

Let's aim for a win-win instead of continuing to wash our hands only to then dry them on the ground

A comparison of two opposing approaches to teaching Haitian school children: The renowned 1982 Joseph C. Bernard education reform and the 2021 “Cadre d’Orientation Curriculaire” developed by Haiti’s Ministry of Education in collaboration with the French Development Agency.

This is an adaptation and update of our [article in le Nouvelliste](#).

INTRODUCTION

Since Minister Nesmy Manigat was reinstated as the head of Haiti’s Ministry of National Education and Vocational Training (MENFP) in November 2021, he has launched several initiatives aimed at radically expanding the role of Haitian Creole (*Kreyòl*) within the traditionally French-dominated school system of Haiti. This shift in policy and the current public debate surrounding it offers many opportunities and challenges for the country. In the 1980s, a similar education reform based on the mother-tongue was attempted, but, as we will discuss below, it ultimately failed in many of its objectives. In this article we aim to help spread understanding of the significance and difficulties (opportunities and challenges) of Haitian language-in-education policy reforms, like those currently being pursued by the Ministry of Education.

This article focuses on two opposing proposals for Haitian language-in-education policy — the first from over 40 years ago and the second from 2021. This piece draws upon a much larger research project conducted by the MIT-Haiti Initiative team where we evaluate an extensive set of Haitian education policy documents and provide a broader analysis of the historical and theoretical issues regarding the (mis)use of language in the Haitian classroom. We are currently pursuing publication of the results of this expanded project in an academic journal.

Of the two language-in-education policy programs considered here, the more recent is part of a project that has been financially and technically supported by the French Development Agency (i.e., *Agence Française de Développement*). Its curricular agenda was formally published by the Haitian Ministry of Education in 2021 in a document called

the “Curricular Orientation Framework for the Haitian Educational System. Haiti 2054” (in French, *Cadre d’Orientation Curriculaire pour le système éducatif haïtien Haïti 2054*), henceforth COC 2021. [i] This document offers a framework for primary and secondary education in Haiti, stating that its overall objective is to form a novel sort of citizen who can serve the future of their country. The COC 2021 furthermore asserts that it is part of a larger project aiming to achieve the mission of Haiti’s renowned 1982 Bernard Reform.[ii] The Bernard Reform, the earlier language-in-education program considered in this article, proposed a radical transformation of the school system in Haiti.[iii] Named after the then Minister of Education, Joseph C. Bernard, the reform mandated a *ten*-year “fundamental education” program that would use Kreyòl as the *primary language of instruction*. That is, Kreyòl would be used in the teaching of all core subjects, such as mathematics, history, science and so on. Furthermore, corresponding textbooks would be written in Kreyòl rather than French, so that students could understand subject matter faster and more thoroughly. This reform was in many ways ahead of its time. It maintained that, if students build an intellectually solid and emotionally resilient foundation through their mother tongue — which is Kreyòl for essentially all Haitian children — they will have a greater ability to successfully learn second languages, such as French, in courses devoted to this objective. Unfortunately, faced with opposition to his reform from within the Duvalier regime, Joseph C. Bernard was removed from his position in mid-1982. In the following years, political instability and resistance to the expanded role of Kreyòl caused Bernard's Reform to encounter many obstacles and undergo several transformations before the Ministry began implementing changes to the education system in the 1990s. As a result, many key stakeholders and even pro-Kreyòl educators have since misunderstood, misinterpreted or misrepresented the actual content and strength of the Bernard Reform’s mother-tongue-based curriculum.

The truth is that despite the COC 2021’s assertion that the Bernard Reform is its primary inspiration, these two reforms represent two diametrically opposed visions of the role that Kreyòl should play in the Haitian classroom. Below we shall demonstrate how these policies and the reasoning motivating them are entirely inconsistent with one another. While Bernard's reform was based on scientific research in linguistics and pedagogy that demonstrate the importance of mother tongues in education, the COC 2021 provides an unfounded defense of education policies that prioritize French over Kreyòl as language of instruction, therefore devaluing the only language that, as stated by Article 5 of Haiti’s 197 Constitution, “unites all Haitians.” These policies continue to fail millions of Haitian children. What Minister Joseph C. Bernard proposed for the education system was a true anti-

colonial revolution that could serve as a model for the transformation of schools in other countries enduring analogous linguistic injustices.

