Ofelia García

4 Informal bilingual acquisition: Dynamic spaces for language education policy[1]

Introduction

Language policy (LP) scholars in the more globalized world of today have been critical of the top-down approaches that characterized early language planning in the 1960s. But in giving agency to speakers and adopting post-structuralist positions, critical language policy scholars have often not questioned the institutional domains in which LP work has focused. This has been especially the case in speaking about education and "acquisition planning" (Cooper, 1989), and the school domain to which it has been relegated.

Cooper (1989) described the formulation and implementation of language policy as a "spiral process, beginning at the highest level of authority and, ideally, descending in widening circles through the ranks of practitioners who can support or resist putting the policy into effect (p. 160)." The idea in Cooper's formulation of acquisition planning was that interested governmental and school authorities decide on the desirable form and use of languages. Teachers then would follow these directives as "soldiers" (Shohamy, 2006), and the result would be language spread (García, 2010). But others have shown that educators negotiate the language education policies that are imposed, and in so doing become policy makers themselves (see especially Menken & García, 2010 for teachers. See also Mc Carty, 2010). Rather than a spiral, García and Menken (2010) argue that language education policy is dynamic, with educators negotiating institutional demands on a moment-to-moment basis, according to their diverse students' plural needs.

This paper builds on a dynamic critical notion of language education policy, but brings a dynamic lens to the concept of institutional domain. It departs from other studies of language education policy by problematizing the notion of the

---

1 This chapter draws from García, Ofelia. 2009. "Bilingualing" without schooling. The role of comprehensive education. In: H. Varenne and E. Gordon (eds.), *Theoretical Perspectives on Comprehensive Education: The way forward*, pp. 187–216. Lewiston, New York: The Edwin Mellen Press. I am very grateful to Hervé Varenne and Ed Gordon for their permission to use this material.

school domain for educational purposes, focusing instead on how informal, rather than formal school efforts, shape the language practices of speakers, especially the acquisition of bilingual or multilingual practices.[2] Early language planning and policy work served the interests of nation-states. Thus, what is known as bilingual education, or alternatively as second or foreign language education, has dominated research on the many ways people acquire the languaging (Makoni & Pennycook, 2007) they use. This paper, however, focuses on a little understood phenomenon, that of *informal bilingual acquisition*. We argue here that when we take the perspective of speakers, and not of nation-states, bilingual acquisition, just like language itself, cannot be controlled within a school domain. The dynamism of the language education policy is not confined to the actors of the policy, but extends to the spaces in which those policies are negotiated. In speaking of this informal acquisition, the chapter introduces the concept of *transglossia*, which focuses on a new description of how complex language practices, that is, *translanguaging*, is used in interrelationship within same domains for sense-making.

This paper then proposes that scholars of language education policy widen their lens to take into account a *comprehensive language education* policy that is different from a school language education policy. A comprehensive language education is not confined to formal schools or complementary schools, such as after-school or weekend spaces where speakers are engaged in new language practices (Blackledge & Creese, 2010; Fishman, 1980). It encompasses both planned or intentional activities, and unplanned or unintentional ones. That is, a comprehensive language education policy includes what we might call *supplementary education* practices (Gordon et al., 2005), as well as the processes of simply living a bilingual existence that we might call, following Varenne (2005), *human education*. The chapter reviews bilingual acquisition efforts supported by supplementary education, but focuses on the intricacies of human education and what it teaches us about bilingual acquisition and language practices.

The chapter ends by arguing that unless we change our descriptions of how languages function in society, include "subaltern" understandings, and embrace a more comprehensive view of education beyond schooling, we are negating the human potential for open communication and educability as a life-long process.

2 Throughout this chapter we use the term "bilingual acquisition" to refer to the multiple acquisition of many languages without regards to the number. Thus, our use includes what others call "multilingual acquisition" or "plurilingual acquisition."

Education and informal bilingual acquisition

Krashen (1985) has distinguished between informal language *acquisition* and more formal language *learning*. According to Krashen, acquisition refers to "picking up" a language subconsciously, usually in domains other than those associated with formal schools – communities, families, workplace, media. Learning, however, refers to language that is formally taught in classrooms.

When originally proposed, Krashen alluded to the success of those who become bilingual informally, as opposed to the great failure of formal language education in foreign language and second language classrooms. Although touting the success of informal language acquisition and the failure of formal language instruction, this theoretical distinction only became a way of infusing the language classroom with more informal and naturalistic ways of teaching language. In second language education, grammar-translation approaches gave way to communicative approaches, with language being used for authentic communication. The growth of bilingual education throughout the world, as opposed to just foreign or second language instruction, has also been an attempt to capitalize on the informal ways in which language is successfully acquired, since bilingual education creates a context in which an additional language is used as a medium of instruction, rather than being formally taught. Although the theoretical distinction between acquisition and learning did much to change the ways in which languages were formally taught in schools, it did not succeed in focusing scholarly attention on the informal ways in which bilingual acquisition occurs outside of the strictures of the school domain or on the agency of communities of speakers in such an educative process. The process by which language practices have evolved in 21st century society is the subject of the next section.

From diglossia to transglossia

Diglossia, a societal arrangements in which one variety of a language (or one language) is used for prestigious or High functions, whereas the other variety (or language) is used for informal or Low functions, has been a foundational principle in macro-sociolinguistics since Ferguson introduced it (1959) and Fishman extended it (1967). Fishman et al. (1971, p. 560) warn that: "socially patterned bilingualism can exist as a stabilized phenomenon only if there is functional differentiation between two languages." In Fishman's macro-sociolinguistic framework, diglossia is necessary because "no society needs two languages for one and the same set of functions" (1972, p. 140).

