Nancy H. Hornberger
*General Editor*

SPRINGER REFERENCE

*Editors*
Jim Cummins
Nancy H. Hornberger

# Encyclopedia of Language and Education

SECOND EDITION

# 语言与教育百科全书

（第2版）

*Bilingual Education*

双语教育

VOLUME 5

上海外语教育出版社
外教社 SHANGHAI FOREIGN LANGUAGE EDUCATION PRESS
www.sflep.com

# Encyclopedia of Language and Education

# 语言与教育百科全书

（第2版）

Volume 5

# BILINGUAL EDUCATION

# 双语教育

*Edited by*

JIM CUMMINS

*University of Toronto*
*Ontario Institute for Studies in Education*
*Canada*

*and*

NANCY H. HORNBERGER

*University of Pennsylvania*
*Graduate School of Education*
*USA*

上海外语教育出版社
外教社 SHANGHAI FOREIGN LANGUAGE EDUCATION PRESS

Springer

**图书在版编目（CIP）数据**

语言与教育百科全书：第2版.5／（美）霍恩伯格（Hornberger, N. H.）总主编.
—上海：上海外语教育出版社，2012
ISBN 978-7-5446-2381-0

I. 语… II. 霍… III. ①语言学—百科全书—英文 ②教育学—百科全书—英文
IV. ①H0-61 ②G40-61

中国版本图书馆CIP数据核字（2011）第175032号

**图字：09-2009-492号**



**项目总负责：庄智象**
**责任编辑：孙 玉 孙 静 蔡一鸣 许进兴 张亚东 梁晓莉**

出版发行：上海外语教育出版社
（上海外国语大学内） 邮编：200083
电 话：021-65425300（总机）
电子邮箱：bookinfo@sflep.com.cn
网 址：http://www.sflep.com.cn http://www.sflep.com
责任编辑：孙 静

印 刷：上海当纳利印刷有限公司
开 本：700×1000 1/16 印张 25 字数 545 千字
版 次：2012年2月第1版 2012年2月第1次印刷
印 数：1 500册

书 号：ISBN 978-7-5446-2381-0 / Z・0049
定 价：1800.00元（全套10卷）

ENCYCLOPEDIA OF LANGUAGE AND EDUCATION

SECOND EDITION

# Encyclopedia of Language and Education

## VOLUME 5: BILINGUAL EDUCATION



*The volume titles of this encyclopedia are listed at the end of this volume.*

# Encyclopedia of Language and Education

Volume 5

# BILINGUAL EDUCATION

*Edited by*

JIM CUMMINS

*University of Toronto*
*Ontario Institute for Studies in Education*
*Canada*

*and*

NANCY H. HORNBERGER

*University of Pennsylvania*
*Graduate School of Education*
*USA*

*Volume Editors:*
Jim Cummins
University of Toronto
Department of Curriculum, Teaching, Learning
Ontario Institute for Studies in Education
Toronto, M5S 1V6
Canada
jcummins@oise.utoronto.ca

Nancy H. Hornberger
University of Pennsylvania
Graduate School of Education
Philadelphia, PA 19104-6216
USA
nancyh@gse.upenn.edu

*General Editor:*
Nancy H. Hornberger
University of Pennsylvania
Graduate School of Education
Philadelphia, PA 19104-6216
USA
nancyh@gse.upenn.edu

*Library of Congress Control Number:* 2007925265

ISBN-13: 978-0-387-32875-1

The electronic version will be available under ISBN 978-0-387-30424-3
The print and electronic bundle will be available under ISBN 978-0-387-35420-0

Printed on acid-free paper.



9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 0

springer.com

NANCY H. HORNBERGER

# GENERAL EDITOR'S INTRODUCTION[1]

## ENCYCLOPEDIA OF LANGUAGE AND EDUCATION

This is one of ten volumes of the *Encyclopedia of Language and Education* published by Springer. The Encyclopedia bears testimony to the dynamism and evolution of the language and education field, as it confronts the ever-burgeoning and irrepressible linguistic diversity and ongoing pressures and expectations placed on education around the world.

