ANDROULA YIAKOUMETTI AND EDITH ESCH

Educational Complexities inherent in Bidialectal Communities and the Potential Contribution of the Common European Framework of Reference to Second-dialect Development

This chapter explores the sociolinguistic phenomenon of bidialectism which has been used as an umbrella term to describe a variety of situations. Some sociolinguistic issues – such as the relation between standard and non-standard varieties, dialect continuum, and speakers' attitudes towards linguistic varieties – are briefly outlined to demonstrate that bidialectism is not homogeneous but rather is a multifaceted phenomenon. The main aim of the chapter is to unveil some educational complexities and pedagogical implications associated with bidialectal communities. This exposition serves to highlight the benefits that may be derived from allowing research on bidialectism and work that guides the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (CEFR) to inform one another.

1. Introduction

The topic of linguistic variation and, in particular, dialectal variation has been of interest to scholars and lay people alike throughout history. In Ancient Greece, for example, this interest is evident from Plato's descriptions of the different Greek peoples: Athenians appear to have been verbose, Spartans laconic and Cretans pithy (Hymes, 1973, as cited in Rickford, 2002). Such interest in linguistic variation is no doubt derived from the fact that language plays a central role in one's identity.

The phenomenon of bidialectism has been under the research spotlight in recent times as sociolinguists strive to differentiate between standard and non-standard dialects in hot spots across the globe. A number of studies have been carried out in the USA (Rickford & Rickford, 1995; Harris-Wright, 1999; Wolfram, Adger & Christian, 1999), Australia (Malcolm, 1999, Eades & Siegel, 1999) and Europe (Ammon, 1989; Stijnen & Vallen, 1989; Yiakoumetti, Evans & Esch, 2005). In the USA, the largest body of non-standard dialect research has been on the use of African American Vernacular English. In Australia, sociolinguistic research has concentrated on ethnic varieties and has led to the official recognition, at the federal level, of the validity of English varieties spoken by minority indigenous groups. In Europe, a number of countries, such as the Netherlands, Sweden, and Cyprus, have been mainly exploring regional bidialectism. The phenomenon of bidialectism has been approached from different angles: description of differences between standard and non-standard varieties, identification of attitudes towards dialects, proposals for bidialectal language programmes and suggestions for teacher-training programmes.

This chapter aims to unveil a number of educational issues associated with bidialectism. Like bilingualism, bidialectism as a construct has been used as an umbrella term to describe a variety of situations. Researchers should clearly address obvious sociolinguistic issues of variation (such as number of dialects within a linguistic community, attitudes of speakers towards the co-existing linguistic varieties, and the relationship between standard varieties and non-standard varieties) when exploring bidialectal educational systems. Such sociolinguistic issues are briefly outlined in the following section. However, the focus of the chapter falls upon educational issues that ought to be considered in bidialectal communities. The main aim is to elucidate some of the educational complexities that exist in these communities.

A secondary aim is to bridge the gap that exists between research in bidialectism and work that has informed the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (CEFR). There is substantial merit in considering how the CEFR could potentially shape bidialectal programmes around Europe. While the CEFR in its current form is primarily concerned with second-language (L2) learning, with appropriate modification, it

could embrace bidialectal learners. Bidialectal learners often have a dialectal mother tongue which is different from the standard variety that the educational system treats as their mother tongue. Because of the close relatedness between the two varieties, the "school mother tongue" cannot be legitimately treated as a foreign language. However, bidialectal learners do need to be taught new language elements if they are to master their second dialect. Drawing upon work on the European Language Portfolio (ELP) (Little, 2002) and the concept of language learner autonomy (Little, 2007; Esch, 2008), some of the criteria that could be used in researching and/or implementing bidialectal education are examined. We argue that it would be beneficial to incorporate the general principles that guide the CEFR into mother-tongue (L1) education for bidialectal learners. Such an incorporation would expand the scope of research on the CEFR to include L1 second-dialect learning. It is only recently that Little (2006) pointed out that, although the CEFR acknowledges that a person's experience of language expands from the language of the home to that of the society and thence to the languages of other peoples, the CEFR and ELP have so far been solely concerned with second/foreign language learning.

The focus of the current examination is a key educational principle that is applicable to any bidialectal society: the need to pay attention to learners' L1 dialectal varieties and to the sociolinguistic roles of these varieties within a community. Language education should give bidialectal learners access to the multiple linguistic systems of the community into which they are born. There exists persuasive evidence that, if this is to happen, learners need to be made explicitly aware of their actual linguistic environment. This awareness can be facilitated by the teachers who are indispensable in transmitting/maintaining linguistic variation within a speech community. Of course, teachers' sociolinguistic responsibility can be effectively exercised only if the speakers of a community are willing to follow teachers' lead.

