

Inka Štrukelj
Institute of Sociology
Ljubljana, Yugoslavia

UDC 376.744:316.356.72

BILINGUAL/BICULTURAL EDUCATION: PROBLEMS AND PROSPECTS*

Introduction

Since the theme of this paper covers such a vast area, we will deal only with some of the major factors influencing the setting up and maintenance of bilingual education.

Bilingual education, or better, language education policy in multilingual societies, has become a central concern in modern societies. For reasons as varied as they are complex, educational planners, educators, and linguists worldwide are today involved in developing and carrying out an array of problems which often have little more in common than the fact that they make use of two or more languages in the formal education of children.

Bilingual education is not a unitary thing and no assessment of its influence can be made, because such influence may vary with the variety of conditions of its occurrence. Bilingual programs, on the other hand, have such a multitude of forms, embedded in such diverse political and socioeconomical contexts, interacting with such distinct consequences as to make the designation "bilingual education" by itself more frequently a term of obfuscation than of enlightenment (Kjolseth, 1972). The term "bilingual schools" means many things even in the same country, and in any discussion is likely to mean different things to different persons with the potential of conflict either in fact or perception (Cziko and Troike, 1984). Differences in program orientation, organization and content as well as variations in micro and macro environments frequently reflect differences in the reason for which they were established (MacKey, 1972a; Fishman and Lovas, 1972; Mackey and Beebe, 1978).

Public education is mostly a reflection of socioeconomic and political realities. As the institutions of education stand between the dominant institutions of politics and the economy, to focus upon any education program in isolation from the surrounding social forces which form its immediate context can only produce a misleading picture of what is actually there. All education, more than educational enterprises, is deeply embedded in complex historical, political, economic, social, cultural and psychological contexts, many of which may not be immediately obvious.

In attempting to arrive at a better understanding of the complex phenomenon of bilingual education, careful generalization may be made and interpreted with caution since each social setting and each individual program can to some extent be unique. Bilingual

* Original: English

education partakes of social and ethnic structure, economic development, cultural capital, cognitive behaviour, pedagogical practice and so on (Spolsky and Cooper, 1977). Although it partakes of many aspects of language planning, it cannot be reduced merely to a facet of that field, or even treated as a technical question of applied linguistics, but it should be treated as an educational enterprise and institutional process deeply embedded in a sociocultural context.

We may be misled by the slogan of modern linguistics that anything can be said in any language, as this slogan refers to the potential equality of languages, as expressions of human nature, while as expressions of historical, political and social experience, languages are not equivalent. The natural acquisition and formal learning of language in multinational societies is determined by the correlation between ethnic groups and social classes and type of language, the effects of social awareness and of possibilities of social mobility, the allocation by the community of different functional roles to different languages, and the language attitudes that provide the basis for that allocation (Savard and Vigneault, 1975; Giles, Bourhis and Taylor, 1977).

Non-reciprocal political economy produces non reciprocal inter- and intra-group forms of bilingualism. For the majority group bilingualism is additive and in no way presents a threat to its language maintenance. For the minority bilingualism tends to be in many surrounding displacive or replacive and presents a major threat towards language shift. This difference is a clear basic reflection of the distinct effects of a particular economy on two speech communities including school programs and their effects.

There is considerable literature on bilingualism covering a wide range of aspects of language competence at the level of individual abilities (Paradis, 1978; Spolsky and Cooper, 1978; Hornby, 1977; Swain and Cummins, 1979) and descriptions of societal situations at the level of community interaction (Fishman, 1976; Simoes, 1976; Spolsky and Cooper, 1977). Only recently the researchers' attention has shifted from analysis of the features characteristic of individual bilingualism to societal factors which promote or threaten it within the community. They turned their attention to the fact that equal opportunities and social emancipation of minority/migrant groups is not controlled by linguistic, but by political and economic factors that the long term goal of the great majority of bilingual programs was - and still remains - proficiency in the majority language, not language maintenance and societal bilingualism. They also began to be deeply concerned with those policies stating as their official goal social pluralism, but actually confining bilingualism and biculturalism to the school without any attempt to effect upon community diglossia and without changing the nature of a basically monolingual and monocultural society.

Multiculturalism and Bilingual Education

The multiculturalism movement, as a political movement, seeks public recognition for ethnic groups as part of the total

society. The ideology set forth by the proponents of multiculturalism takes seriously the idea of unity and diversity and articulates the notion that people are different even though they are alike, the difference being not intended to mean that some are superior and other inferior. The ideology of multiculturalism is not related to be the old nationalistic idea of superiority of one's own culture but as a pluralistic ideology where cultural differences are seen as good, and all to be respected.

