

Lost in transculturation: The case of bilingual education in New York City*

Ofelia García

1. Another *West Side Story* by way of introduction

I started teaching in an alternative public school in New York City in 1970 in what was then called Hell's Kitchen. The neighborhood was then a seething mix of tenements and factories not too unlike the description given to us by Jacob Riis in his *How the Other Half Lives* (1890). The community was that of Leonard Bernstein's *West Side Story*, with violence, tragedy, and despair coexisting with love and hope. Prostitution and drugs were visible, but so were struggling families, anxious to build a better life for themselves. At the time, Puerto Ricans, US citizens by virtue of their colonial status, made up eighty percent of the New York Latino population, and bilingual education was just coming into being. Responding to the dismal failures of Puerto Ricans in New York schools, as well as to the political pressure of a Puerto Rican Civil Rights Organization, *Aspira*, the New York City Board of Education supported the creation of transitional bilingual education programs where newly arrived Puerto Rican children could be educated in Spanish while getting intensive English as a Second Language instruction. I became a bilingual teacher overnight, teaching English as a Second Language as well as subject matter in Spanish.

Thirty years after my initial teaching appointment, the transformation of Hell's Kitchen into what is now called "Midtown West" mirrors changes in the City and its schools. Cruise ships are now docked in the once abandoned piers. The sex shops have been transformed into fusion restaurants that blend different ethnic cuisines. The tenements have been replaced by luxury condos, such as the newly opened AOL Time Warner Center where apartments sell for two million to thirty-two million dollars. The few tenements that remain are now crowded by mostly Mexican, Central and South American immigrants, as many Puerto Ricans have moved out, leaving symbolically behind the Puerto Rican Traveling Theatre.

The moving images of cruise ships and a traveling theatre, the hybrid smells and tastes of fusion restaurants, and the technological triumph

evoked by the AOL Time Warner building are suggestive of the flux and the transcultural context in which we find ourselves in the 21st century. Our postmodern era has been described as a post-industrial period in which new technologies, media images, and service economies characterize a global, multinational, capitalist marketplace (Appadurai 1996; Graddol 1997; Sefranek 2003). And yet, for a short time in the days following September 11, 2001, we were reminded of how life in the flux could be an illusion. The image of modern travel, the airplane, was turned into a weapon that made time stop for all of us. As the airplane merged with the weapon, we were brought face to face with how our global interdependence and our local realities coexist, often inextricably tied in tension.

The image of the airplane-turned-weapon is instructive today to analyze the turn that bilingual education has taken in the United States as immigration has increased and our linguistic profile has become more heterogeneous and complex. In the face of the new linguistic flux and hybridity brought about not only by the proliferation of languages in the United States, but also by the speed of communication and travel made possible by technology, the transitional bilingual education models of the past are being substituted by two-way dual language bilingual education models (TWDL from now on) where children of different linguistic profiles are integrated for instruction in two languages. These dual language bilingual education programs clearly respond and are able to better accommodate the greater language and cultural hybridity of the 21st century. And yet, they contain within them the risk of turning their own hybridity into a weapon capable of destroying the minority language. In this paper we point to the possibilities and the dangers of dual language bilingual education programs¹, arguing that unless these programs reclaim diglossia (see below) and extend it in ways that support the new hybridities, as well as the old differences, they run the risk of losing themselves in English.

2. Diglossia and U.S. schools

The study of societal multilingualism and the scholarly recognition of the role of minority languages in the 20th century owe much to the work of Joshua A. Fishman. Building on the model of diglossia posited by Ferguson in 1959, Fishman (1972) has argued that stable societal multilingualism requires the functional allocation of languages and their compartmentalization in social life. That is, in order for two languages to be maintained

intergenerationally, a *diglossic* arrangement is necessary, with each language being used for distinct purposes or in different domains.

Transitional bilingual education programs in the developing world has been a form of educational development and a way to empower the minority group (Benson 2004). The programs implemented in US elementary schools at the end of the 20th century usually have one Latino bilingual teacher who teaches recently arrived students in Spanish and English, often going back and forth between the two languages. By violating diglossic principles, transitional bilingual education programs are agents of language shift to English (Fishman 1976; García 1993). And yet, transitional bilingual education programs are useful “safe houses” for these newly arrived students. In these programs, Latino students are able to learn about the ways of schooling in the United States, as well as acquire English, with a teacher who is a cultural and linguistic broker (García 1991; García and Baker 1995).

