20

Doing and Undoing Bilingualism in Education

Ofelia García and Ruanni Tupas

1   Introduction

Nation-states usually control education to ensure that only the society's authorized values, histories, and ways of languaging (i.e., the social act of using language) are learned (or not). Thus, most schools throughout the world continue to build their programs and instruction on monolingual models. In the few cases when bilingualism in education is promoted by nation-states, the complex multilingual practices of youth are mostly ignored, and sometimes even stigmatized.

This chapter explores the ways in which educators, policy makers, and researchers in different societal contexts understand bilingualism, and the ways in which bilingualism and multilingualism are done and undone, learned and unlearned in various educational settings. In keeping with the conventions adopted in this Handbook, when we speak about bilingualism and bilinguals from now on, we are also encompassing multilingualism and multilinguals. Throughout the chapter attention is paid to the ways in which the monolingual ethos continues to be upheld in schools, as well as the reasons for doing so. We point to the consequences that this monolingual ethos has had for bilingual learners, and we propose taking up a more dynamic understanding of bilingualism and adopting what we describe as translanguaging, or using language not as a system with socially and politically defined boundaries, but as a dynamic and fluid linguistic repertoire that draws from a unitary system instead of the named languages of nation-states. We propose that translanguaging might be a way of working against the ways in which the complex linguistic practices of bilingual learners have been ignored in schools.

We first describe the competing understandings of the bilingualism of learners in schools, as we also look at the difference between schools' expected performances of bilingualism and those in society and bilingual communities. We then turn to the ways in which bilingualism is done and undone, learned and unlearned in schools. Throughout the chapter we

point to the role that education scholars and researchers have had in contributing to the construction of our present understandings of bilingualism in education and the reasons for that construction.

2   Competing Understandings of the Bilingualism of Learners in Schools

What is bilingualism and who are bilingual learners? Depending on the sociopolitical educational context and the power of the language and learners, these definitions could be totally different. In this section we look at how bilingualism in education is differently understood depending on the social characteristics of the learners. We also describe how performances of bilingualism in school differ from those of bilingual communities and individuals.

2.1   Types of Learners and Bilingualism

The ways in which the bilingualism of learners is understood most often has to do with the social standing of the learners and the dominance, and thus market value, of the languages that make up their bilingualism (see Grin, Chapter 9, this volume). Throughout the world, the bilingualism of elite speakers (what Fishman, 1977, called *elite bilingualism*) is accepted and praised in schools as an accomplishment. This elite bilingualism is understood as being composed of two different languages, at least one of which is a dominant European language, today most likely English. Schools not only celebrate this type of bilingualism but also promote it. Thus, language education programs are developed to ensure that this type of bilingualism flourishes. Bilingualism for white learners of the powerful class is considered a resource (see Lo Bianco, Chapter 8, this volume, for further discussion).

In contrast, the bilingualism of indigenous, conquered, colonized, refugee, or immigrant youth in schools (what has been called by Fishman, 1977, *folk bilingualism*) is often perceived as a problem. To eradicate the bilingualism of these poor students of color, schools most often impose monolingual education. Sometimes schools enact more benevolent forms of extermination – transitional bilingual programs, as well as some forms of mother tongue-based multilingual education programs – where the students' home languages are used only until they learn the dominant language.

Likewise, deaf youth bilingualism in schools is considered a problem, but this time it is seen as a medical condition. The solutions for eradication are not educational, but technological ones, most recently in the form of cochlear implants. Deaf bilingualism is recognized as being bimodal, meaning that deaf youth can use a sign language and can write an oral

language (Swanwick, Wright, & Salter, 2016; for further discussion, see Tang & Sze, Chapter 24, this volume).

It is elite bilingualism that is most valued in schools and promoted. Bilingualism considered folk and bimodal is not only stigmatized in schools, but one of the functions of schools is to eradicate it. The next section focuses on the two tools that schools use to privilege elite bilingualism over the bilingualism of the many, viz., language standardization and a monoglossic ideology.

2.2   Bilingualism of Learners in School

One of the most important functions of schools has always been to teach a standardized form of language, especially written language, which is considered academic. Thus, it is not surprising that bilingualism in schools is accepted only as the use of two or more standardized dominant oral languages. The many sign languages, and the languages of minoritized groups that have not been standardized and are not written, as well as the complex language practices of bilingual speakers, are excluded from the authorized definition of bilingualism in education.

Sociolinguistic and psycholinguistic research has shown that bilinguals do not use their different language practices for the same purposes and are not in any way linguistically balanced. Yet schools expect students to have "equal" proficiency in two or more languages, and to use them separately, as autonomous wholes. Bilinguals in schools are expected to be two monolinguals in one (Grosjean, 1982). Moreover, monolingual assessments perpetuate this view of bilingualism (see Treffers-Daller, Chapter 15, this volume, for related discussion). García (2009a) has referred to this ideology about bilingualism as monoglossic (see also Fuller, Chapter 6, this volume).

