

Tove Skutnabb-Kangas and Teresa L. McCarty

KEY CONCEPTS IN BILINGUAL EDUCATION: IDEOLOGICAL, HISTORICAL, EPISTEMOLOGICAL, AND EMPIRICAL FOUNDATIONS

In Volume 5, **Bilingual Education**, eds Jim Cummins & Nancy Hornberger. **Encyclopedia of Language and Education**, 2nd edition. New York: Springer, 3-17.

Introduction: Why Do We Need to Define Concepts?

The concepts we use are almost never neutral. In contested arenas such as bilingual education, words and concepts frame and construct the phenomena under discussion, making some persons and groups visible, others invisible; some the unmarked norm, others marked and negative. Choice of language can minoritise or distort some individuals, groups, phenomena, and relations while majoritising and glorifying others. Concepts also can be defined in ways that hide, expose, rationalize, or question power relations.

Because concepts and terms develop historically, the same concept may have several definitions. For example, “language immersion” has historically been associated with French-Canadian immersion for middle-class Anglophones (Cummins & Swain, 1986; Lambert & Tucker, 1986). The term was misleadingly appropriated by U.S. policymakers to describe submersion programmes (called “structured immersion”), despite protest from the concept’s originator (Lambert, 1984: 26-27). Recently the term has taken on new meaning in Indigenous-language immersion programmes to revitalize endangered Indigenous languages (Bear Nicholas, 2005; Hinton & Hale, 2001; Hinton et al., 2002). The ideological, historical, epistemic, and empirical bases for these varied uses of “immersion” are distinct, as are program practices.

A further reason for interrogating concepts is the presence of multiple paradigms. For example, literacy can be defined as the ability to read and write. Yet this definition masks two different paradigms informing literacy research and practice. *Autonomous* views characterize literacy as abstract, neutral, and independent from the social context and language users (Ong, 1982). *Ideological* views characterize literacy as “socially and historically situated, fluid, multiple, and power-linked” (McCarty, 2005: xvii-xviii; Street, 1984, 2001). Educationally, an autonomous view emphasizes discrete language skills, often taught through direct instruction and scripted phonics programs. An ideological view binds reading and writing to oracy, emphasizing the development of different literacies (and multiliteracies) for different purposes through meaningful social interaction and critical examination of authentic texts.

In this chapter, we define and “unpack” key concepts in bilingual education, focusing on those encountered most frequently in the research and pedagogical literature. We then examine one illustrative case – the term “limited English proficient” in U.S. language policy – to illustrate the ideological, historical, and empirical underpinnings of such concepts. We conclude by considering the implications of this work for bilingual education practice and linguistic human rights.

Key Concepts and Terms

Additive language learning. A new language is learned *in addition to* the mother tongue, which continues to be developed. The learner’s total linguistic repertoire is extended.

Assimilation. Process by which minoritised peoples are brought into conformity with the dominant language and culture, often through coercive practices to replace heritage languages and cultures with those of the majority.

Bi-/multilingual education. Use of two or more languages as media of instruction in subjects other than the languages themselves (Andersson & Boyer, 1978). *Non-forms* of bi-/multilingual education lead to monolingualism, and include: (1) mainstream monolingual programmes with foreign language teaching for dominant language speakers; (2) monolingual dominant-language medium programmes in which Indigenous/minority children learn the mother tongue/heritage language as a subject, often outside regular school hours; (3) submersion (“sink-or-swim”) programmes; and (4) segregation programmes. *Weak forms* aim for strong dominance in the majority language, and include transitional (1) early-exit, and (2) late-exit programmes. *Strong forms* include: (1) mother-tongue maintenance or language shelter programmes; (2) two-way bilingual (dual language) programmes; and (3) plural multilingual programmes such as the special European Union Schools. Only strong forms lead to high levels of bi-/multilingualism and are associated with greater academic success for language minority students (Thomas & Collier 2002). These programmes also respect linguistic human rights.

Bi-/multilingualism. Includes: (1) *individual bi-/multilingualism*, sometimes called plurilingualism, involving proficiency in and use of two or more languages by an individual; the term does not always imply an equally high level of proficiency in all the relevant languages; (2) *societal bi-/multilingualism*, when two or more languages are widely used in a community or state; the term does not always assume official status for the languages; (3) *bilingualism as an educational goal*, a bilingual speaker who is able to function in two or more languages in monolingual or multilingual communities at the same level as native speakers and in accordance with the sociocultural demands for communicative and cognitive competence by these communities and the individual, and who identifies positively with both (or all) language groups and cultures, or parts of them (Skutnabb-Kangas, 1984: 90).

