Extending Understandings of Bilingual and Multilingual Education

Ofelia García and Angel Lin

Contents

Introduction 2
The Good of Bilingual Education 4
The Interrelationship of Bilingual Education to Social, Political, and Economic Factors 4
Bilingual Education and the Global Neoliberal Economy 6
Bilingual Education and the State 8
Bilingual Education, Power, and Advocacy 9
Families and Communities in Bilingual Education 11
Material Resources for Bilingual Education: Teachers, Curricula, and Pedagogy 12
Beyond Named Languages 13
Beyond Models and Types 17
Conclusion 17
References 19

Abstract

Our traditional understandings of bilingual and multilingual education have been disrupted, as scholars in different parts of the world have questioned some of them. In this chapter we extend the definition of bilingual education to the use of diverse language practices to educate, and we identify the different ideologies that lead to diverse ways of doing bilingual education around the world. We show how bilingual education has to respond to the language practices of people, taking on a social justice purpose, and reinforcing the idea that language is used by people to communicate and participate in multiple contexts and societies.

O. García (✉)
The Graduate Center, The City University of New York, New York, NY, USA
e-mail: OGarcia@gc.cuny.edu

A. Lin
Faculty of Education, The University of Hong Kong, Pokfulam Road, Hong Kong
e-mail: yeonmia@gmail.com; angellin@hku.hk

© Springer International Publishing Switzerland 2016

O. García et al. (eds.), *Bilingual and Multilingual Education*, Encyclopedia of Language and Education, DOI 10.1007/978-3-319-02324-3_1-1

This chapter brings some order to the differences in perspectives that follow in this volume, without negating them. We discuss some of the shared understandings of the authors—the goodness of bilingual education; its relationship to social, political and economic factors including the global neoliberal economy and the state; its relationship to power and advocacy; its engagement of families and communities; and its lack of material resources. And we summarize what some of the authors in this volume claim would be necessary for bilingual education to adapt to the changing world of the 21st century–going beyond named languages and going beyond traditional models and types of bilingual education.

Keywords

Bilingual education models • Families • "Named" languages • Neoliberal economy • Translanguaging

Introduction

In the twenty-first century, our traditional understandings of bilingual and multilingual education have been disrupted, as scholars in different parts of the world have questioned some of them. *Bilingual education* has been traditionally defined as the use of two languages in education, often with the purpose of making students bilingual and biliterate, but other times, especially in educating language minoritized people, simply to enhance comprehension and develop linguistic competence in a dominant language (Baker 2011). Scholars often use the term *multilingual education* to refer to the use of more than two languages in education, an important development in a globalized world where two languages in education may not be enough. But the term multilingual education is also used differently. It is used to refer to the teaching of more than two languages to make students at least trilingual (Cenoz 2009) but also to the use of the many languages of students in classrooms today, often language minoritized students, to make subject matter comprehensible and enhance the development of a dominant language (See "▶ Teaching for Transfer in Multilingual School Contexts" by Cummins, this volume). The title of this volume, *Bilingual and Multilingual Education*, reflects the necessary extension of bilingual education to also encompass multilingual education. Many of our authors use bilingual education as the umbrella term, also encompassing multilingualism. For example, Mwaniki, Arias, and Wiley ("▶ Bilingual Educational Policy," this volume) define *bilingual education* as "any attempt to strategically employ *two or more languages* in instruction for either the purpose of linguistic accommodation for students who do not speak the language of instruction or to promote the learning of more than one language to achieve individual, community-based, societal, or political goals."

In this volume we adopt a definition of bilingual education as *the use of diverse language practices to educate*. As the contributions in this volume make clear, the use of diverse language practices responds to different language ideologies, some

that see language difference as a problem (leading to transitional bilingual education programs), some that see it as a resource (leading to developmental bilingual education programs) or even a right (leading to developmental maintenance programs) (see Ruiz 1984). In some cases, the diverse language practices used in bilingual education correspond to those used by the students in language minoritized homes and/or communities. In other cases, teachers' use of diverse language practices correspond to those associated with other people in different societies and communities of practice and not to those that were originally part of the students' linguistic repertoire. Our use of "diverse language practices" instead of "diverse languages" is purposeful. It points to the idea that bilingual education has to respond to the language practices of *people* and not simply to those that political states or national groups and their schools have constructed as autonomous and bound languages. Bilingual education then takes on a *social justice purpose*, reinforcing the idea that language is used by people to communicate and participate in multiple contexts and societies. A bilingual education that extends children's own language repertoire by appropriating other linguistic features enables the child to be an equal participant in many communities of practice, to truly become what we traditionally call bilingual or multilingual. By upholding the terms "bilingual" and "multilingual" despite our own heteroglossic theoretical lens, we recognize the very real and material effect of named languages on people. Our volume recognizes the importance of named languages for the field of bilingual and multilingual education and for children and communities, while encouraging scholars to think differently about language, in teaching for bilingualism and multilingualism.

This volume also reflects the tensions that we are experiencing in the field today – What is language? What is bilingualism? Is there a difference between bilingual, multilingual, and mother tongue education? What is the purpose of bilingual education? Whose interest does it serve? What are the parameters of the field? These and many others are questions that readers will have, as they engage with the chapters in this volume. Depending on the different perspective of the author, a result of diverse histories and contexts for the work, these questions will be answered differently. We have purposely decided on a volume that includes and puts alongside each other different perspectives, for we believe that it is important to see bilingual and multilingual education from many different angles. For us, human intention is paramount, and it turns out that different people in various contexts need different things from an education that leverages diverse language practices.

In this chapter, we attempt to bring some order to the differences in perspectives without negating them. What can we then say are the shared understandings that the authors of this volume have and what understandings are being extended? What are the principles of bilingual education that we can uphold when reading this volume? We discuss here some of these shared understandings – the goodness of bilingual education; its relationship to social, political, and economic factors including the global neoliberal economy and the state; its relationship to power and advocacy; its engagement of families and communities; and its lack of material resources. We then turn to some extensions that some of the authors included here claim would be necessary to adapt to the changing world of the twenty-first century – going beyond

named languages and going beyond accepted models and types of bilingual education.