An exception to this monoglossic understanding of bilingualism in education is the Council of Europe's (2001) efforts to promote plurilingualism, defined as the ability to "which all knowledge and experience of language contributes and in which languages interrelate and interact" (p. 4). But although this flexible plurilingualism is promoted for university students in Europe, bilingual learners in primary and secondary schools all over the world, including Europe, are most often subjected to educational programs with monolingual monoglossic ideologies. For example, many plurilingual refugee youth in European schools first have to demonstrate "full" proficiency in the dominant language in order to have access to universities. This is the case too among the youth in minoritized language communities in Asia, whose plurilingual practices, which are themselves products of multilingual forms of education, are devalued; full proficiency in the dominant national language is expected from them. For example, Mandarin is a compulsory examination subject for admission into higher education in China (Adamson & Feng, 2009).

Bilingualism in schools continues to be viewed as additive (Lambert, 1974). The idea is that schools add a second or third language to students' first language. Scholars working with this additive bilingualism research perspective have made important contributions. For example, they have shown that the use of the learner's first language in instruction is important to develop a second language. And this research has conclusively shown that a bilingual additive education is superior to a monolingual subtractive education (see, among others, Baker, 2011; Collier & Thomas, 2017; Cummins, 1979a; Lindholm-Leary, 2014).

And yet this monoglossic view of bilingualism as being simply additive ignores the complex fluid language practices of bilingual people throughout history (Canagarajah & Liyanage, 2012) and throughout the world. Learners' bilingualism is not simply additive, but dynamic (García, 2009a) and language practices are heteroglossic (Bakhtin, 1981), containing within them not one or more unitary languages, but features that "interanimate each other" (p. 47). Eastern scholars like Khubchandani (1997) have long held this view, but it is only recently that Western scholars of bilingualism have acknowledged this.

García (2009a) has referred to two types of bilingualism where fluid linguistic practices are evident today: recursive bilingualism and dynamic bilingualism. Minoritized groups who through processes of colonization and conquest have experienced a great deal of loss of their linguistic practices of origin exhibit a bilingualism that we can call *dynamic recursive*. This has to do with the ways in which speakers bring in bits and pieces of their language practices of origin into their present language practices, as they recover them. But all bilingual speakers throughout history, and especially in Africa, Asia, and Latin America, experience what has been called dynamic bilingualism, a way of languaging that responds to speakers' own agentive way of using their language repertoire, instead of using what society calls one language separately from what is named as another one.

Western scholars have recently begun to pay more attention to dynamic bilingualism and heteroglossic language practices, as their own language practices have been affected by globalization and a neoliberal economy that supports the free flow of capitalism in ways that benefit transnational corporations and economic elites, and that results in the commodification of bilingualism (Flores, 2013). Bilingual speakers are now said to have mobile resources (Blommaert, 2010) or flexible bilingual practices (Blackledge & Creese, 2010). This type of dynamic bilingualism has been called by many names with slightly different meanings: polylanguaging/polylingual languaging (Jørgensen, 2008), metrolingualism (Otsuji & Pennycook, 2010), translingual practices (Canagarajah, 2013), and translanguaging (Blackledge & Creese, 2010; García, 2009a; García & Li Wei, 2014; Otheguy, García, & Reid, 2015). Although sociolinguists increasingly acknowledge the fluid

dynamic practices of bilinguals, these are mostly ignored and stigmatized in schools (Pulinx, van Avermaet, & Ağirdağ, 2017).

The monoglossic ideology of bilingualism in education as only consisting of standardized languages performed equally well for all purposes leaves out most learners, but most especially those who have been minoritized. Learners who have been conquered or colonized, or who have had to migrate to a different country, or who are seen as clinically deaf, most often have not been given the opportunity to learn what are considered their home languages in schools, with the exception of those fortunate enough to be enrolled in bilingual/multilingual programs or so-called heritage language classes. And yet, in many of these programs, only the standardized version of the home language is legitimized, often leaving these bilingual learners feeling that their home language practices are also deficient. Their home languages are also blamed for interference with the dominant language. Bilingual learner's language practices are always in contact, or said another way, their languaging always includes features that are said to belong to two or more different languages, although it is the product of what Otheguy et al. (2015) have called their unitary language system. Thus, bilingual students are evaluated in schools as having poor command of their named languages, and are often labeled as "semi-lingual," or even "alingual." This creates great linguistic insecurity among bilingual learners. Because these students' dynamic bilingualism is not recognized as fitting the acceptable definition of bilingualism in education (i.e., an addition of two or more standardized languages), their language is dismissed as inadequate, poor, deficient. It is important to underscore that the stigmatization of the bilingualism of minoritized learners is produced precisely through the process of schooling. It is the expectations that schools hold about the language of bilinguals that create the educational failure of minoritized bilingual students.

