

In Skutnabb-Kangas, Tove, ed. 1995. Multilingualism for All. Lisse, The Netherlands: Swets and Zeitlinger, pp. 221-256.

## MULTILINGUALISM FOR ALL - GENERAL PRINCIPLES?

Tove Skutnabb-Kangas and Ofelia Garcia<sup>1</sup>

"... a multicultural and monolingual curriculum is a useless palliative in a society that claims to promote cultural pluralism ... multiculturalism cannot be genuinely achieved without an adequate policy of multilingualism." (Tosi 1984, 175)

"The dominant monolingual orientation is cultivated in the developed world and consequently two languages are considered a nuisance, three languages uneconomic and many languages absurd. In multilingual countries, many languages are facts of life; any restriction in the choice of language is a nuisance; and one language is not only uneconomic, it is absurd." (Pattanayak 1984, 82)

"Many of my contemporaries have only learned Spanish in school, but they never learn it perfectly. At the same time they stop speaking their own language which in my case is Aymara. They end up as people without identity, people who belong nowhere." (Vice-president Victor Hugo Cárdenas, Bolivia, in an interview by Steffen Knudsen, in *Zig Zag - en verden i brægetse*, 26, 1994, p. 9.; our translation from Danish).

"Berlin of 1884 [when Africa was divided between the European empires, our remark] was effected through the sword and the bullet. But the night of the sword and the bullet was followed by the morning of the chalk and the blackboard. The physical violence of the battlefield was followed by

the psychological violence of the classroom. But where the former was visibly brutal, the latter was visibly gentle ... The bullet was the means of the physical subjugation. Language was the means of the spiritual subjugation. (Ngũgĩ, 1987, 9).

"... attempts to artificially suppress minority languages through policies of assimilation, devaluation, reduction to a state of illiteracy, expulsion or genocide are not only degrading of human dignity and morally unacceptable, but they are also an invitation to separatism and an incitement to fragmentation into mini-states." (Smolicz 1986, 96)

"The real issue, therefore, is not whether, how or under what forces does an individual or a group become bilingual; it is whether and at what cost does one become a monolingual..." "If social integration is taken to be a psychological state characterized by positive self/ingroup identity along with positive other/outgroup identification (Mohanty 1987), then to bilingualism, both at the individual and at the social levels, seems to promote social integration." (Mohanty, forthcoming, 163, 158)

"I am really worried about those children who do not have a strong mother tongue. Of course, as a parent, you do not need to ensure that the children learn their mother tongue up to a really high level, if you can be hundred percent sure of a few things. If you KNOW that you are never going to move house or school or country, that the parents' relationship is VERY stable, and that the child is NEVER going to have ANY emotional or learning problems in her life, then you can take risks with your child and not send them to mother tongue classes." (Joanna Sancha, teacher in the English subsection in The European School of Brussels, in an interview 8 June 1994)

#### Introduction: multilingualism for all

The first challenge of multilingual education in the 21st Century will be how to combine the two trends that have dominated bi/multilingual education in the past, one for the rich or majorities or dominant groups, with an emphasis on increased knowledge, scholastic achievement and benefits, and one for the poor or minorities or dominated/subordinated groups, with a focus on increased educational access, linguistic human rights, and self-determination. More and

more, as the world becomes increasingly interdependent, it is important for all its citizens, not just privileged elites or poor minorities, to be fluent and literate in at least two languages.

The second challenge will be to be able to offer all citizens of the 21st Century a multilingual education that would increase the global knowledge and scholastic achievement of all, while providing greater social equity (between different regions of the world, between classes/social groups, racial, religious and age groups, the genders) and participating in the elimination of prejudice, racism and antagonism labelled "ethnic".<sup>3</sup>

For multilingual education to become this integrated alternative for the education of all citizens, it also has to move beyond its focus on only two languages (as in bilingual education), and beyond the nice phrases about the equality and worth of all cultures (as in much of multicultural education which treats racism and classism as information problems and many mother tongues as a nuisance), and to recognize the linguistic human rights of all groups.<sup>4</sup> But multilingualism and multiculturalism must rest on bilingualism and biculturalism, as a first step. This also means that two opposite types of understandable but still irrational fear have to be overcome. One, typical of many Western countries - and the U.S.A. is one of the "best" representatives for it - could be labelled the "majority group misperception of bilingualism". It sees bilingualism as dangerous for national unity, as a factor which can lead to "ethnic unrest" or "ghettoization" or "separatism", and in the last end to the disintegration of the "nation state".<sup>5</sup> The other one, which we could label the "minority group misperception of bilingualism", sees bilingualism as something that a powerful majority forces on an unwilling powerless minority in order to be able to assimilate them. A recognition of this fear (which apparently was real under the Soviet rule) can be seen in the title of Mart and Ulla Rannut's chapter in this book and in Alexei Leontiev's chapter where his criteria for whether linguistic groups are decreasing or increasing includes the number of bilingual speakers: if most speakers are bilingual, the group is decreasing; if the number of bilinguals is stable or diminishing, the group is increasing. But this fear is also felt by some representatives of stable national linguistic minorities with maximal legal protection (see e.g. Thomas

Rosenberg's (1994) book on Swedish speakers in Finland). In this chapter, however, we do not touch upon the complex issues of how overcoming the fear of bilingualism might be attempted. It is inextricably mingled with the larger societal power issues (which we will not discuss in this chapter, having done it often and extensively elsewhere) which form a basis for any educational policy. Instead, the rest of this chapter outlines the progressive

steps that can be taken so that additive multilingualism and multiliteracy (and, to some extent, multiculturalism) would result. It then discusses general principles that schools can follow in order to enable students to become both multilingual and multiliterate. Both the progressive steps and the general principles for multilingualism and multiliteracy are derived from the strong forms of multilingual education (Baker 1993, see below) discussed in the book.

### Multiplying and using the lenses

#### The global WHY

Our global changed consciousness has made evident not only our commonalities, but also our differences. As we try to capture the world's diversity with one of the instruments we have for communication, language, we have come to understand how limited and limiting having only our mother tongue, without extensive access to other languages, is, in making sense of the cultural and linguistic pluralism of the world and, indeed, creating this world (García 1992, Khudbandani 1983, Pattanayak 1991, Skutnabb-Kangas 1988).

An accomplished photographer knows that to capture the essence of multiple images, a variety of lenses are needed. Even the most far-reaching wide-angle lens cannot seize the complexity of reality. In the same way, a monolingual person, even if speaking a Language of Wider Communication<sup>8</sup> such as English, can never make complete sense and have full understanding and knowledge of other ethnolinguistic groups – or even their own group. One has to be able to see one's own group both from the inside, from the point of view of Self, and from the outside, as different Others see it, in order to fully appreciate and know it.

To include the world's diversity in a picture, a variety of lenses are needed. But it is not enough to inherit or be able to buy many lenses. An accomplished photographer also needs proper instruction: opportunities to use varied lenses to create multiple images and a balanced and focused vision, and to learn when to use one lens or the other, or both or all.

The purpose of this chapter is to identify principles used in educational systems to enable students to become expert "linguistic photographers", with a variety of lenses, able to use their multilingualism to get more focused and complete pictures of our heterogeneous world, to make others see what they see, to understand that others may be using different lenses – and to create new worlds. As the world recognizes its own multilingualism, multilingual education has been increasingly recognized as a means to provide the world's

citizenry with the varied lenses needed to capture, understand and create our global reality.

#### The differentiated WHYS

But the reasons for adding a second or third lens are often very different for diverse groups. Acknowledging this also implies that we do not see ourselves as romantic Whorfians. Some groups have recognized multilingual education as a means to make their own children bilingual, thereby improving opportunities of doing business with and getting ahead in an increasingly interdependent world. Immersion programmes, the European Schools and International Schools<sup>9</sup> are examples of this approach of enrichment and extra benefits. For others, multilingual education represents a means to better understanding of other ethnolinguistic groups with which they are in contact. Both immersion programmes and two-way programmes may have an element of this "integrative" motivation. Still others, often threatened ethnolinguistic groups have adopted multilingual education as a means of linguistic survival. Maintenance/language shelter or revitalisation programmes for minorities, e.g. the Frisian schools in the Netherlands or the Finnish schools in Sweden or Kōhanga Reo programmes in New Zealand, are of this type. And yet another use of bilingual education has been to educate in the mother tongue ethnolinguistic groups which had previously been excluded from equal educational opportunity and, especially, equality of outcome. Again, both maintenance and two-way programmes may belong to this group. Likewise, many educational programmes in African countries could be counted under maintenance programmes.<sup>10</sup> The reasons and goals in using two or more languages in the educational system thus vary greatly, ranging then from increased knowledge and economic gain, to increased mutual understanding, to ethnolinguistic survival, to improved educational opportunity and outcome. Many programmes are multipurpose and combine several of the goals.<sup>9</sup>