The Good of Bilingual Education

All scholars here represented, hailing from all over the world, have one understanding in common – *leveraging the language practices of the children who are being educated is a good thing*. It is good whether the children are immigrants, refugees, regional minorities, indigenous peoples, deaf, hearing, or majorities. This principle reflects that of many proponents of bilingual education. For example, in 1976, Joshua A. Fishman writing about international bilingual education asserts that bilingual education is good for majorities, good for minorities, good for language learning, and good for education. Simply teaching in a monolingual mode that reflects the language practices legitimized by the dominant group or the state is harmful to children. It results in academic failure, linguistic and identity insecurities, and the inability to enjoy the critical metalinguistic awareness that enables students to become critical analysts and users of language in society. And of course, it results in restricting the language repertoire of children to that sanctioned and upheld by the political state in which the education system functions, most of the time resulting in monolingualism, or in what we might call restricted bilingualism, meaning that students are taught to suppress some of the features of their repertoire as inappropriate instead of expanding them fully. Wright and Baker ("▶ Key Concepts in Bilingual Education," this volume) summarize the results of research on bilingual education:

> Overall, research ranging from evaluation studies, comparative analyses, and meta analyses have generally found that bilingual approaches are superior to monolingual approaches, and that longer-term programs aiming for bilingualism and biliteracy have more positive linguistic and academic outcomes for students than do short-term (i.e., transitional) program models.

Tupas & Martin ("▶ Bilingual and Mother Tongue-based Multilingual Education in the Philippines," this volume) claim that the most successful attempts in bilingual education "have been those which *empower local people*. . .to decide on the social development needs of their communities" (our emphasis). Thus, good bilingual education always empowers those who are being educated.

The Interrelationship of Bilingual Education to Social, Political, and Economic Factors

Our authors do not simply see bilingual education as an educational approach that just develops bilingual proficiency or even that just serves students. Although bilingual education has been always seen in interrelationship with social, political,

and economic factors, our understandings of linguistic ideology have penetrated scholarship on bilingual education. Our authors examine how language functions in bilingual education as a proxy for other social and material conflicts. As Holborow (1999) has noted in speaking about English: "Like railways, language can be used for many purposes, and not always those laid down by its British engineers" (p. 92). *Bilingual education is interrelated to social, political, and economic factors*, especially to those of the political state in which it operates, but also to the interests of a global neoliberal economy (see especially "▶ Sociopolitical Issues in Bilingual Education" by Flores & Bale, this volume). All the contributions in this volume point to the complex relationship that exists between political states and their indigenous, colonized, and minoritized communities.

Because languages may be equal, but as Dell Hymes (1992) well reminds us, they hold different values and power in society; it turns out that all bilingual education efforts suffer from the societal hierarchization of languages, which is, of course tied to the political power of the state or to the people who speak the different languages. Dominant spoken languages hold much more weight than all minoritized languages, whether indigenous, immigrant, regional, or signed languages. Instead of equalizing the power of languages, most traditional bilingual education programs give preference to the language of more power. The social status of the minoritized language and the historical background of the minoritized group determine the general support from members of society, and especially of dominant groups. Thus, not all groups fare equally in bilingual education, even in the same geographic territory and with the same macro-societal policies. The dominance of one language or another itself is no guarantee of success in bilingual education, for this is experienced differently in various contexts with different political profiles and by groups of students with different social characteristics. We see this throughout the many contributions in this volume.

The interrelationship of bilingual education to social, political, and economic factors is also evident in the role that *elites* play in carrying it out. Elites in many societies crave bilingual education for the benefit of their own children, but only in dominant languages or varieties that they consider societal resources. This is the case of many of the bilingual education programs in Latin America (See "▶ Bilingual Education in Dominant Languages in South America" by de Mejía, this volume) and in Europe (See "▶ Bilingual Education in Europe: Dominant Languages" by Hélot & Cavalli, this volume).

Within many bilingual education programs only the "standard" variety of the languages are included. In the former British colonies, only certain "standard" varieties of English have become the linguistic capital of the internal elite, and there is the tiering of English proficiencies correlating with job and economic opportunities (e.g., in Hong Kong, Singapore, India, Pakistan, the Philippines). This "standard" variety of English is also held by the internal elite in other contexts where English has become the prestigious second, third, or fourth language to develop for middle class children through CLIL programs (e.g., in Europe; more on this below). In the USA, many bilingual education programs claim to include Spanish and yet stigmatize the bilingual practices that many of the bilingual students

bring into their "Spanish." The acceptance of only the "standard," even as bilingual education programs include a minoritized language, show the reluctance of many educators to include linguistic practices that deviate from what is considered the only way to speak the minoritized language. In this struggle, the linguistic practices of the minoritized community and their children are often stigmatized, perhaps giving children even a greater sense of linguistic insecurity than if their home language had been totally excluded. Elites also play a role in maintaining the status quo, of both dominant and minoritized languages, by restricting education to their own language practices, excluding others and maintaining power. Powerful local elites are also complicit in imperialist and colonial designs that rob all children of a meaningful bilingual education.

Bilingual Education and the Global Neoliberal Economy

The interrelationship of bilingual education especially to economic factors is evident in its concern with the neoliberal global economy in which it operates. As Heller (2011) has said, "in the globalized new economy, communication is central to the functioning of the market; language, culture, and identity are tied to the emergence of niche markets and added value, in a process of localization that globalization has made possible, indeed necessary" (p. 20). In many of the contexts in which bilingual education operates bilingualism is upheld simply because of its market value.

