Forging Multilingual Spaces

BILINGUAL EDUCATION AND BILINGUALISM
Series Editors: Professor Nancy H. Hornberger, *University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, USA* and Professor Colin Baker, *University of Wales, Bangor, Wales, Great Britain*

Recent Books in the Series

Forging Multilingual Spaces
Integrated Perspectives on Majority and Minority Bilingual Education

Edited by

Christine Hélot and Anne-Marie de Mejía

Contents

The Contributors

Jim Anderson is Lecturer in Modern Languages in Education in the Department of Educational Studies at Goldsmiths, University of London. He has many years' experience of working in London comprehensive schools where a wide range of languages have been taught. His research interests lie in the field of bilingualism and new media literacies. Jim is coordinator of the Flexible PGCE in Community Languages (Arabic, Mandarin Chinese, Panjabi and Urdu) at Goldsmiths, which won a 2007 European Award for Languages. He has recently directed a project, funded by the Nuffield Foundation, to create curriculum guides for Arabic, Mandarin, Panjabi, Tamil and Urdu. These were published by CILT, the National Centre for Languages, in 2007.

Cristina Banfi is currently in charge of the Department of Language Planning for the Ministry of Education of the City of Buenos Aires. She holds a Teacher of English degree from INES en LV 'J.R. Fernandez', an MPhil in Linguistics from the University of Cambridge and a PhD, also in Linguistics, from University College London. She has taught at university level in the UK, the USA and Argentina, at teacher training colleges, and at schools at primary and secondary school levels. She has published many articles and edited a journal. She has organised several conferences and has an active participation in professional associations.

Cristina Escobar Urmeneta is Professor of Foreign Language Pedagogy in the Faculty of Education at the Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona. She has conducted research in the teaching and learning of foreign languages in multilingual environments. More specifically, she has specialised in Portfolio Assessment and in Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) in inclusive classrooms. She has extensive experience as a pre-service and in-service teacher educator and has written numerous articles on foreign language teaching and learning.

Ofelia García is Professor at Columbia University's Teachers College in the Department of International and Transcultural Studies. García has been Dean of the School of Education in the Brooklyn Campus of Long Island University and Professor of Bilingual Education at The City College of New York. Her latest books include *Imagining Multilingual Schools* (with Skutnabb-Kangas & Torres-Guzmán), *A Reader in Bilingual Education* (with Colin Baker) and *Language Loyalty, Continuity and Change: Joshua Fishman's Contributions to International Sociolinguistics* (with Peltz &

Schiffman). She is a Fellow of the Stellenbosch Institute for Advanced Study (STIAS) in South Africa, and has been a Fulbright Scholar, and a Spencer Fellow of the US National Academy of Education.

Eve Gregory is Professor of Language and Culture in Education at Goldsmiths College, University of London. Her research interests are in bilingualism and early literacy, home–school relations and ethnography. She has written widely in these fields. Her most recent book is *Learning to Read in a New Language: Making Sense of Words and Worlds*, published by Sage (2008). She has directed and co-directed a number of funded research projects into children's home language and literacy learning in bilingual contexts.

Rainer Enrique Hamel is Professor of Linguistics in the Department of Anthropology at Universidad Autónoma Metropolitana (UAM) in Mexico City. He is a member of the Mexican Academy of Science and the Director of the inter-institutional Research Programme 'Indigenous Communities and Intercultural Bilingual Education'. His areas of research include sociolinguistics, applied linguistics, bilingualism and bilingual education, language politics and planning, and discourse analysis. He has published several books and over 70 articles and book chapters in five different languages. Over the past years he has worked as a visiting researcher and professor in the Universities of Campinas and Belem, Brazil, Stanford and UC Santa Barbara, USA, and Frankfurt and Mannheim, Germany, as well as in other countries.

Christine Hélot is Professor of English at the University of Strasbourg in the teacher education department (IUFM d'Alsace). Prior to this post, she was a Lecturer in Applied Linguistics at the National University of Ireland. She is the author of several books in French on bilingualism in the family and in school contexts and on intercultural education. She has also published many articles on bilingualism and bilingual education in France, language policy, language awareness, linguistic diversity, teacher education and children's literature. She is a member of the editorial board of the *Bilingual Family Newsletter* and the journal *Language Policy*.

Charmian Kenner is Lecturer in Educational Studies at Goldsmiths College, University of London, where her research focuses on bilingualism, literacy and family learning. She has recently led ESRC-funded studies on early biliteracy, intergenerational learning between young children and grandparents and bilingual learning. Her books include *Home Pages: Literacy Links for Bilingual Children* (2000) and *Becoming Literate* (2004), both published by Trentham.

Anne-Marie de Mejía is currently Associate Professor at the Centre for Research and Teacher Development at Universidad de los Andes, Bogotá, Colombia. Prior to this, she worked for many years at Universidad del Valle in Cali, Colombia. Her areas of research include bilingual classroom interaction, bilingual teacher education and teacher empowerment. She has worked with the Colombian Ministry of Education on the research and development of bilingual programmes in Colombia. Her latest books include *Power, Prestige and Bilingualism* (2002, Multilingual Matters), *Bilingual Education in South America* (2005, Multilingual Matters) and *Empowerment. Empoderamiento y Construcción de Currículos Bilingües* (2006, Universidad del Valle) with Harvey Tejada and Sol Colmenares.

