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To my father

who taught me that books

are tools for transforming reality.
"One day in 1973, Christian Cuxac explained to me that he intended writing a thesis about his country, the Roussillon (the French part of Catalonia), and about the balance of power between the Catalan and French languages. Two or three years later, when I asked him how his research was progressing, he told me he was now working on the language situation of the deaf. "The deaf! I thought you were interested in Catalonia." "So what?", he replied, "the deaf and the Catalans, the problem's the same, they're all colonized, their very mode of expression is denied".


I would like to thank Virginia Volterra, who is very interested in the language situation of the deaf and in achieving their full social integration and equality through the normalization of their diversity, for having showed me this brief paragraph with which we both immediately identified, each of us from the point of view of our own fascinating subject. For it is my greatest hope that the present book will serve to make diversity a source of mutual enrichment, not an excuse for the domination of some over others. Regardless of who the some and the others may be.
PROLOGUE TO THE CATALAN EDITION

A good few years ago, when I first became interested in the psychology of bilingualism and the problems of education in situations where languages were in contact, I soon realized that, while many such situations existed throughout the world and plenty of information was available about them, when it came to substantial innovations or theories capable of explaining the results achieved, most or nearly all the interesting ideas came from Canada where the topic had come in for intensive study from the 1950s onwards. When I remarked about this to my students, I used to add, half joking and half seriously, that I greatly hoped that one day Catalonia might replace, or at least join Canada, in carrying out this task so that anyone interested in gathering documentation on immersion would have to refer to the projects and the research being carried out here in Catalonia. How that psycholinguistics is beginning to get established here and I have the pleasure of writing this prologue to a book such as the one the reader is presently holding in his hands, I dare to think that in the end my old dream may well come true.

In this book, Josep M. Artigas has published a collection of essays that were written separately but which together give a very clear idea of what immersion is in Catalonia, what it is aiming at, what results are being achieved, and how this is being accomplished. The book is based on the author's experience, first as an immersion teacher and then as a researcher observing the action of other teachers. It derives from first-hand information which has been subjected to more detailed study through reference to the most up-to-date literature on the subject, two qualities that are seldom found together in the same author. It is a book that sets
forth original ideas, a book which can therefore be described as daring in
view of the youth of the author and the many pitfalls in the ground he is
treading. But at the same time it is the fruit of extremely mature
reflection. The first proof of this lies in the clear, precise pages
devoted to the description of immersion and its meaning, and to the
specific conditions it must fulfill in order to be successful. Artigal, who
is a strong supporter of immersion, shows that the method is feasible and
can even be beneficial for the students, though nowhere does he claim that
it is necessarily better than instruction in the mother tongue.

If the word "immersion" is taken in its strictest sense, Catalonia
ranks second only to Canada in terms of the number of students in immersion
programs. But there is one important difference between the way immersion
is applied in the two countries: whereas in Canada it usually commences
when the students enter compulsory schooling, in Catalonia it begins in
kindergarten, at age four or even earlier. When the method is used with
such young children, there is no longer any sense in making the usual
distinction between the "spontaneous acquisition" of another language and
its "academic acquisition" by means of some type of teaching method.
Kindergarten children come into contact with a second language in the same
way as emigrants do on meeting the inhabitants of their new country. Or,
what is even more relevant, the kindergarten child comes into contact with
a second language in much the same way as it learnt its own language,
through a context of dialogues closely related to its own activities. But,
whereas it is relatively easy to agree on the manner in which a second
language is acquired, opinions are divided as to exactly how and why this
occurs. Nowadays stress is usually laid on progress in comprehension thanks
to the comprehensibility of the message made possible by the context.

Without rejecting this hypothesis, Artigal emphasizes instead the role
of production and singles out the importance of the overall situation — of
the expectations of the group — in what he calls the "joint output
context". As Artigal himself observes, there is an obvious connection between this notion and Vigotski and Bruner's ideas about first language acquisition. Moreover, it is an explanation which, in addition to its theoretical interest, affords scope for pedagogical innovations, both in immersion programs and in second language instruction generally.

Another chapter in the book comes to grips with a topic of considerable interest for many teachers: the possible detrimental effects of immersion when most of the students belong to families with somewhat low socio-cultural backgrounds. This problem was of concern to me from the outset and I called for the greatest possible attention to be paid to it. It is clearly significant that Lambert, the first theoretician of immersion, commented that most immersion programs that have produced positive results have involved children from middle-class families, that is, families with a relatively high level of schooling.

There was considerable comment some years ago about the studies carried out by Berstein, a sociologist of education, into the higher rate of academic failure found among working-class children on account of their language deficit. According to Berstein, though everyone speaks the same language, the linguistic code or modality of language used by the English working class differs from that used by the more highly educated middle class. And since the middle-class code is the one used by teachers in school, it becomes a barrier to children who are unfamiliar with it on entry to school. From a present-day perspective, and without referring to the question of different codes, I would say that all children, whatever their social background, begin to dialogue with the adults around them in the pursuit of strictly pragmatic goals. But some children grow up in families where they are also encouraged to speak in a less direct and more objective manner, in what Cummins would term more decontextualized language, designed to foster information and reflection. And since this is
precisely the use of language that is encouraged and systematically practised by the school, such children find themselves in a much better position to assimilate the school language than children from culturally less privileged families. Consequently, if the latter find that the school not only uses a different type of language but addresses them in a tongue that is not their own, the difficulties are increased and with them the likelihood of ultimate failure.

Without denying the relevance of this line of argument, Artigal notes that it is especially justified in cases where immersion in the new language starts at the beginning of compulsory schooling at a time when a somewhat decontextualized language is already being used. If, on the other hand, contact with the new language occurs in kindergarten, the situation is different. The dialogue between the pupils and their kindergarten teacher is very similar to the dialogue that children of this age engage in at home, whatever the social or cultural level of the family. It is precisely at this age that the child's language can start to become independent of dialogue and of its immediate activities and Artigal endorses the suggestion made by Vila and Serra that the effort of using a new language in kindergarten can even stimulate this process.

This may provide the explanation for the brilliant results achieved in immersion kindergartens, results that surpass those in mother tongue maintenance kindergartens. The hypothesis is certainly an attractive one, though demonstrating it requires far more empirical data than is presently available on the academic achievements of immersion children in later years. Nor should it be overlooked that improved results may be the consequence of better teaching caused by the high motivation of the teachers who take part in immersion programs. Artigal himself refers to this possibility in recalling the halo effect, which frequently causes pedagogical innovations to be successful because of the enthusiasm of those responsible for implementing them.
However, the important point to be borne in mind is that the language which, to quote Cummins, I have referred to as decontextualized, it not only the language the school uses to transmit knowledge, or rather, to stimulate the acquisition of knowledge, but also the language in which the child thinks and reflects. What we need to discover is how far a child who has acquired the ability of communicating in another language, in this case Catalan, has also acquired the ability to think and reflect in Catalan and thus to assimilate in Catalan the knowledge he or she will receive in the new language.

The last part of the book refers to immersion as a tool for linguistic normalization in Catalonia. Artigau's posture reveals a clear commitment to the Catalanization of education but he is not naively optimistic: immersion programs in Catalonia, as he quite rightly says, have been successful to a point that has taken even their initiators by surprise. This success is due to a variety of factors: to the consensus among political parties in favour of normalization, to legislation which makes the Catalanization of education possible, to the support of the Catalan government, to the approval of many parents, and, most important of all,

* (Translator's note) In Catalan psycho- and sociolinguistics, the term normalization refers, not to the process of linguistic standardization (of grammar, spelling, vocabulary etc.) which was accomplished in the early 20th century, but to the restoration of the Catalan language to "normal" social usage after the long period of diglossia caused by the repressive measures applied by previous, non-democratic regimes, particularly the Franco dictatorship.
to the enthusiasm of numerous teachers. According to the data he presents (which, as he himself points out, may be slightly over-optimistic, but not very much so), close to 70% of public school children in Catalonia between the ages of 4 and 7 years are now being educated in Catalan, and of these approximately half, around 65,000, are in immersion classes (immersion classes being defined as those in which at least 70% of the students have Spanish as their first language). On the other hand, the proportion of the total Catalan public school population receiving instruction in Catalan is considerably lower for the simple reason that in many public schools the process of Catalanization started at the bottom, with the lowest grades, and theoretically it should extend upwards year by year as new generations of children enter school. However, not all public school teachers in Catalonia are qualified to teach in Catalan or themselves have Catalan as their first language. In fact, in many schools the teachers interested in teaching in Catalan have been concentrated in the grades where instruction is already given in this language so that fewer teachers will be available from now on and it will become increasingly difficult for the use of Catalan to spread. One solution would be to regulate the creation of new teaching posts and transfers of staff in order to meet the needs of the schools, particularly in terms of instruction in Catalan, but such a proposal would be of doubtful legality and would arouse opposition even from the teachers' organizations. Indeed, though such a measure might achieve a more even distribution of teachers qualified to teach in Catalan, it would do nothing to increase the total number who are prepared to do so. The problem raises many different types of implications and probably can only be solved in the long term. In tackling it, Artigal in no way claims to offer a solution, but simply to point to the danger that immersion, and the Catalanization of education generally, may be entering a blind alley.

And finally a recommendation. Besides reporting on the success of early immersion in Catalonia, Artigal's book sets out some of the reasons
for this success, and in so doing contributes to the advancement of knowledge about second language acquisition. But the initial immersion process does not end in kindergarten and, as Artigal himself quite clearly states, a child from a Catalan immersion class cannot be considered at the age of six, for instance, at the beginning of his or her school career, to be in the same situation as a child who has Catalan as his or her first language and therefore the school cannot give the same treatment to both. Nor is it certain, I would add, that such children are ripe to learn to read in Catalan at the same age, or can be taught to read in the same way. Neither do we know whether they use Catalan to think about the knowledge they are required to assimilate and process. Numerous questions, in short, still remain to be answered.

Artigal's book -- and this is not the least of its merits -- calls for the continuation of the immersion process in Catalonia, for its extension from kindergarten to the whole of basic schooling. Fortunately work is already underway but widespread collaboration is still required if, by dint of combined efforts, we are to succeed in creating the type of school we wish for. On the threshold of a world in which mastery of several different languages seems increasingly vital, the Catalan experience can prove very valuable indeed.

Miquel Siguan

Psycholinguist

Honorary Director of the Institute of Education Sciences

University of Barcelona

March 1989
PROLOGUE TO THE ENGLISH EDITION

Though the inertia of conventionalisms might lead one to think the opposite, the boundaries of linguistic and cultural areas do not always coincide with the political frontiers of modern states. For instance, of the ten languages in the European Economic Community that are spoken by more than four million people (German, English, French, Italian, Spanish, Dutch, Catalan, Portuguese, Greek and Danish), there is one, Catalan, which is not the official language of an independent country. This fact, not surprisingly, is the consequence of a series of historical and political factors.

Located in the north east corner of the Iberian Peninsula, Catalonia is a country of 32 000 sq. km (12 500 sq. miles) inhabited by six million people. It accounts for 6% of the territory of Spain, 15% of the population, and approximately 20% of the GNP. Catalan is the language, not only of Catalonia itself, but of a larger area known as the Catalan Countries which also includes the region of Valencia, with some 3 733 000 inhabitants, the Balearic Islands, with a population of 681 000, and the Roussillon, north of the French border, which has 331 000 inhabitants.

Catalonia gradually emerged as a nation in its own right in the course of a gradual historical process which had its political beginnings a thousand years ago -- the millennium has just been celebrated -- when the Catalan counts shook off the links that bound them to the Empire of Charlemagne. Geographically speaking, Catalonia is a sort of natural corridor, and it accordingly developed a strong awareness of its own national identity, together with an open-minded attitude towards cultural trends from the rest of Europe and the Mediterranean. Throughout the highs and lows of its political fortunes over the last few centuries, Catalonia
has constantly aspired to self-government. In 1659 it was divided up politically between Spain and France, and in 1714 Philip V deprived the Spanish part of Catalonia of its remaining national rights and political institutions by military force. In the mid-19th century, however, a cultural and political revival known as the Renaixença ("rebirth") took place and gave rise, at the beginning of the 20th century, to the Mancomunitat, a limited form of administrative self-government whereby Catalonia for the first time recovered part of its national institutions before they were again abolished by the dictatorship of General Primo de Rivera (1923-1929). After the Second Spanish Republic was set up in 1931, the process towards the restoration of political self-government again got underway, only to be brutally cut short by the dictatorship of General Franco (1939-1975). The approval of the new Spanish democratic Constitution in 1978 and the passing in 1979 of the Catalan Statute of Self-Government (which defines the areas of jurisdiction of the Catalan autonomous government or Generalitat) marked the beginning of a new, and still unfinished process, which seems likely to permit the establishment of satisfactory political links with the rest of Spain and of Europe.

This long series of political vicissitudes has inevitably had linguistic repercussions, with the result that, in Catalonia, language has become, not merely a cultural, but also a political matter. On numerous occasions the chances of a voluntary union between the various peoples of Spain have been undermined by a mistaken view of a united Spain, based upon the imposition of cultural and linguistic uniformity and on the political centralism defended by the majority of Spanish governments. It may be that the fragile unity of Spain, which was strikingly revealed in past centuries by the progressive dismantling of the Spanish Empire, caused the top political elite to see uniformization as a means of preserving, at least within Spain itself, the glory of past territorial domination. That the Catalan people should have succeeded in preserving their language in the
face of this imposed uniformity, and despite long periods of oppression, diglossy, and illiteracy in their own tongue, must constitute one of the most surprising assertions of collective identity in Western Europe. It should also be recalled that, between 1950 and 1975, the population of Catalonia leapt by 75%, a percentage that exceeds the average for Spain, Europe and indeed the entire world during the same period. The cause of this growth was immigration from the Spanish-speaking parts of Spain and it occurred under the dictatorship of General Franco, which was clearly hostile to all signs of Catalan identity, including the language. These events have led to the creation of a somewhat unusual linguistic situation in Catalonia. On the one hand there are native-born Catalans who habitually speak Catalan and who, since the return of democracy, are able to make public and official use of their own language. Young people are also now taught it in school and have learnt to write it correctly. On the other hand there is an immigrant population whose usual language is Spanish and who, after a quarter of a century of enforced ignorance, are finally becoming aware of the land in which they live and taking an interest in its language. One important sign of this interest is the desire that their children should become thoroughly familiar with Catalan. For both communities, knowledge of Spanish is assured by the extent of its presence in the communications media and in print, and by the fact that it is a compulsory part of the school curriculum.

In view of this situation, politicians, educationalists and psycholinguists have proposed a variety of measures and methods designed to move towards something approaching an ideal situation in which the whole Catalan population would have a normal level of knowledge of the language of the country, Catalan, and at the same time the best possible command of other languages, first and foremost Spanish, which has official status throughout Spain. Bilingualism in Catalonia would mean that the country’s inhabitants would be able to develop similar skills in Catalan and in
Spanish, whatever their place or birth. The Law of Linguistic Normalization, passed by the Catalan Parliament in 1983, seeks to work towards the achievement of this objective.

At the outset of this process, of course, the Catalan language finds itself in a situation of clear inferiority for reasons already referred to which have nothing to do with the language itself. Though in 1989, for instance, over 50% of television broadcasting time available to the citizens of Catalonia was in Catalan, and the number of books published in Catalan was growing steadily year by year, attaining a total of 4145 titles on sale in 1987, still the situation was far removed from the "ideal" described above. This then, since the return of democracy, has been the challenge facing all sectors interested in what is termed "linguistic normalization", that is, the return of the Catalan language to a "normal" situation after centuries of oppression.

In this context, the work of Josep Maria Artigal is of great importance, not only in scientific or academic terms, but also as a means for maintaining social and political harmony. There is much discussion about immersion, for reasons that sometimes have little to with the true potential of the method. There have even been references to political imposition and psychological coercion. Josep Maria Artigal has studied the subject in depth, in its psychological, sociological and strictly linguistic dimensions; he has conducted a series of precise empirical follow-up experiments designed to identify the steps to be taken and the conditions to be met in order to ensure its successful application; and he has compared his findings with similar experiments performed elsewhere, especially in Quebec, the Basque Country and Finland. Despite the author's young years, it can therefore be said that this first publication of his output in an internationally known language comes as the recognition of the seriousness and maturity of his work. This is a cause for twofold satisfaction. In the first place because such research may become a key
tool for achieving linguistic normalization in Catalonia. And secondly
because it provides an opportunity for Catalonia to offer to the
international community, and especially to Europe, a set of research
findings that will also play an important part in the construction of a
Europe whose unity and cultural wealth will be enhanced by the ability of
its citizens to acquire mastery of several different languages.

Jordi Porta Ribalta
Director, Jaume Bofill Foundation
Barcelona, February 1990.
The texts published in this book were originally written as separate articles during the 1987-88 academic year. They were later revised and extended and the first chapter, written especially for the book, was added. Despite the diverse origins of the various parts, however, the final book endeavors to follow a single line of thought so that the chapters may make up a coherent sequence in the order in which they are presented.

It should also be mentioned that the original articles were written, and the subsequent revision and preparation of the final versions was carried out, thanks to a grant from the Jaume Bofill Foundation in Barcelona.

I would like finally to thank all those whose disinterested help has contributed to making this book what it is, especially Joaquim Arnau, Aurora Bel, Angèle Bertran, Lina Casanovas, Joan Manuel Cubilla, the team of advisers of the Intensive Plans for Linguistic Normalization (Catalan Department of Education), Teresa Martí, Antoni Milian, the teachers of the Escola Púlblic Llibertat in Badalona, Jordi Porta, David Ribes, Miquel Siguan, Ramon Simón, Teresa Tort and Ignasi Vila. My thanks also to Jacqueline Hall for making the preparation of the English translation a pleasant and easy task.
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CHAPTER 1 THE MEANING OF IMMERSION

The first educational experiment in what would later be called immersion got underway in September 1965 in the kindergarten class at the Saint Lambert school in Montreal, Quebec. It is a well known fact that the main distinguishing feature of any educational experiment in immersion is that the language of communication and instruction used in the school is different from the language used at home by the children attending the program. It takes little thought, however, to realize that there is nothing new about this type of educational situation. The children who attended school in ancient Rome, for instance, studied in Greek; in the 19th century, the sons and daughters of the aristocracy and the wealthy middle classes had governesses and tutors who spoke another language; children in Africa and Asia have been attending classes for many years in the language of the colonizing powers — French, English, German, Dutch or Spanish; and in General Franco's Spain, schoolchildren were obliged for decades to receive instruction in Spanish, even when their mother tongue was Catalan, Basque or Galician.

Why then do we refer to immersion as a new experiment in education? What is supposedly "new" about it? What difference is there between what we now call an immersion program and many of these other situations which also involved a change of language? Or, to ask the question most relevant to the situation in Catalonia, what is the difference between the Catalan-speaking boys and girls who thirty years ago went to school in Spanish, and today's children who speak Spanish at home and attend a Catalan immersion program?

In order to answer these questions, we must make it clear from the outset that a situation in which the language spoken at home is not the same as that spoken at school cannot be described as good or bad, effective or ineffective, beneficial or harmful in itself. It has been shown that instruction in a language different from that spoken in the home works in
some cases and not in others, owing to a variety of pedagogical, psychological, sociological and political factors. In order to assess the viability of an immersion program in a particular place at a particular time, a twofold reasoning must be adopted. First of all the relevant set of factors must be identified as precisely as possible, and secondly one must establish whether or not they exist in the situation under study. In the following paragraphs I will endeavor to set out this twofold reasoning by defining precisely what the requirements for an effective and useful immersion program are and ascertaining whether or not those requirements are fulfilled in Catalonia.

THE NECESSARY REQUIREMENTS FOR AN IMMERSION PROGRAM

In 1928, specialists in education from all over the world met at the International Education Office in Luxemburg to reflect on bilingual education. The main topic of discussion was research carried out in various places where pupils belonging to language groups in a situation of inferiority were attending classes in languages that were socially, economically and politically stronger. A large-scale study of Welsh children in English-language schools and a number of research projects conducted in the United States among non English-speaking pupils who were likewise attending school in English received particular attention. The results of these studies, which have come in for widespread comment, showed that these pupils who underwent a program involving a home-school language switch generally had poorer academic results and levels of intelligence than children educated in their family language. These findings led the International Education Office to issue a public statement to the effect that primary education in the mother tongue was to be considered a condition sine qua non for the full academic and psychological development of children. The same principle was reiterated by UNESCO in another famous
and much-discussed statement made in Paris in 1951: "it is axiomatic that the best medium for teaching a child is his mother tongue" (UNESCO 1953).

A few years later, however, Paul and Lambert (1962) did some research among French-English bilingual children with a view to measuring certain components of the supposed bilingual deficit and were surprised to observe that the predictions made by UNESCO and the International Education Office were not borne out in the population they studied. Their bilingual children scored higher than the monolingual children with whom they were compared, not only in verbal but even in non-verbal abilities. These unexpected findings soon gave rise to other studies which yielded similar results, among them Balkan (1970) in Switzerland, Ben-Zeev (1971) in New York and Israel, Ianco-Worrall (1972) in South Africa, and Scott (1973) in Montreal (all quoted by Lambert 1978:215).

At the same time as these new results were coming out, several authors (Lambert and Tucker 1972) and Lambert (1974)) compared two groups of Anglophone pupils in Quebec, one attending school in English and the other taking part in French immersion programs (which, as stated above, had begun in 1965). They discovered that the development of those who had followed a program involving a change of language was similar, and in some ways better than their peers who had attended school in the same language as they spoke at home.