Content and language-integrated learning (CLIL)/ Cognitive academic language learning (CALLA). The teaching of some subjects through the target language; an approach to language learning through content-area study (www.clilcompendium.com/brief.htm; Chamot & O’Malley, 1994).

Ecology of languages. The study of languages in their ecological and sociocultural context; a perspective on the relationship between languages guiding language policy strategies, with the goal of achieving a harmonious balance between all languages in a given environment (Fill & Mühlhäusler, 2001; Haugen, 1972; Hornberger, 2003; Mühlhäusler, 2003; Skutnabb-Kangas, Maffi, & Harmon, 2003).

English-as-a-second-language (ESL). English can be a second language: (1) in terms of the order of learning (as opposed to a first language); and/or (2) when used in the environment outside the classroom (as opposed to English-as-a-foreign language [EFL], which involves

primarily classroom learning). ESL contexts include those in which English is learned by those for whom it is not the mother tongue (e.g., Indigenous peoples and immigrants in Australia), and postcolonial settings in which English remains the language of power (e.g., Nigeria, Singapore). English is also a second language in European countries in which English proficiency is required for key functions such as in higher education or commerce (e.g., the Netherlands, Sweden), and where there is considerable exposure to English in the wider society (e.g., in the media).

English-only. Also called U.S. English and Official English (<http://www.us-english.org/inc>), this U.S.-based political movement seeks to ban instruction and public discourse in languages other than English (Crawford, 1992; González & Melis, 2000, 2001). English-only policies exist in 23 U.S. states.

Ethnicity/ethnic identity. Historical, geographical, cultural, linguistic, sociolinguistic, and/or national associations that bind individuals together as a distinct, self-identified group. Group-defining characteristics may include common descent (“factual” or “mythical”), religion, and social organization. Although language is not a defining characteristic of ethnicity for all people, it has been accorded priority by many (Fishman, 1989, 1999; Smolicz, 1979). All people, not only minorities, possess ethnic identities.

European Union Schools. Special EU schools with sections for various languages in which each language (mostly students’ mother tongue) is the primary medium of education. The first foreign language is taught as a subject from grade 1; a few context-embedded subjects (e.g., physical education, arts, etc.) are taught in mixed groups through this language from grade 3, preferably with no mother tongue speakers; a few additional subjects are taught through it in later grades, but decontextualised verbally and intellectually demanding subjects (e.g. history) are taught through the medium of the first foreign language only from grade 8, when students have studied the language as a subject for seven years and have had some less demanding subjects taught in it for five years. There is more teaching through the mother tongue in grades 10-12, especially in demanding subjects. Instruction in a second foreign language (one of the languages of other sections) begins in grade 7. All teachers are minimally bilingual. For each subject, students choose the language in which they take their final exams. Everyone becomes minimally bilingual at a high level, and many become trilingual.

First language (L1). Often a synonym for mother tongue, or in contrast to a second language (L2); the language first learned, best known, and/or most used.

Foreign language (FL). A language learned mainly in the classroom, for reading texts and/or communication with its speakers (e.g., Arabic in Korea, English in Mongolia, French in Russia).

Immersion programmes for dominant language speakers. Parents of linguistic majority children with a high-status mother tongue (e.g., Anglophones in Ontario, Canada) choose voluntarily to enroll their children in a programme in which instruction is conducted through the medium of a foreign/minority language. Most of the children in these classes are majority language children with the same mother tongue. Teachers in these programmes are bilingual so

that children can initially use their own language and still be understood. These programmes are implemented in additive language learning contexts in which children's mother tongue is not in danger of being replaced by the language of instruction. Although children enrolled in French immersion programmes in Canada initially represented a largely homogenous Anglophone population, increasingly, children whose mother tongue is neither English nor French are enrolling in these programs.

Immersion programmes for Indigenous peoples or minorities. Dominated-group children who have partially or completely lost their ancestral language choose voluntarily, among existing alternatives, to be instructed through the medium of the Indigenous/minority language, in classes with children with the same goal and target language, in which the teacher is bilingual so that children can initially use their dominant language, and in contexts in which that language is not in danger of being replaced by the Indigenous/minority language; an additive language learning context.

