

14: Migration in Europe: Challenges and Opportunities (The Stanford Berlin Symposium on Transition in Europe), ed. by Heike Dönenbacher, 70
Karen Kramer and Steve Baughman, 70-84. Berlin: Stanford Program in Berlin.

3 LANGUAGE, EDUCATION AND CULTURAL DIVERSITY

3.1 Linguistic and Cultural Diversity as Challenge and Opportunity: American and European Perspectives

John R. Rickford

Introduction

The title of my paper is intended to convey the point that linguistic and cultural diversity is too often regarded, even by the supposedly liberal academic establishment (linguists and educators, for instance), as a challenge--for individuals, for schools, and society--rather than as an opportunity. A similar point has been made by others. For instance, Crawford's (1992) book-length discussion of bilingualism and the politics of the "English-Only" Movement in America includes a chapter entitled, "Problem or Resource?"; McKay and Wong's (1988) book on language minorities in the US is similarly entitled: *Language Diversity: Problem or Resource?*, and, as Khan (1980:86, fn 13), notes, it was Fishman (1976) who first distinguished these perspectives. I was first brought to the realization that this point remains to be made, however, when teaching "Introduction to Sociolinguistics" last Autumn using the brand-new, second edition (1992) of Wardhaugh's sociolinguistics text. The subject of African American Vernacular English or "Black English" was treated therein in a chapter entitled "Language and Disadvantage," in which the author notes (p. 327) the widespread belief that one could be disadvantaged "not just socially or esthetically, but also cognitively, i.e. intellectually" by speaking this variety, just as one could be by being an exclusive user of Bernstein's (1961) "restricted code." Although the author does mention (pp 338-39) some of the critiques which Labov (1972) and others have made of this view, these are covered rather briefly, and one comes away with a distinct sense that the "language deficit" and "the child as problem" perspectives which were central foci of the American literature in the 1960s were once again rearing their ugly heads. These perspectives need countering in America, and since I understand from Guus Extra and others that the deficit and problem perspectives are very much alive in the study of multilingualism in Europe, I believe they need countering there too.

In the rest of this paper I will discuss some of the challenges and opportunities posed by linguistic and cultural diversity, because these are not fully recognized, I believe, neither in Europe nor in the USA. The value of considering issues and findings from both of these areas, is that some aspects of linguistic and cultural diversity have received fuller consideration in Europe, while other aspects have been worked on more fully in the US.

One point that remains to be made before I turn to the challenges and opportunities themselves is that the choice of "diversity" rather than "immigrant languages" or "multilingualism" in my title is deliberate. If we restrict our attention to recent immigrants,

we lose sight of the similarities and differences (cf Ogbu 1988) between their situation and that of ethnic minority groups of long standing— for instance, African Americans and Chicanos in the US, the Basques in France, or Welsh and Romani populations in Britain. And if we concentrate on multi-*lingualism* alone, we lose sight of the similar challenges and opportunities for individuals, schools and society posed by non-standard *dialects* of the dominant language—for instance African American Vernacular English in the US, West Indian English in England, or *Gastarbeiterdeutsch* in Germany. These *dialects* sometimes constitute sources of *multi-culturalism* and *identity* as significant as those provided by different *languages*, and so deserve equal consideration in a forum of this type.

1. Challenges

I'll begin by briefly identifying some of the research challenges/needs concerning the language, culture and education of language minorities that await our attention in the 1990s (1.1-1.5) and then consider, in more detail, the issue of educational solutions, in terms of monolingual/bilingual education (1.6).

1.1. Better Data

Our first need is for better data on the number of language minorities, especially in Europe, where censuses do not include questions about home language or mother tongue use, as they do in the US. As Extra and Verhoven (1993:6) point out, what European researchers have to do is infer language minority size from statistics on legal "foreign residents;" not only do such statistics ignore immigrants who have no legal status, but criteria like nationality and/or country of birth "show strong erosion over time because of an increasing trend toward naturalization and births within the country of residence." Martin-Jones (1991), assessing the methodology of the Linguistic Minorities Project in England, identifies two other data challenges: (i) the need for a dynamic picture of language use, from samples at two or more points in time, and (ii) the need to complement broad quantitative surveys with more focused ethnographic studies of how and why minority languages are used in specific community contexts. Data of both kinds is needed to inform language policy decisions.

