

# Bilingual Education and Policy

Christine Hélot and Ofelia García

## 27.1 Introduction

Bilingual education is a simple label for a complex phenomenon (Cazden & Snow, 1990). Implemented all over the world, bilingual education (BE) has been a cutting-edge field of research and practice for the past fifty years. Linked to research on bilingualism (and multilingualism) in its interdisciplinary dimensions, the field of BE continues to grow exponentially in the twenty-first century as globalization, migration, and hyperconnectivity among people mean that we use language(s) differently. When most people in the world today use more than one named language to communicate in their everyday life, when so many children come to school with so many different language practices, and when the past fifty years of research have shown the various benefits of BE, it is surprising that BE is not offered more widely. Where do the obstacles lie? Who does BE serve and to what purpose? Which languages are favoured and which are not? How have all the different frameworks and types of programmes been researched? How has the field moved forward to propose more dynamic and transformative pedagogies of BE?

BE is a highly ideologized domain of research and practice where different conceptualizations of language and bilingualism have played a major part in the way programmes have been implemented in schools in different parts of the world. It is also a highly contextualized field of study because of the very large number of settings in which it has developed. This means that BE does not look the same in Europe, the US, Latin America, Africa, and Asia. Sometimes it even looks different in different places within these countries. There is no one-size-fits-all model. It is a highly politicized issue because it serves many students at different levels in different languages with different societal goals. In some contexts,

BE reinforces existing social hierarchies; in others, it serves the educational need of minoritized speakers; yet in others it helps to revitalize languages of communities in danger. Today, some children attend bilingual day-care centres from the age of three months, attesting to the growing commodification of BE in developed, as well as less developed, countries. Yet nowhere is BE safe from politicians, one-language only movements, or policy makers who regiment which languages are included or excluded out of curricula, which kind of bilingualism should be supported or not, and whose language practices are valorized and whose are stigmatized. Even BE in signed language for the deaf community is being challenged by medical advances such as implants, arguing deaf children should be made to hear.

BE has been defined as a specific form of language education where two languages (or more), rather than one language only, are used as a means of instruction (Baker, 2001; García, 2009). It can concern learners who are already bilingual when they start their schooling, or children who speak only one named language and who are exposed to an additional language as a medium of instruction. Instruction through two languages has taken so many forms, that such a definition falls short of the complexity involved in describing and analysing the many different types of BE. More comprehensively, García (2009) defines BE “as a way of providing meaningful and equitable education as well as an education that builds tolerance towards other linguistic and cultural groups” (p. 6).

One could argue that traditional foreign or second language teaching programmes (where the language is taught as a subject) also aim for intercultural understanding and some form of bilingual competence, but the difference with BE is substantial: using two languages of instruction in school often questions the hegemony of the dominant language; it can challenge national language borders and fashion multiple identities. Therefore, the general goals of BE are far broader than those of second language teaching:

BE focuses not only on the acquisition of additional languages but on helping students to become global and responsible citizens as they learn to function across cultures and worlds, that is beyond the cultural borders in which traditional schooling often operates. (García, 2009, p. 6)

Today, scholarly work on BE has moved the field forward from seeing BE simply as the use of two languages in education and bilinguals as two monolinguals in one person (Grosjean, 1982). Many researchers have challenged the monoglossic ideology of bilingualism (García, 2009; Gogolin, 2002; Heller, 2007) which views monolingualism as the norm, and the languages of bilingual speakers as separate and whole. More recently, research on bilingualism has taken a new path regarding the

conceptualization of language and languages as no longer bounded autonomous systems (Blackledge & Creese, 2010, García & Li Wei, 2014; Makoni & Pennycook, 2007; Martin-Jones, 2007; Weber & Horner 2012; among others). This has led to the development of a heteroglossic perspective on language and languages that better reflects the fluid practices or languaging of bi- or plurilingual speakers. Such a perspective has then given rise to a “reimagining” of bilingual pedagogy no longer centred on languages but on the practices of bilinguals, on their languaging as normal modes of communication. The concept of translanguaging, that is, the idea that bilinguals deploy linguistic features that are part of their unitary language system, has gained some ground in the education of bilinguals (Blackledge & Creese, 2010; García & Li Wei, 2014; Otheguy, García, & Reid, 2015). This research (for the most part published in English) is transforming approaches to BE, suggesting that language use in instruction can be more flexible, more dynamic, and socially transformative because the main aim is greater equality and equity.

Several recent comprehensive publications on BE and multilingual education illustrate how these new perspectives better reflect the reality of bi- and multilingualism in our globalized societies and push theory forward as far as our understanding of language is concerned. They include the 2009 volume by García *Bilingual Education in the 21st Century*; the 2012 *Routledge Handbook of Multilingualism* edited by Martin-Jones, Blackledge, and Creese; the 2015 *Handbook of Bilingual and Multilingual Education* edited by Wright, Boun, and García; the 2017 5th volume of the latest edition of the *Encyclopedia of Language and Education*, entitled *Bilingual and Multilingual Education* and edited by García, Lin, and May; and the 2017 6th edition of *Foundations of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism* by Colin Baker and Wayne Wright.

## 27.2 Categorizing Languages in BE

The different conceptualizations of BE throughout the world cannot be understood outside of the historical, political, and social processes at work in the hierarchization of languages. These processes are reflected in education language policies that categorize languages with different labels according to their official status at the national or supranational levels.

Generally speaking, BE either involves learning through two dominant languages that have the same power within a polity, for example French and English in Canada, or two languages of unequal status, like English and Spanish in the US, Spanish having gone through a process of minorization (Flores & Rosa, 2015) because of policies of assimilation. BE can also include indigenous languages which have been marginalized by

colonization and have become so endangered their survival depends on BE. Many indigenous languages in formerly colonized contexts have acquired a new legitimacy through BE programmes, such as those implemented in Hawai'i, New Zealand, and South Africa for example, and Basque, Irish, or Welsh in Europe, but BE can also be used as a scaffold to a dominant language, as is the case of some BE programmes in Africa, Asia, and the US. Deaf communities around the world have also clamoured for bimodal BE in an effort to include signed languages, many times without success.