2. Bidialectism: An umbrella term

2.1. Standard and non-standard varieties

A bidialectal situation is one in which two varieties of the same language are used alongside each other. The two varieties differ linguistically but also share a number of features. Usually, a bidialectal speaker is considered to be one who speaks the standard variety as well as a non-standard variety of a language. It is at this point that the first vagary of the concept of bidialectism arises: the use of the terms standard and non-standard falsely implies the existence of clearly identifiable linguistic codes. This could be considered true in cases such as English and most English-based Creoles (Winch & Gingell, 1994), Standard High German and the Swiss German dialects (Rash, 1998), Standard English and African American Vernacular English (Rickford, 1999), and Standard English and a local white variety of English spoken in the UK (Edwards & Cheshire, 1989). In these cases, standard and non-standard dialects are so different from each other that variation in people's speech can be conceptualised as switching between discrete systems (Cheshire, 2005). However, nothing could be farther from the truth in other bidialectal settings (Kaplan, 1969) where the linguistic variation between standard and non-standard varieties is better conceived as a continuum. The spoken classroom standard of Cypriot teachers, for example, adequately demonstrates the existence of this continuum. Greek Cypriot teachers in Cyprus supposedly use Standard Modern Greek in the classroom environment but, in fact, they use what Arvaniti (2006) calls Cypriot Standard Greek. This term neither refers to what Greeks around the world call standard (that is, Standard Modern Greek as used in Greece) nor to basilectal forms of the Cypriot dialect. Rather, it refers to the way Cypriots speak in semi-formal and formal situations: the differences between the Cypriot dialect and Standard Modern Greek have thus become gradually consolidated, while the users remain unaware of them. This example exposes the futility of strict categorisation and demonstrates the sort of complexities that are at play in bidialectal societies. Questions such as "whose standard?" should be asked. It is enlightening to simply consider that the standard variety of English in the Caribbean island of

St Lucia (used as the medium of instruction in schools) is a non-standard variety in the UK context (Winch & Gingell, 1994). It cannot therefore be overstressed that issues of variation as well as "possession" of a variety need to be addressed with appropriate sensitivity when studying bidialectism.

2.2. Majority and minority non-standard speaking populations

Bidialectism itself demands to be studied differently based on whether a non-standard speaking population forms the majority or the minority in a given setting. For example, in the USA, Appalachian citizens and their dialect are viewed as inferior and substandard (Andersson & Trudgill, 1990). Some cities (such as Cincinnati, Ohio) have recognised this problem and even declared Appalachians as minorities (Wildeman, 2004). In contrast, as Papapavlou and Pavlou (1998) point out, although Greek Cypriots are dialectal speakers, they are not a minority in their own country nor are they in any way socioeconomically and culturally deprived in comparison to the rest of the Hellenic world. Similarly, James (1996) explains that the dialect of Malay known as Brunei Malay is not a minority variety in Brunei but the popular majority variety. This variety, which exists alongside the national variety, Bahasa Melayu (one of Brunei's official languages), is even used in a large number of official texts (Martin, 1996). It is clear from the above examples that it would be dangerous to treat bidialectism as a universally homogeneous phenomenon. Regional majority dialects (i.e., dialects of populations who, though a majority in their territory, are minorities at the national level) ought to be considered under a different light. The linguistic power game is altogether different in such settings. (See Maurais, 1997, for a discussion of the topic at a language level rather than a dialect level.) Such disparities caused by geographic pockets is evidenced by a conundrum commonly faced by immigrants: what should those who settle in a territory with a regional majority dialect do? Should they learn the regional dialect and assimilate with the locals or should they learn the national standard? For the Cypriot linguistic landscape, for example, Pavlou and Christodoulou (2001) argue that immigrants on the island need to be familiar with both the local regional majority dialect and

Standard Modern Greek to communicate adequately with other members of the Cypriot speech community. However, as the authors explain, immigrant students seem to be in a dilemma as far as the sociolinguistic value of the two varieties is concerned. This dilemma is derived from the fact that Cypriots themselves view the regional dialect as inferior compared to the standard and thus immigrants too tend to develop similar opinions. Such examples demonstrate the different dynamics that can arise from diverse bidialectal settings.

2.3. *Educational policy*

Tensions between standard and non-standard varieties come to the fore in the school when educational policies endorse the use of the standard (Rickford, 1999b; Cheshire, 2005). Indeed, a number of studies demonstrate that, when the school learning environment is not inclusive of non-standard varieties, negative attitudes are created towards the non-standard varieties themselves as well as their non-standard speakers. For example, there is evidence that some teachers ascribe negative characteristics to non-standard speakers (Garrett, Coupland & Williams, 1999; Haig & Oliver, 2003). Teachers may lower their expectations because they assume that non-standard speaking students are less able, based solely on their non-standard mother tongue (Wolfram & Christian, 1989). It has been demonstrated that teachers may have dismissive attitudes towards non-standard speaking parents (Purcell-Gates, 2002). Studies on bidialectal parents' attitudes indicate that, paradoxically, they too view dialects as inferior and prefer their children to be educated in the standard variety (Hoover, McNair, Lewis & Politzer, 1997; Wolfram et al., 1999). Unfortunately, it has also been demonstrated that adults' negative attitudes are mirrored in students' attitudes who view their own non-standard mother tongues as inferior (Pavlou, 1997). However, attitudes towards non-standard varieties as reflected in educational policies are not always negative. As Trudgill (2000) points out, varieties in Norway, Switzerland and Luxembourg provide notable examples.