But the United States' sociolinguistic and socioeducational situation was soon to get more complicated as the world became globalized. At the end of the 20th century, a change in U.S. immigration law made it possible for many more Latin Americans, Asians and Africans to immigrate to the United States. At the same time that there was freer movement of speakers, new technologies made it possible for languages to move over a multiplicity of communication channels and at a speed unheard of in the 20th century (Maurais and Morris 2004). On the other hand, globalization made it possible for English to increase its supremacy in language domains with high prestige, especially science, mass media, technology, popular culture, international business, and education. The paradox created by the greater heterogeneity and hybridity of discourse alongside the greater homogeneity and hegemony of English at the beginning of the 21st century has impacted how immigrants are being educated in the United States, often leaving them with much less than what they had in the late 20th century.

Today, transitional bilingual education has been outlawed in Arizona, California, and Massachusetts (Crawford 2000). And it is the model known as *Two-way Dual Language* or *Dual Immersion* (TWDL) that often has become the only viable alternative to transitional bilingual education for immigrant children (Cloud, Genesee and Hamayan 2000; Lindholm-Leary 2001, Torres-Guzmán 2002). Unlike transitional bilingual education programs, dual language bilingual education programs follow both diglossic and additive principles of bilingualism. In dual language programs the two languages are strictly compartmentalized, and the children stay in the pro-

gram for the duration of their elementary schooling. Two-way dual language programs are also better models of second language acquisition and social integration, since recently arrived immigrants are schooled with those who are fluent in English and born in the United States. Given that mass migration and electronic mediation mark today's world, the Two-Way Dual Language models are better able to accommodate the hybridities and flux of today.

But two-way dual language bilingual education programs are not always able to sustain linguistic differences and bilingualism. Although the programs compartmentalize the two languages strictly, they keep the children, all of whom show different degrees of bilingualism, integrated for instruction throughout the entire day. The TWDL model then *sustains diglossia* by compartmentalizing the languages of instruction, but *violates it and works against it* because children who have no language in common creatively mix the languages in an effort to communicate. Although the linguistic arrangement of dual language programs can support the complex multilingualism and cultural and linguistic hybridity of the 21st century, the TWDL model can also work well to promote English language monolingualism, in much the same way as transitional bilingual education programs have done in the past.

3. New York City's sociolinguistic profile

New York City is one of the most multilingual cities in the world (García and Fishman 2001). As we enter the 21st century, only 52 percent of the school-aged population (5 to 17 years old) is English monolingual, and 29 percent of the school-aged population speaks Spanish at home. According to the 2000 Census, there were 405,522 school-aged children who spoke Spanish at home in New York. In addition, there were 50,665 students who spoke Chinese; 27,549 who spoke Russian; 25,285 who used Yiddish at home; 18,844 who spoke French Creole; and 12,515 who spoke French. There were also 11,599 students who were speakers of Korean; 10,340 who spoke Hebrew; 9,892 who used Arabic at home; 9,702 who spoke Urdu; 9,072 who used Italian; and 7,557 who spoke Polish (U.S. population Census 2000).

New York City has a very different sociolinguistic profile today than when I started teaching, when speakers of languages other than English were mostly Puerto Ricans. Today, Spanish is still the number one lan-

guage, although the speakers of Spanish are no longer Puerto Ricans and the varieties of Spanish heard around the city are more diverse than ever. Although Puerto Ricans are still the majority Latino group in the city, they have consistently lost dominance, dropping from 90 percent in 1960 to 37 percent in 2000. And although the Dominican population has risen to make up 19 percent of Latino New Yorkers, there has been an enormous growth of Mexicans, Central Americans and South Americans. This increase has challenged the supremacy of Caribbean Spanish in New York City. In 1960, 90 percent of Latinos in New York City were speakers of Caribbean Spanish, whereas in 2000 only 57 percent of New York Spanish speakers could be considered speakers of Caribbean Spanish (Zentella 2001; García 2001, 2002, 2003a, 2003b).

Spanish has a very large presence in New York City. Of the two Spanish-language daily newspapers, *El Diario La Prensa* sells 60,000 copies a day and *Noticias del Mundo* sells 28,000 copies. The second most heard radio show in New York City is a Spanish language show, *El vacilón de la mañana*, heard in *La Mega*, one of four radio stations that transmits Spanish language programs in New York City.

As the city has grown to be more Spanish-speaking, and more diversified in the varieties of Spanish used, the Spanish language itself has gained more global status. For example, the *Instituto Cervantes*, a non-profit organization created by the Spanish government to teach Spanish and to contribute to the advancement of the Spanish and Hispanic American cultures throughout non-Spanish speaking countries has become firmly established. In 2004, the *Instituto Cervantes* opened the doors of an unequalled Spanish language and cultural center in New York, offering academic and cultural programs in Spanish.