We hope to show in this article that the policies, arguments, and pedagogic philosophy underpinning the Bernard Reform are just as relevant to Haiti today as they were in 1982. There are many lessons to be drawn from this reform that can inspire both educators and politicians seeking to build a school system that honors the identity of the Haitian people and provides quality education for all.

THE JOSEPH C. BERNARD REFORM, 1979-1982 – WHAT IS IT?

The term “Bernard Reform” refers to a set of education policies spearheaded by Joseph C. Bernard during his tenure as Minister of Education between April 1979 and July 1982. During these three years, he attempted to completely overhaul linguistic practices of Haitian schools by giving Kreyòl an extensive role in children’s education.

There are three main policy documents from Bernard’s tenure as Minister of Education that we must review in order to understand the reform.

The first is the Law of September 18, 1979.[iv] Passed by the Haitian Parliament, this law allowed Kreyòl to serve as both a language of instruction (i.e., a medium of instruction) and as an object of instruction (i.e., a subject to be taught).[v] Although this only made Kreyòl permissible in schools, rather than mandating its use, this seemingly modest first step was necessary as the country's Constitution had, since 1954, prohibited the use of Kreyòl in public services unless specifically authorized by law.

The second document is a decree issued by the Ministry of Education on March 30, 1982, entitled the *Decree organizing the Haitian educational system in order to offer equal chances to all and to reflect the Haitian culture* (i.e., *Décret organisant le système éducatif haïtien en vue d’offrir des chances égales à tous et de refléter la culture haïtienne*). This policy document presented Bernard’s plan for a “fundamental school” program, initially intended by Bernard to be ten years long (but subsequently shortened to nine years). In the curriculum mandated by this decree, Kreyòl was not only an object of instruction, but also a language of instruction for the first ten years of schooling. Students would learn French from the first year as an academic subject. Significantly, it would be taught as a second language rather than treated as the presumed mother tongue of the students, as had been the

traditional practice. Starting from the sixth grade, French would be used as a second language of instruction alongside Kreyòl. For more details, see the table below accompanying this article.

The third document was published by the Ministry of Education, also in 1982. Entitled *The Educational Reform — Elements of Information* (i.e., *Réforme Éducative — Éléments d'Information*), the primary goal of this document was to explain the motivations and goals of the Decree of March 30, 1982. This document provides several arguments for the importance of teaching Haitian children in Kreyòl. Despite the document being over 40 years old, the data and conclusions of modern pedagogic research continue to corroborate Minister Joseph C. Bernard's reasoning for mother tongue education. Here are some of the arguments presented in the document:

- The Haitian education system must be based on science; it should not be based on the preferences and prejudices in our imagination or ideologies (pp. 12, 37-8).
- Schools must honor the culture and identity of the children they serve (p.10).
- In Haiti, the use of French as the main language in schools has caused many problems, such as a high dropout rate in even the earliest grade levels and many students failing to achieve literacy (p. 13).
- The use of French as the language of instruction from the earliest grade levels greatly benefits the children of the elite since they already know how to speak French from their homes before they enter school (pp. 38-39).
- Pedagogic science shows that, if children start school with their mother tongue as the language of instruction, then they are able to build a solid intellectual foundation which can be used to efficiently learn a second language — such as French for Haitian children (pp. 39-40).

In addition to this, the document explains that the reform was intended to be part of a broader movement toward having Kreyòl eventually serve as a language of instruction *at all levels of the education system* (pp. 50-51).

The reform aimed to make every student *functionally* bilingual. “Functional bilingualism” means that a person can “function” in a second language in context-specific domains, often those related to academic activities. For example, a university student may be able to understand a textbook or article in a second language, but may still feel more comfortable using their mother tongue when asking questions to their professor or debating

with their peers. This functional bilingualism does not require students to master the second language to the same level of proficiency as their mother tongue, but rather that they are capable of efficiently using the second language in the specific areas where they need it.

