

NATIONAL MINORITY LANGUAGE EDUCATION AND BILINGUALISM IN THE USA НАЦІОНАЛЬНА МЕНШИННА МОВА ОСВІТИ І БІЛІНГВАЛІЗМУ У США

The concept of bilingualism and the history of research on bilingual education programs in the United States are reviewed. The aim of the research is to review the educational policy for language minority children in the USA, in particular, the choice of whether to include native language instruction as part of the educational program. Six models for bilingual education, need for bilingual education, benefits for bilingual education are considered as well.

Key words: *bilingualism in the USA, bilingual educational programs, national minorities, language minorities, ethnolinguistic policy, native language.*

Розглядається концепція білінгвізму та історія досліджень програм двомовної освіти в Сполучених Штатах. Метою дослідження є вивчення освітньої політики щодо дітей мовних меншин у США, зокрема, вибір того, чи включати в навчання рідну мову як частину освітньої програми. Розглянуто також шість моделей двомовної освіти, потребу у

двомовної освіти, переваги двомовної освіти. Ключові слова: білінгвізм у США, двомовні навчальні програми, національні меншини, мовні меншини, етнолінгвістична політика, рідна мова.

Рассматривается концепция билингвизма и история исследований программ двуязычного образования в Соединенных Штатах. Целью исследования является изучение образовательной политики в отношении детей из языковых меньшинств в США, в частности, выбор того, включать ли в обучение родной язык как часть образовательной программы. Рассмотрены также шесть моделей двуязычного образования, потребность в двуязычном образовании, преимущества двуязычного образования.

Ключевые слова: *билингвизм в США, двуязычные учебные программы, национальные меньшинства, языковые меньшинства, этнолингвистическая политика, родной язык.*

УДК 37:81:316(73)

Krsek O.Ye.,
Ph.D in Pedagogy,
Head of Chair of foreign languages and professional communication
of Volodymyr Dahl East Ukrainian
National University

Statement of the problem in general aspect.

Throughout the world today, there are many more bilingual individuals than there are monolingual; and there are many more children who are educated via a second language than are educated exclusively via their mother tongue. Thus, in most of the world, bilingualism and innovative approaches to education involving the utilization of more than one language constitute the status quo – a way of life, a natural experience. In these days of increasing global interdependence, all American residents will benefit personally and socially if the largest possible number of residents can speak, read, write, and understand at least one language in addition to English [8, p. 8].

The analysis of recent research and publications. Over the last several years, a number of comprehensive reviews have been conducted of research and evaluation studies concerning bilingual and immersion education (Baker K., de Kanter A., Crawford J., Cummins J., Diaz R., Fisher, Guthrie, Swain, Lapkin P., Troike, Willig A., Cole M. and Griffin G. discussed how new technologies can be used to improve education, especially for minorities and women in science and mathematics. The policy debate over how best to educate students who enter school with limited ability in English has focused on the issue of native-language support in instruction (August D., Garcia E., Baker K., de Kanter A.).

The aim of our research is to review one aspect of educational policy for language minority children in the USA, in particular, the choice of whether to include native language instruction as part of the educational program.

Main material presentation. In the United States, bilingual education was not uncommon in the eight-

eenth and nineteenth centuries. Linguistic pluralism and diversity were acknowledged and tolerated, if not always encouraged. When defining bilingual education in the USA, it is important to understand that, unlike in much of the rest of the world, bilingual education in the United States has primarily been a program whose goal is to teach English rather than to develop bilingualism/biliteracy. The vast majority of USA bilingual programs are designed for students who come to school speaking native or home languages other than English and who are learning English as a second or additional language. Amado Padilla proclaimed, "As we enter the twenty-first century, we must develop new approaches to instruct language minority students. To do this we must combine our second language learning strategies with advances being made in the cognitive sciences and in educational technologies" [8, p. 22]. *Bilingual education* is a broad term that refers to the presence of two languages in instructional settings [2–5; 8; 11; 14]. The term is, however, "a simple label for a complex phenomenon" that depends upon many variables, including the native language of the students, the language of instruction, and the linguistic goal of the program, to determine which type of bilingual education is used. Students may be native speakers of the majority language or a minority language [8, p. 9]. August D., Garcia E., Hakuta K., Laosa S. remarked in their investigations that the history of bilingual education in the United States is frequently divided into two periods: pre-World War I and post-1960 [1; 5]. From the 1920s until the 1960s, little attention was given to the language needs of non-English-speaking students. Students were placed in regular classrooms, where they "sank or swam". It was not until the 1960s that