Indigenous education. There are at least three senses of this concept: (1) natural systems ("formal" and "informal") of child socialization developed by Indigenous peoples in accordance with local norms, to teach Indigenous knowledge and skills through the Indigenous language; (2) imposed colonial and post-colonial schooling, usually through the dominant language, with assimilation as a goal; and (3) contemporary Indigenous self-determinant schooling, usually based on culturally relevant content and pedagogy, and including instruction in and through the Indigenous language.

Indigenous peoples. Communities, peoples, and nations which, having a historical continuity within pre-invasion and pre-colonial societies that developed within their territories, consider themselves distinct from other sectors of the society(ies) now prevailing in those territories. They form non-dominant sectors of society determined to preserve, develop, and transmit to future generations their ancestral territories, identity, and often, their language as the basis of their continued existence as peoples, in accordance with their cultural practices and social and legal systems (Cobo 1987: 4). The International Labour Organisation's (ILO's) 1989 definition may be the strongest legally: "...peoples in independent countries who are regarded as indigenous on account of their descent from the populations which inhabited the country, or a geographical region to which the country belongs, at the time of conquest or colonization or the establishment of present state boundaries and who, irrespective of their legal status, retain some or all of their own social, economic, cultural and political institutions." Self-identification is included within the ILO definition "as a fundamental criterion for determining the groups to which the provisions of this Convention apply" (<http://www.unhchr.ch/html/menu3/b/62.htm>).

Language. The system of sounds, words, signs, grammar, and rules for (1) communication in a given speech community for spoken, written, or signed interaction; (2) storing, acting out, and developing cultural knowledge and values; and (3) displaying, analyzing, structuring, and creating the world and personal and social identity. Theoretically, language also can be seen as existing only in practice, when being used, created, and enacted. The existence of discrete

languages (rather than continua of mutually intelligible dialects) has also been called a Western myth (e.g., Mühlhäusler, 2003).

Language endangerment. Situation in which intergenerational transmission is proceeding negatively, with fewer children in each generation acquiring the language in childhood. Other criteria include low numbers of speakers, reduced number of communicative domains, and low status. Fifty to 90 percent of the world's spoken languages may be extinct or seriously endangered by 2100 (Krauss, 1992; UNESCO Ad Hoc Expert Group on Endangered Languages, 2003;

http://portal.unesco.org/culture/en/file_download.php/947ee963052abf0293b22e0bfba319cclanguagevitalityendangerment.pdf; http://portal.unesco.org/culture/en/ev.php-URL_ID=8270&URL_DO=DO_TOPIC&URL_SECTION=201.html

Language maintenance or language shelter programmes. Linguistic minority children (often with a low-status mother tongue) choose voluntarily, among existing alternatives, to be instructed through the medium of their mother tongue, in classes with minority children with the same mother tongue, in which the teacher is bilingual and there is a pedagogically sound instructional programme in the majority language as a second or foreign language, also provided by a bilingual teacher.

Language planning. Sociocultural process undertaken by an authorizing body (e.g., government, schools), communities and/or families to promote language change through: (1) *status planning*, decisions and activities specifying how languages will be used, by whom, in what contexts, and for what purposes; (2) *corpus planning*, including language codification, elaboration, standardization, and development of print materials; and (3) *acquisition planning*, language program development (Cooper, 1989; Haugen, 1983; Kaplan & Baldauf 1997). Language planning may be guided by one or more orientations: (1) *language-as-a-problem*, in which linguistic diversity is viewed as a problem to be overcome; (2) *language-as-a-right*, the negotiation of language rights, often in contested contexts; and (3) *language-as-a-resource*, the promotion of linguistic democracy and pluralism (Ruiz, 1984). (See also Grin, 2006 on economic considerations in language planning and policy).

Language policy. Sociocultural process that includes official acts and documents as well as everyday language practices that express normative claims about legitimate and illegitimate language forms and uses, and have implications for status, rights, roles, functions, and access to languages and varieties within a given polity, organization, or institution; the scholarly study of how decisions about language are formulated and implemented, often considered a subset of language planning (see, e.g., Lo Bianco, 1987).

Language regeneration. For an endangered language, deliberate language planning and policy activities aimed at: (1) *language revival*, restoring oral and/or written functions for a language no longer spoken, and for which little or no literary tradition exists; (2) *language revitalization*, giving new vitality to endangered-language domains and functions; and/or (3) *reversing*

language shift, producing new generations of speakers (Amery, 2000; Fishman 1991, 2001; Huss, Camilleri, & King, 2003; Paulston, 1993; Romero & McCarty, 2006).