The government of Jean-Claude Duvalier fired Minister Joseph C. Bernard a few months after he signed the Decree of March 30, 1982, and then ceased all reform activities. After Duvalier fell from power in 1986, the project was revived under a new Minister of Education, but by then most of the enthusiasm for teaching in Kreyòl had been lost. Many detractors felt that the Bernard Reform was too radical and did not want French to lose its place in society. In other words, they generally did not want to lose the prestige and economic benefits afforded to their social class by fluency in French. On December 1, 1988, the Ministry of Education issued another decree supposedly implementing the Bernard Reform throughout the country. This decree, however, made no clear statement regarding the roles of Kreyòl and French in the education system. As a result, there is today a lot of confusion and misunderstanding about the actual extensive role granted to Kreyòl in the reform. The extent of misrepresentations of the Bernard Reform in subsequent official policy documents amounts to a form of cover-up or, at best, to incompetence or neglect.

The COC 2021 policy document – WHAT IS IT?

The COC 2021 document was developed by the MENFP with the financial and technical support of the French Development Agency as part of their Project NECTAR (*Nouvelle Éducation Citoyenne Tournée vers l’Avenir*). According to the Project NECTAR web page, the French Development Agency gave the Haitian government a grant of 8 million euros “in order to support the curriculum reform that began with the Bernard Reform and with the aim of improving teaching in the third cycle of primary school [grades 7-9] and secondary school [grades 10-13].”[vi] Despite this statement that Project NECTAR targets only the higher grade levels, the project has also produced the COC 2021 document in order to “cover fundamental education [grades 1-9] as well as secondary education [grades 10-13] to guarantee total internal coherence.”[vii]

The stated linguistic goal of the COC 2021 is for all students to achieve *balanced* bilingualism in French and Kreyòl. “Balanced bilingualism” implies that a person can “*at the same level of ease in both languages in terms of speaking, listening, writing, reading*” [viii]. This goal of achieving perfect linguistic parity in terms of fluency is absolutely impossible, given the realities of the Haitian educational system and the country’s demographics and

sociolinguistic profile. In truth, from our analysis, this is not the actual goal of the COC 2021. The document requires that Haitian children start using French as a language of instruction in the 3rd grade, and then, starting from the 5th grade, French becomes *their sole language of instruction for all core subjects*. Thus, from the 5th grade onward, the students' mother tongue would be employed for only two to three hours a week in Kreyòl language classes. The “balance” here seems to be heavily weighted in favor of the small francophone elite who grow up speaking French at home, thus having a command of spoken French from the start of school. Such “balance” is at the expense of the large monolingual Kreyòl-speaking majority with little, if any, exposure to French in their normal everyday lives.

In our view, independent of the the actual objectives of the COC 2021, the effect of the policies it promulgates would be to continue to demoralize and de-incentivize this monolingual majority, first by treating Kreyòl — the sole language that unites all Haitians — as incapable or inappropriate for producing and sharing knowledge beyond a 5th grade level, and, consequently, to ensure a massive early departure from the school system.

One must then ask how such devaluation of Haiti's national language and identity is supposed to produce the citizenry Haiti needs for a better tomorrow in 2054? Regardless of one's stance on this, such an anti-Kreyòl curriculum is not based on any solid scientific data and results. The COC 2021 goes against robust findings from the past few decades of research in linguistics and science of education affirming the necessity of students' fluency in their language of instruction. Moreover most linguists today would agree that all languages have, in principle, the same capacity for the expression of thought and concepts. Any apparent limitation is due to the fact that the language has, for far too long, been by and large excluded from the production and transmission of academic knowledge. But there's no principled reason why a curriculum framework in a sovereign Kreyòl-speaking nation would ban the use of the sole national language in the higher grades of the school system.”

A curriculum that restricts the use of Kreyòl while targeting “balanced bilingualism” gives the children of Haiti's elite a tremendous advantage in the school system — which through academic advancement and diplomas translates to a tremendous economic and social advantage. In contrast, most children in Haiti are immersed in the Kreyòl language in almost every aspect of their lives. How will these children ever achieve comfort “at the same level” in both French and Kreyòl in all respects? How will they learn to use French to make jokes, haggle prices in the market, cheer at soccer matches, and so on, if the only place

they find this language is on the school bench, most often from the mouths of teachers who themselves do not even have anything close to a mastery of the French language? Really there's nothing "balanced" in the COC!