Likewise, Spanish has become an important commodity to do business with the growing Spanish speaking population in the United States, as well as with Latin America. The Latino market's current purchasing power in the United States has been assessed at \$206 billion (Zentella 2001). In June 2002, Coca-Cola, Wendy's, Sears and other major corporations spent fifty million dollars in Spanish language commercials for the World Cup that was being transmitted by *Univisión*. It is significant that *Univisión*, the major Spanish language network in the United States, advertises itself by saying: "*Univisión, as American as flan,*" claiming a Spanish-language Americanness akin to the custard-like desert of all Spanish-speaking nations, and increasingly of the U.S. (García 2003c).

Despite the more global aspects of Spanish today, Spanish in the United States continues to be seen as the language of those who are poor and non-white. Recently, for example, the author of an advice column of a mainstream journal, *Vanity Fair*, told a reader: "Forget Spanish. As for everyone's speaking it, what twaddle! Who speaks it that you are really desperate to talk to? The help? Your leaf blower?" (Ask Dame Edna 2003: 116).

4. Dual language bilingual education in New York City: Supporting diglossia and hybridity

The increased presence of Spanish in New York City, coupled with the improved image of Spanish in the world's stage, has been a determining factor in the creation and development of two-way dual language programs in Spanish and English. In the late 1990s TWDL programs, especially at the elementary level, were encouraged in New York State as a way to meet the exigencies of regulations concerning English Language Learners and new immigrants, and as a way to integrate a growing Latino population that had been segregated for instruction in transitional bilingual education programs. With the exception of one Chinese (Mandarin)/English two-way dual language bilingual education program, the rest of the TWDL programs in New York City are Spanish/English. According to a document produced by *New Visions for Public Schools*, two-way dual language bilingual education programs have two defining characteristics: (1) "There is separation of the two languages for instruction. Sustained periods of monolingual instruction promotes linguistic development better than mixing languages within the same lesson. The non-English language is used at least 50 percent of the time for instruction." (2) "The program serves a balanced ratio of students who speak each language, ideally 50/50 but not to go below 70/30." The first criteria of language separation sets the stage for *diglossia*, while the second criteria of a balanced number of speakers of each language sets the stage for *hybridity*.

5. Diglossia

The language separation or *diglossic* instructional arrangements in the many Spanish/English programs follow different patterns. In one of the

Spanish/English TWDL schools, Spanish instruction takes place for an entire week with a Spanish language teacher, and then students switch over to the English language teacher who follows up the instruction in English (*alternate week compartmentalization*). In another TWDL school, students are taught in English one day and Spanish the next (*alternate day compartmentalization*). Other schools alternate time of day, with one language being used in the morning for instruction, and the other language used in the afternoon. Some schools alternate the order of languages, following what is called a "roller coaster" model in which if Spanish is taught in the morning in Day 1, it is taught in the afternoon in Day 2. Most TWDL schools maximize diglossia by having different teachers teach in the different languages (*alternate teacher compartmentalization*).

In the *Mandarin/English DL school*, the two languages are clearly delineated. English is taught in the morning and Mandarin is taught in the afternoon by the same bilingual teacher. In addition, from 3:00 PM until 5:30 PM there is free and compulsory Mandarin-only instruction taught by teachers who are not certified and are not employees of the New York City Department of Education.

Despite the external diglossic structure of dual language bilingual education models, the diversity of children, teachers and ways of using the two languages reflects a hybridity that has little to do with the language and cultural differences experienced in the classrooms of Hell's Kitchen in the early 1970s.

6. Hybridity: The children

Most of the children who attend the Spanish/English dual language schools seem to be Latino. But, these children, for the most part, have little in common with the Spanish-speaking teacher. In a country like the United States where language shift advances quickly, most of the Latino children are no longer speakers of Spanish. Many second generation children hear Spanish in family situations, if not from the parents, from the grandparents. But for many, the language exists only in their memory or in the cultural attachment of the growing Latino popular culture of the United States – in the songs of Shakira, Jennifer Lopez, and the others. Many other children are products of mixed marriages, and Spanish is not the language of the home. Others come from Latin American countries that are officially Spanish speaking, but from regions or families where Spanish has never been

spoken. This is the case of the large Garífuna-speaking population in New York City, Hondurans who might speak Spanish as a result of schooling in Latin America, but for whom Spanish is not a home language and who use Garífuna, and not Spanish, in raising their children. This is also the case of the growing population of indigenous-language-speaking Latinos in New York City, many speakers of Quechua/Quichua, of Guaraní, and of Mayan languages.

As we have seen, even when the children are Spanish speakers themselves, there is tremendous heterogeneity in the Spanish language varieties spoken in New York City classrooms. The entire sociolinguistic complexity of Latin America can be observed in one dual language classroom. And this linguistic complexity is often juxtaposed in the texts produced by the children, written many times in groups and by groups of speakers that represent the entire linguistic continuum not only of Latin America but across the Americas, with U.S. Spanish also becoming one more variety.

