

6. EDUCATION AS A SITE OF LANGUAGE CONTACT

Colin Baker

This chapter reviews the multidimensional research on bilingual education, covering contexts where bilingual children are in transitional classrooms as well as schools where curriculum content is experienced in two (or more) languages. Bilingual education has become a major tool in language reversal planning, since language transmission within families within minority languages typically provides a considerable shortfall in language reproduction. To play its part in language reversal, bilingual education needs to show its relative effectiveness, both as an educational approach and for language maintenance planning. Immersion and dual language approaches have increasingly demonstrated such success. However, bilingual education is neither a universal panacea for language planners, nor is it effective purely due to dual language classroom approaches, as recent research reveals. Such research locates the political nature of bilingual education, not only at the level of policy making, but also in qualitative research in classrooms. It illuminates how language and literacy practices can latently legitimate and reproduce unequal relations between language majorities and minorities. Emerging directions in bilingual education research include trilingual education, the bilingual education of deaf students, the consequences of information technologies for bilingual classrooms, and the effect of the internationalization of English on language contact in schools. This reflects an international interest for research at the varying levels of philosophy, policy, provision, practice, and not least the politics of education as a site of language contact.

Research on education as a site of language contact has become multidimensional and multidisciplinary.¹ Such research includes sociolinguistics and psycholinguistics, philosophy and pedagogy, classroom practice and provision, local and national policy formulation, and not least ideology and politics. Bilingual education (used in its widest sense) is not just about a school with a dual language policy, provision for children who speak an immigrant or minority indigenous language, or how two languages are distributed in teaching and learning in classrooms. Bilingual education is a central part of national or regional language planning that, on some occasions, seeks to assimilate indigenous and immigrant minorities, or integrate newcomers or minority groups. On other occasions, bilingual education is a major plank in language revitalization and language reversal (e.g.,

among Native American Indians, the Sámi in Scandinavia, and the Māori in New Zealand). These developments ensure that politics is rarely absent from debates about bilingual education. Indeed, there is no understanding of bilingual education without contextualizing it within the politics of a nation (e.g., Canada) or region (e.g., the Basque areas in Spain) or a state (e.g., California).

Different research perspectives on education as a site of language contact will now be presented, but these are not the only perspectives. There is also research on public opinion (e.g., Krashen, 1999); psychological perspectives (e.g., Bialystok, 2001); historical perspectives (e.g., Crawford, 2000; Kloss, 1998; Lewis, 1981; Wiley, 1998, 2002); and national variations (see Cummins & Corson, 1997; see also Ricento & Wiley, Eds., 2002, *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, Volume 154). Also, the perspectives presented here are capable of disaggregation into components (e.g., pedagogy into teaching methodology, learning strategies, curriculum resourcing, teacher training, and school organization). Such perspectives also overlap and interact (i.e., language planning and economics interact with politics).

Bilingual Education as Language Planning

A “new millennium” concern for endangered and dying languages has given an added *raison d’être* to bilingual education. In the last decade, the expected demise of many or most of the world’s languages has created a fresh impetus for grounded language planning (Crystal, 2000; Krauss, 1995; Littlebear, 1999; Nettle & Romaine, 2000; Skutnabb-Kangas, 2000). For a minority language to survive, it has to produce new speakers, mostly via the family and the education system (including adult language learning). Language planners tend to believe that bilingual education is an important means of language maintenance, language revitalization, and reversing language shift, for example among Native American Indians (Francis & Reyhner, 2002; House, 2002; McCarty, 2002), Ecuadorians (King, 2001), and the Basques (Gardner, 2000). When there is a shortfall in the family reproduction of a minority language (family language transmission), the responsibility for maintaining numbers and densities of speakers falls on bilingual education. Language acquisition planning via bilingual education becomes essential for language revival, but insufficient by itself (Welsh Language Board, 1999).

Language revival requires other institutional support systems than bilingual education to succeed (May, 2001; Gardner, 2000). For example, schoolchildren can become competent in two languages, but those languages are subsequently lost in the playground, street and shop, workplace, and leisure life. Other forms of language planning are crucial in addition to bilingual education for language revitalization (e.g., institutionalization, legitimization, corpus planning, language reproduction in the family, an economic or instrumental value to the language, and an integrative value such as in cultural, leisure, social, community, and religious activities (Francis & Reyhner, 2002; Gardner, 2000; Welsh Language Board, 1999). The reverse is also important. Bilingual education cannot gain its justification solely from language restoration or maintenance. It requires research to demonstrate underlying

educational advantages (e.g., raising student achievement, increasing employment opportunities), issues discussed later in this article.

There is sometimes over-optimism among language planners about what can be expected from and delivered by bilingual education in revitalizing a language. When a language fails to be reproduced in the family, and when there are insufficient support mechanisms outside education (e.g., language rights, minority language mass media, employment utilizing bilingualism), excessive expectations of language reversal via bilingual education are not uncommon. While bilingual education has an important role in language reproduction, and without bilingual education a minority language may not be able to survive except through intense religious usage, bilingual education cannot deliver language maintenance by itself.

