International Journal of Linguistics and Discourse Analytics
Vol. 4, No. 1, September 2022
P-ISSN 2721-8899 E-ISSN 2721-8880

SOCIOLINGUISTICS AND EDUCATION: THE USE OF MINORITY LANGUAGE FOR INSTRUCTION IN THE CLASSROOM

Ni Wayan Sumariadhi[1], Md. Yudyantara Risadi[2*], Ni Luh Putu Uttari Premananda[2]
[1]Hotel Department, Tourism Academy Denpasar, Denpasar, Indonesia
[2]Culture Tourism Department, UHN IGB Sugriwa Denpasar, Denpasar, Indonesia
yudyantara@uhnsugriwa.ac.id[*]

ABSTRACT

This study aims at (1) investigating issues regarding differences between language use in the classroom and in students' homes and communities in multicultural countries, (2) exploring issues regarding to the use of minority language in the classroom and programs promoting the use of the home dialects of minority children in instruction (3) discussing the position and significance of sociolinguistics in the context of minority language for foreign language education. This study used Library Research Method. The data were obtained by reviewing some existing works from E-books and journal articles found online and websites in relevance with the topics discussed. After identifying and locating relevant information, the data then were analyzed qualitatively. The results of the investigation showed that there are differences between language use in the classroom and in students' homes and communities. These differences cause the students from minority language fail in school. To assist the students, bilingual programs for instances two-way immersion program, accommodation programs were then applied. Finally, the study revealed that the position and significance of sociolinguistics in foreign language education can be examined along three dimensions: attitudes towards learning a foreign language, inclusion of culture in foreign language lessons, and the contribution of language planning to foreign language education.

Keywords: Bilingual; Culture; Education; Home Dialects; Minority Language

I. Introduction

Many sociolinguists have been drawn into public debates about educational implications of their research. For example, the sociolinguists have played in debates over the place of nonstandard dialects in schools, and they claims that the children who use nonstandard forms suffer from 'verbal deprivation' or 'have no language' as argued by Bereiter and Engelmann (1966, in Wardhaugh and Fuller, 2015). In other words, children who use vernacular dialects are

linguistically deprived or deficient. Hudson (2004) in Reaser and Adger (2008) has argued that 'one of the fundamental questions on which linguists disagree is whether or not our subject is useful for education". Reaser and Adger argue that sociolinguistics findings are highly relevant to education. Major questions in the field, such as ethnicity, identity, gender, class, language prejudice underlie issues of social inequity that persist in education.

The chief contribution of sociolinguistics in educational settings has been to draw attention to the differences between language use in the classroom and in students' homes and communities. Gee (2001: 657) in Handbook of linguistics says that "one of the most pressing issues in education today is the fact that many children from lower socio-economic homes, many of them minority children, do poorly in school" Gee points at the linguistic gap between society and the language of education in schools, particularly when children have had little practice at home, school based forms of language and interaction. As a result, they come to school with nothing relevant in the language of instruction. As it is believed instruction is the most important thing to conduct in the class because it can help children in acquiring the specific information (Risadi, Astawa, Winia, Laba, 2020).

This writing investigates the relationship among sociolinguistics, education, and social justice. It starts by showing how language is important to the teaching and learning experiences which occur in school settings. Particularly important here for sociolinguists are the differences between language use in the classroom and language use commonly found in the students' homes and communities. Educational linguists are concerned with describing these differences, often drawing on the ethnographic traditions. Sociological explanations for differences in characteristic habits of pupils from different social backgrounds have also proved of relevance to educational sociolinguistics. This writing cites studies which are concerned with tracing the effects of the language of the home on classroom-based teaching and learning experience, and vice versa. Finally, it discusses the position and significance of sociolinguistics in the context of minority language for foreign language education. In detail, this study has 3 statement of problems namely, 1) Is there difference(s) between language use in the classroom and in students' homes and communities in multicultural countries and its impact to students' performance in school?, 2) What is the program (s) to assist the students from minority language?, and 3) What is the position and significance of sociolinguistics in the context of minority language for foreign language education?