In the Chinese/English TWDL school, an outsider is able to identify the few non-Chinese students in the school, mostly students of African descent from the Anglophone Caribbean whose parents support the school's traditional discipline and structure. At a glance, Mandarin seems to be the heritage language of most of the children. Little by little, however, the linguistic complexity of these seemingly Chinese children emerges. On the one hand, there are children who are no longer speakers of Mandarin, and who struggle, alongside their English monolingual classmates, to acquire Mandarin. On the other hand, there are many children who are ethnically Chinese but who live today as children of white Anglophone parents, having been adopted at birth. And then, there are many who live in homes where another Chinese language is spoken – especially Cantonese, Fuzhounese, Shanghainese, Wenzhounese and Taiwanese. The linguistic complexity of all of China and of all of Taiwan is concentrated and evident in this small school, alongside the linguistic complexity of Anglophones not only in the United States but in the world. And many times, in one child's discourse one can hear evidence of it all. This is what makes dual language programs in the United States such a rich context for the study of multilingualism, for in a small space multilingual interactional negotiations are constantly taking place.

7. Hybridity: The teachers

In the Spanish/English TWDL programs, most bilingual teachers are of Latino background, although increasingly the teachers are not of the same national origin as the children. As we have seen, 80 percent of children of Latino background in New York City in 1960 were Puerto Ricans. Today, students of Puerto Rican background represent approximately a third of Latino students in the city. However, the majority of Latino students of Puerto Rican background, now most often second or third generation, are in monolingual classrooms and not in bilingual education classrooms, even of the dual language kind. But teaching has been a very attractive profession for New York Puerto Ricans who make up the majority of the city's Latino teachers. In Dual Language classrooms, Latino teachers, mostly of Puerto Rican background, are teaching Latino students who are not of Puerto Rican background, and increasingly not of Caribbean background. And thus, in these classrooms, all varieties of Spanish and ways of using Spanish are manifested, with the power of the teacher giving preference to Caribbean Spanish with its radical pronunciation and its exaggerated histrionics, and the power of the number of students giving preference to the more conservative pronunciation and the more understated Central and South American discourse. Increasingly these competing Spanish language discourses are transformed and hybridized as they're used in collaborative activities and in learning, and as teachers attempt to accommodate linguistically to the many Spanishes and the many Englishes of the classroom.

More and more, teachers in Spanish/English TWDL classrooms are also Anglos. As a result of the higher standards for teachers that resulted in the establishment of the New York State Teacher Certification exams, Latino bilingual teachers without native-like English writing proficiency have been shut out of classrooms (García and Trubek 1999). The shortage of bilingual teachers has encouraged the recruitment of former Peace Corps volunteers, generally Anglos who have acquired Spanish as a second language in the rural communities of Guatemala, Honduras, Mexico, and the like. The Spanish language these teachers bring is very different from that which their students speak. As second language speakers of Spanish, these teachers are confronted with varieties of Spanish that are sometimes not only alien to them, but that are juxtaposed with English, many times African American English or varieties spoken in the Anglophone Caribbean. The distance between the Spanish these teachers struggle to speak and the languages of their students is great.

In the Chinese/English TWDL School, the teachers are of three kinds. Firstly, there are Chinese American teachers who are bilingual and certified in New York State to teach childhood bilingual education. Secondly, there are Taiwanese nationals, who are most often Mandarin monolinguals and who are paid through private sources, often by Chinese American associations and by the Taiwanese government. Thirdly, there are Chinese elders in every classroom, supported by Chinese American associations. Each of the three groups has a different sociolinguistic profile.

The Chinese American teachers are often English dominant, since the exigencies in academic English of the three tests of the New York State Teacher Certification Examination are certainly much higher than those required in Mandarin in the Bilingual exam. All teachers are of Chinese-ethnic background, with one teacher being half-Chinese, half-Anglo. And although all are bilingual by New York State standards, some speak Mandarin hesitantly by Chinese standards. In fact, there's a special program that takes some of these Chinese American teachers to Taiwan in the summer in the hopes of strengthening their Chinese language proficiency. In contrast, the Taiwanese Chinese teachers are not proficient in English, and although many are speakers of more than one Chinese language, they use solely Mandarin in instruction. On the other hand, the Chinese elders display the linguistic heterogeneity of the Chinese American community. Not all of them are speakers of Mandarin. Most are speakers of Cantonese, Fuzhounese, and Shanghainese, the languages of many children for whom instructional support in their mother tongue is not available. In the pre-school and kindergarten classrooms, these Chinese elders abound, making it possible for Chinese children from non-Mandarin speaking homes to feel at home in the school.