María Emilia Montes Rodríguez studied journalism at the Universidad Javeriana in Bogotá and has an MA in Ethnolinguistics from the Universidad de Los Andes. In 1994, she received her Doctorate in 'Linguistique Théorique et Formelle' from the Université de Paris VII-Jussieu. Much of her research work has been devoted to the grammatical description of Tikuna, an isolated Amazon language. She has also been involved in educational consultancy work in indigenous education in Colombia, Brasil and Peru, and has participated in education and development programmes for indigenous teachers. She has published articles and books in the areas of grammar, ethnolinguistics, ethnoeducation and sociolinguistics. Since 1998 she has been working at the Universidad Nacional de Colombia, Facultad de Ciencias Humanas en Bogotá. She has also worked at the Universidad del Valle in Cali and Universidad de Los Andes.

Muiris Ó Laoire is a senior lecturer at the Institute of Technology Tralee, Ireland and works on a consultative basis on the Review of Languages at the National Council for Curriculum and Assessment (NCCA) Dublin. He is co-editor of *Teagasc na Gaeilge* (Ireland) and *The Celtic Journal of Language Learning* (USA). He is author of textbooks, academic books and several articles on sociolinguistics and language pedagogy. He is a past president of IRAAL, the Irish Association of Applied Linguistics, the Irish affiliate of AILA.

Silvia Rettaroli is a teacher of English and has been a teacher educator for the last 25 years. She has also worked as school manager at bilingual schools, where she has developed a number of professional development projects. During the 1990s she worked as Foreign Languages Co-coordinator in the Research and Educational Development Unit of the Ministry of Education of Argentina and was in charge of designing the national matrix for the Argentine Teacher Education curricula. Her main

areas of interest are professional development and bilingual education research.

Virginia Unamuno Kaschapava is Professor of Language Pedagogy at the Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona. Her main research interests are sociolinguistics and discourse analysis applied to language education in multilingual contexts. In the last few years she has focused her attention on the development and implementation of linguistic reception schemes in Catalan schools. She has published widely in these fields.

Chapter 1

Introduction: Different Spaces – Different Languages. Integrated Perspectives on Bilingual Education in Majority and Minority Settings

CHRISTINE HÉLOT and ANNE-MARIE DE MEJÍA

In many parts of the world there exists a traditional divide between policy, practice and research into bilingualism and bilingual education programmes for majority language speakers, and modalities offered for minority language speakers. As a result, policymakers, teachers and researchers who are involved with bilingual programmes in international languages often have little contact with researchers and practitioners who are concerned with bilingual education programmes in minority communities. This separation leads to a necessarily limited view of the progress of research on bilingualism and bilingual education, and means that linguistic and pedagogical insights and perceptions from each tradition are often not available to inform future general developments in the field.

Furthermore, while bilingualism in internationally prestigious languages is generally considered worthy of investment of considerable sums of money, as it provides access to a highly 'visible', socially accepted form of bilingualism, leading to the possibility of employment in the global marketplace, bilingualism in minority languages leads, in many cases, to an 'invisible' form of bilingualism in which the native language is undervalued and associated with underdevelopment, poverty and backwardness. Thus, on the one hand, bilingualism may well bring advantages, prestige and power (de Mejía, 2002), but on the other, it can give rise to problems and disadvantages, 'disempowering' individuals who happen to speak languages considered of limited value in the global marketplace (Cummins, 2000). This double vision of bilingualism has been referred to by Barriga Villanueva (2007: 14) as a phenomenon of 'claroscuros'. She characterises the two sides of bilingualism in the following manner, 'the luminous side is related to a high level of culture, of personal prestige ...; the dark side ... is that which is related to the power and domination of a hegemonic language'.

The discourse commonly used to refer to bilingual education generally reinforces these types of dichotomies. As Hornberger (1989: 273, 2003a) recognises in her postulation of a continua model of biliteracy, rather than concern ourselves with 'polar opposites, ... we need to take account of all dimensions represented by the continua'. In other words, we need to go beyond these dichotomies so that we can represent the nature of bilingualism and multilingualism more appropriately in relation to the complex, shifting realities of the world today. Ofelia García (2005: personal communication) acknowledges, with regard to the situation in the USA, 'The old paradigms of bilingual education do not work anymore. Bilingual situations today are fluid.' The implication is that if we continue to use a naturalised discourse which focuses on dichotomies, barriers will continue to exist and the lack of a shared discourse will be exploited to create division, so that bilingualism in minority languages will continue to be seen as a disadvantage.

In a colloquium organised on this topic at the Fifth International Symposium on Bilingualism in Barcelona in 2005, participants from eight different countries were asked to rethink bilingual education in a way which broke away from dichotomous oppositions, and to critically examine some of the more recent policies and practices in relation to the development of bi/multilingualism in schools. While the main aim of the colloquium was to confront reflections on how to bridge the gap between elite and minority bilingualism, another objective was to gather together researchers who have studied bilingual education from different points of view. Some researchers were more familiar with programmes for indigenous groups (Hamel), others with programmes for national minority groups (O'Laoire, Escoba Urmeneta and Unamuno), others with programmes for migrant minority groups (Anderson, Kenner, Gregory and García) and others again with programmes for dominant language groups (Hélot, de Mejía, Montes Rodríguez, Banfi and Rettaroli).

In the Barcelona colloquium there was testimony to the success of teacher initiatives at grassroots level in countries such as the USA, Ireland, France and England; however, responses at government level were seen as less encouraging. Participants acknowledged the need for the development of more powerful strategies at macro level and highlighted the responsibility of academics in promoting change. There was also a call for the creation of spaces in school programmes, which would allow for bilingual children's voices to be heard in a collaborative learning situation, rather than existing in isolation, in separate streams or in 'pull-out' situations. Charmian Kenner (2005, personal communication) suggested that, 'the needs of L1 and L2 speakers should be met in the same shared space', in a sensitive manner. Both Dual Language Programmes and Language Awareness Programmes were seen as

possible ways forward for developing this kind of 'meeting-place' of different languages and cultures. Thus, the possibility of integrating a language awareness component into bilingual education professional development courses was proposed as a means of helping bilingual teachers come to terms with the challenges of recognising and promoting language and cultural diversity in the classroom. Indeed, it should be acknowledged that today pupils attending bilingual education programmes may speak a different language from the two languages used to learn in school. It is somewhat ironic that bilingual education should exclude the home languages of some pupils in the same way as monolingual education does. This implies that bilingual educators need to rethink their attitudes and representations towards languages and move from a strictly bilingual framework to a multilingual one.

