - English (SL)
   4. Major (1) (nlf) - National Language (1) - LWC (2,3): Pampango-Tagalog-English

IV. Others
   1. Historical/Traditional/Recessive: Iloko-Kankanaey
   2. Emergent-Dynamic
      Minor (0) - LWC (2,3): Bontoc-English
      Major (Rlf or nRlf) (1) - National Language (1) - LWC (2,3): Cebuano/Pampango-Pilipino-English
   3. Special/Scholarly
      Philippine Language (0,1) - LWC; Kallasan/Iloko/Tagalog-English/German
Table 1. (Continued)

IV. Others (continued)


Abbreviations:
0 - Unwritten Language
1 - Recorded (written) but only in some fields
2 - Fully recorded; original research in physical science available
3 - Translation into other languages made regularly
SL - Second Language
OL - Official Language
Med - Medium of instruction in schools
MT - Mother Tongue
Rlf - Regional lingua franca
nRlf - Non-Regional lingua franca
LWC - Language of Wider Communication

Sketches of the stages of bilingual education

Stage 1 (1565-1898): The Spanish colonial period. While the Philippines was 'discovered' by Magellan in 1521, it was not until 1565 that the first schools were established under Spanish colonial rule (see Bernabe 1978:67). Because practically all Philippine languages have borrowed from Spanish, this period is an important one. However, I shall not go into any extended discussion on the policies and programs except to say that while those in Spain decreed that Spanish should be taught to the people, the friars who implemented the important program which was to make the colonized people learn the Christian faith found it easier to learn the local languages themselves to teach about Christianity than for the people to learn Spanish in order to know Christianity. Because the emphasis in education during the Spanish period was on the highest levels (university education), very few learned Spanish. The Filipinos who became educated in Spanish were very few and they constituted the small elite whose influence on Philippine life and culture, and even the affairs of government, extended up to the American period and even to the outbreak of World War II.

The program of educating the Filipino in Spanish was half-hearted and haphazard. In fact, the generally accepted policy was not to educate the Filipino because of the Spaniards' fear that they would revolt against Spain if they knew 'too much' Spanish (summarized in Bernabe 1978).

Stage 2 (1900-1938): Official establishment of the public school system, September 1, 1901. Formal monolingual
education in English and nonformal education in the local languages. This period may be considered the 'golden' years of the English language in Philippine education because English was the sole medium of instruction. While Spanish continued to be used in government because of the Spanish educated government employees (in fact, it was only in 1930 that English could be declared the main language of the courts), the public educational system was taught entirely in English. The policy for English instruction was laid down on April 7, 1900, in the Letter of Instructions to the Philippine Commission by U.S. President William McKinley (Sibayan 1967). The important thing to note is that the policy was determined by outsiders, not by the Filipino people.

This policy on the use of English was reiterated 25 years later by the Monroe Survey Commission, which evaluated the results of 25 years of education in English (Monroe 1925). I quote here the relevant statements from the Commission's report on the continuation of the use of English.

... the use of the dialects would doom the child to a narrow environment which in most cases would restrict his thought and his life (p. 24). ... the introduction of the dialects as the language of instruction would be a divisive influence (p. 26). This intermingling of the school staff among peoples of other regions and dialects is one of the most important social forces making for progress and for the ultimate social and political unity of the Islands. The social unity that can thus be developed underlies all other unities (p. 27). Furthermore, in view of the difficulties of teacher training, textbook preparation, creation of cultural materials, organization of supplementary materials, and many related problems, the administration of a system of schools in many dialects or even in several would be so complicated as to be impracticable (p. 27).

In only one area did the Commission suggest consideration of the possible use of the local language in the schools, that of giving instruction to the children in manners and morals 'since in Oriental culture more importance is attached to proper forms of speech and of social procedures than is usually the case in Western societies' (p. 28).

The Monroe Commission realized in 1925 that of all the problems of the educational system '... no other single difficulty has been so great as that of overcoming the foreign language handicap' (p. 127).

I take pains to quote the foregoing statements because they have bearing on later decisions on bilingual education—for example, the use of the vernaculars3 as the medium of instruction in Grades 1 and 2 from 1957-1974, which was later
abandoned, and the use of English and Pilipino in separate areas in the bilingual education program (Stage 5).

During this period, perhaps the most eager and most influential advocate of the use of the local languages in the schools was Jorge Bocobo, former dean of the College of Law, later President of the University of the Philippines, and subsequently Secretary of Education. Bocobo headed the Education Survey Committee to recommend changes in the educational system, especially in the transition government from 1935–1946 preparatory to complete Philippine independence. The Committee recommended that English as medium of instruction be continued but that primary school teachers be allowed to use the dialect as a supplementary tool of instruction. In 1939, when Bocobo became Secretary of Education, he issued an order to that effect. This may be considered the beginning of formal bilingual education in the Philippines, although the term 'bilingual education' was not used until the seventies.

It was also in this period that the Institute of National Language was established (see Sibayan 1967, 1974).

Stage 3 (1939–1956): The beginnings of bilingual education (BE) and use of the vernaculars. The year 1939 may be considered the beginning of modern formal bilingual education in the Philippines. The use of the vernaculars as an auxiliary medium of instruction, the teaching of the National Language based on Pilipino to senior high school students and to senior normal school students, as a subject, beginning in 1940, and the encouragement of the teaching of Pilipino in the schools by the Japanese occupation forces from 1942–1944, gave impetus to bilingual education. When schools opened after World War II, Pilipino was taught as a subject in primary and secondary schools, and in teacher education and courses for the Bachelor of Arts degree.

It was also during this period that the concept of second language teaching was introduced by Clifford H. Prator (Prator 1950); this generated interest on the part of teachers in the study of Philippine languages, an interest which has continued to the present.

Because the school is an important agent of change in society, one of the important movements for such a change was the community school idea, which aimed to teach the child and also the parents through the use of the vernaculars. The experiments on the use of the vernaculars for education (Ramos, Aguilar, and Sibayan 1967) paved the way for the use of the vernaculars as a medium of instruction. This led to the next stage in the full use of the vernaculars.

Stage 4 (1957–1974): The use of the vernaculars in the initial education of the child. In 1957, the Revised Philippine Educational Program provided for the use of the vernaculars as the language of instruction in grades 1 and 2; the teaching
of English as a subject from grade 1; and the shift to English as the main medium of instruction in all subjects from grade 3 through college, with the vernaculars as an auxiliary medium of instruction in grades 3 and 4, and the national language (now called Pilipino) as an auxiliary medium of instruction in grades 5 and 6. In 1970, the Presidential Commission to Survey Philippine Education (PCSPE) made the following statement on the language of instruction: 'The choice is not either Pilipino or English, to the exclusion of the other in our educational system'. (For a fuller quotation, see PCSPE Report, p. 16; and for an extended discussion, see Sibayan 1975 in Ohannesian, Ferguson, and Polome.) In 1973, the National Board of Education (NBE) announced support for the policy of 'developing a bilingual nation able to communicate in Pilipino as well as in English' (NBE Resolution 73-2, March, 1973, announced by the Secretary of Education and Culture in Department Order No. 9, s. 1973, 16 March, 1973).

The bilingual context in the Philippines. Before I proceed with stage 5, let me backtrack a little and focus on the bilingual context in the Philippines.

The types of bilingualism existing in the Philippines can be viewed within a matrix which accommodates not only the languages I have mentioned so far: Tagalog, English, and Spanish (see Table 1). Perhaps more relevant to our topic is the situation for formal bilingual education. Table 2 summarizes the situation, and can be read in the following way.

If the language of instruction is Pilipino (left-hand column) and the student is a native speaker of Tagalog studying in an urban setting like Manila (MNL), he is fortunate in having the school, the speech community, and mass media (newspaper, movies, TV, and radio) to reinforce his learning of Pilipino. If he lives in a remote rural area, the school and his speech community are available but mass media support is absent or weak. If he is a non-Tagalog (roughly three out of four Filipinos are nonnative speakers of Tagalog/Pilipino) living in an urban area (such as the capitals of most big provinces, for example, Cebu in Central Philippines), then he gets support only from the school and partial media (PM), partial because, unlike Manila, the full extent of mass media may not be available to him. If he lives in a remote rural area, then he has only the school for learning Pilipino. To make matters worse, the Pilipino the pupil hears or learns in this remote rural environment may be from a non-Tagalog/Pilipino speaking teacher who himself feels (or is) inadequate in the language.

There is an emerging group of Filipinos with regard to Pilipino. This is the group whose members come from non-Tagalog speaking families or regions, but have acquired Pilipino in school, reinforced outside school. Many of these may even speak Pilipino like natives but still consider themselves non-Tagalogs. These are labeled Pilipino (A) for Acquired
Table 2. Situation for formal bilingual education.
[Revision of chart in Sibayan (1977e:30)]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SPEAKERS</th>
<th>TAGALOG (N)</th>
<th>PILIPINO (A)</th>
<th>NON-TAGALOG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Urban (MNL)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rurban</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Remote</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pilipino</td>
<td>MT</td>
<td>A(f)</td>
<td>SL(nf)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&amp; SC media</td>
<td>MT</td>
<td>A(sf)</td>
<td>SL(nf)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SL</td>
<td>SL</td>
<td>SL</td>
<td>SL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>School</td>
<td>School</td>
<td>School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>partial</td>
<td>School</td>
<td>School</td>
<td>School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC, PM</td>
<td>PM</td>
<td>PM</td>
<td>PM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Language of Instruction:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SPEAKERS</th>
<th>TAGALOG (N)</th>
<th>PILIPINO (A)</th>
<th>NON-TAGALOG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Urban (MNL)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rurban</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Remote</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pilipino</td>
<td>MT</td>
<td>A(f)</td>
<td>SL(nf)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&amp; SC media</td>
<td>MT</td>
<td>A(sf)</td>
<td>SL(nf)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SL</td>
<td>SL</td>
<td>SL</td>
<td>SL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>School</td>
<td>School</td>
<td>School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>partial</td>
<td>School</td>
<td>School</td>
<td>School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC, PM</td>
<td>PM</td>
<td>PM</td>
<td>PM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Abbreviations:
- A - Acquired (mainly outside school)
- SL - Second Language
- PM - Partial Media
- f - fluent
- sf - semi-fluent
- nf - non-fluent
Pilipino. Note that the table does not indicate any living in remote areas.

Now let us take English as the language of instruction. If a pupil is a Tagalog speaker in an urban setting like Manila, he learns English in school, may speak some English at home (labeled partial SC for partial speech community), and exposed to partial media (PM) (partial because several TV program movies, radio broadcasts, and printed materials, especially comics, are in Pilipino). If the Tagalog speaking child comes from a remote rural community, then he hears and learns English only in school. On the other hand, if he is a non-Tagalog speaking pupil and the language of instruction is English, and he studies in an urban setting like Cebu, he learns English in school and has partial media, but it is doubtful if he speaks English or Pilipino at home. If he comes from a remote rural setting, then he hears and learns English only in school.

A glance at the chart tells us that the non-Tagalog speaker studying in a remote rural area is at a great disadvantage. The most advantaged is the Tagalog speaker who lives in an urban setting like Manila. That at least is the generally accepted or theoretical concept. I say theoretical because there are many pupils now in the provinces, i.e. outside Manila, who are proceeding to learn Pilipino and English even better than their Manila counterparts. They are labelled Pilipino (A), as discussed earlier.

Preliminary events leading to the present bilingual policy. The use of the vernacular as a main medium of instruction in grades 1 and 2 was partially terminated officially during the school year 1974-75. The 'official' statement of recognition, however, for the use of Pilipino and English in the schools was made by the PCSPE (p. 16) when it stated: 'The Commission believes that bilingualism in Pilipino and English is both a fact of Philippine national life today as well as a desirable condition in the contemporary world'.

While the policy is clear, the 'program' to carry out or achieve the policy may undergo various changes, and in the case of the full bilingual education policy the change was very rapid. It is interesting to note here that on March 16, 1973, when the NBE enunciated the policy of developing a bilingual nation able to communicate in Pilipino as well as in English, the 'program' or schedule of implementation by the schools was also announced. The same order reiterated the 1957 Revised Educational Program to the effect that 'the vernacular of the locality shall remain the medium of instruction in Grades I and II with English and Pilipino as subjects. English shall be the medium of instruction starting Grade III. Pilipino shall be taught as a subject in order to develop the ability to speak, read, and write in this language'.

In a little more than a year, the National Board of Education (NBE) abolished the use of the vernacular as a medium of
instruction in Grades 1 and 2 when it announced the new guidelines for a full bilingual education program on June 19, 1974. Neither the NBE nor the DEC explained the reason for this abandonment of the vernaculars. To the writer's knowledge, no serious complaint was made about the change of policy.

The order in 1973, however, contained a provision which was to trigger a chain of events that was to lead to the 1974 decision. I quote the provision in full:

The use of Pilipino as medium of instruction from Grade III up in the certain subjects where learning may be facilitated by the use of the said language, may be allowed provided the following conditions are met: (1) the teacher has the competence to teach in Pilipino; (2) there are adequate teaching materials; and (3) there is readiness on the part of the pupils to learn in Pilipino.

The foregoing requirements set Director Ponciano Pineda of the INL into action. He wrote the Secretary of Education that the same set of requirements be applied to English and not discriminate against Pilipino by demanding that the three conditions be required only for Pilipino. In response, Secretary of Education and Culture Juan L. Manuel (who is also Chairman of the NBE) instructed Director Pineda to submit guidelines and a program on the use of Pilipino and English as media of instruction in the schools. Director Pineda hurriedly called upon a number of persons interested in language in the schools to formulate a program.

Secretary Manuel referred the Pineda proposal to Dr. Liceria Brillantes-Soriano, then Director of Public Schools, for comment. Director Soriano informed Secretary Manuel that the Pineda proposal was unworkable. Dr. Manuel then gave instructions for Dr. Soriano to form a study committee to submit a workable program. The committee, of which I had the privilege of being a member, became known as the Soriano Committee. It was the work of this committee and a subcommittee called Survey Committee on Bilingual Education (SCOBE) that became the basis of the present bilingual education program.

Why were the recommendations of the Soriano Committee accepted while those of the Pineda Committee were rejected? The answer to this question may be inferred from a description of the differences between, and the bases of, the two plans.

The Pineda proposal recommended immediate use of Pilipino in all subjects except science and mathematics (which are to be taught in English) in the primary and secondary schools in non-Tagalog provinces. In Tagalog provinces and in schools in some non-Tagalog provinces where the use of Pilipino as a language of instruction was under way, Pilipino was to be the main language of instruction in all subjects, with English taught as a subject. The objective was to displace English as the language of instruction as rapidly as possible.
The Soriano Committee, on the other hand, advocated: (1) the use of the vernaculars in the first two grades as the main medium of instruction, with Pilipino and English taught as subjects (but this was rejected by the NBE, and the vernacular was made the auxiliary medium of instruction, as mentioned earlier); (2) the use of Pilipino as the language of instruction from grade 3 through secondary schools in social studies/social science, character education, work education, health education, and physical education. English is to remain as the medium of instruction in all other courses, mainly science and mathematics. The Soriano proposal also recommended a schedule of implementation, the most important aspect of which is the designation of four years from 1974-75 to 1977-78 as a transition period or period of preparation for schools, especially in non-Tagalog speaking areas, that could not shift to the use of Pilipino in the subjects to be taught in Pilipino. The committee also recommended that tertiary level institutions (colleges and universities) develop their own implementation plans, provided that by 1984 their graduates can pass examinations for the practice of their professions in Pilipino and/or English. The Soriano Committee clearly recommended a bilingual education program in Pilipino and English, while the Pineda proposal clearly advocated the eventual replacement of English.

The National Board of Education decided to have a bilingual education program with the use of Pilipino and English as media of instruction, beginning in Grade 1 in all schools. It decided that the 'use of the vernacular shall be resorted to only when necessary to facilitate understanding of the concepts being taught through the prescribed medium for the subject, English, Pilipino, or Arabic as the case may be' (DEC Order No. 25, s. 1974). The decision of the NBE for bilingual education in Pilipino and English from Grade 1 through college is based substantially on the findings and recommendations of three surveys/studies, namely, those reported in Otanes and Sibayan (1969), PCSPE (1970), and Gonzales and Postrado (1974).

The bilingual education program (Stage 5) and the theory of the big push. The decision by the NBE and the DEC to put the entire school system from primary to university level on a bilingual education program was a big contrast to the bit-by-bit program formerly advocated by the Institute of National Language and the National Language Section of the Department of Education. The approved program approximates the theory of the big push in economics, which in brief is as follows:

There is a minimum level of resources that must be devoted to ... a development program if it is to have a chance of success. Launching a country into self-sustaining growth is a little like getting an airplane off the ground. There is a critical ground speed which must be passed before
the craft can be airborne ... Proceeding 'bit by bit' will not add up in its effects to the sum total of the single bits. A minimum quantum of investment is a necessary, though not sufficient, condition of success (Rosenstein-Rodan 1951; cf. Paulston 1977).

The implementation of Stage 5 (1974-1984), therefore, can be best seen within the framework of the big push theory.

The big push theory as applied to BE in the Philippines is connected with the Reforms on Basic Education launched by the Philippine Government in 1972 with the issuance of the Educational Development Decree of 1972, authorizing the undertaking of Educational Development Projects 'providing for the mechanics of implementation and financing thereof, and for other purposes' (Presidential Decree 6-A, September 29, 1972). PD 6-A established the Educational Development Projects Implementing Task Force (EDPITAF), which has for its main functions: (1) to supervise and implement foreign assisted projects, and (2) to implement such other projects as may be assigned to it by the Secretary of Education and Culture.

Because the main work on BE as a part of the basic education reform is directed by EDPITAF, the emphasis in the discussion that follows concerns the strategies and programs on BE as a part of the reform on basic education. Basic education refers to the primary and secondary education levels of the formal education ladder. In the Philippines, this is six years in the elementary school and four years in the high school (Philippines 1977b:2).

Major strategy and structure. Even before the announcement of the BE program in 1974, the mechanics for implementing educational reforms had already been planned—perhaps roughly, but with a view to being refined as the work progressed. The reforms in basic education aim at improving the quality of education at the elementary and secondary levels through the upgrading of the basic elements of the curriculum, i.e. teachers, instructional materials, equipment and physical facilities, and establishing an organized and coordinated mechanism for continuous curricular development and textbook production (Philippines 1976b:2).

Mechanism. One of the objectives of the new educational program, especially with the decentralization of the educational system, is the integration of the public and private schools. The country is divided into 13 regions, each headed by a regional director. The regional director is in turn supported by a staff of assistants for higher, secondary, and elementary education, who cover both the public and private schools in their area. In the past, there was one director based in Manila
directing the entire public school system and another director 'supervising' the private schools.

One of the objectives of EDPITAF is to assist in this integration of public and private schools through the Textbook Development Programs (TDP).

The TDP is one of the most ambitious and most encompassing programs ever attempted in Philippine education. As is the experience in most developing (Third World) countries, education is confronted with the twin problems of lack of instructional materials and lack of trained teachers.

The overall purpose of the TDP is to develop the institutional capacity for the continuous development and supply of relevant instructional materials in the country. This involves three aspects: (a) the establishment or strengthening of local institutions to develop the materials, (b) the production and distribution of 60 million textbooks under a five-year program, and (c) the training and retraining of teachers in the use of the new books. On the production of textbooks, the long-range goal is to produce 105 textbooks and 91 teachers' manuals, or 196 titles in all, from 1977 to 1984.

In terms of institutional development, technical assistance, equipment, and facilities will be provided: (a) to expand the functions of the Textbook Board for the management of textbook development at all stages; (b) to establish or strengthen five curriculum development centers (CDC) which will develop curricula and write, test, and revise textbooks in five elementary and five secondary school subjects; (c) to establish 14 regional staff development centers (RSDC) and 34 development high schools (DHS) as a network for testing books and for training about 300,000 teachers in the use of new textbooks; (d) to establish a distribution system consisting of one national and 149 provincial and subprovincial warehouses for facilitating the transport of books from printers to schools.

The Textbook Board. As a part of the big push in bilingual education, the provisions for the selection and adoption of textbooks had to be revised (P.D. 687, Republic of the Philippines, 1975). There are two important provisions of the new textbook law worth noting, one on nationalism and the other on the automatic adoption of textbooks written by the Curriculum Development Centers.

The Textbook Board's function also involved pricing and distribution of suitable textbooks; contracting for curricula development; manuscript writing, testing, and revision; teacher training; paper procurement and printing contracts. Most of these functions have been delegated to other agencies, as will be explained further on.

Curriculum development/manuscript writing. Under the project, the textbook production cycle allocates one year for planning and writing, another year for try-out, and a third year for mass
printing and distribution to schools. Although private publishers are not inhibited from participating, the bulk of the manuscript preparation work is done by five designated curriculum development centers. These centers are to be housed in permanent buildings being constructed at this writing. (The building for the Language Study Center at the Philippine Normal College Campus in Manila will be ready for occupancy in July, 1978.)

Subject area: 
Science and mathematics
Social studies
Language (Pilipino and English)
Practical arts (Industrial and business arts)
Practical arts (Agriculture, fishery, and homemaking arts)

Designated center: 
Science Education Center 
University of the Philippines
Social Studies Center 
Department of Education and Culture
Language Study Center 
Philippine Normal College
Practical Arts Center 
Philippine College of Arts and Trades
Rural Studies Center 
Central Luzon State University

At the request of the Textbook Board, the Centers: (a) develop curricula, (b) write manuscripts, (c) test and revise prototype books, and (d) train teachers in the use of books. The Practical Arts and Rural Studies Centers are developing experimental instructional materials. The Social Studies Center, U.P. Science Education Center, and Language Study Center, on the other hand, are expected to produce 59 textbooks and 50 teachers' manuals between 1976 and 1980. The Secretariat provides professional editorial, art, design, and typesetting services to the centers.

Testing. The second year of the textbook development cycle would be devoted to the testing of 3,000 prototype textbooks in representative classrooms. Testing would be conducted during a full school year in one classroom in a minimum of 40 representative schools. The purpose of the testing program would be to afford a reasonable opportunity to revise and improve the textbooks before full-scale production. Testing may actually result in the development of two or more versions of a textbook, each version suitable for pupils of different backgrounds.

Teacher training. A massive teacher training and retraining program, involving more than 300,000 teachers, is underway. This is done through the five CDCs, 14 Regional Staff Development Centers (RSDC), and 34 Development High Schools (DHSs), which have been selected for their geographic spread and their quality. There are also 56 elementary schools, known as
Decentralized Resource Centers (DRCs), for echo seminar training sites. This network of schools is also used for testing the manuscripts. The staffs of the Bureau of Elementary Education and Secondary Education of the DEC assist in these retraining programs.

There are two types of training programs: an integrated four-level mass orientation program and an integrated three-level mass training program. The four-level program is:

A. Level 1, participated in by:
   1. school division superintendents
   2. regional supervisors
   3. RSDC directors
   4. RSDC program coordinators

B. Level 2, by:
   1. school division superintendents
   2. assistant school superintendents
   3. division supervisors

C. Level 3, by:
   1. district supervisors
   2. school principals
   3. assistant school principals
   4. head teachers, and

D. Level 4, all classroom teachers

The three-level program is:

A. Level 1, participated in by:
   1. Summer Institute trainers
   2. Regional and RSDC staff who will conduct level 3 training at regional level

B. Level 2, by:
   1. all Decentralized Learning Resource Centers (DLRCs)
   2. Divisions Office Staff who will conduct level 3 training at division level

C. Level 3
   all public (elementary/secondary) school teachers

Textbook manufacture and distribution. One of the more difficult aspects of the project is the printing and distribution of books. The Textbook Board Secretariat takes charge of this activity. The manufacturing unit is responsible for purchase of papers, awards for contracts for printing and binding, and distribution of the books from the printers to the schools. Table 3 shows the five-year program.

The goal of the government is to have one book per subject for every two pupils in each public school at each grade level, a ratio of 1 to 2. The present ratio is 1 to 10. Books will be loaned to students free of charge in the public schools. Private schools, however, may purchase the books at cost.
Table 3. Five-year program for supply of textbooks to primary and secondary schools (in thousands of books).
(from: Philippines 1977b:10)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Primary school</th>
<th>Secondary school</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1977-78</td>
<td>9,062</td>
<td>447</td>
<td>9,509</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978-79</td>
<td>11,092</td>
<td>952</td>
<td>12,044</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1979-80</td>
<td>7,668</td>
<td>865</td>
<td>8,533</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980-81</td>
<td>12,015</td>
<td>1,639</td>
<td>13,654</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981-82</td>
<td>13,870</td>
<td>1,503</td>
<td>15,373</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>53,707</strong></td>
<td><strong>5,408</strong></td>
<td><strong>59,113</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The distribution system consists of a central textbook warehouse at the University of the Philippines campus and a network of provincial and subprovincial warehouses.

A statement must be made regarding the training of teachers and supervisors in both Pilipino and English. While the academic training of teachers and supervisors started with those in teaching English as a second language in the early fifties, the training of teachers and supervisors in Pilipino started in the late fifties. By the late fifties, the Philippine Normal College and University of the Philippines Institute for Language Teaching were training teachers and supervisors, some in English and some in Pilipino. The Department of Education has been sending to the two institutions scholars from the school system, in groups of 15 to 20 in English and the same number in Pilipino, every year up to the present. These academically trained teachers and supervisors became the leaders in their own communities. The great majority of supervisors of the public schools in the Philippines were practically trained in these two institutions. It was not therefore difficult for the bilingual education program to have leaders to train the classroom teachers and even higher level personnel. A word must be said here, too, about the Language Center of the Ateneo de Manila University, where many private school teachers and supervisors are trained. The Language Study Center of the Philippine Normal College and the Ateneo de Manila University formed a consortium for a doctorate in Linguistics in 1971, and recently, with the addition of De La Salle University, a new consortium was established for an advanced degree program for bilingual education.

Evaluation. Evaluation of the textbook component would include data on the actual number of books printed and delivered to schools, as well as an analysis of the results of the program of testing prototypes. Moreover, it would include a program to measure the incremental change in learning achievement which results from the provision of the textbooks.

The project schedule is graphically shown in Table 4.
A massive program such as that just described necessarily requires heavy financing, and for this the Philippine government had to negotiate loan agreements with the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development (IBRD).

Tables 5 and 6 present the cost by purpose and the summary of financial needs.

Table 5. Summary of estimated project costs by purposes (in thousands of U.S. dollars).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Textbook development</td>
<td>$10,297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Teacher training</td>
<td>5,971</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Textbook manufacture, storage, and distribution</td>
<td>18,991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Management information system</td>
<td>242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Mass media pre-investment study</td>
<td>348</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Contingencies</td>
<td>15,748</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$51,597</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6. Summary of funding (in thousands of U.S. dollars).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Philippine Government appropriation</td>
<td>$26,383</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IBRD (World Bank) loan</td>
<td>25,215</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$51,597</strong></td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Concluding statements. It is difficult to draw the line that divides strategy from structure. With regard to strategy, it can be said that bilingual education has been carried out, ranging from the silent or nonformal variety to the formal variety. The strategies for achieving this have been piecemeal in a sense, with individuals and small groups trying to assert the right of the
Filipino to use his Philippine languages for the education of his people. This later became national in scope with the drawing up of the Philippine Constitution in 1935. The program for carrying this out, however, was still piecemeal, with the vernaculars being used first as an auxiliary medium of instruction, then as the medium of instruction in the first two years of the child’s education, but later being abandoned; the teaching of Pilipino as a subject in schools, and finally its use, beginning in 1974, as a language of instruction. The formal bilingual education program which recognized the value of Pilipino and English took the better part of 35 years in development. Considering the somewhat pessimistic view taken by those who evaluated the school system in 1925 (Monroe 1925), 35 years is not very long.

In conclusion, allow me to say that the Philippine version of bilingual education is for everyone—the rich and the poor. As President Marcos so aptly put it:

National pride requires a national language for the transmission of learning, yet no Filipino educator dares today to attempt a monolingual policy to use only Pilipino as our language of instruction. The fact is that beyond achieving a nationalistic dream, such a course would seriously impair immediately the acquisition of learning in our society (Marcos 1977:5).

Through bilingual education we have partially succeeded in satisfying our ethnic identities, transcending the parochialities of the ethnic to join the mainstream of national life through Pilipino, and the international community through a language of wider communication—English. It is our hope that through a fully developed bilingual education program, where Pilipino and English are used in separate subjects, we will fully achieve the goal of having a people competent to communicate in both languages.
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1. The National Board of Education is the policy determining body regarding educational matters. Its decisions which are announced officially through the Department of Education and Culture are set within other governmental policies. Many of
these policies are outlined by the National Economic and Development Authority (NEDA).

2. I discussed the implementation of language policy in the Philippines in a previous paper (Sibayan 1967:126-189). In that paper, however, I discussed more than just the implementation of language policy from 1899-1966. I gave a historical sketch of language laws in the Philippines and analyzed how language policy was implemented especially by the Department of Education from 1957-1966. I suggested how language policy may be properly implemented, for example, through (1) research-based preparation of materials, texts, tests, language studies, etc.; (2) teacher and administrator preparation and education; (3) development of methodology and techniques, with provision for evaluation; (4) public information; and (5) financing. I emphasized the importance of proceeding slowly in putting official decision into effect. I realize now (more than a decade later) after having been exposed more to the complex interactions of decision-making groups and individuals and having learned more about hopes and aspirations intermingled with ideas of nationalism and internationalism that there are certain forces that impel many decision makers to act quickly. These actions are often viewed (at the moment of decision and even later in retrospect) as 'rash' or 'unplanned'. I now find that the explanation for these things becomes more reasonable. Gunnar Myrdal gives a good explanation for these seemingly hasty actions in his classic work Asian Drama (p. 82): 'The European countries also experienced difficulties and controversies in developing and standardizing a national language. The only difference is that the South Asian countries cannot afford a process that takes centuries; they need much quicker results'.

3. During this period of formal monolingual education in English, there were advocates of the use of the local languages as medium of instruction in the schools. In 1907 a bill was passed in the Philippine Assembly but was disapproved by the American-dominated Philippine Commission. The best arguments for the use of the local languages were given by Saleeby, an American who wrote:

The chief argument put forth in defense of the present policy (i.e. the sole use of English as a language of instruction) is the better fitness of English to foster democratic ideals and to help the cultural development of the Filipinos along American lines of self-government. This argument is obviously fallacious. No language that fails to touch the masses is fit for a democratic organization. The public cannot be served adequately by a language they cannot understand or use ... The interest and welfare of the community require the publication, development and distribution of competent literature in its own dialect (Saleeby 1924:28).

Later, in 1931, Cecilio Lopez, dean of Filipino linguists and first secretary of the Institute of National Language (INL), said
almost the same thing, this time more clearly (Cecilio Lopez 1931: 18):

Of what use is English to a Filipino child from his seventh to eleventh year, the lapse of time, let us say, spent in the primary classes? Or, after finishing the intermediate studies when as a young boy he must stay at home and help his parents in their one-thousand-and-one daily tasks or probably go somewhere in the Islands to earn his daily bread? ... It must not be understood that I disapprove the study of English entirely. But if the later language must be taught from the very first year, best results can only be obtained by teaching it side by side with the Filipino child's mother-tongue, for, above all, a foreign language is only best learned by analogical formations and associations with the language of which the learner is already in command.

Lopez concludes his chapter on 'The Filipino Child and the English language':

... regarding the English language, the highest honor, I believe, that it can aspire to in the Philippines is that of a 'secondary language' for the intercourse of the Filipinos with the outside world, but not as the 'national language' (p. 19).

4. When the Department of Education ordered the use of the vernacular of the locality as a medium of instruction in grades 1 and 2, starting in the school year 1957-1958, many private schools, especially the so-called 'exclusive' schools, did not follow the order. They continued to use English as the main medium of instruction. Filipino, however, was taught as a subject in these schools. It is interesting and perhaps instructive to go into the reasons for this seeming 'disregard' for a Department of Education Order. According to Dr. Narciso Albarracin, a lawyer who was Director of Private Schools at the time, the reason this was allowed by the Bureau of Private Schools is that parents had the right to have their children educated in a manner they thought best for their children, provided it was not against the fundamental laws of the state. The two main reasons for vernacular education then were: one positively stated, that the child learned more quickly and easily, and acquired more content (subject matter) in his vernacular than in English (cf. UNESCO 1953 and Bull in Hymes 1964:527-533); and the other reason, negatively stated, is that because the great majority of children (more than 50%) drop out after grade 4, the child has more use for his vernacular and is likely to retain his literacy in it much more than if he were taught in English. In a sense, therefore, vernacular education was a program for the poor. This orientation had a bad effect, as it turned out. Those who believed
their children did not have to drop out did not feel any need for vernacular education. This may be one of the reasons why, when the National Board of Education dropped the vernaculars as the main medium of instruction and made it only an auxiliary medium, there was practically no opposition.

5. Silliman (1977) claims that the majority of her subjects (115 persons from the political, educational, and mass media elite) in Central Philippines did not have this opportunity.

6. The Committee, constituted by Dr. Soriano, was designated as the 'Committee to Prepare Guidelines for the Implementation of the NBE Policy in the Use of Pilipino and English as Media of Instruction'. The membership was: Dr. Liceria Brillantes Soriano (Director of Public Schools), Bonifacio P. Sibayan (President, Philippine Normal College), Andrew B. Gonzales (Academic Vice-President, De La Salle University), Fe T. Otanes (Director, Language Study Center, Philippine Normal College), Genoveve E. Matute (Chairman, Department of Pilipino, Philippine Normal College), Adela Adarna and Beatrice Low (Supervisors, Manila City Schools), Catalina V. Ty, Fermina G. Gatal, Dolores T. Dungo, Ester Tuy, Lorenza Abellera, Melba Tugade, and Fe R. Dacanay (Supervisors of the Department of Education and Culture), and Rufino Alejandro, formerly of the Institute of National Language. The SCOBE was composed of Andrew Gonzales, Chairman; Fe Otanes, Vice-Chairman; Fe Dacanay, Secretary; and Esperanza Gonzales and Ester Tuy, members. For the report of the committee, see Gonzales and Postrado (1974).

7. I asked Secretary Manuel why the NBE decided to discontinue the use of the vernacular as medium of instruction in grades 1 and 2. He said that it was the consensus of the NBE that Pilipino could be learned easily by the children as it was a Philippine language, that it was difficult for the government to produce materials in too many vernaculars, and that it was the experience of Filipinos that anyone who learned to read and write in English could become literate in his own language.

8. A word must be said here on Spanish and Arabic (cf. Sibayan 1974:229-230 for Spanish and 248 for Arabic). I have information to the effect that Spanish is retained in the curriculum because of international political reasons. In fact, the 1973 Constitution eliminated Spanish as an official language but a Presidential Decree was issued in March, 1973, recognizing it as an official language because many of the important government documents especially in law are available only in Spanish (P.D. 555 s. 1973. See also Yabes 1973). With regard to Arabic, it is mentioned in the Department Order in the definition of bilingual education that Arabic shall be used in the areas where it is necessary. One notes here that Arabic is not to displace either Pilipino or English. The areas where it is necessary are the Muslim populated areas in Southern Philippines.

9. The findings of the SCOBE were summarized in a typewritten manuscript and reported orally to the Board by Andrew Gonzales. The summary of recommendations for the guidelines, based on the
SCOBE and on the 1969 Survey reports, were prepared by
Bonifacio P. Sibayan, Fe T. Otanes, and Nelia Casambre, and
reported by Dr. Liceria B. Soriano to the NBE.

10. The provision on nationalism in the new textbook decree
states:

The [Textbook] Board shall, as a matter of policy encour-
age the writing of textbooks for Philippine Schools by Fili-
pino authors using such Philippine sources of subject
material as will develop in pupils and students a deeper
sense of nationalism, respect for Philippine institutions
and appreciation of our cultural heritage (P.D. 687, Sec. 9).

11. The Publishers Association of the Philippines protested
that the law violated the principle of free enterprise and that it
would kill the still growing printing and publishing industry in
the Philippines. Another requirement objected to by the Associ-
ation was the requirement that before any book is adopted as a
textbook it should undergo extensive testing in the schools and
appropriate revisions be made. The members of the Association
claimed that this requirement would entail too much expense and
if the book submitted was not adopted by the Textbook Board,
they would lose their investment.

12. The University of the Philippines Science Education
Center and the Language Study Center of the Philippine Normal
College were supported in the beginning by grants from the Ford
Foundation. Both centers are now entirely supported by the
Philippine Government.

13. We have also managed to take advantage of a very usable
past with regard to language, through the continued recognition
of Spanish as an official language. With the recognition of
Arabic for use especially in Muslim areas we have tried to take
care of the needs of an important group of Filipinos, the Muslims.
This makes it perhaps more appropriate to say that we have a
multilingual education program.
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Abstract. This paper seeks to present a model for bilingual education in Africa. Resting on the hypothesis that education aims at certain expected final sociopolitical outcomes, it suggests that there are three principal models of bilingual education today, namely, the Unity in Diversity Model, the Diversity in Unity Model, and the Unification in Diversity Model. Having suggested that the most appropriate model for Africa is the Unity in Diversity Model, it goes on to give some details of such a theory.

In presenting the theory, the paper begins by examining the three principal goals of such a theory: the identification of the African bilingual situation, the specification of the model that best suits the African situation, and the specification of the means of achieving or establishing the model. Finally, it suggests an analysis of the various elements to be handled within the specification of the theory: the learner, the language situation, the goal of bilingual education, and the process of bilingual education. In passing, the paper reasserts the view that an adequate policy of bilingual education in Africa must recognize that the most effective medium of pre-primary and primary education is the African child's mother tongue. The paper also expresses, in passing, the view that an adequate theory of bilingual education is an interdisciplinary affair grounded in both linguistics and education.

Introduction. Three operative phrases in the topic of this paper deserve some preliminary clarification. These are: 'an adequate theory', 'bilingual education', and 'Africa'.

What is an adequate theory? Chomsky (1965:30-37) has popularized not only the notion of a theory as a model but also three
domains for testing the adequacy of a theory: observation, description, and explanation. For the purpose of this essay, and as has been argued by Chomsky himself in respect of linguistic theories, for a theory to be adequate it must cover all observed data, provide an explicit description of the observed data, and suggest some explanation of the facts in respect of the data.

Different things can be meant by the phrase 'bilingual education'. Indeed, each of the two words making up the phrase, or the total phrase itself, often suggests different concepts. For Macnamara, for example, bilinguals are 'persons who possess at least one of the language skills even to a minimal degree in their second language' (Macnamara 1967:59-60). In contrast, Cohen (1975:8) sees a bilingual 'as a person who possesses at least some ability in one language skill or any variety from each of the two languages'. Yet Fishman (1971:560) would insist that a bilingual must be diglossic, using one language more in certain domains and the other language more in other domains. Similarly, it is generally known that education would be conceived as being nonformal, informal, or formal, rural, vocational, or special, child, adult or lifelong, primary, secondary, or tertiary, scientific, artistic, or industrial, etc. (see, for example, Faure et al. 1972).

Not surprisingly, then, bilingual education can be seen in the existing literature as a concept with a universal application or with different characteristics in different communities. Thus, speaking clearly of bilingual education as a universal concept, Cohen declares (1975:18):

'Bilingual education' is the use of two languages as media of instruction for a child or group of children in part or all of the school curriculum. Bilingual education may be one-way. In two-way bilingual education, the children in each ethnic and linguistic group learn curricula through their own language and through a second language. All curricula may be taught in both languages to both groups, or perhaps just certain subject matter (such as social studies). However, bilingual education usually implies that more than just language is being taught in the second language. In two-way bilingual education, the different native language groups may be kept segregated (sometimes just for the first two or three years of primary school). In one-way bilingual schooling, only one group learns bilingually.

In comparison, one may refer to Fishman's notion (1970:48) of bilingual education as a means of 'safeguarding and augmenting the cultural and linguistic resources' of a country. However, by the time one gets to Fishman's statement in the same paper (1970:51) to the effect that interests in bilingual education per se may be 'whether as a way to language maintenance, to cultural pluralism, to overcoming the educational retardation of
many non-English speaking learners, or as part of the educational right of every family to self-respect and cultural integrity', one is prepared for Fishman's closing remarks (1970:58) that clearly show that bilingual education cannot have a universal application in 'a world which is highly uneven in terms of development and highly variegated in terms of the stages and types of social problems being experienced'. Thus, one is not surprised when Fishman sees bilingual education as 'a genuine expression of America's sociocultural and educational maturity (rather than merely a sop to the "poor Chicanos", so that they don't become too nasty)', and not 'a mere euphemism for programs in English as a Second Language which, though unquestionably essential, constitute only a part and kind of dual language education' (Fishman 1970:52-53).

Thus, too, Cohen, commenting on the 1970 publication of Lambert and others (Lambert et al. 1970:276), remarks that the admonition expressed by the authors suggests that these findings apply to comparable sociopolitical situations where the languages in question share the same relative degree of prestige. In summary, then, bilingual education must be rightly seen as a universal concept that must also have different adequate models appropriate for different parts of the world. This is perhaps an inescapable conclusion from the fact that, as linguists will see it, 'bilingual education' is a noun phrase, an endocentric construction with 'education' as its head; and then, as a philosopher of education will say, education primarily aims at serving individual societal needs.

This brings me to what I refer to as Africa in this paper. Obviously, Africa is one of the world's continents. However, I do not intend to refer to the entire continent; rather I mean black Africa, that is, Africa south of the Sahara and north of the Limpopo, which could be conceived as constituting a sociocultural block with certain common educational and sociolinguistic features differentiating it from the rest of the continent at its extreme north and south, in particular.

What, then, is the necessity for an adequate theory of bilingual education for Africa? Apart from the general need for an academic justification of such a theory in respect of any community, Africa deserves special attention. The preponderance of national efforts in Africa is on education, which is generally accepted as an all-conquering investment and insurance against poverty, disease, ignorance, and even political disunity and backwardness (Resolutions...1968). Consequently, African countries spend a disproportionate percentage of their national resources (between 30 and 50%) on education.

The current happenings in the Federation of Nigeria are typical of black Africa, although to varying degrees according to population and overall wealth and development. In 1976 alone, the new oil wealth of the country was used to launch a nationwide Universal Primary Education, with an initial enrollment of over three million children (several times the enrollment
in the previous year); to expand and make cheaper secondary education by building several new schools and pegging fees at less than half of the average paid the previous year; to increase the nation's universities from six to 13; and not only to make university education free, but also to subsidize heavily the boarding and lodging of university students. Indeed, less than two years after those developments, the total expenditure on education has become so high for the nation's prevailing economy that a new economic order has been imposed, whereby Universal Primary Education would be borne by all governments (federal, state, and local), secondary school fees would be increased, and boarding and lodging of students would no longer be subsidized heavily, if at all.

Although education could be nonformal, informal, and formal, it is generally known that the huge expenditure on education in black Africa is generally on the formal aspects. Certainly, technological advancement is one of the basic goals of such formal education in Africa. And as Fishman has rightly noted (1968:46):

Technology is basically monethnic and uniformizing throughout the world. It leads linguistically to but one, two or three world technology languages and to essentially similar lifestyles regardless of language.

In consequence, formal education has generally been given to African children partially in their mother tongues, but mainly in one or two of the 'world "technology" languages'. For example, the recently decreed National Policy on Education (Federal Ministry ... 1977:8) has the following language provisions for primary education:

Government will see to it that the medium of instruction in the primary school is initially the mother tongue or the language of the immediate community and, at a later stage, English.

Of course, the only language of secondary and tertiary education is English. Pre-primary education which has a different language provision is not within the public system.

Unfortunately, such educational policies are not usually planned and implemented adequately, and therefore poor education generally results. The students can efficiently recite memorized facts but cannot apply them to everyday living. For instance, they cannot see how a knowledge of areas and volumes of cuboids or cylinders or cones is relevant outside the mathematics class. After all, the area of a circle, for example, means nothing more than \( \pi r^2 \), that is, 3.1416 or 22/7 times radius. What is the meaning of 3.1416 and what is its relevance? The present writer can recall an experience in Standard Five of his primary education. After the teacher had taught
a geography lesson on the rotation of the earth, the present writer, as a young inquisitive boy, asked:

Does rotate mean 'to move round'? Have you been talking about this earth on which we stand? Then if it is true that the earth moves round, why is it that we go westwards all the year round to the next village to collect our mail?

Sharply came the teacher's rebuking and equally revealing answers in this vein:

You are always asking questions. Look, here is Dudley Stamp's Geography. Examine the page and tell the class if I am right or wrong. Of course, 'rotate' means 'to move round'. Of course, it is this earth on which we are. Why do we always go westwards to the next village to collect our mails? Ask the whitemen. Ask Dudley Stamp. That's the lie they tell and call geography. Write it down correctly and you will score 100% in the next Primary School Leaving Certificate Examination. If you write another thing, if you write what you know about your village and the next, you will fail and you will not go further.

What a poor quality of education! Yet that poor primary education is terminal for most African children. Besides, the quality of secondary and tertiary education for the few who have it is to be questioned. In order to have, therefore, what the present writer has christened as 'education with greater surrender value', be it at the primary, secondary, or tertiary levels, in order to have value for the colossal amount spent on education, it is imperative to have an adequate theory of bilingual education for Africa.

This paper, however, does not seek, let alone pretend, to present a full-scale theory of bilingual education for Africa. It only attempts to make some suggestions about such a theory, and if the suggestions can be seen to have made some useful contributions towards the development of such a theory, then the purpose of the paper must have been richly served.

Three models of bilingual education (with their variants) today. Earlier in the introduction, it was suggested that bilingual education should be best conceived as a universal concept with different manifestations all over the world, and therefore deserving different adequate models appropriate for the various parts of the world. This suggestion touches upon the concept of bilingual education and deserves further discussion here.

Writing on the topic 'Bilingual education: The foreign experience', Cohen says the following in his opening paragraph (1975: 21-22):
In foreign nations, children have often received their schooling in several languages, sometimes not including their own mother tongue (see Anderson and Boyer 1970). Frequently, the children emerge from these programs bilingual. For the most part, however, the programs are not examples of 'bilingual education' in the way the term was defined above [see the definition attributed to Cohen earlier in this paper], since the students receive the content subjects in only one language. They are not actually being taught bilingually. In some cases, the students are taught in their mother tongue. In other cases, the students are taught in a second or third language, while their mother tongue may be taught as a subject. In the few instances where researchers have described and evaluated such programs, it is usually because the language selected for instructional purposes runs counter to what would be expected. For instance, the mother tongue is used as the language of instruction in an area where another, dominant language, is generally used in school. Or students are taught in a second language in an area where their own mother tongue is used for teaching most or all such students.

This statement of Cohen is quoted because, in the opinion of the present writer, it validly illustrates the need for a wider notion of bilingual education than is usually accepted, a notion that has one foot very firmly in linguistics, and the other in education. Three aspects of the quotation have led to this observation. First, it asserts that students receive bilingual education only when they are 'actually being taught bilingually' through receiving the content subjects in the two languages. Secondly, it says that such programmes have been reported as instances of bilingual education simply because of the unusual lack of correspondence between the language of the community and that of the school. Thirdly, as is more clearly shown subsequently in the spread of the programmes listed, the statement does not cover Africa, since Africa is not represented by any of the reported programmes.

It seems indisputable that the narrow meaning given to 'bilingual education' by Cohen is too partial to have universal application. It would seem that there are two defects in his notion. It not only interprets 'education' inadequately, but also imposes an unnecessary restriction on its process medium-wise. In a way each of the two defects is attached to one of the two words comprising the term 'bilingual education'. Cohen seems to have taken the view that education is only formal or that only formal education has 'content subjects', and that such formal education can be divorced from nonformal or informal education in the recipient and then be put absolutely in watertight compartments. I believe that all forms of education have 'content subjects'; that education is received formally (for example, at school), informally (for example, in clubs), and
nonformally (for example, at home); that, in fact, formal education constitutes only a very small percentage of the total education of an individual; that once a person receives education—whether formally, informally, or nonformally—the entire thing remains within him as a unit; and that the contents of the various forms of education may greatly overlap.

Thus, just learning a second language may imply a great deal of re-learning a second time the same contents already covered nonformally through the mother tongue. Therefore, bilingual education does not need to imply that more than just language is being taught in the second language, since that language has its sociocultural and cognitive content. On the other hand, the process of receiving formal or nonformal education, for example, does not need to be restricted in a bilingual educational process. Cohen himself has suggested (1975:20) that 'to have a bilingual program, ESL instruction must be accompanied by instruction in and through the first language of the students'. What is being suggested here, in addition, is that the 'instruction in and through the first language of the students' may also precede the ESL programme. The two programmes need not be simultaneous, although they could be. Similarly, the ESL programme part of bilingual education may mean just learning the second language as a subject, or it may mean using the second language as the medium of 'content subjects', or it may mean both. Thus the programmes which Cohen has regarded as being 'not examples of bilingual education' are bona fide examples, and children taught in them are 'actually being taught bilingually'. It is interesting to note that Cohen has said earlier on the same page quoted: 'A bilingual education program usually commences as a unilingual program of instruction in the vernacular of the students'.

Finally, Cohen's suggestion concerning the reason for describing and evaluating the various programmes may be accurate. However, it does not seem to follow that the same reason makes them qualify for the label 'bilingual education'. In fact, it is illogical to regard them as such for the reason given. All of them are examples of bilingual education because the learners involved receive their education in and through two languages. Besides, the programmes do not exhaust all possible examples and if they are to be disqualified because of the lack of correspondence of the language of the school and the language of the community, how about other foreign programmes such as those in black Africa that do not show the same lack of correspondence between the two languages involved? Formal education programmes in black Africa are compulsorily bilingual and they do not demonstrate the same lack of correspondence between a dominant school language and a dominant community language.

The foregoing paragraphs, which discuss Cohen's statement on the foreign experience in bilingual education, seem to have led us firmly to the conclusion that bilingual education can take different forms in different parts of the world and that
different models may be adequate for the different forms. This is to be expected. Every educational programme aims at certain expected final sociopolitical outcomes and, as Fishman has rightly noted (1970:53):

Both the logic and psychology of bilingual education are leading in the same direction of more genuine concern with bilingual curricula for various models and ideals of societal bilingualism.

The crucial question to ask, then, is which 'various models and ideals of societal bilingualism' can account for the universal phenomenon of bilingual education in a world which, according to Fishman (1970:58), 'is highly uneven in terms of development and highly variegated in terms of the stages and types of social problems being experienced'. Fortunately, it would seem that a small number of principal models of bilingual education (together with their variants) can adequately account for the entire universal phenomenon. In fact, what this paper is suggesting is that three such principal models may be sufficient.

The number of models has been arrived at by the configuration of societal bilingual factors resulting from a consideration of anticipated sociopolitical outcomes of bilingual educational programmes the world over. Three parameters are suggested for the identification or specification of societal bilingual factors. These are: the language situation, the state of political development, and the level of educational modernisation.

It is assumed that every bilingual educational programme serves a national political community. Therefore, throughout this paper the national political community is taken as the basis for all our exploration and analysis.

Within the parameter of language situation, any national political community is examined for the pattern of language distribution and use. In that connection a community may be monolingual, bilingual, or multilingual. If monolingual, the language is usually the mother tongue of the members of the community. If bilingual, both languages may be the mother tongues of the two divisions of the community, or else, one may be a mother tongue and the other a second language in the community (a very rare occurrence for a full national political community, but very common in states or districts within a multilingual or even bilingual national political community). If multilingual, all of the languages may be mother tongues of groups of the citizenry of the community; or one may be a second language and the others, various mother tongues; or two may be second languages and the others, mother tongues (a very rare occurrence but at least exemplified in the Cameroon Republic); or more than two may be second languages and the others, mother tongues (a distinct possibility in Africa, but no real example of this is known to me).
As Nicholas Hans has observed (1947):

Educational reforms since the First World War are so intimately connected with politics, with problems of race, nationality, language and religious and social ideals that they cease to be of narrow professional significance and have become a matter of general interest as the main problem of democratic government.

This state of affairs regarding educational reforms necessitates the analysis of the nature of political development for each community, particularly since all national political communities can be located at different points on the possible 'successive stages of politico-geographical integration' (Fishman 1968:41ff.). Thus, within the parameter of political development, the axis of nationalism and nationism (both terms as used by Fishman 1968 and 1972) should be recognized for our analytical exploration. Generally, all monolingual political communities have developed both nationalism and nationism. Only a few bilingual political communities have developed both nationalism and nationism and there is always the tendency for nationalism to undermine nationism. Yet fewer multilingual communities have managed to develop either nationalism or nationism positively and effectively. Nationalism in such multilingual communities is always suspected as detestable 'tribalism' or 'parochialism', and nationism almost always exists as a mere visionary idealism.

The parameter of the level of educational modernisation brings us to the different kinds of population found in each national political community. Here, following other social analysts (for example, Lerner 1958), we recognize three major types of population: the traditional, the transitional, and the modern, categories which are

not only in terms of beliefs, attitudes and behavior related to broader and more authentic ethnicity but in terms of identification with non-locals, media participation literacy, and political participation more generally. (Fishman 1972:87)

After a consideration of the three parameters of language situation, political development, and educational modernisation, resting on the hypothesis that every educational (bilingual educational) programme must have specific anticipated sociopolitical outcomes, and believing that two essential universal ingredients of such outcomes are nationalism and nationism, we propose that these three models of bilingual education (including their variants) would adequately handle bilingual education for all national political communities: the Unity in Diversity, the Diversity in Unity, and the Unification in Diversity.

The Unity in Diversity Model of bilingual education is aimed at producing strong nationism through positive intermediate
nationalism for multilingual national political communities with traditional or transitional populations. The Diversity in Unity Model is aimed at sustaining and enriching the achieved nationalism through directed nationalism for multilingual national political communities with modern populations, each with a dominant language. This model has its leading variant in which the word 'diversity' can be replaced by 'diversification'. Within that variant, bilingual education is given largely with the purpose of enriching what is an established and acceptable form of monolingual education in a modern community. Finally, the Unification in Diversity Model seeks to regain and sustain strong nationalism in erstwhile virile, bilingual but sometimes multilingual, national political communities undergoing tension from a new upsurge of nationalism. Usually, such communities exist in contemporary populations. In short, in respect of nationalism and nationism the Unity in Diversity model creates, the Diversity in Unity enriches, and the Unification in Diversity model sustains.

As would be expected, there already exist examples of each of the three models of bilingual education, or at least examples of communities needing each model. The obvious examples of the first model are provided by the countries of Africa. America is the best example of the second and there you can find its two variants. The recommendation for replacement of the 'assimilationist "melting pot theory"' with the pluralistic (bilingual educational) 'salad bowl theory' (Warner and Stole 1945; Glazer and Moynihan 1963; and Gordon 1964), or the call for 'a genuine expression of America's sociocultural and educational maturity' (Fishman 1970) which may sometimes be regarded as, or mistaken for, a call for an educational programme for the poor (see the Bilingual Education Acts of 1968 and 1974) is illustrative of the main Diversity in Unity Model. Similarly, there is the call for bilingual education in America as a richer form of education not only 'for those who want it' (Fishman 1970:56) but also, indeed, for everybody, as a desirable enrichment and ennobling process. That constitutes the variant of the main model and is epitomized in the title of Publication 51 of May, 1975, of the United States Commission on Civil Rights Clearinghouse, A Better Chance to Learn: Bilingual-Bicultural Education. Finally, Canada provides the best example for the Unification in Diversity Model. Britain, with its recent upsurge of nationalism in Scotland and particularly in Wales, provides a European example of the need for the model in order to contain and positively utilize such growing nationalism through a bilingual education programme.

Certainly, the conditions for bilingual education vary for the three proposed models. Bilingual education is a necessity for Africa. It is inescapable as long as education is to serve the needs of each African national political community as an entity advancing progressively from the traditional stage to the modern. In contrast, bilingual education in America is not such a political necessity but is at best (as expressed in the words of
Fishman quoted earlier) 'a genuine expression of America's socio-cultural and educational maturity'. In further contrast, for Canada bilingual education is politically desirable, perhaps necessary.

The discussion in this section has been undertaken with the main aim of putting within a general theory of bilingual education the type of bilingual education that can be adequate for Africa. We may now turn to a more detailed consideration of the provisions of what is being suggested as an adequate theory of bilingual education for Africa, the Unity in Diversity Model.

A theory of bilingual education in Africa: The unity in diversity model. In this discussion attempts are made to present the provisions of a theory of bilingual education for Africa, not only for the sake of that model, but also as an illustration of what sorts of questions any other model of bilingual education should try to answer.

Objectives of the theory. There are three main objectives of the theory of bilingual education for Africa. First, it must identify the African bilingual situation. Second, it must specify the model that can best suit the situation. Third, it must specify the means of achieving or establishing the model successfully.

In identifying the African bilingual situation, four factors need to be considered. These are: the language situation, the nature of the learner, the goal of bilingual education, and the process of bilingual education.

In specifying the model that can best suit the African situation in respect of bilingual education, two kinds of goals must be recognized. There are politico-economic goals and there are also educational goals. The politico-economic goals have got to be identified at four different levels. There is the local level, which handles the smaller political components of a national political community. There is also the state or regional level, which handles larger components of a national political community. Usually, at the local and the state levels, the principal goal is nationalism. Then there is the national level, which handles the entire national political community as a unit. This is the level at which the goal is nationism. Finally, there is the international level, where attention could be focused on intracontinental cooperation within Africa, intercontinental cooperation between Africa and any other continent, and global cooperation within the entire world as a unit. The educational goals are also to be identified at those same four levels: the local, the state, the national, and the international.

In order to give an adequate specification of the means for establishing or achieving the goals of the model, attention has to be paid to the kind of framework required and the various elements to be handled within the framework. The framework must be one that can accommodate the various factors necessary
for determining the form bilingual education may take in Africa. Theoretically, there are four principal factors that must be provided for within a bilingual education programme for Africa, namely, the learner, the language situation, the goal of bilingual education, and the process of bilingual education.

The learner. In a comprehensive bilingual education programme for Africa, three axes ought to be set up for identifying and describing the learner. There is the individual. There is also the district, region, or state as an entity. Then there is the nation.

At the level of the individual, three kinds of learner ought to be provided for. First, there is the child. In terms of education he can be expected to be given all three forms, the nonformal, the informal, and the formal. Adequate provision for him must include his home, suitable conditions and facilities within his school and his community, where he interacts with other children and elders as well. Sometimes his schooling may be divided into two parts, the pre-primary and primary. Secondly, the individual may be an adolescent. The highest level of formal education attained by most African youth is primary education. For the teeming majority the rest of their education is provided in the community through systems of apprenticeship and all other forms of informal education supplemented by nonformal educational processes. However, for the small minority of African youth, formal education continues through secondary and some aspects of tertiary education. For the learner as an adult, it is generally the informal and the nonformal aspects of education that are available. Cooperative bodies, clubs, community development programmes, cultural unions, political parties and/or activities, and sometimes adult educational programmes are the means by which he continues to receive his education. Again as for the youth, for a small minority of African adults formal education is available at the tertiary level. Thus, not only should an adequate bilingual education programme for Africa make provision for these three categories of individual learners, but also the kind of education available for each should be conceived within an overall concept of lifelong education for each member of the national political community.

The learner may be conceived not as an individual but as a district, region, or state. In that regard, three kinds of entity need to be recognised within black Africa. There are some districts, regions, or states which are monolingual; there are some that are just dominantly monolingual, and there are others that are bilingual or multilingual. The difference between the monolingual and the dominantly monolingual is that in the second there are minority sociocultural groups, using their own languages within the district, region, or state although the district, region, or state as a whole is populated
by one dominant sociocultural group using one language. As one might expect, such districts, regions, or states are more numerous than the purely monolingual, partly because of the political history of Africa and partly because of the growth of urbanisation. In each of the bilingual or multilingual districts, regions, or states, there is no one majority sociocultural group or language, and the linguistic situation in Africa is such that multilingual regions or states are possibly more numerous than the bilingual ones. Certainly, planning a bilingual education programme for each of these three kinds of entity must require a different language policy in order to be successful.

Finally, the concept of the learner can be stretched to the level of nation. Again, as in the case of district, region, or state, three different kinds must be recognised. They are: multilingual but with a majority language, multilingual but with two or more majority languages, and multilingual without any majority language. Certainly, different bilingual education programmes will be appropriate for each of the three kinds of nation in order to achieve nationalism and nationism.

The language situation. Turning to the language situation in Africa, two important statements need to be made. Each African country is multilingual. Secondly, there are several kinds or categories of language to be found in each of the countries. The languages that exist in each African country can be classified along two different dimensions. They can be classified as being indigenous or foreign to Africa. Largely because of a common colonial experience in these countries, a foreign language, usually the former colonial master's, has been introduced into the community and, although a minority language in the community, has been imposed as the official language of communication, administration, and formal education. Thus, the indigenous languages are usually not playing a very significant role at the national level. The only notable exception is Swahili in East Africa, particularly in Tanzania.

The relative importance of the languages that are indigenous to those that are foreign to each African country suggests that a more functional approach may be adopted in classifying the languages in Africa. From that perspective of functional role, three classes of languages may then be recognized, namely: the mother tongue, the second language, and the foreign language.

In any of the Black African countries, the mother tongue (usually an indigenous language) is usually the first language of the individual, although theoretically, within the complex multilingual situation of African countries, it could be the child's second or even third language of experience. It is the language in which the individual transacts his most intimate activities, and therefore the language most associated with the individual's personality. It is also the language he uses most in transacting his regular day-to-day activities. Although
sometimes he may be unaware of it when he has an erroneous idea in the performance of his foreign language, it is generally the language in which the individual has the greatest facility.

The second language may be either foreign or indigenous to Africa. Most often, it is foreign. In reality or potentiality, an indigenous language may also be a second language in an African country, although this is possible only in a multilingual society with several indigenous languages enjoying varying degrees of prestige and use. In that situation, an indigenous language apart from the individual's mother tongue may be used for transacting a great part of his day-to-day activities. In certain cases such activities may be specialised; for example, all formal education or all administrative functions may be conducted in such a language. Among the indigenous languages of Africa, Swahili, Hausa, and Yoruba are three examples of second languages so used.

Those that are designated as foreign languages are the ones used for special occasions or in restricted situations. Such situations or occasions may be limited to the reading of specialised articles or to foreign travels. Although today only modern European languages serve as foreign languages in Africa, there is no practical reason why languages indigenous to Africa cannot also serve. Indeed, this should be a reality within a very successful political, social, and economic programme of the Organisation for African Unity.

From the foregoing paragraphs on the language situation, it can be seen that three questions ought to be asked in planning an adequate bilingual education programme for Africa, whether the learner is conceived as a nation, as a district, region, or state, or as an individual. First, it is essential to ask how many languages should be involved in the educational process for the learner, the state, or the nation. Second, it is necessary to ask the kinds or classes of languages involved. And finally, it is necessary to ask the relationship that exists among the languages involved.

The goal of bilingual education. In considering the goal of bilingual education for Africa, three different areas of operation ought to be recognised: the medium of education, the substance of education, and the product of education. The preoccupation of the medium of education is with language. The substance of education deals with what knowledge, skills, and attitudes are to be imparted through the educational process. The question of the product relates to the type of human beings or entities to be produced as a result of the educational process.

Considering the choice of the medium of bilingual education in Africa, three different possibilities deserve attention. These are monolingualism, bilingualism, and multilingualism. Monolingualism appears a strange possibility since we are dealing with a bilingual process. However, when it is
remembered that education is a lifelong activity and each of its many stages could take any of the three main different forms of formal, informal, and nonformal, then the choice becomes a distinct possibility. The reality of it is then provided by the fact that the different stages and forms of education can be undertaken through the use of different languages within the bilingual educational programme. Moreover, within the African context the use of one language at a time is most advisable at each stage, not only because of the lesser demands upon facilities and resources inherent in the use of one language at a time but also because of the nature of education in Africa generally. As was earlier indicated, education in Africa cannot but be bilingual in its formal aspect. So the use of one language at a time would only be an operational arrangement rather than a determiner of the bilingual nature of the medium of education per se. Indeed, the use of one language at a time, which on the face of it looks like the adoption of a monolingual process, is the only guarantee for the success of bilingual education in Africa.

As was earlier mentioned, there are, however, three questions to be answered concerning the use of one language at a time. First of all, there is the question of the total number of languages to be involved in the overall process of education. Normally, one can take the view that since it is a bilingual educational process, there should be only two languages involved. However, noting the earlier picture given of African education generally, its various forms and stages, we can see the possibility of structuring the totality of the bilingual education process of an individual in such a way that the two languages and cultures involved may not necessarily be constant throughout. This is particularly so because of the complex multilingual situation in Africa and the desirability for the development of nationalism and nationism. Thus, for example, a different specification may be made for the child, another for the young man, and yet another for the adult within formal, informal, and nonformal aspects of education. It is conceivable that at the primary school level, the African child may be educated in two languages and two cultures for the purpose of achieving nationalism. At the same time, as a young man and as an adult at the secondary school and at some stages of tertiary education, he may be educated through two other languages and cultures with the basic aim of achieving nationism. Indeed, for the same person as an adult in the undergraduate and graduate educational process, he might be educated in yet another combination of two languages with the aim of making him an international representative for his own country. The multiplicity of languages and cultures in Africa makes such a combination of choices not only a distinct possibility but something that may be most desirable. Of course, the situation would vary from one country to the other. It is not just the size of the country that determines the desirable combination.
of languages, but rather the multiplicity of peoples, languages, and cultures. Thus, although Ghana, the Federation of Nigeria, and the Cameroon Republic are very different in size, the same pattern of combination may be recommended for them. On the other hand, although Nigeria is bigger than the Cameroon Republic, the pattern of language combination in the latter may be more complex than that in Nigeria.

This now brings us to the second question of the kinds or classes of African languages involved. Under any circumstance, it must be noted, one of the languages to be included in the overall bilingual process in the present African context has to be at one stage or the other a modern European language, not only for the emergence of nationism but also for the development and advancement of the international affairs of each nation, as well as the promotion of its scientific, economic, and technological resources in both research and practice. Similarly, in the interest of the fostering and productive channeling of nationalism, the mobilisation of the entire population and the production of the necessary ingredients for nationism, there must also be at least an indigenous language; normally, this is the mother tongue of the child or, in exceptional cases, the language of the local community in which the child lives.

Of course, it follows that normally, several indigenous languages ought to be involved in the overall bilingual education of the individual citizen. For instance, there is no reason why two indigenous languages—one the mother tongue of the child and the other a major language other than his own—should not be included at the primary or fundamental education level where there is no compelling reason for any foreign language to serve as the medium of instruction, except perhaps for teaching that language as a subject. Indeed, nothing compels the teaching of any modern European language even as a subject at the primary school level in Africa today—particularly since primary education is terminal for most African children—because there is usually no possibility of having effective teachers to make permanent or functional literacy in such a language possible for the children who stop schooling, and more so because primary education prepares the recipients for effective participation in the affairs of the community only at the local level.

Before leaving the issues of the number and kinds of languages to be involved in the bilingual education process of the African, a further interesting point should be noted: it is also possible to have up to two foreign (modern European) languages included in the systematic bilingual education programme of an African country. In the unusual language situation such as that which obtains in the Cameroon Republic, where the country is made up of what used to be anglophone and francophone communities, it is desirable that at one stage or the other in the overall educational structure both French and English be involved in the bilingual educational process of the citizens in order to foster the achievement of virile nationism. Besides,
for effective transaction of both intracontinental and intercontinental international affairs, it is also desirable that some citizens of an African country receive their bilingual education in two European countries. Many anglophone nations have francophone nations as their neighbours and vice-versa. Indeed, a country like (anglophone) Nigeria is surrounded by such (francophone) neighbours. Of course, for such special international use, African countries may include certain members of their citizenry in a bilingual education that embraces more than two modern European languages.

The third question deals with the relationship among the languages concerned. The United States Commission of Civil Rights has noted:

The acquisition of a second language depends not only on exposure and practice but also on attitudes of the group towards itself and other groups and towards its own and the other language. The fact that English has been imposed on language minority children has had a strong adverse effect on the second language learning process within a totally monolingual environment (Publication 51 of May, 1975:71-72).

Thus, the conditions under which two languages are learnt or used as media of instruction make a big difference in the results. If one of the languages is privileged within the community and the other is not, then the anticipated results may be obtained in one group and not in the other. So, in order to create the best atmosphere for bilingual education in Africa, efforts must be made to see to it that a good and positive relationship exists between any two languages used. Only through positive planning and balanced socioeconomic ordering of the community can such an atmosphere be created for the success of bilingual education.

As outlined earlier, the case for the adoption of bilingualism—that is, the use of two languages at a time in every stage of the bilingual process—seems most natural. However, pure bilingual education which this involves does not seem to be a necessity in Africa today. Undoubtedly, such a programme enriches education and is indicative of sociocultural and educational maturity. Africa cannot afford to display such maturity when she has not yet grown up. Indeed, Africa can now display only a false maturity since she is still in her infancy. It seems correct to say today that the use of two languages simultaneously as the media of instruction for any single subject matter whatever must be something for the most advanced countries of the world and not for Africa, which cannot yet find the money and other resources for effective basic education for all her citizens.

This at once suggests that the policy of multilingualism, that is, the use of more than two languages at a time, cannot
be contemplated for Africa today. It may very well be that some people may even want to argue from the conceptual point of view against the use of more than two languages at a time in a bilingual educational process.

Turning to the substance of bilingual education, I suggest that the knowledge, skills, and attitudes to be imparted to the learner may be structured along three different dimensions. They may all be within a monoculture, a biculture, or a multiculture. In the context of Africa and the basic tenets of bilingual education, moniculture seems to be ruled out; biculture may be encouraged at the local or state levels; but certainly, the maximum benefit can only be derived when multiculture is the target. No African country is anything but multicultural.

The product of bilingual education to be anticipated in Africa can be recognised at three different levels: the individual, the state or region, and the nation. At the level of the individual, it would seem that the target product is the citizen. Of course, this citizen has to be nurtured within the concepts of both nationalism and nationism. This means, therefore, that there is an element of time at work in producing him. He may first be a citizen within the concept of nationalism before being a citizen within the concept of nationism. Although not every member of the political community may have to develop into being a citizen of the world in the sense that he is a citizen of his state or his nation, it is also desirable that provision be made for some of the citizens of any African country to reach that international level in their political, conceptional growth and maturity.

At the level of the state, bilingual education may aim at producing a state or region out of several local communities. Within the context of Africa, this concept of the state or region is sometimes no different from that of a nation. It is different only when the entire state is made of only one monolingual and monocultural group. Thus, care must be taken to see that bilingual education aims at nationalism for the monolingual-monocultural state or region, and at nationism for that state with more than one culture or language.

For most of Africa, the goal at the level of the nation can only be nationism and secondarily, internationalism. Undoubtedly, recognising these different products of bilingual education is the only way to ensure that the various factors in the bilingual educational process will be organised in such a way as to make the entire process a success.

The process of bilingual education. There are four different factors in the process of bilingual education, each of them dealing with the organisation of one element or the other. Thus, we have the organisation of language, the organisation of content, the organisation of teachers, and the organisation of the learner himself.
The organisation of language is generally undertaken at two different levels. One is the level of its being a subject and the other is the level of its being a medium of instruction. Language is organised very clearly within the formal form of education. Within nonformal education, however, language is not systematically ordered as a subject, although occasionally the learner may be corrected or be made to use the form that is acceptable to the adults around him. Within informal education, language may sometimes be organised as a subject but even then, language learning is usually undertaken or given in Africa within the concept of functional literacy in the wider context of adult or continuing education.

Again, as in the case of the number of languages to be taught at a time, the organisation of language as a school subject within the formal education system can be based on the policies of monolingualism, bilingualism, or multilingualism. As in the earlier case, a policy of one language at a time within the bilingual education programme is best for Africa. Thus, as in the earlier case, each language has its own domain within the overall educational structure. From experience, given the limited resources, it seems best that the child's mother tongue should be learnt first and any other languages (indigenous or foreign) may come later in order to guarantee maximum success. As is evident from the discussion so far, the teaching of a modern European language may be best restricted to only secondary and tertiary educational levels. In contrast, in many African countries today, a modern European language such as English in the anglophone countries and French in the francophone countries dominates all forms of formal education from pre-primary or nursery to tertiary education. In most cases this is not helpful because it is ineffective. There seems to be no corresponding gain for the losses that may be sustained by the child who is compelled to learn English at a tender age in the nursery school, not only before he becomes literate in his own language but also before he masters his own language. In contrast, it would seem that concentrating first on the child's mother tongue would consolidate his linguistic competence and expand not only his vocabulary inventory but his syntactic and stylistic repertoire. Thus, literacy would be more easily gained, utilised, and made permanent in the language. Besides, the knowledge and skills acquired can be easily transferred appropriately while learning a second or foreign language.

At this stage, it is pertinent to mention the role of translation in the process of acquiring the second language. Recent practices in language teaching often frowned at the use of the translation method. While much has to be gained through the direct method, experience has shown that a complete rejection of the translation method may also be counterproductive and wasteful. As I have stated elsewhere (Afolayan 1968:658ff.), translation is an indisputable tool for the learner of a second
language; therefore, making judicious use of the translation method is bound to facilitate and ensure a better learning of the second language. Particularly in the areas of vocabulary, the use of translation where applicable is very often more economical and effective than the direct method.

The organisation of language according to a policy of bilingualism, that is, the teaching of two languages at a time in a given stage of the bilingual educational process, is not likely to succeed. This is not because of any inherent difference in Africans who may be called upon to learn the languages, but because the facilities and resources for such instruction to be effective are not present to any appreciable degree in any African country. Whether the languages are indigenous or one is indigenous and the other is foreign, the problem of the supply of teachers in adequate numbers or suitable quality remains.

If an organisation of language based on bilingualism is not to be encouraged, then that based on multilingualism cannot be entertained at all. The provision of resources and facilities for a successful implementation of such a policy is simply beyond contemplation, let alone solution.

The organisation of language at the level of medium can also be undertaken within policies of monolingualism, bilingualism, and multilingualism. Again as in the earlier instances concerning the question of the number of languages to be used at a particular time or stage of education, the policy of monolingualism, that is, the use of only one language at a time, is recommended. There is even a stronger case here for keeping the mother tongue of the child as the only language used as the medium of instruction in the early years of his education. Indeed, it is being advocated that these early years be made to cover the entire primary education level.

The view has been expressed that none of the experiments on the use of the mother tongue as the medium of instruction produces any conclusive support for its superiority over any other alternative approach (Engle 1975:26). Furthermore, it has been suggested that 'Perhaps the mixed research results reflect the general foreign trend towards using only one language at a time as the medium of instruction' (Cohen 1975:22). The question now is whether there are any answers to the issues raised.

Concerning the first view about the inconclusive nature of the results of the experiments, three important points ought to be noted. First, the very nature of educational experiments and the very nature of educational evaluation make it very difficult for people involved in such experiments to convince others objectively about the incontrovertible results of superiority provided by the experiments in which they have been involved. My experience, through involvement in the Six-year Primary Project at Ife from its planning stages in 1969 until the present time, has led me to draw this conclusion. Such
Experiments in Africa are undertaken under very great constraints.

Take the question of finance. It is very likely that the experiment is being financed from outside sources. This means that the experiment must work according to a particular timetable in order to justify the continuation of support from the funding body. If, for example, it is found desirable to prolong a particular activity in order to ensure greater success, it would be impossible to do so largely because of the financial constraints. In the case of the Six-year Primary Project, as the name implies, the Ford Foundation guaranteed generous funds for six years only, with the provision that certain reports were to be completed and submitted at stipulated intervals. When it was discovered at the inception of the project, as has been reported (Afolayan 1976), that its very nature had to change and the production of instructional materials that would guarantee successful teaching would require more time, it was absolutely impossible to delay actual teaching in the classroom for about two years and at the same time obtain the promised financial support. In fairness to the Ford Foundation, such a request for a delay was never made, but the facts were well known and later events seemed to justify the conclusion that it would have been impossible to get the project approved, although the representative of the Ford Foundation in West Africa, who had approved the funding, was and is still very enthusiastic about the Project. What were those later events that served to justify the conclusion? After the six years of the experiment to which the Ford Foundation was committed for funding, it was absolutely clear to all involved in the experiment that some more years of work were necessary in order to present more conclusive evidence to objective scholars. For example, it was well known that a more elaborate system of control groups was necessary. It was also known that a new nine-year follow-up stage of the products of Primary Education in their secondary schools or in their apprenticeship in one trade or the other, or in their working life on a comparative basis with those who were not in the experiment, was necessary. It was, however, then made very clear that the Ford Foundation could not commit itself, as a matter of policy, to giving financial support to a particular experiment for so many years.

Consequently, that aspect of the work is now proceeding at a slower pace than would have been the case if all facilities were available. Yet the latest evaluation report on the children in secondary school (Yoloye 1977) provides the type of evidence scholars would want to have, if it can be provided in all necessary areas and in suitable quantities. This report contains 16 tables—seven on various statistics relating to the distribution of populations within experiment and control classes, seven on comparable evaluation scores of experiment and control classes, and two on the affective domain. From the point of view of the people involved in the experiment, these last two tables in
particular are the most important and greatest supporting evidence for the superiority of the mother tongue as the medium of instruction.

One of the tables, Table 12, compares the 'students' problems inventory' of project experimental children with nonproject children in grammar schools. This table shows that the mean score of project children with regard to the number of problems they encounter as students in the grammar school is 9.78, in contrast with the mean score of 14.47 by nonproject children. The second table, Table 13, contains information on the social acceptability of project experimental children in grammar schools as compared with their peers in the same school. It shows that the project experimental children generally had considerably higher social acceptability scores than nonproject children. When it is remembered that the affective domain has always been hypothesized by sponsors of this project as the domain of great expectation for the project, and when it is recalled that it has always been assumed that the project children would have a better social and psychological adjustment, a greater social and psychological integration, a stronger display of initiative, and greater self-confidence, then the significance of the latest evaluation report can be seen.

It must be noted, however, that before this report, even when the children were at the primary school level, reports of parents had confirmed that the children were better adjusted within their own family and within society. Their lessons, particularly those in social and cultural studies, made them turn to their parents as resource personnel, and for the first time parents had cause to believe that what their children learnt at school was of relevance to them and that they were not, after all, 'ignorant and uneducated', as had always been erroneously believed in the past. Indeed, at one meeting of the Parent-Teacher Association, parents had asked that they, too, be given seminar instruction by the sponsors of the project so that they might be able to help their children better.

Perhaps at this stage an example of how the use of the mother tongue can lead to such a better understanding between the school and society or the children and their parents is pertinent. The syllabus in the primary school makes provision for lessons on the family and the home. To teach such lessons in English restricted the teacher to the use of kinship terms such as father, mother, husband, wife, son, daughter, brother, sister, cousin, siblings, aunt, and uncle. None of these terms would prompt the children to go home and seek for more information from their parents, that is, when the use of charts and other teaching aids had succeeded in making them understand the kinship relations. Such terms would hardly ever make them desire to know more about the sociological set-up within the family.

Take the Yoruba family (a Nigerian ethnic group), for example. The kinship terms that are important are Iya, Baba,
Egbọn, Aburo, Iyekan, Obakan, Iyawo, Oqọ, Baale, Iyaale, Orogun, Omolosu. For example, none of these kinship terms is paralleled by any of the English terms; even Iya and Baba do not just mean 'father' and 'mother', respectively. Oqọ within the Yoruba sociological setting does not simply refer to one's husband nor does Iyawo mean simply one's female spouse (wife). Thus, for example, a woman 30 years old can be referred to by a six-year-old boy as his Iyawo simply because she is a wife within the family. One can then see why teaching the Yoruba child about the home in Yoruba would involve concepts and terms that are not yet clearly well known to him and for which he would need explanation and discussion with his own parents and even grandparents.