8. Hybridity: The language other than English

The different and conflicting discourses of the different children and the different teachers in dual language classrooms deeply affect the ways in which the language other than English is taught and used in instruction.

As Spanish/English bilingual education programs came into being in the 1970s, the issue of which Spanish standard was to be used in instruction and in texts was hotly contested. Puerto Rican teachers often complained about the Spanish language material, mostly written in a Mexican American Spanish variety that was generally absent in the Northeast. Now, with

the heterogeneity of Spanish varieties in the city, and especially the diversity of Spanishes spoken by students for whom Spanish is a first language, a heritage language or a second language, the question of which Spanish standard variety should be used cannot even be posed. TWDL programs today exhibit all Spanish language varieties of Latin America, Spain and the United States.

In the Chinese/English DL school, while the Chinese American teachers use a Reading and Writing Workshop approach to literacy that involves Read Alouds and Shared Readings, the Chinese after-school teachers use traditional approaches that emphasize mechanical reading. The Chinese American teachers have child-centered classrooms where children work individually in Independent Reading and in pairs and small groups on Paired Reading or Guided Reading, but the Chinese after-school teachers only use whole class instruction. Chinese American teachers have students respond to authentic literature in journals or have them write book reports, poetry and creative pieces; the Chinese after-school teachers have students copy from the blackboard or from the book. Only structured writing activities are provided.

Although at a glance it seems that there is compartmentalization not only of language, but also of the discourse that surrounds teaching and learning, a closer look enables us to understand the hybridity of teaching Mandarin itself. The students at this school are mostly from non-Mandarin speaking areas of Mainland China – from Guangdong and Fujian. Even though they're mostly from the People's Republic of China, it is the Taiwanese government that provides the books and the teachers of Mandarin.

The People's Republic of China simplified Chinese characters in 1964. This simplified script is different from the traditional characters that immigrants who settled long ago in Chinatown have continued to use all over its streets. But Taiwan also continued to use the traditional Chinese characters. So it turns out that students are being taught to read the traditional script of Taiwanese texts, a script no longer used in their place of origin.

Furthermore, to teach Chinese reading, the school uses *Zhu Yin Fu Ha*, the phonetic logographic symbols used to learn to read Mandarin in Taiwan. But this way of teaching to read in Mandarin is very different from the phonetic Romanized alphabet of *Hanyu Pinyin* used in the People's Republic of China. So again, students are being taught to read through symbols that are never used in their place of origin.

It is clear that when one observes two-way dual language classrooms, strongly child-centered as a result of having children of different linguistic

proficiencies in classrooms where only one language is used at a time, one is confronted by a *heteroglossia*, a hybridity of language use, usually unheard in more traditional classrooms and even in transitional bilingual programs. Dual language classrooms certainly advance transcultural understandings and act as a “third space,” a discursive dialogic space in which, as Bakhtin has made clear, competing discourses coexist and languages are hybridized (Bakhtin 1981). But by not providing linguistically homogeneous groups with differentiated instruction, especially in literacy, the TWDL model can, in practice, work against diglossic arrangements that would sustain bilingualism over the course of a student’s life. At the same time, by not providing opportunities to contrast the two languages and juxtapose them in *instruction* to develop the bilingual awareness of children, the hybridity they reflect can work against the minority language. The continued interactional negotiation of the languages and discourses of children in an instructional space where only one language is used but where the children have different degrees of proficiency, eventually cedes the space to English, the language of power, of assessment and promotion, even when a Language Other than English is officially used in instruction.

9. Lost in transculturation in the USA. From bilingual/bicultural to multilingual/transcultural

Transitional bilingual/bicultural education programs were started as ways to promote the English language acquisition and the bilingualism of the US Spanish speaking population. The emphasis was on the *bi-* for a language minority group, even if for a short period of time. As such, these programs acted as “safe houses” in the sense given to the term by Mary Louis Pratt, a social and intellectual space where the group could constitute itself as “horizontal, homogeneous, sovereign communities with high degrees of trust, shared understandings, temporary protection from legacies of oppression” (1991: 39).

On the other hand, two-way dual language programs are brave attempts to extend the bilingualism of the few in the United States to the many who are English monolinguals. The programs have the potential to shape the new transcultural identities that emerge from the interculturality of multiple knowledge bases that come together in the classrooms. The emphasis is on the *multi-* and the shaping of the *trans-*, a reality in a globalized world and in a post-colonial order.