The Effectiveness of Bilingual Education

It is helpful to make a distinction between ‘weak’ and ‘strong’ forms of bilingualism (Baker, 2001). ‘Weak’ bilingual education contains bilingual children (e.g., Latinos and Chinese in U.S. schools; Turkish and Bangladeshi children in British schools). However, bilingualism is not fostered in such schools which aim to shift the child from the home, minority language to the dominant, majority language. Social, cultural, and political assimilation into the language majority is the underlying aim. ‘Weak’ forms of bilingual education include: submersion, structured immersion, withdrawal classes, various forms of sheltered English, transitional bilingual education, and mainstreaming with foreign language teaching. Second language and foreign language teaching in schools occasionally produces competent bilinguals. Generally, such teaching does not result in age-appropriate proficiency in the second or foreign language, nor reaches a level of language that enables learning of curriculum content to occur via that language. Rather, a subset of language abilities are developed for instrumental or practical reasons (e.g., travel, trade, cultural awareness).

‘Strong’ bilingual education typically has bilingualism, biliteracy, and cultural pluralism as intended outcomes. It achieves these outcomes mainly through students learning content (e.g., mathematics, social studies) through both languages. ‘Strong’ forms of bilingual education include: U.S. dual language schools, heritage language programs, Canadian immersion, the European Schools movement. Over the last few decades, there has been a growing number of educationalists in many countries who support and promote ‘strong’ forms of bilingual education. Research support for U.S. dual language education is increasing (e.g., de Jong, 2002; Lindholm-Leary 2001; Senesac, 2002; Torres-Guzmán, 2002), showing that language minority students’ achievement levels are relatively high in curriculum areas such as English reading and writing, math, science, and social studies. The strongest research support for bilingual education derives from evaluations of immersion education, particularly from Canada since the 1960s (Baker, 2001; Johnstone, 2002).

However, such a positive stance is not shared by all (e.g., the Unz attack on bilingual education in Arizona and California, discussed in Crawford, 2000; see also James Crawford's Internet site: <http://ourworld.compuserve.com/homepages/JWCRAWFORD/>). The critics of bilingual education must not be underestimated (e.g., Rossell & Baker, 1996), nor those who adopt a more neutral stance (e.g., August & Hakuta, 1997). It is also important to note increasing research on transitional bilingual education (Abelardo Villarreal Intercultural Development Research Association, 1999; Carrasquillo & Rodriguez, 2002; Montecel & Cortez, 2002). Nevertheless, researchers have increasingly substantiated the value of two or three majority languages in schools, not just taught as languages but also to transmit curriculum content (e.g., Demmert, 2001; Housen, 2002; Lasagabaster, 2001; Lindholm-Leary, 2001; Mejía, 2002).

Thomas and Collier's (2002) Final Report on their 1985 to 2001 database of 210,054 minority language students' academic achievement in eight different models of education has a wealth of important conclusions that include: schooling in the home language has a much greater effect on achievement than socioeconomic status; late immigrants whose early education was in their home language outperformed early immigrants schooled in English only; enrichment (heritage language) 90:10 programs and dual language programs (50:50) were the most academically successful for English L2 students and had the lowest dropout rates; the strongest predictor of L2 student achievement was the amount of formal L1 schooling, with the more L1 schooling, the higher the L2 achievement; the highest quality ESL content programs reduced about half of the total achievement gap between those in enrichment or dual language programs and those without any bilingual support. Laosa (2000) provides a contrast to the many studies that find particular bilingual education models superior to others. He shows that program characteristics such as the type and number of instructors per student, the instructor's qualifications, and fragmentation of instruction are potentially influential on student achievement. That is, particular models of bilingual education interact with a host of student, teacher, curriculum, and contextual variables in complex ways to influence student outcomes.

'Strong' forms of bilingual education are no guarantee of success, but do appear from 40 years of research to increase the probability of student achievement. However, the precise paths for raising standards via bilingual education are neither simple nor straightforward (August & Hakuta, 1997). There is likely to be a complex equation between models of bilingual education and factors such as the support of the home (e.g., in supporting literacy development), the enthusiasm and commitment of teachers in school, children feeling accepted and secure, and the relationship between bilingual education and cognitive development. The rationale for such 'strong' bilingual education is advancing by taking a more comparative approach. Traditionally, the benefits claimed for bilingual education include increasing achievement, not only in two language competency and biliteracy, but also across the curriculum. Such bilingual education is also regarded as child-centered, identity-forming, and responsive to parental preferences (Baker, 2001). In addition, the Scandinavians, Japanese, and particular elite groups in South America, for example,

have increasingly seen the importance of two or more languages in the global market, in inter-continental communication, and information exchange (Mejía, 2002).

A comparative study similar to Mejía (2002) focuses on innovative bilingual programs in Bolivia, Cameroon, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Guatemala, Indonesia, Ivory Coast, Mali, Mexico, Namibia, Papua New Guinea, the Phillipines, and Vietnam (Center for Applied Linguistics, 2001) encompassing classroom, school, teacher recruitment, and professional development frameworks, plus political and government supports. This valuable new strand of comparative studies of bilingual education includes a comparison of bilingual programs in Canada and the United States (Genesee & Gándara, 1999). These authors include an analysis of the relationship of bilingual education models to intergroup relations, discrimination and prejudice reduction, and cultural awareness. This reveals the important linking of bilingual education to societal and cultural change, and Moses (2000) extends this to the principle of personal self-determination.