A personal note at this stage may be informative. Only within the last year, I lost my mother. It was then that I learnt the full meaning of the kinship term Orogun (literally, 'a rival'; as it is used in everyday affairs, the term means one of the wives within the family). When a woman dies, the wives in the family always get a big goat and this goat must be provided by the children of Orogun ('co-wives') of the deceased. The co-wives of the family who are entitled to this goat usually belong to different lines of a root family and its servants but the 'co-wives' whose children should provide the goat should be those of the actual husband of the deceased. Thus it was my mother's funeral that for the first time made me recognise that Orogun in that context excluded wives of my uncle, who had always been known to me as Baba Agba 'senior father'—indeed, the only one to be called Baba since my own father was the younger of two brothers. When one sees that this same kind of lack of correspondence between what goes on in school and what exists in the community can be found in all areas of the curriculum, including science, mathematics, or religion, one can then see why, to the Yoruba child, education in English will be generally irrelevant and give him no encouragement in dealing with things around him in spite of his having obtained certificates in subjects related to those things.

The second point to be noted about the difficulty in giving conclusive evidence about such experiments is the scarcity of personnel and other facilities. The number of people required to draw up the relevant evaluation report, in addition to carrying out the experiment itself effectively, is simply not there. The original task of the Six-Year Primary Project was to provide a simple test for determining which of two languages might be the better medium of primary education. This task has grown into a major effort in curriculum planning, development, implementation, and evaluation. But in the almost ten years of its existence and expansion, the project has been unable to employ a single full-time researcher. I have always been the language specialist and consultant on the project, but I do not even belong to the Institute of Education where the experiment is located. I belong to the Department of English in the
Faculty of Arts and must not only teach my English language
courses but must undertake research activities and subsequent
publications in the areas of English language in order to earn
my promotions. Yet I have had the responsibility for coordi-
nating all the activities of the writing workshops that produced
the drafts of all the instructional materials, and for editing
these materials not only for appropriate levels of language and
presentation, but also for consistent adherence to suitable
orthographic conventions.

In fact, some of the main contributors to the project do not
belong to the university; some belong to the Ministries of Edu-
cation while some others belong to two sister universities.
Even the director of the project, Professor Babs Fafunwa, who
belongs to the university, has been away on a government
assignment in Lagos for over two years. Thus, while there is
more evidence for the superiority of the use of the mother
tongue as the medium of instruction over the use of any other
language attributable to the experiment, only very little is
readily available in printed form and in a manner acceptable
to scholars. Certainly, the Six-Year Primary Project now de-
serves to have about a dozen full-time evaluators working on
different aspects of the available data so that all the material
that has been accumulated can be made available to the aca-
demic and educational world.

Perhaps it is also pertinent to record at this point that it is
not absolutely correct to say that there is no conclusive evi-
dence available to scholars to show that the use of a child's
mother tongue is superior to the use of another language as
the medium of instruction. I would like to suggest that the
children of Africa, in comparison with the children of Britain
or America, offer living, conclusive evidence at the completion
of their primary education. African children tend to be less
responsive and have less initiative than their British or Ameri-
can counterparts, even in the classroom when instruction is
being given. They are considerably more passive than their
British or American counterparts not because they are less in-
telligent, less active, or less talented, but rather because they
do not quite get to the root of what is being learnt, let alone
question or see the applicability or relevance of it. The Afri-
can children are being taught in a language they do not under-
stand. They are being taught by teachers who cannot simplify
their language to suit the children. After all, there is an ex-
periential aspect of understanding words and terms (Gladstone
1967). It is being suggested that the experiential aspect of
understanding is crucial for any original reflection and applica-
tion of the content of that learning which attaches to the terms
and words.

A visit to the classrooms of the experiential children would
convince any doubting Thomases. The children are as lively
and inquisitive as their counterparts anywhere. Within the
first few weeks they questioned the inconsistent aspects of
Yoruba orthography and showed that the practical orthography
which children need does not require all the detailed information a linguist might consider necessary for easiest application. Thus, it can be asserted that abundant evidence exists to support the superiority of the use of the mother tongue over the use of any other language as the medium of primary or fundamental education. What has been sought is the objectivisation of such evidence in acceptable evaluation parlance.

The third point for explaining why the evidence may be inconclusive is the nature of evaluation of any comprehensive experiment on education. It is not only that a simple experiment on the language medium is not adequate to test the superiority of one language over the other in the African educational setting, but also that the necessary complex experiment will often require unavailable instruments of evaluation. Thus in the latest report (Yoloye 1977:30) the consultant evaluator, Professor E. A. Yoloye of the University of Ibadan, Nigeria, had this to say:

Some problems have plagued the evaluation of the project as we often have in other educational research projects. These include:

1. Difficulty of controlling staff and student movement—transfers, dropout, etc.
2. Difficulty of controlling for all variables, e.g. Intelligence, Socio-economic background, Teacher effect, Age, etc.
3. Fear of creating permanent damage in experimental children.
4. Administrative problems of manpower allocation and/or recruitment, conflict with official policy.
5. Difficulty of monitoring interactions in the classroom.

Finally, before leaving the question of the arrangement of language on the medium level, let me make some comments on Cohen's view which was mentioned earlier; namely, that 'perhaps the mixed research results reflect the general foreign trend towards using only one language at a time as a medium of instruction'. The important question to ask about this view is why the use of one language at a time as the medium of instruction should lead to mixed results. From experience it would seem that the answer to such a question is that the mixed results come from the differences in the educational facilities and resources available in various places. The conclusion drawn by Cohen (1975:29) on the admonition of the sponsors of the Montreal experiment is valid for all other experiments; namely, 'that these findings apply to comparable socio-political situations where the languages in question share the same relative degree of prestige'. Indeed, one must add that comparable educational facilities and resources, human and nonhuman, must also be available.
One point not often noted is that two bilingual education programmes involving two different sets of languages may produce different results. Apart from situations which are socioeconomic as well as educational in terms of facilities and resources, two aspects of the language situation may influence or determine the result of bilingual education. Experiments involving French and English may produce results in Britain which differ from those produced in Canada, largely because English is the dominant language of British life whereas this is not the situation in Canada. Similarly, a bilingual programme involving French and English in Britain or Canada may produce a different result from a bilingual educational programme involving English and Yoruba in Nigeria, largely because English and French are related languages whereas English and Yoruba are not. Similarly, a bilingual programme involving Yoruba and Igbo (two Nigerian languages) in Nigeria may produce different results from one involving English and Yoruba, or English and Igbo, in the same environments. Examine, for example, the degree of correspondence of these words in Igbo, Yoruba, and English.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Igbo</th>
<th>Yoruba</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>etp</td>
<td>etsa</td>
<td>three</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ogu</td>
<td>ogun</td>
<td>twenty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ugboko</td>
<td>igbo</td>
<td>forest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>oka</td>
<td>okuta</td>
<td>stone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ewu</td>
<td>ewure</td>
<td>goat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ogo</td>
<td>oko</td>
<td>farm</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In short, care must be taken when a global assessment, particularly on a comparative basis, is to be made on bilingual education experiments, exercises, or experiences.

The syllabus. In discussing the syllabus of bilingual education, we come face to face with what may be regarded as our basic notion of education in general, since we have already argued for a close association between bilingual education and education generally, in the contemporary African context. Education is seen as the process or machinery for enabling an individual to develop skills and attitudes leading to self-fulfillment and usefulness to the community or society. For our purpose, education is not to be exclusively related to the school. In the words of Edgar Faure (Faure et al. 1972:82-83):

The most unquestioned dogma in education is that related to the school: Education equals School. Of course, it is true that schools, in absolute terms—by numerical expansion and qualitative improvement—continue to develop their fundamental role in the education system. But the school's importance in relation to the other means of education and
of communication between the generations is not increasing, but diminishing. In fact, this equation between school and education will persist until we have a society where people will go on being educated more or less continuously, for a long time or at intervals. We must see more clearly the image of education as a continuous project for society as a whole, not only with its schools but also its transport and communication systems, its multiple means of communication and the organized, diversified interactions of all its free citizens.

For us, therefore, as has already been emphasized, education is seen in its totality, comprising formal, informal, and nonformal aspects. It is to be seen within the concept of lifelong education from the cradle to the grave (see Dave 1973) and in this process the family and the community at large are the instruments of the nonformal and informal aspects while schools, institutes, colleges, and universities deal with the formal aspects.

Unlike the organisation of language where the various factors are considered in such a way that one particular choice is made out of the three options of monolingualism, bilingualism, and multilingualism, the parameters in the organisation of content are complementary. In order to be adequate, therefore, the contents of bilingual education are to include specifications regarding nonformal, informal, and formal aspects.

It must be noted, however, that the contents of nonformal, informal, and formal aspects of education are not in watertight compartments. Certain parts of the three forms are consecutive, some overlap, and others are simultaneous.

It should be further noted that the three are aspects of a lifelong educational process. The contents must therefore be huge, numerous, and multifarious indeed. Although it is possible to attempt an inventory of all items to be included for an African country or even Africa as a whole, it seems clear that at the implementation stage the specific selections to be made will have to vary widely, sometimes according to communities and sometimes according to agents of transmission such as the home, club, or society, or even the school or college.

Therefore, having grasped the distinctive features of the three aspects of nonformal, informal, and formal education, and having accepted the earlier suggestion that education in Africa has to be bilingual, what is needed for an adequate organisation of the contents of bilingual education for Africa is a specification of the principal aims and objectives of education for Africa. Although many such aims and objectives will necessarily be common to all Africa, it seems best that this process of specification be undertaken for each African country. To make the specification the best, most relevant,
and most comprehensive, the exercise should be carried out as a major national cooperative effort, involving every and all component elements of the nation--professional, academic, ethnic, social, cultural, political, geographical, etc.

Here, more than anywhere else in the consideration of an adequate theory of bilingual education for Africa, we have to make distinctions of concepts--usually in education as a discipline, particularly those concepts which bear upon curriculum development, implementation, and evaluation. The concepts of immediate concern are 'aims' (or 'goals') and 'objectives' which are very clearly distinguished in curriculum work. Aims or goals are usually general, while objectives are usually specific. In the words of Bloom and others, statements such as 'the worthy use of time', 'the development of good citizenship', and 'to develop an appreciation of the value and power of mathematics in our technological society', which are general statements of purpose, would be better labeled 'goals' than 'objectives'. A goal is something broader, longer-range, and more visionary than an objective. It is '... something presently out of reach; it is something to strive for, to move toward, or to become. It is an aim or purpose so stated that it excites the imagination and gives people something they want to work for, something they don't yet know how to do, something they can be proud of when they achieve it' (Cappel 1960:38). Goals must of course be translated into school programmes and activities. In turn, the explicit behaviours that a program will help the student develop are its immediate objectives and should be related to the statement of long-range purpose that initiated it. It is these more immediate aims that must be made precise enough to guide instruction and evaluation (Bloom et al. 1971).

Once the appropriate aims and objectives of the bilingual education programme for any African country have been identified, the next crucial step is the actual selection of a syllabus that will lead to the achievement of these aims and objectives. The most significant point to note here is that the syllabus selected and the emphasis given to specific parts of it, both in organisation and effective implementation, will determine whether the primary goals of nationalism and nationism will be attained. The common mistaken notion in Africa is to believe that the nature of language distribution and use in a country determines the degree of political unity (nationism) in the community. Thus, Paragraph 8 of Section I of the National Policy on Education of the Federal Republic of Nigeria (1977:5) says:

In addition to appreciating the importance of language in the educational process, and as a means of preserving the
people's culture, the Government considers it to be in the
interest of national unity that each child should be en-
couraged to learn one of the three major languages other
than his own mother tongue. In this connection, the
Government considers the three major languages in
Nigeria to be Hausa, Ibo, and Yoruba.

The truth, however, is that

... not all language differences that exist are noted, let
alone ideologized ... The general point here is that
differences do not need to be divisive. Divisiveness is
an ideologized position and it can magnify minor differ-
ences; indeed, it can manufacture differences in lan-
guages as in other matters almost as easily as it can
capitalize on more obvious differences. Similarly,
unification is also an ideologized position and it can
minimize seemingly major differences or ignore them
entirely, whether these be in the realm of language,
religion, culture, race, or any other basis of differenti-
ation.

Conscious and even ideologized language differences
need not be divisive, whether at the national or at the
international level. Thus the pattern of national di-
glossia has its international counterparts as well (Fish-

What will establish political unity (nationism) in each African
country is the appropriate selection and effective transmission
of a bilingual education syllabus that will inculcate in the citi-
zens respect for the heritage of their own immediate ethnic
group and the heritage of other ethnic groups, a team spirit
at all levels of national life, and the determination to sink or
swim with other members of the community in the attempt to
build an accepted new order of political, social, economic, and
technological national life. Certainly, the language situation
cannot be neglected, since language must serve as the medium
of any selected syllabus; but the crucial issue is the adequate
value of what is selected, the general acceptability of it and the
successful transmission of it. As was said earlier, the immedi-
ate ethnic group must be given its rightful place as an inter-
mediate stage in the development of nationism. For too long
has the cultivation of nationalism been viewed negatively as
the ruination of the African country. As Fishman has aptly
remarked (1970:56) in a different but comparable situation:

The ruination of the country is more likely to come, as
it always has in the past, by the insidious implication
that by forgetting the problems, by forgetting oneself,
by overlooking one's parents, by throwing away treasures
that are rightfully one's heritage, one could help the country.

What is most crucial is that the selection does not put too much emphasis on nationalism. By the end of his primary education each child should have received nonformally, informally, and formally a very strong dose of nationalism and a yet stronger dose of nationism. What matters most is not the language or languages in which this is done, but how effectively it is done. The language question is therefore essentially one of providing an efficient medium for transmitting the chosen ideas embodied in the syllabus. Only a bilingual programme of the type being advocated in this paper, particularly the aspect of an educational language policy which is discussed in the last section, would provide the necessary answer.

However, at this stage it must be equally noted that in selecting, grading, and arranging the contents of bilingual education for Africa in such a way that the goals and objectives of the particular programme may be achieved, one must bear in mind that the question of language medium also has to play an important role. Undoubtedly, as has already been shown, the relevance of certain aspects of the content will be facilitated or undermined by the language through which the learner is exposed to these aspects. That is why, at least for the affective results, traditional aspects of the contents are best presented to the learner through his mother tongue. Again, until the second language is well established, the mother tongue has an advantage over the second language in making the content of education more meaningful and relevant. Hence selection, grading, and blocking of the content of education must be done with an eye on the expected language of instruction.

It is pertinent and informative to complete this section with an illustrative quotation from the statement of educational aims and objectives in Nigeria. The document from which the quotation is taken is a product of the type of national cooperative effort advocated earlier. Of course, both the process and the final product of the effort are not without their faults or weaknesses. For example, as a result of official red-tapism, the document was not decreed until 1977, although the first of the several concentric national conferences was called in 1969! Undoubtedly, however, the final document serves as a good illustration, and its first section, on the philosophy of Nigerian education, is as follows:

1. Since a national policy on education is Government's way of achieving that part of its national objectives that can be achieved using education as a tool, no policy on education can be formulated without first identifying the overall philosophy and objectives of the Nation.
The five main national objectives of Nigeria as stated in the Second National Development Plan, and endorsed as the necessary foundation for the National Policy on Education, are the building of:
(1) a free and democratic society;
(2) a just and egalitarian society;
(3) a united, strong, and self-reliant nation;
(4) a great and dynamic economy;
(5) a land of bright and full opportunities for all citizens.

2. Nigeria's philosophy of education, therefore, is based on the integration of the individual into a sound and effective citizen and equal educational opportunities for all citizens of the nation at the primary, secondary, and tertiary levels, both inside and outside the formal school system.

3. In consequence, the quality of instruction at all levels has to be oriented towards inculcating the following values:
   (1) respect for the worth and dignity of the individual;
   (2) faith in man's ability to make rational decisions;
   (3) moral and spiritual values in interpersonal and human relations;
   (4) shared responsibility for the common good of society;
   (5) respect for the dignity of labour; and
   (6) promotion of the emotional, physical, and psychological health of all children.

4. For the philosophy to be in harmony with Nigeria's national objectives, it has to be geared towards self-realization, better human relationship, individual and national efficiency, effective citizenship, national consciousness, national unity, as well as towards social, cultural, economic, political, scientific, and technological progress.

5. The national educational aims and objectives to which the philosophy is linked are therefore:
   (1) the inculcation of national consciousness and national unity;
   (2) the inculcation of the right type of values and attitudes for the survival of the individual and the Nigerian society;
   (3) the training of the mind in the understanding of the world around; and
   (4) the acquisition of appropriate skills, abilities, and competences both mental and physical as equipment for the individual to live in and contribute to the development of his society.

6. The desire that Nigeria should be a free, just, and democratic society, a land full of opportunities for
all its citizens, able to generate a great and dynamic economy, and growing into a united, strong, and self-reliant nation cannot be over-emphasized. In order to realise fully the potentials of the contributions of education to the achievement of the objectives, all other agencies will operate in concert with education to that end. Furthermore, to foster the much needed unity in Nigeria, imbalances in inter-state and intra-state development have to be corrected. Not only is education the greatest force that can be used to bring about redress, it is also the greatest investment that the nation can make for the quick development of its economic, political, sociological, and human resources.

7. The Government will take various measures to implement the policy. Accordingly:

(1) Education will continue to be highly rated in the national development plans, because education is the most important instrument of change as any fundamental change in the intellectual and social outlook of any society has to be preceded by an educational revolution.

(2) Lifelong education will be the basis for the nation's educational policies.

(3) Educational and training facilities will be multiplied and made more accessible, to afford the individual a far more diversified and flexible choice.

(4) Educational activity will be centered on the learner for maximum self-development and fulfillment.

(5) Universal basic education, in a variety of forms, depending on needs and possibilities, will be provided for all citizens.

(6) Efforts will be made to relate education to overall community needs.

(7) Educational assessment and evaluation will be liberalised by basing them in whole or in part on continuous assessment of the progress of the individual.

(8) Modern educational techniques will be increasingly used and improved at all levels of the education system.

(9) The education system will be structured to develop the practice of self-learning.

(10) At any stage of the educational process after primary, an individual will be able to choose between continuing his full-time studies, combining work with study, or embarking on full-time employment without excluding the prospect of resuming studies later on.

(11) Opportunity will continue to be made available for religious instructions. No child will be forced to
accept any religious instruction which is contrary to the wishes of his parents.

(12) Physical education will be emphasized at all levels of the education system.

8. In addition to appreciating the importance of language in the educational process, and as a means of preserving the people's culture, the Government considers it to be in the interest of national unity that each child should be encouraged to learn one of the three major languages other than his own mother tongue. In this connection, the Government considers the three major languages in Nigeria to be Hausa, Ibo, and Yoruba.

Organisation of 'teachers' and teaching media. It is generally well known that learning cannot take place unless the object of learning—that is, the subject matter—is made available to the learner in digestible form. This requires not only that the syllabus be organized adequately (which has been discussed) but also that teaching media and 'teachers' be organized in such a way as to facilitate the students' learning of the subject matter. Earlier, it was suggested that the respective contents of the three forms of education—nonformal, informal, and formal—are not in watertight compartments. It is now being emphasized that 'teachers' of the three forms of education cannot also be in watertight compartments.

A great deal of what passes for an informal form of education in Africa is traditional and is culturally transmitted through various sociological institutions. However, it must be noted that agents of formal education (schools, institutes, colleges, universities, etc.) are also institutions within the society through which certain aspects of education can also be transmitted nonformally through social interactions. Indeed, those agents of formal education can also be used to transmit informally certain aspects of education, particularly through various school organisations, clubs, and voluntary organisations such as the Boy Scouts and Girl Guides. To complete the picture of the impossibility of completely separating the agents of nonformal and of formal education, for example, it might be noted that the home, which is normally an important agent of nonformal education, can under some circumstances be an agent of formal education. Parents may decide to prepare their children for the higher primary grades or the beginning of secondary education in a system far away from home. In such circumstances, they organise formal lessons for their children up to the desired level. In fact, American missionaries in parts of Africa have in the past educated their children for this kind of transfer to American schools.

In discussing the organisation of 'teachers' and teaching media, therefore, we should not follow the line of the three forms of education, rather we should see an organisation of the agents into human and nonhuman elements. The 'teachers'
are of two kinds, distinguished according to the form of contact they have with the learner; i.e. direct and indirect agents.

Four major categories of direct agents can be recognised in Africa. The first category is made up of members of the family of the learner. In the African context, of course, 'family' means not only one's parents, brothers, and sisters; it also means what is generally referred to in Africa as 'the extended family', which may sometimes include third or fourth cousins, particularly on one's father's side in most cases. It is not inconceivable for a child to grow up not with members of his nuclear family, but with other members of his extended family. Of course, too, the family in Africa may also include servants.

The second category of agents is made up of community members. They may be peers of the learner, or people who are older or younger than the learner. Besides, 'community' in this respect may refer not only to the entire sociopolitical unit, but also to each of several smaller units within it. Thus, members of the same class or the same school as a learner provide for him, or serve as, community members. Similarly, members of the same club or society, the same compound or village, may also serve for him as members of the same community. The third category of 'teachers' consists of people who are often exclusively referred to, or recognised as, the only 'teachers'. These are professional teachers at various levels of a given country's formal educational system. Finally, there is the category of government officials who serve as visiting teachers and school inspectors. This last group has the least contact with the learner. Undoubtedly, from the list one can see that each category can be assigned to one form of education or the other as its principal domain, although as has been said earlier, each can be the agent of all three forms of education. Thus, the family and other relations can be assigned to nonformal education; community members to informal education; and teachers, together with government officials, to formal education.

Five indirect categories of 'teachers' can be identified in Africa. These are: educational planners, syllabus designers and constructors, linguists and other educationists, textbook writers, and examiners and officials of various examining bodies. The planners are those who identify the aims of education for the country and draw up educational policies. The syllabus designers and constructors are the curriculum specialists who reduce the stated aims of the planners to specific objectives and spell out how to achieve the objectives. Linguists and other educationists usually serve as advisers, resource people, and researchers who feed planners, curriculum workers, and all others with up-to-date information on the desired area or content of education, and on the nature of the learners themselves or the nature of the learning process.
Textbook writers are those who produce the contents in manageable packets for the use of teachers and pupils alike in the learning process. Finally, examiners and officials of various examining bodies are those who undertake to evaluate the quality of learning that has taken place and also to certify the level of attainment of the various learners.

Besides the human 'teachers', there are also 'technological' ones, three of which can be identified in Africa. These are: the government, books and other instructional materials, and technological devices. It may appear strange that the government has been identified as a 'technological' agent when people always serve as government officials. It is well known, however, in Africa at least, that quite often government decisions and subsequent follow-up actions may be directed by records and written regulations rather than the human beings immediately responsible for taking the decisions. Books and other instructional materials are indeed the most direct 'technological teachers'. Finally, devices such as radios, tape-recorders with appropriate tapes, record players with appropriate records, and even more sophisticated devices such as overhead projectors, language laboratories, and closed-circuit television and commercial television are increasingly becoming teaching media in contemporary Africa. Perhaps of all these agents the radio is the most influential.

In organising 'teachers' and teaching media in Africa, six important points may be further noted. The first concerns the need for cooperation among the various elements of the community in any African country in order to achieve maximum efficiency in the country's educational programmes or even at the continental level. There are not many experts in the various aspects of the educational enterprise. Maximum utilization of those available is therefore the only guarantee for success.

Second, teachers need to be developed to the professional level. The pre-service and in-service training programmes for teachers in most African countries are rather inadequate. Indeed, teachers are not only in short supply but are also not of the right quality. The teachers' professional rights to curriculum planning and the examination and evaluation processes of the level of learning achievement are not yet generally recognised in Africa. It is only when teachers become professionals that the quality of bilingual education in Africa can reach a desirable level of efficiency and effectiveness.

Third, there is the necessity to provide books and all other instructional materials to accompany the bilingual education programme. This, of course, means that many indigenous African languages have to be developed, maintained, and used in books and instructional materials. This is an area where a defeatist attitude is usually prevalent in Africa. It is often erroneously believed that African languages cannot be used for producing instructional materials, let alone for teaching the
content required in mathematics and science. The experience of the Six-year Primary Project at Ife, Nigeria, which has been mentioned several times in this discussion, and other similar experiments—even national programmes like the one involving Swahili in Tanzania—provide sufficient proof that the capacity of African languages is not different from that of any modern European language. In fact, this constitutes the most significant and incontrovertible achievement of the Six-year Primary Project, so much so that in 1973, when some newspapers expressed anxiety about the implications of the project, the Ministry of Education of the Western State of Nigeria issued this statement, among others, in a release:

The experiment which will be under close study and review by the Ministry is expected to be helpful in forming a sound basis for the production of teaching materials in conventional primary school subjects (Daily Sketch, November 7, 1973).

Fourth, education in Africa tends to be too examination-oriented. Certificates on theoretical knowledge often replace real mastery of skills. Efforts are therefore necessary to correct this imbalance if the bilingual education programme is to achieve its educational goals and objectives. Fifth, as useful as technological devices may be, care must be taken not to impose white elephants on bilingual education programmes in Africa. These technological devices can easily become white elephants largely because of the level of technical development in Africa and because such devices are usually not made for use in Africa.

Finally, it must be noted that teachers and books play the most important roles in this respect. These two are usually the agents that spell doom for bilingual education in Africa. However, the most important point about them is their relevance to the medium of instruction. Just as books can most easily present materials that will establish permanent literacy in children if written in the mother tongues of the children, effective African teachers can be more easily trained in using their mother tongue as the medium of instruction than in using modern European languages (e.g. English or French).

**Organisation of the learner.** The final and, indeed, the most important aspect of organisation of a bilingual education programme is the organisation of the learner himself. The principal target of any educational programme is the learner. The success of any programme therefore depends upon how much he can benefit from it. It is in proportion to the degree of his benefiting from it that society at large can benefit from it. For the success of any bilingual education programme for Africa, the learner must be organized adequately and he can be organized along three dimensions.
Physically, his own biological needs and welfare need to be organised. This will take the form not only of his biological needs regarding health, food, clothing, and shelter, but also regarding physical arrangements in the learning environment. He needs to be provided with adequate instructional materials, teachers, and other teaching media. Moreover, he must be provided with adequate room or space, and the necessary equipment. Such equipment, of course, will include not only desks and chairs but also laboratory and library facilities, good lighting, and adequate ventilation. The location of the learning environment should also be wholesome enough to make effective learning possible.

The learner should also be organised socially. The social arrangement of his time, his opportunities, and his community should be adequate for effective learning. The social environment in terms of other people with whom he interacts should encourage and stimulate him to progress in life. Socially, what he is learning should be acceptable and required, just as he himself must feel socially wanted. He must also see that learning is equally desired in terms of his society.

Psychologically, he must be considerably motivated in his learning. Rewards and punishments attached to his successful learning or his failure to learn should maximise his learning efforts, not undermine them.

What I have dealt with so far are general aspects of organisation of the learner. For the African situation, it is not sufficient to mention those aspects of organisation; they must also be positively related to prevailing circumstances. The physical and social organisation of the learner can be taken for granted in most developed countries, but this is not true in the African environment. The suitable physical and social environment for formal learning is not yet generally present within the socioeconomic development of African countries; that is why secondary and post-secondary education has tended to be oriented toward the expensive boarding school system. Besides the limitation set upon the spread of that level of education because of the costs, the psychological disadvantages, particularly at the secondary school level, when children must leave their homes at the tender age of 11+ and sometimes go into completely strange environments far from their homes, have proved very disruptive to the personality and social development of many African children. Undesirable habits are easily picked up from other children who come from diverse cultural and socioeconomic backgrounds.

Consequently, it is very important to the success of bilingual education in Africa for the physical and social amenities in towns and villages (particularly in the villages) to be considerably improved. The incidence of teachers living in urban areas far from their rural schools is very common, largely because no adequate physical facilities are available. Many rural schools exist for years without any direct supervision or
inspection visits from government officials, largely because roads leading to the schools are not motorable. At the tertiary level, particularly at the university, the African learner experiences most the effects of the inadequate physical and social environment.

Answers to these problems will have to be found in better planning, in order to control the student population explosion resulting from unplanned development. It is also most desirable to pay more attention to nonformal and informal education and to place less emphasis on formal education, which is so expensive that it tends to reduce development in other sectors of the community without correspondingly contributing to the community's social and economic development. Today, much of the money spent on primary education is wasted because, for many African children, it constitutes only an annoying interruption in their nonformal and informal education. They leave school without being completely literate, only to be apprenticed to a driver, motor mechanic, carpenter, or even a petty trader. The answer, then, might lie in effectively cutting each African country's educational cost according to her cloth, tailoring it in every respect to the bilingual educational requirements imposed upon her. Of course, the earlier suggestions regarding the various elements of bilingual education (such as a better concept of the African learner, a better understanding and utilization of the language situation, a more comprehensive outline of better goals and objectives for bilingual education, achieving better administration of the process of bilingual education in regard to language, content, teachers, and technological teaching media are bound to contribute not only to the more productive physical, social, and psychological organisation of the learner but also to the overall success of a bilingual education programme in Africa, based on the Unity in Diversity Model. It is not only natural but also proper for us, as language specialists, to take it as a self-evident truth that language planning leading to the formulation of an adequate educational language policy for Africa is a prerequisite for the formulation, implementation, and evaluation of an adequate programme of bilingual education for Africa. One should not, therefore, conclude an examination of the issue of an adequate theory of bilingual education for Africa without taking a look at the kind of educational language policy necessary for the successful implementation of such a model.

Incidentally, I have previously examined this question of an educational language policy for Africa, and I now touch upon my proposals on the matter, which constitute only a fragment of such a policy.

An educational language policy for Africa. An educational language policy for Africa is taken to be a plan of action or set of ideals concerning the language or languages to be used in the process of developing knowledge, skills, and attitudes
in an individual African which will lead to his self-fulfillment and social usefulness in the African community of which he is a member. Three things are required of such a policy: the identification of the languages that are available for use in Africa, the specification of the roles of these languages for the purpose of education, and the determination of the means by which the languages can play their expected roles. Much has already been said in this paper on the identification of the languages available for use in Africa. In this fragment of a policy, therefore, attention will be paid only to the specification of the roles of the languages and the determination of the means by which they can play their expected roles.

Specification of roles for languages. I suggest that the starting-point for the specification of roles for the various languages available for education in Africa is the determination of the basic goals of education in terms of the answers to the four questions: (1) education for whom? (2) education for what purpose? (3) education at what level? (4) education through what medium?

In determining the basic goals of education for developing African countries, I make the following assumptions in order to provide answers to these four questions.

1. Education for whom?

   A. Every citizen of any African country, old or young, male or female, high or low, should receive education.

   It is out of the question for education to be confined, as in the past, to training the leaders of tomorrow's society in accordance with some predetermined scheme of structures, needs and ideas or to preparing the young, once and for all, for a given type of existence. Education is no longer the privilege of an elite or the concomitant of a particular age: to an increasing extent, it is reaching out to embrace the whole of society and the entire life-span of the individual (Faure et al. 1972:161-162).

   B. Education should be for the entire life-span of the individual, not just for a particular age, youth, or adulthood.

   C. Education should be not just for ruralization or urbanization, industrialization or technology, idealism or vocation, but for every aspect of the modern man in modern society, or even in an envisaged future society.

2. Education for what purpose?
A. All citizens are expected to be educated to achieve self-fulfillment and also to contribute maximally to the development of the community or nation.

B. Most primary school products make their contributions to the community or nation through local activities and interactions, mostly among speakers of their own indigenous African language.

C. From the products of secondary and tertiary education are to be found most of those citizens to contribute to the development of their countries at the national level through the official language of the country which, as suggested previously, would normally be English, French, Portuguese, or Spanish.

3. Education at what level?

A. Mainly for reasons of economic constraint, no developing African country can now or in the foreseeable future aim at anything higher than universal primary education within her formal educational system.

The expenditures on education of most African States represent a very high proportion of their national budgets and incomes and in present circumstances it would be difficult to exceed those percentages without endangering the entire economic and social development of those countries (Preamble to Resolution 1, African Ministers of Education 1968).

B. Informal and nonformal education should be made available in a coordinated and effective fashion to each citizen at every level of development.

C. The integration of formal, informal, and nonformal kinds of education within a national system that involves all local communities will diversify resources and reduce costs, particularly through self-help and cooperative projects, and, consequently, will make education available at all levels to every citizen.

4. Education through what medium?

A. Education is most relevant and effective when given through the discovery-cum-activity method which can foster initiative, resourcefulness, versatility, a spirit of scientific enquiry, imaginative understanding and, above all, continuing self-educational processes in the learner.

B. The most natural and effective medium of educating any given human being is his mother tongue. The use of a second or foreign language as the medium of education, except for teaching the language itself, can therefore be only second best.
The development of skills in different learning styles, e.g. inter-learning and self-learning awareness of the need for learning throughout life, mastery of skills and the need to integrate in-school and out-of-school learning are all very important factors when considering educational objectives in terms of life-long education (Report, UNESCO 1975).

Undoubtedly, the development of such skills, particularly the integration of in-school and out-of-school learning, is best achieved in the learner's mother tongue, which is the language of his immediate community.

C. In all human communities there may be two kinds of language, one native and the other foreign to the learner, available for use for educational purposes. In all developing countries (as in ex-colonial countries) learners are saddled with at least two media of formal education, one foreign and the other indigenous; learners in all developed nations can have only one language (their mother tongue) to use as the medium of their formal, informal, and nonformal education. Special care should therefore be taken to ensure that citizens of developing countries are not educationally handicapped by the inevitable language situation.

To further the task of determining the basic goals of education, I propose the following thesis.

1. Formal education in developing African countries is so characteristically given through the unnatural medium of a foreign language that scholars, educationists, and experts have accepted the equally unnatural and wrong-headed equation that education (formal, informal, and nonformal) for the African is equal to knowledge of a modern European language such as English, French, Portuguese, or Spanish.

A. The strong version says that a given African is not educated because he is illiterate in a modern European language such as English, French, Portuguese, or Spanish. The African is banned from learning physics or about spaceships, space travel, or automobile engineering unless he can first be proficient in a modern European language. Is the efficient illiterate roadside mechanic found in African cities and towns, or even in villages along a major road, uneducated in any aspect of automobile engineering?

B. The weak version (the more subtle and perhaps more dangerous to African education because it is found in most specialists, developers, and executors of the curriculum) takes different forms. For example, it is found in those curriculum specialists who, in their endeavours, either ignore the unnaturalness of using a foreign language medium or half-heartedly or semi-blindly perceive that unnaturalness and
then completely sweep it under the carpet or at best pay lip service to it.

2. The use of the unnatural foreign language medium should be imposed on educational systems in developing African countries as a last resort and for special reasons. The only acceptable special reasons are educational and political.

   A. Educational

   (1) If the community is so linguistically pluralistic that only a foreign language can be viably used within the educational system.
   (2) If the individual will be deprived of self-fulfillment or maximum usefulness to the nation or local community.

   B. Political

   (1) If the political unit or country is so hopelessly multilingual that only a foreign language, without the support of any local indigenous languages, can be used to maintain the country's existence.
   (2) If the country's political need for unity, growth, and maturity require it.

3. Primary education should aim principally at educating the citizens of developing African countries for living efficiently and effectively in their own speech communities, but secondary or tertiary education should aim at educating them (the minority involved) for playing well the roles that national and international demands, needs, and responsibilities may require of them.

4. An integrated educational system that subsumes formal, informal, and nonformal types of education can best serve the needs of developing African countries. The proportion of those three types of education within the system will be determined by the local economic, social, and political conditions of each country.

The actual roles of languages. The role of languages in education is best seen along the dimensions of the various forms of education: nonformal, informal, and formal. Now let us turn to these educational forms, starting with the nonformal and informal aspects which, from the earlier discussion of the effectiveness of bilingual education in Africa, deserve greater attention in planning and implementation than they usually receive.

Roles of the various languages in informal and nonformal aspects of education. The respective agents of nonformal and
informal education are the family and the community at large. The very nature of activities within the two social institutions determines the roles to be assigned to the three kinds of language.

Within the family as an agent of education there is no doubt that the language to be given pride of place is the language used by the members of the family to one another. Although there are some special families, particularly those resulting from mixed marriages and/or those that have been under unusual influence from foreign cultures, where the second language of the community or country at large may be their own dominant language, it is indisputable that for African families in general, their mother tongue (indigenous language) serves as the language of intrafamily interaction. Naturally, in some cases, the language used in a family may be an indigenous African language used in another local community. This is the case when a family has moved into another speech community as a result of economic, social, or political factors.

Undoubtedly, the foreign language hardly ever has any significant function to perform within the nonformalized education resulting from African intrafamily interactions. As has been noted, there could be a few families using the second language of the country as the language of the family; but it is hardly conceivable that any African home will be using a language designated as 'foreign' for conducting its intrafamily interactions. The only possibility for such a situation is if historical circumstances and experiences have imposed such a language on the family. For example, it may be the result of mixed marriages and/or living for a long time in a place where the language is used as a first language; for instance, if a man from an anglophone country lived in Paris, married a French lady, had three children, and returned to his African country with his wife and children, aged two, four, and six years (compare a man from a francophone African country with similar conditions after a long sojourn in London). Such situations are considerably subjected to pressures and may subsequently be altered by the surrounding language situation. Besides, they constitute only a variation of the situation of a family living in a speech community other than the one using its language as the mother tongue. Except for such rare situations, a language classified as a foreign language by an African country cannot be the language of nonformal education of the country's children. Normally, such a language would be foreign to a family and could not be a significant medium of nonformal education.

Similarly, not being the language of local communities, the foreign language could not be a major medium of informal education given through the instrumentality of the community as an educating agency. Such a foreign language can at best serve as the medium for teaching the language for specialized purposes. For example, a tourist club or a friendship society
in an anglophone country may embark on learning French, Spanish, Portuguese, Russian, or Chinese through the medium of the language itself. A similar club or society in a francophone country may embark on learning English, Spanish, Portuguese, Russian, or Chinese.

The case for the second language is stronger than that for the foreign language in this business of informal education. This is to be expected since the second language is by definition more commonly used than the foreign language in each local community. There could be several local rural communities in an anglophone country, for example, where no French is spoken. In contrast, it is unlikely that there would be any such local communities in which no English is spoken. (Comparable statements should be possible about English and French in a francophone country.)

Indeed, within each local community the second language, unlike the foreign language, is not to be restricted to being the medium of teaching the language itself. Much intra-community interaction would be conducted in the second language. This is particularly true in the urban—especially cosmopolitan—centres or settlements. Although in very small remote rural communities the role of the second language may indeed be insignificant, it seems correct to suggest that the second language plays a greater role within informal education than the foreign language or languages.

Except in urban and cosmopolitan local settlements like those in state or provincial capitals of African countries, the major language of informal education, as of nonformal education, is the language of the local community. Such a language is bound to be the indigenous African language which is the mother tongue of the majority of the people in the community. It is inconceivable that any local community, as an educating agency, would use a foreign language as the educational medium for its citizens. It should be borne in mind that both the second and the foreign languages are in this respect normally foreign to the local African communities. The exceptions are the original European settlements, such as those of the English or the Dutch in Eastern and Southern Africa, particularly in Kenya, Zimbabwe (Southern Rhodesia), and the Republic of South Africa. To such local communities, the country’s official language (which may be viewed by the African majority as the country’s second language) is indigenous rather than foreign.

The local urban and cosmopolitan settlements constitute complex language situations that vary considerably from place to place. Their languages of formal, informal, and nonformal education follow patterns that may differ from those in the rest of the country. As has been noted, the assignment of specific languages to the three categories of mother tongue, second language, and foreign language in some of the settlements may differ from the general pattern of assignment of such languages in the rest of the country. Second, a dominant
indigenous local African language may or may not be found in these settlements. Third, the number of languages of the various kinds found in them may vary widely. Thus, while in some settlements (for example, those in Tanzania) it may be possible to assign the primary function of medium of all kinds of education to the dominant indigenous African language, in some others more than one indigenous African language may share this function; and in some others, local African languages and the country's second language or languages (European languages such as English in Ghana, French in Guinea, English and Dutch or Afrikaans in South Africa) may share the various functions either along the dimensions of education (formal, informal, and nonformal) or along various races within the community.

All things considered, in the interest of maximum effectiveness and greatest or widest level of democratization, informal and nonformal education should be given to Africans through local indigenous African languages. Although the most urban cosmopolitan settlements such as the state or provincial capitals may pose special difficulties, the policy of making the indigenous local languages the cornerstone of informal and nonformal education is the best for all African countries.

Roles of the various languages within formal education. There are two basic roles for the various languages within formal education. The first role is that of a school subject. The second is that of the medium of instruction. Let us consider the nature of these roles at the various levels of education.

The various languages as school subjects. The nursery school is the level at which the mental and emotional development of the child is in its formative stage. It should be the object of any worthwhile nursery education to develop the mental and emotional capacity of the child. Language is, on the one hand, the tool for the mental and emotional growth of the individual child; it is, on the other hand, more than such a tool. Verbal development and aptitude can hardly be distinguished from mental and emotional development and aptitude; thus it is important that the language of nursery education should be the one in which the child's mental and emotional development takes place. It is therefore important that the language adopted should be the language used in the community at large. Consequently, within the nursery educational system the need for the preeminence of the mother tongue as a school subject is not in doubt. The child's verbal development should be promoted through an effective and integrated programme of mother tongue education, planned in such a way that a close link with what goes on at home is achieved.

Although the early stage of the child's development is that during which he can most easily learn several languages, it
does not seem desirable that he should be made to learn several languages in the nursery school while trying to enhance and develop his knowledge in his mother tongue. However, there may be a good case for attempting to introduce the second language as a school subject at the nursery school. The main argument for doing so rests on the facility with which a young child may internalize the larger prosodic or suprasegmental features of the second language which he is expected to learn in later life. In particular, at such an early age, if he is exposed to good models and made to sense the difference in the prosodic features of his mother tongue and those of the second language, he is more likely to acquire a satisfactory level of international intelligibility in the language than if he were introduced to those features in later years. It must be noted, however, that recent studies by the International Study of Educational Achievement in Language indicate that the age for introducing a foreign language to a learner may not be as crucial as the length of time, the quality of teaching, the degree of motivation, and the quality of instructional materials and aids. But given that these other factors are kept as constant terms in the language learning process, one must still agree that if the child is introduced to a foreign language at the earliest opportunity, he is likely to acquire greater facility in it than if he were introduced to it in later life. As a young child, he is likely to enjoy the language learning process more and therefore learn more effortlessly; for example, the younger he is, the less intensive is his knowledge of his mother tongue. Besides, he is likely to be less distracted by other preoccupations and consequently, is more likely to concentrate on the language learning process. Yet, in the developing countries, it is seldom advisable to introduce second languages as a school subject at the nursery level.

The role of foreign language as a school subject in nursery education should be minimized. There is a strong argument for not introducing any foreign language—particularly a modern European one—at this level in any developing African country. If, however, the linguistic situation of the country calls for the adoption of an indigenous language as a foreign language, then that political or educational necessity might also recommend the introduction of the language even at this earliest level of education. Such an early introduction of the foreign language as a school subject should then aim at allowing the child to acquire greater familiarity and experience with the major features of the language, such as prosodic and para-linguistic ones.

Undoubtedly, the mother tongue continues to be important at the primary school educational level. Cognitively, the child is ready to acquire new perspectives in mental development. Notions such as those of time and space, among other abstract ideas, can now be acquired. Again, the basis for the overall educability of the child is now to be laid in the versatility of
his linguistic competence. The verbal development most com-
mensurate with the child's mental needs is best attained or 
attainable through his mother tongue. Besides, it is obvious 
that at this level the most suitable language is bound to be not 
only a school subject but also a tool for the learning of other 
ideas. And it is the case in almost every developing African 
community that the mother tongue is the language to which the 
child is exposed during the rest of the day outside school 
hours--at home, at play, and at other activities.

Similarly, there may be a good case for the teaching of the 
second language as a school subject at the primary school 
level. If such a language is ever expected to play an im-
portant role in the child's life, as a second language usually 
does, then the primary school is the stage at which serious 
efforts must be made to acquaint him with the patterns of the 
language in such a way that he not only understands the 
nature of the language, but also falls in love with it. How-
ever, the overall educational needs and available resources of 
an African country must be overriding in this matter. For a 
majority of African nations today, there is the need not to in-
crease public expenditure on formal education and, at the same 
time, to maximize the value of the money spent. There may 
therefore be an even stronger case for delaying the teaching 
of a second language, particularly if it is not an indigenous 
language, until the level of secondary education, which pre-
pares students for national rather than local roles.

The case for a foreign language as a school subject at this 
level of primary education, as at the nursery level, is very 
weak. If, however, the foreign language is one that is in-
digenous to the community, the need for introducing it may 
actually indicate the nature the programme in that language 
should take at this level of education. At the very least, the 
programme should include the major prosodic features of the 
language.

Although the mother tongue will still have a place as a school 
subject at the secondary educational level, its importance will 
have diminished. At this level the pupil should have acquired 
the mechanics of the language. Some advanced usages, techni-
cal terminologies, and the use of the language in creative work 
are likely to require further development. Largely because 
the learning of the language at this level cannot be preparatory 
to its use as an educational tool either at a later part of this 
level itself or at succeeding levels, the emphasis will shift 
from the use of the language to the introduction of its aca-
demic analysis and description.

The teaching of the second language at this level is bound 
to gather greater momentum, not only because it is likely to 
be the child's educational tool at this level and other subse-
quent levels of formal education, but also because at this level 
the knowledge of the second language should match the needs 
that the pupil will ever have for it, particularly if he does not
go on to further education. Thus, his knowledge at this level should prepare him linguistically to play his role in the social, religious, administrative, and academic spheres of community life. There is no doubt that results of secondary education will be the main contributors to national life, its growth and development in most developing African countries, particularly the multilingual countries.

The importance to be attached to foreign language at this level is not very great. The child will need it only for some special purposes. Unless it is an indigenous language introduced for certain political or national needs, it will be needed by only a small minority of the total secondary school population. The content of the foreign language programme as a school subject is therefore bound to concentrate on the need for the language by a minority of the citizens of the country.

At the post-secondary educational level, the study of the mother tongue as a college subject tends to be a purely academic exercise. The emphasis should no longer be on the use of the language, although workshops, seminars, and projects, particularly those of a creative nature, demanding the use of the language, may still feature prominently.

The second language as a college subject should receive the greatest attention of all the categories of language at this level of education. Not only will the use of the language be brought to an advanced stage; the academic analysis and description of the language will also be pursued vigorously and brought to a high level. There is no doubt that the learning of the second language at this level prepares the students for entry into international communities and for effective participation in international affairs.

Certainly, at this tertiary level of education, the foreign language may receive as much attention as any other language as the subject of academic study. Indeed, one could say that at this level foreign languages can legitimately receive the greatest attention. There is no single human language that is not a fit subject of study but, undoubtedly, it is unlikely that any African country would have the unlimited resources that would enable her to teach all foreign languages to all people, no matter how many. Immediate relevance or national need should be the determining factor, and it should be possible for a student to begin a course in any nationally required foreign language ab initio at this tertiary level of education.

The various languages as media of instruction. The most natural language to be adopted as the medium of nursery education is the child's mother tongue. However, regrettably, the practice in most developing African countries today is to use a modern European language as the medium of instruction. This is largely because the nursery educational system often falls outside the nation's educational programme. Nursery schools
are generally private schools. As private schools they are elitist. The sponsors of such schools, and those who patronize them, see them as a means to an end. They aim primarily at ensuring the children's success in education through the medium of a modern European language adopted as the country's second language. They do not consider nursery education as a kind of education by itself. But the unreasonableness of such a practice is borne out by the fact that the children are often completely ignorant of the language in which they are expected to learn and develop mentally and psychologically.

Primary education is the only formal education available to most citizens of developing African countries—that is, formal education is meant for a minority (at most 20-25% of the citizens). As the basic education available to most African children within the formal educational system, primary education is best given in the child's mother tongue. For one thing, the adoption of the child's mother tongue will ensure and enhance the overall meaningfulness of the lessons he receives. This claim should not be considered invalidated by the results of bilingual research experiments in developed countries such as Canada (reported in Tucker et al. 1975), which tend to indicate that lessons in a second language may not be less meaningful than those in the mother tongue. It must be noted that the conditions for teaching the second language in such advanced countries are not obtainable in Africa. For example, the Tucker report says that 'the teachers are native speakers of the target language who ideally have had previous experience teaching child native speakers at the same grade level as their immersion class'. For another thing, the adoption of the mother tongue as the medium of instruction will lead to greater initiative, a more integrated personality, and improved self-reliance on the part of the children being educated. This is because education given can rise above the level of rote-learning to that of self-discovery and absorption of ideas and concepts that fundamentally change the children's attitudes and behaviour patterns. Furthermore, the training of many qualified teachers is possible when the language of instruction to be used is the mother tongue of the teachers and their pupils. Thus, effective teaching is enhanced and productive learning results.

As in the case of nursery education, primary education in the second language, particularly a modern European language, is generally bound to be a failure. It is often difficult to produce the right number and quality of teachers to teach primary education in such a language. In order to make available the right sort of model, the most natural method is to use native speakers of the language. However, sufficient native-speaking teachers of such a language are not available at a price developing countries can afford. Consequently, whenever such a policy is adopted, nationals of the developing countries are used as teachers of the languages. At the primary school
level, such teachers usually fail to reach a high degree of proficiency in the language, and are, therefore, unsatisfactory models. The pupils who imitate them and follow their example are bound in later life to face serious problems of unlearning many of the features they have erroneously acquired. Yet the most serious defect is not linguistic, but educational. What usually passes for education hardly ever rises above mere rote-learning and subsequent recital of facts and information on demand. What else can it be when pupils are called upon to learn in a language they cannot yet understand and the teacher cannot adapt his language to the changing levels of different classes? Even where some education eventually manages to survive in the learners, it remains at the cognitive level and rarely reaches the affective domain.

Largely because of the multilingual situation in most developing African countries, secondary schools are generally national in character. This means that pupils from different ethnic groups speaking different languages usually enter any given secondary school. Besides, it is from such education that the country obtains most of the people who participate in its national life and activities. Such activities are usually conducted in the de facto or even de jure national language of the country; this is usually the language of the colonial masters. Consequently, the most natural language to serve as the medium of secondary education is the country's second language. It should be noted that in East African countries, particularly Tanzania, an indigenous language, Swahili, serves as that country's second language which now is both the national and official language of the state.

The use of the mother tongue as the medium of secondary education is uncommon in Africa. Few African languages can today be effectively used as the medium of secondary education, partly because there has been no attempt to do so and partly because there is usually not just one single mother tongue for all pupils in any secondary school. The case of Swahili in Tanzania does not invalidate this conclusion. On the one hand, Swahili is yet to be used as the medium of secondary education. More importantly, even when used, it will not be the mother tongue of all the secondary school pupils; it will remain as a second, albeit the national, language.

The very nature of foreign languages makes them unsuitable as the medium of instruction at the secondary level. The knowledge that pupils have in them is usually too slight to equip them for learning through this medium. Of course, any foreign language can serve as the medium of teaching the language as a school subject.

The use of the mother tongue as the medium of post-secondary education does not exist within the educational system of developing African countries today, though attempts are being made to teach certain African languages as academic
disciplines through the medium of the languages themselves. This new trend is to be encouraged. It is a desirable policy deserving vigorous pursuit. Educational and national considerations would not recommend using the local mother tongue as the medium of post-secondary education.

In contrast, because of the international character of post-secondary education, education at this level is given through the international language available in the country. This is usually the modern European language being used as the second language as well.

The starting-point for carrying out such a policy is the drawing up of an integrated educational policy, specifying roles for the three components of formal, informal, and nonformal levels within the system. Then, at the centre of an integrated policy for each community should be the local indigenous language. Making the local language the pivot of such an integrated educational policy is bound to maximize the effectiveness of the educational machinery in each community. It would then be possible to adjust the relative proportions assigned to formal, informal, and nonformal levels within the system of lifelong education for all citizens according to available local resources, enhanced by any foreign gifts during any given planning or development period. In such a programme that does not rely on foreign language resources, it would be possible to emphasize informal and nonformal levels and de-emphasize the formal level, showing clearly that education is not tantamount to what is given at the formal level, while at the same time making whatever is given at that formal level a part of an overall, well-designed system. What is more, besides enhancing the quality of education and relating education to available resources most meaningfully, such a policy is bound to contribute positively towards the realization of an endoglossic political language policy in developing African countries.

The existing educational language practice in developing African countries is very different from the recommendation just made. There have been no conscious efforts to have an integrated policy linking all three levels of education. Nonformal and informal levels have been largely neglected within any plans. Besides, even within the planned formal level, the existing language practice in respect of the place of the mother tongue can be divided into two major groups according to the major languages of the metropolis used: the francophone and the anglophone. Excluding the Republics of South Africa and Rhodesia, there are 37 independent countries in Africa: 16 are officially English-speaking, 16 are officially French-speaking, 2 are officially bilingual, 2 are Portuguese-speaking, and 1 is Spanish-speaking. The francophone countries, under the influence of the French colonial policy of assimilation, tend to pay little or no attention to the indigenous African languages. The anglophone countries pay
attention to the indigenous African languages, although only in the lower classes of primary education do these languages play significant parts.

It should not be thought that this unprogressive treatment of African languages within the formal educational system has been the sole handiwork of the colonial masters. In the history of education in Africa, any policy emphasizing the use of indigenous African languages as the media of instruction and the pivot of educational programmes has always been under serious suspicion (Foster 1965:165). Such a policy is always seen as a deliberate attempt by the colonial masters to provide Africans with an 'inferior' education, or at least to hinder progress in secondary school and university education. In other words, such policies have always been treated as the Bantu education policy of apartheid South Africa is treated today.

It is time for a deliberate policy of change. From our discussion so far, the role assigned to each kind of language in the new policy can be summarized as follows:

I. The Mother Tongue

A. In nonformal education: to be the basis at the level of pre-school, in-school, and post-school stages.

B. In informal education: to play the central role at this level in order to make education available to all at pre-school, in-school, and post-school stages.

C. In formal education
   1. In nursery education:
      a. to be taught as a principal subject and
      b. to be the medium of all instruction
   2. In primary education:
      a. to be a principal school subject
      b. to serve as the medium of instruction
         (wherever practicable)
   3. In secondary education:
      a. to be a school subject with language and literature components, but
      b. except where it is the indigenous language serving as the national language of the country, it is not advisable that it should be the medium of instruction of subjects other than the language itself.
   4. In post-secondary education:
      a. to constitute an academic discipline with language and literature components.
      b. except in teaching the language as an academic discipline and in special courses such as those aimed at producing creative writers in the language, it is not advisable as the medium of any instruction.
II. The Second Language

A. In nonformal education: not appropriate for use for all citizens; suitable in certain situations to reinforce or supplement formal education for the minority at in-school and post-school stages.

B. In informal education: not to be the key medium for all citizens but, in order to widen, deepen, and strengthen national consciousness (loyalty across the local ethnolinguistic group within the multilingual state), its use should be consciously planned so that the number of citizens involved may continuously increase at both in-school and post-school stages, but most especially at the post-school stage.

C. In formal education:
   1. In nursery education:
      a. to be a school subject, with emphasis on its principal prosodic suprasegmental features;
      b. not advisable as the medium of instruction, except in very special cases where the children represent different languages and it is imperative that they attend nursery school for practical reasons.
   2. In primary education:
      a. to be a principal school subject with emphasis on situational language use. Note that this also includes provision for the teaching of another local community's indigenous language as a school subject. Since such a language is a second language to the child, it means that two languages (one foreign, the other indigenous to the country) are to be taught as school subjects at the primary school level.
      b. not advisable as the medium of primary education, except in very rare cases of linguistic pluralism.
   3. In secondary education:
      a. to be a principal school subject with language and literature components;
      b. should normally be the medium of instruction.
   4. In post-secondary education:
      a. to be an academic discipline with language and literature components;
      b. necessarily to be the medium of instruction except in teaching other languages.

III. The foreign language:

A. In nonformal education: not suitable for use except for the small minority learning or using the
language at in-school and post-school stages.

B. In informal education: again not suitable for a significant role except for the small minority learning or using the language at in-school or post-school stages.

C. In formal education:

1. In nursery education:
   a. not advisable as a subject, except in rare cases where the foreign language is required by the political needs of the country;
   b. not plausible as the medium of instruction.

2. In primary education:
   a. not strongly desirable as a school subject;
   b. not feasible as the medium of instruction.

3. In secondary education:
   a. to be a school subject, with emphasis on the use of the language;
   b. not desirable as a medium of instruction, except perhaps for teaching the language as a subject.

4. In post-secondary education:
   a. to be an academic discipline with language and literature components, with the possibility of going from the very beginning to the advanced stages of use of the language;
   b. not to be the medium of instruction except in teaching the language as an academic discipline.

Ways of making the various languages fulfill their assigned roles effectively. As has already been suggested, the starting-point is the formulation of an integrated educational language policy that covers all three primary aspects of nonformal, informal, and formal levels of education. After the specification of the roles of each kind of language (mother tongue, second, and foreign) within the policy, the next issue is how to make each language perform its assigned functions effectively. This issue is rather complex. It can be at five different stages of selection, grading, staging, presentation (Mackey 1965), and evaluation (Bloom et al. 1971) of the contents of each secondary aspect (for example, basic literacy programme, vocational training, and primary education). Yet each aspect is to be found within each primary aspect, level or kind of education (nonformal, informal, and formal). Obviously, a full treatment of the issue at those various stages and levels cannot be attempted within a single paper. It is sufficient for our purpose if certain important aspects of the issue can be given for illustration; accordingly, I am going to consider briefly some important aspects of the language of nursery education, the teaching of a second language in primary school, and foreign language in post-secondary education.
In considering the implementation of the policy on nursery education, one has to bear in mind that it is most desirable that whatever level of language knowledge and ability the child has acquired at home must be identified and systematically developed at school. Sounds, sound patterns, lexical and syntactic patterns which have proved difficult to the child in his pre-school experience need to be systematically taught at school. Moreover, it is desirable that an attempt be made to enlarge the child's experience. In order that all these goals may be attained through a systematic teaching of the mother tongue, care must be taken that the linguistic items covered in the nursery school are those that are closely associated with the child's everyday and expected experiences at home, school, and in the community at large. Then, if a second language is to be introduced at all, the emphasis should be on large prosodic features, such as the international and rhythmic patterns of the language. Thus, the emphasis would be on some language games, playing upon the sound patterns of the language rather than upon issues emphasizing the child's cognitive development through the acquisition of words and syntactic patterns. This means that nursery rhymes and songs without emphasis on the cognitive aspect should constitute the programme of second language education at the nursery school level.

For the successful implementation of the policy concerning the teaching of a second language as a subject at the primary school stage, it is essential for the child to fall in love with the language. The child cannot do this unless the language materials are presented in meaningful situations in which the child may wish to be involved. It is only through such a systematic situational presentation of the language that the learning of that language can be identified with a process of getting the child to enter into the culture of the second language. This means that the programme's emphasis should be placed on the hypothesis that the learning of a second language necessarily implies the process of acculturation in that language. It must be admitted, however, that even with such an emphasis on situational teaching, the degree of success is bound to be greatly determined by the quality of teachers. This is particularly the case for English in anglophone African countries. It would seem that the answer to this thorny problem is best provided by the use of specially trained primary school teachers of the English language, as was attempted in the Six-year Primary Project of Ife, Nigeria.

Of course, there are two serious objections to such a proposition, which have been raised by officials of the Western State Ministry of Education in Nigeria with regard to the practice of the project at Ife. The first objection is against specialization of teachers at the primary school level, and the second is against the probable increase in costs.

There are three answers to the objection against specialization within the general framework that primary school teachers
are usually expected to be generalists who should be capable of stimulating children to learn various skills, attitudes, and bodies of knowledge. First, language is not just a school subject but the tool for learning other subjects. Secondly, unlike other subjects, language learning (particularly when speech is involved, as in the case of second languages in African countries) requires the teacher's model. Thirdly, whereas every primary school teacher should be considered capable of stimulating pupils to learn other school subjects, it is false to presume this to be true with regard to providing an adequate model in a second language.

Concerning the second objection, it could be argued that costs need not increase. In the first place, providing such specialist teachers should not necessarily increase the number of teachers in any given school. About a quarter of the total number of teachers required should be specialist teachers. Of course, ingenuity in timetabling would have to follow. In the second place, the costs of teacher training need not increase. Again, what may be needed is that about a quarter of the total number of training colleges be designated for training the specialist teachers. Language training facilities may then be concentrated in those colleges. To combat any claims to special salaries by the specialist teachers, the same basic academic admission requirements should be demanded uniformly for all training colleges and the training should have the same uniform duration. Finally, to counter the possibility of greater rate of loss of such teachers to other sectors of the national economy than the rate found for other primary school teachers, the demographic statistics of primary school teachers should be studied and admission policy be made to reflect such facts. For example, in one state in Nigeria, women trained for primary school teaching tend to remain at the job. For such a state, selection for specialist training may be made with some bias for the female applicants.

For a third illustration, let us consider how to implement the part of the policy regarding a foreign language at the post-secondary level. Although the foreign language may receive as much attention as any other language as the subject of academic development and concentration, there is no doubt that the range of any programme in a foreign language will be quite distinct from that of the second language or the mother tongue. Provisions in such a programme may spread from elementary materials needed by beginners to those required for advanced work in the language; such provisions are found in many developing countries today. Undoubtedly, audiovisual components of the course, concentrating on the use of the language, are bound to feature prominently. Largely because of the limited use of the language by the learners in everyday activities, such a programme may even incorporate compulsory visits by the learners to countries in which the language is used as a mother tongue,
for the purpose of acquiring necessary experience in the language.

Although there are bound to be differences at various stages, and levels of differences in certain aspects, the situation deserving attention and demanding necessary solutions tends to be generally of the same nature as the picture presented in Table 1, which is a revised version of an earlier table (Afolayan 1969). This summarizes the problems and advantages of using either the mother tongue of the African learner or a modern European language as the medium of his instruction within the formal aspect or level of the educational system.

Table 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advantages</th>
<th>Problems</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Easy availability of teaching materials, books, aids, methodology, etc., through adoption and expansion of existing materials, facilitation of acquiring the European language.</td>
<td>Lack of reality of subject matter; lack of teachers' competence in the language; exposure of pupils to bad language models; necessity of later unlearning of incorrect language forms; psychological and cultural disadvantages.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problems at Stage A to a lesser degree; encouragement of rote-learning; greater interference from the mother tongue.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Availability of materials, books, aids, etc., since this is the practice in some areas; a certain degree of linguistic competence and some grounding in school subjects.</td>
<td>Provision of books, aids, and other materials in the mother tongue; development of the mother tongue to handle science and technology; need for, and consequently problems of, intensive course in the modern European language to be adopted later; possible delay of subject course at the beginning of secondary education; possible necessity for simplification of initial textbooks at the secondary school; teachers' language training; great initial burden; restriction on geographical mobility of primary school teachers; above all, a sense of psychological</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 1. Continued.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advantages</th>
<th>Problems</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D. Deeper linguistic competence; greater reality of ideas; achievement of sounder education with greater self-reliance and initiative; and enhancement of the prestige of the mother tongue, besides its development to meet modern technological demands.</td>
<td>defeat on the part of all concerned with such a policy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acute situation of problems at Stage C is applicable at this stage; handicap in undergraduate and post-graduate studies, particularly in research; antagonism generated for the second language; decrease in national and international mobility.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

KEY: A = The situation in which a modern European language is adopted as the medium of instruction from the very first class in the primary school. B = The situation in which the mother tongue is adopted at the medium of instruction in the first half of primary education and a modern European language is adopted beginning with the second half of primary education. C = The situation in which the mother tongue is used as the medium of instruction of primary education and a modern European language is adopted for post-secondary education.

Conclusion. The type of educational language policy I have suggested is considered to be the best for the education of children in developing African countries today. It can also become an effective midwife to a successful political language policy. There are many problems facing the successful implementation of such a policy, the most difficult one being the sense of psychological defeat or lack of essential political will found in most Africans and African governments; but the greatest consolation is that the problems can be solved. The successful adoption of Swahili in Tanzania and experiments such as the Six-Year (Yoruba medium) Primary Project of the Institute of Education of the University of Ife have demonstrated that the expectation that the problems can be solved is not just a pious hope or mere wishful thinking.

NOTE

The Six-Year Primary Project at Ife is an experiment seeking to characterize what constitutes primary education with the greatest surrender value for Africans in general and Yoruba-speaking Nigerians in particular. There are three major parameters in the enquiry. First, there is the issue of the medium of instruction. Participants in the experimental classes use
their mother tongue (Yoruba) throughout and the control
classes use their mother tongue in the first three classes,
English in the last two years, with the fourth year being a
transitional period when either language is used as deemed de-
sirable. Second, there is the question of curriculum. Some
new enriched materials are used by experimental classes and
Control Group A. Control Group B uses traditional materials
used in all state schools. Finally, there is the variable con-
cerning English language teaching. Experimental Group A uses
specialist teachers and Experimental Group B uses traditional
teachers, but both groups use new enriched materials. Con-
trol classes use traditional materials and teachers. In effect,
new teaching materials (about 150 books) have been prepared
in the children's mother tongue, Yoruba.
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I would like to examine today the linguistic competence of bilinguals and their ability to perform successfully in monolingual and bilingual settings in the light of what is known about the function of social and stylistic variation in language. The data come from a first analysis of the speech of Italian immigrants in Buenos Aires.

I advance the hypothesis that, since the 'communicative competence' of speakers who make everyday usage of two or more codes includes drawing on each of these codes, plus the ability to mix them and switch among them, the structure of each code taken separately is usually reduced in some dimensions. Therefore, if the speaker's verbal ability is evaluated in a situation where he or she is forced to stay within a single code, such as in all contacts with the monolingual community, this speaker's communicative competence will seem to be less rich than it actually is. On the other hand, the speaker's total repertoire is fully exploited in those bilingual settings where the speaker can call on the resources from each of the available codes and on the strategies of switching among them.

I propose to investigate whether for situations of bilingualism in general, each of the two systems in contact can be shown to be in some sense 'reduced' compared to the same code used by speakers for whom it is the only one available, i.e. monolingual speakers of either of those codes. In the case of monolingual speakers, the speaker's use of that code covers the whole set of his or her verbal exchanges and the structure of the code has to be made adequate to fulfill all the necessary communicative functions. On the other hand, bilingual speakers can exercise their communicative skills by drawing on both codes and on the combinations that result from switching between them. Therefore, in neither code will
a fully developed communicative performance be possible, and, presumably, the situations which require that only one of the codes be used will inhibit the bilingual speaker's communication.

I find that social and educational problems arise from the fact that this inhibiting effect of the use of just one of the available codes is not self-evident in the analysis of the speaker's production. Often, when a bilingual speaker has become quite proficient in her or his second code as a separate entity, she or he is considered to be expressing her/himself at her/his highest potential when employing that particular code monolingually. No language problem is then acknowledged. However, though quite possibly in such situations the bilingual speaker comes across as nonassertive, insecure, too quiet, not very articulate, all of these will be considered unfortunate personal or cultural characteristics. That same speaker probably reports feeling more at ease when talking to other bilinguals, and when 'mixing languages'. I try to indicate that CS (code or language switching) situations are in fact more comfortable because they allow the bilingual speaker to activate her/his complete communicative competence. One reason why the unfavorable influence of the monolingual situation on the linguistic performance of a bilingual speaker is not recognized is that language proficiency is usually measured by laymen and linguists in terms of the referential function. If the referential meanings can be expressed, no attention is paid to faulty control of that part of the linguistic structure which serves other social and stylistic functions.

Halliday (1973:35) remarks on the dominance of the referential function of language in the adult's conception of the use of language: 'The adult tends to be sceptical if it is suggested to him that language has other uses than that of conveying information; and he will usually think next of the use of language to misinform—which is simply a variant of the informative function'. Halliday, like Hymes, Gumperz, Labov, Ferguson, and others, has insisted (1973:22) that it is not only clear that language can be put to many uses but that linguists must study 'the relation between the function of language and language itself ... Has the character of language been shaped and determined by what we use it for? There are a number of reasons for suggesting that it has'. Halliday develops this idea: 'If a language is, as it were, programmed to serve a variety of needs, then this should show up in some way in an investigation of linguistic structure. In fact this functional plurality is very clearly built into the structure of language, and forms the basis of its semantic and "syntactic" (i.e. grammatical and lexical) organization' (1973:105).

One very important reason for us to be convinced that 'the character of language has been shaped and determined' by the different functions of language, including nonreferential ones, is that Labov and other scholars working in his framework have presented evidence that language structure includes a variable
component where the choices are not referentially distinctive but have social and stylistic significance (Labov 1966, 1968, 1969, 1971, 1972a, 1972b, among others).

Gumperz's latest papers on interethnic communication contain overwhelming evidence of the difficulties in communication caused by an inappropriate use of the devices that convey social and stylistic meanings (Gumperz 1976, 1978). These papers have a tradition in the sociolinguistic field: Gumperz's focus in his own work on the nonreferential functions of language led him to begin to understand the mechanisms and meaning of code-switching. In the same way, besides showing the logical structure of Black English, Labov also redirected linguistic analysis to the nonreferential functions of language to disclaim the antisocial hypotheses of the verbal deprivation of Black children (1972b). Hymes has been the most explicit (1978:12) in distinguishing between the grammatical and the stylistic components of language structure. 'It is hard, after all ... to imagine what the grammatical relations that produce the diversities of surface form are for, if not for relations of style. From such a point of view, style is not a dispersion of grammar; grammar is a precipitate of style'. Hymes emphasizes 'the necessity of investigating the organization of differences of form in terms of style as well as of grammar in the narrow sense' (1978:16; see also Hymes 1974:164-166, 175, 177). It is within this approach, where some of the facts of language are explained by considering its nonreferential uses, that I reexamine the structure of cocoliche. 1

Cocoliche is the name given by non-Italians, i.e. monolingual Spanish speakers of Argentina and Uruguay, to the speech used by Italian immigrants in addressing members of the local (Spanish-speaking) population. Whinnom (1971) used cocoliche to illustrate his theory that a pidgin can only arise in a situation of multilingualism. He considers that since all there was in Argentina was bilingualism, the contact of Italian and Spanish did not give rise to a pidgin and cocoliche is therefore a case of linguistic tertiary hybridization.

Although Whinnom is basically right in his conclusion that cocoliche is not a pidgin, this fact can perhaps be explained more accurately on the basis of other factors, such as the similarity of Italian and Spanish and the very tenuous character of the social barriers in the recipient society. However, it could be argued that at least for the first, pre-1914 immigrants, the variety of mutually unintelligible dialects plus the lack of a shared Italian standard, as well as the fact that Italians interacted with fellow workers from Eastern Europe, Northern Spain, etc., could have provided the multilingual conditions which supposedly would give rise to a pidgin. In any case, either because of the absence of a truly multilingual situation or due to the presence of other factors, cocoliche is something different from a pidgin. It has characteristics closer to those of a creole, even though it does not have native speakers.
Italians came to Argentina in two major waves: the first extended from about 1860 to the beginning of the First World War in Europe, and the beginning of the second wave coincided with the end of the Second World War. The Italian immigrants tried from the very beginning to learn Spanish. Quite soon after arriving (not more than a few weeks in most cases) they had already learned enough of the local language to satisfy their most urgent communicative needs such as looking for places to eat and live, a job, and so forth. The Argentine population did not make any corresponding effort to learn Italian for practical communicative purposes and the Italian they did pick up from their exposure to the immigrants was used mainly to enrich their own repertoires, as extra stylistic resources. They found the Italianized Spanish humorous and this was exploited in the popular arts.

Although Italians did not encounter insurmountable social barriers (indeed, the second generation has become part of the middle class), the contact of the immigrants with the Spanish-speaking population was limited to commercial interaction: they had, for example, such artisan skills as shoemaking, or they engaged in retailing, often of garden produce. Their affective life was still with their own kind, preferably with those who had come from the same village, or the same small geographical area in Italy, and who mostly spoke the same or related dialects. This state of affairs, described in detail by Meo Zilio (1964), was confirmed by all my informants in their oral narratives about their arrival in Buenos Aires and their subsequent living conditions.

Thus, their imperfect competence in Spanish was put to use in a very restricted domain. Later, when they raised their children, they started to speak to them in Spanish at home. To understand why the parents of the second generation Italian Argentines raised them as Spanish monolinguals, we need only recall that the Italian regional dialect had no prestige at all. The dialect brought with it a linguistic stigma with respect to standard Italian. Therefore, immigrants preferred to address their children in imperfect Spanish, with the justifiable expectation that it would improve through contact with monolingual peers, teachers, and the rest of the Spanish-speaking native society, rather than trying to teach them their native Italian dialect, a form of speech which had absolutely no value for them other than the fact that they felt comfortable using it with close relatives and intimate friends.

Of the three types of languages distinguished by Ferguson and DeBose (1977) from 'the full, natural languages that constitute the traditional object of the linguist's study' (1977:99), i.e. 'simplified registers', 'broken language', and 'pidgin', cocoliche is closest to the category of 'broken language', i.e. 'learners' production of a target language' (1977:109). But for many speakers of cocoliche it is not the case that they 'are in the process of learning it' (1977:100). Most cocoliche speakers
have been in Argentina half their lives and their Spanish has reached a 'fossilization' stage so that it cannot be said that they are in the process of learning the local language, at least not to any greater extent than everybody can be said to be constantly learning the language of the community.

Ferguson and DeBose characterize these language types as follows: 'All three are in some sense reduced in comparison to full languages, and they are not natural in that they do not serve as the normal mother tongue of a speech community' (1977:99-100, emphasis added). In this sense, cocoliche fits into this group: it is not the normal mother tongue of the Italian immigrants in Buenos Aires and I will show that it is 'in some sense reduced'.

However, the 'reduced' aspect of cocoliche is far from obvious. Cocoliche is rich in inflectional morphology and shows syntactic complexity. The lexicon, which draws on both codes in a mixed fashion, cannot be considered especially limited, and the phonology has been enriched by the addition of some of the nonoverlapping phonemes of the inventories of Spanish and the regional dialect. But it can be shown to be a dramatically reduced form of Spanish if we look at those parts of the structure which are used to express nonreferential oppositions, i.e. those which have social and stylistic significance.

At first, it seems that what can be said in Spanish can be said in cocoliche. But this is false. This statement can only be defended for the very narrowly defined referential part of the language structure. Many of the forms of the variable social and stylistic component of Spanish structure are not present in cocoliche. Cocoliche, defined as a variety of Spanish, is an underdeveloped variety, simpler than Spanish, not functionally equivalent to Spanish. On the other hand, it is the only variety in the immigrants' repertoire which they can use to address Spanish monolingual interlocutors, while the total communicative competence of immigrants includes much more than this imperfect variety of Spanish. Their communicative competence, when implemented in situations which allow for mixing of forms and switching to the dialect, is as rich as the communicative competence of any speaker of a natural language.

What is revealed by the analysis of cocoliche is that many of those forms which have been identified in Buenos Aires Spanish as being structured along a sociostylistic dimension fail to be exploited by cocoliche speakers, even by those who show other signs of good Spanish proficiency, such as nearly native Spanish phonology, or frequent usage of Spanish lexical items. I am going to discuss here one example of a sociolinguistic variable of Spanish on the phonological level and one example from the discourse level, both of them unexploited in cocoliche.

The phonological sociolinguistic variable of Spanish which has been studied best is $<s>$, which occurs as [s], [h], or [ð]. For the Spanish of Buenos Aires, Terrell (n.d.) has analyzed the constraints which can be isolated in the use of $<s>$ in the
speech of 24 informants, all of them 'porteños', i.e. natives of the city of Buenos Aires, all virtually of the same socioeconomic level. Other studies of this same variable of Spanish are based on data from other communities: Bahía Blanca (Argentina), Panama City (Panama), Caracas (Venezuela), Cuba, Puerto Rico, among others. All studies of the variable <s> in monolingual Spanish coincide in showing that it is stratified socially and stylistically. The native Spanish speaker employs each variable under phonological, morphological, and syntactic constraints, and the frequency of [∅] clearly increases in lower socioeconomic strata and in the most 'informal' styles. The phenomenon of hypercorrection has been observed in the replacement of the [h] variant by the full form [s] before consonants.

My quantitative examination of more than 50 hours recorded by 50 first-generation Italian immigrants in Buenos Aires reveals that independent of their proficiency in Spanish, they show an almost categorical occurrence of final variant [∅]. Less than 2 percent of the occurrences are full [s], and often all of the examples of final [s] for any particular informant occur variably in one or two lexical items, for example, the numeral dos 'two'. Thus the speech of Italian immigrants in Buenos Aires shows a frequency of [∅] for word-final position never reached by native speakers in that community, no matter how low they be on the socioeconomic scale or how informal their style. The frequency of [∅] in place of [h] or [s] as well as its unconstrained distribution in the speech of first-generation Italians in Buenos Aires has only one significance: that of foreignness. Furthermore, the absence of word-internal [h] before consonant and its replacement by [s],

['ehte] ~ ['este]  
[ehpe'ra] ~ [espe'ra]

a hypercorrective feature found among lower middle class native speakers, also reaches almost categorical frequency (over 95 percent) which can only be labeled foreign.

What I find worth emphasizing is that by realizing all final <s> as [∅], and all word-internal <s> as [s], Italian Argentines are unable to take advantage of one of the clearest sociolinguistic units of the Spanish of the area. The categorical realization of <s> as final [∅] or word-internal [s] not only gives them a foreign accent and leads them to be perceived as uneducated, although it is very likely that the connotation of foreigner overshadows the class one. But more important, as far as communicative performance is concerned, it deprives these speakers of a chance to exploit a signal which is systematically used by native speakers to distinguish styles and consequently to characterize speech events. The reduction of the native variability of final <s> to a unique phonetic realization [∅], and that of word-internal <s> to [s] can be seen
as a simplification of the structure of Spanish. However, the consequences are not functionally relevant from a referential point of view. In most cases, enough of a signal is left after the deletion of the <s> to express the morphology; for instance, in the first person plural of the verbs, in the masculine definite article, etc. In cases in which some ambiguity might eventually arise, it is always resolved in the linguistic or extra-linguistic context. This simplification of the variable part of the phonological component of Spanish does not therefore really affect the referential communicative function, but it does limit the social and stylistic resources. For other phonological variables of Spanish which have been studied (<z>, consonant clusters), I have encountered similar reductions of the variation to a single variant which connotes only foreignness.

I now examine the alternation of tenses of the subjunctive, the conditional, and the indicative. Although this seems to be a case of tense variation, I now think that it belongs to variation at the discourse level. In any case, it constitutes a clear area of social and stylistic variation, which I have studied for Buenos Aires Spanish for only one of its environments, the conditional clause (Lavandera 1975).

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Si tuviera tiempo, iría.} & \quad \text{(imperfect subjunctive)} \\
\text{Si tendría tiempo, iría.} & \quad \text{(conditional)} \\
\text{Si tengo tiempo, iría.} & \quad \text{(present indicative)} \\
\text{Si tenía tiempo, iría.} & \quad \text{(imperfect indicative)}
\end{align*}
\]

rough translation:

'If I have time, I'll go.'

The tendency to substitute indicative and conditional forms for those of the subjunctive is favored in Buenos Aires Spanish by the lower social strata and by all speakers in less careful styles. This substitution lowers the overall frequency of forms of the subjunctive mood.

By comparison, the absence of subjunctive forms in cocoliche goes beyond anything observable in the native varieties and cannot be explained as interference from Italian, since the forms of the subjunctive absent from cocoliche texts exist in the Italian dialects, usually with the same or very similar morphology, and I myself elicited them in part of the interview where the informants were asked to translate certain Spanish sentences with the subjunctive forms into their dialect. The following are a few of the examples obtained.