II. Methods

This study was conducted by using library research. According to Biria (2017), library research is the systematic study and investigation of some aspect of library and information science where conclusions are based on the analysis of data collected in accordance with pre-established research designs and methodologies. In this study, the researchers obtained the data

by reviewing some existing works from E-books and journal articles found online and websites. After identifying and locating relevant information, the data were analyzed qualitatively to answer research questions.

III. Findings and Discussion

Differences Between Classroom Language And Home/Community Language And Cultural Tradition

Disadvantage and classroom language

Differences between classroom language and home/community language and cultural tradition are one of the most widely cited explanations for classroom-related language difficulties experienced by pupils. Susan Philips (1972, 1983) in Mesthrie, et al (2009) studied the differences between assumptions governing speech and silence found in (Indian) homes and in the (non-Indian-controlled) public schools on the Warm Springs reservation. Warm Springs children learn early in life that speaking is an adult privilege; children are expected to listen quietly to adult conversations, and to learn from what they hear. Once children reach adulthood, they will have acquired enough information to have things worth saying, and will, in turn, provide verbal lessons for the next generation for young listeners.

In classroom settings, the social meanings associated with silence are read quite differently by teachers and other school personnel. Here, a child's silence signals the failure to complete homework assignments, to pay attention to class discussion, or to be an active and participatory learner in other ways. The likelihood of conflicts between intended and received messages is enormous under these circumstances. And as Philips' research shows, the school success of Warm Springs students is seriously short-changes by those conflicts.

Shirley Brice Heath (1983) in (Mesthrie, 2008) found similar differences between language use in the classroom versus home/community in her studies of the 'ways with words' in rural South Carolina. Heath conducted extensive observations of home language use within middle-class white, working-class white and working-class black communities. Then she went into the local elementary schools, to see whether these patterns of home language use prepared students for successful school experiences.

Middle-class white parents spend much time reading stories aloud and discussing story-events with their pre-school children. Heath argues that middle-class white children are therefore not surprised by the question-asking, revoicing and other features of teacher talk and respond enthusiastically to its demands.

Working-class white parents also spend time reading stories, but are more likely to read to their children then to read with them. Reading is largely a one-said speech event, with parents presenting the story and children absorbing it. Thus, Heath argues, working-class white students come to school less familiar with the question-centered language of teaching and learning which

teachers use in the classrooms. Why they can provide accurate retellings of a storyline, they are less comfortable giving their own opinions or making predictions based on such material.

Working class black parents do not spend time in reading stories, or in any other one-to-one linguistic exchange. However, they encourage children to think and speak for themselves, and are delighted when children do so in public settings. Heath finds that such preparation transfer into the classroom with some difficulty. Teachers are not willing to reinforce such outspokenness, and are often distressed at the amount of talk which working-class black students introduce into the classroom. Both points undermine teachers' claims of control over language and create conflicts between students and teacher which may never be resolved. Philip's and Heath's explanations for home/school language differences are tightly focused around differences between the home and school cultures. This 'cultural relativist' stance was not characteristic of educationists in the performance of working-class and minority children at schools.

Restricted and elaborated codes

According to Wardhaugh and Fuller (2015), an early perspective on the role of social class in education can be found in the work of Bernstein (1961, 1971, 1972, 1990). Bernstein's regards language as something which both influences cultures and is turn influenced by culture. A child growing up in a particular linguistic environment and culture and learns the language of that environment and that culture, and then continues to pass on that learning to the next generation. Bernstein believes that there is direct and reciprocal relationship between a particular kind of social structure, in both its establishment and its maintenance, and the way people in that social structure use language.

Individuals also learn their social roles through the process of communication. This process is different from social group to social group, and because it is different in each social group, existing role differences accomplished in society. In other words, speakers learn the language that is relevant to their social status thereby learning the requirements and restrictions that regulate behavior within that social position. Of particular concern to students' use of language in the classroom, it can be concluded that students from different social and economic backgrounds respond differently to classroom experiences. It can be said that students' language links to position in social structure.