We are witnessing a revival of interest in the area of study variously called intergroup relations, majority-minority relations, and ethnic studies. While the "why" of this revival is an important question for the sociology of science, and more so, for the sociology of knowledge, the current revival in ethnic group studies seems to be something more than just a rekindling of intellectual interest, but a reformation of the basic conceptual and theoretical tools with which the interactions of diverse social groups, and the societies in which they live, are understood. As the result of this current way of thought, we are experiencing the emergence of what Kuhn (1962) for the sciences generally, and Friedrichs (1970) for sociology in particular, have called a new "paradigm," resulting in the formation of fundamentally new perspectives from which theory and research about intergroup relations may be conducted and applied in life.

Multiculturalism is an essentially generalized tolerance for ethnic diversity in one's society and requires ethnic group affirmation and consolidation, maintained and improved tolerance levels generally in the society, and the dissemination of the multicultural point of view through community and school programs. Multiculturalism is a situation where own-group and other-group cultures are valued, and where major common social and political institutions are developed to tie all together.

Multiculturalism implies three questions of importance to individuals living in plural societies: 1) Is it considered of value to maintain one's distinctive identity and cultural group characteristics? 2) Is it considered of value to maintain positive relationships among the cultural groups within the society? and 3) Which group, the majority or the minority, benefits from a multicultural policy, or do both?

The policy of multiculturalism within a bilingual framework encourages the retention, development and sharing of the cultural heritage by all groups in a country, intergroup harmony, and this is to be achieved by improving confidence in one's own identity, and by sharing cultures among all groups. When bilingualism and biculturalism are accepted as value objectives resulting from a multicultural policy, it is necessary to change the structure of the educational system for both the majority and the minority.

As social diversity rather than uniformity characterizes modern society, the social management of diversity becomes a relevant question in considering integration or separation of minority groups from the mainstream society. Patterns of schooling are obviously instrumental in managing diversity just as they transmit some of the symbols of cultural unity.

Education is basically a process of communication through which the individual internalizes the symbolic frame of reference of his culture. With this material he builds up his own internal frame of reference and organizes his behaviour according to the prevalent social patterns. The communication is performed with the help of verbal languages which codify the symbolic system of common frames and provides basic cues to organize behaviour (Berger and Luckman, 1972). Language is thus the basic tool of cultural unity.

"It is axiomatic that the best medium for teaching a child is his mother tongue. Psychologically, it is the system of meaningful signs that in his mind works automatically for expression and understanding. Sociologically, it is a means of identification among the members of the community to which he belongs. Educationally, he learns more quickly through it than through an unfamiliar linguistic medium" (UNESCO, 1953:11).

The aims of bilingual/bicultural education are as diverse as the aims of the society itself, for in the final analysis they are determined by the values accepted by the society. Equal partnership in education implies equal educational opportunities for majority and minority children. For a minority group, equal partnership also means the possibility of preserving its ethnic and cultural identity. The majority by force of number and usually of power is able to develop its educational system in response to its own needs while the minority can draw attention to its special needs but it must rely on the understanding and multicultural policy orientation of the majority if it is to have access to an educational system which reflects its needs.

A major goal in bilingual education, as of all formal education, should be the students' acquisition of a body of knowledge and skills which is necessary for successful performance as an adult in that society. The development of language/communicative competence in the first and second language should be stimulated in a meaningful context and designed to support the rest of the curriculum, and to assure that the language experiences of the child are meaningful and comprehensible. Besides, bilingual education, like all education, has the power to transform, but only if it transcends contextual factors inside and outside the school and creates a context of its own which will enable the child to make the most of whatever educational experience is available.

Bicultural education is most essential for the development of a value system, and education for attitudes of acceptance, openness, and equality and concomitant behaviour. There are some prerequisites for bicultural education if the child is to develop a value system which allow him to greet the fellow children, individually or as members of a group, on equal terms with himself or his group, and based on a sense of equality to both express and administer justice in all his human interactions. It seems to us that three basic conditions are necessary: first, as an individual, the child must be freed of the crippling, ungratified need for security, for membership, and for self-esteem, which prevents the growth of the democratic, tolerant personality; second, he must be exposed to content, experiences, and models which teach these values to him and from which he may

learn; and third, as increased knowledge does not necessarily imply increased respect, understanding, or acceptance, he must be in an environment which not only allows but encourages and rewards the situational expression of the values he has learned. All children need knowledge of human behaviour which cuts across two or more groups, sharpened interpersonal skill for use where ambiguity of meaning is a commonplace, and attitudes which permit this knowledge and these skills to be utilized in productive interaction. The acquisition of confident and easy openmindedness to variations in patterns of behaviour and values, in short a generalized stance of the intellectual and emotional receptivity which permits communication and human transaction to occur.