The Advantages of Bilingual Education

Advocacy for bilingual education varies according to local politics and the status and power of majority and minority languages, but tends to revolve around eight interacting advantages of bilingual education for individuals. Research support is far from uniformly strong across these overlapping headings, with a need for further studies particularly on items 1, 6, 7, and 8 below.

1. Bilingual education allows both languages (sometimes three languages) to develop fully. This allows children to engage in wider communication, having more options in patterns of communication across generations, regions, and cultural groups (Cummins, 2000).
2. Bilingual education develops a broader enculturation, a more sympathetic view of different creeds and cultures (Francis & Reyhner, 2002). Rather than token multicultural lessons, bilingual education gives deep insights into the cultures associated with the languages, fosters a broader understanding of differences, and at its best, avoids the tight compartmentalization of racism, the stereotyping of different social groups, and fosters a more multiperspective and sensitive-to-difference viewpoint.
3. Bilingual education leads to biliteracy (see Hornberger, 2003). Being able to read and write in two or more languages allows more possibilities in uses of literacy (e.g., in employment), widening the choice of literature for pleasure, giving more opportunities for different perspectives and viewpoints and leading to a deeper understanding of history and heritage, of traditions and territory (Tse, 2001).
4. The plentiful research on Canadian immersion studies and also on heritage language education suggests that curriculum achievement is

increased through dual language approaches to cultivate student learning across the curriculum (Cummins, 2000; Tse, 2001).

5. Research suggests that when children have two well-developed languages, there are cognitive benefits for being bilingual (Bialystok, 2001). Schools are often important in developing a child's two languages to the point where they may be more creative in thinking due to their bilingualism (Baker, 2001), more sensitive in communication as they may be interpersonally aware, for example, when needing to codeswitch and be able to inspect their languages more closely (that is, they have metalinguistic advantages; see Bialystok, 2001).

6. In heritage language education, (developmental maintenance bilingual education), children's self-esteem may be raised (Cummins, 2000). When a child's home language is replaced by the majority language, the child, the parents and the child's community may seem to be rejected. When the home language is used in school, then children may feel themselves, their home and community to be accepted, thus maintaining or raising their self-esteem. Positive self-esteem, a confidence in one's own ability and potential, interacts in an important way with achievement and curriculum success.

7. Bilingual education can play a key role in establishing identity at a local, regional and national level (Baker & Jones, 1999). Sharing Basque, Catalan, Irish, or Breton identity is aided by the heritage language and culture being celebrated in the classroom. Developing a Chinese-American, Punjabi-British, or Greek-Australian identity can be much aided by 'strong' forms of bilingual education, and challenged or even negated by 'weak' forms.

8. The economic advantages of bilingual education are increasingly being claimed. Being bilingual can be important to secure employment in many public services and sometimes private companies as well. To secure a job as a teacher, to work in the mass media, to work in local government and increasingly in the civil service in countries such as Canada, Wales, and the Basque Country, bilingualism has become important. Thus, bilingual education is increasingly seen as delivering relatively more marketable employees than monolingual education (Dutcher, 1995; Henley & Jones, 2001; Tse, 2001).

To this list may be added the potential societal, ethnic group, or community benefits of bilingual education (Lo Bianco, 2001; May, 2001; Peyton, Ranard, & McGinnis, 2001; Stroud, 2001; Tse, 2001) such as continuity of heritage, cultural vitality, empowered and informed citizenship, raising school and state achievement standards, social and economic inclusion, social relationships and networking, ethnic group self-determination, and distinctiveness.

The Limitations of Bilingual Education

While bilingual education world-wide has an increasing number of supporters, it is not without some virulent critics, especially in the United States; see Cummins (2000). There are also limitations to the pedagogical view of bilingual education. Bilingual education is no absolute guarantee of effective schooling. It is naive to assume that employing two or more languages in the school curriculum automatically leads to a raising of standards, more effective outcomes, and a more child-centered education. In reality, the languages of the school are but part of a wider matrix of variables that interact in complex ways to make schooling more or less effective. Among bilingual schools in every country, there appears to be a mixture of the outstanding and the ordinary, those in an upward spiral of enhancing their quality, and those which depend on past glories rather than current successes. The school effectiveness research movement has located many of the important factors that make schools more or less effective (August & Hakuta, 1997). Bilingual education is only one ingredient among many.

Another limitation of the pedagogical perspective on bilingual education is the type and use of language learned at school (Baugh, 1999). Canadian research suggests that the language register of formal education does not necessarily prepare children for language use outside the school (Cummins, 2000). The language of the curriculum is often complex and specialized. The vernacular of the street is different. Canadian children from English-speaking homes who have been to immersion schools and learned through the medium of French and English sometimes report difficulty in communicating appropriately with French speakers in local communities. Local French speakers can find such student's French too formal, awkward, or inappropriate.