#### "Strong" models of multilingual education

As the practice of multilingual education has expanded, different models have been developed to respond to the purposes outlined above. This book treats in depth several models of multilingual education which can be considered "strong": their linguistic aim is to promote multilingualism (or, minimally, bilingualism) and multiliteracy.<sup>10</sup> Other educational models can be considered "weak": their linguistic aim is not multilingualism and multiliteracy, but rather

monolingualism or limited bilingualism. Some of them do belong to the category of *bilingual education* in the classic sense of the term<sup>11</sup>, though, because they use two languages as media of instruction, e.g. all transitional models. Others use one language only as a medium but teach foreign languages as subjects, i.e. they are not properly to be considered "bilingual education". Only one of the models discussed in depth in this book could, with some considerable modification, be called "weak", namely the International Schools. Among the strong models, we can identify the following four, which will be described (see also Skutnabb-Kangas 1988 and 1990b for definitions):

1. *Plural multilingual model* (also called mainstream bilingual/multilingual);
  2. *Immersion model*;
  3. *Two-way dual language model* (also called two-way bilingual immersion, as in Dolson & Lindholm's chapter in this book);
  4. *Maintenance model* (also called language shelter or heritage language model).
1. *Plural Multilingual model*: The European Schools studied by Baetens Beardsmore are a prototype for this model. These schools are controlled by the education authorities of the member states of the European Union and the languages of the different subsections are official languages of the member states. In that sense, then, all children are considered "language majority students" and all languages are "majority" ones. The students are of different nationality and language background – therefore "plural" – and several languages are used as media for instruction and the goal is that all students become not only bilingual but multilingual – therefore "multilingual".
- The societal aim<sup>12</sup> is clearly one of enrichment and pluralism, while the linguistic aim is to make students high level multilinguals and multiliterates, able to function in the European Union and beyond.
2. *Immersion model*: This originally Canadian model, discussed in this book by Cummins and Artigal, has spread to many countries<sup>13</sup>. Immersion programmes typically involve ethnolinguistic majority children, although there are some exceptions.<sup>14</sup> Two languages are used as media of instruction, initially the students' second language.<sup>15</sup> This model aims to make students bilingual (or, in Europe, multilingual) and biliterate so that they can function in (and draw benefit from) pluralistic societies. The societal goals have so far to a large extent been more about maintaining old (or gaining new benefits or privileges for middle class populations than general equity).
3. *Two-way Dual Language model*: The bilingual immersion schools in California and elsewhere in the United States, discussed in this book by Dolson and Lindholm, are the prototype. Here, there are both majority and minority students, and both

languages (in most cases English and Spanish<sup>16</sup>) are used as media of instruction with both groups, with a strict separation of languages. Again, the objective of this type of bilingual education model is enrichment and pluralism, and bilingualism and biliteracy, for both the majority and the minority group. Alternate days programmes could be seen as a sub-category under two-way programmes.<sup>17</sup>

4. *Maintenance model*: These schools are most often organized by an ethnolinguistic minority community, and most typically educate minority children using both the minority and the majority language, with strict separation. Initially, the students' native language is used for most of the content matter education, especially in cognitively demanding, decontextualised subjects, while the majority language is taught as a subject only. Later on, some (but by no means all) maintenance programmes use the majority language as a medium of education for part of the time, but in proper maintenance programmes the minority language continues as a medium of education in several (or most, or all) subjects throughout the school. For a few national minorities, maintenance programmes are a self-evident, "normal" way of educating their children, a natural human right. It is indicative that most minorities of this type, e.g. the Swedish-speakers in Finland, Afrikan- and English-speakers in South Africa, or Russian-speakers in Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania, are either former power minorities or in a transitional phase where they have to accept the fact that they no longer have the power to impose their will on a numerical majority but where they still do have the power to organise their own children's education through the medium of their own language. Of course, it should be a fundamental, self-evident linguistic and educational human right for any ethnolinguistic minority to use its own language as the main medium of education, but in fact most minorities in the world do not have this basic right.<sup>18</sup> A few indigenous peoples (who are numerically a minority in most of their own countries) have maintenance programmes (see e.g. Black 1990, Harris 1990, Krehu 1994, Magga 1994, McLaughlin 1992, McLaughlin & Tierney (eds.), 1993, Stairs 1988, for examples); most of them do not (see e.g. Jordan 1988, Hamel 1994a, b). Most immigrant and refugee minority children do not have access to maintenance programmes either, even if it can be shown that they result in high levels of bi/multilingualism, enhanced school achievement and more societal equity.<sup>19</sup>

The purpose of this type of multilingual programme is to ensure that language minority children continue to maintain and develop their mother tongue up to a native (national minorities, indigenous peoples) or at least near-native (immigrant minorities) level, learn the majority language at a native level, and become biliterate. In a European context, they typically also learn further foreign languages. This type of multilingual programme enriches society at

large by promoting pluralism and mutual understanding and by ensuring that minorities gain access to linguistic and educational prerequisites for social, economic and political integration (see also Mohanty, forthcoming).

Although the strong forms of multilingual education outlined above have different sociolinguistic realities with regard to the linguistic background of the students and the language(s) of the classroom, and different sociopolitical realities with regard to the power relations between the groups attending and the rest of society, they all share an aim of cultural and linguistic pluralism, with the bi/multilingualism and bi/multiliteracy of students as an avowed minimum aim.

#### "Weak" models of multilingual education

For purposes of comparison when we discuss educational principles for multilingualism, we also mention two other models of education which are classified as "weak" in Baker's typology (1993). One of them, the Transitional model, uses two languages as media of instruction, whereas the Mainstream Monolingual, with Foreign Language Teaching only uses one language as the medium of instruction. These models are presented only because the principles for education leading towards high levels of multilingualism can be seen in a clearer way by comparing them with these two models which do not have multilingualism as their goal.

5. *Transitional model:* This model is strictly for (immigrant or refugee) minority students who do not know the majority language well enough for using it initially as a medium of instruction. It is thus based on defining the students negatively, as deficient, in relation to their (lack of) knowledge of the majority language. (see Skutnabb-Kangas 1990a, 1991b, Wink 1994). Initially, the minority language is used as a medium of instruction until the child becomes orally fluent in the majority language, at which time instruction continues first mainly and very soon only through the medium of the majority language. There may (often in Europe) or may not (mostly in the USA) be a mother-tongue-as-a-subject component after the transition. Sometimes there is some auxiliary teaching through the medium of the mother tongue even after the transition during a limited time.

Teaching through the medium of the mother tongue is not seen as a right that the child is entitled to; the mother tongue is seen as useful only so far as its auxiliary use enhances the knowledge of the dominant language (see e.g. Baker & de Kanter 1981 for clear statements on this; in the U.S.A. context even reports like Ramirez et al

(1991) clearly embody this type of principles in their design and presentation, seen from a "European" point of view. It is often, especially in the higher grades, more the attitude towards the minority mother tongue, the rationale legitimating its use as self-evident right, or an instrument towards better proficiency in the majority language) than the number of hours devoted to the minority language that is decisive for how a model should be classified.

There is often no clear language policy for this model, with both languages used as the teacher sees fit. This model is, after ordinary submersion models (where minority children are instructed through the medium of the dominant language only), the most prevalent education type in most European and Europeanized countries<sup>21</sup> using more than one language as media of education. Transitional bilingual education encourages shift to monolingualism in the majority language.<sup>21</sup>

6. *Mainstream Monolingual with Foreign Language Teaching:* This model teaches one or several foreign languages as subjects in separate classes, for a few hours per week. All students are treated as if they were language majority students or dominant language speakers, and the majority or dominant language is used for instruction (except maybe in the foreign language classroom). This is still the preferred mode of foreign language instruction in the world, leading most often not to high levels of multilingualism, even if it can give a solid basis for multilingualism later, if the students continue to develop and have opportunities for using their foreign languages. With some considerable modifications, the International Schools discussed here by Carder can also be considered under this model. In the International Schools, students of different ethnolinguistic backgrounds are taught through the medium of English (or another "international" language) only, with a strong ESL program. The language of the host country is often taught as a second language in primary school. Although students in these schools gain full literacy in English, their use of another language (either their mother tongue or the language of the host country), is often limited, especially in one of the modes: either in writing (for the mother tongue - which is not often taught), or orally (which is often the case for the language of the host country if the students do not have extensive active contact with host country peers during their leisure time). Full bilingualism and biliteracy are rarely achieved in these schools.<sup>22</sup>

We will refer to these models below in our comparisons. Next we move to a pragmatic "guided tour" through the progressive steps which schools may take when planning for multilingualism.

