

РЕГИОНАЛЬНАЯ ПОЛИТИКА В ОБЛАСТИ ОБРАЗОВАНИЯ ОДАРЕННЫХ ШКОЛЬНИКОВ В ДОНЕЦКОЙ ОБЛАСТИ

М.Н. Кабанец

Статья посвящена руководящим принципам региональной политики в области образования одаренных в Донецкой области и освещает стратегические направления образовательной политики в области по социально-педагогической поддержке одаренных школьников.

Ключевые слова: одаренность, одаренный ученик, одаренные школьники, образование одаренных, региональная политика.

Кабанец Марина Николаевна – кандидат педагогических наук, доцент, завдувач кафедри мовної підготовки ДВНЗ «Донецький національний технічний університет» (м. Покровськ, Україна). E-mail: kabanets.marina@yandex.ru

Kabanets Maryna – Candidate of Pedagogical Sciences, Associate Professor, Head of Language Training Department of HSEE “Donetsk National Technical University” (Pokrovsk, Ukraine). E-mail: kabanets.marina@yandex.ru

UDC 372.761.57(73)

ENGLISH-ONLY MOVEMENT: ITS CONSEQUENCES ON THE TEACHING OF LINGUISTIC MINORITIES STUDENTS IN USA

O.Ye. Krsek

The article covers the language policy in the USA schools of the 20th century based on the English monolingualism ideology. The English-Only movement is characterized; it didn't gain public support in the USA in the last quarter of the previous century and influenced the teaching students belonging to linguistic minorities in schools of the United States.

Key words: ethno-cultural education, linguistic minorities, bilingual programs, English monolingualism ideology, the language barrier, English-Only movement, language policy.

Statement of the problem in general aspect. For many Americans, the symbolism of the English language has become a form of civic religiosity in much the same vein as the flag. This symbolism is not new; it

can be found in the words of Theodore Roosevelt: “We must have but one flag. We must also have but one language. That must be the language of the Declaration of Independence, of Washington’s farewell address, of Lincoln’s Gettysburg speech and second inaugural. Similarly, US English, the largest and oldest organization supporting the English-only movement, proclaims in its mission statement: “The eloquence [of the English language] shines in our Declaration of Independence and Constitution. It is the living carrier of our democratic ideals.” The English-Only movement, which advocates that English be the official and only language used in the United States, dramatically influences the life of language minority children, their families, and educators working with them [1]. The education of students from disadvantaged groups has been frequently a topic of political, sociological, pedagogical debates. When a school reinforces an English-Only policy, it sends a message to all children that minority languages have less value than English as tools of learning. And because the school is a microcosm of society, this message also suggests that those languages are not an integral part of the American society. This message equally deprives mainstream children of the opportunity to experience the cultural diversity in this country, and robs every child of the chance to learn the full potential of human possibilities [3].

The analysis of recent research and publications. The English-only movement is not on the margins of American society; it is a mainstream operation. The first order in understanding the English-only movement is to understand the organization known as “US English.” US English claims it does not maintain a racist, anti-immigrant agenda. Many of its original supporters were people of color or immigrants, including Linda Chavez, U.S. Senator S.I. Hayakawa, Alistair Cooke, and Arnold Schwarzenegger. However, according to federal records, US English has had close ties to the anti-immigrant organization Federation for American Immigration Reform (FAIR) and has been financed by the Pioneer Fund, a racist organization that promotes the use of eugenics and also funded Richard J. Herrnstein and Charles Murray’s infamously racist work *The Bell Curve*. A number of anti-immigrant and population control organizations have been linked to US English. John Tanton, the founder and original chairman of US English is the architect of this network. Tanton states that “the question of bilingualism grows out of U.S. immigration policy.” To Tanton, the huge influx of non-English-speaking immigrants overwhelms the “assimilative capacity of the country” [2].

The famous American investigators of English-only movement in the USA J. Crawford, R.D. Gonzalez, R. King, T. Ricento wrote about it as

efforts by federal and state governments, lobbyists, organizations, or private citizens to make English the “only” or “official” language for use in public or governmental situations in the United States.