Thus, after a period during which exclusive use of the mother tongue in the early years of schooling had been assumed to be virtually indispensable, analysis of a variety of educational experiments in different situations around the world involving languages in contact revealed that, though children need in some cases to be educated in their home language, in others it is possible, and even beneficial, for them to be taught in another language. This led researchers to distinguish for the first time between additive and subtractive bilingualism in school (Lambert 1974) or between bilingualism and semilingualism (Cummins 1979b) or again,
more specifically, between immersion and submersion. In other words, they classified the different situations involving a home-school language switch and applied the term "immersion" to those experiments which, because they fulfilled certain prerequisites, were beneficial to the children to whom they were applied, while the word "submersion" was used to describe those which, as noted years earlier by the International Education Office and UNESCO, had detrimental effects on the academic, linguistic and psychological development of the children.

In the last fifteen years, numerous authors have done research into similar educational experiments in an attempt to identify the specific factors which might explain why and when a change of language is beneficial for the children to whom it is applied. The results are not yet conclusive and indeed certain contradictions have emerged (Bibeau 1984, 1988). Nonetheless, the majority seem to make a broad distinction between three particularly significant types of variables when explaining why a change of language between home and school is or is not efficient and why teaching in a new language (Lm)* can have additive or subtractive effects on the linguistic, academic and psychological development of the pupils. These three main variables are as follows:

* On account of the connotations often implicit in the terms "Second Language" and "L2", in this book we will use "New Language" or its equivalent "Lm" when referring to Catalan as a language to be learnt. The terms "Second Language" and "L2" will be confined to references to other authors who do use them.
1. the social status of the home language and culture,
2. the attitudes of the pupils towards the school language and their reasons for learning it,
3. the type of pedagogical treatment whereby the children acquire the new language.

Thus the first variable to be taken into account is the social status of the family language and culture and, consequently, the children's evaluation and perception of that language. Various experiments indicate that attendance at an immersion program is likely to be successful when the children's home language and culture are those of a strong social majority (Swain 1981a). Immersion can provide such pupils with a good command of the school language, provided it is learnt in a natural way, through real functional, communicative use. Moreover, there is no reason why normal development of home language skills should be interrupted (Genesee 1988) since the latter, being dominant, will be significantly present in the environment outside the school (Lapkin and Swain 1984). The children's first language, though usually absent during the first years in school (Swain 1981b, Swain and Lapkin 1983), is introduced into the curriculum later on.

Regarding the second of the variables listed above, research suggests that pupils' attitudes towards the new school language and the whole set of motivational factors which encourage them to acquire are as important to the success or failure of the immersion program as actual academic potential. Another variable singled out by researchers as strongly related to attitude and motivation is the fact that a program involving a change of language can never be imposed, nor must it be seen by the child as an explicit or implicit rejection of his or her own family language and culture. It thus follows to some extent that children to whom
this type of program is applied must be able to use their home language as long as they wish or need to do so, and that the teachers, though they never use it themselves, must always be able to understand it.

Underlying the third variable related to the success or failure of an immersion program is the idea that communication must always be guaranteed, in other words, that classroom interactions in the new language must always be both meaningful and efficient. The first reason is that, if the message in the new language which reaches the pupil is incomprehensible, acquisition of that language will be impossible (Krashen 1983, Krashen 1984, Cummins 1984c). The second is that the children must not only receive the new language in a comprehensible manner, but be able to "use it satisfactorily". As I will attempt to explain later on, mastery of the new language will be built up on the basis of communicative procedures which, though not very highly developed in verbal terms, are both meaningful and efficient from the very beginning of the learning process. To put it another way, the children will use the school language, and by using it will acquire it, provided the communicability of their output in this language is assured. Hence, in a program involving a home-school language switch, the prime objective of the pedagogical approach from the very first day must be to guarantee mutual communication between teacher and pupils in all their joint activities. And in order to guarantee the meaningfulness and efficiency of classroom interactions, at least two things are necessary (Terrell 1985: 465): 1/ any activity undertaken must become an objective in itself, that is, attention must always be focussed on what the speakers want to do and not on the formal correctness of the words in which they express this objective; and 2/ an effort must be made to discover some way, excluding use of the home language, of ensuring that the activity may be understood and carried out.

Thus it can be stated that one of the basic features of an immersion program is that the new language is not taught and acquired as an end in itself but as a tool for doing other interesting and motivating things in such
a way that the attention of the class is on "what" is being done and not on the language used to do it (Krashen 1984). As Swain and Lapkin put it,

"As a general statement, then, the immersion approach to second language education in a Canadian context involves emphasizing the communication of meaningful content material through French, rather than focussing on the teaching of the second language itself." (Swain and Lapkin 1983: 9)

I will be arguing later on that it is not entirely convincing to claim that a new language can be learnt and later used and that it seems more reasonable to postulate that it is precisely through its actual societal use that it will ultimately be acquired. If this is so, the best way of defining an immersion program is as a large, natural context for the use and acquisition of a new language which teacher and pupils build up together.

THE POLITICAL DIMENSION OF PROGRAMS INVOLVING A LANGUAGE SWITCH

The status of the home language, attitude and motivation towards to the school language, and the right pedagogical treatment, are thus three basic and essential requirements -- though not the only ones -- for a beneficial and efficient program involving a change of language. It is important to stress, however, that no educational choice involving a change of language is ever purely linguistic in character. It always has a social dimension and always reflects the intentions of those who propose, implement or impose it. Any decision concerning the linguistic aims of education is a response to a particular social context and to a set of individual and collective goals. Language is one of the most sensitive tools whereby we all establish our personal identity and our membership in a group. It follows that any educational choice involving a change of language implies a conscious or unconscious political decision. As Siguan and Mackey point out,
"Any system of bilingual education is decisively conditioned by the socio-political bilingual circumstances in the society which establishes it and by the goals this society sets itself" (Siguan and Mackey 1986: 104).

An educational situation involving a change of language is both a sign and a consequence of a given balance of power between the languages in question and of a set of intentions deriving from this same balance of power. No situation in which a change of language takes place in the classroom can be understood unless this political dimension is borne in mind.

On the other hand, neither is it possible to analyze or propose an immersion program solely on the basis of political considerations. While immersion appears to be the best known way of attaining certain political objectives, it works if, and only if, certain psychological, sociological and pedagogical requirements are met. In a society whose own language has been relegated to a position of inferiority and which is bent on recovering it -- as is the case in Catalonia --, an immersion program can become a very powerful tool for achieving this goal, as long as the aforementioned requirements concerning the status of the family language, motivation and attitude towards the school language, and the use of the right pedagogical treatment are fulfilled. It is important to note that there is general agreement among researchers that an immersion program can have positive results provided there are social guarantees to safeguard the home cultural and linguistic identity of the children attending it. When this is not so, the studies show that immersion, or more precisely submersion, may well produce different results. In other words, some political intention is always essential to an immersion program: it always exists, either explicitly or implicitly, but it is not sufficient in itself. Other sociological, psychological and pedagogical conditions must inevitably be present.
THE IMMERSION PROGRAM IN CATALONIA

The reasons for the growth of the immersion program in Catalonia in recent years (by the 88-89 school year some 65 000 pupils were attending it) may very well lie partly in the fulfilment of the requirements described above as basic and indispensable in any situation involving a home-school language switch. The family language and culture are dominant in the environment where the program is applied; the attitude and motivation of the children towards the school language, and the optional character of the program seem to be guaranteed; and the high quality of the teaching in immersion classes is generally acknowledged -- indeed immersion and pedagogical renewal seem, so far, to be two inseparable trends (Arenas 1986a). 

At this stage in the argument, however, it is important to note that, while the fulfilment of the first and second requirements is determined to some extent on society and lies outside the context of the school itself, requirement 3 depends much more directly on professional educators and consequently on the conditions in which they work. In the Catalan immersion program, it has been possible to meet the third requirements -- "the correctness of the pedagogical approach whereby the children acquire the new language" -- thanks mainly to the dedication of the teachers who have carried out the various experiments. As long as the immersion project affected only a small minority of children, individual good will was generally sufficient to solve the special pedagogical and didactic problems raised by a program involving a change of language. But as soon as the scheme began to grow, the lack of an appropriate political and administrative framework, of suitable working conditions, and of adequate theoretical and practical counselling became apparent. From now on the very size of the immersion program will call for large-scale, well planned action with political support such as only government can provide.
It is necessary, first and foremost, to extend the present conception of an immersion program lasting only to the end of the first part of primary education, that is to the age of eight. At the same time steps must be taken to ensure that all teachers in charge of pupils between kindergarten and the end of compulsory schooling (age 14) who have undergone a change of language receive more thorough, ongoing training. And above all, this on-the-job training must provide teachers, not merely with further education in Catalan language and culture, but with the means to carry out the very specific pedagogical renewal (Obadia 1984, Snow 1987) which is vital to any school program involving a change of language. As Snow remarks,

"Immersion teaching involves much more than simply taking the standard school curriculum and teaching it in a foreign language. Pre-service and in-service training are required to adequately prepare teachers for the challenge of immersion teaching" (Snow 1987: 6).

An immersion program can be beneficial if it is properly carried out, that is, if the correct educational treatment is adopted from beginning to end. Hence if here in Catalonia we wish to go on "Catalanizing" compulsory education, if our aim is to continue setting up schools in which the Catalan language enjoys the status that should belong to it and which can help restore it to its rightful place in society, certain conditions which are presently lacking must be fulfilled. Government must take a more decisive stand and make more funds available and in this connection the Canadian experience must once again be borne in mind.

"The present formula for bilingualization in Canada can be partly explained by the allocation of new public funds which encourages Canadian "school councils" to start up classes and hire staff. This money (...) has let to the creation of the hundreds of immersion classes which presently exist and all that surrounds them
It seems reasonably clear at the present time that Catalan immersion had succeeded even beyond the expectations of its originators * (Belart and Rossell (1984), Arnaud and Bel (forthcoming), Vila and Sera (forthcoming)). After a period of enthusiasm, immersion in Catalonia finds itself at the beginning of a new stage in which the constant increase in the number of parents who opt for this form of education is outpacing the existing framework 7. Previously the crucial question was to assess the beneficial effects of the program: now it is quite simply to determine the feasibility of making immersion generally available.

As we enter this new stage, our first concern must be to seek new ways of meeting the third of the requisites set out above, in other words of ensuring that the right pedagogical treatment is used and of meeting the requirements relating to staff, theory, material needs and political action which would make immersion viable, not only in the form of a limited number of trial experiments, but as a standard and readily assessible option. From now on the future of immersion in Catalonia will depend to a large extent on the existence of the conditions required by the large-scale development of the correct pedagogical approach and this is something that cannot be guaranteed by the good will of a handful of teachers once the experiment is no longer confined to a minority. Until quite recently the controversy over immersion revolved around the questions "Why?" and "Why not?". From now on a new question has to be added: "How?". Finding out "how" this type of program can be expanded, pedagogically, socially and politically, has become the crux of the discussion, the key factor on which the medium-term success or failure of the experiments depends. The motto of the years to come may well be "Immersion in Catalonia? By all means. But how?".
THE AIMS OF THE PRESENT BOOK

The foregoing argument constitutes the foundation on which this book has been built. The remaining chapters will be based on the assumption that a set of circumstances exist in present-day Catalonia which coincide, at least in general terms, with the set of variables defined by previous authors as necessary for the development of an immersion program beneficial to the children who take part in it. Having established this, the book goes on to consider practical ways in which the immersion program may be developed. In the next chapter we will study the procedure that teacher and pupils build up together in order to enable the latter "to use meaningfully and effectively, and in so doing to acquire" the new language of which they as yet have insufficient knowledge. In Chapter 3 we address the problem of the low socio-cultural background, and presumably also the poor linguistic skills, of the children who attend Catalan immersion programs. In the last chapter we examine the present legal boundaries within which the immersion program operates in Catalonia.

Thus in the coming pages we will be dealing from a psycholinguistic, sociolinguistic and politico-linguistic point of view with a variety of questions related to an educational option that already exists in Catalonia and is growing day by day. We will endeavor first and foremost to address some of the "misgivings" frequently expressed by teachers, parents and people interested in the subject generally.

Not all the aspects which need to be taken into account will be covered and our analysis cannot in any way be considered exhaustive, though it is our hope that the reader will find it useful. A number of things are taken for granted. It is assumed in the first place that an immersion program cannot succeed unless the home language enjoys greater prestige and power than the school language. It is also assumed that other important factors are the prestige of the school language, and the motivation and
attitude of the children towards what for them is a new language. And it is
taken for granted that access to a program involving a change of language
must always be optional and voluntary:

"Once an immersion program is established in a community, it still
remains an optional program. Participation in the program is
voluntary, and parents can always choose to enrol their children in
the regular English program (...) rather than in an immersion
program" (Swain and Lapkin 1983:2).

A further assumption is that the implementation of a program of this
type must not mean the explicit or implicit rejection of the children's
home language and culture. And finally it is taken for granted that,
provided these conditions are met, attendance at an immersion program is
not in any way detrimental to the acquisition of the home language and
culture:

"For the members of the majority group, learning a second language is
not likely to pose a threat to a sense of personal or cultural
identity, nor to the maintenance of the first language" (Lambert

On this basis we formulate the hypothesis that these requirements are
fulfilled in present-day Catalonia in the case of Spanish (the socially
strong language) and Catalan (the language in a situation of inferiority
which is given precedence in school). Obviously the mere fact of assuming
this to be so or of formulating the hypothesis does not validate it and, if
our assumptions were shown to be incorrect, the whole argument would cease
to apply.
FINAL REMARK

One of the questions I asked at the beginning of this first introductory chapter referred to the difference between the situation of the Spanish-speaking children who opt nowadays for a Catalan immersion program and the situation of the Catalan-speaking children who, in bygone years, were obliged to attend school in Spanish. I would like to close this chapter by returning to this question and provide at least an overall answer. On the basis of the reasoning set out above, it seems possible to argue that the conditions we assume exist today in the situation in which immersion is applied in Catalonia did not exist in the case of the Catalan-speaking children who, in former years, were educated in Spanish. The home language of those children was not socially dominant at the time; education in Spanish was not optional; many of the teachers were not bilingual and thus were unable to understand the children when the latter were not using the school language; respect for the home language and culture was not guaranteed, and even less was there any type of special educational treatment to make allowance for the change of language.

Obviously both now and then a home-school language switch took place. But on the basis of the arguments set forth in this chapter, it is not possible to consider both as immersion programs.
Notes to Chapter 1

1. Many current works on the subject would have defined this third point as "the level attained by pupils in their home language on beginning to learn the school language". For a discussion as to why we do not consider this variable to be the third pre-requisite and refer instead to the "correct pedagogical approach in the new language", the reader should refer to the third chapter of this book, *Immersion for children from low socio-cultural backgrounds*.

2. For a more detailed analysis of this question, referring specifically to the situation of Catalan education, see especially López del Castillo (1988): *Quina llengua i quina escola*.

3. This figure can be compared with those for pupils in immersion programs in Canada. In 1977-78, twelve years after this type of program got underway, there were 45 679 pupils in immersion programs throughout Canada (0.75% of the total number in primary education in the entire country). By the 1982-83 school year there were 122 750 pupils (3.20%), while in the 1986-87 school year, the figure had increased to 202 066 (5.39% of pupils and 10.2% of schools all over Canada) (Gibson 1987, quoted by Boland-Wills et al. 1988: 38). In Quebec, where this type of education began, there were 18 200 pupils in immersion programs during the 1986-87 school year (1.7% of the total school population of the province) (Rapport annuel 1986. Commission aux langues officielles, quoted by Rebuffot (1988:24)) and 12.6% of children whose home language was English (Stern 1984:61). It must be pointed out that Anglophones, the only group who have access to this type of program, since they form the dominant language group, account for only 18% of the population of the province of Quebec.

For more information on the number of children presently attending immersion programs in Catalonia see Chapter 4, *Immersion as a means towards normalization of the Catalan language*.

4. The link between immersion programs and pedagogical renewal seems to be constant, both in Catalonia and elsewhere (Rebuffot 1988).

5. For fuller information about the need to extend the immersion approach
to the whole of compulsory schooling (until age 14), see Chapters 3 and 4 of this book.

6. The studies carried out so far to assess the suitability of the Catalan immersion program in the present-day situation in Catalonia point to positive results, or at any rate, to an absence of negative results, in comparison with programs not involving a language switch. Nonetheless it must be observed that few studies have been conducted, that they have measured small populations of schoolchildren, and that they have often been confined to analyzing pilot schools which often present special characteristics. We must wait therefore for the results of ongoing studies, such as one currently being conducted by Arnau, Boada and Forns, which will follow a large sample of children in immersion programs in the Barcelona working class suburbs of Santa Coloma de Gramenet and Ciutat Badia from the ages of 4 to 7.

7. Researchers into school curricula generally refer to a so-called halo effect which tends to inflate or increase the results of any project the first time it is carried out but which can fall off when these projects are implemented on a larger scale. This factor must undoubtedly also be taken into account in the case of Catalan immersion in order to make realistic medium- and long-term analyses.
CHAPTER 2

THE JOINT CREATION OF THE SCHOOL LANGUAGE

"The important data are not just the utterances produced by the learner, but the discourse which learner and caretaker jointly construct."

(Rod Ellis -- Understanding Second Language Acquisition -- p. 129)

In a situation like that of Catalan kindergarten total immersion classes, in which comprehension of the school language is assured very early on and the home language can be used effectively, since the pupil can resort to it at any time to express whatever he or she wants, what is the children's first output in their new language? The things they have heard the teacher repeat most often? The things involving fewest phonetic, lexical and morphosyntactical interferences with the home language? Or perhaps the things most closely connected with school, those that do not "exist" outside school and so are not in conflict with the children's existing linguistic background? Or possibly the most functional things, those they need most in order to take part in class activities? Or those they find most motivating?

All these questions have been asked with reference to new language acquisition and there are reasons to believe that all the variables underlying them play some part in a situation involving a home-school language switch such as the one we are considering here.

The present study, however, without underestimating earlier hypotheses, focusses on another type of variable that must be taken into
account if we are to discover to what purpose, how and when children in kindergarten total immersion classes first use the school language. In the present chapter we suggest that other considerations, while not the only ones, are also relevant:

In what type of communicative contexts do the children's first uses of the new language appear?
How far do these first uses of the new language depend on the type of context in which they are produced?
And consequently, what is the role of these first contexts in the process of new language acquisition?

"WANTING TO" AND "BEING ABLE TO": TWO IMPORTANT VARIABLES

Before going on to analyze the precise nature of the contexts in which the first uses of the new language take place in a kindergarten total immersion classroom, we must first try to define the boundaries of the problem to be studied, which is obviously too complex and far-reaching to be dealt with exhaustively in the present work.

We shall do this by distinguishing between two types of variable related to the use of a language which is still being acquired and to the context in which it is used. These variables have to do with what we will refer to respectively as "wanting to" and "being able to". In other words, it seems possible to argue that pupils in total immersion kindergartens use Catalan to convey their linguistic needs in contexts where they "want to do so" and "are able to do so effectively".

"Wanting to", in this case, means that the use of the new language depends in the first place on whether the children have reasons for using it, on whether they have a positive attitude towards it, and on whether the
situations conveyed through it are meaningful, attractive and motivating for them. Language is currently considered by linguists, sociolinguists, ethnolinguists and psycholinguists as the most powerful tool whereby people establish relationships with others and intentionally modify their social environment, particularly their immediate environment. It seems logical therefore to believe that the use of Catalan as the "new school language" will depend first and foremost on its functionality, its usefulness as a tool for building up affective relationships within the class.

But it is not enough for the children to be motivated, to want to use the new language. It is vital at the same time that they should be "able to use it effectively", that from the very first moment, use of the new language should be socially meaningful and operational. To put it another way, the communicability of their discourse must be guaranteed despite their still inadequate skills in a language they have only just begun to acquire. In a situation of early total immersion where, as already pointed out, understanding of the school language and use of the home language are both possible and compatible, four- to five-year-olds are not prepared to gamble with the success of their relationship with others. If this relationship may be endangered by the use of the new language, then they resort to Spanish, the language in which they are already able to ensure effective interaction. Thus in a kindergarten total immersion classroom, whenever the children "want" to communicate in the new language but are not "able" to do so, they use the language in which they can communicate, Spanish.

Positive attitudes, motivation and the affective link implicit in any use of language can thus be compared to the gas that drives an automobile. Without gas the car won't go, since the engine won't run. It makes no difference how powerful the engine is. Gas is always necessary. As Ausubel says (1978), no type of meaningful learning is possible without intentionality. But at the same time the engine is also necessary since it
is useless having gallons of gas if the engine is faulty and won't start. In terms of the foregoing comparison, a kindergarten total immersion classroom does not only have problems of "gas", though clearly "gas" is vital. Indeed the processes and procedures that take place in a school can never be reduced simply to a question of "wanting to". The use of the new school language also depends on whether teacher and pupils are capable of building an "engine".

In the present chapter, therefore, our approach to the first contexts in which the new language is used will be limited in the following way. Attitude and motivation are of vital importance in any process of new language teaching and learning and have consequently received widespread attention from authors such as Gardner and Lambert (1972), Dulay and Burt (1977), Schumann (1978), Gardner (1979), Fillmore (1976), Tucker (1977) and Dulay, Burt and Krashen (1982). They are not however the central concern of this work, though after dealing with "being able to" we will again revert to the key matter of "wanting to". The present chapter concentrates mainly on what kindergarten immersion pupils do, and how they do it, in order to "be able" to make meaningful and effective use of a language of which they have as yet little or no knowledge.