The publication of this work charts the deepening and broadening of the field of language and education since the 1997 publication of the first Encyclopedia. It also confirms the vision of David Corson, general editor of the first edition, who hailed the international and interdisciplinary significance and cohesion of the field. These trademark characteristics are evident in every volume and chapter of the present Encyclopedia.

In the selection of topics and contributors, the Encyclopedia seeks to reflect the depth of disciplinary knowledge, breadth of interdisciplinary perspective, and diversity of sociogeographic experience in our field. Language socialization and language ecology have been added to the original eight volume topics, reflecting these growing emphases in language education theory, research, and practice, alongside the enduring emphases on language policy, literacies, discourse, language acquisition, bilingual education, knowledge about language, language testing, and research methods. Throughout all the volumes, there is greater inclusion of scholarly contributions from non-English speaking and non-Western parts of the world, providing truly global coverage of the issues in the field. Furthermore, we have sought to integrate these voices more fully into the whole, rather than as special cases or international perspectives in separate sections.

This interdisciplinary and internationalizing impetus has been immeasurably enhanced by the advice and support of the editorial advisory board members, several of whom served as volume editors in the Encyclopedia's first edition (designated here with*), and all of whom I acknowledge here with gratitude: Neville Alexander (South Africa), Colin Baker (Wales), Marilda Cavalcanti (Brazil), Caroline Clapham* (Britain),

[1] This introduction is based on, and takes inspiration from, David Corson's general editor's Introduction to the First Edition (Kluwer, 1997).

*J. Cummins and N. H. Hornberger (eds), Encyclopedia of Language and Education, 2nd Edition, Volume 5: Bilingual Education, ix–xi.*

Bronwyn Davies* (Australia), Viv Edwards* (Britain), Frederick Erickson (USA), Joseph Lo Bianco (Australia), Luis Enrique Lopez (Bolivia and Peru), Allan Luke (Singapore and Australia), Tove Skutnabb-Kangas (Denmark), Bernard Spolsky (Israel), G. Richard Tucker* (USA), Leo van Lier* (USA), Terrence G. Wiley (USA), Ruth Wodak* (Austria), and Ana Celia Zentella (USA).

In conceptualizing an encyclopedic approach to a field, there is always the challenge of the hierarchical structure of themes, topics, and subjects to be covered. In this *Encyclopedia of Language and Education*, the stated topics in each volume's table of contents are complemented by several cross-cutting thematic strands recurring across the volumes, including the classroom/pedagogic side of language and education; issues of identity in language and education; language ideology and education; computer technology and language education; and language rights in relation to education.

The volume editors' disciplinary and interdisciplinary academic interests and their international areas of expertise also reflect the depth and breadth of the language and education field. As principal volume editor for Volume 1, Stephen May brings academic interests in the sociology of language and language education policy, arising from his work in Britain, North America, and New Zealand. For Volume 2, Brian Street approaches language and education as social and cultural anthropologist and critical literacy theorist, drawing on his work in Iran, Britain, and around the world. For Volume 3, Marilyn Martin-Jones and Anne-Marie de Mejia bring combined perspectives as applied and educational linguists, working primarily in Britain and Latin America, respectively. For Volume 4, Nelleke Van Deusen-Scholl has academic interests in linguistics and sociolinguistics, and has worked primarily in the Netherlands and the USA. Jim Cummins, principal volume editor for Volume 5 of both the first and second editions of the Encyclopedia, has interests in the psychology of language, critical applied linguistics, and language policy, informed by his work in Canada, the USA, and internationally. For Volume 6, Jasone Cenoz has academic interests in applied linguistics and language acquisition, drawing from her work in the Basque Country, Spain, and Europe. Elana Shohamy, principal volume editor for Volume 7, approaches language and education as an applied linguist with interests in critical language policy, language testing and measurement, and her own work based primarily in Israel and the USA. For Volume 8, Patricia Duff has interests in applied linguistics and sociolinguistics, and has worked primarily in North America, East Asia, and Central Europe. Volume editors for Volume 9, Angela Creese and Peter Martin, draw on their academic interests in educational linguistics and linguistic ethnography, and their research in Britain and Southeast Asia. And for Volume 10, Kendall A. King has academic interests in

