1 Bilingual Community Education: Beyond Heritage Language Education and Bilingual Education in New York

Ofelia García, Zeena Zakharia
and Bahar Otcu

Introduction

This book focuses on educational spaces shaped and organized by American ethnolinguistic communities for their children, what we are calling here *bilingual community education*. Some of these activities include what others might call supplementary or complementary schools – after-school and weekend programs. Others are informal educational spaces. Yet others are private day schools or public school ventures where the community has been the leading force.

We use New York, a global multilingual city, as a case study to explore the structures and meanings of bilingual community education, as well as to better understand American ethnolinguistic communities and their networks in today's globalized world. In doing so, we extend present understandings of 'heritage language education' and 'bilingual education'. We also reconceptualize the notion of an 'ethnolinguistic speech community' for a global world.

In this chapter, we trace the development of educational spaces for US ethnolinguistic communities, as we point to the small amount of attention that these community-driven efforts have received in the scholarly literature until very recently. We discuss the differences in naming these activities ethnic mother-tongue schools, supplementary/complementary schools, heritage language education programs or bilingual education programs. In choosing to name these activities *bilingual community education*, we indicate that the focus of these activities is *bilingual* in nature, and not just the maintenance of an 'ethnic-mother tongue' or the development of a 'heritage language'. In indicating the *community* aspect of these activities, we distance ourselves from bilingual education programs in which the educational agents are other than those within the particular bilingual community, and where the governmental focus is the development of the dominant national language, namely English in the US case.

We divide this foundational chapter into three parts. Section I, Traditions and Context, reviews the tradition and continuities of bilingual community education in the US, and then turns to describing the sociolinguistic situation of New York City to ensure that readers understand how the dynamism and contacts in a global city shape all these efforts.

Sections II and III engage examples from this book to conceptualize *two major theoretical contributions* that we wish to make to the field of language education:

- First, these bilingual community education spaces, because of both their sociolinguistic and their socioeducational characteristics, *go beyond what has been called 'heritage language education', as well as the timid efforts of public US 'bilingual education'* (Section II: Beyond heritage language and bilingual education).
- Second, our cases lead to *new understandings of US ethnolinguistic communities,* beyond those of 'speech communities' of traditional sociolinguistics towards diasporic communities (Section III: Beyond ethnolinguistic communities).

Our chapter closes with a Conclusion that describes some of the challenges that these schools face, and offers recommendations for future directions.

The first part of Section I describes the long tradition of bilingual community education in the US. We pay attention to the role that it has played in different periods of US history. As we do so, we explore the scarce scholarship that has surrounded the existence of these bilingual community education efforts. We also try to disentangle the disparate visions that each name for these activities has conjured.

I: Traditions and Context

Traditions and continuities

The attention paid to the education of American children in public schools has diverted interest from efforts by different US communities to educate their children in ways that reflect their various characteristics, languages, cultures and values. Yet there has been a long US tradition of bilingual community schooling.

Early German language communities established their own bilingual schools with community funds, sometimes aided by public funds. It is well known, for example, that in the late 18th and early 19th centuries there was a sizable network of parochial German-language schools of the Lutheran and the Reformed churches in Pennsylvania and Ohio (Castellanos, 1983; Crawford, 2004; García, 2009a). Although Germans had the largest network of schools that used languages other than English (LOTEs hereafter) in the 19th century, there were other ethnolinguistic groups who also organized their own schools. The Cherokees, for example, established and operated their own educational system in the 1850s, in which their children were taught to read and write Cherokee (García, 2009a).

This tolerance towards the establishment of educational programs by ethnolinguistic communities nearly came to a halt in the xenophobic atmosphere surrounding the early 20th century. Between 1890 and 1930, 16 million immigrants entered the US, increasingly from Eastern and Southern Europe, as well as the Greater Syria region of the Ottoman Empire. Gradually, the great number of Germans in the US, coupled with their enemy status during World War I, fueled suspicion against all ethnolinguistic groups (Crawford, 1992; García, 2009a; Kloss, 1977). The mood of the time was captured by Theodore Roosevelt when he said in 1915: 'There is no room in this country for hyphenated Americanism ... We have room for but one language here, and that is the English language' (as cited in Edwards, 1994: 166).

By 1923, 34 of the 48 US states required that English be the sole language of instruction (García, 2009a). In that same year, in *Meyer vs Nebraska*, the US Supreme Court asserted that Meyer, a parochial school teacher in Nebraska, had not violated the state's 1919 statute that mandated English-only instruction when he taught a Bible story to a 10-year-old child in German (Del Valle, S., 2003). This more tolerant attitude, coupled with the increasing support for 'cultural pluralism', espoused by John Dewey and Horace Kallen, led to additional efforts by some US ethnolinguistic communities to establish educational programs for their own children. Around this time, the Chinese, Japanese, Arabic, Greek, Yiddish and French-speaking communities developed

a network of after-school and weekend programs in which their languages and cultures, and in some cases their religions, were taught.

In the 1960s, the ethnic revival that accompanied the era of Civil Rights led to the further development of bilingual education programs, often supported by ethnolinguistic communities, especially Latinos. With funding from the Ford Foundation, a bilingual two-way program was established in the Coral Way Elementary School in Miami-Dade County. The goal of the program was to develop English language proficiency and maintain the Spanish of recently arrived Cuban children, as well as to develop the Spanish language proficiency and the English of Anglo children. This program led the way for the renaissance of bilingual education in the US in the second half of the 20th century. Bilingual programs to teach English, as well as to maintain the Spanish language, were developed by Latino communities in Texas, New Mexico, California and Arizona (García, 2009a). As Castellanos (1983) reminds us, this growth of bilingual education programs in the 20th century started without any federal involvement.

In 1968, the US Congress passed Title VII of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act – the Bilingual Education Act. The Act authorized Congress to put aside money for school districts that had large language minority enrollments and that wanted to start bilingual education programs or create bilingual instructional material.

The ethnic revival of the 1960s (Fishman, 1985a) also fueled scholarly interest in sociolinguistics, bilingualism and ethnic studies. It was at this time that Joshua A. Fishman conducted his *Language Loyalty in the United States* study (Fishman, 1966). 'Ethnic-group schools', or as he later called them, 'ethnic mother-tongue schools', were included in Fishman's study as important community institutions that sustained the life of ethnolinguistic groups in the US (Fishman & Nahirny, 1966). These ethnic-group schools were networks of all-day and supplementary schools organized, maintained and funded (fully or in part) by the ethnolinguistic communities themselves. Fishman noted then three types of such schools that accounted for almost 1885 units:

(1) Day schools that provide instruction in the linguistic, cultural and religious heritages of ethnic groups.
(2) Weekday afternoon schools, or supplementary schools that are in session two or more weekday afternoons throughout the school year.
(3) Weekend schools that normally meet on Saturdays or Sundays.

Fishman noted that these efforts by ethnolinguistic communities to educate their children under community auspices and in languages other than English were significant for language maintenance purposes. He claimed then:

> Language maintenance in the United States is desirable, in that the non-English language resources of American minority groups have already helped meet our urgent national need for speakers of various non-English languages, and that these resources can be reinforced and developed so as to do so to a very much greater extent in the future. (Fishman, 1966: 370–371)

The activities of these ethnic mother-tongue schools identified by Fishman contrasted sharply with what publicly funded bilingual education programs came to be. In 1974, when the Bilingual Education Act was re-authorized, bilingual education was redefined as:

> [I]nstruction given in, and study of, English and (to the extent necessary to allow a child to progress effectively through the education system) the native language of the children of limited English speaking ability. (As cited in Castellanos, 1983: 120)

Whereas the ethnic mother-tongue schools in the Fishman study, the two-way bilingual education program of Coral Way, and the developmental maintenance bilingual education programs in the American Southwest and elsewhere had as their goal the bilingualism and biliteracy of children, this new definition of public bilingual education restricted it to a transitional goal. That is, the focus of public bilingual education became the development of the academic English (and not the maintenance or development of the language other than English) of those ethnolinguistic minorities who had 'limited proficiency' in English, and often were recent immigrants. Although some bilingual education programs continued to support the development of children's home languages, the federal goal in supporting bilingual education became the improvement of English for immigrants, and not the education of American ethnolinguistic communities in ways that supported their bilingualism and biliteracy.

In the 1980s, Joshua A. Fishman revisited the study of community resources of languages other than English in the US. He again included among these resources the educational institutions that he now called 'ethnic mother-tongue schools' (Fishman, 1980a, 1980b). In the two decades that separated the first study from the second, the number of these ethnic mother-tongue schools had grown from 1885 to 6553. Yet, pointing to the fact that two-thirds of these institutions operated only on afternoons or

weekends, Fishman *et al.* (1985: 38) concluded: '[E]thnolinguistic education is supplementary, and therefore it is quite probably too meager to constitute a serious contribution to language maintenance'. Fishman argued then for high-quality bilingual all-day schools, whether community-funded or supported through public funds, oriented toward the task of language maintenance. He said:

> We have been guilty of horrible neglect with respect to our language resources. Language maintenance bilingual education can be one long-overdue step in the direction of reversing this shameful and wasteful policy. (Fishman, 1980c: 170)

By the time that Joshua A. Fishman completed his 1980 study of the community resources of ethnic languages in the US, a new movement was afoot. Spearheaded by Senator Samuel Hayakawa, the Official English movement and US English posed new restrictions on the use of languages other than English, especially in bilingual education. Although efforts to introduce constitutional amendments at the federal level to make English the official language of the US were later abandoned, the movement continued at the state level (Crawford, 2004; García, 2009a; García & Kleifgen, 2010). At the time of this writing, 31 US states have English-only laws.

This more restrictive language ideology and policy has had negative effects on public bilingual education, especially in California, Arizona and Massachusetts, where bilingual education was rendered illegal (see especially, Gándara & Hopkins, 2010). Bilingual education in the US has been progressively silenced, as English-only approaches are favored for the teaching of emergent bilingual students who need to develop English for academic purposes. Despite the recent growth of two-way bilingual education programs (often called 'dual language') and immersion bilingual education programs, as well as the continued existence of developmental maintenance bilingual education programs, the focus of transitional bilingual education programs has become the education, usually in English only, of emergent bilingual students, now called 'English language learners' (see García & Kleifgen, 2010, for a discussion of these discursive changes).

