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Introduction

Although multilingualism is the norm in the world, the English-speaking world often dismisses the value of languages other than English (LOTEs). This is because of the stature of English as a powerful world language – the language of empire, imperialism, and globalization. Thus, speakers born to monolingual English-speaking parents often see themselves as superior to those who speak other languages, and self-sufficient in their monolingualism. The field of English language teaching has seldom paid any attention to the multilingualism of students of English, often dismissing what students know or understand in languages other than English. This chapter attempts to elucidate the relationship between multilingualism and English language education. It considers how, despite the blinders about multilingualism in the language education field of English-language-dominant countries, English language education has been a catalyst for the growing multilingualism in the world and for the growth of bilingual education. At the same time, this chapter looks at how students' multilingualism impacts upon English language education both in countries considered English speaking and in countries where English is an additional language.

We start by reviewing how multilingualism has been viewed historically, particularly in English language education and in the English-speaking world. We then identify and review some of the critical issues that emerge when multilingualism is considered in relation to English language education. Scholarly contributions that engage with these critical issues are then reviewed. We end by identifying some future directions.

Historical perspectives

The development of language education programmes and practices in relation to multilingualism is largely dependent upon the political economy of the historical period, as well as that of the space in which they come to be. Thus, this section on historical developments is framed around the different ideologies that have emerged, especially
since the early twentieth century, and focuses on the spaces in which they have been most prevalent.

Colonizing ideologies

The multilingualism of speakers who were educated in English did not emerge as an area of scholarly attention until the early twentieth century. Prior to that, speakers of LOTEs were seen as colonized or conquered minorities whose educational failure, when taught through English, was expected because of their inferior status as simple labour for their superiors.

In the twentieth century, speakers of LOTEs who were successfully educated through English were generally of a powerful social class. The monolingual education that they received in the English-speaking world, most notably in the UK, but also in the USA, made them bilingual, while not diminishing their privilege as elites or diminishing their competence in the LOTE. The tradition of a privileged elite English monolingual education for powerful elites in order to make them bilingual continues to this day, and is evident in many private boarding secondary schools in the UK, the USA, Canada and Australia.

At the turn of the twentieth century, societies such as those of the UK and the USA started to understand the importance of education for all in ensuring their future as industrialized nation states. Whereas the UK turned its attention towards educating those who spoke the languages of Wales and Scotland, as well as those of its former colonies, the USA became concerned with how to educate the many immigrants who were coming into the country at the time, as well as the indigenous peoples living there. The result was a forceful imposition of English and the insistence that these others become monolingual English speakers in order to create monolingual nation states. In countries such as Australia and New Zealand, the purpose of monolingual education explicitly became the eradication of the many languages of the indigenous peoples. For example, in New Zealand in 1913, 90 per cent of Māori schoolchildren could speak Māori; by 1975, the figure was less than 5 per cent (Durie 1997). LOTEs were seen as a problem, and an English monolingual education system resulted in the invention of so-called "monolingual nation states" resulting in the failure of the many language-minority students. Language education in the English-speaking world can be seen, in retrospect, as a way of stamping out multilingualism, rather than nurturing it.

Critical ideologies

In the mid-twentieth century, the language education profession started to gain a consciousness of its own. By the rise of the ethnic revival of the 1960s, it was clear that a monolingual English-only education was not working for language-minoritized communities, and that English monolingual nation states could not be realized. As the relationship between empire and colonies changed, minoritized communities rose in indignation, and demanded that their LOTEs were their right and were not to be seen as a problem. Many nation states started to acknowledge their multilingualism.
In 1969, the Official Languages Act declared Canada to be bilingual in English and French. Moreover, in Québec, where the Francophone numerical majority had been politically minoritized, the Parti Québécois gained political power. Majority anglophone parents, worried that their children were not becoming bilingual in traditional foreign language education programmes, demanded a different kind of language education programme. In 1965, and under the guidance of Wallace Lambert and his colleagues, the St. Lambert school was established, which provided the model that became known as immersion bilingual education (Lambert and Tucker 1972). Rather than teach a second language explicitly, as “foreign language” and “second language” education programmes do, bilingual education programmes use an additional language as a medium of instruction to teach content (Garcia 2009; see also Chapter 3 for descriptive terms for English). In the early immersion bilingual education programme of St. Lambert, French was used in the first year, with English language arts taught in Grades 2 and 3 for approximately an hour a day, and thereafter each language was used for 50 per cent of the time to teach content. Bilingualism became addressed in language education as the Canadian state acknowledged its own bilingualism. As we will see, a critical ideology also emerged with regards to language education in the USA, albeit with very different characteristics.