The least recognition of bilingualism in education is reserved for those who are deaf. The language capacity of the Deaf relies heavily on bodily gestures, and yet oralism remained largely the only way to educate the Deaf until the 1980s. Even after signed languages were standardized, Deaf learners' bimodal bilingualism has remained mostly unrecognized in education. With deaf youth increasingly immigrating to contexts with different signed and oral languages, Deaf bilingualism is becoming more complex, and yet continues to be mostly absent in schools (Swanwick et al., 2016; see Tang & Sze, Chapter 24, this volume).

It is education, then, through the process of accepting only the balanced and equal use of standardized languages as the only form of bilingualism, that is responsible for the academic failure of many bilingual learners. Bilingual learners and their language practices are not celebrated, but measured against monolingual learners in the majority language. The lens of deficiency is most often cast over them.

2.3   Performances of Bilinguals in Communities

Whereas schools continue to demand equal and balanced performances in standardized languages for academic success, bilingual practices go beyond the borders in which schools construct and constrain notions of language. In schools, bilingual learners and their families are subjected to concepts that make little sense in their everyday language performances. When bilingual families register their children in schools, they are stumped when asked: Which language do you speak at home? Which is your dominant language? Which is your mother tongue? Which is your first language? These are all questions that monolingual families can reply to easily, but for many bilingual families, these answers are complicated. In today's globalized world and complex family structures, families' language use is much more complex than the single answers expected by these questions.

In many educational settings, bilingual speakers are socialized very early to recognize some features of their language performances as belonging to one named language or another. However, in informal unmonitored situations, many bilinguals use their full linguistic and semiotic repertoire to make meaning among themselves. Unmonitored situations include interactions in contexts such as bilingual homes or neighborhoods where there is no external authority watching over how speakers use what are deemed to be appropriate linguistic features and constraining the ways in which bilinguals may deploy their meaning-making resources. Unlike in schools, where only certain language performances are authorized, these more informal contexts may allow the use of a bilinguals' full language repertoire, especially when interacting with other bilinguals. For example, Ofelia's daughter recently dropped off her two-year-old son and the stroller. She knew that Ofelia had a hard time operating the stroller, so she said, as she demonstrated: "Mami, atiéndeme please. Push the palanquita pa'rriba to open the stroller." In many schools in the United States, she would have been forced to say: "Push the lever up to open the stroller." In a school in Cuba, she would have been asked to say: "Empuja la palanquita para arriba para abrir el coche." But Ofelia and her daughter and grandchild live a bilingual life in the United States, so in the life of the bilingual family it is not necessary to use solely features of what is considered English, or what is considered Spanish, to have a meaningful interaction. Ofelia and her daughter are free to use their entire language and semiotic repertoire (see De Houwer, Chapter 17, this volume, for discussion of language choice).

Like Ofelia and her daughter, many bilingual speakers are constantly *translanguaging*, that is, using their unitary language repertoire (Otheguy et al., 2015) purposefully and strategically. In unmonitored situations, they are free to use their own entire language repertoire in agentive ways. But schools, with their monoglossic ideologies about bilingualism, are the

language-monitoring situations par excellence. In monitoring the language use of students, schools turn bilingual speakers to governable subjects (Flores, 2013) whose social and economic opportunities are constrained through the imposition of an artificial, monolingual, monoglossic language norm. The translanguaging of bilingual students is evaluated negatively and simply not recognized, for this would require a heteroglossic bilingual lens of liberation of minoritized speakers, not domination. That is, for translanguaging practices to be recognized as legitimate, language would have to cease to be used as a way to produce governable subjects. Instead, however, schools label the students' translanguaging as linguistic interference. Based on a monolingual standard, the bilinguals' translanguaging is subjected to an analysis of language contact phenomena, described as loans, calques, code-switching, and so on (see Aalberse & Muysken, Chapter 26, this volume), introduced by Western scholars of bilingual studies beginning with Wilhelm von Humboldt in the late 18th and early 19th centuries and particularly since the work by Uriel Weinreich and Einar Haugen in the mid-20th century. In education, the traces of such language contact phenomena and code-switching have often been seen as a kind of interference, that is, as deviations from the standard named language, the only one legitimized for education. Bilinguals' translanguaging is constructed as an aberration from a monolingual standard, and then identified as the cause of academic failure (see Bigelow & Collins, Chapter 2, this volume, for a complementary perspective).

We have reviewed the competing understandings of bilingualism in the lives of different bilingual learners, both in and out of school. In the next section, we turn to describing how bilingualism has been promoted or not in schools, for whom, and why.