In implementing, researching or evaluating bidialectal students' performance, one must be mindful of the deep aims implicit in the educational policy. Language educational policies in bidialectal communities that, at best, ignore the fact that some children go to school equipped with a native dialect which differs from the educational standard should be understood differently from an educational policy that harnesses the potential of non-standard varieties. A language policy that cultivates a standard variety that exists in opposition to social, ethnic or minority dialects differs dramatically from a policy that views the standard and non-standard varieties as complementary to each other. True bidialectism is fostered only when the educational policy is pluralist, incorporating language variation. As is the case of bilingualism (Baker, 2006), one cannot overstress the multidimensionality of bidialectism.

3. Pedagogical implications for bidialectal communities

3.1. Language programmes

Almost four decades ago, Fasold and Shuy (1970) identified three types of programmes associated with bidialectal settings: dialect-eradication programmes, dialect-promotion programmes and bidialectal programmes. Today, the situation remains relatively unchanged with each of the types having its advocates. The first type attempts to replace students' non-standard linguistic varieties with the standard (Custred, 1990). For example, Esch (2002) describes the French educational policy efforts to systematically assimilate provincial speakers who are linguistically French. Her case study examines attempts which were directed particularly at those who lived near Germany at the beginning of the twentieth century. The second type runs contrary to the first and argues in favour of educating standard (and non-standard) speakers about valuing linguistic variation and thus eliminating their prejudices against non-standard varieties and their speakers (Gfeller & Robinson, 1998). Evaluation of a programme in Papua New Guinea which used Tok Pisin (Melanesian Pidgin English) as the medium

of instruction revealed that this form of instruction facilitated rather than hindered the learning of Standard English (Siegel, 1997). The third type of programme, which is bidialectal, aims to educate non-standard dialectal speakers in the school standard whilst teaching them to value their home varieties (Feigenbaum, 1975; James, 1996). There is an excellent case for strongly advocating this third type as the most beneficial option for bidialectal communities. Such programmes do not force students to abandon their dialectal mother tongue. On the contrary, their home dialect is made welcome at school and, in some cases, is formally used as a tool for the advancement of students' linguistic repertoire (i.e., by facilitating learning of the standard educational variety).

The success and appropriateness of bidialectal programmes in Europe was first demonstrated almost half a century ago by Österberg (1961) who argued that bidialectism, like bilingualism, should be considered as a phenomenon in its own right. In his experiment, Österberg divided students in the Piteå district of Sweden into two groups. One group was exclusively taught in Standard Swedish, students' second dialect, whereas the second group was taught in both the dialectal and the standard variety. Initially, this second group received reading instruction in the Piteå dialect for ten weeks. It then was exposed to a gradual transition from the dialect to the standard for four weeks which finally led to exclusive exposure to the standard for another 21 weeks. During this time (35 weeks), the first group received the same instruction exclusively in Standard Swedish. After the intervention, the reading performance of students in Standard Swedish was tested and it was demonstrated that the group which was exposed to the standard alone performed less well compared to the group which was exposed to both varieties. Österberg's results provide strong evidence in favour of bidialectal exposure.

If bidialectal language education is to be truly effective, the different factors that render each bidialectal society unique ought to be addressed. These key factors include the attitudes of the public towards the standard and non-standard varieties, the status of the varieties, and the distance between the standard and non-standard varieties (the length of the dialect continuum). Of course, it must be noted that, in bidialectal settings, there may be some children whose mother tongue is also the variety of instruction

while, for other children in the same school, this same variety of instruction is a non-native dialect. Both groups of students should therefore be considered in designing effective language programmes. It is fundamental that any bidialectal language programme reflect the linguistic environment for which it is designed.

There are a host of sound reasons to propose that work on the CEFR can inform bidialectal language education in Europe. The CEFR promotes the inclusion of detailed checklists of descriptors arranged by level and skill (Council of Europe, 2001). These "can do" descriptors seek to be comprehensive, specifying as full a range of language knowledge, skills and use as possible. Such a framework could be beneficial for second-dialect classes (as distinct from second-language classes). It could offer bidialectal students the opportunity to develop their linguistic and cultural awareness of the L_1 varieties that co-exist in the communities in which they live. This awareness could preserve students' cultural identity/heritage, maintain students' home linguistic variety, and develop students' standard educational variety. By formally including all the L_1 varieties, students would become aware of the diversity of L_1. The L_2 CEFR scheme would, in turn, assist in making students aware of the diversity of the European heritage as a whole. However, caution is advised. In communities in which linguistic variation between related dialects is better conceived as a continuum, such a framework – which views related linguistic varieties as clearly distinct entities – may prove problematic. It would be difficult for students of such communities to conceptualise the varieties as discrete systems. Different frameworks, which reflect the linguistic situation in question, should therefore be developed for such societies.

3.2. *Culture*

Despite the variation that exists behind the definition of culture (Bourdieu, 1977), culture is one of the most important factors influencing the language education of bidialectal settings. Most schools in Western societies are based on the dominant mainstream culture which is generally associated with the standard variety of a language. It is therefore suggested that the

linguistic and cultural competence that non-standard speaking students bring along with them to school should be acknowledged, respected and used as a resource (and not seen as a liability).