According to Bernstein, there are two quite distinct varieties of language in use in society, they are elaborated code and restricted code (Wardhaugh and Fuller, 2015). According to Bernstein, these codes have very different features. Elaborated codes make use of 'accurate' – in the sense of standard – grammatical order and syntax to regulate what is said; uses complex sentences that employ a range of devices for conjunction and subordinations; employs prepositions to show relationships of both a temporal and a logical nature, employs a large

vocabulary by using all parts of speech (Wardhaugh and Fuller, 2015). The use of elaborated codes can be seen in the following example:

"*In 2009 I don't think that life will be much different. There won't be any robots cooking cleaning and doing other household jobs. Cars won't be flying and huge skyrise buildings. Not many inventions will have been made but one that will be made will be small not very important ones. (http://www.oocities.org/tsl546/langedb.ppt)*"

Elaborated codes are associated with the middle-class families. The codes access to a wide range of syntactic and semantic alternatives. The middle-class students are encouraged to use these options in imaginative and unpredictable ways. As a result, they have precise, highly creative, and richly expressive speech descriptions. The codes used in education, administration, and high domains.

In contrast, the restricted codes employs short, grammatically simple, and often unfinished sentences of 'poor' – meaning nonstandard – syntactic form; uses a few conjunctions simply and repetitively; employs little subordination; tends toward a dislocated presentation of information; is rigid and limited in the use of adjectives and adverbs; makes infrequent use of impersonal pronoun subjects; confounds reasons and conclusion; makes frequent appeals to 'sympathetic circularity,' for example, You know?; uses idioms frequently; and is 'a language of 'implicit meaning' (Wardhaugh and Fuller, 2015). The use of restricted codes can be seen in the following example:

"*In the future I recon We are going to live in space and the moon and hovering cars. I said that because might be mostly covered in water and we would be friends with alien beings. (http://www.oocities.org/tsl546/langedb.ppt)*"

Restricted codes are associated with working class and other marginalized (disadvantaged) groups. The codes access to limited of linguistics options. As the result they have a very limited range of opportunities within society.

According to Bernstein, every speaker of the language has access to the restricted code because all employ this code on certain occasions; for example, it is the language of intimacy between familiars. However, not all social classes have equal access to the elaborated code, particularly lower-working class people and their children, who are likely to have little experience with it. In particular, children from the lower working class are likely to find themselves at a disadvantage when they attend school, because the elaborated code is the medium of instruction in schooling. When schools attempt to develop in children the ability to manipulate elaborated code, they are really involved in trying to change cultural patterns, and such involvement may have profound social and physiological consequences for all engaged in the task. Educational failure is likely to result.

Bernstein believes that the British social-class system does not allow the lower working class easy access to the elaborated code. Members of that class most frequently use the restricted

code, which limits the intellectual horizons of its speakers (Wardhaugh and Fuller, 2015). He argues that poor performance of minority and working-class students due to a language deficit or 'verbal deprivation' or equivalent to not having a language.

In line with this, Bereiter and Engelmann (1966) in (Wardhaugh and Fuller, 2015) who studied African American Vernacular English (AAVE) speakers in America stated that such children show 'a total lack of ability to use language as a devise for acquiring and processing information. Language for them is unwieldy and not very useful'. In the late 1960s, Bereiter and Engelmann's view led to certain proposals to teach Black children the standard variety of the language. To remedy the deficiencies they believed to exist, Bereiter and Engelmann proposed a program designed to teach Black children how to speak; for example, how to make statements, to form negatives, to develop polar concepts ('big' and 'little'), to use prepositions, to categorize objects, and to perform logical operations. In this view, children who spoke AAVE suffered from 'verbal deprivation' or 'had no language' and it was the duty and responsibility of educators to supply them with one. Labov and others have been severely critical of such views, believing that they completely misinterpret the linguistic abilities of Black children (Wardhaugh and Fuller, 2015). These children speak a variety of English which is different from the standard favored by educators, but it is neither deficient nor unsystematic. Indeed, the variety is both systemic in itself and also related systematically to the standard. Moreover, many Black children live in a rich verbal culture in which linguistic ability is highly prized and which many opportunities are offered for competition in verbal skills. To assume that such children cannot affirm, negate, categorize, or think logically because they perform poorly in certain extremely inhibiting testing situations is absurd. They must use language all the time in order to get by, and any fair test of linguistic ability shows them to be as skilled any other children.