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Se ovesse soldi, me catasse na casa} & \quad \text{'If I had money, I'd buy a house.'} \\
\text{Se tenesse soldi, io catasse na casa} & \\
\text{Vorresse Dio che fosse più giovanne!} & \quad \text{'I wish I were younger.'}
\end{align*}
\]

But a careful reading of the cocoliche texts shows that, in fact, it is not so much that tenses from other moods occur in contexts which would have required a form of the subjunctive in standard Spanish, but that there is an absence of the
appropriate contexts for the subjunctive mood at the discourse level.

If we start the analysis from the forms themselves, as has been the usual procedure in the quantitative sociolinguistic studies of variation, and we try to establish the frequency of the imperfect subjunctive in relation to all the contexts where its occurrence would have been grammatical, we would not perceive the issue. We could only conclude that the interviews, group sessions, and spontaneous conversations which I have collected have inexplicably failed to elicit a statistically significant number of environments where the variable <subjunctive/conditional/indicative> can be studied. Once we define the context for that variation, this paper would have to report a relative failure at eliciting a sufficiently high number of texts of indirect discourse, of texts including conditional, concessive, or relative clauses in the past, and so forth.

A possible solution which I would have adopted five years ago would be to structure an interview situation which would favor the production of those linguistic environments. This task, even if accomplished with some degree of success, would not reveal that all the conversations we recorded, in many varied natural settings, in fact took place without recourse to those contexts which allow the subjunctive and therefore its stylistic variation with tenses from other moods. Therefore, I now think we must examine what functions are served in Spanish discourse by those environments which allow the occurrence of the subjunctive mood—i.e. what functions are served by indirect discourse, the different nonpast adverbial clauses (concessive, conditional, final), relatives modifying indefinite noun phrases—and see whether those functions are fulfilled at all in the cocoliche variety, and if so, by what other features.

As an example of an environment of the subjunctive mood clearly avoided by cocoliche speakers, we can take indirect discourse or reported speech. In some clauses of indirect discourse the subjunctive is never replaced in native Spanish by other moods. The only way to get by without using subjunctive forms is to avoid indirect discourse altogether. When the speech reported refers to instructions, directions, or advice given with regard to actions which from the point of view of the original utterance were not in the past, the subjunctive is mandatory. Nevertheless, there is variation between the imperfect and the present subjunctive.

Nos dijo que nos quedáramos quietos hasta que él volviera. (impf. subj.)
quedemos vuelva. (pres. subj.)
*quedáramos *volverfa. (conditional)
*quedamos *vuelve. (pres. indic.)
*quedábamos *volvfa. (impf. indic.)

'He told us to stay quiet until he came back'.
In these cases cocoliche speakers simply refrain from using indirect discourse and use direct discourse instead, i.e. quotations preceded by a form of the performative 'to say' (dijo, dice). In general, lower class native Argentine speakers tend to prefer direct discourse while upper class speakers use the indirect form of discourse more often. In all social classes, we have some fragments of indirect discourse while I have not so far come across any indirect discourse in the many cocoliche narratives which report dialogues. This use of direct discourse is so frequent that it is one of the stereotypes of cocoliche. In the fifties, an Argentine comedian, Pepe Iglesias, 'El Zorro', played a character with an obviously Italian name, Caruso, who would start all his narratives with the following sequence.

Le digo Comandante, me dice Caruso, le digo Comandante, me dice Caruso, le digo, me dice, le digo, me dice.

'I say "Commander" to him, he says "Caruso" to me, I say "Commander" to him, he says "Caruso" to me, I say to him, he says to me, I say to him, he says to me.'

Every story started with this sequence, which inevitably cracked up the audience.

Let us compare this with the following fragments taken from some of the narratives in the corpus.

El hombre se interesó muchísimo e, ya había tomado informe, el dueño que me había tomado a trabajar estaba muy contento dicen que yo muchacho e un muchacho que trabaja entontese el hombre me dijo, dice, sí, dishe, haces te valere, dicen, hace te, valere porque el hombre está muy contento, muy conforme. A mí el hombre me había dicho, dicen, Roque, dicen, vo te quedé tres días, si me gusta tu trabajo te quedé, si no, dice, te pago, te va. Pero deso pasaron cinco días; entonces yo pensé, digo, bueno, a ver cuánto me paga ahora, el viernes lo llamé yo. Digo, don Manuel, y, qué hacemos, digo, me quedo o me voy? me gusta o ... ? Sí, sí, sí, dice, quedaste, quedaste, dice, que, sí, dice, ahora voy de mi hermano, dice, Abram, viene mi hermano, dice, vamo a arreglar.6 (R.F.)

Una noche tenfamo que ir a un baile. No venfano a invitar para ir a bailar. Pero mi papá no era porque no le gustaba, era que la noche era muy fea, había nieve, llovía, tonse, dice, no vamo. Pero yo me gustaba tanto ir al baile que dije, y vamo, y vamo, y vamo, boué. Llegamos allá, no visitó y todo y no fuimos. Y llegamos y se pagó la luz. Bueno, no quedamos a rato de porque la mima gente de la mima, lo mimo dueño en la calle dice, ¿qué van a hacer ahora acá? ... Bueno, dice, no cambian y no vamo a dormir y yasta.7 (M.S.)
If we rewrite these stories in indirect discourse, we obtain at least some examples where the subjunctive is obligatory. The standard form which I have used here would be the imperfect subjunctive, but a more colloquial style would make it possible to replace them with present subjunctives.

El hombre se interesó muchísimo, ya había tomado informes, el dueño que me había tomado a trabajar estaba muy contento, le había dicho que yo era un muchacho que trabajaba, entonces el hombre me dijo que me hiciera valer, que me hiciera valer porque el hombre estaba muy conforme. A mí el hombre me había dicho que me quedara tres días, que si a él le gustaba mi trabajo que me quedara y que si no, que él me pagaba y me fuera. Pero de eso pasaron cinco días y no me dijo nada, entonces yo pensaba si estaría conforme, si estaría contento, cuanto me pagarías; el viernes lo llamé yo y le dije que qué hacíamos, si me quedaba o me iba, si le gustaba o ... Me dijo que sí, que me quedara, que me quedara, que sí, que él iba en ese momento a lo de su hermano y que cuando viniera el hermano arreglaríamos.

Una noche teníamos que ir a un baile. Nos venían a invitar para ir a bailar. Pero mi papa no era porque no le gustaba (no gustara), era porque la noche era muy fea, llovía, entonces decía que no fuéramos. Pero yo me gustaba tanto ir al baile que dije que fuéramos y que fuéramos y que fuéramos, bué. Llegamos allá, nos vestimos y todo y nos fuimos. Y llegamos allá y se apagó la luz. Bueno, nos quedamos un rato, pero la misma gente de la misma, los mismos dueños en la calle dijeron que qué íbamos a hacer entonces allá ... Bueno, yo dije que nos cambiáramos y que nos fuéramos a dormir y ya está.

All speakers in my corpus use only direct discourse to report speech; they do not vary between different types of discourse. And yet these speakers would be grouped, on the basis of their Spanish phonology, their use of Spanish lexical items, and other similar measures, in the highest level of Spanish proficiency. A form of discourse which requires use of the subjunctive and furthermore shows variation within the subjunctive is avoided, even though we have evidence that these same speakers know the verbal forms in question. M. S. herself produces a conditional clause with the imperfect subjunctive within one of the fragments of direct discourse. She quotes her father, saying:

Decía, ay, s'hija, dice, si supiera, dice, lo que sufriyo, no tenía nada para comer.

'He used to say, daughter, if, he says, if you knew, he says, how much I suffered, I had nothing to eat.'
Therefore, the absence of discourse forms favoring the occurrence of specific grammatical means cannot be explained on the basis of a reduction in the grammatical inventory.10 In this case, for instance, we know that the grammar of these speakers includes the tenses of the subjunctive mood, i.e. they have them in their 'competence' and even produce some subjunctives in actual speech. However, compared to texts elicited from native speakers of the same socioeconomic level, education, and in similar situations, the subjunctive appears almost to be absent from cocoliche texts. The range of uses of the subjunctive and the frequency with which the speaker wants to avail himself of this linguistic device are notoriously reduced among cocoliche speakers compared to the range and frequency of the native speaker's usage.11

Now, from the point of view of a narrowly defined referential function, everything which is said with a type of discourse which requires or favors the subjunctive mood can be paraphrased with a form of discourse which accepts the indicative mood. Therefore, the area of choice between discourse implemented by forms of the subjunctive and discourse implemented by forms of the indicative or the conditional conveys mainly nonreferential information, and is instead an area of stylistic and social variation. This area of choice is another part of the potential of Spanish which the cocoliche speaker fails to exploit. In the sense in which I am here using the term 'simpler', this variety of Spanish is simpler insofar as it does not include some of those forms which are primarily exploited to express social or stylistic meanings.

I want to emphasize here that I am not suggesting that direct discourse as a linguistic form is in itself in some sense simpler than indirect discourse, nor that the use of the subjunctive mood implies a greater complexity of some sort or is stylistically richer than the use of other moods. It is the possibility of effecting a 'choice' between direct and indirect discourse and consequently, the possibility of choosing between tenses of the subjunctive and tenses from the other moods, which is missing from the cocoliche repertoire. Furthermore, I find that this 'choice' belongs to the stylistic component (as distinct from the grammatical component) and that it conveys social and stylistic significance, even though both discourse forms may be considered referentially equivalent (see Hymes 1974 and 1978).

Thus, the fact that some Italian dialects make fewer formal distinctions in the subjunctive mood than standard Italian in no way implies that the dialects are 'reduced' with respect to the standard. Nor does the fact that English has virtually no subjunctive mood mean that it is in some sense more reduced than Spanish, for example. The variable components of both English and the Italian dialects draw on language areas other than the mood system to express social and stylistic meanings.

What I want to point out is that the monolingual speaker of any dialect or language, dependent on that dialect or language
for all speech interaction, develops a series of alternatives within it which serve to express stylistic differences. Thus, monolingual Spanish speakers exploit the distinction direct/indirect discourse to convey stylistic significance, while the partial usage of the Spanish code made by Italian immigrants leads to a reduction of the variable component of Spanish by the exclusion of indirect discourse from usage. Similar reductions of the variable sociostylistic component can probably be discovered in the use of Italian dialects by the immigrants as compared to monolingual speakers in Italy using the same dialects.

In this sense, the analysis of my data on cocoliche, of which I have presented two examples, seems to indicate that the variable component of Spanish is acquired later, incompletely, or never by cocoliche speakers. For part of their verbal interaction, however, they have access to more than just this Spanish code, and my hypothesis for future research, based mainly on Gumperz's findings about the meaning of code-switching, is that these social and stylistic significances are communicated by means of a larger repertoire.

My interviews are structured so as to distinguish at least four kinds of speech events, of which two are artificially elicited, and the other two are spontaneously produced. The first 'artificial event' is a request for a story told in the dialect, emphasizing the interviewer's desire to record it in the dialect. What is produced under these circumstances is the least intelligible of all the situations for a monolingual Spanish speaker, i.e. it is the closest rendition to a 'pure dialect' text. I received two kinds of responses to this request: some speakers felt quite at ease with the task and unhaltingly told a long story, and others complained explicitly that it was already difficult for them to speak the dialect and they continuously and involuntarily switched into Spanish, which they sometimes perceived and corrected. They made many corrections in the form of repetitions, including some in the wrong direction, i.e. after the appropriate dialect form, they gave the equivalent Spanish form. The other extreme of the repertoire was also artificially induced by asking the speakers to tell the same story again, but this time in Spanish. Because it was a translation task and probably also because it came so soon after an effort to speak the dialect, what they produced was Spanish, but more halting than ever, with many self-corrections, shortened versions, etc.

The 'spontaneously' produced 'events' are: speech used to address monolingual Spanish speakers not of Italian background (the closest the speaker could get to Spanish was produced in these situations), and finally, secretly recorded speech events in the home setting. The latter can be divided, according to the speakers' own judgments, into talk taking place in the dialect, mixing the dialect and Spanish, and Spanish. However, we find mixing and lively conversations in all three of these
categories; the first does not approach the dialect as it appears in the stories, and the third does not approach the Spanish used to address monolingual speakers.12

The data indicate that for these speakers Spanish and Italian are not independent codes, at least not more so than the different registers of a monolingual speaker. In fact, the dialect and Spanish are only labels assigned to different speech events where the circumstances of the interaction, the greater or lesser amount of attention paid to speech, the presence or absence of monolingual Spanish speakers, and so forth, lead to a different apportioning of forms from the dialect and Spanish and to their distribution at different levels. The switch from code to code and mixing of codes provide the stylistic resources lacking in the Spanish code as mastered by cocoliche speakers. On the other hand, the form of speech they produce (and recognize) as Spanish, which is what has been stereotyped as cocoliche, lacks the variable component of local Spanish which conveys the social and stylistic meanings. If we want to describe their total repertoire, it would probably be appropriate to use Labov's model of variables and variable rules and define variables which group dialect and Spanish forms, as well as intermediate forms, as alternants. This description will reveal the variable component in the language structure of these bilingual speakers.

During a quarrel which was recorded surreptitiously by José Passamonte, brother and nephew, respectively, of the two women involved, the older woman, an Italian immigrant, expressed her increasing anger by gradually switching into what they call the dialect (less readily comprehensible to me, for instance, than what she would label as her Spanish). The younger woman, her niece, a 22-year-old second generation Italian Argentine, failed to make the slightest switch even though she understood her aunt's speech effortlessly, and found all the means she needed to show her annoyance within Spanish itself. When the tape was played back, both women agreed in identifying those stretches of speech in which the aunt spoke 'dialect' (although it contained unmistakably Spanish forms throughout) and those in which she spoke Spanish (equally interspersed with dialect forms). What we have, in fact, is a continuum which is perceived categorically by the members of the Italian immigrant community as either dialect or Spanish. Labov has already directed our attention to the categorical perception of continuous production.

My current research seems to indicate that the interspersion of Italian dialect forms with Spanish forms carries stylistic significance and defines speech events for interactional purposes. A switch from 'one code' to 'another code' defines the speech event. In talking among themselves these speakers can and do exploit all these devices. It is easy to understand why they all agree in reporting those situations of interaction with people originally from the same geographical areas as being more
comfortable and pleasant. They report that this is so, among other reasons, because they can talk dialect. Although what they in fact talk does not in a linguistic analysis show up as dialect, they are nevertheless right in pointing out a linguistic difference, since in such situations they have access to a much more complex linguistic repertoire which allows them to communicate many more meanings.

On the other hand, as the two examples just discussed seem to indicate, bilingual Italian immigrants do not have access to a complete repertoire when they talk to native Spanish monolinguals. The use of the Italian-based variants does not carry any social or stylistic significance for the Spanish monolingual Argentine hearer, especially one who is not of Italian descent. It is instead interpreted simply as a lack of proficiency in Spanish, and if carried too far, may hinder comprehension. Furthermore, the Spanish end of the Italian speaker's continuous repertoire does not include the sociolinguistic variables of Buenos Aires Spanish. The bilingual speaker is in those situations restricted in his or her communication by the use of an underdeveloped code, a code which at best fulfills only the referential function.

What I want to emphasize is that the expressive limitations which I found in the variety of Spanish spoken by Italian immigrants does not mean that the total verbal repertoire at their disposal lacks the means to distinguish among speech events along the scale of degree of formality/informality, or that they have no way of signalling excitement or emphasis in speech when they wish to do so. In most of their interaction they communicate social or stylistic meanings by effecting choices across different codes, and it is only the Spanish they master, i.e. cocoliche, which does not include the linguistic means to communicate such meanings.

Conclusions. We can probably extend these observations about cocoliche to other situations of bilingualism. The argument then is that the studies of variation conducted so far have shown that one of the components of language is a variable component, in which the choice among forms which say referentially the same thing can be exploited to convey social and stylistic significance. In the case of cocoliche, it becomes clear that the sociostylistic variable component is not part of this variety of Spanish. When forced to restrict themselves to Spanish, bilingual Italian immigrants have to make do with a reduced code, the reduction consisting mainly of the absence of the sociolinguistic variables.

The second part of the argument depends on the validity of Gumperz's evidence and theory of the meanings of code-switching. I would like to advance the hypothesis that since, as Gumperz has shown, the bilingual speaker draws on code-switching and mixing to convey a good part of the stylistic and social meanings of his or her everyday verbal interaction, either
code separately remains underdeveloped for the expression of such nonreferential meanings. It follows that these speakers will feel uneasy in either code on its own, and will prefer those communicative situations in which their whole linguistic repertoire is appropriate.

In the case of Chicano and Puerto Rican bilingual speakers in the United States who carry out part of their verbal exchanges in Spanish and part in English, it is a plausible hypothesis that at least for some of them, neither their variety of English nor their variety of Spanish will offer them all the stylistic and social variation available to monolingual speakers of either code. In interacting with other bilinguals, however, the variable component gets developed for the bilingual system as a whole, and includes variation among forms drawn from both English and Spanish and forms created by the bilingual interaction itself. If this is the case, it follows that in all contacts with the majority English monolingual community, the Chicano and Puerto Rican bilinguals are forced to use just part of their bilingual repertoire, the variable component is probably reduced, and they find themselves handicapped and unable to express some of the social and stylistic meanings necessary for effective communication. Those of us who have come to believe that a great deal of what people communicate are not referential but social and expressive meanings cannot take the restrictions on such parts of the total communicative competence lightly.

NOTES

A shorter version of this paper was read with the title 'Code labels for speech events among bilinguals'. The field work was funded by the Social Science Research Council and the American Philosophical Society. The general analysis was conducted under a John Simon Guggenheim Fellowship (1977-1978). I would like to thank all three institutions for their generous support.

1. I collected data for the study of cococoliche in Buenos Aires in June-August, 1976, and January-February, 1977. During that time I trained a young Argentine man, José Passamonte, whose parents are Italian immigrants. He is now continuing the field work.

2. Ferguson and DeBose (1977:100) make the following characterization: 'The first type are "simplified registers", which are more or less conventionalized varieties of language used by members of a speech community to address people whose knowledge of the language of the community is felt to be less than normal (cf. Ferguson 1975). The second type is "broken language", the imperfect approximations of a language by speakers of another language who are in the process of learning it (cf. Ferguson 1963). The third type is the pidgin itself, which the authors of the paper regard as typically
resulting from the use of both simplified register and broken language in the same communication situations'.

3. It can be said that it is 'simpler' just as one accepts that the grammar used by young children is simpler than that used by older children or by adults, or that the grammar used by a second language learner at the beginning stages is simpler than that of more advanced students or of native speakers. No other notion of 'simpler' is involved here. In a way, 'simpler' here can be equated with less fully developed or incomplete.

4. Terrell's analysis is based on a set of interviews, each of which averaged an hour in duration. Many of these I recorded as a member of the Buenos Aires team of the 'Proyecto de estudio coordinado de la norma lingüística culta' (cf. Lope Blanch 1969) under the supervision of Ana María Barrenechea. She made this material available to Terrell, as he acknowledges in note 2 of his study. For a comparison of the different dialects, see Terrell (1977). For references and reviews, see Lavandera (1974 and 1976). The most thorough analysis of the language variable based on a socially stratified sample is still Cedergren (1973) for Panama City.

5. I could not use the data from the only quantitative study on phonological variation in Spanish in a bilingual situation (Ma and Herasimchuk 1971) because they do not distinguish among speech events in the way that I need to for the point I am making here. Instead, they have an opposition of reading vs. speaking styles. The Puerto Rican situation is also very special in that, as Ma and Herasimchuk report (1971:357), 'Spanish values and contacts are continually reinforced ... maintaining the functional levels of the Spanish language'. There are additional differences in methodological decisions between their study and mine which make it impossible to compare the two here. On the other hand, a number of statements by Ma and Herasimchuk indicate that their perception of the situation they are studying is similar to what I am presenting here. 'Bilinguals interact and communicate with each other, using both languages, far more frequently than they interact and communicate with members of the surrounding monolingual community' (1971:352). 'Our hypothesis is that speakers who show greater sensitivity to Spanish than to English, i.e. use Spanish more frequently over a wider range of social interactions, will reflect this fact linguistically by having more varieties in Spanish than in English' (1971:355). 'This rapid and continuous language switching is the defining characteristic of a particular conversational style among certain types of bilingual intimates, i.e. it can be considered a language variety of its own' (1971:359).

6. 'The man was very interested, he had already gotten reports, the owner who had taken me on was very happy he says that I, boy, is a boy who works, so the man told me, he says, yes, he says, stand up for your rights, he says, stand up for your rights because the man is very happy, he is very satisfied. The man had told me, he says, Roque, he says, you
stay three days, if I like your work you stay, if not, he says, you go. But five days went by; then I thought, I say, he must be satisfied, he must be happy, I say, alright, let's see how much he pays me now, on Friday I called him. I say, Don Manuel, so, what do we do? I say, do I stay or do I go? Do you like it or ...? Yes, yes, yes, he says, stay, stay, he says, yes, he says, now I'm going to my brother's, Abram, my brother comes, he says, we'll arrange it'.

7. 'One night we had to go to a dance. They came and invited us to go dancing. But my father, it wasn't because he didn't like it, it was because the night was awful, it was snowing, it rained, so he says, we're not going. But I liked going to the dance so much that I said let's go, let's go, let's go, well. We got there, we got dressed and all and we left. And we got there and the lights went out. Well, we stayed a while but the people themselves, the hosts in the street were saying, what are you going to do now? ... Well, I said, let's change and we go to sleep and that's it'.

8. 'The man was very interested, he had already gotten reports, the owner who had taken me on was very happy, he had told him that I was a boy who worked, so the man told me I should stand up for my rights, that I should stand up for my rights because the man was very satisfied. The man had told me to stay three days, that if he liked my work I should stay and if not, he would pay me and I would go. But five days went by and he didn't say anything to me, so I wondered whether he was satisfied, whether he was happy, how much he'd pay me; on Friday I called him and asked him what we'd do, whether I stayed or went, whether he liked me or ... He told me yes, that I should stay, that I should stay, that yes, that he was going over to his brother's right then and that when the brother came, we would arrange it'.

9. 'One night we had to go to a dance. They came to invite us to go dancing. But my father, it wasn't because he didn't like it, it was because the night was awful, it rained, so he said we shouldn't go. But I liked going to dance so much that I said we should go, we should go, we should go, well. We got there, we got dressed and all and we left. And we got there and the lights went out. Well, we stayed a while, but the people themselves, the hosts in the street said what were we going to do there ... Well, I said we should change and go to sleep and that's it'.

10. On this issue, Dell Hymes (personal communication) has directed my attention to Whorf's focus on the 'habitual' as distinct from the 'potential' (cf. Whorf 1941).

11. I did not compare it with the interviews reported on in Lavandera (1975) because here the difference would be even greater, since I made a special effort to elicit si-clauses. I have used other, unstructured, interviews for comparison (Lavandera 1971) from my study of the speech of dressmakers.
in Buenos Aires, along with other materials I have recorded in the same city throughout the years.

12. After I left Buenos Aires, two older relatives (both women, 63 and 85 years old) came to Argentina from Southern Italy to join their children. José Passamonte was able to record conversations addressed to monolingual speakers of the dialect. I am now starting to analyze this material.
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THE LANGUAGE FACTOR IN THE EVALUATION
OF BILINGUAL EDUCATION
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When we begin to examine educational endeavors closely, it eventually becomes clear that they are predicated on assumptions about causal relations. The question is not simply, 'How well is the child doing in school?' but, 'What are the reasons for the degree of success or failure?' In other words, what are the causal relations? The presupposed relations between school results and factors believed to effect or cause those results are fundamental to the inception, implementation, and evaluation of school programs. The posited causal relations are often only implied in the stated goals of the educational program. Sometimes they may be fortuitously embodied in the very structure of the program itself even though they may never have been stated in any of the planning stages nor in the explicit documentation of objectives. Usually, they become most obvious and explicit only in the hindsight of post mortem evaluation. But whether they are made explicit or not, assumptions about causal relations are always there beneath the superficial manifestations of educational programming, and they are always exerting their pressures from the beginning to the end of schooling.

For instance, we might consider the posited causal relation that has motivated 'compensatory-transitional bilingual education' in the United States. In the now famous Lau v. Nichols case, the Supreme Court of the United States ruled in favor of Lau, thus upholding the rights of linguistic minorities to have access to public education. Mr. Justice Stewart made the following statement which was concurred in by the Chief Justice and Mr. Justice Blackmun:

Basic English skills are at the very core of what ... [the] public schools teach. Imposition of a requirement
that, before a child can effectively participate in the educational program, he must already have acquired those basic skills is to make a mockery of public education. We know that those who do not understand English are certain to find their classroom experiences wholly incomprehensible and in no way meaningful (1974, No. 72-6520, p. 3).

In this statement the Court assumes that the comprehensibility of educational experience is causally related to the language of instruction. More particularly, it is asserted that children who do not understand the language of instruction cannot profit from the educational experience. Further, it is implied that the society and the schools are under a moral obligation to act on the basis of this commonly understood causal connection between the classroom and the community.

We might argue against the assumptions of the Court on the grounds of the data presented by Swain at this conference. For instance, we might insist that the statement of the Court be modified to take into account the fact that many children do succeed in learning a language of instruction that initially was incomprehensible to them, and they do in many cases profit from educational experiences presented in what was at the beginning an incomprehensible language. Bowen (1977) has used this argument in his discussion of linguistic perspectives on bilingual education. Nevertheless, no one, as far as I know, has argued that knowledge of the language of instruction is not a facilitating factor in school achievement. Under some circumstances it seems possible for a child to acquire the language of instruction while also making progress in subject matter achievement. There is no record, however, of a child making substantial progress in school achievement without prior or concurrent advances in ability to use the language of instruction for communicative purposes.

While the posited causal relation between proficiency in the language of instruction and school achievement has been used as an argument for compensatory bilingual schooling, it has also been used as a principal argument in favor of bilingual schooling aimed at the maintenance of minority languages and cultures. For example, Spolsky (1977) says,

It must be obvious to all that incomprehensible education is immoral: there can be no justification for assuming that children will pick up the school language on their own, and no justification for not developing some program that will make it possible for children to learn the standard language and for them to continue to be educated all the time this is going on (p. 20).

This indictment presupposes that comprehensible education is possible and that it is causally related to the language of
instruction. Further, it presupposes a moral obligation to act on this assumption. In this regard, Spolsky's statement echoes the sentiments of the Supreme Court in the Lau v. Nichols case.

While Fishman, Spolsky, Cooper, and others at this conference have stressed the importance of causal factors of the macrosocietal sort, when it comes down to an argument for the moral justification of bilingual education, it seems that the criterion of greatest importance is the effect of schooling on the child in the classroom. Professor Lewis sums up some of these arguments very convincingly in his concluding statement on the morality of bilingual education. Although the effects of forces outside the classroom may have profound influences on the outcomes of any educational program, it seems that we intuitively reason that the achievement of the child (both cognitive and affective) is of greatest moment.

 Among the factors believed to affect school performance of children rather directly are home background variables such as the language(s) of the home, socioeconomic status, innate ability (frequently identified with IQ scores), school readiness, attitudes of the parents and aspirations for their child (children), and classroom variables such as the communicative effectiveness of the teacher, quality of the curriculum, and so on. These and other variables are mentioned in evaluative studies and proposed models for the evaluation of bilingual schooling by Macnamara (1966), Lambert and Tucker (1972), and others. These sorts of variables might be classed under the general heading of microindividual factors. Many of them can be controlled by school policy makers.

Another sort of variable which is less easily controlled is the macrosocietal type which has been stressed by Lewis, Fishman, Spolsky, Paulston, Cooper, and others at this conference and elsewhere. Though the effect of this sort of variable may be judged to be weightier, it is also less easily measured. Examples of macrosocietal factors would be the sociological interaction of linguistic communities in multilingual societies, the relative economic positions of diverse linguistic and cultural groups, the political influence and power of interacting groups, and the religious and cultural functions of multiple languages and language varieties in a national or possibly supranational society. However, as we saw earlier, when it comes to strong arguments for bilingual schooling, the causal factors judged to be of greatest importance are apparently those that affect the school achievement of children. Therefore, it seems reasonable to ask which of the possible factors believed to be causally related to school performance are most important.

For instance, we might consider the language factor. Just how important is proficiency in the language of instruction to the school achievement of children? In order to seek an empirical answer to this question, it is necessary to have some
method of measuring and quantifying language proficiency as well as school achievement. In recent years, methods for the measurement of language proficiency have been most carefully investigated in relation to the assessment of second language acquisition. It has been demonstrated repeatedly with populations of subjects ranging from early grade levels through adulthood, with many different language backgrounds, and with widely varying contexts of learning, that there exists a global language proficiency factor which accounts for the bulk of the reliable variance in a wide variety of language proficiency measures. Without going into any of the details we may simply sum up a great deal of research by pointing out that this global language factor seems to be about equally well measured by listening, speaking, reading, and writing tasks. It is an extremely robust variable and so far has defied attempts to divide it into multiple contributing components (e.g. phonology, vocabulary, and syntax, or an oral component versus a visual component; see Oiler 1976, Oiler and Hinofotis 1976, Anderson 1976, Scholz et al. in press, Carroll in press, Oiler and Perkins in press, and Oiler 1979, especially the Appendix).

While the results of language testing research are too tentative at this point to suggest that there is only a global factor of language proficiency and that there are no unique factors which are reliably associated with distinct components (say, vocabulary as opposed to grammatical knowledge, or accent versus fluency), all of the available data support the claim that there is a very large global factor that accounts for the majority of the reliable variance in all of the diverse measures investigated.

The more crucial question from the viewpoint of education in general and bilingual education in particular is how important this global language factor will prove to be in relation to other psychometric constructs such as verbal and nonverbal IQ, and various achievement and subject matter constructs. Some preliminary results on this latter question were obtained in two recent studies. The first involved native speakers of the majority variety of English in the St. Louis schools. Thomas Stump and I collaborated in obtaining standardized achievement and IQ scores for about 100 children at the fourth grade and 100 at the seventh grade levels. Stump also administered three short dictations and three 20-item cloze tests. The exact procedures followed and copies of the language tests are given in his report (Stump 1978). The test formats for the language measures used were similar to those used in many of the second language research and testing studies already alluded to in relation to the global language proficiency factor.

In the analysis of Stump's data we found that the first principal factor extracted accounted for most of the reliable variance in all of the 11 measures used. For the fourth graders, the arithmetic subscore from the Iowa Test of Basic Skills and the nonverbal subscore from the Lorge-Thorndike
Intelligence Test both loaded substantially on a factor that received substantial loadings from the dictation and cloze scores. Given the brevity of the language tests, it seems safe to conclude from Stump's data that the bulk of the variance in all the tests was attributable to variance in proficiency in English. Results for the seventh grade children were similar. The only notable difference was that the language factor seemed to be larger at the seventh grade than at the fourth. For the seventh grade sample, the nonverbal IQ score loaded on the global language factor at .85. This single factor accounted for 62 percent of the variance in all of the 11 tests included. Only the arithmetic subscore for the seventh graders failed to load on the language factor at .7 or above. Even the arithmetic subscore, however, was significantly correlated with the language factor. The conclusion that seems warranted is that language proficiency may be the most important variable in measurable school achievement even for native speakers of the language in question.

A second study shedding light on these issues comes from Streiff (1978). She investigated the language proficiency variable in relation to achievement test scores for a group of Hopi-English bilingual children in northern Arizona. The language tests she used consisted of an oral and a written cloze test. The achievement measures were the seven subtests of the California Achievement Test. A single global language factor accounted for 79 percent of the variance in all of the tests. Factor loadings were above .9 for all of the achievement subscores save one (the language structure subtest which loaded at .76). Interestingly, the arithmetic computation subscore (as distinct from the word problems in arithmetic) loaded at .92 on the global language factor. Essentially all of the reliable variance in all of the tests seemed to be accounted for by an overall language proficiency factor.

We may conclude that the acquisition of proficiency in English is the principal factor in the achievement tests investigated for the bilingual population studied by Streiff, just as it was for the monolingual population studied by Stump.

The intriguing question that arises is, why? Why is the language factor so strongly correlated with achievement in subject matter areas such as arithmetic computation? Or nonverbal IQ scores? We might have expected language proficiency to be substantially correlated with reading achievement, but how is it that it also appears to be the main factor in tests of arithmetic which do not ostensibly rely on language knowledge at all? Or on nonverbal IQ questions that very carefully avoid the use of verbal symbols as much as possible?

For several years now I have been considering the possibility that language proficiency and its acquisition may be much more fundamental to the acquisition and storage of knowledge than much of the theorizing in linguistics, psychology, and education might have led us to believe. In thinking about the nature
and likely effects of a psychologically real grammatical system that would enable the learner to make the requisite pragmatic connections between utterances and the contexts of normal experience, it seemed plausible to me that what achievement tests measure may be indistinguishable in a fundamental sense from what language proficiency tests measure—this in spite of the fact that the former may be deliberately aimed at particular types of knowledge while the latter are not. That is, I was led to consider the hypothesis that perhaps the achievement of skill in arithmetic (or statistics, at a more advanced level), or social studies, or chemistry, or whatever field, might not only be closely related to language proficiency (and in a sense dependent on it), but in a deeper sense, such seemingly specific attainments might be the attainment of language proficiency—namely, the ability to negotiate the deep and surface structures of the linguistic forms used to express and characterize, and maybe even constitute, the specific subject matter.

Occasionally, I was encouraged to pursue this line of thinking by the appearance of a book such as the one titled Language Comprehension and the Acquisition of Knowledge edited by Roy O. Freedle and John B. Carroll (1972). Although it would be incorrect to imply that their title was intended to express the hypothesis I have been discussing their book did offer a number of papers that could be considered supportive of such a general line of thought. Their version of the hypothesis would simply be a weaker one where language plays an important intermediary role. (This, incidentally, is a version to which I return later.)

The more startling aspect of the stronger hypothesis, which I want to pursue a bit further, is that the acquisition of proficiency in a language may not be (strictly speaking) a result of intelligence—where intelligence is judged to be an a priori, independent, or antecedent fact—but rather the proficiency that is attained in a given language (or languages) may be what human intelligence is, in a deeper sense. Thus, language proficiency may not be a mere superficial manifestation of what intelligence can do, rather it may be the intelligence itself. Acquiring a language, from this point of view, would not be a process executed by intelligence, but rather would be thought of as the normal maturation, or amplification of the intelligence itself. In such a view, language proficiency is not so much a manifestation or symptom of intelligence as it is the essence of the dynamic maturing intelligence itself.

'But', someone may say, 'surely you are not saying that intelligence might be the attainment of proficiency in English? ' They would be quite correct. I am not saying that. Intelligence (according to the hypothesis we are exploring) would not be equatable with proficiency attained in English except by monolingual English speakers. For speakers of Mandarin, their proficiency in Mandarin would probably be the best index of their 'intelligence' in the sense we are using the term. What I am suggesting is that perhaps the acquisition of skill
in some language is essential to the normal development and maturation of intelligence insofar as intelligence exists at all in any form. More than this, I am proposing, just for the sake of argument, that it might be worthwhile to entertain the idea that intelligence in the older traditional sense of an a priori antecedent sort may be an invalid construct.

While it would be unfair of me to try to associate the hypothesis that we have been considering with linguistic theory per se, the seeds of the notion are certainly to be found in the writings of Chomsky. Although he distinguished between the innate ability to acquire a language and the maturation of that ability in actual language acquisition, in Language and Mind he suggests that 'at the level of universal grammar ... [the linguist] is trying to establish certain general properties of human intelligence. Linguistics, so characterized, is simply the subfield of psychology that deals with these aspects of mind' (p. 28). Further, in reference to Juan Huarte, Chomsky says, 'typical of his later thought is his reference to use of language as an index of human intelligence, of what distinguishes man from animals, and, specifically, his emphasis on the creative capacity of normal intelligence' (p. 10). In actuality, nearly all proposals for the measurement of intelligence derive from the idea that language ability is the best place to begin. Binet started there, and it has only been within recent decades that so-called nonverbal intelligence measures have been developed. It is questionable whether Binet ever had in mind the notion of intelligence as distinct from language proficiency which has been popularized in the twentieth century. In any event, the success of so-called nonverbal measures of intelligence is certainly not beyond question (cf. Gunnarsson 1978, Flahive in press, and Robertson 1972).

Another line of thinking that spurred my interest in the possibility that language proficiency might be more closely tied to intelligence and achievement than educational labels on tests would lead us to believe, was Spearman's theorizing about a general factor of intelligence. At about the turn of the century, Spearman published his argument for a general factor of intelligence along with his dénouement of the factor analytic method. Jensen (1969) and other IQ theorists have continued to develop and to exploit (I think it is fair to use that word) the concept of general intelligence. Jensen claims that a large portion of the variance in IQ tests (especially this g-factor) is genetically determined.

Nunnally (1967) explains the factor analytic method used by Spearman in the original demonstration of the existence of a g-factor and describes a simpler method for testing for such a global factor. Nunnally's method when applied to the data of Stump and Streiff (previously cited) reveals a substantial global factor accounting for the bulk of the variance in IQ scores, and achievement scores. This global factor seems best
explained as a language proficiency factor simply because the language proficiency tests are the only ones that consistently produce the expected patterns of interrelationship. Furthermore, any one of a dozen or more widely researched language proficiency measures seems to be an excellent measure of the observed global factor. It makes sense, therefore, to refer to the general factor as a language proficiency factor. Put simply, people who know the language of the tests well get high scores on the g-factor, and people who do not get low scores.

It seems that the Jensen IQ argument (see his recent defense of the Stanford-Binet in the Journal of Genetic Psychology 1977) is highly suspect. We know that language proficiency is largely learned, not inherited. Further, while it is usually assumed that innate abilities cannot be modified by instruction, it can hardly be claimed that language proficiency cannot be so modified. That is to say, if intelligence is essentially indistinguishable from language proficiency, intelligence in the sense of IQ variance must be determined largely by experience rather than heredity. It is important to note that here we are speaking with reference to test variances rather than the deeper issues of what constructs or realities underlie those variances.

To return to the original hypothesis which we were considering, we may argue (I think plausibly) that language proficiency may be the essence of human intelligence at the deepest level, and it may be the essence of school achievement at a more superficial level. It might even be useful to think of intelligence in the abstract as universal linguistic deep structures of some sort, while subject matter achievement may involve the manipulation of specialized surface structures in particular pragmatic correspondence with specialized contexts of experience.

A broad implication of such a line of reasoning is that the purpose of education should be to facilitate the acquisition of symbolic manipulative skills in the generative sense of linguistics. In an age of exponential growth and change, the idea that knowledge can be contained in static educational receptacles and that it can be dispensed in small doses in classrooms is increasingly obsolete. It is about as appropriate to the characterization of knowledge as mere inventories and taxonomies are to the characterization of psychologically real grammars. It seems to me that linguistic theory, even if it should do little else (and one would hope for it to do much more), will have been profitable if it merely succeeds in clarifying the concept of generative system. Surely the characterization of human knowledge in general will not prove to require less powerful theoretical models than those required for the characterization of the knowledge of language. In fact, I am inclined to believe that a pragmatic generative system is more than merely a helpful metaphor in enabling us to
explain the recent psychometric findings cited in this paper. In fact, I believe the exegesis of the metaphor will prove helpful, perhaps even necessary, to the explanation of the very nature of human intelligence.

While I believe that the hypothesis we have been considering up to this point is plausible, it is not beyond dispute. Therefore, I would like to put it into a weaker form which I think is not debatable. This weaker form can be stated with reference to the variance in educational tests: the variance in language proficiency measures can be used to predict the bulk of the reliable variance in a wide range of educational measures including IQ and achievement tests. Further, in relation to this weaker hypothesis (which does not depend on posited constructs supposed to account for variance in the tests), it is possible to propose an explanatory model of the causal relation between home background variables, the attainment of proficiency in the language of the schools, and school achievement (as measured by standardized tests).

Figure 1. School achievement as a dependent variable mediated by language proficiency which is causally related to home background characteristics such as language(s), socioeconomic status, and so on.

Home background (Lg, SES, etc.) → Attainment of language proficiency → School achievement

What I am suggesting here is that the language factor, more specifically the proficiency of the child in the language of instruction, constitutes a major (perhaps the major) causal variable entering into the determination of school achievement. Further, as was suggested by Cooper and others, I am proposing that the language proficiency variable is an intervening variable which mediates between the home background of the child and school learning. It is in this sense that language is the crucial educational link. As evidence for the posited causal relationship, I refer to Fishman (1977) who cites Coffman and Lai-Min (1974). Their study summarizes findings of the International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Achievement. This recently completed study will eventually appear in nine volumes reporting data from over 250,000 students in 14 different countries. Fishman reports, 'it was found that prediction of student achievement in subject matter areas can be made almost entirely from achievement in reading, and that prediction of achievement in reading can be made substantially from home background variables' (p. 138). We know, on the strength of studies by Streiff (1978), Stump (1978), Scholz et al. (in press), Kaczmarek (in press), and a
great many others, that reading proficiency is virtually co-
terminous with a global language proficiency factor.

Finally, I would like to conclude with some brief comments
on implications of the foregoing for bilingual education.
First, it would seem, in view of the strength of the language
factor for even monolingual children, that the use of the ver-
нacular language of the child as a language of instruction has
strong empirical support. This, to my mind, seems to be the
most satisfying argument in favor of bilingual instruction where
the vernacular language of some children differs from that of
the majority. Notwithstanding, Swain's remarks would suggest
that under certain conditions where provision is made for ac-
quision of a nonvernacular language of instruction, achieve-
ment may not be adversely affected over the long haul. In
view of her findings, for some children, arguments for bilingual
instruction will have to find another footing--perhaps along the
lines of the now popular arguments for cultural pluralism (the
maintenance of sanity and humility through multilingualism, see
Spolsky this volume, and Fishman).

A second implication of the findings already discussed per-
tains to specific attempts to measure the effects of bilingual
programming on achievement. Frequently, school readiness or
innate abilities are proposed as covariates--i.e. variables that
must be controlled in order to obtain the desired comparisons.
If the findings previously reported are correct, to control for
scores on an IQ test is to control for language proficiency (and
achievement at the same time). Therefore, the researcher
would be attempting to compare children on achievement scores
while at the same time controlling the variance (that is, equal-
izing it to some extent) in the variable of interest. This impli-
cation has far-reaching consequences for conclusions drawn
from studies where comparisons were made between children
who experienced bilingual instruction and children who did not.
It also has important theoretical consequences for attempts to
compare IQs of children from diverse ethnic and linguistic back-
grounds.

A third implication is that scores on language proficiency
measures are probably among the test scores that can be ex-
pected to yield the greatest amount of interpretable information
about the effects of bilingual schooling. For instance, gains
in proficiency in the vernacular language as well as gains in
proficiency in the other language(s) of instruction will no doubt
prove to be among the most reliable and valid indicators of the
effectiveness of bilingual programs (as well as other educational
programs in general). Indices of language proficiency of teach-
ers, aides, and interlocutors in the broader community may also
prove useful in evaluating the effectiveness of school curricula.
In any case, it is to be expected that indices of language pro-
ficiency will continue to be sensitive indicators of the effective-
ness of school programs. Results to date would lead us to ex-
pect that such measures will account for above 50% of the
variance in educational tests for monolingual school-goers, and above 75% of the variance in achievement measures for ethnic and linguistic minorities.
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THE ROLE OF EVALUATION
IN BILINGUAL EDUCATION

G. Richard Tucker and Gary A. Cziko
McGill University

As several of the other participants at the 1978 Georgetown University Round Table on Languages and Linguistics have observed, the selection, in a particular country, province, or city, of the languages to be taught or to be used as media of instruction clearly constitutes an important aspect of educational and thus of national planning. It seems apparent that despite research, experimentation, or innovation, second language teaching programs or bilingual education (BE) programs will not succeed or thrive unless they are consistent with government policy, whether explicit or implicit, or with the clearly expressed goals of local educational authorities. Educational or national policy, we have observed (Tucker 1977), serves to define the parameters within which language teaching programs can be developed. Furthermore, it seems apparent that social pressures motivated by a diverse array of contributory factors can lead to policy change while the results per se of empirical research rarely do. Nevertheless, it is our basic premise that the notion of an innovative approach to education implies, even necessitates, a comparison of the proposed program with some alternative approach(es).

Before we proceed to examine some of the more specific details or components of typical BE program evaluations, let us first consider a variety of situations in which it would seem appropriate to consider the adoption of some form of bilingual education. Programs involving bilingual education might be desirable in settings where, for example, some foreign language of wider communication (e.g., English, French, Spanish) or an indigenous national language (e.g., Amharic, Pilipino, Swahili) has been adopted as a medium of instruction for all pupils regardless of their mother tongue; or in a country where
immigrant children from diverse backgrounds enter a monolingual school system (e.g. Chicano, Italian, or Portuguese youngsters in the United States or Canada); or perhaps even in a setting where speakers of a nonstandard language variety (e.g. Black nonstandard English, Haitian Creole) attend a school where the teachers and the texts employ a more prestigious standard form. In addition, BE programs have been used in many countries where a serious desire exists to develop pupils' abilities in each of two official languages (e.g. Flemish and French in parts of Belgium; English and French in parts of Canada; Afrikaans and English in parts of South Africa).

On the basis of our personal research experiences during the past ten years in Canada, Haiti, Nigeria, the Philippines, and the Sudan, we conclude that at least five factors provide justification for the implementation of bilingual programs: (1) the rapid spread of universal primary (and in many countries secondary) education; (2) an increasing concern with the validity of educational goals; (3) the desire to develop permanent functional literacy for the greatest possible number of citizens; (4) a belief that language can serve as a vehicle to foster a sense of self-esteem as well as a sense of ethnic awareness, identity, or pride; and (5) recent theoretical insights into the nature of native- and second-language acquisition. Thus, for example, the decision was taken by the Regional Ministry of Education in the southern Sudan, to introduce children to primary education in one of nine vernacular languages in the 1977-78 academic year, and to bridge pupils gradually into Arabic and then ultimately into English as languages of instruction. In this rural agrarian and nomadic setting, where fewer than 17 percent of the children who are eligible-by-age presently attend primary school and fewer than 2 percent who are eligible-by-age attend secondary school; where a need exists to provide access to at least rudimentary education and perhaps to functional literacy for so large a proportion of the population; where a desire exists to forge a united country after a protracted and bitter civil war, some form of bilingual education seems pedagogically and politically sensible.

In the Philippines, despite the existence of longitudinal empirical data which indicated that Filipino children immersed in English with Tagalog Language Arts as a subject for study would become proficient in all aspects of English, would develop a mastery of academic subjects, and would become literate in their mother tongue (Davis 1967; Revil et al. 1968), the National Board of Education decreed in 1973 that 'English and Pilipino serve as media of instruction and be taught as subjects in the curriculum from Grade 1 to the university level ...' The desire to ensure literacy in the mother tongue, to maximize the value of education for those who will likely not complete their schooling, and to enhance national pride and unity,
probably far overshadow the goal of developing the highest possible level of second-language proficiency in a select elite.

In Canada, dissatisfaction with the level of French-language proficiency attained by Quebec English-speaking youngsters, despite up to 12 years of formal study of French as a second language, led a number of their parents to demand the establishment of an innovative BE program where the second or target language would be used as the initial medium of instruction. In this case, where the home language was not in jeopardy because of its firmly entrenched ascribed status in North America, it was felt that a teaching program which utilized the target language as the major vehicle for instruction would be pedagogically more effective than a program of study about the language per se.

After a thorough review of the available longitudinal, critical, and empirical assessments of BE programs, Tucker (1977: 39-40) concluded:

What generalizations can be drawn or what recommendations can be made, if any, on the basis of the present review? I believe that the present review together with the others which have been prepared for this series will permit the conclusion that some form of bilingual education program is desirable in any community where there exists a serious and widespread desire or need for a bilingual or multilingual citizenry; and furthermore, that social rather than pedagogical factors will probably condition the optimal sequencing of languages. Thus, in situations where the home language is denigrated by the community at large, where many teachers are not members of the same ethnic group as the pupils and are insensitive to their values and traditions, where there does not exist a pressure within the home to encourage literacy and language maintenance, and where universal primary education is not a reality it would seem desirable to introduce children to schooling in their vernacular language. For example, the Mexican-American child in many, but not necessarily all communities, the American Indian child and the Canadian Eskimo child would each probably be encouraged to develop to his very fullest potential in such a bilingual program.

Conversely, in settings where the home language is highly valued, where parents do actively encourage literacy and where it is 'known' that the children will succeed, it would seem fully appropriate to begin schooling in the second language.

In conclusion, it now seems apparent to me that no uniform recommendation (such as the UNESCO axiom) can be made that will suffice for all pupils. The available empirical data do not permit universal generalizations. Rather, they highlight the fact that the constellation of
social and attitudinal variables interact in unique ways in diverse sociolinguistic settings to affect the child's ultimate level of linguistic development.

What, then, is the role of evaluation in bilingual education? What type or types of evaluation are desirable or useful? From whom and for what reasons does the pressure to evaluate typically come? What types of evaluation models have been used successfully in the past? How do the results from evaluations filter down to parents, educators, administrators, and decision-makers?

Bilingual education programs: Three illustrative examples. In the sections to follow, we discuss these as well as related questions; and when appropriate, we draw on our experiences with BE programs in various settings. For purposes of the discussion, let us describe briefly programs in three different settings where we have worked.

Canada. Twelve years ago, in September 1965, the South Shore Protestant Regional School Board began its first experimental French 'immersion' classes for a group of English-speaking kindergarten children. This project, designed to promote functional bilingualism through a policy of home-school language switch, was initiated by the Board on an experimental basis in response to numerous requests from parents living in the community. The program, which started out with two kindergarten classes in one school during 1965-66, has expanded throughout the South Shore system. During the school year 1977-78, this innovative program is being offered from kindergarten through Grade 11. This year, approximately 35 percent of all eligible kindergarten pupils have enrolled in an immersion program on the South Shore.

The kindergarten curriculum has been left largely to the discretion of the participating teachers. They stress the development of vocabulary and passive comprehension skills in French along with the other traditional kindergarten activities. They use a direct native language approach, in contrast to the second language methods typically used with English-speaking children. At the end of the kindergarten year, the children are assessed through direct observation by teachers and evaluators; but no attempt has ever been made to test them formally. By the end of the school year, most have built up an extensive recognition vocabulary and attempt to use single French vocabulary items as well as occasional short sentences. Productive skills vary considerably from one child to the next, but all are able to comprehend, without difficulty, simple children's stories as well as their teacher's directions.

At Grade 1, reading, writing, and arithmetic are introduced exclusively via French. No attempt is made to teach the children to read in English, and parents are specifically urged not
to do so in the home. In Grade 2, two daily half-hour periods of English Language Arts are introduced. The rest of the curriculum remains essentially the same, with reading, writing, arithmetic, and elementary science being taught via French. The amount of instruction via English is increased gradually and by Grade 7 slightly more than 50 percent of the curriculum is taught in English with the balance in French.

At the request of the Board authorities and the Minister of Education of the Province of Quebec, we were asked to formally evaluate the program (see Lambert and Tucker 1972). The progress of the pupils in a Pilot Experimental class and in a Follow-up Experimental class has been compared each year with carefully selected Control Classes of French children instructed via French, and English pupils taught via English. The Control Classes were selected from schools in comparable middle-class neighborhoods. In view of the well-documented influence of social class on language and intellectual development, and since the number of students involved was relatively small, considerable care was taken to equate very carefully the Experimental and Control Classes on intelligence and socioeconomic factors.

No attempt whatsoever was made to preselect or screen children for the Experimental Classes on the basis of IQ or other variables; thus, both the Pilot and Follow-up Classes (in fact, all subsequent classes) contained children with a wide range of IQ and even had a few pupils with recognized perceptual-motor deficits.

We have now been following these two separate Experimental groups of children, the Pilot and Follow-up Classes, since they began their formal schooling.

Nigeria. Prior to 1970, Yoruba for three years and then English for the next three years were used as media of instruction in the six-year primary education of all Yoruba-speaking children in the western part of Nigeria. The Yoruba Six-Year Primary Project (Fafunwa et al. 1974) was initiated in 1970 in an attempt to devise a program which would make the primary education of these children more effective and meaningful by using Yoruba as the sole medium of instruction for the first six years of school. To test the effects of the exclusive use of Yoruba as medium of instruction, a research project was initiated. Experimental and control classes were set up at St. Stephen's 'A' School in Ile-Ife, Western State, Nigeria. Early in the implementation of the project, however, the project administrators found what they believed to be serious defects in the primary school curriculum, and so took on the job of creating a new curriculum incorporating the subjects of Yoruba, English, science, social and cultural studies, and mathematics. Both the St. Stephen's experimental and control groups have made use of this new curriculum. In addition, a specialist teacher of English was used to provide English instruction for
the experimental class, while the usual classroom teacher provided English instruction for the control class.

In 1973, the project was expanded to include ten additional 'proliferation' schools, eight of which were to use Yoruba as the sole medium of instruction (the proliferation experimental group), while the remaining two were to follow the usual pattern of three years of Yoruba followed by three years of English (the proliferation control group). A comprehensive evaluation of the Yoruba Primary Project began in 1976 with the testing of academic achievement, Yoruba- and English-language skills, and intelligence of Grade 3 children in the St. Stephen's and proliferation experimental and control classes, as well as children in selected traditional schools. This large-scale, longitudinal evaluation will continue until these children have completed primary school. It will attempt to determine the effects of using Yoruba as the exclusive medium of instruction, the impact of the new curriculum materials, and the effectiveness of using a specialist teacher for the teaching of English.

Philippines. A number of exciting, innovative BE experiments have been conducted in the Philippines. We will have occasion to refer to work by Davis (1967), and Revil et al. (1968), and by Tucker, Otanes, and Sibayan (1970). For many years, English was the sole medium of instruction in school although Pilipino has been taught as a subject since 1940. In 1957, however, as a result, in part, of a study conducted in the province of Iloilo (see Ramos, Aguillar, and Sibayan 1967), a decision was made to use the prevailing local vernacular as the medium of instruction in Grades 1 and 2, with a shift to English as the major medium in Grade 3 (cf. Fafunwa et al. 1974, Yoruba then English in Nigeria; Modiano 1973, vernacular then Spanish in Mexico; de Ronceray and Petit-Frère 1975, Creole then French in Haiti).

Following this approach, initial instruction and initial reading activities occurred in the child’s mother tongue. Oral ESL activities began in Grade 1, followed by English reading-readiness activities in Grade 2. A careful, critical, and longitudinal follow-up experiment was conducted several years later in Rizal province (Davis 1967) to replicate and extend through six grades the findings of the original experiment and to try to determine empirically the most appropriate time to introduce reading in English. The performance of the children was re-evaluated at the end of their second year of high school (Revil et al. 1968), so that it is possible to draw a series of rather comprehensive conclusions about the efficacy of this type of educational program.

The Rizal Experiment examined two main questions. The first was designed to provide information that would help Filipino educators to decide when reading activities should be introduced in the teaching of ESL in Tagalog-speaking areas. The second was designed to yield information that would be
helpful in deciding when English should be introduced as the medium of classroom instruction. The performance of five groups of pupils was examined. The groups varied according to the grade level at which reading in English and instruction in English was introduced. Thus, pupils in Group 1 began their schooling in English and were introduced to English reading immediately at that grade. They did, however, have one period per day devoted to Tagalog Language Arts. The pupils in Groups 2 and 3 began their schooling in Tagalog, but were introduced to ESL with accompanying English reading activities in Grade 1. The pupils in Groups 4 and 5 likewise began their schooling in Tagalog. They were introduced to oral ESL activities in Grade 1 but English reading activities were postponed until Grade 2. Groups 2 and 4 made the transition from Tagalog-medium to English-medium instruction at Grade 3. Groups 3 and 5 made the transition at Grade 5. Each of the five groups comprised six classes of 50 pupils each. Insofar as was possible, factors such as teacher education and experience, school facilities and community socioeconomic characteristics, were equated. The Tagalog Picture Vocabulary Test was administered as a pretest and criterion variable data were later adjusted using analysis of covariance techniques.

The language-teaching experiments just described briefly supported the observation of many educators that the exclusive use of one language—either a local vernacular or Filipino—as the chief medium of instruction in the early grades results in transition difficulties for pupils when an abrupt change is made to English as the medium of instruction. (A similar finding has been reported by Douglas 1977, for students educated in Arabic through secondary school when they switch to the English-medium University of Khartoum.) Therefore, it was decided to experiment with an alternate days bilingual approach in an attempt to maximize the advantages inherent in native language instruction coupled with solid grounding in English. It was hoped to reduce the transition difficulties while retaining the advantages of introducing children to schooling in their own vernacular.

Thus, an experiment was designed in which four classes of children participated. Class 1 followed a standard Filipino curriculum; Class 2, a standard English curriculum; Classes 3 and 4 followed an alternate days bilingual approach—i.e. English
was the language of instruction on Day 1; Tagalog, Day 2; English, Day 3; Tagalog, Day 4; etc. The material covered on Day 2 was not simply a repetition of that covered on Day 1; but was instead a continuation of the previous day's lesson. The experimental program began in academic year 1968-69 and the results of the first formal evaluation have been published (Tucker, Otanes, and Sibayan 1970). It is our understanding that the project was terminated after the initial two years. We allude to it here because we shall later refer to an interesting feature of the testing program. Let us turn now to a consideration of some of the factors that may lead to the inclusion of an evaluation component in an innovative program.

The pressure to evaluate. The pressure to evaluate a BE program may come from many sources. It may come singly or in combination from parents, professional educators, educational administrators, funding agencies, or other government bureaucrats. Let us consider a few examples. In the early days of planning for the St. Lambert experiment, there was distinct pressure from both parents and administrators of the School Board for an evaluation to be conducted of the effects of the proposed program of home and school language switch on the development of native-language skills, cognitive or intellectual development content-subject mastery, and social or attitudinal development of participating pupils. The parents and board members were actually expressing the fear that their children might not fare as well in this innovative program as peers taught via the mother tongue. Thus, they were asking for what we might refer to as 'summative' evaluation. Essentially, they wanted to know how participating children would compare on a series of tests or measures with a 'control' group of more traditionally educated youngsters. This type of evaluation is frequently called for. Typically, parents, administrators, funding agencies, and government officials all seem to want to know what the cumulative effects will be on children who participate in a particular innovative program for a specified period of time, in comparison with children who participate in the more traditional programs. Furthermore, many such evaluators tend to examine exclusively the product (usually as a series of dependent measures) of such an intervention as opposed to the actual process of the intervention. Thus, it would seem appropriate to encourage the broader application of 'anthropological-type' observational studies of bilingual programs as a valuable adjunct to the usual empirical, summative evaluations (cf. Bruck and Shultz 1977; John and Souberman 1977).

It is interesting to note that despite their apparent popularity, there have been exceedingly few critical, empirical, longitudinal evaluations. The paucity of such studies can be attributed to a variety of sources such as the transience of potential researchers, the unwillingness or liability of funding agencies to commit funds for a multi-year or even decade-long
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project, and the unfortunate tendency for administration to regard initial results as a major criterion for continuing or terminating a proposed lengthy project (Campbell 1969).

This is unfortunate for it is only by assessing the cumulative impact of a wide variety of innovations such as the St. Lambert program of home and school language switch and the Yoruba Six-Year Primary Project that we can begin to understand the role of language in education. Thus, summative evaluation constitutes, for us, one of the important elements in theory building.

There exists, of course, another type of evaluation referred to as 'formative'. The ostensible purpose of formative evaluation is to provide rapid feedback to classroom teachers or to educators concerning the desirability of introducing curricular or structural modifications in the program. Thus, the results of an analysis of the errors made by participating pupils with certain aspects of the target-language verb system (Harley and Swain 1978) may have important implications for the content or sequencing of the syllabus. Likewise, the results of an analysis which compares the effects of introducing one group of children to reading in their mother tongue (L1) followed by reading in the second language (L2) versus a second group which is first taught to read in the second language (Cziko 1976), may have important and immediate structural implications. These types of assessment have the goal of providing rapid feedback to teachers and administrators, and fall under the rubric of formative evaluation.

It has been our general experience, however, that this type of evaluation is rarely undertaken on any systematic basis, and that even when such research is planned, feedback rarely reaches classroom teachers or administrators rapidly enough or in such a form that it can be utilized to effect change in ongoing programs. For example, in the Philippine alternate days experiment, we regularly videotaped lessons in the four classes; but the tapes were not watched by participating teachers with a view toward modifying their classroom behaviors. In the St. Lambert research, we collected very detailed information about difficulties which participating children had with determining the grammatical gender of French nouns; but we never helped the teachers to devise remedial lessons to correct this persistent problem, despite the fact that we had earlier done so for a university program (cf. Tucker, Lambert, and Rigault 1977). It does seem to us as though a wide variety of individuals or groups for various reasons do ask that some form of evaluation accompany each innovative program. We shall return later to the question of how the results from such evaluations actually affect educational planning.

Choice of an evaluation model. Let us turn now to a consideration of the selection of evaluation strategies for BE programs and of the specific components of various types of
evaluation. It should be taken for granted that the goals of the particular BE program dictate the choice of an evaluation strategy. However, it has been our experience in Quebec (and we believe the situation prevails elsewhere as well) that many parents and educators have not yet articulated clearly their expectations for the academic, affective, cognitive, linguistic, or social development of children who participate in bilingual programs. Although it can be assumed that a complex array of personal, pedagogical, social, and political factors will influence the choice of goals, it is absolutely essential that consensual goals be locally agreed upon before the efficacy of bilingual programs can be adequately assessed.

The lack of clearly defined goals raises the important issue of what criteria shall constitute successful educational innovation. Does the performance by a certain proportion of students in an experimental group at a specified level on a standardized norm-referenced test constitute success? Does a mean performance by students in an experimental group equivalent to that of a traditionally instructed group of youngsters on a specific test constitute success? Does ability to understand, speak, read, and write the target language as well as the mother tongue in such a manner (albeit unspecified) as to be able to pursue higher education, or to secure employment, constitute success? Clearly, the choice of evaluation strategy will be determined at least in part by the specific program goals.

There has been some discussion recently concerning the general form BE program evaluations should take (Cummins 1977; Paulston 1975; Tucker 1976). All of the evaluations in which we have been involved have used what may be called the 'standard experimental' approach whereby the type of school program is considered to be the independent variable and a number of measures of academic achievement, language skills, intelligence, and attitude constitute the dependent variables. Paulston (1975) criticizes this approach since she feels that social factors are the most important independent variables and the failure to identify and investigate these (considering type of program as an intervening variable) often leads to contradictory results that lack generalizability to other settings. Cummins (1977) goes a step further in stating that the language abilities of children under evaluation must be carefully measured and also considered to be an important intervening variable affecting cognitive, academic, and linguistic development. Finally, Macnamara (1974) expresses the opinion that the factors affecting the outcome of a BE program are so numerous and complex that it is impossible to generalize the results of any BE program evaluation to other settings, regardless of the research model used. How, then, can we justify our use of a standard experimental approach in the evaluation of BE programs and how can we hope to build a general theory of the role of language in education?
Let us first address the issue of the appropriate research model to be used in BE program evaluations. We agree with Paulston that type of school program is only one of the variables influencing the cognitive, linguistic, and academic development of a particular child, and that social and other factors may be equally, if not more, important. However, in any particular BE program setting it is usually not possible to investigate all of the relevant social factors due to the very fact that the program takes place in one particular social setting. Although it may be possible to study the effect of socioeconomic status (SES) (see, for example, Cziko 1975), or some other factor for which there is variation within the setting under investigation, the evaluator can in most instances do little more than use a standard experimental approach, with program type as the independent variable and test scores of some sort as the dependent variables. The effect of language abilities as intervening variables can be assessed within this approach if care is taken to measure these abilities accurately and thoroughly. It is only after a number of such evaluations are carried out in different settings that one can attempt to investigate the effects of social factors. The very fact that Paulston was able to formulate an elaborate theory of bilingual education based on the results of evaluations which used this approach, may be taken as an indication of its effectiveness.

Note, however, that the formulation of a general theory of BE in no way implies that the results of any one BE program evaluation can be generalized to a program in another setting. The dangers of attempting to generalize evaluation findings were clearly identified by Macnamara (1974), who emphasizes the uniqueness of each research setting. For example, although it has been demonstrated many times that English-Canadian children who take part in French immersion programs gain an impressive mastery of the French language with no adverse effects on the development of English-language skills and academic achievement (Swain 1974), there is no guarantee that a new French immersion program in another setting will be equally effective. The employment of an incompetent or unmotivated teacher, for example, could cause a new program to become a catastrophe. Also, evaluations typically use groups of children as the unit of analysis and do not usually describe the effects of the program on each individual child nor relate success in the program to individual differences (see, however, Genesee 1976; Tucker, Hamayan, and Genesee 1976).

This means that there is always the possibility that a child may flounder badly in a program that has been shown to be successful in other settings for other children. This is no reason to believe, however, that we cannot have an explanatory, useful theory of BE based on the results of program evaluations. Such theories already exist (Lambert and Tucker 1972; Paulston 1975), and it is certain that these will be revised and refined as new data from BE program evaluations become available.
Such theories will never replace the need for careful formative and summative evaluation of innovative BE programs, but rather depend on such evaluations and may serve as guidance and inspiration for administrators and educators considering the implementation of new programs.

We will not discuss at length all of the design considerations that must be taken into account when implementing a BE program evaluation since this is the principal topic of another paper in this monograph. We will, however, discuss some basic methodological considerations and mention how real-life constraints often necessitate the use of research designs which are far from optimal.

By far, the most crucial design component of any objective evaluation is the assignment of children to the experimental and control classes to be evaluated. Optimally, one would like to be able to assign children randomly from some population of interest to the experimental and control classes (see Campbell and Stanley 1965:25, 26). In this way there should be no systematic differences between the classes in intelligence, SES, or any other variables that might otherwise bias test results. In addition, this procedure allows the use of inferential statistics to generalize the results of the evaluation to the population from which the experimental and control children were drawn. Unfortunately, our experience indicates that this procedure is seldom if ever used. The St. Lambert experiment is a case in point. Although originally children were assigned randomly to the experimental and control classes from a population of kindergarten pupils whose parents were willing to have their children participate in the experiment, pressure from certain administrators and influential parents eager to have their children placed in the experimental group resulted ultimately in an assignment that was not random.

The second approach, which is less desirable but often more practical, is the random assignment of preexisting classes to experimental and control conditions (see Campbell and Stanley 1963:47-50). However, since preexisting groups may differ initially in their knowledge of subjects to be later tested, and/or on other potentially confounding variables such as intelligence and SES, pretesting of both experimental and control groups is required. In the St. Lambert experiment, this pretesting took the form of administering tests of nonverbal intelligence and assessing the SES of each child's family prior to the beginning of the treatment. If pretest results show that the groups do differ in ways that might bias later evaluation results, analysis of covariance procedure can be used to analyze the evaluation results controlling for the effects of the pretest variables, i.e. using them as covariates.

It is important, however, that the pretest data be collected before the treatment has had a chance to affect these scores (see Elashoff 1969). This is especially crucial in the case of intelligence since if intelligence is tested after the program has
been in effect, adjusting for it or other measures of cognitive or academic skills may actually result in adjusting for the effects of the program while attempting to assess the effects of the program! In the St. Lambert program and in the Philippine research, measures of SES and intelligence were obtained before the program was likely to have an effect and were both used as covariates. In the Yoruba project evaluation, however, SES and intelligence were not determined until the end of Grade 3. It was, therefore, unfortunately not possible to use intelligence as a covariate, although SES was used since we considered it unlikely that the program had affected the SES of pupils' families. That the lack of baseline intelligence data has seriously reduced the power of the Yoruba evaluation to detect the effects of the program is a striking example of the importance of collecting such data for evaluations where preexisting groups are used. Even when it is possible to assign children randomly to the experimental and control groups, the collection of relevant pretest scores and the subsequent use of analysis of covariance can considerably increase the sensitivity of the evaluation to the effects of the program (Campbell and Stanley 1965:26).

There is one remaining design problem that should be mentioned here—the possible confounding effect of class teacher. Since it is inevitable that different teachers be used for experimental and control classes, it turns out that program effect and teacher effect are completely confounded. There is no easy way to untangle these variables and usually the best that one can do is to make sure that experimental and control class teachers are equally qualified. However, if more than one experimental class or more than one control class can be included in the evaluation, it is possible to compare two or more classes within the same treatment condition to investigate the presence of a teacher effect. If, after adjusting for pretest scores, no significant differences are found on the test variables, we can be more confident in attributing any observed differences between the treatment groups to the different educational programs being offered. Such an analysis was done for the Grade 3 and Grade 4 evaluations of the Yoruba project, comparing the test scores of four urban proliferation classes within the same treatment condition but with different teachers. The findings that these four classes did differ significantly on several measures of language skills and academic achievement indicate that the differences observed among the various treatment groups may be due not to the different programs being offered, but rather to teacher effects or other uncontrolled or unmeasured factors.

Content of evaluation. Whenever an evaluation of a BE program is to be undertaken, one of the first decisions to be made is what components of the program are to be evaluated. This decision concerning the number and type of dependent variables to be included in the evaluation will depend not only on the
goals of the program but also on the availability of appropriate control groups and test materials. These dependent variables may be divided into four major types: (1) language skills, (2) academic achievement, (3) affective consequences, and (4) long-term effects.

Language skills. It is difficult to imagine a setting where the assessment of language skills in one or both languages would not be of primary concern. In the evaluation of 'transitional' bilingual programs where the LI of the pupils is used as a bridge to the mastery of the language of the majority, an important measure of the effectiveness of the program lies in the comparison of the L2 skills of pupils in the program with those of comparable pupils not in the program. In the evaluation of 'maintenance' bilingual programs where competence in both languages is desired, the effectiveness of the program is in part indicated by a comparison of both the LI and L2 skills of pupils in the program with those of pupils not in the program.

Content-subject mastery. The assessment of subject content mastery is also of central importance in BE program evaluations since it is an indicator of the effectiveness of using a particular language as the medium of instruction for a specific particular school subject. There are, however, difficulties in comparing two different languages as media of instruction. These difficulties, discussed by Cummins (1977), result from the inability to separate the effects of instruction in a language from the effects of testing through the language. Thus, if the control group had been instructed in a subject via L1 and the experimental group via L2, testing through L1 may be inappropriate for the experimental group. Even though L1 may be the experimental group's stronger language, they may be unfamiliar with the subject vocabulary in L1. On the other hand, if the experimental group is tested through L2, these pupils may have difficulty demonstrating their knowledge of the subject through L2, despite having had no difficulty in learning via the language. In the Philippine alternate days study, this problem was handled by dividing the class in thirds and administering Tagalog, English, or bilingual versions of tests to the pupils. In the Yoruba project, approximately 80 percent of the pupils in a class were given the version of the test corresponding to the language through which they had received instruction, while the remaining pupils were given the other language version. In situations where one wants to eliminate completely language of testing effects, the most effective and interesting technique would be to give all pupils bilingual tests such as those used in the Philippine study, so that for any question the pupils would have the choice of answering the L1 or L2 version of the question. In this way not only would the test be equally suitable for both experimental
and control groups, but the choice of language for each response would itself be an interesting source of information. Of course, there may be situations where one is particularly interested in the effect of the language of testing, in which case the Philippine model would be most appropriate.

Affective consequences. It is generally agreed that the affective consequences of BE programs are of great importance. Three types of attitudes are of interest to the evaluator. First, attitudes of the pupils toward the program itself reflect the attractiveness of the program and may be considered an indirect measure of the ability of the program to motivate the children and to elicit and sustain their interest in education. Second, attitudes toward the language being taught and toward speakers of the language have been shown to be related to proficiency in the language (Gardner and Lambert 1972), and are therefore also of interest. Finally, since a BE program may also incorporate educational innovations not having to do with language (the teaching of science in the early elementary years, for example), attitudes toward traditional values and beliefs, religion, science, etc. may also be of interest. However, it seems that an assessment of the attitudinal consequences of BE programs are seldom included in program evaluations. This is no doubt at least partly due to the difficulty of measuring attitudes effectively and validly, particularly for young children, and the necessity of constructing appropriate instruments for the program under study.

In spite of these difficulties, an attempt at measuring the affective consequences of a BE program may provide important information that would otherwise be neglected. For example, using interviews and questionnaires to determine the attitudes of the pilot group of St. Lambert students toward Canada's first French immersion program for English-speaking children, it was found that although these graduating secondary school students were generally pleased with the program and considered themselves fortunate to have had the opportunity to participate in it, they also indicated that they were disappointed with certain aspects of it and offered suggestions for improving it. In another study using adjective rating scales (Cziko, Holobow, Lambert, and Tucker 1977), it was found that English-Canadian children who had participated in a bilingual French-English program had more favorable attitudes toward French-Canadians than did English-Canadian children in traditional English programs. This is an encouraging finding when one considers that friction between English- and French-Canadians has appeared to increase recently to the point where the partition of Canada has become a possibility.

Presently, an attempt is underway to measure the affective consequences of the Yoruba primary project. Using a sentence completion task, the influence of the program on the children's pride in Yoruba culture, attitude toward school,
the English language, English-speakers, and scientific explanation (among other things) will be investigated. This information, along with measures of language competence and academic achievement of children in the program compared with appropriate controls, should provide a more complete picture of the total impact of the program.

Long-term effects. If we assume that the goals of every BE program are to provide adequate language skills and other fundamental skills for those pupils capable and eager to continue their education to the secondary and university levels, and to provide maximum 'surrender value' for those who will not do so, then a truly complete evaluation of a BE program must include an assessment of the long-term consequences of the program. Although to our knowledge, such 'tracer' studies have never before been carried out, there are two such studies in progress that should provide important information about the long-term consequences of such programs. One of these tracer studies involves maintaining contact with the pilot experimental St. Lambert group as they pursue postsecondary studies, enter the job market, and start families of their own. We are particularly interested in determining whether their experience in the St. Lambert program will have an effect on where they decide to live, their employment opportunities, and their integration into both the English and French communities in Canada.

The other tracer study involves a similar assessment of the long-term effects of the Yoruba project. Here we are particularly interested in determining whether the English-language ability of graduates of the program (in which Yoruba is used as the sole medium of instruction) is adequate for secondary and university study where English is the sole medium of instruction. We are also interested in determining whether the program's emphasis on developing literacy in Yoruba has a lasting impact on the lives of the vast majority of primary school graduates who do not continue their formal education. Let us now consider issues related to the choice of instruments to assess these four major types of skills which we have identified.

Choice and construction of testing materials. The choice and/or construction of testing materials is an important component of any BE program evaluation. For measuring intellectual ability, a good number of standardized group tests are available (see, for example, Anastasi 1968:640, 641), including nonverbal tests such as Raven's Progressive Matrices (1958), which are especially useful when children of different language backgrounds are to be compared. There are also a number of standardized group tests of academic achievement available. These, however, are of limited usefulness since they may not correspond to the curriculum of the program being evaluated;
they are not often available in languages other than English; and they often have been developed to reflect particular world views or cultural perspectives that may not be relevant for the groups being studied. Standardized group tests are also available for testing language skills, although the majority of these tests include only vocabulary and reading comprehension measures. Therefore, the evaluator of a BE program is often faced with the task of constructing his own testing materials if there is a need to assess: (1) the academic achievement of children following any program which uses a special or non-traditional curriculum, regardless of medium of instruction; (2) language skills other than reading comprehension and vocabulary; or (3) the affective consequences of a program.

In spite of the importance of developing reliable and valid testing instruments for use in gauging the impact of a BE program, there is typically little assurance that the tests used are in fact reliable and valid. It has been our experience that even when there has been adequate money and lead time available for careful construction of tests, the basic ingredients of test development, such as pretesting and item analysis, are neglected. Tests of academic achievement must, of course, be constructed by individuals with knowledge of the objectives and content of the program syllabus. It is unlikely, however, that such people will have an adequate knowledge of the principles of psychological testing, nor does it appear that they seek out individuals with such knowledge to aid in the construction of these tests.

In some ways, the construction of tests of language skills poses less of a problem. If, in fact, the ultimate language goal of any BE program is native-speaker competence in all aspects of the target languages, then it follows that for summative evaluation one need not be concerned with the particular language syllabus of the program being evaluated. In addition, research by Oller (1972, 1973) has shown that integrative tests such as cloze and dictation tests, which are relatively easy to construct and score, can serve as reliable and valid measures of general language competence. Our own use of cloze tests and dictation (see Cziko 1975; Cziko, Holobow, Lambert, and Tucker 1977) has shown that these integrative tests are among the most sensitive measures of language proficiency of the many types of language tests (both standardized and 'homemade') we have used in the evaluation of various French immersion programs in the Montreal area. The advantages of integrative language tests were also demonstrated by the results of recent evaluations of the Yoruba project (Cziko and Ojerinde 1976; Ojerinde and Cziko 1978). We found that the scores of a large number of language subtests were highly intercorrelated, suggesting that general language competence, and not distinct language skills, was measured by these tests.

However, while integrative test scores are useful in comparing an individual with a group or a group with another group
(i.e. as a norm-referenced test), individual scores in themselves have little meaning. Furthermore, although Group A may perform significantly better statistically than Group B on a cloze test of English, this does not necessarily mean that Group A's English program is 'significantly' better than Group B's. It may be that the cloze test is so sensitive to variations in language proficiency that the meaningful magnitude of a statistically significant difference may be very small indeed. What may be more useful, then, is the development of criterion-referenced tests of language proficiency, i.e. tests constructed in such a way that an individual's score serves as an indication of his absolute language proficiency. This obviates comparing his score with that of other individuals or other groups. If a minimum desirable level of language proficiency can be determined, then the success of a program can be measured by the number of children at or above this minimal level, regardless of the overall group mean on the test.

Of course, this use of criterion-referenced tests is only possible where the goals of the program have been clearly defined. Another disadvantage of cloze and dictation tests is that they require both reading and writing skills. Thus, they may be unsuitable for children in the early primary grades. Also, there may be strong pressure from teachers and administrators to evaluate reading, writing, listening, and speaking skills separately, especially for purposes of formative evaluation. If it is decided to construct tests of these skills, the form such tests will take will depend on the availability of audiovisual equipment.

For example, to measure second-language speaking skills, the St. Lambert evaluation (Lambert and Tucker 1972) employed tape recorders to collect pupil speech samples which were later rated by sophisticated native speakers of the language. For the Yoruba Grade 3 evaluation (Cziko and Ojerinde 1976), however, since neither tape recorders nor electricity were available, performance on a block-stacking task requiring verbal communication in English (see Samuels, Reynolds, and Lambert 1969) was used as an indirect measure of speaking skills. Not only did the unavailability of recording equipment prevent a direct evaluation of these children's speaking skills, but it was also not possible to administer a test of listening comprehension with the same recorded voice as stimulus for each group.

Finally, the construction of measures of the affective consequences of a BE program probably requires even more care and sophistication than the construction of tests of academic achievement and language proficiency. We have worked with teachers who, while appearing quite capable of writing items for tests of academic achievement, attempted to construct affective measures composed of multiple-choice items with one 'correct' choice per item! While outside help was clearly needed in this case, it should be kept in mind that the most competent
psychometrician who does not understand the history, culture, and values of the group under investigation can do no better.

The main idea that we wanted to convey in this and the preceding two sections is that problems of research design and test selection or development confront even the most experienced investigator as he prepares to undertake a new evaluation. Thus, if there does exist a serious desire to include an evaluation component in any BE program, it should be recognized that planning for such an evaluation must begin at the very outset of the program. Once it has been decided to include an evaluation component, the question arises as to where should the responsibility lie for conducting formative or summative evaluation: with staff from the participating schools or boards? with local university or independent consulting groups?