It should be stressed that the editors of this book do not wish to deny the importance of context in analysing bilingual or multilingual education. Our aim is, in fact, to find new ways of revisiting bilingual education typologies and, hopefully, to redirect bi/multilingual education policy. While it is clear for the authors in this book that the present linguistic and cultural diversity of our classrooms questions existing bilingual programmes, the ways in which the relationships between minority and majority languages are treated in national policies (or supranational policies at the European level) can inform researchers looking for new models of language education; models which focus on practices that highlight the value of bi/multilingualism in any language and which take into account the social practices of languages, and not just national education agendas. In other words, as we stated initially, what we want to address in this book is the traditional divide which exists in most countries between language education for the monolingual majority in dominant languages and compensatory education in the national language for the bilingual minorities. We also wish to argue for the recognition of a necessary complementarity between foreign language education and the education of language minority students, based on the principle of integration across linguistic communities.

Beyond the contextual and structural characteristics of bilingual education developed in the countries represented in this book, we wish to understand the ways in which all these programmes are being questioned by researchers and practitioners who are redefining the goals of language education (and bilingual education) in order to adapt to the growing linguistic and cultural diversity of classrooms and pupils. While Fishman (1976, 1977, 1982) believed in the notion of 'enrichment' bilingual education as a model which offers the greatest potential benefit, not only to language minority speakers but to the national society as a whole, and consequently that it should be extended beyond its elitist origin from the majority group to the minority group, we would argue

today that minority language settings can also teach us a lot about language learning in majority contexts. As researchers in the field of language biographies have shown, multilingual students have a more developed awareness of the relationship between language and identity and language and power. They also show greater metalinguistic resources when learning languages in formal contexts. In other words, as García *et al.* (2006: 10) explains, 'immigrants, exiles, refugees and other "transnationals" have resources, namely their ability to have "double vision", or to be "in the middle", so as to be able to have a critical orientation towards the many places in which they have lived'. Thus, an integrated vision of bilingual education does not mean applying the same goals and programmes to minority students as to majority students, but educating minority and majority students together, as in the Dual Language Immersion schools in the USA or the peace schools in Israel (www.handinhand.org.il).

Looking at the eight countries described in this book, it is clear that within each sociolinguistic setting, different languages are allocated different spaces in the respective curricula (or no space at all). They are taught according to different modalities, assigned more or less time, more or less space, more or less value. Thus, most education systems reflect the divided vision prevalent in society that some languages are worth more than others. Schools everywhere reflect societal characteristics, societal needs, societal views and, above all, societal power constellations. Programmes that pose little threat to the established power structure are the ones that generally get implemented in schools, yet reflective practitioners and researchers are continually challenging institutional racism in schools and devising potentially empowering pedagogical alternatives (Cummins, 2000).

The contributors to this volume give examples of such programmes, while at the same time focusing on the inter-relationships between language and the wider social and political environment, contesting traditional relations of power. For example, some of the authors point to the gap between bilingualism developed in the home context and bilingualism developed at school and how educational language policies deny the former and invest heavily in the latter. This is another type of dichotomy which needs to be reframed conceptually and envisaged as a continuum, rather than being examined in isolation. It needs to be understood within a framework where all dimensions of bilingualism are linked to one another. Due to the fact that some home bilingualism is supported in school and some is not, depending on the status of the language concerned, Hornberger and Skilton Sylvester's continua of biliteracy model (2003) is particularly useful in this respect, because it was developed within an ecological perspective which makes transparent the ideologies that pervades language policies and language choice.

As Heller and Martin Jones (2002: 30 quoted by Creese & Martin, 2003: 164) point out, an ecological approach makes clear 'what kinds of language practices are valued and considered good, normal, appropriate or correct in particular classrooms and schools, and who are likely to be the winners or losers in the ideological orientations'.

What we would like to show in this book is how it is possible to approach language education from a more ecological point of view, that is to say where all languages are envisaged as learning resources for those who speak them, as well as for the monolingual majorities. Thus, we contend that any language should be seen as a linguistic and cultural resource to learn another language, including the school language, helping to promote mutual understanding and opening to others. We agree with Ruiz (1984) and Hornberger (1991: 226) who maintain that, 'The primary identifying characteristics for enrichment bilingual education is that the program structure incorporates a recognition that the minority language is not only a right of its speakers but a potential resource for majority language speakers'.

Most of the papers in this collection are co-authored because the researchers needed to collaborate with colleagues in order to be able to jointly examine the diverse forms of bilingual education in their own sociolinguistic and political context. They examine points of contact between minority and majority bilingual or multilingual provision in eight different national scenarios, discussing ways in which the unequal balance of power across different languages and literacies is either reinforced, or challenged by policymakers and educators, and examining reasons for this. The emphasis is on asking whether it is possible to find 'various modes of interplay' (Hélot, 2005: 5) between prestigious bilingualism and the bilingualism of minorities, and whether this approach can help to envisage new models of language education in school settings.

This volume is divided into two sections. The focus of the first section is entitled 'Bilingualism in the Americas' and includes discussion of the situation in one North American nation, the USA, and three Latin American countries: Colombia, Argentina and Mexico. The second section is concerned with the situation in Europe and includes contributions from France, Ireland, Catalonia and England.

