

1 Introduction

Key Concepts and Issues in Bilingual and Multilingual Education

WAYNE E. WRIGHT, SOVICHETH BOUN,
AND OFELIA GARCÍA

What is bilingual and multilingual education? In the simplest definition, bilingual education is the use of two languages for learning and teaching in an instructional setting and, by extension, multilingual education would be the use of three languages or more. In a narrower definition, literacy is developed and/or specific content areas are taught through the medium of two or more languages in an organized and planned education program. In most cases, one of these is the “home,” “native,” or “mother-tongue” language, and one is the “dominant” societal language or a “powerful” international language. In multilingual education settings, the other languages may be dominant regional languages. However, as will be shown throughout this handbook, even these basic concepts such as language, home language, dominant language, native speaker, bilingual, multilingual, and bilingual and multilingual education are highly complex and contested constructs; thus considerations about which languages or varieties of languages to use as media of instruction are not always straightforward. Because education is most often the responsibility of nation states with artificial (and contested) geographical boundaries encompassing many—and oftentimes dividing—linguistic groups, decisions about bilingual and multilingual education are highly political, and influenced by a variety of historical, economic, and sociocultural factors.

For example, in 1998 a formal debate over bilingual education was held at California State University Long Beach, in the context of the Proposition 227 Campaign to pass a law restricting the state’s bilingual programs through mandates for English-medium instruction. The first author (Wright) was present during the heated exchanges, and listened incredulously as the local chairperson for the Proposition 227 Campaign—an elementary school teacher in Orange County—claimed that bilingual education was a “failed experiment,” that “we only do bilingual programs for Spanish speakers,” and that “other countries don’t do bilingual education, only the United States!”

The Handbook of Bilingual and Multilingual Education, First Edition. Edited by Wayne E. Wright, Sovicheth Boun, and Ofelia García.

© 2015 John Wiley & Sons, Inc. Published 2017 by John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

At the time of this debate, Wright was teaching in a Cambodian (Khmer) bilingual education program at an elementary school just a few miles away. The second author (Boun) was a senior in high school in Cambodia learning both English and Khmer, and later studied at a multilingual university—the Royal University of Phnom Penh. The third author (García) was a former Spanish–English bilingual teacher in New York City, a professor conducting research on bilingualism and bilingual education in New York City and internationally, that year along the Uruguay–Brazil border as a Fulbright Scholar.

As our personal experiences illustrate, political attacks, misinformation, and outright falsehoods often permeate debates over bilingual and multilingual education. Ironically, during this period of renewed attacks on bilingual education in the United States, other countries around the world were turning to bilingual and multilingual education to address linguistic realities and student needs. UNESCO and UNICEF, for example, promote mother-tongue-based multilingual education as a key component of education reform assistance to developing nations struggling to provide universal access to a basic education. Other nations with historically homogeneous populations are also beginning to turn to bilingual and multilingual education to address the realities of demographic change.

In the United States between 1998 and 2002, three states (California, Arizona, and Massachusetts) passed anti-bilingual education laws (G. McField, 2014), and federal education policy—the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001—removed all mention, encouragement, and direct financial support of bilingual education (Menken, 2008). However, the tides are beginning to change. After 15 years of anti-bilingual legislation in these three states, bilingual programs have been *restricted*, but *not eliminated*. Waiver provisions, loopholes, and differing interpretations of the laws by various policy makers provided space for many schools to continue or even expand bilingual education programs. In California, legislative efforts are now underway to reverse Proposition 227 and undo the harm caused by the ill-informed law (McGreevy, 2014). Even with Proposition 227 still in place, California became the first state in the United States to recognize the valuable linguistic skills of graduating bilingual students by awarding a “Seal of Biliteracy” on their high school diplomas—a model now being replicated in other states, including New York and Texas (see <http://sealofbiliteracy.org/>).