In other words, BE has developed differently in the case of dominant, immigrant, indigenous, or signed languages. Sometimes the label “heritage” language is used to refer to the languages of immigrant (for example Spanish in the US), indigenous, and even deaf communities. The term “heritage” has been questioned by several researchers (García, 2005; Wiley, 2007; Kupisch & Rothman, 2016) because it hides the bilingual identity of its speakers and because of the way the competence of adult heritage speakers has been analysed in terms of incomplete acquisition. Kupisch and Rothman (2016) argue that the difference in heritage speakers’ languaging is not incompleteness but differentiated acquisition and that a bilingual perspective should be adopted to understand both their language practices and learning needs. While the term heritage is used in the UK alongside the term community languages, it is rarely used in other European countries where languages are labelled as “foreign”, “regional”, or “immigrant”, these denominations also reflecting the different power of their speakers. Hélot and Erfurt (2016), in their volume on BE in France, explain how this labelling allows for BE in some languages but not in others. For example, languages referred to as “regional”, like Breton or Corsican (among others), qualify for immersion education; English and Spanish as “foreign languages” qualify for content and language integrated learning (CLIL) education; but Arabic or Turkish as immigrant languages do not qualify for either. As explained by Sierens and Van Avermaet (2017) for Europe, “BE in migrant languages has nowhere been able to establish itself as a fully valued teaching model” (p. 489). Because of an ideology centred on the acquisition of national languages as the main path to integration, and in spite of discourses on inclusive educational policies, BE in migrant languages is not envisaged as a way to participate in European identity, national cohesion, or even better educational achievement for the people concerned.

On the other hand, BE in dominant languages is very strongly supported by European institutions that are stressing the economic advantages of bi- and multilingualism, and the value of linguistic and cultural diversity for European identity. The support for BE in regional minority languages, or “national” minority languages, as they are sometimes referred to in European policy documents, can therefore be understood in relation to

the incorporation of these groups in a European identity. In contrast, the marginalization of migrant languages is a reflection of exclusion policies.

A further point should be mentioned regarding the hegemony of the English language. English dominates foreign language instruction all over the world. The growth of BE programmes throughout the world is also a direct result of the way in which English is being constructed as essential for participation in the global economy. As a result, BE programmes in minoritized languages can be at risk because of the demand for English as social and cultural capital (Cenoz & Gorter, 2015).

### 27.3 Differentiating Learners in BE

Generally speaking, BE has been developed to serve the needs of various kinds of learners, and often, its development has to do with the social position of its speakers in the economic, racial, and national hierarchies of power that exist. On the one hand, there are the children of the elite schooled in several dominant languages in private schools and some international schools whose bilingual schooling is unquestioned. On the other hand, there are those who are lower in the social hierarchy—immigrants, indigenous peoples, the deaf—for whom BE is often out of reach, despite its promises. BE programmes for the elite, especially in countries in Latin America, Asia, and Africa, where English is not the dominant or national language, are commonplace. In contrast, BE programmes for children who are seen as inferior because they are said to speak immigrant, indigenous, regional, and/or signed languages are questioned and are often under-resourced. Often these BE programmes are transitional in nature—what Baker (2001) has called “weak forms” of bilingual education. In the US, for example, inequities in educating language-minoritized children in the form of under-resourced and under-funded schools plague even bilingual education programmes that have been developed supposedly to educate them (García & Kleifgen, 2010, 2018).

Speakers of languages considered as “immigrant languages” are rarely viewed as bilinguals or multilinguals by education systems that have problematized their language needs within a deficit perspective and compensatory approaches that erase their plurilingual and pluricultural repertoires. Consequently, the linguistic needs of immigrant students are for the most part underserved and their educational path characterized by discriminatory practices. There are still classrooms or playgrounds in Europe, for example, where bi- and multilingual children are forbidden to use their family languages and punished or silenced during pedagogical activities designed for monolingual learners (Agirdag, 2010). In these subtractive times (as described by Bartlett & García, 2011), the bilingualism of

immigrant students is for the most part made invisible, denied, unfairly assessed, problematized negatively, and, as expressed by Flores and Rosa (2015), the expression of raciolinguistic ideologies. These racialized representations of bilingualism are, for example, very present in the continuous media discourses in Europe blaming immigrant students for the poor results in the Organization of Economic Co-operation and Development's Programme for International Student Assessment (PISA) evaluations and those in the US blaming them for the "achievement gap".

Indigenous children, that is, those who are autochthonous to a geographical territory and who have been conquered or colonized, seldom have opportunities to be educated bilingually, despite the fact that many of them are bilingual to begin with. The many indigenous children are also placed differently in the social hierarchy of privilege and power that makes BE possible. At the top of the hierarchy are children considered indigenous to a territory within a nation-state that has incorporated them and considered to speak "regional languages". Then, there are those who have been colonized by a "foreign" power, as is the case of many African and Asian children, who are said to be multilingual, speaking many languages that are often considered merely "dialects". Finally, there are indigenous children of colour who have been conquered or colonized within their own territory and are said to speak "indigenous languages" that have been mostly lost. These categories, of course, have been externally imposed and are not historically accurate, but they have resulted in different privileges and unequal access to bilingual education.

Indigenous children of colour, attending schools in what were formerly colonies in Africa and Asia, are in many cases multilingual. However, they are usually instructed monolingually through a colonial language that is constructed as "second" and as not really theirs. Sometimes they receive a transitional form of bilingual education, with one of their more dominant languages used in the first three to four years of school until the shift is made to the former colonial language—usually English or French. Their learning needs are often conceptualized in terms of mother tongue support, not necessarily integrating a bi- or multilingual perspective where all their languages are used as languages of instruction to access curriculum content. Skutnabb-Kangas and McCarty (2008) explain that without such an understanding of mother tongue education, the students do not benefit from the cognitive and social benefits of BE. The issue here is that these children are being discriminated against through language use in school that does not meet their educational needs.

There are, of course, BE programmes in former colonial contexts, but in most instances, these are experimental programmes, and their success always depends on the ability to document progress in the former colonial

language. This is, for example, the case of the three-year BE experiment in French Polynesia in which children were taught through Tahitian, as well as French. The researchers had to prove that BE did not have a negative effect on the acquisition of French (Paia et al., 2015). What the research showed, however, like in other contexts of indigenous BE, was the crucial role of the indigenous language in the cultural, identity, and academic development of Tahitian students.

There are also children of indigenous people whose language practices were silenced by conquerors and colonizers within their own territory as “natives” were constructed as “savages” and “primitive”. This is the case, for example, of Native Americans in the US and of Māoris in New Zealand. Their efforts with BE are brave attempts at language revitalization. For example, the Kōhanga Reo early childhood centres in New Zealand, where members of the community, including elders, immerse very young children in Māori language and cultural practices, has been most influential with other threatened communities around the world in developing what are called “language nests”.