Language rights. *Negative language rights* concern the right to non-discrimination in the enjoyment of human rights; *positive language rights* involve the freedom to practice or use distinctive aspects of a group's culture, including language and religion. Positive language rights typically require a state obligation to support minority languages.

Limited English proficient (LEP)/Non-English proficient (NEP). A definition in U.S. language policy in which minority students are identified negatively, in terms of what they do not yet know fully; revised in 2001 to *English language learner* (ELL), a more positive term but one that nonetheless emphasizes what linguistic minority students do not know and invisibilises what they do know (e.g. their own or their parents' language and culture).

Linguicism. Beliefs, attitudes, and actions whereby differences of language serve to structure inequality between linguistic groups; ideologies, structures, and practices used to legitimate, effectuate, regulate, and reproduce an unequal division of power and resources between groups defined on the basis of language (Skutnabb-Kangas, 1988: 13).

Linguistic human rights (LHRs). Individual and collective language rights that every individual has because of being human, in order to be able to fulfill her/his basic needs and live a dignified life. In theory, LHRs are so inalienable that no state or person may violate them (Skutnabb-Kangas, 2000; Skutnabb-Kangas & Phillipson, 1994).

Linguistic imperialism. A form of linguicism in which one community or collectivity dominates another, as in colonialism, imperialism, and corporate globalisation, and in which the language of the dominant power is privileged structurally in the allocation of resources and ideologically in beliefs and attitudes toward languages (Phillipson, 1992).

Linguicide/linguistic genocide. The deliberate elimination of a language, without killing its speakers; forcing speakers to give up a mother tongue through "forcibly transferring children of the group to another group"; "causing serious bodily or mental harm to members of the group" (United Nations International Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide 1948, E 793, Articles 2e and 2b); or "prohibiting the use of the [mother tongue] in daily intercourse, or in schools, or the printing and circulation of publications in the language of the group" (from the 1948 Final Draft of the above, not part of the Convention).

Majority language. Language of a dominant group, in terms of numbers and/or power.

Minorities. Defined similarly to ethnic groups (numbers, dominance, characteristics), and by a desire to maintain distinctive characteristics; there is often no common descent (e.g. women; gay, lesbian, bisexual, and transgendered persons; Deaf persons). Ethnic minorities can have national/autochthonous or immigrant origins. Few countries state how long an immigrated minority must reside in a country before becoming a "national" minority (Hungary: 100 years);

some countries are unwilling to accept that they have immigrants (“guest workers”). “Being” a minority in the sense of having less power than some other group(s) (i.e. being minoritised) is a relationship rather than a characteristic; it presupposes that (an)other group(s) has/have been majoritised. Human agency can transform these relations in a more equal direction. In international law, the existence of a minority does not depend on a decision by the state but must be established by objective criteria. Minorities have some rights in education that are not accorded in international law to children under other labels (e.g. “linguistically diverse students,” “English language learners”). In international law, minorities do not have a right to self-determination (e.g., independence), whereas Indigenous peoples do.

Minority language. Language that is not the dominant language of a territorial unit such as a state, because the speakers of the language have less power (they have been minoritised), and the language is generally spoken by a smaller number of people. Power relations – not numbers – constitute the defining characteristic of “minority” languages (e.g., Navajo speakers are numerically dominant within the Navajo Nation yet their language is minoritised within and outside their lands; many African languages are minority languages from a power point of view although they have more speakers than those of official languages). In many countries, all groups are minorities.

Monolingual ideology. False belief that monolingualism at both the individual and societal levels is normal, desirable, sufficient for most purposes, and unavoidable; monolingual fallacy/habitus/reductionism/naivety.

Monolingualism. Functioning in a single language (includes dialectal variation; one may be bidialectal but monolingual).

Mother tongue. Language(s) one learns first, identifies with, and/or is identified by others as a native speaker of; sometimes also the language that one is most competent in or uses most. There may be a change of mother tongue during a person’s lifetime according to all other criteria except the first. A person may have two or more mother tongues (“bilingualism/multilingualism as a mother tongue”). Indigenous or minority mother tongues are sometimes called *heritage languages* (often when children do not know them well), *home languages* (implying that they are/should not be used for official purposes), or *community languages* (falsely implying that majority populations do not form a community). The last three terms can (but need not) contribute to the minoritisation of the language(s). Even if they do not yet know (much of) a language, Deaf persons and Indigenous peoples have the right to claim a Sign language or an ancestral language as their mother tongue on the basis of identifying with it.