A plethora of research work demonstrates that language usage can vary extensively from one cultural group to another and that such variations can cause miscommunication between standard and non-standard speakers (Cazden, John & Hymes, 1972; Ball, 1995a; Ball, 1995b). There is thus considerable urgency for educational systems of many bidialectal societies to treat non-standard children's home language and culture with sensitivity. It is undeniable that these children's linguistic varieties are as complex as standard varieties despite the fact that they are governed by different linguistic rules. It is also undeniable that these students' cultural communicative system may not only differ from the standard system but, in some case, will also conflict with it (Ball & Farr, 2002). One of the reasons for dialectal students' low school language performance is the denial of the above undeniable facts. However difficult the task of integration may be, embracing cultural and linguistic diversity can yield only positive outcomes.

A number of researchers (e.g., Lee, 1993) suggest the implementation of cultural scaffolding, a process which enables dialectal students to use resources they have already mastered through cultural experiences in order to understand and undertake new academic tasks. As Little (2007) notes, learners cannot construct their knowledge out of nothing. They should be given access to the multifaceted culture into which they were born.

3.3. Language attitudes

Dillon (1980) emphasises the importance of attitudes by noting that it is attitudes – not dialects – which play a major role in the communication among linguistically diverse speakers. At this juncture, Giles and Trudgill's experiment (as cited in Andersson & Trudgill, 1990) is taken as an example which demonstrates that it is not the linguistic value of dialects that matters to people but rather the social acceptance of these varieties. Subjects in the UK and the USA were asked to listen to ten different accents of British

English and then rank them for desirability. In the UK, the accents were easily identified and ranked by prestige. However, in the USA, subjects – who did not know the social status of the different accents – did not rank them in the same way. It is clear that, when the association of class and status was no longer available, the stereotype was not available either (Wildeman, 2004).

It is essential that affective variables are taken into account when considering the suitability of an educational policy for a bidialectal situation. Downing (1978) described affective variables, which can overwhelm cognitive factors, in terms of bilingual situations. His analysis holds equally for bidialectal settings. If instruction delivered in the standard is perceived as a derogation of the non-standard mother tongue, negative emotions may be aroused and cognitive difficulties may be aggravated. On the other hand, if learners perceive their own dialectal mother tongue to be unworthy as a medium of education, the possible cognitive facilitation of having instruction that incorporates this variety may be diminished or negated by the learners' negative value judgement of the variety in this role.

It is important therefore for any language policy to consider the language attitudes of everyone involved (e.g., teachers, parents, children). Wolfram and Fasold (1969) warned that speakers who use socially stigmatised dialects sometimes have the same low opinion of these varieties as do speakers who do not use them. The authors' warning has been verified empirically in numerous contexts. A recent example comes from the Senegalese context. Esch's case study (2007) demonstrated that French/Wolof bilinguals in Senegal held extreme negative views towards speakers of French with a Senegalese accent. As a result, even though materials/instruction in socially stigmatised varieties might sound logical, they may not be acceptable to the very individuals who use the stigmatised varieties. If this is the case, incorporating a dialect that its speakers do not wish to be openly associated with may lead to unwanted problems.

3.4. Teacher-training programmes

It is important to note that it is necessary but not sufficient to have relevant and appropriate principles supporting bidialectal language programmes (discussed above). The role of the teacher as a pedagogue for culturally and linguistically diverse learners cannot be overstressed. Teachers in bidialectal societies, in their role as transmitters of knowledge, possess a great deal of power that, if used inappropriately, may create more harm than good. Whether the teachers of such linguistically diverse societies specialise in mother-tongue or foreign-language education, there exist a number of important variables to consider.

A number of researchers (e.g., Eades, 1995; Malcolm, 1995) have highlighted the need for teacher training that exposes teachers to the linguistic and sociocultural differences that exist between standard and non-standard varieties and their speakers. These sentiments deserve continuing and, indeed, enhanced support. Firstly, teachers in bidialectal communities need to be educated about the role of language in education. They need to know the central role language plays in a child's identity. The child's dialect and accompanying culture should not be stopped at the school gates. If dialectal children feel that their "own" language – which is a connection to their family and community (Wolfram & Christian, 1989; Fordham, 1998) – is not good enough for the school, they face an experience of discontinuity. Teachers have the great responsibility of making non-standard-speaking students feel not only accepted but also proud of their dialect. Teachers also have the added responsibility of educating standard-speaking students about linguistic diversity and acceptance of different dialects and cultures. To have teachers who will be able to fulfill these responsibilities, training programmes that promote an inclusive vision are needed. Of course, the nature of these programmes will differ with the bidialectal situation in question.

Where dialects are socially stigmatised, there is good reason to structure training programmes such that they primarily focus on the social functions of language. Social functions include the understanding that students' language is a symbol of identity (Joseph, 2004) and that access to the standard variety can empower dialectal learners. Training programmes

should make teachers aware that, when children's repertoire consists solely of a non-standard variety, they are likely to experience linguistic discrimination (Milroy & Milroy, 1999). It is therefore important that teachers learn to explain to students that, in some bidialectal settings, the standard is necessary for success in mainstream domains. This is evident from studies on language and employment (Atkins, 1993). People who speak stigmatised dialects may be rejected on the basis of their speech, which has nothing to do with their performance in job-related tasks.