In the USA, Cuban refugees fleeing Fidel Castro’s communist regime started arriving in Miami-Dade County in the early 1960s. Their intent was to remain in the USA only until Castro was deposed, and they thus lobbied for bilingual education for their children so that they could maintain their Spanish. The result was a two-way bilingual education programme at Coral Way Elementary School, with Spanish-speaking students receiving half of their instruction in English, and English-speaking children receiving half of their instruction in Spanish. At the same time, and as a consequence of the Civil Rights Era, Mexican Americans, Puerto Ricans and Native Americans started to demand maintenance bilingual education programmes, in which language-minoritized students were taught in both English and their LOTEs. In 1968, the US Congress passed Title VII of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act - what became known as The Bilingual Education Act - ushering in the use of LOTEs in education as sanctioned by the US government. However, the intent of the minoritized community to use their LOTEs, especially Spanish, to educate their own children was lost in the US federal government’s interpretation of the community’s intent. The goal of federally sponsored bilingual education was the quick acquisition of English by poor minority students. It was perhaps the US Supreme Court decision in the judicial case of Lau vs. Nichols (1974) that best expressed the ideology of the US federal government towards bilingualism: the use of students’ home language in education is meant only to ensure their comprehension, and in no way recognizes their bilingualism or the multilingualism of the USA. In 1974, when the Bilingual Education Act was reauthorized, a definition of bilingual education was offered, limiting the use of LOTEs to the temporary instruction of those who did not speak English, that is, to transitional bilingual education. Only those who did not speak English, those who became known as “Limited English Proficient”, had language rights in education, but only temporarily; this in no way signalled a greater tolerance towards bilingualism or multilingualism in the USA (for more on this history, see Crawford 2004, Garcia 2009, Garcia and Kleifgen 2010).
In the UK, despite harsh language education laws such as the Welsh Education Act of 1870, which prohibited the speaking of Welsh at school, Welsh-speaking and Gaelic-speaking parents started to develop Welsh- and Gaelic-medium schools in the 1940s. By the 1960s, these schools had also started to attract anglophone children, motivated especially by the increase in the use of Welsh in Wales in public sector employment (Jones and Martin-Jones 2004). The Welsh Language Act of 1967 established the equal validity of Welsh and English. Bilingualism was now understood as a right for both majorities and minoritized peoples and many developmental bilingual education programmes were developed.

Although the languages of regional autochthonous groups such as Welsh had undergone much loss, the languages of indigenous peoples all over the world had been decimated. As mentioned above, this was the case of Māori. In 1840, the Māori signed the Treaty of Waitangi with the British, establishing that their language was a treasured possession to which they were entitled. In the 1960s, a court tribunal established the validity of the treaty, and Te Kōhanga Reo programmes started to grow. These “language nests” are centres where the whānau, or extended family, impart Māori spiritual values, language and culture to preschool children under the age of five. Eventually these programmes were expanded to include Kura Kaupapa Māori programmes at the elementary level and Wharekura programmes at the secondary level, all instances of immersion revitalization bilingual education (May 2004).

However, as bilingual education was developed as a way to improve the education of minoritized communities in local spaces, the world was changing again, this time responding to the rise of corporations as interconnected networks. The post-Fordist economy began to look for service work across nation states, leading to massive migration and to the movement across state boundaries of former colonized populations.