TWO WAYS OF USING A LANGUAGE YOU DON'T KNOW WELL ENOUGH

In order to begin to discuss ways of using a language of which one has insufficient knowledge, I will start with two examples. These consist of two excerpts observed in kindergarten total immersion classes of four-year-old children. This is usually the first year in school and thus the first year of meaningful contact with the Catalan language.
Example 1*

For the last few days the children have been saying there is a witch in the school and talking about it constantly. In order to take advantage of this spontaneous topic of interest, the teacher draws a picture of a witch on one side of the blackboard and leaves it there for four weeks. During this time he frequently goes up to the picture of the witch as though he were listening to what the witch was saying.

It is important to note that the whole sequence of events is always the same. The teacher goes up to the witch, listens to what she says, turns round to look at the class and waits until he has caught the children's attention. Then he tells them what the witch has said, there is some kind of reaction in the class and afterwards activities go on as usual.

The teacher comments on what the witch has said in the following ways:

Teacher "The witch says we're making such a din she's getting a bit of a headache" (La bruixa m'ha dit que té una mica de mal de cap perquè sem una mica de xivarri) or

---

* The first two examples are from four-year-old immersion classes at the Escola Públia Sant Josep Oriol in the district of Trinitat Nova in Barcelona. The teachers who take part are Teresa Martí and Josep M. Artigal. This first took place in January 1986 and the second in February 1987.
Teacher "Can you guess what the witch said? Shall I tell you? She says that one of these days we may be going on a trip to the country! Would you like to go on a trip to the country?" (Sabeu què m'ha dit la bruixa? Voleu que us ho expliqui? Doncs diu que poteu aviat farem una excursió a la muntanya! Us agradaria que féssim una excursió a la muntanya?)

Another thing the teacher does is to put a chair in front of the picture so that the pupils can also "listen to the witch and tell the class what she said to them".

A few days after this discourse activity has been introduced, while the rest of the children are engaged in other activities, Sara, one of the pupils, spontaneously acts as follows:

Sara  (goes up to the blackboard, stands on the chair, "listens to the witch", turns round towards her classmates, and waits for them all to be quiet)

Teacher What did she say to you? (Qué t'ha dit?)

Sara Tomorrow pool. (Demà piscina.)

Teacher That's right! Tomorrow we're going to the swimming pool.

That's quite true. The witch told you that tomorrow we're going to the swimming pool. (Sí, noia, demà anirem a la piscina. És veritat. La bruixa t'ha dit que demà anirem a la piscina.)

Sara (gets down from the chair and the class goes on as usual).

* (Translator's note. All the words spoken by both teacher and pupil are in Catalan)
Example 2

A few days ago the whole class spontaneously invented a linguistic activity which consists of guessing what there will be for dessert each day in the canteen. This activity has a fairly ritualized structure and always takes place at the same time, just before noon, when morning classes end and the children go to lunch. It starts after the classroom has been tidied up. All the children are sitting in their places and the teacher is standing in front of the blackboard. The discussion begins with questions of the following type:

Teacher Let's see, Jessica, what do you think we'll have for dessert today? (Aviam, Jessica, qué pot haver-hi avui de postres?)

Jessica Apples. (Poma.)

Teacher Apples, very good, apples. Jessica thinks we'll have apples today. (Poma, molt bé, poma. La Jessica pensa que avui hi haurà poma)

* (Translator's note) All the words spoken by both teacher and pupil are in Catalan
or alternatively*:

Teacher Gorka! What would you like for dessert today? I wonder if we'll guess right! (Gorka! Què t'agradaria a tu, Gorka, que hi hagués avui per postres? A veure si ho endevinem!)

Gorka Oranges (Taronja)

Teacher Very good, Gorka. Oranges. Hey, I wonder if we've guessed right and we really will have oranges. (Molt bé, Gorka, taronja. Aviam si avui trobem taronja i guanyem, eh?)

Each time the children answer, the teacher draws the dessert mentioned on the blackboard, while at the same time repeating the name several times. When necessary he or she gives the right name in Catalan, but without making any explicit correction. The activity ends when the children reach the canteen and see whether they have guessed right or not, though for the purposes of this example we are only concerned with the first stage in the game.

Three weeks or so after this linguistic game is invented, Alba, one of the little girls in the class, asks the class teacher, Teresa, whether she can be the teacher and ask the other children what they think they will have for dessert. Teresa immediately agrees.

* [Translator's note] All the words spoken by both teacher and pupil are in Catalan.
It is important to remember that, as has been pointed out earlier, Alba could conduct this activity in either Catalan or Spanish. This is how she goes about it*.

Alba (stands in front of the blackboard, crosses her arms, and waits for her classmates to be quiet and concentrate their attention on her)
Children (everyone is quiet and looks at Alba)
Alba Carles!
Carles Apple. (Pomn.)
Alba (turns round and draws an apple on the blackboard)

THE JOINT OUTPUT CONTEXT

The first interesting feature to emerge from these two examples is that the (verbal) texts produced by the children are not exact imitations of the linguistic pattern proposed by the teacher in similar situations. The children create a text in the new language to suit their needs and abilities, a text which, though extremely simple, is entirely meaningful and effective in the context of the overall discourse activity within which it is produced. In other words, Sara and Alba display the ability to define and develop a coherent discourse activity despite the slender resources available to them in the new language.

* (Translator's note) The words spoken by both children are in Catalan. In addressing her classmate, Alba uses his Catalan name "Carles" and not his Spanish name "Carlos".
Nonetheless, this competence or ability to define and develop activities effectively in the new language cannot be attributed to the individual pupil's skill; rather it is a possibility built up through collaboration between the various speakers. In the excerpts it is the class as a group which constructs joint procedures for communicating in a language they want to use in such a way that their still inadequate skills will not endanger the effectiveness of the discourse they build up together. Thus it would seem that the first output which the children produce in the new language within a given context (the class) and a given group of speakers (their classmates and especially the teacher) appear as a result of strategies which the class builds up in collaboration in order to carry out joint communicative activities in the new language.

In all the kindergarten total immersion classrooms observed we find situations in which the children "do things in Catalan" which, like those in the examples, lie somewhat outside the range of their individual skills in the language at the time the verbal conduct takes place (Artigal 1987a). In these situations the children are able to "use a language of which they have little or no knowledge" primarily because they do so in collaboration with others. What is more, the existence of these situations seems to have no connection with the teacher's awareness or non-awareness of them, though as a result of such knowledge his or her pedagogical action may be reinforced in such a way as to propose activities likely to create contexts of this type.

I refer to situations of this type as the "joint output context" and define them as situations in which the children can express more in the new language than they would be competent to produce as individuals. One of the basic characteristics of such situations is that the speakers share a certain amount of knowledge about what is being done or said and a set of procedures for acting and speaking which makes it unnecessary to verbalize everything that is required by the interaction they build up together. And
it is precisely because this "possible lack of verbalization" does not involve loss of meaning and communicative effectiveness in the contexts we are describing, that children in total immersion kindergartens are able from very early on to define and develop activities successfully in what is still for them a new language. Thus a "joint output context" allows the pupil to "operate" — that is, to define and develop relationships with others through language — using the still limited tools available to him or her in the new language.

Having established this, we can now return to the original question and begin to formulate a possible reply:

In what contexts does the first output in the new language appear?

Or, to put it another way, in what conditions are children in Catalan total immersion kindergartens able to use Catalan instead of Spanish, provided that they also want to do so?

Observations carried out with four-year-olds in kindergarten total immersion classrooms suggest that much of the first output in the new language appears in joint output contexts, that is, in contexts that are primarily characterized by sharing.

THE ROLE OF COMPREHENSION AND PRODUCTION IN ACQUIRING A NEW LANGUAGE

One of the most interesting features which emerges clearly from all the excerpts is the will to collaborate so that the dialogue may proceed, to negotiate by any means available the development of the jointly constructed discourse, to make sure communication is not broken off but continues to operate. One of the rules that enable the teacher and children to build up joint output contexts is of particular importance. It consists of saying
either "everything's going fine, we can carry on" or "watch out, a problem has arisen that has to be negotiated". It would seem therefore that the strategy for running the class is in the last resort a pragmatic one (Taeuschner and Artigal 1987, Voltes et al. 1989) and that its overriding objective is to construct efficient, operational communication.

This interpretation corresponds partly to that put forward by various authors -- Hatch (1978), Hatch and Long (1980) and Terrel (1985) -- with reference to second language acquisition generally and even applied by Cummins (1984c) and Krashen (1984) to acquisition of the school language in immersion programs. Even so, there is a difference between the meaning these authors give to initial "communication strategies" (Hatch 1978) and the hypothesis proposed here with reference to the first strategies for L2 use in Catalan immersion classrooms. Basically this difference is related to the functional value attributed in each case to the first uses of the new language, that is, to the view that is taken of the relationship between comprehension and production in the process of L2 learning and acquisition.

For the aforementioned authors, the communicative strategies used by the learner at the outset of the process of L2 acquisition serve basically to prolong the conversational exchange and thus receive more meaningful input in the new language from the other speaker who is proficient in the language. Their arguments rest in fact on a definition previously proposed by Krashen which, though similar, is more specifically morphosyntactical in nature. For them, as for Krashen, the whole new language acquisition process depends on the accessibility or comprehensibility of the linguistic input the pupil is offered by his or her environment.

"Second language acquisition theory provides a very clear explanation as to why immersion works. According to current theory, we acquire language in only one way: when we understand messages in that
language, when we receive comprehensible input. Memorizing vocabulary words, studying grammar, and doing drills make a very small contribution to language competence in the adult and even less in the child — the only true cause of second-language acquisition is comprehensible input" (Krashen 1984: 61).

Though it cannot be denied that access to comprehensible input is important, a more vital role would seem to be played in the foregoing examples by the first output of these immersion class children. Besides eliciting meaningful input from the adult interlocutor with a command of the target language, the first output of the children in the new language seems to serve as a pre-requisite and point of departure for their own L2 acquisition process. That is, it seems possible to hypothesize that "the first activities undertaken with others in the new language", the communicative discourse in the new language which the child is capable of constructing (defining, developing, negotiating etc.) at a given time with another speaker, will allow him or her later on to recognize more complex inputs in the same language, in other words, to establish hypotheses about these inputs which are not yet entirely within his reach. This amounts to postulating a genetic link between a first "active" communicative competence and later linguistic competence in the target language.

Thus, to return to the examples presented at the beginning of the chapter, we notice how Sara and Alba do much more than produce two short, simple utterances:

Sara Tomorrow pool (Demà piscina)

and

Alba Carles!
If these verbal texts are studied against the background of the overall activity within which they were produced, we can argue that the Sara and Alba's discourse begins long before these words are pronounced, and that the set of non-verbal actions carried out by the two little girls are as important as what they actually say. When Sara goes up to the blackboard, stands on the chair, "listens to the witch", turns round and waits to catch the attention of the rest of the class, she is already producing a discourse without which her later verbal text could not be interpreted, or, at any rate, would be interpreted in a different way. The same argument can be applied to the second example. By saying "apple" Carles is giving a coherent answer to Alba's original question because the two children share specific referencees and strategies which make their limited verbal texts both meaningful and effective. If Alba had begun the same linguistic game with another interlocutor with whom there was no shared discourse structure like the one the whole class had built up for this activity, her performance would have been ineffective. Or, what amounts to the same thing, she would have constructed it in Spanish.

In these examples then, Sara, Alba and Carles produce what is, in linguistic terms, a very simple verbal message. But their overall performance, the whole set of things they jointly presuppose, do and say, is much richer and more complex (Artigal and Camps 1982). And this joint activity taken as a whole, besides eliciting meaningful language input in the new language from the teacher, will serve as a precedent and a prerequisite for access to further, linguistically more elaborate uses of the new language.

Now a different example. It is my belief that when I was a child, Catalan-speaking boys and girls such as myself learnt to speak Spanish in a variety of ways. Playing Cowboys and Indians like in the movies was just one of these ways but it was of considerable significance. The first reason was that we felt motivated to play. The second was that in those days all
movies were shown in Spanish (never in Catalan) and this created a social model so powerful that it was "impossible" to use any language but Spanish. We knew of course, even at that age, that "¡manos arriba!" ("stick 'em up!") could be rendered in Catalan as "mans enlaira!". But this knowledge was of no use. The Catalan expression had no "punch" in the situation created by the game. And the third very important reason was that my friends and I were able, from a very early age, to "play" Cowboys and Indians in Spanish without knowing any Spanish. In other words, thanks to movies about the Wild West we were able to use a language that we did not yet know. Since knowledge about the structure of the game was shared by all of us, we only had to decide who was to be the goody and who the baddy and to shout "bang, bang" and "¡manos arriba!" in order to organize a successful game and have a good time without our jointly constructed "action" ever breaking down. In this way we were able to "play" effectively from the very first day and gradually we filled the game in with a language we did not yet know. Birdwhistell (1971) has shown that in communication the interlocutors do not in fact communicate but participate. In kindergarten total immersion classes that is also what children do in the school language and what they learn to do. They find out first and foremost how to take an active part in interactions conveyed through a language of which, to begin with, they have insufficient knowledge.

NEITHER IMITATION NOR DEDUCTION BUT RECOGNITION

If the foregoing assumptions are correct, children in kindergarten immersion classes learn the language as they use it (Artigal et al. 1984, Artigal 1987b). First of all because it would seem that as complex a social tool as language can only be acquired through use (Vygotski 1962, Bruner 1985) and secondly because a language that has not yet been acquired

"the only way language use can be learned is by using it communicatively",

or in the words of Di Pietro (1987: VIII) referring specifically to the second language:

"it is as users of the new language that people become learners of it".

Thus in the case of Catalan kindergarten total immersion classes the joint output context seems to play a central role in this apparently contradictory process of "using something one does not yet possess". Our hypothetical joint output context allows the children to create a message of their own which is both linguistically "possible" and "effective" as a discourse. It is "possible" in terms of the knowledge available to them at any given time and "effective" in terms of the things that can be taken for granted in any given situation since they are shared with other interlocutors. Basically, then, it is "possible" and "effective" owing to the existence of a shared context which is constantly assessed through collaboration.

In point of fact, as the reader will already have realized, implicit in the foregoing explanation is a theoretical assumption which is fundamental to this hypothesis: it is impossible to understand the way children acquire language merely as a process of imitation of the linguistic model to which they are exposed and/or deduction from it.

In the 1960s, when Chomsky's theory hit the field of psycholinguistics, it caused among other things a thorough revision of the
empirical-type explanations which maintained that children acquire language by merely imitative and/or deductive means. Over the last few years there has been basic agreement among psycholinguists to the effect that the child is an "active hypothesis generator" (Bruner 1978), a subject capable of applying some type of hypothesis to the linguistic input offered by his or her environment. In other words, in order to acquire a language, it is not enough to have access to the corresponding input, to have a verbal model at one's disposal. The learner must at the same time recognize in this input or model offered by the environment certain elements and/or strategies which he or she in some way already possesses since otherwise it could not be acquired. Some kind of "minimal mental equipment" (Bruner 1983: 119) seems in any case to be essential for the learner to have access to the language of his or her environment. This basically is the idea on which Krashen's hypothesis about the importance of comprehensible input rests. For Krashen, "comprehensible" means "accessible from the linguistic background which the learner, at any given point in the acquisition process, already possesses".

However, going beyond Krashen's hypothesis and referring specifically to the situation of school immersion, it is also in this sense that the children's output in the new language -- i.e. their overall performance, "the sum total of the things they do and say" (Artigal 1985) -- can be seen as a point of departure, as a tool for mediation between the input and its assimilation. When Sara and Alba develop a discourse in what for them is a new language, they do so, as we have seen, on the basis of an implicit, shared context. It would appear that their first performance, in so far as it exceeds their actual utterances, becomes a starting point from which they can hypothesize and thus gain access to input in the new language. In other words, their own social practice becomes a point of departure for further acquisition of the new language, since it becomes a means whereby they can recognize new, more elaborate input and subsequently interiorize...
it. Or, to put it in yet another way suggested by Vygotsky's analysis (1962), the immersion children observed seem to build up Catalan (intrapersonally) from their (inter-psychological) performance with others.

If this whole line of reasoning is correct, it does not appear possible to consider comprehension and production in the new language independently from one another, or to claim that comprehension comes first, followed by production. Rather it would seem that the "point of departure" for attaining comprehension of the new language is related to earlier productive performances -- less highly organized as text but fully meaningful and efficient -- which take place from the very beginning of the learning process. Meaningful access by the children to the new language model offered by the environment cannot therefore be considered something passive, consisting merely of recognizing through comprehension the similarities between new input and what they already possess. Their own active output, their first "uses" of the new language in immersion programs, as in the Cowboys and Indians example, also play an important role in the acquisition process.

Consequently the didactic strategy to be pursued in a Catalan early total immersion program should not be concerned solely with ensuring that the children receive semantically and pragmatically comprehensible input, a condition which, as has already been noted, seems clearly guaranteed in our case. It must also endeavor, first and foremost, to create situations through collaboration in which the children may produce output in the new language. This is important first of all because the school language, Catalan, occupies the socially inferior position, while the home language, Spanish, is dominant and the children tend to use their native language since by so doing they are sure of being understood. It is important secondly, and more fundamentally, because the jointly constructed strategies for maintaining and regulating the first communicative exchanges
can be considered a pre-requisite to the actual process of acquiring the school language.

This idea has clear pedagogical and didactic repercussions. In the first place it modifies the notion of a necessary initial silent period among students who are acquiring a new language (Krashen 1982, Terrell 1985).

"The explanation of the silent period in terms of the input hypothesis is straightforward -- the child is building up competence in the second language via listening, by understanding the language around him" (Krashen 1982: 27).

And secondly it enables us to reconsider the importance of the first uses of the target language (Artigal and Campos 1982, Artigal et al. 1984).

As I have already noted, in the view of several authors -- Hatch, Long, Krashen, Terrell and others, as quoted above -- the pupils' first products do not seem to involve acquisition of competence but only access to more meaningful input from an interlocutor who is already proficient in the new language. Accordingly it is deemed ineffective and sometimes even harmful for the learner to use the new language during the first period of acquisition.

But this does not seem to be borne out by total immersion kindergartens. As we have already seen, and as will be shown in the next example, children use the new language very early on and this does not appear to complicate the acquisition process in any way. The main point for consideration here then should not be how the pupils are to gain access to comprehensible input, but rather how they can be enabled to produce meaningful and effective output despite their low level of competence in the new language, or to put it another way, how to make possible in
practice the hypothesis that "language is learnt as it is used; it is not learnt first and used later".

BUILDING UP DISCOURSE THROUGH COLLABORATION

In our analysis so far, we have endeavored to avoid a strictly sentence-based approach and to apply a method closer to so-called discourse analysis. That is, we have attempted to focus our analysis, not on the sentences which each individual speaker is capable of producing, but on the overall conversation that teacher and pupils build up together. This has certain implications, some of which I would like to list:

. A series of linguistic activities -- as proposed by Gumperz (1972) or by the speech acts theory (Austin 1962, Searle 1969) -- take place in a kindergarten total immersion classroom.
. Each of these activities has to be jointly organized by the interlocutors, that is, by the teachers and children.
. The linguistic activities that occur in the classroom are defined by boundaries and possess an internal pattern which must be recognized by all the participants, otherwise the activity cannot be efficiently organized -- in accordance with Sinclair and Coulthard's proposal (1975).
. Partly as a result of the foregoing considerations, the meaning and effectiveness of the first activities in the new language depend, not only on the competence of the children to produce sentences within the discourse that is being developed, but above all on their ability to negotiate as a group the acts which are conveyed through this discourse (Widdowson 1978).
. Consequently the acquisition of Catalan in a total immersion
kindergarten situation can be considered to begin with activities involving a low level of skill in producing text which operate as a point of departure from which full mastery in the new language may be achieved later on.

The most significant feature of these implications is the notion of collaboration", the idea that any discourse, however slight, which is produced in the new language by any of the learners is jointly constructed by the whole class. In a total immersion program, the process of acquisition of Catalan gets underway, as I have tried to show, on the basis of activities whose most salient characteristic is that they are jointly constructed and developed. Thus the first output in Catalan depends, not only on all the "things the children are already able to do and say" at a given moment, but more fundamentally on the existence of a set of strategies which must be shared with the other speakers and, of course, on the ability of the latter to recognize and use them. In a joint output context the pupils need to adapt their productions carefully to their interlocutors so that the jointly constructed discourse may be defined and developed coherently. Thus the children's first output in the new language depends on other people and on the children's own ability to take others into account. Kindergarten children build up the new language from joint output contexts in which one of the main things they have to do is to adapt their discourse on each occasion to other speakers taking part.

We will now look at an example which illustrates how the first uses of the new language are related to a jointly constructed possibility. It consists of two long excerpts from the very beginning of the school year - the fifth and fourth weeks respectively -- in which we can observe how the same child -- Albert -- reveals different levels of use of Catalan in two different productions.
The whole class is out playing in the yard. The teacher is tying Jonathan's shoe laces and Albert is standing beside her looking on. When the teacher has finished tying the laces and Jonathan walks away, this excerpt begins.

Teacher Hey, listen Albert. Does your father drive a car? Does he drive a cab? (Escolta Albert. Escolta. Que conduceix un cotxe? Que porta un taxi el teu pare?) (she imitates the movements of a driver)

Albert (shakes his head)

Teacher No. (No.)

Albert Not the cab. But he has a panel truck. (El taxi no. Pero tiene una furgoneta.)

Teacher Ah, he has a panel truck? (Ah! Té una furgoneta?)

Albert (nods)

Teacher And does he drive the panel truck? (I conduceix la furgoneta?) (movement of driving)?

* This and the following example are from one of the four-year old immersion classes at the Escola Pública Llibertat in the Barcelona suburb of Badaona. The teacher is Angéls Bertran. The excerpts are from the 1987-88 school year.