sociolinguistics and educational linguistics, with work in Ecuador, Sweden, and the USA. Francis Hult, editorial assistant for the Encyclopedia, has academic interests in educational and applied linguistics and educational language policy, and has worked in Sweden and the USA. Finally, as general editor, I have interests in anthropological linguistics, educational linguistics, and language policy, with work in Latin America, the USA, and internationally. Beyond our specific academic interests, all of us editors, and the contributors to the Encyclopedia, share a commitment to the practice and theory of education, critically informed by research and strategically directed toward addressing unsound or unjust language education policies and practices wherever they are found.

Each of the ten volumes presents core information and is international in scope, as well as diverse in the populations it covers. Each volume addresses a single subject area and provides 23–30 state-of-the-art chapters of the literature on that subject. Together, the chapters aim to comprehensively cover the subject. The volumes, edited by international experts in their respective topics, were designed and developed in close collaboration with the general editor of the Encyclopedia, who is a co-editor of each volume as well as general editor of the whole work.

Each chapter is written by one or more experts on the topic, consists of about 4,000 words of text, and generally follows a similar structure. A list of references to key works supplements the authoritative information that the chapter contains. Many contributors survey early developments, major contributions, work in progress, problems and difficulties, and future directions. The aim of the chapters, and of the Encyclopedia as a whole, is to give readers access to the international literature and research on the broad diversity of topics that make up the field.

The Encyclopedia is a necessary reference set for every university and college library in the world that serves a faculty or school of education. The encyclopedia aims to speak to a prospective readership that is multinational, and to do so as unambiguously as possible. Because each book-size volume deals with a discrete and important subject in language and education, these state-of-the-art volumes also offer highly authoritative course textbooks in the areas suggested by their titles.

The scholars contributing to the Encyclopedia hail from all continents of our globe and from 41 countries; they represent a great diversity of linguistic, cultural, and disciplinary traditions. For all that, what is most impressive about the contributions gathered here is the unity of purpose and outlook they express with regard to the central role of language as both vehicle and mediator of educational processes and to the need for continued and deepening research into the limits and possibilities that implies.

Nancy H. Hornberger

# INTRODUCTION TO VOLUME 5: BILINGUAL EDUCATION

The term *bilingual education* refers to the use of two (or more) languages of instruction at some point in a student's school career. The languages are used to teach subject matter content rather than just the language itself. This apparently simple description entails considerable complexity deriving from a multitude of sociopolitical, sociolinguistic, psychological, economic, administrative, and instructional factors. Thus, the goals, implementation, and outcomes of bilingual education programs can be analyzed from a wide range of disciplinary perspectives.

Bilingual education can be traced back to Greek and Roman times and currently a large majority of countries throughout the world offer some form of bilingual education either in public or private school settings. Formal academic research has been conducted on bilingualism and bilingual education since the 1920s and a voluminous academic literature has accumulated on these topics. Since the publication of the first edition of the *Encyclopedia of Language and Education* in 1997, the psychoeducational research on bilingual education has been synthesized and evaluated by several independent research teams (e.g., August and Shanahan, 2006; Cummins, 2001; Genesee, Lindholm-Leary, Saunders, and Christian, 2006) and considerable confidence can be placed in some general conclusions about the outcomes of bilingual education. However, controversy surrounding bilingual education continues unabated in a number of countries.

To take just one example, the level of antipathy towards bilingual education in the USA over a 25-year period is reflected in the views of prominent politicians and social commentators. President Reagan characterized bilingual education in 1981 as "absolutely wrong and against American concepts." Ten years later, historian Arthur Schlesinger Jr. opined that "bilingualism shuts doors" and "monolingual education opens doors to the larger world" (see Cummins, 2001). In early 2007, former Speaker of the House of Representatives, Newt Gingrich, characterized bilingual education as "stunningly destructive" and argued that American civilization will "decay" unless the government declares English the nation's official language.