Progressive stages toward multilingualism/multiliteracy through schooling. Full additive multilingualism and multiliteracy just doesn't happen accidentally. Instead, it is planned and organized by different agents. Parents, communities, school administrators and educators, and students themselves must actively commit themselves to multilingualism and multiliteracy on a long-term basis. So must the politicians. Although all agents in the educational process must remain actively involved throughout the stages leading to full multilingualism, different agents take on more active roles in each of the stages. We have identified four stages through which students move toward full multilingualism and multiliteracy. These stages, and the steps taken by the different agents, are displayed in Table 1 and discussed below:

Table 1. *Progressive stages toward full multilingualism and multiliteracy*

<b>FIRST STAGE: PRE-MULTILINGUALISM STAGE</b>	
<i>Time Frame:</i>	Before school starts
<i>Principal Agents:</i>	Parents; Politicians
<b>SECOND STAGE: EMERGING MULTILINGUALISM STAGE</b>	
<i>Time Frame:</i>	The initial school years (K-3)
<i>Principal Agents:</i>	The Administrators & Staff; The Teachers
<b>THIRD STAGE: DEVELOPING MULTILINGUALISM STAGE</b>	
<i>Time Frame:</i>	The middle years in school (grades 4-10)
<i>Principal Agents:</i>	The Teachers; The Administrators and Staff
<b>FOURTH STAGE: FULL MULTILINGUALISM/MULTILITERACY STAGE</b>	
<i>Time Frame:</i>	The final school years (grades 11-12)
<i>Principal Agents:</i>	The Students
<b>FIRST STAGE: PRE-MULTILINGUALISM STAGE</b>	
<i>Time Frame:</i>	Before school starts
<i>Principal Agents:</i>	Parents; Politicians

Step one is that the parents commit. Parents, either monolingual or multilingual, decide to send their children to a multilingual school (see again note 2). These parents are well informed, interested in multilingualism and multiculturalism as important societal aims, and willing to become active

participants in their child's multilingual education. Many times they become involved in establishing the multilingual school. In order for the school to be able to start, at least local but often also regional and national politicians need to at least accept but preferably actively support education leading towards multilingualism. Often this is the main hurdle to be overcome (and hundreds of books have been written analysing the sociopolitical reasons).

#### SECOND STAGE: EMERGING MULTILINGUALISM STAGE

*Time Frame:* The initial school years (K-3)  
*Principal Agents:* The Administrators & Staff; The Teachers

Firstly, schools, the administrators and staff, support multilingualism by establishing and continuing to keep a *multilingual* language surround: a social context in which the different languages are used orally and in written form *outside* of classrooms.

Secondly, the teachers establish a *monolingual* language surround in the classrooms where the students' *first* language is used, and a *more bilingual* or multilingual language surround in classrooms where the students' *second* language is used (whether as a medium or as a subject). While the L1 classroom always functions as a monolingual language surround, the L2 classroom *initially* functions as a multilingual language surround, using the students' L1 to contextualize input. This is so even in the Canadian immersion schools, where students frequently use their L1 initially to make sense of the linguistic input given to them by the teacher in their L2.

Students with different language backgrounds are taught separately. They are *not mixed* for *INSTRUCTION* at this stage (and at least never for instruction in cognitively and linguistically demanding, decontextualized subjects). But when possible, they are *mixed* for highly contextualized school *ACTIVITIES*, such as lunch, recess, gymnastics, music, "European Hours" or equivalent.

This emerging multilingualism stage could take the first three or four years of formal education, depending on at what age this starts.<sup>23</sup>

#### THIRD STAGE: DEVELOPING MULTILINGUALISM STAGE

*Time Frame:* The middle years in school (grades 4-10)  
*Principal Agents:* The Teachers; The Administrators and Staff

Firstly, the classroom teachers support the development of multilingualism and multiliteracy of students by creating *monolingual* language contexts in terms of the *input from teacher to students*, in the classrooms in which content is taught in

- either language, L1 or L2, and in the language arts classrooms. The students thus receive a wealth of input in one language at a time, and they are themselves expected to produce rich output in either of the two languages involved, L1 or L2. Students with different language backgrounds can now be mixed for progressively more content instruction through the medium of their L2, provided four conditions are present.
1. All students in the school have equal opportunity to experience instruction both in their first language, as well as in their second language.
  2. The subjects taught through the medium of L2 are in the beginning of the more context-embedded kind, and become more cognitively demanding and decontextualized only towards the end of this stage.
  3. Teachers maximize their use of context-embedded language, especially in the beginning.
  4. Appropriate instructional material in the language of instruction, as well as appropriate supplementary instructional material in the languages of the students, are readily available. For example, all classrooms should be equipped with bilingual dictionaries and multilingual reference books.
  5. Instruction through the medium of the students' L1 continues in several subjects, according to a carefully monitored plan.

Secondly, the administrators and staff continue to support multilingualism and multiliteracy by keeping a *multilingual* language surround in the school: all the languages are used orally and in written form *outside* of classrooms.

This stage is the longest one: it could last between five to seven years. It is in this stage that what Cummins-Cummins (1980a, 1981) has called CALP (Cognitive-Academic Language Proficiency) or context-reduced language is fully developed. Thus, the ability to fully use the second language in context-reduced ways has eight to ten years to develop.

A third and even fourth language can be introduced after the first three years of this stage, i.e. in grade 7 or 8.

#### FOURTH STAGE: FULL MULTILINGUALISM/MULTILITERACY STAGE

*Time Frame:* The final school years (grades 11-12)

*Principal Agents:* The Students

Fully multilingual/multiliterate students now contribute to the *multilingual* language surround of the *school and the classrooms* and use their multilingualism as an instrument for further inquiry, knowledge, expression and analysis.

Students at this stage choose their instructional language in voluntary subjects.

and it can be their L1, L2, L3 or even L4. The language of instruction in some of the core subjects is prescribed and in some of them it continues to be the student's mother tongue. The students also choose the language/s in which they will be assessed. The classroom language surround now resembles that used for initial L2 instruction, with *teacher input* to students being *monolingual*, but *student input and output* being frequently *multilingual*. That is, although monolingual instruction in all of the languages continues during this stage, students are now free to use their many languages in getting information and in creative expression. Thus, in practice, classrooms become a more multilingual language surround than formerly.

It is instructive again to remind ourselves of the fact that full multilingualism and multiliteracy takes a *long* time to develop, as most authors in this book confirm. It is generally achieved only in the last couple of years of secondary education, that is, after ten years of a carefully orchestrated multilingual education.

In each of the four stages toward full multilingualism, different agents have the main role, and different modes of expression, ranging from monolingualism to multilingualism, are used, although, of course, all agents and all modes of expression are present during all the stages. To get to a full additive bilingual/biliterate stage, students must be given practice in using one or the other lens, and using both or all. In this process, they must be guided sometimes by parents who make the decision to give them a second lens, sometimes by experts who know all the lenses that are available and their full range of possibilities, sometimes by instructors who know how to use a particular lens or how to use them in combination. But beyond all this guidance, students must be allowed to create their own images by using their lenses freely and without constrictions. This then is the challenge of every multilingual educational context, how to control the functions of the two languages in their midst and to allow their development and expansion, while potentializing for the students the power of the languages at their disposal.

To do this, good multilingual educational contexts must follow certain principles, and it is to those principles that we now turn.

**The guiding principles for education for multilingualism, multiliteracy and multiculturalism**

It is important to first underline that a sound multilingual educational policy is in several ways not too different from a sound educational policy in general.

Despite the fact that both teachers and students develop high levels of metalinguistic awareness, the focus is often not on language per se, but rather the education of students, with multilingualism and multiliteracy being both a means to enhance good schooling<sup>24</sup>, and one more product of good schooling. Informed parents, enlightened politicians and school administrators, and well-educated and committed teachers are important for the education of any child. Likewise, well-structured schools, progressive and inclusive educational policies and teaching strategies, rich and diverse materials, and fair educational assessment are principles of effective education for all. All this is most important in multilingual education too.

But to achieve the full multilingualism and multiliteracy of students, certain additional principles have to be followed by the *agents* involved, developed by the *educational context* in which the action takes place, and supported by the surrounding *society*.

Planning for multilingualism, multiliteracy and pluralism through schooling requires the active involvement of *agents* from the community, as well as the school. Furthermore, these agents must be engaged in developing a *school context/culture* that supports multilingualism, multiliteracy, and pluralism, beyond that which exists in the societal culture.

But this school culture must also be supported by society at large. A multilingual and pluralist school culture cannot exist in opposition to that of the *societal context* in which the school has life. True, the school culture can be different and attempt to alter the community. But in order for a school culture to have long-lasting impact on a societal context by truly transforming citizens, it must be nurtured by societal aspirations. Thus, a multilingual and pluralist school culture can only ultimately be effective if it responds to the needs of its societal context. It is then important, whenever possible, to plan for multilingualism, multiliteracy, and pluralism, as resources of the entire community, both minority and majority, as e.g. Joshua Fishman saw already in 1976. As we have said earlier, the focus of this chapter is on the within-school conditions for multilingualism, not the societal prerequisites.<sup>25</sup>

If multilingualism, multiliteracy and pluralism are to be a goal of schooling, it is most important to have a fair amount of control over the nature of the educational agents and the educational culture. One can also, within the educational system, plan the sociolinguistic characteristics of incoming students into a school to some extent through cooperation between schools and school districts. It is clear that one single school cannot use, say, fifty languages as media of instruction, in a community with fifty linguistic groups present. But the European Schools, for instance, use 8 or 9, without much difficulty. If

different schools have partly different, partly overlapping sets of languages of instruction, and inform about it properly, parents soon learn where "their" language is used. In that way different schools can "specialize" in different languages and to some extent "plan" or at least entice the intake.