The assessment of language/communicative competence in both languages and the choice of the bilingual/bicultural program closely depends on the standard demanded by the community and on the decisions and policies made by its social institutions (Mackey, 1977a). In this context, definitions and descriptions of individual and societal bilingualism, have to undergo considerable revision, in the light of different policies, which in turn promote, tolerate or disdain language and cultural diversity and pluralism within the political, economic, social and cultural aspirations of the overall society (UNESCO, 1977).

Issues of Bilingual Education

The past decades have witnessed a remarkable growth in bilingual education throughout the world. A considerable number of studies have been concerned with language teaching in multilingual settings. The research literature was faced with a complex of societal questions and educational problems of interdisciplinary nature. One common objective of these research studies was the improvement of academic performance of children of minority and migrant populations. Their school failure brought to the general attention a number of social, economic and cultural problems, and in particular their education being provided to them in a medium different from their native language and from that of their community life. There was a growing awareness that the assessment of language competence as well as the choice of bilingualism depend on the standards required by the community and on the policies and decisions made by its social institutions. The attention was therefore focused on the goals and processes inherent in monolingual/compensatory education, partial/transitional and maintenance bilingual education and on the social and educational outcomes of these measures.

In the U.S.A., the site of one of the most massive language shifts in the world history, in the mid-1960s massive discussion on bilingualism and bilingual education developed mainly on the sociological and educational level. While at the sociological level the discussion was focused on minority languages' status and their culture carrying nature in a context looking for alternatives to the assimilative hypothesis, at the educational level the effectiveness of compensatory education operated by the majority group was questioned as it ignored the minority children's linguistic repertoire and attempted to adapt them to the socio-cultural model of the dominant society. The discussion was concentrated on the state of minority languages in the

community and their use as media of instruction, on typologies of bilingual education required to realise the objectives of societal multilingualism and multiculturalism. The role of L1 and L2 in the curriculum and the impact of minority language maintenance in the wider socio-cultural context were identified as two major aspects of bilingual/bicultural programs.

At the same time two aspects of bilingual education were discussed: 1) compensatory/transitional education which favours the use of the minority language to enable the child to master subjects until adequate skills in the second language are developed. The outcome of this imposed and absorptive model is transitional bilingualism for the child and assimilation for the minority groups; 2) in the maintenance model the minority language is used as a more stable medium of instruction and the majority language is gradually introduced until both become media of instruction for all subjects. The outcome is believed to be balanced bilingual competence in the child and cultural pluralism in the community. It was especially stressed that if the minority wants to preserve its own language, it should become diglossic for compartmentalised intragroup in intergroup purposes (Fishman, 1967, 1980).

Several large-scale evaluations of the effectiveness of bilingual education in the U.S.A. (largely introduced in 1968 after the Bilingual Education Act had been approved) concluded that bilingual programs had not been shown to be effective (Baker and de Kanter, 1981). Bilingual children were, it was believed, backward in school, they scored poorly in intelligence tests and appeared to be socially maladjusted. Some researchers detected language handicaps, some spoke of mental confusion, and found mental development reduced by half. But all of these studies used definitions of bilingualism which were too vague and did not take into consideration the significant factors such as socio-economic status, the 'cultural level, and the degree of linguistic proficiency and linguistic dominance of the children studied. These studies have met serious criticism from other researchers as to poor quality and partly because of their evident bias against bilingual education (Fishman, 1977; Dulay and Burt, 1978; Troike, 1978). More recent research demonstrated that bilingualism, far from being detrimental, can enhance intellectual development.

An important context to be considered in this discussion is bilingual education for majority-language children. By this is meant children whose native language is that of the majority of the country and also the official language of the country. Examples of this context are the French "immersion" programs for the teaching of Spanish, French, or German in the U.S.A. and various binational and international schools found in the major cities of many countries (Lambert and Tucker, 1972; Mackey, 1972b; Titone, 1979). What is common to these bilingual education programs is that they are provided primarily for children who are of the dominant language and ethnic group of the country for the purpose of developing proficiency in a second language which (usually) enjoys high status. The most thoroughly researched and best known programs of this type are the Canadian immersion programs which have recently spread throughout all the provinces and major cities of Canada (Cziko, et al., 1979, 1980; Swain and

Lapkin, 1982; Lambert, 1982). The well documented and replicated findings regarding language learning in immersion programs have important implications for theories of language learning, reading and bilingualism and for the potential use and advantages of bilingual education programs in other contexts.