Native speaker. Individual whose competence in a language almost always derives from the language being the mother tongue and first language learned.

Non-native speaker. Label that defines a person’s language competence negatively, vis-à-vis others for whom the language is a mother tongue, rather than positively as a user of the language as a second or foreign language.

Oracy. High levels of spoken language proficiency; to be a competent speaker or storyteller. An *orate* is an individual who communicates through listening and speaking but not reading and writing; orates often have superb memory strategies in comparison with persons considered literate because orates carry their entire “library” in their heads. *Orature* is oral literature.

Oralism. Teaching Deaf people to “lip-read” and speak only; discouraging or prohibiting them from using a natural Sign language.

Second language (L2). Language learned after acquiring the mother tongue (as opposed to first language), or learned and used in the environment, often in addition to school (as opposed to foreign language).

Segregation programme. Linguistic minority children with a low-status mother tongue are forced to accept instruction through the medium of their mother tongue in classes with minority children with the same mother tongue, where the teacher may be monolingual or bilingual but is often poorly trained, the class/school has poorer facilities and fewer resources than classes/schools for dominant group children, and teaching of the dominant language as a second/foreign language is poor or non-existent. Later integration is not a goal in these programmes.

Sign languages. Natural languages that developed in Deaf communities similarly to the way in which spoken languages developed in hearing communities. Examples are AUSLAN (Australian Sign Language), ASL (American Sign Language), and Swedish Sign Language. Sign languages are complex, abstract linguistic systems with their own grammars. They have a small closed set of distinctive features, meaningless in themselves, that combine in ways peculiar to each language to form morphemes, which are then combined into meaningful signs. In analyzing a sign, the equivalent of the phoneme is the chereme. Cheremic variation in individual signs plays the same role in differentiating one sign from another as does phonological variation in distinguishing words. There are five parameters within which cheremic variations occur in natural Sign languages: (1) handshape(s); (2) location of sign; (3) palm orientation; (4) movement(s); and (5) nonmanual features (e.g., facial expressions, use of shoulders and body). By changing the chereme in any one of these five areas, the meaning of a sign is altered.

Structured immersion. An approach in the United States in which linguistic minority students are submersed in the dominant language with little or no support for their mother tongue; combines aspects of English-as-a-second-language and submersion/”sink-or-swim,” with the goal of replacing the mother tongue with English.

Submersion/”sink-or-swim” programme. Linguistic minority children with a low-status mother tongue are forced to accept instruction through a foreign majority/official/dominant language, in classes in which the teacher does not understand the minoritised mother tongue, and in which the dominant language constitutes a threat to that language, which runs the risk of being replaced; a *subtractive* language learning situation. In another variant, stigmatised majority children (or groups of minority children in a country with no decisive numerical and/or power majorities) are forced to

accept instruction through the medium of a foreign (often former colonial) high-status language (because mother tongue medium education does not exist). This often occurs in mixed mother tongue classes, mostly without native speakers of the language of instruction, but also in linguistically homogenous classes, sometimes because mother tongue education does not exist or because the school or teachers hesitate to implement a mother tongue-medium programme. The teacher may not understand children's mother tongue(s). The foreign language is not learned at a high level, at the same time as children's mother tongues are displaced and not learned in formal domains (e.g., mother-tongue literacy is not achieved). Often the children are made to feel ashamed of their mother tongues, or at least to believe in the superiority of the language of instruction.

Subtractive language learning. A new, dominant/majority language is learned at the cost of the mother tongue, which is replaced or displaced, with a resulting diglossic situation. The individual's total linguistic repertoire does not grow.

Transitional early-exit and late-exit programmes. Linguistic minority children with a low-status mother tongue are initially instructed through the medium of their mother tongue for a few years; the mother tongue is used as an instrument for acquisition of the dominant language and content. In *early-exit* programmes, children are transferred to a majority-language medium programme as soon as they develop (some) oral communicative competence in the majority language, in most cases after one to three years. In *late-exit* programmes children may receive some instruction through L1 up to the fifth or sixth grade; sometimes the mother tongue is taught as a subject thereafter. For both program types, the primary goal is proficiency in the dominant language.