3 Ways in which Bilingualism and Biliteracy are Learned and Unlearned in Schools

Schools have had a most important role in doing, but mostly undoing, bilingualism. As we have said, most educational systems in the world promote and enforce monolingualism in education in order to inculcate the state's children with certain values, histories, and ways of using the dominant language. In so doing, schools produce governable subjects and serve the interests of the elites.

The academic subject called language arts in some educational systems (i.e., classes that focus on reading, writing, and communicating in the language of instruction) is a most important part of the monolingual monoglossic educational enterprise. But as today's globalized world has started to acknowledge its vast bilingualism, specialized educational programs that focus on either promoting bilingualism or ensuring that it is

controlled or eradicated have proliferated. Next, we discuss the two different goals of these specialized educational programs – learning bilingualism or unlearning bilingualism – as we discuss whom they serve, how, and why.

3.1 Learning to Do Bilingualism through Schools

We begin by identifying how educational programs to learn to be bilingual serve three types of learners and social goals: elite and middle-class learners, minoritized learners, and learners in multilingual states.

Elite and middle-class learners, often monolingual to begin with, learn to be bilingual in school by adding a so-called foreign or world language. Throughout the world, and especially in Asia, the dominant language added is increasingly English (Park, 2009; Park & Wee, 2012), although Mandarin Chinese is also competing for attention. To learn to be bilingual, elite and middle-class learners participate in different types of educational programs that are described in depth by Juan-Garau and Lyster (Chapter 11, this volume) and Muñoz and Spada (Chapter 12, this volume):

- *Foreign/world language education* programs, the most popular way of learning an additional language. These programs focus on the acquisition of an additional language, and abound in secondary and tertiary education.
- *Content and Language Integrated Learning* (CLIL) programs, where the additional language is used as medium of instruction, going beyond core foreign language programs.
- *Immersion bilingual education* programs, where majority children, usually young, are *initially* taught through the medium of an additional language, until both languages achieve instructional parity. Especially popular today are English-medium instruction (EMI) programs, where often immersion in English outweighs instruction in the other language.
- *Developmental bilingual education* programs, used to instruct elite and middle-class children who want to become bilingual, and where two languages are used as medium of instruction.

Minoritized youth learn to be bilingual through the very same *developmental bilingual education* programs listed in the last item just given (see also Bigelow & Collins, Chapter 2, this volume). Especially since the ethnic revival and the civil rights and decolonization efforts of the mid-20th century, some minoritized groups have been successful in demanding such programs for their children. This is the case of many indigenous groups where language revitalization projects are under way. Perhaps one of the most successful indigenous groups in this regard has been the Māoris of New Zealand. This has also been the case of many regional minorities, for example, the Welsh in the United Kingdom and the Basque

in Spain. Although most efforts to make minoritized youth bilingual and reverse language loss take place in well-established developmental bilingual education programs that focus on developing the minority language, *heritage language education* can also help in this process. These programs, in which instruction is solely in the minority language, are generally found in secondary schools and university programs or in complementary schools (Blackledge & Creese, 2010).

Some nation-states that aim to be multilingual also make available some multilingual school options for their youth. The trend, of growing importance in some Asian countries in particular, refers to efforts by many countries to ensure that their entire population becomes multilingual through *multilingual education programs* (MLE). The reasons for MLE programs vary. In some contexts the goal is to use the pupils' mother tongues to develop proficiency in two national languages, since developmental bilingual education in these highly multilingual contexts is deemed insufficient. This is what is known as mother tongue-based multilingual education (MTB-MLE) (Tupas, 2015). The Philippines, East Timor, and India are good examples of societies that have introduced MTB-MLE to ensure the inclusion of the languages of minoritized youth in education, while developing other national languages (Curaming & Calidjernih, 2014; Mohanty, 2006; Tupas, 2015). In yet other contexts, multilingual education is fueled by the desire to teach English so as to access the symbolic goods that English supposedly represents (Adamson & Feng, 2009; Hu, 2007), while also supporting national languages. This is the case, for example, of Kazakhstan, where trilingual education in Kazakh, Russian, and English is being promoted. This is also the case of the Basque Autonomous Region of Spain, where bilingual education programs in Spanish and Euskara have been transformed to trilingual programs in Spanish, Euskara, and English (Cenoz, 2009). An unusual case of MLE is that of Luxembourg, a country that promotes trilingual education to ensure that not only Luxembourgish but also German and French are spoken throughout its territory.