A further concern about bilingual education is that language learning may stop at the school gates. The minority language may be effectively transmitted and competently learned in the classroom. Once outside the school gates, children may switch into the majority language. Thus, the danger of bilingual education in a minority language is that the language becomes a language of school but not of play; a language of the content delivery of the curriculum but not of peer culture. Extending a minority language learned at school to use in the community is something that is difficult to engineer, difficult to plan, but nevertheless vital if the language is to live outside the school gates.

Bilingual Education as Politics

Encircling bilingual education there are always expressions of political ideology, tides of political change and political initiatives. Bilingual education has become associated with political debates about national identity, dominance and control by elites, power relationships among politicians and civil servants, questions about social order, and the perceived potential subversiveness of language minorities (Garcia, 2002; Tollefson, 2002). Whether in Macedonia (Tankersley, 2001), China

(Zhou, 2001), the United States (Wiese & Garcia, 2001), or the South Pacific (Lotherington, 1998), bilingual education is both predicated on prevailing politics and can be located within attempts to effect social, cultural, economic and political change, particularly in strengthening the weak, empowering the powerless, and revitalizing those most vulnerable.

This has been well illustrated by Tankersley (2001) in her article suitably entitled “Bombs or bilingual programmes?: Dual language immersion, transformative education and community building in Macedonia.” Contextualized within the ethnic conflict in the Balkans and the recent war in Kosovo, she examines a Macedonian/Albanian dual language program. The program demonstrated success in aiding community rebuilding after the war and the growth of cross-ethnic friendships. The research shows the potential for a dual language program to develop students’ respect for different languages and cultures, and help to resolve ethnic conflict. However, since the Macedonian language was connected with greater power and prestige, obtaining an equal balance of languages in the classroom was complex.

Wiese and Garcia (2001) show the importance of a historical perspective on bilingual education as politics through an analysis of the U.S. Bilingual Education Act from 1968 to the present, showing how changing ideologies in minority language children’s rights, equality of educational opportunity, assimilation, and multiculturalism became translated into legislation and tested in litigation. This culminated in the renewal of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act with the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 with its renewed focus on accountability and testing. While Title V authorizes programs for Native Indian, Native Hawaiian, and Alaskan Native Education, Title III requires testing in English for most language minority students. All states are required to monitor the progress of some 3.68 million language minority students in meeting their English proficiency and academic objectives. Minority language competencies appear to be ignored, as is the possibility of increasing bilingualism across the United States. The paradox is that the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 reduces the chances of a bilingual population while (a) there is a chronic shortage of teachers trained for the LEP population; (b) Democratic and Republican politicians are reaching out to Latinos who are seen as ‘swing voters’ in key states; and (c) following the September 11 terrorist attacks, politicians, the press and the public have bemoaned the lack of language and cultural skills in U.S. intelligence and defense.

Research and analysis of Proposition 227 in California has led to it being the most profiled example of power and politics dominating bilingual education (Crawford, 1999, 2000; Stritikus, 2001; see also *Bilingual Research Journal*, 24, 1&2). In effect, Proposition 227, passed in 1998, aimed at outlawing bilingual education in California, allowing temporary sheltered English Immersion. Proposition 227 was passed in a public ballot by a margin of 61% to 39%. Analysis of the voting and subsequent surveys found that Latinos were clearly against the proposition, but nevertheless, bilingual education had become virtually illegal. With the sweet scent of victory in California, Ron Unz proceeded to Arizona and

elsewhere across the United States (see James Crawford's web site: <http://ourworld.compuserve.com/homepages/JWCRAWFORD/>) (Crawford, 2002).

The almost overnight change to bilingual education being virtually outlawed in California has three lessons for research:

1. There was a failure to disseminate research backing for strong forms of bilingual education widely and effectively. Dissemination of research is needed not just to teachers but also to parents and the public. It is essential that the public image of bilingual education is based on fact rather than fiction, evidence rather than prejudice.
2. Bilingual education is not simply about provision, practice, and pedagogy but is unavoidably about politics.
3. Secure evidence is needed from individual case studies, studies of outstanding schools and from examples of effective practice. However, research on bilingual education also has to provide robust evidence for high standards, high achievements, and those outputs and outcomes of schooling that parents, public and politicians regard as important. No matter how comprehensive and elaborate are the theoretical foundations of bilingual education, how strong the educational arguments for bilingual education, and how strong the arguments for the preservation of dying languages in the world, it is the politics of power, status, assimilation, and social order that can deny bilingual education so readily.

Qualitative Research Approaches to Bilingual Education

If a count were made of research on bilingual education in the last three or four years, it is qualitative investigations that have become relatively voluminous. These studies derive from varying related epistemologies, including microethnography, case studies, phenomenology, conversation analysis, critical poststructural analysis, and provide a microscopic analysis of one or a few individual cases, classes, or sites. Using one child (e.g., Day, 2002, on minority language socialization in a mainstream kindergarten), one teacher (e.g., Stritikus, 2003, on a teacher's role in the enactment of Proposition 227), one classroom (e.g., Bourne 2001, on identity construction via student interaction), two schools (e.g., de Coursey, 2002, on the processes of learning in immersion), a group of eight children (e.g., Thompson, 2000, on third generation immigrants), one family (e.g., Daniel-White, 2002, on immigrant Latino parental involvement in homework), and three case studies of showcase schools (Torres-Guzmán, Abbate, Brisk, & Minaya-Rowe, 2002), such research has moved bilingual education discourse from mostly output and input-output studies to engagement of 'situated process.' With emphases on discourse, communication analyses, observation of teacher-student, student-student, teacher-parent, and parent-student, interactions, the sociocultural, sociolinguistic, sociopolitical contextualization and classroom dynamics of a case provide a canvas

for studying the development of identity, literacy, oracy, networking, group membership, and particularly the processes of learning. Martin-Jones (2000) provides a thorough historical review of three decades of bilingual classroom interaction research.