Perhaps just as invisible as indigenous people, but now also silent to the hearing world, are deaf students. For a long time, the deaf were obliged to acquire oral speech and categorized as deficient because of a medical condition, rather than offered the possibility of BE through a signed language (Swanwick, 2017). Technological advances, such as cochlear implants, have further problematized the value of BE for the deaf. Yet, BE for the deaf can do much to leverage their bimodal capacities for learning, bringing forth the interrelationships between signed languages and written languages. The advocacy of deaf communities shows great disparities throughout the world, but the legitimization of signed languages in many countries has led to signed languages becoming languages of instruction. Today, with deaf youth increasingly immigrating to contexts with different signed and spoken languages, deaf bilingualism is becoming more multifaceted, and yet this complexity is hardly recognized even in the few BE programmes for deaf students.

Minoritized speakers have always had little access to effective and productive education programmes, and especially to BE. A growing body of research argues that BE, in their case, is a matter of social justice and linguistic human rights (Skutnabb-Kangas & Phillipson, 2017; Weber, 2014).

At the other end of the spectrum, children of the international elites have long benefited from private education and instruction in not only two, but several languages. Their desire to become bilingual has been seen as a given in order to become transnational multilingual elites in present day globalized societies. Whether financed by corporations or the governments of powerful nations (as in the case of French schools abroad, for example), these learners’ plurilingual competence in prestigious

languages is highly valued at home, supported at school, and seen as highly desirable in contemporary society.

Finally, the children of the middle classes who attend state schools also need to develop a wider range of linguistic and intercultural competences to function in globalized societies. Because traditional models of language education have shown limited outcomes in the development of bilingualism, middle class parents are learning to navigate educational systems and find BE programmes that will increase their children's linguistic and cultural capital (see, for an example in the US, Jaumont, 2017). It has also become quite common for such families to resort to informal BE outside of schooling through the recruitment of au pairs (Bouchés, 2017) or through language immersion summer camps.

## 27.4 Differentiating Types of BE

The scientific literature on BE has provided a detailed analysis of many different models, types, and frameworks (see Baker, 2001; Baker & Wright, 2017; and García, 2009, for comprehensive reviews). Various typologies (Genesee et al., 2006; Hornberger, 1991) have been drawn up according to the goals of the programmes, for example maintenance, transitional, or enrichment aims; some are mainstream models, others are not; some serve minoritized students and others majority students.

A general overview of research shows a proliferation of denominations for BE programmes with different levels of erasure of the adjective bilingual or, at the other end of the spectrum, promotion of hegemonic languages such as English. Like the labelling of languages, the labelling of BE programmes hides the complexity of the factors involved in their implementation, aims, and outcomes in very different contexts. *Transitional BE* only supports BE for a limited time and ends up being discontinued once learners can access knowledge in the school language. *Developmental BE* aims for the continuous support of home language practices by continuing instruction through the medium of two languages. Substantial research has shown the greater effectiveness of types that fit within a developmental framework over those that are transitional in nature. Yet, this has not necessarily convinced policy makers to support these programmes further.

Although developmental BE is the type preferred in the education of elites, it is the object of attacks when it is practised with minoritized populations. In the United States, for example, BE that served minoritized students came under repeated attacks from English-only pressure groups at the turn of the century, even when they were transitional in nature. These groups were instrumental in the legal banning of all types of BE in

California, Arizona, and Massachusetts in 1998, 2000, and 2002, respectively. The attack on bilingual education resulted in the elimination of the term “bilingual” from all federal legislation and even from branding as “bilingual” the bilingual education that was being forged as a globalized neoliberal economy was coming into being—what was designated as *dual language education* (DLE).

Sometimes also referred to as two-way immersion or two-way dual immersion, “dual language education” was conceived as being two-way, that is, made up of both English-speakers, as well as learners of English, who are instructed in two languages while developing both of them. These programmes are a strong form of BE with the noteworthy ethical aims of social cohesion. Present day researchers (Baker & Wright, 2017; García, 2009; García et al., 2018; Menken & Avni, 2017; Sánchez, García, & Solorza, 2017) are reintroducing the term bilingual to describe them (thus, Dual Language Bilingual Education or DLBE) in order to combat the delegitimation of BE in the US and to disrupt the very strict guidelines of two categories of students and strict language compartmentalization. Furthermore, many scholars have warned that DLBE programmes run the risk of supporting the bilingualism of white majority families, while continuing to view the bilingualism of minoritized families of colour with suspicion, a caution first exposed by Valdés (1997) and expressed by many others (Gort, 2015, 2017; Gort & Sembiante, 2015; Palmer et al., 2014; Sánchez, García, & Solorza, 2017) Varghese & Park, 2010). Nevertheless, two-way dual language bilingual programmes in the US are meeting a growing demand from parents who are advocating for BE in the public sector and for languages other than Spanish (Jaumont, 2017). Recent research by Collier and Thomas (2017) in the US has shown that DLBE has had a clear positive impact on both kinds of learners—English-speaking and Spanish-speaking—and that they allow those classified as “English learners” to achieve as well as their monolingual English language peers. Faced with a globalized economy, as well as the failure of English-only programmes to educate emergent bilinguals, even states that had previously outlawed bilingual education have started to advocate for DLBE. In 2016, voters in California lifted restrictions on BE, with the support of 73% of the total population. The Massachusetts Legislature also approved a bill in 2017 that reinstated a bilingual education option.

The tension inherent in dual language bilingual education programmes has to do with their potential as a way of educating *all* students bilingually regardless of where they fall in the bilingual continuum, and the strict ways in which they are implemented as “dual language”, allowing little flexibility of language practices. Because of the ways in which many times it has been implemented, DLBE has been and is in many cases “a promise unfulfilled” (García et al., 2018).

*Immersion* is another well-known denomination in BE research and better understood by the wider public because of the success of French and English programmes for Anglophones in Canada (Swain, 2000). Immersion means students are fully or partially learning curriculum content in French at no cognitive cost to English, the language first acquired. Thoroughly researched and shown to be very efficient, Canadian bilingual immersion programmes have had a huge impact on BE in many other countries. In Europe, for example, immersion BE was the model chosen to support the revitalization of regional languages such as Irish, Welsh, Basque, and Catalan, among others. The most successful and widely researched immersion programme in Europe has been implemented in the Basque Autonomous Region of Spain, where the regional government has made the revitalization of Basque a priority and allowed substantial funding for its implementation and for teacher education (Cenoz, 2009).