Thus, bilingual and multilingual education is alive and well and expanding. Indeed, in a world with only 196 “nation states” but over 7,000 named spoken languages (Lewis, Simons, & Fennig, 2013), bilingual and multilingual education is essential. As García (2009) has argued, in the 21st Century “bilingual education, in all its complexities and forms, seems to be the only way to educate as the world moves forward” (p. 6).

Nonetheless, there are a wide variety of often conflicting ideologies, theories, policies, and practices surrounding bilingual and multilingual education throughout the world. In some cases, bilingual education may even be misused to limit access and opportunities for linguistic minority students. This speaks to the great need for a comprehensive *Handbook of Bilingual and Multilingual Education* to: (1) discuss the theoretical foundations and present bilingual and multilingual education as a

current, strong, and cutting-edge field; (2) provide a broad overview of the historical development and current status of the field; (3) provide vivid critical examples of policy and practice in action; and (4) move the field forward by rethinking older constructs and introducing fresh ideas that better reflect and address the reality of our multilingual, multicultural, and increasingly globalized world.

The only attempt at a comprehensive internationally focused handbook on bilingual education was in 1988 in an edited volume by Christina Bratt Paulston containing 27 chapters each focused on a different country or region of the world. While this collection of individual case studies was highly informative, it did not lay out the theoretical foundations of the field. Important textbooks in the late 1980s and early 1990s helped solidify the field of bilingual education by providing educators with theory, research, and practical suggestions, including, for example, Ovando and Collier (1985), Crawford (1989), and Baker (1993). These key early textbooks have all subsequently been updated to 5th editions (Baker, 2011; Crawford, 2004; Ovando & Combs, 2011). The *Encyclopedia of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism* edited by Baker and Jones (1999), and the more recent *Encyclopedia of Bilingual Education* edited by González (2008), in addition to the 2nd edition of the ten-volume *Encyclopedia of Language and Education* (May & Hornberger, 2008) with Volume 5 focused on Bilingual Education (edited by Jim Cummins and Nancy Hornberger) cover a wide range of topics, and have further established bilingual and multilingual education as an important academic field. Recent books and scholarship, including García's (2009) *Bilingual Education in the 21st Century*, have helped challenge some of our cherished constructs and underlying theoretical foundations, and have introduced new terms and ways of conceptualizing key issues as we move forward in our rapidly changing world.

Overview and organization

This Handbook builds on the excellent prior work described above by providing both depth and breadth across three major sections: (1) Foundations for Bilingual and Multilingual Education, (2) Pedagogical Issues and Practices in Bilingual and Multilingual Education, and (3) Global Dimensions of Bilingual and Multilingual Education. The 41 chapters in this Handbook are authored by 78 distinguished, well-known, and rising scholars from around the world. Collectively their chapters provide case studies of, or draw examples from, specific countries and regions from all continents of the earth except Antarctica.

Authors in Sections 1 and 2 were asked to provide an historical overview of their topic, discuss the current state of knowledge with a focus on methodological and theoretical issues and problem areas, and discuss future directions. Authors of the country/region-specific chapters in Section 3 were asked to provide a brief historical overview, a brief summary of the current state of bilingual/multilingual education, and then discuss a specific case or provide a focus on one or more of the specific issues in their region/country. These chapters in Section 3 provide vivid examples of the issues raised and discussed in Sections 1 and 2.

Foundations for bilingual and multilingual education

Given the interdisciplinary nature of the field of bilingual and multilingual education, the 10 chapters in Section 1 bring in a wide variety of theoretical foundations informed by diverse academic fields. The authors in this section challenge some long-held notions and push us to consider new ways of conceptualizing and understanding our multilingual world. In Chapter 2 Angel Lin argues that, while sociolinguistics has focused on sociopolitical and sociocultural aspects of bi/multilingualism, there is a need for a better understanding of bi/multilingualism and bilingual education as a response to the human condition in a contemporary world marked by global crises, oppression, resistance, and increasing fragmentation. She introduces the term “grassroots trans-semiotizing” to highlight the varied ways local and trans-local actors make creative use of multiple kinds of semiotics (not just written and spoken language) to make meaning and build trans-local internetworks and communities. Lin gives specific examples of trans-semiotizing practices of a Hong Kong-based hip-hop artist who meshes local vernaculars and musical styles in a manner that has global (trans-local) currency.