It is, of course, impossible and would be pretentious to come with a list of principles for multilingual education which is claimed to be exhaustive. We know that many points could be added or deleted. Also, our points have not been weighted in here in any way, so we would not recommend assessing a programme by simply counting on how many characteristics it would get a plus. In addition, we have, as mentioned earlier in this chapter, omitted the larger societal context/culture which is basic for educational agents and the educational context to function in a way conducive to multilingualism. But with many reservations, we venture to suggest that among the important characteristics that we see as desirable or required of the educational agents and the educational culture (i.e. the guiding principles for multilingual education), are the following (and a shorter list is given in the Introduction to this book):

Table 2. *Characteristics desirable for education leading to multilingualism and multiliteracy*

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| I. <i>Educational Agents</i>           |   |
| A.                                     | Multilingual administration & staff.                    |
| B.                                     | Bi- or multilingual teachers.                           |
| C.                                     | Committed parents (bi- or multilingual or monolingual). |
| D.                                     | Progressively multilingual students.                    |
| II. <i>Educational Culture/Context</i> |   |
| A.                                     | Multilingual educational context.                       |
| B.                                     | Multilingual language policy.                           |
| C.                                     | Multilingual educational strategies.                    |
| D.                                     | Multilingual materials.                                 |
| E.                                     | Multilingual fair assessment.                           |

These principles, presented as characteristics of educational agents and the educational culture, are discussed in the next section. The last section then shows how the principles could be applied to characterise the six models of education (multilingual or not) discussed previously.

### I. *Educational Agents*

- A. *A completely multilingual (or minimally bilingual) administration and staff.*

1. The administrators, teachers, counselors, paraprofessionals and clerical and custodial staff must be *multilingual* or minimally bilingual. Preferably they should be productively fluent in more than one language, but at a minimum they should all have receptive bi/multilingual ability (or be willing to work toward it within a specified time limit).
  2. The bi/multilingual administrators, teachers, counselors, paraprofessionals and clerical and custodial staff should be of *different ethnicities and/or nationalities*. Cultural and linguistic pluralism is then always obtained within the school community. No child should be put in a situation where there is no adult in the school speaking the child's language.
  3. All languages should have *native language speakers, as well as second language speakers*, among the staff. In this way, different ways of speaking languages will be acceptable, including different accents and varieties.
  4. The ethnolinguistically diverse staff of the multilingual school should be *committed to* (and be economically rewarded for) *developing their own bi/multilingual proficiency*, as well as that of their students.
  5. The career patterns in the school should reflect appreciation of diversity. It is especially important to plan both short-term and long-term solutions to ensure that competent *minority members occupy high status positions* in the school, both in administration and among other staff.
- B. Highly qualified teachers of all languages present in the school who are bi/multilingual.**
1. Teachers who are multilingual should, whenever possible, actively *teach only through the medium of one language and/or teach only one language* (even if, as we said before, the teacher receptively uses also the other language, especially during the emerging multilingualism stage, and gives translation equivalents when needed). When a bi/multilingual person functions as a teacher of *one language*, the "one language-one person" relationship is clearly demarcated, establishing distinct language boundaries, both for the teacher and for the student. This encourages students to respond to the teacher in the language in which input is received. At the same time, bi/multilingual teachers are important identity role models, also in terms of showing (outside the classroom, or in class, for translations, etc) that it is NOT necessary to choose either/or, but a both/and; and that this latter choice is both possible and preferable.
  2. Multilingual teachers should have *native or very high levels of linguistic competence* in the language in which they teach or that they teach. Balanced multilingual individuals are a theoretical ideal since multilinguals most often use one language for one purpose, and the other for another. It may in some countries be difficult to find multilingual individuals who have full range of competence in the two

- languages for *all* topics and subjects (e.g. Fishman 1971). But bi- or multilingual teachers who have high levels of linguistic competence in *one language* and a bit lower in the other(s) can be relatively easy to find in most countries. Besides ensuring a rich linguistic input for students, these multilingual teachers, though functioning as teachers in one language only, also stimulate a richer linguistic output from the students since the students know that the teachers understand several languages.
3. These multilingual teachers differ from monolingual ones not only in linguistic capacity, but also in their formal education and knowledge. Just like monolingual teachers, multilingual teachers are knowledgeable of:
    - a. the subject matter taught;
    - b. pedagogical principles and teaching strategies; and
    - c. the language, history and culture of the ethnolinguistic group whose language is used in instruction or is taught.

*In addition to the above*, multilingual teachers need to be also knowledgeable of:

    - d. theories of mother tongue and second language acquisition and bilingual language development;
    - e. strategies for teaching second and foreign languages as subjects and using them as media of instruction;
    - f. sociolinguistic and psycholinguistic principles of multilingualism and language contact; and
    - g. theories and practices of bilingual and multilingual education.

Thus, the training of multilingual teachers should go beyond that given to monolingual teachers, including more specialized courses.
  4. The ethnolinguistically diverse competent teachers of the multilingual school should be *committed to and be economically rewarded for developing their own bi/multilingual proficiency*, as well as that of their students.
- C. Active parental participation and support.**
1. Parents must have made the *choice of multilingual schooling for their children*.
  2. Parents should be well *informed* at all times.
  3. Parents must be *committed to the multilingualism and multiliteracy of their children*.
  4. Parents should be encouraged to *participate* in the multilingual school, bringing not only their language/s, but also their history, culture and values into the school.
  5. Parents should be interested in the *development of their own bi/multilingual proficiency*. Whenever possible, opportunities for the development of the multilingual proficiency of the parents should be provided within the school setting.
  6. Parents must be *organized to direct the school's educational and language policy*. They should hold administrators and staff responsible to carry out their wishes on ways in which their children are educated.

*D. A student body that is (expected to become) progressively multilingual and multiliterate:*

1. Depending on the sociolinguistic context of the community from which the school draws its student body, initially students could have different language ability, from all being totally monolingual in one language or the other, to some having different degrees of multilingual proficiency. Progressively, however, all students will be expected to become fully multilingual and multiliterate.
2. Students should be well informed at all times. They should know enough about the long-term goals of their schooling, the strategies for how to get there, and the benefits of high levels of multilingualism, as well as how to cope with possible negative outsider attitudes. They should be progressively more responsible for the development of their own multilingualism.
3. Students should be sufficiently organized so that their needs are met and their educational wishes and aspirations respected.

## II. Educational Culture

### A. A completely multilingual educational context. The multilingual language surround outside the classroom.

1. The entire school system must be designed to promote (minimally) bilingualism for all, multilingualism for most (or, initially, for some, in traditionally monolingually oriented countries), monolingualism for none. A multilingual programme in a monolingual school or classroom where multilingualism is the goal for only some students (e.g. minority students are to become bilingual whereas the majority students can stay monolingual), does not provide the appropriate support for multilingual proficiency.
2. The bilingual/multilingual school system must encompass the whole of primary and secondary education. Full bi/multilingualism needs a LONG time to develop.<sup>26</sup> Both the main languages need to be developed throughout the entire schooling, starting in primary education and continuing throughout secondary education, as will be discussed below. This is especially so for minority languages. A third and fourth language can be added after students have reached the later phases of the developing multilingual stage.
3. The multilingual school system should encourage a multilingual language surround in the entire school, also outside the classrooms, in practice and not only as a nice vague recommendation about equal value of all languages and cultures. Some recommendations follow:
  - a. Staff should be encouraged to use all the languages everywhere, in the hallways, offices, lunchroom, playground, restrooms, and in announcements. If of the two or more languages in the school one or several have minority status or are less

used in the societal context outside school, conscious effort must be made to use that/those language/s as much as possible in the school. That is, the lesser used language should have a life of its own in the school beyond the classroom.

- b. Correspondence and notices should always be written in all the languages represented in the school. When this is not possible, the administration should differentiate, on the basis of an evaluation of the purpose of the communication. For parents, letters and notices should be written in the language they know best. For staff and students, letters and notices should be written in (one of) the lesser used language(s). This maximizes the opportunity to use the lesser used language(s) for meaningful and authentic communication.
- c. School signs should be posted in both or all languages.
- d. There should be some bulletin boards devoted to each of the languages used as media of instruction, other boards should be designated as multilingual and focus on awareness of, and familiarity with, (the) other languages.
- e. In general, the different languages of the school assemblies, dealing with general school matters, should be chosen, depending on the topic of the assembly and the needs of the school, according to a careful plan. Some schools may alternate languages for school assemblies by term, month, week or even time of day.

