

# Different Educational Approaches to Bi- or Multilingualism and Their Effect on Language Attitudes

David Lasagabaster

## 1 Introduction

A review of the history of humankind reveals that multilingualism has been a constant. In her enlightening article on the history of multilingualism, Franceschini (2013) explains that as early as ca. 2600 BC, the Sumerians already needed to train multilingual civil servants to respond to the challenges posed by their large empire, a preoccupation also shared by the Hittite and Egyptian empires. Similarly, in the Roman period, key institutions were multilingual. During the Middle Ages multilingualism was also commonplace, the merchants being among the most multilingual people (the Hanseatic League represents a remarkable example). Multilingual skills were part of many people's everyday life and Franceschini (2013: 5) concludes that “[w]e can assume that functional multilingualism was seen as the norm, and that non-ideological, pragmatic attitudes prevailed.” Therefore, it can be affirmed that multilingual educational practices have existed for millennia, although a radical change took place from the fourteenth century onwards.

The Renaissance (from the fourteenth to the seventeenth centuries) became a turning point and the blossoming nationalist ideology led to the spread of a monolingual mindset in the belief that multilingualism could endanger national cohesion. In the case of education, these prejudices stemming from vested interests created the myth of the overcrowded school curriculum that had no space for any language other than the national language, presupposing that learning another language would detract from national-language literacy (Clyne 2005). In this period, purist attitudes started to emerge and there was an interest in homogenising societies. This trend was reinforced during the nineteenth century with the formation of nation states which forced the transformation of multilingual societies into a monolingual community, a time

---

D. Lasagabaster (✉)

Departamento de Filología Inglesa, Universidad del País Vasco (UPV/EHU), Vitoria, Spain  
e-mail: [david.lasagabaster@ehu.es](mailto:david.lasagabaster@ehu.es)

when nationalism became one of the leading forces in the spread of monolingualism. Since then, the dominant European ideology has inextricably linked the notions of nation, language and identity (Franceschini 2013), and regional or indigenous languages have been regarded as a threat to national unity for decades, their teaching being prohibited at school. In the early twentieth century, methodologically unsound research undertaken among economically deprived children also aimed to undermine multilingual practices and concluded that multilingualism had pernicious effects on children's cognitive development. A side effect of this unfortunate and biased conclusion was the boost of negative attitudes towards multilingualism.

Nevertheless, and despite all these pro-uniformity attempts, societies the world over have remained multilingual due to the impact of globalisation, the ever increasing flows of people, the burgeoning desire to maintain local languages and the spread of English as a global *lingua franca*. As a result of these intertwined processes, multilingualism is still the norm rather than the exception, despite the relentless pressure exerted by the aforementioned homogenising ideology in many parts of the world. In fact, it is currently estimated that there are between 6,000 and 7,000 languages spoken on the planet and the majority of the world population is bilingual or multilingual. But how is multilingualism defined nowadays? In the following section we will attempt to answer this question.

## 2 The Terms Bilingualism and Multilingualism

This section is devoted to analysing the terms *bilingualism* and *multilingualism*, a distinction that will pave the way for the following section in which I intend to examine how this terminological clarification bears on different types of bilingual and multilingual education models.

Multilingualism is traditionally used as an umbrella term that includes bilingualism. The Oxford dictionary, however, defines a bilingual as the person who is able to speak two languages equally well, whereas a multilingual person is described as the person able to speak or use many languages. Based on these definitions, two main conclusions could be drawn. Firstly, we can conclude that bilingualism refers to two languages and multilingualism to many. In fact, the dictionary includes an entry that leads the reader to “compare bilingual, monolingual” and the word *compare* implies that the terms “bilingual” and “multilingual” are not used as synonyms. Moreover, the Latin prefixes “bi” and “multi” literally mean “two” and “many” respectively, which would underpin our first conclusion. Secondly, our attention is drawn to the fact that whereas the bilingual person is supposed to speak or use both languages “equally well”, this adverbial phrase is obliterated in the case of the multilingual. One could also infer that it is quite habitual to speak two languages equally well, but that this is a much convoluted task when three or more languages are involved. This latter idea is closely linked to the concept of multicompetence (for further information, see Cook 2006), which unfortunately falls beyond the scope of this chapter. I will focus then on the first conclusion in the following lines.

It could be advocated that researchers should attempt to avoid using both bilingualism and multilingualism interchangeably, as this lack of precision may lead to misinterpretations of research data. A second reason to propose this distinction is based on empirical research. Those researchers (Jessner 2006; De Angelis 2007; Aronin and Hufeisen 2009; Cenoz 2009; Dewaele 2010) who actively work on multilingualism have highlighted that there are significant differences between the acquisition of a second language and the acquisition of third or additional languages. De Angelis (2007), for example, provides abundant evidence illustrating the existing differences between L2 and multilingual acquisition. Jessner (2006: 13) happens to be very assertive and concludes that “nowadays it is known that learning a second language differs in many respects from learning a third language.” This conclusion is also valid for bilingual and multilingual education and both terms should preferably be distinguished.

### 3 Bilingual and Multilingual Education

A review of the literature leads us to conclude that there is currently a terminological confusion concerning bilingual and multilingual programmes that undoubtedly needs to be clarified (Fortune and Tedick 2008), as terminological ambiguity may hamper the coherent design and implementation of such programmes. Darquennes (2013) distinguishes four main types of multilingual education: (a) multilingual education aimed primarily at the majority population; (b) multilingual education aimed primarily at the indigenous minority population; (c) multilingual education aimed primarily at the immigrant population within a state and (d) multilingual education aimed at an affluent international audience. The latter category encompasses those schools attended by children of diplomats, officials working for international organizations and expatriates working for multinational companies. This type of multilingual education would nicely fit into elitist multilingualism and therefore will not be of concern in this chapter. Taking into account the remaining chapters gathered in this volume, nor will this introductory chapter focus on the case of the immigrant population, but rather on the much more popular types (a) and (b) programmes mentioned above.