At the same time, however, the number of bilingual and emergent bilingual students who need to develop academic English in US schools has continued to grow, largely because of the global political economy, advances in technology, and the resultant transnational movement of people, information and products. Simultaneously, the US came to understand the importance of languages other than English for national security, especially after the September 11, 2001 attacks and subsequent US-led war on terror.[1] The 2006 National Security Language Initiative seeks to increase the number of US learners, speakers and teachers of 'critical-need foreign languages' from kindergarten to university through funding for flagship programs and other initiatives. Thus, the languages of ethnolinguistic communities have re-emerged as objects of study in the 21st century. With bilingualism restricted in public schools, the emphasis became the 'heritage languages' of American ethnolinguistic communities, especially at the tertiary level.

From the early 1980s, Guadalupe Valdés strongly advocated that secondary and tertiary institutions should develop alternative programs to foreign language education in order to teach Spanish to bilingual students in whose homes Spanish was spoken. She rightly argued that traditional foreign language programs were inadequate for these students (Valdés *et al.*, 1980).

Although the term 'heritage languages' had been widely used in Canada to refer to the languages of ethnolinguistic communities other than English and French since the 1960s (e.g. Cummins, 1983; Cummins & Danesi, 1990), the name was not used extensively in the US until 1999, when the first National Conference on Heritage Languages in America was held at Long Beach, California. As García (2005) has argued, the term heritage language education was adopted as bilingual education faced greater restriction in its efforts to educate bilingual and biliterate Americans. Since then, scholarship on heritage language education has expanded, referring to the teaching of languages other than English to ethnolinguistic minorities for whom the language is 'heritage' (see Brinton *et al.*, 2007). Guadalupe Valdés defines 'heritage speaker' as, 'a student who is raised in a home where a non-English language is spoken, who speaks or merely understands the heritage language, and who *is to some degree bilingual* in English and the heritage language' (Valdés, 2000: 1, our italics). Brinton *et al.* (2007) define a heritage speaker as an 'individual exposed to a language spoken at home, but educated *primarily* in English' (p. 374, our italics).

The differences in conceptualization and ideologies between advocates of bilingual education (of the developmental maintenance or two-way type) and heritage language education are telling. Whereas bilingual education refers to using both the language other than English and English as media of instruction, heritage language education refers to teaching the language other than English, most often as a subject, to bilinguals. Whereas bilingual education efforts are concentrated in the elementary, middle school and secondary school levels, where the use of two languages is seen as a way to holistically educate emergent bilingual Americans, heritage language education efforts are focused in tertiary and secondary education, where language education is departmentalized and language is taught as a subject. Whereas bilingual education offers the possibility of an all-day education through

both the language other than English and English, heritage language education is only concerned with the language other than English, and in Brinton *et al.* (2007) seems to define itself as either 'supplementary' or 'remedial', ceding the primary educational space to English. This is in contrast to bilingual education, which defines itself by the use of two languages in education alongside each other.

Yet with the renewed interest in languages other than English occasioned by the passage in 2006 of the National Security Language Initiative, and the waning of true bilingual education efforts, heritage language education professionals argued, rightly, that it would be ethnolinguistic minorities, especially in higher education, who would be most likely to master the 'critical need languages' identified by the federal government – Arabic, Chinese, Hindi, Persian and Russian. As bilingual education yielded to English ideologies and abandoned much of its focus on the development of the language other than English, the heritage language field expanded. The growth was also related to the fact that language minorities other than Spanish-speaking ones were often more comfortable with a focus on heritage language education, rather than a bilingualism that they often associated only with Spanish-speakers and a historic Civil Rights era.

Gradually, community-based programs, such as those that Fishman had called 'ethnic mother-tongue programs' became allied with the heritage language education movement, and not with the dwindling bilingual education movement that distanced itself more and more from the goals of bilingualism and biliteracy. The heritage language education movement, in the form of the Alliance for the Advancement of Heritage Languages, housed at the Center for Applied Linguistics, provided these programs with a much-needed network of support. Furthermore, many of these community-based programs defined their task as simply teaching the 'heritage' language to ethnolinguistic minorities.

What the cases in this book show, however, is that today these programs demonstrate a complexity that is not fully captured by seeing them simply as 'heritage language' programs. These cases also show a commitment to bilingualism that goes beyond the timid US conception of 'bilingual education'. The educational spaces presented here focus not solely on teaching a 'heritage' language, a language of the past, but on living these language practices in the present, and providing students with life experiences and performances that will enable them to practice their bilingualism in a future global world. The goal of these bilingual community education programs in the present is not simply the maintenance of an ethnic-mother tongue, as Fishman would have said, or the development of a heritage language, as heritage language proponents would claim. The goal of these bilingual community education programs is the *bilingual* development of American children living in a global multilingual context. Thus, as the educational aspirations of these ethnolinguistic groups have gradually adapted to an American student body that is now often transnational and transcultural, the reality of these bilingual community education efforts has become bilingual, as students and teachers negotiate the use of the home language practices (which are plural) within the English discourse of the students.

These bilingual community education efforts also differ from what others, for example many Europeans, call 'supplementary schools' or 'complementary schools' (see especially Blackledge & Creese, 2010) in that they also include private day schools, and even some public all-day school efforts where the community has been the catalyst and is fully involved. In including some public school cases, as well as community-based agencies supported by public funds, we argue that bilingual community education does not have to be fully funded by the ethnolinguistic community itself. In cases where those communities have been minoritized, in particular, private resources to organize educational efforts are not available. Including these cases makes the point that US ethnolinguistic communities are able to organize educational efforts for their children that include their bilingualism, while also benefiting from public funds, whether from US sources or foreign government sources, as well as private funds. The funding of these bilingual community education programs is always mixed, and not solely raised by the local community. Thus, these efforts are for American children, funded by a mix of local and global public and private funds, but always in the hands of US ethnolinguistic communities.

The next section discusses the New York City multilingual context in the global present. We do so to contextualize the cases in the book, before we turn to the focus of this chapter in Sections II and III – the reconceptualization of these educational spaces as bilingual community education, and the reimagining of American ethnolinguistic communities as diasporic plural networks.

The global 'Multilingual Apple'

New York City is one of the best-known 'global cities' (Sassen, 1991), because of its important role as a dynamic center for global economics with transnational and cross-border networks. 'The city that never sleeps' is the center of much global economic activity, with its famous stock exchange and corporate headquarters of many businesses. It houses the United Nations and many consulates from all over the world, as well as world-famous museums, operas, educational institutions and media conglomerates. In addition, it is

one of the most multilingual cities in the world, a product of its global status that attracts people from all over the world, including powerful elites and immigrants who come for work. As a result, the 'Big Apple', is what García and Fishman (1997/2002) have called a 'Multilingual Apple'. García (1997/2002) has described the city's multilingual development through time. In this section, we limit ourselves to the sociolinguistic situation of the city in 2009, using the US Census data, and comparing it with previous trends.

The problems with language census data are well known. Some of these issues are associated with the fact that data collection is based on self-reporting. Thus, data is likely to reflect ideology or perception, rather than actual language use or proficiency. For example, comparing the 1980 and 2009 US Census language data for New York City, a significant increase in the number of Haitian Creole speakers is noted. However, we cannot tell whether that rise is due to an increase in population or to the greater consciousness among Haitians that they are Creole speakers, rather than French speakers. Another problem is that the categories of data collection and analysis may not reflect local realities. For example, the census counts only French Creole, complicating the issue of whether those identified as French Creole speakers are actually Haitian Creole speakers or speakers of other French Creoles (for more on this, see Barrière and Monéreau-Merry, Chapter 16). Besides Haitian Creole, there are also important New York City (NYC) languages that are not counted separately in the census. This is the case, for example, for Bengali, an important language in the city. The census does tell us that in 2009 there were 111,202 speakers of Indic languages beyond Urdu, Gujarati and Hindi, but it does not specifically tell us which they are. The same problem is faced by African languages, which remain lumped into one category. Yet, Busi Makoni (Chapter 9) argues that claiming one language in multilingual Sub-Saharan Africa, where people speak in many different ways, often having little relationship to 'a language' as named by officials (see Makoni & Pennycook, 2007), may make this task impossible. Many of the chapters included in this volume allude to other problems with solely relying on census data. For example, Ghaffar-Kucher and Mahajan (Chapter 4) refer to the fact that Pakistanis often report speaking Urdu at home, although in reality other languages, such as Punjabi, may be spoken. Finally, because many groups have a high number of undocumented NYC residents, they are under-represented in the census. The majority of the chapters in this book argue that the sociolinguistic diasporic situation of ethnolinguistic groups in New York is much more complex, fluid and interactive than has been traditionally described and than could be understood through looking at the census. However, regardless of the limitations of census data, it does give us an indication of the great ethnolinguistic heterogeneity of New York City.

The multilingualism of New York City is evidenced by the fact that 52% of the population over five years of age (3,712,467 people) speak a language other than English at home (US Census Bureau, 2009). Although Spanish is indeed the largest language in the City, spoken by 24% of the population over five years of age, the language diversity in New York is greater than in most US cities, indicating its global reach. Table 1.1 displays the top 24 languages other than English spoken by New Yorkers over five years of age.