But in the 21st century, as the movement of people, goods and information has become more complex and technology have afforded us different and simultaneous communication capabilities, the separate functional distribution of two languages in bilingual and multilingual societies has been increasingly questioned. For example, Indian sociolinguists have pointed out that multilingual contact is the norm in India, and yet language practices have been maintained for generations (Mohanty, 2006). The Indian sociolinguist Annamalai (2005, p. 111) explains: "When multilingualism is taken as the norm, the functional (or ecological) relationship between languages in a multilingual network (or linguistic ecology) defines the nature of each language in the network." Mühlhäusler's ecological approach (2000, 2002) posits that languages automatically readjust themselves to fit into the environment and that they are maintained precisely through language contact, rather than in isolation. The spread of English throughout a globalized world has also meant that more groups of people use English without giving up their language practices, and most often use these practices in interrelationship, as the multimodalities made possible through advanced technology confronts us with different language practices simultaneously.

If we focus on how the languaging of people in today's complex world incorporates practices that are traditionally linked to other groups or communities (Rampton, 2006), we start understanding that the process of bilingual acquisition relies on what García (2009, forthcoming) has termed *transglossia*. I have argued elsewhere (García, 2009) that transglossia is a stable, and yet *dynamic*, communicative network, with many languages in functional interrelationship.

Transglossia rests, but goes beyond, the important concept of *heteroglossia* posited by Bakhtin (1981), which Bakhtin defines as the differences of language practices and the different social forces that move them. According to García (forthcoming), transglossia adds a dimension that has much to do with the concept of *transculturación/transculturation* coined by the Cuban ethnologist Fernando Ortiz (1940) in explaining the complex processes of cultural transformation in Cuban society. As Mignolo (2000) has pointed out, Ortiz' concept of transculturation questions the directionality of cultural transformations, and offers an alternative description to the myth that it was the European "discovery" that constructed the Americas, by pointing out that it was the other way around. That is, the Americas created Europe, as American riches made it back. Ortiz' concept of transculturation questions the epistemological purity of traditional descriptions and disciplines, as it affects the knowing subject because as Mignolo (2000) has said, it "infects the locus of enunciation" (p. 220). Transculturation changes the principles of previous descriptions and transforms the views of how people interact. Transculturation involves what Mignolo (2000)

calls "border thinking;" that is, "knowledge conceived from the exterior borders of the modern/colonial world system," that is, "subaltern knowledge."

In a similar way, *transglossia* releases ways of speaking of subaltern groups that had been previously fixed within static language identities and that are constrained by the modern/colonial world system. Thus, transglossia has little to do with the static maintenance of two or more languages of nation-states and other societal groups which maintains the asymmetry of language practices. The focus of transglossia is, as Mignolo (2000: 231) says about transculturation, to question and transgress "the coloniality of power and knowledge." The objective of transglossia is to have subaltern groups develop what Mignolo calls "an other tongue," "the necessary condition for 'an other thinking' and for the possibility of moving beyond the defense of national languages and national ideologies – both of which have been operating in complicity with imperial powers and imperial conflicts" (p. 249). Whereas diglossia was said to rely on static language patterns in different domains to achieve stability and preservation of group bilingual practices, transglossia refers to the fluid language practices that question traditional descriptions built on national myths, as well as that challenge the locus of enunciation.

Transglossia is then tied to what we're calling here informal bilingual acquisition because it releases "an other tongue," the tongue of the subaltern, instead of that of the nation-state. Thus, the description of informal bilingual acquisition differs from that of formal bilingual acquisition. But before we turn to that discussion, it is important to describe what we mean by informal bilingual acquisition.

Informal bilingual acquisition

Formal bilingual learning is always intentional, that is, students are enrolled in courses for the purpose of becoming bilingual. But the *education* that spurs informal bilingual acquisition could be 1) *planned* or *intentional*, with speakers consciously wanting to acquire additional ways of communicating and being involved in activities that might be called *supplementary education*, or 2) *unplanned* or *unintentional*,[3] with speakers becoming bilingual without explicit formal intent

3 In calling this type "unplanned," we're not implying that there is no intent and deliberation. For example, some ways of texting messages by teenagers are "planned" to ensure that parents cannot read them.

simply by living and participating – what we're calling here *human education.* These processes can be diagrammed as in Figure 1.

Degree of Control and Intentionality			
+ Control & Intentionality	**Formal** Bilingual Learning		School Education
	Informal *Planned* Bilingual Acquisition	*Supplementary* Language Education	Comprehensive Education
– Control & Intentionality	**Informal** *Unplanned* Bilingual Acquisition	*Human* Language Education	

Figure 1

Although treated here as categories, it is important to understand that these are continuous processes that occur mostly simultaneously, although sometimes sequentially. All human beings are at all times involved in processes of languaging that are educative, that is, in human language education. And if engaged in multilingual contexts, all are involved in human bilingual education.

Formal bilingual learning is best served when accompanied by the informal acquisition of supplementary language education and human language education, and vice-versa. There exists a myriad of combinations in which all these educative processes interact dynamically, although most scholarship has only focused on the education promoted by school. Fishman (1991: 371), has warned:

> The corresponding need for out-of-school ... reinforcement is doubly or triply great in conjunction with various aspects of language learning and this is so due to the communicational and identificational roles of language.... Without considerable and repeated societal reinforcement schools cannot successfully teach either first or second languages and, furthermore, where such reinforcement is plentifully available, languages are acquired and retained even if they are not taught in school.