1.2. Sex/Gender

One aspect of minority language use which seems to have received very little study in the bilingual/immigration language literature is the role of sex or gender, a factor which we know from the study of social dialects more generally to be very significant. When I was teaching at the Stanford in Oxford summer program in London in 1990, I was interested to learn from Robin Cohen, a University of Warwick sociologist who was also in the program, that some recent CSE "O" and "A" level results in England had shown strong sex differences among Black students—the children of West Indian immigrants: Black males did *worse* than both Asians and Whites, while Black females did *better* than both Asians

and Whites. This may or may not be related to evidence (for instance in Hewitt 1986:106, 155) that in areas where the black population is more diffuse, Black girls tend to use less creole, and to be discouraged from linguistic and cultural rebellion more assiduously than boys are. Note, however, that the pattern among other groups might be quite different. Among rural East Indians in Guyana, the tradition was to provide more education for boys than for girls, and because of this fact and their greater restriction to home/village contexts, girls and women often spoke more creole. I have no idea what the facts are for L1 and non-standard L2 use by sex among recent immigrants in the US and Europe, but they are likely to be significant.

1.3. Caste-like and Immigrant Minorities

Another sub-group issue is whether there are characteristic differences in language use and school success between what Ogbu (1988:232) calls *caste-like minorities*, those who have been involuntarily incorporated into society (Blacks through slavery, Chicanos and Indians through conquest) and *immigrant minorities*, those who have come "more or less voluntarily for economic, political and social self betterment." In the US at least, he finds that the latter are less disillusioned than the former and do better in school, and he provides a complex explanation for this in terms of cultural ecology, the study of institutionalized and socially transmitted patterns of behavior (234). Briefly, Blacks and other caste-like minorities are systematically perceived and mistreated in more negative ways than are immigrant minorities; in response they are more mistrustful of the school and other social institutions, and evolve attitudes and skills which may be more "incompatible with school requirements." The extent to which guest workers and other immigrants in Europe can be regarded as "voluntary" is not entirely clear, but in any case it would be interesting to see whether their attitudes and experiences and educational prospects are more similar to those of castelike or immigrant minorities in the US.

1.4. Misdiagnosis as Learning Disabled or Educationally Handicapped

One issue which Ogbu mentions (ibid, 237) as negatively affecting the educational and career prospects for American Blacks is "the disproportionate labeling of Black children as educationally 'handicapped.' He cites evidence from a court case brought by blacks against the San Francisco School District showing that "in the twenty California school districts which enrolled 80 percent of black children in 1976-77, black students comprised about 27.5% of the school population but 62% of those labeled educable mentally retarded." Such mislabeling is of course often due to insensitivity on the part of the schools to the distinctive language and culture of Black youth, as was clear from the 1979 "King" case in Ann Arbor, which started because kids speaking African American Vernacular English were "placed in speech pathology classes for a non-existent language deficiency" (Smitherman 1981:11).

I'm afraid I get a little agitated when I consider this issue because we experienced it first-hand within a few months of our immigrating to the US in 1980, in a school district which many consider among the most enlightened in the land. Our oldest child, although born in the US, had grown up in our native Guyana, and she was still adjusting to this country and her new second grade classroom when her teachers called to tell us that they were considering placing her in "Special Education" classes. The evidence was partly the fact that she said little or nothing in class and was best friends with another immigrant child, a Malaysian, whom the teacher regarded as linguistically and educationally suspect for some other reason. Well, I could go on and on to tell you how my wife and I both hit the roof and how, by bringing evidence of the work she had done in her Guyanese classes a year before—far superior to what they were demanding in this second grade classroom—we were able to disabuse them of this misguided notion. The irony is that by the end of the year our daughter had done so well on one of the school district's tests that she was placed in an accelerated program for the mentally gifted. It is sobering to think that if her teachers HAD succeeded in placing her in a special education or learning disabled class, their diminished expectations and misapplied remedies might have become self-fulfilling, leading to diminished school success.

Evidence that linguistically and culturally mediated misdiagnosis of immigrants in Europe might also be taking place comes from the data in table 1, from Kardam and Pfaff (1992:56). As the authors note, "*Hauptschule* and *Sonderschule* [this latter category including the last two rows in the table] are the school types in which minority children are increasingly over-represented."

The challenge for researchers is to document the nature of these misdiagnoses in detail, and to arrest the process, perhaps by helping to develop more accurate and language/culture-sensitive tests of disability.