Bilingual education scholars share both an interest and a preoccupation with the growing importance of English as the dominant language in major sociocultural, political, economic, legal, and educational events. On the one hand, this in itself propels the importance of bilingual education, as many people in the world clamor for the need to make their children English-speaking. On the other hand, the fascination with English has consequences for the development and maintenance of minoritized languages. For example, in discussing the languages of the autonomous regions of Spain, Vila, Lasagaster, and Ramallo ("► Bilingual Education in the Officially Multilingual Autonomous Communities of Spain," this volume) consider the effects of the increased popularity of Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) classes in English on the students' acquisition and development of Basque, Catalan, and Galician. Not all authors are preoccupied with the spread of English, but all share the fear of a dominant language threatening the development of minoritized languages in bilingual and multilingual programs.

Our growing globalization means that political states or national groups are not the only ones making language policies. Supranational bodies are also now in position to make language education policies. One case in point is the UN Conventions to protect the rights of indigenous multilingual learners. But as Skutnabb-Kangas (2000; "► Language Rights and Bilingual Education," this volume) points out, these have not been well implemented or enforced. These policies generally support only negative linguistic human rights, instead of positive ones, meaning that they only prohibit discrimination on the basis of language, rather than promoting bilingual and multilingual education programs for the benefit of all. The global

neoliberal economy transcends political states, but it works always in its own favor, giving only limited accessibility to minoritized languages that may empower local communities.

Economic globalization has also had, as a result, the *growing mobility of populations*, as well as their growing transnationalism. In some cases, these migrations threaten a dominant group. In others, however, the increased migrations of a global world also threaten a minoritized group. This is, for example, the case of the Pasifika of New Zealand (See "▶ Bilingual Education in Aotearoa/New Zealand" by Hill, this volume) or of the new students from South Asia coming into Hong Kong (See "▶ Bilingual Education in Hong Kong" by Pérez-Milans, this volume). This greater mobility also impacts the ways in which traditional bilingual education has been conducted with indigenous groups. This is the case, for example, of the intercultural bilingual education programs for indigenous peoples in Latin America. Although they were originally conceived for rural populations, they are increasingly being carried out in the urban settings in which the indigenous people now live (see "▶ Indigenous Bilingual Education in Latin America" by López & Sichra, this volume).

This greater mobility occurs not only through physical moves and migrations across geographic areas. People with different language practices also have an *increased presence in virtual worlds* because of new technologies. Whereas powerless minoritized groups have been geographically isolated or socially marginalized in the past, our technological advances have made their presence well known. Education systems that in the past ignored the presence of language minoritized groups, now have to contend with their ubiquitous presence – in classrooms but also on the web, on the radio, on television. These diverse language practices are registered and divulged widely beyond the speakers' own communities or societies. Bilingual education has also acquired an important role in sustaining language practices that are considered endangered. Many minoritized communities use bilingual education to ensure that their languages are maintained, and as we see in this volume, the success of the revitalization of Māori and of Hawaiian is often attributed to the "language nests" bilingual programs for their young.

At the same time, the greater movement of people means that *students' identities* have also become more fluid and complex (see "▶ Identity, Transnationalism and Bilingual Education" by Choi, this volume). In contact with majority groups, and with greater access to majority languages, some minoritized students develop attitudes of linguistic insecurity and stigmatize their own language practices, preferring those of dominant groups. This is the case that Tupas & Martin outline in the chapter here about the Philippines (see "▶ Bilingual and Mother Tongue-Based Multilingual Education in the Philippines") with students' holding more negative attitudes towards their own language practices and preferring the colonial (English) and national (Filipino) language.

The increased visibility of language minoritized populations also has to do, of course, with *social movements* that occurred in the entire world in the second half of the twentieth century. Although many have observed the fall of these social and ethnic movements as the century came to a close (what Joshua A. Fishman has called

The Rise and Fall of The Ethnic Revival, 1985), the impact of these social movements has awakened a consciousness to diversity and to the inequalities that are not only based on social class, race, ethnicity, and gender, but also language.

Bilingual Education and the State

Despite our perspective as editors that bilingual education needs to pay attention to the diverse language practices of *people* and our consciousness of the growing power of the globalized neoliberal economy, we decided early on to commission chapters that describe bilingual education efforts within different political states or territories. Although we recognize that a neoliberal economy where market capitals have expanded globally has led to a disruption of the modernist link between language and territory, all the authors here included agree that *schools operate in the shadows of nation-state ideologies*. These ideologies are many times determined, or at least impacted, by historical and sociopolitical contexts and the geographies in which they are carried out.

Despite the many different actions of educators and students (see, for example, Menken and García 2010), actors are always negotiating top-down state policies, whether explicit or implicit. Scholars also agree that it is much easier to operate bilingual education programs when the macro-societal language policies support the efforts of local schools. Schools reflect the society in which they operate, and so it is important to view the different approaches to bilingual and multilingual education in the tension produced from top-down policies as negotiated from the bottom-up and vice versa.

Language education policies promoted by states, as we said above, are necessary to promote bilingual education programs, but they are not enough. Even policies that are said to favor language minoritized peoples are often unresponsive to their plurilingual societal realities. Many of the bilingual education scholars here included attest to this. For example, the tripartite language policies of India seem to perpetuate the hierarchization of its languages (See "▶ Bilingual Education in India and Pakistan" by Mahboob & Jain, this volume). Even when these policies are benevolent towards minority groups, they are often based on Western notions of multilingualism – the idea of multiple monolingualisms (Banda 2009). As Mwaniki, Arias, and Wiley ("▶ Bilingual Educational Policy," this volume) say, the result of these policies is then that "languages which have existed side by side for significant periods of time, complementing and supplementing each other in a multilingual symbiosis, are suddenly cast as competing for spaces." The tension is then that multilingualism is socially recognized only as distinctive monolingual enclaves, when the sociolinguistic reality is a lot more fluid and complex. This is especially so in the case of the Deaf (see "▶ Signed Languages in Bilingual Education" by Bagga-Gupta, "▶ Sign Bilingualism and Deaf Education: From Deaf Schools to Regular School Settings" by Tang, this volume).