The impact of a diversified workforce in closing the academic achievement gap between white and non-white students was shown in special investigations by Dee T., Easton-Brooks D., Boser U., Dickson L., Porter S., Umbach P., etc. Studies by Bireda, Boser U., Chait C., Ingersoll R., May H. Survey of the States' Limited English Proficient Students and availability of Educational Programs and Services for such category of students was carried out by Chan Tse., Fleshman H., Greenberg G., Hopstock P., Marcias F., Reynaldo F., Rhodes D.

The problem of educating teachers for language ethnic minority students in the USA were studied by Boser U., Clewell B. C., Dee T.S., Easton-Brooks S., Gay G., Ingersoll Y., Lewis C.W., Lucas T., McKay S.A., Milner H., Nieto S., Porter S., Puma M.J., Strom, K., Umbach P.D., Villegas A.M., Zhang Y., Lucas T.

The aim of the given paper is to disclose the language policy in the U. S. schools of the 20th century based on the English monolingualism ideology, to emphasize the difficulties of realizing bilingual programs designed for teaching children belonging to linguistic minorities in schools of the United States.

Main material presentation. As James Crawford noted, “Language diversity in North America has ebbed and flowed, reaching its lowest level in the mid-20th century. But it has existed in every era, since long before the United States constituted itself as a nation” James Crawford wrote in his work “War With Diversity - Language Policy in an Age of Anxiety” about English-only activism. He indicated that the targets of this campaign-linguistic minorities, bilingual educators, civil libertarians, Indian tribes, and others. English-only movement, also known as Official English movement, refers to a political movement for the use only of the English language in official US government operations through the establishing of English as the only official language in the United States of America. The United States has never had a legal policy stating an official national language. However, at some times and places, there have been various moves to promote or require the use of English, such as in schools for Native American children in the past. There have been some language selection policies implemented at the state level. Although some Americans see these movements as patriotic or wellintended, other Americans perceive such efforts to be anti-immigrant or racist. These movements tend to experience their greatest popularity during times of economic hardship, massive immigration, or war.

At the same time, they represent a desire by members of the English-speaking majority in the United States to create national cohesiveness under the banner of the English language.

Some nations across the globe are becoming more linguistically diverse as a result of the transnational migration of peoples. Others are experiencing an increase in their language diversity as a result of differential growths of their populations, resurgence of language and ethnic nationalism, language revitalization movements, and the official recognition and promotion of multiple languages. The U.S. Census Bureau predicts that by 2020, the U.S. people of color will make up 39% of the total U.S. population. The single most difficult aspect of the schooling of language minority students is providing them adequate access to the core curriculum. Most school districts have opted to enforce a policy of learning English first—before these students can be taught other subject matter. This puts language minority students in a precarious academic situation. Many schools are beginning to require special preparation, professional development, and even licensing for their teachers to instruct these students in English. Many language minority students who enter the schools early in their life can sometimes catch up academically with native English speakers when they work harder than these peers. However, the concentrations of language minority students are in high-minority, high-poverty schools, which are often under-resourced and struggle with hiring a fully credentialed and qualified teaching workforce. Receipt of adequate instruction is the exception, not the rule, for language minority students. The absence of teachers and other school staff who can communicate with parents of language minority students is also a problem in informing parents about the academic performance of their children, about the activities of the schools, or even about the expectations of the teachers. As language minority students, especially children, acquire some English, they often abandon the use of their heritage language. This creates another communication difficulty between children and parents in these homes that strains the quality of family interactions.

Recent research made by Anderson A., Clark E., Faltis C., Floden R., Garcia E., Greenberg J., Moll L., Thonis E. Velez-Ibanez C. allows teacher educators to readily generate a list of teacher competencies. In order for learners who are not yet fully proficient in English to progress academically, support systems must be created within the classroom to facilitate learning. Access to the native language provides one important element of support for comprehension and learning that is not available in all-English classroom settings. Setting up activities in ways that establish direct connections with

existing knowledge that the learner bring to the task is another element of support (often culturally based) that bilingual teachers must provide.