These conclusions are contradicted by the outcomes of all recent research reviews on the effects of bilingual education, including the

*J. Cummins and N. H. Hornberger (eds), Encyclopedia of Language and Education, 2nd Edition, Volume 5: Bilingual Education, xiii–xxiii.*

August and Shanahan volume that reported the findings of the National Literacy Panel on Language Minority Children and Youth set up by the US government to evaluate the scientific evidence on this topic. The oppositional hyperbole clearly reflects the sociopolitical and ideological dimensions of bilingual education rather than its educational outcomes. The use of a language as a medium of instruction in state-funded school systems confers recognition and status on that language and its speakers. Consequently, bilingual education is not simply a politically neutral instructional phenomenon but rather is implicated in national and international competition between groups for material and symbolic resources.

Bilingual programs are usually minimally controversial when they are implemented to serve the interests of dominant groups in the society. In Canada, for example, little controversy exists in relation either to French immersion programs intended to support anglophone students in learning French or French language programs intended to help minority francophone students outside of Quebec maintain French. These programs serve the interests of the two official language groups. However, only in the province of Alberta and the territory of Nunavut in the Arctic region has there been widespread implementation of bilingual programs involving languages other than English and French. Similarly, in Europe, there have been very few bilingual programs set up to serve migrant populations in comparison to those that teach the languages of national minorities whose status has been formally recognized within the society.

Thus, the controversy in the USA can be seen in the context of the fact that it is one of the few countries in the world that has implemented bilingual education on a reasonably large scale for minority groups that do not have legally recognized status as national minorities or as official language groups.

## RESEARCH FOUNDATION

As noted above, there is considerable consensus among applied linguists regarding the outcomes of bilingual programs. The research on bilingual education supports the following conclusions:

1. **Bilingual programs for minority and majority language students have been successfully implemented in countries around the world.** As documented in the reviews in this volume and its first edition predecessor, students educated for part of the day through a minority language do not suffer adverse consequences in the development of academic skills in the majority language. As one example, there are more than 300,000 English-background students in various forms of French–English bilingual programs

in Canada (see Genesee and Lindholm-Leary, Dual Language Education in Canada and the USA, Volume 5).

2. **The development of literacy in two languages entails linguistic and cognitive advantages for bilingual students.** There are hundreds of research studies carried out since the early 1960s that report significant advantages for bilingual students on a variety of metalinguistic and cognitive tasks (reviewed in Cummins, 2001). Bilingual students get more practice in learning language resulting in greater attentional control and higher levels of metalinguistic awareness.
3. **Significant positive relationships exist between the development of academic skills in first and second languages (L1 and L2).** This is true even for languages that are dissimilar (e.g., Spanish and Basque; English and Chinese; Dutch and Turkish). These cross-lingual relationships provide evidence for a *common underlying proficiency* (or what Genesee, Lindholm-Leary, Saunders, and Christian (2005) call a cross-linguistic *reservoir of abilities*) that permits transfer of academic and conceptual knowledge across languages. This transfer of skills and knowledge explains why spending instructional time through a minority language entails no adverse consequences for the development of the majority language.
4. **The most successful bilingual programs are those that aim to develop bilingualism and biliteracy.** Transitional bilingual programs provide some L1 instruction as a short-term bridge to mainstream instruction in the dominant language. However, these short-term programs are less successful, in general, than programs that continue to promote both L1 and L2 literacy throughout elementary school. Particularly successful (in the USA) are *dual-language programs* that serve majority-language dominant students in the same classes as minority students with each group acting as linguistic models for the other.
5. **Bilingual education for minority students is, in many situations, more effective in developing L2 literacy skills than monolingual education in the dominant language but it is not, by itself, a panacea for underachievement.** Francis, Lesaux, and August (2006), writing in the August and Shanahan volume, summarize the outcomes of the bilingual programs they reviewed:

> In summary, there is no indication that bilingual instruction impedes academic achievement in either the native language or English, whether for language-minority students, students receiving heritage language instruction, or those enrolled in French immersion programs. Where differences were observed, on average they

> favored the students in a bilingual program. The meta-analytic results clearly suggest a positive effect for bilingual instruction that is moderate in size. (2006, p. 397)

However, underachievement derives from many sources and simply providing some first language instruction will not, by itself, transform students' educational experience. As outlined in many of the papers in this volume, effective instruction will affirm student identities and build on the cultural and linguistic knowledge they bring to the classroom.