The classification put forward by Darquennes turns out to be problematic if applied to Spain (among other contexts). The main reason for this lies in the fact that in the six officially bilingual communities (Balearic Islands, Catalonia, Galicia, Navarre, Valencian Community, the Basque Country) in Spain, students attending bilingual programmes are not usually separated according to their mother tongue and, therefore, the same multilingual programme is aimed at both majority and indigenous minority populations. For example, in model D programmes implemented in the Basque Country and in which Basque is the language of instruction, both L1 = Spanish and L1 = Basque students are enrolled in the same group (as is also the case of two-way double immersion programmes in North America). This is just one example of how difficult it becomes to make generalisations concerning multilingual

education. In addition, this classification does not consider the number of languages involved, and bilingual and multilingual programmes are encompassed within the multilingual label.

The distinction between bilingual and multilingual education seems to demand further elaboration. García (2009) defines bilingual education as the use of two or more languages in the instruction and assessment of learners, on the condition that the languages are used as a medium of instruction and not simply taught as an additional language. Cummins (2011: 161) also coincides in this definition and refers to the use of “two (or more) languages of instruction”. Once again bilingual and multilingual programmes are not distinguished.

In this chapter, *bilingual education* will be referred to when the education model concerned uses two languages as media of instruction and/or the objective is to reach bilingualism. Thus, schools in which a foreign language is only taught as a subject will not be regarded as bilingual models, as the results obtained in most parts of the world confirm that in these cases students’ level of proficiency in the L2 leaves much to be desired. The objective of other programmes (despite being preceded by the label *bilingual*) is not to develop proficiency in both languages. Cummins (2011), for example, underscores that during the last four decades *transitional bilingual education* in the United States has only been aimed at promoting students’ English proficiency. This type of programmes is encompassed in the so-called *weak forms* of education for bilingualism, as the actual language outcome is monolingualism. In contrast, *strong forms* of bilingual education such as immersion aim to produce bilingual and biliterate students (Baker 2011). It is worth considering that the Basque and Catalan education systems prove that bilingual communicative competence and biliteracy can be achieved only by using the minority language (Basque/Catalan) as language of instruction, as the majority language’s (Spanish) vitality makes up for its use only as a subject. Research undertaken in the Catalan education system and the Basque model D confirms that balanced bilingualism can be reached without using the majority language as medium of instruction. The objective of these programmes is to reach bilingualism.

Among strong forms of bilingual education, Fortune and Tedick (2008) distinguish three immersion models that have distinct features: (a) one-way foreign language immersion: this model serves a majority language group in the process of acquiring the same second language (e.g. Swedish immersion in Finland; in the United States, this model exists in 18 different languages); (b) two-way bilingual immersion; this model caters for speakers of the two languages of instruction who are in the process of acquiring the partner language (e.g. in the US Spanish=L1 and English=L1 students enrolled in the same class). This model is a good example of the current proliferation of labels, as it is also referred to as “two-way bilingual immersion”, “two-way immersion”, “dual language” and “dual language immersion”; and (c) indigenous language immersion: this model is dedicated to the cultural and linguistic revitalization for Native or Aboriginal groups around the world (e.g. Maori immersion in New Zealand). The common objective of these three models is additive bilingualism and biliteracy. Due to the different local needs, sociolinguistic contexts, status of the languages concerned and other idiosyncratic

features, from an international perspective all these programmes are usually included in a single “bilingual education” label. In any case, it has to be acknowledged that there is such variation in how these models are put into practice not only in the macro context (each country), but also in the meso context (each region/autonomous community/state/province) and even in the micro context (each specific school), that scholars are inevitably forced to fall back on working model definitions. Just a comparison of the definitions adopted at national level reveals very different situations and illustrates the complexity of trying to provide definitions suitable to the various contexts where immersion is currently being implemented.

Multilingualism, as understood in this chapter, goes a step further in its linguistic objective, which is why the label *multilingual education* will only be used if the educational model concerned uses three languages as media of instruction and/or the objective is to reach at least trilingualism. The Basque experimental programme called *Framework for Trilingual Education* would be encompassed in this category, as Basque, Spanish and English are used as means of instruction in the 118 schools involved in this experience. Genesee (2008) reports that trilingual school programmes also exist in North America: in Montreal some English-speaking Jewish students attend Hebrew/French/English immersion programmes, and students of Mohawk take part in a Mohawk/English/French programme. However, the use of more than two languages as media of instruction is rather complicated and not very widespread, which is why those education systems whose objective is to develop trilingualism are also included in this category.

The presentation of a typology of multilingual education is beyond the reach of this chapter due to the many challenges it poses and the complexity brought about by different programme designs, diverse sociolinguistic contexts and the variety of languages involved. However, the reader interested in a tool especially designed to describe any situation of multilingual education can rely on the *Continua of Multilingual Education* proposed by Cenoz (2009: 34).

Apart from the difficulties concerning the definition of multilingual education, an additional hurdle is to be found in the lack of continuity of multilingual education at all levels, especially in the case of indigenous minority languages. In many parts of the world, multilingual education is rarely found on all rungs of the educational ladder, especially at university level (see Doiz et al. 2013a).