1.5. Inter-ethnic Miscommunication

A final research need or challenge is for better understanding of the contextualization cues and cultural differences in verbal and non-verbal language use that produce misunderstandings and lead to discrimination even when language minorities are relatively fluent in the majority language and dialect. Research in Britain (for instance by Gumperz 1982, Gumperz, Jupp and Roberts 1979, Roberts, Davies and Jupp 1992), is considerably in advance of research in the US with respect to this, but Kochman's (1981) study of how Black/White differences in classroom interaction, argument and other aspects of rhetorical style can lead to interethnic misunderstanding represents a start. Taylor and Matsuda (1988) are also relevant, covering the literature on differences in story-telling style that lead to classroom discrimination.

1.6. Monolingual or Bilingual Education for Linguistic Minorities

In view of the fact that in both areas school systems cater primarily to majority students who speak the standard form of the national language (English, German, and so on), the central educational challenge both in Europe and the US is what to do about the large numbers of ethnic minorities whose native language is a minority language or a nonstandard dialect of the majority language. As a group, such minorities tend to do much worse academically than their mainstream counterparts. For instance, Hispanic students in their final year of high school in the US "are about three and a half years behind national norms in academic achievement" (Romaine 1989:217, citing Cummins 1984:7-8), and in Germany, "50% of the Guest Worker children do not get any kind of leaving certificate from any kind of school" (Skutnabb-Kangas 1984a:31, citing Kühn 1979). Although this failure must be attributed in part to other aspects of minorities' structural position in society (for instance, their menial jobs and location in "poor housing and areas of inadequate educational and social facilities"—Khan 1980:8), the "barrier" posed by their minority language or dialect is also a relevant factor, and one which schools CAN address (unlike the other problems).

In a short paper, it is difficult to do justice to the range and complexity of the educational "solutions" which have been proposed in response to the "challenge" offered by minority languages and dialects, particularly since the multilingual problems and solutions differ to some extent from one country to another. However, we can broadly distinguish three solutions:

- (1) Monolingual education in the majority language (L2 for minorities);
- (2) Monolingual education in the minority language (L1 for minorities);
- (3) Bilingual education, taking both varieties (L1 and L2) into account.

1.6.1. Monolingual Education in the Majority Language (L2)

This is, as Skutnabb-Kangas (1984a:35) has noted, "the most common model for minority children throughout the world, . . . used almost exclusively in Denmark, Norway, France, Great Britain, Holland, etc. and to a great extent in . . . West Germany (Table 2, Classes 1-3)." Economically, it is the least expensive solution for governments to provide, at least in the short run, and it has a cultural assimilationist goal which they tend to find administratively efficient and politically attractive. One merit of this approach, at least where minority children are retained in "regular classes" with majority children (type 1 in table 1) is that they have the greatest contact with native speakers of the standard or majority language, and this facilitates their mastery of it. Kardam and Pfaff (1992:65) conclude, for instance, that Turkish children's lack of exposure to peer group German in "special classes" for foreigners (type 2 in table 1, but presumably also types 3-6) "contributes to underdevelopment of German for daily interpersonal communication as well as academic language skills."

However, as Skutnabb-Kangas (ibid) points out, monolingual L2 education programs "show bad results all over the world," and tend to "educate future assembly line workers and future unemployed." This is particularly likely to be true where minorities are ambivalent or hostile towards the majority culture, insecure about their own culture, and insufficiently developed in their "Cognitive Academic Language Proficiency" (CALP) in their native language when they start school (Cummins 1981:19-20). The effect of this kind of submersion is semilingualism or subtractive bilingualism, in which L2 gains are small and accompanied by L1 losses. As Nehr (1990:92) observes:

Comparative research has shown that submersion programs with Navajo Indians [in the US] and Finnish migrant children in Sweden have resulted in low proficiency in the second language and decreased ability in the mother tongue (Fthenakis et al 1985: Chap 2).--Nehr (1990:92)

It should be noted that linguistic and ethnic minorities often ARE ambivalent or hostile towards the majority culture. Both in England and the USA, Black teenagers have embraced their vernacular and resisted the standardizing pressures of the school as a means of maintaining and asserting their ethnic identity (Fordham and Ogbu 1986, Rickford 1992, Wong 1986). And Heyman, quoted in Skutnabb Kangass and Toukomaa (1976) reports similar feelings among Finnish immigrants in Sweden, who "feel an aversion, and sometimes even hostility, towards the Swedish language and refuse to learn it, or learn it under protest."