At one low point in academic reasoning about bilingualism, some scholars in the early to mid 20th century conjectured that bilingualism was negatively correlated with attempted measures of “intelligence” (see Hakuta, 1986 for a review). In Chapter 3 Anatoly Kharkhurin provides evidence that bilingual practices not only lead to cognitive advantages in some areas, but also that these strengthened cognitive mechanisms may also increase the creative potential of bilinguals. Based on these findings, Kharkhurin proposes an educational model that incorporates bilingual and creative aspects of human development.

Bilingual and multilingual education, along with other language education fields, has been strongly influenced by theories from the field of second language acquisition (SLA). In Chapter 4, Guadalupe Valdés, Luis Poza, and Maneka Brooks challenge longstanding cognitivist orientations of SLA that focus on language as an individual process with the goal of linear progress in acquiring a grammatical system and language proficiency equivalent to that of a “native speaker.” Valdés, Poza, and Brooks identify and discuss two important shifts that have resulted from the “social turn” in SLA research: changing perspectives on language, and changing theoretical positions in SLA. These socially oriented shifts move away from unrealistic deficit-oriented expectations for students such as “native-like proficiency,” error-free production, or becoming balanced bilinguals (i.e., two fully proficient monolinguals in one). Instead, the authors argue for a sociocultural view of SLA as a process “leading to repertoires or linguistic resources termed multi-competence or plurilingualism.” This in turn has the “potential of informing and enriching the design of classroom environments in which students would be able to experience multiple ways of using both their home language and English for a variety of academic purposes in both their written and oral forms.”

Literacy instruction is typically the most contested and ideologically driven content area in the school curriculum (Edelsky, 2006). Viv Edwards in Chapter 5 notes that teachers in bilingual and multilingual classrooms must often resort to

reinventing “pedagogical practices devised with monolingual, more culturally homogenous populations in mind.” However, she argues that, with our broader and deeper understanding of the extent, nature, and complexity developed over recent decades, we “now have a much clearer idea of the pedagogies that more closely meet the needs of multilingual learning communities in relation to both learning in general and literacy learning in particular.” Despite this clearer picture of *what* needs to be included in teacher education, and *why* it needs to be included, the real challenge, Edwards asserts, is “*how* teachers can best be supported to make the necessary changes.”

In Chapter 6, Laura Valdiviezo and Sonia Nieto acknowledge cultural diversity as foundational in bilingual/multilingual education; culture is learned, thus biculturalism is one of the goals of bilingual education. However, Valdiviezo and Nieto argue that culture has been misunderstood theoretically and misapplied in practice. Given that culture is “dynamic, multifaceted, embedded in context, influenced by social, economic, and political factors, created and socially constructed, learned, and dialectal,” becoming bicultural is a complex process. Valdiviezo and Nieto note that, when internalizing at least two cultural systems, “sometimes their inherent values can be contradictory or even diametrically opposed.” To challenge assumptions about cultural diversity, they argue for more critically based research examining local cultural practices to understand the complex relationships of language and culture in bilingual and multicultural classrooms.