Part 1: The Americas

Our characterisation of the situation of bilingual education in four national scenarios in the Americas is intended, on one hand, to complement the discussion of developments in Europe in Part 2 of this collection of papers. It is also a convenient label to group together countries, which although sociolinguistically diverse in nature, are

marked by their differing relationships with the Spanish language at international and intranational level. Mexico, Colombia and Argentina all recognise Spanish either as their official language or as the first language of the majority of their population,[1] while in the USA there are more than 30 million speakers of the language, according to the Census carried out in 2000 (Hamel, 2003).

However, it must also be recognised that this apparent homogeneity with respect to the Spanish language conceals a wide range of diversity. In the USA alone, the Hispanic (Latino) community form a,

> very heterogeneous medley of races and nationalities (. . .) Latinos include native born US citizens (predominantly Chicanos – Mexican-American – and Nuyoricans – 'mainland' Puerto Ricans) and Latin American immigrants of all racial and national combinations. (Flores, 1993: 199)

Not only is the Latino community a diverse community, but there is also evidence of a highly complex linguistic situation with multiple varieties of Spanish spoken and the emergence of a language continuum with varying levels of proficiency and with distinctive characteristics, such as a tendency to replace the subjunctive and conditional forms with the indicative, due to the high degree of contact with English (Gutierrez & Fairclough, 2006).

However, in spite of this situation, traditionally the teaching of Spanish as a foreign language in the USA has been based on the teaching of a standard form of the language and the rejection of local varieties. Yet, as Gutierrez and Fairclough (2006: 174) argue, sociolinguistic studies of language heterogeneity have begun to challenge such concepts as 'the standard language', and thus, 'the goal should be for students to communicate both with Spanish speakers in the United States and around the world (so they) should also (be) able to communicate using the predominant local or regional vernacular norms'.

Even though Spanish is challenging English in certain parts of the USA where a number of towns have predominantly Spanish-speaking populations (Graddol, 2006), the use of this language in bilingual education in the USA has been mainly confined to transitional bilingual programmes (TBE) aimed at integrating minority students into the monolingual English-speaking mainstream. Initially, these were envisaged as 'early exit' programmes, based on a deficit perspective, positioning bilingual children as 'handicapped'. Later, there was the emergence of TBE 'late exit', or language maintenance programmes, where children's bilingualism was seen as a resource rather than a problem (Abbate-Vaughn, 2004).

More recently, two-way bilingual education, or 'dual language programmes', have continued this vision of additive bilingualism,

helping students from linguistic minority and linguistic majority backgrounds to develop two languages, as well as promoting 'positive cross-cultural proficiency and understanding in all students' (Abbate-Vaughn, 2004: 31).

These programmes ideally involve balanced numbers of students from each language background, and have been instrumental in offering both Anglophone and Latino students the possibility of learning Spanish and English in a bilingual environment, particularly at elementary level (Freeman, 1998). However, as noted by Torres-Karna and de Kanter (2004: 351–352), the undoubted success of this initiative in developing Spanish–English bilingualism among these populations should not blind us to the intrinsic difficulties involved in providing appropriate educational provision for 'low socioeconomic status language minority students with language majority students from middle-class professional homes'.

The other three Latin American nations that form part of our collection, Mexico, Colombia and Argentina, were subjected to an official policy of compulsory Castilianisation, which characterised the situation of the colonies under Spanish rule in the 15th and 16th centuries. However, in 1550, Carlos V also allowed for the use of vernacular languages in certain areas; in particular, Nahuatl in Mexico, as well as Quechua for the Andean region and Tupi-Guarani for the central South American area (today Paraguay) (Hamel, 2006). Thus, a certain degree of multilingualism was favoured in certain majority languages, though as time progressed the two former colonial languages, Spanish and Portuguese, were increasingly consolidated as the main languages of communication and unification within the newly emergent nation states in Latin America in the 19th century.

Furthermore, during the 20th century, as these two languages developed into international languages, indigenous languages found themselves increasingly under threat throughout the region (Hamel, 2006). As Barriga Villanueva (2007: 16) observes in the case of Mexico, since colonisation 'there has been a continuous pendular movement between two main poles: indigenous languages and Spanish, although in reality the pendulum has swung more towards Castilianisation, and with this, the displacement of the Indo-Mexican languages'. In the case of the National Programme of Intercultural Bilingual Education (PNEIB) set up in Argentina in 2004, which aims at revitalising indigenous knowledge, language and identity, 'curricular contents are, for the most part, not delivered in the pupils' native language, but rather in Spanish' (Banfi & Rettaroli, this volume).

In the course of these developments, the Spanish language gained independence from the Castilian variety, and language academies were set up to preserve the distinct varieties of the language in the different

Latin American nations (Hamel, 2006). However, more recently, it has been noted that the Spanish language is, itself, under threat in various Latin American nations. In Colombia, for example, the Colombian Language Academy has expressed concern about the rapid spread of English, particularly among the upper and middle classes by means of the elite bilingual school system, and its negative effect on the perceived status and importance of Spanish as a language appropriate for the development of scientific discourse (Patiño, 2005).

In a recent survey of bilingual education in the Andean region of South America, King (2005: 2) distinguishes between

> enrichment models (of bilingual education) which promote language development for the elite; and ... transitional (or nominally main-tenance) models for indigenous sectors which, in the long term, promote subtractive bilingualism.