the failure of English classrooms to educate non-English-speaking students began to receive national attention. Bilingualism is a term that has been used to describe an attribute of individual children as well as social institutions. At both levels, the topic has been dominated by controversy. On the individual level, debate has centered on the possible costs and benefits of bilingualism in young children. On the societal level, fiery argument can be witnessed in the United States about the wisdom of bilingual education and the official support of languages other than English in public institutions. Particularly in the latter case, emotions run hot because of the symbolism contained in language and its correlation with ethnic group membership [5, p. 373].

Need for Bilingual Education. Language-minority students in U.S. schools speak virtually all of the world's languages, including more than a hundred that are indigenous to the United States. Language-minority students may be monolingual in their native language, bilingual in their native language and English, or monolingual in English but from a home where a language other than English is spoken. Those who have not yet developed sufficient proficiency in English to learn content material in all-English-medium classrooms are known as limited English proficient (LEP) or English language learners (ELLs). Reliable estimates place the number of LEP students in American schools at close to four million.

Benefits of Bilingualism and Theoretical Foundations of Bilingual Education. Bilingual education is grounded in common sense, experience, and research. Common sense says that children will not learn academic subject material if they can't understand the language of instruction. Experience documents that students from minority-language backgrounds historically have higher dropout rates and lower achievement scores. Finally, there is a basis for bilingual education that draws upon research in language acquisition and education. Research done by Jim Cummins, of the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education at the University of Toronto, supports a basic tenet of bilingual education: children's first language skills must become well developed to ensure that their academic and linguistic performance in the second language is maximized. Cummins's developmental interdependence theory suggests that growth in a second language is dependent upon a well-developed first language, and his thresholds theory suggests that a child must attain a certain level of proficiency in both the native and second language in order for the beneficial aspects of bilingualism to accrue. Cummins also introduced the concept of the common underlying proficiency. Padilla A. notes the importance of bilingual education in terms of demographic projections for increasing linguistic diversity in the United States into the foreseeable future. In this respect, he identifies a startling revelation: that members of the

current "majority" who decry their presumed "support" of the poor are likely to be the primary "dependents" of the increasing populations of immigrant "minorities" as they get older relative to the younger and working immigrant groups [8, p. 11]. Marguerite Malakoff and Kenji Hakuta, in "History of Language Minority Education in the United States" (Chapter 2), provide a comprehensive review of the public policy debates and legislative actions concerning bilingual education. Beginning with the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, Malakoff and Hakuta identify the changing dynamics of American attitudes toward bilingual education [8, p. 12]. Bilingualism is usually recognized as the sign of an educated and cosmopolitan elite. Yet, in the United States, we have a policy that seeks to eliminate bilingualism among those who have the best possibility of becoming fluent bilinguals, that is, children who enjoy the privilege of a home language other than English. Ideally, a public education system should provide instructional support to make these children competitive in English without contributing to the loss of their home languages. As for Campbell R., Lindholm K. these potentially "true bilinguals", then, should be viewed as a critical national resource [3; 7]. Senator Paul Simon has argued that the implicit policy of monolingualism in the United States has isolated this country with respect to the world marketplace; the consequence is that U.S. business interests are losing their economic competitiveness to countries that actively promote foreign language instruction and bilingualism in the education of their children [8, p. 22]. Tucker G. states, "Our ultimate goal should be a language-competent society. What this means is a society in which all residents (citizens and immigrants) of the United States have the opportunity to develop the highest possible degree of proficiency in understanding, speaking, reading, and writing in English. At the same time, English-speaking individuals should have an opportunity to develop an ability to understand, speak, read, and write a second language. This goal should be the force that drives the mission for sound language instruction, and it should be the rallying point for the political stance that must be taken. The goal of a language-competent society can be enhanced by research that is conceptualized according to the dictates of a paradigm that seeks organized facts that can build on each other to inform us about the best way to carry out language instruction practices" [13]. In 1968, bilingual education programs in public schools were legitimized at the federal level by the Bilingual Education Act. The return of bilingual education to public schools is closely tied to the civil rights movement of the 1960s. On January 2, 1968, President Lyndon B. Johnson signed into law the Bilingual Education Act, with the words, "Thousands of children of Latin descent, young Indians, and others will get a better start – a better chance in school". Federal policy in bilingual education since

