Introduction

In this chapter, we explore the phenomenon of bilingual education in an increasingly globalised, multilingual world. After defining key terms and explaining a variety of bilingual education programme formats, we focus our discussion on language contexts where English is one of the bilingual target languages. In doing so, we foreground two competing language ideologies that underlie the design and implementation of bilingual education – monolingualism and multilingualism – and analyse the way that these ideologies underpin both policy and practice. We conclude with a discussion highlighting key areas of dispute and debate, as well as a description of some of the implications and challenges for bilingual education practitioners. Because the issues involved in bilingual education both globally and locally are broad and complex, our discussion is not exhaustive. Instead, we hope to articulate some of the core findings within the field and provide an overview of some of the current tensions.

Essentially, when looking at the field of bilingual education from a global perspective, one can distinguish between contexts where acquiring English is a national priority and contexts with other linguistic and educational priorities. When the learning of English is a priority or is present at all, its power, prestige and status as a global lingua franca makes it a popular choice among parents as they work to provide a meaningful education for their children. Yet some of the most successful bilingual and multilingual programmes are established in areas around the world where English is not a language in play but where historically marginalised linguistic minorities are starting to receive what is often referred to as mother tongue-based multilingual education (MTB-MLE). While we discuss some of the successes that these MTB-MLE programmes have had around the world, we will focus primarily on language contexts where English is pursued as a local or national goal.

Key terms and types of bilingual education

Defining bilingualism depends largely on who defines it, in which contexts and for which populations. It is widely agreed that there is a continuum of bilingualism and biliteracy (Hornberger, 1989) and that bilinguals fall between two poles. For example, some bilinguals have barely the
second language competencies to understand basic phrases and produce language on a rudimentary level in a limited number of contexts. Other bilinguals are much more fluent and versatile and possess language competencies that allow them to use their second language across a variety of domains of language use.

While bilingual competencies vary among users of two or more languages, ‘balanced bilinguals’ have well-developed language skills in both languages across many language domains and are able to command relatively equal levels of native-like fluency. And while balanced bilingualism is certainly something to aim for, such a goal is not always practical or even necessary, as many domains of language use in a person’s life are relatively monolingual (Fishman, 1967). Thus, balanced bilinguals represent a small portion of the entire bilingual/multilingual population (Crawford, 2004), and most people who consider themselves bilingual fall somewhere between bilinguals with limited proficiency and balanced bilingualism. In some circumstances, they may have polished second language skills in their area of work or study but have fewer linguistic competencies in other domains, such as familial interactions or in religious life. Defining what it means to be bilingual becomes important in bilingual education because if the goal of a bilingual programme is balanced bilingualism, the programme may be judged to have failed because of the difficulty in attaining equal competence in two languages. However, if bilingualism is defined more loosely, bilingual education programmes might in fact develop a degree of bilingualism amongst students such that they remain dominant in their first language but also have more limited competencies in their second language.

Monolingual ideologies are pervasive in contexts where language diversity is seen as a problem or a threat to traditional or socio-historical ways of using language. Often associated with the ‘one-nation-one-language’ ideal (see also Crookes, this volume), these ideologies will invariably lead to only ‘weak’ forms of bilingual education, if any at all (Baker, 2001). When bilingual education is offered in contexts where monolingual ideologies prevail, the goal is to use students’ first language to transition into the dominant target language, usually the national language. This model of bilingual education often leads to what is referred to as ‘subtractive’ bilingualism because the goal is not to maintain students’ two languages but rather to assimilate them into the dominant language group. In a subtractive model, the students’ first language is gradually removed – or subtracted – and replaced by the second language. Once students are able to function in classes taught in the dominant language, little to no support is offered to maintain their mother tongues.

Bi/multi-lingual ideologies describe contexts where languages are seen as a resource and efforts are undertaken to foster, create and/or maintain two or more languages. When bi/multilingual ideologies prevail, a ‘strong’ form of bilingual education is often implemented. In this case, ‘additive’ bilingual education, whereby a new language is added to the learners’ linguistic repertoire, incorporates the languages of linguistic minorities and majorities alike in school curricula and pedagogy in order to develop or sustain a multilingual society. Such practices can provide a more equitable and meaningful education to children with non-dominant languages.