Implementation of MLE programs for all citizens remains elusive. On the one hand, only schools in the most resourced areas with wealthier students seem to be successful. On the other hand, in most cases, there is a privileging of resources in English and the national language (e.g., Mandarin in China, Thai in Thailand, Khmer in Cambodia). In Luxembourg, despite a trilingual education system, immigrants, especially those of Portuguese descent, do more poorly than others. Thus, despite efforts to make multilingual education equitable across social classes in many contexts, socioeconomic class and ethnicity have huge impact on youth's access to multilingual education. Tupas (2015), referring to MTB-MLE education in Southeast Asia, warns of the inequalities of multilingualism (see also Lo Bianco, Chapter 8, this volume, for related discussion).

3.2   Unlearning Doing Bilingualism through School

Most monolingual education in the world promotes the unlearning of bilingualism, and many specialized educational programs focus on unlearning bilingualism (Skutnabb-Kangas, 2000). Among the most important types of programs to unlearn bilingualism are *second language* programs in the dominant language, *transitional bilingual education, EMI* programs, and even some *developmental bilingual education and MTB-MLE* programs.

Second language programs can be of different types. But whether the teacher pulls out some students, supports them within a classroom, or is the sole teacher of the class, the minoritized students in these programs are deemed to be in need of remediation (see also Bigelow & Collins, Chapter 2, this volume). This is also the case of students in *transitional bilingual education* programs, used throughout Africa, Asia, Latin America, and the United States to unlearn the students' nondominant language practices, with their home languages used only temporarily.

The accelerated growth of EMI programs is also viewed as a threat to bilingualism (Dearden, 2014). Throughout the world, English is being introduced as a medium of instruction because it has been found to attract students and increase the profits of educational institutions that are the product of the neoliberal push for the privatization of education (Park, 2011). Taguchi (2014) presents case studies of EMI education in China, Qatar, Japan, Hong Kong, and South Africa.

It is important to underscore that although developmental bilingual education and MTB-MLE programs have been introduced as a way to break the cycle of educational failure among pupils who have been educated in languages they are unfamiliar with, they can often function in the same ways as transitional bilingual education. In some contexts, developmental bilingual education programs pay more attention to the development of the majority language than to the minority language. Most MTB-MLE programs are implemented only in kindergarten and the first three years of education. The goal of these programs is for students to transition slowly into monolingualism in the national language, or into bilingualism in the national language and a foreign language (mostly English nowadays) (Dekker & Young, 2005), thus helping children unlearn their bilingual and multilingual practices (Tupas, 2015).

4   Language Education Policy Issues to Teach (or not) Bilingualism

After decisions are made by educational authorities to set up programs to learn or unlearn bilingualism, the real work of educational policy makers and educators starts (see Lo Bianco, Chapter 8, this volume). In this section we discuss issues having to do with the language policy of the programs, focusing specifically on timing decisions. Language education policies

guide the ways in which the education program and curriculum are organized. The main language policy decisions have to do with time – the time in which the educational program starts, how long it takes, how much time is devoted to it, how language is allocated, as well as whether the languages are introduced simultaneously or sequentially.

Programs to unlearn bilingualism start as early as learners arrive in schools. To learn bilingualism, on the other hand, there are different types of programs: some start in early childhood, others when learners enter primary schools, still others when students enter middle school or even secondary schools or universities. There has been much controversy about when it is most beneficial to start these programs. Although there are advantages to starting earlier, especially in phonological benefits, there is research that shows that the same milestones can be achieved if learning for bilingualism starts in middle school or secondary schools, as long as there are adequate resources and ample investment in the learning (see further discussion in Juan-Garau & Lyster, Chapter 11, this volume, and Muñoz & Spada, Chapter 12, this volume). There is scholarly consensus, however, that the most success in achieving bilingualism occurs when students are educated bilingually throughout their schooling (Cummins, 1979a; see also Collier & Thomas, 2017).

Another language education policy decision that has to be made has to do with how much time should be devoted to instruction in one or the other language. When two languages are used to unlearn bilingualism, the language policy calls for less and less use of the home language of the students. Sometimes the home language is used initially 90% of the time, or even 100% of the time, with that proportion diminished, until it eventually almost disappears, relegated maybe to a language arts class.

Scholars seem to agree that the time intensity decision for programs to learn bilingualism has to do with the social standing of the students and the status of the named language. In situations where schools work to revitalize the minoritized language, more time needs to be devoted to that language in order to work against the power of the dominant language in society. This is also the case when a group wants its children to learn a language that is not dominant in society. In many of these cases, immersion bilingual programs start early, with 100% of the time devoted initially to the language that is not dominant in the social context. But bilingual and multilingual education programs and CLIL programs most often use two or more languages in different combinations, sometimes for different grades, and depending on the instructional material and teachers that are available. The scholarly recommendation, however, is that no less than 50% of the instructional time be devoted to instruction through the additional language so that there is parity among languages (Baker, 2011; see Juan-Garau & Lyster, Chapter 11, this volume). In reality, however, we have seen many educational programs where learners become bilingual even though the nondominant language is used for less than half of the

instructional time. In these programs, however, the nondominant language is validated and deemed important, spoken by administrators and teachers, and treasured by the community.