The motivational prerequisites for learning need to be relevant and directly evident to the learner, and the participant structures which serve to engage the learner in the task or activity must be appropriate for that learner, as well. While certain aspects of good teaching undoubtedly cut across all learning contexts, teachers prepared to implement a bilingual program are distinct from mainstream teachers in at least three ways: (1) they are proficient in two languages and are able to use both to deliver effective instruction in all areas of the curriculum; (2) they are skilled in integrating “students” work at mixed of linguistic and conceptual complexity”; and (3) they “know the rules of appropriate behavior of at least two ethnic groups” and are able to “incorporate this knowledge into the teaching process”. As bilingual teachers plan strategies for pursuing academic goals, they must invariably draw upon their knowledge of the child's language and culture to deliver an effective plan for attaining the desired outcomes.

Depending on the program/school context, the needs of the student, and the kinds of resources available, arguments can be raised in support of different alternatives for delivering English second language services, but three key factors appear to be particularly important as remark Allen V., Crandall J., Enright A., Kessler C., Richard-Amato P., Rigg P.:

1. Whatever path is chosen, the key to success includes close articulation between different program components;
2. Integration of ESL and content area instruction must be maximized wherever appropriate;
3. Classroom procedures must incorporate social aspects that meet second language learners' needs, such as organizing classrooms in ways that facilitate student-student interaction and using cooperative learning activities.

In order for these factors to become incorporated as central elements within ESL programs, collaborative frameworks must be developed that involve clear communication and mutual support among all the adults who determine the quality of education for language minority students, including teachers with administrators, teachers with teachers, and teachers with parents. What skills, then, are needed by ESL teachers serving language minority students? ESL specialists must possess a thorough understanding of theory and research which allows them to become knowledgeable and informed advocates of language minority students within the school context. Among the critical instructional issues that they must be able to understand and apply in the classroom and illustrate to non-specialists are:

- how to use modified speech appropriately with second language learners;
- how to create multiple opportunities for “negotiation of meaning” within natural learning contexts;
- how to contextualize learning (such as by providing additional visual support and planned, meaningful redundancy); and
- how to use those variables related to second language development that are under their control to maximum advantage (for example, by creating opportunities for talking and turn-taking, selecting topics, and insuring bi-directionality of communication in the classroom).

It is important to note that professional development cannot be imposed from the outside; the need and desire for change must grow from within each individual. The notion that knowledge comes from action and reflection on that action is central to this pedagogical approach. Reflecting on shared experiences is essential to deepening our understanding of ideas and of individual interpretations, to confronting our beliefs as well as our biases, to making learning explicit, but also to creating new interests and awareness of new needs. our beliefs as well as our biases, to making learning explicit, but also to creating new interests and awareness of new needs.

Language-minority students in U.S. schools speak virtually all of the world's languages, including more than a hundred that are indigenous to the United States. Language-minority students may be monolingual in their native language, bilingual in their native language and English, or monolingual in English but from a home where a language other than English is spoken. Those who have not yet developed sufficient proficiency in English to learn content material in all-English-medium classrooms are known as limited English proficient (LEP) or English language learners (ELLs). Reliable estimates place the number of LEP students in American schools at close to four million.

The opportunity to use their mother tongue affects the educational and cognitive development of language minority children. Like native English speakers, language minority children go to school with many well-developed skills in their first language (L1). These children, as Ollia L. O. and Mayfield M. L. stated, are also able to use their L1 for culturally appropriate activities in various contexts with different participants and topics. These skills constitute the bridge which connects L1 with the learning of English [4]. Edelsky C. maintains that once a firm base has been founded in language minority children's native languages, they are willing to explore and find out how a new language works. These children can also apply their background knowledge in their L1 to make sense of the unfamiliar, to create

their own English written text, and to read English materials written by others [5]. Even when the written form of the L1 and English - such as the Chinese characters and the English alphabet – are distinctly different, the children are still able to apply the visual, linguistic, and cognitive strategies used in their L1 to reading and writing in English [6]. These essential resources are made unavailable, however, when children are thrown into an English-Only situation where they are expected to learn unfamiliar content in an unfamiliar language. Without the bridge provided by their L1, their chances of achieving academic success may be severely reduced.