Although in some of its lofty humanistic language the COC 2021 may appear both as a positive step towards achieving universal quality education and as aligned with the ideals of the Bernard Reform, the reality is far from it. In fact, the COC 2021's language-in-education policies are in *opposition* to the Bernard Reform, whose policies were based on careful scientific research in both linguistics and pedagogic science. That's why we can say that this COC 2021 is "poison in the wine" (to paraphrase a Kreyòl idiom) that we found in the 1982 Bernard Reform.

Do we want to take a win-win approach to language-in-education policy, or are we going to continue washing our hands only to dry them on the ground?

Comparing the Bernard Reform (1982) to the COC (2021)

Table: Language of Instruction Policies of Bernard Reform and COC 2021

	Bernard Reform (1982)	Cadre d'Orientation Curriculaire, i.e., COC 2021
1st grade	Kreyòl	Kreyòl
2nd grade	Kreyòl	Kreyòl
3rd grade	Kreyòl	Kreyòl and French
4th grade	Kreyòl	Kreyòl and French
5th grade	Kreyòl	French
6th grade	Kreyòl and French	French
7th grade	Kreyòl and French	French
8th grade	Kreyòl and French	French
9th grade	Kreyòl and French	French
10th grade	Kreyòl and French	French
After 10th grade	Describes itself as part of a project for Kreyòl to eventually be used as language of instruction at all levels of education	French
	A (late) additive approach, whereby French is added in 6 th grade while Kreyòl is never removed – a form of mother-tongue-based multilingual education	An early-exit subtractive approach, whereby students begin learning in French in 3 rd grade, and completely lose the use of Kreyòl as a language of instruction in 5 th grade

The prescriptions in the COC 2021 fall into the category of bilingual programs called “early-exit *subtractive* approaches.”[ix] In these approaches, children start school in their first language while learning a second language as a taught subject. Soon thereafter, students begin a full transition to the second language as the language of instruction. Before the 5th year of primary school, the students' mother tongue is completely removed as a language of instruction. These methods have become widespread in lower-income countries, many of which are former colonies that still fetishize their former colonizer’s language as tool for élite closure and geo-political hegemony. According to experts in education, however, such approaches do not yield positive results in terms of learning outcomes or grade-level advancement. A major flaw in these models is that students rarely become proficient in the second language before the transition. The problem is compounded when we consider that most teachers — particularly outside of the most expensive private schools — do not actually have a mastery of the target second language. As a result, the “teaching” that they then do in the second language is largely dependent on rote memorization instead of active learning. That is, students will be required to memorize and recite large blocks of text without necessarily understanding their content. This greatly reduces how much they truly learn in their formal education. Despite this sacrifice to their general knowledge base, it’s too often the case that even the small number of students who graduate from high school do not feel comfortable in this second language.[x]

In contrast, Bernard’s Decree of March 30, 1982, proposed an *additive approach* — that is, an approach in which the curriculum adds the use of a second language without removing the learners’ native language from the classroom. Today, such additive approaches are called *mother-tongue-based multilingual education* or MTB MLE.[xi] In such an approach, the first language of the child is used as the *only* language of instruction up to at least the 5th grade, while students study a second language in language-learning courses. They then start using this second language as an *additional* language of instruction in about the 6th grade, with the mother tongue continuing to be used as a co-language of instruction. Scientific research clearly shows that the additive approach of MTB MLE produces better academic results than the subtractive approach[xii]. Furthermore, studies show that students who spend more years with their native language as the language of instruction are more successful in learning a second language. The additive approach helps students develop solid intellectual and academic foundations through their first language, which in turn helps them to learn both additional languages and core academic subjects.

In Kreyòl, the approach of the Bernard Reform could be called an “apwòch 2 kabès”— that is, a “win-win approach” (where “2 kabès” is etymologically derived from the Spanish “dos cabezas” referring to the ending of a domino game in which the winner can place their winning piece at either end of the domino configuration, thus a “double win”!). In this win-win approach, Haitian students could finish school with both a solid general academic foundation through their native Kreyòl *and functional* bilingualism in French.

On the other hand, the policies of the COC 2021 ought to be considered an “apwòch lave men, siye atè” — a “wash your hands and then dry them on the ground (or “squeezing blood from stone”) approach. Students and teachers put in a lot of work, parents invest a lot from their meager economic but the result is failure for most everyone: a waste of both time and resources.