She argues that these two different models lead to different 'imagined communities' (Norton, 2000, cited in King, 2005: 2). While parents and staff in enrichment model schools hope that students will become fluent in a high status language, such as English or French, so that they are able to move in international circles, those working with indigenous minority language groups 'tend to emphasize mastery of Spanish and transition to the dominant language and national culture' (King, 2005: 3). Hamel (2006) sees the latter as part of a wider strategy of language policy and education for indigenous peoples involving the suppression of indigen-ous languages and the assimilation of their speakers in the process of building a unified nation state.

In similar fashion, this time from a broader Latin American perspec-tive, Hamel (this volume) identifies a first space (or domain) with the intercultural bilingual education programmes offered to indigenous pupils at public schools, which are characterised by a lack of pedagogical and human resources. He sees a second space as that belonging to elite bilingual schools where the emphasis is on the teaching and learning of prestigious international languages. Although, as Hamel observes, there is generally very little contact between the two types of communities and their schools, he does envisage the possibility of reciprocal processes of mutual exchange and learning across the systems, leading to the fostering of the growth of multilingual spheres and the development of pluricultural nation states that value cultural and linguistic diversity.

De Mejía and Montes Rodríguez are also concerned about similar issues in relation to the Colombian context. They note that while,

> discussion in majority language contexts has concentrated particu-larly on pedagogical and administrative aspects involved in the implementation of bilingual programmes ..., in minority language

contexts, there has been an emphasis on the non-neutrality of languages and an overemphasis on political and anthropological issues. (De Mejía & Montes Rodríguez, this volume)

They propose a dialogue between the actors in these different spaces, particularly in relation to the linguistic, cultural and contextual issues that have been successfully addressed in ethnoeducation programmes,[2] and the pedagogical initiatives related to efficient processes of the teaching and learning of languages developed in bilingual education in majority language contexts.

The relationship of different languages with different spaces, foregrounded in the title of this book, brings to mind the concept of 'third spaces' (Bhabha, 1994) which has been in use in recent years in the fields of cultural studies and applied linguistics. These intermediate spaces between relatively stable and homogeneous norms in 'first' and 'second' spaces have been seen as essentially problematic because they constitute neither one thing nor another but are heterogeneous in nature. They also presuppose the presence of relatively fixed outer norms. However, it may be argued that these spaces can transcend their component sources through a dialectical process to make a new, expanded space which permits the possibility of stimulation and renewal, as well as threat (CELTEAL, 2005). Thus, for example, in a bilingual education context, it may be asked how students construct learning experiences that are meaningful for themselves out of what they receive from their teachers and others. Another question that arises has to do with how particular teachers and learners in specific classroom settings adopt or adapt teaching methodologies, materials, established bilingual models and rules governing classroom language use in relation to the demands of their particular context.

These are some of the issues addressed by García in her discussion of the relationship between the teaching of Spanish and the use of Spanish in teaching in the US school context in this volume. She considers that there is evidence that enlightened bilingual teachers can go beyond the established norms of elite foreign language programmes and those which characterise transitional bilingual education programmes for minority language speakers in order to enable children's plurilingual and pluriliteracy practices. However, this implies that they need to be able to 'work in the gap' (and) 'to hold a heteroglossic view of how language is negotiated' (García, this volume), rather than continue to support the monoglossic language ideologies that the author considers characteristic of language in education polities in the USA.

In her analysis of data from a dual (Spanish–English) language classroom, García characterises this 'unconscious' reaction of individual teachers against externally imposed structures developed in the dual

language model of bilingual education as the 'Trojan Horse' of the language separation model. She notes that although the teacher in the class observed was very concerned to maintain the standard separation of the two languages, the actual language practices of the bilingual learners, which reflected their heterogeneous levels of language proficiency, combined with the collaborative nature of workshop literacy activities militated against the strict separation of English and Spanish decreed in the tenets of the dual language programme. Thus, the bilingual 'space' spontaneously created by the participants in the interaction reflected the communication needs and potential of the students far more appropriately than could have been achieved in a separatist approach to language use.

This focus on individual initiatives 'place(s) the classroom practitioner at the heart' (Ricento & Hornberger, 1996: 417), facilitating processes of educational and social change and institutional transformations from the grass roots, a 'bottom-up' perspective. García (1993: 36) sees teachers as prime agents in these processes. Thus, she maintains that, '(the teacher) must stop being an instructor, accepting of orders, of curriculum planned, of material given, and must claim her role as an educator'. This echoes Cummins' recognition of teachers as powerful actors in shaping school contexts. As he says,

> Legislative and policy reforms may be necessary conditions for effective change but they are not sufficient . . . The social organisation and bureaucratic constraints within the school reflect not only broader policy and societal factors, but also the extent to which individual educators accept or challenge the social organisation of the school . . . (Cummins, 1986/2001: 657)

Consequently, we need to ask how far these essentially individual actions of particular teachers in particular classroom situations should be seen within wider changes in policy and pedagogy. How far is it necessary that bottom-up, grassroots initiatives, such as that documented by Garcia, mesh with top-down developments in policy to achieve noticeable effects?

In this respect, de Mejía and Montes (this volume) recognise the positive results of some productive individual experimentation in ethnoeducation programmes in minority language contexts in Colombia. Yet, they also acknowledge that there is a strong case to be made for a policy of 'positive discrimination' towards this type of bilingual/multilingual programme in order to 'compensate for the linguistic fragility of minority contexts' (de Mejía & Montes, this volume). The responsibility given to individual bilingual indigenous teachers to 'innovate, research and transform contents and practices' (de Mejía and Montes, this volume) has, in many cases, proved to be too heavy a burden and has

resulted in a lack of visible results. Thus, the authors argue it is important to develop a national bilingual education policy to ensure State commitment to implementing the principles enshrined in the country's political constitution.