Wong-Fillmore L., Gibson M.A. have maintained that the consequences of losing a mother tongue for language minority children are often extensive and severe [7, 11]. Wong-Fillmore L. explains that in homes where parents do not communicate with children in the mother tongue, family communication may deteriorate. Where parents and children do not share a common language, communication is often limited to the basic necessities, preventing parents from transmitting to their children the complex set of values, beliefs, wisdom, and understanding which provide the foundation for their children's learning and development [8].

Wong-Fillmore L. also noted a quick shift in language use in home and at school among language minority children, especially the younger ones, in the United States. She argues that children lose their mother tongue at a far higher rate than they learn their second language [9]; this phenomenon, she further explains, is one in which “learning a second language means losing the first one” [10]. In an immersion program, where English is the only instructional language, the children are at a greater risk of losing their mother tongue before they have fully mastered their second language. As education in the United States has traditionally been verbocentric [12], with language as the dominant way of learning and teaching, the limited language skills these children possess, either in their mother tongue or a second language, are unable to support their learning.

What is the English only movement? On the most basic level, it is the movement to pass constitutional amendments at the national and state level to make English U.S. official language. These attempts to make English the official language have created a bitter debate between those for and against the movement. Each side sincerely believes their position will make for a stronger and more unified America. However, because of strong emotions, the ideology on both sides has become riddled with a mixture of historical facts, mythology, and half truths. Elliot Judd, in his article, *The English Language Amendment: A Case Study on Language and Politics* states this most eloquently: A language is more than a grammatical or communicative

system. It is a symbolic system laden with emotional attachments that can arouse the deepest passions. This issue of having an official language is not a new debate as our founding fathers wrestled with this issue. They ultimately decided not declare an official language rather than create conflict that could have jeopardize our fledgling nation. According to Elliott Judd, the reasons for not naming an official language included a belief in tolerance for linguistic diversity, the economic and social value of foreign language knowledge, and cultural freedom of those living in a new country. Language was a personal choice. Freedom of choice in language served to attract immigrants to America, and linguistic diversity allowed information to be disseminated to these groups.

Reasons for the English Only Movement the first, and perhaps the most nationalistic, is the belief that English unites American peoples as a nation. S.I. Hayakawa, in his article, *Bilingualism in America: English should be the only Language*, cites the example of Japanese and Chinese immigrants in California. Prior and during World War II, the relations between these two groups were poor at best. However, as new English speaking generations came along, they began to communicate and socialize. Today this has resulted in these two groups forming Asian-American societies.

Prior to the twentieth century, the U.S. government had actively imposed the use of English among Native Americans and the inhabitants of the incorporated territories of the Southwest. By the 1880s, the Bureau of Indian Affairs implemented a policy of forced Anglicisation for Native Americans sending Indian children to boarding schools. Such policies did not succeed in eradicating the children's native languages, but it did instil in them a sense of shame that guaranteed the exclusive use of English for future generations [2]. Language rights need to be demystified and the theory of the ‘additional privilege’ deconstructed. Language rights are not an ‘extra-advantage’ but the factor that helps adjust an uneven playing field. In this regard, it becomes essential to stress the positive effects of language rights in reducing the potential for linguistic and social conflict. Language is a powerful force for mobilizing public opinion to affect not only language policy, but also broad issues of state formation, politics, and administration. Establishing “a system of language rights can protect all citizens from leaders who wish to use language for destructive and unscrupulous aims” [14]. The single most difficult aspect of the schooling of language minority students is providing them adequate access to the core curriculum. Most school districts have opted to enforce a policy of learning English first—before these students can be taught other subject matter. This puts language minority students in a precarious academic situation. Many schools are

beginning to require special preparation, professional development, and even licensing for their teachers to instruct these students in English. Many language minority students who enter the schools early in their life can sometimes catch up academically with native English speakers when they work harder than these peers. However, the concentrations of language minority students are in high-minority, high-poverty schools, which are often under-resourced and struggle with hiring a fully credentialed and qualified teaching workforce. Receipt of adequate instruction is the exception, not the rule, for language minority students. The absence of teachers and other school staff who can communicate with parents of language minority students is also a problem in informing parents about the academic performance of their children, about the activities of the schools, or even about the expectations of the teachers. As language minority students, especially children, acquire some English, they often abandon the use of their heritage language. This creates another communication difficulty between children and parents in these homes that strains the quality of family interactions.