In societies where the non-standard varieties are geographically distinguished, training programmes should primarily focus on the linguistic differences between the related varieties. Naturally, developing teachers' language skills is essential here. Where feasible, teachers should learn to be ready to use children's native non-standard dialects. Feasibility deserves to be considered because, in a society where a number of dialects are at play, it would be difficult for teachers to speak all the dialects. If such circumstances exist, teachers should learn to discuss the linguistic differences between the different varieties and to adapt instruction so as to include all children. The contrastive analysis approach could be used by teachers to distinguish the differences between standard and non-standard varieties. This approach has been used successfully by a number of researchers in the USA (Taylor, 1989), Europe (Yiakoumetti, 2006, 2007) and Australia (Harris, 1990; Malcolm, 1997).

3.5. Authentic materials

Unquestionably, teaching materials are critical for the success of any language programme that includes linguistically diverse students. Such materials should contain samples of the different linguistic varieties found in a specific setting and should demonstrate when and how these varieties are used in the community, inside and outside the school environment. Teachers of linguistically diverse students should take advantage of the fascinating authentic sources that are at their disposal. They could use dialectal issues and cultural experiences as stimuli for student learning (Anderson, 1990). For instance, teachers can set up projects for students to investigate dialect

usage in the wider community. In completing such projects, students would be encouraged to become "ethnographers" in collecting their own speech data from their local communities (Alim, 2005). If dialectal students are required to carry out such projects, they would start to place greater value on their non-standard varieties and they would view their varieties worthy of investigation/exploration. Similarly, standard-speaking students would be sensitised to linguistic variation and actively exposed to the cultural and linguistic differences of their non-standard speaking counterparts. Such directed first-hand involvement with language will, no doubt, help to "validate" non-standard varieties and eliminate prejudice. In the UK, initiatives such as these were taken by Cheshire and Edwards (1998) who developed materials on topics such as language variation and Standard English. Students who participated in the research describe how they discovered that their local dialect was part of a wider pattern of linguistic variation. This was a valuable educational experience for them. As Cheshire (2005) explains, such awareness would empower children to face the attitudes towards sociolinguistic variation that they will encounter in the adult world. Initiatives that harness authentic materials would ultimately reduce dialect discrimination in schools and society.

As Little, Ridley, and Ushioda (2002) emphasise, rich authentic input is a necessary part of any pedagogical scheme that aims to foster learner autonomy and effective language learning. Breen and Mann (1997) describe autonomous learners as being active and strategically engaged in their learning. Authentic materials (that are relevant to dialectal students' "reality") form a sort of "armoury" for such students which would naturally allow them to take responsibility for their learning. By assigning classroom tasks that engage learners' attention and encourage them to assess their own linguistic behaviour, teachers can help learners to realise that they are the key agents of their learning (Dam, 1995; McGarry, 1995).

3.6. Assessment of dialectal learners

Children who speak non-standard varieties may be frequently misdiagnosed as low achievers (Williams, 1976; Irvine, 1990). Their excellent dialectal performance may be viewed as one that requires correction (Russell, 2002). Sadly, it has also been illustrated that non-standard-speaking students have been wrongly diagnosed as having language impairments (Bayles & Harris, 1982). Wolfram et al. (1999) note that such students are often inaccurately assessed because of tests which are generally based on samples of the standard-speaking population. This testing procedure results in a single acceptable variety with narrow allowance for variation (Ball, Bernhardt & Deby, 2006). Other researchers (Leap, 1993) have pointed out the cultural bias in many assessment tools. Teachers that do not understand the real nature of cultural and linguistic variation are likely to underestimate the difficulties that dialectal learners face in the standard-speaking classroom environment. They may also wrongly view children's persistent use of non-standard features as evidence of cognitive deficit. As Bayles and Harris (1982) point out, if the non-standard variety was taken as the norm against which the test results were measured, these children would have been diagnosed as having a normal language ability. It is thus critical that teachers do not view dialect differences as errors needing correction (Epstein & Xu, 2003). On the contrary, they should view dialectal difference as a useful source for discussing linguistic variation and formally contrasting standard and non-standard varieties.

There is excellent reason to believe that the CEFR and the ELP can contribute to the development of an appropriate assessment culture for bidialectal education. Both schemes view self-assessment in L_2 learning as a key feature (Little, 2005). The principles that govern this L_2 self-assessment could potentially also be relevant to second-dialect (D_2) learners. The self-assessment grid could benefit both learners and teachers. Dialectal learners would develop their reflective capacities by having to evaluate their own D_2 learning progress and intercultural experience. Conscious self-judgement would facilitate the explicit dialect-learning process and lead to learner autonomy. Learners would develop awareness not only of their own progress but of the nature/relation of their L_1 dialectal varieties as a

whole. There is no doubt that dossiers which contain bidialectal students' opinions of their D_2 capacities would usefully highlight the complexities inherent in bidialectal communities. The generation of learner self-assessment grids and dossiers would provide teachers with an invaluable tool to directly access students' own opinions of their varied L1 repertoires. First-hand comprehension of the complexities that challenge bidialectal learners would facilitate the development of appropriate assessment materials/tests by teachers. These tests, which would not be based solely on the assessment culture of the standard variety, would be more appropriate for bidialectal students.