Table 1.1 Languages other than English (LOTEs) spoken by New Yorkers over five years of age, 2009*

	LOTES	*Number*
1	Spanish	1,869,995
2	Chinese	408,105
3	Russian	202,225
4	French Creole	106,020
5	Italian	101,261
6	French	86,220
7	Yiddish	85,341
8	Korean	74,273
9	African languages	63,890
10	Polish	58,520
11	Tagalog	57,209
12	Greek	56,688
13	Arabic	55,474
14	Hebrew	52,424
15	Urdu	35,408
16	Hindi	34,908
17	German	25,212
18	Japanese	22,210
19	Serbo-Croatian	19,470
20	Portuguese	16,404
21	Persian	11,452
22	Vietnamese	9,849
23	Hungarian	9,409
24	Gujarati	9,336
	Total NYC LOTES speakers	3,712,467

*This data is from the US Census Bureau (2009), *American Community Survey*, Table B16001. The US census does not track numbers for Bengali, which is a big language in New York City, falling somewhere around 50,000

The difference between the reported presence of LOTEs in New York City homes today and that in the past is striking. For example, in 1980 when Joshua A. Fishman conducted his second study of language resources in the US, Italian was the second reported home language in the City. Today, Italian has moved to fifth place. Chinese, which was reported as the fourth language in 1980, has moved to second place, and Russian, which was reported in ninth place in 1980, has moved to third place. Even more striking is the fact that French Creole, which was reported in 19th place in 1980, has now moved up to fourth place.

In 2009 the NYC Latino group, numbering 2,315,041 and making up 28% of New Yorkers, is highly diverse, in terms of national origin, immigration histories and language use. Likewise, the Asian group, numbering 1,004,177, or 12% of the New York City population, comprises peoples from diverse origins and regions in East and South Asia. Table 1.2 displays the composition of the NYC Latino group by national origin, whereas Table 1.3 illustrates the largest Asian group populations.

Whereas New York City in the 1980s was still mostly a Puerto Rican city (see García, 2011a), and Caribbean Spanish (Puerto Rican, Dominican

Table 1.2 Latino groups in NYC with population over 10,000, 2009*

	National origin	*Number*
1	Puerto Rican	782,222
2	Dominican	582,456
3	Mexican	305,664
4	Ecuadorian	185,022
5	Colombian	111,440
6	Salvadoran	45,291
7	Cuban	43,040
8	Peruvian	39,046
9	Honduran	36,951
10	Panamanian	21,035
11	Spaniard	16,196
12	Argentinean	15,070
13	Venezuelan	12,364
14	Nicaraguan	11,077
15	Chilean	10,866
	Total number of Latinos, NYC	2,315,041

*US Census Bureau (2009), *American Community Survey*, Table B16001

Table 1.3 East and South Asian groups in NYC with population over 5,000, 2009*

	Groups	*Number*
1	Chinese (except Taiwanese)	464,201
2	Asian Indian	202,408
3	Korean	87,556
4	Filipino	80,890
5	Bangladeshi	43,878
6	Pakistani	34,086
7	Japanese	26,648
8	Vietnamese	14,859
9	Taiwanese	7,154
	Total	1,004,177

*US Census Bureau (2009), *American Community Survey*, Table B02006

Republic and Cuban) was overwhelmingly present, the numbers in Table 1.2 reveal that today Caribbean Spanish-speakers make up only 60% of the Latino population. With Mexicans and Ecuadorians now constituting the third and fourth largest Spanish-speaking groups in the City, other Latin American indigenous languages have also entered the picture. As Makar (Chapter 2) shows, Mixteco has become an important language in the City, although it is not accounted for in the census. More than anywhere in the world, New York City is home to a large number of Latinos who interact in different varieties of Spanish, now all in contact (see Otheguy & Zentella, 2011). The pan-Latino identity that results is fluid and changing, as groups interact with each other and with others, and as individuals with different national origins intermarry (see García, 2009b).

The greater language contact that Spanish-speaking groups experience in New York City is also reflected among many other groups. New York City provides the sociolinguistic context for linguistic and cultural contact among groups that never would have interacted in their countries of origin, or who have been in conflict. For example, the Chinese category includes all who consider themselves Chinese in the US, including those born in the US whose ancestors come from countries such as the People's Republic of China, Taiwan, Singapore, Hong Kong, Malaysia, Indonesia and Vietnam. This category collapses Han Chinese and others who may not be Han Chinese. In counting Asians, the US census separates Taiwanese from Chinese. Yet, linguistically the Taiwanese may have more in common with Mandarin-speaking Chinese than those who categorize themselves as Chinese have in common with each other. In New York, Chinese from the People's Republic

of China and Taiwan coexist, blending varieties of Chinese, as well as going beyond political and cultural differences (see Lo, Chapter 18). The same can be said of Indians, Bangladeshis and Pakistanis, who in the US may interact for the first time. Ghaffar-Kucher and Mahajan (Chapter 4) identify, for example, the differences and continuities between Punjabi speakers, bringing Indian Sikhs and Pakistanis from both sides of the national borders into contact in NYC. Japanese, Koreans and Chinese, with histories of occupations and invasions, build a pan-East Asian identity in New York, as they learn to appreciate the continuities between Chinese characters, Japanese kanji, and Korean hanja (see Chung, Chapter 5; Kano, Chapter 6; and Lo, Chapter 18). In addition, Arabic speakers from Lebanon, Egypt, Morocco, Yemen and many other places interact in their different varieties and in so doing shape *'āmiyyas* in New York (see Zakharia and Menchaca Bishop, Chapter 11). However, the complex multilingualism of New York occurs not only because there are many languages other than English spoken in the city, but also because many New Yorkers are bilingual, and even plurilingual, as we have noted above, and their individual practices in LOTEs interact with English, the powerful language of the Big Apple.

Thirty-six percent of New Yorkers were born outside of the US, making it the US city with the seventh-largest foreign-born population. However, although Miami and Los Angeles, cities with larger proportions of foreign-born populations than NYC, have a preponderance of Spanish speakers, only a quarter (24%) of New York City's multilingual population speaks Spanish. Thus, New York, as the city with the largest population, has the greatest language diversity, and the most language resources, in terms of numbers (3,712,467 speakers of LOTEs over the age of five, see Table 1.1).

More than half of New Yorkers over age five who speak languages other than English at home also speak English very well (54% or 2,013,350); yet, 46% claim to speak English less than very well. Thus, New York City's population is not only highly multilingual, but their bilingualism is also highly varied, with almost half still developing English. These emergent bilingual New Yorkers, who are developing their English proficiencies, require services that include the use of additional languages.

In July 2008, Mayor Bloomberg signed Executive Order (EO) 120, mandating all City agencies that provide direct public services to make these services available in the top six languages of New York's emergent bilingual population. This includes the translation of documents, interpretation services and signage. Executive Order 120 also expands other multilingual services, including a 311 Customer Service Center that provides information about city government and non-emergency situations in over 170 languages.

The biggest need for emergent bilinguals who are developing English is, of course, in education. In 2010–2011, 41% of students in New York City public schools spoke a language other than English at home (we think this number is an underestimation, since the census numbers are greater, and parents often do not report their language use to school for fear that their bilingual children will be stigmatized). That same year, one in four students, that is, more than 287,203 students, did not score at a proficient level of academic English (NYCDOE, 2011). Although 50% of New Yorkers who speak LOTEs at home speak Spanish (see Table 1.1), 64.8% of emergent bilingual children in public and charter schools in New York City who are classified as 'English language learners' speak Spanish at home (see Table 1.4). Thus, two-thirds of the current emergent bilingual population developing English in NYC schools is Spanish-speaking. Following Spanish, the Chinese emergent bilingual population makes up 13.6%, whereas speakers of Bengali, Arabic and Haitian Creole follow, making up 3.5, 3.0 and 2.6%, respectively.

The difference between the numbers in Table 1.1 and those in Table 1.4 is telling, for although Spanish and Chinese are still in first and second place, respectively, Bengali, Arabic and Haitian Creole, the other big languages of emergent bilingual New York students, are not as prominent among the language resources of the city. Two main factors influence this statistic. First, groups such as speakers of Russian, Italian and French, big languages in New York, are already highly bilingual and many speak English very well. Second, Yiddish-speakers are mostly Hasidic Orthodox and attend their own religious schools (see Peltz & Kliger, Chapter 13). Students who speak Spanish,

Table 1.4 Top languages of New York City emergent bilinguals

	Language	*Number*	*Percentage*
1	Spanish	100,129	64.8%
2	Chinese	21,002	13.6%
3	Bengali	5,396	3.5%
4	Arabic	4,692	3.0%
5	Haitian Creole	3,970	2.6%
6	Russian	3,048	2.0%
7	Urdu	2,898	1.9%
8	French	1,979	1.3%
9	Albanian	987	0.6%
10	Punjabi	896	0.6%
11	Korean	879	0.6%

Chinese, Bengali, Arabic and Haitian Creole not only have high numbers of emergent bilinguals, but they also attend NYC public schools.

The chapters in this volume do not strictly represent either the groups that speak the most numerous LOTEs at home or the groups that have the most emergent bilingual students. As Matarese (Chapter 19) indicates, there is little relationship between the number of speakers of LOTEs at home, or the number of speakers of LOTEs who are bilingual or emergent bilingual, and the institutional resources, as well as the bilingual community education programs, that are supported by the efforts of ethnolinguistic groups. For example, because of their use in religious institutions, Hebrew and Arabic are over-represented in community institutional support, whereas Spanish and Chinese are under-represented. At the same time, as Zakharia and Menchaca Bishop's chapter (Chapter 11) indicates, Arabic speakers in New York City are also woefully disadvantaged with regards to bilingual education programs needed.

In Section II of this chapter, we turn to examining the cases in this book as we reconceptualize these community-supported educational spaces as *bilingual community education* rather than heritage language education or bilingual education per se. To do so, we focus first on the sociolinguistic aspects – language teaching and language use in classrooms. We then turn to examining their distinct socioeducational patterns – the role of community and parents, and the forging of educational partnerships.

II: Beyond Heritage Language and Bilingual Education

The sociolinguistic and socioeducational context of bilingual community education programs is certainly different from what the literature describes as either heritage language education or bilingual education. On the one hand, as we will see, the language goals and language use differ from the ways in which heritage language education and some forms of bilingual education describe them. On the other, the ethnolinguistic community itself, especially the parents, are the reason and the motor for the existence of these programs, unlike the way in which these communities are described in the educational literature. Educational partnerships are also prevalent in these educational spaces, unlike the isolation of many public school efforts or the ways in which 'heritage language education' has been often described as being separate and segregated. We start by looking at the sociolinguistic context of these bilingual community education programs, before we turn to the role of the community and parents, and of partnerships.