Research findings are consistent in showing that elitist bilingual education has never been a problem. Privileged children from the dominant group do well academically whether they are educated in their mother tongue or in a second language. In comparing the context of language immersion programs for majority children with other bilingual education settings it is necessary to stress that the success of the immersion model is likely due at least in part to the fact that these children for the most part come from middle-class families which provide a rich native language environment at home, that the children are enrolled in these programs at parental request, and that the programs themselves have often developed as a result of a parental initiative. It is also necessary to point out that after an initial period of immersion in the second language, the two languages are expanded until they develop parity in the school curriculum. Besides they do not present any threat to the pupils' native language primarily because of the school program design itself. In the resulting additive bilingualism, each of the two linguistic and cultural entities contribute complementary and constructive elements to the development of the child.

In contrast, when minority children are placed in monolingual majority language educational settings, their native language skills often rapidly decline, which was termed "subtractive" bilingualism (Lambert, 1977). Subtractive bilingualism is said to exist if the contribution of the two linguistic and cultural entities are not complementary but competitive and therefore represent a threat to the children's cultural identity.

These factors are of crucial importance to keep in mind, since critics of bilingual education (especially of minority ethnic groups) have erroneously taken the successful results of immersion programs as evidence that minority and migrant children could likewise develop second language proficiency and be successful in schools if they were similarly immersed (actually submerged) in the majority or official language of the country, with no provision made for the use of their native language at school.

An alternative in minority children education is the provision of two separate educational systems with the majority language as the language of instruction in one and the minority language as the language of instruction in the other. Such linguistic separation is practiced to some extent in various countries. For the minority this separation is a potential aid to linguistic survival but it also poses difficult problems connected with the social context, as such separation can result in linguistic and ethnic segregation. A separate educational system for the minority offers apparent linguistic equality, but it may not provide equivalent educational opportunities. The emphasis on the linguistic and cultural needs of the minority must not obscure the importance of other aspects of education. If educational opportunities are limited, students may not have the chance to

develop their talents and skills. This will involve a loss not only to the individual child but also to his/her minority group as a whole. (Fishman, 1979).

When we talk specifically about Europe, we refer to several different economic and political entities with a variety of economic and political situations within which individual linguistic conditions show different patterns of orientation. Apart from language diversity resulting from the presence of autochthonous ethnic minorities, individual countries' sociolinguistic situation also varies considerably between multidialectism involving similar and mutual intelligible or dissimilar social varieties (dialects). Growing rapidly since the Second World War, language diversity in Europe has largely resulted from migration movements which involved several thousand hundreds unemployed or underemployed labourers from less developed European areas (mainly from Mediterranean countries) normally from one country to another, but also within the same country (e.g. South-North of Italy and Yugoslavia).

Until the end of the 60's bilingual education resulting from educational policies could be reduced to six basic models: 1) monolingual schooling in the national official languages for speakers of other national varieties (dialects); 2) monolingual schooling in the national official language for minority speakers either of low status but elsewhere national languages and for autochthonous minority languages; 3) monolingual schooling in the elsewhere national languages for autochthonous minority speakers; 4) bilingual schooling in multinational countries like Switzerland or in countries with autochthonous minority speakers of high status languages protected by international treaties (like French and German in Italy); 5) bilingual education for middle upper class children in highly privileged private or international schools and 6) schooling in one or two of the official languages of the receiving countries for children of migrant populations. This covers also those primary and secondary school curricula which may include the migrant child's national language.

Although research has long been involved in various aspects of the educational advantages of bilingual schooling in multinational countries, bilingual education in international schools and of the possible disadvantages of monolingual schooling in the national official language, a major impetus to discussion and research on bilingualism and bilingual education was provided by studies of the linguistic segregation of migrants and of monolingual schooling for their children.

The education of immigrant groups represents the most widespread context for bilingual education in most European industrialized countries like West Germany, Sweden and the United Kingdom (Bhatnagar, 1981). The objectives of bilingual programs found in these contexts may vary to some degree, but most have the same basic rationale of using the native language of the children to ease the transition to the usual language of instruction in the school (usually the national language of the receiving country) and at the same time to prevent academic retardation by allowing the children to learn some of the school curriculum in their native language while proficiency in the second language is

developing. Although the so-called maintenance programs are intended to develop students' proficiency in their native language, most programs are in fact transitional in nature with students being moved out of bilingual classes into regular all second language classrooms as soon as their second language is deemed adequate (Tosi, 1982).