One reason for such aversion may be the psychological and sometimes physical coercion which language minorities often experience when a policy of monolingualism in the majority language is being pursued. Cesar Chavez, the Chicano civil rights leader who died in California last month, spoke several years ago of the "bitter resentment" he felt as a child at not being able to speak his native Spanish in school, and of the physical punishment he experienced:

When we spoke Spanish, the teacher swooped down on us. I remember the ruler whistling through the air as its edge came down sharply across my knuckles. It really hurt. . . . (Cesar Chavez, in Levy 1975:24; quoted in Grosjean 1982:28)

Similar experiences were faced by American Indians who were forcibly removed from their tribes in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries and sent to "faraway boarding schools where they were punished when caught speaking any language other than English" (Crawford 1992:44). The "success" of this linguistic and cultural genocide was dismal, as Crawford (ibid), referring to a 1969 investigation, noted: "40% of Oklahoma Cherokees were literate in no language, 75 percent of their children were dropping out of school, and in one county, 90 percent were on welfare."

Lest it be assumed that the United States had a monopoly on this kind of barbarity, note the parallel between Chavez's experience and that of this Kurdish minority woman reporting her childhood school experiences in Turkey:

Anyone who spoke Kurdish was terribly punished. The teachers hit us on the fingertips or our heads with a ruler. It hurt terribly. . . [in Clason & Bakso 1979:79, 86-7; translated by Skutnabb-Kangas 1984b:311-12, and reprinted in Romaine 1989:218)

Similarly, Romaine (ibid, drawing on Skutnabb-Kangas 1984b:309) reports that some Finnish schoolchildren in the Tornedal area of Sweden "had to carry heavy logs on their shoulders or wear a stiff collar" for speaking Finnish. In another area, whole groups of workhouse children would be lined up to have their ears boxed if anyone spoke Finnish.

Although examples of this type do not and did not exist everywhere, they exemplify the deep antipathy which some school and government officials have towards immigrant and minority languages, and they show us an unpleasant implementation side to L2-only education policies which might otherwise appear more palatable. It is difficult to see how enforced linguistic assimilation of this type could lead to school success, engender loyalty to the new country or produce good relations with members of the majority culture.

1.6.2. Monolingual Education in the Minority Language (L1)

This second policy, represented by type 6 in table 2, is best exemplified within Germany by classes for Turkish speakers in Bavaria. The syllabi and teaching materials for such classes often come from the immigrants' country of origin, and, as Skutnabb-Kangas (1984a:26 notes), such classes "are also supposed to offer instruction in German as a second language, but this is often not lived up to." This kind of policy has a superficial commitment to maintaining the language and culture of the child, and preparing the children of "guest workers" to return to their "home" countries when the terms of their contracts are fulfilled. But in fact, as Skutnabb-Kangas (35-36) points out, it represents a form of apartheid, preventing minorities from getting "their share of power and of the goods and services of the mainstream society" and "limiting their linguistic capacity to influence the society." Although Skutnabb-Kangas (ibid) suggests that the *rage* this kind of policy might engender is more positive than the *shame* which monolingualism in L2 engenders, it suggests a mind-set in which immigrants and other minorities are seen as temporary problems which will eventually go away, and cannot be considered a serious solution to the challenge of educationally liberating these populations, facilitating their incorporation in the larger society, and enhancing their achievement.

2.3. Bilingual Education, Taking Both Varieties (L1 and L2) into Account

Some form of this third option is recommended for linguistic minorities by most researchers. One type is that provided for Finnish, Yugoslav and other immigrant groups

in Sweden, in which the minority language is used as the medium of education for the first three to six years, while increasing amounts of instruction are provided in the majority language (Swedish), with higher grades being taught primarily or entirely in this L2. According to Skutnabb-Kangas (1984a:30):

This is the model which the immigrant organizations want and most researchers recommend ... because it seems to produce the best results with relation to bilingualism, school achievement and the happiness of the children (Hanson 1982).
--Skutnabb-Kangas (1984:30)

Cummins (1981:20-21) reports on successful bilingual education programs in Canada, Sweden and the US, and he attributes their success to two factors:

1. Learning L2 no longer threatens students' identity, because the use of their L1 in the school gives them pride in their own cultural background and reinforces their self-concept.
2. The use of L1 as the language of instruction builds on the linguistic and intellectual skills which students bring to the school.