Nation state ideologies in an emerging global world

By the time bilingual education efforts in the USA were getting under way, the country was undergoing another shift. A need for more workers in the service economy had prompted changes in the Immigration Act of 1965. The many Mexican Americans in the American Southwest, Puerto Ricans in the American Northeast and Cubans in Florida were now joined by Spanish-speaking immigrants from all over Latin America, and by immigrants from East Asia, South Asia and Africa. US bilingual contexts started to become multilingual and language diversity became ever more heterogeneous. The impact was felt in language education programmes and practices. Whereas in the last decades of the twentieth century bilingual education programmes were tolerated, they increasingly came under attack as the century came to a close. Many local educational authorities significantly reduced their bilingual education programmes, which were rendered illegal in three states: California (1998), Arizona (2000) and Massachusetts (2002). English-only approaches started to be preferred in the form of English as a second language (ESL) programmes. ESL had been an integral part of bilingual education programmes in the USA, and “pull-out” ESL programmes in which specialized ESL teachers worked with small groups of students for a period of time were prevalent. However, during this time,
another two ESL models came into being. ESL push-in became preferred to the pull-out model, with ESL specialists working with students inside mainstream classrooms. In other cases, structured immersion/sheltered English programmes were organized in which bilingual children, who increasingly became known as “English language learners”, were placed with a teacher who scaffolded content instruction. The relationship between bilingualism and education had come full circle, with bilingualism again being seen as a problem that had to be eradicated as the USA became increasingly multilingual.

Likewise, especially in the UK, the growth in the numbers of children from the former colonies and refugees from Eastern Europe, East Africa and South and East Asia had been persistent since the 1960s, but a policy, first, of education in separate induction centres, and, then, of dispersal, ignored the issue of multilingualism. In 1985, the Swann Report, Education for All, proposed that students who were developing their English were not to be cut off from mainstream classrooms. Although making the argument that LOTEs could be resources for monolingual children, the effects were that the children's LOTEs continued to be perceived as a problem that had to be eradicated, thus closing off the possibility of multilingual British citizens. However, again, as the growing multilingualism was rendered a problem, the world was changing, this time spurred by the neoliberal forces of a global capitalism.

**Neoliberal ideologies**

From the 1970s on, the process of making profits by extracting wealth from colonized LOTE-speaking populations - what Harvey (2003) called “accumulation by dispossession” - started to be accomplished not through imposition, but through the manipulation of market forces that include the recalcitrant multilingualism in the midst of English-speaking societies. In order for the neoliberal economy to function, it was important to include language and cultural difference as a means to expand the number of consumers. Advances in technology have facilitated the inclusion of linguistic and cultural differences in consumption.

There are many manifestations of this greater tolerance towards multilingualism in language education policies. In 1993, the Council of Europe proposed the Charter on Regional and Minority Languages, giving ethnolinguistic minorities the right to use their languages in education in countries that ratified the charter. The Council of Europe (2007) also lays out the primary purpose of plurilingual education:

> The purpose of plurilingual education is to develop speakers’ language skills and linguistic repertoires. The ability to use different languages, whatever degree of competence they have in each of them, is common to all speakers. And it is the responsibility of education systems to make all Europeans aware of the nature of this ability, which is developed to a greater or lesser extent according to individuals and contexts, to highlight its value, and to develop it in early years of schooling and throughout life. Plurilingualism forms the basis of communication in Europe, but above all, of positive acceptance, a prerequisite for maintaining linguistic diversity.

(Council of Europe 2007: 7)
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Clearly plurilingualism is touted as a resource in this new political economy, and, in particular, the acquisition of English is considered essential (Phillipson 2009). Interestingly, it is again the power of English that is the catalyst for bilingual and multilingual education in many contexts.

Whereas traditional "foreign language education" programmes have been branded failures, alternatives to the already existing bilingual education programmes are being developed throughout the world. In the UK and other European countries, Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) programmes, a type of bilingual education in which an additional language is used as a medium of instruction but only for a period or two, are including all children in language learning (Coyle and Baetens Beardsmore 2007). In the USA, an integrated type of two-way bilingual education, in which language majority and language minority children, usually in elementary schools, are taught together for 50 per cent of the time through one language and 50 per cent of the time in another, is receiving more attention. These programmes are often called dual immersion or dual language programmes.