Moreover, Bernstein's characterization of language itself was not that of a specialist: actual linguistic examples were rather rare in his studies. By contrast, linguistics at that time was stressing the relations between 'universal' deep structure and surface manifestations in different languages and different dialects of the same language. Dialect differences which seem large scale to the non-specialist or prescriptively trained analyst are often minor in the overall context of the language system. A famous demonstration of this was Labov's account of copula deletion in Black English of the US. The copula is the linking element in language, expressed in English by the verb to be (and its realizations as am/is/are/were, etc.), as in She is smart or He is my uncle. Black English and some other dialects of English tend to delete the copula (She smart, He my uncle).

Labov showed how this surface difference concealed a great deal of underlying, logical similarity. He first noted that there were contexts when the copula couldn't be deleted in Black English, e.g., at the end of a sentence (How smart you are!, not How smart you!). This variability, far from being defective, mirrored a rule of standard English which allows the copula

to occur in contracted form (She's smart; He's my uncle). The most compelling part of the analysis showed that contraction is disallowed in certain contexts in standard English: e.g., in the sentence How smart you're! From the viewpoint of set theory and logic, the rules of Black English and standard English turn out to be parallel: the set of potential sentences in which Black English permits deletion is precisely that in which standard English permits contraction.

In addition, there is ample research which shows that verbal proficiency is valued in AAVE linguistic performances (Kernan, 1972 in Wardhaugh and Fuller, 2015); but such verbal skills are different from the ones that many teachers value. That such children need 'compensatory education' for their lack of linguistics ability is a complete misinterpretation of the facts. They may need some help in adjusting to certain middle-class values about how language is used in education, but that is different matter and is a problem for many non-Black children too. Such views also assume that a major function of schooling is to indoctrinate working-class children in middle-class ways, with language central to this process.

Labov's demonstration of the logic underlying the deletion of the verb be dispelled the idea that the black child was non-verbal or linguistically deprived. Yet, many children still experience difficulties in bridging the gap between the variety spoken within their community and the variety demanded by the school, despite the demonstrations of underlying similarity. As the example of classroom language above shows, power, regulation and control are embodied in teacher–student communication and are central to students' success or failure in the classroom. Bernstein's work does address these issues and could just as well suggest a different practical application from that made by the deficit theorists. As Trudgill (1975) in Mesthrie, et al (2009) argues, it is likely that the problem lies not with the child from a working-class or minority background, but with the expectations of schools. Trudgill suggests that schools should be flexible enough to adapt to the needs of the child. Interpreted in this way, Bernstein's ideas could be used to suggest that it is not the child who should be made to change, but the school system itself.

In other words, Heath, Bernstein and other researchers remind us that classroom language cannot be understood outside of a broader analysis of social opportunity and social control. Those connections are particularly important for sociolinguists interested in finding ways to improve student language skills and, thereby, increase their opportunities for successful educational experiences

Role of the Home Dialect in Education

One of the issues which is basic to the design of curricula for teaching children who speak a dialect other than the prescribed standard is what role the home dialect will play in the classroom. Siegel (2007) in (Wardhaugh and Fuller, 2015) addresses the use of Creoles and nonstandard varieties in education, pointing out multiple problems with forbidding the home

language of children. These include the social, cognitive, and psychological disadvantages of being told that one's way of speaking (and being) is wrong and undesired in the school context. Such admonishments lead to children struggling with identity issues surrounding their heritage, insecurity about expressing themselves in front of the teacher and other classmates, and difficulty acquiring literacy skills.

