Bilingual Education
Southeast Asian Perspectives

Angel M. Y. Lin and Evelyn Y. F. Man

Foreword by Jim Cummins

HKU PRESS
香港大學出版社

Hong Kong University Press
The University of Hong Kong
Pokfulam Road
Hong Kong
www.hkupress.org

© Hong Kong University Press 2009

ISBN 978-962-209-958-6 (*Hardback*)
ISBN 978-962-209-959-3 (*Paperback*)

All rights reserved. No portion of this publication may be reproduced or transmitted, inany form or by any means, electronic or mechanical, including photocopy, recording, or any information storage or retrieval system, without prior permission in writing from the publisher.

British Library Cataloguing-in-Publication Data
A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library.

10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1

Printed and bound by Condor Production Co. Ltd. in Hong Kong, China

Hong Kong University Press is honoured that Xu Bing, whose art explores the complex themes of language across cultures, has written the Press's name in his Square Word Calligraphy. This signals our commitment to cross-cultural thinking and the distinctive nature of our English-language books published in China.

"At first glance, Square Word Calligraphy appears to be nothing more unusual than Chinese characters, but in fact it is a new way of rendering English words in the format of a square so they resemble Chinese characters. Chinese viewers expect to be able to read Square Word Calligraphy but cannot. Western viewers, however are surprised to find they can read it. Delight erupts when meaning is unexpectedly revealed."

— Britta Erickson, *The Art of Xu Bing*

Content

Foreword vii

Introduction xi

Chapter 1
Language Policy and Planning in Southeast Asian Contexts 1

Chapter 2
Bilingual Education in Different Contexts: Principles and Practice 11

Chapter 3
Key Issues in Immersion Education: Implications for Hong Kong 41

Chapter 4
History and Development of Bilingual Education in Hong Kong 73

Chapter 5
Research on Bilingual Education in Hong Kong 87

Chapter 6
Negotiating between Nationalist and Globalization Agendas: Lessons from the Divergent Paths of Singapore and Malaysia 105

Chapter 7
Contexts of Language Policy and Planning in Southeast Asian Societies: Need for Innovative Approaches 119

Bibliography 143

Index 159

Introduction

Questions regarding whether a first or a second/foreign language should be used as a medium of instruction (MOI) in schools (and if yes, for whom, and when) have been enthusiastically debated in recent years in Hong Kong. The public debates, however, have largely not been able to benefit from the existing international body of research in bilingual and immersion education or the educational experiences of other regions. The reason is that such knowledge is often either couched in specialized, technical language or scattered over diverse journals and books, which are often off-putting to teachers, parents, school principals, policymakers and the general public. There is an urgent need to critically integrate and review the international research literature with a view to informing public debates and policymaking regarding the medium of instruction in Hong Kong schools. In January 1999, we obtained a research grant from the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region Government's Standing Committee on Language Education and Research (SCOLAR) to embark on such a study. The objectives of the study were:

- To identify and critically examine the theories, concepts, and various options and models relevant to an understanding of using L1/L2 as a medium of instruction in schools;
- To identify and critically examine practical studies and empirical research on the use of L1/L2 as a medium of instruction, and various options in using different languages as instructional media at different stages of education which may be relevant and applicable to the Hong Kong context;
- To identify and critically examine the best current practices in the world on using students' L1/L2 as a medium of instruction, giving special consideration to the experiences of countries or areas reverting from using a second language to using the mother tongue as an instructional medium; and
- To identify the conditions under which successful practices elsewhere might be applicable in the local context to assist language planners, policymakers and school

> practitioners to make informed decisions about the language(s) of instruction in schools to raise language standards in Hong Kong.

The critical literature report we wrote in response to the task set for us by SCOLAR has become only the starting point of the present book. Over the years, we have witnessed significant changes in both the policies of the Hong Kong government and those of other Southeast Asian societies. The present book has come a long way from our starting point, and now includes coverage of the recent developments of bilingual education policies in Hong Kong, Singapore and Malaysia.

The book can be divided into three main parts. Part I consists of three chapters that give an overview of the basic principles and prototypical models of bilingual education originating in North America and Europe. It provides the reader with a general background for understanding key issues in immersion education, a category within bilingual education, and their implications for other Southeast Asian societies. Part II consists of two chapters. Chapter 4 focuses on discussing the bilingual education policy changes that happened after Hong Kong was returned to China by Britain. Chapter 5 summarizes significant research studies on Hong Kong's bilingual education policy and practice, to provide a picture of what we already know and what we still do not know about the bilingual education situation in Hong Kong. Part III consists of two chapters. Chapter 6 compares the divergent paths in language education policy taken up by Singapore and Malaysia since independence. While Singapore has taken a consistently pragmatic path from day one, Malaysia's nationalist MOI policy since independence and its recent policy to bring back English as MOI for science and math subjects in the schools reflects a difficult, tension-filled negotiation between nationalist and globalization imperatives. Chapter 7 outlines different theoretical frameworks and models for language-in-education (LIE) planning and proposes and discusses the pros and cons of a range of policy options based on these frameworks.