Many different contexts are usually quoted in the literature as examples of purportedly multilingual educational contexts, but I will focus on just a few due to space constraints. There is no doubt that Asia and Africa (together with Latin America) are the most multilingual continents. A paradigmatic example in the Asian continent would be the case of India, a country with two official languages (Hindi and English) at the federal level and 22 constitutionally recognized official languages. Mohanty (2006: 268) asserts that “attitudes of mutual acceptance, and a ‘true’ multilingual worldview are seen as very characteristic of Indian multilingualism”, but this traditional coexistence has been put into jeopardy by the powerful presence of English. However, the Indian people are still required to develop oral and written skills in many languages, which led to the establishment of the so-called “three-language formula” in 1957. Since then, this formula includes the regional or

mother tongue as the first teaching language, Hindi as the second language and English as the third language. Mohanty (2006) underscores that the lack of a uniform language policy perspective has entailed that the three-language formula simply embodies a political and ideological statement that maintains little connection with actual practices and asserts that it is not common to have three languages as media of instruction. Mohanty (2006: 279) concludes that education in India is multilingual only on the surface, while it remains mainly monolingual at an underlying level.

In Hong Kong a similar situation can be found. For over 150 years, Hong Kong was a British colony and English was the sole official language, until Chinese became co-official after a strong bottom-up social movement in 1974 (Li 2013). The general education policy is of biliteracy and trilingual abilities due to the fact that English is valued for maintaining and boosting economic vitality. Putonghua (Mandarin) represents the national language and *lingua franca* among dialect speakers in Greater China, and Cantonese is the identity language used as language of instruction in primary and secondary education (gradually substituted by Putonghua). Controversy surrounds this multilingual language policy, as “one perennial problem is that for average Cantonese-dominant Hong Kongers, neither English nor Putonghua is easy to learn” (Li 2013: 81). Moreover, Cantonese shares the official status with Putonghua and English only in name but not in spirit (Lee and Leung 2012). Last but not least, English-medium instruction is not as successful as expected and has in fact sometimes become an insurmountable stumbling block for students who “are not achieving gains in content learning equivalent to those of students in mainstream mother tongue education” (Hoare and Kong 2008: 257).

In Africa, the linguistic situation of South Africa could also be mentioned. Despite being one of the handful of countries in the world that recognises more than two languages (11 to be precise) as official, African languages are only used in the first 3 years of education. At higher levels of education, only English and to a lesser degree Afrikaans are used as media of instruction, which entails that most of school and university students are taught in a language “in which they may not have developed adequate proficiency for academic study” (van der Walt and Kidd 2013: 27). This is the outcome of colonial and post-colonial political decisions that have negatively impacted on attitudes towards African languages (Jones 2012) and fuelled the belief that colonial languages are vital.

Despite the increasing demand for multilingualism, all the previous examples illustrate that multilingual education is not an easy enterprise and that often only lip service is paid to its implementation. In contrast, Luxembourg’s multilingual educational system provides a particularly successful example, worth mentioning at least briefly. The Luxembourg language law of 1984 recognises three languages (Luxembourgish, French and German) in the country and all of them are used as means of instruction, English representing the fourth language in the curriculum. Horner and Weber (2008) indicate that Luxembourg’s trilingualism is regarded as a symbolic pillar of national cohesion and as an asset in the job market. As a matter of fact, a multilingual spirit is very much embedded among the Luxembourg population and, for example, the place of French, German and English literatures in schools and cultural life are taken for granted and students are not likely to call these

literatures foreign. This would thus be a good case in point of multilingualism viewed as a unified entity, as languages are considered from a holistic and integrated perspective. However, as Clyne (2005) underscores, this is an unusual state of affairs in Europe for most European educational systems do not espouse this strict version of multilingualism.

## 4 Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL)

As for the broad European context, European institutions are promoting the spread of multilingual education, as it is expected that all European citizens should have practical skills in two languages in addition to the mother tongue. This top-down approach to multilingualism is also supported by national, regional and local education authorities, as there is widespread belief that Europe's future must be multilingual. This language policy has fostered the implementation of CLIL (Content and Language Integrated Learning), to which I will briefly refer due to its paramount role in different chapters of this volume. Most CLIL programmes are taking place in bilingual programmes, whereas multilingual programmes are mainly found in education systems with an indigenous minority language. It is estimated that there are approximately 60 indigenous minority languages in the European Union and 150 in the whole of Europe (Darquennes 2013), but only a few of them are included in multilingual school programmes.

Coyle (2007: 545) defines CLIL as “an integrated approach where both language and content are conceptualized on a continuum without an implied preference for either.” In this chapter CLIL is about using a foreign language, not an L2 or indigenous minority language (see below). This term is very popular in Europe, but its use is spreading over many other parts of the world (Asia and South America), except across the North American context where CBI (Content-based instruction) is preferred (for more information on this, see Tedick and Cammarata 2012). CLIL has become a fast developing phenomenon in Europe. According to Eurydice (2006) (a network that provides information on European education systems and policies which is co-ordinated and managed by the European Union's Education, Audiovisual and Culture Executive Agency), CLIL programmes are offered to between 3 and 30 % of pupils at primary and/or secondary education level, although there are sharp contrasts between the 31 countries analysed. As for trilingual programmes, this report asserts that:

Seven countries (Estonia, Spain, Latvia, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, Austria and Sweden) provide scope for trilingual CLIL provision combining the national language and two foreign languages (Spain and Latvia), or the national language, a foreign language and a minority language (Estonia, Spain, Latvia, the Netherlands, Austria and Sweden) (Eurydice 2006: 19).