Responsibilities for evaluation. It seems to us that a distinction might usefully be made between the responsibility for formative versus summative evaluation. To date, as mentioned previously, evaluators really seem not to have provided useful formative data to people who must devise curricula, produce materials, train teachers, or implement programs. It is entirely possible, given the general pattern and time frame of most academic research projects, that school boards must themselves assume primary responsibility for formative research. On the other hand, we believe that summative evaluation should be conducted by people who are 'outside' the system, individuals who are interested and informed but who do not have a particular pedagogical or theoretical axe to grind and whose job does not depend upon whether the outcomes are positive or negative (cf. Campbell 1969).

Individuals who undertake to evaluate BE programs must be sophisticated researchers with advanced training in research design, statistics, and applied linguistics, who possess sensitivity for the concerns of their intended audience and for the values, attitudes, and traditions of the groups whom they are studying. They need not necessarily be or have been practicing classroom teachers, but they must certainly be able to communicate their initial questions and later their findings in precise, nontechnical terms to diverse sets of audiences. Furthermore, we would argue that program evaluation in the so-called 'developing countries' can best be done by nationals of the countries, and that one of the greatest challenges we face is preparing language-education researchers from developing countries to undertake these tasks (cf. Sack et al. 1976).

We recommend the provision of a variety of oral and written reports each year concerning the research undertaken. In Montreal, although we have tried to follow this general suggested pattern, we have not always completed each phase. We operate on a testing cycle so that the majority of our summative evaluation is conducted in the spring. We try to analyze the data as rapidly as possible and to present the results of the
evaluation informally to board administrators before the summer recess begins. Over the course of the summer, we complete or refine our analyses and write (ideally) two types of reports --first, a nontechnical summary of the research findings, intended for widespread distribution to parents, teachers, and board members; and second, a more technical report intended for Ministry of Education employees, colleagues, etc. We also make it a practice to send copies of such reports directly to the office of the provincial Minister of Education—from whom we usually receive no reply—and also to the office of the Prime Minister of Canada—from whom we always receive a reply. In addition, we try at least once a year to participate in an open meeting with parents and teachers to discuss diverse aspects of the evaluation. We have found much to our chagrin in the past few years that we have not been as conscientious as we should have been in sharing the results or other information with the actual program participants, who by now are advanced secondary or junior college pupils.

In Nigeria, a special meeting was held in May, 1977, to discuss the philosophy, the goals, the content, and the test results to date with the Ministers of Education, their assistants, and the chief inspectors from each of the five Yoruba-speaking states. This meeting provided an open and candid discussion of the issues among project staff, consultants, and the key Nigerian decision-makers. Thus, we conclude that it is extremely important to disseminate information about the program being scrutinized as broadly and as rapidly as possible.

Repercussions of program evaluations. Let us now turn our attention to a consideration of the general purposes which can be served by program evaluation, as well as to a brief consideration of the repercussions of such evaluation in Canada, Nigeria, and the Philippines. One important general repercussion of the decision to conduct a formal evaluation is the necessity to specify or to operationalize program objectives. Thus, individuals are forced to work together to define the goals of the proposed program and the criteria for successful implementation. Ideally, parents and educators will work together toward this end. The extent to which such collaboration occurs varies drastically from setting to setting, but active community involvement would seem to constitute one necessary ingredient for successful program implementation.

Another general, more negative repercussion of the decision to involve 'outside' resource people in the task of summative evaluation is that such evaluation may actually paralyze the curricular or methodological flexibility that seems to characterize many successful teachers or programs. It is the case that many community-based or church-based BE programs have thrived for years despite (or because of) the absence of formal evaluation. Nevertheless, we do reiterate the position stated earlier, that an innovative approach to education necessitates
a comparison of the new program with alternative approaches. Thus, it would seem psychologically desirable to view the task of an evaluator ultimately not as one which requires that he decide whether a particular program is one which works or does not work, but rather to evaluate the relative strengths and weaknesses of a variety of program alternatives and to specify the conditions under which each might be more or less successful. In this way, an examination of the results of critical, longitudinal summative evaluations can lead to the formulation of a clearer understanding of the roles of language in individual growth and ultimately in national development.

What role has program evaluation per se played in the spread of BE for English-speaking youngsters throughout Quebec and Ontario, and indeed to every other province in Canada (Swain 1974)? The move to bilingual education occurred in response to a variety of social pressures which today link the development of second-language fluency to the preservation of economic or occupational mobility within Quebec, and in a more general way to the preservation of Canadian national unity. It may be only happy coincidence that the majority of BE program evaluations have been positive and that the number of programs has grown rapidly; however, the results of evaluation studies certainly provide some measure of assurance for parents and for educators, and we can conclude in retrospect that the widespread adoption of this unique—almost radical—approach to elementary education would not have occurred had the results of evaluation studies been unfavorable. The Canadian experience, then, has been one of collaboration among English-speaking parents, educators, and researchers to develop a system of education to better prepare children for an evolving social reality in which a knowledge of French will be essential.

It may be instructive here to compare the Canadian experience with that of the Philippines. Despite a body of longitudinal empirical data to the contrary (Davis 1967; Revil et al. 1968), Filipino educators have adopted programs with increasingly large components of instruction via Pilipino. The desire to ensure literacy in the mother tongue or national language, to maximize the value of education for those who will likely not complete their schooling, and to enhance national pride and unity, probably far overshadow the goal of developing the highest possible level of second language proficiency in a select elite.

Once again, it seems apparent to us that no uniform recommendation concerning the choice or sequencing of languages as media for literacy training or for instruction can be made that will suffice for all pupils in all settings. Rather, the available data highlight the fact that a variety of factors—individual, instructional, and social—interact in unique ways in diverse settings to affect the student's ultimate level of achievement and of development. Because of this diversity, it seems to us that evaluation—both formative and summative—should constitute
an important component of each new BE program. The continuing synthesis of data from such programs should eventually yield a clearer understanding of the role of language in education.

In writing this paper we have been forced to consider the problems and flaws of our own evaluation research to date. Insofar as we have been able to come up with ideas and suggestions to improve the quality and usefulness of BE program evaluations, we have--we believe--demonstrated the need for those involved in evaluation research to review periodically and attempt to improve the quality and usefulness of their work.
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TEST ENCOUNTERS OF THE THIRD KIND

Gilbert Narro García
Georgetown University

I propose to address the issue of students' rights in testing situations and to make suggestions about what I believe should be recognized as test subjects' rights in encounters with tests and testing situations. Moreover, I believe this because I believe that test encounters entail specific rights and responsibilities.

But before I explore these notions, I would like to share with you some of the background and history in which the field of tests and the art of testing have played a role. The review, moreover, will enable you to appreciate the situation in which educators and education find themselves today. Most importantly, the review will help you understand some of the significant developments in the field, and by extension, will enlighten us about our rights.

The field of testing has had a long and eventful history. For example, it is documented that as early as 1000 B.C., competitive examinations were employed by an emperor in China for the purpose of selecting government officials. The practice lasted until about 1905, at which time the Chinese civil service examination system was radically changed. The examinations met their demise simply because they tested literary abilities exclusively and thus were not useful in discriminating among the kinds of government candidates needed in the twentieth century military and economic arenas. Closer to home, the United States federal government made use of competitive examinations as early as 1872; these examinations were patterned after the English system set up in 1833 to select trainees for the civil service in India. Moreover, around 1900, Hugo Munsterberg developed what is believed to be the first competency examination. His examination was based on a careful study of the abilities required to be a motorperson on
the Boston Elevated Railroad. The examination was exemplary in that it related scores to actual levels of performance.

Much later, in 1917, a group of psychologists developed the Army Alpha and Beta tests. The Alpha test was a verbal test, while the Beta test was nonverbal. Both were used to classify and assign recruits to different military tasks. Of special interest is the fact that an extended version of these tests evolved into the original federal civil service examination system, a system initiated in 1922. From these early beginnings, then, the testing industry has ballooned to heights never envisioned by the pioneers. In fact, there are presently about 1,250 different kinds of tests on the market. It is reasonable to assume that most if not all of the early tests used in the United States were written and administered in English. It was not until much later in our history, specifically during the World Wars, that large-scale foreign language testing took place.

Notwithstanding the vast number of tests on the market, they appear to play a finite number of roles. In other words, tests have been developed for a specific number of purposes. For example, there are tests which assess general proficiency in subject matter or skills, language or otherwise. There are also tests of aptitude and achievement, but because there is abundant and detailed literature on these types of tests, I am not going to elaborate further. The literature is also replete with descriptions and definitions of testing approaches, and so I will not comment substantively on this topic either; rather I present here a general resume.

Testing approaches can be divided into five categories: discrete point tests, integrative tests, direct rating methods, self-report rating methods, and direct observation. Generally speaking, there are tests that are measures of language, cognition, effect, and socialization. They are written in the native language of the test subject, as well as in the subject's second language. Moreover, they directly test the native language or the subject's second language. Finally, tests are also criterion or domain referenced.

But descriptions of the types of tests available and the roles that they play are not interesting in and of themselves. The significant issues which this paper discusses are the validity and reliability of assessment instruments on the whole in the context of social rights and responsibilities. Indeed, if the history of test development is long and disparate, the use of tests has been just as erratic.

There are a number of people, groups, and institutions that have a legitimate interest in tests, the testing situation, and test results, e.g.: students who want to know how they are doing; parents who want to know how their children are doing; teachers concerned about the effectiveness of their teaching; school administrators interested in assessing the success of education programs; the school district and community concerned about the status and quality of the education system;
states that need to know where to direct financial and technical assistance; institutions of higher education that must exercise placement responsibilities; and the federal government, which is mandated to provide equal educational opportunities to all citizens.2

The reason why testing controversies have arisen is that at one time or another, the rights of some of the parties just cited, especially students, have been infringed upon and abused. Controversy has led to countless court cases in which judicial systems have been called upon to settle issues of language, of testing, and of language-based regulation. In fact, the courts have addressed a host of significant issues with respect to citizenship requirements, voting rights, employment, and education. Regarding citizenship requirements, in 1940, the Federal Code established English literacy as a condition for naturalization.3 The stated policy basis for the statute was that being able to read the Constitution in its original language assured a person's dedication to constitutional principles—a dedication demanded by the oath of citizenship. Leibowitz (1969) points out that:

This theory is questionable since there is no evidence that the Constitution and its principles can no longer be understood if read in a foreign language. Nor is there any reason to believe that ability to comprehend constitutional niceties in any way relates to good citizenship.

The courts have also addressed themselves to education issues. For example, in Meyer vs. Nebraska (1923), the Supreme Court ruled that requiring the language of instruction to be English in a state or territory of the United States was constitutional. On the other hand, it also held that 'restriction of complementary or supplementary secondary language efforts by various ethnic groups was unconstitutional'. In still another area, in Lassiter v. Northampton Election Board (1959), the Court upheld the North Carolina statute requiring the prospective voter to 'be able to read and write any section of the Constitution of North Carolina in the English language'.4 The Court also cautioned that it would strike down any English literacy test if it was employed to perpetuate discrimination, but since no such charge had been placed before it, it would not rule on the issue.

What the courts did not remedy, the Congress did. Thus, the Voting Rights Act of 1965 suspended literacy tests and other education prerequisites to voting in any state of the Union. Unfortunately, the Congress continued to express reservations about the absence of any restrictions. Senators Robert Kennedy and Jacob Javits5 felt that restrictions were still needed. Consequently, Kennedy introduced Section 4(e) of the Voting Rights Act, which provided that persons who have not successfully completed the sixth grade could not vote
in any election. But the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia declared this section unconstitutional in the Morgan v. Katzenbach case. Notwithstanding precedents of this type, English literacy requirements continued to exist in other areas.

Literacy in English has been used as a condition of employment in certain fields. In fact, literacy conditions have existed because of legislation and because of local restrictions on the activities of particular persons. Of special interest here are statutory English literacy restrictions on occupational opportunity. Thus, from 1885 to about 1920, numerous restrictions were enacted to curb the increasing role of foreigners in the United States labor market. Many states simply passed statutes limiting aliens' rights to work.

Numerous court cases challenged these allegedly discriminatory practices. But the courts also indicated in a variety of rulings that where a knowledge of English is necessary in order to practice a profession safely, then English literacy requirements are reasonable. But again, what the courts did not fully resolve, Congress attempted to remedy. Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 made it unlawful for an employer to use the results of a test to discriminate on the basis of race, color, religion, sex, or national origin. Moreover, the Act established the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC), and this body formulated a set of 'Guidelines' by which employers can gauge the legitimacy of their employment practices. The key phrase of the EEOC's standards on tests is job relatedness. Thus, in the Griggs v. Duke Power Company case, the Supreme Court struck down the use of general aptitude tests and a high school diploma as requirements for certain jobs. The ruling established several points: the Supreme Court held that a professionally developed test was one which was validated according to acceptable standards. As such, the Court found that the Duke Power Company could not demonstrate that a high school diploma or satisfactory scores on the Bennet and Wonderlic tests were related to job performance. In addition, the burden of proof was shifted to the employer, i.e. the employer would have to persuade the courts of the fairness of its employment practices.

If congressional legislation and court decrees have had a profound effect on the rights of citizens in general, they have altered and defined the rights of 'school citizens' in particular. In 1969, for example, 48 of the 50 states legally sanctioned English requirements. Moreover, 32 of these states required English as the basic language of instruction in their public or private schools. In 1978, on the other hand, while the majority of the states still require English as the basic language of instruction, more than 20 of them allow or require that instruction also be provided in languages other than English. This phenomenon, of course, is due mainly to Title VII of the Elementary and Secondary Education Amendments of 1967, otherwise known as the Bilingual Education Act. The significance
of this Act is that it marked the first time that the federal government had recognized the special education needs of limited English-speaking children. Moreover, this Act is in bold contrast to official policy which existed up until 1934, which required that English should be the language of instruction in Indian schools. A similar policy existed in Hawaii from 1919 to 1927, at which time the territorial legislation was declared unconstitutional in the case of Farrington v. Tokushige. In addition, from 1903 to 1914, the federal government attempted to impose English as the sole medium of instruction in Puerto Rican schools, but in 1945, when education policy was placed in the hands of local officials, Spanish was established as the medium of instruction at all education levels.

The picture that emerges, then, is that as long as English was mandated as the sole medium of instruction, testing was conducted in English, regardless of the person's native language or English language proficiency. It is also interesting to note that no significant or formal efforts were made to question the validity of the statutory mandates, at least not until the Lau v. Nichols case. Generally speaking, mandates and decrees in the education arena have resulted in a policy similar to the one that has developed in the employment arena; that is, the Bilingual Education Act's policy seems to reinforce arguments that would require the state to assume the burden of showing that language statutes reasonably serve some legitimate state interest in education or cultural assimilation. But the notion should not be accepted without exploring all of the ramifications and limitations.

For example, it is evident that the courts have not seen fit to be as aggressive and swift in the education arena as they have been in other sectors of American society. In many instances, the courts have presumed intelligence tests to be valid instruments in situations where their selective application was not established. Likewise, despite the fact that in recent years the mislabeling thesis has spawned litigation with increasing frequency, judicial review of school testing practices raises the important question of the courts' jurisdictional power. In fact, the practice of reviewing school testing policy stems from a tradition of judicial deference to the administrative decision-making processes of local government agencies in general, and local school boards in particular, as indicated in the line of federal court cases implementing the desegregation mandate of Brown v. Board of Education. On the other hand, although it has become a well-established rule in federal courts that the adoption of an education policy which has the effect of maintaining a pattern of racial segregation is not permissible, at times the courts nevertheless have affirmed the right of each local board to classify students according to its measurement of their intellectual abilities.

In Hobson v. Hansen (1967), the District Court of the District of Columbia ruled that the D.C. Board of Education
had unconstitutionally deprived the children of the right to equal educational opportunity by virtue of existing practices which permanently tracked students into ability groupings, based on intelligence test data. The court examined the assessment instruments, and found that the skills measured were not innately intellectual; rather, they were acquired through cultural experience. In fact, the evidence confirmed a direct correlation between test score and social status. Moreover, in Diana v. State Board of Education, the courts went one step further, and questioned the validity of practices and instruments used to assess children's IQ in a language that was not their native language, and which reflected cultural values which were not the children's native cultural values. 13

The stipulation ending the case required that, (1) children in the school district be tested in their primary language and interpreters be used in the absence of a bilingual examiner; (2) Mexican American and Chinese children then in Educable Mentally Retarded classes be retested and reevaluated; ... (4) the state undertake immediate efforts to develop and standardize an appropriate IQ test. 14

An important by-product of the Diana case was the departmental memorandum by the Director of HEW's Office of Civil Rights, stating that it was illegal for schools to assign students whose dominant language was other than English to educable mentally retarded classes on the basis of tests which attempt to measure intelligence levels, but which require knowledge of English language skills to accomplish their objective. 15 It is interesting to note that in 1973, in Lau v. Nichols, the lower court denied an appeal by parents to compel the San Francisco school district to provide all non-English-speaking Chinese students with bilingual compensatory education. The court reasoned that the use of English as a language of instruction (and presumably, testing) was rationally related to the educational and socializing purposes for which public schools were established. 16

In cases of this type, it is important to focus on the notion of 'rational relatedness'. For example, in the Griggs case, the court stated that if employment tests acted to disqualify more Negro than white applicants, the state had the burden of proving a manifest relationship between job and test. 17 Whether the same approach is, in fact, appropriate in the area of intelligence testing remains to be seen. In Hobson, Judge Wright stated that 'we now firmly recognize that the arbitrary quality of thoughtlessness can be as disastrous and unfair to private rights and the public interest as the perversity of a wilful scheme'. 18 Indeed, it is more than obvious that practices designed to measure and label the mental abilities of children cannot be served in any reasonable way by assessment.
instruments which measure a totally irrelevant cultural orientation. But while these have been significant rulings which have affected education policy to a large extent, I have hinted here that the courts have not seen fit to discount the use of standardized tests altogether. Their interest in these matters has focused on the misuse of intelligence and/or language instruments for employment or educational purposes.

Recapitulating some of the foregoing comments, we note that legal intervention in the education arena has been limited largely to questions of equal educational opportunity. Indeed, during the past two decades, the courts have sought to define the meaning or meanings of equal educational opportunity. Yudof assigns equal educational opportunity to three categories: (1) as equal treatment of the races; (2) as equal access to education resources; (3) as equal education outcomes. Unfortunately, the courts have primarily addressed inequalities of the first and second types, and only recently have they addressed the third type. For example, they have begun to address within-school practices such as ability grouping and special education placement exclusion of ineducable children, which classify students on the basis of academic performance or potential derived from standardized tests. Notwithstanding a host of major court rulings and legislative mandates, practices which result in the violation of the rights of children in numerous ways and areas are still in effect.

Jane Mercer argues that current classification procedures continue to violate the rights of children to be evaluated within a culturally appropriate normative framework; their right to be assessed as multidimensional beings; their right to be fully educated; their right to be free from stigmatizing labels; and their right to cultural identity and respect. Likewise, Joseph A. Califano, Jr., Secretary of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare, recently stated that educators should try harder to discount the effects of social disadvantage on academic competence and should begin by reexamining the worthiness of existing standardized achievement tests. Fortunately, we lately have had evidence of more than just cautionary remarks. We have been witnessing an acknowledgment by the courts that social science findings provide a legitimate framework for evidence. The exemplary case, of course, was the Brown desegregation case, in which the court accepted evidence which supported the allegation that children attending segregated school were being subjected to undue psychological damage. Likewise, the courts seem more receptive to evidence which supports the contention that standardized and achievement testing presents linguistic, cultural, and psychological difficulties to many limited English speakers.

But we must not lose sight of the fact that court action has left numerous areas of practice unanswered for a variety of reasons, the chief one being that many attorneys for the plaintiff in recent education cases have been ignorant of
available social science data, especially with respect to tests, testing practices, and the use of test results. The problem is compounded by the existence of conflicting and often blatantly contradictory data that even social scientists have trouble interpreting. On the other hand, I suspect that the situation will be remedied as the courts acquaint themselves with social science evidence. Moreover, as the number and type of congressional mandates increases, the courts' role(s) will increase. It is not too difficult to conclude that courts are going through a trial and error period with respect to cases of an education nature.

Another reason for an anticipated increase in court intervention is that testing agencies seem to be resorting to defensive behaviors as more and more of their instruments are challenged. For example, the Chronicle of Higher Education recently reported that 'from now on, in the [testing] industry's view, the greatest burden in defending testing against such charges [of test-bias] must be borne by schools, colleges, employers, and other test users, not by the test makers'. This overconfidence and arrogance is obviously unwarranted, and constitutes a rather premature claim that they have done all that can be done to correct their instruments and to assume the validity and reliability of standardized assessment tests. Testing agencies should stand forewarned that, based on precedent which shifts the burden of proof to the defendant, they stand to lose more than just face if and when test bias cases reach higher litigation levels.

Other charges have centered on the use of tests, an area of concern which will continue to grow. The Chronicle article cited earlier quotes a member of the American Psychological Association's Committee on Testing to the effect that 'education testing has an enormous effect on people's lives, and there ought to be some sort of monitoring and overview; somebody to represent the student's interests. The question is, Who does it?' The question has not gone unanswered. A variety of events have transpired.

As far back as 1972, the National Education Association supported a recommendation by participants at its Civil and Human Rights in Education Conference that 'a moratorium on standardized tests be instituted immediately'. Unfortunately, nothing of the sort has happened. Another event which might be seen as a response to the question has come in the form of a case now before the Supreme Court, namely, the Bakke reverse discrimination case. Depending on the final ruling, reliance on test score results could be strengthened or weakened. But the significance of whatever action is to be taken is that, again, the courts have been asked to intervene on behalf of students' rights. (It might interest the reader to know that the Indian Supreme Court recently ruled in favor of the defendant in a case which is strikingly similar to the Bakke case.)
A third indirect response to the question transpired as a result of the Lau v. Nichols decision. Almost immediately after the ruling, the Office of Civil Rights (OCR) drafted a set of 'remedies', and imposed them on 333 school districts believed to have large numbers of limited English-speaking children. In essence, the 'remedies' specified a five-level system for categorizing school children's language abilities. But DeAvila and Duncan (1976) criticized the practice vigorously and declared that 'the major difficulty lies not so much in the fact that the system was arbitrary, but that its relation to either theory or explicit measurement procedures was un-stated'. Paradoxically, this particular federal intervention is a classic example of a violation of students' rights to be tested via instruments and procedures that are sound, reliable, and valid. Moreover, this blatant disregard for the welfare of the public, especially students, has gone almost totally unchallenged since the 'remedies' were issued in 1975. (The exception to this is the Alaska State Boards of Education v. U.S. case, still in litigation.) Challenges have been in order with respect to the government's perception of the practices which are being termed illegal, as well as with respect to OCR's assessment 'remedies'.

A fourth response to the question is Public Law 94-142, known as the Bill of Rights for Handicapped Children. One section of the act addresses the rights of the handicapped child/student regarding testing. It requires that tests and other evaluation material used in placing handicapped children be prepared so as not to be racially or culturally discriminatory, and that the tests be presented in the child's native language.

The fifth and final major activity which addresses the question is Representative Michael Harrington's Testing Reform Act of 1977. This is a Nader-type act that specifies a set of 'students' rights in testing'. It will be reintroduced in the near future, and though it is limited in scope, it is the wedge that will open the door to additional government intervention. The overriding message here is that what social institutions have not found time nor interest in correcting, the Congress has--a lesson to education leaders who abhor federal roles in education.

What I now propose to do is to share with you what I believe to be a fair distillation of rights that must be recognized in the testing situation. They are the result of my analysis of the social science, legislation, and litigation literatures. As such, they constitute what I believe to be a core of basic rights--a 'Bill of Rights in Testing', if you will--that are intended to extend beyond the confines of educational settings. In other words, these are rights which I believe should be recognized in any testing situation, regardless of the test or the test subject. Moreover, for convenience, I have divided them into three categories: (1) rights with respect to the testing environment;
(2) rights with respect to the test instrument; and (3) rights with respect to test results and their use.

(1) Regarding the testing environment, the test subject has a right to: (1) be briefed in detail on all of his/her rights regarding the test and testing procedures in writing and orally; (2) be tested in familiar and comfortable situations which include linguistically and culturally familiar test administrators; (3) review and have reviewed for him/her the nature and kind of test items to be encountered in the scheduled examination; (4) alternative testing procedures, schedules, and environments; (5) be provided with 'catch up' teaching/review if and when past test results have reliably identified particular needs or weaknesses; (6) be administered a specific kind and number of test instruments, based on a careful analysis of institutional and personal information needs; (7) be tested in environments that are not time constrained unless the test agency has reliably indicated that the time constraint factor in no manner obstructs or impedes test performance and outcomes.

(2) Regarding the test instrument, the test subject has a right to: (1) be briefed on the nature and purpose of the test, in writing and orally; (2) be briefed on the reliability and validity parameters, in writing and orally; (3) be tested via instruments which were developed by qualified and licensed psychometricians and/or instructors with training in psychometric principles; (4) be tested via test instruments which have been approved by a local panel of psychometrists, teachers, parents, and older students, e.g. a 'community testing council'; (5) be tested via meaningful, constructive, and educational tests; (6) be tested in the same fashion in which he/she has been taught; (7) be tested primarily on content which has been directly and indirectly taught to him/her and which appears on school system and teacher syllabuses; (8) have all instructions and directives in a language, language level, and language style which he/she functionally understands, speaks, reads, and writes; (9) know the extent to which personality and fatigue variables and expectations of success deflect him/her from the test objectives; (10) have all test items in formats that minimize his/her reading into the test items that which was not intended by the test agency; (11) be tested via instruments that do not penalize him/her for language dialect differences or because of language limitations, e.g. in cases where the language in which the test is written and administered is not the test subject's native language, and this second language is not his/her dominant language, unless the test agency otherwise supports that language factors do not significantly affect test performance and outcomes; (12) be tested via instruments which are significantly more than translations from one language to his/her native language, and which reflect appropriate cultural adjustments; (13) refuse to take a scheduled test instrument.
(3) Regarding test results and their use, the test subject has a right to: (1) be briefed on the nature and limitations of expected test results, in writing and orally; (2) have actual test results interpreted in clear and practical terms; (3) have test results interpreted on the basis of appropriately normed cutoff discriminator points; (4) have test results interpreted by qualified and licensed psychometricians; (5) have test results interpreted in the presence of parents and teachers; (6) have access to all test records on file, including anecdotal and summary statements which have been used to prescribe remedies and/or other activities; (7) have test results used as one of several criteria for decisions regarding placement, promotion, retention, and/or remediation; (8) challenge the test agency's notions of correct and acceptable responses; (9) be retested in cases where test results or their use result in disputes between the test subject and the test agency; (10) be awarded damages from the test agency and administrator in cases where it is found that the test and the test results have been used in such a fashion as to result in overt and/or covert abuse or injury to the test subject.

The need to recognize these basic rights becomes even more important and pressing in light of the move toward minimal competency standards for high school graduation and grade promotions. Evidence of this tendency is seen in decisions by numerous local school boards to change graduation requirements, and more often than not, to move without the support of state legislation. In fact, prior to 1977, 11 legislatures and 16 state boards had taken either legislative or state board action to assure that some form of minimal competency testings or standards were initiated in the public schools. For example, legislation in effect in California stipulates that no high school diploma may be issued after June, 1980, unless a proficiency test has been passed. The impact on bilingual education in particular is no different than the impact that the current move towards implementation of standards promises to have on education in general. Moreover, the concern over rights does not stop with students; rather, it should extend to all professionals in education if they consider the growing move to assess teaching competencies at all levels.

My objective in this paper has not been to frighten educators into feeling that the situation is heading toward total government regulation. My objective has been to point out that educators must act with vigor and sincerity to correct current problems and practices, especially those evident in the field of tests and testing, regardless of whether they are the result of unconscious or planned causes. Otherwise, Congress and the courts of the land can be expected to exercise their mandated roles regarding equal educational opportunity. In other words, educators can expect more decrees and laws that will intervene in areas heretofore sacred. Moreover, actions like these, when carried out in atmospheres of intimidation and
pressure, have a good chance of creating practices which are more abusive than the original ones. But most important to the thesis of this paper, so long as we have not had the opportunity to identify the test objects, we have not known nor been aware of our rights. We must investigate the issues involved in cases where disputes have arisen with respect to rights violations, for it appears that only through dispute do we get a clear picture of the practices that pervade the field of testing in American society.

NOTES

1. Examples of direct rating testing approach: (1) discrete point test, B.I.N.L. (Herbert 75); (2) integrative test, FSI Scale (FSI '63). Examples of indirect rating testing approach: (1) discrete rating, T.O.E.F.L. (ETS '75); (2) integrative test, Cloze (Taylor '53).


3. See Immigration Act of October 14, 1940.


14. Id.


17. 401 U.S. at 426-432.
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TOWARD A THEORY OF PRESCHOOL BILITERACY

Theodore Andersson
The University of Texas as Austin

Introduction. Bilingual schooling in the United States is not in the best of health. If one traces it back to its roots in foreign language instruction, one finds that these roots are often feeble. The origins of its bicultural component are also characterized by stress and strain between and among ethnic groups. The theory of bilingual education (BE), grounded in the social and biological sciences, generally is not well understood and, in consequence, not well applied. Bilingual schooling is lodged in an institution, the public school, which does not inspire universal confidence. And, worst of all, our voting and taxpaying fellow citizens are ambivalent about supporting BE. This is the situation as we approach the expiration date (June 30) of the Bilingual Education Act (BEA) and debate the controversial issue of whether, or how, to revise this important piece of legislation.

Though I follow with interest the efforts of others to strengthen BE through improved teaching, more harmonious ethnic relations, a better understanding of the social and biological sciences, reforms in the public schools, and the education of public opinion, it is the opportunity to fortify the BE of the preschool child that seems to me to hold out special promise.

The growth and development of young children is attracting more and more attention, but fortunately their education has not yet been institutionalized to the point of rigidity, so there is plenty of room for research and experimentation, and circumstances are favorable. At this age, contact between children of different ethnic groups can be harmonious if parents are tolerant. The social and biological sciences are also gradually extending our understanding of the development of infants and young children. And the BE of children at this age, if successful, as it has on occasion proved to be, can greatly
augment the joy of bilingual parents and through them can exert a positive effect on other parents. Thus it may help to create a better informed and more supportive attitude toward BE on the part of voters and taxpayers. In the few minutes at my disposal I want to sample the cross-disciplinary evidence favoring early learning, especially early reading in one or two languages, then look at a few cases, and finally consider the theoretical and practical implications of preschool biliteracy for bilingual education in the United States.

Research. Research concerning preschool biliteracy, though still fragmentary, encourages one to test the hypothesis that the early childhood years, generally between the ages of two and four years, are 'the best time to become bilingual and biliterate' (Andersson et al. 1978). The more one observes or reads about the behavior of infants and very young children--provided always that one is able to discount one's own adultism--the more amazed one becomes at their learning and creative instinct.

We may perhaps one day look forward to studies of prenatal kinesics, but for the present let us begin with two studies of kinesics in newborn infants.

**William Condon and Louis Sander.** William S. Condon, a psychiatrist at the Boston University Medical Center, had been studying interactional synchrony--bodily response to speech--in adults for a decade when he decided to turn his attention to neonates. In 1974, he and his colleague, Louis W. Sander, issued a by now well-known report (Condon and Sander 1974) as a result of their research on 16 babies from 12 hours to two weeks old. They recorded on videotape or sound film several hours of awake-active-state behavior of infants exposed to adult speech, to isolated vowel sounds, and to tapping sounds. The babies reacted rhythmically to adult speech, whether in American English or in Chinese, and whether live or recorded, but not to the disconnected vowels or tapping sounds. As a result of their study, Condon and Sander speculate as follows:

If the infant, from the beginning, moves in precise, shared rhythm with the organization of the speech structure of his culture, then he participates developmentally through complex, sociobiological entrainment processes in millions of repetitions of linguistic forms long before he later uses them in speaking and communicating. By the time he begins to speak, he may have already laid down within himself the form and structure of the language system of his culture. This would encompass a multiplicity of interlocking aspects: rhythmic and syntactic 'hierarchies', suprasegmental features, and paralinguistic nuances, not to mention body motion styles and
rhythms. This may provide an empirical basis for a new approach to language acquisition.

Colwyn Trevarthen. Another student of newborn infants is Colwyn Trevarthen, a New Zealand-born biologist who began his experiments at Harvard in 1967 and has continued them at the University of Edinburgh since 1971. Like Condon and Sander, he has recorded on sound film many hours of infant behavior in interaction with mothers; but, unlike Condon and Sander, he is primarily interested not so much in infant response to adult speech, but in babies' embryonic speech.\footnote{The films tell us what the baby chooses to do', Trevarthen says. He and his fellow researchers have found that at 2 months infants know the difference between people and objects and that they make deliberate attempts to converse with their mothers and other adults'. At this age Trevarthen has found that infants are 'already equipped with the outline of speech and gestures'. Whether or not the infant makes sounds in prespeech, there is a specific breathing pattern, and there is the rhythm if not the substance of adult conversation. Trevarthen notes a difference between boys and girls in their expression of prespeech: 'Boys are more aggressive in communication, often using vigorous body movements and more frequently taking the initiative. Girls tend to be more cooperative and steady in conversation and to use gentle hand motions'. A surprise finding was that infants under six months rarely imitate their mothers. 'Frequently the mother is imitating the baby'. Unlike psychologists, who consider language to be shaped largely by the baby's environment and experience, Trevarthen tends to share 'Darwin's notion of human intelligence ... that the fundamental features [are] innate and the human mind already endowed with complex processes'.

Eric Lenneberg. Lenneberg's comprehensive study (1967) of human language as a biologically rooted manifestation of species-specific cognitive propensities led him to conclude that the state of language-readiness is of limited duration, beginning around age two and declining with cerebral maturation in the early teens (1967:376).

Benjamin Bloom. Let us now consult a couple of psychologists. According to Benjamin Bloom the development of general intelligence corresponds roughly to the growth of the brain. Here is a summary of his conclusions (Bloom 1964:68).

Using either Bayley's correlation data ($r^2$) or the Thorndike absolute scale (both of which yield essentially the same results), it is possible to say, that in terms of intelligence measured at age 17, at least 20% is developed by age 1, 50% by about age 4, 80% by about age 8 and 92% by age 13. Put in terms of intelligence measured at
age 17, from conception to age 4, the individual develops 50% of his mature intelligence, from ages 4 to 8 he develops another 30%, and from ages 8 to 17 the remaining 20%. This differentially accelerated growth is very similar to the phenomenon we have noted in Chapter 2 with regard to height growth.

With this in mind, we would question the notion of an absolutely constant IQ. Intelligence is a developmental concept, just as is height, weight, or strength. There is increased stability in intelligence measurements with time. However, we should be quick to point out that by age 4, 50% of the variation in intelligence at age 17 is accounted for. This would suggest the very rapid growth of intelligence in the early years and the possible great influence of the early environment on this development.

We would expect the variations in the environments to have relatively little effect on the IQ after age 8, but we would expect such variation to have marked effect on the IQ before that age, with the greatest effect likely to take place between the ages of about 1 to 5.

Burton White. Similar evidence is being assembled by Burton L. White, Director of the Pre-School Project in the Harvard Graduate School of Education, who began by studying children from birth to age six but decided later to focus on the period from birth to three.

If most of the qualities that distinguish outstanding six-year-olds can be achieved in large measure by age three, the focus of the project could be narrowed dramatically. We rather abruptly found ourselves concentrating on the zero-to-three age range (White et al. 1973:20).

White's continuing research has led him to the following conclusion (White 1975:129-130):

... [I]t is my belief that the educational developments that take place in the year or so that begins when a child is about eight months old are the most important and most in need of attention of any that occur in human life ... Once more, my view is that not more than two-thirds of our children currently get adequate development in the areas dealt with here, and no more than ten percent of our children do as well as they could during the first years of their lives. This state of affairs may be a tragedy, but it is by no means a twentieth-century tragedy. In the history of Western education there has never been a society that recognized the educational importance of the earliest years, or sponsored any
systematic preparation and assistance to families or any other institution in guiding the early formation of children.

Ragan Callaway. Ragan Callaway, another student of early child development, leads us into the subject of early reading. Referring to the human language acquisition device (LAD), he observed (Callaway 1970:6):

The innate mechanisms which make up the biological components of LAD become operable, according to transformational linguists, by mere exposure to language in the social environment. It seems clear that at least some of the essential skills in learning to read are facilitated by LAD...

The child learns spontaneously to analyze representational auditory stimuli, i.e. the sounds of speech, between the ages of two and four. This universal time-dependent achievement is not the simple outcome of exercising some perceptual skill, but according to the logical analyses of those who have examined the phenomenon critically, involves very complex and difficult cognitive operations--operations so complex and difficult that innate mechanisms which expedite the process must be inferred...

The relationship between LAD and reading consists in the fact that the brain function involved is the same as that required in the reading process after the sound is decoded from the visual symbols of language; that is, as the child recognizes the words in a sentence he gets their meaning in terms of sound values just as he does in spoken language.

Glenn Doman. A name that is almost synonymous with early reading is that of Glenn Doman, Director of the Institutes for the Achievement of Human Potential in Philadelphia, whose work with brain-damaged children led him by chance to discover that even such handicapped children could learn to read at an early age. His popular book (Doman 1964) infuriates many professional educators, especially reading specialists, and many others, but has inspired hundreds of mothers to initiate their two-year-olds into reading.

Doman asks rhetorically if it is not easier for a child to understand a spoken word rather than a written one. 'Not at all', he replies.

The child's brain, which is the only organ that has learning capacity, 'hears' the clear, loud television words through the ear and interprets them as only the brain can. Simultaneously the child's brain 'sees' the big, clear television words through his eye and interprets them in exactly the same manner.
It makes no difference to the brain whether it 'sees' a sight or 'hears' a sound. It can understand both equally well. All that is required is that the sounds be loud enough and clear enough for the ear to hear and the words big enough and clear enough for the eye to see so that the brain can interpret them—the former we have done but the latter we have failed to do (Doman 1975: 5-6).

According to this view, reading, like walking and talking, is a developmental skill. It appears to have been no better learned than it is because adults are insensitive to children's wants at the critical time and when the time has passed try to remedy the situation in typical adult fashion by overanalysis, analysis which is better calculated to satisfy an adult appetite than a child's curiosity.

Someone has remarked that the best way to produce a nervous breakdown in a centipede would be to try to teach him to walk. Likewise, the best way to prevent a child from learning to walk would be to try to teach him. Let us ponder the implications for the learning-to-read process.

Ragnhild Söderbergh: Case No. 1. One mother into whose hands Doman's book fell was Ragnhild Söderbergh, a linguist and now professor of Child Language at the University of Stockholm. She resolved to try the Doman procedure on her daughter, aged two years and four months. This is how she describes her experiment, the first case I shall cite (Söderbergh 1973:14-15).

The reading experiment was carried through with a purely linguistic aim. I wanted to find out how a small child that is shown cards with whole words written on them—one word on each card—and is told what is written on the cards, finally succeeds all by himself in learning to read. I wanted to find out about the process behind such an acquisition of reading ability. The experiment showed that the girl 'stored' the words in her memory, and as soon as a new word was presented to her she compared this word with the earlier learnt ones. Through analyses of and comparisons between words the child gradually succeeded in breaking the words up into smaller and smaller units; first she recognized and was able to read morphemes, especially endings. Later also graphemes (i.e. letters) and at last she arrived at a full knowledge of the correspondences between graphemes and phonemes ('letters and sounds'): she had broken the code and was able to read any new word presented to her. In the experiment this breaking of the code was achieved within 14 months (with a daily reading session of 5-20 minutes) ... The overall experience from the different children...
that learnt to read between one and a half and three was that they did so with great interest and as easily as they acquire spoken language, given that language deals with matters that mean something to them.

Söderbergh drew the following conclusions from the foregoing and other evidence. (1) Ages one and a half to three seem to be the most favorable for encouraging children to read. (2) If the word 'teaching' is used for initiating a child into reading, it should be understood to have a special sense. The 'teacher' serves as an important model for reading as for speaking, senses the interests of the child, and helps provide suitable learning materials to satisfy these interests. (3) The best 'teacher' is in general the mother. (4) The best 'school' is the home. (5) Reading, like walking and talking, is a developmental task, but unlike walking and talking it can more easily be inhibited, retarded, or shortcircuited if not encouraged at the proper time and in the proper way. (6) In reading, as in other forms of learning, most rapid progress is made when there is the best 'match' between a child's intellectual development and environmental stimulation.

Ragan Callaway, Case No. 2. Callaway (1973:21) recounts the following personal experience.

I became interested in the area of early learning in 1958, when my first child learned to read at the age of 2 years 8 months ... I presented the first three letters of the alphabet to my son one night when he was 23 months old and was delighted when he recognized them the next day. He knew the names of all the letters within a month. During the period between 2 years 0 months and 2 years 8 months he learned about 200 words and acquired a rudimentary knowledge of phonics. At this time he suddenly discovered how to read sentences and on his own initiative began reading simple books. At this age he was able to successfully attack most new words that he encountered.

The next four months were extremely exciting and rewarding for my son. As well as being a physically active, robust, and generally average boy of his age, he spontaneously read an average of four to five hours per day, adding 600 new words to his recognition vocabulary. By the age of 3 years 0 months he had a recognition vocabulary of 800 words and tested at the third-grade level on several standardized reading tests.

Raquel and Aurelio Christian: Case No. 3. Let me next cite some cases of preschool biliteracy. Raquel Christian, now aged nine years two months and in the third grade of a monolingual American school in Bryan, Texas, and Aurelio,
aged seven years 10 months and in the second grade of the same school, are the children of Chester Christian, professor of Spanish at Texas A and M University, College Station, and his Peruvian wife, Nancy; the children were initiated into reading in Spanish at about age two. Their father comments: 'The results ... seem to indicate the efficacy of Spanish reading as a basis for reading in English, as well as its advantages for learning content in the early grades'. He reports that 'Raquel learned during her first four months in kindergarten, without aid and on her own initiative, to read books in English such as those by Dr. Seuss, and Aurelio learned rapidly to read English when he was taught in first grade'.

Christian asserts: 'In an important sense, the education of those who speak two languages can never be "equal" to the education of monolinguals: it must be inferior or superior. Whether it will be the one or the other depends heavily on whether literacy is provided in only one or in both languages'.

Mariana Past: Case No. 4. Another case of bilingualism and biliteracy involves Mariana Past, aged six, daughter of Al and Kay Past. Both parents are bilingual but dominant in English. Nevertheless, they use a good deal of Spanish in the home and cultivate Spanish-speaking friends as much as possible. When Mariana was about two, her parents initiated her into reading in both English and Spanish. This was really not an entirely new experience for Mariana, for her parents had been reading to her for well over a year in both languages. Mariana responded with enthusiasm to the Doman-type flashcards and learned quickly. By age four she was reading in both languages. At this point she began taking piano lessons, and her teacher noted that she learned to read music rapidly, presumably because she had already mastered two symbolic systems. Mariana was given special permission to enter a bilingual kindergarten in Austin, Texas, when she was four years ten months old. She was enthusiastic about school, and by the end of the year she was reading English at the fourth-grade level and Spanish at the second-grade level. In the summer following Mariana's kindergarten year, the family moved to Beeville, where she was unfortunately assigned to an all-English first grade. However, she was given permission to attend the reading lesson in a bilingual second grade and to visit the school library, where a Spanish-speaking librarian speaks to her in Spanish and suggests Spanish books to her. Thanks to these opportunities and her parents' continued reading and conversation in Spanish, Mariana is able to maintain her Spanish. Her latest interest is to compose stories in English and Spanish on the family typewriter.'
Yuha Lee: Case No. 5. The final case of early biliteracy that I cite here is that of Yuha, daughter of Ok Ro Lee and Mrs. Lee, described in a Georgetown University doctoral dissertation directed by Professor Robert Lado. Yuha's parents and a grandmother living with the family were all born in Korea. The grandmother is monolingual in Korean, the parents are both bilingual but dominant in Korean, and Yuha and a sister Chinha, one year younger than Yuha, are balanced bilinguals. Yuha was the subject of a doctoral study conducted by her father to test the hypothesis that early bilingual reading can be used as an aid to bilingual and bicultural adjustment for a second-generation child in the United States. Yuha was exposed to spoken English outside the home and was taught by her father to read first in English, her weaker language, when she was four years old. Since Korean was the exclusive language in the home, and since Yuha practiced reading and writing in a Korean program in a public elementary school, Yuha was both fluent and literate in her first language. In fact, at the end of only a one-month program 'she could read and write Korean a little better than she could ... English'.

On November 10, 1977, she scored 69 on the Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test, Form B, administered in Korean by the investigator. This places her at the 86th percentile for her age when her raw score in Korean is equated with the English norms of the test. Her IQ through the same English equivalence is 116. These scores can be interpreted as indicating a balanced bilingual competence in Korean and English.

Most important of all, Yuha manifested pride in her knowledge of both Korean and English, and in her 'ability to speak and behave like an American in an American situation and like a Korean in a Korean situation'. The study bore out the conclusion that the subject's 'early bilingual reading facilitated, at least partially, her bilingual and bicultural adjustment'.

Conclusion. The evidence supporting the hypothesis that children two years old want to and like to learn to read is growing. Of how many children this can be said we do not know. It is natural to speculate that only unusually intelligent children can learn to read early, and there does indeed seem to be a correlation between intelligence and early reading. The question is: Do children learn to read because they are intelligent or does early reading promote intelligence? Or does early reading have little or nothing to do with intelligence? Is early reading, as Callaway suggests, natural, as natural as walking or talking? Does it represent an opportunity missed, because grown-ups are not yet aware of infants' reading potential, and fall to respond to their signs of curiosity? I recall two cases: that of the low SES Black boy who taught
himself to read before the age of five by watching TV commer-
cials,11 and that of a Mexican American student of mine who
taught himself to read Spanish as a preschooler by picking up
La Prensa, the San Antonio newspaper of years gone by, and
asking some member of the family what certain letters and
words said. It was only a matter of time before he broke the
code by pronouncing words and thus unlocking their meaning.
I myself favor the hypothesis that all normal children of about
two have a biologically rooted potential for reading.

If this hypothesis should prove to be well founded, what are
the implications for us as parents, as educators, and as voters?

As parents, should we not, as Trevarthen's research sug-
gests, learn to listen to, read, and respond to our children
from the prespeech period and on through the years? Such
parents Burton White calls A-type parents, one of whom may
one day teach Burton White, as Mr. Lunski taught Glenn Doman,
that among the myriad ways that infants have of controlling
their world is early reading.

As educators, it seems to me that we should continue our
efforts to understand the foundations of language—the social,
economic, political, but especially the biological foundations of
language. We are still far from having developed a coherent
theory of preschool education. When we do so, I have a hunch
it will have to include a theory of preschool literacy—or,
preferably, biliteracy.

Clearly, early biliteracy relates to bilingual education. As
practiced in the United States today, it does not sufficiently
emphasize literacy—and I mean biliteracy. It does not always
produce the bilingual bicultural adjustment that Yuha, with the
aid of her parents, achieved. And it does not enjoy the whole-
hearted support of both majority and minority elements in our
communities and in our nation that is essential to success.

To achieve this success we shall need to multiply the cases
of biliterates like Yuha Lee, Mariana Past, the Callaway child,
and Raquel and Aurelio Christian. We shall need first to under-
stand the biological foundations of literacy and then to explain
them to parents, fellow educators, and fellow citizens.

We obviously have a long row to hoe.

NOTES

1. See Patrick Young, 'Babies Can Communicate at Birth',
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3. See especially pp. 9-15 for a fascinating description of
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reading at four.
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6. 'Social and Psychological Implications of Bilingual Literacy', p. 38.
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THE SIGNIFICANCE OF TESOL

Charles H. Blatchford
University of Hawaii

If the title of this paper were expanded to fit in with the Round Table theme, it would read: 'The Significance of TESOL in Bilingual Education in International Settings', and the more I think about it, the words could probably be transposed to read 'The Significance of Bilingual Education to TESOL in International Settings' without much damage being done. It is somewhat difficult for me to conceptualize bilingual education globally; in certain countries it is assuredly a fact, but as an international phenomenon it does not necessarily exist. Although there is bilingualism and bilingual education in some countries, in others there is simply the mandate for the study of a foreign language. In the West, that foreign language is more and more coming to be English, and the fact that English is so widely studied a foreign language leads to my title as it stands. The abbreviated title, 'The Significance of TESOL', may give the impression that I am going to preach to you. But that is not really so, since I assume that a speaker addressing an audience such as this is speaking to the converted who already see some of the significance of TESOL in the international dimensions of bilingual education. So, rather than dealing only with its importance, I would like to focus on two aspects which I see as significant challenges of TESOL and to TESOL in the international setting. And here I am thinking of TESOL both as a profession and as an organization.

The first challenge concerns needs and materials. If the study of EFL is a mandate, not for English as an instrument or medium for other study, but just as a means of introducing students to another culture, the teaching of English faces a challenge--one of interest. To have to teach English in a situation where it is a requirement is a tremendous challenge, and I believe that in most such situations, there is a great
waste of student and teacher time and resources. Perhaps ministries of education should reexamine why they want to make a second language a requirement. To manufacture a need through legislation of a requirement is rather absurd; and for teachers to have to meet that false need is nigh impossible. To cite a domestic example, I do not think that the foreign language teachers in my home state of Hawaii are doing themselves a service by supporting a bill now in the State House of Representatives which would require four years of high school foreign language study. It would secure their jobs, to be sure, but it would not really make their teaching life easier since they might need to overcome no small lack of student motivation. Internationally, I am sure we can all think of countries where not too much English is learned during many years of schooling and where students flock to private language schools to take cram courses to pass TOEFL. I think much more English might be learned if English for Specific Purposes (ESP) courses in test-taking were designed and offered as respectable academic fare.

In sum, the primary challenge is to define the need for studying English and then to be clever enough to meet that need by using available materials or designing new ones. In other words, the challenge is to make English language learning sufficiently rewarding in and of itself to attract and keep students. One benefit which I think we in the United States are learning from our colleagues concerned with EFL in overseas settings is the importance of directing materials to relevant content areas; this is what ESP is all about. And in an appropriate context, I think we can see ESP as a form of bilingual education. ESP is not, however, without its own silly extremes of super-specialization.

The second challenge can be stated in parallel, namely, to make English language teaching sufficiently rewarding in and of itself to attract and keep teachers. And one of the primary means of providing those rewards is sufficient teacher preparation. With the increasing demand for English language instruction, there is an increasing need for teachers. What models of teacher preparation should be advocated? Should the content of preparation programs in the United States, Canada, and England be exported? The main model we in the United States have at hand is what our academic institutions do, and I do not think they do a bad job. However, is it appropriate for other settings? Are the Norris Guidelines applicable to Thailand? to Brazil? to Morocco? What are the basic things that teachers need to know? What are the luxuries? What does a teacher need to be an adequate technician, and what does he need to be the inspirational artist? Perhaps the basic consideration is the English language proficiency of the teachers themselves. If teachers of English are
barely conversant in English, what is the best way to remedy or surmount that deficiency so that their students can learn the maximum amount? I think it would be a challenge to design an ESP course in English teacher preparation where the end product would be a qualified English teacher, of course, but where more attention would be placed on the process of becoming one and on enjoying the process. Albert Marckwardt said:

What we must strive to develop is a generation of students who will approach language with sentiments and feelings other than those of anxiety and frustration, a generation of students who will not shrink from the pencil when asked to draft a statement about something or other and who can draft one which will express with clarity and precision what they want to say. A calm, reasoned and sane attitude toward language can be one of the greatest factors in bringing this about. You, as custodians of the language, can be one of the most vital factors in developing this sanity. 3

I would like to provide teachers with a sense of satisfaction and reward in their own learning of English so that they can pass the same sane attitude on to their students.

This brings me to another aspect of the second challenge. I think that in the United States there is a general reluctance within the academic realm of teacher preparation to talk much about alternate methodologies which either may not currently be in vogue, or which some may consider fads, but which would in a bilingual way help out with the problems of poorly prepared teachers. I think particularly of alternatives like The Silent Way, Counseling-Learning/Community Language Learning, and Suggestopaedia, all of which allow, and in one case require, the use of two languages by the teacher. I fear that there is a dearth of American methodologists who could conduct any teacher training in these alternative approaches which might enhance the teaching of English in its international settings. Already, I think that there may be more happening in places such as France, England, and Japan in the use of these alternative methods than there is in the United States. More may also be happening in private or commercial language schools than in academically oriented institutions which one would like to consider the bastions of innovation to which one could look for leadership. Americans may be dragging their feet in accepting these suspect approaches because they originated outside the mainstream of TESOL, a factor which casts a shadow on their pedigrees. This is felt despite the patent fact that these approaches work, as shown, for example, by the success of Peace Corps training.

A further cause of mistrust is that, although we can see with our eyes that these methods work, we do not believe our
eyes because there are not yet supporting research studies and statistics to prove it. My point is that we in the United States may ascribe to another culture our own resistance to the threat of these unorthodoxies: e.g. students in Japan will not accept X method because they will demand a book and the method does not call for one. Nonetheless, these approaches may be very powerful in providing English learners, including the teachers we are talking about, with satisfying experiences of language learning. I would just like to be sure that in meeting the challenging task of teacher preparation, we spread out the variety of approaches, methods, and techniques that teachers can use, and especially those that would utilize a bilingual individual, letting teachers choose a method that is compatible with their own philosophy of teaching. I myself have been influenced by the three approaches I have mentioned.

A reason for wanting to include these alternatives or options is the notion of individualization of instruction. In my own methods course, an exercise that I give concerns a 'learning styles inventory', which rather dramatically reveals the variety of individual learning styles in the class. I carry this one step further and indicate that just as each person learns differently, each of these people is also going to teach with a different style, and that each of these different styles may or may not coincide with cultural or ethnic styles. The consequent interplay between style and teaching approach or method is a variable that has to be considered for effective teaching, and if the teacher has a knowledge of a variety of approaches, he will be the better prepared. I feel that it is our duty as professionals in the field to display the gamut of the methods available and then allow the teacher to choose within the bounds of his best knowledge and of his degree of comfort.

One of the reasons why I have at times—and in my closet!—been somewhat defensive about ESL/EFL vis-à-vis bilingual education, is that I am not bilingual. When I began teaching, there was good justification for this—the prevailing theory being that the student's language should not be used in class. This theoretical stance nicely justified a whole lot of expatriates teaching overseas remaining monolingual and perhaps ipso facto, linguistic imperialists. Today, however, as I have indicated, the theoretical base has changed, and there are at least three previously mentioned, ready-made methodologies which can utilize bilingual teachers, in addition to a more tried-and-true grammar-translation approach.

In summing up, whether English is a part of a bilingual education program in another country or not, there is still a great deal of significance to the role of teaching English to speakers of other languages if there is a need for it. If English is simply a school subject to be studied, it is not likely to be significant in and of itself, but rather the significance lies in the passing of a test. If English is used for studying other
content matter, the learning of English becomes more significant.

The challenges I see to teaching English to speakers of other languages are in making English language learning and teaching sufficiently satisfying and rewarding to learners and teachers alike, so that English is a partner with other languages, in whatever bilingual setting, in enhancing the life of the individual and the community, and its teaching and learning is not a sterile exercise in frustration.

NOTES

1. See, for example: 'ESP given major consideration at recent APEI seminar in Iran.' Linguistic Reporter 20 (May 1978), 2.


LINGUISTICS AND PREPARATION OF BILINGUAL MATERIALS

Robert Lado
Georgetown University

1. Definitions. Bilingual materials are designed to contribute toward bilingualism on the part of students who are not fully bilingual but are in the process of becoming so. Materials printed in two languages, such as product labels and instructions for markets extending beyond one language area, are excluded because they are not designed to contribute toward achieving bilingualism but are intended for communication in whatever language is most accessible to the users.

We must admit at the outset that teaching-learning materials alone do not produce bilinguals. There must be a comprehensive bilingual/bicultural program with trained teachers and broad support from parents and the community. Bilingual materials can contribute significantly to such a program, however, and it is difficult to imagine a good bilingual program without them.

Such materials can be divided into those that are intended for bilingual mastery and those that contribute primarily to other studies in the educational development of bilinguals.

2. Natural bilingualism versus bilingual programs. Since language is acquired naturally by children through participation in meaningful situations involving the native language, and bilingualism is acquired naturally also by participating in meaningful situations involving two languages, one could hypothetically assume that bilingual materials should simply expose children to situations in both languages as in natural bilingualism, without any special order, selection, organization, or emphasis.

Such a view, however, would lead to the use of monolingual materials in both languages without regard to the special
learning capabilities, cognitive mapping, and linguistic and cultural needs of bilinguals. This creates problems since that part of the dominant language that has already been internalized need not be taught for that purpose, and what has not been internalized in the second language requires special exposure which is usually absent or deemphasized in native language materials. The result is bound to be frustration and failure in what is not known, boredom with what is already known, and wasted time and effort in the haphazard occurrence of what needs to be learned.

Furthermore, since mental maturity and second language competence are not usually at the same level, the use of separate monolingual native language materials for both languages keeps the bilingual student either below his level of maturity in order that the language be accessible to him linguistically, or at his level of maturity but beyond his linguistic competence. Either solution presents problems.

3. Role of linguistics. Linguistics helps to understand what must be included in materials for bilingual mastery and to check the appropriateness of the language in those that contribute primarily to other educational objectives.

Linguistics describes, explains, and relates the elements, units, patterns, and rules that constitute a language and arrives at explicit understandings of the nature of language. And central to that nature is its power to govern the production and comprehension of an unlimited number of new sentences from a limited number of rules, patterns, and elements.

Because of the practically limitless number of sentences that can be produced and understood by the speakers of a language, it would be hopeless to try to learn all the sentences needed for even ordinary communication as discrete items. It is imperative that the student internalize by whatever means the system of rules, patterns, and elements of a second language to become bilingual.

Linguistic studies of language acquisition among bilinguals can help us select and order the language component of bilingual situations, and if the materials are to be more economically organized than the haphazard, hit-or-miss stance of anything that happens to be said spontaneously in each situation, we need to plan the sequence and grading of the materials with the aid of linguistics.

Much is being made nowadays of letting the students do what they spontaneously want to do. This is evident when we are urged to let them begin by creating their own dialogues, or talk only about themselves. That is like having an airline pilot ask the passengers which way to point the plane after takeoff for the sake of their motivation and interest. It would certainly be downright exciting to be on such a flight. The pilot would surely have the undivided attention of the passengers, and they would never forget that adventure—their own
exploration into the unknown. But would they get to their destination at all, let alone get there on time? I prefer to have the pilot decide which way to head the plane. Perhaps we have forgotten the famous question posed by a progressive education pupil some decades ago: 'Teacher, do we have to do what we want to do today?' As I recall, that question helped to dismantle progressive education.

Linguistics can help us go beyond a mere replication of the natural acquisition of two languages by (1) organizing the materials cumulatively in strategically selected situations, (2) planning reentry as needed for mastery, (3) providing accurate and economically worded explanations, (4) providing the most complete, best organized inventory of the elements, patterns, and rules that constitute the system of the language, and (5) grading.

Grading is a dimension of good materials that can be achieved more effectively through the aid of linguistics. The difficulty of added layers of embeddedness, for example, can be sensed in part by experienced teachers, but it can be understood more precisely by those same teachers if laid bare by linguistic analysis. And motivation depends to a considerable degree on whether the progression in difficulty is suited to the developing capacity of the students: if the complexity is beyond their power of comprehension, they will be discouraged. If, on the other hand, the materials are too simple, the students will be bored and will not maintain their learning drive.

4. How does linguistics contribute to the foregoing?

4.1 Internal structure of the system. Linguistics makes a unique contribution in describing and explaining the internal structure of the language system. Bilingual materials must contribute to the internalization of the structure of at least one of the languages, assuming that the structure of the first or dominant one has already been internalized. There is no better source than linguistics to find the explicit description of the internal structure of the languages.

The native speaker has mastered the great bulk of the system of his language by the time he enters school at the age of six. He still has to develop further some complex rules and to learn to discriminate with greater precision many differences in construction which he has acquired superficially. But the corps of the language has been internalized, while in the second language, the internalization of that central corps still remains to be accomplished.

Bilingual materials writers must turn to linguistics for the description of that internal corps of the system. How does the language express questions in contrast to statements, requests, and exclamations? How does it express various types of questions such as those that elicit yes or no answers; those that inquire as to the place, time, and manner of an occurrence by
means of interrogative pronouns; questions that are intended to elicit the subject of an action which is otherwise known to the inquirer; those that elicit a complete report because presumably the questioner knows nothing of the event or has doubts as to the veracity of a previous account and wishes a full report; questions that merely require assent to the statement to which they are appended; questions that seek a cause; those that elicit an indirect object as reply; those that are conditional, contrary to fact, hypothetical, rhetorical, indirect, or are used as polite invitations, etc.?

How does the language express number, tense, gender, mood? How does it avoid excessive repetition, that is, what elements do speakers normally delete as they carry on communication? How does the speaker expand sentences and parts of sentences to give greater detail to what is being communicated?

Even educated native speakers are unable to express the rules or describe the patterns by which they construct and understand sentences unless they have made a special study of them in grammar or linguistics courses or in independent reading.

Linguistics develops a metalanguage to describe those rules, patterns, units, and elements that native speakers have internalized and use largely out of conscious awareness. And those descriptions help the developer of bilingual materials to make certain that the bilingual student will be exposed to the structural corps of the language in teaching-learning strategies. The linguistic descriptions do not state how the structures are to be internalized; that is the responsibility of the bilingual materials writer and teacher. Good linguistic descriptions merely present them in neat, compact, comprehensive statements.

Fries' (1952) description of the question patterns of modern English made it possible to prepare more effective materials to teach questions to foreign students, as Chomsky's auxiliary transformations make it possible to plan the teaching-learning of that major rule in modern English more effectively for speakers of other languages. In that sense, English as a Second Language (ESL) materials are part of the bilingual materials in which English is one of the languages to be mastered. In the same sense, Jespersen's description of mass nouns and count nouns makes it possible to develop better lessons for bilingual materials.

Without linguistic grammars, bilingual materials will be haphazard in their preparation and difficult to evaluate with regard to imparting the central corps of the language.

4.2 Conflicting points of view versus bad advice. Problems that seem to plague linguistic study are the frequent revolutions in its philosophy and point of view. In my experience we have seen the rejection of traditional grammar by the structuralists, the repudiation of structuralism by Chomsky and the transformationalists, the attack on transformationalism by the
generative semanticists and sociolinguists, and the internal
disagreements within each of those views and movements. How
is the bilingual teacher and the developer of bilingual materials
to turn confidently to linguistics, and when, since linguists
may do a 180-degree about-face without warning, and some-
times twice in succession? How can we discern which linguis-
tics to apply, and which advice is good and which is bad?

There is one characteristic of linguistic and grammatical
studies that distinguishes what we may be able to use and
what we may not. It is simply whether or not the study
describes or explains some comprehensive part of a particular
language. The studies we cannot use are those that tell us
how linguistic studies should be carried out or how bad pre-
vious studies have been, but which do not describe or explain
any substantial part of any language. Given the complexity
of language, we can expect that when the authors of such
papers get down to the business of describing or explaining a
language, they will change their model. On the other hand,
any study that describes or explains any substantial part of a
language can be reinterpreted with relative ease in a form that
is suitable for bilingual materials, whereas papers that merely
tell us how the study should be conducted cannot easily be
implemented even if their suggestions are sound. In any
event, the applied linguist who works on bilingual materials
is not the one responsible for the basic linguistic studies; the
applied linguist is responsible for the pedagogical organization
and presentation of the two languages in their cultural frames
of reference, and that is a major responsibility in itself.

On the basis of that characteristic, we find useful Jesper-
sen's Essentials of English Grammar (1933) and the larger A
Modern English Grammar (1909), published before structuralism
had come on the scene. We find useful Fries' The Structure of
English (1952) in a structural key. Because it explains a sub-
stantial part of English, we find useful Chomsky and Halle's
The Sound Pattern of English (1968), but we still consult
Kenyon and Knott's A Pronouncing Dictionary of American Eng-
lish (1944), of prestructural vintage. And we find indispensa-
ble the standard dictionaries that lexicographers compile in
monolingual and bilingual formats. The usefulness of the
sources just cited and similar works is enhanced by clarity of
presentation, accuracy of description, and comprehensiveness
or completeness, regardless of the model or philosophy of the
authors.

On the basis of that characteristic, we must reject the ad-
vice of a recent article which first boasts that in the nascent
field of the analysis of the meaning of sentences in utterances
there are already three approaches: the performative, the
prescriptive, and the pragmatic, and that only the pragmatic
approach meets all the objections of that author to the first
two. The article then advises us that since learners are going
to make mistakes anyway, 'Why not encourage the students to
learn effective though incorrect forms such as "Why do you there?" I asked a number of persons what they would understand if asked such a question by a foreign student and their interpretation varied from 'Why did you do that there?' to 'What are you doing there?' To my query as to their reaction to such a question, they said things like, 'He has a problem with his English. The words put together do not mean anything. He does not know much English. What does he mean? Does he mean what are you doing or why are you doing that?'

In addition to not describing or explaining any comprehensive part of the English language, the advice violates sociolinguistic realities, since listeners do react to markedness of various types. From a structural linguistic point of view, it is not English. From a transformational point of view, it is not a well-formed sentence. From the point of view of linguistic geography, it does not represent any recognizable geographic variety of the language. From the point of view of communication, it is confusing. The professionally committed ESL teacher, whether in a bilingual program or in a regular ESL class, should simply refuse to teach it.

4.3 Sociolinguistics, variation, and secondary reactions. A major decision to be made in the preparation of bilingual materials concerns the particular variety or varieties of the language to be presented. This decision has been the source of much discussion and controversy with regard to Black English in reading materials.

More recent studies of variation point to the gradience of registers normally used by the speakers of a language. Sociolinguistic studies are useful in the preparation of bilingual materials by providing both the descriptions and secondary reactions to various standards and registers. Making use of such data can prevent alienation and at least some of the failures and injustices that result from ignoring the language varieties used by the pupils and forcing some inflexible artificial standard on them, or at the other extreme, ignoring any standard variety altogether and limiting the materials exclusively to the local variety of the language at a particular time.

The decision as to what varieties to present is not up to the sociolinguist but, as Fishman (1977) points out, to the parents, the community, and the school, taking into account the realities involved and the educational and societal objectives adopted. The training of bilingual teachers becomes crucial in view of the finding by Shuy et al. (1969) that listeners react negatively more than favorably to accented speech.

4.4 Psycholinguistics. Psycholinguistics studies the processes involved in using a language, the limits of immediate memory in those processes, and the acquisition of language by children, although the latter need not be the exclusive domain of psycholinguistics nor is psycholinguistics limited to child
language acquisition studies. Psycholinguistic studies, including those on child language acquisition, however, are still in a very tentative discovery stage and cannot be expected to give us sufficiently detailed and comprehensive descriptions and explanations of substantial portions of the language for bilingual materials preparation. Psycholinguistic studies are a good source of research problems in bilingual studies and of possible explanations of observations in performance among bilinguals.

4.5 Discourse analysis. This recent development in linguistics shows good initial studies of extended discourse in conversation or in the separate skills of speaking and listening, reading and writing. It is clear that the analysis of isolated sentences cannot give a full description of a language simply because language is used typically in suprasentential utterances.

The developing analysis of conversational rules, including gradience and turn-taking, will obviously be useful in the preparation of bilingual materials. This takes us into the ethnography of speaking (Gumperz and Hymes 1972; Gumperz and Hernandez-Chavez 1971; McDermott 1977, among others), which goes beyond language to account for linguistic interaction. Again, the particular approach of the analyst is of less interest than the actual descriptions produced, since a few examples are of little practical value in the preparation of bilingual materials.

4.6 Early bilingual reading. Another potential contribution to bilingual materials can come from the emerging field of early bilingual reading. Although early reading is not restricted to linguistics in origin, it is a linguistic process bearing strong resemblance to language acquisition. Two recent doctoral dissertations, Past (1976) and Lee (1977), describe case studies of children who were taught to read in two languages before first grade as an aid to bilingual and bicultural development.

4.7 Contrastive linguistics and error analysis. The learning strategies of a bilingual differ from those of monolinguals who are extending their knowledge of their only language. Bilinguals may apply the rules of their dominant language when they process new utterances in the other; and as they master the second language they may transfer rules from it to the first. These transfers go unnoticed when the two languages coincide, but they become apparent when the two languages differ. Thus, we notice differences in the English spoken by bilinguals when their dominant language is Spanish, French, Arabic, and Vietnamese, for example. We even notice differences in the English spoken by Spanish speakers from different parts of the Spanish-speaking world, e.g. Argentina and Mexico, Puerto Rico and Peru, and Spaniards from different regions of Spain.
Contrastive linguistics applies linguistic techniques to the analysis of the similarities and differences between two languages. Where the two systems differ, a potential learning problem is identified, and provision can then be made to cope with it. When they coincide, no problem is anticipated; we actually expect facilitation because the system already internalized by the student will also function in the second language and need not be made the object of conscious verbalization and practice.

Contrastive linguistics does not predict that every speaker will make every possible mistake shown by differences between the two languages (Lado 1957), any more than medical science can predict which individuals will be affected by an epidemic developing in a particular area. It would be reckless, however, to ignore the threat posed by a serious epidemic simply because the doctor cannot say that you personally will be affected; you take your chances at your own peril. And so it is with all the social sciences, where 100 percent predictions are the exception, and factors that account for as little as 5 percent of variance may be considered important.

Error analysis identifies learning problems on the basis of performance. In addition to errors attributable to native language transfer, there are problems that result from the complexities of the second language itself. These may involve overextension of a rule to utterances where it does not apply, or underextension where it does apply. There are also errors which, although not directly traceable to the native language, appear more often when the bilingual is translating from one language to the other than when he/she is speaking or writing from thought. The avoidance phenomenon, the fact that bilinguals avoid the use of potentially troublesome constructions and words, is not explained by error analysis, but it is by contrastive analysis (Schachter 1977).

In all, both contrastive linguistics and error analysis can contribute to the preparation of better BL materials. They both depend on good linguistic analysis and they both help in determining which parts of the language systems will require special attention and which will not, and what linguistic explanations will most clearly and economically point out the specific learning tasks facing the students.

4.8 Applied linguistics. Although all good linguists are able to interpret linguistic studies for their possible application to bilingual materials, it is the main responsibility of applied linguistics to work out pedagogical sequences, practical explanations, grading, and adaptations to age, educational level, and setting. Here too, unless the applied linguist has the specific expertise for a particular bilingual adaptation, he/she will have to collaborate with bilingual teachers and others who can supply that expertise. And again, it will not be satisfactory that the applied linguist simply suggest how to
adapt the description to the particular bilingual group involved. The applied linguist should prepare the sequencing and explanations and let the bilingual teacher prepare the actual lessons. Even this, of course, does not guarantee successful materials.

5. Limitations of linguistics. Once the materials and their sequencing have been chosen and set, linguistics has less to contribute to them. We must turn to pedagogics and the psychology of learning. Yet theories of learning are too vague and somewhat simplistic to account for bilingual acquisition and provide adequate models for the complexities and specifics of achieving bilingualism. The state of the art takes us back to gifted bilingual teachers and developers of bilingual materials, who will do well to look into what linguistics can contribute to the success of their work, and who must try out and improve their materials in the field before publishing them.

6. Conclusion. BL materials developers need descriptive, structural, transformational, and/or generative semantic linguistics to determine what is meant by English and Spanish or whatever the two languages may be. This determination is necessary for the selection, progression, and explanation of the language component of BL materials.

BL materials writers need sociolinguistics for the social implications of variations in the language, including information on the effects of dialect markedness, accentedness, and acceptability.

BL materials writers need psycholinguistics to understand better the processes of speaking and listening, reading and writing, and the limits of the utterances that can be processed as language.

Within this need for linguistics, BL materials developers need the result of the work, the descriptions of English and of markedness of variations and of the processes and dimensions of memory, rather than polemics as to what sect of linguistics has the whole truth, or how the description is to be done or should have been done, usually by others. The BL materials writer may legitimately be expected to fill in some details of information which may not be mentioned in larger descriptions, but it is the responsibility of the linguist to provide the larger description with considerable detail, not simply stating the way it ought to be done.

We have had too much of showing with a few selected examples that all previous linguistic studies were wrong, and not enough serious studies showing the results of better descriptions. We need works like Jespersen's, Kenyon and Knott's, Fries', Chomsky and Halle's, Shuy's, etc. which give us material to work with. The particular theoretical basis fades into the background as we examine the actual descriptions and explanations provided.
BL materials do not need off-the-cuff dicta based on speculative if legitimate linguistic views. If linguistics provides only polemics as to what theory is best, or advises the use of language that is meaningful only in some highly restricted view of language, BL materials writers and teachers will do well to ignore linguistics and apply whatever common sense in language they can muster on their own. If, however, linguistics provides comprehensive descriptions of specific languages, factual and insightful studies of social variation and reactions to markedness and accentedness, factual and revealing studies of the processes of speaking and listening, reading and writing, and error and contrastive analyses showing the areas of stress and difficulty, BL materials writers and publishers cannot afford to ignore them.

NOTE

1. Einar Haugen, author of The Norwegian Language in America, A Study in Bilingual Behavior, suggested in the discussion at this Round Table that in addition to leaning on his native language competence to construct utterances in the second language, the bilingual speaker may be particularly concerned about errors that are sharply marked as resulting from his particular language base.
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It is widely noted that children can become native speakers of a second language if they start on it while they are very young, some time before the age of eight or nine. Traditionally, we have ascribed this to a more receptive 'language acquisition device', available only prior to the onset of puberty. In other words, maturity has as one effect the reduction of certain aspects of language-learning potential.

While it is true that children can eventually come close to, or actually develop, native-speaker competence, nobody can really tell why this is so. In a presentation at the American University in Cairo in March, 1977, Evelyn Hatch took issue with the assumption that children learn more readily than do adults, pointing out that a miniscule portion of the language suffices to meet expectations set for child learners. A little language skill goes a long way.

One thing seems uncontestable. If children start early and keep at it, they will develop an exceptionally good pronunciation. It is possible that a limited level of maturity is the best explanation for whatever early childhood success can be demonstrated. As far as I am informed, however, there is no conclusive experimental evidence proving definitively that maturity is the key. Other explanations might have comparable explanatory power, and these should be examined to make sure we are not being misled.

What other explanations might be considered? Maybe there is a consistent motivation feature, with a survival goal motivating the child beyond what is normal for older students. Perhaps the explanation is that with young children there is always a meaningful context into which language is bedded. We do not normally use obscure patterns, vocabulary, etc., when communicating with children; exactly the opposite—we use simple
language, even baby talk. Perhaps there is a difference in input, so that somehow the nature of the data changes when young children are communicants. Perhaps there is a difference in the processing procedures used by more mature and sophisticated listeners.

I would like to suggest still another hypothesis: that the difference might be related to the student's state of literacy. This will not be easy to prove, since literacy and maturity go hand in hand, though it is consistently true that first languages are always learned by illiterates. In a society where literacy is virtually universal, however, the correlations between preliterate and prepuberty will be high, and therefore hard to separate for experimental treatment. The difference may well be in the mind of the subject, though for this reason the child is no less effective. It bears considering that young preliterate learners can with no hesitation accept the spoken language as the exclusive medium for learning. Children entering school are characteristically oral-dominant and remain so at least until sometime near the end of grade 2. For some children oral dominance may last longer, until late in the elementary school years. But at some point, with constant exposure to written forms, students become visual-dominant. Processing aural vs. visual stimuli involves a bedrock kind of difference, crucial to the cognitive development of a child in a literate society.

The mastery of reading leads the child to create fixed associations between groups of sounds and the spellings that represent these sounds. It is the use, not the existence of the secondary representation of language—in writing—that makes the difference. Literacy is overpowering. Even when the input is oral, a postliterate will himself create, if necessary, a conventional spelling to lean on. Conceptualization in a second language on the basis of known spelling rules will naturally be facilitated if the native and target languages share the same alphabet (as do Spanish and English). However, even if the spelling systems are different, the native-language system can interpose itself between the newly acquired language system and the literacy-generated influence that we call spelling interference.

Can we prove, or disprove, the thesis that native-language literacy increases some of the problems of learning a new language? Perhaps studies concentrating on adult illiterates in language-learning environments might be revealing. Until research ideas can be tried out, we can only speculate; but there is some evidence that might modestly support the literacy-handicap hypothesis.

Education scholars are aware that all or nearly all children enter school as aural-dominant learners. (Since they do not read, the conclusion is inevitable.) Most at some point become readers, and in normal cases, with the schools' extensive emphasis on reading skills, students reach what educators call 'parity', with equal ability to form perceptions aurally through
listening or visually through reading. Then, rather than remaining at the balance point of parity, there is a 'crossover' which carries the student into visual dominance. The process is not quite as simple as it may sound, but it is essentially accurate.

Scholars do not agree on just when the crossover occurs; estimates range from grade 2 to grade 6. All, however, seem to agree that the crossover does occur. When it does, a very basic change takes place in the student's mind. Different areas of the brain are activated, and new patterns of thinking are developed. Once literate, the student can never really go back to preliterate status. He will rely more and more on his visual skills, and as he grows older, he will probably resent any efforts to force learning by ear only.

Failure to recognize these facts may indeed account for the limited success of audiolingual methods of language study, especially with adults. Many students are seriously disconcerted when written lesson materials are deliberately withheld. My recollection of language instruction at the Foreign Service Institute is that we were most likely to be successful with students who had studied Spanish by the grammar-translation method or the reading method in school, and with that experience as a background, then studied Spanish with oral emphasis but not exclusive oral input.

I am suggesting, then, that achieving literacy may accompany, indeed may cause, a basic difference in the cognitive style and organic structure of the way the student thinks, and that this difference is established for the rest of his life. The literate human is never the same again. His pattern of processing data will be so thoroughly modified that further consequent changes are bound to occur. Illiterate children are surrounded by sounds that are there, 'in place'. Their gestalt-like world is changed into one which associates time and direction as the conspicuously linear mode of written language is added to the student's repertoire of perception tools.

How can the influence of literacy be separately judged? I have tried to do this by designing a test to evaluate the English of three groups whose language-learning experience differs in ways that can perhaps be assigned literacy correlates. The test presumes to measure certain skills by both aural and visual techniques, after which we can perhaps make some specific correlations between test performance and cognitive style, specifically as this affects preliteracy and postliteracy, comparing competence to similar items which were first learned before or after literacy in the subjects' first language was achieved. Results will of necessity be very tentative, and open to confirmation or refutation by more extensive and more sophisticated research.

Note that while grammar cannot be eliminated as a functioning element of language, it is primarily pronunciation that is measured and evaluated in this project.
The test is of oral productive skills, so it is necessary to examine one student at a time. The test interview takes about 15 minutes and involves six subtests. They are shown in Table 1.

Table 1. Description of tests.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subtests</th>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Skills tested</th>
<th>Input</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Derivational</td>
<td>Imitating a model and then modifying it by adding a specific suffix</td>
<td>Morphophonemic alternations, allophonic distributions</td>
<td>Aural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>Interpreting written monosyllables</td>
<td>'Spelling' pronunciations</td>
<td>Visual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>Interpreting written polysyllables</td>
<td>Common deletions, misleading spellings</td>
<td>Visual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>Interpreting written letter and number sequences</td>
<td>Contrastive stress</td>
<td>Visual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Imitation</td>
<td>Repeating sentences after a model</td>
<td>Common allophones, consonant clusters, interference</td>
<td>Aural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Response</td>
<td>Answering with one word reply</td>
<td>Common allophones, interference</td>
<td>Aural</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The test, of approximately 100 items, was administered to representative members of three groups, which for the purpose of identification and reference will be called 'Anglos' (a small control group of native speakers of English with no Spanish in their language background), 'Chicanos' (native speakers of Spanish, usually born in the United States, or brought here as infants, who gained control of their second language—English—before they became literate), and 'Hispanos' (native speakers of Spanish, born out of the United States, and achieving literacy in Spanish before beginning to study English).

