

**Ontario's Language Education for Newcomers:
Analyzing a Paradoxical Bilingual Multiculturalism Policy**

Keenan Krause

Faculty of Arts and Science, University of Toronto

Produced through the Laidlaw Undergraduate Research and Leadership Scholarship

With the guidance and supervision of Dr. Kevin Lewis O'Neill, University of Toronto



Abstract

Along with most government bodies in Canada, the Ontario government seeks to portray itself as an effective practitioner of multiculturalism. The Ontario and Canadian government have highlighted and tried to prove their multiculturalism through an education system that effectively empowers and supports students from diverse backgrounds. This paper investigates Ontario's education policy focused on newcomer students in secondary schools. This analysis leverages educational policies, data, and research to illustrate that, despite successes in other areas, language education of newcomers in Ontario struggles to fulfill provincial commitments to multiculturalism. This limitation demonstrates gaps within Ontario's public goal of multiculturalism and this paper outlines some of the implications on newcomer communities and its relevance to the broader population.

Ontario's Language Education for Newcomers: Analyzing a Paradoxical Bilingual Multiculturalism Policy

Canada is well-known in the educational world as being a leader in the field. Canadian students tend to land near the top of ranks across core academic variables: mathematics, science, and literacy proficiency (Schleicher, 2018, p. 6-8). However, the educational feat of particular relevance to this research is Canada's ability to minimize the educational achievement gap between immigrant and domestic students more than most countries (Schleicher, p. 28). As a public advocate and practitioner of multiculturalism, the Canadian government finds pride in effectively integrating immigrant students into their educational systems. As shown through 2018 educational data from PISA, an international educational survey, newcomer students in Canada perform similar to domestic students academically and express a level of belonging that mirrors the broader student population. For example, when asked if they agree with the statement, "I feel awkward and out of place in my school," 74% of all participating Canadian students chose "disagree" or "strongly disagree" (OECD, 2018). In comparison, 75% of participating newcomer students chose the same. Similarly, when asked if they agree with the statement, "I make friends easily at school," 73% of Canadian students and 71% of Canadian newcomer students agreed (OECD, 2018). As such, data broadly illustrates Canada's success in creating an education system that integrates newcomer students academically and socially.

The question that this research seeks to answer is whether this positive integration comes at a negative cost. The paper starts with a comparison of American and Canadian definitions of newcomers. The study then transitions to its primary focus on the implication of newcomer student integration into the Ontario public education system at a secondary school level. Since

educational policy is under provincial jurisdiction in Canada, Ontario is the chosen province of focus for the paper as it takes over 40% of immigrants entering Canada (Government of Ontario, 2019). As will be shortly argued, Ontario policy classifies newcomers primarily based on English deficiency – a framework which is critiqued later in the paper. As such, language education policy and its implementation are critical areas for analysis and the focus of the paper. Through this analysis of newcomer language education in Ontario, the relationship between newcomers and the government’s prized multiculturalism will be contested by demonstrating limitations that newcomer families experience integrating into the Ontario public education system. Finally, this paper will finish with the argument that prioritizing heritage language programs is crucial to fully adhere to provincial and national commitments to multiculturalism.

Research Definitions and Frameworks

The central term for this paper is “newcomer.” As newcomer is an emerging term in mainstream education vocabulary, it does not possess one single, universal definition. A quick search for a newcomer definition will likely result in one centered around an individual or individuals who have recently arrived in a new country for long-term residence. However, as this section will explain, this understanding of recent immigrants in Canadian and American educational settings is not the sole characteristic of newcomers and, occasionally, is not even a factor. As such, this paper forms a definition using the perspectives of front-line educators and education policymakers, irrespective of what traditional theoretical academic definitions may be.