Bilingual education, therefore, “is a seemingly simple label for a complex phenomenon” (Cazden and Snow, 1990: 9). As there is no universally accepted definition of bilingualism, bilingual education thus depends entirely on the context in which it is implemented (Baker, 2001; García, 2009). What we argue here, therefore, is that just as it is difficult to define bilingualism, bilingual education similarly means different things to different people. While the label implies the use of two languages in a school setting, the type of programme selected and the pedagogies used within it depend on the language ideologies of the community, school district and geographical region and the particular social, political and educational goals of formalised schooling. Colin Baker (2001) has developed a useful typology to describe strong and weak forms of bilingual
education. He distinguishes between language contexts that represent or promote monolingual or multilingual ideologies, as can be seen in Table 14.1.

As Table 14.1 shows, the primary societal goal of ‘weak forms’ of bilingual education is not bilingualism but assimilation into the dominant culture and monolingualism in the dominant language. Within these weak forms of bilingual education, students who become bilingual, in that they maintain their home language and learn the language of formal schooling, often do so because of positive influences from family and community outside school rather than due to the effects of their actual schooling.

The ‘submersion’ – or ‘sink or swim’ – model assumes that what students need to acquire the target language is sufficient exposure to it. Unfortunately, language minority students in submersion programmes often fall behind their native speaking peers in content areas. Historically, in the name of colonisation and nationalism, students in English-using contexts like the United States, Australia and New Zealand were exposed to such programmes (Crawford, 2001).

Table 14.1 Strong vs weak forms of bilingual education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Weak forms of bilingual education</th>
<th>Type of programme</th>
<th>Typical student</th>
<th>Language(s) used for instruction</th>
<th>Societal / educational goal</th>
<th>Individual / language outcome goal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Submersion</td>
<td>Language minority</td>
<td>Majority language</td>
<td>Assimilation</td>
<td>Monolingualism</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submersion with pull-out language classes / sheltered instruction</td>
<td>Language minority</td>
<td>Majority language with ‘pull-out’ L2 lessons</td>
<td>Assimilation</td>
<td>Monolingualism</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Segregationist</td>
<td>Language minority</td>
<td>Minority language (forced, no choice)</td>
<td>Apartheid</td>
<td>Monolingualism</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transitional</td>
<td>Language minority</td>
<td>Moves from minority to majority language</td>
<td>Assimilation</td>
<td>Relative monolingualism</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Separatist</td>
<td>Language minority</td>
<td>Minority language (out of choice)</td>
<td>Detachment / autonomy</td>
<td>Limited bilingualism</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Strong forms of bilingual education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of programme</th>
<th>Typical student</th>
<th>Language(s) used for instruction</th>
<th>Societal / educational goal</th>
<th>Individual / language outcome goal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Immersion</td>
<td>Language majority</td>
<td>Bilingual with initial emphasis in L2</td>
<td>Pluralism and enrichment</td>
<td>Bilingualism and biliteracy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance / heritage language</td>
<td>Language minority</td>
<td>Bilingual with emphasis on L1</td>
<td>Maintenance, pluralism and enrichment</td>
<td>Bilingualism and biliteracy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two-way/Dual language</td>
<td>Mixed language minority and majority</td>
<td>Minority and majority</td>
<td>Maintenance, pluralism and enrichment</td>
<td>Bilingualism and biliteracy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mainstream bilingual</td>
<td>Language majority</td>
<td>Two majority languages</td>
<td>Maintenance, pluralism and enrichment</td>
<td>Bilingualism and biliteracy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Adapted from Baker, 2001: 194.
Submersion models contribute to ‘language shift’ or the move, for language users, from Indigenous and minority languages into the dominant or majority languages (Fishman, 1991, 2001). While language rights legislation has mitigated the imposition of both English and non-English submersion programmes in some Western countries such as the USA and the UK and Denmark and Sweden, linguistic contexts in Africa, Asia and South America have often adopted submersion models with regard to both English and other dominant languages. While UNESCO and other international aid organisations are working to interrupt this trend, submersion education remains common, especially in parts of Africa (Bamgbose, 2000) and Southeast Asia (e.g. Cambodia and Laos, see Kosonen, 2005; Philippines, see Dekker and Young, 2005; Thailand, see Kosonen, 2008; Timor-Leste, see Taylor-Leech, 2013). Yet despite the historical prominence of submersion models of education, many grassroots organisations are working toward MTB-MLE, often with the help of local and governmental organisations (Clinton, 2013).