Sociolinguistic goals and language use

Bilingual community education programs provide a context for American children to live the language other than English, not as heritage, but as life in an American present and a global future. That is, the focus is on the development of a holistic bilingual community in the US, and not just on the learning of an LOTE. Thus, as we will see in this section, their language use is flexible, characterized by what we call *translanguaging* (more on this concept below), and the goal of these efforts goes beyond the simple teaching of language.

As we have said, in heritage language education scholarship, the language other than English is often the sole focus of instruction. Attention is mostly given to the development of the LOTE itself, especially for academic contexts. In so doing, heritage language education programs believe in the sole use of the LOTE in instruction, following direct methods of teaching languages. In contrast, bilingual education programs use the LOTE alongside English. With few exceptions, the educational efforts described here are not just ethnic mother-tongue schools or heritage language programs, but are bilingual in the sense that, besides using the LOTE in instruction, they also use English. The examples that follow in the rest of this chapter are all taken from this volume, and thus reference is made only to the author(s).

Most of the bilingual community education efforts described in this volume use English, as well as the LOTE, to educate. This is the case, for example, for the all-day schools described in this book in Arabic/English, French/English, Greek/English, Haitian Creole/English, Hebrew/English, Spanish/English and Yiddish/English. However, this is also the case for the Saturday program organized by the Russian community (Kleyn & Vayshenker), the community agency program organized by the Mexican community (Makar) and the after-school program run by the Chinese American community (Lo). Implicitly, all the programs here described use both the LOTE and English in instruction. Perhaps it is the Persian-speaking parent in Shirazi and Borjian (Chapter 10: 166) that says it best:

> I habitually love and praise my children in Persian, and habitually send them to bed and tell them to brush their teeth in English . . . The notion of ethnic language is false; we don't teach Persian to our children as part of their heritage or identity, and tell them that's why they have to learn it, because that ethnicizes Persian. That provincializes Persian . . . They will work here, have friends here; they are American, they need to speak English.

Thus, all the community education efforts here described are bilingual in nature, whether they use the two languages explicitly, as a stated goal in their policy, or implicitly in their practices.

Yet, these community efforts go beyond many public bilingual education programs. For example, two-way bilingual education programs and developmental bilingual education programs – the first encompassing two ethnolinguistic groups and the second only one – separate the two languages strictly. In the US these two types of bilingual education programs are increasingly called 'dual language' as a result of the silencing of the word 'bilingual' (for more on this, see Crawford, 2004; García, 2009a; García & Kleifgen, 2010). In fact, these so-called 'dual language' bilingual education programs often pride themselves on the separation of languages, although as García has shown (2011b), there is much flexible language use in the classrooms also (for a critique of the 'dual', see especially García, forthcoming).

Heritage education and 'dual' language education display a monoglossic ideology with regard to bilingualism (for more on monoglossia, see García, 2009a; also see Del Valle, J., 2000). That is, they see bilingualism as linear and additive, as being the sum of two separate languages, instead of acknowledging its heteroglossic character (see Bailey, 2007). Cummins (2007) has referred to this ideology of bilingualism as the 'two solitudes'. Yet, the cases in this book often support a more 'dynamic bilingualism' (see García, 2009a), with multiple language practices in inter-relationship with each other. That is, these bilingual community education efforts show a great deal of flexible language use, as we will see in the next section. This dynamic bilingual use has been called 'translanguaging'. (For more on 'translanguaging', see especially García, 2009a; also see Creese & Blackledge, 2010 and Blackledge & Creese, 2010. Cen Williams, 1996, first used the term to refer to a flexible pedagogy to learn Welsh in Wales.)

Translanguaging

There is a great deal of distance between the monolingual or monoglossic policy stated by some principals and teachers of bilingual community efforts and the heteroglossic practices observed by the authors of these chapters (for more on the distance between language policy and practice, see Menken & García, 2010). For example, the Hebrew day school has a policy of using Hebrew only as the language of instruction and conversation, with English discouraged. Yet, teachers' Hebrew proficiency level and the wide variance in that of students' results in this policy not being observed (Avni & Menken). The teachers in the Yiddish school do not follow the policy of Yiddish-only use in the school, for they claim that the 'mixed form' is the way in which they normally express themselves when they speak with their mothers and

others (Peltz & Kliger). The Korean schools also have a policy of using only Korean in instruction (Chung). Chung adds, however, that such 'policy is enforced flexibly by circumstance and at the discretion of teachers' (p. 95). In the Turkish school described by Otcu, teachers often warn students to speak Turkish. Yet, students speak English to each other and often to teachers (Otcu). A sixth-grader in the Greek community school described by Hantzopoulos also reports that, when she does not understand something, the teachers tell her in English and then repeat it again in Greek. Similar phenomena are observed in an Arabic day school, where much translanguaging takes place among teachers and students in the classroom, hallways and playgrounds. While some teachers use translanguaging as an instructional strategy, they struggle to locate their approach within a tradition of a monoglossic bilingual policy (Zakharia & Menchaca Bishop).

The Cypress Hills Community School divides Spanish and English strictly by day and week. Yet, teachers in the upper grades break away from this strict separation to respond to students' communicative needs (Ascenzi-Moreno & Flores). A different trend is seen in the Bengali Udichi School and in Public School (PS) 189, where translanguaging occurs more frequently in the beginning, and less so as students progress. Choudhury describes how, at Udichi, teachers initially use both Bengali and English, but gradually switch to Bengali as students become more proficient in Standard Bengali. In practice, however, as a teacher explains in an interview, students are always permitted to speak in English, which teachers then translate into Bengali, and students repeat (Choudhury). At PS 189, Barrière and Monéreau-Merry describe how students use both English and Haitian Creole orally and in writing during initial stages, but over time, students are encouraged to separate their two languages.

Unlike the programs described above where translanguaging practices violate the monolingual instructional policy, the Japanese school described by Kano has a flexible organizational structure that views bilingualism not as an end product, but as a dynamic process, and clearly rejects the compartmentalization of languages. This is the same practice observed in the after-school program supported by the Chinese American community to help their children excel academically, described by Lo. Because the purpose is to accelerate academic competence, and not just to teach a LOTE, both Chinese and English are used to support learning without any language compartmentalization.

Perhaps it is the case of the educational program supported by the Mexican community agency, Tepeyac, with its use of English, Spanish and indigenous languages, especially Mixteco, that best captures the complexity of the dynamic language practices of these bilingual community education

efforts. Makar cites Rivera-Sánchez (2002: 21), who describes what she calls the 'spread community' of the 21st century as 'a recreation of symbolic references and sociospatial transformations in which separated worlds are nowadays in *juxtaposition*' (our emphasis). Makar states: '[R]ather than deterritorializing these languages, members of the community have found a way to reshape their practices'. Like the Chinese American after-school program described by Lo, the educational activities in Tepeyac do not include the teaching of Spanish or English as subjects. Yet, the program facilitators use both languages 'juxtaposed' in tutoring to support the academic needs of Mexican American children. Interestingly, there are classes in Mixteco, but tutoring is not done in Mixteco because the facilitators do not speak it. Yet, the program facilitators encourage Mixteco children to work through Mixteco in order to understand the academic content. For example, a Mixteco-speaking boy is observed drawing a small animal and says and writes *'leko'* next to his drawing, in interaction with a Spanish-speaking girl who then says and writes *'conejo'*, and the teacher who says and writes 'rabbit'. Makar makes the important point that these bilingual community education practices, in which the entire repertoire of the children's language practices is activated, would have seldom happened in Mexico, where children with different language backgrounds rarely interact because of the segregation of indigenous and mestizo communities. Bilingual community education in the US goes beyond looking backwards towards the language 'heritage', the language past, and instead focuses on a multilingual future of tolerance and integration that is very much part of American democracy. As the program coordinator says, the emphasis is not on roots, although history is important. The goal of the Tepeyac program is to get the children to understand their place in a multilingual, transnational world and to encourage their plural interactions. In many ways, these bilingual community education programs are as American as apple pie, promoting a sense of tolerance and democratic justice that is sometimes not present in the communities' historical past or even in societal contexts where these languages are widely spoken. The focus of these bilingual community education programs is on encouraging interaction and interdependence among American children with roots that have commonalities as well as differences.

Busi Makoni in her chapter on the educational efforts of Sub-Saharan African communities takes the notion of these bilingual community education efforts even further, offering an alternative language ideology to that of language maintenance and revitalization. African languages, she contends, are not enumerable objects, but are communicative resources. Africans do not simply see their languages as those that are often identified as the big New York African languages – Amharic (Ethiopia), Dinka (Sudan), Igbo (Nigeria), Kru (southeastern Liberia), Mandinka (Senegal, The Gambia, Mali, Guinea, Côte d'Ivoire), Pulaar (Senegal, Guinea Bissau and Mali), Soninke (Mali, Senegal, Côte d'Ivoire, The Gambia), Swahili (Kenya), Twi (Ghana), Wolof (Senegal) and Yoruba (Nigeria). The 'languaging' of Africans includes complex indigenous communicative resources that go beyond the so-called African languages, and that also include those called English and other colonial languages, such as French. Sub-Saharan African communities in NYC often form associations that use all their complex languaging to offer services to new immigrants, including job-seeking, health matters, immigration, lending and even learning English, but rarely do they establish educational programs to teach what others consider their 'languages'. Rather, their complex languaging is transmitted through socialization in more informal venues, such as braiding salons, churches and households. This, Makoni argues, is in keeping with the African concept of teaching and learning in which everyone is a teacher and any space is an appropriate educational space.