Policy-makers also often formulate a policy which they have no intention of implementing. This is what Bamgbose (1999) calls "implementation avoidance

strategy." Macro-language policies that support and officialize minority languages are not a guarantee that these languages will be used for official purposes, and especially in education. Makalela ("▶ Multilingualism in South Africa: Reconnecting with *Ubuntu* Translanguaging,"this volume) reminds us that although 11 languages have been included in the constitution of South Africa, indigenous African languages are neglected, especially in education, a result of the unequal power of the people who speak them after having been subjected to racial (and linguistic) apartheid.

Because of the different histories, traditions, and positions of languages within political states and national groups, the different contexts still hold sway in how bilingualism is viewed. As Hélot and Cavalli (See "▶ Bilingual Education in Europe: Dominant Languages," this volume) make clear, it is not the same to carry out bilingual education efforts in border contexts, in colonial contexts, in indigenous contexts, in immigration contexts, or in contexts with strong language education traditions, including core "foreign" language education, as well as Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL). Furthermore, it is not the same to carry out bilingual education efforts in more democratic societies than in more authoritarian ones.

Bilingual Education, Power, and Advocacy

All the authors in this volume attest to the *contentious* and *conflictive nature* of bilingual and multilingual education, regardless of social contexts. This leads to scholarship that is not neutral. Instead, many bilingual education scholars adopt an *advocacy position*.

One reason for the contentious nature of bilingual education is that various groups and societies want different things for different children. For example, for some societies (and parents) bilingual education fulfills the nation's desire for internalization. For others, it responds to the need for a national standard language for national unity and pride. Yet for others, it has to do with the development of a minoritized or endangered language. Sometimes these three goals exist within the same society. And dominant groups gladly support bilingual education efforts to ensure their own children's bi- or trilingualism and bi- or triliteracy, while perceiving the same bilingual education efforts of language minoritized communities as threatening national stability.

Another conflict in bilingual education scholarship has to do with people who perceive that multilingualism is important to participate in neoliberal global markets, whereas others see it only for national identity and cultural authenticity. Some scholars, such as Gándara and Escamilla ("▶ Bilingual Education in the United States," this volume) advocate for bilingual education by promoting a rationale that includes both global and local benefits and that include gains to both the market and individuals' cognitive and sociopsychological well-being. Speaking about the USA, Gándara and Escamilla say, "Bilingual instruction would not only increase their academic achievement, social and psychological well being, but would also strengthen both their own labor market prospects and the economy of the nation."

These are at times contradictory wishes, for dominant groups are not always willing to have others' children achieve educational success, and other children's linguistic resources are often viewed as sub-standard (e.g., the Spanish spoken by Latino children in the USA is often not seen as valuable "standard" Spanish).

In most contexts, the consumers of bilingual and multilingual education come from three main sectors: indigenous or autochthonous peoples, migrant communities, and majority people. Often these people have different wishes and educational goals for their own children. Within one society, this might cause conflict. This is the case of almost all cases explored in this volume, for example, Central Asia (Bahry et al.), the Middle East and North Africa (Zakharia), Pacific Islands (Geraghty et al.), or Western Europe (Sierens & Avermaet and Hélot & Cavalli).

In most contexts, bilingual education is a balancing act, always mindful of what the majority society wants, while attempting to also serve minoritized populations. The chapters here show all the compromises that bilingual education has had to make in order to survive. One example of this tendency to compromise is the development of so-called "two-way dual language" education in the USA. These programs carefully avoid any mention of "bilingual," a term that has acquired negative connotations in the USA (García 2009). Another example is the tendency to support bilingualism as a resource, in many ways giving in to the demands of a neoliberal economy. As Petrovic argues (2005), adopting the language-as-resource orientation bolsters the market forces that work against minoritized peoples and that reinforce, rather than negate, the social power imbalances between majorities and minoritized communities.

To avoid all these sociopolitical trappings, scholarship in bilingual education often operates in third *spaces* and avoids dichotomies. For example, Bagga-Gupta ("▶ Signed Languages in Bilingual Education," this volume), speaking about deaf education uses "third position" to refer to neither privileging technically/medically based oral methods nor visually/manually based sign communication.

All the scholars here included agree on a point of view that seems contradictory on the surface. All agree, as we said before, on the efficacy of bilingual education, and yet all *call for more rigorous research* to support their efforts. It seems that the results of bilingual education continue to be controversial, especially for the wider public and policy-makers. This has to do, as we have been saying, with the fact that elites within societies protect the place of their own language practices in education, a guarantee that their children will continue to perform better in assessments of proficiency and academic competence than those who have different language practices. How to make the research evidence convincing to all is perhaps the one concerted wish of all bilingual education scholars.

All of these chapters show the *tentative and controversial nature* of bilingual education in the world. In describing the different developments of bilingual education in various historical periods in different contexts, all the authors point to the tenuous existence of bilingual education in their societies. Not only do the chapters clearly demonstrate the tensions that exist within understandings and implementation of bilingual education, but also its imperiled and contested nature. Together the

chapters give us the impression that despite much movement in the social sciences towards what has been called a social multilingual turn (Conteh and Meier 2014; May 2014), there is no secure future for bilingual or multilingual education in the world. Gao and Wang ("▶ Bilingual Education in the People's Republic of China," this volume) say it best in relation to China: "the future of bilingual education is without guarantees."

Just as bilingual education is accepted for the children of the powerful but is contested for others, it is also often restricted just to children who are said to be "typical". For example, it has been suggested that students with disabilities and students with low literacy are being excluded from dual language bilingual programs in the United States. Bilingual education scholars are mindful of this issue in the implementation of programs and in the ideologies that surround enrichment bilingual education.

The commitment of scholars of bilingual education lies in *promoting human communication* to its fullest and in advancing social equity. The continuous hierarchization of people who speak different languages means that bilingual educators have to be *vigilant to work against the power and hierarchization* of the language practices of dominant groups.

Families and Communities in Bilingual Education

Bilingual education is an important means to *engage different types of families and communities in children's education*. The inclusion of the community's language and cultural practices brings the school and the home closer together. Including the language practices of the community means that families can participate in their children's education, making it possible for them to continue their labor as legitimate educators of their children. The involvement of families and elders in the education of their own children is an object of self-empowerment for minoritized communities. It also corresponds to family and community language planning efforts that are important for some language minoritized communities.