Jim Cummins suggested already in 1979 (see 1979a, 1979b) that it takes three to five years for emergent bilingual learners to be able to perform academic tasks in what is considered an additional language. In reality, bilingualism is always emerging, for the features that we use and the linguistic performances in which we engage depend on the interlocutors and the tasks that we are performing. There is no end point to bilingual learning. That is, bilingual learners never "have" bilingualism; they "do" bilingualism; they engage in what we might call bilingual performances.

A most important language policy decision has to do with whether the two languages ought to be used separately in instruction. Classroom teachers who work against bilingualism, as well as those who work for bilingualism, often end up establishing and firming up a diglossic relationship between two or more languages that maintains the hegemony of the dominant language and solidifies a linguistic hierarchization based on the power and market value of the language being learned. Foreign language programs, second language programs in a dominant language, and CLIL, immersion, and EMI programs all claim to use only the so-called target language so that students can be allegedly immersed in the language of instruction (for this position, see Juan-Garau & Lyster, Chapter 11, this volume). In reality, however, much use is often made of the "other" language, as instruction has to be scaffolded so that meaning is made (García, 2009a). Most types of bilingual and MTB-MLE programs formally advocate for a language separation or isolation approach. Languages are said to be separated according to day or week, time of day, subject, and so on. Often the argument made for the language separation approach in bilingual programs has to do with protecting the minoritized language and ensuring its important place in the curriculum (Juan-Garau & Lyster, Chapter 11, this volume). Once again, this language separation is artificial, not responding to sociolinguistic principles of language use and adaptability (Fishman, 1977) or to the translanguaging practices of bilingual speakers. The complete language separation arrangements in MTB/MLE programs ensure that only standardized named languages are admitted, ignoring the more dynamic language practices of bilingual learners, that is, their translanguaging.

In programs to learn bilingualism, another policy decision has to be made as to whether both languages should be introduced at the same time (simultaneously), or whether one language needs to be taught first before an additional language is introduced (sequentially). In most programs to learn bilingualism, the additional language is introduced sequentially. This is the case of all foreign language and CLIL programs (Muñoz & Spada, Chapter 12, this volume). It is also the case of

immersion bilingual education (Juan-Garau & Lyster, Chapter 11, this volume), and of most developmental bilingual education and MLE programs. Many transitional bilingual education and MTB-MLE programs also prefer this sequential introduction to additional languages. This is evident particularly in educating indigenous poor children in the African, Latin American, and Asian contexts. When more than one language is used in primary education, the traditional thinking has been that one language ought to be used first to teach literacy, and only then could another language be introduced. Especially when languages have different scripts, the typical understanding is that children need to master the conventions in one language first. However, this conventional wisdom of the sequential introduction of languages for literacy has repeatedly been questioned throughout history (see, for example, Escamilla, Hopewell, Butvilofsky et al., 2014; Fishman, 1977; for more on the acquisition of biliteracy, see Bigelow & Collins, Chapter 2, this volume).

5   Classroom Instruction to Teach Minoritized Learners for Bilingualism

Schools, with their monolingual monoglossic ideologies, have been quite successful in teaching for monolingualism, even when on the surface bilingualism is the goal. This has been especially so when the learners are minoritized bilingual learners. In this section we focus simply on teaching *for* bilingualism, and on teaching those who are most vulnerable – minoritized bilingual learners who are ironically bilingual to start with. We turn to issues of pedagogies and resources that are most important to successfully deliver the classroom instruction to teach for bilingualism. We focus on three questions: What pedagogical practices and principles are needed to engage these students in an education that would support and extend their own bilingual practices? What shifts would be needed in assessment? What type of teachers and instructional material would need to be included? We offer a critical pedagogical approach for bilingual learners, an approach that is based on a dynamic and heteroglossic understanding of bilingualism. We describe a holistic approach to bilingual education that might be a way of working with the complex linguistic practices of bilingual learners, that is, their translanguaging.

5.1   Pedagogy for Bilingualism: Translanguaging
Until the mid-20th century, foreign language education programs emphasized grammar and reading. Being bilingual was a mark of high culture, and knowing the grammar and literature of another language group was said to provide one with superior understandings about other cultures and

the world, but also about one's own. In fact, the study of foreign language was often said to help develop one's own language. This emphasis began to change in the mid-20th century when the grammar-translation method was abandoned for more communicative approaches. Oracy was then emphasized and the study of traditional grammar receded, as the emphasis on literacy skills gave way to oral communication. The communicative approach to language learning resulted in the development of immersion pedagogies, where the language being learned was solely used as a medium of instruction. The conventional wisdom became that bilingual learners need to perform solely in the language of instruction, always keeping the two languages separate and isolated from each other.