4. Conclusion

It is certainly true that the natural phenomenon of bidialectism (like bilingualism) manifests itself successfully in language education systems in societies around the world. Why then, despite voluminous literature on the likely efficacy of bidialectal education, have most societies failed to promote, maintain or even cope with bidialectism and effective bidialectal education? Perhaps the answer lies in the fact that bidialectism has not been treated as the complex, multifaceted phenomenon it actually is. The aim herein was to initiate a discussion of the numerous subtleties inherent in bidialectism and to "unpack" some of the issues that ought to be considered when bidialectism is investigated. It should be stressed that all of the issues that have been set out are interconnected, each influencing the other such that they should not be treated in isolation.

The undeniable fact is that dialectal children come to school fluent in their native dialects. These dialects will emerge in the classroom whether or not teachers and language systems allow it. How teachers respond to dialects can profoundly affect students' sense of identity and ultimately their performance. This chapter highlights the possibility of bridging work on bidialectism, language autonomy and the CEFR. Although the CEFR and its companion piece, the ELP, along with language learner autonomy have historically been directed towards second-language learners (Dam

& Legenhausen, 1996; Legenhausen, 2003), they are equally relevant to second-dialect learners. In bidialectal communities, speakers have a two-fold identity based on both the standard speech and culture and the non-standard speech and culture. If the latter identity is consistently used at home, then the first (which is emphasised at school) should ideally co-exist in harmony. Linguists and educationists should aim to create autonomous learners who have no difficulty crossing cultural/linguistic boundaries and who are aware and proud of their varied linguistic repertoire. Herculean task that it may sound, it is nevertheless possible.

References

Alim, H. S. (2005). Critical language awareness in the United States: Revisiting issues and revising pedagogies in a resegregated society. *Educational Researcher, 7*, 24–31.

Ammon, V. (1989). Aspects of dialect and school in the Federal Republic of Germany. In J. Cheshire, V. Edwards, H. Munstermann & B. Weltens (Eds.), *Dialect and education* (pp. 113–138). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Anderson, E. (1990). Teaching users of diverse dialects: Practical approaches. *Teaching English in the Two Year College, 17*(3), 172–177.

Andersson, L. & Trudgill, P. (1990). *Bad language.* Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Arvaniti, A. (2006). Linguistic practices in Cyprus and the emergence of Cypriot Standard Greek. In S. Fukuda & G. Gibbard (Eds.), *San Diego linguistic papers 2* (pp. 1–24). University of California, San Diego.

Atkins, C. (1993). Do employment recruiters discriminate on the basis of nonstandard dialect? *Journal of Employment Counseling, 30*, 108–118.

Baker, C. (2006). *Foundations of bilingual education and bilingualism* (4th ed.). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Ball, A. F. (1995a). Investigating language, learning, and linguistic competence of African American children. *Linguistics and Education, 7*(1), 23–46.

Ball, A. F. (1995b). Community-based learning in urban settings as a model for educational reform. *Applied Behavioral Science Review, 3*(2), 127–146.

Ball, A. F. & Farr, M. (2002). Language varieties, culture and teaching the English language arts. In J. Flood, D. Lapp, J. P. Squire & J. M. Jensen (Eds.), *Handbook of research on teaching the English language arts* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Ball, J., Bernhardt, B. & Deby, J. (2006). Exploring first nations English dialects and implications for policy and practice. Retrieved 25 April 2008, from <http://reach.uvic.ca/documents/Dialects_Proceedings_Ap_2006bb.pdf>.

Bayles, K. & Harris, G. (1982). Evaluating speech-language skills in Papago Indian children. *Journal of American Indian Education, 21*(2), 11–20.

Bourdieu, P. (1977). Cultural reproduction and social reproduction. In J. Karabel & H. A. Halsey (Eds.), *Power and ideology in education* (pp. 487–511). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Breen, M. P. & Mann, S. (1997). Shooting arrows at the sun: Perspectives on a pedagogy for autonomy. In P. Benson & P. Voller (Eds.), *Autonomy and independence in language learning* (pp. 132–149). London: Longman.

Cazden, C., John, V. & Hymes, D. (1972). *Functions of language in the classroom*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Cheshire, J. (2005). Sociolinguistics and mother-tongue education. In U. Ammon, N. Dittmar, K. Mattheier & P. Trudgill (Eds.), *Sociolinguistics: An introductory handbook of the science of language and society* (2nd ed., pp. 2341–2350). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Cheshire, J. & Edwards, V. (1998). Knowledge about language in British classrooms: Children as researchers. In A. Egan-Roberson & D. Bloome (Eds.), *Students as researchers of culture and language in their own communities* (pp. 191–214). Broadway, Cresskill, NJ: Hampton Press.

Council of Europe. (2001). *Common European framework of reference for languages: Learning, teaching, assessment*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Custred, G. (1990). The primacy of standard language in modern education. *American Behavioral Scientist, 34*(2), 232–239.

Dam, L. (1995). *Learner autonomy 3: From theory to classroom practice*. Dublin: Authentik.

Dam, L. & Legenhausen, L. (1996). The acquisition of vocabulary in an autonomous learning environment: The first months of beginning English. In R. Pemberton, E. S. L. Li, W. W. F. Or & H. D. Pierson (Eds.), *Taking control: Autonomy in language learning* (pp. 265–280). Hong Kong: Hong Kong University Press.