Siegel (1999) goes on to outline three different ways in which the home dialects of the children can be incorporated into instruction; they are instrumental, accommodation, and awareness program (Cheshire, 2005). In these programs the goal explicitly to enable students to acquire the standard language while maintaining their way of speaking and thus their linguistic self-respect. In instrumental programs, the language is actually used for instruction and for initial literacy, with the standard language introduced to a later stage, for example, the use of Tok Pisin in schools in Papua New Guinea (Wardhaugh and Fuller, 2015). Accommodation programs accept a Creole or minority dialect in classroom, although they are not used as a medium of instruction or subject of study; some basic sociolinguistics is also taught, and the students examine linguistic and pragmatic differences between their own dialects and the standard variety. Different types of accommodation programs have been used in Hawaii, in Australia with speakers of Aboriginal English, and in the Caribbean (Cheshire, 2005). Accommodation programs allow for particular tasks, such as creative writing or oral expression, to be carried out in the home language, as in a reform of secondary education in Jamaica. Awareness programs include accommodation activities but also involve explicit learning about different varieties of the language and the social process through which one dialect becomes the standard. Awareness programs also include a contrastive component in which the students learn about the rule-governed natures of all dialects, and contrast the rules and patterns of their own variety with the standard (Wardhaugh and Fuller, 2015). Awareness programs of various kinds have been carried out in Britain and USA (Cheshire, 2005).

All such programs require a recognition of the legitimacy of the home dialects of the children. If the teachers and administration do not wish to legitimate the dialect, it cannot be used in the classroom. It is possible to both legitimate the dialect and teach the standard, of course, but this requires an ideological stance which allows for pluralism and acknowledges linguistic inequality.

Finally, there is a pedagogical issue. Many educators believe that immersion in the language or dialect to be used in education, that is, the standard, is the best way for children to learn that variety. However, research does not support this view; while obviously exposure to the standard variety is necessary, complete immersion (or 'submersion') has not been shown to be the most effective way to learn that standard (Craig 2001, Cummins 1988, Rickford and Rickford 2000) in (Wardhaugh and Fuller, 2015). Moreover, denying the legitimacy of the children's

home language may have a serious negative impact in terms of both social and psychological development.

Researches Regarding the Use of Minority Languages in the Classroom

One of the frequently cited reasons against the use of anything but the standard majority language is the idea that the most effective way to learn a second dialect or language is complete immersion. Research on bilingual education has not, however, supported this view. Since the early 1990s, evidence has accumulated that immersing children in the target language is not the most effective means of teaching them that language; instead, bilingual education with some instruction in the home language leads to academic success in the long term. What is often called the Ramírez Report (Ramírez et al. 1991 in Wardhaugh and Fuller, 2015), submitted to the US Department of Education, was the result of an eight-year longitudinal study of over 2,300 Spanish-speaking children from 554 classrooms, ranging from kindergarten to sixth-grade, in five different states. It compared different program types and found that the more years of bilingual education children had, the better they performed on English standardized tests in the sixth grade.

There are several things to note about this finding. First, the positive effect of bilingual education in test scores was not always found earlier than the sixth grade; acquiring a language for academic success takes time. The long-term effectiveness of first learning to read in one's first language is definitely higher than having children learn to read in a language they are in the process of acquiring. Second, there is a superficially counter-intuitive result that children who have more schooling in Spanish do better on tests in English than children who have more exposure to English. This finding is linked to the first point, that the children who are in bilingual education programs simply have better literacy skills in the long run because they learn to read in a language they speak fluently, as opposed to a language they are learning. Thus, it is not simply exposure to English (sometimes called time on task) but the nature of exposure to English that is important.

The next large-scale study, which had similar results, was Thomas and Collier's series of publications based on a five-year study of 210,054 student records for children from kindergarten to twelfth grade across the country (Thomas and Collier 1995, 1997, Collier and Thomas 2004) in (Wardhaugh and Fuller, 2015). Again, they looked at student performance according to the type of program the children were enrolled in and also found that bilingual education programs were more effective in creating successful students in the long run. Further, they found that the more time the students spent learning in the minority language, the better they did. That is, students in programs which were 90 percent in Spanish were the highest achievers, followed by students in programs which were 50 percent in Spanish, with students in programs with fewer years of bilingual education, ESL programs, or English mainstream programs doing less well.