In Europe, one finds a widely implemented type of BE programme under the denomination *content and language integrated learning* (CLIL). The main goal of CLIL is concerned with devising more efficient teaching approaches of additional languages in mainstream education, for the most part dominant European languages; CLIL is not concerned with the specific language needs of learners who are already bi- or plurilingual, which is somewhat paradoxical because these learners are in fact in a situation similar to CLIL, learning content and the language of instruction at the same time. For this reason, Hélot and Cavalli (2017) are critical of CLIL because it focuses on languages (and dominant ones) rather than on speakers of languages, and therefore does not truly challenge the monoglossic ideology of mainstream schooling.

That said, the conceptualization of CLIL by the researchers who conceptualized it first (Mehisto, Marsh, & Frigols, 2008; Coyle, Hood, & Marsh, 2010) opened real didactic potential to rethink second language acquisition through its integration into content teaching. Dalton-Puffer (2011) sums up the objectives of CLIL in the following terms:

The primary motivation for using CLIL is the desire to improve language skills by broadening the scope of traditional foreign language teaching, while at the same time achieving the same level of specialist knowledge as would be attained if the lesson were taught in the students' first language. However, in many cases additional expectations are associated with CLIL: that it will deepen the degree of subject learning through cognitive stimulation; offer access to knowledge repositories available in other languages; better prepare students for a professional career in an era of globalization; deepen intercultural understanding and language awareness; provide a more learner-centred and innovative didactic approach; overcome traditional subject boundaries, to name but a few.

(p. 183)

However, there has been such a range of different implementations of CLIL in so many diverse educational contexts that Dalton-Puffer (2011) concludes that these aims rarely stand up to empirical review. The same conclusion is reached by Cenoz, Genesee, and Gorter (2014), who argue that CLIL is an umbrella term that lacks conceptual clarity because, among other reasons, research in Europe tends to set itself apart from the substantial body of knowledge developed on BE in the US and Canada.

It is mostly the diversified implementation of CLIL across so many European countries that makes it difficult to evaluate the model and its effect on learners and teachers. Wicke and Haataja (2015) review CLIL in Germany and distinguish between “hard CLIL” and “soft CLIL”. In hard CLIL, subject content is taught by subject teachers in a second language, and the primary goal is subject content, whereas in soft CLIL, the content is taught by language teachers and the main goal is second language learning. This of course is linked to the professional status and identity of teachers who, in Germany, teach several subjects, whereas in France they are monodisciplinary, which means content teachers must be educated to feel secure enough in their linguistic competence to teach their subject through an L2. Dalton-Puffer (n.d.) summarizes a study from Hong Kong (Kong, 2009)

that showed clearly that the professional identity of the teacher has a considerable bearing on the design of the language and content components of the CLIL lesson: when language teachers teach CLIL, there is evidence of a clear tendency to trivialize the subject content, whereas teachers with qualifications in the subject tend to react with little sensitivity to the linguistic needs of the learners. (para. 11)

This means that CLIL teacher education would benefit from the latest research on bilingual education (García, 2009), specifically on translanguaging pedagogy (García, Johnson, & Seltzer, 2017) or the use of both languages throughout content lessons. As researchers in the field of bilingual education for many years, we have always argued that the labelling of various models of bilingual education should not erase their bilingual dimension, which is perhaps one of the reasons why CLIL remains on the whole a weak form of BE.

Another point made by researchers on CLIL in Germany (Dalton-Puffer, 2011) and in France (Hélot and Cavalli, 2017) is that because English is the most widely offered language in these programmes in Europe, evaluating CLIL in English should include a reflection on the popularity of English in terms of linguistic and cultural capital for adolescent learners. A further point concerning CLIL is the fact that in most countries it is not offered to all learners but chosen by the most motivated students (and parents) who see the added value of this language learning model. Thus, despite the positive experiences of CLIL among students who can avail of it across

Europe (Coyle, 2013), and the support for CLIL in European language policy documents, it should not be forgotten that in the countries where CLIL is selective, it participates in the reinforcement of educational inequality and social hierarchies.

A useful distinction in the scientific literature was made by Baker (1993), who classified BE models as promoting either *strong* or *weak forms of bilingual education*. His analysis shows clearly how *weak forms of BE* are the preserve of language-minoritized communities: most common are submersion approaches, for example, placing students in monolingual classrooms with students who speak the dominant language without any support. There are some submersion approaches that offer some measure of support to students. For example, in the US, there are structured English immersion or Sheltered English programmes where English-only is used in instructing those who are learning English, but where the instruction is adapted in some ways. There are also English as a New or Second Language programmes, where in some of which a small group of students classified as “English learners” are offered special instruction for some period of time (known as “pull-out ESL”), and others where a specialized ESL teacher offers emergent bilinguals support in their mainstream class (known as “push-in ESL”). Transitional BE programmes that have monolingualism as an outcome and assimilation as a social aim are another weak form of BE. *Strong forms of BE* on the other hand, have been developed mostly for majority children, in dominant languages, and aim clearly for bilingualism and biliteracy, pluralism, and enrichment. They include all the developmental BE programmes where instruction is carried out through two dominant languages, for example, CLIL in Europe and the immersion programmes developed in French and English in Canada. Strong forms of BE can also be made available to both minority and majority children together, as in the two-way DLBE programmes in the US, where English speakers and speakers of the other language are instructed bilingually together and access all curriculum contents through the two languages. Further strong forms of BE programmes are those which aim at the development and maintenance of indigenous or heritage languages of minoritized communities in which emphasis is in developing and leveraging the home languages of the learners, and bilingualism and biliteracy is the expected outcome.

Another dichotomy extensively used in research on BE since the work of Lambert and Tucker (1972) is the difference made between *additive and subtractive bilingualism*. The distinction points to the varied societal and educational conditions in which BE develops. Cummins (2001) defined *additive bilingualism* as referring “to the form of bilingualism that results when students add a second language to their intellectual tool-kit while continuing to develop conceptually and academically in their first language” (p. 163). *Subtractive bilingualism*, on the other hand, develops when the second

language has more power than the first and gradually replaces the first language. Subtractive bilingualism happens in the context of submersion education, such as when emergent bilingual students are educated through the dominant language of instruction with no effort on the part of the school to support their other language(s).