But beyond the inclusion of people, the engagement of families and communities means that understandings and knowledge are expanded beyond those of the groups in power. The inclusion of families and communities in bilingual education is not simply a matter of benefit to the children because of increased home participation; it benefits the production of knowledge because the lenses to understand the world are expanded by incorporating different perspectives and epistemologies embedded in the linguistic and cultural practices of local communities. Because of this, bilingual education has played an important role in ensuring that endangered languages be used to create knowledge and scholarship. In these cases, bilingual education has not been simply an instrument to "save" an endangered language and its speakers, but rather to expand understandings beyond those of powerful western societies.

Material Resources for Bilingual Education: Teachers, Curricula, and Pedagogy

Teachers have an important role in educating. Without educators, schools cannot be transformed. Families of students and communities with distinct language practices may push for bilingual education, but all scholars here included recognize that *educating bilingual and biliterate teachers* and teachers who understand multilingualism is paramount if we are to succeed in bilingual education endeavors.

The role of the teacher may vary in different cultural and educational traditions, but the value of *good teacher education* is recognized by all scholars. Educators who work in bilingual education must adopt a firm stance about the value of children's own language practices in their education. But they must also develop appropriate instructional designs that enact those stances. Stance and instructional design, both in instruction and assessment, are linked (García et al. 2016). Of course, teacher education programs are also linked to the social and economic interests of states, for they are sources of employment and revenue for certain groups. Without recognizing the link between the social, political, and economic factors and the design and implementation of bilingual education programs, attention might be paid to micro factors that will never change the realities of education for marginalized groups and their empowerment.

Likewise, the development of *appropriate curricula and authentic instructional material* are also factors that are tied to economic interests. The production and publishing of educational material, and especially of assessment instruments, is a big profit-making business. It does not make economic sense to publish material in small languages; yet, we know that the existence of educational material is essential if we want teachers to educate using different language practices. Furthermore, because of the plethora of bilingual education programs at the elementary level and their scarcity at higher grades, there is little instructional material for secondary bilingual education. We have noted, again and again, that if bilingual teachers do not have authentic challenging and creative material in both languages, preference is given to the dominant language. And if big publishing companies do not publish material for communities that speak minoritized languages, then bilingual teachers are often burdened with having to develop that material themselves. Often bilingual teachers have to translate instructional material or find adequate texts. This is an unfortunate situation that results in added attention to dominant language practices instead of upholding those of minoritized people. Mwaniki, Arias, and Wiley ("▶ Bilingual Educational Policy," this volume) summarize it saying that "teachers are seemingly left to their own devices, the implementation and actualization of a semblance to bilingual education rests almost entirely on the ingenuity/circumspection of teachers in implementing official policy."

This situation is also highly influenced by assessment instruments. Even when bilingual education is available, many political states offer assessment only in the dominant language. This has to do especially with the fact that competition among political states, promoted by practices such as the Program for International Student Assessment (PISA), is only assessed using the dominant language. And the

increasing neoliberal trend in education means that students are only compared according to assessment instruments in the dominant language. Furthermore, teachers and even schools and school districts are assessed according to the performance of their students in these standardized tests given only in the dominant language. Bilingual education has never had so much powerful ideological competition, for it has been increasingly difficult to convince communities, families, educators, and even students of the value of being educated bilingually when their performances are only evaluated monolingually.

Beyond Named Languages

All the authors here included support Jim Cummins early and important contribution to the field of bilingual education – the *interdependence hypothesis* (1979, 1981). There is almost universal agreement among scholars that the language practices of bilinguals are interdependent and that enhancing the child's home language practices will surely result in more academic competence in a new language.

One of the most important shifts in scholarship in the twenty-first century has been the adoption of a postmodern or poststructuralist lens to examine social or humanistic questions. The modernist link between language and territory may have been broken, but schools, operating as instruments of the political state, continue to hold modernist positions on language and education. We see in this volume the tension between scholars that hold on to more modernist positions that students have a first language (L1) and a second language (L2) and those who see bilingualism as a continuum, as language use in context and situations which make it difficult to determine what is an L1 and an L2.

Interestingly enough, among those who hold that students have an L1 and an L2 are two very different groups – majority communities who wish to teach two or more dominant languages to their children, and minoritized communities who are especially interested in carving a space for their language and cultural practices in schools. Although educators teaching a "foreign" language or teaching bilingually in two or more dominant languages often insist that "the target language" has to be used, there is evidence of the flexibility in the ways in which the languages are used. This has to do with the fact that what is most important is the child's comprehension of language and content (see, for example, Liebscher and Dailey-O'Cain 2005; Turnbull and Dailey-O'Cain 2009). And although Canadian immersion bilingual programs insisted on full immersion in French for the Anglophones for whom the programs were first developed (See "▶ Bilingual Education in Canada" by Dicks & Genesee, this volume), today bilingual instructional strategies are much more common for the diverse population they serve (Cummins 2007). In contrast, language minoritized groups who after years of oppression and struggle are given the opportunity to teach their children in their language, often hold very protective views of how language is to be used in school, insisting on the complete separation between the indigenous language and the dominant language in society. This is the case of many of the Māori programs in New Zealand (See "▶ Bilingual Education in

Aotearoa/New Zealand" by Hill, this volume) and in many indigenous communities (See "▶ Bilingual Education for Indigenous People in Mexico" by Hamel for Mexico; "▶ Indigenous Bilingual Education in Latin America" by López & Sichra for Latin America; "▶ Indigenous Bilingual and Revitalization-Immersion Education in Canada and the United States" by McIvor & McCarty for Canada and the USA, this volume). The difficulty, however, lies in identifying the role of the indigenous language in communities where the identification function is paramount, but the proficiency is limited. In their volume on indigenous youth views about language, Wyman et al. (2014) show how young indigenous people struggle with competing ideologies about language. The youth express their love of their language, and yet, unlike their elders, claim a role for all their language resources in order to participate in the history and culture of the community. For indigenous minorities, oppressed and threatened with extinction, schooling is important. But as McCarty et al. (2014) express, indigenous schooling has to be reimagined to capitalize on youth's fluid sociolinguistic strengths. Instead of identifying language with a traditional place in which it holds a set of stable characteristics, it is important for schools to provide an *embodied space* with youth activity at the center of placemaking (O'Connor and Brown 2014).