Speakers involved in formal bilingual learning and planned bilingual acquisition have been called *elective bilinguals*, whereas immigrants, indigenous peoples, and autochthonous minorities who become bilingual simply by living are usually identified as *circumstantial bilinguals*, since their use of the additional language is a product of the circumstances in which they live and is not

an elective intentional choice (the distinction between elective and circumstantial bilinguals has been proposed by Valdés & Figueroa, 1994). But again, this is not always so, since speakers of majority and minoritized languages[4] all have intentions and choices, even though the institutional opportunities afforded to majorities are greater than those given to minorities.

In the next section, we describe what we are calling informal planned bilingual acquisition, that is, supplementary education efforts. In so doing, I start to question who and what controls bilingual acquisition, a topic that will be further explored in the section on unplanned informal bilingualism.

Planned informal bilingualism and supplementary education

That bilingual acquisition has become important for many adults, as well as children, is evidenced by the many products that are sold in the market. Audiotapes and electronic products of all kinds, some produced by private companies like Pimsleur, others by government units such as the Foreign Service Institute of the U.S. Department of State, abound. Some of these products target specific language communities. For example, among U.S. Latinos *Inglés sin Barreras* is popular, a program that purports to teach English while sleeping. Most products promise that one can learn the additional language while doing other things, like driving and cooking. Language software such as the commercial product *Rosetta Stone* provides interactive lessons that include speech recognition tools and correction systems.

That bilingual acquisition is marketable is also evidenced in the thousands of websites where one can go to acquire an additional language, often maintained by paid advertisements. Some websites offer language lessons to interact with people in specific trades or populations. In the United States, a website offers Spanish for those who want to speak to their maids! Both the British Council and the BBC maintain important websites for acquiring English.

The ability to download multimedia files through pod casting is also enabling many to share their own languages, and others to acquire them on their own, without the help of schools, intermediaries, or even advertisements. Technology has also enabled machine translation, facilitating the acquisition of an addi-

4 We refer here to minoritized languages and not just minority languages to emphasize the power dimension of languages.

tional language. Bilingual acquisition is now more than ever in the hands of people who can act to access it.

Besides commercial products and technology, there are ways of tapping into the language resources and practices of the community that speaks the language that is being acquired. To develop listening proficiency in the additional language, people can listen to radio, watch television, or go to movies in that language. To develop reading proficiency, they can read newspapers, books, and public signs in the community. Whenever they can, they interact with the local speech community itself. They go to local community centers where the language is used, or they attend religious services in that language. When it is impossible to find a speech community, these individuals travel to other countries where they live with families who speak the language.

In an effort to promote the plurilingualism of European citizens, the European Commission introduced *Erasmus*, an exchange program that encourages university students from different European countries to study for part of their degree in a different language in another country. In answering whether students need to be fluent in the language of the university in which they plan to study, the website says:

> If you are starting from scratch, do not be put off . . . everyone can learn languages. You will find that it is easier and more fun when you are living and studying in the country than when you are in the classroom at home! (Erasmus, 2007).

Erasmus recognizes the advantage of informal bilingual acquisition, even when planned, over more formal bilingual learning in classrooms.

In communities where bilingualism is important, *family bilingual planning* is rapidly becoming an important endeavor, a way of promoting informal bilingual acquisition while making families conscious of its potential. For example, in Wales, all parents attending family planning clinics are now also given a kit-box with information on bilingualism, in an attempt to stimulate them to reflect seriously on the possibilities of a bilingual future for their children (Edwards & Newcombe, 2006). In Scotland too, there is official support of the same kind, with the promotion of guidebooks entitled *The Family Language Action Plan*, addressed to families to encourage them to speak Gaelic to their children (García, 2009).

Language revitalization (Hinton, 2001, 2002; Hinton and Hale, 2001; King, 2001; Nettle and Romaine, 2000) or *Reversing Language Shift (RLS)* (Fishman, 1991) efforts throughout the world for communities who have experienced language loss have also been built on the potential of informal planned bilingual acquisition – community-based programs, language camps and clubs, theatrical performances and religious services, play centers. We discuss some of these efforts below.

For indigenous peoples, language revitalization efforts include ways of tapping into the language practices of the community. For example, in Australia and Papua New Guinea, *community-based local programs* parallel the ways in which indigenous people have been observed to learn – by imitation, observation, and individual trial and error (Grenoble & Whaley, 2006 citing Harris 1977). Thus, these programs select a community activity that is well suited to informal acquisition, use the indigenous language in carrying out the activity, and then encourage others to join in. This is also the principle used in the *Master-apprentice programs* developed after the 1990s in California for indigenous languages. This program pairs those who want to become bilingual with elder master speakers in real-life situations such as cooking or gardening. The apprentices are full participants and in so doing the indigenous language is acquired (Grenoble & Whaley, 2006).

The potential of informal bilingual acquisition is also recognized by the many *summer immersion camps* that are organized for the purposes of developing fluency in additional languages. There are many of these summer immersion camps for language majorities who want to become bilingual. They have also been shown to be extremely effective in reversing the language shift of indigenous peoples and autochthonous minorities or in maintaining and developing their home languages, and that of immigrants. For example, the European Bureau of Lesser Used Languages supports summer immersion camps for the small regional languages of Europe. They also provide backing to *community-based language clubs* in which members come together socially to use the additional language. And they award the title of "Language friendly Community" to municipalities that encourage multilingual signs and correspondence, multilingual language use at public events, speeches and reports, multilingual cultural activities such as theatre and religious services, and the integration of speakers of other languages.