But increasingly, the standards-based instruction that now dominates schooling in the United States, coupled with the English-only assessments that have become the only measure of academic progress, is restricting the multiple languages, literacies and knowledge-bases that are present in U.S. dual language classrooms (García 2003a; García and Menken forthcoming). Faced with *No Child Left Behind* legislation that mandates strict English-only assessment guidelines for all children, the present structure of dual language models cannot be successful in sustaining the multiplicity of voices and heteroglossia that they were meant to develop. In this transcultural and globalized space, especially as experienced from within the United States’ hegemony, the power of English homogenizes and with ease shrinks the *multi-* and the *trans-* into a monolingual U.S. reality. Paradoxically, the transcultural heterogeneous space of dual language classrooms erodes the local minority language reality, as difference is lost.

Michael Clyne, referring to the more dynamic language contact of today’s world and the understanding that bilingualism cannot be studied from monolingual perspectives talks about *plurilingualism* (2003). We have seen in Dual Language classrooms the more dynamic, more encompassing and more inclusive use of the *multiple languages and literacies* of the 21st century, with each of them touching, “shrinking with intimacy” as the Mexican-American Gloria Anzaldúa would say (1987). But the tension is between the plurilingualism of the classroom, exercised by children and teachers with *little power*, and the monolingualism of assessment of the *all-powerful* state educational authorities.

The power dimension of languages is a most important variable in considering the success of language policy efforts, and especially language policy in education (Bratt Paulston 2004; Clyne, this volume; Edwards, this volume; Spolsky, this volume). It is clear that in the United States the power of English gives little room to other languages. The U.S. educational system does not support the kind of plurilingualism that Clyne speaks about, where bilingual children would be taught and evaluated without being continuously compared to monolinguals. In fact, more than ever, United States schools assess bilingual children from monolingual English-only perspectives.

The way in which United States educational authorities have chosen to interpret the “transcultural” context of the 21st century has the potential of robbing the powerless of the few “safe houses” which they had been able to build for themselves at the end of the twentieth century. Little does this “transcultural” context have anything to do with the concept of “transcul-

uration” as coined by the Cuban ethnologist Fernando Ortiz. In his *Contrapunteo Cubano del Tabaco y del Azúcar* Ortiz (1978/1940) had said:

We understand that the word *transculturation* better expresses the different phases of the transitive process of one culture to another, because this consists of not only acquiring a different culture, which is really what the Anglo-American word *acculturation* means, but the process also necessarily implies the loss or lack of hold of a first culture, that which can be called a partial deculturation, and it also points to the consequent creation of new cultural phenomena that could be called neoculturation. In effect, as the Malinowski school claims in all embraces of cultures there is something of what happens in the genetic copulation of individuals: the child always has something of both progenitors, but it is always different from each of them (p. 96, my translation).

But this embrace where both are permanently changed is not part of the United States ethos. In two-way dual language classrooms, children of all linguistic profiles embrace for a short time, but the power of English and the insistence that a full academic, professional and social life can only be led as monolingual English-only individuals relentlessly affects only the Spanish- or Chinese-speaking children, leaving the English speakers mostly untouched.

So what has been gained from going “transcultural”? What has been lost in leaving the bicultural? What have we gained from our linguistic hybridity? What have we lost in abandoning more traditional ways of defining bilingualism?

I would submit that the impact of globalization on bilingual education for powerless groups in the United States has only created a cosmetic change, one which gives the appearance of integration, of transculturation, of hybridity, of flux. But seen from the perspective of the minority group itself, this flux has worked against their empowerment, as the homogeneous spaces in which they worked with each other have shrunk. Transitional bilingual education programs that provided a “safe house”, even for a short time, are under attack and have been increasingly disbanded. Even in transitional bilingual education programs, teachers are increasingly told not to speak Spanish to the children. Bilingual education teachers have lost their jobs. Spanish in US public schools has often receded to after-school programs or to instances when the teacher can close the door. Spanish continues to lose itself in the apparent transculturation of the USA.

10. Conclusion

It is clear from the foregoing analysis that the dual language models of the 21st century respond to a changed transcultural context where hybridity is a defining characteristic. But hybridity increases risks of disorder, and unless it is used purposely by the educators in charge, it could provide a way in which the language of power exerts itself. In the United States we seem to have gone from a clearly *non-diglossic model of transitional bilingual education* to a mostly *transglossic model of dual language education*. We have created the “illusion” of an honest linguistic and cultural embrace, but in so doing, we have destroyed the educational spaces in which speakers of languages other than English could use those languages to acquire knowledge, status and power, and could do so without sharing space with those who already speak the language of power and who will, no doubt, do better in the high-stakes English-only assessments.