The language situation of migrant children is to a great extent characterized by an official policy that has failed to integrate the bilingual needs of the children and their families. Migrant children experience the pressures and conflicts of maintaining the cultures and languages of their parents in a predominantly unilingual receiving country. Unable to preserve an authentic model of their original culture, immigrant children are in danger of succumbing to a process of deculturation different from the transculturation process that affects their parents, rooted as they are in their own culture. While a confrontation between the two cultures is always rewarding, the loss of the native culture can only give rise to difficulties and conflicts. Forging the native culture for that of the receiving country is likely to cause psychological disturbances, since the obligation from the individual to appropriate values which might conflict with those of his home culture is a source of anxiety. The concept of anomie explains this conflict (Beardsmore, 1977). The child who has to switch from one cultural group to another must readjust his patterns of behaviour to the new standards. He himself is faced with an incoherent frame of reference, leading to isolation, bewilderment and anxiety as well as pathological reactions (rejection and refusal of the receiving country culture).

Since the mid-70's debate, research has seemed to be equally concerned with the teaching of the receiving country's language, the maintenance of the native language and also with the children's linguistic and academic problems in case of return. The migrant children's education largely depends on the different political and economic situations in different countries and their language programs for migrant children can be traced: 1) the submersion model with extra remedial classes in the country's national language; 2) the compound model with a small portion of the timetable for the practice of native language skills while the receiving country national language remains the predominant medium of instruction and 3) the bilingual model where instruction is offered mainly through the native language with an increasing portion of the timetable in the receiving country language taught as a second language in migrant children classes. The first model could be labelled as assimilationist, the second transitional, while the third is oriented through language maintenance to bilingualism and biculturalism (Skutnabb-Kangas, T. and P. Toukoomaa, 1976).

In the research studies connected with language competence the notion of semilingualism has been used as a term to describe the type of faulty linguistic competence which has been observed in children who have since early childhood had contact with two languages without sufficient or adequate training and stimulation in either of the two languages. The notion of semilingualism and its critical appraisals within the sociopolitical framework have brought about discussion and research that indicates the inadequacy of monolingual L2 education and in supporting the

hypothesis that instruction and literacy in L1 could counteract the negative effects of double semilingualism (Paulston, 1975; Skutnabb-Toukoomaa, 1976; Cummins, 1976; Brent, 1979). It was also noted that the origin of the children's low academic achievement and worse social opportunities was the inadequacy of the language education offered by schools. It was argued that the notion of semilingualism from a social conflict perspective aims to integrate and evaluate the concept within a sociological framework of community relations and that the macro social factors as economic, power conflict and social class translate into language behaviour at the micro social level and thus accounting for the low performance of different migrant children (Skutnabb-Kangas, 1978; Cummins, 1979).

Knowing the context of bilingual education it is obvious that the implications of linguistic theories to different contexts where social and educational change take place is not sufficient to evaluate language policies, educational measures and language competence. While applied linguistics has provided valuable contributions to theory and research, other social disciplines should be included in the study of the socio-political reality and the problems of minority/migrant children. In the last decade bilingual education began to be viewed not only as an autonomous area of research where linguistic attainment and academic results could be assessed and compared only on pedagogical grounds but as a field of interdisciplinary research oriented towards macro socio-economic factors which lead to different types of bilingual education and inter-ethnic relations.

Most bilingual programs have done little assessment of outcomes on a large scale of measures, leaving us without information about background mediating variables such as child and family characteristics, language use in the home, native language, literacy level, affective factors, teacher allocation of time by language, community involvement, and so on. As far as research on bilingualism and bilingual education is considered a crucial task, it is necessary to move from normative descriptions to analysis of actual occurrences and outcomes. We urgently need more contextualized accounts which will identify the macro socio-economic and geopolitical coordinates that impinge upon bilingual program designs and outcomes as well as studies capable of discovering what actually goes on in specific bilingual programs. We also need to know the actual social, academic and linguistic differences the programs make for carefully differentiated sociolinguistic categories of children.

No feature of bilingual education can be considered in itself either assimilationist or pluralist as it is only within the specific socio-economic and political context of ethnic relations that any program feature takes relevance in one or another direction. A realistic evaluation of bilingual education should attempt to relate on linguistic, psychological, sociological, economic, political, religious and cultural factors. It could be said that the social factors are not only important for the understanding of bilingual education but that they represent powerful forces governing the success or failure of bilingual education. Only considering macro social factors which have led to a particular form of mono- or bilingual education can the educational and not only the linguistic outcome be evaluated and

the long-term implications of that language and minority policy assessed.

While for a long time research on bilingual education has been under a strong influence of the functional structural theory of social change which seeks the solution of educational problems in terms of pedagogical efficiency within the curriculum, adopting the alternative model, the conflict theory, and treating bilingual education as the result of certain social factors rather than as the cause of certain behaviours in the children, adequate solutions to educational problems outside the programs could be foreseen.

Concluding Comments

Even a superficial review of the literature shows that there exists today a confrontation between two powerful theoretical perspectives for the analysis of ethnic group relations (i.e. the long established theory of assimilation and the recently emerged theories of social pluralism) which in turn may have deep consequences not only for social theory but also for social policies regarding ethnic groups.