The promises of informal bilingual acquisition is also behind the many *supplementary after-school or weekend language activities* organized by communities who want their children to become bilingual, either in the language of the majority or the language of the ethnolinguistic minority.[5] Children are immersed in drama, song, cookery, art, all done in the additional language. It is precisely the promise of this informal context for language acquisition that has spurred the growth of *bilingual pre-schools* or *play groups* throughout the world and of immersion bilingual programs for early childhood. Small children

---

5 Many use the term "heritage language programs" for these activities. I have objected to the term "heritage language" because of its backward connotation, but also because it replaces the more dynamic concept of bilingualism. For more on this, see García (2005).

have also been observed to learn languages by imitation, observation, and individual trial and error. Pre-school bilingual programs build on this capacity of young children to acquire understandings, as they acquire an additional language. This is also the source of the success of the so called "language nest" movements in places like Aotearoa/New Zealand and Hawaii. For example, *Te Kōhanga Reo* programs in New Zealand involve pre-school children under the age of five in centers where the *whanau*, or extended family, impart Māori spiritual values, language and culture (Fleras & Spoonley, 1993; May, 2010). It is the use of language informally, in authentic and meaningful culturally relevant ways that has succeeded in revitalizing the Māori language.

Although planned informal bilingual acquisition has long been recognized as important in acquiring an additional language (Fishman, 1991), scant scholarly literature exists on how this actually takes place. From the foregoing, however, we can surmise that there are a few principles involved in what we're calling here *supplementary education* efforts for bilingualism:

- A focus on using the language as an instrument for communication and signification, rather than on the language itself;
- Real speakers and their language practices as the center of attention, rather than teaching the language as an object;
- The additional language complements but does not in any way threaten the other language or identity;
- The process is dynamic and developmental, although not linear, and responds to the communicative situation in question, rather than being considered an artificial step-wise system outside of the speakers themselves.

Although this kind of *supplementary planned language education* relies on the use of language as practiced in a *speech community*[6], it still does not always involve active participation in a *bilingual community of practice* (more on this below). It relies on the planned acquisition of an additional language as if it were two separate languages, that is, it mostly considers bilingualism as *dual languages*.[7] Although this supplementary planned language education often does not partake of the constructed definitions of academic language used in schools, it still views the acquisition of two "standard" languages as the goal.

6 We define speech community, following Romaine (1994: 22) as a group of people who "share a set of norms and rules for the use of language."

7 The recent trend in the U.S. of calling bilingual education programs dual language responds to this more elite notion of bilingualism where the two languages are kept separate under all circumstances, while it attempts to distance itself from the controversy over bilingual schooling.

Because it does not evolve from participation in bilingual communities of practices, it supports a *monoglossic* language ideology that obviates the *heteroglossia* that is prevalent in bilingual communities.[8] It is the *transglossia* that makes it possible to offer a new description of the *translanguaging* practices that make up unplanned informal bilingual acquisition or human education, that is the focus of the next section.

Unplanned informal bilingualism and human education

Planned bilingual acquisition is deliberate and as such, speakers in some way are complicit with the modern/colonial world system and how it views languages as autonomous systems functioning within nation-states. Unplanned bilingual acquisition is more complex than that which is planned, for, as we will see, it involves using language practices in *functional interrelationship* for communicative and social benefit (Martí et al, 2005). Bilingual speakers pragmatically access their multiple linguistic and cultural resources, as they participate in plural social networks. Mühlhäusler's *ecological approach* (2000, 2002) to bilingualism proposes that speakers find "a situation of equilibrium whereby languages automatically readjust themselves to fit into the environment, and perpetuate themselves through *language contact*, rather than isolation" (my emphasis, quoted in Tsai, 2005: 11). In bilingual speech, Lüdi (2003) tells us, "rules and norms are activated that overlap single languages and govern the harmonic, i.e. the 'grammatical' mixing of elements from different languages." Gutiérrez and her colleagues (Gutiérrez et al., 2001: 128) explain that the hybrid language practices of bilinguals is "a systematic, strategic, affiliative, and sense-making process" that is most important for the community's educative potential. As Homi Bhabha (1994: 2) says: "the intersubjective and collective experiences of nationness, community interest, or cultural value are *negotiated*" and that "*opens up the possibility* of a cultural hybridity [a newness] that entertains difference *without an assumed or imposed hierarchy*" (my italics). In other words, unplanned informal bilingual acquisition fits squarely a transglossic arrangement where the linguistic hierarchies previously described by the modern/colonial world system are altered by changing the locus of enunciation and opening up the possibility of subaltern voices and knowledge.

8 Bakhtin (1983) contrasts the traditional concept of monoglossia to heteroglossia, that is, the multiplicity of languages and rhetorical forms that are the product of linguistic interaction.

Following García (2009) I refer to all processes of engaging in multiple discursive practices to make meaning as "translanguaging." Translanguaging is an approach to bilingualism that is centered, not on standard autonomous languages as has been often the case, but on the practices of bilinguals that are readily observable. Translanguaging, goes beyond what others have termed "code-switching." Whereas code-switching describes bilingual contact from the perspective of the language itself and perceives it as deviant from standard language practices, translanguaging refers to the language practices of bilinguals from the perspective of the users themselves. Translanguaging is thus the normal mode of communication and sense-making strategies that characterizes bilingual communities throughout the world (García, 2009).