Although, from the outside, these bilingual community education programs may appear language maintenance-oriented and many of the authors herein repeat this idea, in reality the efforts of these programs are much more complex. Their goals are to support the plural lives of ethnolinguistic American communities in interaction with English and a complex and dynamic US society, what García (2011c) refers to as *sustainable languaging*. Rather than isolating, these bilingual community education programs are enriching. Rather than reproducing a past that is often full of pain and inequities, they point to an American future of interactive language and cultural resources.

Beyond language teaching

As we have seen, these bilingual community education projects are not solely teaching language. In fact, to us they are considered bilingual education programs because the language practices of the bilingual community are being used in music, theater, arts, religion, hair braiding, tutoring in academic subjects and many other cultural activities, but also in video, TV and technology. That is, children are precisely performing these language/cultural practices (see Pennycook, 2000; 2010) in situated action, rather than just learning the language, and always doing so in the context of their transnational and transcultural lives. The educational philosophy of the adults in these programs has much to do with Bourdieu's (1991) concept of *habitus*, or the tendency to act in particular ways as inculcated through implicit and explicit socialization. However, as we will see below when we reconceptualize the concept of an ethnolinguistic community, the community

of practice (Lave & Wenger, 1991) that results is not homogeneous, as language practices are incorporated into the children's physical selves through different actions, producing a multiplicity of identities.

In describing a series of performances involving songs and skits, and related to Jewish faith and observances in a Hasidic Yiddish yeshiva, Peltz and Kliger express clearly how the focus of these bilingual community education programs is not just the language, but the embodied performance of an identity. The authors comment:

> None of the projects sought a bilingualism that would give the children linguistic proficiency solely. All instructional school programs used Yiddish language instruction as a pathway for transmitting ethnocultural or religious conventions. (p. 215)

The passing on of cultural and religious values is an important reason why parents send their American children to these schools. Yiddish is acquired by Hasidic Jews, Hebrew by Jews, Punjabi by Sikhs, Arabic by Muslims, and Greek by Greek Orthodox, precisely to read holy texts and transmit religious and cultural traditions. In the Hebrew day school, Hebrew is embodied in the embroidery of the Hebrew names in the kippot (skullcaps) of the boys and in the charm necklaces of the girls. Avni and Menken summarize the role of Hebrew in these institutions, saying:

> Unique in its uses and symbolism, Hebrew assumes a pragmatic and ideological function in linking religious, ethnic, nationalistic, and cultural aspects of Judaism, and in uniting Jewish people across time and space. (p. 194)

Ghaffar-Kucher and Mahajan describe how Sikhs send their children to temples, *gurdwaras*, especially to become well versed in the *Mool Mantar*, the most important verses within their holy scriptures, the *Sri Guru Granth Sahib*. It is this text through which American Sikh children learn to read Punjabi and become familiar with the founding principles of Sikhism, including the Five Ks – *kesh* (uncut hair), *kanga* (small comb), *kara* (circular bracelet), *kirpan* (small sword) and *kacha* (shorts) (Ghaffar-Kucher & Mahajan).

The Greek Orthodox Church has also played an important role in the development of supplementary and all-day bilingual community Greek schools. Yet, Hantzopoulos describes how this strict association between the Greek Orthodox Church and the educational programs it runs is limiting; it does not reflect the changing Greek community, in which there is much intermarriage and many who are not members of the Greek Orthodox

Church. Despite all these groups' efforts to transmit a monolithic religious–cultural inheritance, the chapters to come repeatedly assert the disruptions that American children in a US heterogeneous context introduce.

Perhaps one of the examples in the book that most convincingly shows that these bilingual community education efforts are not narrowly focused on the transmission of a 'heritage' language is that of the Saturday school organized by the Russian community (Kleyn & Vayshenker). Not only are there Russian language classes and English language classes, but there is also instruction in maths, physics, chess, theater and art. In an effort to recognize that these are Russian American children, some of these classes are taught through Russian, but others through English. The idea is to transmit to the children the areas of expertise for which the culture associated with Russian has traditionally been known – such as numeracy and mathematical knowledge, chess and physics – and in so doing to develop their bilingualism in English and Russian.

There is great emphasis in bilingual community schools on having children perform their ethnolinguistic identities through music, theater, dance and other relevant practices; thus these classes and activities are an integral part of the curriculum. The Saturday Russian program also offers Russian drama classes, staging performances of modern Russian writers and poets (Kleyn & Vayshenker). The after-school program organized by the Chinese American community includes not only Chinese dance, but also Kung Fu, considered a Chinese martial art (Lo). Tepeyac's after-school program for Mexican American children includes folkloric ballet and soccer (Makar).

Performances of language and cultural practices are at the heart of these community efforts. In the weekend program run by the Turkish community, the children perform their Turkish identity by dressing in red and white for all ceremonies. Every Saturday starts with a ritual in which the children recite *'Andimiz'* (Our Pledge). They also sing Turkish songs with patriotic Turkish themes (Otcu). In the Greek schools, children perform during the *yiortes* (holiday) celebrations, and Greek dancing and music are an important part of the performances and the curriculum (Hantzopoulos). The Iranian parents who organize educational programs for their children also often turn to theatrical performances (Shirazi & Borjian). One mother wrote and staged a play that the children performed at an annual *Norooz* (New Year) party. The Fedowsi School, a Saturday Persian program in Westchester County and Long Island, involves children in performances for cultural events, including *Mehregan*, the pre-Islamic Festival of Autumn, *Yalda*, commemorating the winter solstice, and *Norooz,* the Iranian New Year.

The Udichi Performing Arts School is the context for learning Bengali, but always alongside the perfoming arts. Choudhury describes that the day starts with the national anthem of both Bangladesh and the US, followed by Bengali songs, such as Tagore's *'Amra shobai Raja'* [We're all Kings]. Lessons in music, art, dance and/or tabla (Indian drum) follow, along with Bengali. The children learn about key events – the Language Movement of 1952, Independence Day, and Victory Day.

Despite the emphasis on the performance of 'Bengalism', the inclusion of the US national anthem alongside the national anthem of Bangladesh points to the children's joint performance of 'Bengalism' juxtaposed with 'Americanism'. It is not just ethnic 'heritage' identities that are being performed in all the bilingual community education programs here described. The performances are of American multiple identities.

Videos, television and technology have become important ways in which these American children live in multiple spaces. For example, Mexican American children in the community program described by Makar watch TV programs directly from Mexico and connect with children in cities such as Puebla. Makar comments:

> If the children can simultaneously navigate two distinct spaces, geographical and symbolic, and draw tools from these spaces to make sense of their identity – then their bilingual development becomes an echo of these two spaces, these two languages that interact in the same dynamic way in which they inhabit these two countries. (p. 54)

As in the case of the juxtaposition of 'Bengalism' and 'Americanism' described by Choudhury and referred to above, the simultaneity of spaces, languages and cultures experienced by Mexican-origin children in the activities described by Makar contributes to the construction and recognition of what growing up American means in the complex communities of the present. In performing their complex identities that include features from different contexts always in interaction and motion, the children in all these bilingual community education efforts are reflecting an important way of being American in the global context of the 21st century.

Beyond ethnocultural/linguistic transmission, some of these bilingual community programs offer a possibility for what Zakharia and Menchaca Bishop conceptualize as language education for positive peace. Drawing on concepts from the field of peace studies, the authors suggest that bilingual community education can serve as a foundation for developing positive peace, or promoting the absence of structural violence. It can do so by developing cultural understandings, as well as addressing injustice, discrimination and

conflict through language policies and practices that integrate students' ethnolinguistic identities. In contrast, language education for negative peace is framed around a security agenda, or the elimination of direct violence, as in the case of the National Security Language Initiative, in which languages and their speakers are viewed as 'foreign' and, thus, not American. Such language efforts create tensions for bilingual Americans whose languages are not envisioned as part of bilingual American identities, and thus are seen as obstacles to peace. The dynamic forms of bilingual community education that many of these chapters describe may be viewed as language education for positive peace, as exemplified not only by the Arabic case study, which demonstrates how one school attempts to integrate Muslim Americans' linguistic and cultural repertoires, but also in the various other cases offered in this book. For example, Tepeyac, the community agency described by Makar, is part of the National Coalition for Dignity and Amnesty and offers Mexican-origin families protection from labor abuses, advocacy for immigration reform, advice on immigration issues, and consultation on health matters. Such holistic approaches to address forms of structural and cultural violence fall under the purview of education for positive peace.

The bilingual community education efforts in this book provide reciprocal support to the community. Whereas many of these programs support parents and community members in their quest to enable their American children to navigate these multiple worlds, it is the community and the parents that are the backbone of these efforts. The next section describes the extraordinary role that parents, communities and other partnerships play in the lives of these bilingual community education efforts, in the context of understanding how these programs differ from heritage language education, as well as public bilingual education.

Socioeducational context: Collaborations

The US public school is often detached from the community and functions as an island, often responding to the demands of the state and local education departments rather than to those of the community. In New York City, parents who visit schools have to sign in and show identification to school safety agents who are part of the police force. Often this process alienates language minority parents, who feel threatened. Once in the school, there is no guarantee that the staff will be able to assist parents in a language they understand. Realities such as these create much distance between the school and the community.

In contrast, the bilingual community education efforts that we include in this book *are* the community. The linguistic and cultural practices are not

considered liabilities, and are not perceived with scorn and fear. Instead, they are precisely the strengths. It is language minority parents and communities that hold the value in these efforts. The educational programs cannot exist without the parents and the community, just as they cannot exist without partnering with others. Thus, the programs themselves constitute a network of collaboration, rather than functioning as separate entities in which only school administrators, teachers and students exist.

The role of parents and community

Parents and communities in bilingual community education efforts are precisely the leaders in establishing, organizing and running these programs. This is in stark contrast with the negative view of minority parents in the mainstream literature on American schooling. Language minority parents are often stigmatized and considered incapable educational partners (Ramirez, 2003). Mainstream schools do not involve parents who speak languages other than English, often ignoring the communities' funds of knowledge as sites of knowledge construction (González *et al.*, 2005). The bilingual community efforts in this book, however, explicitly demonstrate the strength of these parents and communities.