† (Translator's note) Words spoken in Spanish are shown in Italicics in both the original text and the English translation, while words spoken in Catalan are shown in roman type.
Albert It's white. (Es blanca.) (Albert has noticed some children playing soccer) Hahaha (he points to the children) Look at that kid. He's taken his shoe off. (Mira que niño. Se ha sacado un zapato.)

Teacher He's taken it off. Listen, does your father drive the panel truck? (Se l'ha tret. Escolta. Que condueix la furgoneta el teu pare?)

Albert What? (¿Qué?)

Teacher Does he drive the panel truck? (Condueix la furgoneta?)

Albert The panel truck is a truck but it's called a panel truck. (La furgoneta es un camión pero que se llama furgoneta.)

Teacher And does he carry things in the panel truck? (I porta coses amb la furgoneta?)

Albert A panel truck kind of truck and he puts things inside. (Un camión de furgoneta y mete las cosas.)

Teacher I see! What kind of things? (Ah! Quines coses?)

Albert Things for work, for work. (La cosas de trabajar. De trabajo.)

Teacher And what kind of things are they? (I quines coses són?)

Albert I told you, things for work. (De trabajo, ya te lo digo.)

Teacher Water? Does he carry water? (Aigua? Porta aigua?)

Albert (Nods) And earth. (Y tierra.)

Teacher And sand? Does he carry sand too? (I sorra? També porta sorra?)

Albert (It is not clear whether he nods or not)

Teacher Yes? (Sí?)

Albert (Nods)
Teacher That's great. And do you help him Albert? (Molt bé. I tu l'ajudes, Albert?)
Albert (Shakes his head)
Teacher You don't help him? (No l'ajudes?)
Albert (Shakes his head)
Teacher Why not? (Per què?)
Albert My father won't let me. (Mi padre no me deja.)
Teacher Ah!

In this third example, Albert uses only Spanish. Anybody watching the video recording of this excerpt would think it was a normal bilingual conversation in which the teacher uses only Catalan and Albert expresses himself quite normally in Spanish. For instance, teacher and child say a word like "panel truck" or "furgoneta" (which is spelled the same in both Spanish and Catalan but is pronounced differently) with perfect Catalan and Spanish pronunciation respectively.

In the next example, though, anyone not aware of the origin of the recording would think it was a normal conversation in Catalan. Just a month after arriving at the school, Albert and his classmates make certain short simple utterances in correct Catalan. With the exception of two

Albert "neeaocnya!" (which means nothing in either language)

and

Albert "¿Qué?" ("What?")

all the expressions are correct in Catalan, even phonetically.
Example 4

Half the children have left the classroom with the assistant teacher. The others have stayed with the class teacher and are "working with picture cards". This activity is always held in one corner of the classroom where there is a rug. The children sit on the ground in a semicircle and the teacher sits in front. The teacher always uses a hand puppet to conduct the activity. The puppet takes cards out of a box. On each is a picture of something that is considered to form part of basic vocabulary. Each time she takes out a new picture, she shows it to the children, pronounces the name and/or asks the children to do so, and then throws it on the floor. Finally when the box is empty, she asks the children to help her to pick up the pictures that are scattered about the rug, at the same time asking them again to name the object in the picture. As in the first part of the example she frequently uses the picture card she has just picked up to ask the children to identify and name objects or people in the classroom.
(We are in the first part of the activity. The puppet is taking the pictures out and showing them to the children before scattering them on the floor) 

Teacher And what's this one? (I aquest qué és?) (she picks up another picture and shows it) a (pause) <boy> (un ... <men>)*

Everyone** <Boy> (<Men>)

Teacher A boy, a boy. (Un nen, un nen.)

Albert Necasaoonya!

Teacher Albert.

Albert What? (¿Qué?)

Teacher Show me (pause) a boy (pause) (Ensanya'm ... un nen ...) (she points to the other children in the class).

Albert (stands up, walks towards another boy with his finger ready to point to him)

† Translator's note. Words spoken in Spanish are shown in Italics in both the original text and the English translation, while words spoken in Catalan are shown in roman type.

* When two successive productions are shown between "< >" it means they have been made simultaneously.

** "Everyone" is used here to mean "all or most of the children in the class".
Teacher: Hey, Albert! (Ai, l'Albert!)
Albert: (Touche Jonathan's head with his finger)
Teacher: What do you say? (Qué dius?)
Albert: A boy. (Un nen.)
Albert: (Goes back and sits in his place)
Albert: (Goes up)
Teacher: Wow! Now we'll get him mixed up! You'll see. He'll get all mixed up! (Ai! Ara l'enredarem. Ja veureu. L'enredarem.)
Albert: (Walks towards his classmates till he reaches Alexia and taps her on the head) (Looks at the teacher and waits)
Teacher: Well? (Si?)
Albert: A girl. (Una nena.)
Teacher: That's great Albert. And now, something more difficult. A doll. (I ara. Més difícil. Una nina.)
Albert: Do' (Mia)'
Teacher: A doll. (Una nina.)
Albert: Doll? (Nina?)
Jonathan: Silly doll. (Nina tonta)

* The sign " >" at the end of the word means that it is incomplete.
Teacher  A doll (pause) in the classroom. (Una nina ... de la classe.)

Albert  (He turns towards the box of dolls, looks at it for a moment, runs up to it and picks one up)

Albert  Mmm! (He walks towards the teacher holding the doll)

Teacher  What's that? (Qué és?)

Albert  Doll. (Nina.)

Teacher  Very good, Albert! We'll give you a kiss. You've earned it, haven't you? (Molt bé Albert. Un petó. Te l'has guanyat. Eh?)

Albert  (He was already on his way towards the box of dolls but changes his mind, turns to the teacher when she says "a kiss" (un petó) and walks back towards her)

Teacher  Mua mua!* (using the puppet she gives Albert a little peck)

Albert  Mmm! (turns round and hurls the doll into the box)

Everyone  Oh (smiling)!

Teacher  Well done Albert. (Molt bé Albert.)

Some time later, the children are helping the puppet to pick up the pictures that were scattered about the floor and put them in the box.

Teacher  Look! Beatriu is going to help me again. Beatriu! (Mira. La Beatriu m'ajudarà una altra vegada. Beatriu!)

* [Translator's note] "Mua mua": onomatopoeia indicating a kiss.
Unidentified pupil (is doing something not visible on the screen)
Teacher Let's look at Beatriu. Hey! (Mirem la Beatriu. Eh!)
Beatriu (stands up, picks up the picture and shows it). It's a balloon. (Es un globus.)
Teacher Balloon! Great! Beatriu is really helping me.
(Globus! Molt bé! La Beatriu si que m'ajuda!) (she gives Beatriu a little tap on the stomach with the puppet)
Beatriu (leaves the picture in the box and returns to her place)
Teacher What about Verónica Castillo? Will she help me again? (I la Verónica Castillo que em torna a ajudar?)
Verónica (goes up to where the pictures are lying on the floor, picks one up and smiles)
Teacher Let's see! (Aviam!)
Verónica A snail. (Un cargol.)
Teacher Fine Verónica!. It's a snail! (Molt bé Verónica. Es un cargol.)
Verónica (leaves the picture in the box and goes back to her place)
Carles It's a snail. (Es un cargol.)
Teacher What about Albert? Will he help me again? Help me again, Albert! (I l'Albert? Que em torna a ajudar? Torna'm a ajudar, Albert.)
Albert (Smiles and gets up)
Teacher I wonder, I wonder! Which one will Albert pick up?
Let's see. (A veure, a veure. Quin agafarà l'Albert! Aviam.)
Albert (goes up to the pictures, throws himself on the floor, picks one up and shows it) It's a bench. (Am un banc.)

Teacher Well done, Albert. It's a bench. (Molt bé Albert. Am un banc.)

Albert (Leaves the picture in the box and goes back to his place)

When analyzing the different uses of Catalan in the first and the second of these last examples, it can first be argued that the utterances in the second excerpt are simpler than those in the first part and are often confined to responses previously verbalized in the question asked by the teacher. It is true that in this last example the children do no more than produce expressions of the type

Albert A boy. (Un nen.)
Albert Doll. (Nina.)
Beatriu It's a balloon. (Am un globus.)
Verònica A snail. (Un cargol.)

which, moreover, are easily memorized since the range of options is small.

But even so the explanation seems incomplete. The significant difference between the two excerpts would appear to lie in the type and number of things which must be expressed verbally in each case. The whole activity in the picture card excerpt is highly ritualized. It operates as an implicit shared topic on which the class makes comments and it has been constructed in such a way that the limits of each turn of speech are marked by actions which are scrupulously respected by all the participating children such as the "little tap given by the puppet" or "putting the picture card away in the box".
In the conversation between the teacher and Albert in the school yard, on the other hand, none of these things had been specified or agreed in advance and consequently they have to be negotiated through the text verbalized by the speakers. This is at least partly why Albert's productions in the picture card example are much more "Catalanized" than those he will verbalize a week later in the dialogue at recreation time quoted above. It does not seem possible to account for the difference solely as a function of Albert's skills in Catalan in each of the excerpts. The disparity between his achievements in the two excerpts is related to variables which lie outside Albert himself. In the picture card activity, Albert does not simply put a hypothetical individually acquired competence into practice. The discourse Albert and his classmates engage in -- or, to put it another way, the possibility of constructing this discourse -- has been jointly built up.

THE SHARED CONTEXT AS A POINT OF DEPARTURE

One of the problems raised by the foregoing explanation is that activities like the picture card game require extremely direct guidance from the teacher. It seems clear that the children are already competent to recognize the underlying structure of the proposed activity, but this structure is still defined and implemented (directly or indirectly) by the teacher. At this point in the course, then, it is mainly she who determines how "Catalanized" the pupils' output will be.

However, the teacher's action is obviously an important starting point in achieving behavior like that of Sara and Alba quoted at the beginning of the chapter. The two little girls were competent to initiate and organize a coherent activity in the new language thanks to the existence of an underlying structure within which
"the responses of each member (could) be shown to be dependent on a prior response of the others" (Bruner 1983: 132).

This structure or "script" (Shanck and Abelson 1977) was known and shared with the rest of the class because it had previously been created and used by the class as a whole under the guidance of the teacher. In the first two examples, Sara and Alba to some extent exchanged roles with the teachers. That is, they had the opportunity of "doing what the teacher does" without needing to reach the latter's "level of verbal skill" thanks to the fact that their discourse was built on what I have called a joint output context.

This context marked the boundaries of their own action, made their intention clear, established turns of speaking, focussed on those aspects of the discourse that were to be considered most relevant, made it possible to anticipate things that had not yet been said and/or done, made the extremely simple verbal text produced by the children into new, relevant and coherent information, lent significance to gestures, looks and actions "when words failed", in short assured that the children's first output in the new language would be both meaningful and effective.

If language is to be viewed as our prime tool for establishing, maintaining and modifying our relationships with others (Vygotski 1962, Austin 1962, Searle 1969), if all linguistic output has to be "negotiated" between the speakers in the context within which it is used (Brown and Yule 1983), if in order to assess a communicative context we have to recognize the intentions of other speakers and the whole set of presuppositions we
share with them (Lyons 1977)*, then the children observed in Catalan total immersion kindergartens are acquiring this type of skill in a meaningful way. Or, to put it another way, if we acknowledge that learning to differentiate between what can be taken for granted and what is new in the output of each individual speaker is one important aspect of acquiring a language (Clark and Clark 1977), then this type of ability is clearly acquired in the joint output context illustrated above.

These then are some of the skills which the teacher imparts and the children learn during the first period of access to the new language in classroom activities like the picture card game. In fact the teacher's strategy consists of two basic tasks:

- first to ensure that communicative exchange occurs
- and second to reduce the difficulty encountered by the child, not only in understanding input in the new language, but especially in producing output in it.

One of the main differences between the last two examples quoted is the amount of difficulty involved. In the picture card excerpt, Albert has to solve far fewer problems than in the conversation with the teacher a week later in the school yard. Indeed, the idea that the language acquisition process requires the adult to assess the amount of difficulty the child has to face has been clearly present in psycholinguistic studies devoted to first language acquisition over the last few years (Bruner 1982, Bruner 1983, Lieven 1984). But the same principle has also been widely upheld and applied to second language acquisition by authors as early as

* For further, more detailed analysis of these matters and of their importance in a program involving a change of language, see Chapter 3, Immersion for children from low socio-cultural backgrounds
Comenius (1592-1670) (quoted by Titone 1986). In fact, practically the whole of second and foreign language didactics is explicitly or implicitly founded on a gradual increase in difficulty from the first to the last lesson, the precise level of difficulty to be determined in each case. The difference between the increase in difficulty observed in the examples from total immersion kindergartens and the "traditional" order found in foreign language text books is that in the former the criteria are basically pragmatic whereas in the latter they are generally phonetic, lexic and/or morphosyntactic in character.

THE INDEPENSALE ELEMENT OF SHARING

I began this chapter by assuming that children in Catalan total immersion kindergarten classes use Catalan, which for them is a new language, if: a/ "they want to", and b/ "they are able to do so effectively". Thus by distinguishing between the variables related to "wanting to " and "being able to", I confined myself to dealing with the second point: the analysis of certain features of contexts in which it is possible to build up the first uses of a language that one does not yet know well enough. Finally I argued that the most important of these features is sharing. The first uses of a language of which one has little or no knowledge are built on a series of known facts, presuppositions and strategies which the different speakers share. It would appear that nothing unites people more than the things they share. Thus the explanation postponed at the beginning of the chapter for methodological reasons, finally closes on itself.

The importance of motivation and attitude in any situation involving new language learning or acquisition seems fairly clear, particularly in the case of early school immersion. This has been stated repeatedly in the majority of studies on the topic but usually from a macrosociological
viewpoint. The status and social value of the various languages present in each case are considered, the image of the school and family languages that the child has on arrival at the school is stressed, or the importance of the implicit value inevitably attributed by the school to the new language in all its day-to-day activities is pointed out. All these variables mold the child's attitude and motivation towards the new school language and so play a vital part in the subsequent success or failure of school programs involving a home-school language switch.

But while none of these factors should be overlooked, the internal microsociology of the class is also crucial. And it is within this complex microsociological framework that "the way the first uses of the school language are built up" becomes important. When Alba plays the role of the teacher, she asks Carles a question and Carles answers her. Alba and Carles can do all this in Catalan precisely because they have in common a whole series of things that do not need to be expressed in words. The things they share, the elements that enable them to "be able to use the new language" in the first place thus also become an vital reason for "wanting" to do so. The possibility of using a language they do now know well enough thanks to the things they share with others finally acts as the link that unites the group and gives it cohesion. Strange though it may seem at first sight, experience shows that an early total immersion class usually has a very strong sense of group awareness. At the beginning of the process, the members do not share the language in which learning will take place and internal relationships will be built up but, if the foregoing arguments are correct, they must inevitably share the procedures and specific goals which will make it possible to use, and hence to acquire, the new language.
CONCLUSIONS

In this chapter we have been asking when, how and why children who attend immersion programs stop using their home language, the language they know best, and begin to produce output in the school language.

Replies to this question have often assumed that the new language is used if it has previously been acquired. In other words, they state basically that a language is first learned and then used. In the present work I have tried to argue that such answers are incomplete and, above all, that they fail to take into account certain essential aspects of the new language acquisition process. Observations carried out in total immersion kindergarten classes enable us to argue that, while it is true that the children often use "the language they already know", they will only acquire "the language they do not yet know" in so far as its use goes beyond the limits of the skills they have achieved as individuals. The process of new language acquisition begins with the meaningful and effective development of output that goes beyond their true present ability to produce text. And the possibility to do this is something which, in the last resort, must be jointly constructed by the teacher and children.

In the case of Catalan immersion, then, the teacher’s action should be directed, not so much towards the children’s actual utterances, but towards the whole interaction that teacher and pupils construct together, since it is this interaction that ensures the coherence of their utterances. This means to some extent that the output produced by the children in the new language must be meaningful and effective from the very first moment and that it is on these foundations that proficiency in the new language will gradually be built later on.
To summarize briefly:

- children in total immersion kindergartens use Catalan from very early on if, despite their still limited skills in producing text in this language, they are able to define and develop communication in a meaningful and effective way

- access to meaningful input, though necessary, does not in itself provide an adequate explanation for the children's productivity in the new language

- I use the term "joint output context" to refer to the set of variables which allow the first coherent uses of the new language to take place when the acquisition process has only just begun

- one of the key functions of immersion kindergarten teachers would seem to be to ensure the existence of joint output contexts

- the teacher uses only Catalan but she does not always design linguistic interaction in the same way or build up the same type of basic discourse structure. The children use one language or the other -- in our case Catalan or Spanish -- according to the extent to which they are able to build up this collective discourse together

- consequently the use of Catalan depends on strategies which the whole class builds up together and shares.

In this way the new language, instead of being something external which has to be learnt, becomes from the very first moment a tool for doing things, for establishing links with others, for converting a particular situation -- the classroom -- into a shared, jointly built up reality. As Edwards and Mercer put it (forthcoming: 26),

"teachers and children are building up a shared history of discourse and activity".
Notes to Chapter 2

1. This chapter is a revised and extended version of a paper entitled "La construcció conjunta mestra-nen del primer discurs en L2 en un programa d'immersió" which was presented at the 12th Seminari de Llengües i Educació, "Llengua de l'alumne i llengua de l'escola", Sitges (Barcelona), 23-26 September 1987.

2. Owing to the linguistic and cultural proximity of the Catalan and Spanish languages and to the strategies normally employed by the teacher with children in this age group to negotiate the "meaning" of their communication, the new language is understood very early on, or at any rate is understood as well as the home language is understood by pupils of the same age who opt for an L1 maintenance program (Serra and Vila (forthcoming)).


4. This study is based on ongoing research into the first output in Catalan produced by four-year-olds in Catalan total immersion kindergarten classes which constitutes the author's doctoral thesis.

5. It is interesting to note in this connection that children's output in the new language in total immersion kindergartens is not homogeneous over a given period of time: it comprises some very "Catalanized" performances and others in which Spanish is totally dominant.

6. Hatch and Long, and even Cummins, base their arguments on Krashen's "hypothesis of comprehensible input" according to which comprehension is a necessary requirement and point of departure for second language acquisition.
Krashen proposes a hypothetical pattern of acquisition:

\[ \text{comprehension} \rightarrow \text{acquisition} \rightarrow \text{production} \]

in which comprehension always precedes production. In the words of Krashen himself:

"Comprehensible input is responsible for progress in language acquisition. Output is possible as a result of acquired competence" (Krashen 1982: 61).

In another work (1984) referring specifically to immersion he states:

"Speaking, actual production, does nothing to directly cause second-language acquisition, since it is only input that counts. Speaking is a result of acquisition: the ability to speak a second language "emerges" or develops on its own only after the acquirer has built enough competence by listening and reading." (Krashen 1984: 61).

7. It is important to note in this connection that the place of immersion within the dichotomy usually applied to second language acquisition of "naturalistic" versus "classroom" second language acquisition is not clear (Ellis 1985). Immersion can be described rather as "the natural acquisition of a second language in the classroom". This is a very important feature of immersion programs: in the first place because it enables the language to be acquired from, and at the same time by means of, its use in other activities which are not specifically linguistic; and in the second place because it is always
difficult, especially in kindergarten classes, to consider new language learning on the basis of a *posteriori* communicative functions. It seems more likely that the language becomes a useful tool for doing things from the very first moment the child comes into contact with it.

8. This point seems now to be accepted by most authors both with reference to the first language and to new languages. The question presently at issue is whether the background which enables the learner to recognize the language which he or she receives from the environment is innate and/or cognitive and/or social and/or semiotic.

9. This hypothesis is coherent with the psycholinguistic explanation according to which language learning consists to some extent of acquiring procedures for converting into text "something" one already possesses but previously conveyed by other means (Brown 1973, Halliday 1975, Bruner 1975).


11. This point bears obvious similarities to Grice's "principle of cooperativity" (1975).
CHAPTER 3

IMMERSION FOR CHILDREN FROM LOW SOCIO-CULTURAL BACKGROUNDS

DEFINING THE PROBLEM

Why does a home-school language switch result in high levels of functional bilingualism and academic achievement in middle-class majority language children ... ?

(J. Cummins, Linguistic interdependence and educational development of bilingual children, 1979b: 222)

This is the opening paragraph of one of Cummins' most widely divulged and significant works. Three words in this brief text, however, are especially thought-provoking with respect to present-day Catalan early total immersion programs: "middle-class children". There is no doubt that most of the children who attend early total immersion programs in Catalonia are from the "majority language group", as specified by Cummins, but they are not exactly middle-class children. Does this mean that the "high levels of functional bilingualism and academic achievement" mentioned in the quotation will not be reached? Cummins is in fact concerned here with comparing children from majority and minority language groups but the reference to a middle-class background is quite clear. Why does he make this particular point? Would the rest of the paragraph be invalidated if the children were not middle-class children? Certainly this is one of the main questions teachers, parents, and other people interested in immersion in Catalonia often ask themselves.
Canada undoubtedly provides the prime and best known model of an educational program involving immersion in a language different from that of the home. Experiments in immersion conducted in Canada over the past twenty years seem to lead to the conclusion that, provided it takes place in the Canadian situation, immersion has no negative effects on the overall linguistic and cognitive development of the students and that in some ways at least it is even beneficial. The main findings of the many studies carried out is that the attainment level of children who have followed an immersion program would not have been significantly different had they gone to school in the same language as they spoke at home (Cummins 1979a). And when any variation is detected, it is usually positive.