Conducting research in bilingual and multicultural classrooms and contexts, however, is not a simple straightforward task, as detailed in Chapters 7 and 8. While there is strong research evidence of the effectiveness and benefits of bilingual education over education provided solely through a dominant societal language (August & Shanahan, 2006; Genesee, Lindholm-Leary, Saunders, & Christian, 2005; G. P. McField & McField, 2014; Ramirez, Yuen, Ramey, Pasta, & Billings, 1991; Rolstad, Mahoney, & Glass, 2005; Slavin & Cheung, 2005), Colin Baker and Gwyn Lewis warn in Chapter 7 that “the search for the Holy Grail of a perfect piece of research on bilingual education is not elusive. It is unattainable.” While noting many specific examples of research findings favorable to bilingual education, they also note the boundaries and limitations of these studies, argue that research findings need to be treated critically and cautiously, and warn against our cravings for simple conclusions. They do not dismiss such research, however, because, without it, “our understandings and actions will be unrefined, conformist, naïve, even mindless.” They conclude that “such research illuminates and challenges, makes our thinking more sophisticated and structured, celebrates as well as contradicts, ensuring informed debates as well as doubts, even leading to more coherent and rational decisions ... for the sake of children.” While Baker and Lewis focus on the methodologies and findings of academic research, in Chapter 8 Angela Creese and Adrian Blackledge, with seven of their research colleagues, focus on issues related to the process of conducting research “multilingually.” They note that language and linguistic varieties make up an essential dimension of researcher identities, which, in turn, can shape research designs and arguments made in interpretive research. Given the overlap of method and theory, the authors

argue for linguistic ethnographies to “explore this overlap” and understand the ways in which “individual trajectories feed into interpretive practices.” To illustrate the power of linguistic ethnography, the authors share vignettes of researcher narratives written by members of their research team as they undertook a large study in bilingual classroom contexts.

As noted at the beginning of this chapter, decisions about bilingual and multilingual education are often driven by ideologies and politics. In Chapter 9, Mirose Paia, Jim Cummins, Isabelle Nocus, Marie Salaün, and Jacques Vernaudon explore the intersections of language ideologies, power, and identity in the context of efforts in French Polynesia related to bilingual education and indigenous language revitalization. The authors first examine how societal power relations in this colonial context “transformed the population from one of the most literate in the world in the early 1800s to being only minimally literate in their mother tongues by the 1960s.” They then describe the Polynesian Languages and Cultures Project designed to reverse low literacy rates by promoting “students’ total linguistic and cognitive potential at school focusing particularly on early bilingual education.” In studying this program, Paia and colleagues found that the key to academic success was not simply a matter of incorporating the first language into instruction, but rather “the extent to which the interactions between teachers and students generate a sense of empowerment among the students.” They conclude “students will learn the target language (both L1 and L2) if they are given opportunities to use it for powerful purposes.” We wish to acknowledge another empowering feature in connection with this important chapter. The study highlighted in this chapter is part of a larger research collaboration between Jim Cummins from the University of Toronto in Canada, local researchers from the University of French Polynesia (Paia & Vernaudon), and colleagues from France at the University of Nantes (Nocus & Salaün). We wish to acknowledge Jim’s efforts to work with and help translate his colleagues’ work—which was conducted and written in first draft in French. This is in keeping with Angel Lin’s call in chapter 2 to develop “trans-local mechanisms to translate and/or make available diverse local research work.”

Chapter 10, by Terrence Wiley, considers the political contexts of bilingual and multilingual education programs through the framework of language policy and planning. He notes that in institutional contexts “policies and practices related to prescribing and governing behaviors are instruments of social control.” Traditionally, language planning has been viewed as institutional policymaking to “prescribe or influence language(s) ... that will be used and the purposes for which they will be used.” However, Wiley raises a number of important questions about this process: “Who gets to define what language problems are? How, why, and for whom, have they become problems? And does the process of language planning itself cause language and communication problems? In other words, why should we assume that the process is only for benevolent purposes?” To address these questions, Wiley, extending Kloss (1998), provides a useful framework for classifying and analyzing language policies as promotion-oriented, expediency-oriented, tolerance-oriented, restriction-oriented, or repression-oriented; in addition there may be policies of

erasure and null policies (i.e., the absence of policy). He argues that teachers must be aware of the negative consequences of harmful language policies, and also must become familiar with positive examples of culturally and linguistically responsive teaching and learning. With such awareness and knowledge, teachers can “play a significant role in advocating for students and mitigating the effects of poorly conceived or inappropriate educational language policies.”