Parents and community members not only organize these efforts, but they are often the unpaid teachers. In Udichi, out of 14 Bengali instructors, six work without pay (Choudhury). In Korean schools, the teachers are mostly parents and are minimally compensated (Chung). Ghaffar-Kucher and Mahajan describe how many of the Hindi programs are run from the basements of homes where parents are the volunteer teachers. In the Princeton Community Japanese Language School described by Kano, 70% of the teachers are parents. The teachers at Atatürk school also teach mostly voluntarily, with only a stipend that covers the cost of commuting (Otcu).

Parents not only contribute as teachers, but are also key in fund-raising. In the Atatürk school parents organize events such as the Turkish Bazaar, where Turkish goods and food are sold to raise funds to support the school (Otcu). In Udichi, Bangladeshi parents organize cultural events, offer help by bringing food and contribute the profits to support the school (Choudhury).

Parents have been the driving force behind the establishment of a 'dual language' bilingual education program at Cypress Hills Community School (Ascenzi-Moreno & Flores), the new French programs (Ross & Jaumont), as well as the Russian, Korean and Chinese programs (Kleyn & Vayshenker, Chung and Lo respectively). In fact, Cypress Hills Community School has a parent co-principal who works alongside the administrative co-principal. It was

also an alliance of French-speaking parents who advocated for the establishment of a K–12 bilingual French–English charter school, which opened in 2009. Because parents are so involved, they hold much power in organizing the programs and running them. Ascenzi-Moreno and Flores describe how, when a reading curriculum was imposed on the Cypress Hills Community school by outside agents, the parents, a network of Latino parents from different origins, as well as English-speaking parents, mandated that it be stopped. As the parent-co-director said:

> [T]he school was created by parents who had ownership of the dual language program. They believed in the ideas and found value in the teacher-made curriculum, which they knew addressed the needs of their children and the community, rather than bringing in prescribed curriculum that had no attachment to the community. (p. 225)

Sometimes these bilingual community education efforts are organized by community-based agencies that have been established by the community itself. The after-school programs for Chinese American children described by Lo are managed by not-for-profit community-based organizations, such as the Chinese American Planning Council. In the case of the Atatürk School described in Otcu's chapter, it was the Turkish Women's League of America that founded the school, and continues to donate funds to it. In addition, two other Turkish-American organizations offer indirect support by their presence as umbrella organizations – the Federation of Turkish-American Associations and the Assembly of Turkish-American Associations. French expatriates founded Éducation Française à New York with parents and volunteers offering after-school French classes.

Not only are the parents and communities deeply committed to the educational programs and their continued existence, but they are also linked to other networks and partnerships that have global reach. This shows once again that, rather than isolating, these are efforts that go beyond the ethnolinguistic group itself, beyond the US, and beyond concepts of single identities and unique citizenships. The next section describes some of the partnerships that have made this global reach possible, and that go beyond what traditional monolingual public schools can offer.

Partnerships

Bilingual community efforts are often thwarted by critics who complain that children in these programs are isolated from others in the American 'mainstream'. Yet, an analysis of how these programs operate leads us to understand that these programs have a larger reach across the

globe and provide a deeper interactive, international and plural experience than most US public school contexts. Thus, rather than being isolating, these educational efforts provide American children with the global links that the US needs.

Although many of these bilingual community efforts receive books, materials and other resources from foreign governments, this does not represent a 'foreign' orientation, but a global one. First of all, it is the American ethnolinguistic community that often seeks out the partnership with foreign governments (as well as local government), as a means to win support for their own efforts, but not to be controlled by government. Second, the foreign government support is used to ensure that the children are successful in the US by instilling pride in their heritage. The support of foreign governments is used to develop US citizens able to navigate different linguistic and cultural contexts.

A good example of the role and the complexity of these larger complex partnerships is the functioning of the network of schools of the US Korean community. The schools are organized into two networks – the Korean School Association of America founded in 1982, and the National Association for Korean Schools founded in 1985 – and the South Korean government provides textbooks and materials for both (Chung). Yet it is clear that the goal of these educational activities is the academic success of American children of Korean background, and not of Korean children. For example, the Foundation for Korean Language and Culture was established in 1997 not strictly to promote Korean, but rather to establish Korean as an acceptable subject in the SAT subject test in order to advantage Korean American children. The efforts of this Foundation were funded by the Korean conglomerate Samsung and the South Korean government, as well as by the Korean American community. These partnerships have also made it possible to develop dual language bilingual education programs in Korean/English for American children, as well as to increase the teaching of Korean in US public schools (Chung). Through all these partnerships, Korean American children are supported in succeeding in a competitive US global market, in which the Korean language will increasingly be an asset and a resource.

The Japanese government has supported programs to teach Japanese to 'sojourners', temporary residents, since the 1970s. In 1971 Japanese corporations supported the founding of the Japan Overseas Educational Services in order to promote the education of Japanese children abroad. The Japanese government subsidizes rent for school buildings, salaries for teachers and textbooks. In the greater New York area, most Japanese educational programs are under the auspices of the Japanese Educational Institute of New York, founded in 1975 (Kano). However, increasingly, as Kano describes,

Japanese bilingual community efforts focus on the success of Japanese American children in the US (and not 'sojourners'). These Japanese educational programs also support the acquisition of Japanese language and culture by all American children, even those without a Japanese background.

Many other bilingual community education efforts described in this book also receive support from foreign governments for similar purposes to those outlined above. The Greek Ministry of Education provides the Greek textbooks used in many of the church-run Greek schools (Hantzopoulos). The Turkish government provides instructional space in the Turkish Consulate and school textbooks imported from Turkey (Otcu).

The Mexican government supports a Binational Migrant Education Program, which provides funding for teacher exchanges between Mexico and the US and allows students to migrate between the two countries by facilitating a binational transfer document (Makar). The Mexican government also supports a program called Plazas Comunitarias, which supports literacy courses and education in Spanish, implemented through community-based organizations. In all of these cases, it has been the Mexican American community that has advocated for this support, and the programs reflect the transnational nature of the community.

The programs in New York City organized by the Chinese American community also receive support in the form of free textbooks and professional development from the governments of the People's Republic of China and/or Taiwan, through pressure exerted by the Chinese American community (Lo). An example of how the concept of 'foreign' countries and citizenship is disrupted in the complexity of a US global city like New York is the fact that foreign governments often support educational programs that do not correspond to students' national origins. For example, the Taiwanese government and the Chinese government both support programs in Mandarin Chinese regardless of the origins of the students. Thus, one often finds Taiwanese children learning the simplified characters used in Mainland China, and children from Mainland China learning the traditional characters of Taiwan.

The partnerships and collaboration that these bilingual community education programs establish in order to survive should be an important lesson for all educators. Just as the parents and the community stretch to support these programs, the teachers do also. In many cases it is individual teachers who establish unlikely partnerships in order to do their job well. For example, a teacher in a Tamil class has an ongoing relationship with the Canadian Board of Education in Toronto, where they teach Tamil in public schools. They provide her with lesson plans and curricula, which she then adapts for use in the school (Ghaffar-Kucher & Mahajan).

Beyond other governments, some of the bilingual community education efforts included here are supported by New York State, New York City and/or federal funds. That is the case for the public 'dual language' bilingual education programs described in these chapters and some other programs, like many after-school programs. For example, the Chinese American Planning Council, which runs the largest after-school program at PS 20, receives funding from the New York City Department of Youth and Community Development (Lo).

Perhaps the example in the book that shows the most collaboration and the building of partnerships is that of the French American community. The growth of French–English bilingual community programs in New York City is the direct result of collaboration between French/US governmental and non-governmental partners; local, national and international organizations; private foundations; parent groups; and the local NYC Department of Education (Ross & Jaumont). The French Ministry of Education provides help to one-third of the French/English bilingual community programs in New York City in the form of teachers from the French public civil service, scholarship aid for French citizens and program accreditation. The French government also maintains an Agency for French Education Overseas, which offers special grants to support classes in French as a mother tongue. However, it is the collaboration of the New York City Department of Education, together with the French American community, Francophile Americans and French expatriates that has made the French Heritage Language after-school programs possible. The New York City Department of Education provides public school classroom space free-of-charge for these programs.

These partnerships are clearly extensions of parents and communities, as discussed in the previous section. Nevertheless, these collaborative structures clearly show that bilingual community efforts do not isolate or provide a structure for group segregation. Instead, they provide American children with opportunities to understand a global world and to have experiences beyond a local national or ethnic context. Rather than placing them in the disadvantaged position in which American ethnolinguistic minorities are held, which is purported to only be remedied by full linguistic and cultural assimilation to English-only, these bilingual community education efforts place these children in an advantaged position. Their bilingualism and understandings of other cultures and countries set the stage to make them highly competitive in the global market.

These bilingual community education efforts also insert complex language and cultural practices as a definition of what it is to experience an American childhood. This ensures that we go beyond traditional definitions

of what it is to be an American 'ethnolinguistic speech community'. This is precisely the topic of Section III of this chapter, which follows.

III: Beyond Ethnolinguistic Communities

The cases in this book enable readers to understand that American ethnolinguistic communities are much more fluid, diverse and complex today than in the past, and that therefore the notion of a static 'speech community' of traditional sociolinguistics may need to be extended to that of *'diasporic plural networks'*. Traditional sociolinguistic analysis of speech communities may need to give way to what Busi Makoni has called 'diasporic sociolinguistics' or what Blommaert (2010) has called the 'sociolinguistics of globalization'. The American ethnolinguistic communities of the present are transnational and fluid, leading us to abandon the traditional notion of a 'speech community'. Fishman (1972b: 22) defined 'speech community' as 'one, all of whose members share at least a single speech variety and the norms for its appropriate use'. Twenty-years later, Romaine (1994) put the emphasis not on the sharing of the same language, but on norms and rules for the use of language. She clarifies: 'The boundaries between speech communities are essentially social rather than linguistic' (Romaine, 1994: 22). Regardless of whether the notion of a 'speech community' uses linguistic or social criteria, it results in the view that there are separate social, cultural or linguistic entities, and that there are nested communities within the nation-state.