However, as Nehr (1990:92-3) notes, Cummins' *threshold level* hypothesis, according to which L2 instruction should be delayed until proficiency is established in L1, has been called into question on the basis of findings by Hakuta and Dias (1985) that Spanish speaking minority children who were simultaneously educated in Spanish AND English for the first two years [that is, in a different, non-canonical variety of "bilingual education"] learned both languages equally well. Her own study of an experimental program in West Berlin in which Turkish children were simultaneously introduced to literacy through Turkish and German showed encouraging results:

It is...remarkable that all those children observed could, after two years at school, read both Turkish and German better than earlier school generations. It has also been clearly shown that learning to read in two languages does not overwork the children, but actually helps them. --Nehr 1990:101.

Unlike the situation in Germany, which is "officially said to be neither a country of immigration, nor a multicultural nation," and one where "migrant workers and their children...have no claim to have their languages officially recognized and promoted" (Nehr 1990:88)— and this characterizes most Western European nations as well— federally funded bilingual education has been provided in the United States since the passage of the Bilingual Education act in 1968 and its key amendments in 1974 and 1978. By 1980, there were 575 federally funded projects in the US, involving 79 minority languages and 315,000 children, at a cost of \$167 million (Grosjean 1982:75).

As Grosjean (ibid, 77) notes, two aspects of bilingual education in the US have been "extremely controversial from the outset":

The first concerns its effectiveness, and the second pertains to its role: should it be compensatory and transitional or should it maintain the minority language and culture? —Grosjean (1982:77)

The two issues are not unrelated. Skutnabb-Kangas (1984a:36) is particularly critical of most bilingual education programs in the US on the grounds that their *transitional* orientation leads to children being transferred to L2 (English-only) instruction too early—once they appear able to follow simple instructions in English but before they can compete with majority children in “cognitively and linguistically more demanding decontextualized tasks.” The result, she notes is that they often fail miserably. Not all bilingual education programs in the US are of this “early exit” variety, however. Crawford (1992:229) summarizing the results of a careful four-year study by Ramirez et al (1991), noted that while:

...there were few significant differences in achievement between immersion and early-exit programs, that is, between children taught almost exclusively in English and those taught mostly in English, . . . *children in late-exit programs, taught primarily in Spanish, had the most sustained growth in achievement* [measured on English language tests in reading, language and mathematics].—Crawford 1992:229, summarizing research by Ramirez et al 1991. (Emphasis added.)

The concurrence of these research findings with the results reported above for Finnish children in Sweden should lead us to recommend “late exit” bilingual education (i.e., with L1 or minority language use developed for up to six years in school) for language minorities both in Europe and the US. The prospects that this will actually happen are discouraging, however. Within the US, bilingual education is one of the gains for language minorities--along with bilingual ballots and driver's license tests--that is being threatened by the steadily spreading “English Only” movement (see Crawford 1992 for details). European governments in turn appear to be willing to do less with respect to the languages of immigrants and language minorities than they were in the mid 1970s. For instance, the EEC Directive on the Education of Migrant Workers' Children, already modified before its passage in 1977 to remove the compulsory requirement of mother tongue teaching (Khan 1980:85, fn 10), seems to have translated into concrete gains for linguistic minorities in very few countries. In England, for instance, the Education Reform Act [ERA] of 1988 provides NO allowance for the teaching of any languages except English (and Welsh, in Wales), and in this respect represents a rejection of the 1975 Bullock Committee recommendation that:

Every school with pupils whose original language is not English should adopt a positive attitude to their bilingualism and, wherever possible, help maintain and deepen their knowledge of their mother tongue. --Bullock 1975, para 265; cited in Khan 1980:85, fn 7.

As Alladina (1993:63-64), notes: "ERA 1988 has initiated another phase in the response to the multilingual reality of Britain,"— a regression to notions of 'one nation, one language.'

On this somewhat dismal note, we should end our discussion of the central language and education problem involving linguistic minorities in Europe and the US: the solution is at hand, but governments and majority citizens may be loath to implement it.

2. OPPORTUNITIES

I have spent so much time and space on challenges that little remains for "opportunities," but I hope to make up in intensity for what I lack in extent.

2.1. Finding Out More about Language Acquisition, Acculturation and Mixing

This is a somewhat selfish opportunity, but it is nevertheless a real one. The linguistic diversity offered by immigrant populations and linguistic minorities offers us invaluable opportunities to understand better than we do now the process of second language acquisition and acculturation, the principles governing code-switching, and the nature of simplification and mixing (perhaps even pidgin and creole formation) in language contact. This kind of opportunity is being exploited much more in Europe— see, for instance, Nortier (1993) and Pfaff (1993)— than in the US.