As CLIL syllabuses are usually developed to meet local needs, there is huge variation in its implementation, but there is also a common denominator: most of the programmes are carried out in English, a language which has established itself



to a greater extent than Latin, French and other dominant languages in earlier times and its perceived importance has made it the preeminent foreign language in CLIL contexts. In bilingual settings this entails the presence of multilingual practices, which is why the use of the term L3 or third language is more and more common in the literature (Jessner 2006; De Angelis 2007; Cenoz 2009) and “can be regarded as a specific aspect of the study of multilingualism” (Cenoz 2013: 72). This is leading to a world context in which, as Ricento (2013: 138) puts it, “[f]rom a global perspective, the number of people who use English as their first or native language is decreasing, while the number of people who use it as a second or *third language* for various purposes—in local, translocal, or transnational contexts—is increasing” (my emphasis). Spain is one of the countries significantly affected by this global trend.

The lack of precision when it comes to the use of terminology can also be observed in the description of CLIL programmes. The confusion between CLIL and immersion creates problems for those willing to become better acquainted with these approaches, as these terms are used interchangeably in the literature. This is the case of the aforementioned Eurydice (2006) report, in which the CLIL label becomes a generic term to describe all types of provision in which a second language (irrespective of it being a foreign, regional or minority language and/or another official state language) is used to teach certain subjects in the curriculum other than language lessons themselves. However, and despite the obvious similarities between CLIL and immersion, several important dissimilarities (teacher training, teaching materials, the sociolinguistic context, methodological aspects and linguistic objectives) should serve as the argument in favour of a clear distinction between these two types of programmes (see Lasagabaster and Sierra 2010 for further discussion). In this chapter, the label CLIL will only be utilised to refer to programmes in which the L2 or Lx is a foreign language.

## 5 Multilingual Education in Spain

Christian (2008) points out that there are currently about 600 immersion schools in the United States which account for well over 100,000 thousand students. These are significant figures on their own, but far below other contexts such as Spain, whose population (44 million) is much smaller than that of the United States (ca. 310 million), but where there are more students involved in immersion programmes than in the United States as a whole. The presence of co-official languages (Basque, Catalan and Galician) in different autonomous communities has led to the spread of bilingual education programmes. Moreover, as Coyle (2010: viii) points out CLIL is clearly on the increase:

Spain is rapidly becoming one of the European leaders in CLIL practice and research. The richness of its cultural and linguistic diversity has led to a wide variety of CLIL policies and practices which provide us with many examples of CLIL in different stages of development that are applicable to contexts both within and beyond Spain.



This diagnosis is also shared by Johnstone (2009: v), who affirms that the desire to maintain and foster the co-official languages is complemented by the burgeoning of CLIL programmes:

Spain is rapidly becoming a leading country in the world of early bilingual education (EBE)—well-known for several years for its first-language maintenance and second-language immersion programs in Basque and Catalan, but in recent years accompanied by an increase in EBE for English that is breathtaking in its scope and its speed of implementation, and laudably intended for ordinary children in state schools rather than restricted to privileged elites.

This means that in the Spanish bilingual communities the incorporation of (mainly) CLIL in English is making some autonomous communities implement multilingual education programmes. Nevertheless, some schools offer a multilingual educational system as bait to boost their enrolment figures, a trend that is increasingly popular. Consequently, the concept of multilingual education runs the risk of being watered down, as many schools claim to implement multilingual programmes just because they teach a few different languages as subjects. The strict view of multilingualism would point out that the hearing of different languages in the playground and the corridors (for example, due to the presence of immigrant students), and their use in some scattered posters on the walls are not enough to make a school multilingual (despite the obvious benefits of making these other languages visible). In accordance with the strict view of multilingualism advocated in this chapter, I will use the term *multilingual education* to refer only to schools in which more than two languages are used as means of instruction or in which trilingualism (and trilateracy) is a clearly stated objective (see the previous section).

Although the Spanish State ensures the basic unity of the education system, the 17 autonomous communities that make up Spain have assumed powers based on their respective Statutes of Autonomy. These powers allow them to organise and administer the education system within their own territory. The case of the officially bilingual regions aforementioned is worth underscoring, as they have implemented innovative programmes that boost the use of English as language of instruction while also maintaining and promoting teaching in their respective minority language. Consequently, multilingual programmes can be found in all the Spanish bilingual autonomous communities (see Lasagabaster and Ruiz de Zarobe 2010), albeit to different degrees of development. Although several aspects of CLIL are currently being researched, in the next two sections I will focus on studies on language attitudes due to their enormous impact in the language learning process.

## 6 Language Attitudes

The term *attitude* can be defined as a positive or negative feeling about some person, object or issue acquired through social interaction. Since language is the main form of human communication and interaction, language attitudes have the potential to influence such interaction to a great degree. Much attention has been paid to

language attitude research during the last decades and this interest has contributed enormously to the development of this field of research. In second language acquisition, attitude studies have focused on many different areas such as speakers of the L2, L2 learning, parental attitudes, language use, language learning preferences, language policy, minority languages, English as a *lingua franca* and bilingual education among others.

The affective-attitudinal component plays a paramount role in language learning (Jessner 2006; Garrett 2010), as *mutatis mutandis* positive attitudes are very likely to facilitate the learning of another language. Students' attitudes towards the L2 or Lx are crucial to language learning success, although research studies have also demonstrated that language achievement can bring about more positive attitudes: "for some learners the initial motivation to learn a language does not come from internally or externally generated self images but rather from successful engagement with the actual language learning process" (Dörnyei 2009: 29). Research studies undertaken in very different contexts have demonstrated that the attitudes and motivation to learn a foreign language can vary not only from language to language—even within the same group of learners—but also within different age groups. It has also been observed (Davies and Brember 2001) that there is a general decline in positive attitudes towards school subjects as academic years go by, indicating that the more years students spend studying a subject, the more disenchanted they become with it. In this vein, the study by Heining-Boynton and Haitema (2007) reported the attitudes of students towards a foreign language (French or Spanish) over a 10 year period in North Carolina (the United States) and the results revealed that students' enthusiasm declined among both boys and girls (although girls harboured more positive attitudes). These authors conclude that attitude formation toward language learning is a critical component of early schooling.

