

refugees. There are presently some 80 different languages spoken as mother tongues in the Norwegian school. Thus the Norwegian Language Council invited representatives of the new fellow citizens to take part in a discussion on the teaching of Norwegian as a second language at its annual meeting in January 1990. At this meeting a representative of the indigenous Sami speaking population also gave a speech. The theme of the annual meeting in January 1991 was concerned with different topics under the heading 'Norsk skriftkultur' (Norwegian written traditions, i.e. the culture of writing engendered since the introduction of literacy in Norway).

Linguistic Legislation on Sami

In the beginning of this article, Norway was characterized as a nation of official bilingual literacy, referring to its two official language norms, Bokmål and Nynorsk. In 1990 this situation was in a way altered, indeed improved, as multilingualism officially expanded, the indigenous Sami language gaining official status in parts of Northern Norway. Some months ago Parliament passed a Sami Language Act giving certain elementary linguistic rights to the Sami people and defining Sami as an official language in the municipalities of Guovdageaidnu (Kautokeino), Karasjohka (Karasjok), Deatnu (Tana), Unjarga (Nesseby), Porsangu (Porsanger) and Gaivuotna (Kåfjord). This new act has not been put into effect yet, so it would be premature to try to say anything about the linguistic consequences of this new situation for the Sami people in Norway. The Sami Language Act, however, broadens the basis of official multilingualism considerably and may thus form the basis of a new language situation in parts of Norway.

TOVE BULL,

*School of languages and literature,
University of Tromsø, Norway.*

LATINOS AND BILINGUAL EDUCATION IN THE UNITED STATES: Their Role as Objects and Subjects

1. Latinos in the U.S.

The Spanish-speaking Latino community in the United States is diverse and large. The 23 million Latinos counted in the 1990 Census have different countries of origin: some came from the Spanish-speaking Caribbean (Puerto Rico, Cuba and the Dominican Republic); some came from Mexico; and more recently some came from countries in Central and South America.

Although Latinos have distinct geographical origins, there are some characteristics that they all share. Regardless of proficiency, the Spanish language is the link to their ethnic identity, although some Latinos speak it natively and as their only language. English is their second language in the sense that it is not linked to their ethnicity. All Latinos were subjects of colonies of Spain in Latin America. They shared a socio-historical relationship with the United States as the imperialist neighbour of the Latin American country of their origin. The United States may have overtly taken-over some countries (as in the case of Puerto Rico and Port of Mexico) or may have maintained indirect control and influence over other countries.

Some Latinos are U.S. citizens, by birth. All Puerto Ricans, regardless of whether they are born on the island or in the mainland are U.S. citizens a right granted to them by the Jones Act of 1917. The Mexicans who woke up one day to find themselves in the United States by the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo after the Mexican American War in 1848 were also granted U.S. citizenship by birth. Other Latinos have lived in the United States long to be naturalized as U.S. citizens. Some Latinos, however, are U.S. residents hoping to become citizens. There are some Latinos who are political refugees, whose status is undecided. There are also Latinos who are illegal immigrants making it difficult to know the precise number of Latinos in the U.S.

The inferior position of Latinos in the United States, due to the sociohistorical relationship which the United States has had with Latin American countries mentioned earlier causes the conflict that surrounds much of the Bilingual Education discourse in the United States. It is therefore important to consider some of the sociolinguistic characteristics of Latinos before we turn to Bilingual Education as an educational alternative for them.

A. Categorization-by-others

As with most non-dominant groups, Latinos in the U.S. are subjected to categorization by others. This means that the majority in control decides for them how they must relate to themselves and to the majority. As we will see below, these decisions affect both their ethnolinguistic characteristics, as well as structural and economic ones.

B. Ethnolinguistic Characteristics

The bilingualism of all Latinos is involuntary. When Latinos come to the US they have no choice but to learn English. There is great interest among Latinos to learn English, and they learn it well. But with acquisition of English, they are forced to give up Spanish. Thus subtractive bilingualism is involuntary, as the Latinos are forced to undergo language shift from Spanish to English as soon as possible. However, this linguistic and cultural assimilation rarely leads to economic gain, though it is the motivating factor for language shift.

C. Economic and Structural Characteristics

With regard to economic attainment, Latinos fare poorly compared to non-Latinos in the U.S. The median income of Latino families in 1989 (\$23,400) was about 67 percent of the median of non-Latino families - (\$35,000). More than double the proportion of Latino families lived in poverty in 1989 (23.4%) than non-Latino families (9.2%) (U.S. Bureau of the Census 1991).