1960 has been made to ensure equal educational opportunity for minority-language children of limited English proficiency (LEP). They began because of court decisions enforcing civil rights legislation such as the Civil Rights Act of 1964, the Equal Educational Opportunities Act of [11, p. 81].

M. Malakoff and K. Hakuta researched History of Language Minority Education in the United States. They summed up, "The final legislation recognized the "problems of those children who are educationally disadvantaged because of their inability to speak English". Section 702 of the law defined bilingual education as a federal policy, which would be "to provide financial assistance to local educational agencies to carry out new and imaginative elementary and secondary school programs designed to meet these special educational needs". As the intention was to encourage varied and innovative programs, rather than mandate a strict policy, the law neither defined nor prescribed types of programs needed. However, it recognized that bilingual programs need not be limited to only language arts and noted that possible programs for grants included "programs to impart to students a knowledge of the history and culture associated with their languages" [8, p. 33].

August D. and Garcia E. distinguished six models for bilingual education, which are best seen as prototypes within which considerable variation and combination can occur: (1) transitional bilingual education, (2) maintenance bilingual education, (3) submersion model, (4) English as a second language, (5) U.S. immersion or sheltered English, and (6) the immersion model [1, p. 61].

Transitional bilingual education. The transitional bilingual education models are the most common in U.S. public schools. These programs are intended to provide both English language instruction and grade-appropriate subject content prior to mainstreaming into a regular English-speaking class.

Maintenance bilingual education. The program targeted students from two distinct groups, and the goal was for all students to achieve proficiency in both languages. Instruction is provided in both languages.

Submersion and ESL models. The submersion model is, in fact, the absence of any special program: It is the "sink or swim" method. The ESL model provides special English instructional activities on a pull-out basis, and the remainder of school day is similar to a submersion model.

Canadian immersion. The Canadian immersion programs were first developed to produce French-English bilinguals among the English-speaking community in and around Montreal. This model has been extended to three-way immersion, adding a third ethnic group language to French and English. It is important to note that this model, while successful, was largely implemented with majority language, middle-class children who faced no pressure to abandon their native language.

U.S. immersion or sheltered English. U.S. immersion, or sheltered English, is a variant on the Canadian model with a major difference: It is designed to develop proficiency in English only [1, p. 62].

Of these six types of programs, the majorities are designed to help students make the transition from one language to another; that is, they take monolinguals and produce monolinguals. Characteristics of Good Bilingual Education Programs include the following characteristics: high expectations for students and clear programmatic goals; instruction through the native language for subject matter; an English-language development component; multicultural instruction that recognizes and incorporates students' home cultures; administrative and instructional staff, and community support for the program; appropriately trained personnel; adequate resources and linguistically, culturally, and developmentally appropriate materials; frequent and appropriate monitoring of student performance; parental and family involvement.

As for Roeming R., one significant element to bilingualism in the United States begins with providing better welfare of specific groups of people who cannot, because of language barriers, contribute fully in our social organization. Another reason for bilingualism in the U.S. is the interest of professional second language groups, who find it essential to continue their support for language study development [9, p. 73]. In addition to the significant elements to increase bilingualism, native speakers might find it meaningful to continue their mother tongue, traditions, and cultures. Lambert N., Tucker G. consider that one important reason for this is that there have been findings that concluded "a foreign language facilitates mastering the higher forms of the native language" [13, p. 122]. Bilingualism could better prepare the U.S. citizens for an ever-expanding global society.