The case for bilingual and multilingual education may also be made from a framework of language rights, as addressed by Tove Skutnabb-Kangas in Chapter 11. She argues that the core of education-related linguistic human rights “are the right to learn one’s own language thoroughly, at the highest possible level, and likewise to learn thoroughly a dominant or official language in the country where one is resident.” She reviews a number of international declarations from the United Nations raising issues of linguistic human rights, but acknowledges “there are so far very few binding and unconditional rights, with financial support, to mother-tongue-medium education.” With charges of linguisticism (linguistically argued racism) and “linguistic genocide,” Skutnabb-Kangas identifies a vicious circle wherein the lack of recognized and binding linguistic human rights leads to societal-dominant-medium education which, over generations, leads to loss of the language and the ultimate need for revitalization efforts.

The six chapters in part 1 of Section 2 address practices and pedagogies for bilingualism and multilingualism. Nelson Flores and Hugo Baetens Beardsmore argue in Chapter 12 that these bilingual program models and structures often serve contradictory roles, both challenging and reinforcing existing societal hierarchies. Drawing on García’s (2009) distinction between monoglossic and heteroglossic perspectives, they note most bilingual programs are grounded in a monoglossic perspective which views monolingualism as the norm and treats bilinguals as two monolinguals in one (double monolingualism). Hence, transitional models which focus on moving students quickly from L1 to L2, and even additive models that seek to add L2 to L1, take this monoglossic view, as do dual language programs which insist on complete separation of the languages during instruction. Flores and Baetens Beardsmore argue that monoglossic perspectives and practices erase the fluid language practices of students who do not compartmentalize their language practices into neat and discrete languages. While recognizing the value and contribution of such bilingual programs in contrast to instruction only in the dominant society language, they argue for programs grounded in heteroglossic perspectives of languages, wherein bilingualism is viewed as the norm and program structures acknowledge multilingual speakers’ fluid language practices in their full complexity.

At the heart of such heteroglossic approaches to bilingual education is translanguaging, as described in Chapter 13 by Ofelia García and Li Wei. Translanguaging originally referred to classroom practices of deliberately changing the language of input and the language of output, for example, reading about a topic in one language, and then writing about it in the other language (Williams, 2012). García (2009) extends this original notion: “Translanguaging, or engaging in

bilingual or multilingual discourse practices, is an approach to bilingualism that is centered not on languages as has been often the case, but on *the practices of bilinguals* that are readily observable" (p. 44). García and Li Wei argue that translanguaging is the normal mode of communication in communities throughout the world as it encompasses the "multiple discursive practices in which bilinguals engage to make sense of their bilingual worlds." García and Li Wei assert that, when used in schools, translanguaging provides bilingual students with the opportunity to use their full linguistic and semiotic repertoire to make meaning. They argue that translanguaging is transformative for the child, for the teacher, and for education itself, and particularly for bilingual education. This concept of translanguaging moves the field beyond the narrow view of codeswitching, wherein the focus is on the language (code), and enables us to understand the processes by which bilingual students perform bilingually in a myriad of multimodal ways in the classroom. Indeed, despite being a fairly recent construct introduced into the field, the authors of 14 of the chapters in this Handbook make use of the term as they take a heteroglossic view of the issues discussed in their respective chapters.

A heteroglossic view of literacy opens the way to conceptualize and explore multiliteracies, as addressed by Madhav Kafle and Suresh Canagarajah in Chapter 14. They describe multiliteracies as "constituting a mixing of languages, modalities, and cultures" including diverse varieties of English and diverse visual, oral, and multimedia resources. While noting that the notion of multiliteracies has its roots in the work of the New London Group (1996) in the 1990s (with influences from New Literacy Studies in the mid 1980s), and has received the attention of scholars, Kafle and Canagarajah observe "it has been slow to transform pedagogies of academic literacy." They acknowledge that we currently lack well-developed pedagogical models of multiliteracies to guide teachers, even though "there are multiliteracies right under our noses in our classrooms." To develop much needed pedagogical models of academic multiliteracies, Kafle and Canagarajah argue for the need to change our focus from product-oriented studies to understanding actual processes and practices, to learn from students' learning strategies outside of classrooms, and to change assessment practices that evaluate writing based on monomodal norms focused on product and grammar. They warn that "till such broader ideological and normative changes take place, teachers and students will be reluctant to engage in academic multiliteracies."