One strong strand in such qualitative bilingual education research concerns literacy development and biliteracy (e.g., Baynham & Prinsloo, 2001; Hornberger, 2003; Martin-Jones & Jones, 2000; Reyes & Halcón, 2001). Using contexts of classroom, home, and community, such literacy research tends to be less concerned with teaching and learning methodology and more focused on, for example, the relationship between asymmetrical power relations and literacy practices that reproduce social inequalities and competing discourses about what counts as literacy. Current biliteracy research argues that language policies and practices in education are struggles over power and authority, equity and marginalization, legitimacy and social order, symbolic domination and identities, social categorization and social hierarchization. Any consideration about who should speak what language, how, when, and where is essentially about what counts as legitimate language and who has dominance and control. Hence those in power who legitimate the current social order regulate access to linguistic norms and linguistic resources to preserve their power and position.

Such biliteracy research topics include: teacher dominated classroom literacy practice; the use of closed and convergent questioning; recitation and chorus responses by pupils; lesson routines which are safe; 'doing the lesson' without cognitive gain; using a prestigious colonial language that is remote from the child's home and community experience; the use of 'safetalk' and 'safetime' to reproduce marginalization and academic failure; and the paucity of classroom materials in a minority language reinforcing the dominance of a majority language. The collection of chapters on biliteracy among Latino students by Reyes and Halcón (2001) engages many of these themes with a more optimistic and constructive approach than most. A comprehensive framework for integrating this research, evaluating its contribution to local and national debates is Hornberger's *Continua of Biliteracy* (see Hornberger, 2003). Using dimensions of media, contexts, development and content, she provides an agenda for full biliterate development and expression.

New Directions

There are several innovative, developing areas of research that deserve brief mention:

1. Trilingual education has become a European topic of much interest (see the 2001 special issue of *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism* 4,1; Chapters 9 to 14 of Cenoz and Jessner, 2000, and Cenoz, Hufeisen, & Jessner, 2001). For example, research in the Basque Country on the use of Basque, Spanish, and English in different bilingual education models suggests that students in a heritage language (developmental

maintenance) program tend to outperform more monolingual students in learning a new language (Lasagabaster, 2000). Also, education that utilizes three languages for content delivery appears, in these early days of research, to result in no loss of linguistic achievement and increased metalinguistic awareness.

2. The deaf community's development of their own bilingual education (Baker & Jones, 1998; Burch, 2000) has lacked a sustained research focus, but as bilingual programs for deaf students expand, the opportunity for investigating an increased range of variables in bilingual education is available.

3. Similarly, there is a dearth of research on the nature and success of bilingual education for different varieties of special educational needs children (Frederickson & Cline, 2002).

4. Rapid developments in information technologies will have consequences for bilingual education. There are 'English language dominance' dangers for bilingual education and issues surrounding equality of access to information technologies for language minority students. But there are also many potential opportunities such as e-books, machine translation, voice recognition, WebTV, international e-mailing and text messaging (Bishop, 2000; Skourtou, 2002). Close to completion is the integration of speech recognition that turns spoken words into text, a machine translator that converts the text from one language to another, and a speech synthesizer that turns the text back into audible words.

5. The nature of international bilingual education is also being developed and challenged in the context of the internationalization of English and its growing world-wide prominence as a second language rather than a mother tongue (Graddol & Meinhof, 1999).

6. A recent area for research activity is the relationship of feminist poststructuralism to bilingual education, requiring a gendered understanding of second language learning and bilingual education (Pavlenko, 2001; Pavlenko & Piller, 2001). This has valuably challenged bilingual education researchers and their agendas.

Research on bilingual education has a long but difficult future. While using the most robust qualitative and quantitative research methods, and while aiming to be balanced and impartial in interpretations and conclusions, impactful research on bilingual education will almost inevitably meet ideological and political arguments. The passionate politics surrounding immigration, social and political cohesion, and imagined threats to peace and prosperity, will pitch such research into the cauldron of political competition and controversy. However, such political debates unequivocally need to be informed by research. The alternative is decisions about languages and education based on ignorance and prejudice, resulting in policies that

may increase inequity, injustice, and intolerance. Thus the challenge for bilingual education research is to investigate and inform policy and practice so as to increase successively the probability that language minority children experience equity, justice, and tolerance, not just in school, but as the empowered citizens of tomorrow.

Note

1. The author wishes to express his appreciation to Gareth Roberts, Terrence Wiley, and the Editor for their most helpful comments on a draft.