The constructs of additive and subtractive bilingualism have proved very useful to understanding the relationship between societal power relations, institutional racism, and the under-achievement of minoritized learners. Throughout his publications, Cummins (1986, 2001) has insisted on the positive role played by schools and teachers who contest these coercive societal power relations in both monolingual and BE programmes. When minoritized students are schooled in additive bilingual contexts, they have been shown to acquire a high level of competence in both languages (August & Shanahan, 2006).

In a recent review of BE, Flores and Baetens Beardsmore (2015) go beyond Baker's classification of strong or weak BE programmes to distinguish between BE that either challenges or reinforces societal hierarchies. In doing so, they question the notion of additive bilingualism because it projects a conception of languages as distinct and compartmentalized in a first language (L1) and second language (L2), for example. This is the case of CLIL programmes in Europe, French/English immersion in Canada, and DLBE programmes in the US that support dominant language speakers to increase their linguistic capital through separate or additional instruction in an additional language. Flores and Baetens Beardsmore propose an analysis of BE programmes based on the socio-historical conditions that made them possible, with a view to exposing the possibilities for social change embedded in the structure of BE programmes. Their analysis is based on the distinction made by García (2009) between a monoglossic and heteroglossic understanding of bilingualism.

## 27.5 Recent Conceptual, Policy, and Programmatic Turns in BE

Because there are so many forms of BE, and so many different understandings of what constitute BE, recent research has moved away from using typologies to describe BE models. As shown by García (2009), they do not capture the linguistic complexities of multilingualism in the twenty-first century. However, it has taken a long time for research on BE, and even more for policies and practices in BE, to free themselves from the domination of a monoglossic ideology surrounding bilingualism. Structured by a dichotomous interpretation of languages as either L1 or L2, and therefore on bilingualism being simply additive or subtractive, and consequently on

a pedagogy of language separation, the scholarly field of BE has begun to question its assumptions in the twenty-first century as many of the programmes and policies that are being developed continue to reflect the earlier conceptualization.

In the twentieth century, BE had two goals—either it served the cultural interests of the elite who wanted access to a “foreign” language, or it was seen as a way to “remediate” the language deficits of minoritized speakers, as they learned a “second” language. In the 1960s, during a short-lived period of defence of civil rights and a struggle for independence and autonomy of minoritized people all over the world, BE was organized by communities who wanted to educate their children with cultural and linguistic practices that they considered their own. BE was a source of pride. Through struggle and community resistance, some measure of success was achieved, but the BE movement soon became coopted by the interests of the global neoliberal economy that needed flexible multilingual workers (Flores, 2013). To build on the tropes proposed by Duchêne and Heller (2013), BE for pride has been today substituted by BE for profit (see Flores & García, 2017, for the shortcomings of both ideologies in the US; the same analysis could be applied to the European context).

That BE is important for children of all kinds is a given. The problem, however, is that although more inclusive, many of the recent types of bilingual programmes (for example, DLBE in the US and CLIL in Europe, as we saw above) rely on outdated conceptualizations of bilingualism that favour only the interests of nation-states, and not necessarily those of minoritized communities.

In the early twentieth century, bilingualism was most often sequential, that is, learners came into classrooms with one language and acquired a “second language” that they would not necessarily appropriate as their own. Educators in foreign language education programmes, as well as in bilingual education programmes, thought then of bilingualism as the simple addition of two languages. Today, however, more and more children are growing up as simultaneous bilinguals, a product of the greater movement of people in a globalized world fuelled by a neoliberal economy, but also by war and growing inequality. This has led many scholars to talk about bilingualism as first language (De Houwer, 2009). Multilingual people cross physical and virtual boundaries every day, and their dynamic bilingualism (García, 2009) has become more visible to us all.

As the complexity of language practices that accompany multilingual users became more visible, BE acquired another responsibility—to impose linguistic order and to control the language practices of the multilingual students in their midst. At the same time, as a neoliberal globalized order was imposed, BE assumed a separate responsibility, that of responding to the growing marketization and commodification of bilingualism. The two

seemingly contradictory goals of control of multilingual practices of communities and commodification of bilingualism for profit are smoothed over in the newer types of BE programmes, which although open to minoritized multilingual speakers are poised to benefit only language majorities, unless their policies and practices become more flexible. This is the case, for example, of some DLBE programmes in the US. One educational authority that we know of demands that an imaginary line be drawn in each classroom, with everything on one side of the room in one language, and everything on the other side in the other. This educational authority requests that the “dual languages” be mirror images of each other, negating the dynamic nature of all bilingualism.

One of the functions of schools has always been to develop children’s use of the standardized dominant language of the state, but in adopting more than one language of instruction, BE has the potential to also foster equity among social groups, that is, racial, gender, and labour justice. However, the focus on languages as entities of nation-states, and not on the language potential and practices of all human beings, can drive BE to constrain educational opportunities for minoritized communities and to not provide any measure of equity. The policing of separate use of two languages as if they were spoken by two monolinguals in two different national contexts disregards the dynamic practices of bilingual people. A very long time ago, one of the most perceptive and early scholars of bilingualism, Einar Haugen (1972), argued that for a language to be sustained in a community where the dominant language was another, “it is better to bend than to break.” There is little bending in many of the dual language programmes recently instituted in the US, as well as in CLIL programmes in Europe, or even in many of the BE programmes institutionalized in supposedly multilingual nation-states like Luxembourg. The question for us is why? Could it be that language, bilingualism, and even BE as presently implemented are being used as proxies for racism and xenophobia and to further institutionalize inequities? This is the position of many scholars who study the effects of raciolinguistic ideologies (see, for example, Rosa & Flores, 2017). What can then be done to act on the potential of all types of BE programmes?

If the starting point of BE became the children, families, and communities that want and need BE to educate their children meaningfully, we would start by recognizing language to be simply the users’ full semiotic repertoire to make meaning. This is the perspective taken by the concept of *translanguaging*, a term first coined by Cen Williams in Welsh to describe a bilingual pedagogical practice where English and Welsh were used in the same instructional space, one for input, the other one for output (Baker, 2001; Lewis, Jones, & Baker, 2012a, 2012b). Recent translanguaging theory focuses on speakers’ capacity to deploy features (or signs)

from their semiotic repertoire as the most suitable hint to communicate a message (García & Li Wei, 2014; Otheguy, García, & Reid, 2015). Although a translanguaging capacity is present in all speakers, multilingual users of language are different from monolingual ones in two ways: they have more features in their semiotic repertoire, and they have more experience with selection of features to communicate. That is, multilinguals have more features in their semiotic system because they live socially in two or more worlds and through two or more named languages. In addition, they have more experience selecting suitable features (from their linguistic or communicative repertoire) to fit different communicative situations, since they often have to communicate with those whose semiotic repertoire reflects only one world. These differences mean that multilingual users are often perceived by monolinguals as “making errors”, but it is important to understand that this is a *social* judgment, not a cognitive nor a linguistic one.