The challenge of sustained multilingualism in our globalized world, and of the survival of local languages and cultures, will increasingly depend on *transdiglossic* models of schooling and other ways of behaving socially that both build on our increased hybridity, as well as protect our unique differences. Louis-Jean Calvet (1999) talks of a “gravitational model” of diglossia in which global powerful languages like English can coexist with and not threaten local languages. This is the view also expressed for Nigeria by Igboanusi and Wolf (this volume) and for South Africa by Alexander (this volume) and Finlayson and Slabbert (2004). Two-way Dual language models have the potential for a transdiglossic education that would truly and over time support bilingualism in the United States. But they need to carefully *balance* their structure, now fully diglossic, with a more hybrid structure, just as they would need to *balance* their participants’ practices, now fully hybrid, with more diglossic practice. The two criteria of the dual language program mentioned above would have to be balanced in the following ways:

1. The strict compartmentalization of languages needs to cede some instructional space for putting the two languages alongside each other for purposes of study and comparison in order to develop children’s metalinguistic awareness of their own bilingualism and biliteracy;
2. The instructional integration of the linguistically different children needs to make some space for instruction of linguistically homogene-

ous students at times, especially for literacy and most certainly during the years of emerging bilingualism.

Two-way dual language bilingual education programs today often do only what the left side of *Figure 1* displays. To sustain our differences and develop the capacity for a multilingual citizenry, we need to *balance* the left side of *Figure 1* with the right side. That is, besides language separation, TWDL bilingual education programs must ensure that teachers have opportunities to compare and contrast the students' languages, and on instances, use code-switching for instructional purposes (Myers Scotton, this volume; Van der Walt, Mabule, de Beer 2004). It is only by putting languages alongside of each other that students become conscious of their bilingualism and biliteracy. And besides integrating children with different socio-linguistic profiles, enabling the joint co-construction that is so important to scaffold learning of language minority students (Walqui 2002), TWDL programs must also separate them for specific targeted instruction in the child's first language.

Diglossia	+	Hybridity
Language separation	+	Integration for language comparison and study
Hybridity	+	Diglossia
Children with different linguistic profiles always mixed for instruction	+	Children of same linguistic profile separated for some instruction, especially literacy and during the early years of bilingual instruction

Figure 1. Transdiglossic-balanced two-way dual language bilingual education

The question for those of us who live our differences in the United States, of course, is whether the development and spread of transdiglossic two-way dual language bilingual education models is at all possible, given the Anglophone world's hegemonic position in the global order. But at least it is important for those of us who are involved in the education of language minorities to understand and reveal the Oreo nature of many US educational programs – *dual*, *bi*, and even *multi* and *trans* on the outside, but just as *mono* as monolingual instruction on the inside. It is also essential that

we guard against the potential of these programs to turn the flux of a linguistically shared space into a weapon that may destroy the language other than English that they were meant to expand.

We cannot avoid the hybridity of the 21st century, and educational programs certainly must respond to it and reflect it. Two-Way Dual language bilingual education programs are a step in the right direction. But for the languages of the less powerful to survive within our increased hybridity, diglossia is still a useful concept, one that has to be reclaimed, as well as reshaped to reflect the greater dynamism and complexity of language use in the 21st century. The alternative would be to lose ourselves in the powerful languages of a new world order.

Notes

- * I wish to thank Leah Mason for her careful reading of this article.
- 1. My 1985 paper with Ricardo Otheguy, "Tending Our Own Garden" (unpublished) already pointed to the danger of trends to include language majority children in bilingual education programs. More recently, Guadalupe Valdés (1997) has raised serious issues regarding dual language programs and language minority children.

References

- Alexander, N.
this volume Socio-political factors in the evolution of language policy in post-Apartheid South Africa.
- Anzaldúa, G.
1987 *Borderlands/La Frontera: The New Mestiza*. San Francisco: Aunt Lute Books.
- Appadurai, A.
1996 *Modernity at Large. Cultural Dimensions of Globalization*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Ask, Dame Edna
2003 *Vanity Fair*, p. 116.
- Bakhtin, M. M.
1981 *The Dialogical Imagination*. Austin: University of Texas Press.