## OVERVIEW

The first ten chapters analyze a range of conceptual issues in bilingual education while the remaining chapters focus on bilingual programs in specific geographical contexts. McCarty and Skutnabb-Kangas initially clarify the terminology, distinctions, and definitions that clutter the bilingual education landscape. They pay particular attention to the ideological underpinnings of terminology evident in the ways in which issues and debates are framed.

May elaborates on some of the relevant types of bilingual education and reviews some of the major research studies supporting the positive outcomes of L1 instruction for minority language students. He cautions, however, that research results cannot be interpreted in a vacuum—the social and educational context is always relevant in determining what types of program will be appropriate and successful.

Lo Bianco reviews some of the early findings that suggested positive cognitive and linguistic effects of bilingualism and which opened the field of discourse to the implementation of enrichment, as opposed to compensatory, bilingual education. He then goes on to examine the intersection of sociopolitical and educational factors in the ways bilingual programs have been implemented in the USA, Australia, and Sri Lanka.

Schwinge focuses on the development of biliteracy within bilingual programs. She adopts Hornberger's (1990, p. 213) definition of biliteracy as "any and all instances in which communication occurs in two (or more) languages in or around writing." The research she reviews is primarily ethnographic in nature, some of which is framed explicitly within Hornberger's (2003) *Continua of Biliteracy* framework. Schwinge's review emphasizes the importance of students' linguistic and cultural funds of knowledge as a basis for learning, the reality of transfer across languages as revealed by qualitative research, and instructional approaches that have shown promise in promoting biliteracy.

Cummins highlights the fact that monolingual instructional assumptions continue to dominate pedagogy in bilingual programs. These assumptions are reflected in the rigid separation of languages in many

bilingual programs and the rejection of translation as a potential instructional strategy (e.g., in the writing and web-publication of dual-language books by students). These assumptions have resulted in minimal teaching for transfer (L1 to L2, L2 to L1) within bilingual programs and lost opportunities to optimize both language accomplishments and academic achievement.

Freeman's paper examines how broader societal power relations among local and global communities shape the forms of bilingual education that are implemented and the teacher–student interactions that occur within bilingual programs. The historical and current power relations operating in any particular society can affect how the term *bilingual education* is perceived by different groups. In New Zealand, for example, the term has negative connotations for Maori educators and communities attempting to revitalize the Maori language through Maori-medium schooling. In this context, bilingual education implies a dilution of the emphasis on Maori language and culture. Freeman points out that student identities are constantly being negotiated and shaped within all forms of schooling and thus different forms of bilingual or monolingual instruction are never neutral with respect to the intersection of student/community identities and societal power relations.

Jessner reviews recent challenges to the implicit conceptualization of the bilingual as a "double monolingual." The term *multicompetence* has been adopted to highlight the fact that L2 users have a different mental structure than monolinguals. The dynamic model of multilingualism described by Jessner goes beyond just positing an overlap or interdependence between L1 and L2; rather a complete metamorphosis of the cognitive systems of the bi/multilingual individual is involved. This approach adopts a holistic view of L2/L3 users, and argues for the establishment of multilingual rather than monolingual norms within sociolinguistic and educational contexts. This orientation has important implications for both instruction and assessment of L2 users.

Francis presents an alternative approach to conceptualizing the cognitive structure of bi/multilingual individuals. He points out that modular approaches to the study of bilingualism attempt to analyze the cognitive components that make up a person's knowledge of two languages and his or her ability to use them. To what extent are these components autonomous domains and in what ways do they interact with other components? Francis discusses the possibility that there may be degrees of modularity in which some aspects of language development might unfold in a highly modular or "closed" way while others may be more interactive or open-ended. He relates this discussion to the notion of a cross-linguistic common underlying proficiency as well as to a number of practical issues in instruction and testing.