One should keep in mind the lack of control that Latinos have over their own ethnolinguistic and structural characteristics as we discuss the conflict surrounding bilingual education for Latinos in the U.S. While Latinos are forced to be linguistically and culturally assimilated, they are structurally and economically excluded. This contradiction between the expectation that Latinos will become linguistically and culturally unmarked (that is, same as the Anglo majority), and the reality that they are economically excluded and inferior to the Anglo majority leads to conflict over the objectives of bilingual education.

2. Bilingual Education for Latinos in the U.S.

The Bilingual Education Act (also known as Title VII of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act) which started the modern wave of federally supported bilingual instruction in the United States was passed in 1968. What had started out as a proposal to funnel federal funds for the education of Latinos, and particularly of Mexican Americans and Puerto Ricans (groups suffering from high educational failure), eventually became a program to teach English to speakers of all other languages. It is the conflict between the original intention of the legislation and the program it has become, as well as the conflict between the majority in control of the schools and the minority which it has had to employ to carry out the program, that affect all discourse surrounding bilingual education today.

The original intent of the Bilingual Education Act was to use two languages as an educational alternative in the instruction of language minority pupils, specifically Latinos, who experienced educational failure. Originally the goal of bilingual education legislation was not linguistic. That is, it neither had the acquisition of English, nor the maintenance of Spanish, as an objective. It was thought that hiring bilingual teachers who would use both languages in instruction would be beneficial to Latino students. This original intent of Bilingual Education was misconstrued, and educational failure was redefined to mean lack of proficiency in English. That is, rather than helping Latino students, who were often fluent in English but could not function successfully in an Anglo school world, bilingual education became a method of teaching English to those who did not speak English. In order to qualify for federal funds during the first four years of the legislation, children in the bilingual education program had to be not only deficient in English, but also poor. Though the poverty criterion was fortunately removed in 1974, the linguistic remediation aspect of the Act remains the central tenet of bilingual education in the United States.

Even when its goal was monolingualism, bilingual education required bilingual teachers. It was felt that a Spanish-speaking teacher would be able to teach English more effectively than an Anglo person who would not be able to use Spanish in teaching English. It was also believed that when the natural code-switching of bilinguals is brought to the classroom, it erodes the boundary between the minority and majority language, causing language shift to the majority language.

But what legislators failed to realize was that Latino teachers who were members of the language minority communities could not simply be robots of the federal government or of the school administration. Although their task was defined as the teaching of English to students who were not proficient in it, many began to regard the development of proficiency in Spanish as an important educational goal.

The conflict between empowerment to previously subjugated groups by raising many in their ranks to professional status and the desire to use that group to impose majority values which may be in conflict with those of the minority was cause of the controversy surrounding bilingual education in the United States. It is true that Latino teachers involved in transitional bilingual classrooms (classrooms whose main purpose is to teach English quickly so that students could enter

the English-only classes) are very effective. As bilingual teachers who are able to switch from one language to another, they perform their English teaching duties much more effectively than their English-only colleagues. This part of their job is not questioned. In fact, the Latino community agrees with the intent of teaching English as quickly as possible to the Latino pupils. But the community do not want to give up Spanish and the Latino teachers understand this. The Latino teachers become allies of the community and as they continue to teach English, they start working for saving Spanish. Many teachers realize that in order to develop the minority language, much more is needed than just switching languages. Switching is a very effective approach in cases of *emergent bilingualism* when the purpose of instruction is the acquisition of a second or foreign language. However, switching languages accelerates the erosion of the boundary between languages, permitting the dominant language to take over the minority one. No longer wanting to support *transitional bilingualism*, some Latino teachers start making efforts to separate the two languages. School districts that support this community effort have developed dual language programs where the use of the two languages is compartmentalized.

Since the 1980s, efforts have been launched to use bilingual education funds for programs that use only English in instruction. The argument is made that if the purpose of the Bilingual Act is to teach English, then English as a Second Language-Only Programs or Structured English Immersion Programs, are especially good ways of accomplishing that goal. The opponents of bilingual education instruction want to give jobs to mono-lingual non-Latino individuals, taking away jobs from bilinguals, who are invariably members of the minority community. Disempowering the language minority group will diffuse for them the controversy surrounding

<i>Editor</i>	E. Anagnostis
<i>Artistic Editor</i>	Blair H. Jernigan
<i>Editorial Board</i>	Ara Banghose Jini Neustupny Mancel De Greve Andrew Gonzalez Benjamin K. Tsou
<i>Editorial Assistant</i>	J. S. Rappasree Jennifer Bayer

All correspondence including changes of address and requests to be placed on the mailing list should be addressed to the Editor:

E. Anagnostis
Director
Center for Studies of Indian Languages
Manassas, VA
Phone: 570-006
Title:

Fryske Akademy

bilingual education; but the possibility of Spanish language maintenance and development will certainly disappear.