But neither the explicit language pedagogy that focused on the structure of the language being learned, nor the immersion approach that focused on communicative interaction in only one language at a time resulted in being appropriate for the schooling of minoritized bilingual learners in the long run. To engage these learners, a pedagogy must focus on leveraging the entire linguistic repertoire of bilinguals and their dynamic language practices. How can the concept of translanguaging be turned into pedagogical practice?

A translanguaging pedagogy relies on different epistemological understandings of language and bilingualism that go *beyond* the concept of two or more named languages (García & Li Wei, 2014; Otheguy et al., 2015). Although translanguaging recognizes the material and real effects that the construction of named languages has had in the lives of learners, it does not solely respond to the external constructions of standardized named languages of nation-states that schools reify (see Fuller, Chapter 6, this volume, for an analysis of the language ideologies associated with the project of the nation-state). Rather, a translanguaging pedagogy leverages the unitary full repertoire of linguistic features and semiotic practices that bilingual learners use. Rather than starting with named languages, a translanguaging pedagogy starts with the language practices of bilingual learners. By leveraging their entire language repertoire, translanguaging returns the power of language to speakers and engages their communicative human potential, rather than authorize only the conventions of named languages that have been codified by the nation-state to develop governable subjects.

García, Johnson, and Seltzer (2017) identify three components of a translanguaging pedagogy: stance, design, and shifts. Teachers who leverage bilingual students' translanguaging have a *stance*, a deep belief that their students' language practices are a resource that transcends the standardized language(s) of schools and can be used to make meaning of academic tasks, learn, and develop bilingual practices. Besides a stance, these teachers also *design* units, lessons, instruction, and assessment that integrate home and school languaging practices. But beyond the translanguaging design, a translanguaging pedagogy also relies on teacher *shifts*,

the appropriate moment-by-moment decisions teachers make to respond to learners' languaging.

Translanguaging pedagogy supports students' bilingual practices, even in classrooms that aim at making them unlearn their bilingualism. It makes space for students' bilingualism and ways of knowing. It also supports bilingual students' socioemotional development and bilingual identities. In doing this, a translanguaging pedagogy is a tool for social justice, disrupting the linguistic hierarchizations that schools have created (García et al., 2017).

A translanguaging pedagogy does not only scaffold the learning of a new language. It *transforms* the notions that learners have about named languages and legitimizes the linguistic practices of bilingual speakers (García & Li Wei, 2014; Otheguy et al., 2015). Furthermore, a translanguaging pedagogy engages students in a critical examination of how named languages have been invented (Makoni & Pennycook, 2007) and used in schools to create inequalities. Only by leveraging the fluid language practices that make up the linguistic repertoire of bilinguals, and by building their critical understandings of how the invention of named languages has worked to produce governable subjects, will bilingual youth be able to engage in their education and become agentive learners.

Some literacy programs have begun to emphasize that it is important for students to leverage their translingual practices especially in writing (Escamilla et al., 2014; Horner, Lu, Royster, & Trimbur, 2011). But this recognition is still not in any way tapped by assessments, especially of the standardized type, as we discuss in the next section.

5.2   Assessment for Bilingualism: Translanguaging

Assessment of language proficiency is intimately tied to instruction. Language proficiency has been constructed as knowing conventional language features that have been standardized and using them appropriately to speak, read, and write. But the translanguaging performances of bilingual learners many times expose linguistic features that go beyond those of the monolingual standard. Yet the psychometric construction of language assessment requires that language be limited to specific features that can be explicitly and reliably measured. Thus, the use of language for real purposes in social and academic interactions is rarely measured (see also Treffers-Daller, Chapter 15, this volume). Some efforts have begun to appear, but these tend to be limited to classroom assessments (De Backer, van Avermaet, & Slembrouck, 2017).

Moreover, assessment of language proficiency is most often used to limit access to educational opportunities. A form of assessment that would measure linguistic performances not *for access* to educational opportunities, but *for success* in schools would be more authentic, evaluating the success of the multiple creative interactions of how learners *do* language in

different circumstances and for various tasks. But for now, the standardized assessment of the ability to language in order to make an argument, tell a joke, find text-based evidence, etc., is hard to find. Technological innovation might help the testing industry come up with these more authentic assessments of language performance. But for this to occur, attention has to be paid to the psychometric measures of consequential validity, that is, to the differential effects of the tests between bilingual minoritized students and other groups, rather than simply on reliability measures. That is, language testing must be explicitly connected to social justice (Deygers, 2017). Most summative assessments are almost never concerned with how learners "do" language, but with whether learners "have" certain features that are considered standard.