In concluding this introduction, we want to thank Professor Jim Cummins for his encouragement and support for our work all through these years. We hope that this book will serve as a bridge between international research and local research on bilingual education and inform the debates in policy making regarding MOI issues in Hong Kong as well as other Southeast Asian societies. As we are putting the finishing touches on this manuscript, the Hong Kong government has just announced that the labels of EMI and CMI schools in Hong Kong will be eliminated and secondary schools will be given more flexibility in choosing their MOI. This is a welcoming direction and we hope that this research manuscript will offer parents, teachers, principals, students and policy makers the much needed research-based information in their LPP discussions and deliberations.

Angel Lin and Evelyn Man
Hong Kong, January 2009

1 Language Policy and Planning in Southeast Asian Contexts

In this chapter, debates revolving around the global spread of English, linguistic imperialism, World Englishes and the theories of postcolonial performativity are introduced. Is English a cultural imperialistic tool of the West, or is English being increasingly hybridized and used for their own daily purposes by many Southeast Asian people? How is language policy and planning (LPP) related to the creation of social and educational (in)equalities? The chapter discusses these issues and concludes with the proposal that Southeast Asian postcolonial societies need to develop their own LPP frameworks.

The Global Spread of English

English has become an everyday presence in many cosmopolitan cities in Southeast Asia. For instance, in international airports in Seoul, Singapore, Hong Kong and Kuala Lumpur, bilingual or multilingual signs are everywhere, and among them are always English signs. The global spread of English has arisen from a host of historical, political and socio-economic factors. In many Southeast Asian contexts such as Singapore, Hong Kong and Malaysia, where English was historically a colonial language imposed by former British colonial governments, English has carried with it the baggage of colonial histories and exploitations. However, today English has also become a predominant medium of global trade, finance and commerce, science, technology and the Internet. It serves as a chief medium of communication for different peoples coming from both within and beyond Asia. It is a common scene in Southeast Asian cities that people of diverse ethnic backgrounds are communicating in some variety of English. So, has English shaken off (or merely masked?) its colonial history and become a widely used “lingua franca” (or common language)

for intercultural communication among peoples from Southeast Asia and beyond? In the following sections we review different arguments and perspectives on this question.

Linguistic Imperialism

The theory of linguistic imperialism has been put forward to describe and explain, among other phenomena, the global spread and domination of English (Phillipson, 1992, 1994, 1997, 1998). Imperialism is typically chacterized by exploitation, penetration, fragmentation, and marginalization of native peoples, their labours, cultures and resources. Imperialism has taken many forms, including economic, political, military, cultural and social penetrations and exploitations. Linguistic imperialism, which is a form of cultural imperialism, "permeates all other types of imperialism, since language is the means used to mediate and express them" (Phillipson, 1992, p. 65). English linguistic imperialism is one example of *linguicism*, a notion defined by Phillipson (1992, p. 47) as:

> ideologies, structures, and practices which are used to legitimate, effectuate, and reproduce an unequal division of power and resources (both material and immaterial) between groups which are defined on the basis of language.

Phillipson (1992) argues that in the postcolonial era — in the last phase of English linguistic imperialism — the ex-colonizers need not be physically present in the "Periphery" countries, for there exists an indigenous English-educated elite who identify with the ex-colonizers' Anglocentric interests and values, typically through having studied in a "Centre" country, and it is in their own interests to perpetuate the domination of English in their home countries at the expense of the natural use and development of the indigenous language(s). The Centre countries, especially the UK and the US, exercise influence through hegemonic language ideologies (or ideas about language) by dictating the norms of "standard" English to learners and speakers of English in Periphery countries.