The most successful bilingual programs are two-way immersion programs (also called dual language programs). These programs clearly benefit the children by providing them with instruction in their dominant language and exposing them to English through Anglophone peers; such programs have social and psychological advantages which contribute to academic success. Genesee et al. (2006) in (Wardhaugh and Fuller, 2015) also show that English language learners who participate in two-way immersion programs are less likely to drop out of school, have higher long-term academic achievement, and show more positive attitudes on the whole toward school. And for the Anglophone children in these programs, they are not only less likely to discriminate against members of other ethnolinguistic groups, but they also do well academically (Lindholm-Leary 2001) in (Wardhaugh and Fuller, 2015). Although the majority language background part of the population in two-way immersion programs has not been studied as extensively, there exists no evidence that there is any negative impact on Anglophone students who are in bilingual programs in the United States, and they have the positive benefit of learning a second language at a young age.

Sociolinguistics and Foreign Language Education

In classrooms around the world, some of the same issues arise about whether minority languages should be used, and if so, how they should be incorporated into the instruction. Legitimation of home languages and cultures is balanced against the desire to empower the students by teaching them an instrumentally important majority (or international) language.
The position and significance of sociolinguistics in foreign language education can be examined along three dimensions: attitudes towards learning a foreign language, inclusion of culture in foreign language lessons, and the contribution of language planning to foreign language education.

Language attitude

Attitudes towards various uses of language in society can be either positive or negative. Tan and Tan (2008) in (Wardhaugh and Fuller, 2015) look at student attitudes toward Singapore English and Standard English in order to ascertain what is the best pedagogical practice given that the overall goal is for the children to learn Standard English, but they live in an environment where they are exposed to Singapore English, which differs, at times considerably, from the standard. The results from the attitudinal survey showed that the students appreciate the value of Standard English, but that they do not feel that Singapore English is 'bad English.' Use of this variety is an important part of their Singaporean identity. However, such a view of the use of Singapore English is very dependent on context and the interlocutors. Singapore English is considered 'inappropriate' from an English teacher, but less so from a Math teacher. It is the desired code for speaking to friends and family outside an educational context. It is also worth

noting that the Standard English guise which was rated most highly was the one spoken with a Singaporean, not American, accent.

An example of a negative attitude is the development and use of new words in order to avoid gender discrimination. Examples do not occur frequently in Turkish; however, the use of 'biliminsani' (science person) as opposed to 'bilimadani' (science man) is becoming more common in academic circles (Bayyuurt; 2013). English offers more examples, "police officer" instead of "policeman", "chair" instead of chairman", "humankind" instead of "mankind". All of foregoing reinforces the connection between language and attitude.

The place and significance of culture in foreign language education

A look at the concept of culture within the scope of foreign language learning reveals that experiences acquired by the students in their native language are restructured as a result of new concepts and experiences acquired while learning a new language. Students active their prior cultural knowledge before starting the foreign language class and try to make sense of new cultural concepts by comparing and contrasting them with previous ones (Bayyuurt; 2013). To Fantini (1997) in (Bayyuurt; 2013), learning languages by comparing and contrasting the similarities and differences between two cultures is a period of transition in which students' awareness of the foreign language and the culture associated with that language increases. At the end of this transitional period, a universal culture will emerge.

Some researchers believe that incorporating the culture of foreign language in the classroom is a waste of time since the students will never need such knowledge, while others claim the multilingualism and multiculturalism are qualities students need to understand and integrate newly met concepts. To this end, foreign language teachers' cultural awareness should be increased and foreign language learning materials should be restructured in line with multiculturalism and multilingualism (Bayyuurt; 2013).

According to Bayyuurt (2013), another approach to the inclusion of culture in foreign language classroom is to prepare the cultural component of the curriculum in view of learner needs, local/source culture, language identities, and the learning contexts. It is important to analyze culture-related approaches in countries that have received English as the language of the dominant power.

IV. Conclusion

Answering the first research question, it can be concluded that there are differences between language use in the classroom and in students' homes and communities in multicultural countries. There exists linguistic gap between society and the language of education in schools,

particularly when children have had little practice at home, school based forms of language and interaction. As a result, they come to school with nothing relevant in the language of instruction.

