

Language Planning and Language Education

edited by
Chris Kennedy

Language Planning and Language Education

Edited by

Chris Kennedy

*Department of English Language and Literature,
University of Birmingham*

London

GEORGE ALLEN & UNWIN

Boston

Sydney

© George Allen and Unwin (Publishers) Ltd, 1983
This book is copyright under the Berne Convention. No reproduction
without permission. All rights reserved.

**George Allen & Unwin (Publishers) Ltd,
40 Museum Street, London WC1A 1LU, UK**

George Allen & Unwin (Publishers) Ltd,
Park Lane, Hemel Hempstead, Herts HP2 4TE, UK

Allen & Unwin, Inc.,
9 Winchester Terrace, Winchester, Mass 01890, USA

George Allen & Unwin Australia Pty Ltd,
8 Napier Street, North Sydney, NSW 2060, Australia

First published in 1984.

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data

Language planning and language education.
1. English language—Study and teaching—Foreign students
I. Kennedy, Chris
428.2'04'07 PE1128.A2
ISBN 0-04-407019-5
ISBN 0-04-407020-9 Pbk

Library of Congress Cataloging in Publication Data

Main entry under title:
Language planning and language education.
Bibliography: p.
Includes index.
1. Language planning. 2. Language and education.
I. Kennedy, Chris.
P40.5.L35L26 1983 409 83-12286
ISBN 0-04-407019-5
ISBN 0-04-407020-9 (pbk.)

Set in 10 on 11 point Plantin by Setrite Typesetters
and printed in Great Britain
by Billing and Sons Ltd, London and Worcester

Acknowledgements

The publishers wish to thank the following for permission to reproduce articles in this book:

Georgetown University Press for 'Language planning, language spread, and language change' by R. L. Cooper in *Georgetown University Round Table on Languages and Linguistics 1979: Language in Public Life*, edited by James E. Alatis and G. Richard Tucker and 'Sociolinguistic surveys at the national level' by Wilfred Whitely in *Georgetown University Round Table of Languages and Linguistics 1972: Sociolinguistics: Current Trends and Prospects*, edited by Roger W. Shuy.

Cambridge University Press for extracts from 'Language modernisation and planning in comparison with other types of national modernisation and planning' by Joshua A. Fishman, *Language in Society Journal*, vol. 2, 1973 and 'The nationalisation of Swahili in Kenya' by Lyndon Harries in *Language in Society Journal*, vol. 5, 1976.

Center for Applied Linguistics for an extract from 'Implications of language learning theory for languages planning' by Christine Bratt Paulston in *Papers in Applied Linguistics, Bilingual Education Series 1* and 'Survey of language use and attitudes towards language in the Philippines' by Bonifacio P. Sibayan in *Language Surveys in Developing Nations*, edited by S. Ohannessian, C. A. Ferguson and E. C. Polome.

The University of Texas Press for 'Language planning processes for pluralistic societies' by Lachmann M. Khubchandani in *Language Problems and Language Planning Journal*, vol. 2; 3; (6), 1979.

The University of Papua New Guinea for 'Can English and Pidgin be kept apart?' by Derek Bickerton in *Tok Pisin I Go We?* edited by K. A. McElhanan, Special publication no. 1, May 1975.

TIETO Ltd., for 'Cultural pluralism, nation-building and educational policies in peninsular Malaysia' by J. K. P. Watson in *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* edited by Derrik Sharp, vol. 1, no. 2, 1980.

Loreto Todd for 'Language options for education in a multilingual society: Cameroon', *POLYGLOT Journal*, vol. 2, fiche 1, 1979.

A. N. Kerr for 'Language and the education of immigrants' children in Sweden', *POLYGLOT Journal*, vol. 1, fiche 3, 1979.

Chapter 1 was first published in *Frontiers of Bilingual Education* (eds.) Bernard Spolsky and Robert Cooper (Newberry House Publishers, Ma., May 1977) pp. 282-94;

Chapter 11 was first published in *Language Education in Multilingual Societies* (ed) Arthur Yap (Singapore University Press, 1978) pp. 69-79.