- Benson, C.
2004 *Bilingual Programs as Educational Development: Access, Quality, Empowerment and Equity*. (LAUD Series A: General and Theoretical Paper No. 605). Essen: University of Duisburg-Essen.
- Bratt P. C.
2004 *Preliminary Thoughts on Extrinsic Linguistic Minorities*. (LAUD Series A: General and Theoretical Paper No. 592). Essen: University of Duisburg-Essen.
- Calvet, L.-J.
1999 *Pour une écologie des langues du monde*. Paris: Plon.
- Cloud, N., Genesee F. and E. Hamayan
2000 *Dual Language Instruction: A Handbook for Enriched Education*. Boston, MA: Heinle & Heinle.
- Clyne, M.
2003 *Dynamics of Language Contact*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- this volume Empowerment through the community language – A challenge.
- Crawford, J.
2000 *At War with Diversity. US Language Policy In an Age of Anxiety*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Edwards, J.
this volume The power of language, the language of power.
- Ferguson, C. A.
1959 Diglossia. *Word* 15: 325–40.
- Finlayson, R. and S. Slabbert
2004 *Is Instruction in the Mother Tongue Always the Optimal Choice? South African Case Studies with Reference to the Inclusion/Exclusion Debate*. (LAUD Series A: General and Theoretical Paper No. 602). Essen: University of Duisburg-Essen.
- Fishman, J. A.
1972 *The Sociology of Language*. Rowley, Ma: Newbury House.
- 1976 *Bilingual Education. An International Sociological Perspective*. Rowley, Ma: Newbury House.
- Freeman, R.
1998 *Bilingual Education and Social Change*. Clevedon, Avon: Multilingual Matters.
- García, O. (ed.)
1991 *Bilingual Education: Focusschrift in Honor of Joshua A. Fishman*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- García, O.
1993 Understanding the societal role of the teacher in transitional bilingual classrooms: Lessons from sociology of language. In *Bilingual Education in Friesland*. K. Zondag (ed.), 23–38. Leeuwarden: Gemeenschappelijk Centrum voor Onderwijsbegeleiding in Friesland.
- 2001 New York's multilingualism: World languages and their role in a U.S. City. In *The Multilingual Apple: Languages in New York City*, O. García and J. A. Fishman (eds.), 3–50. Berlin: Mouton.
- 2002 Students of Latin American descent in New York City schools. Keynote address. New York University, November 1, 2002.
- 2003a Nouvelles espérances et barrières dans le domaine de l'éducation aux États-Unis. *Hommes et Migrations* (France) no. 1246. (Novembre-Décembre): 17–27.
- 2003b La enseñanza del español a los latinos de los EEUU. Contra el viento del olvido y la marea del inglés. *Ínsula* julio-agosto, núm. 679–680 (julio-agosto, Spain).
- 2003c The politics and policies of Spanish in NY. Keynote lecture given at the Symposium on The Politics of Spanish. Graduate Center, CUNY; April 4, 2003.
- García, O. and C. Baker (eds.)
1995 *Policy and Practice in Bilingual Education. Extending the Foundations*. Clevedon, Avon: Multilingual Matters.
- García, O. and J. Trubek
1999 Where have all the minority educators gone and when will they ever learn. *Educators for Urban Minorities*. 1: 1–8.
- García, O. and J. A. Fishman (eds.)
2001 *The Multilingual Apple: Languages in New York City*. Berlin and New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- García, O. and K. Menken.
forthcoming The English of Latinos from a plurilingual transcultural angle: Implications for assessment and schools. In *Dialects, Other Englishes, and Education*, S. Nero (ed.). Mahwah, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum.

- Graddol, D.
1997 *The Future of English?* London: The British Council.
- Internet Websites
Instituto Cervantes. www.cervantes.org.
- Lindholm-Leary, K.
2001 *Dual Language Education*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Maurais, J. and M. Morris (eds.)
2004 *Languages in a Globalising World*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Myers-Scotton, C.
this volume How codeswitching as an available option empowers bilinguals.
- Ortiz, F.
1978 *Contrapunteo cubano del tabaco y el azúcar*. Caracas, Venezuela: Ayacucho. (Original worked published in 1940).
- Pratt, M. L.
1991 Arts of the Contact Zone. Association of Departments of English. *Bulletin*, 33–40.
- Sefranek, M.
2003 Multiliteracies and hybridity. Unpublished paper. Teachers College, Columbia University.
- Spolsky, B.
this volume Language policy failures.
- Torres-Guzmán, M. E.
2002 Dual language programs: Key features and results. *Directions in Language and Education*. 14: 1–16.
- United States Population Census
2000 *File 3*. Washington, D. C.
- Valdés, G.
1997 Dual-language immersion programs: A cautionary note concerning the education of language-minority students. *Harvard Educational Review* 67: 391–429.
- Van der Walt, C., D. R. Mabule, and J. J. de Beer
2004 Letting the L1 in by the back door: Code-switching and translation in Science, Mathematics and Biology classes. *Tydskrif vir Taalonderrig* 35, no. 2–3.
- Walqui, A.
2002 Scaffolding instruction for English learners. Conceptual framework for quality teaching for English learners. West Ed unpublished manuscript.
- Wolf, H.-G. and H. Igboanusi
this volume Empowerment through English: A realistic view of the educational promotion of English in post-colonial contexts: The case of Nigeria.
- Zentella, A. C.
2001 Spanish in New York. In *The Multilingual Apple: Languages in New York City*, O. García and J. Fishman (eds.), 167–202. Berlin and New York: Mouton.