As a new term in education literature, “newcomer” is commonly used to supplement or replace similar labels, including an English as a Second Language (ESL) student, depicting recent immigrants with distinct learning needs. Although the term “newcomer” is present in

Canadian literature, it has had a much larger impact on American educational frameworks so far. Currently, over 60 secondary school programs in America are dedicated to educating newcomers. The Center for Applied Linguistics collects information from these American schools, including distinct definitions used by each program to define and classify students as newcomers. After refining their data to show only urban and metropolitan high school newcomer programs, an analysis demonstrates that 88% of newcomer programs indicate that an English deficiency is one of, if not the sole, fundamental characteristic of a newcomer student (Secondary newcomer programs in the U.S., n.d.).

Although there were two other main factors included, interrupted education and a foreign country of origin, language is the most prevalent in newcomer program definitions. For example, a New York City principal defined newcomers simply as “any student learning English as a new language” without any mention of migration (Secondary newcomer programs in the U.S.: New World High School, n.d.). As evidenced by the 60 programs explicitly devoted to the term, the idea of linguistically diverse ‘newcomers’ has already influenced American education systems. This focus is congruent with the history of American education. The U.S. has spent over a century using schools to integrate immigrant children into society and minimize differences by teaching them “American” values, culture, and, most prominently, language (Fass, 2007, p. 492).

While Canadian policies are generally seen as more accepting of immigrant cultures than American equivalents, policies around newcomers and language education are where some overlap exists. Unlike in America, Canada’s newcomer education programs are few, and as such, a database with educational definitions of a newcomer does not exist. However, by focusing on Ontario and exploring government publications, an implicit definition can be ascertained. One of

the most influential documents that outlines the characteristics of the term “newcomer” is the Ontario curriculum on English language learners (ELLs). In the curriculum, the government defines ELLs under two categories: “Canadian-born English Language Learners” and “Newcomers From Other Countries” (Ontario Ministry of Education, 2007a, pp. 8-9). This depiction provides a framework mirroring American schools as it defines newcomers based on two factors: being from another country and lacking English proficiency.

This newcomer framework illustrated through Ontario government policy and its implications in language education is only valuable to analyze when juxtaposed with the national value of multiculturalism. Multiculturalism, as defined by Castles (2004), is made up of two dimensions: “recognition of cultural diversity and social equality for members of minorities” (p. 25). Canada exports an image of valuing multiculturalism to domestic and international audiences. However, while this is complicated in practice, this paper will portray Canada and its various levels of government as preachers of multiculturalism, whether or not they practice what they preach. However, the one aspect that does not always comply with the goal of multiculturalism in Canadian policy is language learning. Originating with the administration of Canadian Prime Minister Lester B. Pearson and his government’s establishment of the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism, all of Canada moved towards bilingualism within a multicultural framework (Ricento, 2013, p. 485). So, while Canada may accommodate recent immigrants’ religious practices or cultural festivities on the surface, a requirement exists for those same communities to learn and use Canada’s official languages: English and French.

Language and Identity

A focus on language is a crucial variable because of its role as a bridge to culture. While analyzing the national implications of language, Friedman (2010) writes that language socialization is the process in which individuals become cultural beings as “they acquire the ways of speaking, acting, and being in the world that are recognized as legitimate within a community (or communities) of practice” (p. 1). In this sense, language is comparable to a secret code that allows membership into a community that may not allow entrance otherwise. However, in reality, this secret code is not merely a specific pre-established phrase. Instead, it is a pattern of behaviours and beliefs that are ingrained within a language. Duff (2007) explains that through language learning, teachers and community members also teach “moral dispositions and social entitlement implicitly indexed through language socialization practices” (p. 314). As a result, language learning is not just a key to enter but also a map required to navigate a new space.

Just as language is a core mechanism for cultural membership, a loss of language can be equally influential as it limits one’s participation within that community. For immigrant communities, leaving their homeland is more than just a physical move. When people emigrate, Mucherah (2008) notes that they also leave “behind ties to their culture such as their land, ceremonies (these are cultural practices), foods, and relationships, retaining only their native language as a tie to their identity as cultural beings” (p. 189). Along with these cultural elements that they are disconnected from, heritage language is a crucial means to connect with older family members who tend to be the keepers and teachers of culture and history (Mucherah, p. 189). As a result, once people move, there tends to be a familial effort to maintain heritage

language competency to preserve a cultural connection that becomes less attainable in a new country.