In saying that the immersion programs developed in Canada produce a high level of competence in the school language one may even seem to be stating the obvious. An English-speaking child who attends a French immersion program will obviously gain a better grasp of French than another Anglophone who goes to school in English and only does a few "hours of" French language arts. The reader may argue, however, that the crux of the matter is whether the children have to pay any price for attaining this "high level of competence in the school language". Or more precisely, whether their achievements in other subjects and their general psychological growth may be affected in any way.

The results obtained in Canada seem fairly clear in this respect:

"There is no evidence to suggest that the bilingual education experienced by immersion students has led to any negative consequence with respect to general intellectual functioning" (Bruck, Lambert and Tucker 1974).
or again,

"in sum, students in the early total immersion program are able to master the content of such subjects as mathematics, history, geography and science to the extent that their peers in the regular program have. Furthermore, the total immersion experience seems to have sharpened their work-study skills and has left them with no sign of cognitive confusion. Indeed, the results suggest that the immersion students may be reaping positive benefits, not only in enhanced English language skills but also in more specific intellectual skills" (Swain and Lapkin 1983: 63).

At this point in the argument, we must ask ourselves whether the results observed in Canada are also likely to be obtained in the situation surrounding the immersion program in Catalonia.

At the beginning of the 1970s, various authors, notably Lambert (1974), established that the results of a program involving a home-school language switch depend to a large extent on the status of the respective languages in the social environment where the experiment is being carried out and on the children’s general attitudes and motivations toward them. These same authors consider that participation in an immersion program can be beneficial, provided the family language is socially dominant and provided, at the same time, the children have positive attitudes and motivation toward learning both the new school language and their home language.

This basically sociolinguistic reasoning is adapted to the situation surrounding Canadian immersion programs where Anglophone children (speakers of the majority language) voluntarily attend school in another language, normally French. The same appears to be true of the situation of kindergarten children in Catalonia whose language, Spanish, is socially
dominant, and who opt for an immersion program in Catalan. To this extent the situation in Catalonia does not seem very different from the Canadian model which is our point of reference.

But Cummins (1976, 1981a, 1984c) later adds a new pre-requisite for the success of an immersion program. Without contradicting the sociolinguistic argument outlined above, he uses a more psycholinguistic line of reasoning in an endeavor to account more satisfactorily for when and why a program which involves language switching is likely to be beneficial. On the basis of two hypotheses which are to some extent interrelated -- "development of linguistic interdependence" and the "threshold level of linguistic competence" -- Cummins sets out a new explanation which can be briefly summarized as follows:

a/ the success of an educational program seems to be largely dependent on the level of knowledge the pupil is able to achieve with respect to the pattern of school language usage he or she will find in academic interchanges (Wells 1981),

b/ there are reasons to believe that the level of academic linguistic knowledge reached by a given child during the educational process is correlated to his or her type of linguistic knowledge in the home language on entry to school,

and therefore,

c/ the type of linguistic knowledge of the home language the children have acquired before entering an immersion program seems to directly determine the success or failure of the program.

Or, in the words of Cummins himself,
"the level of L₂ competence which a bilingual child attains is partly a function of the type of competence the child has developed in L₁ when extensive exposure to L₂ begins (... ) there is an interaction between the language of instruction and the type of competence the child has developed in his L₁ prior to school." (Cummins 1979b: 233).

It would appear then that a minimum level of competence in the pattern of academic language usage must be reached in the home language and that students from the majority language group and a high socio-cultural background would normally be sure to have attained this level, in which case a "beneficial developmental interdependence" between the two languages should be established, making education in the new language generally successful.

THE QUESTION OF THE SOCIO-CULTURAL BACKGROUND OF THE STUDENTS

Since students in immersion programs in Canada come from average or above-average families and socio-cultural backgrounds, the required threshold level of competence in the home language seems in most cases to be guaranteed. In Catalonia, on the other hand, pupils who enter an early total immersion program usually come from a low socio-cultural background.

This brings us back to the question raised at the beginning of the chapter: can a program involving a home-school language switch be beneficial when the children do not belong to the middle or upper class? Or, more specifically, do children from a low socio-cultural and economic family background enter school having already developed the minimum competence in their home language assumed by Cummins to be the threshold level required in order to cope successfully with an immersion program?
This line of reasoning and the questions it raises, which, as I will attempt to show, derive from a particular interpretation of Cummins' hypotheses, are one aspect of the present situation of the Catalan immersion program which still need clarification and thus give rise to considerable and widespread misgivings as to the viability of immersion. Serramona (1988), for instance, expresses concern on this score in the following terms,

"if the immersion programs in Catalonia are examined in the light of the aforementioned principles (...) then the minimum level of competence in the home language needed in order to attain knowledge of another language is still a requirement" (Serramona 1988: 20).

WHO HAS TO ADJUST TO WHOM?

In the rest of this chapter I will be attempting to explain why doubts about the viability of the present Catalan early total immersion program for children from the majority language group but from low socio-cultural backgrounds are based on a restrictive interpretation of Cummins' hypotheses.

When Cummins talks about the school language, he is not simply referring to a particular language or "tongue" -- Catalan, Spanish, French, English etc. -- but to the type of abstract, highly formal and decontextualized language which is characteristic of the present school system (Bruner 1984a). This means that in order to satisfactorily perform the tasks set them by the school, students must learn to master a type of language in which the meaning of words is independent of the context surrounding them (Luria 1980a). According to Cummins -- and many other authors such as Luria, Bruner, Wells and Vila -- the success or failure of
an education program is determined precisely by the command of this type of language that can operate out of context. For these authors, the activities the school offers the child constitute a highly symbolic environment in which mastery of type of language closely related to the context in which it is used is not enough. The techniques and contents children have to cope with in school require a "conceptual-linguistic knowledge" (Cummins 1979b) without which the type of information transmitted can be neither understood nor assimilated. Thus the minimum language skills assumed by Cummins to be necessary in order to ensure successful participation in an immersion program do not refer simply to a particular level of knowledge of the home language (i.e. the particular tongue -- in this case Spanish -- spoken in the home) but rather to what Cummins calls Cognitive Academic Language Proficiency (CALP) (Cummins 1980) which is related to aspects such as vocabulary-concept knowledge, metalinguistic insights, or knowing how to process context-reduced input. The "threshold hypothesis" is to be understood in this sense, as referring specifically to a given minimum level of CALP.

As Serramona points out (1988), there are certain similarities between the "threshold level" proposed by Cummins in relation to programs involving a home-school language switch and Bernstein's analyses (1973) of the relationship between language, code and school. Nonetheless, Cummins' approach to the link between the L1 and L2 seems to be still more closely related to the "comprehensible input hypothesis" previously proposed by Krashen. According to the latter, we acquire new competence in the L2 when we understand language that contains structure that is slightly beyond our current L2 competence (Krashen 1982: 21). If this "comprehension" fails to occur then, in Krashen's view, the process of acquisition of the new language will be impossible. Thus understanding becomes a vital prerequisite and without the "necessary comprehension" there is no acquisition of the L2.
In this respect Cummins' approach to the home and school languages comes very near to Krashen's theses on comprehensible input in the second language. Cummins argues that if on entering school a child's knowledge of the family language (L₁) is very closely linked to contextualized communicative procedures, then he or she will be unable to understand the formal, symbolic, decontextualized school language (L₂) and consequently unable to acquire it. If on the contrary the child begins school with highly developed academic functional linguistic skills suited to processing the decontextualized linguistic exchanges which take place in formal school activities, then a positive relationship between the two languages will be possible precisely because they are similar types of language and therefore mutually comprehensible. In the latter case we can speak of the "developmental interdependence" (Cummins 1979b) of the two languages since both are functioning with the same abstract formal operational linguistic-cognitive processes that correspond to CALP. For Cummins, then, it is the type of linguistic educational treatment that constitutes the "threshold level" in an immersion program and that is capable of interdependent operation. Such is the meaning, for instance, of the statement made by Sanchez and Tembleque:

"Total immersion in the second language is only efficient if the subject has attained the appropriate level of development in the first language at entry to school" (Sanchez and Tembleque 1986: 21).

But why should we be asking whether the type and level of linguistic development attained by the children in their first language is suited or unsuited to the type of language used in school? It is also possible ask whether the linguistic treatment used by the school is suited to the children. If the home language is the socially dominant one, so that its presence and status are assured, and if the children's general attitudes
and motivation toward both languages meet the immersion requirements, then the question to ask with respect to immersion programs is how the type of language with which the children enter school and the type of language in which the school greets them can be brought together. Deciding "who has to adjust to whom?", whether it is up to the pupils to adjust to the level of the school or up to the school to connect with the pupils, is of secondary importance. What is vital is that the two should come together.

It is in this connection that an apparently unimportant feature of the Catalan immersion program becomes especially relevant. In Catalonia the normal age for children to enter a program involving a change of language is four and more and more are doing so at three in accordance with the suggestions of various specialists (Nata 1987, Vila 1987a). In Canada, on the other hand, immersion begins at five or later, while in Finland, to quote another example, it starts at six. The age at which an immersion program begins may be fundamental when it comes to considering how to go about making sure that the type of linguistic knowledge and the functional linguistic skills the children possess and the pattern of language used in the school are brought together from the beginning of the program.

With children aged three or four it is much easier to propose an educational linguistic treatment based initially on a context-embedded form of interaction designed to connect with the type of language the children bring with them from home than it would be at age five or later. In the first place because the later they come into contact with the new school language, the harder it will be to alter the type of linguistic treatment used to convey the tasks set by the school and to contextualize them. And secondly, and above all, because initiation to the contextualized use of a new language can best be done before the age of six. If the acquisition of the new language involves the pursuit of formal academic goals from the outset and is therefore built on decontextualized language, then research shows that older children, aged seven, eight or even more, do best. If, on

"The finding that older learners are more efficient than younger learners at acquiring context-reduced, academic skills in the L2, but not necessarily at acquiring context-embedded, interpersonal communicative L2 skills can be established in a variety of learning contexts and subcultural settings" (Harley 1986: 25).

The question of the age at which it is usually best to begin learning a new language, or more precisely to enter an immersion program, is certainly a complex one and, if dealt with in isolation, may even be fallacious. A number of studies have measured the relationship between the age of the student and variables such as biological factors, affective and/or motivational factors, the evolution of cerebral dominance, the time of exposure to the new language, and the educational intervention conditions. Currently the main conclusion to emerge from such studies is that the question should not be asked merely in terms of age. The age for acquiring a new language should be examined along with the type of language in which the acquisition process will be conveyed (Harley 1986). The best age will vary according to how this process is set up.

Even though determining the age at which the process should be begin is an intrinsically unclear and difficult matter (Stern 1976), the advantages of commencing rigorously contextualized acquisition of the new
language by means of kindergarten total immersion seem fairly obvious. All that is required is that the school should be endowed with the ability to establish the level and type of language appropriate to each case and from that point on, in accordance with the "comprehensible input hypothesis", the road that teacher and pupils travel together will lead eventually to what Cummins terms Cognitive Academic Language Proficiency. In short, if it is up to the school to adjust to the point the pupil has reached and then to begin development towards abstract formal context-reduced language, the earlier this process begins the easier it will turn out to be.

If we now return to Cummins' theses as set out at the beginning of this chapter and confine our analysis to the present situation in Catalonia, it becomes possible to state that "the importance of the knowledge of the home language with which the children enter an immersion program" is inversely proportional to the ability of the school to adapt its educational treatment, without ever giving up use of the new language, to the type of linguistic procedures that will be needed in each case. As Arnau says,

"given the right motivation, success or failure at school are primarily determined by whether or not the educational treatment is suited to the possibilities and the situation of the children" (Arnau 1985: 9).

ACCESS TO DECONTEXTUALIZED LANGUAGE

I would now like to comment, albeit very briefly, on some of the distinguishing traits of contextualized and decontextualized use of language in order to refer later to the transition from one to the other. I will primarily be concerned with pointing out the similarities and differences of the two types of language and especially with describing how the second
is reached from the first. In order to do this I will start with an example.

Let us imagine that one Sunday evening a motorist stops his car, lowers the window on the driver's side and calls to a passer-by, "Hey, I need to fill up". Let us further imagine that the passer-by immediately replies "Make a right at the third set of lights and about half a mile on you'll come to a square where there's a shopping mall".

This short imaginary dialogue can be understood as contextualized use of language in that most of the procedures used by the speakers to construct their brief communicative exchange and make it meaningful go far beyond the actual words they speak, which are dependent to some extent on the context in which the linguistic act takes place. Neither speaker for instance mentioned "gas", though for both of them this was the main topic of conversation. And the motorist set off convinced, not only that by making a right at the third light he would find a gas station, but also that at least three other conditions would be met: that there would not only be stores at the shopping mall but a gas station as well, that, even though it was Sunday evening, the gas station would be open, and that, at that particular place and time, the shopping mall was the closest place where gas was obtainable. But if we take a second look at the dialogue, we will see how none of these things were actually said by the imaginary passer-by. The point of this example is that all this information had to be inferred from the context in which the various statements were uttered.

Now let us imagine that our motorist has filled up with gas and, before driving off, decides to go into a bar inside the shopping mall. He enters, walks up to the counter and says to the waiter, "Hey, I need to fill up". This time we can imagine that the waiter will answer something like "How about a good cold beer?". In no circumstances, even though the driver has pronounced exactly the same words as previously, will the waiter give the same answer as the first imaginary passer-by. The waiter's
possible responses are limited, not by what the motorist has said, but by
the context in which he has said it. Or, what amounts to the same thing, in
both cases it is the context in which the exchange takes place that gives
coherence to the words of the two speakers.

The things done in this example, and especially the way in which they
are done, are reminiscent of what Cummins refers to as "Basic Interpersonal
Communicative Skills" (BICS) whose function is to make contextualized
interactions function efficiently.

In contrast, as I write this book I cannot build up a communicative
exchange with the reader based on a particular set of circumstances, a
"here and now" common to both of us which, instead of being specifically
stated in linguistic terms, is jointly renegotiable on the basis of the
non-linguistic context. The "here and now" in which I am writing and the
"here and now" in which the reader -- and other potential readers -- is
reading are different in many ways.

Current theories consider a written text -- or at least the majority
of written texts -- as a linguistic event taking place in a "context"
which must be shared by writer and reader if the communicative act is to
function. But in this case, the necessary "context of the text" does not
consist solely, or even basically, of the place and time at which the book
is being written or read, or of the set of external circumstances
surrounding the act of writing or reading. The "context" is something more
abstract, contained within the text itself, or, to put it another way, the
text organizes itself as its own "context" (Lyons 1977). As Byrne asserts
(1979) (quoted by Cassany 1988: 32), the "context" is gradually built up as
the text itself is being built up.

In accordance with current theories, it is not possible to talk about
written materials in general but about different types of written
materials: an item in a newspaper, for instance, an advertisement found in
the mailbox at home, a letter to someone dear to you, an astrological
chart, a horror story, or a book like the one the reader is presently reading. In each of these cases, the text is constructed in a way that is specific to a particular type of written material: each one, in other words, is organized according to a specific textural structure. These different ways of organizing different types of text are basically the "context" which the writer and reader have to share. In this sense, therefore, writing or reading a horror story or an item in a newspaper, even when both deal with the same event, are to some extent different acts, and involve the use of procedures which are also different in some respects.

Returning now to the example of the book, it is possible to argue that the method for making a text like the present one both comprehensible and meaningful is inevitably linked to what has been written, once and for all, to how it was written and to the reader's knowledge about the way texts of this type are usually written. Use of language is always social and must therefore be comprehensible and meaningful for the participants. But the procedures for achieving this vary. In this sense, a (decontextualized) document like the present book and the (contextualized) dialogues involving the imaginary motorist looking for gas work in different ways.

Clark and Clark (1977), for example, show how all communicative interactions are built on a type of agreement defining "given versus new information" which the interlocutors must recognize and abide by. In their view, the basis of communication is always the distinction between what the speakers consider as "given", i.e. already known to both of them, and what can be introduced as new precisely because it is known to one speaker but not to the other. This type of agreement exists and plays an essential part both in the first example of the motorist and in the example of the interaction between the writer and the reader of a book. However, the way the "given" and "new" elements are defined, and the procedures for referring to them during the communicative interchange, are clearly
different. The motorist had many possibilities of referring to a context in which the time and place of communication were shared with his imaginary interlocutors: in the case of someone writing or reading a book, such possibilities are considerably fewer or at any rate of a different kind. In the latter situation, the given/new structure of the exchange has much more to do with the way the text is written or read than with the various "heres" and "nows" in which the reading or writing takes place.

Let us now return once more to the original example and imagine this time that we are at the gas station. The driver gets out of the car, turns to someone who was already there when he arrived, and says "Fill it up". It is obvious that the words "Fill it up" do not constitute a precise description of a particular object or process. The driver is mainly expressing an intention, a wish that a particular act be carried out. He is not merely commenting on something that exists "outside" himself. He needs to ensure that his gas tank, which is now almost empty, will be filled up. Now, as Austin (1962) and Searle (1969) demonstrated, if this is ultimately to happen, several conditions must be fulfilled. In the first place the driver will assume, from the way he is dressed, that the person who "was already at the gas station when he arrived" is a gas pump attendant and therefore in a position to carry out his instructions. The reaction of this person to his "Fill it up" will enable him to check whether this assumption was correct; if it was not, he will have to find someone else and begin the linguistic act over again. In the second place, the person who turns out to be the attendant will take it for granted that the driver's intentions are reasonable and that he is not intending, for instance, to set fire to the tank in the gas station, otherwise the linguistic act will immediately be cut short and it will be impossible to accomplish the original aim of getting the tank filled. In the third place, the driver will expect the pump attendant to perform the act within a reasonable length of time and not, for example, sit in his chair until the
football match he is listening to on the radio is finished. If this were to happen, the driver might well ask where there is another gas station and everything he has done from the time he stopped the first passer-by will have been to no avail.

Like the driver and the gas pump attendant, someone writing a book always has a particular intention. The difference is that in the case of the book the necessary conditions which will enable the writer to attain his goal cannot be negotiated with the reader in the same "here and now" in which the exchange between the sender and the receiver of the signal takes place. The two interlocutors cannot gradually revise the procedures for making the linguistic act effective while the exchange is in progress. The point I wish to stress here is that, while the imaginary driver and writer have to do similar things if they want to attain their objectives, they have to resort to different procedures in order to do so.

Going back now to Cummins' original formulation, it is interesting to observe how his assumptions about the school language also apply to a book: not only is a book written in a particular language -- Catalan, English, Spanish, French etc. -- but, it is built on a type of language, like that considered by Cummins to be specific to formal education, which is especially designed to function out of context. The clarity, meaningfulness and coherence of a book depend fundamentally upon procedures lying within the actual written text. Thus to some extent at least, a book is an example of the decontextualized language which children will have to master in order to successfully tackle the type of academic activities they will be confronted with in school. The relevant point for our purposes is that the ability to construct satisfactory contextualized linguistic exchanges, like the one involving the motorist, is a necessary but not a sufficient prerequisite for the successful development of linguistic procedures which go beyond the specific "here and now" shared with the other speaker. A child able to communicate contextually in an L1 who finds him or herself in a
school where an L2 is operating in a decontextualized manner will not be able to establish the "meaningful link between the L1 and L2" implicit in Krashen's hypothesis of comprehensible input.

The linguistic exchanges involving the motorist and the writer are small simplified examples of two types of language use, one of which functions at a contextualized level, linked to the "here and now", and always negotiable with the interlocutor, while the other is decontextualized, formal and highly symbolic. Obviously the distinction between these two types of language and the analysis of the relationship between them are more complex than has been explained here. However the two examples can be of use in making the following three observations:

1/ both types of language are based on suppositions and presuppositions and the interaction is directed towards certain objectives which both speakers must know (or recognize) and accept;
2/ the two types of language use different procedures to accomplish the aims described in point 1 in an effective and meaningful way;
3/ given the similarity implicit in point 1, and the diversity implicit in point 2, access to decontextualized language can be understood as learning to use different, more powerful procedures to do what one has previously learnt to do in a contextualized manner.

Point 3 is fundamental to Cummins' theses. The decontextualized use of language -- which is vital to academic success -- is built in the first instance on contextualized interactions, after which more powerful, symbolic procedures are acquired, the transition necessarily involving a specific qualitative change'' such as the one underlying Cummins' threshold level hypothesis.

Behind Cummins' proposal, in other words, there is always a twofold idea: in the first place, contextualized language is a prerequisite and
point of departure for access to "Cognitive Academic Language Proficiency" which is capable of functioning in a decontextualized way; and secondly, the qualitative leap implicit in the transition to this decontextualized language is difficult to make in a new language when the way the school treats language and the type of linguistic background the child brings from home do not coincide.

If the home language and school language are of the same type and level, then input in the new language will be comprehensible and consequently interdependent development of both languages, L₁ and L₂, will be possible. Otherwise, if the child is still using exclusively contextualized level in the L₁ and the school uses an exclusively decontextualized educational approach, then the qualitative leap will be impossible, the L₂ will be incomprehensible and no type of developmental interdependence can take place. The key variable therefore is the type of educational approach the school "offers" the children and consequently whether or not the type of linguistic-cognitive input it proposes is accessible given the background they bring from home.

THE ROLE OF THE EDUCATIONAL APPROACH IN THE CATALAN IMMERSION PROGRAM

In the present situation of immersion in Catalonia, given that the home language is dominant, that the correct attitude and motivation can be assumed to exist, and that children enter this type of program fairly early, it seems possible to claim that by use of an appropriate, high quality educational approach it should be possible to develop the cognitive-linguistic skills that are deemed necessary in order to cope successfully with "decontextualized education" in another language. The acquisition of the competence needed to cross the threshold level hypothesized by Cummins can be assured, in the present situation existing
in Catalonia, not by first giving priority to the home language and acquiring the new language later, but in school and by means of the school language itself.