Why do people in former colonies seem to willingly accept the continued domination of English in their societies? To explain this, Phillipson (1992) draws on the Gramscian notion of "hegemony", which prevails in the third and last stage of imperialism called "neo-neo-colonialism":

> The sophistication of the arguments grows on a scale advancing from the use of force to the use of carrots to the use of ideas. At one stage, the colonial power could use coercion when selling one of its products, English. When the counterpart became slightly more equal, and brute force could no longer be applied or was no longer an ethically acceptable alternative, carrots were more suitable. But the ideal way to make people do what you want is of course to make them want it themselves, and to make them believe that it is good for them. This simplifies the role of the 'seller', who then can appear as 'helping' or 'giving aid', rather than 'forcing' or 'bargaining with' the victim. (p. 286)

The notion of "hegemony" attempts to explain why some ex-colonial peoples seem to embrace their former colonizers' cultures and languages as superior to their native

cultures and languages. English, for instance, can be seen to be standing in a hegemonic relationship to many former British-colonized peoples when they have internalized (e.g., through education and socialization) the belief that English is intrinsically a better language for science and technology, for arts and cultures, is superior to their own native language, or is the marker of civilized, modern citizenship. We shall return to a discussion of different perspectives on this issue in the section on multlilingual and multicultural identities in Southeast Asia. Now, let us look at another related set of questions revolving around which variety of English should serve as a standard for learners in non-Anglo countries, for instance, in the former colonies of Britain in Southeast Asia.

World Englishes

In many Southeast Asian cities such as Singapore and Hong Kong, it is common to find people conversing in different varieties of English. Which variety (or varieties) should be put forward by language planners and educators as the pedagogical model(s) to teach and learn in schools? In many ex-British colonies, British English norms have been used as the target norms. American English has also become important because of its increasing trade and political presence in Southeast Asia in the post-war era.

Researchers of World Englishes (Kachru, 1985, 1992, 1997) have differentiated among different kinds of English, chiefly based on geographic locations and national boundaries. Those English varieties spoken in Anglo countries (e.g., the UK, the US, Australia, Canada) are called "core" or "inner circle" varieties, while those spoken as second languages (ESL) (e.g., India) are called "outer circle" varieties. Those spoken in places as foreign languages (EFL) are called "expanding circle" varieties. An image of three concentric circles (inner circle, outer circle, expanding circle) is used to build a model of a hierarchy of Englishes, each having different status and authority. The inner circle varieties are *norm-giving*; the outer circle *norm-developing*; and the expanding circle varieties *norm-dependent*. This means that many learners in Southeast Asian societies will find themselves trying to learn the target varieties in the inner circle (e.g., British English or American English).

The World English (WE) paradigm (or theoretical framework) has changed our concept of "English" from a monolithic notion to a pluralistic notion of "Englishes". That is, there is not one single legitimate English in the world; there are many legitimate Englishes. It has also highlighted the notion of ownership of English by people in ex-colonies of Anglo-speaking countries. That means English no longer belongs only to the former colonial masters. Different Englishes are now being developed and *appropriated* (i.e., taken as their own) in their own right by peoples who use them as their first or second languages and very often as a marker of their own identities (e.g., in Singapore and India).

While the WE paradigm has been seen as progressive in liberalizing the ownership of English and in pluralizing English, some researchers have observed that it misleadingly presupposes that all people in a nation necessarily speak the same national variety of

English. It has also failed to question the native speaker/non-native speaker (NS/NNS) dichotomy in any profound fashion (Graddol, 1997; Pennycook, 2003). It continues to privilege native speakers in the inner circle (as norm-giving) over non-native speakers, and then ESL speakers in the outer circle (as norm-developing) over EFL speakers in the expanding circles (as norm-dependent). We shall return to a discussion of this issue later when we discuss developing frameworks for language policy and planning that are appropriate in Southeast Asian contexts. In the next section, let us return to the questions we raised at the beginning of the section on linguistic imperialism.

Emergence of Hybridized Multilingual and Multicultural Identities in Southeast Asia

Is English an imposed language, a vehicle of linguistic and cultural imperialism, and a killer language that threatens the continued existence (e.g., learning and use) of other natural languages and cultures in ex-colonies (e.g., Phillipson, 1997)? Or is it merely a medium for international communication that exists side by side with other local languages which different peoples keep for expressing their local identities (e.g., Crystal, 1997)? It seems that both positions seem to be a simplification of what usually is a much more complex situation. Instead of trying to argue for one or the other position in the abstract, perhaps we should go beyond such a totalizing, dichotomous way of thinking and actually look at each specific sociocultural context in all its concrete complexities.
For instance, in a study (Lai, 2003) of young people's cultural identification patterns and language attitudes, it was found that young people who identify themselves as Hong Kongers are also affectively inclined towards *both* Cantonese and English. To them, Cantonese and English are not mutually exclusive and they find it natural (or almost impossible; see Li & Tse, 2002) to mix English words into their everyday Cantonese. Also, given the special socio-political, historical context of Hong Kong, it seems that many Hong Kong people did not entirely accept British colonial rule in the pre-1997 era and yet are equally ambivalent about Socialist Chinese domination in the post-1997 era. Such mixed, ambivalent feelings in national and sociocultural identification seem to correlate with the freely intertwining of Cantonese and English words in the everyday public life of Hong Kong people, and these "non-pure" linguistic practices seem to be playing an important role in marking out the Hong Kong identity — they seem to serve as distinctive linguistic and cultural markers of "Hong Kong-ness" and seem to constitute some defiant acts of identity. It is almost like saying: *We're Hong Kong-ese and I don't care whether I'm speaking "pure Chinese/English" or not!*