The call to change our current assessment practices based on monolingual testing policies is further addressed by Elana Shohamy and Kate Menken in Chapter 15. Through an historical review of testing in various countries, Shohamy and Menken document many cases of misuse, abuse, and other injustices as testing serves as "a tool to create and/or reinforce societal divisions, marginalization, and discrimination." They demonstrate the power of testing in creating educational language policies, and call into question the validity and reliability of tests for immigrant emergent bilinguals. As an alternative approach, Shohamy and Menken argue for bi/multilingual testing that builds upon the recent research highlighting the dynamic and creative language practices of bilinguals, as summarized above and detailed in many of the chapters of this handbook. Such bi/multilingual tests,

they claim, “offer a new direction for creating tests that are more relevant, that minimize the misuses [and] biases, ... and that more accurately show what emergent bilinguals know and can do.”

In order to effectively address the issues raised above and detailed in the chapters of this Handbook related to the cognitive and creative advantages of bi/multilingualism, bi/multiliteracies, culture, ideologies, power, identities, language policy, language rights, program structures, translanguaging, bi/multilingual testing, and so forth, we need teachers who are well-prepared to work with linguistically diverse students in their classrooms. In Chapter 16, Anne-Marie de Mejía and Christine Hélot acknowledge the critical role that teacher-educators must play to help teachers understand the complex multilingual realities of their classrooms, and help teachers develop pedagogical strategies which allow students to make full use of their bilingual and multilingual repertoires. They argue that if teachers “are helped to become aware that some languages and some learning contents are excluded from the curriculum and that such choices are political in nature, they may also be enabled to become aware of their ability to challenge and resist coercive power relations in the context of their teaching.”

In Chapter 17, the final chapter in Section 1, Beatriz Arias addresses the important issue of parental and community involvement in bilingual and multilingual education. Arias describes the need for a two-way dialogue between educators and parents, and argues that the expectations and values parents of bilingual and multilingual students bring around schooling need to be recognized and incorporated into successful school outreach to families and communities. In her review of traditional parental involvement models, she finds that most have evolved from deficit views of minority parents and their children. Arias argues for new non-traditional approaches by giving examples of successful parental involvement models and immigrant parent–community partnerships that have been implemented in the United States and have led to advocacy for educational reform.

Pedagogical issues and practices in bilingual and multilingual education

The eight chapters in part 2 of Section 2 are also foundational in nature, but focus on pedagogical issues and practices in bilingual and multilingual education at various schooling levels and with selected populations of students. The first four chapters address bilingual and multilingual education policies and practices across four levels of traditional schooling—early childhood (Ch. 18), Primary School (Ch. 19), Secondary School (Ch. 20), and Higher Education (Ch. 21).

Eugene E. García and Amy M. Markos examine early childhood education (ECE) among dual language learners (DLLs) in Chapter 18. They argue that, given the increasing numbers of DLLs in the United States and globally, dual language exposure can have a significant influence on the development and learning attributes of this population in ECE settings. In order to better understand the development of DLLs in ECE settings, they offer a new conceptual model that takes into account important aspects of the DLL experience including “societal,

community, and family contexts; early care and education contexts; child characteristics; and developmental competencies.” García and Markos call on ECE teachers to develop necessary knowledge and skills specific to young learners who are developing in two languages simultaneously and on researchers to “promote new research that moves away from comparison models and towards efforts that aim to understand the specific complexities and uniqueness of the experience of young bilingual learners.” In Chapter 19, María Estela Brisk, Ester J. de Jong, and Meredith C. Moore discuss the research trends on bi/multilingual education at the primary (elementary) school level within a framework that emphasizes the importance and value of linguistic and cultural diversity in schools while acknowledging local contextual realities. They contend that bilingual education practices and models are highly contextualized, but this complex nature has rarely been considered in research in bi/multilingual education. The framework is founded on educational equity realized through three principles: affirming identities, additive bi/multilingualism, and structuring for integration. Brisk, de Jong and Moore argue that this framework contributes to “fair and good schooling for bilingual/multilingual learners within bi/multilingual programs as well as in schools that do not use the students’ mother tongues as the language of instruction.”

