

Dr. Tove Skutnabb-Kangas, Brussels, 4-5 May 2019, www.Tove-Skutnabb-Kangas.org

Examples of some common models of both weak and strong models of bi/multilingual education. All the strong models, with “good” results have goals which are positive for the children concerned; they/their parents have chosen the model voluntarily, and there are alternatives. The teachers are bi/multilingual and able to enhance children’s metalinguistic awareness of how languages function, and differences between the 2(3) languages. (common underlying proficiency, Cummins). MAJ =Majority; MIN = Minority. Both are defined in terms of power relations, not necessarily demographics (numbers). A numerically much smaller group – e.g. English-speakers in (former) colonies can be *dominant in terms of power*, so MAJ for this Table. Often numerical minorities are also MINorities in terms of power. “Poor” vs “Good” results are linguistic, cultural, affective, cognitive, social and school achievement related. and group-based. Individuals may differ. **GOALS.** Often the goals are not explicitly formulated (i.e. in models with “poor” results there is often not any conscious intention to harm the children, no “evil motivation”). Instead, the goal/intent can be deduced from the results. If the educational administrators and politicians have been told, repeatedly, what the results of various models are, and they still choose a model with “poor” results that harm the MIN children, this can be seen as “ educational effects-discrimination”. The negative goal/intention is still there, embedded in the way the institution - educational authorities and schools - functions. The institution of formal education will over time do the “harm”, despite nice and well-intentioned teachers. See genocide definitions 2b & 2e in the UN Convention of the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide 1948. Some MIN children (e.g. Asian children in UK or Canada) may as a group succeed even in submersion programmes but often this is *not because of the way their education is organised, but despite it.* THERE ARE NO ONE-MODEL-FITS-ALL. All models are context-dependent and have to be adjusted.

Table 1 Some models of bilingual education programmes (Tove Skutnabb-Kangas, copyright Tove)

Programme	Segregation	Submersion	MIN language maintenance	Immersion for ”maj.”	Dual lg/ two-way	MIN revitalisation immersion
Linguistic goal	Dominance in L1	Dominance in L2	Bilingualism	Bilingualism	Bilingualism	Bilingualism
Societal goal	Apartheid/ repatriation	(Forced) assimilation, marginalization	Equity and integration	Linguistic & cultural enrichment	MIN equity Integration MAJ lg cult enrichment	Reconciliation (Indigenous peoples or MIN whose lg is endangered)
Child’s lg	MIN	MAJ + MIN	MIN	MAJ	MAJ+MIN	Min? Maj?
Teaching lg/ LOI, lg of instruction	MIN	MAJ	MIN; MAJ as subject; maybe LOI after gr.8	Min + bil. later, most often MAJ from gr 7, MIN as subject only	Min + bil. later (e.g. gr,6: 50-50%; 80-20%,) the longer Min. lg the better	MIN; MAJ as subject
Teacher	Often monol.	Monolingual	Bilingual	Bilingual	Bilingual	Bilingual
Does child know teaching language?	yes	MAJ yes MIN no	MIN yes	Initially no	MAJ not initially; MIN yes	MIN? No, or a little
Programme chosen voluntarily?	no	MAJ? MIN no	MIN yes	yes	Both yes	MIN yes
Are there alternatives?	Often no	MIN no	MIN yes	yes	MAJ yes MIN ?	MIN yes
Results	Poor	MAJ ? MIN poor	Good	Good	Good	Good