IS THE CHOICE OF THE TEACHING LANGUAGE REALLY THE PROBLEM?

One could argue that the failure we see in the Haitian school system is not a result of language policy. This argument can frequently be found on social networks, sometimes among Haitian teachers, and sometimes even among some Kreyòl teachers. Many people believe that the problem instead stems from the lack of school materials and the poor quality of teacher training — challenges often encountered in lower-income countries such as Haiti.

There do indeed exist many significant challenges facing Haitian education beyond the linguistic factor, and these should not be overlooked. Haiti has too few well-trained teachers and only a small percentage of them are fluent in French.[xiii] Additionally, many schools have too many students and not enough resources. That said, even in countries with strong economies, generally well-trained teachers, and typically smaller classroom sizes (such as Canada and the United States), “immersion schools” with programs that employ second languages as the vehicle of instruction from early grades have still been found to encounter challenges. This is particularly the case for students in immersion schools who lack opportunities to practice their target second language outside the classroom and for those whose parents who cannot offer them additional language-learning support and resources, as is common for children from lower-income families. Countries that can consistently afford highly trained teachers alongside quality materials have a better chance of success.[xiv] .

In resource-rich societies, experts recommend five to seven years of learning a second language in order for students to feel comfortable in this second language.[xv] Be

that as it may, a study[xvi] observing middle-class English-speaking Canadian students who attended French immersion schools found that the students were far from “native-proficiency” (or from the COC’s “balanced bilingualism”) at the end of their program, and that they still preferred to use their native English for academic tasks due to a lack of confidence in French. As Kathleen Heugh, a professor of Language Education and Multilingualism, astutely observed with regards to African education systems: “(I)f the immersion model has not met with the success it promised early on in the well-resourced Canadian conditions, there is no way that it could serve the majority of children in African countries well.”[xvii]

Given the challenges such programs have had in achieving their intended objectives in wealthy countries, there is no reason to believe that schools using subtractive early-exit curricula in low-income countries should broadly produce students “comfortable” enough to abandon their mother tongues and learn entirely in a foreign language by 5th grade.

CONCLUSION

Forty years after Duvalier removed Joseph C. Bernard as Minister of Education, Haitian authorities still cite his reform as the inspiration for their own language policies, just as in the COC document published by the Ministry of Education in 2021. It seems, however, that the experts and technicians who wrote the COC 2021 never actually read the Decree of March 30, 1982, or they chose to ignore it completely. It is not without tragic irony that the Bernard Reform, which sought functional bilingualism through mother-tongue-based multilingual education, has, since then, been presented as the ideological inspiration of the COC 2021’s curricular framework — a framework that promptly removes Kreyòl as a language of instruction and seeks a “balanced bilingualism” that selectively benefits a small number of children from the Francophone elite. Instead of the authorities encouraging the use of the national language, Kreyòl, for active learning and knowledge production at all levels of education, policy documents such as the COC 2021 seek to zombify students by consigning them to parroting a language they do not master. Such methods have caused the educational failure of the majority of the population, condemning the country to continued misery and frustration. This is yet another factor that makes Haiti “the most *impoverished* country in the Western Hemisphere.”

ENVOI

Between the time of writing the original Kreyòl version of this article, which was published in August 2022, and the writing of this updated English version, there have been some positive developments on the language-and-education policy front in Haiti.

On August 25, 2022, Minister Nesmy Manigat cited, in a tweet, a new version of the COC dated 2022. In this tweet, the Minister announced that Kreyòl will be used as a language of instruction starting from the first year of primary school all the way to the last year of secondary school. But the Minister's announcement is not entirely consistent with other aspects of his planning. For example, in announcing revisions to COC 2021, the Minister mentions the use of French as a language of instruction alongside Kreyòl starting in the 3rd grade. But a previous memo from the Minister, dated February 21, 2022, requested that only Kreyòl be used for manuals in the first 4 grades, except for the French manual. But, given the announcement dated August 25, 2022, we must ask: Can French be used as the language of instruction alongside Kreyòl in the 3rd and 4th grades if textbooks for the first four grades, outside of the French manuals, are to be written exclusively in Kreyòl? And we must remember that the 1982 Bernard Reform called for Kreyòl to be the sole language of instruction in the first 5 grades. All this makes it seem that the updated COC, in spite of the progress there, has also run into contradiction with Bernard's Reform.