In Chapter 20, Christian Faltis and Frank Ramírez-Marin, discuss current research and trends in secondary bilingual education by examining how programs and practices are developed to address (and not address) the needs of emergent bilingual youth. Drawing on the notions of language as languaging and bilingualism as translanguaging, they argue that secondary bilingual education should be conceptualized from a perspective that views “language development as emerging from complex practices in which students comprehend language used in academic contexts and communicate widely about new thematically interconnected topics.” They call on teachers to acknowledge and affirm that the language practices of emergent bilinguals always entail translanguaging practices for purposeful communication. In Chapter 21, Christa van der Walt discusses bi/multilingual practices in higher education (HE) and the challenges faced by higher education institutions (HEIs) in response to the perceived inevitability of English used as the language of learning and teaching (LoLT). She maintains that monolingual teaching and learning is attributed to the view that a language plays a crucial role in achieving national unity and that bilingualism is detrimental to young minds. Drawing on García’s (2009) categorization of language arrangement in school, van der Walt shows that the use of English in various bi/multilingual programs and models “adds yet another dimension to existing multilingual arrangements and, in fact, turns most monolingual institutions into bilingual ones and bilingual institutions into multilingual ones.” To conclude, van der Walt argues for the acknowledgement of bi/multilingual students by discussing a range of multilingual teaching and learning practices and strategies in terms of García’s distinction between *flexible convergence* and *flexible multiplicity*.

The next three chapters address special populations of students in bilingual and multilingual classrooms with unique needs, including students with dis/abilities and exceptionalities (Ch. 22), Deaf students (Ch. 23), and Indigenous students

(Ch. 24). In Chapter 22, Teddi Beam-Conroy and Patricia Alvarez McHatton discuss the ways in which schools respond to the needs of linguistic minorities who have not yet attained proficiency in the majority language typically used for instruction in special and exceptional education programs. They maintain that many English learners (ELs) with dis/abilities and exceptionalities remain under- and over-identified and improperly served, and their placement in both special education and gifted education have been confounded by issues of race, ethnicity, power, and privilege. They point to three factors that contribute to the disproportionate representation of ELs in the United States, including referral, identification and assessment, and services. Beam-Conroy and McHatton call for the “need to provide special education and gifted programs that are conducted bilingually/multilingually to ensure these students are receiving services that fully address their needs.”

In Chapter 23, Timothy Reagan examines the nature, objectives, and characteristics of bilingual deaf education in different countries around the globe. Reagan discusses the distinction between the pathological view of deafness and the sociocultural approach to deafness, arguing that “while the pathological view of deafness would lead us to try to correct a deficit, the sociocultural view would lead us to efforts that focus on issues of civil rights and to assist the Deaf to function fully, *as deaf people*, in the dominant culture.” Reagan presents three types of signing (signed languages, contact signing, and manual sign codes) which together contributes to the emergence of an unusual kind of diglossia in many Deaf communities, in which most Deaf individuals are both bilingual to some degree and trimodal in their language use. Reagan argues that bilingual bicultural programs for the Deaf should go beyond the focus on linguistic issues to serving as agents and settings in which deaf children and deaf adults can be empowered.

