

Contents

Preface, vii

1

Bilingual Education
in Historical Perspective, 1

2

French Immersion: An Experiment
in Bilingual Education, 12

3

Research Findings: English Language
and Academic Outcomes, 27

4

Research Findings:
French Language Achievement, 44

5

Three Case Studies in Immersion, 62

6

The Suitability of Immersion
for All Students, 78

7

Social-Psychological Studies of Immersion, 100

8

Immersion in the United States, 116

9

Educating Minority Language Children:
The Case for Bilingual Education, 132

10

Sociocultural Perspectives
on Bilingual Education, 151

11

Bilingual Education:
Teaching and Learning English, 171

12

Conclusions, 191

References, 197

Index, 211

Index

- Academic ability, 119, 169, 192. *See also* English language achievement; French language achievement
- Academic achievement. *See also* Additive bilingualism; Early immersion; Evaluation; Late immersion; Subtractive bilingualism
 evaluation of, 32-33, 41
 of minority language students, 169-170
 and student ability, 79-83
 and teacher expectations, 164-165
- Academic instruction
 in bilingual education, 177, 184
 in immersion programs, 16-17
- Activity-centered immersion, 20, 62, 73-75, 187
- Additive bilingualism, 41, 104, 194
- Age and second language learning, 13, 56-67
- Attitudes
 ethnic, 105-106, 114, 143, 193
 toward immersion, 46, 84, 93, 101-103, 191, 193
 language, 8-9, 13-14, 101, 108
 of parents, 84-85, 93, 107, 143
 toward schooling, 158-160
 and second language use, 106-108
 stereotypes, 100
- Behavioral problems, 83-85, 92
- Bilingual education. *See also* Goals; History
 Cummins' theoretical framework, 138-144
 definition of, 1, 135-136, 155
 and ESL, 189
 evaluation of, 144-150, 154, 195
 history, 1-2, 132-136, 171
 and immersion, 26, 126, 137, 172-174, 196
 psychoeducational rationale, 137-144, 150, 194. *See also* Sociocultural factors
 Title VII, 134-135
 typologies, 2-5
- Bilingual proficiency development, 141
 common underlying proficiency model, 142
 linguistic interdependence, 142
 separate underlying proficiency model, 142
 sociocultural factors in, 142
- Black students in immersion. *See* Cincinnati immersion program
- Cincinnati immersion program, 120-125, 129-130
- Cooperative learning, 169
- Comprehensible input. *See* Negotiation of meaning
- Culver City, 117-119, 129-131
- Dade County, 134
- Delayed immersion, 39-40. *See also* Immersion
 description of, 21
 English language results, 40, 43
 French language results, 44. *See also* French language achievement
- Double immersion, 20, 24, 62-68, 75, 95
- Drop-outs, 83-85, 91-93
- Early immersion. *See also* Attitudes; Goals; History; Immersion
 academic achievement, 41-43
 alternatives, 20-21, 26
 description of, 12, 26
 English language results, 34-40
 French language results, 44-49, 51
- English language achievement, 43. *See also* Delayed immersion; Early immersion; Evaluation; French-medium schooling; Late immersion; Partial immersion; Transfer
 and academic ability, 80-81
 evaluation of, 31-32
 psycholinguistic measures, 32
- English language instruction
 in immersion, 12, 16-17, 20-22, 63-64, 69, 117, 119, 120, 126
 for minority language students, 171, 188-190
- Ethnic identity, 101, 103-105, 114
- Ethnography, 110-114, 170
- Evaluation. *See also* Academic achievement; English language achievement; French language achievement
 generalizability of results, 28-29
 instruments, 31-33
 research design, 27-29
 student samples, 29-31
 testing procedures, 33-34
 use of standardized tests in, 31-32