Perhaps though, rather than juxtaposing individual versus society or state, we should be thinking of a more inclusive, a more additive vision, where macro and micro levels are addressed in a more integrated fashion. As Hornberger (2003b: 301), commenting on an article by Skilton-Sylvester (2003), reminds us, 'macro-level policies and ideologies are so entangled with teachers' policies and ideologies at the micro level that educators need to be involved at both levels, if a truly additive perspective is to be possible'.

In this sense, the chapter by Banfi and Rettaroli is important, as the authors focus their attention specifically on the profiles of teachers working in the different types of bilingual programmes in Argentina. These include: Intercultural Bilingual Education Programmes for Indigenous Children, Bilingual Education Programmes for Deaf Children, Bilingual Education in State Schools, Bilingual Education Programmes in Language Contact Situations and Bilingual Education Programmes in Elite Schools. The researchers come to the conclusion, along with many other writers on bilingual education provision (Baker, 1995; Lindholm-Leary, 2005), that the lack of teacher background in bilingualism and bilingual education can result in difficulties in the effective implementation of bilingual programmes at both majority and minority level. The authors make a case for 'cross-programme cooperation and collaboration in teacher development activities' (Banfi & Rettaroli, this volume). They argue that for this to happen it is important that all the different modalities of bilingual provision present in the country be officially recognised as such. Thus, the authors maintain that 'an explicit acknowledgement of the existence of bilingual education as an encompassing term would be helpful in providing common ground and theoretical support for all these different programmes'.

Echoing Hamel (this volume), Banfi and Rettaroli (this volume) recognise that due to the fact that the origin of many of these programmes is mutually exclusive and also that neither teacher nor student populations overlap, there is a 'total lack of contact ... (which) generate(s) mutual mistrust and prejudice'. In order for this to be overcome, the authors advocate that all actors in bilingual programmes (teachers, headteachers, school supervisors, education authorities) should be familiar with five basic areas of knowledge: the languages and cultures involved in the programme; the content to be taught; pedagogical knowledge; and knowledge about bilingualism and bilingual education.

The issue of terminology referred to in relation to educational programmes in Argentina is worth raising here, as it sheds light on the ideologies that underpin the label 'bilingual education' in different parts of the continent. Banfi and Rettaroli (this volume) note that 'although the label ''bilingual school/programme'' is widely applied in common parlance to a number of different types of programmes, it is only this modality (i.e. Intercultural Bilingual Education Programmes for Indigenous Children) that is granted official recognition, as exemplified in the recently approved Law of National Education in Argentina (2006)'. Until the South Atlantic Conflict in 1982, the prestigious English–Spanish schools were referred to as 'British-type' schools (ESSARP, 1995), rather than bilingual institutions.

This recognition of bilingual education provision for students from minority indigenous communities is similar to pronouncements in Colombia. Article 10 of the Political Constitution (1991) states that,

> Spanish is the official language of Colombia. The languages and dialects of the ethnic groups are also official in their territories. The teaching given in communities with their own linguistic traditions will be bilingual.

However, Barriga Villanueva sounds a note of caution in this respect. She reminds us, in the case of Mexico, that,

> Official and academic discourse has sometimes propagated a false idea of bilingualism as the 'mastery of two languages'. If this were so, there would not be room for the negation of ethnic identity and the danger of the extinction of some languages. (Barriga Villanueva, 2007: 24)

In contrast to the explicit recognition of bilingual teaching and learning as a right for indigenous groups in Argentina and in Colombia, García notes the gradual elimination of the term 'bilingual' in US legal discourse over the past five years, as a result of the pressure from the 'English Only' movement. As well as the fact that California, Massachusetts and Arizona have declared bilingual education illegal, the Bilingual Education Act itself has been supplanted by the 'No Child Left Behind Act' (2001) and the Office of Bilingual Education and Minority Languages Affairs has been renamed the 'Office of English Language Acquisition, Language Enhancement and Academic Achievement for Limited English Proficient Students'. Perhaps it is significant that the only bilingual modality that is currently seen as successful in the US context is entitled 'Dual Language' rather than 'Bilingual Education'.

In spite of the fact that the Americas is the second poorest part of the world, after Europe, in terms of native languages (García *et al.*, 2006), in general it may be said that interest in bilingualism and bilingual

education is gaining momentum, even though, in the case of the USA, this may be referred to as 'dual language' provision. In Latin America, this interest has been evidenced in the creation of an international symposium series on bilingualism and bilingual education (Buenos Aires, 2004; Bogotá, 2006) aimed at an exchange of knowledge among those working in majority and minority language contexts in the region. Researchers and academics from different traditions have begun to recognise the importance of each other's contributions to developments in the field. Thus, the way is open for a widening vision, which takes into account the changing linguistic and cultural constellations of a globalised world in flux, as well as the increasing complexity of local interests and priorities.

Part 2: Europe

The presentation of the four European countries (autonomous region in the case of Catalonia) described in this second part of our book reflects the wide variety of sociolinguistic contexts present in Europe and how educational language policies can only be understood within a historical and political perspective. It is not our aim here to compare these different settings[3] but rather to envisage them as a multiple springboard to rethink bilingual education within the present development of multilingualism in each of the countries concerned. We would like to argue, based on the authors' analyses, that for the most part, bilingual education has been framed within a monolingual habitus, and we propose to examine here whether and how it is possible to go beyond this monolingual framework and envisage language education as more inclusive, more integrative and more coherent.