### B. A Multilingual Language Policy. Progression in relation to the languages as subjects and as media of instruction.

1. The Mother Tongue (MT)<sup>27</sup>
  - a. The students' mother tongue (from now on, MT) is expanded and developed, and students are made to feel linguistically secure in their MT by the following:
    - a. Giving everybody's MT important functions in the school curriculum and using (proficiency in) it as one of the measures of school success (i.e. as one of the core subjects in the curriculum).
    - b. Securing the role of the students' MT as a link to their ethnolinguistic identity, by making sure that those teaching it are members of the same ethnolinguistic group and/or have native-like or near-native proficiency in it, in addition to being extremely knowledgeable of the history and culture of the ethnolinguistic group.
    - c. Using the MT as a medium of instruction throughout the whole educational process, from K-12, at least in some subjects, so as to expand the functions for which that language is used at home, especially initially. This is important for all students, but especially crucial if the MT has a limited societal role.
    - d. Teaching the MT as a subject, throughout the whole educational process, from K-12, ensuring that this complements its use as a medium of instruction and in the school at large.

- e. Students must be in *linguistically homogeneous groups for MT language arts instruction*.
- f. Ensuring that the students' MT, especially if of minority status, is protected from the encroachment of the majority language by maintaining a non-hierarchical functional differentiation in which the MT has clearly defined functions and spaces. In addition to having a specific teacher for teaching the MT, separation can be accomplished through the following:
- Specific spaces where the MT is always used;
  - Specific contents taught in the MT;
  - A specific time of day using (only) the MT;
  - Specific days when (only) the MT is used
- g. Exposing students to the *different social, regional, age and gender varieties of the MT* beyond the home context, those spoken and written by different monolingual communities, as well as those spoken and written by different multilingual communities<sup>28</sup>.
2. *The Second Language (SL)*
- The students' second language (from now on, SL) is expanded and developed, and students are made to feel linguistically secure in their SL by the following:
- a. Giving the SL important functions in the school curriculum and using (proficiency in) it as one of the measures of school success (i.e. as one of the core subjects in the curriculum).
- b. Securing a positive identification with the SL as a link to another ethnolinguistic community, by making sure that those teaching it are bilingual members of the SL *ethnolinguistic group* and/or have native-like or near-native proficiency in it, in addition to being extremely knowledgeable of the history and culture of the ethnolinguistic group, that the students are not forced to use the SL productively before they feel ready for it, and that they can always switch to their MT when they feel the need for it.
- c. Using the SL as a medium of instruction, in carefully monitored situations, with a well-thought-through progress plan (see below) and with supportive methods (see below).
- d. *Teaching the SL as a subject, throughout the whole educational process, from K-12*, ensuring that this complements its use as medium of instruction and in the school at large. The SL should be taught as a second language (i.e. not as a mother tongue, and not together with native speakers), by bi/multilingual teachers, during the whole educational process, from K-12. Students must for the first many years be in *linguistically homogeneous groups for SL language arts instruction*. During the later phases of developing bilingualism and during the full bi/multilingualism phase the groups need not be linguistically homogeneous, but still they should not

- contain native speakers of the SL.
- Special L2 intensive classes should be available to students who want or need them (e.g. when coming from another school/country).
- e. Students must for the first many years be in *linguistically homogeneous groups when using a SL as a medium of instruction* (as in immersion), except when in specifically designed context-embedded situations. During the later phases of developing bilingualism and during the full bi/multilingualism phase the groups need not be linguistically homogeneous.
- f. During the emerging multilingualism stage the *silent period* in the students' L2 should be respected. The emphasis should be on the wealth of L2 input from the teacher, from guests, materials, etc. Students should be allowed to answer in their L1. However, progressively students must be encouraged to produce output in the L2, both orally and in written form.
- g. Exposing students to the *different social, regional, age and gender varieties of the SL* beyond the school context, those spoken and written by different monolingual communities, as well as those spoken and written by different multilingual communities.
3. *The progression*
- The students' MT is the basis for the acquisition and development of the students' second and further languages and for developing full bilingualism/multilingualism. Each stage of bilingualism requires different educational language policies with regard to both languages. Therefore, the progress in relation to both will be presented in relation to the three school stages discussed above. However, we have not included the progression part in our Table 3, applying the principles to the six models discussed, because of the amount of detail needed. Several of the other characteristics in table 3 could (and some should) also be differentiated according to the stages, as we have done here.
- During the *emerging multilingualism stage*, MT is the medium of instruction and L2 is being taught as a second language. During this stage, the students' MT may be used to make input given in students' L2 comprehensible, even if the teacher uses L2 only (as in the immersion model).
- Free activity, playtime, recess, and lunchtime should be planned so that students of different language background interact freely from the very beginning, but in supportive environments, counteracting hierarchisation that would value one language over others.
- L2 should only be used as a medium after minimally a couple of years of studying it as a subject, and then only in specifically designed context-embedded activities. These activities might be similar to those that take place during European Hours in the schools here described by Baetens Beardsmore, where students and teacher work

together on a collaborative project to be shared with other students. Other context-embedded activities might later on include lessons in Art, Music and Physical Education. When using the L2 in these context-embedded activities, linguistically heterogeneous groups can be arranged, but they should always contain more than one child from each language group, in order to make support in the MT and translations possible when needed. In that way, both input and output, in the first as well as the second language, can be realistically and authentically produced.

Progressively, during the *developing multilingualism stage* (after approximately the first 5-7 years), the time devoted to using the MT as medium of instruction can be decreased and the SL can be increasingly used as a medium. In the beginning, the use of context-embedded language in teaching through the medium of L2 should be maximized, even when the content is cognitively undemanding. The subjects to be taught through the medium of L2 should move toward the more cognitively demanding end (history, biology, etc) during the seventh to ninth year of multilingual education, and the language use may necessarily become more context-reduced.

During the later phases of the developing multilingualism stage, students of different language backgrounds can be grouped for instruction using a language that is a second language for all of them. In core subjects, however, these heterogeneous groups should not contain native speakers of the language of instruction, whereas any combinations can be used in voluntary subjects, and some of them can be taken through the medium of a language which may for some students be their L1 and for others their L3 or even L4 (e.g. studying photography in grade 9 through the medium of Greek, with both Greek and other students, in a European School). This heterogeneous grouping works as long as all students are required to receive instruction through the medium of at least their first and second language.

During the *full multilingualism and multiliteracy phase*, most students move, in terms of competence, beyond mother tongue and second language, to full multilingualism and multiliteracy. During the two final school years all groups in voluntary subjects can include students of all language backgrounds. It is important, though, that some of the most linguistically demanding core subjects are studied through the medium of the students' MT, in order to ensure full linguistic and cognitive proficiency at a native level.

During the full multilingualism stage students should also follow a course on sociolinguistic and psycholinguistic aspects of multilingualism, so that they can reflect on their own linguistic experience. This should also include discussing political aspects of language policies worldwide.

During the full multilingualism stage students are encouraged to use both languages actively as instrument for inquiry, knowledge and creativity. Practice in doing some

of this has occurred throughout the school years, spontaneously, because of the multilingual language surround of the school, as well as in organized ways, as a result of the educational strategies used, even in classrooms that functioned in one specified language only. Some of them will be discussed below.

### C. Inclusive educational/pedagogical strategies that support multilingualism and multiliteracy.

1. An *inquiry-based, problem-oriented approach to learning* uses both or all the languages as instruments for knowledge.<sup>26</sup> Students are encouraged to use the languages of their choice during the process of inquiry, both to inquire and to multiply the sources of knowledge and in finding solutions to problems which they pose. However, products in a specified language, either orally or in writing, are required at times, especially in the different language classrooms.
2. A *student-centered and interactive pedagogy* allows for student to student, as well as student to teacher and teacher to student collaboration. However, during the emerging multilingualism stage and the first stage of the developing multilingualism stage the teacher should plan some teacher-directed activities for L2 learners in order to provide the instructional scaffolding they need.
3. *Whole language strategies*<sup>27</sup> are used, including reading of authentic literature in all languages and, when it exists, of literature written by other multilinguals, and reflecting the dynamic use of two or more languages by multilingual communities. Newspapers and magazines from different monolingual contexts, as well as multilingual ones, should be used as reading material.
4. *Use of the writing process*, including the keeping of personal journals where students are encouraged to use all their languages as a means of expression, either separately or in combination, reflecting the bi/multilingual literature they read. The students should be encouraged to be responsible for their own portfolios, also used for assessment (see below).
5. *Authentic communication in all languages*. This should include talking and writing to officials, friends and relatives in monolingual communities, as well as in bilingual and multilingual communities, using the appropriate language(s) for communication.