In the last 20 years, there has been a shift from understanding speech communities as categories, to recognizing 'communities of practice' (Lave & Wenger, 1991). In the community of practice view, a group may be oriented to the same practice, but not necessarily in the same way. Thus, rather than viewing the community as a homogeneous whole, the focus is on difference and tension as the ordinary condition. Since identity is rooted in action, and not in categories, there can then be a multiplicity of identities.

Postmodern scholarship has problematized the notion of 'community' even further by viewing it merely as a social, political and discursive process. This is the position of language ideology theorists (see Gal & Irvine, 1995; Gal & Woolard, 2001). Thus, an ethnolinguistic community may have little to do with ethnic and linguistic inheritance. Rampton (2006: 17) concludes:

> [B]elonging to a group now seems a great deal less clear, less permanent and less omni-relevant than it did twenty-five years ago, and this makes

> it much harder to produce an account of 'the language of such-and-such a social group', or 'language among the __' than it used to be.

Language and ethnicity are not simple reflections of 'heritage speech communities', or of 'practice communities'. The social action and networks in which individuals are involved in the here-and-now juxtapose multiple linguistic and cultural identities from which we select features at different times to perform our identities (Rampton, 2006).

As such, in global cities where individuals act and interact closely, there is a proliferation of transnational identities that live 'with and through, not despite, difference; by *hybridity*' (Hall, 1990: 236). American ethnolinguistic communities are fluid and heterogeneous. Although in this book we used the traditional sociolinguistic idea of a 'speech community' to commission the chapters, the chapters themselves reveal the fluid and heterogeneous nature of these groupings. The chapters also reveal the discursive 'inventions' of ethnicity as linguistic and cultural inheritance. Whereas the chapters identify the enormous effort exerted by some of these educational programs in socializing American children to specific language and ethnicity constructions, they also reveal the constant disruptions of these monolithic categories, especially by children, but also by adults.

Busi Makoni is explicit about these language and culture constructions in the context of Africa. She says:

> The concept of African languages as enumerable objects and associated names were products of colonial language ideology reinforced by contemporary, top-down language policy discourses. In pre-colonial and plurilingual urban Africa, languages are best construed not as enumerable entities but as communicative resources. Such resources are plurilingual, heterotrophic, and diversified local practices typical of Africans. (p. 142)

The chapters in this volume show that the concepts of 'heritage languages and ethnicity' in a global city are also inventions. The communicative resources of the children who participate in these bilingual community efforts are likewise plurilingual, heterotrophic and diversified, a product of their constant interactions in plural networks both in the US context and globally.

Diasporic plural networks: Some examples

The communities, as well as the language and cultural practices described in the chapters in this book, are not monolithic or homogeneous. For example, the parents who advocated and built the French 'dual language' bilingual education programs in the City included 'European and Canadian expatriates in Manhattan and West Brooklyn, West Africans in Harlem and the Bronx, Haitians in East Queens and East Brooklyn, and North Africans in West Queens' (Ross & Jaumont: 233). In fact, Haitians constitute 29% of the French 'dual language' bilingual education programs, and 50% of those enrolled in the French Heritage Language Programs in New York City (Barrière & Monéreau-Merry). Although some of the bilingual community education programs that Barrière and Monéreau-Merry describe teach in Haitian Creole and English, others teach in French and English, and yet others use all the language practices of the Haitian community, including English, French and Haitian, and most often in combination. There is clearly a complex diasporic network that is creating a context for different French practices in the city, and so we cannot properly speak of a 'French ethnolinguistic community'. Further, French practices in the City include not only what some might consider English practices, but also practices that include what others might call Haitian Creole, Pulaar, Wolof, Mandinka, Soninke and Bambara practices, among many other West African ones. Diasporic networks in New York City, as all these cases show, are plural with regard to language and cultural practices, national origin and religion.

One such example is the plural Punjabi-speaking community in New York described by Ghaffar-Kucher and Mahajan. Punjabi is written by Indian Sikhs in Gurmukhi script, and is flourishing in New York because of its tie to the Sikh religion. Pakistanis, however, write Punjabi in the Shamukhi script, and because Urdu was chosen as the official language of Pakistan, Pakistani Punjabi-speakers hardly ever write their language. Furthermore, to distinguish themselves from Sikh-Punjabis in New York, Pakistani-Punjabis often claim they are Urdu speakers, even if they are not. Yet, because of their Muslim identity, Pakistanis often prefer to learn to read the Qur'an in Arabic, rather than learning to read Punjabi or Urdu. Thus, Pakistani-Punjabi speakers often interact more closely with different national origin and ethnic groups who are Muslims than with other Punjabi-speakers, or other Pakistanis. Their identity construction in NY is then multiple, complex and different from that which they would have developed if they had stayed in Pakistan. Sikhs also interact in New York more with other Indians, Hindi-speakers or not, as well as with Pakistanis, Punjabi-speaking or not. The ethnolinguistic boundaries are porous and complex, and New Yorkers move in and out of them with ease.

The complexity of the so-called Bengali-speaking community in New York City is described by Choudhury, including not only Bangladeshis, but also Indians from West Bengal. Bengali itself also has many variations. In writing, both Shadhubhasa and Choltibhasha forms are used. In speaking, although the standard in both countries is based on the dialect of Nadia in India's West Bengal, Bangladeshi Bengali has borrowed from Persian and

Arabic, whereas Indian Bengali has borrowed more heavily from Hindi. Bangladeshis are mostly Muslim, whereas Indians from West Bengal are mostly Hindus. Yet, despite these differences, in New York City they often come together and establish networks of communication that would not have been common in their countries of origin.

The Russian-speaking community stretches from Russia to the Baltic Republics of Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania, across the Central Asian nations of Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan and Uzbekistan, to the Caucasus states of Azerbaijan, Georgia and Armenia, and the former Soviet republics of Belarus, Moldova and Ukraine, as well as to the diasporas, especially of Israel, Canada and the US. Thus, many of the Russian speakers in New York are multilingual to start with. While the Russian speakers in New York City have historically been Jewish, and many have lived in Israel and also speak Hebrew, the Russian-speaking New York community cannot be reduced to a single ethnicity, national origin or religion, or a single set of cultural or even linguistic practices (Kleyn & Vayshenker). In interacting, the separate constructions of Russianness and the Russian language tied to nation-states in their countries of origin become flexible, plural and complex, as the network is defined by difference and divergence.

Although it is the Greek Orthodox Church that organizes most bilingual community efforts for Greek speakers in the US, many of the children who participate have one parent from a different linguistic, cultural and/or religious background, particularly as the number of inter-ethnic and inter-religious marriages among Greeks and non-Greeks continues to rise (Hantzopoulos). Further, there are children who attend these Greek Orthodox church-run bilingual community efforts who are not ethnically Greek, but instead are Serbian, Syrian or from other national contexts. What brings them to the school is the religious affinity they have with the Greek Orthodox Church. Yet, some ethnic Greeks are not, in fact, Greek Orthodox, but can still attend these church-run Greek schools. Again, it is in the close interactions afforded by NYC that nation-state monolithic identities disappear.

The Chinese community that Lo describes is completely diverse. Some come from Mainland China, others from Taiwan, still others from Singapore, Hong Kong, Vietnam, Laos and Cambodia. Some speak Mandarin, others Shanghainese, Cantonese, Fukienese or Toisanese (Taishanese). Some write the simplified characters used in Mainland China and Singapore, whereas others use the traditional characters common in Taiwan and Hong Kong. In these bilingual community education efforts, all are seen as one. And yet, it is in their interactions within the bilingual community education efforts that the concept of a single Chinese community is simultaneously constructed, and disrupted.

We have already discussed the differences in Spanish-speaking communities, with different national origins, different varieties of Spanish, different languages, different immigration histories, different political relationships with the US, and different racialized identities. Makar's chapter demonstrates that Mexicans in New York are speakers not only of Spanish and English, but also of Mixteco, Zapoteco, Mayan and other indigenous languages. How all of these get re-imagined as one ethnolinguistic group is important to consider. What are the advantages and disadvantages of this discursive 'invention' for Latinos, as well as for the larger US society¿ Certainly there is a Pan-Latino ethnicity that is constructed in the US, as different national, linguistic and cultural groups interact through language practices that contain features of Spanish. How is this construction used and misused¿ These are important questions for those of us interested in the education of ethnolinguistic minorities. Makar's chapter also shows that New York Mexicans are quite different in social class as well. New York is home to elite Mexicans, professionals and business people, as well as low-skilled workers. Some have attended only *primarias* (elementary schools), others *secundarias* (junior high schools), yet others *preparatorias* (senior high schools). Although back in Mexico these groups would not have attended the same educational programs, in New York they populate these bilingual community education efforts together. Thus, the interaction of diasporic networks in NYC is more fluid, and democratic, than that of social and ethnic communities in other settings.

Zakharia and Menchaca Bishop suggest that, while the term 'Arab American' is used to represent an Arabic-speaking ethnic collectivity living in the US, its members differ in significant ways. They speak distinct Arabic varieties, participate in various religions, reflect a range of socioeconomic status, have varying degrees of formal education and hail from over 20 countries in western Asia and northern Africa. For some, their migration to the US is another step in a series of displacements and re-settlements, with or without citizenship, making the notion of 'country of origin' incompatible for their description. These immigration histories reflect historical and ongoing instances of political conflict, and some who hail from the region do not identify as Arab or Arab American, regardless of whether they share the language or not. However, in the US, they may begin to identify as such, with or without the Arabic language.