That bilingual acquisition would happen spontaneously, without planning from the state or controlled by school, without direction, in overlapping ways, is considered threatening to the "regulatory" language practices that nation-states impose on their citizens. And yet, this is the most common way of becoming bilingual, especially in Africa, Asia and the Pacific. The Polish writer, Ryszard Kapuściński describes how people became bilingual in Ethiopia:

> To protect themselves from the plague of informers, people learned – *without anyone knowing how or where, or when, without schools, without courses, without records or dictionaries* – another language, mastered it, and became so fluent in it that we simple and uneducated folk suddenly became a bilingual nation. (1989, p. 94, my italics)

In Melanesia, for example, an area comprising the south-west Pacific island nations of Papua New Guinea, the Solomon Islands, Vanuatu, New Caledonia and Fiji, up to 1,500 languages are spoken, and many people speak four or five languages without the benefit of schooling (Romaine, 1994). In South Africa, Batibo (2005: 1) describes the language practices of a Tshivenda speaker:

> [H]e may speak Tshivenda to his parents but use IsiZulu to address his workmates, and then receive orders from his employer in Afrikaans. But he may use English in a bank or when talking to educated strangers, and finally use Fanagalo in a pub with colleagues.

Batibo (2005) also gives the example of a woman trader in a Lagos market who may choose to address her client in standard Yoruba, dialectal Yoruba, Pidgin English or, if she is educated enough, Standard English.

But beyond these complex multilingual situations in the developing world, it turns out that this is the way in which most people throughout the developed world, and even in nation-states that consider themselves "monolingual," become bilingual. In countries like the United States where bilingualism is not recognized or encouraged, we come across adults who have develop bilingual repertoires informally through work, family, community, and who can negotiate the functional interrelationship of their multiple languages and the different social roles afforded them – the Salvadorian attendant in the Korean nail salon who can communicate in Korean, the Italian contractor who gives orders to his Mexican workers in Spanish, the Brazilian seamstress who participates in conversation with her Latino co-workers in Spanish, the Korean green grocer who speaks to his workers in Spanish, the many African Americans who speak Spanish to their Spanish-speaking neighbors, the scores of U.S. Latinos who speak English with features of African American Vernacular, and the countless U.S. Latinos who acquire English as adults without the benefit of schooling or any planned activity, and without limiting those efforts to a specific domain.

This unplanned informal bilingual acquisition is even more prevalent among children. In New York City where English-speaking children are often left in the care of Spanish-speaking nannies, there are many children growing up bilingual. In some cases, these nannies have been intentionally hired for this purpose, but in most cases, the unintended consequence of this child-care arrangement results in bilingualism. And the same happens when U.S. Latino children are born into families where Spanish is spoken. Despite never having the advantage of bilingual schooling, these children acquire Spanish, as well as English. Some acquire English before they go to school even when their parents do not speak it, from the television, the radio, the computer, the signs, or because as a Latina mother once told me, "English is in the air."

Unplanned informal bilingual acquisition does not rely on targeted action and cannot be controlled so as to be able to describe two or more separate language systems, but it happens nonetheless. It does need, however, "communities of practice" that provide experience using languaging in socially meaningful ways. A community of practice, according to Eckert & McConnell-Ginet, 1992: 464 is:

> An aggregate of people who come together around mutual engagement in an endeavor. Ways of doing things, ways of talking, beliefs, values, power relations – in short, practices – emerge in the course of this mutual endeavor. As a social construct, a Community of Practice is different from the traditional community, primarily because it is defined simultaneously by its membership and by the practice in which that membership engages.

Paraphrasing Lave and Wenger (1991: 115), bilingual acquisition and a sense of multiple identities are inseparable.

A *dynamic understanding of language socialization*, beyond that originally proposed by Schieffelin and Ochs (1989), is needed to understand this unplanned informal bilingual acquisition. Schieffelin and Ochs (1989) proposed that children are socialized through language (how they learn the group's ways of being and doing via language) and to language (how they become speakers of the languages

of their community) at the same time. But language socialization is not only directed from caretakers to children, it does not only occur in childhood, and is not just developmental. Language socialization is steeped in practice that shifts in response to negotiation with the social context and participants in which the interaction takes place. It is a lifelong process in which those being socialized, including children, exhibit considerable *agency*, choosing among multiple options offered, and sometimes *resisting* and *constructing* new ways of using language and new identities. Language socialization must be understood as participation, and not simply as transmission. We know, for example, that bilingual children growing up in bilingual households can change ways of speaking, as well as "accents" on and off, depending on the social context in which they're interacting and the identities they're performing or want to project. In explaining this more dynamic model of language socialization, phenomenon, Bayley and Schecter (2003: 8) state:

> Socialization by and through language is not simply a process in which experts in a particular community pass on ways of understanding and acting in the world to novices. Rather, even young novices.... differ in what they draw from socialization activities.

Furthermore, language practices, language ideologies and identities change over a speaker's lifespan, reflecting changing social networks, pressures, and opportunities (Luyx, 2003). Unplanned informal bilingual acquisition involves the acquisition of a linguistic repertoire that can draw upon plural systems, and the social meanings of the different combinations. And it is situated in a place of resistance, of power, and of solidarity. This fluid discourse is central to the construction of the multiplicity of identities in which multiple factors like age, race, social class, generation, sexual orientation, geopolitical situation and institutional affiliation come to bear (Pavlenko & Blackledge, 2004).