Two-way bilingual (dual language) programmes (sometimes erroneously called double or dual immersion in the U.S.). Approximately 50 percent majority and 50 percent minority students (with the same mother tongue) choose voluntarily to be instructed by a bilingual teacher, initially mainly through a minority language (the 90 percent/10 percent model) or through both languages (the 50/50 model), with the dominant language taught as a subject (at the beginning separately to both groups, e.g., mother tongue English to native English-speakers and ESL to minority language speakers in the U.S.). The percentage of instruction in the dominant language increases in all 90/10 models, in some to 40 to 60 percent by grade 6, whereas it stays the same in the 50/50 model. In cases where there is no follow-up through the medium of the minority language after grade 6 when many children move to another school, two-way models can be placed in the transitional model category when considering the child's full educational (K to 12) career. Two-way models thus combine in one classroom a maintenance model for minorities (especially in the 90/10 model) and an immersion model for the majority, while maximizing peer-group contact in the other language for both groups. In some cases two-way immersion may include instruction in two minoritised languages (e.g., Navajo and Spanish in the U.S.), coupled with ESL instruction for both groups.

An Illustrative Case: Historical, Ideological, and Empirical Underpinnings of “Limited English Proficiency” in U.S. Language Policy

In the U.S., a child's identification as "limited English proficient" (LEP) is the primary criterion for participation in state and federal bilingual education programmes. As defined by federal law, "limited English proficient" refers to (1) persons not born in the United States or whose native language is other than English and who come from an environment in which a language other than English is dominant; (2) Native Americans or Alaska Natives who come from an environment in which a language other than English has had a significant impact on her or his English proficiency; and (3) persons classified as "migratory," with a native language other than English and who come from an environment in which a language other than English is dominant. In all cases, individuals so identified must demonstrate "sufficient difficulties" speaking, reading, writing, or understanding English as to deny them opportunities to learn successfully in English-language classrooms and participate fully in society (http://www.helpforschools.com/ELLKBase/legal/Definition_LEP.shtml).

Emphasizing what individuals lack rather than the proficiencies they possess, the term LEP reveals the "language as problem" orientation in U.S. language policy (Ruiz, 1984). The centerpiece of this policy is the Bilingual Education Act of 1968, the purpose of which was, according to its legislative sponsor, not "to create pockets of different languages throughout the country," nor to "stamp out the mother tongue," nor to make [minorities'] mother tongue the dominant language," but rather to "make those children fully literate in English" (cited in Crawford, 2004: 107). The compensatory and transitional nature of the policy is underscored by the fact that it gave preference to children from low-income homes and did not require instruction in children's native language (Crawford, 2004: 117).

In 1973, the policy was modified to direct schools to use students' native language "to the extent necessary to allow a child to progress effectively through the education system" (Crawford, 2004: 114). Five years later, a one-word qualifier reaffirmed the policy's transitional approach: LEP students' primary language could be used *only* to the extent necessary to further their English-language development. Subsequent reauthorizations reserved funding for "special alternative" (English-only) programs. In 2001, the legislation was re-titled the English Language Acquisition, Language Enhancement, and Academic Achievement Act, with the sole purpose of ensuring that LEP children "attain English proficiency, develop high levels of academic attainment in English, and meet the same challenging State academic content ... standards as all children" (English Language Acquisition, Language Enhancement, and Academic Achievement Act, Part A, Sec. 3102[1]). The term LEP has been replaced by "English language learner" (ELL), a term that appears benign but is consistent with the dismantling of a "bilingual education" policy discourse. These changes in terminology have been coterminous with policies to regulate immigration, particularly along the U.S.-Mexico border. As such, the terminology contributes to a larger discourse of containment aimed at regulating diversity deemed threatening to national interests (McCarty, 2005).

Implications and Future Directions

In this chapter we have shown how terminological choices shape and are shaped by broader ideological, historical, and sociopolitical forces. These choices have far-reaching consequences for language learners and their communities. In the U.S. example above, language choice serves to delegitimise minority students' mother tongues as languages for academic development, while linking those languages and their speakers to poverty and low social status. Other

examples (e.g., immersion programmes for Indigenous peoples or minorities) illustrate the ways in which concepts and terms can frame and support democratizing educational goals.

As researchers and educators, our first charge is to carefully and critically examine the terms and concepts that constitute the “toolkit” for our work. How do they describe and frame the characteristics of language learners and their communities? To what extent do they circumscribe or expand learners’ opportunities and potentials? What language planning orientations underpin particular terminologies and concepts? Whose interests do they serve? We can then employ these tools strategically toward social justice ends. While changes in terminology alone cannot reverse educational inequities, they are nonetheless essential to the development of a counter-hegemonic discourse that respects and promotes linguistic human rights.