Skutnabb-Kangas taught us long ago (1988) that identifying a first or second language depends on the criteria one uses. Is it the first one acquired? The first one learned? The one most used? The one in which the speaker considers herself or himself more proficient? The one with which the speaker identifies? The one with which others identify the speaker? These are all questions that have different answers and that may lead us to abandon a strict categorization of an L1 and an L2. For example, indigenous youth whose heritage language has been forcibly taken away from them cannot be considered L2 speakers, even if they are relearning it in school. Their bilingualism, as García (2009) says is recursive, being reclaimed and repositioned bit by bit. In so doing, the indigenous language is being brought by its young speakers into a dynamic future which cannot just reproduce the past.

The same issue exists when identifying which is the L1 and the L2 of Deaf people. Since most Deaf students have hearing parents, sign language may not be the first language learned, and yet, it is the main language of communication among the Deaf. As the chapters here by Bagga-Gupta and Tang make clear, Deaf youth use their semiotic systems fluidly, as they blend their sign and spoken languages.

The issue of what is an L1 and what is an L2 has become contested in the twenty-first century as multiple norms are made visible. Translanguaging theory (see, for example Blackledge and Creese 2010; Cenoz and Gorter 2015; Creese and Blackledge 2010; García and Li Wei 2014; García & Lin, "▶ Translanguaging in Bilingual Education," this volume; Hornberger and Link 2012; Lewis et al. 2012a, b; Li Wei 2011; Otheguy et al. 2015) supports the idea that named languages are social constructions and that bilingual education needs to leverage *all the language practices* of children and not simply those legitimated in schools. Bilingual children have one complex and extended repertoire of linguistic features and not simply two bounded languages – an L1 and an L2 or Arabic, Chinese, English, Spanish, etc. (see Wei and García 2017).

As Makalela ("▶ Multilingualism in South Africa: Reconnecting with *Ubuntu* Translanguaging," this volume) states, the oneness ideology of European modernism is inconsistent with many value systems that predate European colonialism, including what constitutes "languages." The autonomous bounded nature of European languages contrasts sharply with the dynamic bilingualism (García 2009) and translanguaging of multilingual people around the world, especially indigenous communities.

Translanguaging scholars argue that bilinguals have a linguistic repertoire that consists of features that are societally assigned to one language or the other but that from the point of view of bilingual speakers is part of a unified language system that is their own. Translanguaging in bilingual education then upholds the language practices of children in their complexities and not simply the language features of standard academic language as defined by political states and their education system. Scholars who uphold translanguaging in bilingual education support the development of minoritized languages and majority languages. But they do so by starting from the diverse language practices of the children and not simply from a position that they have a bounded L1 to which then an L2 is added.

Theories of translanguaging (García and Li Wei 2014; see also García and Lin, see "▶ Translanguaging in Bilingual Education," this volume), while upholding bilingualism, disrupt the idea that there is simply monolingualism and bilingualism/multilingualism. Bilingualism is not simply an addition of two languages (Grosjean 1982; Heller 1999), although it has an additive philosophy, in the sense that it expands (adds to) the language repertoire of the student. Bilingualism is dynamic (García 2009) and new language features functionally interact dynamically with old ones. Students act on their dynamic bilingualism, and teachers and students must then leverage translanguaging in order to go beyond the socioeconomic trappings of many bilingual education programs.

Many authors in this volume take up the notion of translanguaging in describing the language use of multilinguals. This is especially visible in Deaf bilingual education. Bagga-Gupta ("▶ Signed Languages in Bilingual Education," this volume) talks about the transmodal and translanguaging features of human communication. In the case of the Deaf, she points to the "linking" and "chaining" between oral languages and signed languages as everyday normal bilingual practices. Jessner ("▶ Multicompetence Approaches to Language Proficiency Development in Multilingual Education," this volume) refers to the bilinguals' coordination of their language resources and their constant decision making as to what strategic moves they should make to achieve specific communicative effects. And speaking about South Africa, Makalela ("▶ Multilingualism in South Africa: Reconnecting with *Ubuntu* Translanguaging," this volume) calls for educators to discard the separatist worldview of colonialism and adopt an *Ubuntu (interconnectedness)* translanguaging framework which takes into consideration the sociocultural and linguistic fluidity of African humanism.

García and Lin ("▶ Translanguaging in Bilingual Education," this volume) have attempted to bring together the two positions on language by positing a strong and a weak version of translanguaging. The *strong version* posits that bilingual people do not speak language*S* but rather use their integrated repertoire of linguistic features

selectively to respond to the communicative needs and achieve their communicative purposes in context. On the other hand, a *weak version* of translanguaging supports national and state language boundaries but calls for softening these boundaries.

Even though in the twentieth century bilingual and multilingual education supported the strict separation of languages, the chapters in this volume also suggest that there is a shift going on that supports what Cummins has called "bilingual instructional strategies" (2007). Some scholars, grounded in an understanding of language as bounded and autonomous system sometimes refer to this use of bilingual instructional strategies by the term code-switching, arguing that this is what bilingual students do and what teachers all over the world do in order to make themselves understood (Lin 2013). Others, however, are increasingly understanding this more fluid use of language from the perspective of translanguaging theory, claiming that although from the outside this might be understood as going from one language to the other, the bilingual child or teacher is simply leveraging their own integrated linguistic system of features that make up their repertoire. The words, sounds, and morphology are not from one language or another. They are simply the bilingual's words, sounds, and morphology that bilinguals learn to then suppress or activate when they are in different communicative situations.