Breaking with other scholars on how to raise children bilingually, Roca (2005) challenges the idea that it is possible to follow the *one language-one person principle* in the hybrid communities of bilingual practices of the United States. She compares her mother's success in having raised her bilingual, even though she was a Cuban refugee with no money or training and at a time when Miami hardly spoke Spanish, to her own struggles raising her son, Juanchi, in bilingual-Miami today. Roca tells us that her partner and she speak to their son almost exclusively in Spanish, but then continues,

> but the two of us very often speak English between ourselves. He watches far too much television (in both languages), although we have spent a small fortune on videos and DVDs in Spanish, searching everywhere on the back of a DVD ... to see if it has a Spanish audiotrack.... He hears too much English-language news.... We have made a conscious effort to teach Juanchi Spanish, but we have not made any effort to teach him English. We believed that his acquisition of English would come by osmosis, as it has, via interactions with the American side of the family, with the English mode of instruction at his Montessori pre-K school, and with monolingual friends. Juanchi listens to us speak to each other in English, and many of our friends sometimes speak to him in English. My partner's mother speaks to him only in English because she does not know Spanish, and *Clifford the Big Red Dog* is not available in Spanish (pp. 115–116).

Roca's words remind us that in the complex globalized world of today with its mixed and unconventional family configurations, bilingual acquisition happens in unplanned ways, by "osmosis" she says, because life itself is that way, even if there is intent and volition.

Today there are also many cases of reconstituted families where there may be no common language shared between the new partners and their respective offspring in the family cell. For example, a new sort of family cell is fairly frequent in international circles like the headquarters of the European Union in Brussels, where mixed language marriages among the civil servants from all over Europe are commonplace (Baetens Beardsmore, 2009). Just as in India or South Africa, the language practices of these homes are complex and do not simply correspond to different interlocutors or places, as had been described in the literature of planned bilingual acquisition. The human potential for drawing from multiple sources in our meaning-making practices is far greater than our social understandings of how language and bilingualism "should" behave.

The potential for educability in unplanned bilingual acquisition is great. One only has to notice immigrant children translating for their parents (Orellana et al., 2003). Or one has to listen to the many African children and adults whose multiple multilingual discourse appears to us, as westerners, to switch from one language to the other, whereas for them it is just their typical language practices. And we have to step into a bilingual home to understand the complexity and richness of language practices with siblings, parents, extended family, acquaintances, all speaking in different ways. Most of the time these bilingual families are *multi-bilingual-tasking* as they watch television in one language, listen to a radio in another one, read lists, labels, books and newspapers in different languages, write to different interlocutors pulling from one or another, at the same time that the young child, the older child, the parents, the relatives are speaking not only in different ways, but also using different languages. And this is not unlike the practices of shoppers and salespersons in the high-end shopping mall in Coral Gables or of the *botánica* in the working class neighborhood of Hialeah, both in Miami-Dade County, which the author witnessed recently.

Advances in technology have extended the possibilities of unplanned informal bilingual acquisition. For example, Voice over Internet Protocol (VOIP), available to consumers at no cost, mobile phones with their capacity for Short Text

Messages (SMS or Short Message Service), and Facebook make it possible for many more people to become immersed in language practices with others than the immediate community, thus exposing speakers to other languaging. The 3-D virtual world, Second Life, offers its "residents" the ability to socialize and chat in many ways and many languages. It also provides machine translation of public chats that makes it possible for residents who speak different languages to communicate. The media is powerful in encouraging this unplanned informal bilingual acquisition.

These processes demonstrate the speakers' tremendous facility in acquiring and using a multiplicity of languaging and performing their plural identities. Children, as well as adults, acquire, through practice, the ability to adapt their languaging to different settings, using their languages and identities in functional interrelationship, not just functional complementarity. Compare this to the limited education that takes place in most countries of the world – Africa, but also the United States – where children's multiple discourses and identities are ignored while they are restricted to one language only, increasingly English, and where schools continue to insist in a unidirectional link between language practices and identity. Translanguaging practices remain stigmatized, even in bilingual schools (see García, 2009). Heteroglossic language practices of bilinguals are often studied only from a monolingual and monoglossic perspective, and thus debased as inferior. For example, the language practices of U.S. Latinos, drawing creatively from both of their linguistic and cultural systems in innovative combinations are often characterized as deficient, a "patois" that is sometimes called *Spanglish* (Stavans, 2004). But their translanguaging reflects choices of a greater range of expression than each monolingual separately can call upon or that schools can ever accept, and conveys not only linguistic knowledge, but also combined cultural, social and political understandings that come to bear upon language practices. Sandra María Esteves (1997) expresses this in a poem to the Puerto Rican woman when she says: "I speak two languages broken into each other but my heart speaks the language of people born in oppression" (p. 384).

Despite the absence of much scholarly theoretizing on the topic of unplanned informal bilingual acquisition, we can advance a few principles:

- It rests on a transglossia that increasingly characterizes language interactions in the 21st century and that enables us to go beyond the limits on language practices set by the modern/colonial world system;
- It is characterized by fluid language practices and especially translanguaging, as well as a heroglossic language ideology;
- It is common throughout the developing and the developed world;

- It is more complex than that which is planned formally because it requires participation in plural social networks;
- It is not based on functional complementarity of languages or identities as in that of the planned kind, but on functional interrelationships that maintain an adjusting language ecology.

Conclusion

Even scholars that study communities' ways with words (see, for example, Heath 1983) privilege school language in their call for teachers to build upon the communities' discourse practices to promote children's "standard" academic language. The impressive work of Moll and colleagues (see González, Moll & Amanti, 2005) documents the "funds of knowledge" of the U.S. Latino communities, but is often used as ways of helping educators improve the school learning of Latino children. We maintain here that informal languaging practices serve important purposes for human educability in and of themselves, that is, that they're also "funds of education" in their own right for entire communities.