Regardless of the historical and sociocultural context in which language education programmes for or against multilingualism have been developed, some critical issues have always been present. The next section focuses on critical issues that surround three topics: (1) power and ideologies, (2) stakeholders - communities, parents, students, and teachers - and (3) pedagogies and practices.

**Critical issues**

As the historical development section makes clear, it is impossible to separate issues of language education practices from those of power, ideology, and the stakeholders involved - the community, parents, students, and teachers. We start here by reviewing issues of power and stakeholders in order to ground the discussion about pedagogy that follows. We warn the reader that these issues intersect and cannot be viewed in isolation.

**Power and ideologies**

As described above, the concept of power and who controls the schools impacts on language and education programmes. It determines whose language is taught and which language practices are valued and which are minoritized. Some minoritized communities, in different historical periods, have been able to exert some power, and thus language and education programmes have shifted in favour of multilingualism in the sense of nurturing students' home language practices. In the majority of cases, however, schools are engaged in hegemonic practices that keep power in the hands of the dominant group (Gramsci 1988). In the English-speaking world, this means that monolingualism often continues to be preferred. A way of enthroning the power of monolingualism is through ideologies that become habitus: that is, "a system of dispositions common to all products of the same conditionings" (Bourdieu 1991: 59) by which the material form of life is "embodied and turned into second nature" (Bourdieu 1991: 63). As we will see, even bilingualism and multilingualism are often shrouded in monoglossic ideologies (Del...

One of the most pervasive monoglossic ideologies in relation to multilingualism and language education is the concept that there are fixed first languages (L1) or native languages and separate autonomous second languages (L2). “Native” English speakers are those who are born and bred with English as a “first” language and who are monolingual. Those who didn’t speak English first and instead acquired it over their lifetime, cannot ever be considered “native” English speakers. For them, English can only be a “second language”. This is the view that permeates the scholarly literature on second language acquisition, which considers these bilingual speakers as incomplete, inferior, second language speakers who have to acquire and be taught a “second language”. Yet, although it is possible to ascertain in monolingual cases when a “second” language is learned or introduced, this becomes more complex in cases in which children grow up bilingually (De Houwer 1990) or in cases in which bilingualism has already emerged, as we discuss below.

This monoglossic ideology has also shaped traditional understandings of bilingualism, seen as linear, either subtractive or additive (Lambert 1974). According to Lambert, subtractive bilingualism refers to the kind experienced by language-minoritized students who have been forced to shift to a majority language. For majorities, however, bilingualism is additive, with one language added to the other in a linear fashion. It is this additive bilingual concept that has been enthroned in language education programmes and in the field of second language acquisition.

A different view of language and bilingualism has been championed by Makoni and Pennycook (2007), who have argued that in multilingual societies there are no autonomous languages that can be isolated into systems of rules and structures as first/native or second languages. Instead, what we have is languaging, that is discursive practices that are a product of social action as speakers shape “old texts into new contexts” (Becker 1995: 9). García (2009) proposes that bilingualism is not additive and linear, but dynamic. This suggests that the languaging of all bilinguals is complex and interrelated; it does not emerge in a linear way. García and Kleifgen (2010) define dynamic bilingualism as “the development of different language practices to varying degrees in order to interact with increasingly multilingual communities” (García and Kleifgen 2010: 42) (see also Chapter 5).

The insistence on continuing to talk about L1s and L2s and additive bilingualism, instead of considering the dynamic, complex, and fluid language practices in language education circles, keeps power in the hands of monolinguals, who speak the dominant language of the society in which they live at birth and who can acquire a “second” language independently. These monolingual speakers are often White, in contrast to the many bilingual and multilingual Brown and Black peoples, who are racialized as unwilling to work on nation building. A “native” English speaker who is “adding” a second language is seen as White, monolingual, and loyal to their nation. In contrast, bilingual speakers are marked as “second language” speakers. Thus, the concepts of L1/native language and additive bilingualism act to exclude from privilege those with more
dynamic bilingual practices, to “minoritize” these groups as the other in relation to an unmarked dominant norm.