Another more contemporary form of weak bilingual education is the ‘transitional’ model, which uses students’ first languages as a ‘transition’ into content instruction in the majority language. The rationale here is that students need from four to seven years to develop academic proficiency in the target language. Academic language proficiency was initially theorised by Cummins (1976) as a way to distinguish between what he called ‘basic interpersonal communication skills’ (BICS) and ‘cognitive academic language proficiency’ (CALP; see also Morton, this volume). More recent scholarship, however, has contested this theoretical distinction between social and academic language, arguing on the one hand that the lines between these dimensions are blurred, and critiquing the assumption that academic language can only be acquired in formal school settings on the other; an uncritical acceptance of this latter assumption implies that working class or language minority families do not practice academic discourses at home and can only acquire them at school (MacSwan and Rolstad, 2003; Faltis, 2013). Nonetheless, the BICS-CALP distinction underlies the reasoning behind many transitional programmes, which prepare students for monolingual content courses in their second language. Because the maintenance and development of students’ first language is not a goal, transitional programmes are often shorter than stronger forms of bilingual education. Once students show sufficient academic language proficiency in L2, they are placed in classrooms with target language native speaking peers and L1 language support typically ceases (Wright, 2010; Ovando and Combs, 2011).

Alternatives to these weaker forms of bilingual education seek an additive approach where the goal is to foster or maintain students’ L1 while they learn an L2. However, ‘strong approaches’ to bilingual education also vary and depend on the sociocultural and economic contexts in which such programmes are found. As goals and contexts change, so too do the ways in which programmes work to develop bilingual students. In the United States, for example, additive bilingual programmes have been inspired by ‘immersion’ programmes in Canada, which, in spite of their label, are actually strong bilingual programmes (Lambert, 1972; Genesse, 1995; Ricento and Burnaby, 1998). Historically, these Canadian programmes have served middle-class English-speaking children in the French-speaking province of Québec. These students attend classes taught in French for the better part of the day throughout their primary grades (Crawford, 2004). Participating students, who already have a wealth of social, economic and L1 linguistic capital, are merely adding French to their linguistic repertoires (Genesee, 1995). Similarly, students enrolled in many private schools on the largely Spanish L1 island of Puerto Rico attend bilingual schools where maths and science are taught in English, while social studies and certain electives are taught in Spanish (Schmidt, 2013).

‘Heritage language’ models, sometimes called ‘maintenance’ or ‘developmental’ programmes in the US, feature a family or community language which may – or may not – be the students’
primary language but nevertheless carries a cultural and linguistic connection for them. Used as the medium of instruction, the heritage language reinforces its connection to ancestry while facilitating its contemporary use. Heritage language programmes have been implemented with some success with Indigenous languages students in different parts of the United States (Hinton and Hale, 2001; McCarty, 2002, 2013; McCarty and Zepeda, 2006). When used among caregivers in early childhood and preschool, these programmes are sometimes called ‘language nests’. Language nests were popularised in New Zealand in the push for Maori language revitalisation and maintenance in a predominantly English-speaking environment (King, 2001). Similar language nest programmes have been adopted successfully in Hawai’i (Warner, 2001).