Skutnabb-Kangas analyzes the intersections between language rights and bilingual education. Linguistic minorities are protected by specific language rights in certain countries and, in addition, all are provided with some general protections under various United Nations charters and other conventions. However, there are relatively few binding *positive* rights to mother-tongue medium education or bilingual education in present international law. Most language-related human rights are *negative* rights designed to promote equality by prohibiting discrimination on the basis of language. Skutnabb-Kangas suggests that the resistance by national governments to the implementation of maintenance-oriented mother-tongue education derives from the fact that these programs are capable of reproducing minorities as minorities—in other words, they operate to counteract assimilation and the disappearance of the minority group as a distinct entity.

The final chapter of this initial section illustrates the struggle for linguistic human rights by means of a case study of the implementation of bilingual-bicultural education for Deaf students in Ontario, Canada. Small and Mason point out that the Education Act in Ontario allows the use of American Sign Language (ASL) and Langue des signes quebecois (LSQ) as languages of instruction in schools. However, the legislation is only permissive insofar as it does not *require* schools serving Deaf students to use ASL nor does it require teachers to have ASL proficiency. The Deaf community has mobilized to pressure the province to strengthen ASL regulations and also to ensure that all Deaf children have the opportunity to gain access to a strong first language. Currently, children who receive a cochlear implant are effectively prohibited from learning ASL by provincial regulations despite the fact that there is no research evidence to support this policy. In fact, the research clearly shows that Deaf children who develop strong ASL proficiency perform better in English literacy skills.

The remaining chapters focus on illustrative bilingual education programs and policies in different regions of the world. Obondo reviews the situation in several post-colonial African countries where policymakers have struggled with the decision of whether to continue with programs that use the colonial language as the medium of instruction in schools or to implement initial mother tongue or bilingual instruction. Research data suggest that significantly better outcomes are attained in mother-tongue medium programs. However, the sociolinguistic complexities of the relationships between local, regional, and national languages in many countries create challenges for implementing mother tongue programs.

Similar multilingual complexities exist in India. Mohanty traces the development of multilingual education from the inception of the "three-language policy" in 1957. This policy envisaged a regional

language or mother tongue as the language of instruction for the first five years of schooling followed by Hindi (in non-Hindi areas) or another Indian language (in Hindi areas) from the sixth to the eighth year of schooling, with English taking over as the language of instruction after that point. This policy has evolved such that currently the majority language of each state has become the first language and medium of instruction in state-sponsored schools with English as the most common second language subject followed by either Hindi or Sanskrit as a third language subject. Mohanty concludes that application of the three-language formula has been erratic and that there has been a lack of coherent language planning in the Indian context.

Yu focuses on recent developments in English–Chinese bilingual education in the Chinese context. Programs have been implemented at the university level and in both public and private schools. At the university level the goal of English–Chinese bilingual education is to meet the challenge of economic globalization and technological expansion by ensuring that Chinese scholars have access to scientific developments which are predominantly published and discussed in English at this point in time. Yu points out that English–Chinese bilingual education is at a very early stage in the Chinese context. For example, the bilingual programs in secondary and primary schools in Shanghai do not have their own curriculum and the teachers who are teaching through English must adapt the regular Chinese-medium curriculum. No guidelines are available for how to improve English proficiency within the context of a bilingual program and thus teachers involved in these recent innovations are faced with multiple challenges.

Pakir provides a historical overview of the development of bilingual education policy in Singapore and evaluates its outcomes in light of international academic comparisons. English is the major medium of instruction in all Singapore schools but the mother tongues of the major groups (Chinese, Malay, Tamil) are also taught. In general, students from the major language backgrounds in Singapore have performed well in international comparisons, not only in mathematics and science but also on measures of English literacy where their scores are at similar levels to several countries where English is the first language of students and the medium of instruction in school (e.g., New Zealand, Scotland).

The chapter by Bahry, Niyozov, and Shamatov reviews the complex sociolinguistic situation in the Central Asian independent states of Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan, and Uzbekistan all of which were republics of the USSR until 1991. The chapter traces developments in the types of schooling provided in Central Asia and outlines current and future challenges for bilingual education as an option for the education systems of this region. Despite the multilingualism that characterizes the entire region, there are relatively few