Stakeholders: communities, parents, students and teachers

Community and parent involvement in developing appropriate language education for their children is crucial. Parents who possess certain kinds of social capital – social connections, relationships, and shared understandings – are most successful in getting schools to develop language and education programmes that support their children’s multilingual development. However, language-minoritized parents seldom have that kind of social capital, although they have important funds of knowledge (González et al. 2005), including linguistic practices, that are sites of knowledge construction and that are often ignored in schools. It is only when these minoritized communities are organized in responsive historical periods and social contexts that they succeed in having their home language practices included in education.

Not all students then are equal or the same. Those coming from homes and communities with social capital have the option to become bilingual or not; they are elective bilinguals. Immigrants, indigenous peoples, and autochthonous minorities are forced to become bilingual; that is, they are what Valdés and Figueroa (1994) called circumstantial bilinguals. English-speaking monolingual students who elect to become bilingual attend foreign/second language education programmes or bilingual education programmes of different kinds. However, circumstantial bilinguals are not given a choice of the type of language education programme they receive. Often, they are simply submerged in English, or they attend special English-only programmes; in a few cases, they have the opportunity to be taught bilingually.

When language-minoritized students take language education courses in secondary and tertiary education to sustain their home language practices, these courses are often referred to as heritage language education, with the connotation that these practices are old, not of the present and not valuable in a contemporary advanced society (for this criticism, see García 2005; see also García et al. forthcoming). Not all language-minoritized students have the same rights to specialized language education programmes. Deaf students have had the least access to bilingual education programmes, and refugees and immigrants have less access to language education programmes in which their home language practices are used than indigenous peoples and national autochthonous minorities (Skutnabb-Kangas 2006).

Without a doubt, the most important aspect of language education is having teachers who are educated to respect the multilingual ecology of their classrooms and to develop the bilingualism of their students. However, general education teachers are seldom bilingual, and teacher education programmes often ignore the study of multilingualism. Thus, general education teachers behave as if all children were English-speaking monolinguals. In contrast, language education teachers, whether they teach “second language”, “foreign language”, “heritage language”, or bilingual education, most often undergo specialized education. However, their training often consists of the traditional
conceptions of additional languages and bilingualism, without attention to the complexity and interrelated nature of the bilingual’s full repertoire and dynamic bilingualism/multilingualism. Often, then, it is precisely language education teachers who stigmatize the language practices of bilingual speakers, rendering their home language practices as consisting of an incomplete acquisition of either English or their “heritage” language. Issues of who is being taught and by whom always intersect with issues of power and ideologies, but often pedagogies and educational practices are considered without regard to issues of power and the stakeholders involved. The next section makes explicit how pedagogical practices are related to power, ideologies, and the identity of learners and educators.

Pedagogies and practices

Language education pedagogies for multilingualism are products of their time and the contexts in which LOTEs are taught. Nevertheless, we review here three approaches to language and education: the grammatical approach, the communicative approach, and the cognitive approach, each of them a product of their time.

**Grammatical approach**

The traditional *grammar translation method* focuses on the translation of texts and the explicit teaching of grammatical structures. Especially since the 1960s, this method has fallen into disuse, as the direct method and the audiolingual method have been adopted. In the *direct method*, teachers model language patterns that students repeat without any translation. In the *audiolingual method*, students practise patterns and dialogues to develop particular language structures. Although different, the grammar translation, direct, and audiolingual methods rely on a grammatical approach that is based on *behaviourist* theories of language learning.