Introduction

This collection of essays arises from the need to provide English-language teachers, applied linguists and others involved in education with an accessible overview of language planning and its relationships with education. English is growing in importance as an international language, especially in the fields of commerce, science and technology. English as a national language in countries where it functions as a second language is undergoing changes associated with growing feelings of nationalism. Varieties of English are developing in sub-continent (Indian English) and nations (Nigerian English) which may be far removed from traditional definitions of Standard English, Pidgin English in Papua New Guinea being an example. These developing varieties are being considered or have been adopted as media for education together with indigenous mother-tongue vernaculars whose speakers are demanding more recognition for their languages. These language developments are a reflection of the socio-economic and political upheavals apparent particularly in the developing world as countries strive for modernisation and Westernisation, at the same time wishing to preserve their cultural identity.

The close relationship between use of a language and political power, socio-economic development, national and local identity and cultural values has led to the increasing realisation of the importance of language policies and planning in the life of a nation. Nowhere is this planning more crucial than in education, universally recognised as a powerful instrument of change. At the focal point in educational language planning is the teacher, since it is the successful application of curriculum and syllabus plans in the classroom, themselves instruments of higher levels of language planning, that will affect the realisation of national level planning. (See ELT Documents 108, 1980a, for further discussion.) Because of this link between national language planning and classroom practice (see Lewis and Massad, 1975), an understanding of language planning can provide explanations to the teacher of why, for example, he is being asked to teach textbook X through the medium of language X. It may also help to explain basic teaching problems. Thus if planners at higher levels have ignored community attitudes towards language X, the teacher may find resistance to learning the language and low motivation. As a further example, practical problems in writing in English may be due partly to lack of attention paid by planners to potential conflicts between the home culture (in this case attitudes towards and functions of writing in that culture), and the demands of the school. (See Stubbs, 1980, and ELT Documents 109, 1980b, for elaboration on this point.) Thus, although at first sight language planning theory may seem far removed from the language teacher, its practical application in education in fact reveals that the teacher is very

much a part of that theory, and that his training should, at all levels, include a consideration of language planning.

Turning to the organisation of the book, it is divided into four sections, each with a particular focus, leading the reader from a presentation of current issues in language planning to the use of surveys for data collection, the implementation and evaluation of planning, and finally to case studies in educational planning. Each section is prefaced by a short introduction which summarises the content and points to links with other sections. At the end of each introduction a further-reading section is provided for those who wish to explore further particular aspects. The bibliography section includes not only references cited in the text but also lists resource documents, journals and major collections in language planning which, it is hoped, will facilitate further research. The book should therefore provide a basis both for courses and research work for teachers, applied linguists and others concerned with language planning.

CHRIS KENNEDY
Birmingham, 1980

Contents

Acknowledgements	page viii
Introduction	ix
SECTION I INTRODUCTION TO LANGUAGE PLANNING	
1 Bilingual Education and Language Planning <i>by J. Rubin</i>	4
2 Language Planning, Language Spread and Language Change <i>by R. L. Cooper</i>	17
3 Language Modernisation and Planning in Comparison with Other Types of National Modernisation and Planning <i>by J. A. Fishman</i>	37
4 Language Planning <i>by C. B. Paulston</i>	55
SECTION II LANGUAGE PLANNING SURVEYS	
5 Sociolinguistic Surveys at the National Level <i>by W. H. Whiteley</i>	68
6 Survey of Language Use and Attitudes towards Language in the Philippines <i>by B. P. Sibayan</i>	80
SECTION III IMPLEMENTATION AND EVALUATION IN LANGUAGE PLANNING	
7 Language Planning Processes for Pluralistic Societies <i>by L. M. Khubchandani</i>	98
8 Can English and Pidgin Be Kept Apart? <i>by D. Bickerton</i>	111
9 The Nationalisation of Swahili in Kenya <i>by L. Harries</i>	118
SECTION IV CASE STUDIES IN LANGUAGE PLANNING AND EDUCATION	
10 Cultural Pluralism, Nation-Building and Educational Policies in Peninsular Malaysia <i>by J. K. P. Watson</i>	132
11 Cultural Pluralism as a National Resource: Strategies for Language Education <i>by M. V. Nadkarni</i>	151
12 Language Options for Education in a Multilingual Society: Cameroon <i>by L. Todd</i>	160
13 Language and the Education of Immigrants' Children in Sweden <i>by A. N. Kerr</i>	172
Bibliography	186
Index	203