Bilingual education came into its own around the world in the last part of the twentieth century, especially as minoritized groups claimed their language rights. Although this effort on behalf of people needs to continue, it is also important not to reproduce the nationalist ideologies that have led states to oppress their minorities. As the link between speech community and territory becomes more and more tenuous in the twenty-first century, we must make room for divergent language practices within one space. Bilingual scholars cannot fall prey to the nationalism to which they have been victims. Instead, the challenge for bilingual educators is how to extend the respect and use of their own minoritized community practices to those of others – newcomers to the enterprise. This is especially relevant when minoritized groups have obtained some rights from language majority communities. The Māori are a case in point. Although clearly their language and cultural practices are still endangered in their English-dominant communities, they must make room to also extend their right to indigenous language to those less fortunate, Pasifika people who cannot claim their language practices as treasures of origin or land. The same can be said about Latinos in the USA. Although still stigmatized and discriminated against, bilingual education in Spanish/English has acquired a limited measure of legitimacy in the USA. How to share that privilege with other less fortunate groups is important. And how to recognize the different language practices among Latinos in bilingual education programs – those associated with English, Spanish, Mixteco, and the myriad indigenous languages of the Americas – is an important endeavor. As Grosjean said long ago (1982) bilingualism is not simply two monolingualisms in one. We know that monolinguals who are said to speak the same language never share the exact same linguistic features. There is, of course, more overlap of features with those with whom they are in close communicative contact than with others, often those of the same social class, of the same neighborhoods, and of the same families. Among bilinguals there is even more variability since they not only diverge

in these social communicative characteristics, but also in histories, contact with others, degrees of stigmatization and discrimination, and degrees of power, among other characteristics. Thus, it is most important that bilingual programs pay attention to the different language features that their students hold, a product of histories of colonization, contact, oppression, etc.

Beyond Models and Types

Because of the modernist tradition of bilingual education, the scholarly field has focused on describing boxed models of programs. Wright and Baker ("▶ Key Concepts in Bilingual Education," this volume) give us a good list of types of programs – developmental maintenance bilingual education, immersion bilingual education, transitional bilingual education, dual language bilingual education, bilingual and multilingual education in major international languages, bilingual education for Deaf students, bilingual special education, and gifted and talented bilingual education. But as Wright and Baker argue in this volume, a shift must occur between focusing on "effective programs" and focusing on "effective practices." As García (2009) has said, there is much flexibility in how these programs are implemented, and so perhaps a better way of studying bilingual education is to think of its features, rather than of models (Baetens Beardsmore 2009; Cenoz 2009).

The challenge for schools in the twenty-first century is how to create flexible dynamic models of bilingual education, where students' language practices are used not simply as a "scaffold" when learning in a second language, but as a *transformative practice that puts power back in the lips of multilingual speakers* instead of simply acquiescing to the power of education and state authorities. To do this, educators must start with the language practices of their students and communities and create bilingual education programs that leverage them and extend them to ensure that children become competent users of language. The goal of education cannot simply be bilingualism in two standard languages, as defined by state and educational authorities. The goal of bilingual education must be the empowerment of bilinguals to use their entire language repertoire in different situations for added criticality and creativity (Li Wei 2011).

Bilingual education program types must then be dynamic, conforming to the existing practices in the community, rather than have the children and communities conform to preestablished notions of what constitutes the two or more languages. Only then will bilingual education programs become instruments of social justice and work to transform the relations of power in which schools (and named languages) exist.

Conclusion

The question of what is appropriate language use in education is a question of power. Who decides what is appropriate? Do states, supra-states, or national groups decide? Or do people decide?

Appropriate language use in bilingual communities consists of being able to use their entire language repertoire without having to actively suppress some of their features. This in itself is a transformative experience that empowers local bilingual people.

Bilingual schools must then create spaces in which students are empowered to freely use *their entire language repertoire* to think deeply, create liberally, and civically engage freely, without always being asked to be less than what they are. Only by being empowered will bilingual children then also learn to suppress specific features of their repertoire in certain spaces. Bilingual education must start with people's language practices, not with languages as having predetermined features which are always those of the powerful, even within minoritized communities. Of course, bilingual education must also show students how to use their language repertoire in ways that are deemed appropriate by powerful language majority communities. But as Pérez-Milans so adequately said "▶ Blingual Education in Hong Kong," this volume, bilingual education has the most chances to succeed when it "*empowers local people*."

In order for bilingual education to act on its potential, we must acknowledge the principles that we have laid out in this chapter:

1. Bilingual education is intrinsically a good thing.
2. Bilingual education is interrelated with social, political, and economic factors, including policies exerted by a global neoliberal economy as well as local states.
3. Bilingual education is entangled in issues of power and advocacy.
4. Bilingual education gives voice to families and communities, especially language minoritized ones.
5. Bilingual education does not have appropriate material resources.

In order to succeed, bilingual education in the twenty-first century must extend its position on named languages and on bilingual education "models." Not everyone in all contexts has to share understandings. But there are two principles that are paramount:

1. *Going beyond named languages*. Bilingual education must start with the language practices of children and not with named languages as defined by states and nations.
2. *Going beyond named models and types*. Bilingual education program designs must respond to the language practices of children and not to preconceived notions of "models" of how language is to be used to which the children must then conform.

The potential of bilingual education lies precisely in empowering the local students who are being educated. In order for it to be good for all, to be free of its relationship with social, political, and economic factors, to empower especially language minoritized families and communities, and to have the adequate resources

to educate fully, it needs to free itself up from the demands of nations and states and instead pay attention to the demands of children, their families, and communities.

References

Baetens Beardsmore, H. (2009). Bilingual education: Factors and variables. In O. García (Ed.), *Bilingual education in the 21st Century* (pp. 137–157). Malden: Wiley-Blackwell.

Baker, C. (2011). *Foundations of bilingual education and bilingualism* (5th ed.). Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

Bamgbose, A. (1999). African language development and language planning. *Social Dynamics, 25* (1), 13–30.