Many researchers are using the construct of translanguaging to challenge the restrictive linguistic policies and practices of always using only one or two languages separately to learn at school. The entrenched bilingual pedagogy of language separation is giving way to a new pedagogy of multilingualism and multiliteracies no longer focused on two languages, but on the full linguistic and semiotic repertoires of learners and on their heteroglossic practices, now seen as central resources for learning (Blackledge & Creese, 2014; Cenoz & García, 2017; Cummins, 2007, 2008; Weber, 2014).

The construct of translanguaging has also been helpful in acknowledging that BE in its traditional interpretation falls short in educating all groups equitably and for bilingualism. More and more researchers (see Wright, Boun, & García, 2015) are analysing the way a translanguaging pedagogy is transformative for children, teachers, and education in general, because it demystifies so many traditional representations of language learning, of bilingualism, and even of language: notions such as the native speaker, balanced bilingualism, L1 versus L2, code-switching, additive bilingualism, heritage language, etc., are all being revisited in order to *put the linguistic practices of multilingual children first* (Weber, 2014). Such theoretical advances are groundbreaking because they answer the very questions teachers are asking all over the world when they have children in their classrooms with a multiplicity of language practices with which they have no familiarity.

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 all their students’ language practices are a resource that transcend the standardized language of schools and can be used to make meaning of academic

tasks and to learn. Besides having a stance, these teachers also *design* units, lessons, instruction, and assessment that leverage their students' linguistic and cultural practices and develop in them a critical multilingual consciousness, that is, an awareness of how named standardized languages have been socially constructed and used to exclude some and include others. However, beyond the translanguaging design, a translanguaging pedagogy also relies on teacher *shifts*, the moment-by-moment decisions teachers make to respond to learners' needs. Translanguaging pedagogy is a tool for social justice, disrupting the linguistic hierarchizations that schools have created.

Translanguaging in BE lives in the tensions, in what the lesbian Chicana scholar, Gloria Anzaldúa (1987) calls "the borderlands", a space of complexity, situatedness, and connection that "springs from inside the crevices that separate social worlds" (Ayala, 2009, p. 72). Translanguaging has been theorized "from the flesh" (Anzaldúa, 1987) and the voices of multilingual people who live in borderlands, in the in-between spaces where worlds and words leak into each other, and where language is neither one nor the other, but both and beyond, with all of it belonging to people.

To incorporate translanguaging into BE, spaces will have to be created within the strict language allocation policies of the present. Working in the tension present in the space between educational authorities that demand rigidity in language allocation and that of the practices of multilingual speakers that do not clearly fit into one or the other space, some educators are beginning to propose ways of introducing translanguaging in-between spaces that are not simply a scaffold or support, but that are transformative for people and society. For example, Sánchez, García, and Solorza (2017), in collaboration with other CUNY-NYSIEB colleagues, have proposed reframing the strict language allocation policy of DLBE. The reframing clearly preserves the spaces for the two named languages in BE, since there is recognition that learners must add new linguistic and other semiotic features to their repertoire and they must practise selecting those that can produce the most success when one or another language is called for in the interaction. Within those instructional spaces for one or the other language, teachers are encouraged to use *translanguaging lifesaver rings* to ensure that students are making meaning of the lesson. This use of translanguaging is considered a scaffold, and teachers put these translanguaging lifesaver rings on students and take them off depending on the task.

However, Sánchez, García, and Solorza (2017) also propose two other translanguaging spaces that are more transformative in recognizing the in-between spaces in which bilingualism is developed. One, a *translanguaging documentation space*, encourages students to use their full language repertoire during specific times in order for educators to be able to properly

assess what students know and how they know it. This space not only validates and authorizes bilingual translanguaging practices in school, but also enables teachers to assess bilingual students holistically. In this way, for example, teachers can differentiate between students' knowledge of features of language (what teachers see as knowledge of English, French, Spanish, etc.) and knowledge of use of language (for example, ability to narrate, to argue, to find text-based evidence, to write argumentative texts, etc.). In addition, and most importantly, the proposal includes a *translanguaging transformative space* that encourages language users to become agentive in their selection of features. Instead of being required to use features associated with one named language or the other by teachers, the students themselves make those decisions. Thus, multilingual speakers have the opportunity to develop the transformative capacity of language to make meaning for themselves and their lives, outside of the bureaucratic policing of language that takes place in schools. The proposal to introduce translanguaging spaces into DLBE has not been without controversy, as even scholars of bilingualism and bilingual educators fear that without strict control, the space for the minoritized language, Spanish in most cases in the US, will be ceded to English.

## 27.6 Conclusion

Bilingual education is not new, and it is spreading throughout the world, but there are tensions in the ways it is often enacted and the plurilingual practices of bilingual people in the twenty-first century. For BE to fulfill its promise of educating all children equitably, some adjustments need to be made to programmes and practices. This chapter offers some ways in which this might happen.

The question for us, two scholars who have spent a lifetime working on BE, is precisely that raised at the end of the musical, *Hamilton*. The story, about the founding fathers of the US, played by actors of colour and written by a Latinx playwright, Lin-Manuel Miranda, ends with a song that raises the question: "Who lives, who dies, who tells your story?" Will BE let minoritized people live and tell their story? Will BE continue to be simply the story told by educational authorities that wish to control the people's plurilingual practices and commodify them for others, or will the story be written by bilingual people themselves? If so, then their complex language practices, and not simply the named languages of nation-states, have to be part of the story we develop in the future.

It is possible to work in the in-between spaces, and simultaneously to toil in the many separate spaces in which we all lead our lives, but it is important to make room in schools for the many who live "entre mundos", in the

borderlands. To do so, language has to be seen first and foremost as an ability of all to make meaning, and not simply as a regulatory mechanism to sort people, or nations. The extent to which we address the tension of these two representations of language in schools will tell the future story of BE.