The output of each of the subtests is oral. The test is given by sound tape to guarantee consistency. The tape player is stopped, after instructions are played, whenever the examinee interprets written input (subtests B, C, D). A second tape recorder makes a record of the entire test, so that interpretations made 'on the fly' can be rechecked for accuracy.

The test papers are in two sets: one for the student includes in written form the directions for each subtest, and the
sections of items where input is visual. The other set for the examiner includes all the material on the students' set plus a tapescript listing of all aural input, elaborated with possible errors to facilitate marking the type of student responses, correct and incorrect. These two sets of test forms appear in the appendix.

It is recognized that students should not be graded on the pronunciation of words they have never met, so in subtests B and C they are asked to state for each item whether or not they know the item. Scoring procedures, then, do not count the unknown item, and percentages of correct response are based on a smaller total. This was relatively infrequent, as subjects were all at high school or university level.

One unexpected difficulty was finding an adequate number of willing test subjects. Many of us have assumed that there are numerous Chicanos in Southern California, but actually coming up with authentic specimens proved anything but easy. UCLA and Santa Monica High School finally produced 11. So there was a total of 29 subjects: 4 Anglos, 11 Chicanos, and 14 Hispanics. It would be well if this modest sample could be enlarged.

The test results, expressed in percentage of accurate responses, are shown in Table 2.

Table 2. Summary of test results.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subtests</th>
<th>Anglo</th>
<th>Chicano</th>
<th>Hispano</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A1. Morphophonemics, deleted /t/</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2. Allophones of /t,d/</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A3. Unmarked</td>
<td>(1.00)</td>
<td>(1.00)</td>
<td>(.86)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1. 'Silent' l</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2. Unmarked</td>
<td>(1.00)</td>
<td>(1.00)</td>
<td>(.99)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C1. Deleted syllables</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2. Miscellaneous deletions</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C3. CA interference</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D1. Contrastive stress</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D2. Unmarked</td>
<td>(1.00)</td>
<td>(1.00)</td>
<td>(.91)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Miscellaneous modifica-</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Miscellaneous allo-</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>phones</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Means of means</td>
<td>(1.00)</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>(1.00)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note that unmarked forms (cited in parentheses) such as those with regular spelling-pronunciation correlations, noncontrastive stress, etc., cause no difficulty. These are satisfactorily learned as the normal forms, so they fit where no special rule (morphophonemic, allophonic, etc.) is needed.
It is clear that Chicanos as a group are more successful learners of their second language than are Hispanos. Chicano percentages of correct responses are consistently higher, often close to native Anglo performance. Why do Chicanos outperform Hispanos? Is it the plasticity of the young age at which they start learning English? Is there some age-bound motivation that is not well understood? Is there a special input thought to be appropriate when communicating with children, some sort of simplified language? Is there some kind of drive for survival? Is it because informal language learning takes place in a meaningful context? Could it be the misapplication of literacy skills?

Some of the test items have written miscues that deflect performance in the direction of an inappropriate spelling pronunciation. Examples can be seen in the relative scores of the visual input items where spelling pronunciations account for errors. Note the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance gaps</th>
<th>Anglo-Chicano</th>
<th>Chicano-Hispano</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B1. 'Silent' l (walk, folk, calf, etc.)</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C1. Implied syllables (chocolate, several, etc.)</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2. Miscellaneous 'silent' letters (island, sword, etc.)</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Means</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Even when the literacy criterion is not directly applied, the Chicano is often closer in performance to the Anglo than to the Hispano, as the following gaps in performance indicate:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance gaps</th>
<th>Anglo-Chicano</th>
<th>Chicano-Hispano</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A2. Allophone distribution /t, d/ (short, wide)</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E1. Miscellaneous modifications (that your, gonna)</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F1. Miscellaneous allophones (rubber, heel)</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C3. C/A interference (sorrow, America)</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Means</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The error rate in handling contrastive stress is of special interest, because the band of differential performances is very wide. The Chicanos find themselves right in the middle of an 82-point spread between Anglos and Hispanos. This is obviously
an area of insufficiency that should concern teachers of both native-Spanish-speaking groups.

D1. Contrastive stress (ACDC. 2343) .41 .41

Contrastive stress is seldom taught, and even more seldom taught effectively. It has no consistent traditional spelling, but no matter—the Anglo natives do not need it.

The only area where the gap between groups places the Chicanos and the Hispanos together is in the morphophonemic variations of stems where the stem final /t/ disappears when the suffix /-an/ is added. The figures are:

A1. Morphophonemic alternation .38 .11

In this case it is not that the Hispanos are good performers, but that the Chicanos are very poor. Only in one of the cases when the spellings are misleading do the Chicanos have notably lower scores than the Anglos.

Overall scores, including all nine categories, the gaps between the means of means, the results are:

Anglos to Chicanos .18 Chicanos to Hispanos .30

The task I set, to find out if literacy influences some oral aspects of language learning, is not well done; maybe it is not well started. I hope it can be tested more at leisure (time available to me has not been adequate). But how can we separate maturity and literacy to treat them differentially?

One possible answer is suggested by Theodore Andersson, who has been working optimistically on early childhood literacy—and biliteracy. He has reported his research recently in Hispania. Perhaps some of his subjects, some who are literate in their first language—literate but not mature—would make possible a test of groups of both literate and nonliterate preschool subjects; therefore, only literacy status would be a differential factor, especially if other variables can be controlled.

I hope such an experiment will prove possible, that we might successfully probe a little further into the mysteries of how people learn languages.
APPENDIX A

TEST SCRIPT AND SCORING FORMS,
MODES OF LEARNING A SECOND LANGUAGE

A
B
C
D
E
F

Tot

Participant

Category

A. DERIVATIONAL MORPHOLOGY

Instructions: Please repeat in a clear voice each word you hear. Then make another word by adding the suffix -en. For example: You hear 'black.' You say 'black blacken.' You hear 'sick.' You say 'sick sicken.' OK. You understand? Answer orally. Let's go.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>REPETITION</th>
<th>DERIVATION</th>
<th>FEATURE(S)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. white</td>
<td>OK/no</td>
<td>OK/no</td>
<td>/-ŋ/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. mad</td>
<td>OK/no</td>
<td>OK/no</td>
<td>/ŋ/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. moist</td>
<td>OK/no</td>
<td>OK/no</td>
<td>deleted /t/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. soft</td>
<td>OK/no</td>
<td>OK/no</td>
<td>deleted /t/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. broad</td>
<td>OK/no</td>
<td>OK/no</td>
<td>/ŋ/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. fast</td>
<td>OK/no</td>
<td>OK/no</td>
<td>deleted /t/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. length</td>
<td>OK/no</td>
<td>OK/no</td>
<td>no modification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. haste</td>
<td>OK/no</td>
<td>OK/no</td>
<td>deleted /t/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. light</td>
<td>OK/no</td>
<td>OK/no</td>
<td>/-ŋ/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. hard</td>
<td>OK/no</td>
<td>OK/no</td>
<td>/ŋ/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. list</td>
<td>OK/no</td>
<td>OK/no</td>
<td>deleted /t/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. height</td>
<td>OK/no</td>
<td>OK/no</td>
<td>/ŋ/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. wide</td>
<td>OK/no</td>
<td>OK/no</td>
<td>/ŋ/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. short</td>
<td>OK/no</td>
<td>OK/no</td>
<td>/ŋ/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. oft</td>
<td>OK/no</td>
<td>OK/no</td>
<td>deleted /t/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. glad</td>
<td>OK/no</td>
<td>OK/no</td>
<td>/ŋ/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. dark</td>
<td>OK/no</td>
<td>OK/no</td>
<td>no modification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. sad</td>
<td>OK/no</td>
<td>OK/no</td>
<td>/ŋ/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. heart</td>
<td>OK/no</td>
<td>OK/no</td>
<td>/ŋ/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. weak</td>
<td>OK/no</td>
<td>OK/no</td>
<td>no modification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. straight</td>
<td>OK/no</td>
<td>OK/no</td>
<td>/ŋ/</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
B. READING LIST - MONOSYLLABLES

Instructions: Read aloud the following list of words. After each word, indicate by saying YES or NO whether you know the word. For example, if you see the word desk, you say 'desk'. Then say 'yes' if you know what the word means, or 'no' if you do not know what the word means. Ready? Let's go.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>FAMILIARITY</th>
<th>FEATURE(S)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>milk</td>
<td>yes/no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>talk</td>
<td>yes/no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>half</td>
<td>yes/no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>walk</td>
<td>yes/no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>felt</td>
<td>yes/no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>silk</td>
<td>yes/no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>calf</td>
<td>yes/no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>should</td>
<td>yes/no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>fault</td>
<td>yes/no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>chalk</td>
<td>yes/no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>help</td>
<td>yes/no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>yolk</td>
<td>yes/no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>held</td>
<td>yes/no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>fold</td>
<td>yes/no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>balk</td>
<td>yes/no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>mold</td>
<td>yes/no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>built</td>
<td>yes/no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>world</td>
<td>yes/no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>volt</td>
<td>yes/no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>folk</td>
<td>yes/no</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C. READING LIST - POLYSYLLABLES

Instructions: Read aloud the following list of words. After each word, indicate by saying YES or NO whether you know the word. For example, if you see the word Panama, you say 'Panama'. Then say 'yes' if you know the meaning of the word, or 'no' if you don't know the meaning of the word. Ready? Let's go.
ITEM FAMILIARITY FEATURE(S)
1. chocolate yes/no deleted middle syllable /-e-/
2. vegetable yes/no deleted middle syllable /-e-/
3. several yes/no deleted middle syllable /-e-/
4. different yes/no deleted middle syllable /-e-/
5. family yes/no deleted middle syllable /-e-/
6. history yes/no deleted middle syllable /-e-/
7. liberal yes/no deleted middle syllable /-e-/
8. mineral yes/no deleted middle syllable /-e-/
9. general yes/no deleted middle syllable /-e-/
10. phonetically yes/no deleted fourth syllable /-e-/
11. Wednesday yes/no deleted /d/ & middle syllable
12. Marine Corps yes/no deleted final /-ps/
13. Grandpa yes/no deleted medial /-p-;/n > m/
14. Durham yes/no deleted medial /-h-/
15. climber yes/no deleted medial /-b-/
16. sorrow yes/no trilled or flapped /r ~ rr/
17. island yes/no deleted medial /-s-/
18. salmon yes/no deleted medial /-l-/
19. sword yes/no deleted medial /-w-/
20. America yes/no reduced vowels - full V >/e/

D. READING LIST - LETTERS AND NUMBERS

Instructions: Read the following sets of letters and numbers as groups. For instance, the letters U plus S plus A are normally read by naming each of the letters, so it is USA. Do you understand? Let's go.

ITEM FEATURES
1. U C L A
2. S C D C
3. K F A C
4. A C D C
5. K F W B
6. 2 4 6 8
7. 1 0 2 0
8. 2 3 4 3
9. 20 21 22 32
10. 46 56 57 67
E. IMITATION - SHORT SENTENCES

Instructions: Repeat each sentence just as you hear it.

SENTENCES FEATURE(S)
1. He has one big room. regressive nasal assimilation /mb/
2. That was an unkind re- regressive nasal assimilation /hk/
   mark.
3. Whattaya want? flapped voiced /t/; reduced you
4. Is this your book? reciprocal assim. /sh/; vowel /U/
5. Are all of us going? regressive voicing /z/
6. Has anything changed? cluster breaker /-jVd/; /θ/
7. Is that your school? reciprocal assim. /ch/; /Vsk/
8. What are you gonna do con- contraction 'gonna'; flap /t/ /r/ tomorrow?
tomor-
9. He definitely will say yes. affricate /γ/
10. He's very articulate. flap/trill /r/; reduced /ə/

F. RESPONSE - ONE WORD

Instructions: Answer each of the questions you hear with a single word.

QUESTIONS EXPECTED RESPONSE FEATURE(S)
1. What do we call a human baby stop /-b-/
infant? 2. What are automobile tires rubber stop /-b-/
made of? 3. What is the name of the water flap /-t-/
   substance that fills the ocean?
4. What do we call a very beggar stop /-g-/
   poor person who asks strangers for money?
5. What's another word for 'woman'? lady stop /-d-/
   (especially if she is very cultured)
6. What do we say of some- dirty flap /-rt-/
   thing not at all clean?
7. What's at the back end of heel dark /-l-/
your foot?
QUESTIONS

8. What do we call the huge building where airplanes are kept?  
   hangar  velar /-ŋ-/  

9. What is a huge hill called?  
   mountain  glottal /-ʔn/  

10. What's the general name for small fruit that grows on bushes?  
    berry  flap/trill /-r-/  

11. What keeps a shirt closed in front?  
    button  glottal /-ʔn/  

12. What's the name of the white stuff that falls from the sky in winter in northern places?  
    snow  prothetic /VsC-/  

13. What season follows winter?  
    spring  prothetic /VsCC-/  

14. How does a young boy get up into a tree?  
    climb  final /-b-/  

15. What color are bananas (usually)?  
    yellow  affricate /y-/  

APPENDIX B

WRITTEN MATERIAL ADDRESSED TO STUDENT, MODES OF LEARNING A SECOND LANGUAGE

1. Your Name______________________________

2. Place of Birth (City and Country)_____________________

3. Your Native Language:  Spanish  English  Other__

4. Your Age When You First Began to Learn English_______

5. Number of Years You Studied (or Studied in) English_____

6. How You Learned English: (Check any ways that apply)
   Mostly from my family____
   Mostly from friends or playmates____
   Mostly in school classes____
   From radio and/or TV programs____
6. Continued

From movies
Other ways (describe)__________________________

A. DERIVATIONS

Instructions: Please repeat in a clear voice each word you hear. Then make another word by adding the suffix -en. For example: You hear 'black'. You say 'black blacken'. You hear 'sick'. You say 'sick sicken'. OK. You understand? Answer orally. Let's go.

B. READING LIST - MONOSYLLABLES

Instructions: Read aloud the following list of words. After each word, indicate by saying YES or NO whether you know the word. For example, if you see the word desk, you say 'desk'. Then say 'yes' if you know what the word means, or 'no' if you do not know what the word means. Ready? Let's go.

1. milk ...
2. talk ...
3. half ...
4. walk ...
5. felt ...
6. silk ...
7. calf ...
8. should ...
9. fault ...
10. chalk ...
11. help ...
12. yolk ...
13. held ...
14. fold ...
15. balk ...
16. mold ...
17. built ...
18. world ...
19. volt ...
20. folk ...

C. READING LIST - POLYSYLLABLES

Instructions: Read aloud the following list of words. After each word, indicate by saying YES or NO whether you know the word. For example, if you see the word Panama, you say 'Panama'. Then say 'yes' if you know the meaning of the word, or 'no' if you don't know the meaning of the word. Ready? Let's go.
D. READING LIST - LETTERS AND NUMBERS

Instructions: Read the following sets of letters and numbers as groups. For instance, the letters U plus S plus A are normally read by naming each of the letters, so it is USA. Do you understand? Let's go.

1. U C L A
2. S C D C
3. K F A C
4. A C D C
5. K F W B
6. 2 4 6 8
7. 1 0 2 0
8. 2 3 4 3
9. 20 21 22 32
10. 46 56 57 67

E. IMITATION - SHORT SENTENCES

Instructions: Repeat each sentence just as you hear it.

(10 sentences)

F. RESPONSE - ONE WORD

Instructions: Answer each of the questions you hear with a single word.

(15 questions)

NOTES

I wish to express my gratitude and appreciation to Marie Malloy, a research assistant who combines initiative, judgment, ambition, and consideration in her service, who generously shared her time and talents in getting and interpreting the data presented in this paper.
1. There is, for example, no reason not to assume that different learners employ varied tactics in learning assignments, or that they vary in their ability to read in different domains.


3. It seems likely that students will vary in their crossover points by at least the grade-2/grade-6 spread.

4. The test forms are presented as appendices; Appendix A shows the entire test script and scoring forms used by the examiner, and Appendix B, the stimulus sheets given one at a time to the student.

5. Theodore Andersson, 'Preschool Biliteracy: Historical Background', Hispania 60:3 (September, 1977), 527-530.
CULTURE AND ETHNICITY IN THE BILINGUAL CLASSROOM

Robert J. Di Pietro
University of Delaware

Abstract. As programs in bilingual education reach new levels of maturity, more is said about the need to make them responsive to the cultures of the students involved. Ethnicity, however, remains a neglected dimension. A survey of the literature dealing with bilingual curricula and the training of bilingual teachers reveals a lack of differentiation between the terms 'culture' and 'ethnicity'. A major part of the problem stems from the fact that we have no intellectual tradition built around ethnicity. Yet, the interaction of ethnicity with language is no less significant than that of culture with language. Ethnicity plays a major part in shaping the identity of people, especially when they are children. Due to the linguistic and cultural alternatives provided by bilingual education, the problem in developing an ethnic self-awareness may be increased. It can be shown that ethnicity plays a major part in the expectations that teachers have for their students. The cognitive flexibility that is a supposed benefit of bilingual education may be negated by an unwanted sense of disorientation in the affectual domain unless attention is paid to the ethnic component. The paper makes a strong plea for bilingual educators to join ranks with the sponsors of ethnic heritage studies in America for the purpose of creating a multifaceted form of bilingual-bicultural-multiethnic education.

'In San Francisco, preschool teachers are examining their feelings about persons of other ethnic backgrounds as they study the causes of racial and cultural stereotyping and their effect on children'. So began the HEW News bulletin of November 28, 1977, as it announced the funding of 64 new Ethnic Heritage Studies grants under the provisions of Title IX.
of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. Other ethnic projects financially supported by HEW in the current fiscal year include a study of the multiethnic heritage of Oakland, California, a program for school librarians in Boulder, Colorado, a multimedia presentation of the history of the Jews of Michigan, a curriculum materials development project for the Polish heritage of St. Louis, Missouri, and a program for training adults to be peer teachers in ethnic courses in New York City. Obviously, ethnicity has come of age as a factor in American education. Or has it? Not one of the 64 grants listed in the bulletin amounts to more than $50,000 and the total expenditure is $2.3 million, a figure which pales considerably when compared to federal support of bilingual education, now over $100 million.

Why this uneven treatment of bilingualism and multiethnicity by our national legislators? Part of the answer lies in the different ways legislation on the two issues came about. Bilingual education was seen by many of its political supporters in the U.S. Congress as an antipoverty measure, i.e. as a way of bringing equal economic opportunities to those Americans cut off from the mainstream because of language. The federal requirement that potential benefactors of bilingual education be not only non-English-speaking but also poor has kept funds from going to those school districts with bilingual children from middle-income families. As a result, bilingual education was stigmatized and kept from becoming a viable alternative to the usual type of monolingual, mainstream public education found in American schools. The Ethnic Heritage Studies Act, on the other hand, was typified as 'enrichment' right from the start. In the view of many of its supporters, this act represents an effort to provide new generations of American children with information about the diversity of culture and ethnicity in their backgrounds. Where the bilingual education act focused primarily on language and was considered to be needed for certain segments of the American population, the ethnic heritage act is inclined to 'nonvital' issues such as immigrant history and the social institutions of ethnic groups.

No matter how our elected representatives on Capitol Hill may wish to structure reality, it is inevitable that we come to talk about the interconnections of ethnicity, language, and culture in bilingual education. Both linguistics and anthropology have a long tradition of associating language with culture. The link of language with ethnicity or culture with ethnicity, however, is not so clear. Whereas we can use the term 'cultural system' and include language in it when we describe aspects of a society, we have yet to establish a theoretical niche for ethnicity which would satisfy all investigators. Certainly, one cannot discuss ethnicity without mentioning the cultural behavior that marks the phenomenon. Ethnicity without its cultural specification would be as meaningless as language removed from culture. It will be difficult to extricate these concepts
but even if we do not progress beyond recognizing that ethnicity, culture, and language are interconnected, we will have made at least a start toward articulating bilingual curricula to reflect all three.

The first order of the day is to find a clear definition of ethnicity. The task is so great, however, that we must proceed in short, deliberate steps. We might begin with observing that the term 'ethnic' demarcates groups of people who share one or more of a number of characteristics: race, religion, historical origin, family relationship, marriage patterns, life styles, and language. But before we discuss how these characteristics operate to define ethnic groups in the United States, we must point out, as did Fishman (1977) at last year's Georgetown University Round Table, that the term 'ethnic' often carries with it a derogatory or demeaning sense. Ethnicity, especially when it refers to membership in a minority group, is perceived sometimes as a threat to the stability of a society. The term 'nativism' has been coined by political scientists and historians to describe a national phenomenon which emerges in times of crisis such as war and depression, and takes the form of hostility toward some ethnically marked group (see Vecoli 1973:90). Nativism leads to the formation of a social 'establishment' which enacts exclusionary practices against those groups perceived to be outside the establishment. Some ethnic groups who have been victims of nativism in the United States are the Jews, the blacks, the Italians, the Irish, and Hispanic peoples.

In an interview with the journalist Noel Epstein (see Epstein 1977:46-47), Professor Higham of Johns Hopkins University describes ethnic groups as 'likely to be suspicious, narrow-minded [and] riddled with prejudices'. Ethnic politics in the United States is often restricted by the media to neighborhood affairs. A recent editorial in the Washington Star ('Mr. Biaggi and the Irish', February 22, 1978) labeled it '... a harmless ritual of honoring old-country traditions and heroes beloved by some of a politician's constituents--laying wreaths on Columbus Day and marching on St. Patrick's.' As sometimes happens with the term 'dialect', 'ethnic' can be thrown as an insult at those who have it by those who perceive themselves as not having it. The expression, 'I speak the language but you speak a dialect' has its counterpart in 'I am an American but you are an ethnic American'. In this way, Americans who hyphenate their nationality run the risk of being stereotyped by other Americans who do not. Sometimes, ethnic Americans reverse the stereotyping process by qualifying 'mainstream' Americans. For example, a Chinese American told me that Americans in general eat more, drink more, and are more boastful than Chinese Americans.

For some groups in the United States, ethnicity comes in phases. In the first phase it embodies a struggle to preserve a home-country identity. The second stage begins when the
children and grandchildren of the foreign-born seek to legitimize an identity of their own. This search for an identity may involve a whole-scale rejection of the parents' ethnic affiliation or possibly some compromise of ethnic traits or even the development of completely novel characteristics. A final stage is marked by nostalgia for the old ways and a quest for one's roots.

Perhaps the most important trait of ethnicity is that it represents an attachment of some sort to a group. In a publication of the National Project on Ethnic America of the American Jewish Committee, Joseph Giordano (1973:11) writes that, '... ethnicity ... is more than a distinctiveness defined by race, religion, national origin or geography. It involves conscious and unconscious processes that fulfill a deep psychological need for security, identity, and a sense of historical continuity'. We should hasten to add that these conscious and unconscious processes do not make uniform and predictable use of cultural patterns in achieving ethnic distinctiveness. Considerable variation occurs within each marking feature.

For example, it is not equally important to all Hispanic Americans to know how to speak Spanish, nor to all American Indians to know their ancestral tongues. Moreover, when Spanish or some other 'ethnically' marked language is spoken by a group, that language can display considerable variation in form. In some cases, an ethnic group can decide that a particular marking feature should be intensified in use. Thus we find a dramatic rise in enrollments in the study of Italian and Hebrew in recent years among Jewish and Italian Americans. In neither case is the language being studied the one which is most closely associated with earlier generations. For most Italian Americans, standard Italian is almost as foreign as French or Spanish might be and for Jewish Americans, Yiddish, not Hebrew, was the predominant functional language of their families. Yet, standard Italian and Hebrew have become the ethnically desired languages in this country—and not the various Italian dialects or Yiddish.

To give another illustration of how ethnic Americans may vary in their use of language as a marker of their identity, Hispanic peoples living in the Southwestern states have come to realize that the area has a special variety of Spanish. This realization easily leads to a debate concerning the use of the regional Spanish in bilingual programs. Some people accept it and others do not. Arguments mustered against the regional variety in education are usually cultural ones. When evaluated in terms of accessibility to a body of written literature and communication with other people, regional varieties can never compete with the standard form of any language. However, bilingual educators must come to realize that the choice of language may be one of the defining characteristics of the local Chicano or other ethnicity. In such cases, alienation from regional speech can be interpreted as an assault on ethnic
Steps to avoid the potential for assault must be taken in the preparation of bilingual programs built around the standard varieties of the languages.

Culture in educational programs involves not only subject matter but also the style of presentation. In the ideal bilingual program subject matter, presentation in the classroom, and language choice all work together to expand the child's sense of being. The need to harmonize all three components is perhaps more critical in some sources than in others. For example, history, as taught in traditional American schools, has been used by curriculum programmers more to instill a national identity in the students than to inform them about the past. History does not report, it interprets. It presents civilization as a spotlight casting various peoples in its brilliance. Some inventors are extolled while others are ignored. Past events, such as the Battle of the Alamo or Custer's Stand, are given values which are sometimes diametrically opposed to the ethnic self-image of the students. According to an eighteenth century philosopher named Giambattista Vico (see Bergin and Fisch 1968), the sense of nationhood brings with it a conceit, a feeling that one's country is superior to all others in all ways. In multiethnic nations, the conceit is often concentrated within the cultural system of one or a few establishment groups. Even those social scientists of a nation who study the cultural ways of other peoples are not always imbued with a sense of altruism. Here are the words of anthropologist Margaret Mead on this point (as cited in Epstein 1977:70):

How often has our Western attempt to preserve native dress, old customs, different styles of architecture, to respect native laws and customs, been only a thin disguise over an unwillingness to admit a people, newly entering into our way of life, to full participation in the culture which we claim to value so highly?

Some educators resent the inroads made by various ethnic groups into the subject matter of schools in much the same way they object to making bilingualism a significant part of the curriculum. Ethnic awareness can be as much a threat to the monolingual, mainstream establishment as is the fear that multilingualism will become a new requirement for advancement to positions of national power and economic well-being. Public education in my own childhood left me with the impression that people from eastern and southern Europe were the least desirable elements of their countries of origin, certainly not as strong, beautiful, or bright as their northwestern brothers and sisters. The inscription on the Statue of Liberty in New York Harbor describes such people as the 'wretched refuse' of other shores. In a survey of over 500 American executives, Reed M. Powell (1970) concluded that ethnicity enters very much into the hiring and promoting of people in the business
world. When asked whether their ethnicity helped or hindered them in their careers, 31.6 percent of the executives of northwest European extraction answered that it had helped them and only 5.3 percent answered that it was a hindrance. For executives of Asiatic backgrounds, only 5.1 percent felt that their ethnicity was a help, and 71.8 percent thought that it worked against them.

Distrust of ethnics by the establishment reached ignoble heights in the Second World War. During that war over 100,000 Japanese Americans were placed in concentration camps. Just before the Allied invasion of Sicily in July, 1943, General George Patton exhorted his troops with the following speech (from Gorer 1948):

> When we land, we will meet German and Italian soldiers whom it is our honor and privilege to attack and destroy. Many of you have in your veins German and Italian blood, but remember that these ancestors of yours so loved freedom that they gave up home and country to cross the ocean in search of liberty. The ancestors of the people we shall kill lacked the courage to make such a sacrifice and continued as slaves.

Fishman (1966) pointed out that a million German Americans stopped speaking German as a result of the First World War. We have yet to assess the psychological damage done to Americans of German and Italian heritage as a result of the Second World War.

American education is founded on the principle that the school experience of learning must extend from the family and the home. In practice however, the gap between home and school is evident. The large numbers of immigrants from various countries that entered the United States from 1880 on changed forever the home life-styles of this country. As a result, the school changed its function from that of extending home experiences to a process of alienation from home values. The founding of the Parent–Teachers' Association in a very important way was an effort to stop this estrangement from continuing. But the PTA does not make school policy or write educational programs. Home and school remain separate, and bilingual programs have inherited the problems engendered by this separation. Hopefully, the information about differences in learning styles among ethnic groups contained in such books as Functions of Language in the Classroom by Cazden, John, and Hymes (1972) eventually will have an influence on American education and help bring home and school together.

The lack of responsiveness to language and culture in mainstream American education has led to unilateral action by several ethnic groups. For example, in Cleveland, a city with an especially large and diversified ethnic population, an Association of Ethnic Heritage and Language Schools has been
organized. Popularly called 'Saturday Schools', they offer afterhours or weekend instruction in 22 different languages. At present, over 300 teachers have been employed to teach 7,000 students 22 different languages. According to the December 1977 issue of the Newsletter of the National Ethnic Studies Assembly (volume 4, no. 1, p. 12), the Association also conducts workshops for teachers and is publishing a useful handbook for teachers and administrators.

Italian American clubs have become especially active in sponsoring language instruction in recent years. From a survey of the activities of 19 Italian cultural organizations located throughout the United States and Canada, I learned (Di Pietro 1977) that classes in Italian are being set up in many locations. As of December, 1977, these organizations reported 845 students, children and adults alike, enrolled and 42 teachers employed. Since my sampling was very restricted, these figures must represent only the tip of an immense iceberg of instructional activity unseen or ignored by our educational establishment. At least professional educators in the well-endowed bilingual programs should make an effort to close ranks with these ethnic programs to advance the cause of multilingual/multicultural education in the United States. The alternative they would provide to monolingual, monocultural education would help legitimize ethnic and cultural pluralism in this country. Since this pluralism grows from the communities themselves, it cannot be ignored by school authorities who defend their programs on the basis of community support.

We have already progressed considerably from the time when American Indian children were made to stand in dark closets for speaking their tribal languages in school and when Spanish American children were fined for using their home language on school playgrounds. From personal visits to public schools in nearby Virginia, I have been able to gather evidence of increased sensitivity by teachers and principals to their students' ethnicity. In addition to the long-established ethnic groups of the area, northern Virginia has recently attracted numbers of Hispanic people, Koreans, and Vietnamese.

The following episode is an illustration of the kinds of problems that occur with regard to ethnic diversity and the solutions which can be found. The principal of an elementary school in Fairfax County, Virginia, with a sizable enrollment of Korean children, designated a day when children were to bring food representative of their home cultures. Some of the Korean children brought food which the other children refused to eat. These refusals were accompanied by several remarks made directly to the Koreans about the food's lack of appeal. A plate of the food was then taken to the principal's office. The principal's immediate response was to express gratitude for the food and to eat it with apparent relish in front of the Korean children who brought it to her. This action seemed to make the Korean children very happy. Later on, one of them
told the principal that her mother had stayed up until three a.m. preparing the food. By recognizing the importance the Korean children placed on acceptance of their food by a school authority, the principal was able to repair the psychological damage inflicted by the children's classmates.

This episode suggests several broader issues to consider with regard to ethnic marking. Will food always be a marker of ethnic identity in such situations? How does its markedness compare to that of dress, skin color, name, and language? In another episode, an East Indian child refused to bring any samples of food from home because he claimed not to like Indian cooking himself. In fact, he said that he did not like any 'foreign' food. The only meal of the week which he enjoyed was the one on Friday evening. On that occasion, the family eats a typically American dish: pizza!

To pursue the question of ethnic marking among recently arrived groups, interviews were conducted with several teachers who work in the bilingual program at Key Elementary School in Arlington, Virginia. The Key School has one of the most ethnically diversified student populations in the state. Under the sponsorship of the Arlington County Teacher Corps, instruction is offered in Spanish, Korean, and Vietnamese. Separate classes have been established for native and nonnative speakers of these languages. ESL is also offered and all children spend a part of the day being taught in traditional English-only courses. Although the curriculum is not fully multilingual, the school has much support from the community for the efforts it is making toward this goal.

In the interview, the teachers spoke at length about the effects that names had on the self-image of the children in their classes and on their own children. One Vietnamese teacher reported that she named her son 'Bang'. At home, he goes by the nickname of 'Bee'. Schoolmates, however, started to call him 'Bang-Bang', as in the expression, 'Bang! Bang! You're dead!'. This development led the boy to select a new name for himself: 'Bing', which was based on his home nickname 'Bee'. 'Bing' sounds like a Vietnamese name while also resembling an American nickname (as in 'Bing' Crosby). Besides, one of the maintenance men at the school is nicknamed 'Bing'.

Another way to preserve the ethnic status of a name while averting its potential for derision by outsiders was offered by a second Vietnamese teacher. Her child, born in the United States, has an English first name, 'William', by which he is known in school. At home, the name is changed to 'Liem' which is phonetically close to 'William' but is a typical Vietnamese name.

A Korean teacher said that one of the native Korean children in her class was named 'Sophie' by her parents. After being allowed to study Korean in school, the child took it upon herself to change her name to 'Soh Fi' by which she wishes to be known to all. After learning how to write her name in the
Korean alphabet, another little girl now uses that spelling on all her assignment papers, including the ones she writes for the English-speaking teachers.

A native Spanish-speaking teacher, when asked if she ever hispanicized the names of her non-Latino students, responded with the following vignette:

I once had a little girl in my class named 'Tam'. Since this name is close to 'Tamara'—a name which I happen to like very much—I began to call her that. But the little girl would not accept this version of her name and insisted that I call her by her 'real' name.

A girl in the sixth grade followed an opposite course. Not only did she hispanicize her own name, but she also identified closely with Paraguayan ethnicity. Although born in North America, she attended school for a few years in Paraguay. Apparently, those years spent in South America were critical ones in establishing her sense of self. She knows how to play the Paraguayan harp and can perform many dances of Paraguay.

Since some of the teachers of Spanish were nonnative speakers of the language, I asked them if they ever hispanicized their own surnames in the classroom. One teacher responded that, while he often hispanicized the names of his students, he always used an English pronunciation of his own name because to do otherwise would sound 'forced' to him.

When asked about the effect of ethnicity on teaching style, several teachers observed a change in their techniques when they moved from classes with mainstream children to those with Vietnamese, Korean, and Spanish children. They agreed that they became more 'demanding' with the ethnically marked children. For example, an Argentine-born teacher told me that she made her Latino children take more pains with their handwriting. She also made them copy passages from books. One of the Vietnamese teachers required her Vietnamese children to stand up when she entered the classroom. Also, when they handed things to her, she expected them to extend the object with both hands as children do in Vietnam as a sign of respect to an elder. Neither the Argentine teacher nor the Vietnamese teacher felt that they could ever use the same techniques with mainstream children.

In discussing their experiences with ethnic labeling, a Vietnamese teacher said that her Vietnamese students become very upset if someone takes them for Chinese. A similar reaction was observed among Korean children who do not like being called Japanese. The teachers all agreed that incorrect ethnic labeling was one of the chief causes of serious fights among the children.

The teachers also concurred that it was important to build up the children's self-image. When asked if this end was achieved through teaching about the history of the various
countries, some teachers expressed a preference for other methods. One used the device of giving each child the flag of the country from which his or her parents came and requiring him or her to do reports on contemporary aspects of the country. Children with mixed ethnic backgrounds were given flags representing the country of origin of both parents. Such children were free to choose one over the other, or keep both, or even make some sort of adjustment in the emphasis they gave each country. This flagging device not only gives the children a base around which to organize their school activities but it also provides a point of reference for the ethnic alignments they will have to make later on in life.

There is much that needs to be done in bilingual education in order to assure that the children's sense of ethnic identity will emerge unscathed from it. Paralleling the articulation of the many points of language and culture which comprise the substance of the curriculum, we need to uncover those 'stress' points where ethnicity becomes an issue. Tastes in food, pronunciation and choice of names, and shifts in teaching style are only a few of the areas where such stress points may occur. Teachers being prepared for bilingual education should be put through a training period where they are encouraged to do some self-analysis about their own ethnicity. A regular series of inservice workshops should be established for those teachers already at work. In such workshops, discussions could center on the problems that have come up in the classroom with regard to the building of self-esteem in the students. Some readings that are useful in this respect are the recent articles by Krug (1977) on the origin of cultural pluralism and by Driedger (1976) on in-group evaluations of ethnic self-identity.

As Fishman (1977) has already pointed out, we lack an intellectual tradition in connection with the study of ethnicity. The Center for Applied Linguistics, an organization which, for some time, has considered itself a champion of bilingual-bicultural education in the United States, recently published a position paper on the subject (see Linguistic Reporter, vol. 20, no. 3, December, 1977, pp. 1, 6-7). In this position paper, eight points are set forth as 'integral parts' of every 'effective bilingual program'. One of these parts is the development of a positive 'self-image' in the students. However, no further detail is given about how this 'positive self-image' is to be achieved, or about how it interacts with the other seven parts (e.g. fluency and literacy in both languages and cross-cultural 'understanding'). Lambert (1977) gives a review of some of the literature dealing with the ethnic factor in education. Like many other specialists in bilingual education, he does not sharply distinguish between 'culture' and 'ethnicity'.

While cultural differences between groups may be great or small, ethnic identity cannot be quantified in the same way.
To use a personal example, as an American of Italian extraction, I find much that is similar to my home culture in the ways of Hispanic Americans. Finding these cultural similarities, however, does not make me any less of an Italian American. Perhaps this is because culture is practiced while ethnicity is believed. Unlike culture which admits adjustments, ethnicity does not appear to be malleable. To educators who take the position that all children should be led eventually into the mainstream of our school programs, I offer the following point for reflection. If you succeed, as well you might, in altering the cultural patterns of such groups as the Vietnamese so that they no longer stand up for the teacher, so that they no longer show respect for older persons, so that they become more assertive and individualistic in their classroom behavior, you will not have loosened the ties of their ethnic affiliation. But you will have created stress points and you will have to decide whether your efforts at cultural and linguistic assimilation were worth the trouble after all. The individual examples of reaction to intercultural stress as presented in this paper suggest the need for an approach that does more than survey group behavior and create test instruments to be administered to all children of a particular ethnic group. We must develop a bilingual methodology that is humane and cognizant of the uniqueness of each child's psyche.

A major portion of the answer to the question of why attention should be paid to ethnicity in a bilingual program lies in understanding that ethnicity conveys a sense of belonging to someone or to some group in a world of strangers. Without this psychological anchor, the many cognitive advantages gained through the use of a bilingual-bicultural curriculum may be eclipsed by a feeling of rootlessness in the affectual domain. While it might be argued that ethical values such as honesty and love are universal and independent of one's ethnicity, these values cannot easily guide a person who is rootless. To disenfranchise children of their ethnicity through education is to make no real progress over former demonstrations of open hostility to the life and language of the home.

APPENDIX

There has been a recent blossoming of works dealing with various aspects of ethnicity in America. The items listed in this appendix will serve as useful references to those teachers who wish to render their school programs sensitive to the ethnic component.

(1) Gambino (1975) describes the contents of several ethnic studies programs already in operation. The author also supplies a list of ethnic studies resource centers and a bibliography which covers works of a general and specific nature on ethnicity. The specific groups covered are: Blacks, Germans,
Irish, Italians, Jews, Mexican-Americans, Asiatics, Puerto Ricans, and Slavs.

(2) Scarpaci (1975) is a collection of the papers originally presented at a conference cosponsored by the American Italian Historical Association and the American Jewish Historical Society at Towson State College in Baltimore. These papers deal with the interaction of Jews and Italians in America, focusing on the various roles played by women. Several of the papers concentrate on the school experiences of the two groups.

(3) Kolm (1973) is the most extensive bibliography to date on all aspects of ethnicity in the United States. Its 1,694 entries cover a wide range of studies on specific ethnic groups, bilingualism, culture, and education. Four hundred fifty-one of the entries are annotated.

(4) Inglehart and Mangione (1974) is a selective bibliography of works on white ethnics, the literature of European ethnic groups in America, history, autobiography and criticism. Teachers of literature should find this collection especially useful.

(5) Herman (1974) is a practical guide to how to integrate ethnicity into the school system. It includes remarks on textbook selection, bilingual-bicultural programs, teacher certification, and experimental curriculum development.


(7) The Immigration History Research Center of the University of Minnesota (826 Berry Street, St. Paul, Minnesota 55114) has published a guide (dated April, 1975) to its extensive manuscript holdings (over 2,000,000 items) of records generated by the ethnic groups themselves. The Center welcomes inquiries about its collections and offers scholarships for research projects to interested parties. The person to contact is Professor Rudolph J. Vecoli, Director of the Center.

(8) The Center for Migration Studies (209 Flagg Place, Staten Island, N.Y. 10304) publishes the International Migration Review which appears quarterly and contains a wide range of studies on the sociological aspects of ethnicity in America. Among other books published by the Center is Tomasi (1977), dealing with the political, cultural, psychological, and linguistic facets of Italian American ethnicity.
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Any attempt on my part to make generalizations about classroom practices in bilingual education which would be valid within any one country or across countries could lead only to my embarrassment and to your confusion. There can be no serious question of setting forth a list of definitive practices which would serve, even reasonably well, in the United States, Great Britain, Holland, Yugoslavia, Tunisia, or any other country we might wish to name. Professor Mackey's comprehensive typology of possible bilingual programs published a few years ago, and Professor Glyn Lewis' speech on types of bilingual communities provide ample evidence to account for some of the sociolinguistic difficulties involved in preparing such a list.

But in an international conference devoted to bilingualism, we cannot ignore other crucial factors in addition to the sociolinguistic setting; for example, the vexing question of the attitude and motivation of language learners resulting from special circumstances which may have made bilingual programs hated but imperative or, on the other hand, eminently desirable. Attitude would naturally vary depending on whether imposed migration or political, social, or technological changes have forced people to accept bilingual programs or whether, on the other hand, the people themselves are eager to learn the language of persons living just across the border with whom they may wish to engage in trade, or more important still, to live in friendship.

I feel compelled to add to the complex array of types and attitudes a longer list of over 300 variables with which every school administrator and classroom teacher is all too familiar. Nor am I taking into account the individual differences which will coexist after even a few days in the classroom which had been homogeneously organized at the beginning of the school year.
A glance at Figure 1 will make the fact of the complexity abundantly clear.

The factors listed on the left are in no particular order. Each one will be of serious concern to the conscientious teacher and administrator. For example, whether the class organizational framework provided is an integrated one where learners of L are placed with language learners; or a pull-out program where newcomers to the school are taken out of regular classes for 20 minutes to two hours of instruction daily in the second or foreign language; or a bilingual program—a term which has assumed so many forms and connotations as to have a different meaning for each of its users; or a program in which the native language of the learner is neither used as an instrument for learning other curriculum areas or as a discipline to be respected, developed, and reinforced in its own right, the objectives of the program, the curriculum, the methods and materials, the skills needed by the teacher and the techniques for assessing the program will be contingent not only upon the age level of the learner but also—with older students—on their particular vocational or professional aspirations and hence on their communicative needs.

Let me say in passing that the Council of Europe, working with experts from several countries, is preparing a series of so-called functional-notional syllabuses in all the European languages for use with learners who will move to other countries for short or long periods, for either social or vocational purposes.

Limitations of time will not permit me to go into each of the individual and community factors noted on the figure in any detail. Suffice to say, in general, that modifications and adaptations in our COMET will have to be made, depending on age level and aspirations—whatever the left side of the figure indicates.

It may be desirable, however, to take a few moments to ask seasoned teachers and administrators to consider all the differences that five learners as against 500 would make in a school, and what steps would need to be taken in countries like the United States, Great Britain, and Israel, for example, where language learners may come from 20 or more different ethnic backgrounds. Closely allied to this question are two related ones. First, despite the gains we have made in the last few years in identifying language universals and some basic similarities in the process of language acquisition, whatever contrasts may exist between L1 and L2, there is no doubt that languages stemming from totally different linguistic families will present innumerable learning problems which will generally require more time to overcome. Second, the cultural background of the learners—for example, their attitude toward education and especially education for the female members of the community—will engender conflicts and misunderstandings between home and school, and unfortunately between parents and
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Types of organization available in the school or community</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age of entry into L1 program</td>
<td>Time of entry into special class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Community (resources, interest, and involvement)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Literacy in L1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Previous schooling in native country (years, subjects, FL learned)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Availability of bilingual personnel (training and qualifications)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Variability distinction between L1 and L2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cultural background of learners (education, customs; e.g. students of both sexes in same class)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of learners involved in the school or community</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### I. WITHIN SCHOOL SITUATIONS

#### I. Types of organization available in the school or community:
- Integrated, pull-out, bilingual, ESL program

#### II. AGE LEVELS
- 5-9
- 10-12
- 13-16
- 16 and above

#### III. TYPE OF PROGRAM
- Continuing Education Program
- Special Purpose Program

#### COMET
- C - Curriculum
- O - Objectives
- M - Methods and Materials
- E - Evaluation Procedures
- T - Teachers (Preparation and Skills)
children; the schools will have to help solve these problems before language learning may be expected to flourish.

Allow me to hurry on to the next group of factors which will necessitate further changes in our COMET. The majority of illiterates or functional illiterates entering into a bilingual program beyond the first year of elementary school will find it difficult to enter the mainstream of the school without intensive tutorial or other kind of help. Moreover, schooling in the native land may not have prepared newcomers to another country for such school practices as tests, grades, homework, and rigid time schedules. Nor, in general, would a knowledge of the host country language gleaned from eight or more years in the elementary and secondary schools of their native land serve as adequate preparation for placement with their age peers and for comfortable participation in the life of the community.

The date of entry into the bilingual program would also force changes in classroom practices. How will the newcomers be brought to the communicative and curricular levels of their peers? I have already mentioned the factor of age, which cannot be ignored or minimized. Let me underscore that it is nonproductive to all of the students and demeaning to the older ones when the age span in a language learning class ranges from 5 to 15 because of the small number of students.

This may be the moment to mention with a sigh of relief the tremendous gain which has been made recently in the field of bilingual and foreign language education. The ban on the learners' use of their native tongue has been lifted. The policy of total immersion of newcomers in a totally foreign culture has at last been reevaluated. This gratifying although belated acknowledgment of the importance of the learners' cultural identity has made it imperative to seek out qualified and empathetic bilingual personnel and to give them further training for the overwhelming task that the solution to some of the problems I have merely touched upon demands. It is imperative, too, in most bilingual programs that the school work with other social agencies to bring about a mutually accepting attitude between entrenched community members and newcomers.

All of the variables I have noted, including the one related to community acceptance, require that classroom practices be directed toward the effective and satisfactory resolution of cognitive and affective problems that will undoubtedly arise as the result of the interaction among the myriad forces impinging upon bilingual education programs.

Having set forth the problems, I regret to say that I will not offer instant solutions which would work with each of us in our different communities or countries, with our students and with our own personalities. What I hope to do is to list first some general guidelines which should be kept in the forefront of our thinking as we plan curricula for bilingual programs and
second, several concrete teaching practices which may suggest still others.
I have mentioned cognitive and affective problems. I should like to start the guidelines by indicating to which of the two domains the suggestions made would contribute, although the domain--cognitive or affective--will be obvious to you, I am sure. Again, unfortunately, limitations of time do not permit me to give more than one or two examples of possible classroom procedures under each of the guidelines. You will note that in preparing them I have expanded Maslow's hierarchy of basic human needs since it is language--even noises in the beginning stages of life--which makes the satisfaction and realization of human needs possible.
Permit me, however, before proceeding to the guidelines, to underscore the most crucial underlying need of children or adults in bilingual or foreign language learning programs. Learners must be helped to maintain their ethnic values, cultural identities, and native language. They do not come to us as a tabula rasa. They come with a perfectly adequate language and a set of cultural values which ensures their membership in a community. The message the school must get across is one that Professor Lambert expressed so well: the new language and culture are designed to serve as additives and not as a subtractive.
Teachers and school personnel have a number of responsibilities to fulfill.
(1) They must ensure that learners come to school without fear--fear that they will be segregated; that they may not have understood the assignment; that they cannot pass the daily test because they have been absent; or that they will be laughed at by teacher and schoolmates when they make mistakes.
(2) They must be sure that learners understand the language of requests and directions, the reading, the listening comprehension exercise, or any other classroom activity. Translation, a buddy system, a teacher aide, or paraprofessional, will make this kind of linguistic understanding possible; but the affective meaning of the term 'understanding'--feeling understood when an assignment is not completed or when absence is due to respect for cultural traditions, as in taking care of a younger or older family member--is even more important.
(3) We must ensure that learners are helped to enjoy many language learning and other related experiences. Listening to music, singing, looking at pictures, listening to stories, going on community trips where feasible, lead to desirable and essential cognitive and affective processes.
(4) Learners must be helped to feel loved through praise and a warm accepting attitude even though it may seem to take them an inordinate amount of time to learn a language item.
(5) Learners should be made to feel that they belong to the total class group because every effort is made to involve them in meaningful class, group, or paired activities leading to
communicative competence because they are given opportunities to display their newly acquired knowledge in audience situations.

(6) Teachers and school personnel should help students to sense that they are making daily progress and achieving the goals which the teacher has clarified (in their native language, if necessary) and which are considered worthwhile to them now and in their later life.

(7) Finally, learners should be helped to feel successful—to attain the self-realization and actualization that Maslow considers the supreme human need. They can be helped to feel successful if they are given frequent, brief tests which have been announced in advance and which are preceded by crystal clear directions.

There are numerous other general guidelines culled from the findings of the sciences of linguistics, sociology, anthropology, psychology, and education. I will simply list them, and in no particular order, since all of them are important at some point in the learning process. Many of these guidelines would be equally important in any educational program.

In order to enhance the learners' self-image, it is important that they be encouraged to use their native tongue whenever feasible, that they be invited to talk about their own cultural background—in the second language if possible, or in their native tongue—with the teacher, with a buddy, or a paraprofessional who will interpret where necessary, and that they be encouraged to understand that all human beings have culture. They should be helped to appreciate the fact that differences in culture are generally the result of geographical or historical factors.

Self-images can also be enhanced when the teacher accepts the fact that all individuals have different styles and rhythms of learning, and that he/she does not expect all language learners to master a corpus of knowledge at the same time. Learners can be helped to retain their pride and their feeling that they are capable of learning if teachers also realize that numerous recognition or recall activities must precede a request for production and that no out-of-class assignment—except perhaps at university levels—should be given unless it has been explained and prepared thoroughly in the classroom.

And now let us turn to the all-important element in the learning process—motivation, which must be sustained through the often frustrating, tortuous road leading to communicative competence. Avenues which have been found to promote motivation include: using an integrated approach to learning, stated very simply, blending real-world communicative functions within an utterance or speech act, indicating how the speech function—apologizing, complimenting someone, asking for information, for example, can be used in a variety of everyday situations. This approach includes the learning of
structures and vocabulary items which would be appropriate in the message that the speaker or writer wishes to express.

Motivation is also fostered by an interdisciplinary approach. The concept is not new in education. Over the years it has produced the resource unit, centers of interest, or thematic units. Whatever the label, the basic aim of the approach is to give learners an open-ended, broad view of a problem, of a period of history, or of any other interesting slice of life—starting with contemporary life—in harmony with their evolving interests. Information and insights from all curriculum areas—social studies, art, music, literature, science—are woven together in order to give learners a many-faceted, integrated overview of the entire problem or period under study.

An interdisciplinary approach demands the cooperation of all members of the school staff and of resource people in the community—an innovative notion in many countries. Fragmented, compartmentalized knowledge is difficult for native speakers to comprehend. How much more difficult for people who may have language difficulties! The reinforcement of different aspects of knowledge from various points of view, and especially from more than one teacher, can only lead to a more effective re-structuring of that knowledge in the learner's mind.

Several other guidelines which seem worth remembering include the following.

(1) Learning should proceed in two parallel streams. We cannot wait until students know all the phonemes of the language or all the sound-symbol relationships, for example, before we help them understand authentic, interesting listening or reading material.

(2) Incidental happenings within the school, the community, and the country should be given precedence over the carefully planned language lesson if they are motivating to learners while reinforcing or presenting pertinent grammatical or lexical items.

(3) A spiral approach should be used to reintroduce, reinforce, and extend previously taught linguistic or cultural materials. Such an approach has the added advantage of ensuring continuity of instruction for language learners. We must not only know 'where they are', an educational cliché which does not really have great significance unless it implies that we know where they came from—in other words, what they have learned before they have entered a particular class or level—but also what they will be expected to know when they progress to the next higher level.

And now I beg your indulgence as I turn to the last section of this paper in which I plan to list some practical suggestions which again would be valid in any educational situation, whether it be in teaching a native language, a second language, or a truly bilingual program. I need not tell this audience that the varieties of bilingual programs run the gamut from teaching concepts of a discipline in the learners' native language and giving the important labels of the concepts in the second language, to
teaching all the curriculum areas in one language in the morning and the same curriculum areas in the second language in the afternoon, or to the total immersion programs which are the subject of research in Canada.

Following is a list of some of the practices which have worked for many teachers.

1. Teachers adapt and modify the existing textbook, making additions and deletions where necessary and changing the sequence of material presentation where logical. For example, the troublesome phoneme which impedes comprehension should be taught before the one suggested in the text unit.

2. They help the students learn two- or three-line realistic dialogues in which the importance and use of a language function within a particular social situation is emphasized.

3. They enable learners to recognize and eventually to create alternative but appropriate sentences for each dialogue utterance. Memorizing dialogues found in texts is generally a waste of teachers' and learners' time. Except for formulae like How do you do, the learners may never again hear the dialogue utterances.

4. They teach the vocabulary that the students need immediately because it is related to places or happenings in their homes and community, and because it enables them to talk about the elements in their environments which are of importance to them.

5. They help the students acquire the ability to use redundancy clues in listening, speaking, reading, and writing; and contextual clues in listening and reading.

6. They ensure that the older students especially internalize the rules which underlie grammatical structures in the second language.

7. They enable learners to keep systematic tables of nouns, verbs, adjectives, and adverbs which would help them to see sound shifts in function shifts if such exist, and to learn how to use different prefixes and suffixes in words having the same roots.

8. Where these are pertinent, they help learners to recognize and to use cognates in the first and second languages. Parenthetically, these should be placed on the blackboard so that sound differences do not interfere with comprehension.

9. They use the same passages at different times for listening comprehension, reading, word study, dictation, expansion, outlining, and summarizing, so that students can learn to appreciate the interrelationship of the four major communication abilities.

10. They proceed from manipulative drills leading to habit formation and fluency to creative activities where learners may select any item in their linguistic repertoire which will be appropriate in the particular speech act.

11. They use the same listening comprehension passage at three different levels of difficulty at intervals during the
semester: first, deleting all adjectives, adverbs, and clauses, and using only yes/no questions; second, deleting the clauses only and using simply Wh questions; and third, reinserting the clauses and using inferential and personalized questions.

(12) They vary the types of pupil participation--large groups, smaller groups, chain drills, paired practice--leading the students gradually to the essence of communication, an exchange of messages between two people.

(13) They individualize instruction to cope with the complex factors noted, with work sheets and other simple audiovisual materials prepared by boards of education and/or committees of teachers.

(14) They engage in role-playing, problem-solving or community learning activities provided that they are within the language capabilities of the learners and that the community resources available make community learning activities feasible.

(15) They plan classroom activities which have balance and variety, and--particularly in integrated classes--activities in which the newcomers can be actively involved from their first day of entry into the program.

I am afraid I have again opened a Pandora's box, but this was done as a preface to my plea that realistic action research be engaged in--research that is based on proven theories and on classroom teachers' knowledge and legitimate concerns. Moreover, teachers and administrators cannot wait until research studies are completed before they are given materials they must have in order to cope with learners from a variety of ethnic backgrounds who are on different points of the continua of the four major language abilities.

Viable, feasible bilingual education programs leading to communicative competence, to an understanding of cultural pluralism (not merely of biculturalism), to enhanced social values, to enriched personalities, are not only possible but imperative in today's world. They demand, however, the concerted efforts of all social agencies in a country and not the efforts of the ministry or board of education alone.

Conferences such as this, which should be followed by intensive, appropriate action in every country represented here, give rise to many hopes. Foremost among these is the hope that societies will be strengthened as bonds of communication make possible the sharing of knowledge and of moral and social experiences among nations.

Each one of us, like Candide, cultivating his own garden, can--by sharing materials, expertise, interest, and enthusiasm--create the better world in which men and women, secure in their own cultural identity, will be proud to join the larger community. The knowledge of more than one language and of a plurality of cultures will enable them to do this.

We are here because of our special interests and concerns. It is up to each of us, therefore, to encourage the formation
and maintenance of carefully designed and evaluated bilingual programs. As our chairman, Dean James E. Alatis, said so well on another occasion: 'If not we, who then?"
Introduction. Observers of Spanish-English bilingualism in the United States have commented on the stability of Spanish and its remarkable persistence in the face of continuing pressure from English, especially in the Southwest. Unlike virtually every other non-English language, Spanish has survived for several centuries as a viable community language in large areas of what is now the United States (Fishman and Hofman 1966, and Christian and Christian 1966). Even languages at one time as numerically strong as German and Norwegian have followed the familiar pattern of practically every minority language in this country by which the second generation, i.e. the children of immigrants, becomes bilingual and the third generation shifts relatively completely to English (Kloss 1966, Haugen 1953, and Fishman 1966). Only speakers of Spanish, according to most investigators, have broken this pattern by maintaining stable speech communities beyond the third generation.

In this essay, I argue first of all that a closer look at the dynamics of language maintenance in Chicano communities shows that the general optimism with regard to the status of Spanish is unwarranted. There is a growing body of evidence that demonstrates that Spanish-speaking communities are shifting dramatically to English. In general, studies of language use are beginning to show very clearly that third generation Mexican Americans—and in urban areas even second generation speakers—are following the familiar pattern of other non-English languages in the United States. The first generation acquires a limited amount of English in adulthood, the second generation becomes bilingual, and the third generation shifts to English.

On the other hand, census studies show a steady increase in the numbers of Spanish speakers, due mostly to a continued
high rate of immigration. We have the paradoxical situation, then, where Spanish-speaking communities in the United States are rapidly losing their ethnic tongue even though Spanish, as a language, enjoys perhaps the greatest number of speakers of a non-English language in the history of the country.

Proponents of bilingual education, too, are in general agreement with the view of a large, relatively stable, Spanish-speaking community. In particular, statements advocating the establishment of programs that are oriented toward linguistic and cultural pluralism are generally optimistic that bilingual education can and does promote language maintenance. Recent judicial decisions and federal and state legislation on bilingual education are seen as important official support for the concept of cultural pluralism. Properly designed programs, it is thought, advance the cause of language maintenance by opening up to linguistic minority children the opportunity for continued study of their cultural and linguistic heritage. The goal of bilingualism is seen to be the attainment of scholastic skills in English and the use of the native language to advance conceptual development and academic achievement as well as for the enrichment of children's personal lives. However, these goals do little to support a dynamic bilingualism within ethnic communities and thus fail to promote linguistic and cultural maintenance.

In the second part of this paper, I argue that bilingual education as it is now conceived, not only does not support maintenance, but cannot support it, given the kinds of goals for bilingualism and the particular concepts of cultural pluralism that are currently advocated. I then propose a set of goals oriented toward the ethnic community that will tend substantially to enhance the effectiveness of bilingual education, directly with respect to linguistic and cultural maintenance and less directly in the area of fuller political and economic participation by linguistic minority groups.

Language use patterns in Chicano communities. There exist relatively few empirical studies of language use within Chicano communities. Several of those conclude that, in the communities studied, the use of Spanish and English has achieved a balance by which the maintenance of Spanish is favored. For example, in a study for Fishman's Language Resources Project, Hayden contrasted language attitudes and language use in two Ukrainian-speaking communities, a French-speaking community, and two Spanish-speaking communities—one composed of Puerto Ricans in New York, and the other of Chicanos in San Antonio. He suggests that of all five communities, only the one in San Antonio has reached 'an accommodation, however precarious it may be, that is retentive of functional bilingualism' (Hayden 1966). Spanish in New York is also being maintained, but he attributes this to the greater recency of immigration, while in San Antonio the contexts in which English and Spanish
are used have become relatively stabilized. That is, Spanish is used more frequently in the spheres of many informal relations while English is used in the spheres of work, school, and business.

The conclusion that this set of conditions reveals a stable use of the two languages and thus a situation of language maintenance derives from the work of Fishman and, in particular, his discussion of the relationship of bilingualism and diglossia (Fishman 1968b). According to Fishman's scheme, bilingualism refers to individual linguistic versatility, whereas diglossia is characterized by the societal distribution of the functions of two languages. Use of each of the languages by bilinguals is not determined purely by personal choice; rather, each language is chosen according to the 'societal domain' of the interaction. Each domain is defined by the socially relevant combination of interlocutors, institutional context, and purpose of the interaction (Fishman 1968a). Thus, an interaction between husband and wife (interlocutors) about child rearing (purpose of the interaction) that takes place in the home (institutional context) would characterize a situation within the 'family domain'. Stable bilingualism refers, then, to the allocation of one of the languages to one set of domains, and that of the other language to another, complementary set of domains.

Other researchers have also made use of this theoretical framework to justify conclusions similar to those of Hayden. In an investigation of 669 high school age youth in four Texas border counties, Victoria Patella and William Kuvlesky (1963) found that the uses of Spanish and English were distributed according to the social situation. Spanish was used mainly in the home while English was used largely in school contexts. Both languages, however, tended to be used in nonschool neighborhood contexts. These investigators found in addition that the use of Spanish was not inversely correlated with upward socioeconomic aspirations. Because of the diglossic distribution of the languages, they interpret their results as generally supporting maintenance of Spanish.

One of the studies that makes the most forceful claims in this regard is Skrabanek (1970). Skrabanek studied 268 rural (Atascosa County) and 276 urban (San Antonio) households in south Texas, obtaining use data in a number of sociocultural situations. He found that all of the subjects, both in the urban and in the rural contexts, spoke Spanish fluently. In fact, the majority spoke it more fluently than they did English. Household heads used far more Spanish than English in all situations, and the children used more Spanish than English in the home and neighborhood, although more English than Spanish was used in the school context. This functional distribution of the languages is again interpreted as indicating a substantial amount of language maintenance. Skrabanek considers age, nativity, and education to have some effect on maintenance, since older persons born in Mexico, and persons with the least education
tend to use more Spanish. But, because of the relative homogeneity of the group, he found the differences in use to be small nevertheless. The maintenance of Spanish is projected far into the future, and he sees this as the main reason that unity, social solidarity, and ethnic pride remain unweakened in the face of American culture.

Other scholars interested in the status of Spanish in the United States are much less sanguine than those I have just cited. A. Bruce Gaarder, for example, compares the situation of Spanish with that of other minority languages in the United States, as well as with languages such as Afrikaans and Raetoromansh that have minority status in their own countries (Gaarder n.d.). He discusses a number of different factors that may either support or work against language maintenance, depending upon specific sociocultural-political conditions. On the basis of this analysis, Gaarder concludes that the use of Spanish will continue to lose ground unless its prestige can be raised, principally through the more general study and use of Standard Spanish.

One of the few empirical investigations that support Gaarder's view is an M.A. thesis by Faltis (1976). For this study Faltis questioned 24 Chicano adults from Las Calles barrio in San Jose, California, concerning their attitudes toward the use of Spanish and their actual use of the language. Contrary to the results of the studies reported earlier in this paper, Faltis was unable to find significant differences in use that corresponded to differences in social setting. In terms of attitudes, the only significant difference was that the subjects believed they would use English more in interaction with Anglos than in intragroup settings, a not very surprising finding. Chicanos whose origin was in a rural area used more Spanish than those raised in an urban setting, and females used more Spanish than males. However, these findings did not affect his major conclusion that, since the two languages are used in all the same social contexts, Spanish is being displaced by English.

A somewhat more revealing study was performed by Laosa (1975), who compared the language use of Cuban, Puerto Rican, and Chicano elementary school children in Miami, New York, and Austin. Of principal interest for this discussion are the results for the Chicano children who showed no significant difference in their use of English across the three contexts of school, recreation, and home. The differences that did occur were between the use of both of the languages in the home context, either alternately or in a 'mixture', and English in recreational and school contexts. In other words, English was used in all contexts, including the home, while Spanish was used only in the home, which context it had to share with English.

Of telling importance in Laosa's study was the difference in use between adults and children. Some of the parents in the study were predominantly Spanish-speaking; others either spoke
predominantly English or used a 'combination' of English and Spanish. The children of the latter, of course, shared their parents' patterns as English speakers. Not surprisingly, the children of the predominantly Spanish speakers also exhibited a predominant English pattern, using mostly English at school and a 'mixture' of Spanish and English at home. This study, then, shows that among Chicano school children, English is used in all social contexts, overlapping with those in which Spanish is used and indicating the instability of their bilingualism, regardless of their parents' use configuration. It also suggests strongly that the pattern of use is shifting sharply toward the use of more English from one generation to the next.

Laosa's findings directly contradict those of Fishman and Hoffman (1966), which are based on data from the U.S. census for the years between 1920 and 1960. These writers claim a very strong prospect of maintenance for Spanish based on the nearly twofold increase in numbers of 'speakers' between 1940 and 1960, as well as on the existence of nearly twice as many second and third generation as first generation speakers.

Thompson (1974) also presents census data which include figures for 1970. The figures for the State of Texas show that Spanish is the mother tongue of 80 percent of third generation Chicanos, an extremely high rate of retentiveness. Moreover, whereas in 1930, third generation speakers were only 22 percent of the total Spanish-speaking population, by 1970 they had reached 62 percent. In terms of absolute figures, the number of speakers had risen from 663,681 in 1930 to over two million in 1970. Thus, apparently, not only has the number of Spanish speakers in Texas increased dramatically, the language continues to be spoken by the vast majority of the third generation.

However, Thompson points out that the census figures are open to very serious question on several grounds. First, the census question on which the figures are based asks about the language that was spoken in the person's home as a child rather than asking either about the native language of the respondent or about the respondent's current dominant language. Thus, Spanish would be considered a person's mother tongue if anyone in the childhood home spoke it. In addition, since Spanish would be considered the mother tongue of all other persons in families in which the head or spouse reported Spanish as his or her mother tongue, the potential error is compounded. Not only can English-dominant respondents be classified as 'Spanish mother tongue' on the basis of the census question; but the children of such persons, who are essentially native speakers of English with possibly no knowledge of Spanish, will also be classified as native speakers of Spanish.

In order to test the validity of the census data, Thompson conducted a study in the predominantly Mexican southeast section of Austin. His language questions asked about actual
use by different members of the family and elicited the responses 'no Spanish', 'all Spanish', or 'half Spanish'.

His analysis showed that, if childhood residence were taken into account as a criterion for classification of respondents, the pattern of shift from Spanish to English across three generations was sharp and clear. The first generation used all Spanish as did the second and third generation if they had been raised in rural environments. But if they were raised in Austin, the second and then the third generation showed dramatic increases in the use of 'half Spanish'.

That the three-generation shift is indeed taking place was confirmed by a second survey in which Thompson asked Austin-raised second generation parents about their children's use. Sixty percent of the families reported that their children used only English, even when spoken to in Spanish. Most of these children learn English before they enter school, which supports Laosa's findings that children of parents who speak 'half and half' tend to use only English.

The Thompson and Laosa studies provide an important insight into the dynamics of language maintenance and at the same time reveal certain deficiencies in studies such as those of Skrabanek or Patella and Kuvlesky. These latter studies attempt to make generalizations about language maintenance solely on the basis of the differential use of Spanish and English across a variety of social situations, i.e. diglossia. They neglect any consideration of change in patterns of use which virtually by definition must be a criterion for maintenance or shift (Fishman 1972a). Change may occur either within a given generation over time or, as the Thompson and the Laosa work shows, from one generation to the next. Stable bilingualism as indicated by differential use of two languages according to social context is a necessary condition of language maintenance. However, the transmission of the native language from parent to child and the continued stability of the patterns of use across generations is also essential in order to speak of maintenance in any meaningful way.

Thus, a reconsideration of Skrabanek's analysis, which employs data taken from children as well as from adults, leads us to a completely different interpretation of his work. A case in point is Table 1, which is a partial reproduction and reorganization of Skrabanek's data. For this table, I reproduce only the figures for the home domain. It is here that one expects the fewest effects of shift since language maintenance has as its last stronghold the family (Fishman 1972). Once a group's language is displaced in the home domain, that language is in effect lost.

Skrabanek bases his conclusions principally on the basis of responses to the 'mostly English' category, noting that fewer than half the children use mostly English at home or at play. The category 'equal Spanish and English' is not counted as indicative of shift. However, Laosa's work suggests strongly
Table 1. Language used by Mexican-American household heads and their children (percentage distribution).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conversational situations</th>
<th>Atascosa County</th>
<th>San Antonio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mostly Spanish</td>
<td>Mostly English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Equal Spanish and English</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heads of households</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With adults in the home</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With children in the home</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visiting friends</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children 18 to 24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With adults in the home</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With children in the home</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With peers</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children 10 to 17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With adults in the home</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With children in the home</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At play</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Adapted from Skrabanek (1970).
that the use of both languages in these contexts is a crucial stage in the process of shift inasmuch as children whose parents use a mixture of Spanish and English in the home become predominant users of English.

On this basis, if we combine the figures for 'mostly English' and 'equal Spanish and English' as indicative of shift to English, we observe a marked change in the pattern of use by age. This is so despite the relatively small age difference in the two groups of children. Even in rural Atascosa County, only about one-fourth of household heads use at least one-half English with other adults, while more than half of the younger children have that pattern with adults. In the urban area, on the other hand, although only 40 percent of the adults use at least one-half English with other adults, 72 percent of the younger children do so, and 80 percent do so with other children, who are their own peers. If the criterion of generation in the United States were to be used, it seems certain that the figures would show an almost total shift in young children of the third generation.

The weight of the evidence, such as it is, seems clear. The use of Spanish by Chicanos is declining precipitously, to the point that it is no longer transmitted effectively to the urban third generation. This is an immensely important datum since it is estimated that 85 percent of Chicanos now live in urban areas (Thompson 1974). Moreover, the research evidence is congruent with the general knowledge within Chicano communities to the effect that the young are 'forgetting their Spanish'. There is now a generation of young adults who rarely use the language and many who can scarcely understand it. The succeeding generation is composed of numbers of children who, upon entering school, will not only learn English but also have the development of their native language disrupted, with the result that, for all intents and purposes, they will have become dominant English speakers.

To sum up, the greater portion of research to date appears to show that the maintenance of Spanish in Chicano communities remains strong. In comparison to the languages of other groups, Spanish has been spoken in the United States longer than any other nonindigenous language and, through the force of continued and large-scale immigration, the prospect for the numerical growth of Spanish speakers is excellent. Census studies even indicate that third generation speakers are increasing, contrary to the patterns of other linguistic groups. Supporting these views are sociolinguistic studies of language use which reveal a diglossic situation in most communities.

Nevertheless, as I have tried to show, the studies based on census figures must be brought into question because of the definitions of mother tongue which do not require personal knowledge of the language. Conclusions drawn from language use studies are also open to misinterpretation. Some of these do not take into account differences in use patterns across
generations. Others fail to consider the dynamics of language choice and their importance in the process of shift.

Total numbers of Spanish speakers or the ability to use the language in particular domains appear to be the principal bases for the judgment that the language is stable. Indeed, these are important indicators of the viability of the language qua language. However, such indices provide very little information about the stability of the language across generations and over time within a community.

Transmission of a language from generation to generation is a crucial dimension in the definition of language maintenance and, as I have attempted to demonstrate, it is along this dimension that Spanish is undergoing a most dramatic shift.

The consequences of these changes are as yet poorly understood. Even less well understood is the role of the educational system and, in particular, programs of bilingual education in determining the role and direction of change. I turn, in the following sections, to a consideration of these questions.

The role of education in language shift. The massive and explosive shift that we are beginning to witness lends a special urgency to our understanding of the sociolinguistic mechanisms that underlie language maintenance and shift, the social, cultural, and political role that language maintenance plays in our communities, and the effects that particular kinds of policies in the institutions of the dominant society have on maintenance.

One of the most important institutions in this regard is the school. It has traditionally been the educational system which has served to exclude Chicanos from effective participation in the economic institutions of the country while at the same time accelerating the deculturation process and the assimilation of large numbers of Chicano children to Anglo norms. Both of these effects are the result of conformist educational philosophies and practices which attempt to remake into the Anglo mold children who are culturally and linguistically different.

In recent years, there has been a wide public recognition of the inadequacies of an English-only education. In response to this we have observed a rapid growth in the establishment of bilingual education programs which attempt to attenuate some of the difficulties of the traditional monolingual education. Their principal emphasis has been on providing equal educational opportunity for linguistic minority children, without direct concern for the development of the children's native language.

Some educators, on the other hand, see the child's native language as an important personal, educational, and national resource that should be maintained. Although there is by no means unanimity in this view, there is widespread optimism on the part of educators and researchers alike that bilingual education can and even should enhance the maintenance of minority languages. These distinct notions about the role of bilingual
education have generated a great deal of discussion concerning appropriate models to fulfill particular aims.

Current models in bilingual education. Among educators, scholars, and other professionals interested in bilingual education, there is general agreement that there exist two basic kinds of program models. One—transitional bilingual education—recognizes the educational benefits of using a child's dominant language as a teaching medium during an interim period in which the official school language is taught. The cognitive and educational retardation, the culture shock, and the alienation that often accompany early school experiences through an unknown tongue can be tempered or even largely eliminated by the use of the child's home language. Then, as the school language is acquired, the child can be provided with all or most of his instruction in that language.

In the maintenance model, on the other hand, the child's first language is not only used as a medium of instruction while the second language is being learned; it continues to be taught throughout a period extending even to the end of the child's schooling. The home language in this model is viewed as a valuable resource for the full educational growth of the individual.

A number of observers have attempted to characterize each of these models. Kjolseth, in a much cited article that is becoming a classic (Kjolseth 1972), sees a continuum of models ranging from a prototypical pluralistic model to a prototypical assimilation model. The former, which is essentially maintenance oriented, involves the use of different varieties of both languages as media of instruction for a minimum of nine years. Such programs are initiated by community leaders and professionals, and are founded on the basis of local empirical research in sociolinguistics. The teachers are of local ethnic origin, and the curriculum includes attention to both the ethnic and nonethnic cultures. Involvement of the community is an essential feature of this type of program.

In contrast, the assimilation model, which is transitionally oriented, lasts three years at most and uses the ethnic language solely as a bridge to the nonethnic standard. The community is rarely consulted, either in the planning or in the implementation of the programs, nor is the local culture in evidence in the curriculum. Teachers, whether of ethnic or nonethnic background, have concerns which are far removed from the interests of the community.

Similarly, Fishman and Lovas (1972) identify a spectrum of program categories which lead to particular societal roles for each of the languages. Their first type, leading to 'transitional bilingualism', has language shift as its objective and uses the native language only to permit the child to adjust to school and/or to master the subject matter, arriving at an English-only curriculum as soon as it is feasible.
An intermediate type of program results in what Fishman and Lovas term 'monoliterate bilingualism'. In this type, literacy is developed only in the official language, though there is some emphasis on developing oral language skills in both languages to serve as a link between home and school.

A third type of program yields 'partial bilingualism' and attempts to produce fluency and literacy in both languages. However, literacy in the home language is limited to subject matter related to the cultural heritage of the ethnic group, while literacy in the official language is not so restricted. Such programs aim at a certain degree of cultural and linguistic maintenance.

Finally, there is the type of program that attempts to develop all skills in both languages and in all subject matters, leading to 'full bilingualism'.

The predominant model: Transitional bilingualism. The Kjolseth and Fishman-Lovas typologies provide a range of hypothetical models, but in terms of its legal foundation, all bilingual education in the United States is essentially transitional in nature. The basic law on bilingual education is Title VII of the Elementary and Secondary Act of 1965, as amended in 1967 and again in 1974, otherwise known as the Bilingual Education Act. It uses neither the term 'transitional' nor the term 'maintenance', yet among its major policy statements it includes the following wording:

... to demonstrate effective ways of providing, for children of limited English-speaking ability, instruction designed to enable them, while using their native language, to achieve competence in the English language.

In defining the meaning of bilingual education programs, the law goes on to stipulate that

(i) there is instruction given in, and study of, English and, to the extent necessary to allow a child to progress effectively through the educational system, the native language of the children of limited English-speaking ability, ...

That is, the goal of equal educational opportunity is to be reached by (1) the teaching of English, and (2) the use of the native language (and culture), but only to the 'extent necessary' rather than as a goal in itself.

Since the federal law was enacted, a number of states have also passed legislation mandating or permitting bilingual education programs. These laws are somewhat more explicit on the compensatory and transitional character of the programs. For example, the laws in Massachusetts, Texas, and Illinois are phrased in almost identical language and provide for the
enrollment of children in bilingual classes only until such time as they achieve a level of English skills that will enable them to perform successfully in classes in which instruction is in English (Center for Law and Education 1975:252-280).

The California Education Code gives the following statement as its rationale for the institution of bilingual education:

The inability to speak, read and comprehend English presents a formidable obstacle to classroom learning and participation which can be removed only by instruction and training in the pupils' dominant language (Sec. 5761).

The compensatory and assimilationist orientation is obvious and is made forcefully explicit by this wording in the same section:

A primary goal of such programs is, as effectively and efficiently as possible, to develop in each child fluency in English so that he may then be enrolled in the regular program in which English is the language of instruction.

In general, judicial rulings related to bilingual education also support a transitional concept. A key decision in this regard was that of Lau v. Nichols (414 U.S. 563, 1974), in which the Court found that an English-only education violated the equal educational opportunities provision of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. While the Court offered no specific remedies, the Office of Civil Rights of HEW has promulgated guidelines which permit compliance with the Lau decision through the institution of either transitional programs or bilingual/bicultural programs. Other important rulings that have been based, at least in part, on Lau v. Nichols also have a transitional orientation. One of these, Serna v. Portales (499 F. 2d 1147, C.A. 10, 1974), specifies 45 to 60 minutes of Spanish instruction in grades 1 through 6 and a continuation of this bilingual education in the junior high school if testing found it to be 'necessary'. The consent decree in Aspira v. Board of Education of the City of New York (58 F.R.D. 6, S.D.N.Y., 1973) although it calls for programs that develop and reinforce Spanish, stipulates that these are intended for children whose deficiencies in English prevent effective participation in school. In addition, it calls for a yearly reassessment of children's proficiencies in order to determine whether they should remain in the program.

As a consequence of this legislation and these court rulings, most bilingual education programs in the United States are by nature transitional. Kjolseth (1972) estimated that, in 1970, as many as 80 percent of the programs had an assimilationist design, and there are few indications that this situation has changed by the latter part of the decade. In a just completed national survey of 37 Title VII bilingual education projects in
Empirical studies. On this point there is but little experimental verification, mainly because few studies have investigated the effect of bilingual education on linguistic assimilation. In one such series of studies by Andrew Cohen that has been widely reported, the progress of children in a Title VII program in Redwood City, California, was followed for four years and compared to that of a similar group of children in an English-only school (Cohen 1975). Cohen found that, in general, the bilingually schooled children read better in Spanish than those who had no formal Spanish instruction. (However, inexplicably, one of the three bilingual groups performed worse in Spanish reading than its comparison group.) He also found that the bilingual groups scored higher on Spanish word-naming and story-telling tasks than did the comparison groups, although the differences were not significant. In addition, the bilingual group reported greater use of Spanish than the comparison group, based on pupil and parent reports, and on observation. From these data, Cohen concludes that bilingual education programs do indeed contribute to Spanish language maintenance.

However, if we examine Cohen's results from the point of view not only of comparison between bilingually schooled and English-schooled children, but also in terms of their own progress through the grades, we see a very different picture. This is so because Cohen's figures compare two groups, both of which may be undergoing language loss, the effects of which may simply be attenuated in the group that is schooled bilingually. In fact, examination of the figures from this perspective seems to confirm this, as seen in Table 2, which is a partial reproduction of Cohen's table.