The school must make certain, first of all, that the pupils are competent to build contextualized communicative exchanges through negotiation. Once this is achieved, and never before, they can reach the Cognitive Academic Language Proficiency required to deal effectively with those academic tasks we have defined as being unconnected to the actual context in which they are carried out.

Indeed, not only is it possible for this process be carried out in the school language but it seems more efficient to do so. One of the procedures for attaining decontextualized language is by comparing different contextualized communicative uses. It is through mastery of a variety of such uses, and from awareness of their practical diversity, that the formal operational thought processes which will enable the child to think beyond the context of practical activities is reached (Luria 1980a). The possibility of comparing between a number of different contextualized communicative uses may well have some connection with the process whereby the formal language used in school is attained. And it seems obvious that children in early total immersion programs are exposed to "different contextualized uses" and have the opportunity to make comparisons between them. Chapter 2 of this book, for example, provides a series of examples and arguments to support this.

As Diaz remarks (1986)

"learning more than one language does not only lead to knowledge of a second language but also to knowledge of language itself. (....) the hypothesis suggests that children can raise their concepts to a higher level of symbolism and abstraction" (Diaz 1986: 49).
Leopold (1970) had already observed that bilingual children, who were obliged very early on to distinguish between words and their referents, soon become aware of the symbolic and abstract nature of language. Being able to see language as just one of many possible different procedures enables children to gain linguistic and cognitive skills which are very important for their development (Vygotsky 1962). By satisfactorily acquiring two languages, children practice a sort of "incipient contrastive linguistics" (Lambert and Tucker 1972) which makes it easier for them to acquire the type of linguistic skills capable of operating in a context-reduced environment such as is found in school.

Thus in the present circumstances, thanks to linguistic activities carried out with contextual support in the classroom, Catalan early total immersion programs "are not merely transmitters of a second language" (Vila 1986); provided the right educational approach is used, they can enable children from a low socio-cultural background to enter the world of education with better chances of success.

"Early total immersion (in Catalonia) is proving to be a very powerful means whereby these children (of low socio-cultural level), by using a second language as their starting point, acquire sufficient mastery of language itself to enable them to successfully tackle the academic tasks set by the school" (Serra and Vila [forthcoming])

For instance, one of the skills needed to acquire the mastery of reading and writing, which is of such vital importance in school, is the ability to make overall inferences and predictions about the the text one is reading or writing (van Dijk 1983, Richaudeau 1981). A child who processes a text word by word will have serious problems uncovering the meaning. Pupils unable to grasp the overall significance of what they are reading or
writing will find it difficult to acquire mastery of the main tool whereby school activities are conveyed (Smith 1979). In a kindergarten total immersion classroom, on the other hand, a lot of work goes into developing skills related to making inferences, to predicting and grasping the overall meaning of a communicative exchange (see Chapter 2). The considerable effort invested in highly contextualized interactions at the outset of an immersion program will make it easier later on for pupils to acquire the type of Cognitive Academic Language Proficiency singled out by Cummins as a vital requirement of educational programs involving use of a language different from the home language. The procedures for inferring, predicting and grasping the overall meaning of interactions that are closely connected to the context in which they take place are not the same as the more textual procedures for doing the same thing in a decontextualized interaction, but the former are a pre-requisite for mastery of the latter.

If building up a communicative exchange involves knowing how to negotiate with another speaker what can be taken for granted, and when and how this can be done, then these are skills that are developed to a considerable extent in a kindergarten total immersion classroom. When in Chapter 2, Sara, Alba and Carles built up the "possibility of using a language of which they still had insufficient knowledge", they did so by assessing what was shared by the whole class. The ability to take into account what is new and what is shared with other speakers would seem, then, to be a feature of Catalan programs involving a home-school language switch. In Canada, for instance, children who opt for immersion have been found to be more sensitive to the communicative needs of their interlocutor than children who are educated in their home language (Genesee, Tucker and Lambert 1975). A bilingual student who comes into contact with the decontextualized, abstract and highly formalized language of school having already thoroughly mastered the ability to anticipate or make allowances
for other speakers has an advantage over a monolingual student with the same level of linguistic attainment (Cummins 1983).

If learning to read and write means, among other things, learning to interpret different types of text in the light of a variety of assumptions and objectives, then the analysis made in the previous chapter of the first uses of the school language in a Catalan early total immersion program revealed abilities of a very similar type. If, in short, language is primarily a tool for doing things with others, and if access to the formal language system is seen as the inevitable optimization of this same communicative function, then this precisely is how children in immersion programs evolve as they acquire the new school language. And, given the sociolinguistic and political setting in which the Catalan immersion program takes place, this evolution affects, not only the new language, but also the other languages with which the children have significant contacts.

Thus the procedures described in Chapter 2 for the construction of the first discourse in the new language in a kindergarten total immersion classroom can be considered, not merely a useful "pre-requisite" for acquiring proficiency in Catalan, but at the same time as a starting point for access to input in any other language, especially the home language, since the latter enjoys social prestige and the child has sufficient exposure to it. Consequently, as Vila has pointed out, a Catalan immersion program also makes it possible "to remedy linguistic deficits in the home language" (Vila 1987b: 11). In fact many of the actions of the teachers and children we have observed in Catalan immersion classrooms bear obvious affinities to Vygotski's well-know references to a "zone of proximal development" and the "vicarious" role played therein by adults, as well as to the "format" and "scaffolding" categories proposed by Bruner (see Bruner 1985)12. This similarity between the initial linguistic development in the home language and the later process of acquiring another language by means of kindergarten total immersion enables the school first to make up for
deficiencies in the family language and subsequently to enhance the children's chances of successful acquisition of the school language.

THE DURATION OF SPECIAL EDUCATIONAL TREATMENT IN IMMERSION

The foregoing considerations provide support for the position that the special educational treatment required by a program involving a change of language should not be confined to kindergarten and the first years of elementary education as presently the case in Catalonia's, that it should not cease at a time when the child is able to develop communicative exchanges in the new language but may well still be making the transition to the formal, abstract type of language in which the bulk of the remainder of the school curriculum will be conveyed (Harley 1986). The Catalan education authorities are taking a risk by dealing with children aged eight and over who have begun their education in an immersion program in the same way as children whose home language is Catalan. It is one thing to say that a concentrated effort to develop contextualized language (BICS) is a vital pre-requisite, particularly with children from low socio-cultural backgrounds, for access to the formal language of education (CALP); it is quite another to imagine that the 'threshold level' hypothesized by Cummins will be crossed spontaneously without any special effort being involved. Indeed Canadian studies indicate that early total immersion is successful and beneficial provided there is a special long-term follow-up and provided, above all, the special approach is not cut short when the children have a sufficiently developed spontaneous command of the spoken language. Otherwise these initial oral skills in the new language, which are normally achieved by the age of about eight, may be limited to highly contextualized interpersonal uses which do not in themselves ensure access to the formal, cognitive-linguistic operational processes through which most curricular tasks will be conveyed throughout the rest of the child's
school career, though they are an essential condition thereof. "Being able to talk the new school language" does not necessarily denote the ability to decipher the meaning of a written text, or to make linguistic sense of a highly decontextualized didactic unit. These considerations, which are closely related to the critical threshold level hypothesized by Cummins, should be taken into account by teachers in charge of children aged eight and over who have undergone a home-school language switch and should therefore be included in counselling services or refresher courses specifically designed for such teachers.

CONCLUSIONS

According to a current popular saying, in the world today there are bilingual people, trilingual people, quadrilingual people ... and English-speaking people. Regardless of the truth or otherwise of this saying, it at least points towards an increasingly clear trend. Knowing more than one language is no longer a cause for surprise or even concern and it seems likely that monolingualism will soon be an option open only to Anglophones. Bi- and plurilingualism have become a normal thing and there is no doubt that nowadays it is monolingual people who are worried about their position. As we reach the threshold of a future united Europe of amazing sociolinguistic complexity, knowing only one language already makes virtually no sense. And in this new state of affairs, too, immersion has an important role to play.

"A growing number now see unilingualism as a severe limitation, and they are eager to find ways of overcoming it. [For English-speaking pupils in Canada], [French] immersion provides one solution for their children anyway" (Clift 1984: 66 [the parentheses are by the original author]).
It is at least significant that of the nearly 202,000 students enrolled in immersion programs in Canada in the 1986–87 school year, only 18,000 lived in Quebec. In other words, though it was in Quebec that immersion programs got started as a way of solving a situation of conflictive diglossy, it is in many monolingual English settings that they have undergone greatest expansion. Similarly, in the single-market Europe of 1992, the educational option of immersion may very well become widespread, especially in sectors where dominant languages currently enjoy considerable strength.

In any case, in an age when the French have reached the conclusion that young people between 12 and 16 use a "language which identifies them", a language endowed, not only with its own particular argot but with its own morphosyntactical resources (Benveniste [forthcoming]), when working with a computer -- and inevitably everybody will soon be working with computers -- involves acquiring one, or several, new languages, and when a nuclear power station, which did not exist a few years ago and not so long from now may have ceased to exist, requires no less than 80,000 special, indispensable terms in order to operate, then it is no longer a question of whether it is better to learn one or two languages but rather of finding the best way of acquiring the capability to learn several new languages perhaps several times during a lifetime. Present studies indicate that it is no more difficult to learn two languages than one, provided one goes the right way about it. The important point is not how many languages to learn but in which sociolinguistic situation these languages are to be acquired and which psycholinguistic and pedagogical methods are to be used to acquire them.

The age of monolingualism is over. If the language we learn at twelve is obsolete by the time we reach seventeen, it is no longer possible to be monolingual. The aim nowadays is to acquire a good command of several languages, not to be a proficient monolingual (Peal and Lambert 1967, Clift 1984, Cummins 1984a, Díaz 1986). Not only because in so doing
one knows "more", but rather because, in some ways at least, one knows it in a different "way". Certain linguistic and cognitive skills, such as understanding the arbitrary nature of signs (Leopold 1970, Cummins 1978), flexibility in negotiating with another speaker the meaning of a conversation (Balkan 1970, Lambert 1978, Ontario Institute for Studies in Education 1987), or the use of internalized language as a tool for solving cognitive tasks (Diaz 1986), seem to be mastered more easily, or at any rate earlier, by plurilingual students than by monolinguals. The main issue is no longer whether it is better to be monolingual or bilingual but what is the most satisfactory manner and time for becoming bilingual. In this perspective the relevant question is whether a small child has any price to pay in order to become bilingual, whether in the process he or she may be risking all.

In this chapter I have attempted to describe the situation of a child from a low socio-cultural background who enrols in an early total immersion program. I have tried to answer the questions which are currently being asked by a variety of people with different points of view about Catalan immersion programs. Questions like: will the child's background in the home language be sufficient when he or she comes into contact with the new school language? or: are there sufficient guarantees that this type of program will have beneficial results for this type of child?

The reply, in a nutshell, is as follows. An immersion program will be beneficial provided that, when the children come into contact with the formal type of language used in school, they possess the cognitive and linguistic skills necessary to cope with this type of language. If they cannot connect with the information the school conveys to them in an abstract, decontextualized manner, then a program involving a home-school language switch will be harmful and can lead to what Lambert calls "subtractive bilingualism". However, mastery of this cognitive-linguistic language does not exist solely in the home language, and it is by no means
impossible for the school to offer a pedagogical approach whereby this type of language can be built up within the school itself.

Hence the success or failure of an immersion program does not seem to be the result of the type and level of competence already achieved in the home language when the child enters the school but rather of the ability of the school to adjust to the type of language the pupils are capable of receiving as meaningful, or, what amounts to the same thing, of the ability of the school to modify the type of pedagogical approach whereby it interacts with the children. In Cummins' words,

"a child's cognitive, linguistic and academic growth can be conceptualized only in terms of the interaction between child input and educational treatment" (Cummins 1979b: 240).

Cummins himself (1983, 1984c) concludes that immersion programs are appropriate for children with a very wide range of linguistic and learning abilities generally and argues that the question is how to find ways of adjusting the immersion program to the needs and abilities of each child.

Fundamentally, as Wells says (1981: 19), it is a matter of "starting where the child is". Or alternatively, as Ausubel puts it,

"Of all the factors which influence learning, the most important is what the pupil already knows. Find that out and teach accordingly"* (Ausubel 1976, prologue).

*{Author's note. Translated into English directly from the Spanish edition.}
We are now in a position to answer the original question implicit in the title to this chapter: Why is there an immersion program in Catalonia? Because for many children it is the best way in the present circumstances of learning Catalan; because there are reasons to believe that for these same children it is a good way of learning Spanish, or at least, no worse than attending a maintenance program in Spanish; and because it seems possible to argue that it is a generally beneficial option. Thus it can be said that

"given its characteristics and provided it is applied in the appropriate way, not only is (Catalan early total immersion) not an impediment or obstacle to the linguistic and academic progress of pupils with a low socio-cultural level, but may even present a considerable number of advantages for them" (Serra and Vila [forthcoming]).
Notes to Chapter 3

1. This chapter is a revised and extended version of a lecture entitled "Ensenyament en llengua no-familiar abans dels cinc anys: consideracions psicolingüístiques" which was originally given at Omnium Cultural in Barcelona on 13 June 1988.

2. As already pointed on various occasions in this book, the "obvious" does indeed occur but not always. In those cases referred to as "submersion", the home-school language switch can even have adverse effects on the level of competence attained in the school language itself.

3. The "interdependence" and "threshold level" hypotheses respectively are defined more precisely by Cummins in the following ways.

"The interdependent principle has been stated formally as follows: 'to the extent that instruction in Lx is effective in promoting proficiency in Lx, transfer of this proficiency to Ly will occur provided there is adequate exposure to Ly (either in school or environment and adequate motivation to learn Ly" (Cummins 1983: 376) and

"there may therefore 'be a threshold level of linguistic competence which a bilingual child must attain both in order to avoid cognitive deficits and to allow the potentially beneficial aspects of becoming bilingual to influence his cognitive functioning'" (Cummins (1976) [quoted by Lambert 1978: 217])

4. The discussion about the viability of extending immersion programs to children from low socio-cultural backgrounds is not confined to the situation in Catalonia. Similar reservations have been expressed by other authors throughout the world (Bibeau 1984).
5. In this respect, Cummins' view coincides with the highly de-contextualizing conception of present-day schools proposed by Vygotsky (see Rivière (1985) and Bruner (1984)).

6. Bernstein's assertion that for some children the type of language used in school may differ from the corresponding type of language used at home has affinities, not only with Cummins' views (1984b) but also, at least in some aspects, with those of other present-day authors such as Stubbs (1984) or Gumperz (1982).

7. For further discussion of Krashen's hypothesis of comprehensible input, see Chapter 2 "The joint construction of the school language".

8. Certain aspects of this idea proposed by Krashen about second language acquisition and adapted by Cummins to programs involving a home-school language switch, in general terms, with Ausubel's theory of meaningful learning (1977, 1978). For Ausubel any learning process necessarily involves the possibility for the learner to connect or establish some sort of link between what is new or in the process of being learnt, and some type of pattern of previous knowledge.

9. Adapted from a similar example given by Brown and Yule (1983).

10. The point of these examples is not to establish a straight parallel between oral and contextualized language on the one hand and written and decontextualized language on the other. This dichotomy does not always apply. For instance, a written note which a waiter in a restaurant sends to the kitchen stating what customers at a particular table want to eat and a lecture on particular aspects of life in the Middle Ages given to an association of local residents are examples of two possible texts, one written and the other oral, in which the dichotomy would be reversed.

11. This idea of Cummins' bears many similarities with Sapir's definition (1954) of the instrumental and representative values of language and of the the way the second develops from the first.
12. Situations of second language learning in school have already been analyzed as "formats of joint action between teacher and pupil" similar to those described by Bruner with reference to the L₁ by Artigal et al. (1984), Artigal (1985), Voltes (1986), Aragonès and Ventura (1986), Aragonès et al. (forthcoming), Taeschner (1986), Taeschner and Artigal (1987) and Erving-Tripp (1987). In accordance with Bruner's descriptions (Bruner 1975, 1982, and especially 1984b), it is a question of situations in which the action of the teachers and the group of learners takes place in a context known and shared by both, in which the intentions of every participant are easily recognizable and in which, through collaboratively established routines, the pupil can significantly reduce the degree of variability of his or her conduct.

For further discussion of the possibilities of applying many of the observations made by Bruner about "caretaking-child formats" to the process of new language acquisition in school, see the above references and particularly the explanations in Chapter 2 of the present book "The joint construction of the school language".

13. In Canada immersion is generally considered to involve the maintenance to some extent of a special approach right to the end of compulsory schooling while in recently begun experiments in Swedish immersion in Finland, the immersion program is expected to last from six to fifteen (Artigal and Laurén (forthcoming)).

14. There are several reasons for believing that in the generalization of immersion programs in Europe, Catalonia may have to play the same role in pioneering and stimulating the process as Quebec formerly played in Canada.
CHAPTER 4

IMMERSION AS A MEANS TOWARDS

NORMALIZATION* OF THE CATALAN LANGUAGE

"The ultimate success or failure of the integration process
will be determined
by the Catalan-born children of immigrants."
(Miquel Strubell, 1988 p. 67)

In the last chapter I attempted to explain in psycholinguistic terms some
of the reasons for introducing a program involving a home-school language
switch in Catalonia. I propose now to analyze certain matters related to
the prospects of such a program reaching full development in the present
situation in Catalonia. The psycholinguistic validity of an immersion
program as a tool for normalization is one thing; whether it is feasible in
the present circumstances is quite another. That so vast and complex a
project should get off to a good start was certainly vital in pedagogical,
sociological and political terms and this seems to have occurred. However,
once the experiment is underway, it is equally important, and perhaps
even more so, to ensure that it is fully developed so that the results

* (Translator's note) In Catalan psycho- and sociolinguistics, the term
normalization refers, not to the process of linguistic standardization (of
grammar, spelling, vocabulary etc.) which was accomplished in the early
20th century, but to the restoration of the Catalan language to "normal"
usage after the long period of diglossia caused by the repressive measures
applied by previous, non-democratic regimes, particularly the Franco
dictatorship.
initially anticipated may be achieved. In this chapter, I will therefore be discussing the recent prospects of immersion reaching its full potential in Catalonia.

THE LEGAL FOUNDATIONS

The legal foundations of the present school immersion project in Catalonia are twofold: one is the premise of the existence of two official languages -- Catalan and Spanish -- (Puig Salellas 1983), and the other is the application to the language of instruction of what lawyers call "a mixed model of individual and territorial rights" (Milian 1983).

The existence of two official languages is a complex matter which raises a number of interesting points, many of which are interrelated to the topic with which we are concerned and could therefore be introduced into the discussion. For present purposes, however, I will confine myself to calling attention to the fact that, by recognizing the official status of a language, government is obliged to guarantee that it is actually learnt. Hence the official status enjoyed by both Catalan and Spanish in Catalonia involves

"the obligation on the part of government to facilitate the teaching of (...) both official languages, since if this were not done, sufficient guarantees would not exist of the constitutionally recognized principles* of judicial security and publicity of the norms* (Milian 1987: 219).

* [Translator's note] These two principles refer to the obligation that laws should be both promulgated and enforced.
This first point, for instance, is explicitly reflected in the following extract from the Catalan Statute of Self-Government*:

"The Generalitat (Catalan government) will guarantee the normal and official use of both languages, will take the necessary steps to ensure knowledge of both and will create conditions that will allow them to attain full equality in terms of the rights and obligations of the citizens of Catalonia" (Estatut d'Autonomia de Catalunya, Parlament de Catalunya, Art. 3.3.).

* (Author's note to the English edition) The Statute of Self-Government (Estatut d'Autonomia) is the basic legal text, the "magna carta", which defines the extent of Catalonia's independence as a self-governing nationality within Spain and the areas in which it can be exercised. One of the points established by this Statute is the full jurisdiction of the Catalan government over the regulation and administration of education. The Statute of Self-government was passed in 1979, four years after General Franco's death in 1975.
or in these two passages from the Law of Linguistic Normalization:

"Catalonia ... has one language of its own and two official languages: the Generalitat must promote and guarantee the full equality of both" [Llei de Normalització Lingüística, Parlament de Catalunya, Preàmbul],

and

"All children in Catalonia, whatever their usual language on entering school, must be able to make normal and correct use of both Catalan and Spanish by the end of compulsory education" [Llei de Normalització Lingüística, Parlament de Catalunya, Art. 14.4.]

The second of these principles is perhaps less obvious than the first. However it is equally important, and perhaps more so, when it comes to analyzing exactly how the immersion program has been built up in Catalonia. The application to the language of instruction of a "mixed model of

* (Author's note to the English edition) The Law of Linguistic Normalization (Llei de Normalització Lingüística) approved by the Catalan Parliament in 1983 asserts first of all that Catalonia's own language is Catalan, and then goes on to declare that Catalan and Spanish share equal official status in this part of Spain. The historical importance of this law stems from the fact that, except during a brief period under the Spanish Second Republic (1931-1939), the Catalan language had been considered officially illegal in Catalonia ever since 1714.
individual and territorial rights" means that a certain degree of personal choice is recognized as compatible with the enforcement by government of certain compulsory measures throughout the country. The principle of "territorial rights", on the one hand, means that government must take steps to ensure that children have access to the language or languages that form part of the compulsory school curriculum, that is, in the case of Catalonia, the two official languages, Catalan and Spanish. The principle of "individual rights", on the other hand, guarantees that individual initiative is maintained in certain areas and periods, and consequently that children have a limited right to receive part of their education in the language of their choice.