In any case, the close relationship between L2 or Lx language learning and attitude has drawn researchers' interest and produced a considerable amount of data, applied research, methodological sophistication and development of theoretical ideas. According to Baker (1992), there are three main reasons why attitude is a central explanatory variable: It is a term in common usage beyond the limited scope of specialists; it provides an indicator of learners' thoughts, beliefs and preferences; it has maintained an influential position in L2 learning theories for over 70 years.

However, and although attitudes are relatively stable within speech communities (Dewaele 2010), they can be characterised as dynamic rather than static, since they may change due to the effect of different individual (e.g. dislike of a teacher) or social factors (e.g. war against the country where the language concerned is spoken). Language attitudes can hence be affected by different agents, and among these, institutions such as schools are powerful influences. Every individual develops in a social context and in today's world many people spend a considerable part of their lives attending education establishments (Lasagabaster 2013).

Attitudes towards languages are manifestly affected and motivated by the languages' presence and their role in education. Many indigenous languages have been stigmatised in the educational domain, as a result of which attitudes towards them tend to be negative even among their own speakers, whereas more powerful

and international languages happen to be very positively rated. The success of language policies and education-related initiatives cannot be properly assessed without reference to language attitudes, which has led to a recent trend to analyse them in both bilingual and multilingual education contexts.

## **7 Language Attitudes, Bilingual and Multilingual Education**

This section tackles the effects of different bilingual and multilingual programmes on language attitudes and how they may affect the spread of multilingual education models and, consequently, of multilingualism. Due to space constraints the discussion will be mainly focused on the Basque Country in Spain, but connections will be made to international contexts.

If a particular language has high status in the eyes of the students enrolled in bilingual education programmes, they will harbour more favourable attitudes towards it. In such contexts the political dimension comes to the fore and the psychological merges with the political, so that attitudes become part of a multilayered and dynamic scenario related to identity construction and language ideologies which has individual, group and societal dimensions. Nowadays there is no doubt that the political dimension of language learning has to be considered when it comes to examining language attitudes.

Nevertheless, language attitudes are also of the utmost importance not only at the macro (political) level but also at the micro (class) level. In fact, one of the crucial roles of teachers is to foster positive language attitudes amongst students. In Spain, for example, reversing negative attitudes and the low status of languages such as Basque, Catalan and Galician was one of the main objectives of the bilingual programmes implemented during the early 1980s. Doubtless, bilingual education has played a paramount role in this scenario and research studies have recurrently confirmed that students enrolled in programmes in which the minority language is used as means of instruction hold significantly more positive attitudes than those who only had Basque, Catalan or Galician as a school subject. This increasing importance of the minority languages in the school system (among other factors) has also enormously contributed to their more positive attitudinal stance in society in general, as attested by the different sociolinguistic surveys carried out in bilingual regions such as Catalonia, Galicia and the Basque Country.

The introduction of CLIL as a way to boost multilingual education involves using the foreign language within an existing bilingual language ecology. Although there are good reasons to implement CLIL, there is a need to examine how this introduction bears on the other languages and their speakers. It is in this context when the study of language attitudes should come to the fore, as it becomes especially crucial in multilingual education contexts in which a minority language is being revitalised. The vast majority of studies on language attitudes have been undertaken in monolingual or bilingual contexts, whereas multilingual contexts have traditionally been overlooked. This gap needs to be filled, since the European

Union's promotion of the "mother tongue+two other languages" policy for all citizens in the European Commission's Action Plan for Language Learning will lead to an increase in school multilingual programmes.

In the Basque Country, Lasagabaster and Sierra (2009) report that some voices claim that the ever increasing presence of English will bring about undesirable and destabilising negative effects on language competence and attitudes towards Basque as the minority language. The main concern is that the time allotted to English as medium of instruction detracts from Basque, negatively affecting the minority language. After all the efforts spent on reversing Basque's situation, this ominous prognosis is understandable but shows that research done in this area needs to reach a wider public. With these critical standpoints in mind, Lasagabaster and Sierra conducted a study to analyse whether secondary education CLIL students held similar attitudes to the three languages in the curriculum (Basque, Spanish and English) to those of non-CLIL students who had more subjects taught in Basque and none in English (except the English language class). The results revealed that CLIL students held significantly more positive attitudes not only towards English (see also Amengual-Pizarro and Prieto-Arranz 2015) but also towards Spanish and Basque. The authors underscore that one of the dimensions considered in the introduction of CLIL programmes was closely related to the belief that this approach would positively affect the development of plurilingual attitudes and interests. Their results tallied with the purported benefits for students of the CLIL approach and indicated that the presence of English as medium of instruction should not be automatically linked to more negative attitudes towards the other two languages, especially towards Basque as the weak link of the language chain. However, the authors acknowledge that longitudinal studies are needed in order to shed more light on this issue and analyse whether these positive attitudes are maintained throughout compulsory education and beyond, as it is necessary to track changes in language attitudes among multilingual students over time in a more systematic way.

Nevertheless, the influence of multilingual education programmes on language attitudes is not always so rewarding and salutary. In Hong Kong (see also Ruiz de Zarobe 2015), the "biliterate and trilingual ability" policy mentioned above has generated much controversy in the Chinese University of Hong Kong (Li 2013). This higher education institution declared Chinese the principal language of instruction, but English has often been used in many disciplines. However, a linguistic storm was unleashed in 2004 when the newly appointed Vice-Chancellor decided to offer more courses in English to foster internationally recognised excellence in research. This decision provoked a prolonged dispute between the university management on the one hand, and quite a few academics, students and alumni associations on the other who considered that English was being conferred special status at the expense of Cantonese and written Chinese (Putonghua/Mandarin). After 4 years of struggle and three legal battles, three different courts reached the same verdict and declared that from a legal perspective English can be the main language of instruction. Hence, this conflict shows that a legally based language policy (in this case the use of English as main language of instruction) may provoke much controversy if it is not in consonance with society's language attitudes and beliefs.