**Communicative approach**

In contrast, the communicative approach was derived from a *constructivist* theoretical framework that suggests that language learning occurs as students draw meaning from experience and interpersonal interaction. This approach was developed in response to the failure of audiolingual methods and the increased need for communication across communities. *Immersion methodology* and *integrated content-based methodology* (ICB) are used frequently in bilingual education programmes to develop bilingualism, as well as in specialized English-only programmes for monolingualism. Teachers plan content and language objectives concurrently, and the additional language is used slowly and with simplification. Graphic organizers are used to scaffold instruction. Whereas the emphasis of immersion methodology is on the learning of content knowledge alongside second-language development, the stress of ICB is more on the development of language and literacy in a second language.
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Cognitive approach

Moving away from the communicative approach, language learning started to be recognized as being as much cognitive as it is social and interactive. The emphasis of the cognitive approach is on the learner's active control over the cognitive processes used in learning an additional language. This approach supports the transfer of knowledge stored as schemata or production systems in one language to the learning of new tasks in an additional language. Language is seen as a process that is an integral aspect of our thinking, meaning-making selves. Learning a language involves action movement, and the perception of affordances or relationships of possibility within different communicative events (Van Lier 2004). Whereas the communicative approach supports language learning through authentic communication, the cognitive approach involves explicit teaching and modelling of learning strategies and language.

Language arrangements

One of the most accepted principles of language education for bilingualism is that the two languages must always be used in isolation, a remnant of the prevalence of the direct method. This is what Cummins (2007) refers to as "the two solitudes". In most language education programmes, whether foreign language, second language, heritage language, or bilingual education, the philosophy has been that the students' home language practices can never be used, and that the teacher should exclusively use the additional language. Even in bilingual education programmes, the two languages are most often allocated strictly according to different teachers, different subjects, different times of day, or different places. However, in practice, most language education programmes use language flexibly. Sometimes this flexibility is random and is used to draw students towards the dominant language. However, if used strategically, the flexible multilingual use of different language practices has an important purpose in language education, as we will see under "Current contributions".

Assessment

Perhaps the most crucial aspect of multilingualism and education in today's society is assessment, as educational systems, especially those in the English-speaking world, have become driven by standardized test results. This culture of high-stakes tests poses a particular risk for multilingual populations, as the present tests are unable to disentangle language from content (AERA et al. 1985). Given that the language practices of bilingual students are complex and different, they are not reflected in the English language conceptions that standardized tests assume. For example, academic language proficiency is usually assessed by evaluating the appropriate use of the sound system (phonology), grammatical structure (syntax) and meaning (semantics) (Gottlieb 2006). The different grammars of bilingual speakers are not considered.

English-language standardized assessments have little reliability and validity for bilingual and multilingual students because they do not end up measuring what they intend.
Often the norming of the test does not include emergent bilinguals, that is, those who are learning English or bilingual populations (Valdés and Figueroa 1994). Martiniello (2008), for example, has shown that bilingual and monolingual students with the same ability often perform differently on particular mathematics items because of unfamiliar vocabulary and complex syntactic structures.

In the USA, federal legislation such as the No Child Left Behind Act of 2002 insists that high-stakes assessments be used to evaluate the progress of emergent bilingual students. Recently, Common Core Standards were adopted by most states, although little has been done to develop assessments that can truly disentangle English language from content, and validly assess the performance of bilingual students. The growing bilingual US student population continues to be assessed with English language tests that render their bilingualism a liability and justify their exclusion from equal educational opportunities (Garcia and Kleifgen 2010).

Clearly issues of power and ideologies, exclusion of important stakeholders, and inappropriate pedagogies and practices have done much to create inequities and misunderstandings about the education of bilingual and multilingual students in English-speaking contexts. The following section gives a glimpse into current contributions that are attempting to redefine multilingualism, thus constructing more equitable and appropriate language education programmes for multilingualism. We focus especially on the redefinitions of language and bilingualism, and end by imagining what language education programmes and practices might look like after being adapted to these new understandings.

**Current contributions**

Globalization in the twenty-first century has led not only to geopolitical changes, but also to geocultural ones, which have affected the sociolinguistic patterns of language in society. Blommaert (2010) discusses the advent of superdiverse patterns of multilingualism, driven by the greater differentiation in immigration, gender, age and local responses in the life-trajectories of people.