The table shows clearly that the bilingually schooled group reports considerably more use of Spanish than the English-schooled group after two years. However, by both the student report and parent report measures, the use of Spanish for the bilingually schooled group actually declined in the period between the pretest and the posttest, both in terms of student use and of family use. Thus, the claim that bilingual schooling contributes to language maintenance can be made only in a very relative sense. Although Spanish use is greater than for English-schooled children, the children in the bilingual program used less Spanish after two years in the program than they did at the beginning.
Table 2. Report of language use patterns.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indices</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Pretest mean</th>
<th>Posttest mean</th>
<th>Posttest mean adjusted for pretest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student language use</td>
<td>Bilingual</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student report</td>
<td>Comparison</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14-point scale</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student language use</td>
<td>Bilingual</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent report</td>
<td>Comparison</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-point scale</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family language use</td>
<td>Bilingual</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student report</td>
<td>Comparison</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12-point scale</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Adapted from Cohen (1975:7).

In another study undertaken in the same bilingual project in Redwood City, Barbara Merino tested the grammatical proficiency of children in grades K through 4, groups comparable in age level to those of the Cohen study (Merino 1976). She found that, although children's grammatical proficiency increased between grades K and 2, by grade 3 it tended to level off, and it actually decreased by the fourth grade. In addition, on a word-listing task, performance in English improved with grade level, but in Spanish it remained stable after the second grade, contrary to Cohen's findings.

Philosophies of bilingualism. The evidence on the effects of bilingual education programs on language maintenance is as yet meager, but as we have seen, the greater portion of it indicates that, at best, these programs serve to delay somewhat the effects of language loss and in many cases differ little in their effect from English-only programs. In spite of these indications, there is widespread confidence on the part of theorists in the field that, with properly designed models, bilingual education can promote language maintenance and cultural pluralism. For example, Ramírez (n.d.) refers to the goal of bilingual/bicultural education as the encouragement of children 'to learn how to function effectively in the Hispanic and mainstream American cultures and to develop positive feelings toward both these cultures'. He goes on to claim evidence that such programs are 'successfully accomplishing these goals'. Andersson and Boyer (1970) felt that bilingual schooling would result in 'wide acceptance of linguistic and cultural pluralism', and more recently, Peña (1976), former director of Title VII programs, defines bilingual education as a program that
'develops and maintains the children's self-esteem and a legitimate pride in both cultures'. In his classification of bilingual education programs, González (1975) includes a Type B (bilingual maintenance) and Type C (bilingual/bicultural maintenance), which consider students’ fluency in a non-English language as 'an asset to be maintained and developed' and which 'seeks to integrate "history and culture" of the target group as integral part [sic] of curricular content and methodology'.

Individual language maintenance as an extension of transactional programs. Pluralistic goals of the sort generally envisioned, by directing attention away from community needs and toward national goals on the one hand and individual needs narrowly defined on the other, fail to promote maintenance in a crucial way—in the family and in the community. To see how this is so, let us examine the major objectives of an education based on generally accepted notions of linguistic pluralism. This will give us a clearer perspective on the relationship between the goals of individual cultural enrichment and the assimilative nature of current policies in bilingual education, even those that are 'maintenance' oriented.

Most current thinking about cultural pluralism emphasizes the ideal of biculturalism, by which the individual acquires the linguistic and cultural characteristics of the dominant society in order to participate fully in Anglo-American social, economic, and political institutions. At the same time, the native language and culture are taught and developed so that the individual will have access to greater opportunities and greater personal fulfillment. Knowledge of and access to more than one language expand the individual's social and cultural perspectives. The native language (and culture) are seen as an important resource, a reservoir of knowledge and skills to be tapped for the betterment of the individual and the nation as a whole.

The benefits that are generally attributed to the native language as a resource fall into four categories: language (1) as an educational resource, (2) as a cultural resource, (3) as a national resource, and (4) as a personal resource.

1. Language as an educational resource. It is generally accepted that, especially in the early period of second language development, children can learn new concepts better through their native language (UNESCO 1953; Andersson and Boyer 1970, inter alia). The use of the native language as a medium of instruction is thus seen as an asset which will enhance the learning capabilities of the child and avoid the educational retardation that is due to the need to learn through a weaker language (Macnamara 1967). The introduction of the child to reading through the native language has also been shown to be more effective than beginning the reading process in an unknown second language (U.S. Commission on Civil Rights 1975).
Additionally, the United States Commission on Civil Rights finds that children who learn through their native language first have greater success in the subsequent learning of the official language (1975:56ff.). The development of positive attitudes toward oneself is felt to be of prime importance in the educational process and learning through the native language serves to develop such a favorable self-concept (1975:30ff.).

2. Language as a cultural resource. Bilingualism provides access to the cultural heritage of both linguistic groups, enriching the lives of bilingual individuals and opening to them new vistas on the world (Ramfrez n.d.). The knowledge of each other's language and culture will also promote understanding between peoples, leading to more harmonious relationships. In the same way that children learn better through their home language, by using the values and the learning styles from their home culture, they will greatly increase their ability to participate meaningfully in the education process (Peña 1976; Oller 1976).

3. Language as a national resource. There is a growing conviction among advocates of bilingual education that linguistic and cultural diversity can become a source of strength for the country (Gaarder 1972; Fishman 1972b). The existence of many cultures within its boundaries will provide a healthy variety of ideas and outlooks that will be beneficial to the entire society. More concretely, the existence of large numbers of persons who speak non-English languages fluently constitutes a valuable pool of human resources for government, for education, and for industry (Gaarder 1972). These groups also have great potential for contributing to the literary, artistic, and folkloric wealth of the nation.

4. Language as a personal resource. In addition to all the foregoing, a culturally pluralistic society will provide its members with wider social and economic opportunities. There will be great need for teachers, secretaries, managers, and diplomats who have knowledge of a language other than English. This will not only open up employment opportunities for bilinguals, but will promote economic integration for persons who might otherwise be excluded. Bilingualism will also encourage travel to countries where the other language is spoken, not only adding to the possibilities of personal cultural enrichment, but making a contribution to international understanding.

The rationale I have presented for cultural pluralism is a litany familiar to most practitioners in the field of bilingual education. It provides the basic set of arguments in favor of a maintenance-oriented program over the transitional type, although the educational rationale, in particular, is strongly favored by proponents of the latter model as well. Many of the goals implicit in such a rationale are unassailable, and some
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have been considered valid for hundreds of years by humanistic educators. It is important to recognize, however, that all of these goals share the underlying principle of an individual, personal bilingualism. Within the pluralistic framework thus defined, the native language of the child must be taken into account in the educational process because it will lead to greater educational, economic, and cultural opportunity for the individual.

The advancement of equal opportunity in the areas mentioned is certainly a worthy goal for education. Yet, 'equal opportunity' in education or employment, except at the very lowest levels, presupposes a demonstrated internalization and commitment, within certain narrow tolerances, to the values of the institutions in question. As the educational and general socio-economic level rises, so does the incompatibility of these values with those of the home community. Thus, the cost of social mobility is assimilation, and assimilation insures mobility to those who are needed to represent societal institutions to the ethnic group.5

Personal enrichment bilingualism does little to change these basic relationships. The increased opportunities afforded by the development of personal bilingualism depend to a much greater extent upon the acceptance of the cultural and linguistic values of Anglo society than upon the individual linguistic virtuosity that is achieved. Thus, an administrator may attain an ethnically sensitive position because he or she is fluent in the language of that group, but a precondition of employment will always be a demonstrated ability to function in an Anglo institution according to Anglo norms.

For most roles within the society, the maintenance of personal bilingualism contributes little to equal opportunity beyond the enrichment of the individual's life in nonvital pursuits. This is analogous to the enrichment achieved by the able violin player who may find increased economic or educational opportunity only if he/she studies music or seeks employment in a music-related business. Otherwise, violin playing (translate as 'personal bilingualism') is largely irrelevant.

If the goal of bilingualism does not focus on strengthening the community and maintaining the close link between it and the individual, it is likely that it will even accelerate societal shift.6 Individual, noncommunity-based bilingual education, because of the benefits of the use of the native language as an educational resource, will tend to enhance the educational chances of the individual. The higher the level of education attained in this kind of educational system, the more removed from the ethnic community an individual will become, since the education received is by design deculturating and assimilatory.7

Moreover, as Kjolseth argues, inattention to community linguistic norms will result in a greater use of English for those familiar interactions formerly reserved for the ethnic group.
Language maintenance as a support for the ethnic community. Directly opposed to the goals associated with personal bilingualism is the objective of a community-oriented bilingualism. This differs sharply from the personalistic approach both in its goals and its outcomes. We can distinguish at least four major goals of community-oriented bilingualism: the ethnic language (1) as a source of solidarity in the community, (2) as a vehicle for ethnic culture, (3) as an instrument of education, and (4) as a vehicle for certain communications between ethnic groups. Additionally, I discuss a major goal for the official language, that of communication outside the bounds of concerns that are directly ethnic.

1. The ethnic language as a source of community solidarity. A common language promotes unity within a community by enhancing people's consciousness of common ethnicity and a common social destiny, as well as by increased communicative possibilities. Solidarity may be attained at several different levels of 'community': (a) extended family and friendship group, (b) local neighborhood or barrio, (c) regional group with common cultural and dialectal characteristics, (d) the ethnic group as a whole. The latter may be relatively restricted as, for example, Puerto Ricans, Chicanos, Cuban-Americans; or relatively inclusive, as Hispanics in the United States, Mexicans, Chicanos, or Spanish-speaking peoples, according to the level of consciousness and sense of commonality.

2. The ethnic language as a vehicle for the culture. Knowledge of and transmission of the ethnic language within the community promotes cultural continuity. The accumulated wisdom and lifeways of a people are more meaningfully carried by the language in which they are experienced. This cultural continuity permits a community to change in response to new environmental conditions, but in an orderly and nondisruptive fashion. For the community, the language has solidarity value; for the individual members of the group, it provides a cultural, social, and psychological point of reference from which to grow.

3. The ethnic language as an instrument of education. As has often been noted, the mother tongue is the most effective medium for early learning. Given an adequate growth of skills in the ethnic language by the individual, and given an appropriate level of development of the language itself (terminology, codification, written materials, etc.), it is also the most natural medium for most subsequent learning. The ethnic language thus becomes an effective means for the active expression of the learning that has been acquired and for the elaboration of the
entire range of ideas. The use of the language in this way solidifies its values for the community, thereby contributing to its maintenance. Community members schooled in this way retain their solidarity with the group even while they are prepared academically to engage in Anglo-dominated economic and political activity.

4. The ethnic language as a vehicle for interethnic communication. Provided that there can exist a broad spectrum of language rights, especially within those Anglo-American institutions that touch the daily lives of Chicano people, the ethnic language will provide access to the institutions of the majority society with some measure of equality. Under the current system, or even under a system of cultural pluralism that emphasized individual biculturalism, equality within Anglo institutions is intimately bound up with level of acculturation and knowledge of English. In a community-supportive pluralism, acculturation is unnecessary to achieve equality. Rather, the ethnic language and culture become the medium of communication between these institutions and the Chicano communities.

5. The official language for extraethnic interactions. Cultural pluralism that involves only individual bilingualism stresses the use of the ethnic language for personal intraethnic interactions and the official language for interactions between the groups. A community-oriented bilingualism, on the other hand, lays stress on the ethnic language for ethnic community functions as well as for interactions between the ethnic community and outside institutions. The emphasis is on the community-relevant interactions.

As the official language, English is still extremely important for Chicanos in all those domains that have a less immediate relevance for the community as a whole. Individual communication of a general nature across ethnic boundaries will still be in the official language. But communication between an institution and community members, individually or collectively, will take place in the ethnic language if access to that institution would otherwise be constrained. Thus, for example, while a faculty meeting may be in English, a parent consultation or a parent-teacher meeting would be in Spanish.

Which intergroup interactions are in the ethnic language and which are in English will depend on local community needs and desires as well as on success in achieving language rights in those areas. Whereas a bilingual community in, say, Nebraska may well accede to city council business being conducted in English, such a procedure in Southern California would constitute exclusion of the Spanish-speaking community.

Nonetheless, access to those areas of extraethnic communication that are not directly related to community needs, e.g. the English-language media or the higher echelons of educational or
governmental bureaucracies, makes necessary and desirable a commensurately high level of individual proficiency in English.

**Conclusion.** The value of bilingualism among linguistic minority groups in the United States can be viewed from a variety of perspectives. On the one hand, knowledge of more than one language can be valuable to an individual for reasons of personal enrichment and because of the educational and employment opportunities that it affords. Personal bilingualism is also of practical use for governmental and commercial institutions in any number of ways.

Bilingualism can also be seen from the vantage point of its importance to the ethnic group. Language maintenance, the stable use of the ethnic language and culture and their transmission to succeeding generations, works to strengthen the ethnic community. It does so in the first instance by acting as a bond within the community and by providing common values and modes of interaction. Transmission of the language and culture insures a continuity that is essential to the ultimate survival of a community and to its orderly change and growth. The language and the culture form a most important link between the members of a community and their past, helping them to fulfill their potential as individuals.

The strengthening of linguistic minority groups in the United States is an agenda of very high priority—for the minority groups themselves in terms of their viability and for the larger society as well. Diversity in a society is not something to be eliminated. Rather it should be nourished and encouraged as a source of strength for that society. It provides the flexibility to create new ideas and it engenders a rich variety of beliefs and ways of life. Such variety prevents stagnation and continuously renews the life of a nation. A weakened group must depend on the rest of society for assistance; a strong group is self-sufficient and itself contributes to the common good. The maintenance of language and culture are an important characteristic of a strong and cohesive community.

Yet as we have seen, the maintenance of language and culture within one of our most important linguistic minority groups is in serious jeopardy. We have also noted that the school, as one of the most influential institutions of acculturation in our society, bears great responsibility either in the maintenance of the language and culture of Chicanos or in the shift to Anglo-American norms. It cannot remain aloof from this process. It must either act as an agent of deculturation and assimilation, or it must work actively and positively with the ethnic communities to support and develop their language and culture in the education of their children.

Bilingual education is a step in this direction. Its focus, however, remains transitional and assimilationist. This, we believe, is due to a narrow compensatory philosophy whereby the native language of ethnic minority children is considered a hurdle to be
surpassed instead of a means by which to develop and strengthen the child and his community.

We urgently need to seek a policy of bilingualism in this country that supports the maintenance, development, and full flowering of the ethnic languages. Moreover, this must be done in a way that not only encourages a personal and individual bilingualism, but beyond this, promotes the learning and use of the ethnic language in such a way that it is maintained strong within the community. Such a policy can only be beneficial, both to the ethnic groups themselves and to the wider society as a whole.

NOTES

1. For descriptions of Puerto Rican language maintenance, see Fishman, Cooper, Ma et al. (1968).
2. Results of this report were published as Fishman et al. (1966).
3. The term 'mixture' here refers both to code alternation (the rapid switching back and forth between two languages) and to the use of one language on some occasions and the other language on other occasions with the same speakers.
5. For a discussion of the relationship between education and other societal institutions, see Hernández-Chávez (forthcoming).
6. Kjolseth (1972:113ff.) refers to this paradoxical situation in bilingual education as a 'maintenance-assimilation program' which realizes individual proficiency in the school but promotes language shift in the community.
7. This phenomenon is reflected in the ambivalence felt in many Chicano communities toward other Chicanos who have attained middle-class status. They are perceived as assimilated agringados who, having rejected the values of the ethnic community, accept Anglo-American ways.

At the same time, parents exhibit a very natural aspiration for their children to achieve educational and economic mobility and regard the learning of English as the means to do so. No contradiction is seen because there is little recognition of the extent of deculturation that is required by the educational and economic systems in order to achieve a substantial amount of mobility. The belief exists that assimilation is a personal choice, unrelated to upward mobility and the characteristics that must be acquired to attain it.

The problem of bilingualism in American society is how to strike a balance between the learning of English and the maintenance of linguistic and cultural bonds with the ethnic community. This needs to be accomplished in such a way not only to permit but to encourage educational and economic advancement. Currently, these possibilities are extremely remote and difficult.
8. The Mexican program of 'integración nacional' has as its official policy the 'castellanización' of the native populations. In describing the effects of this policy on the retention of native cultures, a high official of the Ministry of Education summarized his position as follows: 'No queremos eliminar las culturas indígenas, pero tampoco queremos que esas culturas interfieran con el proceso de integración. Lo ideal sería que los indígenas lograran castellanizarse completamente, reteniendo, en cuanto a sus antiguas costumbres, el sabor de la cultura'.

9. This term refers to legal rights in the area of language granted ethnic minorities through legislation and judicial decision. The kinds of right alluded to include the provision of government services in the ethnic language, bilingual education, the use of the ethnic language in judicial proceedings, and the like. Additionally, ethnic communities may demand that nongovernmental transactions be carried out in their language as, for example, in medical services, communications media, and commercial contracts. For two excellent reviews of some of the issues in language rights, see Leibowitz (1969) and Blaine (1974).
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Introduction. It has become quite obvious from the rich and varied papers presented at this Georgetown University Round Table that the domain of bilingual education is unusually broad. It encompasses all the dimensions of monolingual education, with the added dimension of the use of two languages as media of instruction. Making matters even more complex, the populations served by bilingual education differ significantly in character, in educational needs, and in corresponding use of bilingual instruction. In the United States alone we can identify at least four distinct student populations for whom bilingual education is used. For each, the goals differ somewhat.

Table 1. Population groups served by bilingual education in the United States.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group 1</th>
<th>Limited and non-English speaking (LES/NES)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group 2</td>
<td>Balanced bilingual linguistic minority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 3</td>
<td>English dominant linguistic minority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 4</td>
<td>Native English speaking majority</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As the table indicates, these populations are defined in terms of English proficiency. For the first, the 'limited and non-English speaking minority' students (LES/NES or LESA students), bilingual education is viewed as necessary to ensure equal opportunity to benefit from schooling. For the second group, the 'balanced bilingual linguistic minority' population (those who might have once been LES/NES but who have reached a level of English proficiency equivalent to that of their first language), bilingual education is seen as providing a means for maintaining continued development of the students' home language, thereby ensuring community solidarity, and
continuity between home and school. For the third group, the 'English dominant linguistic minority students' (those students who may have once been LES/NES but who have lost much of their home language; or who never acquired the language of their parents and grandparents), bilingual education is a vehicle for the revival and revitalization of their home language and culture. And finally, for the last group, the 'native English speaking linguistic majority' group children (the Anglo-Americans and Black Americans in our schools), bilingual education is seen as an enrichment of the children's educational experience by providing them with exposure to another language and culture early in life.

Currently, the rights of the second and third groups—the English proficient linguistic minorities—to federally funded bilingual education programs are being argued in political as well as academic forums. For this conference, however, we leave these important questions in the competent hands of others, such as Dr. Eduardo Hernández-Chávez and Professor Joshua Fishman, who are among the leaders in the field in conceptualizing this issue. Instead, we focus on aspects of bilingual education for only the first group—the limited and non-English speaking minority population—who also happen to be the target population for most federal and state assistance.

Although bilingual education for LES/NES students has been with us for more than a decade, it is just beginning to gain institutional legitimacy and become part of the fabric of American education. The landmark U.S. Supreme Court Lau v. Nichols decision of 1974 and the ensuing Lau Guidelines, as well as strong state legislation, have strengthened the mandate for a bilingual approach to the education of students whose dominant language is not English. Even the New York Times, in its editorial entitled 'Bilingual Danger' (December 12, 1976), acknowledged that the use of a student's dominant language as a medium of instruction was an educationally sound approach to be recommended:

We fully support the proper use of bilingual teaching as a pedagogically sound means ... of making possible effective participation in the general business of learning from the very moment a non-English speaking youngster enters school ...

We must now make good on the trust that has been extended to us. We must deliver programs that are effective in accomplishing at least two major goals essential for the academic survival of LES/NES students: (1) the programs must ensure that students' acquisition of basic skills such as math, and their achievement in subject areas such as science and social studies, be at a level comparable to that of their English speaking counterparts; (2) the programs must ensure the students' acquisition of proficiency in English.
The integration of these goals into a cohesive instructional strategy is a complex undertaking, involving the synthesis of language learning principles, academic achievement priorities, and legal guidelines.

While we cannot discuss these two goals from a legal perspective here (but see Hiller 1978; Dulay et al. 1978), we can present them from the perspective of theory and research in language acquisition that has been accumulating rapidly over the last decade.

Two aspects of bilingual instruction are involved in meeting the program goals just mentioned: (1) the language used for subject matter instruction; and (2) the quality of English instruction. In this paper we comment on the current practices in both of these areas, asking whether they are in fact the most likely to help promote the program goals we have mentioned.

The language used for subject matter instruction. Several bilingual instructional strategies have been developed over the years that attempt to address the goals of academic achievement and English acquisition simultaneously. They seem, in fact, to be designed to answer a question bilingual education program planners often ask, namely: what is the fastest way to teach English while, at the same time, promoting the student's advancement in subject matter and basic skills?

Drawing from the theory and research in second language acquisition that has been accumulating over the last decade, we comment on certain bilingual education instructional methods currently used to help accomplish these goals.

Current practice. Several instructional strategies for the presentation of subject matter are currently used in bilingual programs throughout the United States (descriptions are taken from the Program Quality Review Instrument (1978) used by the California State Department of Education).

Preview-review. This strategy includes three steps. (1) A preview is first given to students in one language by an instructor who is a model in that language. (2) The body of the lesson is then given by another instructor in the other language. This person is also a model in the language he/she is using as medium of instruction. (3) Finally, a review of the lesson is conducted. This can be accomplished by dividing the students into dominant language groups--each with a model instructor--or by maintaining a mixed language group and delivering the review in a concurrent approach.

Concurrent method. During lessons, two languages are used interchangeably. Special care is taken to avoid direct translation. One person may deliver the lessons using both languages,
or two individuals may be utilized, each modeling a different language.

Alternate Language Approach. Lessons are one day (or at one time) delivered in one language and then another day (or at another time) delivered in the other language. It is important to note that only one language is used at a time and the same lesson is often delivered twice, once in each language.²

The implicit assumption underlying Preview-Review, the Concurrent Method, and the Alternate Language Approach is that the students will attend to everything they hear and that, therefore, they should learn everything they are exposed to. Specifically, it is assumed that LES/NES students will attend to presentations of the same subject matter concepts twice—once when it is presented through the first language (which they understand) and a second time when it is presented through English, which they are still in the process of acquiring.

Recent work in second language acquisition research suggests that this may be an incorrect assumption. For a variety of reasons, students do not attend to everything in their immediate environment and consequently, do not process everything they are exposed to.

Current research. In second language (L2) acquisition research, convincing evidence has been accumulated to support the existence of what may be called a 'Socio-Affective Filter', a filter which is believed to operate during language acquisition. This construct has been posited to account for 'selective' learning which has been observed in learners of a second language or dialect.

All second language teachers already know that their students do not learn all of the language to which they are exposed. This lack of learning, however, is not necessarily traceable to learning problems or to recalcitrant students. Many times, selective learning is taking place and the selecting mechanisms include what we refer to as the Socio-Affective Filter.

To place this construct in perspective, we present a sketch of the current model of the creative construction process in L2 acquisition. (See Figure 1.)

In the figure, the 'External Linguistic Environment' refers to language input. It encompasses all the language in its sociolinguistic contexts to which the learner is exposed, including, of course, the classroom. The 'Learner's Speech', on the other hand, refers to the language output—that is, the language which is actually produced by learners. In the large center box, labeled 'Internal Mechanisms', are the five internal unconscious and nonobservable factors which have been proposed to account for the differences between language input and output (these are discussed in detail in Dulay et al., forthcoming). As the model indicates, the Socio-Affective Filter is the first
Figure 1. Working model for some aspects of creative construction in language acquisition.
hurdle incoming language data must overcome to be processed further. And, as the term 'filter' indicates, not all language input data makes it through the Socio-Affective Filter for further processing.

The Socio-Affective Filter is not a new construct. It refers to the motives, needs, attitudes, or emotional states of the learner. As the term suggests, these filter the language input that is processed by the learner, and affect the rate and quality of language acquisition.

The 'Socio' in the term represents the social referents that give shape to learners' motivations to learn a new language and their attitudes towards the speakers of that language. For example, if a person is learning English just to pass a school requirement, it is not likely that much English will be acquired. On the other hand, a desire to become an English teacher, or to live and work in San Francisco or New York, may yield different results. Specific motives, needs, and attitudes underlying second language acquisition take their shape from the niche in society that the individual occupies or wishes to occupy and the social activities the learner engages in or wishes to engage in.

The 'Affect' part of the term represents the internal states—anxiety, relaxation, anger, or trust, among others—that affect the manner in which one approaches the task of learning and using a new language.

In L2 acquisition, it seems likely that the Socio-Affective Filter contributes to at least three manifestations of selective learning: (1) the learner's preferences for certain input models over others; (2) the learner's acquisition of certain aspects of language before others; and (3) the learner's (subconscious) determination of the point at which language acquisition efforts should cease.

Depending on various criteria, a learner will 'tune in' or 'tune out' certain speakers of the language. To illustrate this phenomenon, we present just a few examples of learner preferences for certain input models over others. A review of the second language research literature shows that the clearest examples of affective filtering of input involve an apparent preference for certain speaker models over others under certain circumstances; for example, preference for peers over teachers, peers over parents, and own ethnic group members over nonmembers.

The preference for certain models is clearly demonstrated by learners acquiring one of two dialects to which they are exposed in daily communication. A seven-year-old Japanese-speaking boy who had immigrated to Hawaii, for example, was observed to learn the Hawaiian Creole English of his agemates rather than the Standard English of his teachers during his first school year. When he moved to a middle-class neighborhood the following year, however, he quickly picked up the Standard English that his new friends spoke (Milon 1975). In
explaining this phenomenon, the researcher states that 'there is no question that the first dialect of English these young immigrant children learn is the dialect of their peers, and that they learn it from their peers. If they learn productive control of the dialect of their teachers it is not until later ...' (Milon 1975:159).

A similar example—in this case showing first language learners' preference for peers' speech over that of their parents—is provided by Stewart (see Dale 1976:281), who reports that the black children he studied in Washington, D.C., learn the dialect used by their peers (a dialect of Black English that is most different from Standard English), rather than the dialect used by their parents (a dialect of Black English closest to Washington, D.C. Standard English). Likewise, Labov (1972) finds that both black and white children in a middle-class area of northeastern New Jersey learn to pronounce the rs before consonants as their New Jersey friends do, rather than drop the rs as their New York raised parents do. These data, too, show 'that children learn more language behavior from members of their own peer group than from their parents ...' (Dale 1976:281).

Finally, Benton (1964) reports that Maori children learn the English dialect of their own ethnic group rather than Standard New Zealand English. In some cases this model preference is consciously articulated.

One teacher reported that a Maori child had told her: 'Maoris say "Who's your name", so that's what I say'. Maori English is often an important sign of group membership and a source of security for these children (Benton 1964:93; Richards 1974:169).

In addition to screening out certain language input models, the Socio-Affective Filter also seems to result in learners selecting certain types of phrases or vocabulary items to learn and use over others—for example, phrases and sentences that are essential for social participation are learned by children before those that are not, in the first stages of L2 acquisition. Phrases and sentences such as 'It's my turn', 'Pass the ball', and a variety of others are attended to and learned early by beginning L2 learners, leaving other aspects of language for later acquisition.

The Socio-Affective Filter also seems to be involved when some learners (apparently) stop acquiring the target language at a point before they reach nativelike proficiency, but after they have acquired enough to communicate—for example, the use of pidgin languages by communities that rarely interact socially with target language speakers. In the United States some adult learners seem to stop improving in their English proficiency at the point when they can communicate freely but still do not control the fine points of English grammar.
These kinds of behavior may be attributed to the operation of socio-affective filtering factors, which significantly reduce the input data that is made accessible to the learner's cognitive learning mechanisms.

Educational implications. It seems reasonable to assume that a similar filtering takes place in bilingual education subject matter classes that are taught by using English to present the same content or information that has been presented in the student's primary language. When core subject matter is taught to LES/NES students in two languages at once (as in the Concurrent Method), or in one language after another (as in the Preview-Review Method), students probably filter out the language they do not understand in favor of the language they do understand. In other words, much of the English used to present the same content a second time is probably tuned out, as it has no real function in the communicative situation. There would appear to be little motivation to exert the extra effort to attend to information presented in a new language when students have either just heard it in their native language, or know that the same content will soon be presented in their native language.

Using English together with the LES/NES students' native language during the time set aside for subject matter instruction probably results in the students being deprived of valuable subject matter instruction time to the extent that English is used. Moreover, the English to which students are exposed in such situations may not be attended to, and thus, the students' gain in English acquisition through these methods is probably not worth the loss in subject matter learning. To be effective, English instruction cannot simply consist of repeating information students have just heard in their own language. The substance of the English classes must complement or add to that of the subject matter classes if students are expected to pay attention to it. Furthermore, the exposure to English must be structured and tailored to the level of the students' proficiency. These needs cannot easily be, nor were they intended to be, accommodated by subject matter teachers. The responsibility for the teaching of English falls to a well designed ESL program for LES/NES students, whose focus is the effective teaching of English.

It is not necessary, we believe, nor educationally sound, to compromise academic subject matter development for LES/NES students in the name of the teaching of English, especially when other methods to facilitate English acquisition are available. Given the possibility that the language alternation methods used in subject matter classes may not contribute sufficiently to either of the educational goals mentioned earlier for LES/NES students (the development of subject matter skills and the acquisition of English proficiency), we may well ask if the result might not be an increasing number of bilingual
underachievers—students who speak both English and Spanish, but whose subject matter achievement is below grade level. It seems then, that the net effect of using subject matter time to interject English may simply be to reduce the time available to LES/NES students for subject matter learning, something which they can ill afford.

In addition to this probable negative effect on subject matter learning, such unsystematic and unplanned use of English does not constitute anything like the kind of carefully thought out and structured exposure to English which could result from a well designed English program that would accompany the first language subject matter instruction in a bilingual education program. Although we cannot discuss the many ingredients (and there are many) of an optimum English class here, there is one general finding of L2 research which speaks directly to an approach that still guides many English programs for LES/NES students, namely, the reliance on the notion of first language interference in the development of second language curriculum.

The quality of English instruction. Much of the English teaching methodology in use today, whether in bilingual or monolingual programs, has not yet caught up with current theory and research on the learning of a second language. A recent review of the major ESL curriculum series for elementary students, and a survey of some 40 ESL teachers (both conducted by the authors) revealed a heavy reliance in curriculum materials on pattern drills, repetition, imitation, and contrastive analysis. The teacher survey further revealed a dissatisfaction on the part of many of the teachers with the curriculum materials and strategies available to them. Many mentioned the need to improvise in order to compensate for shortcomings in the curriculum.

In this section, we present aspects of current second language acquisition research, in an effort to stimulate the restructuring of strategies, techniques and materials used to facilitate the acquisition of English by LES/NES students.

Current research

A reexamination of first language 'interference'. If one were to designate a 'villain' in the second language learning drama, the undisputed choice would surely be the learner's first language, to wit, the choice of the term 'interference' to refer to second language errors that reflect first language structure. The first language is often thought to get in the way, to 'interfere' with the learner's production of correct second language sentences.

This view has its roots as much in common sense as in behaviorist psychology. If one hears a Latino adult saying 'I have 33 years', one might reasonably deduce that the substitution of _have_ for _am_ was induced by the speaker's native
language, Spanish. Furthermore, one might speculate that wherever the person's first language differed from English, the learner would have trouble; that is, the learner would automatically tend to use native language structure and thereby make an error. This common sense notion has been given a name in behaviorist psychology—that of 'negative transfer'.

A closer look at what second language learners really do, however, is beginning to vindicate the first language. From all the data currently available, it seems that the first language is really a help, rather than a hindrance. It is not an interference, but an option of last resort.

The change in the perceived role of the first language began with the observation that the number of grammatical errors in second language performance that could be attributed to first language influence was far smaller than had previously been imagined. In the first empirical study undertaken in which the grammatical errors made by children were actually counted and classified, less than 5 percent were found to reflect the children's first language (Dulay and Burt 1974). Since this initial finding, numerous studies have been conducted to determine the incidence of 'interlingual' errors (those reflecting the first language) and 'developmental' errors (those similar to errors made by first language learners) in the speech and writing of children and adults learning English as a second language. All the research studies conducted to date have reached the same conclusion, namely, that the great majority of grammatical errors made by children and adults alike are not interlingual, but developmental. A brief summary of these studies follows.6

Child studies. In Dulay and Burt's (1974) initial study of the natural speech of children, an analysis of over 500 grammatical errors made by 179 children learning English in United States schools (in New York and in Northern California) revealed that less than 5 percent of the errors observed reflected the children's first language, Spanish. Since then, other empirical studies have also shown the limited reliance children place on the structure of the mother tongue when learning the second language in a host environment. For example, studies of Japanese-speaking children learning English in Hawaii and in the United States (Milon 1974; Gillis and Weber 1976, respectively), or of French- and Greek-speaking children learning English in the United States (Venable 1974) are typical examples of empirical studies in which the actual incidence of interlingual errors observed was negligible. Ramfrez and Politzer (1975), who studied Spanish-speaking children learning English in the United States, reported a somewhat higher incidence of interlingual errors, though they too noted that these errors could hardly account for the majority of errors the children made. Such findings are not limited to children who are learning English as a second language. Native English-speaking children
abroad have been observed acquiring languages as diverse as Welsh in Wales (Price 1968), French in Geneva, Switzerland (Ervin-Tripp 1974), Spanish in an immersion program in the United States (Boyd 1975), German in Kiel, West Germany (Wode 1976), and Urdu in Pakistan (Hansen-Bede 1975). These researchers all made a point of commenting on the very low incidence of interlingual errors. Instead, most of the errors observed appeared to be developmental—of the sort that might be made by children learning those languages as their first language. While 5 percent interlingual errors does not mean there are no grammatical errors at all that reflect first language structure, it certainly represents an almost insignificant portion of the total errors children have been observed to make while learning to speak English.

**Adult studies.** Studies conducted on the speech and writing of adults learning English as a second language have reached similar conclusions, namely, that the majority of nonphonological errors observed for adults do not reflect the first language of the adults, either. The proportion of errors that reflect the first language, however, is somewhat larger than that which has been observed for children. Approximately 8-23 percent of the adult errors may be classified as interlingual. Though this proportion is larger than that for children, it still represents a minority of the total grammatical errors made by adults. Researchers include White (1977), who studied the speech of adults learning English in the United States, and LoCoco (1975, 1976), who studied proportions of interlingual and other error types in the compositions of native English-speaking adults enrolled in Spanish and German foreign language university classes in the United States.

Other researchers (who did not conduct complete counts but examined error types nevertheless) have also commented on relatively small numbers of interlingual errors in their observations. An Arabic speaker learning English in the United States (Hanania and Gradman 1977), and French speakers learning English in Quebec (d'Anglejan and Tucker 1975) have been studied, as well as native English-speaking students observed in a French foreign language class in a Midwestern university (Valdman 1975). Even studies whose focus appears to be on the description of interlingual errors did not find a majority of that error type (e.g. Scott and Tucker 1974, who studied Arabic-speaking students learning English at the American University of Beirut).

For second language learners, then, the available empirical evidence suggests that error types reflecting the structure of the learner's first language are clearly in the minority, comprising only about 5 percent of child errors and 8-23 percent of the total grammatical errors made by adults. These findings do not seem to justify the major emphasis in current ESL and bilingual teacher training procedures on the occurrence and
eradication of 'interference' errors. The heavy reliance in training programs on the contrastive analysis of the grammars of English and the student's first language, for the purpose of predicting where difficulties or errors are likely to occur, is not empirically justifiable. Furthermore, there is some evidence to suggest that the interlingual errors that do occur are occasioned by less than natural language environments, by older learners consciously resorting to translation when required to produce the second language before they are 'ready', and by other factors, none of which appear to include the 'interference' of the first language on second language behavior. (See Dulay et al. forthcoming, for further discussion.)

Finally, even if the small number of interlingual errors observed were considered worthy of special attention, the available research on error correction suggests that neither correction techniques nor heavy drilling does much to affect the quality of student speech (Hendrickson 1977; Plann 1977; Cohen and Robbins 1976). Thus, whatever attention is given the small number of interlingual errors that appear to occur, it is not likely that the correction or drilling procedures currently suggested by the contrastive analysis tenets are likely to lead to much change in the students' verbal performance.

Second language acquisition as a 'creative construction' process. At the same time as the notion of interference has been losing its value for second language learning, the discovery of basic similarities in the second language speech produced by children and adults of different first languages has generated tremendous enthusiasm and numerous empirical investigations. Much of the speech of second language learners—including children and adults from different language backgrounds—exhibits important similarities in three aspects of grammar: (1) error types; (2) steps in the acquisition of basic syntactic structures; and (3) the order of acquisition of a subset of English structures. While space does not permit in-depth presentation and discussion of the available data, a brief summary of some of the key findings in each area is presented here, in order to give the reader an overview of what second language learners have been observed to do when learning English as a second language. Such information should be helpful in the development of training programs that are more consistent with what is known about the second language learning process.

Error types. Perhaps the major significance of the study of L2 errors to date has been the discovery of a striking similarity between the errors made by learners of a second language and those made by first language learners. The observed similarities provided the first inklings that the kind of mental process which is responsible for the learning of a first language may also underlie the learning of a second.
For example, in the earliest stages of first language development, children produce primarily content words (nouns, verbs, and adjectives), and omit grammatical morphemes (articles, prepositions, and morphological elements) as adults do when they compose telegrams: He throw marble (child) or Send money urgent (adult). The systematic omission of grammatical morphemes in early 'telegraphic' speech is also a characteristic of the speech of L2 learners.

'Overregularization' is another error type that occurs in both the speech of first and second language learners. For example, forms such as mans and feets (the overregularization of the English plural -s) are typical occurrences in the speech of both first and second language learners. Other such 'creative' errors include the use of archi-forms (one form that does the work of several, e.g. one for I and me), the alternating use of the members of a class (such as past tenses for past participles, e.g. I seen her yesterday), double markings (such as double past, e.g. He didn't went); and certain misorderings. (These are described in detail in Dulay, Hernández-Chávez, and Burt 1978, and in numerous articles in the second language literature.)

Steps in the acquisition of basic structures. A variety of research studies has also been conducted to determine the steps L2 learners go through in the acquisition of structures such as English negation, simple and embedded wh-questions and reflexive pronouns. As Tables 2-5 show, learners from languages as diverse as Spanish and Japanese have been observed to follow similar steps as they acquire the basics of negation, simple wh-questions, embedded wh-questions, and reflexives. Not insignificantly, the basic steps are quite similar to those observed by researchers studying children learning English as their first language (although some differences most likely due to the greater cognitive maturity of L2 learners are discernible). Tables 2-5 illustrate the major turning points that have been observed.

Order of acquisition of English structures. Of the areas of recent L2 acquisition research, the study of the acquisition order of grammatical structures has probably generated the most excitement—in particular, the finding that some 12 structures of English appear to be acquired in a similar order by children of different language backgrounds, and by adults as well. Figure 2 illustrates the structures studied and the order in which they were acquired by over 500 children, of Spanish and Chinese language background, across 10 states in the United States (Dulay and Burt 1975). Numerous studies have replicated much of this basic acquisition order when the language elicited represented natural communication (both oral and written). Studies have included: Korean and Spanish speaking children: Fathman (1975); a Vietnamese speaking child: Kessler
Table 2. Some intermediate steps in the acquisition of negation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First language acquisition</th>
<th>Second language acquisition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Klima and Bellugi 1966)</td>
<td>(Raven 1974)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stage 1</strong></td>
<td><strong>Step 1</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S → {no} - Nucleus - {not}</td>
<td>S → {not} - Nucleus - {not}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Examples:</td>
<td>Examples:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No wipe finger.</td>
<td>Not like it now.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not a teddy bear.</td>
<td>Not ready.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wear mitten no.</td>
<td>Not dog.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not cold.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stage 2</strong></td>
<td><strong>Step 2</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S → Nom - Aux - {Predicate}</td>
<td>S → Nom - Aux - {Predicate}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Examples:</td>
<td>Examples:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I don't sit on Cromer coffee.</td>
<td>I no queen.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not little, he big.</td>
<td>I not this way.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>He no bite you.</td>
<td>I not like that.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I don't like here.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dolly 'er' not here.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Don't tell teacher, ok?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stage 3</strong></td>
<td><strong>Step 3</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S → Nom - Aux - {Predicate}</td>
<td>S → Nom - Aux - {Predicate}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Examples:</td>
<td>Examples:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No it isn't.</td>
<td>No, I didn't.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>That was not me.</td>
<td>I haven't seen this before.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No, they're not white.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>They didn't have time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>You can't have this back.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lunch is no ready.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I can't hit the ball.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LI = Norwegian</strong></td>
<td><strong>LI = Japanese</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Milon 1974; Gillis and Weber 1976)</td>
<td>(Hernández-Chávez 1972; Cazden et al. 1975)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LI = Spanish</strong></td>
<td><strong>LI = German</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Wode 1976)</td>
<td>(Hanania and Gradman 1977)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LI = Arabic (Adult)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*While Klima and Bellugi's 'Stages' for LI learners are defined by Mean Length of Utterance (MLU), L2 researchers have not usually done so. Instead they report the steps observed as learners acquire the second language, regardless of MLU. Therefore, we have used the term 'Step' rather than 'Stage' here.*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>L1 = English (Klima and Bellugi 1966)</th>
<th>L1 = Norwegian (Ravem 1974)</th>
<th>L1 = Japanese (Gillis and Weber 1976)</th>
<th>L1 = Spanish (Cazden et al. 1975)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Step 1</td>
<td>Virtually no auxiliaries.</td>
<td>Who that? Where milk go?</td>
<td>Where find it? Where er hers Mommy?</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 2</td>
<td>Some auxiliaries; plus Modals (can, will). No inversion rule.</td>
<td>What he can ride in? Where the other Joe will drive?</td>
<td>What she is doing? Whosis that is?</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 3</td>
<td>Inversion (of acquired auxiliaries); Do-insertion for Wh-questions not in control yet.</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 4</td>
<td>Inversion of all acquired auxiliaries; Do-insertion for Wh-questions under control</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4. Some intermediate steps in the second language acquisition of embedded Wh-questions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intermediate Steps</th>
<th>L1 = Spanish (Dulay and Burt 1977; Cazden et al. 1975)</th>
<th>L1 = Keres (Dulay and Burt 1977)</th>
<th>L1 = Japanese (Hakuta 1975)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Step 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[S] + [Wh-word - Aux - NP]</td>
<td>I don't know where's the food.</td>
<td>I don't know what's that.</td>
<td>I don't know where is it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I don't know what are those.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I know where are you going.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[S] + [Wh-word - Aux - NP - Aux]</td>
<td>I don't know where's the food is.</td>
<td>I know what's that is.</td>
<td>I don't know where is the woods is.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[S] + [Wh-word - NP - Aux]</td>
<td>I don't know where the food is.</td>
<td>I know what that is.</td>
<td>I know where it is.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I don't know what those are.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I don't know what he had.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*No example for Step 2 involving the plural copula was found in the children's speech protocols.*
Table 5. Some intermediate steps in the acquisition of reflexive pronouns for first language and second language.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intermediate steps</th>
<th>L1 = English (Brown 1973)</th>
<th>L1 = Spanish (Dulay and Burt 1977)</th>
<th>L1 = Japanese (Hakuta 1975)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refl. Pron — (self (pronoun) —</td>
<td></td>
<td>(She see(s)) her</td>
<td>You have to make it self.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(He see(s)) him</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(They see) them</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 2</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refl. Pron — Pron [+poss] + self —</td>
<td>hisself</td>
<td>... herself</td>
<td>You can write it with</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>yourself.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>They have to do it with</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>theirself.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 3</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>... himself</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>... theirself</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 4</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refl. Pron — Pron [+accusative] —</td>
<td></td>
<td>... herself</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>... himself</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>... themself(s) /ves</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
and Idar (1977); as well as adults from various language backgrounds: Bailey, Madden, and Krashen (1974); and Krashen, Madden, and Bailey (1975), who studied adults from 12 different language backgrounds; Larsen-Freeman (1975), who included adults from four language backgrounds; Andersen (1976), whose subjects were of Hispanic background; and Fuller (1978), whose study included adults from 16 language backgrounds. All these studies, and others, have found that the order in which these basic structures of English are acquired is very similar for all the language groups studied.10

![Figure 2. Acquisition hierarchy.](image)

In sum, basic similarities characterize the acquisition of English by second language learners of different language backgrounds in terms of (a) error types, (b) steps in the acquisition of certain structures, and (c) the acquisition order of a subset of English structures. The existence of similarities in the verbal output of second language learners of different first language backgrounds points to the existence of universal
mental mechanisms that guide the second language acquisition process, influencing the manner in which students process and finally learn what language they are exposed to.

These findings, which have accumulated over the last decade, have contributed to the gradual development of principles of second language acquisition that differ radically from the habit formation principles formulated in the 1950s. It seems clear that a second language is acquired to a large extent through the 'creative construction' of the new language by the learner, that is, through the learner's systematic and gradual reconstruction of the rules of the language. Environmental conditions such as classroom features and teaching method become maximally effective only when they are in tune with the developmental processes of language acquisition.

Instructional implications. Because these theoretical advances are relatively new, and because little government emphasis has been placed on the improvement of ESL methods and materials, woefully little has been done to develop new instructional strategies that are consistent with language learning principles. Most of the published ESL curriculum materials still rely heavily on drills that are based on imitation, repetition, and memorization of sentence patterns, practices that are completely out of step with language acquisition principles, and which many ESL teachers have found do little to hold the interest or enhance the English proficiency of their students.

It seems time, then, to step up efforts to improve the quality of English instruction in bilingual programs by vigorous efforts in curriculum development that reflect recent psycholinguistic advances. A few suggestions follow.

Creative construction in the language classroom means, in part, that during a significant part of the language class natural communication situations are provided which allow learners to use their creative construction abilities to the fullest. A natural communication situation is not one where dialogues are memorized, or where students are asked unreal questions such as 'What am I doing?' These kinds of activities are not appropriate because a natural communication situation is one where the focus of both the speaker and the listener is on the message being conveyed, not on the form of that message. This kind of situation is perhaps what is most conspicuously absent from most language teaching materials, and the reason is simple: English lessons are intended to teach the forms of the English language, not to convey information about the real world. The message, therefore, is secondary and a look through most language lessons reveals that most carry no message at all, much less focus on one. If we wish to provide natural communication situations in the classroom, we must focus on the message, not on the form of the message. This is not to say that there should be no focus on the form of the language at all, but simply that when we wish to provide a natural communication situation in a
particular lesson, form must take a back seat. For example, one would not stop to correct grammatical errors; one would instead respond to the content of the students' utterances.

Shifting focus from language form to the provision of natural communicative situations requires a different kind of lesson planning. From what is known about the acquisition process, it appears that a key criterion for a productive natural communication situation in an ESL (or any L2) class, at least for beginning students, is that the materials to be presented be visually demonstrable. That is, the students should not need to rely on the verbal instructions or comments to 'get the message'. If they can deduce the message visually, they can infer the correspondence between the form of the language used and the message. This condition, of course, excludes a great number of topics that require verbal explanations to understand, such as the definition of inflation. However, it does include a variety of topics—for example, science experiments, games, or arts and crafts—which are activities where principles can be demonstrated without having to rely on verbal communication.

The use of such topics would supplement and reinforce subject matter presented in a different and much more comprehensive manner in the subject matter class. There are, of course, other techniques which provide the opportunity for natural communication that teachers use already, such as games, role playing, and storytelling via pictures and film.

Conclusion. The current theory and research in second language acquisition which we have presented here offer several suggestions to bilingual education planners and practitioners.

First, it is probably not effective to adulterate basic skills instruction linguistically for LES/NES students by mixing English in with the students' dominant language. Given that students probably filter out the language they do not understand (English) for the one they do understand, the net effect of such practices appears to be reduced time for basic skills instruction. The resulting limited exposure to basic skills instruction may be one factor contributing to the lower achievement of many students in bilingual education programs. The situation can be alleviated somewhat, we believe, if basic skills instruction is provided to LES/NES students only through their native language.

While LES/NES students should receive basic skills instruction through their first language, curriculum areas such as art, music, and physical education may be conducted in English as well as in the primary language; more of the content of these courses is demonstrable, and thus they represent much better second language learning opportunities. Such classes can, if carefully planned, offer special opportunities for both ethnic integration and language learning through the interaction between LES/NES students and fluent English speakers.
Second, the available empirical research suggests there is no compelling reason to organize English curricula around a contrastive analysis of the students' first and second languages. The proportion of grammatical error types actually occurring which are reflective of the first language structure are simply too small to justify the current heavy emphasis on anticipating and eradicating errors predicted by contrastive analysis.

The research findings also suggest that it is probably not necessary to prepare special English lessons for students of different language backgrounds, or to segregate them in special English classes according to language background. The pervasive similarities observed for learners of numerous language backgrounds in the process of acquiring English suggest that linguistically at least, different curricula for different language background students are unnecessary and not empirically justifiable.

Finally, in light of the relatively small proportion of interlingual errors, it does not seem necessary to require of language teachers a knowledge of contrastive analysis of English and their students' first language, at least as far as syntax and morphology are concerned. This is especially true for teachers of younger children, though for older children such knowledge is also of questionable value in the language teaching classroom, given the relatively low occurrence of interlingual errors.

In addition, as we have seen, even if the occurring interlingual errors were worthy of special corrective attention, the effects of systematic error correction of the sort suggested by contrastive analysis tenets does not seem to have much effect on student speech anyway.

Finally, it seems as though the greatest benefits would be gained if teacher training efforts were more reflective of the current state of language acquisition research and of applied linguistics generally: namely, an emphasis away from habit formation and contrastive analysis tenets and towards developmental, psycholinguistic processes, such as creative construction or similar theories based on the observed linguistic development of second language learners.

It seems to us that by doing more justice to the use of LES/NES students' primary language as a medium of instruction, and to the teaching of English, the likelihood of bilingual education program effectiveness in the United States will increase significantly.

NOTES

1. While we use labels and definitions from guidelines in California, the methods themselves are used nationwide, though perhaps called by different names.

2. The other options mentioned in the PQRI include the Standard method, in which the entire class is conducted in
English, and the Demonstrably Equal Effectiveness approach, used when the district decides on an option not listed. If the latter is selected, a description and supportive evidence of its effectiveness must be submitted.

3. 'Input model' refers to target language speakers with whom the learner comes into contact.

4. The substance of the English program could, of course (and probably should), include content which is drawn from subject matter curriculum. This activity would be supplemental, however, and students in the ESL classes would not be expected to acquire or demonstrate knowledge of abstract subject matter through English. (That knowledge would be acquired in the subject matter classes through the student's native language.)

5. Of course, if students have attained proficiency in both the languages used as media of instruction, then language alternation methods for subject matter instruction may be appropriate and effective in maintaining and developing a student's bilingual skills, provided that lessons (or part of lessons) in one language are not repeats of those already presented in another.

6. All of the findings presented here refer to syntax and morphology. We recognize the much greater role the first language plays in pronunciation, especially for adults.

7. These researchers did not report total error counts, making a determination of actual proportion of error types impossible.

8. Studies that suffer from serious methodological flaws (e.g. the use of timed translation tests) have not been included here, as their results cannot be reported with confidence. See, for example, Lado (1978), who reports on the effects of such tasks.

9. There are, of course, minor differences among individual learners within and across the language groups. The similarities across learners of different language groups, however, far outweigh the differences among them.

10. There are also, of course, researchers who have focused on possible differences in the acquisition order, but to date, the similarities found far outnumber apparent differences.

11. We would like to acknowledge the valuable contribution of nine panel members who critiqued, modified, and subsequently endorsed the essence of the recommendations in this section, as presented in Dulay and Burt (1978). They are: James E. Alatis, Courtney Cazden, Charles Knight, Peter Mesa, Nancy Montalvo, Egla Rangel, Lorenza Schmidt, Edward Steinman, and John Tsu.
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INTERNATIONAL COMPARISONS
OF FOREIGN LANGUAGE LEARNING IN THE IEA PROJECT

John B. Carroll
University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill

In the short time that I have been allotted, I can do little more than draw your attention to two massive studies of foreign language learning that were conducted in the so-called IEA project. Perhaps because these studies were published in Sweden (though available also through a United States distributor), they have received little notice in this country. I was the author of the first of these and the chairman of the committee that supervised the study of French as a foreign language. The companion volume is by E. Glyn Lewis and Carolyn Massad, concerning the teaching of English as a foreign language. Unfortunately, I understand, the latter volume is at present out of print, though I can conceive circumstances wherein it might be reprinted.

Many here may be curious about what the IEA project was. IEA is an abbreviated acronym for International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Achievement. Headquartered in Europe, but with branches or correspondents in some 21 countries, it has conducted studies of comparative achievements of primary and secondary school students in a number of subjects, including mathematics, science, civic education, reading comprehension, and literature. There are now published volumes reporting each of these subjects, with several summary and technical volumes. The data of all these studies are now available in a data bank on magnetic tape that contains literally millions of data points.

English as a Foreign Language and French as a Foreign Language were two of the subjects included in this mammoth effort. These subjects were chosen as representative of two types of foreign language subjects, and as being rather commonly taught in the curricula of the various countries
participating in the IEA project. I have to emphasize the word 'foreign' in the phrase 'foreign language'. These studies were not designed as studies of bilingual education, however that may be defined. The directors of the IEA projects in English and French did not even make much of a distinction between 'foreign language' and 'second language'. In every case, we looked at the results of instruction in English or French as a school subject, although in some cases, e.g. English as studied in Sweden or the Netherlands, one might indeed say that English was being studied as a kind of 'second language' that is prominent in the cultural life of the country. Obviously, the goals and conditions of instruction in foreign language varied somewhat over the ten countries in which we looked at instruction in English, and in the eight countries in which we looked at instruction in French, but it turned out that they did not really differ very much. In most countries in which English was taught as a second or foreign language, it was being studied more for utilitarian and practical aims than for literary or cultural objectives, while the reverse was generally the case for French. Also, the studies concerned achievement at the 14-year-old level and at the 'preuniversity' level, i.e. anywhere from grade 11 to grade 14, depending on the educational system of the country.

In view of all these considerations, you may ask how relevant these IEA studies are to bilingual education, which I gather has focused not so much on learning a second or foreign language as on learning to handle two languages simultaneously—building up certain skills in the mother tongue while also acquiring skills in a second language, along with relevant cultural content in the two languages. Further, it would seem that bilingual education has been devoted more to instruction in the very early school years, with the hope that a considerable degree of true bilingualism will develop in the later years. For various reasons, the IEA studies were not able to examine any kind of second or foreign language instruction in the early school grades. Further, most of the studies in English and French instruction were conducted in the more developed countries, whereas bilingual education has been of greatest interest in some of the less developed countries, or at least only in certain subpopulations in the more developed countries.

Nevertheless, I believe the IEA studies can be instructive to students of bilingual education in several ways.

First, they offer models of research designs that might be useful in any efforts to assess the results of bilingual education. The IEA studies were based on quite careful procedures of sampling. To the greatest extent feasible, an attempt was made, in each country, to define the population of potentially testable students (e.g. all 14-year-old students who had had at least two years of French instruction), and then to draw representative samples from that population. The populations were defined in generally comparable ways across all the
countries, in such a way that the studies could yield conclusions generalizable across countries. The studies developed a large number of instruments that can be used as models for similar devices in studies of bilingual education. These instruments included tests of language proficiency at various levels of advancement, that is, tests of reading, writing, speaking, and listening. Some of the instruments developed for the French study have, in fact, been extensively used in the Canadian studies of 'French immersion' in the province of Ontario and elsewhere; I think we can agree that these studies of 'French immersion' are highly relevant to bilingual education. The IEA instruments also included questionnaires for getting at types of instruction, qualifications of teachers, student interest and motivation, etc. Also, the methods of data collection in the IEA studies could be adapted to studies of bilingual education. I would draw your attention to the procedures of statistical analysis employed in my study of French as a foreign language.

There are, however, broader and more substantive implications of the IEA studies for bilingual education. I should point out that the title given for this address is in some ways misleading. The IEA studies, that is, were not 'comparative' in the sense of asking which countries came out ahead, and which fell behind. We did not regard the IEA project as a kind of international intellectual Olympics, although some reports of it in the press have tended to give that impression. I cannot tell you which countries had the best instruction in English as a foreign language, or in French, because the IEA studies did not yield that kind of information. To be sure, the average level of achievement varied widely over countries, and it was our task to try to explain the reasons for these variations.

So, what were some of the reasons that we found for variations in levels of achievement across and within countries? (I draw attention to the fact that there was probably as much variation within countries as between countries.) I think you will agree that many of the reasons we identified will apply as much in bilingual education as in more conventional foreign language instruction.

The results in the two studies—the English and the French studies—were highly similar. Since I know the French study better than the English one, I will refer to the results from the French study. I found ways of pooling my data over countries and even over different subpopulations to boil my results down to something more readily comprehensible and digestible than the voluminous results for particular countries and populations. The final product, then, concerned what I like to think of as an 'international French class'. To be sure, it is a very large class, situated in different countries, taught by different teachers, and composed of different kinds of students at different educational levels, but it is a 'class' in the
sense that all the goals and even the methods are very much the same over the different countries and the different kinds of students. All the students are studying French, and as far as school instruction is concerned, French is French, the world around. The special analysis to which I refer here has to do with nearly 8,000 students learning French in English-speaking countries—England, Scotland, New Zealand, and the United States. (We also studied groups of students in non-English-speaking countries, Chile, the Netherlands, Sweden, and Rumania, and the results were not appreciably different, with some exceptions.) In the group of 8,000 students studying French in English-speaking countries, I was able to identify seven variables that together accounted for about 50 percent of the variance in achievement in either reading or listening skill; for this type of predictive study, that is a very large amount of variance.

The most important variable was the number of years of instruction that the student had been exposed to, i.e. a measure of the time devoted to foreign language study. In all my work on learning, time has consistently appeared as an extremely important variable. In the present case, over the 8,000 students, the number of years of study ranged from less than two years to more than eight or nine years; the average number of years of instruction varied considerably over the countries. The number of years of instruction was the best predictor of final level of achievement, having correlations of .63 with both reading and listening proficiency tests. Time of exposure to study is not, of course, the only determinant of achievement; some students need and take less time than others, while other students require and take much more time than the average.

Among the other variables that determine achievement are the student's motivations and aspirations, the degree to which the student finds foreign language study easy or hard as compared to other subjects, and the actual amount of effort the student devotes to homework. The role of motivation in our data is interesting. We asked students, in a questionnaire, to indicate how much they aspired (a) to read the foreign language, and (b) to understand the language when it is spoken. These two types of aspiration are not perfectly correlated; some students are more interested in reading the language, while others are more interested in competence in the spoken language. We found that aspiration to read French predicted reading proficiency much better than it did listening proficiency, and aspiration or interest in understanding French predicted proficiency in listening to spoken French better than it did reading proficiency. There were also suggestions in our data that students do better in instruction that is adapted to their particular types of aspirations with respect to emphasis on reading and writing vs. listening and speaking.

We had no direct measures of 'foreign language aptitude' as I have defined and measured it in some of my other studies,
but the questionnaire item that asked students whether they found foreign languages easier or harder than other subjects may indeed reflect variations in student foreign language aptitudes. This one questionnaire item had a significant correlation with levels of proficiency finally reached, and made a highly significant contribution to the prediction of the criterion variables after other effects were controlled for. Whatever the reason for this variation, we have to say that individuals appear to differ in their facility in learning a foreign language. Currently, I am studying this variation, working on the assumption that it has something to do with properties of a person's short-term memory capacity, either for visual or auditory materials.

In all, five variables out of the seven had to do with characteristics of the students, or with the amount of instruction they had received. The two other variables that made a significant contribution to the prediction of learning success had to do with characteristics of teachers and with modes of instruction. Teachers do make a difference, according to our results, although we have been able to identify only one major source of this difference, namely, the teacher's self-rated competence in the language being taught, either in the written or the spoken aspects of the language.

The instructional variable that shows up most clearly in our results is a measure of the extent to which students are encouraged to use French in the classroom more than they do their native language. This variable is based on students' reports of the relative amount of time that they spend speaking their mother tongue as compared to the target language. This finding should not be interpreted to mean that students and teachers should necessarily speak the target language all the time in class, but it points to the fact that a generous use of the foreign language in the classroom is one of the most important factors in getting students to achieve high levels of proficiency in the spoken language.

I could go on to mention many other findings in these IEA studies, but time does not permit. I will, however, mention that we found that the age of starting study of a foreign language makes very little difference in the eventual level of proficiency attained, once account is taken of the number of years of instruction. If anything, it appears that students who start relatively late, rather than earlier, learn somewhat faster. I recognize that this finding seems to contradict the widely held belief that an early start is important, but I am compelled to report what we found. Perhaps there is really no contradiction when it is realized that our findings pertain not to 'natural' foreign language acquisition in a bilingual environment, but to acquisition of a foreign language in a school setting.

I must leave it to my audience to make whatever inferences may be made from these findings with regard to bilingual
education. Since children are children, whether they are studying a foreign language as a school subject, or as a skill in the context of bilingual education, it would seem that somewhat the same factors would affect their success. In any event, I encourage you to consider the results of the IEA studies for what they may suggest about bilingual education. I would hate to think that I spent a good portion of my time, over a period of about eight years, working on the IEA study without generating any results that could be applied to the important social problem that is represented by bilingual education.

NOTES


3. Information on the IEA Six-Subject Data Bank can be obtained from the Office of Educational Research and Development, University of Kentucky, Lexington, Kentucky 40506.
PATTERNS OF LITERACY
IN MULTILINGUAL SITUATIONS

Charles A. Ferguson
Stanford University

The issue of literacy is often an important component in the analysis of multilingual situations, and this is true whether the analysis is purely descriptive or policy oriented and whether the multilingualism is individual or societal. Yet the patterns of literacy in multilingual settings are rarely analyzed as such except to discuss the extent of illiteracy or the choice of languages for literacy education, and even at this Georgetown University Round Table on international aspects of bilingual education almost no attention is paid to literacy as such. The purpose of this paper is to highlight some of the features of patterns of literacy which may be important in the analysis of language situations. The examples are largely taken from other countries, but the patterns of literacy discussed are relevant also for bilingual situations in the United States.

Some of the important issues in literacy, such as methods of teaching adult literacy and the relation of literacy to development, have received extensive study, and the research literature on the reading process and the teaching of reading is enormous and still growing. In this paper no attempt is made to review or evaluate these large bodies of research. Instead, four issues are explored which have received much less study but seem important in the relation of literacy to multilingualism.

Functions of literacy. One such issue concerns the functions of literacy in individuals and societies. Social scientists and language specialists of various kinds are now trying to understand how the uses of writing may vary from one society to another and how the introduction of literacy into different communities may have very different effects. This field has been a traditional area for anthropologists, but their accounts
have generally focused only on the invention and diffusion of writing systems (cf. Kroeber 1948), including the so-called 'stimulus diffusion' of cases like Vai and Cherokee, in which a new writing system is invented on the basis of the inventor's familiarity with the idea of writing rather than knowledge of a particular writing system which serves as a model or source. These studies hardly touch on the range of functions of literacy and the quite different values associated with it in different societies.

We have, however, a small stream of anthropologically oriented studies on literacy which provide a good starting place for future research on functions. These include Andree Sjoberg's papers (Sjoberg 1964, 1966), the succession of studies associated with the name of Jack Goody (Goody and Watt 1963; Goody 1968, 1977), and the recent work on the ethnography of writing by Keith Basso (Basso and Anderson 1973, Basso 1974). (It is interesting to note that the Sjoberg, Goody, and Basso studies are relatively independent and refer hardly at all to one another.) This body of research is, however, totally inadequate for our understanding of the functions of literacy in multilingual contexts. In spite of efforts to be truly cross-cultural and general, the research has emphasized only a few major cases—notably, the spread of the Semitic alphabets and the experience of ancient Greece and modern Europe. Information on traditions in South Asia and East Asia has provided some corrective, and a few studies of 'exotic' Native American and West African cases have helped, but the roles of literacy in multilingual developing nations, in language minorities of highly literate nations, and in international communication have hardly been examined at all from this perspective.

Historical studies of the extent and functions of literacy in society typically do not pay attention to minority languages (e.g. Cipolla 1969; Schofield 1968; Furet and Sachs 1974; Alleton 1977; Heath 1977). International studies, including UNESCO publications on literacy, also focus on one language at a time even in multilingual nations where literacy in different languages often has quite different functions in the same populations (cf. UNESCO 1973; Gorman 1977).

In Ferguson (1971), I sketched some of the different functions of literacy in different languages and different writing systems in Ethiopia, but that article devoted a great deal of space to the nature of the writing systems themselves and the different ways they were acquired; relatively little space was left for functional analysis.

Let me give just two examples of different ranges of functions of literacy in particular speech communities, in order to illustrate the notion of differing patterns of literacy. The Tuareg are a society of some thousands of people, many of them nomadic, who live in a large section of the Sahara and neighboring areas. They have had a writing system for centuries, the tifinagh, which provides an adequate representation
of their language, one of the Berber languages of North Africa. Many of the Tuareg today are literate in their traditional writing system. The occasions of its use, however, have remained severely limited. In this speech community, writing is used for scratching graffiti of the 'Kilroy was here' variety on rocks in the desert; it is used for brief love notes, and for various kinds of talismans and charms. There seems to have been no tendency to extend the function of literacy beyond these limits, and the present-day uses may even represent reduction from an earlier range of uses (Cohen 1958 II:334-335). The Cherokee nation in 1820 was a society of some thousands of Native Americans living chiefly in North Carolina and Arkansas, without a traditional writing system. One Cherokee man, Sequoyah, invented a syllabary to write the language and within a few years most of the Cherokee were literate in the syllabary. They supported a newspaper and the publication of books, and they used the writing system to send letters and keep records. In this second case, the use of writing served important communicative functions as well as being an important symbol of social integration and group identification (Walker forthcoming). The two societies, mid-twentieth century Tuareg and mid-nineteenth century Cherokee can be characterized as 'literate', but the functions of literacy are strikingly different in them. Put in other terms, the outcome of the introduction of writing in these societies was different and the resulting patterns of literacy differed in important and not well understood ways.

As an example of different functions of literacy in different languages within the same overall pattern of literacy use, we may cite the literacy of Ethiopian Muslims. Educated Muslims in Ethiopia typically are literate in three languages--Amharic, Arabic, and English--none of which is their mother tongue. Each of the three has its own writing system and the three systems are very different. Literacy in Amharic is the basic literacy of the national education system and is used in signs, newspapers, and a variety of communicative settings. Literacy in Arabic provides religious identification and at some levels of competence makes works written in Arabic accessible (they may be traditional Islamic texts or they may be modern publications of Arab countries). Literacy in English is the basis of higher education and is the symbol of membership in the modernizing elite (Ferguson 1970, 1971).

Nature of writing systems. Our first issue dealt with patterns of literacy use; our second issue is the other side of that coin--patterns of the structure of writing systems themselves. There is a significant body of literature on the creation and modification of writing systems. A few years ago someone made the observation that the most active field of applied linguistics throughout the world was not foreign language teaching or research in machine translation, but orthography creation and reform. Whether this is true or not, it is clear
that many nations and language communities are struggling with orthographic problems, and in some cases they are focal points of considerable tension. China has recently announced hundreds of newly simplified characters and new orthographies for several minority languages (cf. Ferguson 1977); Norway has had four spelling changes in the last 75 years (Gundersen 1977); Zambia is trying to unify the orthographies of its seven major languages (Kashoki 1978); writing systems for a number of Indian languages in North America are currently being devised or promulgated (Walker forthcoming).

Beginning with earlier literature on the history of writing (e.g. Jensen 1969, Cohen 1958, Gelb 1952) and a generation's worth of articles and books on linguistic factors in the structure and use of writing systems (e.g. Pike 1947, Berry 1958, Smalley 1964, Haas 1976), we are now seeing studies which emphasize the social factors of attitudes, processes of diffusion, and patterns of acceptance. This new trend is typified by Joshua Fishman's fine recent book on the applied sociolinguistics of writing systems (Fishman 1977; cf. also Garvin 1954, Ferguson 1968) and we are about to see movement from speculative discussions and the comparison of disparate case studies toward careful, systematic experimental and correlational investigations. Even this promising line of research, however, has only lightly touched the issues of writing systems in multilingual settings and the symbolic value of orthographic changes in a variety of sociopolitical contexts.

As an example of 'multigraphism', let us note some literacy aspects of the Panjabi-Hindi-Urdu language complex in Northern India. For several centuries the literate minority among the millions of native speakers of Panjabi have typically been literate either in Hindi or Urdu, which served as the public and formal languages of the Panjabi speech community. Hindi is written in Devanagari script which runs from left to right, with noninitial vowels represented by attachments to the consonant letters; Urdu is written in Arabic script which runs from right to left and omits many of the vowels. In general, Hindus were literate in Hindi and Muslims in Urdu; very few Panjabis learned both scripts. In recent years three factors led to a change in this situation: expansion of education, expanded roles of regional languages in education and public life, and reluctance of Sikhs to be identified with either Hindus or Muslims. Now many Panjabis are becoming literate in their mother tongue, making use of a third script, Gurmukhi, which had traditionally been used in very limited functions for writing the language. This change in the pattern of literacy alters the access of Panjabis to written materials and affects the group identification of millions of people. Any serious study of the acquisition of literacy in Panjabi would have to include discussion of the characteristics of the respective writing systems and their significance in the community.
Acquisition of literacy in non-Roman systems. A third issue is the analysis of learning to read in scripts other than the Roman alphabet and the acquisition of literacy by methods other than the use of primers and classrooms. The one very limited study of my own in this area, already referred to (Ferguson 1971), examined several traditional paths to literacy in multi-lingual Ethiopia; it convinced me of the value such research would have for our understanding of the reading process and educational problems related to reading.

Many people in Ethiopia learn to read Amharic, the national language, by a traditional method which does almost everything that all schools of reading instruction in the United States would agree does not work. They learn by rote memorization of unintelligible texts in a dead language, reading being learned separately from writing, and their literacy in Amharic is an incidental by-product of the process. This method may have little to commend it for general adoption, but it has a lot to teach us about the processes involved in learning to read. I have no ready way of measuring the actual amount of research, but I believe I am on safe ground if I say that probably 99 percent of the research on the reading process is on the Roman alphabet and is related to contemporary educational settings in the United States and parts of Europe. It is a pleasure to note a small surge of research on the reading of Chinese and Japanese characters which has taken place in the last few years (e.g. Rozin et al. 1971, Tzeng et al. 1977), but this research is just beginning and its unexpected and sometimes contradictory findings are only a tantalizing indication of its potential importance.

On the one hand, our smug confidence that an alphabetic system is the easiest to learn is shattered by evidence that under some conditions morphemic writing of the Chinese type or syllabic writing of the Japanese kana type may be easier for English-speaking children than either standard English orthography or more consistent phonetic orthographies of the i.t.a. type. On the other hand, evidence is accumulating that speakers of Chinese in their mental processing of the characters make use of phonetic aspects of the morphemes represented. Again, there is much to be learned here.

Reading specialists in the Middle East or South Asia are, to a considerable extent, applying ideas based on European and American research in situations where many aspects of the writing systems—and hence the reading process—are very different from the left-to-right, consonant and vowel letters, capital and lower case systems used for almost all the languages of Europe and the United States. Basic research on learning to read systems of the Hebrew and Arabic type and the Devanagari type is needed.

To address this question more directly in the context of multilingualism, let us note that in Asian countries there are many millions of people acquiring literacy in two languages with
different writing systems (e.g. Bengali and English) or in one language in two writing systems (e.g. Hindi-Urdu), or in two languages in the same writing system (e.g. Marathi and Hindi). It seems undeniable that there are many areas of research here which are relevant for understanding education problems in multilingual settings.

Language variation and literacy. The last few years, a number of linguists have turned their attention to the analysis of linguistic variation within speech communities, especially variation which correlates with social variables; and indeed, Georgetown University is the site of an annual conference on linguistic variation. It is somewhat surprising that there is so little research on reading in relation to variation in language. In many languages there is extensive dialect variation but a single standard written language. Linguists and literacy specialists have for a long time discussed the fit between phonologies and writing systems, and there are sometimes rich discussions of dialect variation in connection with the creation of new orthographies, but there is very little experimental research exploring the differences in reading processes as related to dialect differences in phonology (or for that matter, syntax, lexicon, or patterns of discourse). Most of the research in this field is devoted to the investigation of the general effects of so-called 'Black English' on reading skills, but such research is hard to interpret without a larger body of research on regional and social dialect variation in respect to the reading process.

The research area which I am indicating is simply that of literacy in multidialectal settings, as an area related to that of literacy in multilingual settings. In fact, it may sometimes be difficult to draw a boundary line between the two. One particular language situation, diglossia, is receiving some research attention with respect to literacy. In diglossic situations, the form of the written language is strikingly different from the ordinary spoken language, and it seems likely that reading problems have a special flavor in such situations. Recently, one sociologist, De Silva of York University in England, wrote a book, Diglossia and Literacy, in which he examined a number of cases of diglossia in South Asia such as Tamil and Singhalese where the situation is a pure diglossic one, with a high variety and a low variety which are very different. He sees severe educational problems in the diglossia, severe problems in national development and in the development of individuals. His study is based largely on naturalistic observation rather than experimental techniques, but it marks a direction in which literacy research is needed.

Conclusions. In this paper I have listed four issues in the relation between literacy and multilingualism, explored them briefly, and then declared them important as research topics.
Further, I have tended to suggest that research on one topic should take account of research on other topics and that experimental studies are needed in addition to observation and analysis. It is a pleasure in my concluding remarks to point to beginnings of the kind of literacy research I would like to see, in which there is focus on the functions of literacy in the society, the nature of the writing systems used, the acquisition of non-Roman systems, and linguistic variation. I am referring to several of the papers presented at the NIE Conference on Writing held at the Southwest Regional Laboratory in June, 1977—in particular, those by Szwed, Heath, and Scribner and Cole. The last one, which is based on patterns of literacy among the Vai in Liberia, actually examines every one of the four topics listed in this paper; also, it combines anthropological field work with the methods of experimental psychology, and it raises general questions relevant to educational problems on the American scene. It is this kind of research which demonstrates, more convincingly than my exhortations to virtue, the significance of studying literacy in connection with multilingual situations.

NOTE

1. Subsequently, Cherokee literacy declined dramatically, as a result of a number of factors, including the authorities' insistence on literacy in English and the Cherokee view of schools as a white man's institution. At present, the literacy in either Cherokee or English is relatively low, and knowledge of the traditional syllabary is required only for certain Christian religious activities and for the practice of traditional Cherokee medicine. For discussion, see Walker (forthcoming).
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BILINGUALISM AND LANGUAGE VARIETY

Roger W. Shuy
Georgetown University

The history of sociolinguistics is a history of objections to the important first generalizations which linguists make, quite necessarily, about what a language is. The paradox of language is never more clear: we must be like each other enough to be understood and communicate but we must be different enough from each other to establish our own individual identity, our group membership, our attitudes, values, and beliefs about what we are saying. This paradox forms the essential polarities between (1) the grammar of a language, those general principles which enable communication at all, and (2) the use of language, the sociolinguistics which enables us to exert our individuality, our group membership, and our humanity.

The dimensions of language variation can be characterized as three layers of individual control. The first layer offers no control at all. Persons are born with their sex, their age, their place of birth, and their race and, although some may disagree about this, there is little one can do to really change this very much. Language use is directly affected by these features, however, and variability can be found along each dimension.

In contrast, the second layer of variability involves a certain amount of control. Persons usually have some choice over the amount and type of education they obtain, their general area of occupational selection, the extent to which they achieve economically and their housing arrangements and places. One could make a good case that control in such matters is at least partly determined by their age, race, and sex, but it is certainly true that there is more control over the second layer of variables than the first. Again, however, language variability is intimately involved in each dimension of this layer. Sociolinguists and dialectologists have been actively addressing this sort of variation for many years.

The third layer consists of aspects over which speakers have almost total control. These consist of such matters as selection
of topics; communication participants, intention, genre, etc. This type of variation has been recognized for a long time as a branch of rhetoric and, more recently, as a subject for the study of the ethnography of communication, discourse analysis, conversational analysis, cohesion, etc.

Although this three-layered accumulation of language variability is well recognized in every individual speaker, it has not widely penetrated the field of bilingual education. This may stem from several reasons. Perhaps the field has been trying to establish its broad strokes before it gets to its details. Or maybe bilingual education suffers from the false impression that there is a single established norm for language use in each language. A third possibility is that many bilingual educators are not fully aware of the importance of variation in addressing the questions they face daily. Or perhaps those who deal with language variation professionally have not made their knowledge or principles available or convincing to those on the educational firing line.

It is difficult to imagine that language specialists can actually ignore the dimensions of variability which characterize every language; yet, for the sake of convenience, pedagogy often does exactly this. It is thought best to learn the standard variety rather than the various social dialects. It is thought best to study Castillian Spanish rather than the variety spoken in Argentina or Northern Mexico. It is thought best to learn the formal language rather than the casual. It is assumed that different languages have sharp edges separating them from each other.

Perhaps there is good reason to make such selections but any such decision is also a decision not to view the target language with realism. Policy questions surface even at this level. Which Spanish should be used in a U.S. bilingual program? Castillian? Puerto Rican? Cuban? Mexican? Many will claim that there are no substantive differences between these versions but, if this is the case, then Spanish is indeed the most unusual language in the history of humanity. Put another way, should the English learned in bilingual programs be American or British? Northern, Midland, or Southern American? Formal or casual? Male or female? Standard or vernacular? Characteristic of youth or adults? How far should it progress into the third area of control noted earlier? This paper will attempt to illuminate some of the many issues which involve language variation and bilingual education in America today. Instead of starting with sociolinguistic theory or research and applying it to bilingual situations, we will start with bilingual education issues and demonstrate how sociolinguistic knowledge could prove helpful.1

Elsewhere I have described the recent development of bilingual education as a realization of a value which got litigated in the courts and legislated in the government, was then implemented in the schools and finally evaluated again by the government.2

The major point in this abbreviated chronology is the relative absence of a research or knowledge base throughout its
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development. As with so many educational issues which achieve national prominence and attention, the requirement to implement is foisted upon the schools far sooner than they are able to do it. Likewise, the courts have set requirements and time lines far beyond the ability or technology of the institutions or knowledge base in the field.

Figure 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Implementation</th>
<th>Evaluation</th>
<th>Research</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>↓</td>
<td>↓</td>
<td>↓</td>
<td>↓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legislation</td>
<td>Materials</td>
<td>Surface</td>
<td>Correcting implementation and developing theory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>assessment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Language variability is involved with bilingual education in almost every issue or stage: with legislation, with placement, with program and achievement, and with research, to name just a few. This paper outlines some of the language variability concerns in these four areas.

Language variability and legislation. Bilingual education legislation, like much of educational legislation, is an expression of a moral value partly derived from a great deal of intuition but with very little empirical research. At the time of the major legislation, social scientists had not provided Congress with a clear data base for bilingual education any more than they had earlier offered adequate evidence that busing would lead to better learning for the educationally disadvantaged. In fact, when confronted with the assertion that bilingual legislation preceded the knowledge upon which it could be based, bilingual education lawyers have readily admitted that such was the case, noting further that without such legislation, the knowledge base might never have even been started. This is not to say that no knowledge base existed prior to legislation; rather that it was far from adequate and convincing. Nor is this to cast criticism on the legislation, for it was undoubtedly well motivated and much needed. It is called to attention, in this case, as a rather humbling reminder that educational research here, and in many other instances, tends to follow the legislation rather than precede it.

One example of the legislation preceding the technology of bilingual education is exemplified in the Aspira Consent Decree in New York City. This decree specified that the New York school system should determine in which language, Spanish or English, the child could most effectively participate in the classroom. The department of research in that school system pursued the issue by devising two discrete-point tests, one in English and one in Spanish, made up largely of phonological and grammatical items. The assumption was that such test questions would yield answers related to the child's ability to participate in the
classroom in one language better than the other. It is not my purpose here to catalog all the absurdities of this procedure, but it should be stated that it is not likely that any test of isolated grammatical or phonological items can adequately reveal a child's potential for effective participation in the classroom.