Thus the joint application of individual and territorial rights establishes

"a dynamic equilibrium between the principle of freedom of individual action and that of public decision" (Milian 1984: 38),

that is, it lays down the framework within which the school curriculum may be designed.

The main point in our argument is therefore that the three basic legal texts regulating the immersion program -- the Law of Linguistic Normalization, Decree 361/1983 passed on 30 August 1983, and the Order dated 6 September 1983 -- constitute nothing more than the application of the mixed model of individual and territorial rights to the specific situation of education in Catalonia. The pattern adopted is as follows: the principle of individual rights is confined to the first years of schooling -- Nursery School, Kindergarten, and the first and second grades of
compulsory schooling or Basic General Education (Educació General Bàsica or EGB)* -- while the principle of territorial rights, involving governmental responsibility, serves to regulate the higher levels of education. This pattern, combining individual choice and governmental regulation, is the main legal foundation on which the present immersion program rests and is thus an essential part of any analysis of the Catalan education system.

It is on the basis of this mixed model, for example, that the Law of Linguistic Normalization endows parents with the main responsibility in choosing the language of instruction of their children up to the age of seven:

"children are entitled to receive their first education in their usual language, whether this be Catalan or Spanish. The Administration must guarantee this right and provide the means necessary to implement it. Parents or guardians may exercise this right in the name of their children and demand that it be applied" [Llei de Normalització Lingüística, Parliament de Catalunya, Art. 14.2].

* [Author's note to the English edition] The structure of the Catalan school system is as follows: Nursery School (optional), age 0-3; Kindergarten, age 4-5; Basic General Education (Ensenyament General Bàsic or "EGB"), age 6-14. "EGB" in turn is split into three cycles: "Initial Cycle" (cicle inicial), Grades 1 and 2, (6-7 years); "Middle Cycle" (cicle mitjà), Grades 3 through 5 (8-10 years); and "Upper Cycle" (cicle superior), Grades 6 through 8 (11-13 years).
Another well-known legal text of relevance to this discussion is the Royal Decree of 23 June 1978, also known as the Catalan Language Decree (Decret del Català) which made Catalan language arts an obligatory part of the curriculum in all schools while at the same time providing for the existence of schools in which an unlimited amount of instruction would be through Catalan. This Decree, therefore, instead of establishing a mixed model of individual and territorial language rights like the present law, acknowledged the principle of the legal precedence of individual rights over territorial rights, as understood in the present legislation. However the precedence of individual rights was replaced by the mixed model in the three later texts already quoted, which were passed at the same time as the Immersion Program, as such, was legally constituted.

Hence the situation, in short, is as follows. In the first place, by virtue of the existence of two official languages, the principle of territorial rights is not limited to Spanish, the official language of the whole of Spain. And in the second place, parents are allowed a limited amount of personal choice between the two official languages, Catalan and Spanish.

1978-1988: FROM TEACHING CATALAN TO TEACHING ÎN CATALAN

Having studied the psycholinguistic and sociolinguistic features of the immersion program in previous chapters of this book, I would like now to consider to what extent this program is compatible with the legal framework just described. I shall be asking, in other words, what the scope and the limits of a school program involving a home-school language switch are within the prevailing legal framework, how viable it is here and now as a tool for the normalization of the Catalan language. In order to do this, I
will first give a brief historical account of the process that has led to the existence of immersion programs in Catalonia at the present time.

We have just reached the end of the first decade in history in which a Catalan government has been in a position to intervene openly in vital language-related aspects of education. It is possible to divide this period of ten years into two major stages on the basis of the fairly clearly defined priorities that have marked the action taken by the Catalan Department of Education with a view to "Catalanizing" the schools. From 1978 to 1983 the main goal was to ensure the maximum number of hours of Catalan language arts in all schools: from 1983 to 1988 the action of the Department of Education aimed primarily at ensuring the viability of the experiments in immersion which had been undertaken, concentrating on the period which starts when children first enter school, around the age of four, and continues to the end of the Initial Cycle of Basic General Education at the age of 7.

The legal basis provided by the existence of two official languages and the principle of territorially defined language rights made it possible to ensure that by the end of the first period (1978–83) over 90% of pupils in kindergarten and Basic General Education classes in Catalonia were being taught Catalan language arts (Arenas 1986a: 88). However, on account of the socially dominant position of Spanish over Catalan, as established in the previous chapter, instruction in Catalan language arts proved wholly insufficient to yield the results that were intended to derive from the principle of two official languages and of territorial language rights, ie. to guarantee the acquisition of skills in both official languages. The experience of the years from 1978 to 1983 clearly shows that it is impossible to ensure that Catalan, the socially inferior language, will actually be learnt by providing a minimum number of hours of Catalan language arts instruction, especially in the case of pupils who hardly ever use the language outside school. In 1982, for instance, five years after
the establishment of the compulsory minimum number of hours of Catalan throughout Basic General Education, 40.46% of students were still unable to express themselves in Catalan (Department of Education 1984, quoted by López del Castillo 1988: 75) and in 1986 over 40% of students between the ages of 10 and 14 were still unable to write Catalan despite having received, from the beginning of their school career, the minimum number of hours of Catalan language arts classes and of subjects taught in Catalan laid down by law (Grup de mestres per l’Escola Pública Catalana (forthcoming)).

A study published in 1983 by the Catalan Department of Education, "Quatre anys de català a l’escola", states:

"Lastly, by way of a reflection of all we have said so far, let us point out that our evaluation reveals that the mastery of Catalan achieved by Spanish speakers is not even remotely comparable to the command Catalan-speaking students acquire of Spanish and that under present conditions they are unlikely to do so by the end of compulsory education".

Accordingly, the same study concludes that

"the language that receives the poorest treatment outside school ... is the one that should acquire greatest importance in school."

If, as established by law, the normalization of Catalan is necessary to the application of the principles of co-officiality and of territorially defined language rights, and if furthermore, as the Catalan government explicitly argues,
“the Generalitat (Catalan government) must foster the creation of new socio-linguistic conditions in Catalonia ... (which will make it possible) to guarantee the normal and official use, the knowledge and full equality [of both official languages]...” (Extract from the Dictamen del Conseil Consultiu de la Generalitat de Catalunya on the proposed Catalan Linguistic Normalization Law (unpublished)),

then it follows that the measures undertaken between 1978 and 1983 were totally inadequate and must be replaced by other, more efficient ones. Studies on the subject carried out in a wide variety of situations of diglossia show that it is never enough for the school to introduce a minimum number of hours of language arts classes in the socially weaker language into the schedule. In order for the acquisition of this language to be guaranteed, it must receive priority in school over the dominant language (Lambert 1981: 174). In this notion lies the essential difference between the 1978-1983 stage and the 1983-88 stage: from 1983 onwards it is acknowledged that, in a situation where languages are in contact, the language which has fewer social opportunities for development must be given precedence, especially in the early years of schooling.

This then is how immersion programs began to spread in 1983 -- though the first small-scale experiments date back to the 1978-79 school year². Between 1983 and 1988 the growth in the number of schools offering immersion programs was considerable and even surprising, first of all in terms of sheer numbers, and secondly because it has reached proportions that would barely have seemed possible a few years ago.
No official data are yet available as to the number of children who have followed immersion programs over the last five years and the figures set out below, together with their respective sources, must be considered approximate. According to these statistics, the number of children who have attended Catalan immersion programs is as follows:

INSERT TABLE 4-1

The reader may well think that 65,000 pupils is not a very significant number, scarcely 6.5%, in fact, of the almost 1 million children (see Table 4-2) of compulsory school age in Catalonia.

INSERT TABLE 4-2

In order to assess the true significance of this figure of 65,000 immersion pupils, however, we must first specify the criteria for including them in the immersion category:

a distinction must be made, in the first place, between classes in which Catalan is the "language of instruction" (and where the minimum
number of hours laid down by law are devoted to Spanish language arts) and those in which Spanish is the "language of instruction" (and the pupils study Catalan language arts for the minimum legal number of hours)* (Servei d'Ensenyament del Català 1988a);

we must then divide the classes in which Catalan is the "language of instruction" into two categories according to the home language of the pupils: only those classes in which Spanish is the home language of at least 70% of the students are considered immersion classes, while those containing over 30% of pupils from Catalan-speaking families are excluded;

it must also be recalled that the immersion program pupils in the figures include only those in Kindergarten classes (4-5 years) and Basic General Education Initial Cycle classes (6-7 years). From the Middle Cycle of Basic General Education onwards (8 years and over), classes where Catalan is the language of instruction are not differentiated according to whether the children's home language is Catalan or Spanish;

* [Author's note to the English edition] The following minimum number of hours' instruction in the Catalan and Spanish languages are presently established by law for Kindergarten and Basic General Education (EGB) pupils in all schools in Catalonia, whether they are following an immersion program or a home language maintenance program: Kindergarten and EGB Initial Cycle (4-7 years), 4 hours' instruction per week in each of the languages; EGB Middle Cycle (6-10 years), 4 hours per week each of Catalan and Spanish Language Arts, plus at least one school subject taught through each of the languages; EGB Upper Cycle (11-13 years), 4 hours per week of Catalan and Spanish language arts, plus at least two school subjects taught in Catalan and one in Spanish.
finally, though no data are available about immersion programs in private schools*, there seems to be general agreement that they are so few in number as to be statistically irrelevant because hardly any of the private schools where Catalan is the main language of instruction have the minimum 70% of pupils whose home language is Spanish and thus the classes do not qualify as immersion classes.

* [Author's note to the English edition] In Catalonia, as in other parts of Spain, the school system comprises both public and private schools. Some private schools belong to private institutions, such as religious orders, or parents' and teachers' cooperatives, while others are simply under private ownership. They are however entitled to receive government grants. All educational institutions, whether public or private, are subject to official regulations concerning education. In Catalonia such regulations are established by the Catalan government and include those referring to the use and status of Catalan and Spanish as languages of instruction and of communication within the school.
If, bearing these criteria in mind, we relate the approximate numbers of immersion students presented in Table 4-1 to the total number of students in the corresponding grades (Kindergarten and the Initial Cycle of Basic General Education) in public schools only (Table 4-3), we obtain the percentages in Table 4-4:

INSERT TABLE 4-3

INSERT TABLE 4-4

If, having thus calculated that in the 1988-89 school year, just over 38% of these students were in immersion classes, we then take into account that between 30 and 35.6% of Kindergarten and Initial Cycle classes in public schools contain so high a proportion of pupils whose family language is Catalan that, even though the language of instruction in these classes is Catalan, they do not qualify as immersion classes, then the resulting percentage can indeed be described as "quite significant" and virtually beyond imagination in Catalonia only a few years back. It would seem that, in the present school year (1988-89), around 70% of public school children aged between 4 and 7 are being taught through Catalan and that approximately half of these are in immersion programs while the remainder are following Catalan home language maintenance programs.

Strictly speaking, of course, these estimates have little or no statistical value. To claim otherwise would be misleading. But it seems unlikely that the real figures could be very different. Indeed the figure of around 70% of children between 4 and 7 who are receiving instruction in
Catalan is fairly close to the figures in Table 4-5 referring to all Kindergarten and Basic General Education students who are being educated primarily in Catalan.

\begin{center}
\textbf{INSERT TABLE 4-5}
\end{center}

It is true that, according to Table 4-5, during the present school year (1988-89) only 31.7\% of the total number of students in public school Kindergarten and Basic General Education classes are receiving instruction in Catalan and doing the minimum number of hours of Spanish specified by the law. In contrast, the number of public schools falling within this same category in the same year is 74.34\%. The wide gap between the percentage of students and that of schools -- which is much narrower in the case of private schools -- is due to the fact that many schools started only recently to teach through the medium of Catalan from the first year of Kindergarten and the change-over is spreading gradually up through the school at the rate of one grade per year (see, for example, Table 4-7). But it therefore follows that, unless these schools reverse the decision they have made with respect to the language of instruction, the percentage of pupils will soon be very similar to the percentage of schools. In this sense it is possible to state that the figure of approximately 70\% of Kindergarten and Initial Cycle pupils receiving instruction in Catalan is roughly consistent with the percentage of schools providing instruction in Catalan that appears in Table 4-5, though it does not yet coincide with the percentage of pupils given in the same Table. Since teaching through Catalan begins in the first years of schooling and works its way up year by year through the whole school, the gap between the percentage of pupils and the percentage of schools narrows first in Initial Cycle and later in
the higher grades of Basic General Education, as is fact is reflected in Table 4-4.

Even so, it may still seem rash to claim that around 70% of pupils between 4 and 7 attending public schools in the 1988-89 school year are receiving instruction in Catalan, half of them through immersion programs. I am aware that the data presented so far do not constitute precise and unequivocal support for this assertion and, in view of the impossibility of providing more accurate overall statistics, which for the time being simply do not exist, I propose to complete the picture by quoting two precise figures that may at least be indicative of the situation.

1. The registrations of 4-year-old kindergarten pupils in the Barcelona working-class suburb of Santa Coloma de Gramanet between the years 1983-84 and 1986-87 reveal the following trends in parental choice of the language of instruction:

INSERT TABLE 4-6

Rather than the actual percentage of parents who choose Catalan, the most interesting thing about these figures is the sociolinguistic background to which they refer. If the trend in favour of immersion is compared with 1986 Census data relating to language (see Table 4-6), the most remarkable feature of the phenomenon of Catalan language education in Santa Coloma de Gramanet is seen to be the predominantly Spanish-speaking environment in which it is taking place. The figures in Table 4-6 reveal that both the residents of Santa Coloma as a whole and the small children who can opt
for a program involving a change of language fall well short of the average levels of knowledge of Catalan for the whole of Catalonia.

2. Table 4-7 shows the number of public schools and classes in seven large, mainly industrial boroughs located within 20 miles of Barcelona which, during the school years from 1983-84 to 1988-89, followed an immersion program.

INSERT TABLE 4-7

Again, the most interesting fact about these figures is not the unquestionably large number of schools offering an immersion program in each of the boroughs, but the linguistic situation in which this phenomenon is occurring. Table 4-8 shows that the children in these boroughs who are receiving instruction in Catalan for the first time come from, and live in, an environment where familiarity with the Catalan language is slight, to say the least.

INSERT TABLE 4-8

Table 4-8 gives the levels of knowledge of Catalan for the population as a whole and for the 2-4 age group. It should be pointed out that, while the bulk of the census data are published in aggregate form for age groups of five years each (0-4, 5-9 etc.), children below the age of 2 are not included where knowledge of languages is concerned. Statistics on the knowledge of languages need also to be completed by data on the frequency of use, and in many cases it would be desirable to use breakdowns below
municipal level in order to ascertain knowledge and use in particular neighborhoods. However such data have not yet been compiled and, of all the figures presently available, those in Table 4-8 provide the most meaningful information on matters of concern to us here. Despite this, some caution is called for: to say that 41.91% of the total population of El Prat de Llobregat or 42.13% of the inhabitants of L'Hospitalet are able to speak Catalan does not mean that they actually use this language. Nor does it mean that this percentage of knowledge is also valid for the actual neighborhoods where immersion is most firmly established.

BEYOND 1988

One possible inference about the period from 1978 to 1988 is that, in exercising the principle of individual language rights referred to above, parents have sparked off a significant trend towards linguistic normalization in education, especially in public schools. Certainly this development cannot be attributed solely to parental choice of language, but whatever the importance of other variables, the behavior of the parents has clearly played a decisive part.

Even so, the parents have merely got the process underway. Their legal choice of language comes to an end when their children complete the Initial Cycle of Basic General Education at age 7. The question, now that immersion programs have been introduced and are spreading, is: What will happen from age 8 onwards, from the beginning of the Middle Cycle of Basic General Education? One of the still unsolved problems regarding programs with a home-school language switch in Catalonia concerns the time to be devoted to the Catalan and Spanish languages in the curriculum, and above all the methodology to be applied to them, from the Middle Cycle onwards, that is,
when the parents' individual choice lapses and responsibility falls squarely on the shoulders of the Administration.

It seems clear, in the first place, that an immersion program can be neither efficient nor cost-effective if curricular treatment of the school language is suddenly cut off only four years after the program has started (Genesee 1988). Though progressive introduction of the home language is certainly necessary to the viability and efficiency of the immersion program itself (Servei d'Ensenyament del Català 1988b), this in no way implies that the previous educational approach to the new language should be abruptly dropped. A certain continuity must be established between the treatment of the new language before and after the period (from 4 to 7 years) to which immersion is now officially confined in Catalonia. As stated in the instructions issued by the Catalan Government Department of Education to public and private school Principals and Teachers in 1986-87:

"Those schools with (...) classes in the second grade of Basic General Education who have been following the Immersion Program must of necessity make arrangements so that in the third grade of Basic General Education these pupils may continue their education in the same language of instruction as in the Initial Cycle" (Instruccions als directors i claustres de professors dels centre públics i privats sobre l'ús i l'ensenyament del i en català. Punt 3.3. Curs 1986-87. Departament d'Ensenyament. Generalitat de Catalunya).

In any event, this simple recommendation that "arrangements be made" to ensure continuity in the treatment of the new language in schools with an immersion program is hardly sufficient. Some type of outline curriculum must be drawn up by the Administration, and no proposal to this effect has yet been made.
THE DESIGN OF AN OVERALL LANGUAGE PROJECT
FOR SCHOOLS WITH IMMERSION PROGRAMS

During the coming five years, large numbers of pupils who have begun a program involving a language switch will reach the end of what is officially considered the immersion period (Kindergarten and Initial Cycle, ages 4-7) and Government should therefore draw up a plan for the treatment of languages right to the end of Basic General Education in classes which have followed an immersion program. Such a plan need not be inflexible; instead it should be adaptable to the situation of each individual school and even to the evolution of each particular class. It must however do more than prescribe a very low minimum number of hours of language arts classes and instruction through Catalan and Spanish as at present.

The curricular model to be adopted could be based on the pattern of what is termed "early total immersion". Most specialists agree that this is the immersion format best suited to the prevailing socio-linguistic circumstances in Catalonia (Vila 1985, Sanchez and Tembleque 1986, Arnau 1987, Vila 1987b, Mata 1987, Voltes 1988, Serra and Vila [forthcoming]). It is also the most widespread model in other countries (Swain 1978) and, provided certain conditions are fulfilled, seems to offer the best results (Swain and Lapkin 1983, Krashen 1984).

The "early total immersion" model usually consists (with minor variations in different applications) of three separate stages: during the first stage, which normally lasts two to three years, the home language receives no educational treatment at all, though the children are at liberty to use it; during the second stage, the home language is introduced into the curriculum, usually for about 20% of the schedule; and in the final stage, the two languages generally receive equal educational treatment.
Table 4-9 shows the number of hours' instruction in French (the school language) in a widespread model of "early total immersion" applied in Canada.

Let us return now to the current situation in Catalonia. The present percentages of time allocated to instruction in Catalan and Spanish in an immersion program can vary on account of the fact that only the minimums have been established for each language in the Middle and Upper Cycles of Basic General Education. However, if the maximum authorized amount of instruction were given in Catalan language arts and through the medium of Catalan, the result would be as follows:

By comparing Tables 4-9 and 4-10, we note that differences between the two models are confined to the beginning and end of the school curriculum. Thus a possible format for immersion in Catalonia might consist of eliminating the hours of Spanish during Kindergarten or even the first grade of Basic General Education and of increasing the hours of Spanish in the Upper Cycle so that they exceed the present minimums.

The impact of such a proposal would obviously have to be monitored, but so would any option that might be suggested at the present time. While no two programs involving a home-school language switch take place in the same educational and social setting and the generalization of a particular
format does not of itself constitute a guarantee (Lambert 1981), a plan such as that proposed here seems to have fairly good prospects of proving operational in the present educational situation in Catalonia.

Possibly the most controversial point at first sight would be the proposal to entirely eliminate treatment of the home language during the first two or three years of schooling. Yet there are plenty of precedents for an option of this type in the literature. Although home language arts classes and instruction through the home language are an essential part of any immersion curriculum, Swain and Lapkin (1983) state that it is possible, and even preferable, to delay introduction of the home language until the third or fourth year of the program.

"Early immersion began in Canada with the idea that through the exclusive use of French by the teachers in communicating with their students, the second language would be acquired" (Swain and Lapkin 1983: 6)

Other authors make the same point, including Cummins (1983), Swain (1978), Genesee (1988) and the Association Canadienne de Professeurs d’Immersion (1986).

Genesee, for instance, writes:

"in the long run there is no deficiency in English skills which can be related to the fact that, in early immersion programs, teaching of this language does not begin until the end of the third or fourth year of primary schooling" (Genesee 1988: 28).

Cummins remarks likewise that children from French early total immersion programs in Canada, who have been exposed exclusively to French during
Kindergarten and Grades 1 and 2, attain a high level of functional competence in French and later improve their skills in their home language, English (Cummins 1983: 46).

According to the recommendations of the Manitoba Bureau de l'Education Française (quoted in Bolland-Willms et al. 1988: 39), it is vital that the first year of immersion at least should be exclusively in the school language. Swain provides support for this idea by commenting that

"the results also suggest that the early total immersion program format may be preferable to the early partial immersion format in that the former develops second language proficiency rapidly, enabling the pupils to assimilate knowledge presented in that language without handicap" (Swain 1978: 149).

It seems clear that no successful immersion program can "overlook the need to foster the family language" (Servei d'Ensenyament del Català 1988b). What does not seem necessary is that the educational treatment of this language should begin from the time the children first enter school. In view of the findings of studies on the subject in other countries (Swain 1981, Swain and Lapkin 1983) and the present sociolinguistic situation in Catalonia, it appears unlikely that the model proposed in the present book would bring about any type of retardation or handicap in the development of normal mastery of the Spanish language by children following a Catalan immersion program.