Since we have not yet (as of May 2023) seen the official validated version of this new COC, we are waiting for details, including those regarding fundamental questions related to teaching and learning methods, language teaching, functional or balanced bilingualism, curriculum, content, children's identity and national culture. Meanwhile the Minister has continued making progress with the publication and piloting of textbooks in Kreyòl only, for the first two grades (except for the teaching of French with French manuals), while planning to pilot similar textbooks for the 3rd and 4th grades as well, with a recent announcement, on February 21, 2023 (International Mother Tongue Day), that the goal is to have textbooks in Kreyòl up until the 6th grade.[xviii]

One of the fundamental questions about any future updated COC is: Will this new COC target the goal of FUNCTIONAL bilingualism as planned by Joseph C. Bernard for the well-being of all Haitian children? Or will this updated COC target the objective of BALANCED bilingualism, which is the anti-scientific elitist method inherent in the 2021 version of the COC? According to our analysis in this article, the goal of BALANCED bilingualism in Haiti amounts to having the schools function as a tool for reproducing the

social inequality that keeps the country so divided and impoverished. In any case, we have hope when we read what the Minister wrote in this Tweet (from August 25, 2022):

“[MENFP] is pleased to announce this year's changes to the Curriculum Orientation Framework. Kreyòl: Language of instruction up to the final year of highschool. We are moving forward little by little on multilingual education based on Kreyòl.” —

<https://twitter.com/nesmymanigat/status/1562783994605092870>

Despite the contradiction in the Tweet regarding other decisions of the Minister and the Bernard Reform, this latest decision, together with the initiative to have textbooks mostly in Kreyòl up to the 6th grade, is another big step forward for the implementation of the Bernard Reform of 1982. Better late than never!

In the meantime, this Bernard Reform is like a beautiful garden that has been there for a long time (since 1982!) and has been forgotten even though it is still full of beautiful Creole pigs, beautiful vegetables, beautiful fruits that have enough vitamins to satisfy a people who have been hungry for centuries. We only need to enter this garden and take advantage of all the food it can offer us.

REFERENCES AND BIBLIOGRAPHY

[i] MENFP (2021). Cadre d'Orientation Curriculaire pour le système éducatif haïtien Haïti 2054.

[ii] "NECTAR se situe dans la filiation de la réforme Bernard (1982), dont l'ambition était de créer un système éducatif plus dynamique bâti sur des pédagogies actives, sur un socle commun d'apprentissages constituant le fondement éducatif de la citoyenneté et, enfin, sur la valorisation de la langue créole acquérant le statut de langue d'enseignement. ... L'objectif est d'améliorer la qualité de l'enseignement aux niveaux collège (3^o cycle du fondamental) et lycée (secondaire), ..."

<https://www.afd.fr/fr/carte-des-projets/projet-nectar-pour-education-citoyenne-tournee-vers-avenir> . Accessed March 21, 2022

"L'agence Française de développement (AFD) a octroyé à la République d'Haïti une subvention de 8 millions d'euros dans l'objectif d'appuyer la réforme curriculaire entamée lors de la Réforme Bernard et visant à améliorer la qualité de l'enseignement du 3^{ème} cycle du fondamental et du secondaire. En effet, cette réforme doit permettre d'aboutir à la mise en place d'un enseignement fondamental, complet et de qualité sur 9 années, suivi d'un cycle secondaire de 4 années."

"Le projet NECTAR (Nouvelle Éducation Citoyenne Tournée vers l'Avenir) financé par l'AFD a pour objectif d'accompagner le Ministère de l'Education Nationale et de la Formation Professionnelle (MENFP) durant les 5 prochaines années dans la planification, la coordination, et la mise en œuvre de cette réforme d'envergure. Il est question d'une mesure de fond qui concerne l'ensemble du système éducatif, des enseignants aux formateurs, en passant par les élèves et les outils didactiques."