Catherine E. Snow, in "Rationales for Native Language Instruction: Evidence from Research" (Chapter 4), presents a more focused review of the pros and cons of using language minority children's native language in initial education and literacy training. According to Snow, four arguments are articulated against the use of native language instruction: (a) The history argument points to the success of certain European immigrant groups in the absence of federally sponsored bilingual education; (b) the "ghetto-Lation" of linguistic minority children results in segregation, stigma, and the maintenance of intergroup differences; (c) the amount of "time-on-task" is reduced by bilingual education; and (d) the inevitable attrition of native languages makes for a "hopeless cause" in bilingual education [12, p. 60].

Daniel Ramírez Lamus states that although bilingual education has never enjoyed widespread support in the USA, several models can be distinguished

for language minority students: transitional bilingual education, dual language (or two-way immersion) programs, and speech community models. In this literature review, these models are examined to determine which is the most effective [6, p. 80].

Conclusion. The true, additive bilingualism can be a valuable part of the educational enrichment of linguistic minority students. Bilingualism (and language use in general) is a social phenomenon. Work in the area of bilingualism must establish continuities between the phenomenon as it occurs in minority and majority populations.

REFERENCES:

1. August D., Garcia E. E. Language minority education in the United States: Research, policy and practice. Springfield, IL: Charles C Thomas. 1988. 61 p.
2. Baker K., de Kanter A. Bilingual education: A reappraisal of federal policy. Lexington, MA: Lexington Books. 1983. 161 p.
3. Campbell. R.N., Lindholm. K.J. Conservation of language resources. In B. VanPatten J.F. Lee SLAYLL: New York: Newbury House, US. 1981. 91 p.
4. Crawford R.J. Bilingual Education: History, Politics, Theory and Practice, 2nd edition. Los Angeles: Bilingual Educational Services. USA. 1991. <http://education.stateuniversity.com/pages/1788/>
5. Hakuta K., Snow C. The role of research in policy decisions about bilingual education. Washington, DC: U.S. House of Representatives. Education and Labor Committee. 1986. 119 p.
6. Lamus D.R. Bilingual education in the USA: A transition to monolingualism? In M.S. Plakhotnik & S.M. Nielsen, Proceedings of the Seventh Annual College of Education Research Conference: Urban and International Education Section (pp. 80–85). URL: http://coeweb.fiu.edu/research_conference.
7. Lindholm K.J., Dolson D. Bilingual immersion education: Promoting language and academic excellence for language minority and majority students in the same program. Unpublished manuscript, University of California, Los Angeles, Center for Language Education and Research. USA. 1988. 79 p.
8. Padilla Amado M., Halford H. Fairchild Bilingual education : issues and strategies / edited by Amado M. Padilla, Halford H. Fairchild, Concepcion M. Valadez. Sage Publications/Corwin Press, 2455 Teller Road, Newbury Park, CA 91320. US. 1990. P. 261.
9. Roeming R. Bilingualism and the National Interest. The Modern Language Journal. 1971. 55(2). PP. 73–81.
10. Skutnabb-Kangas Tove Bilingualism or Not: The Education of Minorities. Clevedon, Eng.: Multilingual Matters. 1981. URL: <http://education.stateuniversity.com/pages/1788/Bilingual-Education.html#ixzz2ToCwfyFA>.
11. Secada, Walter Research, Politics, and Bilingual Education. The Annals of the American Academy, 508, 1990. P. 81–106.
12. Snow Catherine E. Rationales for Native Language Instruction: Evidence from Research. Bilingual Education / ed. Amado M. Padilla et al, Sage Publications. 1990. P. 60–74.
13. Tucker G.R. Second language education: Issues and perspectives. In A.M. Padilla, H. Fairchild, C.M. Valadez (Eds.), Innovations in language education: Vol. 2. Immersion and foreign language education. Newbury Park, CA: Sage 1990. URL: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/312265592_Bilingual_Education_in_the_United_States.
14. Torres-Guzman M.E., Modelo B. Dual language programmes in the Basque country and the USA. The International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism. 8(6). PP. 506–528.