## References

- Agirdag, O. (2010). Exploring bilingualism in a monolingual school system: Insights from Turkish and native students from Belgian schools. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 31(3), 307–321.
- Anzaldúa, G. (1987). *Borderlands/la frontera. The new mestiza*. San Francisco, CA: Aunt Lute Books.
- August, D., & Shanahan, T. (eds.) (2006). *Developing literacy in second-language learners. Report of the National Literacy Panel on Language-Minority Children and Youth*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Ayala, J. (2009). Split scenes. Converging visions: The ethical terrain where PAR and Borderlands scholarship meet. *Urban Review*, 41(1), 66–84.
- Baker, C. (1993). *Foundations of bilingual education and bilingualism* (1st edn.). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Baker, C. (2001). *Foundations of bilingual education and bilingualism* (3rd edn.). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Baker, C., & Wright, W. (2017). *Foundations of bilingual education and bilingualism* (6th edn.). Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- Bartlett, L., & García, O. (2011). *Additive schooling in subtractive times. Dominican immigrant youth in the heights*. Nashville, TN: Vanderbilt University Press.
- Blackledge, A., & Creese, A. (2010). *Multilingualism: A critical perspective*. London: Continuum.
- Blackledge, A., & Creese, A. (2014). *Heteroglossia as practice and pedagogy*. New York: Springer.
- Bouchés, A. (2017). *La transmission de l'anglais dans des familles francophones: Politiques linguistiques et représentations*. Unpublished PhD thesis, University of Strasbourg.
- Cazden, C. B., & Snow, C. E. (eds.) (1990). *English plus: Issues in bilingual education*. London: Sage.
- Cenoz, J. (2009). *Towards multilingual education. Basque educational research from an international perspective*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- Cenoz, J., & García, O. (guest eds.) (2017). Breaking away from the multilingual solitudes in language education: International perspectives [Special edition]. *International Journal of Language, Identity and Education*, 16(4).
- Cenoz, J., Genesee, F., & Gorter, D. (2014). Critical analysis of CLIL: Taking stock and looking forward. *Applied Linguistics*, 35(3), 243–262.

- Cenoz, J., & Gorter, D. (eds.) (2015). *Multilingual education: Between language learning and translanguaging*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Collier, V. P., & Thomas, W. P. (2017). Validating the power of bilingual schooling: Thirty-two years of large-scale, longitudinal research. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 37, 203–217.
- Coyle, D. (2013). Listening to learners: An investigation into “successful learning” across CLIL contexts. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 16(3), 244–266.
- Coyle, D., Hood, P., & Marsh, D. (2010). *CLIL—Content and language integrated learning*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Cummins, J. (1986). Empowering minority students: A framework for intervention. *Harvard Educational Review*, 56(1), 18–37.
- Cummins, J. (2001). *Negotiating identities: Education for empowerment in a diverse society* (2nd edn.). Los Angeles, CA: California Association for Bilingual Education.
- Cummins, J. (2007). Rethinking monolingual instructional strategies in multilingual classrooms. *The Canadian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 10(2), 221–240.
- Cummins, J. (2008). Teaching for transfer: Challenging the two solitudes assumption in bilingual education. In J. Cummins & N. H. Hornberger (eds.), *Encyclopedia of language and education: Bilingual Education* (2nd edn., Vol. 5, pp. 65–75). New York: Springer.
- Dalton-Puffer, C. (2011). Content and language integrated learning—From practice to principles? *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 31, 182–204.
- Dalton-Puffer, C. (n. d.). *CLIL in Practice: What does the research tell us?* Retrieved from <https://www.goethe.de/en/spr/unt/kum/clg/20984546.html>.
- De Houwer, A. (2009). *Bilingual first language acquisition*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Duchêne, A., and Heller, M. (eds.) (2013). *Language in late capitalism: Pride and profit*. New York: Routledge.
- Flores, N. (2013). The unexamined relationship between neoliberalism and plurilingualism: A cautionary tale. *TESOL Quarterly*, 47(3), 500–520.
- Flores, N., & Baetens Beardsmore, H. (2015). Programs and structures in bilingual and multilingual education. In W. Wright, S. Boun, & O. García (eds.), *The handbook of bilingual and multilingual education* (pp. 205–222). Malden, MA: Wiley.
- Flores, N., & García, O. (2017). A critical review of bilingual education in the United States: From basements and pride to boutiques and profit. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 37, 14–29.
- Flores, N., & Rosa, J. (2015). Undoing appropriateness: Raciolinguistic ideologies and language diversity in education. *Harvard Educational Review*, 85(2), 149–171.

- García, O. (2005). Positioning heritage languages in the United States. *The Modern Language Journal*, 89(4), 601–605.
- García, O. (2009). *Bilingual education in the 21st century: A global perspective*. Malden, MA/Oxford: Wiley/Blackwell.
- García, O., Johnson, S., & Seltzer, K. (2017). *The translanguaging classroom. Leveraging student bilingualism for learning*. Philadelphia, PA: Caslon.
- García, O., & Kleifgen, J. (2010). *Educating emergent bilinguals. Policies, programs and practices for English language learners*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- García, O., & Kleifgen, J. (2018). *Educating emergent bilinguals. Policies, programs and practices for English learners* (2nd edn.). New York: Teachers College Press.
- García, O., Lin, A., & May, S. (eds.) (2017). *Bilingual Education* (Vol. 5). *Encyclopedia of Language and Education*. Cham: Springer.
- García, O., Menken, K., Velasco, P., & Vogel, S. (2018). Dual language bilingual education in NYC: A potential unfulfilled. In M. B. Arias & M. Fee (eds.), *Perspectives on dual language programs* (pp. 38–55). Washington, DC/Bristol: Center for Applied Linguistics and Multilingual Matters.
- García, O., & Li, W. (2014). *Translanguaging: Language, bilingualism and education*. London: Palgrave Macmillan Pivot.
- Genesee, F., Lindholm-Leary, K., Saunders, W. M., & Christian, D. (2006). *Educating English language learners: A synthesis of research evidence*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Gogolin, I. (2002). Linguistic and cultural diversity in Europe: A challenge for educational research and practice. *European Educational Research Journal*, 1(1), 123–138.
- Gort, M. (2015). Transforming literacy learning and teaching through translanguaging and other typical practices associated with “doing being bilingual”. *International Multilingual Research Journal*, 9(1), 1–6.
- Gort, M. (ed.) (2017). *The complex and dynamic languaging practices of emergent bilinguals: Translanguaging across diverse education and community contexts*. New York: Routledge.
- Gort, M., & Sembiente, S. F. (2015). Navigating hybridized language learning spaces through translanguaging pedagogy: Dual language preschool teachers’ languaging practices in support of emergent bilingual children’s performance of academic discourse. *International Multilingual Research Journal*, 9(1), 7–25.
- Grosjean, F. (1982) *Life with two languages*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Haugen, E. (1972). *Ecology of language*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Heller, M. (ed.) (2007). *Bilingualism: A social approach*. Basingstoke: Palgrave.