This relationship between language and cultural identity or membership is known widely enough that it has been present for decades within Canadian documents concerning culture and diversity. Of particular note is the historical context and impact of Canada's Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism (henceforth, The Commission). The Commission emerged as a federal response to the challenge to national unity posed by the Quebec Separatists, the rising volume of immigrants, and the continued presence of Indigenous communities (Ricento, 2013, p. 447). The government understood that the country could no longer achieve unity solely through an ethnic basis and would have to rely on a linguistic one. Haque (2012) sees The Commission's finding to be accurately articulated in this Benedict Anderson quote: "from the start the nation was conceived in language, not in blood" (p. 13). In The Commission's final report, it stated that "Culture and the language that serves as its vehicle cannot be dissociated....those who care about their cultural heritage also care about their ancestral language" (Canada, 1969, p. 13). Here it is evident that the researchers and policymakers understand how language is crucial in one's identity and recorded it in public, national reports.

Furthermore, the members of the Commission did not seek to protect Canada from a supposed threat from newcomers' cultures. They were supporters of it: "The presence in Canada of many people whose language and culture are distinctive by reason of their birth or ancestry represents an inestimable enrichment that Canadians can not afford to lose" (Canada, 1969, p. 14). As a byproduct of The Commission, Prime Minister Pierre Trudeau introduced the federal multicultural policy, a first for any country worldwide. Nevertheless, despite highlighting the

value of newcomer culture and the relationship between culture and language, The Commission concluded that all peoples in Canada must still integrate into a dominant linguistic community. The Commission stated that “The individual must have complete freedom of choice in his integration; the receiving society must, through its institutions, assure him equal opportunities for personal fulfilment” (p. 5). However, although they offer what seems like freedom, it is a freedom of choice with only two options: French or English. As a result, many Canadian institutions continue to function following this sentiment: they offer the freedom to identify and practice what one believes, but only if one does it publicly in English or French.

History of Ontario Language Education

Among the state institutions that function along these lines are Ontario’s publicly funded schools. There is a significant relationship between the school system and the languages of a population. It is widely known within sociology that one of the most influential agents of socialization for youth is schools. This means that schools play a dominant role in exposing youth to social norms and behaviours, including which languages are acceptable. Friedman (2010) notes that schools in Ontario must balance the competing values of “respect for cultural diversity and inclusion” (p. 199). This is no easy task for anyone, and Ontario schools tend to do well in this balancing effort. However, language education for newcomers is where the weight remains too great on the integration side to adhere to the national and provincial multicultural policy.

There are two core programs in Ontario public schools designed for teaching language to newcomers¹. The first is ESL, a program for students whose first language is not English to learn

¹ Ontario, under the national mandate, offers education opportunities in both French and English, Canada’s official languages. However, as English education is used predominantly in Ontario, the paper will default to English

basic English proficiency. The program is the most common for newcomers as they begin to develop their English in Ontario. The Ontario curriculum for ESL and English Language Development (ELD) classes states that “growth towards full linguistic and cultural competence in English should not be at the expense of students’ own languages and cultures” (Ontario Ministry of Education, 2007, p. 4). While this policy connects back to the sentiment for inclusion and diversity outlined by The Commission, gaps appear when comparing policy with reality.