Indeed, the implementation of bilingual education would represent a qualitative jump in the pursuit of equal opportunity and real integration. In order to do so, teachers, parents, and community organizations need to play a fundamental role in the movement to push reforms that bring bilingual education back to the forefront of education for democracy.

References

1. Crawford James Language Loyalties: A Source Book on the Official English Controversy (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1992), www.ourworld.compuserve.com.
2. Crawford James Anatomy of the English-only Movement, conference paper, University of Illinois, March 21, 1996 www.ourworld.compuserve.com.
3. Heath S. B. Sociocultural contexts of language development. In Beyond language: Social and cultural factors in schooling language minority students// Sacramento, CA: California State Department of Education, Sacramento, Bilingual Education Office. [ED 304 241] pp. 143-186.
4. Ollia L.O., Mayfield M.L. Emergent literacy: Preschool, kindergarten, & primary grades. Needham Height, MA: Allen & Bacon, p.34.
5. Edelsky C. Writing in a bilingual program: Haba una vez. Norwood, NJ: Ablex. [ED 305 192], p.89.
6. Freeman Y. S., Freeman D. Whole language for second language learners. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann., p.45.
7. Gibson M. A. Promoting academic success among immigrant students: Is acculturation the issue? Educational Policy, 12 (6), 615-633.

8. Wong-Fillmore L. Language and cultural issues in the early education of language minority children. In S. Kagan (Ed.) The care and education of American young children: Obstacles and opportunities, The 90th Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, p.78.
9. Wong-Fillmore L. When learning a second language means losing the first. Early Childhood Research Quarterly, 6(3), 323-346.
10. Wong-Fillmore L. Learning a language from learners. In C. Kramsch & S. McConnell-Ginet (Eds.). Text and Context: Cross-disciplinary perspectives on language studies. Lexington, MA: Heath, p.156.
11. Wong-Fillmore L. Keeping Pedagogy in and Politics Out Of Our ESL Classrooms. Paper presented at the meeting of Indiana Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages, Indianapolis, IN, p.221.
12. Leland C. H., Harste, J. C. Multiple ways of knowing: Curriculum in a new key. Language Arts, 71 (5) - 1994, 337-345.
13. Tollefson J. W. Introduction: Critical Issues in Educational Language Policy. In: Tollefson, J.W. Language Policies in Education: Critical Issues. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc. (Ed.) – 2002, p.4.

РУХ «ТІЛЬКИ АНГЛІЙСЬКА МОВА»: ЙОГО НАСЛІДКИ НА ОСВІТУ СТУДЕНТІВ З МОВНИХ МЕНШИН В США

О.Є. Крсец

У статті розглядається мовна політика США у школах 20-го століття на основі ідеології англійської одномовності. Характеризується рух «тільки Англійська мова», який не отримав суспільну підтримку в США в останній чверті минулого століття і вплинув на навчання студентів, що належать до мовних меншин в школах Сполучених Штатів.

Ключові слова: етнокультурна освіта, мовні меншини, білінгвальні програми, англійський монологізм, мовний бар'єр, рух «Тільки англійська мова», мовна політика США.

ДВИЖЕНИЕ « ТОЛЬКО АНГЛИЙСКИЙ ЯЗЫК »: ЕГО ПОСЛЕДСТВИЯ НА ОБРАЗОВАНИЕ СТУДЕНТОВ, ПРИНАДЛЕЖАЩИХ К ЯЗЫКОВЫМ МЕНЬШИНСТВАМ В США

О.Е. Крсец

В статье рассматривается языковая политика США в школах 20-го столетия на основе идеологии английского одноязычия. Характеризуется движение «Только Английский язык», которое не получило общественной поддержки в США в последней четверти прошлого столетия и повлияло на обучение студентов, принадлежащих к языковым меньшинствам в школах США.