References

- Amery, R.: 2000, *Warrabarna Kurna! Reclaiming an Australian Language*, Swets and Zeitlinger, Lisse.
- Andersson, T., and Boyer, M.: 1978, *Bilingual Schooling in the United States* (2nd ed.), National Educational Laboratory Publishers, University of Texas, Austin.
- Bear Nicholas, A.: 2005, *Education through the medium of the mother-tongue: The single most important means for Saving Indigenous Languages. Rationales and Strategies for Establishing Immersion Programs*, presentation at the Symposium on Immersion Education for First Nations, St. Thomas University and The Assembly of First Nations, Fredericton, NB, Canada, October 3-6
<http://www.samediggi.fi/lausunnot/Andrea%20Revised%20Rationales%20for%20Immersion.htm>.
- Cooper, R. L. (1989). *Language Planning and Social Change*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK.
- Crawford, J.: 1992, *Language Loyalties: A Sourcebook on the Official English Controversy*, University of Chicago Press, Chicago.
- Crawford, J.: 2004, *Educating English Learners: Language Diversity in the Classroom* (5th ed.), Bilingual Education Services, Los Angeles.
- Chamot, A.U., & O’Malley, J. M.: 1994, *The CALLA Handbook: Implementing the Cognitive Academic Language Learning Approach*, Addison-Wesley, Reading, MA.
- Cummins, J., & Swain, M.: 1986, *Bilingual Education: Aspects of Theory, Research and Practice*, Longman, London.
- Fill, A., & Mühlhäusler, P. (eds): 2001, *The Ecolinguistic Reader. Language, Ecology and Environment*, Continuum, London.
- Fishman, J.A.: 1989, *Language and Ethnicity in Minority Sociolinguistic Perspective*, Multilingual Matters, Clevedon, UK.
- Fishman, J.A.: 1991, *Reversing Language Shift: Theoretical and Empirical Foundations of Assistance to Threatened Languages*, Multilingual Matters, Clevedon, UK.
- Fishman, Joshua, A. (ed.): 2001, *Can Threatened Languages Be Saved? Reversing Language Shift, Revisited: A 21st Century Perspective*, Multilingual Matters, Clevedon, UK.
- Fishman, J.A. (ed.): 1999, *Handbook of Language and Ethnic Identity*, Oxford University Press, New York.

- González, R.D., with Melis, I. (eds.): 2000, *Language Ideologies: Critical Perspectives on the Official English Movement, Vol. 1: Education and the Social Implications of Official Language*. Urbana, IL and Mahwah, NJ: National Council of Teachers of English and Lawrence Erlbaum.
- González, R.D., with Melis, I. (eds.): 2001, *Language Ideologies: Critical Perspectives on the Official English Movement, Vol. 2: History, Theory, and Policy*. Urbana, IL and Mahwah, NJ: National Council of Teachers of English and Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Grin, F.: 2006, Economic considerations in language policy, in T. Ricento. (ed.), *An Introduction to Language Policy. Theory and Method*, Oxford, Blackwells, 77-94.
- Haugen, E.: 1972, *The Ecology of Language*, Stanford University Press, Stanford, CA.
- Haugen, E.: 1983, The implementation of corpus planning: Theory and practice, in J. Cobarrubias & J.A. Fishman (eds.), *Progress in Language Planning*, Mouton, Berlin, 269-289.
- Hinton, L., with Vera, M., Steel, S., and Advocates for Indigenous California Language Survival: 2002, *How to Keep Your Language Alive. A Commonsense Approach to One-on-One Language Learning*, Heyday Books, Berkeley, CA.
- Hinton, L., & Hale, K. (eds): 2001, *The Green Book of Language Revitalization in Practice*, Academic Press, San Diego.
- Hornberger, N. H. (ed.): 2003, *Continua of Biliteracy: An Ecological Framework for Educational Policy, Research, and Practice in Multilingual Settings*, Multilingual Matters, Clevedon, UK.
- Huss, L., Camilleri, A., & King, K.: 2003, *Transcending Monolingualism: Linguistic Revitalisation in Education*, Swets and Zeitlinger, Lisse.
- Kaplan, R.B., & Baldauf, R.B., Jr.: 1997, *Language Planning: From Practice to Theory*, Multilingual Matters, Clevedon, UK.
- Krauss, M.: 1992, The world's languages in crisis, *Language*, 68(1), 4-10.
- Lambert, W.E.: 1984, An overview of issues in immersion education, in California State Department of Education (ed.), *Studies on Immersion Education. A Collection for United States Educators*, California State Department of Education, Sacramento, 8-30.
- Lambert, W.E., & Tucker, R.G.: 1971, *Bilingual Education of Children: The St. Lambert Experiment*, Newbury House, Rowley, MA.
- Lo Bianco, J.: 1987, *National Policy on Languages*, Australian Government Publishing Service, Commonwealth Department of Education, Canberra.
- McCarty, T.L.: 2005, *Language, Literacy, and Power in Schooling*, Lawrence Erlbaum, Mahwah, NJ.
- Mühlhäusler, P.: 2003, *Language of Environment – Environment of Language. A Course in Ecolinguistics*, Battlebridge, London.
- Ong, W.J.: 1982, *Orality and Literacy: The Technologizing of the Word*, Methuen, London.
- Paulston, C.B.: 1993, Language regeneration: A conceptual overview of language revival, revitalization and reversal, *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 14, 275-286.
- Phillipson, R.: 1992, *Linguistic Imperialism*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- Romero, M.E., & McCarty, T.L.: 2006, *Language Planning Challenges and Prospects in Native American Communities and Schools*, Education Policy Studies Laboratory, Language Policy