2.2. Bettering the Body Politic— the Nation as a Whole

Linguistic and cultural diversity offers valuable resources, new perspectives and opportunities to the country as a whole. One example which Crawford (1992:208) offers is the potential foreign language resources which linguistic minorities could offer— provided that their competence in Korean, Spanish and so on is maintained and developed— in the realm of the military, international diplomacy, and business. Another area in which ethnic diversity has already made its impact in the US is in literature, music, sports and entertainment, and the arts. Particularly noteworthy is that some of the leading African American writers— including James Baldwin, Toni Morrison, and June Jordan— not only make use of distinctive African American Vernacular English in their works, but also express the most positive attitudes towards it. Jordan (1985:129), for instance, speaks of "the three qualities of Black English— the presence of life, voice, and clarity— that testify to a distinctive Black value system..."— a far cry from Wardhaugh's notion of "language and disadvantage." Speaking more generally and abstractly, one could argue that adapting to multilingualism and multiculturalism is good for majority language speakers and the nation as a whole, helping to develop qualities like tolerance, sensitivity and broad-

mindedness which are "Good" with a capital "G," and could fruitfully be extended to differences in class, gender, sexual orientation, and political viewpoint. One concrete example of this is the difference which the unprecedented presence of four women senators has already begun to make on the proceedings of the US Senate this year. Although he is a leading opponent of proposals to lift the ban against homosexuals in the military, Senator Sam Nunn recently thanked Senator Dianne Feinstein for her testimony to the contrary, suggesting that her perspective on this issue, as a woman, was distinctive. And Senator Carol Moseley-Braun last month persuaded the Senate Judiciary Committee NOT to renew the patent on the logo of the United Daughters of the Confederacy, which includes the Confederate Flag, the symbol of the proslavery and anti-union forces in the American Civil War. As she said, in a speech which persuaded her fellow senators to vote differently than their predecessors had since 1898:

We should not give our imprimatur to something that is so inflammatory and so painful to so many US citizens." (Senator Carol Moseley-Braun, D-Illinois, quoted in San Jose Mercury News, Friday May 7, 1993)

2.3. Unleashing the Resources and Skills of Linguistic Minorities

Finally, and this is related to the preceding point, the more we recognize and provide room for the distinctive linguistic skills and experiences and viewpoints of minorities, the more and better they'll do in our societies, and the more they'll have to offer in terms of distinctive contributions. The point has already been made in the literature on bilingual education, that, ironically, the more you provide for L1 education in the first six years of school— while providing training in L2— the better immigrants do in the learning of L2 and mastery of other subjects. But it applies to other areas too. If we want to have access to the songs of Aretha Franklin, the novels of Toni Morrison and Amy Tan, the basketball playing of Michael Jordan and the politics of Carol Moseley-Braun, we cannot smush them into conformity with White or mainstream practices and perspectives.

To reinforce this final point, and in the spirit of diversity, I want to close with some segments from a poem entitled "Rayford's Song" by Lawson Inada (1992), an Asian American poet, about a song by Rayford, an African American kid. (I am grateful to Virginia Mak of Stanford University for bringing it to my attention.) Rayford was one of several kids in a third grade multi-ethnic classroom who had sat through weeks and weeks of mainstream songs like "Oh Susannah," and "Row, row, row your boat" before saying to his teacher:

"Miss Gordon, ma'am--
we always singing your songs.
Could I sing one of my own?"

After she grudgingly gave permission, he stood up very straight and sang:

*"Suh-whing ah-loooow,
suh-wheet ah charr--eee--oohh,
ah-comin' for to carr-eee
mee ah-hooooome..."*

In response to this, the class was spellbound, but Miss Gordon, her face in a frown, said:

"Very good, Rayford.
However, I must correct you:
the word is 'chariot.'
'Chariot.' And there is no such thing as a 'chario.'
Do you understand me?"

"But Miss Gordon..."

"I said 'chariot, chariot.'
Can you pronounce that for me?"

"Yes, Miss Gordon. Chariot."

After this put-down, Miss Gordon asks the rest of the class if "anyone else would care to sing a song of their own?" But no one else volunteers:

Our songs, our songs, were there—
on tips of tongues, but stuck
in throats— songs of love,
fun, animals, and valor, songs
of other lands, in other languages,
but they just wouldn't come out.
Where did our voices go?...

May we not still the voices of linguistic minorities nor deny our nations the riches of their songs.