If this superdiverse multilingualism were at the centre of the design of language education programmes, power would be differentially distributed. No longer would a high language and a low language be used in separate domains and functions with power differentials, as in models of classical diglossia (Ferguson 1959, Fishman 1967). No longer would the state exert ideological control to reify one high autonomous language as a means to consolidate political power. And no longer would “second” languages be taught separately and in isolation from “first languages”. Instead, the combination of language and literacy practices that make up the superdiversity would lead to different language education programmes and language use expectations that would focus on students’ full linguistic repertoires, and their dynamic language practices (see also Chapter 23).
Language and bilingualism redefined

As with sociocultural studies of literacy (Street 1985; see also Chapters 24 and 29), the argument being made today about language and multilingualism is that language is not simply a fact, that is, a system of syntactic, semantic and phonetic rules; instead, language consists of strategies for orientation and manipulating social domains of interaction. Language is influenced by social, cultural, political, and economic factors and framed within social practices. Rather than focusing on whole-system differences that correspond to the enumerable languages of nation states, the study of language in society has increasingly focused, as said before, on people's "langaging", the social features that are called upon by speakers in a seamless and complex network of multiple semiotic signs. Different linguistic features are not bounded by geographical territories and national spaces, but rather they represent complex local practices of interactions that are dynamically enacted by human beings (Mignolo 2000). These language practices are linked to broader sociopolitical systems, creating possibilities for agency and resistance (Irvine and Gal 2000).

Postcolonial identities require plural language practices, a dynamic bilingualism and multilingualism that goes beyond diglossia, the additive and subtractive bilingualism of the past, or even the plurilingualism espoused by the Council of Europe today, and instead acknowledge the complexity of langaging bilingualy. While bilingualism in the past was seen as having full command of two languages, and plurilingualism as "the ability to use several languages to varying degrees and for distinct purposes" (Council of Europe 2000), our understandings of language diversity today is much more complex. Many scholars have referred to these dynamic language practices by many different terms that mean slightly different things.

Garcia (2009), extending the term proposed by Cen Williams (1997), has referred to these dynamic multilingual practices as "translanguaging". Translanguaging refers not to the use of two separate languages or even the shift of one language or code to the other, as there is not "a" language. Rather, translanguaging is rooted in the belief that bilinguals and multilinguals select features and co-construct or soft-assemble their language practices from a variety of relational contexts in ways that fit their communicative needs. That is, one language and then the other does not exist prior to and independently of the task content; rather, langanging bilingualy comes into existence with enaction that is realized within an immediate context (Kloss and Van Orden 2009). The focus of bilingualism is not simply to maintain two autonomous languages as manifestations of nation states or static ethnolinguistic identities or language functions. Rather, the focus of langanging bilingualy, of translanguaging, is "redressing the asymmetry of languages and denouncing the coloniality of power and knowledge" (Mignolo 2000: 231) while enacting a bilingual subjectivity that emerges in the interdependence of the contextually appropriate response.

Other scholars have used different terms to note the dynamic language practices of bilingual and plurilingual citizens. Jørgensen (2008; Chapter 5) refers to the combination of features that are not discrete and complete "languages" in themselves as polylingualism. Jacquemet (2005) speaks of transidiomatic practices to refer to the communicative
practices of transnational groups that interact using different communicative codes, simultaneously present in a range of local and distant communicative channels. Otsuji and Pennycook (2010) refer to fluid practices in urban contexts as metrolingualism, rejecting the fact that there are discrete languages or codes.

Today’s language education programmes, then, cannot reflect diglossic language arrangements, as language addition and/or language maintenance are not appropriate goals. Instead, language education programmes must seek language sustainability, which refers to the capacity for language practices to endure, but always in interaction with the social context in which they operate (Garcia 2011). The concept of sustainability contains in its core the grappling with social, economic, and environmental conditions by which systems remain diverse and productive over time. That is, the concept of sustainability is dynamic and future-oriented, rather than static and past-oriented like the concept of language maintenance. Language sustainability refers to renewing language practices to meet the needs of the present, while not compromising those of future generations. Thus, language education programmes need to support speakers’ sustainability of languaging as a dynamic relocalization in space and time that results in generative becomings.