It is not unusual for the general public to take action, even to legislate, without full understanding of the technical issues involved. Recently, the Office of Civil Rights supported research on the extent to which social services are denied to, overlooked by, or misunderstood by the Spanish community in New York (Mendoza v. New York). The idea was excellent and the researchers were carefully selected. The potential usefulness of the project was damaged severely, however, by the OCR's imposition of an unrealistic time frame which caused the researchers to take short cuts, severely reducing the usefulness of their work. Newspaper editorial writers are prime examples of this sort of myopia about what can be measured about learning. The current fad for minimal competency testing is supported by most educational laypersons, including editors, despite the candid admissions by HEW, by the National Consortium on Testing, by the National Academy of Testing, and by the National Academy of Education that we do not really know how to do it. 'Sure you do', the lay experts seem to say, 'just try harder'.

Legislation regarding bilingual education, like legislation concerning all educational issues, has overlooked variability in language. Languages are assumed to be discrete, with sharp edges distinguishing themselves from each other. It is assumed that one can isolate language ability in discrete-point, group administered, paper and pencil tests. It is assumed that research in bilingualism has distinguished the most important aspects of language use from the less important ones and that we have developed a hierarchy of such indications of competence. Legislation assumes that nonexperts in language who know how to measure other things are also competent to measure language. And, perhaps most frightening of all, legislation assumes that the field of bilingual education has the technology, staff, finances, curriculum, theory, and capability for individualization to carry out such programs once they are mandated.

One might question our educational technology and knowledge base in all these areas but one must certainly question our current knowledge base with regard to language variability. For example, we do not know at what age or under what circumstances a mother tongue can resist being wiped out by a second language. If we want to maintain mother tongue ability, we need to know more about this. Legislation assumes that we know. Ralph Fasold's recent analysis of the research on the use of vernacular languages in education clearly demonstrates the weakness of the research bases upon which legislation might act even if such research were noticed or used. He examined the 26 available studies which compared the native language and
direct method approaches over the past two decades or so. Fasold's rather depressing conclusion is that the educational value of the two approaches seems still to be in doubt. Legislation probably could not have benefited directly very much from the research bases which Fasold describes, but legislatures could have been better enlightened about what is known and what is not before specific actions were taken.

Language variability and educational placement. As a result of bilingual education legislation, school systems were faced with the practical problem of sorting out those who 'need' bilingual education from among those who do not. One director of research in a large urban school system told me that he did not care to learn anything about the child's language ability. In other words, he wanted (and ultimately developed) a purely administrative test, not a diagnostic one. It resulted in identifying a set of children who were sent to bilingual classes (without individual diagnosis of strengths or weaknesses) and another set of children who were not.

In their haste to implement bilingual education legislation and mandates, schools often confuse administrative tests of this sort with genuine diagnostic, prescriptive, and individualistic measurement. The so-called language dominance tests are often used as administrative tests to determine, as quickly and efficiently as possible, which language should be used to instruct children. If they appear to be dominant in English, they are sent to the regular monolingual classroom. If it is determined that they are dominant in some other language, they are placed in the appropriate bilingual program. The major thrust of the dominance test, then, is administrative. Through a series of questions, an administrative but not a diagnostic decision is made. The children are placed but not analyzed. No attention is given to the variability of language use but, worse yet, no clear understanding exists even as to what it might mean to be dominant in a language.

The notion of dominance, in fact, assumes a nonvariable, constant environment and set of circumstances for measurement which is directly contrary to all we have learned about language variation. In order to assess language dominance accurately, one would have to assess comparative language abilities in a vast number of contexts, perhaps as many as there are potential contexts to measure, so as to avoid the possibility that any point-in-time assessment turned out to be uncharacteristic. If one would happen to measure my own language dominance in Belgium for example, one would probably have to conclude, quite mistakenly, that it was French.

To determine dominance, one must specify in detail where, under what circumstances, and to what extent the language is used, all in relationship to other possible contexts. Are children dominant in Spanish in their home? at school? on the playground? with their grandparents? By what criteria,
quantitative or qualitative, can one such context be said to be more important than another? It is not to our credit that we tolerate the imprecise uses of terms such as 'dominance' or 'fluency'. Both seem to have only a quantitative dimension. The concept of dominance has the added handicap, however, of contextual isolation.

In the case of the Aspira Consent Decree, it did not occur to the school system that to determine effective participation in the classroom one might observe the languages in use in the classroom, to define what 'effective participation' really means and to seek out subjective judgments of such effectiveness on the part of teachers or even peers. Instead, they found some surface level measurements of language ability, measured them, and pretended that they were important. What the legislation called for was a clear statement of what really mattered in terms of effective language functioning in the classroom. It was unfortunate that the field did not know how to measure this. It is even more unfortunate that we have still never assessed it.

If the schools had only stopped to consider the matter, they might have concluded that it is far more important, for example, to be able to seek clarification than to produce appropriate sounding vowels or grammar. Empirical evidence is clear that one can go so far as to become Secretary of State in this country without producing American-sounding English speech. On the other hand, if one cannot use language to clarify, to promise, to assert, to request, to command, to refuse, to get invited, to open, to close, to continue, to interrupt, etc., one may not get very far at all.

The major point of this discussion is that any measurement of bilingual competence must not focus on language form alone. To measure phonology and grammar to determine language ability is like measuring the strength of individual muscles to assess walking skills. To be sure, individual muscle strength is necessary, but by segmenting it as an indicator of walking ability we have not only distorted the task but have also distorted the measurement. Many language assessments, like other discrete point tests, can be said to measure some of the language skills (particularly the onset skills) which a child has only if we are willing to assume that the skill of language can be isolated and shrunk into small components for the purposes of assessment. One problem of such tests is in how to select representative items. In any language test, a severe problem arises when language is measured outside of its naturally occurring context. Language is always used in a specific situation, at a specific time, with different participants, for different purposes. This principle of the realistic context of language use is a significant contribution of variability studies to bilingual education. It has not yet been used optimally, but the potential is there.

Language variability and language achievement. The same basic issues which connect language variability to bilingual
legislation and educational placement obtain also for language achievement. Language is spoken in a number of contexts, for a number of purposes, with a number of attitudes, with all aspects of the three layers of individual control noted at the outset of this paper. Unfortunately, however, much of what a child learns is negated by classroom expectations of a far different sort. America has not learned this lesson yet even among its English monolinguals and it is, perhaps, too much to expect our education systems to take an even more sophisticated position with its bilinguals.

However shocking it may seem to say so, however, I would like to assert that it may be in the learner's best interests not to learn to speak the target language like a native. To speak the language natively implies a knowledge base which is native; an understanding of politics equivalent to that of a native and a native-like sense of the culture. To speak at a level better than one's cultural or political sensitivity is to invite difficulty. It might be better, perhaps, to maintain a trace of accent, grammatical inaccuracy, or lexical foreignism.

We little understand the underlying motivations for the three levels of language control noted at the beginning of this paper. Researchers in language variation have managed to describe and analyze some of the linguistic features related to language variability as it intersects with race, socioeconomic status, region, age, occupation, and sex. But we have worked largely with clear cases and have avoided more fluid ones. The extremes are always easier to document, as seen by the insistence on lifetime residency for candidacy as a linguistic atlas informant. We know little about the changes over time from Southern to Northern speech in a given individual. We think we know a little bit more about the linguistic aspects of a change from lower to upper socioeconomic status. We have little if any evidence of what happens to a given individual's speech over a lifetime. In fact, we know nothing much about the acquisition of native language ability beyond the age of ten.

These and many other unanswered research questions suggest that a good bit of the blame for the lack of awareness of language variation in bilingual programs should be placed on the sociolinguists themselves. For example, what have we been able to tell the schools about the effect of masculinity identity on the oral reading of young male readers? Is the perception of male reading slowness at least partly related to some boys' unwillingness to read with expression on the grounds that such behavior is sissy? If boys wish to maintain (or insert) traces of masculine identity in their speech, is it not reasonable to expect Southerners to maintain (or insert) such traces in their speech even though they live in the North? Is it not even more reasonable to expect immigrants to maintain (or insert) traces of their native language in their production of their second language? It behooves us to find answers to how this process works if we are to assess language ability with any sense of completeness.
and appropriateness. The study of language variability has hardly begun to take place in this vast area of inquiry.

One might argue that for purposes which are more nationalistic or patriotic, nonnatives might choose to maintain the linguistic labelling of their homeland, if not by using their native language, then at least by speaking English with a clearly recognizable indication of their nonnative status. Language attitudes are clearly within the domain of the study of language variation and this important aspect of bilingual education has yet to be fully explored. Much of language learning assessment treats only the surface aspects of language. One of the more difficult areas to measure involves one's attitude toward the languages one speaks. The range of variability, under such circumstances, may take a number of shapes. Perhaps only certain phonological features are adequate to maintain one's desired identity as a native French speaker. If so, we need to know which ones and to adjust our programs accordingly.

One of the more heinous difficulties in judging ability in the subject areas which make up a school curriculum, whether in a bilingual setting or not, is the confusion of language ability with subject matter knowledge. Every applied sociolinguist has his favorite horror stories to illustrate this point. I can vividly recall the Virginia teacher who, upon hearing the tape-recorded conversation of a working-class speaker, concluded that the man was illiterate despite the total lack of evidence involving reading ability on that tape. More recently, I had the opportunity to consult on a project in which physicians trained in foreign countries were given a supplementary program in the United States as preparation for the examination enabling them to be certified to practice medicine in this country. In response to my question, 'What do you want to find out from this examination?' the medical authorities responded, 'How competent these people are in medicine'. 'Why, then', I asked, 'do you give the examination in English?' If ever there was a confusion in subject matter competence with language ability, it was here. It is not surprising that the schools consider a child of working-class parents stupid because of his non-Standard English when this very confusion obtains all the way through post-graduate medical school.

It has been clearly documented that children who use mainstream English in the schools suffer in how they are assessed in reading, math, science, and social studies in even monolingual settings. How much greater must be the handicap for the non-native English child. How much more must the bilingual program be adjusted to understand the many kinds of language variation which such programs are bound to encounter.

Language variability and research. The general drift of this paper should, by now, be quite clear. We need a much broader and deeper research base for bilingual education than is now available. To date, research in bilingual education has been
considered more an education issue than a linguistic one. The
tendency of the research has been to compare one methodology
with another or one curriculum with another. However, we
have now reached a period in the development of the field when
people are demanding evidence of success or failure in bilingual
education. One substantial reason for the failure of the AIR
evaluation of Title VII programs is that it did not understand
the basic principles of variability stressed here. It is diffi-
cult to put faith in any assessment of the effectiveness of bi-
lingual education which does not distinguish between acceptable
and unacceptable variation, and which does not address lan-
guage variability as it manifests itself in the dimensions of
social, regional, age, sex, race, education, occupation, inten-
tion, genre, topic, etc. It is also growing increasingly diffi-
cult to accept the discrete-point criteria used over and over
again as evidence for language ability in either language.

Recent research in linguistics has focused more and more on
the importance of core syntactic, semantic, and pragmatic pro-
cesses, and less and less on the isolable phonological, morpho-
logical, and lexical items. It was focused on the holistic more
than on the segmental skills. Bilingual education programs need
to focus more on this holistic view and more on the sort of
variability involved in asking questions, making requests, seek-
ing clarification, taking a conversational turn, and reporting
what others have said, for example, than on pronunciation
accuracy or inflectional perfection. This direction is not merely
a tag-on to existing programs; it is the starting point for lan-
guage learning.

Any effective research into the variability of language in bi-
lingual education programs will need to have, at its base, an
adequate linguistic theory of language learning. Whether by
accident or by design, there is, at the core of bilingual educa-
tion, a satisfying theory of language learning. From research
on first or native language learning we know that infants com-
municate ideas first, then later they perfect their phonology,
lexicon, and grammar. Traditional language programs have
second language learners reverse this process, getting the
phonology, lexicon, and grammar first and hoping, later, for
the development of language use. When subject matter is taught
in a second language, the focus gets put right back on the idea
or subject again, just as it is for infants. The resulting learner
variability is, in comparison to that of a mature speaker, great,
just as it is for infants. But the process is sophisticated and
thousands of years of experience have shown it to be the
superior method. Thus, bilingual education, for this very
reason, has at its disposal an adequate language learning
theory: a deep-to-surface structure sequence which has been
proven successful by millions of infants as they learn their
native tongues. Such a theory contrasts sharply with the
surface-to-deep structure sequence found in most second lan-
guage classrooms.
With the advantage of this deep-to-surface theory, bilingual education research could easily capitalize on the advances made recently by other first language learning research. We know, for example, that pronominalization is learned early and easily by children whereas preposed adverbials are learned rather late. Nancy Yanofsky has recently shown, however, that reading instruction does not take advantage of this knowledge. A number of texts analyzed in her research show that preposed adverbs are frequent in beginning reading instruction, while pronouns are introduced rather slowly.

The areas for research into language variation and bilingualism are many. Careful descriptions of the production of such variability need to be made in order to determine how the speakers actually talk. Likewise, sociolinguistic attitude studies need to be made to determine community values toward the various language varieties used in school programs. We desperately need some clarity in the area of language assessment, particularly as it reflects a learner's sequential progress in a number of school and nonschool settings. We need a dose of realism in the development of curricula in language teaching as well, with a focus on the contributions which linguistics can make in bringing about a radical restructuring of language learning classrooms by focusing on core syntactic, semantic, and pragmatic units of language rather than the minute, phonological, morphological, and lexical aspects.

Conclusion. In bilingual education programs, language variability will need to be displayed as a resource rather than as a handicap. Educators, monolingual or bilingual, have been slow to grasp this principle. Journalists seem to accept it, at least partially, when they argue that a good writer must write one way for one audience and a different way for another. Poets have also seen the principle or they would never be able to vary, to twist, or to torture language in a poetic fashion. The openness of poets to this principle is rather apparent in a poem by Ogden Nash who wrote, a few years ago:

There are countries where being multilingual is of no advantage to the tourist,
Because no matter how impeccable his grammar and idiom the natives refuse to understand him unless his accent and inflection are that of the purist
They tell of an American diplomat who lost his suavity never to be restored
When a Paris taxi driver denied the very existence of his destination because he pronounced it Place de la Con-corde instead of Place de la Con-corde.
(At this point I must for the justly maligned Manhattan hackers interpolate a kindly word;
None of them to my knowledge has ever rebuffed a Parisian asking to be taken to the corner of Sird Avenue and Sirty-sird.)

Copyright © 1971 by Ogden Nash. From The Old Dog Barks Backwards by Ogden Nash, by permission of Little, Brown and Company.

Whether or not Nash is right about the contrastive attitudes of the Americans and French concerning language variability, he has captured a small part of the essence of what we need to know about bilingualism and language variety. There is a great deal more.

NOTES

1. For an excellent reversal of this procedure, see Ralph W. Fasold's 'Sociolinguistics: Contributions to Bilingual Education,' unpublished paper presented at the LSA/NIE session of the LSA winter meeting, San Francisco, 1975.

2. R. Shuy, 'On the Relevance of Recent Developments in Sociolinguistics to the Study of Language Learning and and Early Education,' unpublished paper presented at the Early Childhood Education Conferences, Ohio State University, 1976.

3. For an example of this lay expert opinion, see the editorial, 'Competency Testing,' Washington Star, March 5, 1978.

4. R. Fasold, op. cit.

5. The word 'need' is used deliberately here to indicate the overwhelming but naive assumption held by most school systems that bilingual education is compensatory in nature.

6. For an excellent discussion of the various imprecise uses of the concept of fluency, see Kari Sajavaara and Jaako Lehtonen, Spoken Language and the Concept of Fluency (in press), Language Centre News (University of Jyvaskyla, Finland).

7. It must be noted, however, that there are many other reasons to criticize this evaluation, some of which have to do with design and instrumentation, regardless of language unsophistication.

1. The principles of equality and self-determination that provide the rationale for the development of new nations and communities in contemporary times have led to the recognition that situations where creole and standard languages coexist have to be regarded as situations requiring bilingual approaches to education. Among such situations, those where the standard language is also one of the base languages of the creole and where a continuum of language variation between creole and standard has developed constitute a special subtype. The clearest examples of the latter are perhaps the West Indies and Hawaii. The sociolinguistic factors relevant to this subtype of bilingual educational situation, with particular reference to the West Indies, have been discussed in Craig (1971) and (1976).

In the latter discussions, it is shown that the presence of a language continuum makes the educational situation in the English-speaking West Indies virtually a bidialectal one, and that, relevant to educational problems, it bears some resemblance to the social dialect situations that are the objects of concern in, for example, Stewart (1964), Shuy (1964), Baratz and Shuy (1969), Labov (1969), Wolfram (1970), and Fasold and Shuy (1970), although social conditions are different from those in North America, especially in territories where there are strong survivals of basilect creoles.

In the West Indian territories referred to, there is a growing recognition that the requirements of a quasidialectal education include much more than merely teaching the standard dialect without inhibiting the child's home language. To be taken into consideration, for example, are the educational implications of
the relationship between language and the subcultural identifications that go along with social stratification; and there are also the psycholinguistic questions that arise in relation to differences in the communicative and cognitive strategies of differently acculturated speakers in this particular societal context (Craig 1974).

An intractable problem of standard-language teaching in the West Indian situations referred to is the persistence of the interlanguage between creole and standard that is now generally known as mesolect (Bickerton 1973; Rickford 1974). The creole-speaking learner of the standard tends to achieve a competence in the mesolect and then seems to find an increased difficulty in moving from that point in the continuum to an achievement of competence in the standard. Correspondingly, the average, originally mesolectal speaker seems to find it more difficult to achieve competence in Standard English than the average creole speaker finds it to achieve competence in the mesolect. A partial explanation of this observation might be sought in factors that have to do with motivation and the linguistic perceptions of learners: mesolectal speakers probably find it more difficult to perceive differences between their speech and Standard English; consequently they possess a weak motivation to change their speech, and this could result in the arrest of learning; creole speakers, on the other hand, might find it easier to perceive differences between their speech and Standard English and this might, under appropriate conditions, strengthen a motivation to change and facilitate learning up to a mesolectal level.

But the latter explanation fails to account for the fact that, in common experience all over the West Indies, it is mesolectal speakers who are most active in seeking upward social mobility through education, who seem to be most strongly motivated to achieve competence in Standard English, and who display the most frustration in the context of high failure rates in English-language examinations at all levels of the school system. Clearly, the mesolectal speaker is in a position of special difficulty when it comes to moving further towards Standard English from his point on the language continuum; and the difficulty cannot be explained in terms of reduced interlingual perceptions and motivation to learn.

Support for the latter conclusion comes from similar observations relevant to standard-language education in nonstandard speech areas in the United States. Kochman (1969), for example, points out that the 'efficiency quotient' (input vs. output) of programs designed to teach standard dialect to nonstandard speakers is extremely low. The programs referred to tend to achieve very little in two respects; firstly, only a disappointingly small proportion of learners acquire the socially preferred forms that should (within the aims of the programs) replace nonstandard forms; and secondly, vis-a-vis language performance, the programs do not develop the ability to use
language in the second dialect beyond what the child is already capable of doing in his native dialect. The nonstandard dialects here referred to are similar to West Indian mesolectal speech in respect of their structural relationship to English; indeed, they appear to have originated in the same way as the mesolect through a process of decreolisation, as suggested, for example, in Stewart (1962, 1967, 1968). It is here proposed that a common difficulty in moving from mesolect to standard is being experienced in both types of language community.

In Craig (1976), while accepting that factors relating to motivation and to interlingual perceptions—first discussed in Craig (1971)—do seem to be partly responsible for the language-learning problem just outlined, I pointed out: 'The question ... needs to be studied whether the very nature of bidialectal situations does not produce strictly linguistic and nonattitudinal factors that have some additional bearing on the poor results of language teaching'. In the present paper, I come to the point of considering what these strictly linguistic factors might be like.

A possible explanation of the language-learning problem referred to seems to lie in the nature of the structural relationship between mesolect and creole, on the one hand, and between mesolect and standard, on the other.

This two-way relationship with the mesolect as the centre is generally obscured, and has not so far received any attention because utterances that qualify to be regarded as mesolectal do so in two ways. First, they may qualify by containing a mixture of creole and standard features that would not occur simultaneously in either creole or standard.

For example, the sentences in (1) (Rickford 1974:94), taken in each case as a whole, are mesolectal although, with the exception of e, all the features underlined in them are basilect creole features.

(1) She must be da hunt husban.

\[\text{a}\]

'She must be hunting for a husband.'

I done de de

\[\text{b} \quad \text{c} \quad \text{d}\]

'I am already there.'

I ain't know se y'all bin gone

\[\text{e} \quad \text{f} \quad \text{g}\]

'I didn't know that you all had gone.'

However, sentences may qualify to be regarded as mesolectal, second, by virtue of their containing features that are absent from both basilect creole and the standard language as in (2) (Rickford 1974:100), where the underlined features, except probably b, are peculiar to the mesolect.
(2) But I doz go to see people when they sick.

a 'But I usually go to see people when they're sick.'

b He doz be up and cut wood sometimes ...

c 'He generally gets up and cuts wood sometimes ...'

Rickford (ibid.) demonstrates the necessity for the latter type of feature to be studied in its own right, and he goes further to conclude that the particular mesolectal item in the last mentioned examples: doz

... whether borrowed from Irish English, or early Modern English, clearly represents a form of calquing on a grammatical semantic category that existed previously. It adds to a growing store of knowledge that calquing--both lexical and grammatical--plays an important role in all the major transition periods of a creole's life history ...

It would seem that the preceding conclusion relative to doz is correct not only for that item, but that it can be generalized to provide a surprisingly obvious explanation, as will be shown subsequently, for such mesolectal features as are peculiar to the mesolect. If this is the case, then on the way towards seeking a complete explanation of the language-learning problem earlier referred to, one should seek to account for the following:

(3a) The early replacement of some basilect creole features by standard-language ones.

(3b) The persistence of peculiarly mesolectal features that tend to fossilize in nonstandard speakers.

(3c) The persistence of some basilect creole features in the mesolect.

The rest of this paper first examines the suggestion relative to mesolectal calquing and the issues stated in (3), and then considers some implications for standard-language learning and teaching in relevant situations.

2. The most conclusive evidence that is possible concerning the nature of peculiarly mesolectal items lies in the analysis of how mesolectal utterances or relevant portions of such utterances compare in semantactic structure (SS) with the corresponding structure of the creole and standard-language equivalents. Such an analysis of a representative set of items is shown in (4).

It has been remarked before this--as, for example, in Bickerton (1971)--that the English-language 'mistakes' of creole-influenced speakers of English, even when they are not
exactly creole in morphology, can be shown to be derived directly from the structure of creole; but reasons for the phenomena stated in (3) and the related suggestion relative to mesolectal calquing are yet to be looked at systematically. First of all, using the examples in (4) to begin with, we may look at the mesolectal utterances for complete standard-language replacements of creole items. Wherever replacements occur, it may be noted that they are of the kinds shown in (4).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(4)</th>
<th>Creole</th>
<th>Mesolect</th>
<th>Standard</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i. Item</td>
<td>/...ni-mi buk/(JC)</td>
<td>/...mi buk/</td>
<td>'... my book'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS</td>
<td>Particle to indicate possession.</td>
<td>No particle. Word-order only.</td>
<td>Inflection of first NP.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii. Item</td>
<td>/a (ni-mi buk)/(JC)</td>
<td>/iz (mi buk)/</td>
<td>'It's (my book)!'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS</td>
<td>Front-shifting of verb-particle to achieve focus on an NP.</td>
<td>Same as creole with relexification of verb particle</td>
<td>Impersonal pronoun 'it' + copula.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii. Item</td>
<td>/a kot yu kot i/</td>
<td>/iz kot yu kot it/</td>
<td>'What you have done is cut it.'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS</td>
<td>Same as (ii) with verb front shifted and reduplicated as well as to achieve focus on verb.</td>
<td>Same as creole.</td>
<td>Split sentence construction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv. Item</td>
<td>/mi bin.../(GC)</td>
<td>(a) /a(i) bin.../</td>
<td>'I went...'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS</td>
<td>Invariant pronoun + substantive-verb -/bin/</td>
<td>(b) /a(i) did go.../</td>
<td>First person, nominative case of pronoun with verb inflected to show PAST.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) Same as creole except for subject form of pronoun and anglicized phonology of /bin/.</td>
<td>Pronoun + PAST + Relexified verb + CONTINUATIVE 'ing'.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Relexification of /bin/ by English 'go' but with introduction of the creole particle for PAST.</td>
<td>Pronoun + PAST + Relexified verb + CONTINUATIVE 'ing'.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v. Item</td>
<td>/we bin duh nyam.../</td>
<td>'we was eatin...'</td>
<td>Pronoun + TENSE - present + Verb-with-Continuative inflection.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Stewart 1968; Rickford 1974)</td>
<td>Pronoun + PAST + CONTINUATIVE + Verbs.</td>
<td>Pronoun + PAST + Relexified verb + CONTINUATIVE 'ing'.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS</td>
<td>Pronoun + CREOLE-CONTINUATIVE + Substantive verb.</td>
<td>'I am eating'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vi. Item</td>
<td>/I stay eat/</td>
<td>/I stay eating/</td>
<td>Pronoun + TENSE - present + Verb-with-Continuative inflection.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Tzuzaki 1971)</td>
<td>/I stay eating/</td>
<td>Pronoun + CREOLE-CONTINUATIVE + Verb-with-continuative-inflection.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vii. Item</td>
<td>/mi na (en) gat non/(JC)</td>
<td>/a neva get non/</td>
<td>'I haven't got any'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Stewart 1968)</td>
<td>/a neva get non/</td>
<td>Pronoun + TENSE - past + NEG + Substantive-verb + Indefinite-indeterminate-pronoun.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS</td>
<td>Pronoun + NE2 (+PAST) + Substantive-verb + Indefinite-negative-pronoun</td>
<td>Pronoun + NE2 + Substantive-verb + Indefinite-negative - pronoun</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>viii. Item</td>
<td>/a we i de?/</td>
<td>/wier i iz?/</td>
<td>'Where is he?!'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS</td>
<td>Question indicated by intonation.</td>
<td>Same as creole.</td>
<td>Question indicated by intonation as well as reversal of S-V order.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(5a) Phonological change in the direction of Standard English, e.g.
gat → got/get (4vii)
we → wier/weer (4viii)
bin → biin* (4viii)
i → it (4iv)
*(Through the influence of written English, though semantically this is still not standard)

(5b) Relexification that does not involve syntactic change, e.g.
nyam → 'eat' (4v)

(5c) Some differentiation in pronominal morphology with the exclusion of the possessive, e.g.
mi → 'I/me' (4iv)

But note also:
mi = 'my' (4i)

Further examples, apart from these, of such early replacement of creole features by completely standard ones are, of course, numerous within the language community: replacement of creole low, back /a/ by some higher vowel in items such as /gaan/ 'gone', /mada/ 'mother', and so on; relexifications such as /juk/ 'stick' (verb), /lik/ 'hit', and so on; and pronominal differentiation such as he/she, him/her, they/them, where there was no differentiation before. It is to be noted, however, and it will be referred to subsequently, that these types of early, mesolectal changes in the direction of Standard English are of little transformational depth. The most considerable change in terms of such depth is in pronouns, but it is very significant that it is the possessive form (in pronouns as well as in nouns) which, in theory, is more complex than the others, which tends to remain invariant as in creole.

Next, we may examine in (4) those features that appear to be peculiarly mesolectal and that do not belong to either basilect creole or standard language. Included in this set are features that involve the transference of a creole semantactic strategy to utterances that would otherwise be Standard English. The features in the whole set are of the following types.

(6a) Zero replacement of a creole item, e.g.
fi → ø (4i)
stay → ø (4vi)

(6b) Calquing of a creole item by an item used differently in Standard English, e.g.
a → iz (4ii; 4iii)
de → iz (4viii)
ma → neva
   duon
   in  (4vii)
φ-PAST → di(d)  (4iv)
bin duh → invariant  (4v)
'was'

(6c) Persistence of a creole semantactic strategy with
Standard-English lexis, e.g.
   Fronting of verb-particle to show focus on a
   following NP  (4ii)
   Fronting of verb-particle + substantive-verb
   and reduplication of the verb to show focus
   on a VP  (4iii)
   Double negation  (4vii)
   Invariant word order for statement and
   question  (4viii)

Again, it is understood that further examples of the same types
will not be difficult to find within the language community.
What is significant about these types of item is that, in nature,
they derive from virtually the same process as that noted at
(5b): relexification without syntactic change.

It seems clear, then, that changes in the direction of Stand-
ard English that appear in the mesolect are predominantly
either phonological or, like Rickford's doz, are direct lexifica-
tions of grammatical semantic elements that are explicit in
creole. This explains the phenomena referred to in (3a) and
(3b). By implication, this explains (3c) as well, since it
can be expected that creole items within the competence of any
speaker that cannot be phonologically modified or cannot be re-
exified will persist as creole. The nature of such items will
be more fully discussed subsequently.

It is now possible to see, therefore, why creole-speaking
learners of Standard English find it relatively easy to move to
a mesolectal level, but thereafter find it increasingly difficult
to move beyond that; and why nonstandard speakers who are
already at the equivalent of a mesolectal level tend to remain
there without significant change. The reasons are as follows.
Up to the mesolectal level, the semantactic processes and
strategies being performed by the learner are exactly the same
as or closely like those that are habitual in creole, so diffi-
culties of creole-speaking learners of the standard, like those
of the nonstandard speakers generally, are minimal. After
this stage, however, a new order of difficulty begins to be
experienced; and it is the nature of this order of difficulty
that now merits discussion.

3. If we accept that concepts are events which, somehow or
other, occur in the human mind, and that language is a means
of labelling concepts (see, for example, Chafe 1970:17), then
the question at issue is: how do the labelling processes of creole or mesolect differ from those of standard language, as we must assume they do in view of the learning difficulty just discussed?

This question and the assumptions relevant to it assume in turn that there are 'universals of cognitive structure and process that underlie all human language ability and language use' (Kay and Sankoff 1974:62). But such universals, precisely because they concern conceptual structure or conceptual knowledge itself, and not just how the elements within that structure or knowledge are labelled in language, cannot be sought as universals of language in the way Kay and Sankoff (ibid.) suggested. Bickerton's (1977) criticism of the latter, therefore, seems correct in this respect although, by subsequently suggesting that 'the human faculté de language ... must ... contain some kind of analog for the instructions "if your input language has no nonpunctual aspect marker, employ a locative expression preverbally ..."', and so on, Bickerton (1977:64) is, in fact, committing the same error he criticised, of assuming the universals of underlying structure to be far less abstract than they can possibly be.

The nature of underlying conceptual or cognitive structure or of conceptual knowledge, however, is, to begin with, an epistemological question; how elements within such structure or knowledge are labelled is, on the other hand, a linguistic question; and an investigation of one type of question entails an investigation of the other. Enquiry into the two areas of epistemology and linguistic theory has never been adequately synthesized, and this is a task far beyond the scope of the present paper; but an indication of their relevance to the questions that have been raised seems very necessary. Some discussion that relates such enquiry to the description of the competence of speakers in a creole-language continuum is to be found in Craig (1975), and the kind of grammar that such an enquiry justifies is outlined in Craig (1978).

What is important for the present is to consider how the two main assumptions accepted in the first two paragraphs of this section of the paper might elucidate the question posed in the first paragraph. The two assumptions may be restated as follows:

(7a) The structure of conceptual knowledge is the same for all human beings.

(7b) Language is a means of labelling concepts.

If these two assumptions are correct, then the conceptual and linguistic knowledge of speakers in relation to any meaningful segment of any language are related and have a general structure as diagrammed in (8).

What is suggested in (8) is that, when concepts occur in the mind, they may possibly be given direct one-to-one labels in
terms of lexis and syntax simultaneously. This would then be
the first level of language; and it is theorized that if an output
of sentences is made at this level, that output would have the
simplest possible syntactic structure and lexis. After Level-1,
transformational processes involving the movement, deletion,
and grouping of already theoretically existing labels and the
relabelling (lexicalization) of the grouped meanings may be
successively applied on the linguistic string, and this produces
increasingly more complex levels of lexis and syntax from
Level-2 to a possible Level-n. An actual linguistic output
could be made by a speaker at any level, depending on the conven-
tions of his particular language and his individual conditioning
in terms of the use of that language, but at each succeeding
level the meanings expressed would be identical with those
originally existing at Level-1.

The preceding notion of the grammatical results of the rela-
tionship between conceptual knowledge and language ought,
logically, to have been the central theme of the type of enquiry
termed 'generative semantics', following as it did on the pioneer-
ing work of Chomsky (1957, 1965). However, that type of en-
quiry, despite its many insights as exemplified in Lakoff (1971),
McCawley (1968), Bach (1968), and Postal (1970) has failed to
provide an explanation of language, precisely because it has ig-
ored the link between epistemology and linguistic theory and
concentrated instead on a theorized link with logic. These
issues are further treated in Craig (1978).

If the preceding theoretical orientation is correct, even with-
out its further elaboration at this time, we are in a position to
understand the nature of the difference between creole or meso-
lectal language and standard language. All investigators agree
on the lexical and syntactic simplicity of the former as compared
with the latter. In the light of the theory just proposed, this
simplicity stems from the fact that creole is a linguistic output
made at an earlier level (i.e. in terms of the hypotheses in
(8)) than standard language characteristically is. Conceptually
or cognitively and semantically, however, the two types of lan-
guage have the same base preceding and at Level-1.

We may note at this point that two common unclarities found
in recent opinions about simplification in language can be dis-
pelled by the preceding notions. The first has to do with
theories of linguistic and cognitive deficit in speakers of non-
standard languages, pidgins and creoles, or lower social class
speakers generally. Labov (1969) has settled the question in
one way, but within the notions here proposed it is clear that
the cognitive-conceptual base of the mentioned types of speakers
has to be regarded as the same as that of any other types of
speakers; suggestions such as those in the early work of Bern-
stein (e.g. 1961a, 1961b, 1961c) are therefore seen to have no
foundation in theory, even without empirical contradictions
such as those indicated in Craig (1974).
Conceptual events in the mind:

Level-1 Language: Possible labels (lexical and syntactic) that represent the immediate conceptual knowledge of speakers.

Level-2 Language: Possible derived labels expressing the same meaning as in Level 1.

Level-3 Language: Possible further derived labels expressing the same meanings as in Levels 1 and 2.

Level-n Language: Possible n-times derived labels expressing the same meanings as in Levels 1 - n-1.

The second unclarity that can be dispelled at this point has to do with the vague suggestions often made in recent times about a human language facility, a universal base language, and so on, as if these things exist independently of any specific language. What the notions in this paper unequivocally propose is that the latter references all have to do with something that is a necessary part of every individual language; what the references in fact designate is nothing more or less than the base grammar of every language, and that base grammar is the same for all languages.

After Level-1 (as in (8), once again), not only would all languages successively increase in grammatical and lexical complexity, but each language could possibly adopt sets of intermediate-level grammatical alternatives, with resulting surface consequences that could be peculiar to itself; this would account for grammatical diversity as well as similarity between languages.

In these terms, the nature of the differences between creole or mesolect and standard language, and consequently, the nature of the difficulty of the creole or mesolectal learner of the standard, may be summarized as follows.
(9) i. Choice of different grammatical alternatives in the two language systems after Level-1.

ii. Choice of an earlier level (whichever this might be) for a linguistic output in creole or mesolect than for one in standard language.

iii. Consequent upon (ii), continuation of the following procedures after the output level of creole or mesolect has been reached:
   a. Making of new segmentations in any given string of meanings, if higher-level labels for those segmentations exist in the lexicon.
   b. In effecting (a), conservation of existing syntactic relationships and of the speaker's intentions of focussing on specific meanings in the existing string of meanings.
   c. Relabelling with new lexis (lexicalization) of the segmentations identified at (a).
   d. Simultaneously with (c), insertion of syntactic markers and focussing conventions consistent with (b).

It might be noted, in passing, although the argument cannot be developed here, that if creole or mesolect as well as standard language could have been conceived of as characteristically achieving a linguistic output at the same level in terms of (8), then a different analysis would be necessary in (9) after (9i); the situation then would be the same as would have to be assumed for two standard or long evolved languages with outputs at the same levels of labelling.

Some empirical characteristics of creole and standard that support the analysis in (9) and the conclusions that precede it can easily be perceived; and these characteristics are the source of the standard-language-learning difficulty of creole or mesolectal speakers. The categorization of these characteristics in terms of the analysis at (9) has the advantage of indicating the relationship between their grammatical status and the underlying cognitive structure of language. Discussion of the characteristics thus categorized follows.

The difference in choices referred to in (9i) as following after Level-1 can be seen in the grammatical alternatives shown in (10). This list consists of all the categories of items which Bickerton (1974) identifies as universals of early-creolized creoles. Within the theoretical notions here advanced, the question as to whether these similarities derive from the closeness of creoles to the universal conceptual base of language would be settled conclusively by a description of what has here been referred to as Level-1. Such a description, as pointed out already, is beyond our present purposes, but grammatical similarities between creoles strengthen the probability that the stated theoretical notions are right. We could add to the similarities already stated some other ones such as
(10) Creole choice | Standard choice
---|---
i. 'Generic' categorization indicated in nouns by: | 0 - article, e.g. /daag baak/ | Pluralization, e.g. /'dogs bark/
ii. Tense and aspect indicated in verbs by: | Preverbal invariant particles, e.g. (4v) | Inflection of the main verb and variant auxiliary verbs, e.g. (4v)
iii. Focussing of either NP or VP indicated by: | Front shifting (with VP reduplication in the case of VP focussing), e.g. (4ii) and (4iii) | Predication after impersonal 'it + be' or split-sentence construction, e.g. (4ii) and (4iii)
iv. Statement of attribute, location, existence by: | Copula differentiation, e.g. /im de outsaid/ */im a outsaid/ /im outsaid/ /im a man/ */im de man/ | Use of 'be' in all cases /'he is outside' /'he is a man"
v. Negation by: | Multiple marking, e.g. (4vii) | Single marking, e.g. (4vii)

invariant word order for statement and question and the use of particles as a labelling device where standard language tends to use inflections.

The next set of empirical characteristics that support the analysis in (9) are relevant to the notions in (9ii) and (9iii)

(11) i. In order to realize (9iiia) and (9iiic), the production of a 'higher order' type of lexis that includes derived nominals generally, and abstract nominals and adjectives that characteristically carry a +human restriction, such as sincere/sincerity, trustworthy/trustworthiness, idlesome, careful, suspicious ... and so on.

ii. In order to realize (9iiib) and (9iid), relatively high usage of devices such as inflection purely to show syntactic and semantic relationships between lexical items that are already labelled as semantic entities, e.g. the inflection of a verb to show 'plural' in agreement with a plural NP, and the '-ing' suffix of a verb to show continuing, although that element is already labelled by the concatenation of 'be' and the verb.

iii. Because of (i) and also because (ii) makes it feasible, the use of longer rather than shorter sentences with a relatively higher proportion of phrasally complex sentences.
These empirical consequences become evident in the further comparison of creole and standard. As characteristics, they are absent from creole, since creole is lexicalised at a level where they are unnecessary, but they are present in standard language. Those referred to in (11ii) can clearly be seen in standard language equivalents of creole utterances such as those given in (4). Those referred to in (11i) can be seen when it becomes obligatory in translations of creole utterances to use standard language lexis which is nonexistent in creole, but of which the meanings seem to be analytically represented in the creole originals; for example:

(12) i. /iz afta da da waata staat iiitin/
   'It was after that that erosion set in'
   (literally: is after that the water start eating)
   Bickerton (1973:654) (My underlining and comment in parenthesis)

   ii. /im no miin notin im se/
       'He's not sincere'
       (literally: him not mean nothing him say)

   iii. /na len im no moni, im tel lai an im tiif/
       'Don't lend him any money, he's untrustworthy'
       (literally: ... him tell lie and him thief (i.e. steal))

Those characteristics referred to in (11iii) would also, again, be absent from creole but more frequently present in standard language, and particularly standard language that has been influenced over time by the written, literate norm. The reason why the characteristics tend to be absent from creole is that, as implied already in both (9) and (11), the paucity of explicit labelling of purely syntactic relationships and the stringent reduction of redundancy in labelling that is characteristic of creole (all of which is theoretically accounted for, as already explained) require that sentences be kept in relatively short strings unified by single, unexpanded noun phrases, similar verb phrases, and coordinate linking as often as necessary. Deriving from this is the typical staccato phrasing of creole language discourse, illustrated in (13) and (14) with sentences and also what could be taken in theory as rudimentary sentences separated, for clarity, by the mark 'Λ'.

(13) Pes pikinini Λ ia bai yu go wok long, Λ bai yu stap ia Λ na bai yu stap long banis kau Λ bilong mi Λ na bai taim mi dai Λ bai yu lukautim Λ na yu save wokin susu Λ na bai yu givim long, Λ wonem ia, Λ stua, Λ na bai ol i baim.
   'You, first son, will go and work in, you'll stay on my cattle farm and when I die you'll look after it, and you'll keep milking them and you'll send it to the store, and the people will buy it.'
   (Sankoff and Laberge 1974:80)
(14) Im bwail di hat korsiin pan a pari, À an im tek out fi im À an gi Bra Anansi de balans. À Bra Anansi ties i. À So wen i bon Bra Anansi so, À Bra Anansi se: À Laad, À Bra Aligeta, À a disaya yu kaal hat, À man? À Mek mi put i out a son À an mek i likl hata. À Den a stor i miînwail, À den mek i likl hata. À Wen im put i out de, À a stor i, À a stor i, À dat taim it a kuol, À miînwail a kuol. À Den miînwail im stor, À wen im ties it, À an si se À i kuol, À im se: À Laad, À Bra Aligeta, À a nou i hat. À An im dis pik op i À an mek so, À wups. À dat finish nou.

(from Bailey 1971:347)

'He boiled the hot kerosens pan of porridge, and he took out his and gave Bra Anansi the balance. Bra Anansi tasted it. So when it burned Bra Nansi so, Bra Anansi said: Lord, Bra Alligator, is it this you call hot, man? Let me put it out in the sun and make it a little hotter. Then (I will) stir it mean-while, then make it a little hotter. When he put it out there, stirring it, stirring it, that time it was cooling, meanwhile cooling. Then while he was stirring, when he tasted it and saw that it was cool, he said: Lord, Bra Alligator, it is now that it is hot. And he just picked it up, and did so, woops. That is finished now.'

The fact that the procedures referred to in (9iii) and their empirical consequences outlined in (11) are present in standard language but absent in creole has the following result: creole and mesolectal speakers, in attempting to produce standard language, become prone to a type of mistake that has to do with their lack of practice in extending and holding grammatical relationships across sentence boundaries. Mistakes of this type include those which Burt and Kiparsky (1974) refer to as 'global' mistakes and which are typified as being more serious barriers to communication than other types of mistakes are. These global mistakes, as could be predicted from (9iii) and (11), involve S-V-0 order (creole and mesolectal speakers aiming to produce standard language often omit necessary parts of this order in longer sentences), use of standard language connectors: but, because, although, etc. (the creole use of and with appropriate sentences often provides the normal equivalents of these to which the learners are accustomed), distinctions between coordinate and relative clause constructions, parallel structure in reduced coordinate clauses, and tense continuity across clauses.

From all of the preceding, in brief, it seems clear that the creole or mesolectal speaker learning a standard language faces a special difficulty. This difficulty, together with creole language universals and the relationship between creole and standard, can be explained, to an extent not otherwise possible, by
a notion of grammar which hypothesizes that all language derives from a common conceptual base and then develops through progressively more complex levels of labelling. Differentiation between languages exists because alternative grammatical choices become increasingly possible across the successive levels of labelling. Creole as a language system makes a linguistic output at an earlier level of labelling than standard language does. The consequence of this is that creole or mesolectal speakers learning a standard language are required to carry out the procedures outlined at (9) to an extent which their native language system seldom, if ever, requires.

4. In relation to standard language teaching in creole or mesolectal situations, the conclusions so far arrived at in this paper permit some supplementation to the factors and procedures discussed in Craig (1971, 1976). Those procedures merit some repetition to begin with.

The standard language knowledge of the creole or mesolectal speaker, for the purpose of structuring a teaching program, is considered as consisting of sets of structures that are common to both standard and nonstandard speech (Class A structures), sets that would be produced by the learner only in standard language prestige or stress situations (Class B structures), sets which the learner would recognise and comprehend if used by other speakers, but which the learner him/herself would be unable to produce (Class C structures), and sets that would be totally unknown to the learner (Class D structures). The teaching program dictated by this categorization of standard language vis-à-vis the learner and by the considerations related to the categorization is structured as in the following summary from Craig (1976:111).

(1) Topics for treatment in language are selected so as to reflect the interests, maturity, and immediate cultural environment of the learners, but at the same time so as to permit adequate use of the specific linguistic structures that form the goal of teaching at the specific point in time.

(2) The learners are led by the teacher to explore the topic fully in whatever language the learners possess. The teacher may either speak the vernacular, or speak some other type of language closer to the standard or speak the standard itself, so long as the learners are able to comprehend easily; and the teacher accepts whatever language the learners choose to respond in, including such new language as is infiltrating into the learners' competence. This part of the programme is completely oral and may be designated 'free talk'. The purpose of this part is to promote normal growth and development of the learners in whatever language medium is most natural to them.
(3) The teacher uses the selected topic, or aspects of the topic, as the basis of systematic quasi-foreign language practice. Because of the high rate of recognition and comprehension in the bidialectal situation, through the learners' possession of the language strata A, B, and C, teaching procedures do not usually call for a very intensive use of imitation drills, but rather more for substitution and transformation practices, controlled dialogues and dramas, and a heavy reliance on simulated situations for forcing learners into a creative use of the specific linguistic structures that are aimed at. This part of the program may be designated 'controlled talk' and only standard language is used.

(4) For teaching in (3), linguistic structures are selected so that, relevant to the A, B, C, D classification of structures already discussed, the learners are forced to use a target structure or target structures selected from C or D (which for practical purposes may be combined into a single class), and at the same time to use incidental structures which come fortuitously from A and B (which, again for practical purposes, may also be combined into a single class).

(5) Language learners who are also learning to read use material consisting only of such linguistic structures as they have already learned at each given stage, as at (3), and that are relevant to the topics discussed at (2). Language learners who can already read may use materials that are linguistically unstructured (and the more such learners can be saturated with reading, the better). The purpose of this set of measures is to ensure that the acquisition of and interest in reading is not hampered by standard language deficiencies, and that reading and language-learning should reinforce each other; once reading is firmly acquired, however, there is no longer any point in linking it to the formal learning of language structure.

(6) For all learners, use is made in writing only of those linguistic structures that have already been learned as at (3), and in most cases the content of the writing is restricted to topics treated as at (2). By this means, writing is closely linked to proficiency in speech, and one reinforces the other.

(7) The various subject areas of the total school curriculum enter into the selection of topics explained as at (1) so that aspects of these areas get reworked in controlled speech, reading, and writing in the same way as all other experiences.

The supplementation to these procedures that now seems to be indicated needs to consist of methods for habituating learners in the spontaneous and subconscious performance of the
types of task suggested in (9iii) and the consequent achievement of the results specified in (11). This is not the first time that such procedures have been suggested as necessary for learners of the types being considered here; but previous suggestions have arrived at the stated conclusions from somewhat different premises that mainly have to do with observed differences between the communication styles of upper and lower social class speakers in language-continua situations. Such procedures, for example, are outlined in Craig (1972), where the differences in communication styles that seemed to justify them were for the first time linked to a theory of language similar to, though less explicitly formulated than, the one suggested here and in Craig (1978). The procedures involve getting learners to take what might otherwise be terminal standard language strings, but at the level of lexical and syntactic complexity at which creole or mesolect would make an output, and learning to proceed through the transformations that would take these strings to a later level of output as in literate standard language. For most creole or mesolectal learners, this type of learning is necessary for the efficient production of standard language, but even if it is considered to be not crucial from the standpoint of language production, it certainly seems to have an important bearing on the reception of standard language.

Without such learning, many originally non-Standard speakers who succeed in mastering the basic morphology and syntax of the Standard operate at a relatively low receptive level, a fact which seldom becomes evidenced until such speakers begin to experience the demands of higher education (Craig 1976:125).

The focal point of the discussion in this paper is the interrelationship between conceptualization, language structure, and language learning, and how this interrelationship is to be represented in a unified theory. The study of standard language learning in a continuum situation involving creole and standard is a small opening into this vast field.
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This paper concerns two forms of creole English: Gullah (GU), spoken especially on the 'Rice Islands' off the coast of South Carolina and Georgia, and Jamaican Creole (JC), spoken in Jamaica, West Indies. That these languages are genetically related is quite certain, though the details of the relationship are not yet clear. What may hold some interest for a conference on bilingual education is that speakers of dialects, and perhaps especially of creoles, run head-on into the requirements of schooling, which produces special problems both for them and for the schools.

At the present time, any nation which considers itself modern is expected to seek education—or at least literacy—for its people; otherwise they will be sorely handicapped in communicating both internally and internationally. In modern societies, no matter how they are organized or how far they may have 'emerged', the capacity of the individual to direct his own life, and the capacity of government to utilize his abilities, depend on education—which in turn, depends on the individual's ability to use somewhat complex and developed language. Thus there must be a language of education—yet for far more people in the world than not, this will differ from their vernacular or home speech. For this reason, education may be said to force bilingualism or bidialectalism on the greater part of humanity. The problem is nugatory for children who already speak the school language at home; they and the totally unschooled are perhaps the only monolinguals. When the child's home language is very different from the school language, he must become a bilingual—unless the school were to change its language to that of the child's vernacular. As we all know, this expedient is sometimes seriously suggested, though realistically it is
not likely to happen. But what is the objection to becoming bi- or even poly-lingual? Learning a language, if taken seriously, can be an excellent discipline, an enlarging experience. And nobody needs to give up the home language or dialect in order to acquire another. Bilingualism or bidialectalism should be accepted today as a commonplace of modern living and modern education.

And so back to Gullah and the Caribbean creoles, of which Jamaican is the closest. Both are now undergoing rapid de-eroticization, but because of the much larger and denser population in Jamaica, very conservative creole can still be heard there. As I have pointed out elsewhere, Lorenzo Turner's oldest Gullah informants, who were already adults in the 1880s, used Africanisms nine times as often as his middle-aged informants recorded at the same time (about 1940). Decreolization in Jamaica has been proceeding gradually for a long time, more rapidly for the past 40 years, so that a spectrum of usage has developed with conservative creole at one end and standard educated Jamaican English at the other. The speakers of creole, however, greatly outnumber the others. With 'standard' as the goal language of the schools, there is a notable discrepancy—a situation which may be worth observation by teachers of Gullah-speaking children. (I return to this later.)

It might be said that a pidgin language develops from a bilingual situation, but when the pidgin becomes a creole, the situation is reversed to a monolingual one. When speakers of language A and language B, mutually unintelligible, want to communicate—for purposes of trade or any other—the simplified speech they concoct out of parts of A and parts of B is a lingua franca, or pidgin—call it P. Once P exists, speakers of A and B, which are fully elaborated languages, have no further need for each other's language. If P needs to be expanded, it can draw on A or B or some other source: there is no constitutional limit to its possible expansion. And as long as the need is relatively limited, P will remain simple. However, A and B are vernaculars, P is not, and when the need for it ceases—no matter for what reason—it will disappear. This has nothing to do with its nature as a language; what makes it unstable is this role as merely a 'contact' language.

Speakers of A and B were monolinguals to begin with; when they developed P they became bilinguals. A creole language goes the other way round since it originates in a very different situation, in which speakers of P find it easier or more advantageous to expand P than to learn A or B (or any other vernacular). They are monolingual in P, and when they elaborate it to cover not only the simple contact situation but all aspects of life, it becomes a creole and their vernacular.

The plantation society of the American South and the Caribbean furnished the appropriate symbiosis for this elaboration of P. In each case the European language—Portuguese, Dutch,
French, English, or whatever—was dominant; the African vernaculars of the slaves were often mutually unintelligible. Pidgin forms had been developed in West Africa and were used in the slave trade. There is even evidence of some creolization having already taken place in Africa; certainly it developed rapidly on the New World plantations. And once the creole was established as the slaves' vernacular, succeeding generations naturally continued it. The African languages died with their speakers except when a special effort was made to preserve them. But the European language continued as the superstrate, on which the creole speakers could draw. The creole even became the true vernacular of some young whites, who learned the European language well only if they got an education. Thus the plantation society was polydialectal as well as racially and socially stratified.

As I have said, Gullah and Jamaican Creole are so much alike that the connection must be genetic. In fact, it goes back to Africa and their common pidgin core that is reflected only fragmentarily in other types of American Black English. Why should Gullah have resisted decreolization? There are both positive and negative reasons. The negative reason applies also to Jamican and some other Caribbean creoles: they have survived through geographic and social isolation. Linguistic geography has demonstrated that mountainous areas, borderlands, and islands tend to be relic areas. In New England, where postvocalic /r/ is generally lost east of the Connecticut River, it is preserved on Marblehead, Cape Ann, and Martha's Vineyard. The Appalachians, largely because they are mountainous, are linguistically the most conservative large area in the United States today. The islands of Maryland's Eastern Shore are similarly conservative: a traditional way of life has included a traditional way of speech. This is also so for the Gullah people of the Rice Islands, isolated from the mainland of South Carolina and Georgia, producing rice, sea island cotton, and other crops. Under slavery they were held there as field hands; after the Civil War they continued in much the same way, having little communication with the mainland, cut off both geographically and socially from speakers of more general forms of English.

The same was true for Jamaican Creole. Though emancipation came in 1838—a whole generation before the end of slavery in the United States—the blacks continued their almost wholly agricultural way of life in the mountains. Further, the population of Jamaica, since the end of the seventeenth century, has been more than 90 percent black. Conservative JC is therefore, if anything, more archaic than GU—it preserves more pidgin features and more Africanisms, as comparison shows. Because records of the slave trade are fragmentary or inaccessible, we do not know for certain the origin of the Gullah people. It is certainly mixed, like that of Caribbean peoples generally, with slaves brought from the entire area of West
Africa, from Senegal to Angola. Even the name is a puzzle: it may be a reduced form of Angola, or, on the other hand, a tribal name Gola from what is now Liberia. Slaves were brought from both places. Recent reexamination of slave-trade records, however, may throw some fresh light. English colonization of the Caribbean began in the early seventeenth century. As the easternmost island, the most accessible from England, Barbados was the first to be highly developed as a 'sugar colony'. But whites found they could not stand the heat while working in the fields and, in any case, they had hopes of becoming landowners and planters. The English, therefore, followed the Portuguese example and began importing African slaves. But Barbados soon became overcrowded and planters moved with their slaves to other colonies. Barbados had been first settled in 1627; English colonies in Surinam began in 1651; Jamaica was taken in 1655; the Charleston, or Carolina colony was started in 1670. All were offshoots from Barbados. It seems logical that the kind of creole spoken in Barbados—whether started there or begun earlier at some point or points in Africa and later developed in Barbados—would have been taken to the other colonies and have formed the basis for their creoles. Once established in any colony, creole speech would become subject to further influences, with variations developing from colony to colony according to vicissitudes of the slave trade and differing local conditions. The most striking example is what happened in Surinam after 1687, where the English-based creole Sranan came under Dutch influence; the English having yielded Surinam in exchange for New York. Without the superstrate influence of English, Sranan has remained archaic; in the past century and more it has also been penetrated increasingly by Dutch. But Jamaica and Charleston speech continued under English, and, conditions being much the same, did not diverge greatly. Their common core was inherited largely from pidgin.

The best early texts on GU are the animal tales of Charles Colcock Jones (1888) and the local sketches by Ambrose Gonzales (1922). Most people begin with Gonzales because he has appended a glossary of some 1,700 words. As he points out, Gullah is 'entirely a spoken, never a written language. Unfortunately, his way of writing it down is unnecessarily complicated and makes GU seem far more aberrant from the general popular language of the area than it is; (Gonzales would have done better to adopt Jones' spelling method.) Gonzales uses a combination of 'phonetic' spellings and eye-dialect. The normal spelling of accident, for example, would be perfectly satisfactory, but he makes it a-c-k-s-i-d-e-n-t; agonize he spells a-g-g-u-h-n-ize; angel he spells a-i-n-j-u-l. And on and on. Fully 35 percent of the entries in his glossary are tortured in this way: he makes them look illiterate even though the GU pronunciation of these particular words is the same as anybody else's. If these were spelled normally, the
Another thing that makes GU seem strange, at least to non-Georgians or non-South Carolinians, is that GU has a sizable number—or perhaps 11 percent—of words that were also used by local white dialect speakers—and some of which still are. As nonstandard words, these have to be given nonstandard spellings to indicate pronunciation. Examples are aig for egg, cheer for chair, 'oman for woman, ketch for catch, gin'ul for general, bile for boil, and so on. These were not merely or distinctively GU, but were in use also in the local white dialect.

What really characterizes GU as distinct from any other form of American English is the creole inheritance from underlying pidgin, with its African element. The lexical differences are obvious; less obvious, and deeper, are the phonological and syntactic features. Examples of pidgin-derived words in GU are all-time 'always', bex 'angry', bress 'bless', bumbye 'by-and-by', blan 'belong, belonged, used to', fuh true 'truly', full 'fill', good-fashin 'well', lef 'leave', mek 'make', nuf 'a great many', one-time 'simultaneously', tek 'take', tummuch 'a great deal', yeddy 'hear'. Most of these found their way with English pidgin not only to the Caribbean but to India, China, and Polynesia. Many are still used in anglophone creoles.

Then there are the Africanisms, alllying Gullah with Sranan and Jamaican, and the West African creoles of Sierra Leone, Liberia, Cameroon, Nigeria. Some are direct loans: buckruh 'white man', cootuh 'terrapiin', duh 'at or to', jook 'jab', ki^ 'an exclamation of surprise', nyam 'food or eat', oonuh 'plural you', pinduh 'peanut', suh 'a conjunctive word'. Others are loan-translations: all-two 'both', crack (one's) breath 'speak', sweet-mout' 'flattery', tie up (one's) mouth 'be silent'. All these are found in Jamaican Creole, and many more. There are also a few locations used by Gullah but not by other South Carolina-Georgia speakers, black or white: enti 'ain't it', fuh soul 'truly', g'em 'give them', huukuh 'how come', quizzit 'ask', shum 'see 'em', sukuh 'same-like', swonguh 'swaggering'. But these words and phrases by themselves would furnish no great problem of understanding. It is the phonology and syntax that make the real difference. I shall comment on these very briefly.

The consonants of GU and JC are almost the same. Both lack the English sounds /θ, ð, v, z/ and substitute /t, d, b, j/: tink 'think', den 'then', bittle 'victuals', medjuh 'measure'. Both have an extra nasal /ŋ/, usually initial, as in nyong 'young', nyuse 'use', nyankee 'yankee'. In GU, but not in JC, a 'cockney' /w/ often takes the place of /v/ (voice 'voice', puhwoke 'provoke', etc.); in archaic JC this is reversed, /v/ occasionally taking the place of /w/ (vell 'well', woul'd 'would', etc.). Both agree in simplifying consonant clusters—JC more than GU: initial /s/ is lost before /p, t, k/ (pider 'spider'),
tuff 'stuff', ky 'sky'); final clusters regularly lose the second consonant: (cris 'crisp', fis 'fist', taas 'task', san 'sand', etc.). This has the effect of producing many homonyms.

GU and JC differ somewhat as to the vowels—GU coming closer to English by having /ə/ and /ɔI/, neither of which is phonemic in JC. On the other hand, the mid tense vowels of JC have followed English in becoming diphthongs. But even when the phonemes correspond, their phonetic realizations often differ considerably, which makes communication difficult. JC preserves some vowel qualities from eighteenth century English.

As to syntactic features I will mention only those in which GU and JC differ most strikingly from English: pronoun and verb forms. In many West African languages, the pronoun has no formal distinction for case and gender, though person and number may be marked. Conservative GU and JC was the same, but decreolization under English influence has added some English pronouns though not always where they would go in English paradigms. The present patterns are: basically for GU, me, you, he in the singular; we, oonu, dem in the plural; JC uses him rather than he. The second person plural oonu is an African loan in both (probably from Ibo), but GU has pretty well replaced it with y'all. In both GU and JC, I is coming in for first person, and she for third. GU shows possession by adding -own to the pronoun; JC does it by prefixing fi-: thus GU me-own, JC fi-mi, for my, mine, and so on. Decreolization is bringing these paradigms closer to those of Standard English, but not always to exact correspondence.

GU and JC verbs have a single form—in other words, there is no morphology—usually based on the infinitive-present tense form of English verbs: go, come, walk, etc. A few are based on past tenses: broke 'break', married 'marry', etc. Differences of voice, mode, tense, aspect, are indicated by context (time-words and such) or by auxiliaries, mostly English, but including the African [de], in GU duh, in JC de, for progressive action.

It should be clear that the pidgin inheritance common to GU and JC, their African connection, makes them different in some basic respects from ordinary Black English and, of course, from Standard English. They have not merely dialectal variations, but a clearly different system. In the school situation one cannot use simple comparisons or transformations: the creole speaker has to learn the new system. Even if this does not apply to the lexicon, the greater part of which is shared semantically, it applies to the forms of words which differ phonologically, and most strongly to the syntax, especially to pronoun and verb syntax. In learning Standard English, GU and JC speakers have to acquire a foreign morphology. Thus, it would seem advisable to teach Standard English as a foreign language, and treat the similarities as happy accidents.

However, the problem of pidgin and creole languages will never be understood if they are seen only as linguistic
phenomena. It is easy enough to understand how a pidgin would come into existence as a by-product of two languages in contact or how an established pidgin might begin to expand and be elaborated into a creole language. If enough evidence existed, every step of either process might be followed, both in a general way or for specific pidgens and creoles. But this would not be enough to tell us why it all happened—in a word, the problem is a sociolinguistic one. In every case we need to ask what situation produced the pidgin, what kept it alive or let it die, why it did or did not become creolized.

Some rather revealing work is now in progress on an American-Indian-based lingua franca that flourished for some 400 years in what is now the 'inner South' of the United States: Mobilian jargon. At its peak, Mobilian was used in a contact area stretching from western Florida to eastern Texas and north to southern Illinois. In origin a Chicasaw-Choctaw trade language, Mobilian was adopted and used also by the Spanish, French, and English in that area, and by Blacks, some of whom were the Indians' slaves. Recent fieldwork done by Emanuel Drechsel, as yet unpublished, shows a surprising situation: the Indians who used Mobilian were multilingual—they could have communicated in each other's languages. Why then invent and keep alive this 'short form of Choctaw'?

Drechsel sees as the probable reasons first, that Mobilian was neutral—it was nobody's language, therefore in interethnic situations it raised no questions of priority: its users were socially equalized. Second, use of the jargon rather than a full Indian language, reserving the latter for the Indians themselves, had a protective function—it kept outsiders, especially non-Indians, at a certain distance—so much so, indeed, that naive whites thought Mobilian was the real Indian talk, and took the Indians to be as simple-minded as the language. Third, of course, it served the proper purpose of a lingua franca, making communication possible in complex multilingual situations. But by the early part of this century, the spread of English and decline of other languages reduced the utility of Mobilian, and the language itself, to the vanishing point.

The question of survival comes up for GU and JC also. In former times, they served at least the function, in a stratified and stabilized plantation society, of clearly separating the world of masters from the world of slaves. Each group had its own language—and each knew well enough to use it for self-identification and for self-separation. Since it would not have changed the social situation, neither master nor slave would have gained much by being completely bidialectal.

In our present at least nominally democratic and dynamic society, in which literacy is taken as desirable for everyone, it is no surprise that Standard English should be the school language. As I have said, this forces bidialectalism on anyone whose home language is not the school language. What must be avoided, here, I think, is that creole speech should be
condemned or that any attempt should be made to uproot it. Indeed, teachers who do not know it, who do not realize that it is a language in its own right, with a system of its own, should learn exactly that. It is neither deficient nor degraded, and there is no warrant for assuming that its speakers are mentally deficient or degraded. Under correction I suggest that in regard to morphology and syntax, and perhaps even phonology, Standard English should be taught to creole speakers as a foreign language, with full attention to paradigms of the school dialect, and not by comparison with creole, except when the students discover similarities for themselves and become interested in the historical relations.

Again nominally—in Jamaica at least—the creole is so widespread and so very much the language of the majority, that it is in no danger of dying out suddenly. It will sustain itself for some time to come. Indeed, the difficulty there is to find teachers of Standard English who are adequate models. The attempt is being made, however, and time will bring improvement. For GU the situation is less certain because the speakers are fewer and the weight of non-GU dialects much greater. I have recently seen in newspapers and at least one book, the rather plaintive question, 'Can Gullah be saved?' I recognize the romantic appeal of all minority languages and dialects, faced by extinction under pressure of the majority language. We all favor the underdog and want to see him put up a good fight. But to answer the question realistically, GU will last as long as it serves a useful function for the people who speak it—and no longer. If it gives them a sense of community, a language that is all their own, one in which they can in a sense take refuge, one which gives them individuality and ties them to the past—and if they value these qualities—they will keep it up. The younger ones will acquire in addition some form of the local English other than GU—a second string to their bow—a useful thing in the outside, mainland world. Decreolization is in progress but the main creole features may yet survive. What happens to the Gullah community, the Gullah society, will make the ultimate decision.

NOTES

2. Ibid.

7. This is based on a partial count of Gonzales' glossary.


My pleasure at being invited to address the conference on the subject 'Dialect mapping' was chastened somewhat when I began to fit the topic into the conference plan.

Though decisions in many spheres of bilingual education must take account of dialectal variation, the relevance of the information conveyed by dialect maps—certainly those of the conventional kind—I found, on reflection, opaque in a general sense. On the other hand, it seemed to me that one kind of information which we might expect dialect maps to contain, is relevant: this is information about the interrelationships which hold between so-called dialect 'areas'.

Although current opinion on the nature of language variation has, in many ways, discredited traditional notions of 'dialect areas' as relatively clearly defined, separable entities, it is still the case that, amongst the continuously shifting mass of transition phenomena which constitute the speech data in any language area, some features—regardless of their social distribution amongst a community of speakers—do have identifiable area distributions, though the spatial limits on their distributions may sometimes be no easier to mark with precision than their social limits. And there are situations in which accurate knowledge about the relative disposition of areal distributions is useful to the educationist: for instance, when an emerging prestige accent is being shaped by the speech of an influential social group with distinct regional identification. This might have been true, at an earlier time, of the emergence of Received Pronunciation in England, of standard Parisian French in France, and of Hochdeutsch in Germany. Alternatively, where there is need to design a model of pronunciation for educational purposes, it appears that the only resources available are competing regional varieties.
To put the situation concisely: dialect mapping clearly has no inherent relevance to decision making in bilingual education, but there can be specific cases in which knowledge about the spatial distribution of linguistic features may contribute to the sociolinguistic information which forms a context for decision making.

What is important, of course, is that the dialectal information is relevant. And in this respect much of conventional areal dialectology is not directly helpful. Conventional areal analysis and display are based on the bundling of isoglosses: examples are superfluous, but of course Kurath's Word Atlas of the Eastern United States is an archetypal example. There is a substantial element of subjectivity in such mapping procedures as we find in dialect research: the designation of 'major' and 'minor' speech areas is usually done on the basis of a subjective assessment of the relative strength of different isogloss bundles. This is not to say that they are wrong in their major findings—that clearly is not so, at all—but that (1) they cannot be numerically precise in their assessment of the strength of a given boundary, and (2) there is a great deal of data which cannot be fitted into such a subjective schema, simply because there comes a point at which numerical imprecision makes it difficult to determine whether an apparently weak boundary should be considered to be a 'boundary' at all. (3) Also, it is not at all clear what a 'minor' boundary is 'minor' to. The fundamental problem, of course, lies in the concept of 'boundary' to which an inadequate appraisal of the data forces the analyst: boundaries are more or less vaguely distinguishable as being 'strong' or 'weak', and they are seen as separate and separable entities.

My concern in dialect mapping has been to devise procedures which are more in accord with current notions of the relationship between varieties of language (or, more precisely, between features of speech) which are spatially located. The aim was to get information on the spatial disposition and interrelationships of dialectal variants—and direct representation of them—which was of a better quality than that which has to be inferred from displays of the location of isogloss bundles. I will briefly outline and illustrate such a procedure.

The data. The data comprised some 1,200 responses to 294 questions in a postal survey of the dialects of Welsh, collected from 175 sites throughout the Welsh-speaking areas of the country. The data is mostly lexical, though some phonological variants which were sufficiently distinct for correspondents unequivocally to represent them orthographically, were incorporated; and a considerable amount of phonological information can be inferred from the spelling of correspondents, who were encouraged to represent local pronunciation as nearly as they could or as the orthography would allow. The data is coded numerically into the data file for the mapping procedure, and
discontinuous distributions are coded separately for every one of their geographical domains.

The procedure—site clusters. The programme first selects, as a model distribution, the response with the largest distribution over enquiry sites—the geographically most widely distributed item of the 1,200 in the file; it then matches with it all other distributions which correspond with it within tolerances of 80%-120%. Although the tolerances were selected at random, altering them would do no more than increase or decrease the degree of differentiation between the matched sets established. And, since our ultimate aim will be to construct a representation of dialect variants as elements in a continuum, it would alter the differentials between the stages in the continuum in the same way—but without altering the linguistic character or overall geographical domain of the continuum in any substantial way.

After scanning all of the data, further access to the model and its matched distributions is blocked, and the cycle is restarted, taking as model the response with the widest geographical distribution of those remaining.

The findings provided a wide range of matching scores, from 158 to the entirely idiosyncratic. The relative strength of such site clusters falls from a dramatic 158 for the strongest, and 145 for the next, to 30 for the third. These site clusters are, in effect, the 'speech areas' of conventional mapping, and the first 30 of them (in strength rating from 158 to 5) correspond closely with the impressionistic account of speech areas which I had previously arrived at in The Linguistic Geography of Wales (LGW). The immediate contribution of the computerised approach is twofold: (a) to give precise ratings of the number of regional features which characterise a given site cluster; (b) to extend the clustering systematically throughout the data; and, for the next stage of the analysis, I took all site clusters down to a strength of three--this provided a total of 52 site clusters in all.

The procedure—continua. The problem now was so to organize the site clusters as to reflect any relationships which hold between them: to characterise the notions of transition and continuation between the sets of linguistic features which characterise different site clusters.

The data, as it is organized at this stage, is ranked in two ways: (a) in terms of the relative strength of each site-cluster—the extent of its linguistic individuality; (b) in terms of the geographical extent of site-clusters, their site-coverage. The next stage in the procedure is concerned with site coverage, with making explicit the notions of transition and continuation in the spatial dimension. The data, now, are the first 52 in the list of site clusters which was the product of the previous stage.
The procedure adopted was to programme the computer first to discover the site cluster with the widest distribution over sites. Then, taking this site cluster as a model, it was instructed to identify the most widely distributed site cluster of those remaining (a) whose distribution partially coincided with that of the model, and (b) which had no more than approximately 22% of its own domain lying outside the domain of the model. Then, taking this new—less extensive—site cluster as a model, the procedure was to be repeated, so that a chain or continuum of site clusters would be built up, such that each successive one was essentially included within its immediate predecessor. Once a site cluster is used as a model, further access to it is blocked, ensuring that no site cluster may appear in more than one place in the continuum. Finally, when the process of inclusion deriving from the first model is exhausted, it is repeated on those site clusters remaining.

An expressive representation of the procedure and the results obtained from it is contained in the branching diagram in Figure 1 which shows (a) that the site clusters for Welsh are organized into two major continua; it also reveals (b) the order of execution of the procedure which produces the various subbranches, which automatically defines the spatially hierarchical relationship which holds between site clusters within the branches.

Descriptively, this procedure organizes the site clusters in a plausible way for Welsh. Because of the gross disparity between the strengths of the two major clusters and the remainder, one would expect them to dominate the chains. In fact, not only do we, predictably, find that speech areas are assigned as parts of a southern or a northern continuum complex, but within each, subbranches are created with complete geographical credibility, dividing the south mainly into east and west, and the north into east, west, and highland. Interestingly, too, the south has a distinct subbranch which defines a 'midland' subcontinuum as being within the confines of the southern continuum but independent of the major southern subcontinua.

In looking for 'areas', and in trying to define and handle them separately, we conventionally ask an unreal question of the data; the facts of transition militate against any notion of the exclusiveness of dialect areas.

So, it may be more worthwhile to think in terms of related distribution patterns, which organize themselves into complexes of continua, while still acknowledging the fact that regional forms do tend to cluster, to varying degrees, around groups of sites. However, the continuum takes precedence over the individual units within it.

Relative strength of site clusters. Each site cluster retains the rating of its 'strength' which it acquired at the previous stage of analysis. As we have seen, this figure falls as low as
three amongst the site clusters which we have selected for analysis; and dialectologists would rightly be reluctant to regard a strength of three as being adequate to identify a speech 'area'. When we make the grouping of site clusters on the criterion of progressively intensive geographical concentration, however, then the 'weaker' clusters find a natural place in the progression from widest to narrowest distribution, as is illustrated by the branching diagram in Figure 1. The figures enclosed within brackets, after the rank numbers of the site clusters, show the precise strength of each cluster.

Furthermore, although progress down the chain, from the widest distribution to the narrowest, is a reductive one in spatial terms, the degree of lexical specialization of the site clusters is cumulative, as each one superimposes its differential strength on that of the model which selected it. What presentation of areal data in this form does is to emphasise the importance of the dialect continuum over the dialect area as a cohering unit; and it enables us to show how relatively weak 'areas' or site clusters—hardly significant if to be taken separately—fit into a pattern of cumulative differentiation; their site coverage must be taken into account along with their differential strength or weakness relative to other site clusters.

We are essentially concerned with the notions of 'transition' and 'continuum'. The notion of transition is expressed through the cumulative linguistic specialisation which results from superimposing one cluster's individualities of usage upon those of another, in ever-diminishing spatial patterns, such that an implicational relationship holds between successive stages from the lowest point on a branch to the highest.

The notion of continuum is expressed through the relationship of spatial inclusion which holds progressively between the clusters, which is another way of expressing the criterion of partial difference between varieties. 7

Cartographic presentation. Figures 2 and 3, respectively, representing the north and south continua, present the information given in the branching diagrams in near topographical form. Squares in a grid represent the enquiry sites (numbered 1-175). Figures 4 and 5 represent respectively the southwest and northwest branches of the continua, presenting information from appropriate sections of the continua. The figures registered for sites represent their respective branches from the point at which they become independent of others in the same continuum: i.e. the southwest from site cluster 8 onwards in the southern continuum on Figure 1, and the northwest from site cluster 3 onwards in the northern continuum on Figure 1. The strengths of the various site clusters are totalled for all relevant sites, and displayed in the key to the shading patterns used, showing how strength of differentiation increases as areal distribution becomes more concentrated. (The figures for
Figure 2.
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for those site clusters which dominate the site clusters which represent the point of divergence for each branch are, of course, latent in the scores as depicted in Figures 2 and 3.)

I want to stress that I claim no novelty for the concepts which inform this approach to dialect mapping; I have tried merely to interpret the notion of dialect 'area' in terms of the convictions which every dialectologist has about it: that the notion of 'area' is simply an idealised stage in the progress of a continuum; but, given that we concern ourselves with the spatial parameter of variation, then the spatial continuum has reality—though subsidiary to the social continua which characterise a given speech community.

I turn now to the relevance of such information as this in educational practice, and to consider a situation in which educators have had to construct a teaching orthography largely on the basis of competing regional variants—or, at least, it was felt at the time that this was the only option open to them. The remainder of my paper will be a brief account of this case history insofar as it involves regional variation, and an assessment of it, indicating the modest role which this approach to dialect distribution may play in such assessment.

A pronunciation model for learners. One of the problems which have faced educators in Wales over the past quarter-century has been the apparent lack of a single, generally accepted prestigious spoken form of the language: the lack of a recognised standard accent. This resulted from the fact that the historical process of bilingualising in Wales has been a displacive one. English had long been the language of administration and government, the concern of the aristocracy, and as it was adopted by the populace, it retained its domains of use. The Welsh language was not, until very recently, used in public administration nor in industry, commerce, and science-based occupations; accordingly, there never developed a 'secular' accent to service those prestigious fields of activity. However, there had developed, largely in connection with religious institutions, an oratorical variety which, though stylistically marked, was traditionally regarded by native speakers as a model of formal and public speech.

The status of this variety declined, however, as the status of the institutions with which it was primarily identified declined, so that in the 1960s educators looked towards regional varieties of spoken Welsh when they were faced with the task of establishing a 'standard' variety of the spoken language—to be known as 'Cymraeg Byw' 'Living Welsh'—for the teaching of Welsh as a second language. The approach adopted was to propose a 'teaching model' of the standard orthography which would be, in most respects, a broad phonemic script. A set of phonemic values was thus assumed for the orthographic symbols. It was advocated that the model should correspond with the standard orthography insofar as the pronunciations
so implied were ones which actually occurred in some dialect. Of themselves, dialect variants were regarded as having equal status. Indeed, there was no overt comparative evaluation of the appropriateness of competing dialectal variants: their function was to be the yardstick against which the standard orthography was to be assessed and modified.

The result is that the model advocated is multidialectal, in at least two respects: (a) where the forms of different dialects are neutral in regard to the standard orthography (i.e. where none of them corresponds with the phonemic value assumed for the related orthographic symbols), they must be allowed as alternants in the model: thus, because all dialects have a simple vowel in the final syllable of a word like pethau 'things' (though it is written with an orthographic diphthong), either of the two dialect variants is advocated as being acceptable, [pe6a] for some northern areas, [peGe] for others; (b) where a dialectal form is positively affirmative of an orthographic convention, it automatically becomes the norm, regardless of its dialectal provenance: and competing dialectal variants which do not conform to the orthographic convention are automatically rejected. Thus, in a form like cae 'field', a diphthongal pronunciation is advocated because the orthographic diphthong has a correlate in northern dialects' [kaːf], as opposed to southern [kaː:].

Thus, according to (a), some regional tolerances are consciously allowed, while as a consequence of (b) there is rigid orthographic determinism in some cases, which can select forms (and by implication reject coexisting variants) idiosyncratically from one dialect or another. The system so devised, though it has a broadly cohesive orthographic base, is a dialectal hybrid, and it is not surprising that it was met with disapproval by educators at secondary and tertiary levels (largely because of the insistence of educational administrators to recommend its use, on economic grounds, in publishing reading materials for native Welsh speakers as well as for learners of the language; but also because of the implausibility of the dialectally multi-based accent which it represented).

It seems clear that, given the apparently strong division of the Welsh-speaking area into two continua, the only sensible decision to make—if one has to go to regional dialect for a model—is to base it on a phonological system unequivocally associated with one continuum, so that it has credibility, reality, and structural integrity. Other considerations would have to be taken into account—as of the compatibility of lexical and grammatical systems with the phonological system—but my concern today is with accent alone.

What the native speaker does. Between 1969 and 1973, during the course of research into the syntax of the contemporary spoken Welsh of educated speakers, an informal pilot investigation of accept standardisation amongst native speakers of
Welsh was made. A sample of some 20,000 words of radio discussion programmes was examined, providing samples of the speech of over 50 speakers of varied dialectal backgrounds. Though there has been no opportunity yet to develop the work under statistically satisfactory conditions, informal and subjective observation of the data revealed clear tendencies.

The accent of informants with a northern dialectal background was stable and consistent (except in instances to be mentioned later), relative to that of informants with a southern dialectal background. In the speech of the latter, there was considerable variability in use between known dialectal variants and recognisably more 'standard' ones. There were a small set of regional pronunciation variants which had significant diagnostic value: four major surface phonetic features which were potential variability points for speakers with a southern background.