In this sense, then, if "Singlish" is a linguistic marker of the distinctive local Singaporean identity (Chua, 2003), then the so-called "mixed code" of Hong Kong is its counterpart in Hong Kong. Like Singlish, the so-called "Hong Kong mixed code" is not a monolithic, stable entity. In practice, it consists of a whole continuum of different styles of speaking and writing, from the use of here and there a few English lexical items in otherwise Cantonese utterances/sentences to the intertwining of extended English and Cantonese utterances/sentences (Lin, 2000). From the perspectives of performativity

theory on languages and communication resources (Pennycook, 2004), it is a better idea not to view languages as separate stable systems with solid boundaries. As Pennycook (2004) argues, the idea of languages as discrete, stable, monolithic entities with solid boundaries is actually the product of colonial knowledge production. In practice, people draw on a whole range of linguistic resources which cannot be easily pigeonholed as "separate languages" in their everyday linguistic practices. Parallel to these hybridized linguistic practices are their similarly hybridized sociocultural identities. At least among many Hong Kong people as we witness it today, there do not seem to be any clear-cut "pure" sociocultural identities: Hong Kong people's identity seems to be always a "hyphenated" one, indicating its "in-between-ness" (Abbas, 1997). We would want to argue that, as a result of the rise of international cosmopolitan cities in Southeast Asia and the rise of a whole new generation of bilingual speakers in these cosmopolitan cities, we shall witness the rise of cosmopolitan varieties of Asian Englishes (Lin & Shim, 2004) which will not fit comfortably into the hierarchical WE paradigm of core, inner, outer or expanding circles. We predict that these cosmopolitan speakers of Asian Englishes will increasingly seek to assert the legitimacy and status of their speaking styles on an equal footing with Anglo-American English speaking styles, ultimately bringing about a paradigm shift in institutionalizing what target models to teach, learn and test in schools in these societies (Luk & Lin, 2005), although as things stand now we are still a long way from reaching these goals.

Recent research has actually found that, in East Asian cosmopolitan cities, there are increasing transnational popular cultural flows and linguistic hybridization taking place. For instance, Rip Slyme, a popular rap group in Japan, has used English in their lyrics to fashion a kind of "double" identity (Pennycook, 2003):

> … Rip Slyme locate their Japaneseness explicitly, yet at the same time they use the English word for Japanese, seeming in the same instant to refashion their identity from the outside. This Japanese identity is then both 'freaky' and 'double', the latter a recently coined term to describe people of mixed origin. (p. 527)

Admitting research in this direction is still scarce, Pennycook (2003) concludes his article by hinting at the development of bilingual and bicultural identities through transnational popular cultural practices mediated by both English and local languages:

> How does the use of English work as it locates its users both as part of the global imagined community of English users and as participants in the global music industry, creating links through the 'international language' and yet relocating through its juxtaposition with Japanese? How do these new global raplishes work as tools for the performance of identities? (p. 529)

What the theory of linguistic imperialism fails to show is perhaps how English can be actively taken up, how people can actually *appropriate* (i.e., claim ownership of) English and why people strategically choose to use English (Lin, Wang, Akamatsu & Riazi, 2002). Pennycook (2003) observes that the linguistic imperialism theory cannot account for a sense of agency, resistance, or appropriation on the part of ex-colonized peoples. It