One of the main problems of all modern centralized societies, with scientific-technological development rapidly changing the environment, behavioural patterns and lifestyle of the preceding generations, is how the different ethnic groups can retain their cultural identity in a way that guarantees the existence of their traditional values, languages, norms and conceptions of reality. Social unity and cohesion needed for peaceful coexistence and common societal goals should therefore not presuppose on the part of minorities a giving up of the ways they understand and motivate their own socio-cultural existence.

The language of the dominant majority has been and continues to be the language of power and social mobility subjecting the dominated minorities to assimilative pressures. In multiethnic and multilingual countries the use of the language of various population groups in the educational system is a crucial test in determining the ability of these groups to develop and maintain their own characteristics, their own culture and their own traditions. If ethnic groups wish to maintain their identity in a pluralistic society, they need to pass on their distinctiveness to their offspring. In the process of individual development, the child needs to adopt a set of motivations, attitudes, and personality traits moulded within the context of his ingroup and society. Early childhood seems to be an important stage of development if the child is to identify with his heritage and ingroups. The language of a minority group being an essential element of its culture, its capacity of survival as a cultural group, is in jeopardy, if no instruction is given in that language. Therefore, the efficiency of measures concerning the cultural life of groups deprived of instruction in their language is open to question.

The minority language group is usually definable by virtue of its lack of control over the levels of power in the society. This subordinate position in which ethnic groups are placed is the

central criterion which defines them as "minorities" (Tajfel, 1978). The goals of the minority are rarely considered in the development of educational programs: the goals of most educational programs are explicitly or implicitly predefined for the minority by the majority. Dominant groups are not likely to tolerate minority goals which are too far at variance from their own level of power and control over their lives. As success in school and the larger society is defined by those in power, alternative potential measures of success in the terms of the minority group are usually ignored in favour of the former.

While bilingual education in its narrowest sense takes place in the classroom, its most significant consequences take place in society where wealth, work, identity, status, power and language are so intricately intertwined. It is a general tendency to regard bilingual education as a major influence on the maintenance of language and cultural pluralism. There is often considerable overemphasis on the role of the school as a potential factor in social change. The school tends more to be led by the prevailing society than to be its vanguard, and this is especially so in language matters. Consequently, such important issues as bilingual and bicultural education, language and identity maintenance, and the bettering of relations between minority and majority groups may be seen as being served to a large degree by the school, while in fact, their success is dependent mainly upon forces within the larger community. If the community is apathetic or opposed and if all of the interest in bilingual education comes from the minority, bilingual education finds itself in a context of pressures, tensions, grievances, conflicts, and cleavages. Where conflict or divisiveness results, it is not the fault of bilingual education but of lack of appreciation for the diversity of the community and of the world. When bilingual education is given the community support, the diversity will be unifying and gratifying, not only cognitively, but emotionally and culturally as well.

We may parallel an additive biculturalism to Lambert's additive bilingualism and stress that one's identity will not be lost by learning other cultures and languages (Triandis, 1976). Desirable pluralism permits everyone to have additive multicultural experiences and switch from one cultural system to another and get a feeling of accomplishment. A balanced bilingual/bicultural person behaves in a way that is simply not available to monolingual/monocultural persons. But multiculturalism should not be limited to minority group members. Language maintenance is strongly related to the question whether the majority group will choose to learn the minority language and its culture or whether the minority group will be able to enforce its rights and aspirations through reinforcing its political position and community life.

Bilingual education is an area which offers the researcher great scope for relevant and worthwhile work, but it is also an area that requires care and thoughtfulness that extends beyond a strictly scientific orientation. To conclude: we are aware that the "politicisation" of bilingualism/biculturalism and education is more attractive for those minority/migrant groups that still seek power and that those researchers that help them are promoting these movements into important political forces.