It is instructive to realize that the most important issue surrounding bilingual education in the United States today is one of educational control. All groups want to educate their children in their own image. When a monolingual dominant group thinks about the education of language minority children, monolingualism is the standard and the goal. But when that group employs members of the language minority community to carry out that task, there is a risk that the bilingualism and biculturalism of the language minority community would become the standard and the goal. As the minority group is empowered through jobs, preferred status, professionalization, the majority becomes frightened. In an effort to regain control, it enforces monolingualism not only as an educational goal, but also as the most valuable educational approach. It attempts to turn over the jobs to monolingual individuals who like themselves would not appreciate the value of preserving the minority community's language and culture.

The situation in which bilingual education finds itself today in the United States is reflective of the different political periods which the country has experienced. During the era of Civil Rights and the decade of prosperity, there was room to empower Latinos, to give them access to professional status, and there was no need to fear. But as that population gained control and started asserting their wishes as members of a language minority community and as professionals in the field of bilingualism for the maintenance and development of Spanish, the door started to close. As the economic situation of the United States has worsened, regaining control by the majority population has become an important goal. This has been manifested in the powerful English-Only movement of the 1980s. And in the bilingual education arena it has translated into less jobs for Latinos and less acceptability of the use of Spanish in teaching children, even when the goal of instruction is to teach them English.

Footnote

1. An attitudinal survey of the New York Latino community confirming this fact has just been completed by some of my graduate students in a course on Research on Bilingual Education. The following students worked in that unpublished study: Rosina Angeles, Rosa Caram, Rafael Castillo, Pedro Cruz Garcia, Luis Rafael Gomez, Maria Lorca, Milagros Mendez, Feliz Mendoza, Raisa Nadal, Raquel Nadal, Miguel Nunez, Norma Santiago.

Reference:

U.S. Bureau of the Census, *Current Population Reports*, Series P-20, No. 449, *The Hispanic Population in the United States*: March 1990. U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 1991.

OFELIA GARCIA

*The City College of New York
School of Education, New York,
New York 10031, (212) 650-6273*

Fax: (212) 650-6970, e-mail: OGACC@CUNYVM

THE FRYSCHE AKADEMY

The Fryske Akademy was founded in 1938 and has since occupied itself with research in a number of fields, relating to the province of Friesland, its inhabitants and their language. Its three main disciplines are nowadays: linguistics (terminology, onomastics, computerlinguistics, lexicography); history (from medieval to modern time, history of literature); and social sciences (sociology of language political science, labour-market economics, demography). Annually, over 20 books and about 50 articles are published. These are publications of the Fryske Akademy's researchers, often in co-operation with third persons. In addition, the Fryske Akademy brings out the quarterly journal "It Beaken" ("The Beacon"; 3,000 subscribers), and a yearly historical journal, "De Vrije Fries" ("The Free Frisian"). Through the years the number of employees has steadily grown, and nowadays, the Fryske Akademy employs some 70 researchers and administrative personnel.

One of its major linguistic projects is the compilation of a comprehensive dictionary of post-1800 Frisian (Wurdboek fan de Fryske Taal). The dictionary will eventually comprise some twenty volumes, of which seven have already been published. Worth mentioning is also the Language Data Bank, which stores new Frisian texts.

A unique characteristic of the Fryske Akademy is the stimulating co-operation between professional researchers and interested laymen, which takes place in many working groups. Although the Fryske Akademy has no direct educational task as it is basically a research institute, miscellaneous courses are organized, and its researchers regularly give lectures. The Fryske Akademy has three special chairs in Frisian linguistics and literature at the universities of Amsterdam, Leiden and Utrecht.

The Fryske Akademy realizes the special relevance of the activities for autochthonous lesser used languages in Europe. Comparative research is important in this respect. In 1988 an inventory was completed on the position in primary education of 34 lesser used languages in the European Community (EMU project). From 1990 to 1993 teacher training provisions are the object of a new study (EMOL-project). The Fryske Akademy also participates in MERCATOR, the European network for information and documentation on lesser used languages.

FRYSKE AKADEMY

Doelestrjitte 8

8911 DX LEEUWARDEN/LJOUWERT

The Netherlands

Telephone : ..31 58 131414

Telefax : ..31 58 131409

REPORTS

The Minister for Employment, Education and Training in the Australian federal government (John Dawkins) in August 1991 released a Policy Paper on Australian language and literacy policy accompanied by a Companion Volume covering the same content in greater detail, titled **AUSTRALIA'S LANGUAGE**.