- Research Unit, Arizona State University, Tempe
(<http://www.asu.edu/educ/eps1/EPRU/documents/EPSTL-0602-LPRU.pdf>).
- Ruiz, R.: 1984, Orientations in language planning, *NABE Journal*, 8(2), 15-34.
- Skutnabb-Kangas, T.: 1984, *Bilingualism or Not – The Education of Minorities*. Multilingual Matters, Clevedon, UK. [a version with a foreword by Ajit Mohanty published in 2007 by Orient Blackswan, Delhi; <http://www.orientblackswan.com/display.asp?isbn=978-81-250-3268-7>].
- Skutnabb-Kangas, T.: 1988, Multilingualism and the education of minority children, in T. Skutnabb-Kangas & J. Cummins (eds.), *Minority Education: From Shame to Struggle*, Multilingual Matters, Avon, UK, 9-44.
- Skutnabb-Kangas, T.: 2000, *Linguistic Genocide in Education – Or Worldwide Diversity and Human Rights?*, Lawrence Erlbaum, Mahwah, NJ. [slightly revised version, 2008, Delhi: Orient Blackswan, <http://www.orientblackswan.com/display.asp?isbn=978-81-250-3461-2>].
- Skutnabb-Kangas, T., Maffi, L., & Harmon, D.: 2003, *Sharing a World of Difference: The Earth's Linguistic, Cultural, and Biological Diversity*, UNESCO, Paris. [can be downloaded from www.terralingua.org/Publications/Sharing/Sharing.html].
- Skutnabb-Kangas, T., & Phillipson, R.: 1994, Linguistic human rights, past and present, in T. Skutnabb-Kangas & R. Phillipson, with M. Rannut (eds.), *Linguistic Human Rights: Overcoming Linguistic Discrimination*, Mouton de Gruyter, Berlin, 71-110.
- Smolicz, J.J.: 1979, *Culture and Education in a Plural Society*, Curriculum Development Centre. Canberra.
- Street, B.: 1984, *Literacy in Theory and Practice*, Cambridge University Press, New York.
- Street, B. : 2001, The New Literacy Studies, in E. Cushman, E.R. Kintgen, B.M. Kroll, & M. Rose (eds.), *Literacy: A Critical Sourcebook*, Bedford/St. Martin's, Boston.
- Thomas, W.P., & Collier, V. P. (2002). *A National Study of School Effectiveness for Language Minority Students' Long Term Academic Achievement*, George Mason University, Center for Research on Education, Diversity and Excellence, Arlington, VA
(http://www.crede.ucsc.edu/research/llaa/1.1_final.html)

Key words

Additive language learning
 Assimilation
 Bilingual/multilingual education
 Concept definitions
 Dual language programs
 English as a second/foreign language
 Immersion programs
 Indigenous education
 Language endangerment
 Language maintenance
 Language regeneration
 Language revitalization
 “Limited English proficiency”
 Linguicism

Linguistic genocide

Linguistic human rights

Minorities

Mother tongue/first language

Native/non-native speaker

Segregation programs

Sign languages

Subtractive language learning

Submersion programs

Transitional bilingual education programs