References

- Bhatnagar, J. (ed.), 1981, **Educating Immigrants**, Croom Helm, London
- Beardsmore, H.B., 1982, **Bilingualism: Basic Principles**, Multilingual Matters, Clevedon
- Beker, K.A. and A.A. de Kanter, 1981, **Effectiveness of Bilingual Education: A Review of the Literature**, U.S. Department of Education, Office of Planning, Budget and Evaluation, Washington, D.C.
- Berger, P.L. and T. Luckmann, 1972, **The Social Construction of Reality**, Penguin Books, Harmondsworth
- Brent-Palmer, C., 1979, "A Sociolinguistic Assessment of the Notion 'Immigrant Semilingualism' from a Social Conflict Perspective." **Working Papers on Bilingualism** 17, pp. 135-180
- Cicourel, A.V., 1982, "Living in Two Cultures: The Everyday World of Migrant Workers", in **Living in Two Cultures (UNESCO)**, Gower Ltd., Aldershot, pp. 17-61
- Cohen, A.D., 1975, **A Sociolinguistic Approach to Bilingual Education**, Newbury House, Rowley
- Cummins, J., 1976, "The Influence of Bilingualism on Cognitive Growth: A Synthesis of Research Findings and Explanatory Hypothesis." **Working Papers in Bilingualism** 9, pp. 1-43
- Cummins, J., 1979, "Linguistic Interdependence and the Educational Development of Bilingual Children", in **Review of Educational Research** 49, pp. 222-251
- Cziko, G.A., et al., 1979, "French Immersion Programs and Students' Social Attitudes: A Multidimensional Investigation," **Working Papers on Bilingualism** 19, pp. 13-28.
- Cziko, G.A. and R.C. Troike, 1984, "Contexts of Bilingual Education: International Perspectives and Issues," in **AILA Review** 1, pp. 7-34
- Dulay, H.C. and M.K. Burt, 1975, **Why Bilingual Education? A Summary of Research Findings**, Bloomsbury West, San Francisco
- Edwards, J., 1980, **Critics and Criticism of Bilingual Education**, *MLJ* 64(4), pp. 409-415.
- Edwards, J., 1981, "The Context of Bilingual Education," **Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development** 2, pp. 25-44
- Fishman, J.A., (ed.), 1966, **Language Loyalty in the United States**, Mouton, Haag
- Fishman, J.A., 1967, "Bilingualism With and Without Diglossia: Diglossia With or Without Bilingualism," **Journal of Social Issues** 23(2), pp. 29-38

Lük, A. and I. Štrukelj, (eds.), *Dvojezičnost: individualne in družbene razsežnosti*, DDU Univerzum, Ljubljana

Mackey, W.E., 1972a, "A Typology of Bilingual Education," in J.A. Fishman, (ed.), *Readings in the Sociology of Language*, Mouton, Haag, pp. 413-432

Mackey, W.E., 1972b, *Bilingual Education in a Binational School: A Study of Equal Language Maintenance through Free Alternation*, Newbury House, Rowley

Mackey, W.E., 1977a, "The Evaluation of Bilingual Education," in B. Spolsky and R. Cooper, (eds.), *Frontiers of Bilingual Education*, Newbury House, Rowley, pp. 226-282

Mackey, W.F. and T. Andersson, (eds.), 1977b, *Bilingualism in Early Childhood*, Newbury House, Rowley

Mackey, W.F. and von N. Beeb, 1978, "Language Policy, Bilingual Schooling and Bicultural Classes," in T. Andersson and M. Boyer, (eds.), *Bilingual Schooling in the United States*, National Education Laboratory Publication, Austin, pp. 322-336

Paradis, M., (ed.), 1978, *Aspects of Bilingualism*, Hornbeam Press, Columbia

Paulston, C.B., 1975, "Ethnic Relations and Bilingual Education: Accounting for Contractory Data." *Working Papers on Bilingualism* 6, pp. 1-44

Paulston, C.B., 1977, "Theoretical Perspectives on Bilingual Education Programs." *Working Papers on Bilingualism* 13, pp. 130-177

Paulston, C.B., 1978, "Education in a Bi-Multilingual Setting," *International Review of Education* 24(2), pp. 309-328

Savard, J.G. and R. Vigneault, (eds.), 1975, *Multilingual Political Systems*, CIRN, Quebec

Simoes, A. Jr., (ed.), 1976, *The Bilingual Child*, Academic Press, New York

Skutnabb-Kangas, T., 1976, "Semilingualism and School Achievement", *Linguistische Berichte* 45, pp. 55-64

Skutnabb-Kangas, T., 1984, *Bilingualism or Not, Multilingual Matters*, Clevedon

Skutnabb-Kangas, T. and P. Toukomaa, 1976, "Teaching Migrant Children's Mother Tongue and Learning the Language of the Host Country in The Context of the Socio-Cultural Situation of the Migrant Family." Research Report 15, Dept. of Sociology and Social Psychology, University of Tampere

Spolsky, B. and R. Cooper, (eds.), 1977, *Frontiers of Bilingual Education*, Newbury House, Rowley