It is then important to ensure that teachers of bilingual learners remain critical and vigilant about the pitfalls of standardized language assessments in one or another named language. Assessing students in two or more languages is not sufficient if the comparison group consists of monolinguals (Treffers-Daller, Chapter 15, this volume), and if the bilingual context of the lives of bilinguals is not taken into account (Bigelow & Collins, Chapter 2, this volume). Besides holding a critical stance about standardized language assessments, teachers need to develop and use their own *formative assessments* where bilingual students' language ability is assessed holistically, without regard for their use of standardized language features of one named language or another. That is, true and fair language assessments must match the way in which bilingual people use language in society, not an artificially constructed monolingual norm. Assessments are important to enable teachers of bilingual learners to differentiate between the student's language capacities and their language proficiency in one or another named language. These types of language assessments can then be used to shape instruction so that bilingual learners achieve educational success.

5.3 Teachers and Materials for Bilingual Learning: Translanguaging

The most important source of success for bilingual learners is the teacher herself. This has to do with the fact that teachers who have the appropriate stance (in the sense outlined by García et al., 2017) can go beyond the strict monolingual monoglossic language policies of schools. It is most important to have teachers who not only are bilingual, but who are critical of the ways in which language and bilingualism have been constructed in schools and the reasons for doing so. That is, teachers must hold a translanguaging stance. Only then will teachers be able to assume the role that will lead to success in learning for bilingual learners. But beyond the stance, teachers need to be prepared to design instruction and assessment that will lead to learners' success (García et al., 2017).

Schools that work for bilingualism need to have appropriate instructional material that is rich and culturally appropriate, besides being bilingual. Bilingualism cannot be developed just in oral interaction. The schools' version of bilingualism requires books that can be read, discussed, and analyzed as well as authors that write using different language practices, including translanguaging ones. These books cannot solely be fiction, but must also include nonfiction books and textbooks. Local publishers in so-called small languages cannot compete with the publication conglomerates of the developed world, but locally produced books must be held in high esteem by educators, students, and families. These books must reflect who the students are, their language practices, and their translanguaging, instead of depicting only a standardized language that is artificial and that cannot be used to communicate meaningfully in the community. The writing that bilingual learners produce must be displayed publicly, with the language produced by students, and not simply the edited standardized language(s).

It is unfair to ask educators to think critically about the controlling role that standardized languages have had unless they have been aptly educated to do so. Teacher education programs need to shift away from teaching about bilingualism as strictly additive, and instead encompass the translanguaging practices of bilingual communities. Only by doing careful sociolinguistic ethnographies of bilingual communities will prospective teachers be able to develop a stance that views language differently from the standardized notions learned in school (see Hammer & Edmonds, Chapter 19, this volume, for a similar call for careful sociolinguistic ethnography by speech and language clinicians). Only then will teachers be able to develop and incorporate instructional material that reflects the bilingual community practices and to leverage those practices in a translanguaging pedagogy.

6   Conclusion

In this chapter we have critically examined how educators and educational researchers in different societal contexts understand bilingualism, and the ways in which bilingualism is learned and unlearned by youth in various educational settings. Our review of the state of bilingualism in education shows clearly that although most bilingual learners come to schools with diverse language practices, schools continue to build their programs and instruction on monolingual models. This has to do with the role that schools have had in controlling opportunities and resources in society and producing governable subjects. In addition, we would like to note here that the continued hegemony of Western educators and scholars who are not familiar with language use in colonized contexts perpetuates misunderstandings about bilingualism in education. Although Asia, Africa, and Latin America

are rich in linguistic diversity, scholars from those geographical regions seldom enter the scholarly conversation of the supposed multilingual turn (May, 2014). Perhaps more than in other geographical locations, schools in these richly diverse areas continue to impose the monolingual diglossic ideology that they inherited from their colonial histories.

As long as schools constrain their view of language as society's authorized values, histories, and ways of languaging confined to standard repertoires and to named languages in isolation, they will exclude the complex linguistic practices of bilingual learners, and they will fail minoritized bilingual learners. To truly reverse how bilingualism in education is perceived, we would need to turn our attention to how minoritized bilingual communities speak, interact, and live. The situation, however, is quite hopeless, for it is precisely these subaltern people who are most subjected to schooling that is inadequate for them to learn and become educated. The sati that Spivak describes in her foundational text, "Can the subaltern speak?" (1988), is repeated daily by minoritized learners who fail in schools. But this speech of failure and despair is not visible or audible to most Western scholarship. And so schools continue to construct bilingualism to benefit the elites of the world, and especially to further consolidate the power of English in a market global economy, while minoritized bilinguals continue to be excluded from educational opportunities precisely because of the nature of their bilingualism and their translanguaging practices.