In other words, through the critical re-examination of various dichotomies, we ask whether it is possible to bridge the gap between the different forms of bilingualism (and plurilingualism[4]), because we wish to question the negative attitudes towards the bilingualism of minority language speakers, and more specifically towards the often denied, or at best ignored, bilingualism of immigrant populations. Can we develop truly integrated and inclusive language policies that will challenge monolingual monocultural perspectives and envisage plurilingualism from a plurilingual point of view? Can we envisage new relationships between languages at the societal level and translate these into more open education policies which will break down barriers between the different categories of languages? Can we translate these policies at the classroom level so that educators ensure that students from linguistically diverse backgrounds have the right to maintain their home language(s) with the support of the school system. In short, can we

move towards a more integrated multilingual society? These are some of the questions we will be concerned with in this section.

The researchers from the four countries represented here are all trying to grapple with these questions, within the limits of curricula and syllabi designed at the national or regional level and as a product of national histories. They are dealing with linguistically pluralist societies where different languages are in contact, and where the relationships between the various languages are complex. Here again, traditional dichotomies, such as that established between dominant and dominated languages, do not work any longer. Indeed, the presence of many languages resulting from processes of immigration has changed the traditional hierarchies, pushing endogenous minority languages up the ladder and maintaining the exogenous languages of mostly non-European migrants on the margins. It is as if some minority languages are now seen as belonging to the nation, as being part of its heritage, and others, because they have come with economic migrants, are envisaged, like their speakers, as outsiders. For example, regional languages in France have seen a shift in their status in education, no doubt helped by the European recommendations to protect linguistic and cultural diversity, but the fact that they are now being recognised as part of French heritage means that some other languages are not. Yet one could easily argue that the languages of immigration are also part of the history of France (Cerquiglini, 2003). As long as the history of colonisation is ignored, however, the languages of migrants will continue to be viewed with suspicion, as if they were the sign of a threatening heterogeneity, in a society which would prefer to see itself as homogenous and united around its national language.

Let us present briefly each of the countries described in the following chapters. Ireland is an officially bilingual country (Irish and English) where the minorisation of the Irish language is the result of a long history of colonisation. Ireland has a relatively long history of immersion bilingual education through the medium of Irish. Catalonia is an autonomous region of Spain which is also bilingual, with two official languages, Catalan and Spanish. Catalan was forbidden for 40 years, so that education through Catalan as the official language of schooling has been the main agent of revitalisation of the language. After a long history of legislating against its regional languages, France is just beginning to acknowledge the multiplicity of languages present within its hexagonal borders and the discourse of the European Union on the protection of linguistic and cultural diversity is questioning its institutional monolingualism. England, as opposed to France, is a country which sees itself very much as multicultural, and as early as 1975 the well known Bullock report insisted on the recognition in schools of the importance of home languages. However, as explained by Anderson, Kenner and Gregory (this volume), multicultural policies did not automatically translate into

multicultural practices in schools, and ensuing policy documents continued to be based on monolingual assumptions.

Both Catalonia and Ireland have seen a recent and substantial influx of immigrants from all over the world. As a result, their school population has changed considerably in a very short space of time, creating new learning needs. The general consensus in this respect is that newcomers should learn the dominant language as quickly as possible (English in Ireland and Catalan in Catalonia). In England and France, where there is a much older tradition of immigration because as colonial powers these two countries built their postwar wealth on the migrants' labour force, the immigrant population has been expected either to assimilate, integrate or eventually to return to their native country. The main difference between the UK and France is that in the UK communities can be recognised and have special rights, whereas in France the constitution does not recognise minority groups and, in theory, all citizens are equal.

Common to the four countries presented here is the new wave of immigration,[5] no longer related to former colonies but mostly to war-torn and poverty-stricken countries. These new immigrants have brought with them a far greater variety of languages and cultures and their children have had very different experiences of schooling, not to mention life experiences. In the current climate of restrictive immigration policies, and a prevalent political discourse which reinforces the importance of the national language as a prerequisite to obtaining legal status, it is interesting to consider the educational policies implemented for newly arrived immigrants, in relation to the recognition (or not) of their bilingual or plurilingual competence. Thus, the questions we can ask here are threefold:

- Would Ireland and Catalonia, as bilingual countries who have fought for the revitalisation of their language, base their language education policy on a reflection anchored on the value of bilingualism in any language?
- In the case of France and England, what has been learnt from the 50 years of experience with the schooling of immigrant children and from the research carried out on this topic? After half a century of research, are we able to propose more inclusive policies which integrate mother tongue teaching in the mainstream classroom and which promote linguistic tolerance and openness to others?
- Can inclusive linguistic policies develop out of national contexts? What kind of impact can we expect policies from supranational institutions like the Council of Europe and the European Union to have on national agendas? Can we expect the same exclusionary phenomenon at the European level and discover a Eurocentric bias in favour of European languages?

In relation to immigrant minority languages in Europe, researchers in many countries are working alongside European institutions and a substantial number of publications, conventions and recommendations are currently available. Dealing with the educational management of linguistic diversity in the increasingly multicultural and multilingual context of European nation states, the comprehensive volume by Extra and Yagmur (2004) on urban multilingualism in Europe provides important information on the status of immigrant communities and their languages in a variety of contexts. It also presents detailed perspectives on multilingualism in six major European cities and addresses the question of transmission in home and school contexts of the 20 most prominent languages.

In a previous volume, Extra and Gorter (2001) have challenged the limitations of the European Charter for Regional and Minority Languages (1992) and proposed including, rather than excluding, immigrant[6] languages. Their introduction presents a useful comparative perspective on regional and immigrant minority languages in Europe. They point, in particular, to the lack of connection in the sociolinguistic, educational and political domain between the status of regional minority languages and immigrant minority languages. They also show that the linguistic reality in Europe is of the utmost complexity, with roughly 150 languages spoken by pupils in schools in Hamburg, and more than 350 languages in London, for example. They point to the fact that all these languages and varieties exist at the same time and in the same space, constructing what Fraser (1994) calls 'a multiple public sphere', where national cultures and languages and languages of special groups do not simply coexist but where a continuous process of border crossing takes place among all these dimensions.