‘Two-way’ or ‘dual immersion’ models have also been successful strong forms of bilingual education. These programmes require relatively equal numbers of users of the two languages – dominant and non-dominant. Successful dual language programmes use a bilingual and bicultural curriculum where content is delivered in both the majority and minority languages. The language use in two-way programmes varies, but the two most common models use a 50/50 or 90/10 approach, meaning that half of the content areas are taught in the minority language and half in the majority language, or 90 per cent in the minority language and 10 per cent in the majority language, respectively. Additional language classes are also included in the curriculum in both the L1 and L2 of the students. Some schools organise instruction by time of day (e.g. L1 in the morning and L2 in the afternoon) or by alternate days or weeks (L1 the first week, L2 the second) (Wright, 2010).

Current critical issues and debates

Monolingual vs multilingual ideologies

As noted earlier, decisions about bilingual education are often determined by political, social and economic contexts (Blackledge and Creese, 2010). Although financial concerns about cost may affect the implementation of bilingual programmes, more important influences are the dominant language ideologies in particular contexts. Especially in the United States and the United Kingdom, groups and individuals often exercise their franchise to block bilingual programmes. Monolingual discourse has prevailed in these nations, reifying a ‘language-as-a-problem’ orientation toward the use of languages other than English (Ruiz, 1984). ‘One nation—one flag’ ideologies are expressed by elected officials, policy makers and voters, who may see the presence of speakers of other languages as a threat to their way of life on the one hand and to the dominant language on the other (Beardsmore, 2003). These ‘language panics’ (Hill, 2001) are rarely divorced from larger fears about racial, ethnic and cultural tensions that result from economic or demographic shifts, often accompanied by racialised backlashes against immigrants and speakers of other languages. Consequently, it is unsurprising that the primary goal of bilingual education in both the US and the UK has been to transition students, through weak forms of delivery, into the larger English-using environment of public schools.

Within the Western world, “debates about language are often debates about immigration, and about ‘pluralist’ or ‘assimilationist’ policy in relation to immigrant groups” (Blackledge and Creese, 2010: 26; see also Simpson, this volume). Some of the tension about bilingual education, especially in the United States, reflects broader ideological fears about the perceived encroachment of ‘little’ languages (Fishman, 1991) into majority language communities. These largely monolingual contexts regularly position speakers of other languages as a threat to the dominant language (Blackledge and Creese, 2010). For example, voters in California, Arizona and Massachusetts (USA) passed anti-bilingual education ballot initiatives in which media campaigns
were waged through misleading, inflammatory and anti-immigrant sound bites (Johnson, 2005; Wright, 2005; Mora, 2009). The passage of such laws has resulted in a precipitous decline in the number of bilingual programmes in these states (Combs et al., 2005; Combs and Nicholas, 2012; Gándara and Hopkins, 2010; Arias and Faltis, 2012; Moore, 2014). And while the passage of these propositions worked to hurt large minority populations (such as L1 Spanish speakers), they have also affected Native American bilingual and language revitalisation programmes (Combs and Nicholas, 2012).

Unfortunately, language-as-problem-orientations toward linguistic minorities are not limited to the contexts where English is primarily used. Linguistic diversity in relatively new nations has prompted central governments to adopt a restrictionist orientation toward language pluralism, privileging dominant languages. In the Philippines, for example, restrictionist orientations have resulted in submersion models of bilingual education, though, as Dekker and Young (2005) document, relatively new MTB-MLE programmes allow an easier transition into future schooling in Tagalog and/or English. According to Kosonen (2005) and Kosonen and Young (2009), national unification movements in Southeast Asian countries have placed linguistic minority students at a decisive disadvantage. UNESCO, along with these and other applied linguists, argues that formal schooling should be a space where linguistic resources are viewed positively and that strong forms of bilingual education be adopted. This would entail the adoption of bilingual programmes that encourage literacy in students’ first language because their first language is seen as a resource and is to be welcomed into the formal school environment (UNESCO, 2010).