SECTION I

Introduction to Language Planning

This section presents four viewpoints on language planning and introduces the concepts and issues discussed in later sections. Rubin's clear and concise article on the relationships between language planning and bilingual education suggests that a model of language planning, if applied to problems in bilingualism, can be a useful aid in their solution. Language planning is a problem-solving activity concerned with deliberate language change for specific aims, which may be social, political or educational (or a mixture of all three). An ideal language-planning programme would consist essentially of three major phases: first, establishing facts about the situation, isolating the problem, and suggesting alternative strategies and solutions to accomplish the goals of the programme; secondly, implementing the favoured solution; thirdly, evaluating the programme to provide feedback for any necessary revision. Rubin then provides illustrations of how such a procedure might be applied to bilingual education – for example, the problem of whether to use a mother tongue or an imported model for the medium of education.

The article by Cooper develops a point emphasised by Rubin: that language planning must take place in a social context and that to ignore socio-linguistic factors such as attitudes or needs of groups who will be affected can lead to the failure of language-planning programmes. Cooper suggests that since one of the aims of language planning may often be to facilitate or prevent a group's adoption of a particular language or variety, we should seek answers to the question: 'Who adopts what, when, where, why and how?' The answers to this question, which are complex and varied, could provide a useful source of information for use in all three of Rubin's phases of language planning. In the fact-finding first phase, the question could be modified to, 'Who *is adopting* etc. now?' and, 'Who *adopted* etc. in the past?', and the answers would suggest effective implementation strategies in phase two; in the third evaluation phase the answers to 'who *has adopted* as the result of the programme?' would provide feedback on the success or failure of implementation.

Underlying Cooper's proposals is the idea that language-planning programmes may be analogous to commercial marketing operations, the 'goods' to be marketed being in this case language structure or use. Fishman, in a typically stimulating and wide-ranging article, elaborates this viewpoint in seeking, and in a number of instances finding, parallels between language and other-than-language planning, specifically in the fields of economic, social and cultural planning. A particularly valuable section is that on the unexpected consequences of planning or system

linkages. An example would be the chain effect between the introduction of a writing system, the resulting higher literacy, and the creation, as a consequence of links with other parts of the social system, of an unemployed urban élite with raised but unfulfilled expectations. There is as yet no model of language planning which is sufficiently refined to take account of these system linkages, but they do serve to underline what both Rubin and Cooper in their articles take pains to illustrate: that language planning must take full account of the socio-cultural context in which the planning is taking place and that a plan must be flexible enough to readjust itself to unexpected system linkages discovered during the evaluation phase.

Given, then, that we may need to develop a multi-dimensional model of language planning, the question arises: 'What part can the linguist play in planning?' Paulston addresses herself to this question. She proposes that language-planning problems should be divided into two types: language cultivation, dealing with problems of language; and language policy, concerned with social and cultural problems with language as an evident symptom. (Note that the term 'cultivation' is not being used here in the same way as Neustupný (1970; see Cooper, p. 17 of this volume). Each type is associated with three stages of planning: determination (decisions as to goals and outcomes); development (means and strategies to achieve aims); and implementation (the practical application of development). Paulston believes that, to play an effective role in language planning, the linguist can and should concern himself only with problems of cultivation, and especially determination and development, and not with problems of policy. The development of textbooks in response to a policy decision to reform the educational system would be one example of the legitimate role of the linguist in planning. The article is a reminder of the present limitations on a linguist's power to influence language-planning decisions at a political level. Either the linguist accepts these limitations and concludes that any advocacy on his part will only be accepted if it happens to further a particular political aim, or he explores further the relationships between Paulston's cultivation and policy approaches to see where and how he might make a more positive contribution. Information would be helpful here, both from other-than-language planning fields, where similar problems must exist (see the Fishman article already mentioned above), and as a result of evaluation by language planners of their roles in the planning process.