The recent Malaysian experience represents a different illustrative example of what could be described as faulty multilingual education. Multilingualism is taken for granted in Malaysia, as three large ethnic groups coexist in the country: Malays (50.4 %), Chinese (23.7 %) and Indians – mostly Tamils from South India – (7.1 %). Education in different languages is widely accepted in the country (Tan 2005), but most schools have traditionally used only one language of instruction and are usually referred to as Malay- or Chinese- or Tamil-medium schools. In 2003, a bilingual education policy was implemented that envisaged that maths and science would be taught in English. This Malay-English bilingual model coexisted with Mandarin-English and Tamil-English bilingual options that included Malay as a subject, which is called the “three-language solution” and whose aim is to appease ethnic sensitivities. Due to several reasons (the dearth of teachers, the gap between rural and urban schools, the undermining of students’ proficiency in Malay, the poor results obtained in a year-long assessment and very negative attitudes verified in public consultations), in 2009 the government decided that generalised English-medium instruction would be phased out from 2012. The 6 year period in which English-medium instruction was implemented sparked a bitter and heated debate that aggravated extreme language attitudes, two irreconcilable groups being clearly distinguished: those who called it a lost opportunity to connect Malay to the global economy and were very favourably disposed towards English, and those who favoured the promotion of Malay identity and held very negative attitudes towards English and the Anglophone colonial past. This is a clear example of how a loosely planned education initiative aimed at bolstering multilingualism can trigger exacerbated language attitudes and confirms that language attitudes may influence the success or failure of entire language planning strategies (Jones 2012).

Last but not least, I would like to make reference to a holistic approach to language attitudes. Many scholars (Cook 2006; Jessner 2006; De Angelis 2007; Cenoz 2009; Dewaele 2010) endorse the idea that research on multilingualism cannot revolve around monolingual and bilingual parameters and that it deserves to be considered on its own. The central idea is that languages do not reside in separate compartments, but instead they are inter-related and constitute a single and holistic system. In accordance with the concepts of multilingualism and multilingual education as understood in this chapter, some authors (Baker 1992; Lasagabaster 2005, 2009) have proposed that the traditional fractional perspective on language attitudes, whereby they are analysed as separate units by asking the participants about each of the languages independently, should be reconsidered. These authors argue that this holistic approach to multilingualism should be applied to the examination of language attitudes and monolingual parameters replaced by multilingual parameters.

Taking multilingual parameters as a basis, Lasagabaster (2009) compared students enrolled in a trilingual programme with CLIL in English with students who attended a bilingual programme in which English was only taught as a subject. The former obtained significantly higher means in all the five factors (social presence of trilingualism, cognitive and economic benefits of trilingualism, the learning of three languages, social benefits of trilingualism and attitudes towards trilingualism)

distinguished through factor analysis in the holistic questionnaire. Although it was detected that some attitudinal aspects still have to be improved, the results indicate that the implementation of CLIL has a positive effect on language attitudes towards trilingualism. Despite CLIL's beneficial impact, there is a need to work on language attitudes as a way to avoid linguistic friction when a minority language coexists with a majority language and the augmenting presence of English. All the stakeholders (namely teachers, the administration, families, peers and other social groupings) should make a joint effort to spread the rich linguistic capital present in schools and to foster high levels of multilingualism.

### Conclusions

This chapter aimed to make it evident that there is a compelling need to distinguish between bilingualism and multilingualism, because otherwise “coming to terms with terminology can be difficult” (Fortune and Tedick 2008: 3). De Angelis (2007: 8) underscores that “[m]ost people understand a multilingual person to be an individual familiar with three or more languages to some degree of fluency, and a bilingual an individual familiar with two languages, also to some degree of fluency.” This distinction should be maintained when dealing with bilingual and multilingual education, as the challenges posed by each of them are clearly different. The current role of English as a global *lingua franca* is bolstering the implementation of multilingual education programmes whose objective is to produce trilingual speakers, a trend that is nowadays much more widespread than it was in the recent past. The Spanish multilingual context has been presented as a very good case in point and the need for research into the effects of multilingual programmes as urgent.

Strenuous efforts are being made to restore to minority languages their position in educational systems the world over, but on many occasions they still appear unglamorous when compared with English, the current *lingua franca* and the language of Hollywood, science, technology and the NBA (National Basketball Association). The spread of English as the global *lingua franca* by means of globalising forces has generated two main types of attitudes. On the one hand, the attitudes held by those favourably disposed who observe this process as a fact of life that can become an opportunity for individuals and societies to obtain manifold benefits. On the other hand, those more critical are afraid of its homogenising effect and the threat it poses to the survival of local languages and cultures, and even to other international languages and multilingualism without English (Doiz et al. 2013b). Just in Europe the coexistence of English and indigenous minority languages directly affects a panoply of languages such as Luxemburgish in Luxemburg, Swedish

(continued)

in Finland, French in the Aosta Valley, as well as to all the many bilingual contexts in which a regional language (Basque, Breton, Catalan, Frisian, Gaelic, Galician, etc.) is also taught in the curriculum. In such multilingual settings, the study of language attitudes is undoubtedly worth pursuing.