### D. Varied teaching materials

1. Teaching materials in all languages should be *rich and highly varied*, reflecting both the language(s) and the culture(s) of the home community and language as used in different societal contexts, including bilingual and multilingual ones. When the language is spoken in many national contexts, the material chosen should be written by authors of different nationalities.<sup>28</sup>

2. When teaching materials do not exist in a "lesser used language," teachers must make every effort to produce their own. For this purpose, members of the community, including parents, community elders, and students themselves, must be recruited. The preparation of *teaching materials* should be a joint community venture. *Student products* can also be used as teaching materials.
3. Multilingual materials are also needed to encourage students to make *contrastive analyses* of texts and to become aware of language differences and similarities.
4. Materials from oracy-oriented cultures should be used on an equal basis with more literacy-oriented cultures. Both *orature* and *literature* should be equally valued.

#### E. *Authentic and fair multilingual assessment*

1. Language assessment should *never compare native speakers of a language with speakers of that language as a second language*. If students *want* to sit for final exams<examination>, intended for native speakers, in their SL, in addition to or instead of exams intended for second language speakers, they should naturally be allowed to do so. Both types of exam results (in a language as a MT or as a SL) should be of equal value, e.g. for university entrance.
2. Assessment should be criterion-referenced or performance-based, with different (but equal) measures expected of native speakers and second language learners, respectively. Portfolio-based assessments should be used extensively.<sup>22</sup>
3. Content assessment should be conducted in the language in which the student has received the instruction or in the language which the student chooses.

#### Applying the principles to the models

It might be impossible for an educational context that promotes multilingualism and multiliteracy to have all these features. But maximizing these characteristics would ensure that students travel the full distance required to become multilingual and multiliterate.

Table 3 applies (most of) these principles to the different models of multilingual education discussed previously. We are fully aware of the fact that it is obviously a gross oversimplification to try and capture complex processes in a plus/minus dichotomy. Much more differentiation would be needed in the characteristics themselves, in relation to both the content of several characteristics and to how they rate during the 3 or 4 stages. How would a school be placed on IA3 ("Native and second language speakers among the administrators and staff"), for instance, if it has both native and second language speakers of the majority language, but only native speakers of the

minority languages (a common situation for almost all minority groups except Spanish-speakers in the U.S.A.)? Many of the characteristics should also be differentiated according to stage as we did for the Progression in Multilingual languages policy above. The rating is often different for different students in the same class, depending on the students' mother tongue. The Mainstream Monolingual with Foreign Language Teaching Model (6) looks completely different from an American or Russian angle (a good start for majority populations), as compared to a European or Indian angle (the regular absolute minimum, hardly worth including, except as something we have to get rid of). A more finely tuned scale than a dichotomy would also be necessary. Still, we think that the results of our rating exercise are worth including, because the rating process (which we ask all the readers to repeat for themselves and to agree and disagree with our ratings<sup>23</sup>) may make one realise the enormous complexity and variation.

As can be seen in the Table, each model responds to its societal situation and none of them are completely perfect or ideal. However, it is clear that the models applying the greatest number of principles also have the most success in promoting the multilingualism and multiliteracy of students. The Plural Multilingual Model will thus be most successful. We will not discuss any of the details in the table – most of them have been discussed, directly or indirectly, in other articles in this book. But we invite the reader to reflect over their own educational context by trying to place it in the table and by seeing what they might want to change.

It is also obvious from Table 3, that an integrated model for the multilingual education of majorities and minorities is yet to be developed. Whereas the Plural Multilingual Model of the European Schools works well for the selected population of these schools, we do not yet know whether it would function equally well with *all* students, given its traditional educational strategies.<sup>24</sup> The same is to some extent true for the Immersion Model, despite its more varied intake (see e.g. Genesee 1976, 1985, 1987). Whereas the Maintenance Model works well with minority populations, it makes no room for the majority. More hopeful in this regard is the Two-Way Dual Language Model discussed by Dolson and Lindholm. However, its inability to structure a distinct educational language policy for the minority and the majority population, especially in the beginning, may lead to a partial failure in promoting the *full* multilingualism and multiliteracy of many students, both majority and minority, later on. Despite the positive early results in the two-way dual language programs of the kinds presently initiated in the US, it seems to us that it is a weakness that they

Table 3. Characteristics of multilingual education

Name of programme	European Schools	Immersion	2-way biling.	Maintenance	International	Transitional
	strong	strong	strong	strong	weak	weak
<b>TYPICAL CHILD</b>	Heter Maj	Homog Maj	Maj & Min	Homog Min	Heter. Ma&Mi	Min
<b>MEDIUM OF INSTRUCTION</b>						
Initially	L1	L2	Min L1 Maj L2	L1	L2 for most	L1
Subsequently	Both or all	Both	Both	L1 or both	L2&FL	L2
<b>I EDUCATIONAL AGENTS</b>				F S		
<b>A. Multilingual admn. &amp; staff</b>						
1. All multilingual	+	+	-	+	-	-
2. Different ethnicities	+	+	+	+	+?	+?
3. Native & second language speakers	+	+?	-?	+?	-?	-?
4. Committed to own multilingualism	+	+	-?	+	-	-
5. Minority members in high status positions	+	+	-?	+	-	-
<b>B. Multilingual teachers</b>						
1. Teach only (through) one language	+	+?	+?	+	+	-
2. High levels of linguistic competence	+	+	+	+	+	-
3. Specialised education & knowledge	-	+	+	+	-	+
4. Committed to own multilingualism	+	+	+?	+	-	-
<b>C. Committed active parents</b>						
1. Choice	+	+	+	+	+	-
2. Informed	+	+	+	+	+	-
3. Committed	+	+	+	+	+?	-?
4. Participants	-	-?	+	+	-?	-?
5. Develop own bilingualism	+	-	-?	+?	-?	+?
6. Organised to direct policy	-	+?	+?	+	-	-

Name of programme	European Schools	Immersion	2-way biling.	Maintenance	International	Transitional
	strong	strong	strong	strong	strong	weak
<b>TYPICAL CHILD</b>	Heter Maj	Homog Maj	Maj & Min	Homog Min	Heter. Ma&Mi	Min
<b>MEDIUM OF INSTRUCTION</b>						
Initially	L1	L2	Min L1 Maj L2	L1	L2 for most	L1
Subsequently	Both or all	Both	Both	L1 or both	L2&FL	L2
<b>D. Progressively multilingual students</b>				F S		
1. Expect to become multilingual	+	+	+	+	+?	-
2. Informed, responsible for own learning	+?	+	+	+	+?	-
3. Organised for real influence	+?	+	+	+	-	-
<b>II EDUCATIONAL CULTURE</b>						
<b>A. Multilingual surround outside classroom</b>						
1. Goal bi/multilingualism for all	+	+	+?	+	+?	-
2. Goal encompasses 1-12 grades	+	-	-	+?	+	-
<b>3. All languages used</b>						
3a. - in all spaces in school	+	+?	-	+	+	-
3b. - in correspondence	+	-?	+	-	-	+
3c. - in signs	+	-?	+?	+?	-	-
3d. - on bulletin boards	+	+?	+?	+	-	-
3d. - in assemblies	+	-	-?	+	-	-
<b>B. Multilingual languages policy</b>						
1a. L1 has important core subject functions	+	+	+	+	-?	-?
1b. link to identity: same group	+	-	+?	+	-?	-?
1c. L1 used as medium 1-12	+	-?	-?	+?	-	-?

Name of programme	European Schools		Immersion		2-way bilingual		Maintenance		International		Transitional	
	strong	Heter	strong	Homog	strong	Maj & Min	strong	Homog. Min	weak	Heter. Maj&Mi	weak	Min
<b>TYPICAL CHILD</b>												
<b>MEDIUM OF INSTRUCTION</b>												
Initially	L1		L2		Min L1 Maj L2		L1		L2 for most		L1	
Subsequently	Both or all		Both		Both		L1 or both		L2&FL		L2	
1d. L1 taught as a subject 1-12	+		+?		-?		F S		-		-	
1e. Linguistically homogeneous groups for L1 language arts	+		+		-		+		+		+	
1f. Expose students to different varieties of L1			+?		+		+		-		+	
1g. Protect L1 from majority language encroachment	+		+		+		+		-		-	
2a. L2 has important core subject functions	+		+		+		+		+		+	
2b. link to identity: same group	+		-?		+?		+		+?		+?	
2c. L2 used as (one of the) media 3/4-12, according to monitored plan	+		+		+		+		+?		+?	
2d. L2 taught as a subject 1-12	+		-		-		+		+		+?	
2e. linguistically homogeneous groups for L2 language arts, and, for many years, for L2-medium instruction	+		+		-		+		-		-?	
2f. Expose students to different varieties of L2	+?		-		-?		+		+?		+	
2g. Silent period allowed	+		+		-		+		-		-	
<b>C. Inclusive pedagogical strategies</b>												
1. Inquiry-based, problem-oriented	-		-?		+		+		-		-	
2. Student-centred, interactive	-		-?		+		+		-?		-	

Name of programme	European Schools		Immersion		2-way bilingual		Maintenance		International		Transitional	
	strong	Heter	strong	Homog	strong	Maj & Min	strong	Homog. Min	weak	Heter. Maj&Mi	weak	Min
<b>TYPICAL CHILD</b>												
<b>MEDIUM OF INSTRUCTION</b>												
Initially	L1		L2		Min L1 Maj L2		L1		L2 for most		L1	
Subsequently	Both or all		Both		Both		L1 or both		L2&FL		L2	
3. Whole language strategies	-		-?		+		+		-		-	
4. Use of writing processes	-		-		+		+?		-		-	
5. Authentic communication	+		+		+		+		-		+	
<b>D. Varied teaching materials</b>												
1. Rich and varied materials	+		+		+		+		+?		+	
2. Produce own materials with community & students	+?		+?		+		+		-		+?	
3. Materials bi/multilingual	+?		+?		+		+		-		+?	
4. Orature & literature equally valued	-		-		+?		+?		-		+?	
<b>E. Authentic &amp; fair multilingual assessment</b>												
1. Not compare native and L2-speakers	+		+		-		+		-?		-	
2. Criterion-referenced/ performance-based; use portfolios	-?		-?		+?		+?		-?		-	
3. Language of assessment same as medium of instruction, or chosen by student	+		-?		-		+?		+?		+?	