Further Reading

Hudson (1980), though not concerned with language planning, provides a lucid explanation of many of the sociolinguistic terms used in this volume in discussions of language issues (for example, language, dialect, vernacular, domain). For further explanation of diglossia (introduced but

not explained in the Fishman article, p. 43, see Hudson (1980), Ferguson (1959) and Fishman (1970). Trudgill (1974) and Bell (1976) have useful introductory chapters on language planning. For further discussions of language planning, see the collections (*inter alia*) by Rubin and Jernudd (1971) and Rubin and Shuy (1973), and the overview by Kennedy (1982). Relationships between language planning and bilingual education are covered comprehensively in Alatis (1978 and 1980), Fishman (1977) and Spolsky and Cooper (1977 and 1978). A very readable account of the role of language in education is to be found in Spolsky (1978).

1

Bilingual Education and Language Planning

J. RUBIN

In recent years, interest in both language planning and bilingual education has grown, each independently of the other. In this essay I would like to explore how a language-planning approach may enhance planning for bilingual education. The discussion will first elaborate on the field of language planning and then consider the contribution language planning can make to bilingual education, especially in the American context.

Language Planning

Language planning is *deliberate* language change, this is, changes in the systems of a language code or speaking or both that are planned by organisations established for such purposes or given a mandate to fulfil such purposes. Language planning begins with the identification of a problem, in particular with the identification of concrete areas of society that demand planned action regarding language resources. Language planning is thus focused on problem-solving and tries to find the best (or optimal, most efficient, most valuable) alternative to solve a problem (Rubin and Jernudd, 1971).

What might a language problem be? On the one hand, it is often defined in terms of language choice – the need to decide which variety/language will be used by certain sectors of the polity. An example of such problems might be what language to use as a medium of instruction in education, or what language to use in mass-communication, or what language to use in the legislature. It might also be defined as the modification of a language code to certain preferred specifications, namely, the modernisation and standardisation of the lexicon, grammar, pronunciation or discourse. On the other hand, language problems could and have been defined in terms of societal needs, in terms of broader socio-economic goals. Such goals might be the need for more ready access to information in industry or the need to reach a particular group to spread the message of family planning or agricultural improvements. Jernudd and Das Gupta (1971) have

suggested that the definition of language problems should focus not merely on linguistic phenomena, but rather on the socio-political motivation or rationale behind the isolation of language problems. These should be included in the classification and understanding of what language problems are. It seems that, unless we understand how changes in language code or speaking relate to and are motivated by social concerns, we cannot do proper planning; in fact, we are doomed to great frustration and waste of funds.

A couple of examples here, of the need to consider language problems in their social context, might clarify this point. Some years ago in the United States, a few linguists hit upon the idea that by writing readers in Black English they would enhance the black students' performance in school. This idea met with strong opposition. The black parents and teachers objected on the grounds that this would put black students in a disadvantageous position *vis-à-vis* the white student. Others noted that the difficulties did not lie in the language sphere but rather in the teacher's expectation of the student's incompetence. Changing the primer would not necessarily change the teacher's expectations (whether the teacher was black or white). Instead, it seemed important to focus on the teacher's attitudes. It might be said that using these Black English primers would call the teacher's attention to the student's need for greater understanding, but it would not necessarily improve the teacher's expectations of the student. More important, a programme which changes the school language without changing the society is directed only at the symptom and not at the cause of the problem. Indeed, many remedial education programmes are ineffectual because of their isolation from real-life situations.