Language education programmes redefined

Traditional language education programmes and practices have begun to be questioned as our definitions of bilingualism have been extended. Instead of thinking of existing programmes as structures in which to “add” a “second language” (as is the case in foreign language, second language or bilingual education programmes), some efforts are being made to sustain and expand language practices from the students up. An example of this kind of language education programme is being enacted in a limited number of US government-funded public schools for recently arrived immigrants. These schools use the students’ home language practices not in administratively structured ways (through specific periods or teachers or subjects) but throughout the day, both to scaffold lessons for English development and to sustain the complex plurilingual repertoire of emergent bilinguals (for more on these types of programmes, see Garcia and Sylvan 2011). The locus of control of language in these schools is not the teacher, as traditionally enacted. The students themselves control their language practices to make sense of their education and to develop new language practices in English in interrelation with other language practices. We have referred to these kinds of education programmes as dynamic plurilingual education programmes (Garcia and Kleifgen 2010).

The common assumption that only the “target” language is to be used in language education programmes has been increasingly questioned, as have the strict policies of language separation that characterize most bilingual education programmes, and especially “dual language” bilingual education programmes in the USA (Cummins 2007, Fitts 2009, Garcia 2009). Moreover, translanguaging as a pedagogical practice is being increasingly used to sustain the dynamic languaging of students (Creese and Blackledge 2010).

New ways of understanding language and bilingualism are redefining programme structures and pedagogies, although there have only been a few promising assessment
efforts. Technology is assisting with the development of standardized content tests that adapt the language load to the bilingual or plurilingual student's linguistic profile. Thus, the language of the test can be simplified, translated, or changed to adapt to the student's language profile at that particular moment or when dealing with a specific content. These technology-adaptive tests can also provide visuals and glossaries to contextualize language. When writing is required, the tests may allow students to use their full linguistic repertoire in making evident what they know.

Standardized language tests, however, remain problematic, for we have not yet devised ways of testing language and bilingualism in the dynamic ways in which we now understand them. Up to now, assessments have measured growth and ultimate attainment of specific language skills in one or another language, but new language standards adopted by many countries require that students integrate reading, writing, speaking, and listening, and that language be used in dialogical interactions. Bilingual standards should also require that students integrate all their language practices, as they perform bilingualy in different modes and modalities (Kress 2003), being able to move back and forth between standard academic practices and those of their homes and communities as they respond to the content of the task. Filters in the internet are able to create unique information for each of us as we click, providing us with different ideas and information and creating who we are (Pariser 2011). In the same way, internet-based language assessment should be able to accommodate our bilingual selves. The technology is there; what remains is for the testing industry to give up its traditional validity and reliability constructs and accept the challenge of today's dynamic multilingualism.

Future directions

Multilingualism and education will remain a challenge because most educational systems are organized by nation states, which continue to exert their power and influence by manipulating language in ways that benefit them exclusively. If fruitful bilingual and multilingual education programmes and practices are to be developed, education systems must turn from reflecting the interests of the nation state to sustaining learners, notably the children, who, through their dynamic language practices, have to make sense of their increasingly multilingual world.
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Further reading

This is a classic and thorough primer on bilingualism and bilingual education, written in a simple style.
This is an excellent collection of essays focusing on multilingualism and multilingual education cases throughout the world.
This is a collection of essays by one of the world’s most renowned scholars of bilingualism and bilingual education and a pioneer theoretician and researcher. The foundational theories of language and education for multilinguals are explained here.
This book is a repositioning of bilingual education that reviews and problematizes traditional understandings of bilingualism and bilingual education approaches and expands them. Policies and practices in different contexts are considered.
In this work, the language practices of multilingual young people in complementary schools in England are used to explore and expand understandings of nationalism, culture, language, and ideology.