A significant limitation of the ESL program is that while students will gain English skills within a few years, it is not accompanied by maintaining their heritage language skills. In a report from Statistics Canada, the language maintenance of immigrants in Canada is similar to the U.S. since, in both places, it takes approximately three-generations for immigrant families to lose their heritage language in favour of English (Houle, 2011). There are several factors involved in shaping this language loss. For example, Swidinsky & Swidinsky (1997) show that families with stay-at-home immigrant mothers lead to high heritage language transmission and that language transfer decreases with parents’ age (p. 88). However, while language loss is an inevitable reality of migration, some actions can reduce the rates of this loss. After examining the variables that impact language loss, Swidinsky and Swidinsky (1997) concluded that effective education systems that support heritage language learning are vital to the sustainability of minority languages and cultures (p. 92).

In the current language programs, such as ESL, while some teachers may use heritage languages in the classrooms, its use tends to be nothing more than a stopgap to improve students’ English (Fillmore, 1991, p. 334). This type of program would fall under the classification of

language education rather than referencing both English and French education continually to avoid unnecessary complication.

subtractive bilingualism, coined by Wallace Lambert, which depicts learning a second language while losing proficiency in the first. This is a result of the deficit framework that is ingrained in the policy for newcomer programs. As government documents define newcomers on their lack of English proficiency, they overlook the value of a newcomer's heritage language skills. Instead, they focus on how newcomers lack what domestic students possess. Without acknowledging heritage language proficiencies, educators lose opportunities to leverage this knowledge to benefit all students while limiting newcomer students' chances of maintaining these skills. Therefore, although ESL programs are crucial in teaching English, they offer no adequate mechanism to maintain the linguistic abilities, and related cultural connections, that newcomers bring to Canada.

As opposed to the ESL program, Ontario's second language education program is designed to maintain or improve heritage language skills. This program is the International Languages Program (originally called the Heritage Language Program). It functions on the assumption that students have a basic understanding of English and are looking to further their proficiency in a non-Official heritage language. Ontario's curriculum for the program states that the goal is to ensure students are "equipped to become responsible members of our global society. Today's students are living in a global community where communication on the international stage is of crucial importance" (Ontario Ministry of Education, 2016, p. 7). As such, the program's move away from its original classification of Heritage Language to its current label of International Languages symbolizes an emphasis on raising Canadian citizens' success and status on an international field rather than using these language programs to maintain and empower linguistic and cultural diversity locally.

In addition to moving language education's focus away from teaching heritage languages, these programs are also being pushed into the margins of education. For example, all International Language program classes are taught outside of the regular school day, on weekday evenings or weekends (Kim et al., 2020, p. 324). This is partly because Ontario's Education Act mandates teachers to only use English and French as mediums of instruction (Bale, 2019, p. 214). However, the provincial government further marginalizes the program by putting it under the umbrella of Continuing Education rather than the education branch dealing with mainstream K-12 classes (Kim et al., p. 324). Overall, the International Language classes tend to be ineffective for language learning and negative experiences for students (Park, 2013, p. 41). The classes face limited success due to low student motivation due to the program's marginalization, insufficient resources for effective learning, and the diverse ages and skills clumped into a single class (Park, p. 41). This means that even with a program designed to enable linguistic diversity, Ontario does not value the goal enough to ensure its effective implementation.

In short, despite a quarter of Ontario's students speaking a non-official language in their homes, the province fails to provide adequate language education opportunities for the maintenance or improvement of students' heritage language skills. Although the frameworks of language programs seem to promote multiculturalism, they shy away from making meaningful change. There is little evidence that these programs explicitly stigmatize heritage languages, but there is little evidence that also shows their value in maintaining or improving heritage language skills.

Relevance of Culture Maintenance

At this point, a reader may be asking themselves the relevance of this discussion. Alternatively, it is possible to share the blunt view of one commenter of a Globe and Mail article who said: “If immigrants want to save their language - i [*sic*] suggest they stay where they are and don't come here” (Mantel, 2017). There are three core reasons why heritage language education is valuable to Ontario students. First, as noted in the International Languages program curriculum, having a multilingual Canadian population who are exposed to diverse cultures is valuable for social and economic reasons in a globalized world. Second, research illustrates bilingualism’s benefit for student development and capabilities. Teaching newcomer students their heritage language does not just help them perform better in school but also advance their linguistic capabilities (Cummins, 2001, pp. 3-4). In Ontario, heritage language development makes learning English or additional languages a more effective and efficient process (Duff, 2008, pp. 76-78). As such, the belief that heritage language learning limits their ability to learn English is unfounded as it is not a zero-sum game.