Notes

*I am grateful to Professor Russell Berman for the invitation to participate in this conference, to my wife Angela for her support during the writing of this paper.

References

- Alladina, Safder. 1993. South Asian Languages in Britain. In: Immigrant languages in Europe, ed. by Guus Extra and Ludo Verhoeven, 55-65. Clevedon, England: Multilingual Matters Ltd.
- Bernstein, Basil. 1961. Social structure, language and learning. *Educational Research* 3:163-76.
- Bullock, Sir A. 1975. *A language for life*. London: HMSO.
- Clason, E., and M. Baksi. 1979. *Kurdistan. Om fortryck och befrielsekamp*. Stockholm: Arbetarkultur.
- Crawford, James. 1992. *Hold your tongue: Bilingualism and the politics of the "English Only" movement*. Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley.
- Cummins, Jim. 1981. *Bilingualism and minority language children*. Toronto: The Ontario Institute for Studies in Education.
- . 1984. *Bilingualism and special education: Issues in Assessment and Pedagogy*. Clevedon, Avon: Multilingual Matters.
- Extra, Guus, and Ludo Verhoeven. 1993. Immigrant groups and immigrant languages in Europe. In: *Immigrant languages in Europe*, ed by Guus Extra and Ludo Verhoeven, 3-18. Clevedon, England: Multilingual Matters Ltd.
- Fishman, Joshua A. 1976. Bilingual education: What and why? In *English as a second language in bilingual education*, ed. by J.E. Alatis and K. Twadell, eds. Washington, DC: TESOL.
- Fordham, Signithia and John U. Ogbu. 1986. Black students' school success: Coping with the "Burden of 'Acting White'." *The Urban Review* 18.3:176-206.
- Fthenakis, Wassilios E., Adelheid Sonner, Rosemarie Thrul and Waltraud Walbinger. 1985. *Bilingual-bikulturelle Entwicklung des Kindes*. München: Hueber.
- Grosjean, François. 1983. *Life with two languages: An introduction to bilingualism*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.
- Gumperz, John J. 1982. Interethnic communication. In: *Discourse strategies*, by John J. Gumperz, 172-186. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- , T.C. Jupp and Celia Roberts. 1979. *Crosstalk: A study of cross-cultural communication*. Southall, Middlesex: The National Centre for Industrial Language Training.
- Hakuta, Kenji, and Rafael M. Diaz. 1985. The relationship between degree of bilingualism and cognitive ability: A critical discussion and some longitudinal data. In: *Children's language* (vol. 5), ed. by Keith E. Nelson, 319-343. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Hanson, G. 1982. *Integration and participation*. Paper presented at the Fifth International School Psychology Association, Stockholm.
- Hewitt, Roger. 1986. *White talk black talk: Inter-racial friendships and communication amongst adolescents*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Inada, Lawson. 1992. *Legends from Camp*. Coffeehouse Press.
- Jordan, June. 1985. *On call: Political essays*. South end Press.
- Kardam, Filiz and Carol W. Pfaff. 1992. Issues in educational policy and language development of bilingual children in Berlin. In: *Multiethnische Gesellschaft und Schule in Berlin*, ed. by Sjaak Koon, Dieter Pagel and Ton Vallen, 51-68. Münster and New York: Waxmann.
- Khan, Verity Saifullah. 1980. The "Mother Tongue" of linguistic minorities in multicultural England. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* 1.1:71-88.
- Kochman, Thomas. 1981. *Black and White styles in conflict*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Kühn, H. 1979. Memorandum zur Integration der Arbeitsimmigranten in der BRD. *Deutsch Lernen* 3: 82-99.
- Labov, William. 1972. The logic of non-standard English. In: *Studies in the Black English Vernacular*, by William Labov. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Levy, J. 1975. *Cesar Chavez*. New York: W. W. Norton.
- Mckay, Sandra Lee and Sau-ling Cynthia Wong, eds. 1988. *Language diversity: Problem or resource? A social and educational perspective on language minorities in the United States*. Boston, Massachusetts: Heinle and Heinle.