- Fishman, J.A., 1976, **Bilingual Education: An International Sociological Perspective**, Newbury House, Rowley
- Fishman, J.A., 1977, "The Social Science Perspective," in J.A. Fishman, ed., **Bilingual Education: Current Perspectives**, Center for Applied Linguistics, Arlington, pp. 1-49
- Fishman, J.A., 1979, "The Significance of the Ethnic Community Mother Tongue School: Introduction to a Study," **NABE Journal** 3(3), pp. 39-47
- Fishman, J.A., 1980, "Bilingualism and Biculturalism as Individual and as Societal Characteristics," **Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development** 1, pp. 3-15
- Fishman, J.A. and J. Lovas, 1970, "Bilingual Education in Sociolinguistic Perspective," in B. Spolsky, (ed.), **The Language Education of Minority Children**, Newbury House, Rowley, pp. 83-93
- Friedrichs, R.W., 1970, **A Sociology of Sociology**, The Free Press, New York
- Gardner, R.C., 1977, "Social Factors in Second Language Acquisition and Bilinguality," in W. Coons, et al., (eds.), **The Individual, Language and Society**, The Canadian Council, Ottawa, pp. 103-148
- Giles, H. and B. Saint-Jacques, (eds.), 1979, **Language and Ethnic Relations**, Pergamon Press, Oxford
- Giles, H., R.Y. Bourhis and D.M. Taylor, 1977, "Towards a Theory of Language and Ethnic Group Relations," in Giles, (ed.), **Language, Ethnicity and Intergroup Relations**, Academic Press, London, pp. 307-324
- Hornby, P.A., (ed.), 1977, **Bilingualism: Psychological, Social and Educational Implication**, Academic Press, New York
- Kjolseth, R., 1972, "Bilingual Education Programs in the United States," in B. Spolsky, (ed.), **The Language Education of Minority Children**, Newbury House, Rowley, pp. 94-121
- Kuhn, T., 1962, **The Structure of Scientific Revolutions**, The University of Chicago Press
- Lambert, W.E. and G.R. Tucker, 1972, **Bilingual Education of Children: The St. Lambert Experiment**, Newbury House, Rowley, pp. 15-28
- Lambert, W.E., 1977, "The Effects of Bilingualism on the Individual: Cognitive and Sociocultural Consequences," in A. Hornby, (ed.), **Bilingualism: Psychological, Social and Educational Implication**, Academic Press, New York
- Lamy, P., 1979, "Language and Ethnolinguistic Identity: The Bilingual Question," **International Journal of the Sociology of Language** 20, pp. 23-36

- Spolsky, B. and R. Cooper, (eds.), 1978, **Case Studies in Bilingual Education**, Newbury House, Rowley
- Stölting, W., 1978, "Teaching German to Immigrant Children," in N. Dittmar et al., eds., **Papers from the First Scandinavian-German Symposium on the Language of Immigrant Workers and Their Children**, Universitetscenter ROLIG-papir 12, Roskilde
- Štrukelj, I., 1978, **The Dynamics of Societal Bilingualism: Bilingual Education in Slovenia**. Compare 8(1), pp. 93-100
- Štrukelj, I., 1985, **Bilinguismo e relazioni sociali**, La scuola 17-18
- Swain, M. and J. Cummins, 1979, "Bilingualism, Cognitive Functioning and Education," **Language Teaching and Linguistics: Abstracts 12(1)**, pp. 4-18
- Swain, M. and S. Lapkin, 1982, **Evaluating Bilingual Education: A Canadian Study**, Multilingual Matters, Clevedon
- Titone, R., (ed.), 1979, **Bilingual Education**, Oxford Institutes, Milano
- Tosi, A., 1979, "Mother Tongue Teaching for the Children of Immigrants," **Language Teaching and Linguistics: Abstracts 12(4)**, pp. 213-231
- Tosi, A., 1982, "Issues in Im/migrant Bilingualism, 'Semilingualism' and Education," **Bulletin 31**, pp. 1-35
- Triandis, H.C., 1980, "A Theoretical Framework for the Study of Bilingual-Bicultural Adaptation," **International Review of Applied Psychology 29(1/2)**, pp. 7-16
- Troiike, R.C., 1977, "Research Evidence for the Effectiveness of Bilingual Education," **NABE Journal 3**, pp. 13-24
- Troiike, R.C., 1978, "Bilingual Education in the United States: The First Decade," **International Review of Education 24**, pp. 401-405
- UNESCO, 1953, "The Use of Vernacular Languages in Education," **Monographs on Fundamental Education VIII**, Paris
- UNESCO, 1965, **Bilingualism in Education**, Her Majesty's Stationary Office, London
- UNESCO, 1977, "Meeting of Experts on Language Teaching in a Bi- or Plurilingual and Multicultural Environment." Final Report. Paris
- Yates, J.R. and A.A. Ortiz, 1983, "Baker - de Kanter Review: Inappropriate Conclusions on the Efficiency of Bilingual Education," **NABE Journal 7(3)**, pp. 75-84