These first two reasons are instrumental in the goals of integration and development. However, the third and most crucial reason in this paper’s context is the symbolic value of heritage language education. With a more mainstream and targeted heritage language education program, Ontario would fully adhere to its multiculturalism principles and to Canada’s Multiculturalism Act. Created two decades after Trudeau introduced a national multicultural policy, the Multiculturalism Act mandates a national policy to respect and celebrate diversity in Canada. Included within this act is the statement that reads, “3(1) It is hereby declared to be the policy of the Government of Canada to...(i) preserve and enhance the use of languages other than

English and French, while strengthening the status and use of the official languages of Canada” (*Canadian Multiculturalism Act*, 1985). Nevertheless, this research shows Ontario’s ability to meet the latter goal while neglecting their responsibility to fulfill the former.

Despite this commitment's relevance to all of Canada, heritage language preservation and enhancement in Ontario are failing, with a high cost to newcomers’ cultural empowerment. Heritage language loss has grave social implications for newcomer students seeking community and inclusion. As language is about inclusion in addition to communication, there is a pressure to conform to the majority language to fit in. Since Ontario’s language education programs function through subtractive bilingualism, the inclusion in the majority culture results in a simultaneous gradual exclusion from the student’s heritage language community. When studying identity negotiation in relation to language socialization, Kim and Duff (2012) researched the impact on Korean immigrants. Their data is mirrored in this sentiment from an immigrant student who said, “[in high school,] speaking English was perceived as an act of betrayal or lack of allegiance to one’s Koreanness” (Kim and Duff, p. 89). Additionally, Chinese students in Canada expressed feeling trapped between a desire to connect with Chinese peers, who preferred non-English communication, and an urge to achieve better grades through more English use (Kim & Duff, p. 89). Therefore, limited options in what languages are accepted in classrooms restrict newcomer students’ ability to connect with their diasporic peers or community members meaningfully.

However, in addition to the damage of the relationship between members of immigrant communities, limited heritage language education or use in schools creates an implicit hierarchization between domestically- and internationally-born students and communities. Garza and Crawford (2005) outline how multiculturalism policy in schools evolved to form a dominant

framework that continues to measure success through an obligation to conform to the majority. They argue that newcomer programs focused on English-immersion education are problematic due to an “assumption that students must give up their diversity in exchange for full participation and membership in the classroom and society at large” (Garza and Crawford, 2005, p. 616). Instead of a society made of equal communities, a dominant majority still maintains social superiority and privilege. Suppose a newcomer student is socially or academically penalized for communicating in their heritage language and is only permitted to talk in it privately with family. In that case, Koczan (2016) demonstrates how this student would believe that their language, and as an extension culture, is not valued in Ontario (p. 169).

Conclusion

It must be made clear that this paper is not arguing that newcomer students should not learn English; newcomer students need to learn English to adapt to their new contexts. However, if Ontario continues to pride themselves on their multiculturalism and adhering to national policies that demand respect for all cultures, the language education must improve. Schools that prohibit language instruction outside of French and English and require students to complete standardized tests written in English and French are not inherently problematic. The more fundamental issue in Ontario comes when these policies are not supplemented by effective programs to maintain and develop the valuable language skills that newcomer students and families bring with them. Furthermore, unlike some may argue, investing resources into making effective heritage language programs for newcomers is not taking away money from domestic needs. Instead, as many cited researchers argue, empowering newcomers to maintain and develop heritage language skills is a worthy investment for Ontario. As mentioned, teaching

heritage languages encourages newcomers to learn English faster (Cummins, 2001), achieve higher academic success (Park, 2013), and perform better professionally, which could help improve local economies (Swindinsky and Swindisnky, 1997, p. 91).