Dillon, D. (1980). Viewpoint: Does the school have a right to its own language? *The English Journal, 69*(4), 13–17.

Downing, J. (1978). Strategies of bilingual teaching. *International Review of Education, 24*(3), 329–346.

Eades, D. (1995). *Aboriginal English*. Sydney: Board of Studies, NSW.

Eades, D. & Siegel, J. (1999). Changing attitudes towards Australian Creoles and Aboriginal English. In J. R. Rickford & S. Romaine (Eds.), *Creole genesis, attitudes and discourse: Studies celebrating Charlene J. Sato* (pp. 265–278). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Edwards, V. & Cheshire, J. (1989). The survey of British dialect grammar. In J. Cheshire, V. Edwards, H. Münstermann & B. Weltens (Eds.), *Dialect and education: Some European perspectives* (pp. 200–215). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters 53.

Epstein, R. I. & Xu, L. X. J. (2003). *Roots and wings: Teaching English as a second dialect to Aboriginal students, a review of the recent literature.* Saskatoon: University of Saskatchewan.

Esch, E. (2002). My dad's auxiliaries. In M. C. Jones & E. Esch (Eds.), *Language change: The interplay of internal, external and extra-linguistic factors.* (pp. 111–139). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Esch, E. (2007). Français d'ailleurs: The pluricentricity of French identities? In W. Bennett & M. C. Jones (Eds.), *The French language and questions of identity*. London: Legenda.

Esch, E. (2008). Autonomy ten years on: Clash or crash? In R. Pemberton, S. Toogood & A. Barfield (Eds.), *Selected papers from the international conference on autonomy and language learning: Maintaining control.* Hong Kong: Hong Kong University Press.

Fasold, R. W. & Shuy, R. W. (Eds.). (1970). *Teaching Standard English in the inner city.* Washington, DC: Center for Applied Linguistics.

Feigenbaum, I. (1975). The use of nonstandard English in teaching standard: Contrast and comparison. In P. Stoller (Ed.), *Black American English: Its background and its usage in the schools and in literature* (pp. 143–157). New York, NY: Dell Publishing Co.

Fordham, S. (1998). Speaking Standard English from nine to three. In S. Hoyle & C. T. Adger (Eds.), *Kids talk: Strategic language use in later childhood* (pp. 205–216). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Garrett, P., Coupland, N. & Williams, A. (1999). Evaluating dialect in discourse: Teachers' and teenagers' responses to young English speakers in Wales. *Language in Society, 28*(3), 321–354.

Gfeller, E. & Robinson, C. (1998). Which language for teaching? The cultural messages transmitted by the languages used in education. *Language and Education, 12*(1), 18–32.

Haig, Y. & Oliver, R. (2003). Language variation and education: Teachers' perceptions. *Language and Education, 17*(4), 266–280.

Harris, S. (1990). *Two-way aboriginal schooling: Education and cultural survival.* Canberra: Aboriginal Studies Press.

Harris-Wright, K. (1999). Enhancing bidialectalism in urban African American students. In C. T. Adger, D. Christian & O. Taylor (Eds.), *Making the connection: Language and academic achievement among African American students* (pp. 53–60). Washington, DC: Center for Applied Linguistics.

Hoover, M. R., McNair, F., Lewis, R. S. A. & Politzer, L. R. (1997). African American English attitudes measures for teachers. In R. Jones (Ed.), *Handbook of test and measurements for black populations* (pp. 383–393). Hampton, VA: Cobb.

Irvine, J. J. (1990). *Black students and school failure: Policies, practices, and prescriptions*. New York, NY: Greenwood Press.

James, C. (1996). Mother tongue use in bilingual/bidialectal education: Implications for Bruneian Dwibahasa. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development, 17*(2–4), 248–258.

Joseph, J. E. (2004). *Language and identity: National, ethnic, religious*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Kaplan, R. B. (1969). On a note of protest (in a minor key): Bidialectism vs. bidialectism. *College English, 30*(5), 386–389.

Leap, W. (1993). *American Indian English*. Salt Lake City: University of Utah Press.

Lee, C. (1993). *Signifying as a scaffold for literary interpretation: The pedagogical implications of an African American discourse genre*. Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English.

Legenhausen, L. (2003). Second language acquisition in an autonomous learning environment. In D. Little, J. Ridley & E. Ushioda (Eds.), *Learner autonomy in the foreign language classroom: Teacher, learner, curriculum and assessment* (pp. 65–77). Dublin: Authentik.

Little, D. G. (2002). The European Language Portfolio and learner autonomy. *Malfríður, 18*(2), 4–7.

Little, D. G. (2005). The Common European framework and the European Language Portfolio: Involving learners and their judgements in the assessment process. *Language Testing, 22*(3), 321–336.

Little, D. G. (2006). The Common European framework of reference for languages: Content, purpose, origin, reception and impact. *Language Teaching, 39*, 167–190.

Little, D. G. (2007). Language learner autonomy: Some fundamental considerations revisited. *Innovation in Language Learning and Teaching*, 14–29.