ANNOTATED BIBLIOGRAPHY

Cummins, J. (2000). *Language, power and pedagogy: Bilingual children in the crossfire*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Based on three decades of research, this book argues that research on bilingual education has become so unfocused, has sent out mixed messages, and is so ignorant of underlying theory that politicians can use research selectively to fit and support their ideology. Cummins contends that the much publicized research reviews and meta-analyses of bilingual education all assume that research can directly inform policy-making. Cummins sees this as naive due to the myriad of human, administrative, and political influences that impact the implementation of programs. He argues that tested theory should drive policy making. It is theory tested by many individual research findings that permits the generation of predictions about program outcomes under different conditions. That is, research should commence from theoretical propositions, testing, refining and sometimes refuting those propositions. When theory is firmly supported by research, and when it accounts for findings from a variety of contexts, theory should explicitly inform policy-making (see also Cummins, 1999).

Francis, N., & Reyhner, J. (2002). *Language and literacy teaching for indigenous education*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Using a comparative approach, this book considers indigenous education (heritage language education) in the United States, Mexico, Ecuador, Peru, and Bolivia. With particular insights from the Native American Indian experience, the authors analyze and integrate the often perilous state of indigenous languages in the Americas with approaches to bilingual education at the levels of policy, provision and practice (e.g., curriculum design, biliteracy, language assessment).

Johnstone, R. (2002). *Immersion in a second or additional language at school: A review of the international research*. Stirling, Scotland: Scottish Centre for Information on Language Teaching.

The strongest research support for bilingual education derives from evaluations of immersion education, particularly from Canada since the 1960s. Such programs, and research on immersion, has recently spread internationally, culminating in this wide-ranging and detailed report. Johnstone authoritatively analyses the variety of international immersion models, processes, characteristic features, attainments and other impacts. He concludes that immersion students tend to outperform their monolingual peers in literacy, metalinguistic awareness and an analytical approach to language. The longer-term impact is also apparent, with immersion students who reach university having an increased richness of vocabulary, sensitivity to meanings and understanding of abstract concepts. Early immersion is generally, but not always substantially, preferable to partial, delayed, and late immersion models. Late and delayed immersion can be appropriate and valuable for high school students who already have a good standard of both L1 literacy skills and general curriculum achievement.

Lindholm-Leary, K.J. (2001). *Dual language education*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Strong research support for two-way language programs is provided in this book. The author's investigations provide a detailed analysis of processes and outcomes from 20 dual language schools, extending positive findings from student achievement to attitudes (student, parent and teacher) and teacher talk. In a thorough, multiple variable, quantitative style, she analyzes the performance of 4900 students over a four- to eight-year period of longitudinal research, and provides robust evidence for dual language education leading to bilingualism, biliteracy, and achievement typically above grade level. Lindholm-Leary relates such success empirically to a wide range of key factors: curriculum design and implementation, teacher training and development, parent-teacher relationships, student population characteristics, assessment issues, and transition to secondary education.

Mejía, A. M. de (2002). *Power, prestige and bilingualism: International perspectives on elite bilingual education*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

This book provides a wide-ranging international study of "elite" bilingual education. She examines students in varying forms of education where two prestigious languages are used. Recipes for success are shown to be varied and complex, escaping tight models and typologies. The value of a truly international comparative study of bilingual education that analyses bilingual schooling inputs, process and outcomes with a sociocultural,

sociolinguistic, and political contextualization makes this research both pioneering and a powerful advocate for strong bilingual education.

Valdés, G. (2001). *Learning and not learning English: Latino students in American schools*. New York: Teachers College Press.

This intensive two-year research project provides exemplification of the paradox of English language learning policies enacted in schools that can deny access to the language and knowledge that would empower U.S. immigrant children. She shows that, separately and cumulatively, there are complex interacting classroom factors that frequently work against a student's second language development, achievement, employment, citizen rights, and opportunities and self-esteem. Such factors include a lack of regular, purposeful and developing interactions with native speakers; impoverished second language interactions with teachers in a staff-student ratio of over 1:30; passive learning and 'tight discipline' strategies; mixed language competence classes working to a low common denominator; subject matter kept simplistic as the second language is insufficiently developed; and teachers' concerns with 'flawed language' forms rather than communication. Valdés engages multilevel explanations stating "Placing blame is not simple. Structures of dominance in society interact with educational structures and educational ideologies as well as with teachers' expectations and with students' perspectives about options and opportunities" (2001, p. 4).