However, justifying policy change purely off of this list would further reinforce the belief that any program or policy concerning newcomers must be perceived as valuable to the domestic majority. For Ontario to fully embrace its multiculturalism that it prides itself on, public policies and institutions have to ensure that the reasons for programs such as heritage language education should be focused on respecting and embracing all cultures. For Ontario to fully reach its multicultural potential, equal respect and empowerment must come from a desire to embrace all cultures present in Ontario and provide the resources and opportunities to support their growth and sustainability. If unable, Ontario's multiculturalism will fall into Garza and Crawford's hegemonic multiculturalism that highlights a surface level diversity, but more fundamentally, remains an assimilationist project in some areas of multiculturalism. To achieve this goal in the context of newcomer language education, Ontario educators and policymakers must work to shape programs to allow English education to complement and strengthen students' linguistic skills rather than replace it. Therefore, answering the original question about the cost of efficient newcomer student integration, this research highlights a notable gap in policy implementation. Policymakers and educators must reflect on steps to maintain adequate integration processes that ensure cultural and linguistic sustainability for all.

References

- Bale, J. (2019). Heritage Language Education Policies and the Regulation of Racial and Linguistic Difference in Ontario. In T. Ricento (Ed.), *Language Politics and Policies: Perspectives from Canada and the United States* (pp. 213-231). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. doi:10.1017/9781108684804.012
- Bettencourt, E. (2001). *Recent Research on Newcomer Youth*. *Contact*, 27(2), 53–60.
<https://www.teslontario.org/uploads/publications/researchsymposium/ResearchSymposium2001.pdf>
- Canada. (1969). *Book IV: The Cultural Contributions of the Other Ethnic Groups*. Report of the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism. Ottawa: Queen's Printer.
<https://exhibits.library.utoronto.ca/exhibits/show/canadianlawandidentity/cdnlawmulti1/cdnmulti2>
- Canadian Multiculturalism Act* (R.S.C., 1985, c. 24 (4th Supp.)).
<https://laws-lois.justice.gc.ca/eng/acts/c-18.7/page-1.html>
- Castle, S. (2004). “Migration, citizenship and education”. In *Diversity and citizenship education: Global perspectives*, Edited by: Banks, James A. 17–48. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Cummins, J. (2001). Bilingual children’s mother tongue: Why is it important for education. *Sprogforum*, 7(19), 15-20.
<https://inside.isb.ac.th/nativelanguage/files/2015/11/Bilingual-Childrens-Mother-Tongue.pdf>
- Duff, P. (2007). Heritage language education in Canada. In D. Brinton, O. Kagan & S. Bauckus (Eds.), *Heritage language: A new field emerging* (pp. 71-90). New York: Routledge/

- Taylor & Francis. <https://doi-org.myaccess.library.utoronto.ca/10.4324/9781315092997>
- Fass, P. S. (2007). Immigration and education in the United States. In *A Companion to American Immigration* (pp. 492–512). John Wiley & Sons, Ltd.
<https://doi.org/10.1002/9780470997116.ch24>
- Fillmore, L. W. (1991). When learning a second language means losing the first. *Early Childhood Research Quarterly*, 6(3), 323–346.
[https://doi.org/10.1016/S0885-2006\(05\)80059-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0885-2006(05)80059-6)
- Friedman, D. A. (2010). Becoming national: Classroom language socialization and political identities in the age of globalization. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 30, 193–210.
<https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190510000061>
- Garza, A. & Crawford, L. (2005). Hegemonic multiculturalism: English immersion, ideology, and subtractive schooling. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 29(3), 599-619, DOI: 10.1080/15235882.2005.10162854
- Government of Ontario, Ministry of Finance (2019). *Ontario demographic quarterly: Highlights of second quarter 2019*.
<https://www.fin.gov.on.ca/en/economy/demographics/quarterly/dhiq2.html#:~:text=Ontario%20received%2046.2%25%20of%20all,quarter%20of%20the%20previous%20year.>
- Haque, E. (2012). *Multiculturalism within a bilingual framework: Language, race, and belonging in Canada*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Houle, R. (2011). Recent evolution of immigrant-language transmission in Canada. *Canadian Social Trends; Statistics Canada*.
<https://www150.statcan.gc.ca/n1/pub/11-008-x/2011002/article/11453-eng.htm>