Ключевые слова: *етнокультурное образование, языковые меньшинства, билингвальные программы, английский монолингвизм, языковой барьер, движение «Только английский язык», языковая политика США.*

Крсек Ольга Євгенівна – кандидат педагогічних наук, доцент, декан філологічного факультету Східноукраїнського національного університету імені Володимира Даля (м.Севєродонецьк, Україна). E-mail: krsek@i.ua

Krsek Olga Yevgenivna – Ph.D – in Pedagogy, Dean of Philology Department, Volodymyr Dahl East Ukrainian National University (Severodonetsk). E-mail: krsek@i.ua

УДК 321.01 (477)

СИСТЕМА ПРАВОСЛАВНОГО ВИХОВАННЯ БРАТСЬКИХ ШКІЛ УКРАЇНИ (к. XVI – XVII ст.) КРИЗЬ ПРИЗМУ СИНЕРГЕТИКИ

О. О. Кулишева

У статті надана технологія застосування синергетики в історії педагогіки. Досліджені закони та особливості самоорганізації системи православного виховання у XVI – XVII ст.

Ключові слова: *система православного виховання, синергетика.*

Постановка проблеми. Проблема уточнення варіантів розбудови освітніх та виховних систем, коли на сьогодні їх доцільність й виваженість визначає виключно експеримент, для сучасної педагогіки є досить актуальною. До певної міри вирішити цю проблему можна, використовуючи механізм синергетики, що містить можливості для конструювання й розвитку складних організаційних форм у бажаному для суспільства напрямі. Проте, відношення до перспективи використання даної методології й природничо-наукових принципів пізнання в педагогіці серед науковців є достатньо стриманим, бо розвій будь-якої освітньо-виховної системи відбувається, перш за все, під

впливом свідомо організованого керування суспільства, а не стихійної дії [13]. Отже, виникає нагальна потреба дослідити технологію застосування синергетики в історії педагогіки, щоб зрозуміти логіку розвитку педагогічних систем будь-якого часу.

Аналіз останніх досліджень і публікацій. У педагогічній літературі вивченням принципів дії синергетики у педагогіці займалися Ткаченко Л. І. [12], Колеснікова Є. Б. [6], Нелунова Є. Д., Григор'єва Л. А. [9] та інші видатні вчені. Загалом автори розглядали теоретичний аспект цього питання, визначили функції синергетики, основні тенденції її розвитку. Лише незначна кількість праць (Вознюк О. В. [4], Бронніков В. В. [3]) стосувалася історико-педагогічної площини застосування синергетики. Так, Вознюк О. В. у своїй праці описував процес розвитку вітчизняної педагогічної думки у другій половині ХХ ст. Його дослідження дало можливість виявити діалектичні закономірності еволюції освіти та обґрунтувати синергетичну модель глобальних та локальних тенденцій розвитку освіти і вітчизняної педагогічної думки на сучасному етапі. Бронніков В. В. у свою чергу виокремив періоди соціальної самоорганізації українського народу – це час існування Київської Русі, період змагань за повернення власної державності на українські землі (XIV – початок ХХ ст.) і сучасність. Отже, закони статички і динаміки, зовнішній механізм самоорганізації системи виховання не були достатньо вивчені. Враховуючи це, **метою нашої статті** є дослідження православної системи виховання кінця XVI – XVII ст., коли українське суспільство було досить нестабільним й тяжіло до самоорганізації (становлення соціально-політичної системи козацтва, братського руху тощо) із застосуванням системної методології та принципів синергетики.

Виклад основного матеріалу. Система – це «виділена на основі певних ознак упорядкована безліч взаємозалежних елементів, об'єднаних загальною метою функціонування та єдності управління, що виступає у взаємодії з середовищем як цілісне явище» [5, с. 16]. Згідно з визначенням Сластьоніна В., система виховання – це цілісний соціальний організм, що існує при умові взаємодії основних компонентів (суб'єктів, мети, змісту і способу діяльності) та володіє такими інтегративними (об'єднуючими) характеристиками, як спосіб життя колективу й психологічний клімат [11]. У свою чергу Новікова Л. І. основними компонентами системи бачить: мету, виховну діяльність, суб'єкти діяльності та їх відносини, середовище і управління [16]. Проте, на нашу думку, такий підхід до конструкту системи виховання є дещо незавершеним, елементи складно зіставляти