Other researchers in Europe have contributed to the field as well; for example, Byram and Leman (1990) in Belgium, Gogolin (1994) in Germany, Akinci *et al*. (2004) in France, Lüdi and Py (1996) in Switzerland, Nussbaum (2003) in Catalonia, Martin *et al*. (2004) in England, as well as the authors included in Part 2 of this volume. Their work often goes beyond a merely educational perspective and includes sociolinguistic analysis, demographic data, philosophical reflection on ethnicity and identity, as well as the perspective of language rights.

We will not give a complete review here of European perspectives on language rights (see Extra & Yagmur, 2004, and O'Riagain & Lüdi, 2003) but would like to mention some policy documents which refer explicitly to immigrant minority languages. These include the directive from the Council of Europe (1977) to promote mother tongue teaching for the children of migrant workers, the declaration of the European Cultural Foundation entitled 'Moving away from a monolingual habitus'[7] (Declaration of Oegstgeest, 2001) and the Guide for the Development

of Language Policies in Europe (Beacco & Byram, 2003). The Council of Europe language policy division[8] (in Strasbourg, France) has been particularly active in producing several policy guides and studies towards plurilingual education, in encouraging the development of language education policy profiles for each country and in publishing pedagogical instruments such as *The Common European Framework of Reference for Languages* (2001) and the European Language Portfolio (2000). Furthermore, The European Centre for Modern Languages[9] in Graz (Austria) concentrates on implementing these policies through cooperation between different partners working on pedagogical programmes meant to improve the learning and teaching of languages.

While one might think there is a certain emphasis on reflection meant to improve the teaching of European languages, a special section of the language policy division of the Council of Europe deals with 'minorities and migrants' and offers two very interesting studies, one by Gogolin (2002) on linguistic diversity and new minorities in Europe[10] and one on 'Bilingual Education: Some Policy Issues' by O'Riagain and Lüdi (2003).[11] It is indeed noteworthy that the document on bilingual education has been placed in the section 'minorities and migrants', when most bilingual education programmes being developed in Europe at present concern European languages. However, the authors note the following,

> The goal of bilingual language education is not necessarily societal bilingualism. The Council of Europe and the EU promote linguistic diversification. The goal of bilingual education can, therefore be to develop diverse, dynamic and plurilingual repertoires with particular (partial) competences in different languages as a starting point for lifelong learning. (O'Riagain & Lüdi, 2003: 5)

Thus, it is important to understand that, according to the authors of the text, such a goal implies that school-supported bilingual education is not meant only to give monolingual children a better chance on the labour market, but is aimed at maintaining linguistic diversity *and* preserving the linguistic rights of minorities. It is clear here that the objectives of the Council of Europe stress the development of plurilingualism for all pupils and this is important for immigrant minority languages because the notion of plurilingual competence[12] can help to legitimise their competence in their home language. Moreover, as Gogolin (2002) explains, contrary to widely held beliefs, immigrant minority languages are here to stay. The vitality of these languages is evident, even if the language of the majority comes to dominate because the function and practices of language use change in minority situations. Thus, instead of language loss, we should talk of language change, and language education policies and practices should take these changes into account.

Aware that these multilingual public spheres will be a long-term phenomenon in Europe, the European Commission launched a new framework strategy for multilingualism (Eurydice, 2004) in 2005, and some of its policies deal specifically with the integration of immigrant children in schools in Europe. The report published on its website[13] in 2004 gives a clear outline of the situation and challenges facing each country in the European Union. As stated in the conclusion of the report, 'A second challenge is to ensure that immigrants are successfully integrated within their host societies. How can one implement appropriate arrangements to facilitate the integration of immigrant persons while also remaining fully mindful of their origins and attentive to requirements deriving from them?' (Eurydice, 2004: 67). Some final recommendations are made about languages of immigration, which should be seen as a foothold in the host education system and the mother tongue as a bridge between two cultures. It is also proposed that intercultural education be taught not only across the curriculum but this should be seen as an integral aspect of how schools function. Teacher education is briefly mentioned, demanding that teachers mobilise new skills (Bourne, 2003). The report closes with the following statement, 'Educational policy makers in European countries are faced with the difficult task of transforming the intercultural diversity now characteristic of schools into an asset for everyone concerned, whether immigrant or native pupils, teachers or parents' (Eurydice, 2004: 71).

Policy work at the European level does not preclude the work of international organisations like UNESCO, for example, which has also decreed principles relating to minority language speakers. As early as 1953, an often quoted UNESCO declaration considered it axiomatic that the best medium for teaching is the mother tongue of the pupil. More recently, *The Universal Declaration on Cultural Diversity* (UNESCO, 2001)[14] insists as part of its action plan for implementation that linguistic diversity should be encouraged 'while respecting the mother tongue-at all level of education wherever possible, and that the learning of several languages should be fostered from the earliest age' (Point 6). This declaration has been followed by a position paper on *Education in a Multilingual World* in 2003 and a new legal instrument, *the Convention on the Protection and Promotion of the Diversity of Cultural Expressions,*[15] which came into force on 18 March 2007.

However, despite these substantial efforts at policy level to move forward on the issue of immigrant minority languages, what the four chapters which follow show quite clearly is that these languages are still marginalised in the respective countries described. In Ireland, while Irish–English bilingualism is still strongly promoted, little or no account is being taken of the home or heritage languages of new immigrant students. In Catalonia, the main agenda is about the promotion of