- Martin-Jones, Marilyn. 1991. Sociolinguistic surveys as a source of evidence in the study of bilingualism: A critical assessment of survey work conducted among linguistic minorities in three British cities. In: *Migrant languages in Western Europe*, ed. by Kees de Bot and Willem Fase (= *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 90), 37-55. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Nehr, Monika. 1990. The acquisition of literacy in bilingual education: Turkish schoolchildren in West Germany. *Multilingua* 9.1:87-103.
- Nortier, Jacomine. 1993. Code-switching and borrowing in an Arabic-Dutch context. In: *Immigrant languages in Europe*, ed by Guus Extra and Ludo Verhoeven, 237-248. Clevedon, England: Multilingual Matters Ltd.
- Ogbu, John U. 1988. Literacy and schooling in subordinate cultures: The case of Black Americans. In: *Perspectives on literacy*, ed. by Eugene R. Kintgen, Barry M. Kroll and Mike Kroll, 227-242. Carbondale, Ill.: Southern Illinois University Press.
- Pfaff, Carol. 1993. Turkish language development in Germany. In: *Immigrant languages in Europe*, ed by Guus Extra and Ludo Verhoeven, 119-146. Clevedon, England: Multilingual Matters Ltd.
- Ramírez, J. David, Sandra D. Yuen, and dena R. Ramey. 1991. Final report: Longitudinal study of structured immersion strategy, early-exit, and late-exit transitional bilingual education programs for language-minority children. San Mateo, CA: Aguirre International.
- Rickford, John R. 1992. Grammatical variation and divergence in Vernacular Black English. In: *Internal and external factors in syntactic change*, ed. by Marinel Gerritsen and Dieter Stein. Berlin: Mouton De Gruyter.
- Roberts, Celia, Evelyn Davies and Tom Jupp. 1992. *Language and discrimination: A study of communication in multi-ethnic workplaces*. London: Longman.
- Romaine, Suzanne. 1989. *Bilingualism*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Skutnabb-Kangas, Tove. 1984a. Children of guest workers and immigrants: Linguistic and educational issues. In: *Linguistic minorities, policies and pluralism*, ed. by John Edwards, 17-48. London: Academic Press.
- . 1984b. *Bilingualism or not: The education of minorities*. Clevedon, Avon: Multilingual Matters, Ltd.
- , and P. Toukomaa. 1976. *Teaching migrant children's mother tongue and learning the language of the host country in the context of the sociocultural situation of the migrant family*. Helsinki: The Finnish National Commission for UNESCO.
- Smitherman, Geneva. 1981. *Black English and the education of Black children and youth: Proceedings of the national invitational symposium on the King decision*. Detroit, MI: Center for Black Studies, Wayne State University.
- Taylor, Orlando, and Maryon M. Matsuda. 1988. Storytelling and classroom discrimination. In: *Discourse and discrimination*, ed. by Geneva Smitherman-Donaldson and Teun A. van Dijk, 206-20. Detroit: Wayne State University Press.
- Wardhaugh, Ronald. 1992. *An introduction to sociolinguistics*. Second edition. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Wong, Ansel. 1986. Creole as a language of power and solidarity. In: *The language of the Black experience*, ed. by David Sutcliffe and Ansel Wong, 109-122. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Table 1: Percentage of non-German pupils in various school types

Type	1976/77	1979/80	1982/83	1985/86	1988/89	1989/90
All school types	8.0	12.4	18.5	19.8	21.9	21.9
Grundschule	10.1	16.3	25.4	24.3	23.4	22.9
Hauptschule	6.4	27.9	33.8	37.2	45.2	45.6
Realschule	3.5	5.5	8.5	13.9	21.9	22.2
Gymnasium	2.9	3.6	4.6	7.2	10.7	11.4
Gesamtschule	4.4	6.4	13.3	19.6	22.6	22.6
Lern- und Geis- tigbehinderte	3.8	11.8	24.4	30.6	33.2	33.1
Übrige Sonder- schulen	3.2	6.0	12.8	13.8	16.4	18.3

Source: Kardam & Pfaff 1992: 56, table 4

TABLE 2
West German classes

Type of class	Language of instruction	Goal	Integration/assimilation (yes/no)			
			Physical <i>vis-à-vis</i>		Content (C)	Ideology (I)
			German children	other GW children		
1. "regular classes"	L2	Assimilation	+	+	C++	I++
2. "special classes"	L2	Transition and assimilation	-	+	C+	I++
3. International preparatory classes	L2	Transition(?)	-	+	C-	I+
4. 1-2-year national preparatory classes	L2 + L1	Transition(?)	-	-	C-	I±
5. National classes of several years' duration	L1	Transition(?)	-	-	C-	I-
6. Complete national classes	L1	Maintenance	-	-	C--	I--

Source: Skutnabb-Kangas 1984: 28, table 2