Another example of the need to relate language planning to real-life situations is the requirement for foreign-language study in American universities. The problem identified by many was the lack of knowledge about foreign languages typical of many Americans. As a result, a great deal of value was given to the requirement that each college student take two years of language. As a consequence of the limited view of language, a great deal of money was spent on teachers, materials and students' time, but with little success. This problem was confounded by the lack of clarification of which language skills the student was indeed supposed to acquire. Still, it seems that the problem was put backward. Instead of identifying a real need in the community for this skill, such as regular communication with non-English speakers in business or social interaction, the need was seen as an academic deficiency. Naturally, the necessary motivation or goals were not present and the entire venture was doomed to fail. A language problem must arise from the social setting; the need must somehow be felt by the target/client group; advantages must be perceived by them or else the problem is not really a problem and no amount of planning can change the situation.

Another characteristic of language planning is that it is future-oriented.

That is, the outcomes of policies and strategies must be specified in detail in advance of action taken. In any forecasting there is uncertainty or risk, and therefore planning must allow for reformulations as new situations develop and as demands change. One of the useful contributions of the planning approach is that some sort of measure is established in advance, by means of which one can assess whether what was set out was achieved and/or used and whether the strategies have indeed been effective.

In an earlier paper (Rubin, 1971), I outlined several steps to the planning process: fact finding; establishing goals, strategies and outcomes; implementation; and feedback. Although planning may include these steps in different orders and degrees, consideration of all of them makes success more likely.

In the first step, the planner must have a certain amount of information about the situation in which the plan is to be effected. Probably, the more information the better. He should know something about the needs of the target or client which he intends to serve. He should know something about the sociolinguistic setting in which the plan is to be effected: what the patterns of usage are. He should recognise how his plan relates to other continuing socio-economic and political processes. He should have some idea about the value of already functioning related models – in the case of bilingual education, this would include knowledge of alternative bilingual models, of alternative effects of these models, of acceptance of these models. An example of where detailed information was gathered before making policy is the Bilingual/Bicultural Commission in Canada which did extensive studies before making its recommendations to the legislature.

In the second step, several levels of decision-making and different personnel are involved. A policy-maker may identify certain problems as requiring attention. He will then decide on the degree of priority he and his cohorts want to assign these problems, the decision depending in large part on the amount of money allocated to a particular piece of legislation. Sometimes the policy-maker decides on policy based on knowledge of prior studies and a thorough assessment of the values and attitudes involved, but more often such decisions are made without prior studies. As a result, the problem of working out strategies, assessing available materials and human resources, and coming up with proper strategies to meet the stated goals of a piece of legislation is often difficult if not impossible. In the case of US bilingual education, similar problems arose. The legislation came first, and only now are they beginning to get some training programmes and materials development going so that they can begin to accomplish what was set out as goals.

The setting of goals seems to take place at several levels. First, a legislature may establish some general goals and assign responsibility for the implementation of a piece of legislation. Then the agency or institution which receives the mandate may define these goals more specifically, taking into account the amount of funding received and the capabilities of

the staff. Finally, the implementors may define the goals in terms of the local situation. Often, in actual planning, outcomes are not established in advance, even though it would be helpful if they were. Then, one could have some sort of evaluation of the strategies used.

The next step in planning is implementation. This process could involve (a) mobilisation of resources and general financial and personnel management, (b) motivation and supervision of those concerned with both the management of the programme and its targets, (c) the sequencing and co-ordination of related aspects of the policy, such as the preparation of texts in languages not formerly used as media of instruction. Needless to say, proper implementation is a critical variable in the success of any plan.

The fourth step in the planning process is evaluation. This includes analysis of trends and a general monitoring system as well as evaluation of specific aspects of a particular programme. The planner needs to know whether the plan has in fact worked. He must assess whether the actual outcome matches his predicted outcome, and if not, why not. He must know this to modify his strategies in order to achieve his predicted outcome. Again, evaluation, while critical at all states of planning, is often the least attended to.