In contrast, and differing from countries with well-established monolingual ideologies, countries and contexts where multilingual discourses are the norm often promote an additive form of bilingual education, where language is viewed from a rights or resource orientation (Ruiz, 1984). Bilingual education policy initiatives in Singapore (Silver, 2005), Luxemburg (De Korne, 2012), Catalonia, Spain (Urmeneta and Unamuno, 2008) and India (Mohanty, 2013) have taken a more additive view of bilingualism, mirroring the multilingual contexts of these countries. In all four contexts, regional languages are taught alongside national languages. In these contexts, English is also greatly emphasised, if not required (as in the case of Singapore and India). The adoption of multilingual ideologies has resulted in programme models that often entail the use of MTB-MLE in the primary grades in order to develop literacy. As students improve their first language literacy skills, they are gradually exposed to a second or even third language. This exposure often comes in the form of language courses but can also include content courses taught in these languages.

**Determining the languages used for instruction**

While the cognitive benefits of bilingualism have been documented (see Cummins, 1976; Lazaruk, 2007; Bialystok, 2009), the inclusiveness and equity that bilingual education can provide for a community are almost impossible to measure. Given the effect on linguistic minority communities of historical and continuing colonisation in parts of the world, minority language speakers almost everywhere are susceptible to the same restrictive ideologies manifested by dominant language speakers, for example, that there is little educational value inherent in school programmes designed to develop or maintain heritage languages (Smith, 1999). Even when stronger bilingual models replace submersion programmes, policy makers and teachers still face the uphill battle of convincing parents and community members of the merit of using mother tongue instruction in schools rather than English or another regional lingua franca (e.g. in South Africa, Webb, 2004; in Southeast Asia, Kosonen and Young, 2009).
After determining that bilingual education will be the programme of choice, school administrators, teachers and policy makers must create a programme that parallels the rigor and expectations of ‘regular’ classes and must find teachers qualified to teach these classes. Thus, hiring individuals who might not have state or national teaching credentials but do have advanced knowledge of the key languages in question must be considered. These issues are ever present in indigenous communities in the Americas, where few elders have advanced degrees and as such are typically precluded from teaching their native language in schools, despite the fact that they might be among the only remaining speakers with an intricate understanding of the minority language (Lomawaima and McCarty, 2006).

Once a bilingual programme is selected, policy makers, principals, teachers and parents must decide on the school’s language policy. For instance, until recently it has been assumed that the two languages in a bilingual programme should be kept separate in order to minimise interference between them. However, this assumption has been challenged, and terms such as ‘code-meshing’ and ‘translanguaging’ have drawn attention to the legitimacy of connecting the languages in a productive way within bilingual instruction, both across the curriculum and in the classroom. Code-meshing is defined by Michael-Luna and Canagarajah (2007: 56) as “a communicative device used for specific rhetorical and ideological purposes in which a multilingual speaker intentionally integrates local and academic discourse as a form of resistance, reappropriation and/or transformation of the academic discourse”. Translanguaging, on the other hand, “extends our traditional definitions of language and bilingualism. It refers to the ways in which bilinguals use their complex semiotic repertoire to act, to know, and to be” (García and Li, 2013: 137; see also chapters by Morton, Pennycook, and Simpson, this volume). The emergence of these conceptualisations has major implications for bilingual education. It will be interesting to see the extent to which these theoretical terms and concepts influence both pedagogy and practice in the development of bilingual education models around the world.

Implementation of bilingual education

As one would imagine, given the differences between bilingual programmes and the range in contexts that use bilingual models, no two bilingual programmes are identical. Bilingual education administrators must consider the teachers’ language proficiency, students’ proficiency in either L1 or L2, local and national linguistic contexts, and national accountability measures. While a bilingual programme might require some additional funding, the cost of running a bilingual programme might parallel the costs of a monolingual curriculum, if, for instance, bilingual teachers are not compensated for their linguistic abilities (a circumstance we do not necessarily advocate).

While describing every potential bilingual programme is beyond the scope of this chapter, we provide a snapshot of an average day (or week) in three different bilingual models in Table 14.2. It provides the reader with a visual representation of the ways that instructional time is allocated in various models. We encourage readers to compare the amount of time and the scheduling of the classes in each context to the goals of language programmes discussed earlier in the chapter in Table 14.1, and, for those working in bilingual education, to make connections to the models most familiar to you.