+ Model generally has this feature

- Model does not generally have this feature

F = A Finnish School in Sweden (Upplands Väsby)

S = A Spanish School in the U.S.A. (La Luz, Dade County, Florida)

mix language minority and majority students in the beginning and make no differentiation in instruction or assessment, always comparing them in ways which might disregard their linguistic prerequisites and needs. US two-way dual language models that truly aim to develop high levels of multilingualism of language majorities and minorities will have to undergo a series of transformations in the future. Firstly, it seems clear to us from the above that a different educational treatment is needed initially for majorities and minorities. Integration can come about during especially designated context-embedded activities and instruction. But initially effective instruction for majorities and minorities must segregate them for some instruction during some part of the school day. Secondly, assessment for the majority and the minority should never compare their achievement in one or the other language. Mother tongue development and second language development follow different patterns and progressions, and these must be recognized. Finally, two-way dual language models must be expanded beyond elementary school, recognizing the slow development of multilingualism and multiteracy both for majorities and minorities.<sup>35</sup>

Where the International Schools have tried to solve the "problem" of having speakers with several different mother tongues in the same class, by starting from what a language is *for the educational system* rather than for the student (Language A, Language B), and using one common language of instruction (which can be the student's mother tongue, her/his second language, or, at least at the beginning, a foreign language), the European Schools have tried to solve the problem by starting from what the language is (or is supposed to be) *for the student*, and using each of them as languages of instruction. The International Schools then get into problems of mother tongue loss, enormous heterogeneity in initial linguistic proficiency, and unfair assessment – and the introduction of Language A1 and Language A2 is trying to alleviate the latter – whereas the European Schools get into problems of either a less "clean" model (where the students in many subsections in reality do not have the language of the subsection as their mother tongue) or impossible logistics (if they try to maintain the principle of teaching students through the medium of their mother tongue). It seems to us that the problems facing the European Schools may be easier to solve.

Multilingual education must come to grips with the knowledge, gained from the European Schools, that full integration of multilingual and multicultural citizens may be based INITIALLY on partial physical separation, within a context of psychological and partially physical unity and collectivity. ALL ethnolinguistic groups must be given an opportunity for growth and

development in and of themselves, while gaining knowledge of the language(s) and culture(s) of others. They must be given opportunity for linguistic and cultural autonomy, as well as integration and participation in the lives of others. They must learn to use the lens to which they were born, the one they acquired later, and others, and all in combination, as experienced participants in a world that needs the multiple images that only multilingual multicultural citizens could produce.

#### To conclude

Multilingual citizens hold the key to global understanding and improvement. To achieve that, humanity must be aided by an educational context able to expand our ethnolinguistic roots downwardly as well as upwardly, enabling us to move laterally to encompass other ethnolinguistic identities, and to contract into our own, enabling us to be different and the same, connected to others and to ourselves. In a diverse and increasingly interdependent world, we can expect that only the plurality of lenses offered by a multilingual and multicultural education will bring the harmony, balance stability and quiescence of the rapidly spinning top. The motionless illusion of the spinning top holds a lesson for all of us. Serenity, in a rapidly spinning world, can only be gained if we move along with it, with its multilingualism and its multiculturalism, and not if we remain captives of our monolingual, monocultural identity.

Does it sound idealistic? Romantic, naive? Academic poetry? The interesting thing is that some of the most exciting critics of the whole development paradigm we know, analysing political and economic power relations, come to very similar conclusions about the necessity of diversity (see e.g. *The Development Dictionary. A Guide to Knowledge as Power*, edited by Wolfgang Sachs, especially the entries on Equality by C. Douglas Lunniss, Helping (Marianne Gronemeyer), Needs (Ivan Illich) and One World (Wolfgang Sachs). Multilingualism may give more access to Knowledge as Power – and the knowledge of both Self and Other that may come with it, might guide the "user" of that Power in a direction which does not harm the planet as much as the present power élites.

## Notes:

- 1 This article builds on several of our earlier publications and typologies, mentioned in the bibliography. We have here concentrated on the educational context in the schools, and only mentioned societal and political prerequisites for schooling in passing. Those who are interested in seeing how we situate education in general and the education of minorities in particular, should consult our other publications. We thank Hugo Beelens Beardsmore, Alex Housen and teachers in the Brussels European School, especially Joanna Sancha and Julia Leigh, for a wealth of background information and for organising a most informative and delightful visit to the school. Likewise, thanks to Markku Peura, Head of the Sweden Finnish School in Upplands Väsby. One of us (TSK) also wants to thank Raquel Otheguy for so patiently waiting for the one page on Einstein's relativity theory, the writing of which this article and this book have delayed for too many months.
- 2 Hereinafter we shall use "multilingual" to mean both bilingual and multilingual. Debi Prāsanna Patanayak, the former Director of the Central Institute for Indian Languages, used to complain about reductionism, every time one of us used the term "bilingual", and ask which five of his seven languages he was supposed to discard in order to become bilingual only.
- 3 "Multilingual schools" and "multilingual education" is used to mean schools/education where the aim is high levels of multilingualism for all. Using two or more languages as media of education (see also note 11, the classic definition of "bilingual education") is a necessary but not sufficient prerequisite for multilingual education in this sense.
- 4 It is "simplistic and dangerous to give too much currency to the phrase 'ethnic conflict'", says Alan Phillips (1994, 5), in his introduction to Asbjørn Eide's report *New approaches to minority protection* (1994). Eide, a member of the UN Sub-Commission on the Prevention of Discrimination and the Protection of Minorities, summarizes in the report his 3-year study for the Sub-Commission. Eide and Phillips (1994, 5-6) quote the NGO World Congress on Human Rights, New Delhi, 1991, where the phrase 'ethnic conflict' is labelled a misnomer which leads to false perception. Other prominent peace and conflict researchers who have criticized the labelling of conflicts and antagonisms as 'ethnic' as soon as ethnic lines happen to coincide with class lines, economic, geographical, religious, linguistic or other power-related lines in a conflict include Björn Hette (e.g. 1987, 1990) and Rodolfo Stavenhagen (e.g. 1988, 1990). There may in some cases be a *correlational* relationship between conflict and language/ethnicity, but this should not be interpreted as a *causal* relationship (see Phillipson, Rannut & Skutnabb-Kangas, 1994; see also Fishman, 1989 and Patanayak, 1988).
- 5 For more on linguistic human rights, see especially Skutnabb-Kangas and Phillipson 1989, 1994 and de Varennes (forthcoming).
- 6 Related to this is also the belief that bilingualism is causally connected to (other) psychological, educational or economic deficiencies and disasters. For refuting this type of claim, see, e.g. references to Corson, Cummins, Fishman, García, Hakuta, Nieto, Pattanayak, Skutnabb-Kangas, in the bibliography.
- 7 Or Language of Wider Colonization, as we prefer to call it.
- 8 Most International Schools are not part of bilingual/multilingual education in the classic sense of the term, though, because they only use one language of instruction.
- 9 See e.g. Obura 1986, Rubagumya 1991, Rubagumya (Ed.) 1990, for some examples. As Birgit Brock-Utne observes, "[I]n many of the African countries the majority language is treated in a way that minority languages are treated in the industrialized world" (1993, 39).
- 10 For more on different aims of multilingual education, see, e.g. Baker 1993; Ferguson, Houghton and Wells 1977; Fishman 1976; Hornberger 1991; Lo Bianco 1990; Mohanty, forthcoming.
- 11 For more on the distinction between strong and weak models of multilingual education and a typology, see especially Baker 1993, 153). See also the typologies in Skutnabb-Kangas 1984, chapter 6, which Baker has developed further.
- 12 They use two languages as media of education in subjects other than language arts in the languages themselves (Andersson & Boyer 1978).
- 13 For the concepts of linguistic & societal goals, especially when these do not tally with the officially expressed goals which sometimes function as a smokescreen, in the best doubletalk way, see Skutnabb-Kangas 1988, 1991b, and the introduction and final comments by the editors in Skutnabb-Kangas & Cummins (eds.) 1988.
- 14 Early, late or partial immersion programmes which have been studied and reported exist in many countries, e.g. Australia, Canada, Catalonia, Finland (e.g. Helle, in press), Hungary (e.g. Duff, 1991), USA. Many countries are trying them out but without much research follow-up; others are planning them (e.g. Switzerland, or Estonia; see (Ülle) Rannut 1992). For studies on immersion programmes in other countries, see the references in Artigal's and Cummins' articles in this volume and Genesee 1987.
- 15 See e.g. Taylor, in press, on indigenous Mi'kmaq children in Canadian French immersion. See also Swain et al., 1990.
- 16 Unless something else is clearly indicated, we use "L2" or "second language" to mean the language which is the second in the order of learning for the student (as opposed to the first language or a third or fourth language). A second language in this sense may or may not be a language which the student can hear and use in the