Little, D. G., Ridley, J. & Ushioda, E. (2002). *Towards greater learner autonomy in the foreign language classroom*. Dublin: Authentik.

Malcolm, I. G. (1995, April). *Teacher development for bidialectal education*. Paper presented at the Second International Conference on Language in Development, Bali, Indonesia.

Malcolm, I. G. (1997). The pragmatics of bidialectal education. In L. Bouton (Ed.), *Pragmatics and language learning* (pp. 55–78). Urbana-Champaign, IL: University of Illinois.

Malcolm, I. G. (1999). English and inclusivity in education for indigenous students. *Australian Review of Applied Linguistics, 22*(2), 51–66.

Martin, P. W. (1996). Code-switching in the primary classroom: One response to the planned and the unplanned language environment in Brunei. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development, 17*(2–4), 128–144.

Maurais, J. (1997). Regional majority languages, language planning, and linguistic rights. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language, 127*, 135–160.

McGarry, D. (1995). *Learner autonomy 4: The role of authentic texts*. Dublin: Authentik.

Milroy, J. & Milroy, L. (1999). *Authority in language*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Österberg, T. (1961). *Bilingualism and the first school language*. Umeå: Vasterbottens Tryckeri.

Papapavlou, A. N. & Pavlou, P. (1998). A review of the sociolinguistic aspects of the Cypriot Greek dialect. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development, 19*(3), 212–220.

Pavlou, P. (1997). *Children's attitudes toward Cypriot Greek and Standard Modern Greek in Cyprus*. Paper presented at the 3rd International Conference on Greek Linguistics, Athens.

Pavlou, P. & Christodoulou, N. (2001). Bidialectism in Cyprus and its impact on the teaching of Greek as a foreign language. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics, 11*(1), 75–91.

Purcell-Gates, V. (2002). "... As soon as she opened her mouth!": Issues of language, literacy, and power. In L. Delpit & J. K. Dowdy (Eds.), *The skin that we speak: An anthology of essays on language, culture and power* (pp. 121–141). New York, NY: New Times.

Rash, F. J. (1998). *The German language in Switzerland: Multilingualism, diglossia and variation*. Bern: Peter Lang.

Rickford, J. R. (1999a). *African American vernacular English*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Rickford, J. R. (1999b). Language diversity and academic achievement in the education of African American students: An overview of the issues. In C. T. Adger, D. Christian & O. Taylor (Eds.), *Making the connection: Language and academic achievement among African American students* (pp. 1–29). Washington, DC: Center for Applied Linguistics.

Rickford, J. R. (2002). How linguists approach the study of language and dialect. Retrieved 25 April 2008, from <http://www.stanford.edu/~rickford/papers/173_reading_1.doc>.

Rickford, J. R. & Rickford, A. E. (1995). Dialect readers revisited. *Linguistics and Education, 7*(2), 107–128.

Russell, C. (2002). Language, violence, and Indian mis-education. *American Indian Culture and Research Journal, 26*(4), 97–112.

Schmidt, R. W. (1990). The role of consciousness in second language learning. *Applied Linguistics, 11*, 129–158.

Siegel, J. (1997). Using a pidgin language in formal education: Help or hindrance? *Applied Linguistics, 18*(1), 86–100.

Stijnen, S. & Vallen, T. (1989). The Kerkrade project: Background, main findings, and an evaluation. In J. Cheshire, V. Edwards, H. Munstermann & B. Weltens (Eds.), *Dialect and education: Some European perspectives* (pp. 139–153) Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Taylor, H. (1989). *Standard English, Black English, and bidialectalism: A controversy.* New York, NY: Peter Lang.

Trudgill, P. (2000). *Sociolinguistics: An introduction to language and society* (4th ed.). Harmondsworth: Penguin.

Wildeman, C. S. (2004). A multicultural rationale for dialect worth, value and respect. Retrieved 25 April, 2008, from <http://research.trevecca.edu/uploads/20050510120000cswildeman.pdf>.

Williams, F. (1976). *Explorations of the linguistic attitudes of teachers.* Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Winch, C. & Gingell, J. (1994). Dialect interference and difficulties with writing: An investigation in St Lucian primary schools. *Language and Education, 8*(3), 157–182.

Wolfram, W., Adger, C. T. & Christian, D. (1999). *Dialects in schools and communities.* Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Wolfram, W. & Christian, D. (1989). *Dialects and education: Issues and answers.* Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Wolfram, W. & Fasold, R. W. (1969). Toward reading materials for speakers of Black English: Three linguistically appropriate passages. In J. C. Baratz & R. W. Shuy (Eds.), *Teaching black children to read.* Washington, DC: Center for Applied Linguistics.

Yiakoumetti, A. (2006). A bidialectal programme for the learning of Standard Modern Greek in Cyprus. *Applied Linguistics, 27*(2), 295–317.

Yiakoumetti, A. (2007). Choice of classroom language in bidialectal communities: To include or to exclude the dialect? *Cambridge Journal of Education, 37*(1), 51–66.

Yiakoumetti, A., Evans, M. & Esch, E. (2005). Language Awareness in a bidialectal setting: The oral performance and language attitudes of urban and rural students in Cyprus. *Language Awareness, 14*(4), 254–260.