Banda, F. (2009). Critical perspectives on language planning and policy in Africa: Accounting for the notion of multilingualism. *Stellenbosch Papers in Linguistics PLUS, 38*, 1–11.

Blackledge, A., & Creese, A. (2010). *Multilingualism: A critical perspective*. London: Continuum.

Cenoz, J. (2009). *Towards multilingual education. Basque educational research from an international perspective*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

Cenoz, J., & Gorter, D. (Eds.). (2015). *Multilingual education: Between language learning and translanguaging*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Conteh, J., & Meier, G. (Eds.). (2014). *The multilingual turn in languages education. Opportunities and challenges*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

Creese, A., & Blackledge, A. (2010). Translanguaging in the bilingual classroom: A pedagogy for learning and teaching? *The Modern Language Journal, 94*, 103–115.

Cummins, J. (1979). Cognitive/academic language proficiency, linguistic interdependence, the optimum age question, and some other matters. *Working Papers on Bilingualism, 19*, 121–129.

Cummins, J. (1981). The role of primary language development in promoting educational success for language minority students. In California State Department of Education (Ed.), *Schooling and language minority students: A Theoretical framework* (pp. 3–50). Los Angeles: Evaluation, Dissemination and Assessment Center.

Cummins, J. (2007). Rethinking monolingual instructional strategies in multilingual classrooms. *Canadian Journal of Applied Linguistics, 10*(2), 221–240.

Fishman, J. A. (1976). *Bilingual education: An international sociological perspective*. Rowley: Newbury House.

Fishman, J. A. (1985). *The rise and fall of the ethnic revival. Perspectives on language and ethnicity*. Berlin: Mouton.

García, O. (2009). *Bilingual education in the 21st century: A global perspective*. Malden/Oxford: Blackwell/Wiley.

García, O., & Li Wei (2014). *Translanguaging: Language, bilingualism and education*. London: Palgrave Macmillan Pivot.

García, O., Johnson, S., & Seltzer, K. (2016). *The translanguaging classroom*. Philadelphia: Caslon.

Grosjean, F. (1982). *Life with two languages*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Heller, M. (1999). *Linguistic minorities and modernity: A sociolinguistic ethnography*. London: Longman.

Heller, M. (2011). Paths to post-nationalism: a critical ethnography of language and identity. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Holborow, M. (1999). *The politics of english: A Marxist view of language*. London: Sage.

Hornberger, N. H., & Link, H. (2012). Translanguaging and transnational literacies in multilingual classrooms: A bilingual lens. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism, 15*(3), 261–278.

Hymes, D. (1992). Inequality in language: Taking for granted. *Penn Working Papers in Educational Linguistics, 8*(1), 1–30.

Lewis, G., Jones, B., & Baker, C. (2012a). Translanguaging: Developing its conceptualisation and contextualisation. *Educational Research and Evaluation, 18*(7), 655–670.

Lewis, G., Jones, B., & Baker, C. (2012b). Translanguaging: Origins and development from school to street and beyond. *Educational Research and Evaluation, 18*(7), 641–654.

Li Wei (2011). Moment analysis and translanguaging space: Discursive construction of identities by multilingual Chinese youth in Britain. *Journal of Pragmatics, 43*, 1222–1235.

Li Wei and García, O. (2017). From researching translanguaging to translanguaging research. In K. King, & Yi-Ju Lai (Eds.), Research Methods. In Encyclopedia of language and education. Springer.

Liebscher, G., & Dailey-O'Cain, J. (2005). Learner code-switching in the content-based foreign language classroom. *Modern Language Journal, 89*(2), 234–247.

Lin, A. (2013). Toward paradigmatic change in TESOL methodologies: Building plurilingual pedagogies from the ground up. *TESOL Quarterly, 47*, 521–545.

May, S. (Ed.). (2014). *The multilingual turn. Implications for SLA, TESOL and bilingual education*. New York/London: Routledge.

McCarty, T. L., Romero-Little, M. E., Warhol, L., & Zepeda, O. (2014). Genealogies of language loss and recovery. Native youth language practices and cultural continuance. In L. T. Wyman, T. L. McCarty, & S. E. Nicholas (Eds.), *Indigenous youth and multilingualism. Language identity, ideology and practice in dynamic cultural worlds* (pp. 26–47). New York: Routledge.

Menken, K., & García, O. (Eds.). (2010). *Negotiating language policies in schools: Educators as policymakers*. New York: Routledge.

O'Connor, B. H., & Brown, G. (2014). Just keep expanding outwards: Embodied space as cultural critique in the life and work of a Navajo Hip Hop artist. In L. T. Wyman, T. L. McCarty, & S. E. Nicholas (Eds.), *Indigenous youth and multilingualism. Language identity, ideology and practice in dynamic cultural worlds* (pp. 48–69). New York: Routledge.

Otheguy, R., García, O., & Reid, W. (2015). Clarifying translanguaging and deconstructing named languages: A perspective from linguistics. *Applied Linguistics Review, 6*(3), 281–307.

Petrovic, J. (2005). The conservative restoration and neoliberal defenses of bilingual education. *Language Policy, 4*, 395–416.

Ruiz, R. (1984). Orientations in language planning. *NABE Journal of Research and Practice, 8*(2), 15–34.

Skutnabb-Kangas, T. (1988). Multilingualism and the education of minority children. In T. Skutnabb-Kangas & J. Cummins (Eds.), *Minority education: From shame to struggle* (pp. 9–44). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Skutnabb-Kangas, T. (2000). *Linguistic genocide in education, or worldwide diversity and human rights?* New York: Routledge.

Turnbull, M., & Dailey-O'Cain, J. (Eds.). (2009). *First language use in second and foreign language learning*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

Wyman, L. T., McCarty, T. L., & Nicholas, S. E. (Eds.). (2014). *Indigenous youth and Multilingualism. Language identity, ideology and practice in dynamic cultural worlds*. New York: Routledge.