OTHER REFERENCES

- Abelardo Villarreal Intercultural Development Research Association (1999). *Bilingual Research Journal*, 23,1–29. (<http://brj.asu.edu/>).
- August, D., & Hakuta, K. (1997). *Improving schooling for language-minority children*. Washington, DC: National Academy Press.
- Baker, C. (2001). *Foundations of bilingual education and bilingualism* (3rd ed.). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Baker, C., & Jones, M. P. (1999). *Continuity in Welsh language education*. Cardiff: Welsh Language Board.
- Baker, C., & Jones, S. P. (1998). *Encyclopedia of bilingualism and bilingual education*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Baugh, J. (1999). *Out of the mouths of slaves: African American language and educational malpractice*. Austin, TX: University of Texas Press.
- Baynham, M., & Prinsloo, M. (Eds.). (2001). New directions in literacy research: Policy, pedagogy, practice. *Language and Education*, 15, 81–227 [Special issue].
- Bialystok, E. (2001). *Bilingualism in development: Language, literacy, and cognition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Bishop, A. (2000, September). Technology trends and their potential for bilingual education. *NCBE Issue Brief*, 7, 1–15.
- Bourne, J. (2001). Discourses and identities in a multi-lingual primary classroom. *Oxford Review of Education*, 27, 103–114.
- Burch, S. (2000). In a different voice: Sign language preservation and America's deaf community. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 24, 1–19. (<http://brj.asu.edu/>).
- Carrasquillo, A. L., & Rodriguez, V. (2002). *Language minority students in the mainstream classroom* (2nd ed.). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Cenoz, J., & Jessner, U. (2000). *English in Europe: The acquisition of a third language*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Cenoz, J., Hufeisen, B., & Jessner, U. (2001). Towards trilingual education. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 4, 1–10.
- Center for Applied Linguistics (2001). *Expanding educational opportunity in linguistically diverse societies*. Washington, DC: Center for Applied Linguistics.
- Crawford, J. (1999). *Bilingual education: History, politics, theory and practice*. Los Angeles: Bilingual Educational Services.
- Crawford, J. (2000). *At war with diversity: U.S. language policy in an age of anxiety*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Crawford, J. (2002). *James Crawford's language policy web site and emporium*. Available: <http://ourworld.compuserve.com/homepages/JWCRAWFORD/>. [Retrieved 2002, August 15].
- Crystal, D. (2000). *Language death*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Cummins, J. (1999). Alternative paradigms in bilingual education research: Does theory have a place? *Educational Researcher*, 28, 26–32, 41.
- Cummins, J., & Corson, D. (Eds). (1997). *Bilingual Education*. Volume 5 of *The Encyclopedia of Language and Education*. Dordrecht: Kluwer.
- Daniel-White, K. (2002). Reassessing parental involvement: Involving language minority parents in school work at home. *University of Pennsylvania Working Papers in Educational Linguistics*, 18, 29–49.
- Day, E. M. (2002). *Identity and the young English language learner*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- de Courcey, M. (2002). *Learners' experiences of immersion education: Case studies of French and Chinese*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- de Jong, E. (2002). Effective bilingual education: From theory to academic achievement in a two-way bilingual program. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 26, 1–9. (<http://brj.asu.edu/>).
- Demmert, W. G. (2001). Improving academic performance among Native American students. Charleston WV: ERIC Clearinghouse on Rural Education and Small Schools.
- Dutcher, N. (1995). *The use of first and second languages in education: A review of international experience*. Washington, DC: World Bank.
- Frederickson, N., & Cline, T. (2002). *Special educational needs, inclusion and diversity*. Buckingham: Open University Press.
- Garcia, E. E. (2002). Bilingualism and schooling in the United States. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 155–156, 1–92.

- Gardner, N. (2000). *Basque in education in the Basque autonomous community*. Vitoria-Gasteiz: Eusko Jaurlaritzaren Argitalpen Zerbitzu Nagusia.
- Genesee, F., & Gándara, P. (1999). Bilingual education programs: A cross-national perspective. *Journal of Social Issues*, 55, 665–685.
- Graddol, D., & Meinhof, U. H. (Eds). (1999). *English in a changing world*. *AILA Review*, 13. Oxford: Catchline (The English Trading Company).
- Henley, A., & Jones, R. E. (2001). *Earnings and linguistic ability in a bilingual economy*. Research Paper No 2001–18. Aberystwyth: School of Management and Business.
- Hornberger, N. H. (Ed.). (2003). *Continua of biliteracy: An ecological framework for educational policy, research, and practice in multilingual settings*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- House, D. (2002). *Language shift among the Navajos*. Tuscon, AZ: University of Arizona Press.
- Housen, A. (2002). Processes and outcomes in the European Schools model of multilingual education. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 26, 1–9. (<http://brj.asu.edu/>).
- King, K.A. (2001). *Language revitalization: Processes and prospects*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Kloss, H. (1998). *The American bilingual tradition*. Washington, DC: Center for Applied Linguistics/McHenry, IL: Delta Systems.
- Krashen, S. D. (1999). *Condemned without a trial: Bogus arguments against bilingual education*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Krauss, M. (1995). Language loss in Alaska, the United States, and the world. *Frame of Reference (Alaska Humanities Forum)*, 6, 2–5.
- Laosa, L. M. (2000). *Non-language characteristics of instructional services for language minority students*. Washington, DC: National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education.
- Lasagabaster, D. (2000). Three languages and three linguistic models in the Basque educational system. In J. Cenoz & U. Jessner (Eds.), *English in Europe: The acquisition of a third language* (pp. 179–197). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Lasagabaster, D. (2001). Bilingualism, immersion programmes and language learning in the Basque Country. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 22, 401–425.
- Lewis, E. G. (1981). *Bilingualism and bilingual education*. Oxford: Pergamon.
- Littlebear, R. (1999). Some rare and radical ideas for keeping indigenous languages alive. In J. Reyhner, G. Cantoni, R. St. Claire, & E. Parsons Yazzie (Eds.), *Revitalizing indigenous languages* (pp. 1–5). Flagstaff, Arizona: Northern Arizona University.
- Lo Bianco, J. (2001). *Language and literacy policy in Scotland*. Stirling, Scotland: Scottish Centre for Information on Language Teaching.
- Lotherington, H. (1998). Trends and tensions in post-colonial language education in the South Pacific. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 1, 65–75.
- Martin-Jones, M. (2000). Bilingual classroom interaction: A review of recent research. *Language Teaching*, 33, 1–9.