This completes the list and definition of the four steps or parts of planning: that is, fact finding; policy setting with goals specification, consideration of strategies and resources and predicted outcomes; implementation; and feedback. It is clear that planning in fact never quite matches this model. Not all planning includes the necessary evaluation or has the appropriate prior fact finding. Goals are often multiple, hidden and not well ordered. Outcomes are not clearly specified in advance. But the model is there to help us when we need it. In addition, it is probably not a good thing to think of planning as a series of steps but rather to recognise that these steps may come into play at different points in the planning process. For example, goals may be set at a very high level in response to some general feeling that a problem exists. Then, before proceeding with the establishment of strategies, it might be necessary to gather further facts. Or evaluation might be included as a regular part of the implementation process.

There are several things to notice about language planning. First, policy-making is not planning. Often, when evaluating the process of language planning, people say that language planning has failed. Upon closer examination, it turns out that there was little clear indication of the means of implementing the policy and little consideration of alternative means to achieve the goals. If the policy-maker does not have proper background information and does not recognise that the plan must be co-ordinated with other socio-cultural processes, it is more than likely to remain just a policy. A simple example will indicate what I mean. A Russian scholar tried to show the failure of Russian planning by pointing to the fact that a plan to substitute one particular word for another failed. Yet, upon further

consideration of what the government did do to try to change usage, it became clear that all the government had done was to make a pronouncement without offering incentives for use or sanctions for misuse, without specifying when this usage must be in effect. This is *not* planning, just policy setting. Another example of a lack of planning is the foreign-language requirement in US universities. The language requirement was established without specifying what the skills to be attained were, without considering the student's need for this skill, and without considering social opportunities to use this skill. How could one be expected to relate goals to outcomes? No real planning was carried out.

In evaluating language planning, it should be clear what the goals really are. Is the policy meant to contribute to changes in language usage or is it meant to serve certain other, sometimes hidden goals? A case in point concerns the Irish language. For years people have evaluated the attempt to make Irish the language of Ireland as unsuccessful. Indeed, many Irish scholars have told us that it was a failure. But if we look at the situation with a little more care, I think that we can say that the Irish planning might be considered successful. Even though the stated goal was to make Irish a household language, it seems that a major real goal was to achieve Irish liberation and nationalism. This they have done with consummate success. The point is that it is important to distinguish between real and stated goals. Quite often the policy-makers mask what their real goals are for quite obvious political reasons. Evaluation of language planning must take this practice into account in assessing success.

In order to make a proper evaluation of the goals and their outcome, I have divided intended aims into three general areas: linguistic aims, semi-linguistic aims, and extra-linguistic aims.

Under the rubric of semi-linguistic aims are included instances where changes in the language serve not only linguistic aims but also social or political aims. The aims might be related to political control as well as to language benefits. In the most recent Russian decision that ethnic languages be written in Cyrillic rather than in Roman script, as they previously had been, it can be seen that there are distinct linguistic advantages because speakers of the ethnic languages will not have to learn two systems. However, the decision clearly has political aims in that, since Russian is written in Cyrillic, learning to read through Cyrillic script will facilitate learning to read in Russian rather than in those languages written in Roman script. Another example of semilinguistic aims is the US Bilingual Education Act and the rationale behind its passage. Bilingual education came right on the heels of the civil rights movement and relates as much to demands for socio-political and economic rights as it does to concerns for pedagogical improvement.

In some cases, no real language problem exists, yet non-linguistic goals are aided by focusing on language problems. These I call extra-linguistic aims. An interesting case turns up in West Africa, where language

differences were exaggerated in order to express national differences. Two different spellings were created for the Hausa language so as to emphasise national differences, although no real linguistic needs would seem to be served. A more striking case occurred in Russia for some of its Turkic languages. Stephan Wurm (1960) has documented the practice of deliberately writing orthographic representations of the same sound in different languages in a distinct manner in order to present recognition of strong cultural affinities among some Turkic peoples.