tends to construct ex-colonized peoples as passive victims (Li, 2002). Somehow between the dichotomous positions of uncritically celebrating the global spread of English as an innocuous tool for communication, science and technology (Crystal, 1997), and constructing English as a monolithic universal killer language colonizing relentlessly the linguistic and cultural habitats of ex-colonial societies, we have to steer a level-headed, middle way by taking a socioculturally situated perspective; i.e., we need to look at each sociocultural context in all its complexities before jumping to a conclusion. Going beyond the debate between the "imperialism-resistance" theories (e.g., Phillipson, 1992) and the "postcolonial performativity" theories (e.g., Pennycook, 2003, 2004), we have to find a way of understanding and exposing new forms of inequalities in education and society and new productions of *subaltern subjectivities* (i.e., marginalized identities and an underclass sense of self; see Ashcroft, Griffiths & Tiffin, 1998) under forces of globalization. While doing critical education analysis we must also be wary of falling into the trap of doing merely essentialist identity politics (e.g., arguing that one's L1 must be more important than one's L2). Rather, we must struggle to study the new material and institutional conditions that might lead to social and educational inequalities, and to explore practical alternatives in LPP policy and practice.

The New Cosmopolitan Bilingual Elites and the Newly Ghetto-ized Locals under Globalization-driven Bilingual Education Policies

As much as we would want to celebrate the new opportunities that globalization has seemed to offer us in reworking and refashioning our identities as new transnational, global Cosmopolitans, unbound by old forms of essentialist nationalism and culturalism and binary frameworks of identity politics, we also see the anxieties created by globalization forces. Zygmunt Bauman (1998) points out this economic underside of globalization in his book, *Globalization: The Human Consequences*:

> In the words of John Kavanagh of the Washington Institute of Policy Research:
> Globalization has given more opportunities for the extremely wealthy to make money more quickly. These individuals have utilized the latest technology to move large sums of money around the globe extremely quickly and speculate ever more efficiently. Unfortunately, the technology makes no impact on the lives of the world poor. In fact, globalization is a paradox: while it is very beneficial to a very few, it leaves out or marginalizes two-thirds of the world's population.
>
> As the folklore of the new generation of 'enlightened classes', gestated in the new, brave and monetarist world of nomadic capital, would have it, opening up sluices and dynamiting all state-maintained dams will make the world a free place for everybody. According to such folkloristic beliefs, freedom (of trade and capital mobility, first and foremost) is the hothouse in which wealth would grow faster than ever before; and once the wealth is multiplied, there will be more of it for everybody. The poor of the world — whether old or new, hereditary or computer-made — would hardly recognize their plight in this folkloristic fiction. … New

> fortunes are born, sprout and flourish in the virtual reality, tightly isolated from the old-fashioned rough-and-ready realities of the poor. The creation of wealth is on the way to finally emancipating itself from its perennial — constraining and vexing — connections with making things, processing materials, creating jobs and managing people. The old rich needed the poor to make and keep them rich. That dependency at all times mitigated the conflict of interest and prompted some effort, however tenuous, to care. The new rich do not need the poor any more. (Bauman, 1998, pp. 71–2).

Thus, increasingly under the forces of economic globalization, entire factories and jobs can disappear overnight from one locality as fast, nomadic global capital holds no allegiance to communities in any locality and roams from one locality to another across the Globe searching for ever-cheaper land and labour (Bauman, 1998). Also, while the Cosmopolitan multilingual elite well-versed in global English and new knowledge technologies (often mediated through global English) can find jobs anywhere across the Globe (i.e., gaining transnational mobility), those monolingual locals who never catch on to the new skills and new global languages (often due to lack of class-based capital and habitus; see discussion below) are ever more locked up in non-mobility both geographically and socio-economically.

In his plenary paper given at the Crossroads Conference of the International Association of Cultural Studies on 25 June 2004, Larry Grossberg urged cultural studies scholars and critical theorists to go beyond the mere analysis of expressive culture (e.g., popular culture and media), but to also pay attention to the policies of the state and the global flows of capital. He urged critical theorists, educators and cultural researchers to do what he called 'conjunctual analysis' — to analyze the historical conjunctures formed by both cultural and material, economic and political forces. We also see a parallel in critical education analysis in postcolonial studies of LPP contexts. For instance, Rani Rubdy, in her paper on Singapore's bilingual education policy (Rubdy, 2005), gives us a sharp analysis of how the state's English-dominant LPP framework has been driven by both agendas of economic globalization and political management of different ethnic groups. This has resulted in the wiping out of Chinese dialects (including Hokkien, which used to be the mother tongue of the majority of Chinese in Singapore), creating cross-generational linguistic and cultural discontinuities (e.g., English-speaking grandchildren cannot communicate with Hokkien-speaking grandparents), and indirectly fostering the development of "Singlish", an officially denigrated but popularly spoken hybridized Hokkien-sounding variety of English (Rubdy, 2005). Singlish, as a hybridized linguistic variety, is certainly not a language and trademark of the high-flying Cosmopolitan Singaporean identity but instead a marker of local Singaporean identity and a medium for parodying official discourses (Chua, 2003). While the Cosmopolitan, global Singaporean can sometimes switch to Singlish for a joke or for showing "authentic" Singaporeanness, what socially stratifies the Cosmopolitan multilingual high-flyer from the monolingual Singlish/Hokkien-speaking ghetto-ized local is their differential access to and differential degrees of mastery of global or "standard" English. In the words of Singaporean sociologist and cultural theorist Chua Beng-huat:

> The consequence, after 20 years [of the state's language policies], is that Hokkien, along with all other Chinese languages, has become a language spoken by those who have never received a formal education and/or those who did not make the grade in the highly competitive bilingual education system. It is thus reduced to a language of the lowest-educated section of the working class and the illiterate. The linguistic hierarchy, in order of economic and political advantages, is thus English, Mandarin and Hokkien, as depicted in the film, '*Money*' (Chua, 2003, p. 169).
>
> … Ah Beng and his female counterpart, Ah Lian [in a popular TV sitcom] are two caricatures of the Singlish-speaking Singaporeans who are 'adoringly' laughable to the middle-class English-educated writers and audience, for whom switching code from standard English to Singlish is a marker of 'authentic' Singaporean identity.
>
> … Not surprisingly the show's [here Chua is referring to another popular TV sitcom] popularity is based on the 'silliness' of the Phua and his 'Lian' wife, even as they triumph repeatedly over their commonsense-deficient, university-educated architect brother and his Westernised pretentious wife. (Chua, 2003, p. 162)

We must point out that our concern here lies not so much in a nostalgic mourning of the loss of linguistic diversity (though this is a legitimate concern to many) as in the production of socio-economic disadvantage and new subaltern identities: consequences of Singapore's Cosmopolitan-oriented ruling elite's emptying out of the "local" (e.g., local languages) in their thorough-going pursuit of the "global" (e.g., standard English, Standard Mandarin Chinese) under their linguistic engineering policies driven by globalization desires. The emergence of Singlish as a surrogate for the "linguistic local", and in some sense as a reincarnation of Hokkien, is certainly not anticipated by the state's linguistic engineers and might represent the poor's linguistic resistant "weapon", a local linguistic spectre that lingers on to continue to embarrass and haunt the authorities (see Rubdy, 2005). However, as acquisition of standard English correlates with family-based capital and "habitus" (see Lin, 1999, 2005), we can expect new forms of socio-economic stratification along the lines of social class mediated by the (un)availability of family capital predisposing the use and acquisition of global, standard forms of English versus local hybridized forms of English such as Singlish in Singapore or "mixed codes" in Hong Kong (see Lin, 2000). Here, we find Bourdieu's critical analytic tools very useful, as delineated by British sociologist Nick Crossley (2003, p. 43):

> Class-based cultural advantages are passed from parents to children through the habitus, but as pre-reflective and habitual acquisitions they are generally misrecognized within the school system as 'natural talents' and are rewarded 'appropriately'. The school thus launders cultural advantages, albeit unwittingly, transforming them into the hard and clean currency of qualifications.

We see parallel social and linguistic processes taking shape in Iran (Lin, Wang, Akamatsu, & Riazi, 2005) when parents who can afford it send their children to private schools to acquire globally marketable communicative competences in English that the public schools cannot offer, and in Turkey when private institutions that teach in the English

medium multiply and compete with state universities which struggle to offer a balance of local languages and English. The economic drive (both from the local communities and the postcolonial governments) towards the emptying out of the "linguistic local" and the one-sided pursuit of the "linguistic global" must be problematized in our study of the consequences of globalization. While taking care not to embrace linguistic and cultural essentialism as a simple, reductionist reaction to these globalizing forces, we have to both critically examine these processes in their consequences (e.g., new forms of social stratification and new productions of subaltern subjectivities; see Lin, 2005), and explore new alternatives in policy, pedagogy and curriculum drawing on theoretical frameworks that go beyond traditional discrete models of languages, cultures and literacies (Canagarajah, 2005).

Thus, in the final chapter of this book, we shall look at the political roles played by state LPP in shaping the linguistic, educational and cultural habitats of society. We shall outline major approaches to LPP and propose that we need to develop our own approaches which are appropriate for use in postcolonial Southeast Asian contexts and that languages should not be seen and planned as discrete, separate entities but rather as continua (Hornberger, 2003; Canagarajah, 2005).