The lack of attention to informal bilingual acquisition, especially of the unplanned kind, is testimony that western scholarship misunderstands the dynamic heteroglossia of bilingual communities of practices, sensing them as challenges to the "education" (in the narrow sense of schooling) of bilingual communities. Introducing a transglossic lens that releases ways of speaking and understanding that are constrained by the modern/colonial world system, we have shown here how these fluid and multiple bilingual practices are in themselves educative processes for adults and children. Through these translanguaging practices, we develop understandings of life – parenting, cooking, music and movement, religion, games, courtship, intimacy, birth and death – that are educative in themselves. Insisting on monoglossic language practices only limits these understandings. By negating these transglossic communities of practices, scholarship may even be destroying the lifelong opportunities, and even schooling possibilities, of all of us who are able to translanguage and transculture in multiple ways beyond those that have been previously defined.

References

Annamalai, E. 2005. New approaches to language policy. In: F. Martí, P. Orega, I. Idiazabal, A. Barreña, P. Juaristi, C. Junyent, B. Uranga, and E. Amorrortu (eds.), *Words and words. World Languages Review* (pp. 111–117). Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Baetens Beardsmore. 2009. Language promotion by European supra-national insitutions. In: García, O. (ed.), *Bilingual Education in the 21st century: A global perspective* (137–158). Malden, MA and Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell.
Baker, C. 2006. *Foundations of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism, 4th edn*. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.
Bakhtin, M. M. 1981. *The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays*. Austin: University of Texas Press.
Batibo, H. M. 2005. *Language decline and death in Africa. Causes, consequences and challenges*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
Bayley, R. and Schecter, S. R. (eds.). 2003. *Language socialization in bilingual and multilingual societies*. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.
Bhabha, H. K. 1994. *The Location of culture*. London: Routledge.
Blackledge, A. and Creese, A. 2010. *Multilingualism*. London: Continuum.
Cooper, Robert L. 1989. *Language Planning and Social Change*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Creese, A. and Blackledge, A. 2010. Translanguaging in the bilingual classroom: A pedagogy for learning and teaching? *Modern Language Journal* 94 (i), 103–115.
Cummins, J. 2007. Rethinking monolingual instructional strategies in multilingual classrooms. *The Canadian Journal of Applied Linguistics* 10 (2), 221–240.
Eckert, P. and McConnell-Ginet, S. 1992. Think practically and look locally: Language and gender as community-based practices. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 21, 461–490.
Edwards, V. and Newcombe, L. P. 2006. Back to basics: Marketing the benefits of bilingualism to parents. In: O. García, T. Skutnabb-Kangas and M. Torres-Guzmán (eds.), *Imagining multilingual schools: Languages in education and glocalization* (pp. 137–149). Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.
Erasmus Council. 2007. *Frequently asked questions*. Retrieved July 17, 2007, from
Esteves, S. M. 1997. A la mujer Borrinqueña. In: H. Augenbraum and M. Fernández Olmos (eds.), *The Latino reader* (p. 384). Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company.
Ferguson, C. 1959. Diglossia. *Word* 15, 325–340.
Fishman, Joshua. 1967. Bilingualism with and without diglossia; diglossia with and without bilingualism. *Journal of Social Issues* 32 (2): 29–38.
Fishman, J. A. 1972. *Language and nationalism. Two integrative essays*. Rowley: Newbury House.
Fishman, J. A., Cooper, R. L., Ma, R. et al. (1971). *Bilingualism in the Barrio*. Language Science Monographs 7. Bloomington, Indiana: Indiana University Press.
Fishman, J. A. 1980. Ethnic Community Mother Tongue Schools in the USA: Dynamics and Distributions. *International Migration Review* 2: 235–250.
Fishman, J. A. 1991. *Reversing language shift. Theoretical and empirical foundations of assistance to threatened languages*. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.
Fleras, A. and Spoonley, A. 1999. Recalling Aotearoa: Indigenous politics and ethnic relations in New Zealand. Auckland, New Zealand: Oxford University Press.
García, O. 2005. Positioning Heritage Languages in the United States. *Modern Language Journal* 89 (4): 601–605.
García, O. 2009. *Bilingual education in the 21st century: A global perspective*. Oxford: Wiley-Basil Blackwell.
García, O. 2010. Language spread and its study in the 21st century. In Robert Kaplan (ed.). *Oxford Handbook of Applied Linguistics. Rev. 2nd edition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