- Martin-Jones, M., & Jones, K. (2000). *Multilingual literacies: Reading and writing different worlds*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- May, S. (2001). *Language and minority rights: Ethnicity, nationalism and the politics of language*. London: Longman.
- McCarty, T. L. (2002). *A place to be Navajo: Rough Rock and the struggle for self-determination in indigenous schooling*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Montecel, M. R., & Cortez, J.D. (2002). Successful bilingual education programs. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 26, 1–10. (<http://brj.asu.edu/>).
- Moses, M. S. (2000). Why bilingual education policy is needed: A philosophical response to critics. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 24, 333–354. (<http://brj.asu.edu/>).
- Nettle, D., & Romaine, S. (2000). *Vanishing voices: The extinction of the world's languages*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Pavlenko, A., (2001). Bilingualism, gender and ideology. *International Journal of Bilingualism*, 5, 117–151.
- Pavlenko, A., & Piller, I. (2001). New directions in the study of multilingualism, second language learning, and gender. In A. Pavlenko, A. Blackledge, I. Piller, & M. Teutsch-Dwyer (Eds.), *Multilingualism, second language learning and gender* (pp. 17–52). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Peyton, J. K., Ranard D. A., & McGinnis, S. (2001). Charting a new course: Heritage language education in the United States. In J. K. Peyton, D. A. Ranard, & S. McGinnis (Eds.), *Heritage languages in America: Preserving a national resource* (pp. 3–28). McHenry, IL: Delta Systems.
- Reyes, M. de la Luz, & Halcón, J. J. (Eds.). (2001). *The best for our children: Critical perspectives on literacy for latino students*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Ricento, T., & Wiley, T. (Eds.). (2002). Revisiting the mother-tongue question in language policy, planning, and politics [Special issue]. *International journal of the Sociology of Language*, 154.
- Rossell, C., & Baker, K. (1996). The educational effectiveness of bilingual education. *Research in the Teaching of English*, 30, 7–74.
- Senesac, B. V. K. (2002). Two-way bilingual immersion: A portrait of quality schooling. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 26, 1–15. (<http://brj.asu.edu/>).
- Skourtou, E. (2002). Connecting Greek and Canadian schools through an internet-based sister-class network. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 5, 85–95.
- Skutnabb-Kangas, T. (2000). *Linguistic genocide in education—or worldwide diversity and human rights?* Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Stritikus, T. T. (2001). From personal to political: Proposition 227, literacy instruction, and the individual qualities of teachers. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 4, 291–309.
- Stritikus, T. T. (2003). The interrelationship of beliefs, context, and learning: The case of a teacher reacting to language policy. *Journal of Language, Identity and Education*, in press.

- Stroud, C. (2001). African mother-tongue programmes and the politics of language: Linguistic citizenship versus linguistic human rights. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 22, 339–355.
- Tankersley, D. (2001). Bombs or bilingual programmes?: Dual language immersion, transformative education and community building in Macedonia. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 4, 107–124.
- Thomas, W. P., & Collier, V. P. (2002). *An national study of school effectiveness for language minority students: Long-term academic achievement. Final Report*. Washington, DC: Center for Research on Education, Diversity, & Excellence.
- Thompson, L. (2000). *Young bilingual learners in nursery school*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Tollefson, J. (Ed.). (2002). *Language policies in education: Critical readings*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Torres-Guzmán, M. E. (2002). Dual language programs: Key features and results. *Directions in Language and Education*, 14, 1–16.
- Torres-Guzmán, M. E., Abbate, J., Brisk, M. E., & Minaya-Rowe, L. (2002). Defining and documenting success for bilingual learners: a collective case study. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 26, 1–10. (<http://brj.asu.edu/>).
- Tse, L. (2001). "Why don't they learn English?" *Separating fact from fallacy in the U.S. language debate*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Welsh Language Board. (1999). *The Welsh language: A vision and mission for 2000–2005*. Cardiff: Welsh Language Board.
- Wiese, A-M., & Garcia, E. E. (2001). The Bilingual Education Act: Language minority students and U.S. federal educational policy. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 4, 229–248.
- Wiley, T. G. (1998). The imposition of World War I era English-Only policies and the fate of German in North America. In T. Ricento & B. Burnaby (Eds.), *Language and politics in the United States and Canada* (pp. 211–241). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Wiley, T. G. (2002). Accessing language rights in education: A brief history of the U.S. context. In J. Tollefson (Ed.), *Language policies in education: Critical issues* (pp. 39–64). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Zhou, M. (2001). The politics of bilingual education and educational levels in ethnic minority communities in China. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 4, 125–149.