In the case of the bilingual autonomous communities in Spain, where a minority language is spoken and the spread of English is clearly on the increase, linguistic friction is sometimes considerable and researchers need studies on which they can base their defence of an educational system wherein the minority language is fostered as a springboard to multilingualism. Ample research evidence has recurrently discredited the belief that learning additional languages causes interference in the other language (what Clyne 2005 labels the *interference fallacy*), while it has demonstrated that balanced bi- or multilingualism brings cognitive advantages (Jessner 2006; Cenoz 2009; García 2009; Jarvis 2015).

Notwithstanding this, the title of a paper by Edwards and Newcombe (2006), “Back to basics: Marketing the benefits of bilingualism to parents” makes it evident that there is a need to convey a neat message to try to debunk the *monolingual-is-better* myth. Kramsch (2008: 316) argues that there is an additional matter to bear in mind, since there is a generalised feeling that “it is one thing to be multilingual in dominant national languages with high symbolic capital like French, German and English; it is quite another to be conversant in other, minor, languages like Yiddish, Czech, Basque, Breton or Gaelic.” Although studies reveal that schools can develop the language potential of children irrespective of their background and the languages involved, not everybody is willing to accept it. Therefore, the study of different aspects of multilingual school experiences is urgently needed, as only the data obtained through empirical studies will help to improve these programmes and to convince the sceptical who consider that the presence of more than two languages in the curriculum may become a stumbling block for the normal cognitive development of children.

In the current globalised world, monolingualism is simply not affordable and, therefore, there is a need to develop a multilingual approach to language teaching (Hufeisen and Jessner 2009) that will help to improve language attitudes and subsequently language learning. The results put forward in this chapter confirm that language environment and methodology as represented by effectively implemented multilingual programmes are key factors in determining attitudes towards multilingualism.

**Acknowledgements** This chapter is part of the following research projects: FFI2012-34214 (Spanish Ministry of Economy and Competitiveness) and IT311-10 (Department of Education, University and Research of the Basque Government).



## References

- Amengual-Pizarro, M., & Prieto-Arranz, J.I. (2015). Exploring affective factors in L3 learning: CLIL vs Non-CLIL. In M. Juan-Garau, & J. Salazar-Nogueraeds (Eds.), *Content-based language learning in multilingual educational environments* (pp. 197–220). Berlin: Springer.
- Aronin, L., & Hufeisen, B. (2009). *The exploration of multilingualism*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Baker, C. (1992). *Attitudes and language*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Baker, C. (2011). *Foundations of bilingual education and bilingualism* (5th ed.). Bristol/Buffalo/Toronto: Multilingual Matters.
- Cenoz, J. (2009). *Towards multilingual education: Basque educational research from an international perspective*. Bristol/Buffalo/Toronto: Multilingual Matters.
- Cenoz, J. (2013). The influence of bilingualism on third language acquisition: Focus on multilingualism. *Language Teaching*, 46, 71–86.
- Christian, D. (2008). Foreword. In T. W. Fortune & D. J. Tedick (Eds.), *Pathways to multilingualism: Evolving perspectives on immersion education* (pp. xiv–xvii). Bristol/Buffalo/Toronto: Multilingual Matters.
- Clyne, M. (2005). *Australia's language potential*. Sydney: University of New South Wales Press.
- Cook, V. J. (2006). Interlanguage, multi-competence and the problem of the “second” language. *Rivista di Psicolinguistica Applicata*, 6, 39–52.
- Coyle, D. (2007). Content and language integrated learning: Towards a connected research agenda for CLIL pedagogies. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 10, 543–562.
- Coyle, D. (2010). Foreword. In D. Lasagabaster & Y. Ruiz de Zarobe (Eds.), *CLIL in Spain: Implementation, results and teacher training* (pp. vii–viii). Newcastle: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- Cummins, J. (2011). Bilingual and immersion programs. In M. H. Long & C. J. Doughty (Eds.), *The handbook of language teaching*. Malden: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Darquennes, J. (2013). Multilingual education in Europe. In C. A. Chapelle (Ed.), *The encyclopedia of applied linguistics*. New York: Blackwell Publishing. doi:[10.1002/9781405198431.wbeal0785](https://doi.org/10.1002/9781405198431.wbeal0785).
- Davies, J., & Brember, I. (2001). The closing gap in attitudes between boys and girls: A five year longitudinal study. *Educational Psychology*, 21, 103–115.
- De Angelis, G. (2007). *Third or additional language acquisition*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Dewaele, J. M. (2010). *Emotions in multiple languages*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Doiz, A., Lasagabaster, D., & Sierra, J. M. (Eds.). (2013a). *English-medium instruction at universities: Global challenges*. Bristol/Buffalo/Toronto: Multilingual Matters.
- Doiz, A., Lasagabaster, D., & Sierra, J. M. (2013b). Globalisation, internationalisation, multilingualism and linguistic strains in higher education. *Studies in Higher Education*, 38, 1407–1421.
- Dörnyei, Z. (2009). The L2 motivational self system. In Z. Dörnyei & E. Ushioda (Eds.), *Motivation, language identity and the L2 self* (pp. 9–42). Bristol/Buffalo/Toronto: Multilingual Matters.
- Edwards, V., & Newcombe, L. P. (2006). Back to basics: Marketing the benefits of bilingualism to parents. In O. García, T. Skutnabb-Kangas, & M. E. Torres-Guzmán (Eds.), *Imagining multilingual schools: Languages in school and glocalization* (pp. 137–149). Bristol/Buffalo/Toronto: Multilingual Matters.
- Eurydice. (2006). *Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) at school in Europe*. Brussels: European Commission.
- Fortune, T. W., & Tedick, D. J. (Eds.). (2008). *Pathways to multilingualism: Evolving perspectives on immersion education*. Bristol/Buffalo/Toronto: Multilingual Matters.