As Table 14.2 indicates, the Arizona model is strictly English-only for four hours daily, with the remaining two hours devoted to mathematics, lunch and recess/break. What makes Arizona’s segregationist approach particularly problematic is the intentional withholding of content areas like science, social studies and language arts. Mathematics is taught because it is a subject assessed on the state’s high-stakes assessment instrument, but teaching and assessment take place in English. The Japanese–English programme in Illinois is emblematic of a dual language programme;
though it still heavily favours English, it promotes literacy and the use of Japanese among the students. The Abu Dhabi curriculum, on the other hand, is a mainstream bilingual programme which weights Arabic and English equally, representing the desire to maintain students’ L1 but also gain valuable proficiency in English. The Arizona English-only programme is designed to do exactly what its name indicates – transition students into speaking only English. On the other hand, the English-Japanese curriculum at the primary school in Illinois provides basic literacy and vocabulary, which could potentially set a solid foundation for future Japanese acquisition if secondary curricula complement this bilingual approach. The Abu Dhabi curriculum provides students the best chance to develop bilingualism in both Arabic and English, as both languages share high prestige and status within the country and the curriculum provides a balanced approach where both languages are seen as a resource.

**Who should ‘become’ bilingual through bilingual education?**

The societal goals of bilingual education programmes have varied widely, as noted earlier. Is bilingual education merely a means to an end, with students’ first language used only to acquire...
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a basic foundation in the second? Is the development of bilingualism and biliteracy a viable goal? If yes, what is the best way to achieve it? How long should students remain in a bilingual programme? Should the languages be taught separately, or is some degree of translanguaging appropriate? Similarly, questions about which students will benefit the most from bilingual education surface from time to time. While proponents might justifiably declare that majority and minority language students alike can benefit from bilingual instruction, discussions about programme eligibility can be contentious. This is particularly the case when space in bilingual programmes is limited or when government-funded bilingual programmes are tied to students’ lower socioeconomic status, as is the case in the United States. Ironically, in the United States today, there is a great deal of interest in dual language education, a model in which linguistic majority and linguistic minority students are grouped together and receive a portion of their instruction in the dominant language and the other portion in a second language. This model is the fastest growing type of bilingual programme, enjoying the support of language majority and minority parents alike (Howard and Sugarman, 2007; Howard et al., 2007; Thomas and Collier, 2012). According to the Center for Applied Linguistics (2014), there are nearly 450 dual language programmes in schools across the US, and the number is growing. The overwhelming majority of the programmes provide instruction in Spanish and English, although there are a few programmes featuring Japanese, Korean and Mandarin instruction, mostly in the state of California.

Some have questioned whether dual language education, popular among English-speaking Anglo families, actually helps students acquiring English as a second language. An early critique came from Guadalupe Valdés, a second language acquisition researcher at Stanford University. Valdés (1997) questioned whether instruction in Spanish, simplified for English-speaking Anglo children, would disadvantage the native Spanish speakers present in the same classroom. Valdés wondered whether instruction would prioritise the acquisition of basic Spanish for English-speaking children rather than focus on the acquisition of academic content in Spanish for Spanish-speakers. Beyond instructional and curricular issues, Valdés raises broader socio-political concerns about the potential appropriation of the minority language – and the symbolic power it represents in majority contexts – by middle class and affluent Anglo families. She quotes a long-time bilingual educator worried about the merits of implementing dual language: “Dual-language immersion education is not a good idea... If they take advantage of us in English, they will take advantage of us in Spanish as well” (Valdés, 1997: 393). In a similar critique of dual language education, Crawford (2004) worried that its popularity might dilute scarce school district resources allocated for language minority students learning content and English through bilingual education. This circumstance thus raises issues about educational equity and spotlights the “asymmetrical power dimensions around whiteness, wealth, and English privilege” (p. 29) in the United States and elsewhere. On the other hand, at least in the United States, the most common alternative to dual language is transitional bilingual education, a model that has been criticised as ineffective and remedial.