- Hélot, C., & Cavalli, M. (2017). Bilingual education in Europe: Dominant languages. In O. García, A. Lin, & S. May (eds.), *Bilingual Education* (Vol. 5). *Encyclopedia of Language and Education* (pp. 471–488). Cham: Springer.
- Hélot, C., & Erfurt, J. (eds.) (2016). *L'éducation bilingue en France. Politiques linguistiques, modèles et pratiques*. Limoges: Lambert-Lucas.
- Hornberger, N. (1991). Extending enrichment bilingual education: Revisiting typologies and redirecting policy. In O. García (ed.), *Bilingual education, Focusschrift in honor of Joshua A. Fishman* (Vol. 1, pp. 215–234). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Jaumont, F. (2017). *The bilingual revolution. The future of education is in two languages*. New York: TBR Books.
- Kong, S. (2009). Content-based instruction: What can we learn from content-trained teachers' and language-trained teachers' pedagogies? *Canadian Modern Language Review*, 66, 233–267.
- Kupisch, T., & Rothman, J. (2016). Terminology matters! Why difference is not incompleteness and how early child bilinguals are heritage speakers. *International Journal of Bilingualism*, 22, 564–582.
- Lambert, W. E., & Tucker, G. R. (1972). *Bilingual education of children. The Saint Lambert experiment*. Rowley, MA: Newbury House.
- Lewis, G., Jones, B., and Baker, C. (2012a). Translanguaging: Developing its conceptualisation and contextualisation. *Educational Research and Evaluation*, 18(7), 655–670.
- Lewis, G., Jones, B., & Baker, C. (2012b). Translanguaging: Origins and development from school to street and beyond. *Educational Research and Evaluation*, 18(7), 641–654.
- Makoni, S., & Pennycook, A. (2007). *Disinventing and reconstituting languages*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Martin-Jones, M. (2007). Bilingualism, education and the regulation of access to language resources: Changing research perspectives. In M. Heller (ed.), *Bilingualism: A social approach* (pp. 161–182). Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Martin-Jones, M., Blackledge, A., & Creese, A. (eds.) (2012). *The Routledge handbook of multilingualism*. London/New York: Routledge.
- Mehisto, P., Marsh, D., & Frigols, M. (2008). *Uncovering CLIL. Content and language integrated learning in bilingual and multilingual education*. Oxford: MacMillan.
- Menken, K., & Avni, S. (2017). Challenging linguistic purism in dual language bilingual education: A case study of Hebrew in a New York City public middle school. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 37, 185–202.
- Nikula, T., Llinares, A., & Dalton-Puffer, C. (2013). European research on CLIL classroom discourse. *International Journal of Immersion and Content Based Language Education*, 1, 70–100.

- Otheguy, R., García, O., & Reid, W. (2015). Clarifying translanguaging and deconstructing named languages: A perspective from linguistics. *Applied Linguistics Review*, 6(3), 281–307.
- Paia, M., Cummins, J., Nocus, I., Salaün, M., & Vernaudo, J. (2015). Intersections of language ideology, power, and identity: Bilingual education and indigenous language revitalization in French Polynesia. In W. E. Wright, S. Boun, & O. García (eds), *The handbook of bilingual and multilingual education* (145–163). Malden, MA: John Wiley.
- Palmer, D. K., Martínez, R. A., Mateus, S. G., & Henderson, K. (2014). Reframing the debate on language separation: Toward a vision for translanguaging pedagogies in the dual language classroom. *The Modern Language Journal*, 98(3), 757–772.
- Pérez-Cañado, M. L. (2015). CLIL research in Europe: Past, present, and future. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 15, 315–341.
- Rosa, J., & Flores, N. (2017). Unsettling race and language: Toward a racio-linguistic perspective. *Language and Society*, 46, 1–27.
- Sánchez, M.T., García, O., & Solorza, C. (2017). Reframing language allocation policy in dual language bilingual education. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 41, 37–51.
- Sierens, S., & Van Avermaet, P. (2017). Bilingual education in migrant languages in western Europe. In O. García, A. Lin, & S. May, *Bilingual education. Encyclopedia of language and education* (Vol. 5, pp. 489–504). Cham: Springer.
- Skutnabb-Kangas, T., & McCarty, T. (2008). Key concepts in bilingual education: Ideological, historical, epistemological, and empirical foundations. In J. Cummins & N. Hornberger (eds.), *Encyclopedia of language and education* (2nd edn., Vol. 5, pp. 3–17). New York: Springer.
- Skutnabb-Kangas, T., & Phillipson, R. (eds.) (2017). *Language rights*. London/ New York: Routledge.
- Swain, M. (2000). French immersion research in Canada: Recent contributions to SLA and applied linguistics. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 20, 199–212.
- Swanwick, R. (2017). *Languages and languaging in deaf education*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Valdés, G. (1997). Dual-language immersion programs: A cautionary note concerning the education of language-minority students. *Harvard Educational Review*, 67, 391–429.
- Varghese, M. M., and Park, C. (2010). Going global: Can dual-language programs save bilingual education? *Journal of Latinos and Education*, 9(1), 72–80.
- Weber, J.-J. (2014). *Flexible multilingual education. Putting children's needs first*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

- Weber, J.-J., & Horner, C. (2012). *Introducing multilingualism: A social approach*. London/New York: Routledge.
- Wicke, R., & Haataja, K. (eds.) (2015). *Sprache und Fach: Integriertes Lernen in der Zielsprache Deutsch*. Munich: Hueber.
- Wiley, T. G. (2007). Heritage and community languages in the national language debate. *The Modern Language Journal*, 91, 252–255.
- Wright, W. E., Boun, S., and García, O. (Eds.) (2015). *The Handbook of bilingual and multilingual education*. Malden, MA: John Wiley.