What then is the legal scope for an overall linguistic model for Kindergarten and Basic General Education such as the one proposed in this book? It may in fact be quite broad. As it relates to the Middle and Upper Cycles, the plan is perfectly compatible with the present law. At the same time, the solution proposed for the start of the program -- which involves delaying treatment of the home language for two or three years -- is
coherent with the legal principle of individual language rights, as already described at the beginning of this chapter, and with the ultimate objective of achieving competence in both languages, Catalan and Spanish. Though present regulations in Catalonia make it obligatory for immersion programs to include four hours of Spanish per week from the very beginning of schooling (Servei d'Ensenyament del Català 1988b), it seems possible to modify this requirement by law on the basis of the aforementioned legal principle of individual rights. Hence the implementation of the proposed curricular model relating to the language of instruction in a Catalan immersion program does not appear to raise serious difficulties, either in terms of its legal implications, as set out at the beginning of this chapter, or in terms of the psycho-pedagogical arguments just invoked.

THE ROLE OF THE TEACHERS

The viability of this curricular model does however come up against one difficulty: at the present time the teachers who are to carry it out have an insufficient command of the Catalan language. According to the latest data, the Catalan language qualifications of public school teachers as a whole in 1986-87 were as follows:

-------------------------------------------------------------
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INSERT TABLE 4-11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

On the basis of the figures in Table 4-11, it is obvious that not enough public school teachers have Catalan language qualifications. The first reason is that, if in the coming five years a model similar to the one proposed is to be applied to the approximately 70% of children who have
begun their schooling in Catalan over the past four years — either in immersion programs or in Catalan home language maintenance programs —, then the number of students who have opted for education in Catalan will soon outpace the number of teachers qualified to impart this type of instruction. The second reason is that the viability of an immersion program necessarily involves normalization of the use of the Catalan language throughout the school. Immersion in a new language cannot be confined to the interactions that take place within the classroom. In order to be successful, immersion must extend to the entire school environment. Consequently, in the words of Arenas,

"when the claustre* includes the application of the Immersion Program in the above-mentioned plans, this decision constitutes a commitment, not only for those teachers who are motivated by the linguistic integration of the pupils, but for the whole staff (...) the claustre as a representative body, and each individual teacher as an active member of this body, give full backing to the content of the linguistic project" (Arenas 1986b: 33).

The fact that many teachers in Catalonia currently have a low level of knowledge of Catalan is undoubtedly one of the great impediments to the linguistic normalization of schools and particularly to the prospects of extending the immersion programs already underway to the end of Basic

*Translator's note: claustre: body representative of the teaching staff in a school
General Education (López del Castillo 1988). As Sara Blasi writes:

"so that all children may be guaranteed the right to receive instruction in Catalonia's own language, projects for the use of Catalan as a vehicular language must be maintained and increased and, in order to meet this objective, all teachers in Catalonia must be acquainted with the Catalan language" (Blasi, forthcoming).

There are plenty of legal arguments in favour of a change in the present situation with respect to this important question. The following paragraphs from the Law of Linguistic Normalization and the decision handed down by the Spanish Supreme Court on the subject are quite explicit.

"In accordance with the requirements of their professional duties, teachers must know the two official languages" (Llei de Normalització Lingüística, Parlament de Catalunya. Titol II. Art. 18.1),

"Since the question of education concerns the rights, not only of the public service educators, but also of the children who learn, of the parents, and of society, as well as the action of the state, a systematic interpretation of the constitutional and statutory precepts leads us to conclude that, given the system chosen by the public authorities of the Autonomous Community of Catalonia to guarantee the teaching of and instruction in the Catalan and Spanish languages, teachers in basic education must know the two languages of that Community" (Sentencia del Tribunal Supremo, 16 December 1985) (quoted by Mílian (forthcoming)).

Nonetheless the present situation concerning this key issue is not as straightforward as might appear from the texts just quoted. There are
several major legal impediments. The first is the fact that the Catalan Statute of Self-Government, in application of the principle of established rights, accepts the situation of public servants prior to the passing of the Statute. The second is the legal criterion which, in order to avoid discrimination among candidates from different parts of Spain wishing to obtain a first post in the Catalan public service, tends to lower the minimum entrance standards.

It is very difficult to solve this complex and even contradictory legal situation regarding the teachers whose task it is to safeguard the "constitutionally recognized principles of judicial security and publicity of the norms". Certainly it seems likely that more and better political tools should be developed and increased funds be made available so as to ensure that all teachers in Catalonia become fully proficient in the language of the country. And this, without the slightest doubt, is a matter that calls for urgent solutions.

CONCLUSIONS

As pointed out by Benet and Benet (1987), Cubilla, Bepot and Rios (forthcoming) and Huguet (forthcoming), laws seldom precede events, and the case of Catalan immersion has been no exception to the rule. Experiments undertaken in Catalonia involving a home-school language switch have been the fruit above all of the political determination and pedagogical efforts of many people over a period of many years.

* (Translator's note) For definitions of these concepts, see page 89
Accordingly, the laws that have been the main focus of attention in this chapter must be seen as the tools and the outcome of that same determination. Equally, however, laws acquire considerable importance as tools when the events no longer affect only a minority and the complex stage of generalization is reached. Legal provisions cannot explain why and how the immersion program in Catalonia has reached its present stage of development but they can be of some importance when it comes to predicting the likely extent of its future expansion.

The prime objective at the present time where normalization of the Catalan language in education is concerned is that no school which has opted for an immersion program must be obliged to give up this option, in the first place because all kindergarten children who embark upon a new school career must be able to select Catalan immersion if they so wish, and secondly, and even more important, because those who have already chosen this type of education must be permitted to develop it fully, or at least to the fullest extent allowed by the regulations presently in force.

If from 1978 to 1983 the main objective was to provide Catalan language arts classes, and between 1983 and 1986 it was to launch immersion programs with special attention to the 4-7 year age group, action in Catalonia from now on must aim above all at achieving full development of these programs beyond the Initial Cycle of Basic General Education and at making this option generally available in such a way as to respond to and make viable the wishes of all interested parents. The existence of two official languages and of territorially defined language rights, together with the way in which the limited principle of individual rights has been applied, means that the task will belong primarily to the Catalan government and its execution will depend on the ability of that government to operate with the laws already at its disposal.

The immersion program, in short, seems here and now to be psycholinguistically appropriate, sociolinguistically opportune, and
relatively viable in legal terms as a tool for the normalization of the
Catalan language. It remains, however, to make it generally available, in a
full developed form, to all those children who have already chosen it or
who will do so in the future.
Notes to Chapter 4

1. This chapter is the revised and extended version of a lecture given at Omnium Cultural in Barcelona on 15 June 1988 under the original title "Eficàcia i límits del Programa d'Immersió com a eina de normalització".

2. The only occasion on which Catalan was recognized as an official language for educational purposes was during the period of Catalan self-government under the Second Spanish Republic (1931-1939) which lasted less than ten years.

3. Previous experiments in education in Catalan took place in situations in which the home language was the same as the language of instruction, either for all the pupils in the class, or for those pupils who had Catalan as their family language. In these cases Spanish was used as the vehicular language with the remaining Spanish-speaking pupils (school bilingualism).

4. The Catalan Government's Department of Education is presently putting the finishing touches to a statistical study on the subject.

5. The classification has to be made on the basis of classes, not of schools, since there are presently many schools where certain classes receive instruction in Catalan while others receive it in Spanish, either because there are two parallel streams, or because programs in Catalan have commenced only recently and the change of language has not yet reached the end of Basic General Education.

6. No precise figure has yet been established by the Catalan Government's Department of Education and this one has been provided by that organization merely as an estimate. The responsibility for its use, therefore, belongs solely to the author of this book.

7. In the 1981-82 school year, Catalan was the home language of 33.71% of
pupils in Basic General Education in Catalonia, other languages (essentially Spanish) were the home language of 53.65%, and 12.64% were from bilingual homes (Catalan-Spanish). The high percentage of pupils whose usual home language is not Catalan may be due to the lower birth rate among Catalan-speaking families (Arnaud and Boada 1986).

8. The author greatly regrets being unable to present more reliable and precise data on this important question, but so far no one, not even the Catalan government, has carried out statistical work on the subject.

9. It must be pointed out nonetheless that the percentages of schools providing instruction in Catalan and of pupils receiving such instruction can never totally coincide since the number of pupils always varies from one school to another.

10. More detailed information about present levels of knowledge of the Catalan language and the evolution of the situation since 1975 can be obtained from the forthcoming study by Nadie Rixach based on the 1975, 1981 and 1986 Language Censuses and entitled Difusió social del coneixement de la llengua catalana (Generalitat de Catalunya, Departament de Cultura, Direcció General de Política Lingüística). A shorter summary in English by Jacqueline Hall, based on the same data, is also due for publication in 1990 (Catalan title: Coneixements Lingüístics segons els Pedrons de 1986, Generalitat de Catalunya, Departament de Cultura, Direcció de Política Lingüística).

11. For purposes of simplification, three possible immersion models can be defined: 1/ Early Total Immersion, in which the school language is used from the very beginning of schooling as the sole vehicular language for the entire curriculum, the home language being introduced progressively later on; 2/ Early Partial Immersion, which differs from Total Immersion in that the schedule is divided from
the very beginning into two parts, in each of which instruction is
given in one of the languages; and 3/ Late Immersion, which consists
of starting education in the home language and later introducing part
or all of the curriculum in the school language (Swain 1978).
Referring to the Early Total Immersion model considered here, Swain
writes: "[it is called] early because it begins with the first day of
schooling; total immersion because all instruction is initially
provided through the medium of the second language. Typically,
English Language Arts is introduced and taught in English in grades
two or three for approximately one hour a day" (Swain 1978: 142).

12. Regarding the suitability of this type of immersion in the present
situation in Catalonia, see the arguments set out in Chapter 3
Immersion for children from low socio-cultural backgrounds?

13. "Early total immersion begins with kindergarten, grade one and grade
two being taught 100% through the second language" (Halpern 1984:
20).

14. "In early immersion settings particularly, the practice in the first
and second years of the program is to expose the children to a large
amount of second language use (by the teacher) but to let them talk
among themselves and to the teacher in their home language, English."
(Swain and Lapkin 1983: 5); and also "although it is the case that
French is the only language used by the teachers, it is not the case
that it is the only language used by the children. During much of the
first year in an early total French immersion program, the children
continue to speak English among themselves and to their teacher, who,
although a native speaker of French, is bilingual, and therefore can
understand the children when they use their native language" (Swain
1978: 142).
15. "The principle that teachers in Catalonia must acquire sufficient 
mastery of Catalan to be able to use it as a normal means of 
communication and instruction at all levels within the school is so 
obvious that there would be no need to go on stressing it were it not 
for the fact that others also continually persist in disregarding it 
and confusing the staff" (López del Castillo 1988: 115).

16. Apart from the arguments that apply to the present time, it must also 
be pointed out that, if the trend observed during the period 1978–88 
does not vary considerably in the coming years, the school situation 
will even exceed the provisions of the present legal framework (a 
position that has already been taken up by several authors including 
López del Castillo [1987, 1988] and Cubilla, Espot and Rico 
[forthcoming]) and it may be necessary to study the need to introduce 
a new Law of Linguistic Normalization.
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contextualized language 65, 66, 67-74, 86
decontextualized language 62, 63, 64, 65, 67-74, 75, 77, 86
development of linguistic interdependence -> interdependence hypothesis
developmental interdependence -> interdependence hypothesis
dominant/majority language group 2, 5, 57, 59-62, 64, 74, 97
educational approach -> pedagogical treatment
educational (linguistic) treatment -> pedagogical treatment
format 78, 87
home language
use of home language  6, 17, 52
home language skills  5, 60-62
home-school language switch  2, 4, 51, 59, 60, 61, 63, 77,
80, 82, 88, 94, 108, 114

immersion program requirements  2-7, 8, 13, 62, 65
immersion vs. submersion  3-4, 8, 85
intentionality  13
interdependence hypothesis  60, 61, 64, 74, 85
input
comprehensible input  28-29, 33, 34, 53, 54-55, 62, 64,
67, 73, 86

joint activity  30, 31, 37
joint output context  \rightarrow  context

language switch  \rightarrow  home-school language switch
low socio-cultural background  \rightarrow  background

majority language group  \rightarrow  dominant language group
minority language group  \rightarrow  socially inferior language
meaningful learning  13
motivation
motivation towards the school (and/or) home language
5, 8, 19-20, 50-51, 54, 59, 65, 74

output
meaningful & effective output  6, 19-20, 35, 48, 52
new language output  17, 18, 26-30, 33, 37, 43

pedagogical (linguistic) treatment  6, 8, 64-67, 74, 76, 79,
83, 106, 110
program
early total immersion program  107-110, 118
early partial immersion program  118
home language maintenance program  54, 101, 112
late immersion program  118

script  48,
silent period  35
socially inferior language  57, 95
switch  \rightarrow  home-school language switch

threshold level (of linguistic competence)  \rightarrow  threshold
level hypothesis
threshold level hypothesis  60, 61, 62, 64, 73, 79, 80, 85
use/acquisition of the new language  7, 18-20, 26-27, 31-36,
50-53,
zone of proximal development  78
# TABLE 4.1

Total number of students in immersion programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>84/85*</td>
<td>20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85/86*</td>
<td>40,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86/87*</td>
<td>50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87/88*</td>
<td>61,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88/89*</td>
<td>65,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


* Source: leaflet prepared by the Servei d’Ensenyament del Català and distributed at Expolanguages, Paris, February 1986, Publicacions del Departament d’Ensenyament, Generalitat de Catalunya, p.3.


* Jordi Martí: Diari de Barcelona, 19 October 1988.
### TABLE 4.2

Total number of students in Kindergartens and Basic General Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Private</th>
<th>Public</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1986-87*</td>
<td>440 240</td>
<td>534 285</td>
<td>974 525</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987-88*</td>
<td>415 563</td>
<td>530 358</td>
<td>945 921</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988-89*</td>
<td></td>
<td>514 219</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


* Data published by the newspaper AVUI, 22 June 1988, which gives the source as school registrations for 1988-89 in the possession of the Catalan Departament of Education.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Private</th>
<th>Public</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1986-87*</td>
<td>145 629</td>
<td>189 560</td>
<td>335 189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987-88*</td>
<td>135 264</td>
<td>180 880</td>
<td>316 144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988-89*</td>
<td></td>
<td>168 510</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


* Data published by the newspaper AVUI, 23 June 1988, which gives the source as school registrations for 1988-89 in the possession of the Catalan Department of Education.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Immersion students in Kindergartens and Initial Cycle of Basic General Education (public schools only)</th>
<th>% of the total number of students in the same grades (public schools only)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>86/87</td>
<td>50 000</td>
<td>26.37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87/88</td>
<td>61 000</td>
<td>33.72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88/89</td>
<td>65 000</td>
<td>38.57%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 4.5

Instruction in Catalan in Kindergarten and Basic Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>students</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>schools</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>private</td>
<td>public</td>
<td>total</td>
<td>private</td>
<td>public</td>
<td>total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86-87*</td>
<td>144,776</td>
<td>162,142</td>
<td>306,918</td>
<td>608</td>
<td>1,213</td>
<td>1,821</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>33.5%</td>
<td>31.7%</td>
<td>32.6%</td>
<td>48.06%</td>
<td>74.34%</td>
<td>62.11%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Source: Servei d’Ensenyament del català (forthcoming).
### TABLE 4.6

Evolution of the choice of the language of instruction made by parents in Santa Coloma de Gramanet when registering their children in Kindergarten classes^*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Catalan</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td>42.0%</td>
<td>54.2%</td>
<td>51.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>66.0%</td>
<td>34.7%</td>
<td>26.9%</td>
<td>28.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>indifferent</td>
<td>16.6%</td>
<td>23.2%</td>
<td>18.9%</td>
<td>20.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>83/84</th>
<th>84/85</th>
<th>85/86</th>
<th>86/87</th>
<th>87/88</th>
<th>88/89</th>
<th>Catalan lang. schools</th>
<th>Spanish lang. immersion schools</th>
<th>Total schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Badalona</td>
<td>2/3</td>
<td>5/11</td>
<td>12/20</td>
<td>18/50</td>
<td>23/98</td>
<td>28/141</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L'Hospitalet</td>
<td>-/-</td>
<td>-/-</td>
<td>-/-</td>
<td>11/52</td>
<td>13/79</td>
<td>19/104</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matarró</td>
<td>6/-</td>
<td>7/-</td>
<td>9/41</td>
<td>14/54</td>
<td>18/79</td>
<td>19/52</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Prat</td>
<td>0/0</td>
<td>0/0</td>
<td>1/1</td>
<td>8/14</td>
<td>11/32</td>
<td>11/50</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rubí</td>
<td>0/0</td>
<td>0/0</td>
<td>0/0</td>
<td>2/6</td>
<td>6/18</td>
<td>7/21</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Vicenç</td>
<td>-/-</td>
<td>5/7</td>
<td>6/14</td>
<td>6/22</td>
<td>7/31</td>
<td>7/43</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terrassa</td>
<td>2/8</td>
<td>12/29</td>
<td>16/57</td>
<td>25/56</td>
<td>26/137</td>
<td>27/163</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* These data were gathered with the assistance of the Team of Advisers of the Intensive Plan for Linguistic Normalization, Servei d'Ensenyament del Català. The author of the present book, however, is solely responsible for their reliability.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Geographical area</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Understand Catalan</th>
<th>Can speak Catalan</th>
<th>Can write Catalan</th>
<th>Not ascertained</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Catalunya</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total &gt; age 2</td>
<td>5856 435</td>
<td>5287 200</td>
<td>3747 013</td>
<td>1844 493</td>
<td>20 481</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>age 2-4</td>
<td>210 202</td>
<td>174 799</td>
<td>62 217</td>
<td>31 492</td>
<td>4 488</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Badalona</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total &gt; age 2</td>
<td>219 662</td>
<td>179 696</td>
<td>93 768</td>
<td>41 743</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>age 2-4</td>
<td>9 567</td>
<td>2 926</td>
<td>840</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hospital de Llobregat</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total &gt; age 2</td>
<td>274 508</td>
<td>225 776</td>
<td>115 654</td>
<td>51 615</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>age 2-4</td>
<td>9 612</td>
<td>3 454</td>
<td>1 138</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Matarí</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total &gt; age 2</td>
<td>97 540</td>
<td>85 631</td>
<td>56 686</td>
<td>30 720</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>age 2-4</td>
<td>4 090</td>
<td>2 282</td>
<td>1 240</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>El Prat de Llobregat</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total &gt; age 2</td>
<td>61 360</td>
<td>50 806</td>
<td>25 717</td>
<td>15 916</td>
<td>795</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>age 2-4</td>
<td>2 087</td>
<td>905</td>
<td>235</td>
<td></td>
<td>472</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rubí</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total &gt; age 2</td>
<td>45 153</td>
<td>37 631</td>
<td>20 348</td>
<td>9 044</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>age 2-4</td>
<td>2 160</td>
<td>906</td>
<td>190</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Santa Coloma de Gramenet</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total &gt; age 2</td>
<td>132 352</td>
<td>100 562</td>
<td>37 896</td>
<td>15 649</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>age 2-4</td>
<td>5 117</td>
<td>1 170</td>
<td>383</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Saint Vicenc dels Horts</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total &gt; age 2</td>
<td>19 872</td>
<td>16 299</td>
<td>8 462</td>
<td>4 652</td>
<td>176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>age 2-4</td>
<td>922</td>
<td>412</td>
<td>161</td>
<td></td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Terrassa</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total &gt; age 2</td>
<td>156 748</td>
<td>137 716</td>
<td>86 343</td>
<td>44 145</td>
<td>176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>age 2-4</td>
<td>5 939</td>
<td>3 486</td>
<td>1 303</td>
<td></td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[Author’s note] It is important to remember that the Language Census reveals only knowledge, not frequency of use.

*Source: Patrons Municipals de 1986; Cens Lingüístic. Consorci d’Informació i Documentació de Catalunya (CIDOC).*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>%</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>K</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[Author's note] "K" means Kindergarten. The remaining numbers refer to the grades in Canadian Compulsory schooling.

TABLE 4.10

Maximum percentages of Catalan language arts and instruction through Catalan permitted in immersion programs under the regulations presently in force.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Catalan</th>
<th>Spanish</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kindergarten and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initial Cycle</td>
<td>21 h. (84%)</td>
<td>4 h. (16%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Cycle</td>
<td>18 h. (72%)</td>
<td>7 h. (28%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Cycle</td>
<td>18 h. (72%)</td>
<td>7 h. (28%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Author's note) These percentages are obtained by subtracting from the total weekly hours of instruction. The minimum number of hours' instruction through Spanish and in Spanish language arts established by law: 4 hours per week of Language Arts in Kindergarten and Initial Cycle, 3 hours of Language Arts and 2 subjects taught through Spanish in Middle Cycle, and 4 hours of Language Arts and 1 subject taught through Spanish in Upper Cycle (see SEDEC 1988a: 2-3).
TABLE 4.11

Catalan language qualifications of teachers in Nursery school (2-3 years), Kindergarten (4-5 years), and Basic General Education (6-14 years)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Bachelor of Catalan Language teaching diploma</th>
<th>Certificate of Proficiency</th>
<th>No qualifications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2nd level complete</td>
<td>1st level complete</td>
<td>studying</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86-87*</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>7,422</td>
<td>5,259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.95%</td>
<td>31.3%</td>
<td>22.15%</td>
<td>6.87%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>