"Le déploiement du 3^{ème} cycle de l'enseignement fondamental et la généralisation des nouveaux programmes du secondaire permettront d'achever la Réforme Bernard initiée en 1982. La finalité principale de ce projet est de mettre en place une nouvelle éducation haïtienne résolument tournée vers l'avenir et en cohésion avec l'environnement social, culturel et économique, tout en privilégiant l'intégration des citoyens par une meilleure insertion professionnelle."

<https://nectar.menfp.gouv.ht/#/Acceuil> . Accessed March 31, 2022.

[iii] Decree of March 30, 1982: Décret organisant le système éducatif haïtien en vue d'offrir des chances égales à tous et de Refléter la culture haïtienne.

[iv] Haitian government. Law of September 18, 1979.

[v] “Article 1: Usage du créole, en tant que langue commune par les 90% de la population haïtienne, est permis dans les écoles comme langue-instrument et objet d’enseignement.” (Haitian Government, 1979).

[vi] “... dans l’objectif d’appuyer la réforme curriculaire entamée lors de la Réforme Bernard et visant à améliorer la qualité de l’enseignement du 3ème cycle du fondamental et du secondaire. <https://nectar.menfp.gouv.ht/#/Acceuil>. Accessed March 31, 2022.

[vii] “Par la suite un Cadre d’Orientation Curriculaire (COC) sera développé. Il couvrira à la fois le fondamental et le secondaire afin de garantir une cohérence interne totale.” <https://nectar.menfp.gouv.ht/#/Enjeux> . Accessed March 20, 2022.

[viii] “L’ambition de l’école haïtienne est d’amener, d’une manière équilibrée, chacun à parler, comprendre, lire et écrire, avec une égale aisance dans l’une et l’autre langue.” page 16, Cadre d’Orientation Curriculaire (MENFP, 2021). Our bolding and italics.

[ix] Benson, C. (2016). Addressing language of instruction issues in education: Recommendations for documenting progress (Education Monitoring Report). UNESCO. Ouane, A., & Glanz, C. (Eds., 2011). Optimizing learning, education and publishing in Africa: The language factor: a review and analysis of theory and practice in mother-tongue and bilingual education in sub-Saharan Africa. UIL/ADEA.

[x] Dejean, Y. (2010). Chapter 9. Creole and Education in Haiti. In A. K. Spears & C. M. Berotte Joseph (Eds.), *The Haitian Creole language: History, structure, use and education* (pp. 199–216). Lexington Books.

Govain, R. (2014). [La situation du français à l’université en Haïti](#). *Le français à l’université* 19, 4.

Merant, W. (2005). [La compétence des étudiants de l'Université d'État d'Haïti en français écrit](#). *Le Nouvelliste*, December 15, 2005.

[xi] In English: "Mother-tongue-based multilingual education" or MTB MLE.

[xii] Walter, SL, & Davis, PM (2005). The Eritrean national reading survey. Dallas, TX: SIL.

Benson, C. (2016). Addressing language of instruction issues in education: Recommendations for documenting progress (Education Monitoring Report).

Heugh, K., Benson, C., Bogale, B., & Yohannes, MAG (2007). Final Report Study on Medium of Instruction in Primary Schools in Ethiopia. Ministry of Education, Government of Ethiopia.

[xiii] IFADEM (2013). Report of the Mission in the Republic of Haiti.

[xiv] Abello-Contesse, Cristián (2013). Bilingual and Multilingual Education in the 21st Century : Building on Experience. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

[xv] Ouane, A., & Glanz, C. (Eds., 2011). Optimizing learning, education and publishing in Africa: The language factor: A review and analysis of theory and practice in mother-tongue and bilingual education in sub-Saharan Africa. UIL/ADEA.

[xvi] Helle, T. (1995). French Immersion in Canada: The Most Successful Experience in Language Teaching or a Middle-Class Fad (Scandinavian Working Papers on Bilingualism 10). Center for Research on Bilingualism, Stockholm University.

[xvii] Page 123 of Heugh, K. (2011). Theory and practice – language education models in Africa: Research, design, decision-making and outcomes. In A. Ouane & C. Glanz (Eds.), Optimizing Learning, Education and Publishing in Africa: The Language Factor (pp. 105–155). UIL/ADEA.

[xviii] Manigat, N. (2023) [Journée internationale de la langue maternelle: Discours du ministre Manigat à l'UNESCO](#). *Le Nouvelliste*, 2/23/2023.