- immediate environment (one of the other common ways of defining a second language, as opposed to a *foreign* language which one does not use daily in the environment).
- 16 We thank Donna Christian for providing us the latest country-wide information which is included in the Dolson & Lindholm chapter.
- 17 See Curtis 1988 for a description of an alternate days programme, from its inception to its preliminary but temporary death – it functions in Calisoga again. See also Tucker et al. 1970 for an early description of this type of programme, in the Philippines.
- 18 See articles in Skutnabb-Kangas & Phillipson (Eds.) 1994, for analyses and examples; see also Minority Rights Group (Ed.) 1994.
- 19 See e.g. Skutnabb-Kangas 1987 and articles in Peura & Skutnabb-Kangas (Eds.) 1994, for examples of Finnish migrant minority children in maintenance programmes in Sweden; see also Eriksson 1993. Although not discussed in this book, ethnic mother-tongue schools in the United States are of this type; see Fishman 1980, Garcia 1988, Garcia and Orltheygy 1988.
- 20 See note 9 in the Introduction to this volume for the concept of "Europeanized countries".
- 21 For more on how this is done, see Garcia 1993; for a thorough criticism of the model and the ideologies behind it, see Mohanty, forthcoming. This model fits the United Nation's old definition of linguistic genocide – see Skutnabb-Kangas 1993, in press a, b).
- 22 An exception could be native speakers of the majority language of the host country, where this is different from the language of instruction, e.g. native (Austrian) German speakers in the Vienna International School might, as a rule, become high level bilingual and biliterate in German and English.
- 23 This stage roughly corresponds to the emergence of what Jim Cummins (1980a, 1981b) calls BICS (Basic Interpersonal Communicative Skills) or context-embedded language.
- 24 Ajit K. Mohanty summarizes his extensive empirical studies in India, studies where many of the methodological shortcomings of much of Western research into the relationship between bilingualism and cognition have been corrected for, as follows: "... bilingualism or the ability to communicate in two linguistic codes fosters metalinguistic and metacognitive development which makes them [the Kond children studied] cognitively more flexible, endows them with a capacity to control their own cognitive processes more effectively, gives them a better analytic and objective orientation and enhances their sensitivity to communicative input." (Mohanty, forthcoming, 81).
- 25 For some of the relevant applications of theories on macro-societal aspects of

- education to minority education, see references to Cummins, Cameron et al., Heller, in the bibliography.
- 26 See e.g. the evaluation by Ramirez et al. 1991, where none of the groups evaluated had developed anything approaching full bilingualism by the end of grade 6; see also Dolson & Lindholm, this volume. In the Finnish study of working class immigrant minority children in mother tongue maintenance classes in two municipalities in Sweden, children who had most of their education through the medium of Finnish in grades 1-6 and a fair amount still in grades 7-9, did almost as well as Finnish children in Finland on a Finnish language test and somewhat but not significantly better than Swedish *middle class* children in parallel classes in the same schools on a Swedish language test, in grade 9 (see e.g. Skutnabb-Kangas 1987, 1991a, 1993a, 1994a; see also Eriksson 1994 for long-term results).
- 27 On mother tongue definitions, see Skutnabb-Kangas, 1984, chapter 2; 1988; 1990, chapter 2, "Concept definitions". We use here the following definition: "the mother tongue is the language (or the languages) one has learned first and identifies with". This definition (which takes into consideration the varying degrees of linguistic human rights, enjoyed by different language groups) thus disregards both the person's *competence* in the mother tongue and whether the person *uses* the mother tongue, for instance, for official purposes/functions. Both a competence definition ("the language best known") and a functional definition ("the language used most") ignore the fact that the possibility of developing a mother tongue and using it outside the home crucially depends on power relations between speakers of different languages which an individual with a specific mother tongue cannot influence much as an individual.
- 28 An example could be that Spanish MT children in New York should be exposed to Puerto Rican, Dominican, Cuban, Castilian, Mexican, Guatemalan, New York and Californian Spanishes, spoken/written both by monolinguals and by bilinguals, as a first, a second and maybe even a third language.
- 29 See Beutel 1990a,b and Ada & Beutel, forthcoming, for powerful, empirically based reflections on how this can be done.
- 30 For more on whole language curricula and its implementation, see especially, Goodman, Kenneth, E. Brooks Smith, Robert Meredith and Yeta Goodman, 1987. *Language and Thinking in School. A Whole Language Curriculum*. New York: Richard C. Owen. For a look at whole language practices in bilingualism classrooms, see especially, Ada, Alma Flor. 1987. *A children's literature-based whole language approach to creative reading and writing*. Northvale, New Jersey: Santillana; Edelsky, Carol. 1986. *Writing in a Bilingual Program: Habla una vez*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex. For a recent questioning of whole language practices with language minority students, see, Reyes, María de la Luz. 1992. Challenging Venerable Assumptions: Literacy instruction for

- linguistically different students. *Harvard Educational Review* 62: 427-446.
- 31 See Ada et al., 1993, for an excellent example of this type of materials.
- 32 For more on portfolios and alternative assessment, see Mindy Kornhaber and Howard Gardner. 1993. *Varieties of Excellence*. New York: National Center for Restructuring Education, Schools, and Teaching, Teachers College, Columbia University. Also see Linda Darling-Hammond, Jacqueline Anness & Beverly Falk (1994). *Alternative Assessment in Action. Case Studies of Schools and Students*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- 33 In fact our own ratings were not always in agreement for every detail either, except for the European School where we based it mainly on Hugo Baetens Beardmore's description rather than thinking of the variation. In all the other models, the factual variation is enormous, and both of us are obviously familiar with different schools, in addition to the shared principles and experiences.
- 34 According to statistics from the different European Schools, many of them in fact do have a much more socially varied student body than the Brussels school which has been studied most. One of us had a long discussion about this recently with several of the teachers in the Brussels school – thanks again!
- 35 We know that many two-way teachers and administrators would agree with several of our points here. Our criticism should not be seen as criticism of those who have conceived the model or those who teach in it. Both of us are impressed and moved by the unselfish enthusiasm and high-level professionalism and commitment we have experienced in the two-way programmes we have visited. The changes we propose can only come about in a different political climate which may not exist – yet.

## CONSOLIDATED BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Abbi, Anvita (Ed.) (1986). *Studies in bilingualism*. Delhi: Bahri Publications.
- Abdoocader, Levane (1989). *Sydney Voices: a Survey of Languages Other Than English in Catholic Schools*. Sydney: Catholic Education Office.
- Ada, Alma Flor (1987). *A children's literature-based whole language approach to oral reading and writing*. Northvale, New Jersey: Santillana.
- Ada, Alma Flor (1988). The Palero Valley Experience: Working with Spanish-Speaking Parents to Develop Children's Reading and Writing Skills Through the Use of Children's Literature. In Skutnabb-Kangas & Cummins (Eds.), 223-238.
- Ada, Alma Flor, Harris, Violet J. & Hopkins, Lee Bennett (1993). *A chorus of voices: Developing literacy through multicultural poetry. Poetry Anthology*. Carmel, CA: Hampton-Brown Books.
- Ada, Alma Flor & Heutzel, Constance, forthcoming, *Participatory Research as a Pedagogical Social Action*, San Francisco.
- Alatis, James A. (Ed.) (1970). *Bilingualism and Language Contact: Anthropological, Linguistic, Psychological, and Sociological Aspects*. Report of the Twenty-first Annual Round Table Meeting on Linguistics and Language Studies. Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press.
- Alatis, James A. (Ed.) (1978). *International Dimensions of Bilingual Education*. Georgetown University Round Table on Languages and Linguistics 1978. Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press.
- Alatis, James A. (Ed.) (1980). *Current Issues in Bilingual Education*. Georgetown University Round Table on Languages and Linguistics 1980. Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press.
- Alatis, James A. (Ed.) (1994). *Georgetown University Round Table on Languages and Linguistics 1993*. Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press.