Paradoxically, the development of bilingualism per se is not contested, but rather who becomes bilingual and for what purpose. Thus, if an individual decides to add another language to her linguistic repertoire, such a pursuit is worthwhile and praiseworthy. In contrast, if entire communities seek to preserve or enhance the community language, this effort may be viewed with suspicion. Kjolseth (1973) addressed this paradox in an early article on Spanish–English bilingual education in the American Southwest: “Spanish is only a prestige idiom in the United States where there are irrelevant numbers of Spanish-speakers. Where Spanish-speakers are a relatively large group, it is an idiom held in considerable contempt” (p. 7). Today, tensions between group and individual bilingualism remain virtually unchanged in this region of the US.
Implications and challenges for ELT practice and practitioners

Bilingual teacher preparation

Districts or ministries serving a large number of second language English learners who share the same native language may be able to establish a bilingual education programme more easily than if they served students speaking different languages. However, even when parents support the academic development of the first language and the district or ministry provides the financial resources to build the programme, schools must consider how to select and prepare teachers for bilingual classrooms. Proximity to university teacher education programmes might supply some of these teachers, assuming the teachers are fluent in both the second language and native language of their students. Other rural and urban districts may have to recruit teachers, and if financial incentives are offered as part of recruitment packages, additional resources will be required. Some school districts or ministries may initiate and support ‘grow your own’ programmes, in which individuals – often para-professionals or teacher aides – are encouraged to obtain a teaching certificate at a nearby university or community college. Typically, these districts or ministries will partner with the university in a grant project to fund the tuition costs. If obtaining grant funds is impossible, the district or ministries themselves may dedicate all or part of the financial resources necessary, though this kind of support may be difficult to provide when budgets are limited.

Once teachers are in the classrooms, their education and experience should continue through professional development opportunities provided by the school district or educational authority. Ideally, they should also attend local and regional education conferences or meetings to obtain information about theory and research in the field and innovative pedagogical applications. Bilingual educators also benefit from social and professional networks, not only to connect to the latest developments in the field but also to create a sense of solidarity with other bilingual teachers. These networks are particularly important in areas where bilingual education is contested or controversial. In the United States, bilingual education increasingly has been replaced with English-only approaches to the education of second language learners. Former bilingual teachers may find themselves in charge of English-dominant language classrooms and unable to use their bilingualism and bilingual training in their instruction of English learners. In other parts of the world, policy changes requiring teachers to take or retake language proficiency exams that reify or at least favour an idealised standard English variety of the language can also have real implications for bilingual professionals as they are passed over for jobs by monolingual, native speakers, as has occurred in many international contexts (Jenkins and Leung, 2013).

Opening the door for translinguaging in the bilingual classroom

Bilingual education has historically meant the strategic distribution of two languages within a school curriculum. However, the simultaneous use of both languages in a classroom is something that scholars are now beginning to examine (as noted above). Cummins (2005) reiterates the importance for those working within the field of bilingual education to “confront and critically re-examine our own monolingual instructional assumptions” (p. 590). The re-examination of such assumptions may work to further legitimise the use of language patterns that more closely mirror authentic language use in bilingual communities, where there typically is an unclear delineation between the languages used in natural discourse (see Kerr, this volume, for further questioning of the English-only classroom).

We predict that one of the future directions for bilingual education in the coming years will be the need to re-examine bilingual or multilingual contexts in order to understand the extent...
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that translanguaging practices present themselves in formal teaching environments. Canagarajah (2011) and Li (2010) document how translanguaging is a common and ongoing strategy used by bilingual students to learn content subjects. Creese and Blackledge (2010) document the usefulness of such practices in ‘complementary schools’ or learning environments that take place outside of the traditional classroom context. The volume by Blackledge and Creese (2010) speaks to the variety of spaces where a combined use of formal language teaching and translanguaging practices can strengthen students’ learning and comprehension. The increasing attention of recent research to these practices indicates that the research community has begun to question previously assumed ‘best’ teaching practices.