- Kim, H., Burton, J. L., Ahmed, T., & Bale, J. (2020) Linguistic hierarchisation in education policy development: Ontario's Heritage Languages Program, *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 41:4, 320-332, DOI: 10.1080/01434632.2019.1618318
- Kim, J., & Duff, P. (2012). The language socialization and identity negotiations of generation 1.5 Korean-Canadian university students. *TESL Canada Journal*, 29, 81.
<https://doi.org/10.18806/tesl.v29i0.1111>
- Koczan, Z. (2016). Does identity matter? *Migration Studies*, 4(1), 116–145.
<https://doi.org/10.1093/migration/mnv021>
- Mantel, D. C. (2017). Re: *Lost in Translation* [newspaper article comment].
<https://www.theglobeandmail.com/life/relationships/school-and-community-support-is-needed-to-preserve-heritagelanguages/article33267288/>
- Mucherah, W. (2008). Immigrants' perceptions of their native language: Challenges to actual use and maintenance. *Journal of Language, Identity, and Education*, 7:3-4, 188-205.
DOI: 10.1080/15348450802237806
- Ontario Ministry of Education. (2016). *The Ontario Curriculum Grades 9 to 12: Classical Studies and International Languages*.
<http://www.edu.gov.on.ca/eng/curriculum/secondary/classiclang912curr.pdf>
- Ontario Ministry of Education. (2007a). *English Language Learners ESL And ELD Programs and Services*.
<http://www.edu.gov.on.ca/eng/document/esleldprograms/esleldprograms.pdf>
- Ontario Ministry of Education. (2007b). *The Ontario Curriculum: English as a Second Language and English Literacy Development*.

<http://www.edu.gov.on.ca/eng/curriculum/secondary/esl912currb.pdf>

Park, S. M. (2013). Immigrant students' heritage language and cultural identity maintenance in multilingual and multicultural societies. *Concordia Working Papers in Applied Linguistics*, 4, 30-53.

http://doe.concordia.ca/copal/documents/4_Park_Vol4.pdf

OECD. *PISA 2018 Database*. (2018). <https://www.oecd.org/pisa/data/2018database/>

Ricento, T. (2013). The consequences of official bilingualism on the status and perception of non-official languages in Canada. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 34(5), 475–489.

<https://doi.org/10.1080/01434632.2013.783034>

Secondary newcomer programs in the U.S.: Listing. (n.d.). *Center for Applied Linguistics*.

<http://webapp.cal.org/Newcomer/NewcomerListing.aspx>

Schleicher, A. (2018). PISA 2018: Insights and Interpretations. *OECD*.

[https://www.oecd.org/pisa/PISA%202018%20Insights%20and%20Interpretations%20FI](https://www.oecd.org/pisa/PISA%202018%20Insights%20and%20Interpretations%20FINAL%20PDF.pdf)

[NAL%20PDF.pdf](https://www.oecd.org/pisa/PISA%202018%20Insights%20and%20Interpretations%20FINAL%20PDF.pdf)

Swidinsky, R., & Swidinsky, M. (1997). The determinants of heritage language continuity in Canada: Evidence from the 1981 and 1991 census. *Canadian Ethnic Studies/Etudes Ethniques Au Canada*, 29(1), 81.

<http://myaccess.library.utoronto.ca/login?qurl=https%3A%2F%2Fsearch.proquest.com%2Fdocview%2F1293219308%3Faccountid%3D14771>