The four potential variables were as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>North</th>
<th>South</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(i)</td>
<td>[h] prevocalically, as in: he:n</td>
<td>e:n (hen, 'old')</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ii)</td>
<td>diphthong as opposed to long vowel, as in: ma:i:n</td>
<td>ma:n (maen, 'stone')</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(iii)</td>
<td>[x] word initially before [w], as in: xwe:x</td>
<td>we:x (chwech, 'six')</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(iv)</td>
<td>a high 'mixed' vowel [i], as opposed to a high front vowel [i], as in: di:n</td>
<td>di:n (dyp, 'man')</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Furthermore, the territorial distribution of these features was such that—as features of the vernacular—they can be ranged in an implicational scale, each stage in the scale representing a progressively more 'northern' dialect.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>h</th>
<th>diph.</th>
<th>x</th>
<th>i</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LM</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SW</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(N, north; M, midland; LM, lower midland; SW, south-west; SE, southeast)

Variability occurred for speakers whose dialects had minus values for the first three features (I will return to the fourth presently): the implicational scale clearly indicates the differential in variability between speakers of differing dialectal backgrounds. It shows, in particular, that the target for the southerner has a strong identity with the speech system of the northerner and the overall geographical extent of the
northern continuum, as shown in Figure 2, corresponds very closely to that defined by the geographical distribution of [h]. There are, however, three factors which suggest that the target model is not that of northern regional speech. (1) The fourth feature—though distinctive for most varieties of spoken north Welsh—is not in practice a variable for southern speakers: they retain the front close vowel [i] which is the corresponding phone for their dialects. (2) There is no evidence of variability in the speech of southerners in respect of the precise phonetic value of other vowels, either: they simply retain the vowel qualities of the vernaculars. These two factors suggest that, at best, northern speech may function only as an abstract model—as a partial (lacking [i], at least) model of phonological structure, and not at all of phonetic realization. (3) More intriguing are the few areas of variability in the speech of northerners, where it was found that northerners and southerners alike had the same target. Examples are as follows.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vernacular</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Orthography</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>pe6a</td>
<td>pe6ai/-pe6ai</td>
<td>pethau 'things'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tamad</td>
<td>tamaid</td>
<td>tamaid 'piece'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xwarai</td>
<td>xwarai</td>
<td>chwarae 'to play'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is clear that the modification involved in all three cases is modelled on the standard written orthography—hence the tolerance noted earlier in the phonetic realization of the accent. Standardization by southern speakers is only an apparent approximation to northern speech, brought about by the coincidence that the phonology of northern dialects is reflected relatively closely in the graphological structure of the orthography. But note, too, that in the dialect-based model of Cymraeg Byw, the vernacular variants were admitted for learners as equally acceptable alternative pronunciations; it is clear that native speakers are less certain of their acceptability in relatively formal usage.

Although there is no single definitive model of standard pronunciation for modern Welsh, the variability which we have discussed indicates a clear awareness of the prestige of an extravernacular model, one which has its own status, and its own structural integrity deriving from that underlying the orthographic conventions; it is in no sense a dialectal hybrid—it is, indeed, independent of the dialectal variants, filling a quite distinct slot in the usage profile of the community. Thus, Cymraeg Byw seems to have got a basic assumption about the importance of the orthography right, but to have gone wrong in validating it. There are clear tendencies towards a generally recognised spoken model which can be characterised in phonological terms, if not yet in phonetic
values. It seems, too, that there are two competitors for an ultimate model of phonetic values—a northern and a southern. We have no sound basis on which to predict which is likely to emerge as the more prestigious, but it cannot be insignificant that the southerner declines to adopt the markedly northern vowel [i] (although he does adopt the consonant [h]—but, then, his perception of the status of this consonant may be affected by its status in English, which likewise requires the southerner to adopt it in nonvernacular styles).

To sum up, this paper has been essentially a plea for good information about dialect distribution for the educator who has to establish speech models for second-language teaching, (1) in terms of the characterisation of the concept 'dialect', and (2) in terms of the models which native speakers adopt in modifying their speech. With regard to the specific case history which we have looked at, it is clear that, if the speech model had to be abstracted from occurring dialectal forms, it might more usefully have been unequivocally based on a northern variety of Welsh (less the resisted vowel [i]). The model would then have had the cohesion and integrity which a homogeneous one cannot achieve.

NOTES

3. For illustration of this point, see Thomas (to appear), in which comparisons are made of the results of a subjective assessment of speech areas as published in The Linguistic Geography of Wales (LGW), and of a computer analysis of the same data. A fuller description of the procedures involved is to be found in Thomas (1978); see also Thomas (1972) and (1975) for discussion of related aspects of the same research project.
5. For a detailed discussion of methodology, see LGW, chap. 1.
6. In practice, the most widely distributed site cluster covered all 175 sites, and would have absorbed the whole set as subcontinua to itself. However, the cluster has, at its weaker periphery, a large number of low-coring sites, representing occasional geographical outliers permitted by the upper (120%) tolerance of the previous matching procedure. Therefore, site-cluster domains were defined as those sites whose linguistic strength was not less than average for the whole site cluster.
8. As detailed in Cymraeg Byw.
9. Since Welsh orthography was standardised as recently as 1928 (see Orgraff yr Iaith Gymraeg)—mainly on mixed phonemic and historical grounds—it has fewer internal inconsistencies.
than some others, and provides a plausible base for the exercise being described.

10. For a particularly detailed and abrasive attack on the proposals of Cymraeg Byw, see Ceinwen Thomas (1967).
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Despite the official theme of this year's Round Table, this paper deals with bilingual education primarily in the negative sense of discussing its absence. The reason for this is simply that the category of language I propose to treat, namely the dying dialect, is most typically ignored by the schools.

To say this, however, is not by any means to say that the schools have no impact on the dying language or dialect. On the contrary, ignoring the dying dialect is often in itself a significant act which has distinct meaning for the community at large. I would like to explore the role of the schools in language death by drawing on my fieldwork experiences with two dying dialects: the East Sutherland variety of Scottish Gaelic, and Berks County (Hamburg area) Pennsylvania Dutch, as its speakers call it, a dialect of German with a more than 200-year history of continuous use in the United States.

Let me first comment on whether we should be referring to these speech varieties as dialects or languages, in the context within which they are spoken of here. In several clear senses, both are dialects. Each is a regional variety of a language of wider currency, whose standard form is drastically different from that of the regional variety in question. Furthermore, neither of these regional varieties is customarily used in written form by its speakers, who are largely literate only in their second language, English, and both have notably low prestige locally. Thus in the technical as well as the popular sense, East Sutherland Gaelic and Berks County Pennsylvania Dutch may be considered dialects. But there is also a sense in which each of these geographic regions utilizes two distinct languages, one of which is dying. That is, East Sutherland Gaelic is in competition with a speech form which is clearly another language
altogether, namely English, and so is Berks County Dutch. Only one of these competing languages can be expected to survive. Thus, although the Gaelic language will not itself wholly disappear when its East Sutherland variety becomes extinct, and the German language will obviously survive the demise of Berks County Dutch, the Gaelic language is dying in East Sutherland and the German language in Berks County. Consequently, although in the technical sense what is dying in each of these cases is a local dialect, I will nonetheless refer frequently to competing languages, and thus to language death.

A further comment is required where the East Sutherland Gaelic and Berks County Pennsylvania Dutch speech forms are concerned. Neither was, until relatively recently, a 'minority language' in terms of the local setting: East Sutherland was predominantly Gaelic speaking a century and a half ago, and at least the northern two-thirds of Berks County predominantly German speaking. Although in each case the official language of the area was English, English was not the language of the mass of the people. Neither were Gaelic and German Johnny-come-lately languages in these districts; Gaelic was the predecessor of English in East Sutherland, and German very nearly the contemporary of English in Berks County.

How does a speech form move from the position of majority language to that of relic language in a century and a half, and what have the schools to do with the reversal? No doubt there are a number of routes by which the reversal can be accomplished; interestingly, some of the same factors appear in both the East Sutherland and Berks County cases. Despite majority status in their own areas, the East Sutherland Gaels and the Berks County Dutch nonetheless represented a subpopulation in a polity where a quite different ethnolinguistic group was dominant. And as subpopulations they were conspicuous for a number of other traits in addition to failure to speak the dominant language. It is crucial to note that the traits in question all have negative prestige: residence on the social and economic periphery, exclusive pursuit of a low-status occupation (fishing in the one case, farming in the other), and a level of material success markedly below that of the dominant urban other-tongue group in the area. In both East Sutherland and Berks County the school system was the agent of the wider society rather than of the local community, and in both Scotland and the United States the schools have played a largely uncontested role as representatives and purveyors of the dominant English language culture. The schools have faithfully mirrored the attitudes, policies, and goals of the wider society, and their authority to do so has been acknowledged by local communities.

If the schools, in their wider society role, show little enthusiasm for the language of the subpopulation, this is only the linguistic manifestation of a general lack of enthusiasm, within the dominant culture, for the subpopulation itself. The
languages in the cases we are discussing are dialects of strictly local currency, competing with a language of exceptionally wide currency, and are the speech forms of low prestige groups. Thus the hostile attitude of the schools toward the local currency language can be seen as nothing more than a particularly conspicuous example of the general dominant-group hostility toward a socially and economically marginal population.

It is within this generally unfavorable context that we must look at the role of the schools, and in particular their language policies. The hostility of the schools toward the strictly local low prestige language can take several forms. The first and most obvious is to banish the disfavored speech form from the classroom altogether—and sometimes even from the playground as well. The teacher sets the rules as to what variety of speech will be tolerated in his classroom, and applies the rules rigidly even to children who are monolingual in another tongue:

(1) ESG 1: You weren't allowed to talk Gaelic in the classroom.
ESG 2 (his wife): Well, you were made to feel small and embarrassed, y' see. I mean, if you were asked anything ... it was always in English, and as often as not you'd run home ... rather than stand [i.e. stick] it out.
ESG 1: All the teachers we had was English-speaking teachers.

(2) PD 1: I know from my own experience, when I went to school, we were not allowed to speak Pennsylvania Dutch. 'Fact, we were disciplined just as we would have been for cursing. Or any other type of--you know, profanity.

Thus, although the area is bilingual, the school is determinedly monolingual. Even where the schoolteachers are themselves bilingual, they may be required to carry out the school's monolingual policies by totally ignoring the fact that many of the children are monolingual in a language which they, the teachers, can speak perfectly well.

(3) Investigator: ... [P]eople are telling me that the teachers themselves knew how to speak Dutch.
PD 1: M-hm. They did. They did. I was surprised when I heard my [primary school] teacher--well, he was here at the local garage getting gas after school one night, and he was speaking Pennsylvania Dutch. And ... he kind of struck me as being a hypocrite. I mean, he was discouraging us from speaking, and yet he would speak it on his own. Y' know, in private life ... I couldn't quite understand why we weren't allowed to speak
it in school, and yet he did on his own. So I think he kind of carried through a policy that he himself didn't agree with. But, y'know, we had our local county superintendent, would visit the schools, and naturally, if he would hear a student speaking Pennsylvania Dutch, the teacher would be--reprimanded, I guess you could say.

The extreme to which the desire of the schools for a monolingual classroom population can be pressed, was found in East Sutherland shortly after the beginning of this century. Here the schoolteacher moved to extend her influence beyond the classroom into the home, actually visiting recalcitrant families who were persisting in the exclusive use of their mother tongue:

(4) ESG 3: The teacher said--she came along to my mother, and she ... asked my mother, how many more was there to go to school. My mother said 'Five. There's still five of them'. 'Oh, well', she says, 'teach them Gaelic if you want to, but please teach them English before they go to school. Because I've got to have them a year before I can start to teach them anything, by the time I get them taught to speak English' ... Now that half, in our family, could hardly speak any Gaelic ... Y'know, they can ... understand it, ... but they could never carry on a conversation ...

Investigator: So it spoilt them for Gaelic, really?
The five youngest children? ...
ESG 3: Yes, it spoilt them. Yes, it--it really did.

We see in the consequences of the teacher's visit the painful vulnerability of the threatened local currency language. The teacher couched her request in terms of 'additive' bilingualism (Lambert 1977:19), English as well as Gaelic, but the consequence was 'replacive' bilingualism, English instead of Gaelic. This was a predictable result when a representative of the setting which permitted only the officially favored language penetrated into the home setting, the chief bastion of the other, officially disfavored, language.

The second pressure point available to the schools is curricular. If the disfavored language is not to be used as a language of instruction or classroom communication at any time, may it not at least be introduced as a subject of study at some later point in the student's school life--at least after the favored language has been successfully established?

Judging by the histories of East Sutherland Gaelic and Berks County Pennsylvania Dutch, this is likely to happen only by lucky accident (e.g. the arrival of a bilingual teacher exceptionally loyal to his home language) or, more commonly, very
late in the life of the disfavored language, when that language is so clearly dying that it has ceased to pose any threat to the dominant language, and has perhaps even acquired a certain cachet as a quaint folk survival.

What happens when the schools do occasionally undertake to teach a class in the threatened language is itself problematic, and I return to that problem in a moment. More common perhaps is the experience of an East Sutherland schoolgirl who tried recently to persuade the local high school to offer a year of Gaelic for a group of upper-level students who had already completed their basic curricular requirements. It should be noted that there was a teacher at the high school with the proper credentials for teaching Gaelic, though he had never done so locally:

(5) ESG 4: ... [W]hen we were in fifth year in school, finished our 'highers', and we went to the headmaster. And I remember this distinctly. And said, 'Now, next year we have a clear year. We want to learn Gaelic'. He said 'No'. Blatantly, 'No. We aren't—it is not on the curriculum, you are not learning it' ... I can remember there was four or five of us, off our own bat ... And we went to the headmaster, and [headmaster's name] said no. 'No, you can use your time far more usefully' ... You see, he doesn't speak it.

In thus refusing to teach the language of lesser currency, the schools convey a message which is readily perceived by local speakers of that language.

(6) Investigator: ... There's people who spend 8 or 10 years trying to learn French or German.
ESG 5: Yes. And it's all right. Strange. Even in the school. And they say, 'Oh, well, they're in for languages'. But not the Gaelic. So that lets you see that it must be a dying language ... If you were married and had a family the day [i.e. today], you wouldn't bother with it ... I wouldn't bother with it. Because I would say to myself, 'Well, what's the use? It's not a school--it's not taught in the school'.

Here we find a speaker of East Sutherland Gaelic articulating what she feels is a clear message from the school authorities: French and German, languages spoken some hundreds of miles distant, are worthy of study in the local schools. Scottish Gaelic, the indigenous language of the area and still the home language of a small percentage of the population, is not worthy of school time. She translates that message into her own life: this is not a language valuable enough to pass on to your
children. And, in fact, this woman raised three children with only scanty exposure to Gaelic; none of the three speaks Gaelic today.

In the rare instances where the local language of low prestige finds its way into the curriculum, two distinct problems are likely to arise. One is the problem posed by the fact that the local form of the language is a regional dialect which little resembles the standard language. What is the teacher to teach? If he opts for the standard form, he risks alienating his students. The East Sutherland Gaelic speaker quoted in (7) was told in school that since she was a girl, her family name should not really begin with mac, which means 'son', but with nic 'daughter'. She could only protest:

(7) ESG 6: MacAoidh IS my name and it couldn't be anything else!

The standard Gaelic form NicAoidh was totally alien to this native Gaelic speaker. What is more, even a teacher basically sympathetic to the local dialect is unlikely to teach it in the classroom because (1) he may not be a speaker of quite the same variety himself, so that he controls it poorly if at all; or (2) it is unwritten and uncodified, so that he is uncertain how to write it down for the pupils; or (3) the school authorities will be even less pleased at his teaching a dialect form of the language than they are at his teaching the language in its standard form.

The second difficulty, should the local schools make some attempt to accommodate the threatened language, lies in the realistic awareness of the young speakers that theirs is a language of low prestige and that their use of this language is a factor in the negative attitudes of the dominant speech community towards them. In short, it is not at all certain that the local speakers of the threatened low prestige language will react positively to the introduction of their home language into the school (Haugen 1966:15-16, Macnamara 1971:85-86). Many will have accepted the notion that school is a domain for 'correct' and 'standard' speech behavior, a domain preempted by English as the H language (Ferguson 1959) in their experience. If the stigma attaching to their speech community is strong enough, they will prefer to confine use of their mother tongue to settings where only native speakers are present, and to adopt the dominant language in all other settings:

(8) Investigator: Suppose when you got to 7th grade, 8th grade, they had offered Dutch as a school subject ... do you think many children would have chosen it?

PD 2: ... I personally don't think so. Because I still--I still feel it was something most of them
were kind of ashamed of because they were ridiculed with it. I think most of them wanted to get away from it.

These are problems with no obvious or easy solution. Given a local dialect which is already in a precarious state, teaching the standard language form of that dialect may only serve to usher the local form out of existence more quickly by under-scoring its nonstandard character. At the same time, teaching the local dialect form requires that the school relax its traditional role of representing the norms of the wider society --meaning, where language is concerned, prestige forms--and even the native speaker community may reject that move.

It seems clear that a rigid exclusionary position taken by local schools can be damaging for speakers of the low prestige language of strictly local currency. Some of the speakers of the languages under consideration suffered searing experiences at school which left psychological scars:

(9) PD 1: It was—it was sad. I know one boy in particular, when he came [to school] he could only speak Pennsylvania Dutch. And for him it was—it was quite an experience, and he became very discouraged with everything. 'Fact I think he only went as far as 7th or 8th grade.

Recall also the statement in (1) when the speaker remembers being 'made to feel small and embarrassed'. Furthermore, we have seen that a visit from the teacher to the home has the power to effect partial loss of the home language, and that some speakers can articulate what they take to be a message from the school about the low worth of the home language.

Nonetheless I find it advisable to caution against exaggerating the power of the schools and official school policies to 'kill' a language. There are entire nations where the indigenous language is not taught at all in the schools--Somalia is a case in point (Pride 1971:95-98)--and yet is in no danger of disappearing. Similarly, diglossic situations are well known--and here we can point to German Switzerland--where a non-indigenous form of the native language is routinely and universally used in the schools without posing any threat to indigenous forms.

Since this is the case, why does the literature on Gaelic Scotland so sharply single out the schools as the chief villains in the gradual ousting of Gaelic from its home ground (Campbell 1950, Smith 1968, and especially MacKinnon 1972)? And why do we feel so strongly the force of the statements made by speakers quoted in the first part of this paper?

The answer seems to lie in the larger social setting. East Sutherland Gaelic and Berks County Pennsylvania Dutch are not only, or simply, dying dialects. They are one part of a
generally stigmatized identity. I have already indicated that the speakers of these dialects were socioeconomically distinctive; they occupied an unfavorable status in the local economy, and a low echelon in the local social order. The failure of the schools to recognize and support the language of each of these groups was only one aspect of the poor standing of the language and its speakers. In this unfavorable setting; the policy of the schools takes on a symbolic force beyond its face value. There is no inherent reason why people cannot contrive indefinitely to speak one language at home and another in school, as they do in Somalia and in German Switzerland. Yet over the long run neither most of Gaelic Scotland nor most of German Pennsylvania has been able to maintain such a linguistic dichotomy. There is an instructive contrast in the value of the ethnic identities involved: to be Somali in Somalia, or German Swiss in Switzerland, is fully acceptable and desirable but to be Gaelic in Scotland or Dutch in Pennsylvania is to be less than fully acceptable. In this climate, the school policy of exclusion of the local language 'stands for' a general message of rejection of the speakers of that language and their subculture. In the face of that message we find native speakers actively fleeing a stigmatized identity, and this includes jettisoning their native language. This is the reality we see reflected in quotation (8) ('... they were ridiculed with it. I think most of them wanted to get away from it').

The starting point for the flight from the mother tongue is surely the low standing of the subpopulation. Membership in that social group carries negative social value, and membership is most obviously expressed in the cases of the Gaelic and the Dutch by language. There are, to be sure, also differences in cuisine, and still some differences in residence patterns and occupations, among both groups, but language patterns are salient and have become emblematic of ethnic identity. Both groups accept the authority of the school, and the school explicitly rejects the home language. The importance of certain of these factors comes into sharp relief when we compare the Pennsylvania Dutch with their black fellow Americans. Membership in the black subpopulation also carries negative social value, but in this case, membership is demonstrated even more by race than by language, and race is a feature which cannot be abandoned at will. The schools have effectively exercised exclusionary pressures on blacks more often than assimilative pressures, and blacks frequently reject the authority of the school. Under these circumstances, the schools (and the society they represent) have been notoriously unable to 'eradicate' Black English. That is, it is necessary that the other-tongue subpopulation perceive a possibility of escaping the stigmatized identity and that they perceive the schools as a legitimate instrument of social pressure from the wider society before they accede to pressure to give up their home language.
In Somalia and Switzerland there are still further contrasts. One, already mentioned, is that the Somalian and German Swiss identities are not stigmatized in the first place. There is no dominant group on the scene of higher status which speaks an altogether different language. That is, neither the class/language nor the ethnicity/language cleavage exists in these societies. There is no threat to any indigenous group in the continued use of some nonindigenous speech form in the schools.

In order for the schools successfully to play a suppressive role in the fate of a language of only local currency, their standard-setting authority and the presumptive superiority of the culture they represent must be recognized by the other-tongue group. Then, the suppressive message from the schools comes strongly into play. The interesting question which remains open is whether the schools can successfully play a supportive role for an other-tongue group by lending their authority to the language of only local currency. In Scotland and the United States this question is a rather recent one. It is a relatively new thing for subpopulations in these two countries to deny the superiority of the dominant culture and attempt to enlist the schools' authority in the promotion of some restricted currency tongue. Clearly, neither the East Sutherland Gaelic speakers nor the Pennsylvania Dutch in Berks County have taken any such stance, and the local currency language in both areas is dying. The number of fully fluent speakers dwindles with every passing year, and there are no replacements coming up from the ranks of the young. The obstacles faced by subpopulations which hope to preserve their languages at least partly via school support are formidable. They include: (1) the resistance of some of the native speaker group to H use for what may have traditionally been an L language only; (2) the hostility of at least some segments of the dominant population to the use of school time for a local currency speech form; (3) the resultant reluctance of the schools to give wholehearted and well-funded support to the undertaking; (4) the desire of many other-tongue speakers for maximum training in the dominant language; and often, (5) a lack of techniques, materials, and personnel for the teaching of the other tongue.

These are not small hurdles by any means. We need to be realistic, then, in what we can expect of bilingual education. Thanks to the spread of bilingual education, we may hope that fewer children will suffer the distress and discomfort of the Gaelic-speaking child in East Sutherland who went without lunch on her first day at school because she could not understand the teacher's instruction to take lunch along when she went out to the playground. But all too often, speakers of a strictly local currency language or dialect are actually fleeing a stigmatized identity of which that language is part, and only a vocal intellectual or political minority within the native
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speaker community seeks school support for the threatened language.\textsuperscript{5} Where this is the case, it is unrealistic to expect that support from the schools on anything less than a heroic level, coupled with strong sociopolitical pressure outside the schools, will counteract the trend towards dissolution of the speech community.

NOTES

Michael Silverstein kindly read an earlier draft of this paper and offered a number of useful suggestions. This version is the better for the incorporation of several of them.

1. At least in the present century there has been no serious attempt to provide alternative or additional mother-tongue education for language maintenance purposes. The religious separatists among the Pennsylvania Germans constitute a conspicuous counterexample to the so-called 'gay Dutch' of the Hamburg area (that is, Pennsylvania Dutch who are not of the 'plain people'); the latter have no ethnic group schools of the type described by Fishman and Nahirny (Fishman 1966:92–126), nor do the East Sutherland Gaelic speakers. Occasional adult education classes in Dutch and Gaelic tend to draw more outsiders than natives, and they are in any case a sporadic phenomenon.

2. Denison (1971:167) reports that in northeastern Alpine Italy (Sauris), where the local German and Italian dialects are threatened, the schoolteacher similarly requested the use of Standard Italian in the home.

3. What is noted here for East Sutherland Gaelic and its speakers is true in a general sense for all Scottish Gaelic and its native speakers vis-à-vis English.

4. Gaelic-speaking Highlanders are commonly derogated by means of the epithet 'teuchter' in Scotland, and there are equally derogatory local epithets for the Gaelic-speaking fisherfolk in East Sutherland. In Pennsylvania areas with a sizable German population the epithet is 'dumb Dutch'.

5. Adler (1977) finds this internal conflict present in the case of some threatened European languages, e.g. Welsh.
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This paper is concerned with some aspects of language pluralism found within the membership of contemporary American Indian tribes and communities. It also deals with some of the consequences of that pluralism, with which educational policy and bilingual theory are concerned. 

1. At the present time, we estimate that some 206 different languages and language dialects are being spoken in Indian country. The results of a survey by Wallace Chafe, published in 1962, provide a sense of the range of fluency which may be subsumed under this figure: 49 of these languages have fewer than 10 speakers, all over 50 years of age; 6 of these languages have more than 10,000 speakers within all generational groupings in each community. Fluency in the remaining 151 languages may fall at any point between those two extremes. Fluency is not, as some suspect, an open-and-shut, yes-no matter. And, of course, social and cultural factors will also affect the placement for each group—as in the instance where a person knows how to carry out his/her religious responsibilities in the native language, but does not use the language for any purpose outside of that context. 

Levels of English language fluency within the tribes and communities may be similarly wide ranging. It is not uncommon to find, within any given community, persons who speak virtually no English at all. Usually, if such statements can be made for such a highly heterogeneous population, the younger members of the tribe tend to be the more fluent in English and/or rely on English more frequently as the medium of conversation and discussion. The increase in locally available schooling opportunities,
which replaces the older practice of off-reservation, boarding school instruction; the creation of federal work-incentive programs which encourages Indians to seek employment in the off-reservation, urban context; the availability of Sesame Street and other English-dominated media packages; and other such factors have all had a hand in shaping the distribution of English fluency within each tribal and community context. Thus the differences in levels of English facility from one tribe to the next, can be traced in part to the differences in impact which one or more of these factors may have had on any particular locale.

Still, some generalities about the English of Indian people can be drawn. One of these, as described in the Havinghurst report (see Fuchs and Havinghurst 1972:206-212) and in subsequent studies, has to do with the priority which Indian people place on having their children acquire English language skills. A second, as reported in the U.S. Civil Rights Commission's Southwest Indian Report (1973) and elsewhere, refers to the continuing perception by many non-Indians of the inadequacy of the English language skills of Indians. The BIA, for example, continues to treat the strengthening of its students' English skills as one of its highest educational priorities, since, by their report,

... [M]ost Indian children entering BIA schools continue to be tribal speakers first and speakers of English as a second language second [and] ... are closer to tribal life-ways than students enrolled in the public schools (Benham 1977:31).

These data may seem to be contradictory—e.g. how can there be an increase in English fluency, high levels of interest in maintaining English fluency, and still be reported inadequacy of English fluency, all within the same population? The answer lies in part in the level of generalization which must be used to talk about the common problems of the memberships of over 400 politically autonomous and culturally separate Indian tribes. It lies also in the persisting stereotypes of unsocialized Indian behavior reinforced by the media, the textbooks, and other social institutions. Indians have been portrayed as 'poor unfortunates' for so long that it may be difficult for people to see anything other than poverty and misfortune even when they are confronted with facts to the contrary. Witness, for example, the assumption in the passage just cited, that BIA students tend to be closer to tribal lifestyles than Indian students in public schools—when, as of latest count, well over 70 percent of all Indian children are enrolled in public schools, regardless of where they reside. The procedures used for testing levels of language proficiency, which often base their conclusions on nothing more than the results of vocabulary identification tasks, certainly make their contribution. But the
contradictions also refer us to some facts about the nature of the English spoken by persons in many Indian communities.

One hundred years ago, familiarity, to say nothing of fluency, with English was a novel thing in most Indian communities in the west. See, for example, DuBois' comment that: 'for the period 1846-1880, Spanish was the vehicle for communicative interaction with Anglo-Americans ... particularly with the Mescalero' (1977:191). By the beginnings of this century, the prime mandate of the Indian school had become defined around developing speaking, reading, and writing skills in English. Any carryover of native language arts instruction, as had been the case in Choctaw and Cherokee schools, for example, was eliminated by federal fiat. School classrooms and dormitories were set up in the off-reservation contexts, specifically to encourage the use of non-Indian codes. Persons from differing tribal backgrounds were often placed in the same classroom and dormitory, to prevent continued reliance on the student's ancestral language as the means for conversation. Schooling policies, in addition, forbade the use of Indian languages for any public purpose, and punished students who violated the restriction. This added significantly to the pressure to use English as the exclusive means of student communication.

What emerged from this context, as we currently understand it, was a set of English language 'codes' based, to certain extents, on the speaking knowledge which the students had already mastered—the skills in ancestral language expression. As reflected in student term papers and examination essays from Haskell Indian school in 1916 (see Malancon and Malancon 1977 for discussion), sentence constructions, details of spelling (and therefore, pronunciation as well), and vocabulary usage began to show direct Indian language influence, almost as if the students were forming English expressions with non-English grammars. The students obtained a kind of English fluency in this fashion, yet the fluency remained distinct from the sense of fluency defined and expected by Standard English speakers. Tribally distinctive English codes emerged—each formed off the grammar of the particular Indian language. They all utilized a common core of English vocabulary words, with various lexical items from the speaker's Indian language (i.e. Indian loan words) enriching the potential for expression of each code, something which was highly appropriate given the nature of the sentence formation process underlying each code.

The students who went through this process of 'creative construction' are among the grandparents and great-grandparents of today's tribal and community membership. Their children (persons in today's parental generation) learned both their Indian language and their parents' 'Indian English' at home. The schools continued to construct their language arts curriculum in terms of the language needs of Standard English speakers. This, in turn, bypassed the specific language arts needs which the students brought with them into
the classroom. And it also did something else. For the curriculum to have impact on the level of the students' English fluency, instruction would have to make direct inroads into the Indian language grammar underlying that fluency. Growth (i.e. standardization) of English skills resulted in a weakening and ultimately a loss of Indian language skills in many instances. Maintenance of Indian language fluency required resistance and rejection of Standard English influence in the grammar, and this Standard English convention in their speech.

Consider now the contemporary consequences of this situation. Students in the present generation encounter the local variety of Indian English, influenced by the ancestral language tradition of the community, as the first language in the home. They may also be exposed to the ancestral language of their community, depending on the situation within the home and the tribe. Yet even if this does not occur, since the English being learned shows ancestral language influence, the children are able to become passively fluent in their Indian language (i.e. receptively, though not necessarily productively competent) through the acquisition of their locally appropriate, Indian English code. This helps explain why so many nonspeakers in the contemporary Indian communities can understand what parents and grandparents say to them in their native/ancestral tongue, even though they are not able to respond to the speaker in the same linguistic terms. The children's English may in fact allow them to be predisposed to learning (or relearning) Indian language fluency, something which will greatly assist them in later life if, for example, they decide to become active members of tribal government and/or to participate more extensively in the tribe's ceremonial life.

The less positive sides of Indian English fluency may emerge within school-related contexts in a variety of ways. Fluency in the local Indian English code may, for example, lead a student to use sentences such as (1)-(5) in written compositions.

(1) Two womens was out there fighting.
(2) Since the church close down, we been goin to mass in Pajarito.
(3) You do not record none of your wills or any of your transactions with BIA.
(4) Any fiestas which we might have are given early in the summer.
(5) The individual pick out their own cattle.

Each of these sentences reflects a construction type common to the spoken English at one community in the United States Southwest, but quite inappropriate as far as written (or spoken standard) English expression is concerned. Similarly, Indian English fluency may lead the student to interpret material on the printed page in terms quite different from those intended by the writer; familiar 'problems' in reading comprehension.
reported in the literature on Indian schooling can often be traced to such causes. Other examples could be suggested; the point is clear. Without adequate control over the kinds of basic English skills expected and assumed by educational authorities, impediments to educational progress can be predicted. The record on leaving school, test-score placements, and other signs of the so-called 'under-achievement' of the Indian student all bear out the validity of this prediction.

2. The impact of the Indian student's English language skills on his/her educational progress has long been recognized by schooling authorities and by language planners and researchers. As Fuchs and Havinghurst noted in the summary volume of the National Study of Indian Education (1977:208ff.), two solutions—intensive programs of ESL instruction, and programs offering (transitional) bilingual education, have come to be relied upon to bring about the necessary strengthening of English language skills which effective classroom performance appears to require. Until the 1970s, however, the nature of the English language 'problem' toward which these remedial strategies were to be directed was presented in the literature in terms of a subtractive (or outright deficiency) model—identifying what Standard English conventions were not present in Indian English speech; or in terms of a contrastive model—identifying what problem areas in English fluency might be present within the English of a given Indian community. To my knowledge, it was not until 1971 that serious attempts to describe and account for the linguistic and sociolinguistic details actually present in any variety of American Indian English were initiated.

My own study of the varieties of English spoken at Isleta pueblo, New Mexico, began during this period as an outgrowth of dissertation-related studies of Isletan Tiwa, the ancestral language of that community. The first suggestion that Isletan English might have a logic independent of that of Standard English came with the conclusion of an analysis of the surface-level phonology of the English of several adult speakers. While English vocabulary was being employed in their speech, the words and phrases were pronounced in terms of Tiwa, and not English, phonological constraints. (See Leap 1973 for discussion.)

This was not, then, a case of Isletan Tiwa interference with an otherwise intact English phonological pattern: if anything, Isletan phonology has preempted the English pattern, not just selected portions of it. Elaboration of this comment is provided in Leap (1977c) and in Stout's (1977) analysis of the Keresan English of Santa Ana, New Mexico.

The phonological analysis also highlighted a series of Isletan English sentence constructions which seems to be directly influenced by Tiwa grammatical constraint. Additional papers (Leap 1974b and 1974c) reviewed several of these constructions
to show how Tiwa grammatical rule was taking precedence over English grammatical rule in Isletan English sentence formation. The creative synthesis of Tiwa and English syntax present in this English code continued to be the topic of subsequent analysis. Instances appeared such as in the contrastive use of single vs. double negation in the code, where Tiwa semantic rules were being directly replicated in Isletan English. Cases also appeared, as in the formation of sentences with cognate object constructions, where both a Tiwa and an English language explanation could be used to account for the particulars of the derivation. These implied that criteria for selecting between the explanations needed to be developed in the analysis, possibly replicating the decision-making which the Isletan English speaker has to carry out when initiating the act of derivation. (For discussion, see Leap 1977d.)

Constructions also appeared where the source could not be traced either to Isletan Tiwa grammar or to the grammatical component of Standard English: the use of uninflected be in Isletan English shows some decided parallels to the use of be in Black English vernacular, for example. Analysis showed, in fact, that a close association between this aspect of the deep structure of these two nonstandard codes could be established, provided Fasold's definition of distributive be were brought into closer harmony with the absence of tense-specification reflected in his own data but not highlighted in his discussion of theme. (See Leap 1975 for the details.)

While some of the affinities between Isletan and other varieties of nonstandard English were beginning to be explored through such interdialectal comparisons, the limitations of using typological characteristics of one nonstandard code when describing or interpreting the features of a second also were becoming clear. In a recent paper (Leap 1977a), I show how the absence of tense-marking on Isletan English verbs may reflect any number of grammatical constraints. Thus to assume that tenseless verbs in Isletan English are derived through phonological simplification, as is the case in some Black English dialects, is as inappropriate as it is premature.

The uniqueness of the Isletan English code was beginning to be highlighted in the interdialectal comparisons. Speaker assessments of a set of Isletan English sentences, following the elicitation technique outlined in Fasold (1969), proved to be markedly distinct from those given by speakers of Anglo and Spanish American English varieties common to the communities immediately adjacent to the Isletan reservation. (See Leap 1977e, for further discussion.) Arguments that Indian English codes merely represent some variant of regionally appropriate American English are seriously weakened by these findings.

Intertribal comparisons of Indian English forms yielded similarly useful perspectives on the uniqueness of Isletan English. I had been advised on numerous occasions that Indian people in the southwest and elsewhere could place a person's tribal
background merely by listening to the way he/she spoke English. (See, in particular, the anecdote reported in Leap 1974a.) Comparison of these specifics of word-final consonant cluster reduction in Isletan and Cheyenne English (Leap 1977b); Penfield's (1975, 1977) several papers on the continuing autonomy of four Indian English varieties—Navajo, Ute, Mojave, and Hopi, within the same classroom; Stout's continuing analysis of syntactic details and their sociolinguistic correlates within the English of elementary students at Laguna pueblo, New Mexico (much of which is summarized in Stout 1978), and Miller's (1976) study of English language acquisition among children on the Pima reservation, have provided ample evidence to support the language-specific nature of each community's Indian English variety. A study of the English of school children from San Juan and Laguna pueblos, New Mexico, currently ongoing at the Center for Applied Linguistics under support from the National Institute of Education promises to add additional support to these claims, especially where the impact of Indian English fluency on school performance is concerned. Natalie Kuhlman's work on Papago and Pima English (Kuhlman and Longoni 1975, Kalectaca and Kuhlman 1977) achieves the same end, in spite of her continuing reliance on subtractive/deficiency models in her descriptions.

In the light of these studies, my argument (Leap 1973, passim) that there are as many different kinds of American Indian English as there are American Indian language traditions becomes readily understandable. Descriptive data, comparative insights, tribal opinion, and speaker assessments of grammaticality and sentence acceptability all combine to support the claim. The arguments of Mary Jane Cook (1973, passim) and others who continue to interpret the English of Indian people in the southwest strictly in terms of shared, area-wide phenomena must be dismissed in the light of this conclusion.

3. The argument that there are as many kinds of Indian English as there are Indian language traditions—that is, a minimum of 206 different Indian English varieties, carries with it some particular implications for the interests of this year's Georgetown University Round Table and I want to explore several of those implications in the following paragraphs.

Taken uncritically, the claim might seem to imply that speakers of Indian English are also speakers of their appropriate ancestral languages. Such is not always the case, as the argument and statistics in the first section of this paper have already suggested. I am personally aware of instances in Indian country where the control over ancestral language grammar contained in the knowledge of the local Indian English code is the only reflex of Indian language skill which the community membership (or a significant portion of that membership) now possesses. At some phase in the transmission of language skills within the community, Indian English must have begun to
be acquired autonomously—i.e. successful acquisition was not
dependent on the presence of an existing Indian language gram-
mar or Indian language speaking skill. We might, for this
reason, want to view Indian English as some kind of creole if,
in the strict sense of the term, its predecessor was some sort
of pidgin. Then, we would want—as Stout and Erting (1977)
have done for uninflected be in Isletan English—to interpret the
English language dynamics in the community in terms of a post-
creole model. Doing this would detract from the more critical
point: the grammar being transmitted autonomously is a whole
grammar, whatever its origin—that is, it is systematic enough
to be learnable, and complete enough to be learned in the same
(or comparable) form by various segments of the community
membership, through reliance on the same range of cognitive
skills which all human beings employ in the natural language
acquisition process. While the codes may have had their
original basis in some process of relexification or other form
of 'creative construction', such processes do not appear to be
necessary for their successful maintenance or their successful
transmission.

The complexity faced by language arts programs in American
Indian schools can, I believe, best be interpreted in these
very terms. Given the diversity in range and level of lan-
guage fluency which may occur within any Indian speech com-
munity, the local classroom may contain, at minimum: (1) stu-
dents who have learned Indian English and have little, or no,
control over their ancestral language; (2) students who speak
both their ancestral language and some variety of English; and
(3) students fluent in their ancestral language but showing
minimal fluency in English. Schooling authorities tend to view
the language condition of their students through a much more
unified perspective—building the language profile around greater
or lesser degrees of evidenced English fluency. The BIA con-
tinues to estimate the number of speakers of Indian languages
in its schools by extrapolating from the number of students who
speak English as a second language—see the statistics reported
in Fuchs and Havinghurst 1972:207-208, or the conclusions of
the survey of bilingual education needs of Indian children,
carried out by the National Indian Training and Research
Center (1975). Here lies the basis for the oft-reported diver-
gence between institutional and parental expectations where
the student-general need for strengthening English language
skills exists, while the parents (and students) express con-
cern about unaddressed, student-specific Indian language flu-
ency. And even when native language instruction is included
in the school curriculum, the justification advanced for doing
so emphasizes a promised growth in student English facility,
rather than the strengthening of student native language arts.

The school-based perspective on student language needs has
some serious consequences for interests in ancestral language
maintenance as well. For, regardless of the level of ancestral
language fluency which the student brings into the first grade classroom, the general pattern in Indian country shows a marked reduction in (if not elimination of) that fluency by the time the student completes the sixth grade. The causes for this reduction extend far beyond the failure of school to include ancestral language instruction in the curriculum. As argued in an earlier section of this paper, by focusing attention only on English language questions, and by attempting to rework the students' existing control of English into a more standardized format, the school is literally undermining student fluency in his/her ancestral language—the grammar underlying his locally appropriate English code and the grammar underlying his ancestral fluency being, in essence, one and the same.

Under current practice, and I would include here the various transitional bilingual programs funded under the Bilingual Education Act (Title VII, ESEA), a successful program of English language instruction in any Indian school virtually guarantees native language genocide. This will continue to be the case, until educational policy and classroom practice cease treating the Indian English question as something totally autonomous from the remaining portions of the Indian student's verbal repertoire.

4. What kind of educational strategy is appropriate for students with fluency in some variety of American Indian English?

It is not appropriate merely to ignore the differences in structure and usage convention which distinguish the student's Indian English grammar from that of the standard code. To present the students with exercises highlighting the differences between the past tense forms of lay and lie, when the student may not ever use laid or lay (or, more generally, the {-d} morpheme or verbal ablaut) to mark past tense expression for these verbs (if, in fact, he/she defines tense/aspect distinctions in temporal terms at all) is both an inefficient and irresponsible use of the student's schooling experience—to say nothing about the previously noted impact such instruction could have on the Indian language skills he/she already controls.

Still, speaking situations outside the home community and tribal context often require some evidence of Standard English expression as a precondition for effective mobility within their context. Educational programs which fail to provide Indian students with opportunities to gain stronger control over Standard English conventions are therefore equally inefficient and equally irresponsible.

The school's task is to find an educational strategy which will integrate Standard English into the student's verbal repertoire without detracting from the native language skills already evidenced within that repertoire, or allowing Standard English to supersede the English usage patterns already familiar to the student. The school also needs to help the student distinguish between sentence variants, so that he/she can select
the sentence form most appropriate to any given speaking situation. And, because the student's existing English fluency is, to a large part, governed by the grammar of her/his ancestral language, it will also be necessary for the school to provide instruction in Indian as well as English language arts. The more secure the student is in the language skills she/he already controls, the more prepared she/he will be to integrate new speaking tasks into the scope of his verbal repertoire.

In effect, what is being called for here is a program of bilingual education, if by that term is meant an education strategy which starts with the students’ existing language skills—in this case, those subsumed under the phrase 'Indian English', and then directs those skills toward the building of language fluencies deemed appropriate by the membership of the home community as well as by persons in the surrounding society. Such an educational strategy is highly appropriate for schooling programs in Indian country, regardless of specific locale; it is often said that Indian people have their feet in 'two worlds'. If so, it is only fitting that their children gain control over the verbal codes basic to mobility and movement within each sphere.

But a problem remains: the kinds of language needs described here are not viewed as appropriate for bilingual services under current HEW practice. The Lau Remedies, the provisions of the Bilingual Education Act (Title VII, ESEA), and other federal programs facilitating the development of bilingual/bicultural instruction in the nation's schools define student eligibility for federally supported bilingual services in terms of the presence of 'limited English-speaking ability'. LESA, when used in reference to an individual, refers to someone who has difficulty speaking and understanding instruction in the English language because his/her dominant language--i.e. the language most relied upon for communication in the home--is other than English; and whose educational progress can be shown to be impeded as a result of that difficulty.

As this discussion has shown, the Indian English-speaking student may experience the same kinds of difficulties in speaking and/or in understanding English language instruction in the classroom, and may find his/her educational progress impeded as a result of those difficulties—even though the language relied upon for communication in the home is Indian English, and not the student's ancestral tongue. As a result, Indian participation in the Title VII network has never been extensive—in FY 1976, for example, of the $135 million disbursed for basic program support under this Act, only $3.25 million, approximately 2.5 percent of the available monies, were awarded to LEAs serving Indian students—even though Indian students could benefit equally well from Title VII services currently made available to non-Indian LEAs whose students show closer conformity to the description of language need defined in the Title VII regulations.
There has been, in recent months, much discussion about the need to rewrite the Title VII act so that it could become more sensitive to the language needs of the nation's linguistic minorities. In the present case, a simple change in the definition of limited English-speaking ability will allow for greater Indian eligibility for Title VII support without requiring extensive changes in the original mandate and purpose of this legislation: Section 703(a)(1)(B) should be revised to allow LESA to refer to 'individuals who come from environments where a language other than English has had measurable or demonstrable impact on their level of English proficiency'. Following that passage with the remainder of section 703(a)(1) as presently worded will allow Indian students to become eligible for Title VII services provided the students are speakers of their community's Indian English code. Such will clearly be the case for students in many Indian communities, whether they are fluent in their ancestral language or not. The change suggested here would facilitate the introduction of bilingual instruction into the schooling programs serving these communities, and remove the language barrier which so often impedes the progress of the 'monolingual-English-speaking Indian' through the American education system. And I am pleased to report that Resident Commissioner Baltasar Corrada has included it in the proposed reauthorization of the Bilingual Education Act which he introduced to the 95th Congress; and that Senators Dominici and Hart have included the same definition in the text of the comparable legislation introduced in the U.S. Senate.

NOTE

I want to thank Rosario Gingras, Lance Potter, Paul Murphy, and Angui Madera for their help in preparing this statement, and to dedicate the paper to Rudy Troike, former director of the Center for Applied Linguistics, under whose tutelage many of the insights being explored here were originally conceived.
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I feel greatly honored to be here today. Much of what I know about the subject at hand, after all, comes from the work of those who have assembled for these distinguished Georgetown University Round Table meetings, and I am deeply in their debt.

There are those who think that I have not learned well enough from their work, and there are others who think that I have learned only too well. That is always the case. But my experience in examining national bilingual and bicultural education policy in the United States has confirmed my belief that journalists and scholars have exceedingly important benefits to gain from each other—if only we can overcome some of the strains between us.

That will not always be easy. There are many inherent flaws in journalism, mainly growing out of the limited time and space available for what we write, and that understandably makes some scholars uncomfortable in dealing with us. From the journalist's view, there are also problems with scholars, including the tendency of some to indulge in needless obscurity and jargon. I must say that in trying to understand the bilingual-bicultural issue, I feel that I have become multilingual myself—and all in English.

But there are also deeper problems, and one in particular which has been troubling me for some time. This is the tendency of some scholars, in their eagerness to influence public policy, to confuse rhetoric and research, to blur the critical distinction between their scholarship and their ideologies, between what they know and what they believe.

This tendency is certainly neither new nor peculiar to the bilingual-bicultural education issue, and it has been disturbing
a good number of scholars themselves. As Dr. Richard C. Atkinson, director of the National Science Foundation, has remarked, he has heard his fellow psychologists 'too often speaking on issues of education, child rearing, and mental health using what they claim to be research evidence as a disguise for advocating a particular policy'. To his mind, 'some social scientists want to run the goddamn country, and that's an unhealthy attitude'.

But my efforts in the bilingual-bicultural area have served to deepen my concerns. The question that troubles me, it should be emphasized, is not whether scholars should also be advocates; they obviously have as much right as anyone else to press their political views. Rather, the question is when scholars have an overriding responsibility to identify what is research and what is rhetoric, when their scholarly authority ends and their beliefs carry no more or less weight than anyone else's, when they must say there is no reliable evidence to support—or contradict—their personal views. I would go even one step further: Do scholars have an obligation to make available to public bodies information which they fear might damage their personal causes, or are errors of omission permissible?

Let me give you an example. In early 1974, as everyone is aware, the Supreme Court handed down its ruling in Lau v. Nichols. The Court, confirming a guideline of the Health, Education and Welfare Department, ruled that school systems had to provide some kind of special instruction to students who had little or no command of English. It did not specify what that instruction should be, leaving the decision to the school district, in that case San Francisco.

San Francisco then appointed a citizens' task force to devise a remedy, and it also contracted with the Center for Applied Linguistics to provide technical assistance. The task force and the Center worked together. But as I noted in my policy analysis, Language, Ethnicity, and the Schools, there was a problem: The task force did not want the Center to include any studies which raised doubts about the effectiveness of bilingual-bicultural education in improving student achievement. As Dr. Roger Shuy, a distinguished member of this faculty and also associate director of the Center, told me:

Our instructions from the task force were to give them positive instances. We told them that in terms of reading, there wasn't much evidence to show that bilingual education helped. But they didn't want us to say anything like that. They had a political job to do.

What do scholars do in such circumstances? I am sure that the task force demand caused considerable consternation at the Center.
In the end, the Center essentially went along with the demands. The opening section of the plan developed for the school system and the court listed seven fragile studies which could be used to support bilingual education. No unfavorable studies were included. The listing was then followed by this caveat: 'This survey has focused on projects which have shown (or have tried to show) that bilingual or vernacular education really works'. As Dr. Shuy said; 'It was a concession getting that statement in to protect my integrity'.

Where does the scholars' responsibility lie in such a case? Did not the court have a right to know that, so far as bilingual education's impact on achievement and on the acquisition of a second language are concerned, the evidence is fragmented, largely unreliable, and inconclusive? Did not the school officials have a right to know? Above all, did not the parents of the children concerned have a right to know? Does not it make one wonder why the task force members would not trust parents in their own language groups with the available evidence? Would you accept the same standards from a journalist?

Since completing my brief policy analysis, I have had more reason to wonder about such questions. Among other things, attorneys for several school systems have asked me to testify in court cases involving bilingual education. Why me? Surely there are many scholars more qualified than I am to tell a court what is and is not known about bilingual education. As I stated to begin with, much of what I know about the issue, and certainly everything I know about the research aspects, comes from you and your colleagues. But the attorneys have made it clear to me that they cannot get many, if any, scholars to testify on behalf of the school systems. Presumably, the scholars do not want to appear to be opponents of bilingual and bicultural education, even though one of the school systems challenging the HEW 'Lau remedies' growing out of the Supreme Court ruling is run by a school board made up entirely of Alaskan natives.

That makes me wonder again: Can a scholar seriously claim that telling a balanced version of reality, at least as he or she knows reality, might hurt a cause that one deeply believes in? Again, would the same standards apply to journalists? I think not.

I am not surprised at all when attorneys or politicians try to prove their cases with whatever evidence they can muster. That is generally expected of them, and their words consequently are often greeted with the appropriate skepticism. I am sure you do not want to see the same reception for the words of researchers. I certainly do not. Yet I think that is increasingly, if gradually, becoming the case. It was both distressing and humorous to discover that in one bilingual case, Otero v. Mesa County Valley School District No. 51, the court remarked: 'Listening to these experts causes one
to conclude that if psychiatrists' disagreements are to be compared to differences between educators, psychiatrists are almost of a single mind'.

Do not misunderstand. I am aware that the scholarly process demands disagreement. It is also not a swift process that can produce instant answers to pressing social issues. Part of the problem is that the society often expects more from scholars than they can reasonably deliver. The other part of the problem is that scholars often begin to believe that they should oblige.

In the bilingual-bicultural policy area, I believe, one of the problems is that scholars have sometimes let themselves be used and abused by others. They have not emphasized enough in the public arena how little is known about bilingual education. Yet they have often complained, at least to me, about the paucity of research funds available to finance their investigations. Indeed, for nearly a decade now, many persons have been proclaiming that bilingual education is the answer, but, as I have asked in my analysis: What was the question?

To some scholars, of course, the primary question is not what effect bilingual-bicultural education can have on achievement in general. They have stressed that bilingual-bicultural education, in and of itself, should not be expected to make a significant difference in the achievement of poor, limited-English-speaking children. If that is what the evidence shows, those scholars should be stating that specifically, with any appropriate qualifications, to the Congress, the courts, and the parents of those students. If, as some have stated, language barriers do not appear to be the chief cause for the poor achievement of many such students, the policymakers and parents surely have a right to know that.

Statements to this effect are not hard to find in scholarly or professional journals. For example, Dr. Joshua A. Fishman, one of the most forceful bilingual-bicultural advocates in this country, has written that the cumulative evidence on transitional bilingual-bicultural education, which is chiefly what is being funded in this nation, shows that:

... on the whole, bilingual education is too frail a device, in and of itself, to significantly alter the learning experiences of the minority-mother-tongue-poor in general or their majority-language-learning success in particular.

But members of Congress, judges, and parents do not read those scholarly and professional journals, and they are the ones responsible for the decisions that are made.

Dr. Fishman, of course, has long believed that enriching these students' lives with two or more languages and cultures, thereby maintaining minority languages and cultures and also enriching the society as a whole, are sufficient justifications
not only for bilingual-bicultural education, but for the federal government to assume responsibility for its financing and promotion. That position, I need scarcely say, does not necessarily rest on scholarship, just as opposing positions need not rest on scholarship, and Dr. Fishman has made this clear. In the landmark study he headed in the early 1960s, _Language Loyalty in the United States_, in the eloquent chapter on policy recommendations, Dr. Fishman stated:

... these recommendations are not necessarily derived from data reported by the Language Resource Project. Many could have been advanced (and probably would have been) without the data obtained from three years of concerted effort.

That was a refreshing acknowledgment to discover, and I commend Dr. Fishman for it. I only wish that others would include such statements in their public testimony, as well as in their studies, whenever they are expressing their personal views.

I have deep admiration for scholars in general, and I know that what I have said may seem presumptuous to many, particularly coming from a journalist. Journalism, after all, has many problems of its own, and I am only too well aware of them. But I make these remarks with the conviction that the primary search of both scholars and journalists is still for the truth, wherever that may lead. To the extent that this search is compromised, the authority of both is diminished and both we and the nation suffer.
Experience has shown over the last 30 years or more that studies of subjects in the natural sciences, like physics, which had hitherto been regarded as morally neutral are not so neutral. Atomic physics, for example, is as open to moral adjudication as any other form of human activity. That being the case, how much more relevant is discussion of the ethics of aspects of the human sciences, like psychology, sociology, and above all, insofar as it is a science, pedagogy? Not that I believe that the theory of bilingual education is a scientific theory in any explanatory or predictive sense. Neither is it a normative theory, like a theory of grammar. A pedagogical theory does not prescribe rules which, if they are observed, lead to a predictable result. It has to be open-ended, because considerations of who is selected, for what type of education, what they are taught, and for what reason, which are essential ingredients of pedagogic theory, have to do with our concept of the quality of life and the purposes which mankind formulates for itself. Therefore, a theory of instruction is essentially a theory of social morality. Whether or not we are willing to envisage a pluralist society, and how we regard the part bilingual education should play in such a society, are value judgments, and imply the use of moral criteria. To me these appear to be four—social justice, social equality, the significance of communal ties, and finally, the development of individual or personal authenticity and identity. I suggest that bilingual education is justified only to the extent that it meets these criteria, and that the shape of any system of bilingual education is determined by the relative importance it attaches to each of them. Questions of organisation and method are secondary and derivative.

These moral or ethical dimensions of pluralism in education, though they are categorical, are not abstract, as might be
implied by the use of such general terms. They are operational criteria and their existence can only be observed as they determine the conduct of individuals and groups at particular moments in time. In order to understand what is entailed by justice, equality, the nurturing of communal ties, and the promotion of personal identity and authenticity, we are guided not so much by theory but by the way they have influenced the historical development of peoples, especially minorities. James Thurber wrote: 'Let us not look back in anger nor forward in fear but around us with awareness', and we should heed his appeal, especially since one of our most important privileges as teachers is the opportunity to refine sensibility and sharpen awareness. But our awareness of what is significant now is coloured by what we have been exposed to in the past and what we have otherwise learned about the past. A historical perspective is inescapable. The very sense of contrast and dissimilarity with which the past affects us provides the only relevant background against which the features peculiar to our own experience stand out in sufficient relief to be adequately discerned and described. The value of placing the morality of bilingual education in its historical context is, therefore, not out of fear of repeating past errors, nor in hope of being able to plan for an ideal system of bilingual education in the future, but rather to help us refine our awareness of present needs and sharpen our insufficient sensitivity to the moral obligation to meet those needs. It is an illusion to believe that great and desirable things, among which I include the pluralist society, can be achieved blindly by men without a consciousness of the past—a past which many of them believe takes the spirit out of new things. The truth is that the more energetically the past is known, the more energetic is the impulse to go beyond it and progress. This knowledge of the past is life and such life invites to a richer life.

A consideration of our subject in a historical context illuminates another dimension of the morality of pluralism. The values that shape bilingual education are not simply numerous, they are also conflicting. We err if we do not recognise that demands for justice as well as equality may not in the last resort be reconcilable; nor can the individual's demand to be recognised as a self-subsistent, autonomous being necessarily be reconciled with his desire to reverence his communal ties. Respect for tradition often clashes with equally valid demands for innovation. Such values conflict intrinsically, and the human condition is such that choices are forced upon us simply because equally significant values in the same area of human behaviour are also diametrically opposed. The moral universe, like the universe of ethnic groups and nations (some of which adhere to principles which others are unwilling to adopt), is pluralist. There is neither a hierarchy of values whereby we can say that justice is superior to equality, or communal ties to individual and personal authenticity. Nor
do these values enter into any harmonious pattern. We have to choose not simply between right and wrong but between two equal values. They cannot be reconciled and we live from day to day attempting to maintain a precarious equilibrium, such that in doing justice to some we do not invade the inherent rights of others, or that in maintaining the integrity of the historical group to which we may be affiliated, we do not inhibit the individual's, including our own, right to dissent; or in preserving a hallowed tradition, we are not blind to the creative possibilities of innovation. There is only so much of one side of the equation that can be accepted without sacrificing the other. William James recognised this in his Varieties of Religious Experience when he remarked that 'we live in partial systems'—which I take to mean partial justice and partial acknowledgment of other values as well.

Let us for a moment glance at the tensions which exist within the theory of pluralism in the light of these inevitable dichotomies. Clearly, it would be meaningless to imagine that a child is educated independently of a given social and moral pattern or environment. Both logically and chronologically my Welsh inheritance existed prior to my conception. But this priority so far as any Welshman is concerned was only a potential, not an actual, inheritance: I have had to work at it to make it mine. It is, therefore, not 'given' but only 'offered' and offered only as the premise of my creating something new, neither better nor worse, but certainly different. Goethe recognised that in the creation of what is new there is always the necessity to recall; there is always a tradition. 'I have cherished no memory', he writes, but continues: 'when we have met with something great or beautiful or significant we are not to call it back from without ... but it must live in me in the creation of a new and better I'. We often speak very facilely about an ethnic or cultural tradition, but in fact, a tradition is a very tricky thing to get to know. That we can become conscious of it at all is due obviously to its having a recognisable identity. Nevertheless, that identity is flimsy and elusive. It is neither fixed nor finished: it has no changeless centre to which understanding can anchor itself; there is no model to be copied, idea to be realized, or rule to be followed. Some parts change more slowly than others, but none is immune from change. Everything is temporary.

Furthermore, though we have a moral obligation to revere a particular tradition, that tradition is itself open to a judgment of value. Tradition as such is only a formal concept which may become associated with any content, true or false, beneficial or noxious. It is not the fact of its being traditional that makes the cultural tradition of any group valuable, but the values it represents, for example, the reasonableness of what it enshrines. It is this which not only enriches it but universalises it as well. Reason alone unites men, not only within a group but across different groups. Apart from
reason there is only the treacherous convergence of fancies, caprices, and passing interests. The matter was put best by Sir Walter Raleigh who had some interesting associations with Virginia in the seventeenth century. He claimed that 'one who governs by dimensions of former times shall take council of the dead, for the natures of all things under the sun are subject to change save the nature of reason only'. So what do we mean when we maintain that education for a pluralist society entails a regard for this or that tradition? Maintaining a traditional culture is a matter of entering into a rational conversation with the past; it is at once an initiation into an inheritance in which we have a life interest, but also a personal exploration of its intimations and a personal contribution, on our own terms, to its continuance.

A similar tension within our field of endeavour is created by the irreconcilable, but equally justifiable, demands of the communal ties (which we ignore at our peril) in which human beings tend to be recognised solely as members of a community; and, on the other hand, the morality of personal identity arising from the innate demand to be recognised as an autonomous individual, separate and sovereign. This tension, like the others to which I refer, is age-old. It differentiated the Athenian democracy from the Spartan autocracy of which Plutarch, writing of Lycurgus said: 'Nobody was free to live as he wished but as if in a camp everyone had his way of life and his public duties fixed; and he held that he did not belong to himself but to his community'. In general, Lycurgus educated the Spartans to have 'neither the will nor the ability to lead a private life'. Lest you should think that this is an outmoded concept of education, let me quote a leading Welsh thinker and leader of Welsh minority militancy, Saunders Lewis, who claimed that 'Education is determined by the requirements of the nation and not according to the needs of the individual'. At least two of your own most respected scholars say the same thing in more circumspect terms. Ruth Benedict argues quite rightly that 'the life history of the individual is first and foremost an accommodation to the patterns and structures handed down by his community'. She does not refer to the fact that much of the individual's later life is spent in expressing his dissent and revealing nonconformist attitudes—sometimes violently. George Mead, too, argues that 'education is definitely the process of taking over a certain organised set of responses' and his vision of improving education is the enlargement of that set of responses from a small group to an international order. But however enlarged the group, the purpose of education is to take over an already organised pattern.

Let there be no mistake, this side of the argument cannot be faulted—the recognition of community ties forged over centuries should be axiomatic. On the other hand, the Athenian respect for personal identity, the inviolability of the individual's right to mark out his own path, is equally sacred. This is what
De Toqueville recognised as characteristic of the American way of life.

The young were to be brought up to evade the bondage of habit, of family maxims, class opinions and national prejudices; to accept tradition only as a means of information ... to seek the reason of things for oneself and in oneself alone.

About the same time in Wales, a great patriot and writer, Lewis Edwards, was emphasising the same principle: 'The nation and its language', he wrote, 'are lovely in our sight but lovelier still are knowledge and truth which each of us discovers for himself and which are the means with which we fight all types of religious and national prejudice'.

This tension between the value of tradition and the inviolable core of a personal identity which makes each of us incomparable and irreplaceable within any community, is associated with the tension existing between different concepts of justice. Bilingual education, especially in the United States, is associated with the claim to justice and human rights. But within the framework of social justice, different concepts are urged for our acceptance. Some societies argue that justice is done to the different groups when the benefit to society as a whole is maximized, when the advantages to the greatest number of citizens outweigh whatever disadvantages may be experienced by minorities. Accordingly, language policy is justified by the extent to which the country as a whole becomes more efficient, wealthier, stronger, more stable, and more congenial by recognising or not recognising minority groups and their languages. This is the concept which governs bilingual education policy, and language policy generally, in the Soviet Union. The distribution of social roles among the different languages is determined not by whether the minority group and its associated language gains or suffers by such role distribution but by whether the Soviet Union as a whole (in effect, the State) is a beneficiary. This view has almost always been held by colonizing and imperial powers too. Sometimes the State gains by recognising the different minorities, as was the case with the Persians who used a non-Iranian language throughout their vast empire, while at the same time recognising large numbers of ethnic languages locally. Sometimes the State believes it will gain by ignoring the local languages, as was the case in the British Empire until almost the end of its supremacy, and has been the case in the United States until recently. The view cannot be dismissed out of hand and its feasibility is at least arguable. There may be a time in the process of nation-building when it is more advantageous even to the minorities, immigrants, and indigenous alike, that the claims of the State and the incipient nation should prevail. At such a time, it
may be that an unequal distribution of obligations and rights is to everyone's advantage.

A variant of this 'utilitarian' concept of justice regards all languages in a plurilingual society as candidates whose claims have to be weighed against each other by asking which balance is the most just at a particular time and in respect of specified minorities. In this case, there is no single criterion for establishing a permanent balance of advantage.

The second concept of social justice envisages a completely different set of possibilities. According to this notion, justice is what is inherently fair. All languages and all individuals speaking whatever languages have an innate claim and an inalienable right to be safeguarded in and for themselves alone. The loss or disregard of one language, diminishing its role or restricting its currency in society, is not made right by the fact that a larger number of people gain a greater advantage. The smallest and most insignificant language groups or individuals, like the largest and most powerful, have a right to exist and prosper irrespective of any calculation of profit and loss. Such is the view of Professor Robert Nozick, from whom I quote: 'Individuals have rights and there are things which no person or group may do to them without violating those rights ... There are only individual people, different individual people with their own individual lives'. The individuals to whom Nozick refers can claim to have those rights safeguarded not only against other individuals but against their community, their ethnic group, their nation, or any entity which claims superordinate rights or entertains historically enshrined demands. We do no good to the advance of the pluralist society and to bilingual education if we fail to recognise these tensions and the more important fact that they are irreconcilable.

Where we are faced with the choice between equally sacred claims and values what, as teachers and citizens, can we do? Tension does not entail conflict unless we will it so. We accept tension and so promote pluralism. The latter is not only governed by a number of principles but it also engenders at least one principle which, while valuable in itself, ensures that tension and the intrinsic conflict of values is creative rather than destructive. This principle is tolerance. If the need to make a choice between two opposed but equal claims is an essential element in any human condition, I can also accept the claim that some other person is entitled to make a different choice between the same principles, or to attach a different weight to them. Whatever arguments there may be for exercising toleration, it is a social good and necessary to pluralism. A. N. Whitehead recognised that 'one argument in its favour was that while in formal logic a contradiction is the signal of defeat, in the evolution of man it marks the first step in progress'. However cogently Whitehead might argue for it, the value of tolerating contradiction, conflict, and a variety of disparate values, was perhaps more beautifully expressed by
the Chinese Chiang Tzu who might quite easily have been thinking of the large number of languages in his own country when he said:

Suppose that a gale is sweeping over a forest, the trees respond with their varied notes according to all possible differences in their cavities. What need would there be to pass judgment on their multitudinous notes or declare that some and not others are the voice of the gale?
THE 1978 ROUND TABLE IN RETROSPECT

E. Glyn Lewis

1. The 1978 Georgetown University Round Table on Languages and Linguistics (the 29th) brought together for the equivalent of approximately three days speakers representing universities or similar institutions from ten countries, together with many more from the United States itself. Many of them have led the pursuit of the study of bilingual education in their own countries and are recognised internationally. Fifty contributions were presented (including one in absentia and four to special interest groups). Because of the complex interrelationship of aspects of bilingual education, the categorization which has been adopted in publishing the papers is only one of many that could have been adopted. A reading of only a sample of the papers will lead to the realization that while the chosen topics were treated in considerable depth, they also reflected considerable breadth of scholarship. In spite of the range of subjects selected for discussion, it is inevitable that some readers will regret the omission of some topics. This is particularly so where some national systems have not been included. In view of the almost statutory relationship between bilingualism and multiculturalism in the United States, with the benefit of hindsight one appreciates that cultural aspects of bilingual education also might have received greater attention. It is not the purpose of this Conclusion to summarize the contents of the contributions, which would have been an invidious presumption, but simply to take advantage of an opportunity to give a highly personal review of the proceedings of the Round Table. Just as some subjects were omitted from the actual proceedings, so it will be recognised that not all the subjects that were included are reviewed here and the themes that are reviewed are not necessarily the most important. They are the most interesting from the point of view of the present writer.
2 Themes

2.1 Historical themes. Einar Haugen, though American born, represents the contribution typically made by scholars brought up in the great variety of immigrant groups in the United States as well as the richness of American linguistic scholarship available to students of bilingual education. His contribution was a living embodiment of the history of bilingual education in the United States and of its relationship with international studies. Joshua Fishman illuminated the importance of the history of some philosophical ideas exemplified in the work of Herder and Whorf in preparing the ground for the acceptance of bilingual education. The historical dimension was tentatively touched upon by Mackey also, especially in his references to the existence of earlier models of bilingual education experimented with in Europe and elsewhere. The Kahanes analysed the historical process and the pressure of social, educational, and demographic forces resulting in the submergence of certain European prestige languages and the rise of vernaculars. Both Paulston and Lewis examined the significance of historical factors in determining the nature of bilingual communities as well as attitudes to languages in contact. Most of the 'case study' contributions (Suarez, Rubin, Sibayan, and others) also included some examination of the historical development of bilingual education in their particular countries. In fact, there is a growing awareness of the historical dimension of the comparative study of bilingual education but at present the treatment is casual or incidental to what are claimed to be more significant issues. I doubt whether the value of bilingual education or its inevitability will be fully realized unless it is seen as a necessary outcome of historical forces operating internationally.

2.2 Theoretical and philosophical themes. An approach to the understanding of these issues was set forth by Paulston's conclusion (supported by Blatchford) that there is no global or uniform concept of bilingual education. Other contributions illuminated and reinforced this view. They specified the necessary and permanent tensions or contradictions that characterise this form of education: Fishman referred to the three myths which have frustrated its advance (the alleged connection of monolingualism with universalism, freedom, and societal rationalism). For over 3,000 years forces of 'darkness' (the myths already referred to) have warred with the forces of 'light' (the hopes which Fishman entertains for pluralism). From time to time in any country, one or other of these forces is in the ascendant, even if only temporarily. Mackey was concerned with a different tension—that between group requirements and individual rights—and appeared to favour the latter. It was a theme to which Cooper also referred, though he was inclined to travel in the direction of group solidarity. Paulston's contribution was the most explicitly concerned with the theoretical discussion of such
tensions which, because they are so general, tend to be of international relevance. Her discussion set out the tension between, on the one hand, a 'functional-structural' approach which leads to a preference for the maintenance of as much of the status quo as possible (and therefore to a preference for the teaching of E² as a major component of bilingual education) and, on the other hand, the concepts of 'conflict theory' in one of its three forms: Marxist (socioeconomic), cultural revolutionary, and Utopian. Lambert distinguished still another tension in his reference to the two types of provision which may be approved—the 'additive', usually characterising provision for the majority, and the subtractive, usually reserved for the minorities. Such a distinction is highly illuminating and worth pursuing.

2.3.1 Comparative themes. The comparative study of bilingual education, whether it involves groups within the same country or in different countries, cannot neglect comprehensive and well-documented national case studies. This was part of Mackey's contribution. The picture of bilingual education in the United States as a whole was set by Spolsky, who developed a highly useful model for the description of national provision in this field, embracing all the major variables. Saville-Troike took one set of linguistic groups (Native Americans), outlined the changes in policy affecting them, and analysed some of the factors which induced such changes. The Canadian contribution was largely restricted to French/English immersion programme provision, and I must confess to a tinge of regret that nothing was said about the increasingly important issues raised by Canadian immigrant groups, especially the Ukrainians and to a lesser extent the Italians. The other reservation the present writer has is that insufficient recognition was given to the history of various forms of immersion programmes in some European countries during the last 50 years. Suarez's account of the Mexican situation, its statistical dimensions, attitudes to bilingual education, and the forces which influence them was enlightening, as were Sibayan's and Rubin's reports of their continuing studies of the Philippines and Paraguay, respectively.

2.3.2 Some contributors doubted, quite rightly in my view, whether 'case studies' alone offered an adequate base for understanding bilingual education even within a single country, to say nothing of its international dimensions. As Mackey stated, case studies tend to highlight the uniqueness of situations. But unless we can generate fairly general hypotheses and formulate, however tentatively, laws of general relevance, it is doubtful whether experience of particular programmes in one country alone can be of very much use to others. Presumably, this is what Cooper had in mind in requiring that studies should be more theoretically oriented. It is this approach to a theoretical study which illuminates the comparative studies of prestige languages (Kahane and Kahane), the comparison of Jamaican Creole
and Gullah (Cassidy), Dorian's comparison of Pennsylvanian Dutch and Scots Gaelic, and Tucker and Cziko's use of data drawn from their experience of Canada, Haiti, Nigeria, and the Philippines. Such theoretical considerations give coherence to the influence of diverse factors (pedagogic, social, demographic) on bilingual education policy. Cooper explained the difficulty of handling such comparative data, to which Oiler also referred, and an awareness of them was implicit in Carroll's description of the French and English language studies of the IEA. Perhaps the most explicitly cross-national comparative treatment was undertaken by Lewis in his approach to a typology of bilingual communities as a basis for a better understanding of differences of attitude in such communities.

2.4 Linguistic themes. These were among the most fundamental aspects of bilingual education discussed at the 1978 Georgetown University Round Table on Languages and Linguistics. Some speakers were concerned with the linguistic processes arising from contact: for instance, Dorian was interested in aspects of 'language death' arising from the impact of prestigious languages or prestigious dialects of the same language. It was also one of Hamp's main themes in discussing bilingualism among small minorities in parts of Europe such as Southern Italy. The contacts he described, involving Albanian communities and leading to substantial modifications of the grammars of languages in contact, tend—though not necessarily—to 'language death'. Leap, too, was explicit in his reference to the interference of English and Amerindian languages and dialects, as Cassidy was in his treatment of the African substratum to both Jamaican Creole and Gullah. Thomas's interest was more directly methodological—an account of attempts to obtain more sophisticated data concerning the geographical distribution of Welsh dialects so as to allow, among other things, for more precise accounts of the influence of English.

Another aspect of the discussion of changes in the linguistic behaviour arising from language contact was referred to by Kachru in his treatment of the relative importance of code-switching and code-mixing in India, which, he claimed, had received too little attention. He pointed to the fact that continual transfer of units from one language to another serves to develop a new 'code of language interaction'. Somewhat similar forms of linguistic behaviour were referred to in Craig's account of the relation of Creole and standard variants of the same language in the West Indies, giving rise in this case to a 'mesolectal continuum'. Though Craig is concerned with variants of the same language, the principles he examines apply equally well to entirely separate languages, such as those which Kachru had in mind.

Lavandera examined an entirely different aspect of the linguistic behaviour of bilinguals, namely, the discrepancy which may occur between the language relationship as it is conceived by the
group as a whole (the community definition of speech events) and the actual realization of language contact in the behaviour of members of the community (speech events in terms of actual linguistic variants). These differ according to whether the total linguistic repertoire of the community is divided into separate codes (Spanish, an Italian dialect, and standard Italian in Buenos Aires), or two separate codes on the one hand (Spanish and English) and on the other, a mixture of both, as is the case among Mexican Americans of the San Francisco Bay Area.

Literacy as an aspect of change in linguistic behaviour among bilinguals was discussed by Andersson, Bowen, and Ferguson. The first was concerned not only with the case that can be made for preschool bilingualism but with the advantages of early literacy as part of that preschool, home experience of the two languages. It is possible to agree, as I do, with Andersson's general thesis without accepting his view that the 'acid test of education is skill in writing'. Bowen examined the problem of literacy in terms of the mode of acquisition of the two languages (visually or aurally) and exemplified the distinction with reference to the Chicanos, who tend to adopt the aural strategy, and Latin American Spanish-speaking immigrants, who adopt a visual strategy. He pointed to the comparative value of the two modes of acquisition and stressed the important but infrequently realized fact that as a strategy of language acquisition literacy is irreversible. Ferguson was concerned with the more general phenomenon of literacy in a bilingual community and made the valid point that it should not have been omitted from the list of variables suggested by Lewis in his presentation.

Finally, among linguistic issues there were many occasional references to the consequences of language contact. Craig discussed some of the sociolinguistic factors affecting bilingual education, while Leap and Dorian referred to the educational difficulties arising from conflict between languages and the neglect in the school curriculum of all but the most prestigious. From the purely educational standpoint, the most exhaustive treatment of the linguistic issues was Lado's. He considered the possible contribution of linguistics as a discipline, in facilitating the acquisition of more than one language, ensuring appropriate materials as well as a linguistically satisfactory programme, and explaining to students the difficulties they may encounter. Finocchiaro was less concerned with specifically linguistic issues than with the classroom implications of bilingual education. In view of the numerous variables which are involved, she disavowed the practical usefulness of general principles but nevertheless she set forth some useful guidelines.

2.5 Cultural and psychological themes.

2.5.1 Although several papers touched upon the cultural associations of bilingualism, only two papers were devoted to these issues exclusively. Schotta's concern was to place
bilingual education within the context of the multicultural aspects which are mandatory for certain programmes in the United States. She stressed the need to prepare teachers to handle such issues, especially in view of the new standards set by the National Council for Teacher Accreditation.

Di Pietro's contribution to the discussion of multicultural education stressed its relationship to issues connected with ethnicity, claiming that aspects of the latter subject are still neglected by the schools. He pointed to the disadvantages of this neglect, suggesting that the cognitive flexibility which a bilingual education is meant to encourage may be hindered or even completely frustrated by the disregard of characteristics associated with ethnic origin.

2.5.2 Like the themes associated with the cultural aspects of bilingual education, psychological issues in the main were referred to incidentally and usually in connection with attitudes (Rubin, Spolsky, Finocchiaro). Bowen referred to problems of motivation and Lewis was concerned to identify attitude as a community differentiating variable. Lambert's was the one contribution which analysed the psychological issues in depth, referring to historical changes in attitude to bilingual education as well as to the home language, which he claimed was crucial.

2.6 Language policy and implementation themes. Two papers were devoted to language policy in the United States. Heath had regard for the broad, general issues while Vázquez examined the practical problems involved in planning. Like some other contributors, he referred to the tension between group demands and the need to satisfy the individual's cognitive and developmental requirements. In the last resort, any form of bilingual education exists to resolve this tension and Vázquez pointed to the fact that in the United States, satisfaction of group demands tends to lead to the subordination of congressional policy to the interpretations of the judiciary, which some may think are either equivocal or contradictory. Saville-Troike emphasised the distinction between policies which facilitated transition and those which promoted maintenance, and went on to stress the need to recognise a third aim, namely, the recovery of languages which were in danger of being eliminated. Ansre examined language policy from the standpoint of the use to be made of indigenous languages in Africa, while Afolayan distinguished three types of policy for Africa: unity in diversity, diversity in unity, and unified diversity. He argued for the superiority of the first.

2.7 Issues of research and evaluation. Several contributors referred to the difficulty of evaluating the success of programmes of bilingual education in the absence of sound theoretical models. Others, like Cooper, while emphasising the necessity for basing the design of programmes on sound research data, were equally aware of the difficulty of translating theory into satisfactory
practice, and insisted on the absence of any direct relationship between research and improvement in practice. Tucker, arguing from his experience of evaluating programmes in several countries, claimed that 'formative evaluation' techniques or the building into the programme of provision for continuous evaluation was desirable. He also referred to the difficulties encountered in attempting to evaluate programmes in the absence of any means of accounting for social and political pressures. On testing, Paulston proposed the abandonment of standardised tests, while Garcia argued for the recognition of 'student rights' in designing and conducting tests.

3. Finale. No survey of the 1978 Georgetown University Round Table on Languages and Linguistics would be complete without reference to the hospitality of the University, and especially of the Dean of the School of Languages and Linguistics and Mrs. Alatis. Perhaps the warmth and camaraderie of the whole three days were expressed most enjoyably during the dinner given by the University to honour Mr. Melvin Fox of the Ford Foundation on his retirement. The tributes paid to him went beyond formal obligations and expressed the recognition of his support for bilingual education in the United States and internationally, as well as the impact of his personality on such developments.
The 1978 Georgetown University Round Table on Languages and Linguistics presents the proceedings of the first conference on the international dimensions of bilingualism, ever held. Bilingual education has been a concern in the United States for many years, and the passage of the Title VII Act emphasized this concern. But many of the issues of bilingual education reach beyond national boundaries, and so it is now important to consider the interrelationships between national and international needs for bilingual education.

This volume contains over forty contributions by internationally-recognized scholars, educators, linguists, and administrators—specialists in the fields of bilingualism and education. It will serve for many years to come as a sourcebook and handbook for those concerned with bilingualism and bilingual education.