Concluding remarks

Bilingual education is not a new phenomenon, nor is it practised in the same way throughout the world. Historically, different approaches to instruction in two languages have resulted from political or social ideologies of local circumstances. Throughout this chapter we have discussed the complex issues involved in bilingual education, particularly its connection to macro level political movements and ideologies. Language ideologies in contemporary global contexts are often indexed by societies that promote a monolingual discourse versus those who actively seek multilingual approaches. Monolingual discourses often lead to transitional bilingual programmes or no bilingual instruction at all and thus work to maintain the status quo of a dominant majority language alongside a low-status minority language or languages. Countries and contexts where multilingual discourses dominate generally see foreign languages and their speakers as a resource and support the development of students’ literacy skills and content knowledge in their first language as well as their second. Nevertheless, as globalisation continues to bring the world together, bilingual education will continue to change. These changes may result in more English being adopted as one of the languages used in bilingual programmes. Additionally, strict adherence to language separation may start to erode as translanguaging-like approaches gain in popularity.

We also discussed the complexity of language policy issues that must be addressed when developing any bilingual programme. These policy decisions are numerous and difficult, as they often result in the favouring of a particular language over another and, by extension, the speakers of that language over speakers of other languages. In highly multilingual contexts, such as parts of South Africa, even identifying students’ mother tongue is just one of the many tensions that accompany bilingual education in the multilingual world. Determining a students’ mother tongue can itself be difficult (Bangbose, 2000).

Of the key questions regarding bilingual education, one of the most fundamental is: who should receive it? The majority population often covet additive forms of bilingual education for their own members. However, when minority languages and their speakers are perceived as a threat to local norms, bilingual programmes provided to minority communities may be seen as promoting a questionable interest. By this we mean that anti-bilingual sentiments work to justify and strengthen monolingual ideologies that stress the importance of assimilation and the use of the national or majority language in educational settings. This has historically been the case in English-dominant countries where monolingual ideologies have prevailed, resulting in little minority language maintenance and bilingualism.

Future directions for bilingual education will undoubtedly continue to document teachers’ best practices in the classroom; however, we predict that more emphasis will be put on the socio-cultural variables that influence the implementation and success of bilingual education. Continued focus will examine how power relations and perceptions of threat dictate where
programmes are thwarted and where they have been allowed to flourish (see Pennycook, this volume). Furthermore, if recent research is any indication, assumptions regarding the exclusive use of one language in the classroom will continue to be contested as research documents how instruction in bi/multilingual settings around the world use translanguage practices that are more indicative of natural linguistic environments. This circumstance will undoubtedly influence the use of multiple languages in public education, especially in countries where multilingual discourses prevail. Unfortunately, more work needs to be done in curbing the monolingual ideologies typically associated with English dominant countries. So doing would put more value on the language and culture that linguistic minorities bring to their schools and communities.

**Discussion questions**

- What roles do ideology and power play in the creation of bilingual education programmes in your context?
- Given what you now understand about monolingual versus multilingual discourses, what discourse prevails in the country you currently live in? What are some examples?
- Do bilingual programmes exist in your region? If so, do they represent a weaker or stronger form of bilingual education? How and why?
- When working toward the creation of a bilingual programme, why is it important to consider the social and political context in which the programme will be implemented? What might be some of these considerations?

**Related topics**

Appropriate methodology; Content and language integrated learning; Dealing with the demands of language testing and assessment; Educational perspectives on ELT; English for speakers of other languages; Language teacher education; Politics, power relationships and ELT; Questioning ‘English-only’ classrooms.

**Further reading**


Crawford, J. (2004) *Educating English learners* (5th ed.). Los Angeles, CA: Bilingual Education Services. (A bilingual education advocate and historian, Crawford provides a rich history of bilingual education in the United States and highlights how politics has influenced the development of language policies and pedagogies throughout its history.)

García, O. and Sylvan, C. E. (2011) ‘Pedagogies and practices in multilingual classrooms: Singularities in pluralities’. *The Modern Language Journal*, 95/3. 385–400. (This text provides an excellent overview of the different pedagogies and practices that teachers use in multilingual classrooms. Highlighting best practices, the authors demonstrate how teachers can see their students’ language practices as a resource and not as a deficit.)


**References**


Kevin S. Carroll and Mary Carol Combs


Bilingual education