The point of this three-way division is to note that, in evaluating language planning, it is necessary to be clear about what the goals of the policy-makers really were, even though they might not make their goals explicit. Otherwise our conclusions about the success or failure of language planning will be incorrect. In any event, it is important to note that language planning involves many steps and many people and multiple goals. The process of translation of these goals may often distort the original goals of the policy-makers.

One final point before looking at language planning and bilingual education: it is important to see language planning within the framework of continuing socio-cultural interaction patterns and needs. If this is not taken into account, the chances for success are predictably quite low. This is because language is more than an instrument to impart referential meaning. Language is a *social activity* which serves to identify the speaker and to place him in a particular relationship with the addressee. In acquiring language, which is done in a social setting, we learn how to communicate our intent, how to effect social control, and how to achieve effectiveness regarding some communicative task. Surely language planning must take account of these functions if its purpose is to change human behaviour. It must have the co-operation of the target or client population if the policy is to be effective. Good planning must recognise that language serves important social functions.

An illustration is the Hawaiian setting. In Hawaii, many speakers of Pidgin English are thought not to know Standard English. It has been observed that in fact many of them do know Standard English, but are unwilling to demonstrate this knowledge on tests (Day, 1974). The point here is that language knowledge is related very directly to feelings of social identity and social mobility. Those individuals who identify more with the local culture and who do not aspire to a more mainland style of culture are the ones who demonstrate little knowledge of Standard English. That is, their behaviour is not related so much to efforts to teach them English as to their own social goals. In contrast, the Russians have often been quite successful in their attempts to teach Russian because other planning strategies enhanced the need for Russian. In particular, Russian migration patterns led to intermarriage with the other ethnic groups and to greater use by the other ethnic groups of the Russian language. The planning worked because it went hand in hand with processes of socio-cultural

change. There are many other examples, but the point seems self-evident.

Language Planning and Bilingual Education

Let us consider next what light language planning can shed on bilingual education. It should help to clarify and make more specific goals, strategies and outcomes. It seems necessary that those interested in bilingual education should be clear about the goals, settings, values and attitudes, and the functions of languages involved as well as concerning themselves with the universal strategies for teaching reading and subject-matter in mother tongue and in a second language.

A first consideration policy-makers should take into account is what the *real* goal of bilingual education is. Bilingual education is usually not merely a pedagogical strategy to improve learning. More often it is connected to other social goals. In a widely reprinted article, Kjolseth (1970) pointed to two divergent goals within bilingual education. On the one hand, there is the pluralistic model which is characterised by the goal of *stable* bilingualism and biculturalism. On the other hand, Kjolseth (1970) described an assimilation model in which bilingualism and biculturalism are seen as a transition to unilingualism and uniculturalism. Kjolseth notes that the latter seems to be the predominant model in the United States. Most of our bilingual education planning will depend on which model we choose. If the plurilingual model is preferred, bilingual education will be continued throughout the school system. It will be promoted among the major language speakers as well as among those from the minority languages. However, if assimilation is the model we choose, only minority-language members will be 'subjected' to bilingual education and only for the minimum amount of time necessary.

Some would question the expenditure of any money for bilingual education, even if one holds the assimilation model. A recent article by Stephen Rosenfeld, journalist, in the *Washington Post*, challenges the wisdom of the increase in funds for bilingual education. The article illustrates a common fear that bilingual education will somehow destroy the national unity of the United States. Rosenfeld expressed concern for the validity of using bilingual education to achieve even the assimilation model. He emphasises his concern by citing Nathan Glazer, a noted scholar of ethnicity, who, he says, raised the question: 'Is the current wave of ethnic feeling which now seems to be sweeping over America – the wave which carried bilingualism into public policy – weakening this common American glue and aggravating ethnic tensions and differences?' Rosenfeld challenges the idea that bilingual education can serve as a means of achieving eventual assimilation.

It seems clear that, before deciding on bilingual policy, the policy-makers need to be clear that their vision of the country is one that fits with the