- French language achievement, 44, 53–54. *See also* Delayed immersion; Early immersion; Evaluation; Late immersion; Partial immersion
 and academic ability, 81–82
 and attitudes, 84–85, 92–93
 in early versus delayed immersion, 54–55, 60–61
 in early versus late immersion programs, 55–61
 evaluation of, 32–34, 44, 53–54
 and geographical setting, 95–98
 of language disabled students, 85–91
 and socioeconomic status, 94–95
 in total versus partial immersion, 54, 60–61
- French-medium schooling, 37–38, 62, 68–73, 76, 173
- Geographical setting, 28, 95–99, 193–194
- Gifted students, 98
- Goals
 of bilingual education, 5–11, 152, 154
 of immersion programs, 12–13, 100, 116
- Heritage language immersion, 19–20
- History
 of bilingual education, 1–2, 132–136, 171
 of Canadian immersion programs, 5–11
- Immersion. *See also* Academic achievement; English language achievement; Evaluation; French language achievement; Goals; History; Second language teaching
 classrooms, 59. *See also* Language use; Second language teaching
 definition of, 1
 description of alternative forms, 19–25
 enrichment, 116
 pedagogical characteristics, 18
 sociocultural characteristics, 18–19
 suitability for all students, 78–79
 theoretical rationale, 13–14, 25–26, 192
- I.Q. (Intelligence Quotient), 79–80, 82–83, 140, 168. *See also* English language achievement; French language achievement
- Language disabled students, 85–91, 98, 192
- Language use
 in immersion schools, 15, 17–18, 39, 46, 180, 192
 in school, 139, 168, 174–176
 outside school, 58, 61, 106–108, 138–139, 144, 190
- Late immersion. *See also* Academic achievement; English language achievement; French language achievement; Immersion
 academic achievement, 42–43
 centers, 24, 51–53
 description of, 22–24
 versus early immersion, 55–60
 English language results, 40, 43
 French language results, 49–53, 191
- Lau v. Nichols*, 135
- Linguistic interdependence. *See* Bilingual proficiency development
- Magnet schools, 120. *See also* Cincinnati immersion program
- Minority language students. *See also* Academic achievement; Sociocultural factors
 and immersion, 26, 130
 and language development, 143, 179
 and multiple ability classes, 169
 and performance expectations, 163–165
- Mohawk-English immersion, 20, 116
- Montgomery County Immersion Program, 119–120, 129–130
- Motivation, 101, 109–110
- Negotiation of meaning, 180–184
- Parental attitudes. *See* Attitudes
- Partial immersion. *See also* Immersion
 description of, 20
 English language results, 39, 43
 French language results, 44. *See also* French language achievement
- Quiet Revolution, 6–9
- Remedial services, 98
- Research. *See* Evaluation
- St. Lambert experiment, 9–11
- St. Lambert Bilingual School Study Group, 9–10
- San Diego immersion program, 126–130, 169
- Second language learning. *See also* French language achievement
 exposure and, 57–59, 61
 and motivation, 101, 109, 185–187
 and output, 183–184
- Second language teaching
 an integrated approach, 14–15, 176–180
 the interactional basis of, 15, 26, 127, 180, 184, 189, 192
 listening, 15–16
 process approach, 176
 reading, 16
 speaking, 15–16
 task-based approach, 177–178
 writing, 16
- Sheltered English, 189
- Sociocultural factors, 108, 110–111, 114–115, 150. *See also* Bilingual proficiency development; Immersion
 assimilation, 157–158

- conflict paradigm, 153–155
- equilibrium paradigm, 151–153
- ethnolinguistic vitality, 160
- model of minority group education, 166–168
- status differentials, 162, 168, 195
- status generalization theory, 163
- Socioeconomic status, 94–95, 126, 130, 192.
 - See also* Cincinnati immersion program;
 - U.S. immersion programs
- Subtractive bilingualism, 40, 104, 194
- Teachers
 - language use, 17, 111–113
 - training, 18
- Title VII. *See* Bilingual education
- Total immersion, 54. *See also* Goals; History; Immersion
- Transfer
 - of academic knowledge, 42
 - of language skills, 38–39
- Two-way bilingualism, 125–126. *See also* San Diego immersion program
- Two-year late immersion. *See* Late immersion
- Ukrainian-English immersion, 19–20, 95
- U.S. immersion programs, 116. *See also* Cincinnati immersion program; Culver City immersion program; Montgomery County immersion program; San Diego immersion program