Questions for Discussion

1. Pennycook (2003) uses Rip Slyme as an example of transnational popular cultural flows and linguistic hybridization. Find more such examples from your own sociocultural contexts and analyze them.
2. As an English user (if your mother tongue is not English), do you demonstrate different sociocultural identities, either implicitly or explicitly, in different contexts? Conduct a self-analysis by reflecting on your own everyday linguistic practices.
3. Reflect on your own English teaching or learning experiences to discuss whether globalization-driven bilingual education policies in your area/country really lead to social stratification and subaltern subjectivities. If they do, what is (are) the new alternative(s) in language, pedagogy and curriculum that can improve the present situation?

Index

A
additive bilingualism 17, 31, 38, 43, 44, 45, 48, 69, 132
Anglocentric 2
audio-visual 24, 58

B
Baker, C. 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 22, 23, 30, 44
Beardsmore, H. 16, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28
BM (Bahasa Malaysia) 111,112, 113, 116, 122, 128
bridging, bridge 35, 41, 48, 52, 53, 54, 56, 57, 62, 63, 65, 70, 71, 75, 87, 93, 99, 100, 101, 102, 130, 132, 133, 135, 138, 139

C
Canadian French Immersion 15, 16, 17, 21, 22, 29, 35, 37, 39
Canagarajah, S. 9, 140
Cantonese 4, 15, 25, 30, 36, 37, 45, 62, 64, 66, 74, 76, 78, 82, 83, 88, 89, 90, 91, 95, 96, 101, 108, 112, 123, 126, 128
Centre countries 2
CMI (Chinese-medium instruction) 77, 78, 79, 80, 81, 83, 84, 93, 94, 95, 96, 97, 98, 99, 100, 102, 135
code-mixing 76, 84, 85, 101
code-switching 88, 89, 90, 101, 132, 133
communicative repertoire 109, 124, 125, 126, 140
content-based 136, 137, 139, 140, 141
context-embedded 26, 29
context-reduced 24, 28, 29, 53
core French 13, 16, 20, 66, 67
Cummins, J. 15, 16, 21, 22, 25, 29, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 42, 43, 44, 46, 48, 64, 67, 69, 70, 123

D
decision maker/making 79, 124, 135, 139
dropout 41, 42

E
EAP (English for academic purposes) 61, 62, 63, 102, 137, 138
EDB (Education Bureau) 78, 81
EMI (English-medium instruction) 24,

33, 42, 49, 50, 51, 53, 74, 76, 77, 78, 79, 80, 81, 82, 83, 87, 92, 93, 94, 95, 96, 97, 98, 99, 100, 102, 111, 135
English as a foreign language, EFL 3, 4, 67, 139
English as a second language, ESL 3, 4, 52, 53, 57, 61, 67
ETeMS (English for the teaching of math and science) 114
European Schools 13, 15, 17, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 35, 39

F
French Immersion Programmes/Model 15, 16, 17, 19, 20, 42, 48
FSL (French as a second language) 16, 57, 58, 61

G
globalize, globalization 6, 7, 8, 9, 75, 105, 111, 112, 113, 116, 117, 120, 121, 123, 130

H
Hegemony 2, 115
Heritage 13, 14, 105, 106, 107, 108, 109, 110, 116, 117, 120, 123, 128, 132, 133
high-flyer/flying 7
Hokkien 7, 8, 105, 106, 108, 109, 123, 128
HSA (historical-structural approach) 119, 140
hybrid / hybridized 1, 4, 5, 7, 8, 9, 121

I
ICT (information/communication technology) 120, 121
Identity 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 12, 25, 34, 107, 109, 110, 111, 115, 117, 128, 133
Immersion 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 41, 42, 43, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 55, 56, 57, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, 71, 83, 88, 94, 95, 96, 98, 99, 100, 101, 102, 103, 124, 125, 127, 128, 129, 130, 131, 132, 133, 134, 135, 136, 137, 138, 140, 141
inter-class 120
inter-ethnic 12, 120
intergenerational 110
interlingual 115
inter-religious 120

J
Johnson, K. 15, 16, 22, 31, 36, 46, 63, 64, 65, 67, 69, 70, 88, 89, 90, 91, 92, 93, 102, 132