- Franceschini, R. (2013). History of multilingualism. In C. A. Chapelle (Ed.), *The encyclopedia of applied linguistics*. New York: Blackwell Publishing. doi:[10.1002/9781405198431.wbeal0511](https://doi.org/10.1002/9781405198431.wbeal0511).
- García, O. (2009). *Bilingual education in the 21st century: A global perspective*. Malden: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Garrett, P. (2010). *Attitudes to language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Genesee, F. (2008). Dual language in the global village. In T. W. Fortune & D. J. Tedick (Eds.), *Pathways to multilingualism: Evolving perspectives on immersion education* (pp. 22–45). Bristol/Buffalo/Toronto: Multilingual Matters.
- Heining-Boynon, A. L., & Haitema, T. (2007). A ten-year chronicle of student attitudes toward foreign language in the elementary school. *The Modern Language Journal*, 91, 149–168.
- Hoare, P., & Kong, S. (2008). Late immersion in Hong Kong: Still stressed or making progress. In T. W. Fortune & D. J. Tedick (Eds.), *Pathways to multilingualism: Evolving perspectives on immersion education* (pp. 242–263). Bristol/Buffalo/Toronto: Multilingual Matters.
- Horner, K., & Weber, J. J. (2008). The language situation in Luxembourg. *Current Issues in Language Planning*, 9, 69–128.
- Hufeisen, B., & Jessner, U. (2009). Learning and teaching multiple languages. In K. Knapp & B. Seidlhofer (Eds.), *The handbook of applied linguistics* (Foreign language learning and communication, Vol. 5, pp. 109–137). Berlin: De Gruyter.
- Jarvis, S. H. (2015). Influences of previously learned languages on the learning and use of additional languages. In M. Juan-Garau & J. Salazar-Noguera (Eds.), *Content-based language learning in multilingual educational environments* (pp. 69–86). Berlin: Springer.
- Jessner, U. (2006). *Linguistic awareness in multilinguals: English as a third language*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Johnstone, R. (2009). Foreword. In J. Lo Bianco (Ed.), *Second languages and Australian schooling*. Camberwell: Australian Council for Educational Research.
- Jones, J. M. (2012). The effect of language attitudes on Kenyan stakeholder involvement in the mother tongue policy implementation. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 33, 237–250.
- Kramsch, C. (2008). Multilingual, like Franz Kafka. *International Journal of Multilingualism*, 5, 316–332.
- Lasagabaster, D. (2005). Bearing multilingual parameters in mind when designing a questionnaire on attitudes: Does this affect the results? *International Journal of Multilingualism*, 2, 26–51.
- Lasagabaster, D. (2009). The implementation of CLIL and attitudes towards trilingualism. *ITL-International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 157, 23–43.
- Lasagabaster, D. (2013). Attitudes and motivation in bilingual education. In C. A. Chapelle (Ed.), *The encyclopedia of applied linguistics*. Oxford: Wiley Blackwell.
- Lasagabaster, D., & Ruiz de Zarobe, Y. (2010). *CLIL in Spain: Implementation, results and teacher training*. Newcastle: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- Lasagabaster, D., & Sierra, J. M. (2009). Language Attitudes in CLIL and Traditional EFL classes. *International CLIL Research Journal*, 1(2), 4–17.
- Lasagabaster, D., & Sierra, J. M. (2010). Immersion and CLIL in English: More differences than similarities. *ELT Journal*, 64, 376–395.
- Lee, K. S., & Leung, W. M. (2012). The status of Cantonese in the education policy in Hong Kong. *Multilingual Education*, 2, 2.
- Li, D. C. S. (2013). Linguistic hegemony or linguistic capital? Internationalization and English-medium instruction at the Chinese University of Hong Kong. In A. Doiz, D. Lasagabaster, & J. M. Sierra (Eds.), *English-medium instruction at universities: Global challenges* (pp. 65–83). Bristol/Buffalo/Toronto: Multilingual Matters.
- Mohanty, A. K. (2006). Multilingualism of the unequals and predicaments of education in India: Mother tongue or other tongue? In O. García, T. Skutnabb-Kangas, & M. E. Torres-Guzmán

- (Eds.), *Imagining multilingual schools: Languages in school and glocalization* (pp. 262–283). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Ricento, T. (2013). Language policy and globalization. In N. Coupland (Ed.), *The handbook of language and globalization* (pp. 123–141). Malden: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Ruiz de Zarobe, Y. (2015). The effects of implementing CLIL in education. In M. Juan-Garau & J. Salazar-Noguera (Eds.), *Content-based language learning in multilingual educational environments* (pp. 51–68). Berlin: Springer.
- Tan, P. K. W. (2005). The medium-of-instruction debate in Malaysia: English as a Malaysian language? *Language Problems and Language Planning*, 29, 47–66.
- Tedick, D., & Cammarata, L. (2012). Content and language integration in K-12 contexts: Student outcomes, teacher practices, and stakeholder perspectives. *Foreign Language Annals*, 45, 28–53.
- van der Walt, C., & Kidd, M. (2013). Acknowledging academic biliteracy in higher education assessment strategies: A tale of two trials. In A. Doiz, D. Lasagabaster, & J. M. Sierra (Eds.), *English-medium instruction at universities: Global challenges* (pp. 27–43). Bristol/Buffalo/Toronto: Multilingual Matters.

Content-based Language Learning in Multilingual  
Educational Environments

Juan-Garau, M.; Salazar-Noguera, J. (Eds.)

2015, XII, 255 p. 22 illus., 3 illus. in color., Hardcover

ISBN: 978-3-319-11495-8