García, O. forthcoming. From diglossia to transglossia: Bilingual and multilingual classrooms in the 21st century. In *Bilingualism in Education*, ed. by C. Abello-Contesse and R. Chacón-Beltran.
García, O. and Menken, K. 2010. Stirring the onion. Educators and the dynamics of language education (looking ahead). In: Menken, K. and García, O. (eds.), *Negotiating Language Policies in Schools: Educators as policymakers* (pp. 249–261). New York: Routledge.
González, N., Moll, L. C. and Amanti, C. 2005. *Funds of Knowledge. Theorizing practices in households, communities, and classrooms*. Lawrence Erlbaum, Mahwah, NJ.
Gordon, E., Bridall, B. and A. S. Meroe (eds.). 2005. *Supplementary education*. Lanham, MD: Rowman Littlefield.
Gregory, E. and Williams, A. 2000. Work or play? "Unofficial" literacies in the lives of two East London communities. In: M. Martin-Jones and K. Jones, K. (ed.), *Multilingual Literacies. Reading and writing different worlds* (pp. 37–54). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
Grenoble, L. A. and Whaley, L. J. 2006. *Saving languages. An introduction to language revitalization*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Gutiérrez, K., Baquedano-López, P. and Alvarez, H. H. 2001. Literacy as hybridity: Moving beyond bilingualism in urban classrooms. In: M. Reyes and J. J. Halcón (eds.), *The Best for our children: Critical perspectives on literacy for Latino students* (pp. 122–141). New York: Teachers College Press.
Harris, S. 1977. *Milingimbi Aboriginal learning contexts*. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation. University of New Mexico.
Heath, S. 1983. *Ways with words: Language, life and work in communities and classrooms*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
Hinton, L. 2001. Language revitalization: An overview. In: L. Hinton and K. Hale (eds). *The Green book of language revitalization in practice* (pp. 3–18). San Diego: Academic Press.
Hinton, L. 2002. *How to keep your language alive*. Berkeley, CA: Heyday Books.
Hinton, L. and Hale, K. (eds.). 2001. *The Green book of language revitalization in practice*. San Diego: Academic Press. http://www.erasmus.ac.uk/students/faq.html?item=6
Kapuściński, R. 1989. *The Emperor. Downfall of an Autocrat* (translated from the Polish by W. R. Brand and K. Mroczkowska-Brand) New York: Vintage House, 1989.
King, K. A. 2001. *Language revitalization processes and prospects: Quichua in the Ecuadorian Andes*. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.
Krashen, S. 1985. *The Input hypothesis: Issues and implications*. London: Longman.
Lave, J. and Wenger, E. 1991. *Situated learning: Legitimate peripheral participation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Liebkind, K. 1999. Social psychology. In: J. Fishman (ed.), *Handbook of Language and Ethnic Identity* (pp. 140–151). New York: Oxford University Press.
Lüdi, G. 2003. Code-switching and unbalanced bilingualism. In: J. H. Dewaele, A. Housen and W. Li (eds.), *Bilingualism: Beyond basic principles. Festchrift in honour of Hugo Baetens Beardsmore* (pp. 174–188). Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.
Luyx, A. 2003. Weaving languages together: Family language policy and gender socialization in bilingual Aymara households. In: R. Bayley and S. R. Schecter (eds.), *Language socialization in bilingual and multilingual societies* (pp. 25–43). Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.
Makoni, S. and Pennycook, A. 2007. *Disinventing and reconstituting languages*. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.
Martí, F., Orega, P., Idiazabal, I., Barreña, A., Juaristi, P., Junyent, C., Uranga, B. and Amorrortu, E. (eds.). 2005. *Words and Worlds. World languages review*. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.

May, S. 2010. New Zealand. In: J. Fishman and O. García (eds.), *Handbook of Language and Ethnic Identity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
McCarty, T. (ed.). 2010. *Ethnography and language Planning*. Routledge.
Menken, K. 2008. *English learners left behind*. Clevendon, UK: Multilingual Matters.
Menken, K. and García, O. (eds.). 2010. *Negotiating language policies in schools. Educators as policymakers*. New York: Routledge.
Mignolo, W. 2000. *Local histories/Global designs. Coloniality, subaltern knowledges, and border thinking*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
Mohanty, A. K. 2006. Multilingualism of the unequals and predicaments of education in India: Mother tongue or other tongue? In: O. García, T. Skutnabb-Kangas and M. Torres-Guzmán (eds.), *Imagining multilingual schools: Languages in education and glocalization* (pp. 262–283). Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.
Mühlhäusler, P. 2000. Language planning and language ecology. *Current Issues in Language Planning* 1 (3), 306–367.
Mühlhäusler, P. 2002. Ecology of languages. In: R. B. Kaplan (ed.), *The Oxford Handbook of Applied Linguistics* (pp. 374–387). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Nettle, D. and Romaine, S. 2000. *Vanishing Voices: The extinction of the world's languages*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Orellana, M. F., Reynolds, J., Dorner, L. and Meza, M. 2003. In other words: Translating or "paraphrasing" as a family literacy practice in immigrant households. *Reading Research Quarterly* 38 (1): 12–34.
Pavlenko, A. and Blackledge, A. (eds.). 2004. *Negotiation of Identities in Multilingual Contexts*. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.
Rampton, B. 2006. *Language in Late Modernity: Interaction in an Urban School*. Cambridge: Cambridge University press.
Roca, A. 2005. Raising a bilingual child in Miami: Reflections on language and culture. In: A. C. Zentella (ed.), *Building on Strength: Language and Literacy in Latino Families and Communities*. New York: Teachers College Press, pp. 110–118.
Romaine, S. 1994. *Language in society: An introduction to sociolinguistics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Romaine, S. 1995. *Bilingualism (2nd ed.)* Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
Schieffelin, B. B. and Ochs, E. 1989. Language socialization. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 15: 163–191.
Shohamy, Elana. 2006. *Language Policy. Hidden Agendas and New Approaches*. New York: Routledge.
Stavans, I. 2004. *Spanglish: The making of a new American language*. New York: Rayo.
Tsai, P. 2005. *Theoretical issues and approaches to language policy and language planning in Taiwan*. Unpublished specialization exam essay (July 1, 2005), Teachers College, Columbia University.
Varenne, H. 2005. Difficult Collective Deliberations: Anthropological notes toward a theory of education. *Teachers College Record* 109 (7): 1559–1588.

II Social aspects of current multilingualism