Even the traditionally homogeneous Japanese and Korean 'communities' are fluid in NYC, and have changed in recent history. Whereas before 1965 the Japanese were considered 'sojourners', now more than half of the children in Japanese educational programs are permanent US residents. Many are either English-dominant bilinguals or multilinguals, with parents who speak

a language other than Japanese or English (Kano). In the Korean bilingual community education program described by Chung, the Korean 'community' is extremely diverse. Some are professionals who arrived after 1965 with whole families. Others are *kirogi* (goose families), who have come to the US precisely for the opportunity for their children to be better educated and to become bilingual. In the school Chung describes, many of the children are biracial; some are of Korean descent, but have been adopted by English monolingual American families. Most Korean parents now speak English, and parent meetings have to be conducted in English. A Korean language class is available to parents. The school has decided against the offering of Taekwondo in the future, as it is seen, in the US context, as too violent. In balancing an American and Korean way of being, the educators in the school now worry as much about providing a nut-free environment as they do about socializing the children as Koreans.

Although Jewish ethnicity is often presented as monolithic, the chapter by Avni and Menken, as well as the one by Peltz and Kliger, make evident the many differences within what we often call the Jewish ethnolinguistic community. First of all, there are significant differences among Jewish religious movements. Orthodox, Conservative and Reform congregations all run bilingual community education efforts, with great variations, as evidenced when we contrast the efforts on behalf of Hebrew by Avni and Menken, and those on behalf of Yiddish by Peltz and Kliger. Even the term 'Hebrew' itself encompasses Biblical Hebrew, Mishnaic Hebrew, Medieval Hebrew and Modern Hebrew, different not only with regards to the historical period in which they emerged, but also in the functions that they have been assigned. Some Jewish students can only read Hebrew for sacred texts and prayers, sometimes in older varieties of the language. Others read, write, speak and understand Modern Hebrew. In addition, Hebrew has never been the sole language of diasporic Jewish communities or the sole proxy of Jewish identity. Yiddish has always functioned in relationship with the sacred language, Hebrew, but also in inter-relationship with other local languages. Thus, difference itself also defines the diasporic Jewish 'ways of using language'.

Many of the students in the Jewish bilingual community education efforts described are second- and third-generation Americans, and their degree of bilingualism varies greatly. For example, in describing students' proficiency in Hebrew, Avni and Menken say:

> While some students frequently attended weekly synagogue services, and therefore had more opportunities to interact with liturgical Hebrew, others only attended synagogue for bar mitzvah celebrations and/or holidays. This same variability applied to their exposure to native Hebrew speakers and trips to Israel. While some students had opportunities to speak and listen to Modern Hebrew outside of the classroom, many did not. Likewise, while some students had started day school in kindergarten, other students came to Rothberg after several years in the public schools, and had therefore only recently begun studying Hebrew. (pp. 199–200)

The bilingual continuum in these bilingual community efforts is extremely broad, and today many programs include children for whom these languages are assets, not heritage. That is, many Anglo American children anxious to acquire an additional language have been abandoned by US public schools, and therefore have turned to bilingual community education. Thus, these programs do not reflect static ethnolinguistic communities that speak a 'heritage language', but diasporic networks of communication where individuals are plurilingual, and they share some, and not other, linguistic and cultural features with other members of the network.

The complexity and dynamism of the plurilingualism in the diasporic plural networks in the US is threatening to many who do not understand the potential of a multilingual US, as well as to ethnolinguistic communities who may want to preserve what they imagine to be their static identity. Thus, the tendency is to see language and ethnicity in singular terms, whether in reference to 'English' and being 'American', or to 'Russian' or any other LOTE and being 'Russian' or of any other group. This ideology narrows American children's possibilities to develop plurilingual and translingual practices and multiple identities, which are important for the future of the US. Busi Makoni explains this phenomenon when she says: 'In NYC, the heterogeneity of languages and the complexity of ethnicity are partial consequences of individuals' multiple affiliations, and the tendency in the long run is for each sub-ethnicity to develop its own vernacular' (p. 151). The US sociolinguistic context with its monolingual, monoglossic ideology contrasts sharply with the plural linguistic and ethnic possibilities of these networks. The effect is a narrowing of possibilities, with distinctions and boundaries among groups, and groupings, that may not have made sense in another context. For example Busi Makoni explains that the Dinka in Africa are a heterogeneous group, and they refer to themselves as Moinjaang. However, in New York, at least five different languages fall under the rubric of Dinka. The result is often a categorization along ethnolinguistic lines that is inconsistent with their everyday actions and with the wishes of the people involved.

The effect of considering the examples in this book not as efforts of the ethnolinguistic community, but as assets of diasporic plural networks means that we can leave behind the notion of these languages and communities as being minoritized. In fact, these bilingual community education efforts

show that these dynamic plural networks offer assets and resources for a global world that will surpass the narrow need of a monolingual public school system to teach English-only well. Nevertheless, there are many challenges that remain, and much needs to change in order for these bilingual community education efforts and public school efforts to jointly contribute to a meaningful education for American children in the 21st century. The challenges and future directions are considered in the next section, which also serves as the conclusion of this chapter.

Conclusion: Challenges Ahead and Future Directions

All of the examples in this book point to the challenges that remain for bilingual community education efforts. Because these efforts are marginalized and not seen as in the mainstream, the possibilities that these efforts hold for American society are not being realized. A paucity of adequate teaching material, unqualified teachers, poor pedagogy and limited opportunities for professional development are factors that work against these efforts.

As we have said before, most programs use material and books that are sent by foreign governments. However, this material has been elaborated by Ministries of Education to construct their national citizens, and is mostly inappropriate for American children who have language practices that include English, and who may or may not be familiar with the context in which the books were produced. Furthermore, American children who attend these educational programs often are socialized as school children in US public schools with collaborative pedagogical practices. The more traditional pedagogy followed by some of these efforts contrasts sharply with the constructive and transformative pedagogies of American public schools. Many of the educators in these bilingual community education efforts teach today as they themselves were taught, not only in a different era, but also in a very different sociolinguistic and sociopolitical context. Teachers in most of these programs commented on their interest in further professional development to align instruction with the needs of American bilingual children. They are simply overwhelmed by the differences of the children, and do not understand how to individualize instruction to meet their needs. However, there are no structures in any of these programs to help teachers develop appropriate pedagogical techniques to use with American emergent bilingual children who are acquiring languages other than English as a result of these bilingual community efforts. These teachers, for example, know very little about bilingualism in education, about the role of the home language in

developing bilingualism, about the potential of translanguaging in classrooms, about scaffolding instruction and about providing multiple entry points to the lesson for individual students.

Despite all the limitations, these bilingual education community efforts have much to teach US public schools, just as public schools would have much to teach these bilingual education community efforts. However, the separation that presently exists between the two systems makes this collaboration impossible. Children get very little recognition for their efforts and hard work. The US public school does not recognize the value of attending these programs, and as a result, children often hide their experiences from teachers and other classmates. In order for children who attend these programs to get maximum benefit, both systems would have to work collaboratively, recognize and value each other's work, and learn from each other.

Because the US public school shuns bilingualism, these ethnolinguistic performances have been pushed into minoritized spaces. That is, the various locales for American children to formally develop Arabic proficiency, for example, have been largely reduced to Islamic centers, schools or mosques. Similarly, learning Greek has been reduced to the institution of the Greek Orthodox Church, and learning Hebrew to the Jewish synagogue. As such, despite the enormous efforts of the communities, parents and children, and their many accomplishments, children who attend these educational spaces continue to be stigmatized and minoritized, instead of being recognized for their enormous assets and resources, as well as their pluralities.

Until US society and US public schools view bilingualism not as a hindrance but as a resource, and welcome the many educational efforts of bilingual community education programs as valuable activities for American children, these efforts will continue to be seen as marginal, and often as suspicious. The loss will be that of US society, and especially of monolingual American children who are going to need bilingual proficiency to work in a global world.

The US has recognized the need to develop bilingual US citizens. The 2006 National Security Language Initiative provides funding for the development of programs, teachers and learning material to expand the teaching of languages other than English, especially those that are critical to national security in K–16. Yet currently, very few American children learn languages other than English in primary schools, and in secondary schools students rarely go beyond the basic level (Rhodes & Pufahl, 2010). Less commonly taught languages such as Arabic, Chinese, Farsi, Japanese, Korean, Latin, Russian and Urdu account for less than 10% of all K–12 language enrollments (*Foreign Language Enrollments*, 2010). Clearly, the US public school today is more concerned with the teaching of English to immigrants than the

teaching of languages other than English to all. Public schools simply have not learned the simple lessons on bilingualism offered by Jim Cummins (1979) and Joshua Fishman (1976) over a quarter-century ago – that using the child's home language will result not only in the better use of academic English, but also in the development of a powerful bilingual citizenry, capable of moving the nation into the future.

Whereas the nation uses resources to fund the learning of languages by those whose home languages do not include those practices, it does not recognize the language resources of those who already speak those languages at home. This has often been observed in the literature. What is new in the positioning offered in this book, however, is the idea that ethnolinguistic communities as autonomous and segregated groups do not exist in the US – that what exist are American diasporic plural networks that interact dynamically using many language and cultural practices. New also is the idea that these bilingual community efforts are not just about groups of people maintaining the static language practices of the past, or developing the unchanging language practices of their heritage. These efforts are about educating American children bilingually and transculturally so that these large diasporic networks can build a better US future for all. At present, this is just a dream.

These bilingual community efforts push us further to reconsider the marginal situation in which the US has held its ethnolinguistic communities and their educational efforts. These are not simply 'ethnic' schools, or 'mother-tongue' schools, or 'heritage language' programs. However, at present, that is the way in which we conceptualize them because we have pushed them out of the mainstream educational space. If we really wanted a future in which the US will emerge as leader, we would have to blend and integrate the efforts of these US bilingual community education spaces with those of the public schools and recognize this collaboration for what it could be – the only way of educating *all* American children for the plural networks of the 21st century.

Acknowledgment

The authors are grateful to Sarah Hesson for her careful reading of this manuscript.

Note

(1) This was, of course, not the first time that the learning of languages other than English was encouraged for national security. During the Cold War, the National Defense and Education Act was passed in 1958 to fund the study of 'foreign' languages, especially Russian.

Part 2

Communities Educate their Own Bilingual Children