K
Kachru, B. 3

L
labelling, labelling effect 77, 79, 80, 84, 96, 98, 128, 135, 136, 140, 141
LAC (language across the curriculum) 52, 54, 87, 94
LPP, language policy and planning 1, 4, 6, 7, 9, 119, 120, 121, 122, 123, 124, 126, 135, 136, 138, 139, 140, 141
LIE (language-in-education) 73, 75, 76, 77, 83, 105, 106, 107, 110, 112, 117, 119, 121
Lin, A. 4, 5, 8, 9, 37, 63, 64, 69, 70, 74, 76, 90, 101, 121, 135, 138, 139
lingua franca 1, 106, 110, 132
linguicism 2
linguistic imperialism 1, 2, 4, 5
Llewellyn Report 88

M
Malay 61, 105, 106, 107, 109, 111, 112, 113, 117, 122, 128, 133
Mandarin 8, 105, 106, 107, 108, 109, 117
MIGA (medium of instruction grouping

assessment) policy 76, 90, 95
mixed code 4, 8
mixed mode 17, 38, 41, 65, 67, 101
Modern Standard Chinese 15, 36, 37, 38, 45, 47, 66, 68, 73, 74, 76, 83, 84, 95, 102, 112, 122, 123, 126, 128
MOI (medium of instruction) 11, 15, 16, 18, 23, 25, 27, 28, 29, 30, 35, 38, 47, 51, 62, 67, 73, 74, 75, 76, 77, 78, 79, 80, 81, 82, 83, 84, 87, 88, 89, 93, 94, 95, 96, 97, 99, 102, 106, 107, 108, 110, 111, 112, 113, 114, 115, 116, 122, 123, 124, 125, 128, 130, 133, 135, 136, 137, 139, 140
Molteno Project 48, 51, 53, 54, 55, 56, 68, 69, 70, 71, 133
mother tongue education 77, 79, 83, 84, 87, 88, 92, 98, 100, 107, 124, 125, 128, 129, 130, 133, 136, 137
mother-tongue education policy 57, 62, 73, 79, 83, 111, 112, 123,
multicultural 3, 4, 29, 31, 107, 115
multi-ethnic 12, 29, 31, 110, 132
multilingual 1, 4, 7, 12, 15, 24, 25, 27, 51, 107, 110, 115, 117, 123
multinational 12
multiracial/ism 107
multi-tribal 12

N

NNS (non-native speaker) 4
NS (native speaker) 4, 22, 49, 57, 58, 59, 116, 135

P

partial immersion 17, 18, 20, 38, 41, 48, 56, 57, 65, 66, 67, 68, 94, 95, 100, 101, 102, 124, 125, 127, 129, 130, 131, 133, 134, 136
Pennycook, A. 4, 5, 6, 9
Periphery countries 2
Phillipson, R. 2, 4, 6
policymaker, policymaking 12, 42, 46, 48, 119, 128, 139
postcolonial 1, 2, 7, 9, 49, 61, 73, 75, 76, 77, 83, 84, 111, 117, 120, 121, 122, 123, 128, 130, 132
postcolonial performativity 1, 6
PSLE (primary school leaving exam) 108
Putonghua 15, 25, 36, 47, 73, 82, 83, 84, 95, 102, 123, 126, 128

S

SAP (special assistance plan) schools 67, 108
SAR (as in Hong Kong SAR) 75, 76, 80, 81, 83, 123
Sarasas Ektra Bilingual School 138, 140
SES (socio-economic status) 36, 38, 47, 132
sociocultural 4, 5, 6, 9, 12, 30, 45, 63, 64, 69, 71, 90, 103, 110, 123, 126
socio-economic 7, 8, 15, 16, 33, 35, 36, 37, 38, 47, 48, 49, 56, 69, 73, 75, 78, 79, 90, 92, 94, 100, 101, 112, 119, 121, 130, 132, 133
sociohistorical 11
socio-political 4, 46, 73, 83, 110, 119
St. Lambert 16, 18, 19
storytelling 38, 70
submersion 43
subtractive bilingualism 31, 36, 132
Swain, M. 15, 16, 20, 21, 22, 23, 63, 64, 65, 66, 69, 89, 90

T

Tamil 105, 106, 107, 111, 116, 117, 122
threshold 39, 42, 43, 44, 46, 47, 62, 63, 76, 93, 96, 100
TOC (target-oriented curriculum) 93
total immersion 17, 18, 19, 23, 30, 36, 38, 65, 66, 67, 124, 125, 127, 129, 130, 131, 132, 133, 134, 136, 137
Trainee-Practitioners (TP) 114

transnational 5, 6, 7, 9, 121
Two Way/Dual Language 15, 30, 38, 39
Two Way/Dual Language Immersion/ Model 13, 15, 17, 29, 30, 35

U

upgrade/upgrading 36, 70, 116

W

WE (World Englishes) 1, 3, 5