Classroom talk is seen as a special register with conventions of its own, especially IRE sequences. Analyses of pupils' responses in class shows that pupils from a minority background might employ different strategies which reflect the norms of their culture, but which clash with classroom expectations. A key theme in educational linguistics is the role of language in school success or failure. Bernstein conceptualized two different orientations towards language, the restricted and elaborated codes. He saw each of these as more characteristic of one social class than another. Since classroom discourse favored the elaborated code, pupils with little previous access to it were at a disadvantage compared to those from a middle-class background whose primary socialization, included the elaborated code. The notion of the two opposing codes has been severely criticized by sociolinguists. Nevertheless, Bernstein's work is important, at least in revealing the gap between children's experience and school's expectations.

Answering the second research question, it can be concluded that the UNESCO team of specialists favours the use of vernacular languages wherever practically possible, seeing them as the most viable way into early cognition. Cummin's interdependence hypothesis stresses the symbiotic relationship between learning in a first language and in a second language. Success in learning in the second language comes only after a threshold has been reached in the first. Under these circumstances, learning in a second language may well help to sustain the first language.

There are different programs in bilingual education in which the home dialects of the children can be incorporated into instruction; they are instrumental program, accommodation program, awareness programs, and two-way immersion program. These programs aim at helping minority language students to perform better in schools.

Answering the third research question, it can be concluded that the position and significance of sociolinguistics in foreign language education can be examined along certain dimensions: attitudes (can be either positive or negative) towards learning a foreign language, inclusion of culture in foreign language lessons, and the contribution of language planning to foreign language education

References

Bayyurt, Y. (2013). Current Perspective on Sociolinguistics and English Language Education. *The Journal of Language Teaching and Learning. 1*. 69-78. Istanbul: Bogazici University.

Cheshire, J. (2005). *Sociolinguistics and Mother-tongue Education*. In Ammon, U., Dittmar, N., Mattheier, K., and Trudgill, P (eds.) Sociolinguistics: an introductory handbook of the science of language and society. Second edition. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Gee, P. J. (2001). *Educational Linguistics*. In Aronoff, M. & Rees-Miller, J (eds.) The handbook of Linguistics, Blackwell Publishers Ltd.

No Name. (2013). *Sociolinguistics and Education*. Retrieved from (http://www.oocities.org/tsl546/langedb.ppt) on 30th October 2017.

Mesthrie, R. (2008). *Sociolinguistics and Sociology of Language*. In Spolsky, B. & Hult, M. F (eds.) The handbook of Educational Linguistics, Blackwell Publishers Ltd.

Mesthrie, R., Swann, J., Deumert, A., Leap, L. W. (2009). *Introducing Sociolinguistics*. Second Edition. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Reaser, J., Adger. T. C. (2008). *Vernacular Language Varieties in Educational Settings: Research and Development*. In Spolsky, B. & Hult, M. F (eds.) The handbook of Educational Linguistics, Blackwell Publishers Ltd.

Risadi, M. Y., Astawa, I. G., Winia, I. M., & Laba, I. N. (2020). The English Scanning Skill of Bilingual and Monolingual Tourism Students in Denpasar Academy Tourism. *Journal of Business on Hospitality and Tourism, 6*(1), 139-150.

Thomas & Collier. 1997. *Strong Foundation of Multilingual Education*. Retrieved from https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Multilingual_Education on 12th November 2017.

Trent, E. (2013). *Opinion: The Benefits of Multilingual Education*. Retrieved from http://tech.mit.edu/V133/N49/trent.html. on 1 November 2017.

Ucelli, P., Snow. C. (2008). *A Research Agenda for Educational Linguistics*. In Spolsky, B. & Hult, M. F (eds.) The handbook of Educational Linguistics, Blackwell Publishers Ltd.

Wardhaugh, R., Fuller, M. J. (2015). *An Introduction to Sociolinguistics*. Seventh Edition. UK: Blackwell Publishing Ltd