Tiffany S. Lee and Teresa L. McCarty address Indigenous bilingual and multilingual education in Chapter 24. They argue that Indigenous language education must be understood in relation to issues of cultural survival, self-determination, and sovereignty. Lee and McCarty contend that the recent shifts in power relations as a result of a rising Indigenous activism has led to the promotion of Indigenous linguistic, cultural, and educational rights, “as schools are increasingly appropriated for the purposes of language and cultural maintenance and revitalization.” Nonetheless, they acknowledge, the implementation of Indigenous bilingual-multilingual education has undergone significant challenges including societal-level racism, economic inequality, and, at the macro-level, the limited numbers of Indigenous teachers and teaching materials. The final chapter (Ch. 25) in Section 2 addresses the reality that learning may take place outside of traditional school settings through non-formal bilingual education. Lesley Bartlett and Monisha Bajaj argue that this is an important but understudied phenomenon. They note that such out-of-school contexts may include nongovernmental organizations, community-based organizations; technology-enabled independent learning, families, religious groups, and playgroups, and that nonformal bilingual education in these contexts may be either planned or informal and unplanned. However, Bartlett and Bajaj maintain that nonformal bilingual education has not

received sufficient attention. Drawing on García's (2009) notion of supplementary education for bilingualism, which gives primacy to the speakers of a language rather than treating language as an object to be consumed, they call for the need for increased attention to translanguaging and for more research on bilingualism and peace.

Global dimensions of bilingual and multilingual education

The final 15 chapters in Section 3 provide a vivid description of bilingual and multilingual education in policy and practice in specific countries and regions around the world, authored by scholars with deep familiarity with these contexts. The authors of each chapter provide a brief historical sketch and description of the current state of affairs, and then provide a more detailed analysis of a particular policy, program, or issue related to bilingual or multilingual education. Though it was not possible to include every country, these chapters together offer a journey around world analyzing the principles and practices described in Sections 1 and 2.

Our journey begins in the United States in Chapter 26, where Deborah Palmer, Christian E. Zuñiga, and Kathryn Henderson critically analyze the implementation of a specific highly structured dual language bilingual program that is widely implemented in the state of Texas. Thomas Ricento discusses Canada in Chapter 27 with a particular focus on the country's language policies since the 1960s. Ricento argues that Canada's language policies, based largely on English and French, do not adequately reflect the multilingual and multicultural reality of the nation.

Across the Atlantic Ocean, Jasone Cenoz and Durk Gorter, in Chapter 28, describe and analyze the development of multilingualism in European nations through the teaching of—and teaching through the medium of—minority languages, state languages, and English. Noting that multilingualism has a long tradition in Europe, and describing progressive multilingual education policies such as Mother Tongue +2 (languages) and Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL), Cenoz and Gorter express concerns about the growing dominance of English in most programs, and argue for a more flexible “focus on multilingualism” that goes beyond the isolation of the different languages in various models, and instead helps students apply what they in learn in one language to other languages.

Moving next to the Asia region, Anwei Feng and Bob Adamson, in Chapter 29, describe the wide linguistic diversity across China, along with the growing popularity of bilingual and trilingual education and the intense debates in the country over their concepts, practices, and consequences. Feng and Adamson call for a transdisciplinary approach to research to guide educators in making evidence-based decisions regarding the use of regional and national languages and English in bilingual and multilingual education programs. The next two chapters address two Asian nations that—unlike China—have historically had little linguistic and cultural diversity. In Chapter 30 Akie Tomozawa and Junko Majima describe the changing demographics in Japan and the government's “slow but steady progress” in overcoming years of monolingual ideologies to allow some use of immigrant students' mother tongues as they are taught Japanese as a second language.

Likewise, in Chapter 31, Jin Sook Lee addresses South Korea's rapid change from linguistic and cultural homogeneity to diversity, and the government's efforts to offer supplemental "multicultural programs" designed to address the linguistic and cultural needs of immigrant newcomer students. Lee also addresses a range of issue related to the popularity of Korean-English bilingual programs.

In the Southeast Asia region, Wright and Boun describe, in Chapter 32, the linguistic diversity and radical changes in education language policies in Cambodia as driven by historical, colonial, political, and economic factors. They focus on the current government's efforts—with substantial assistance from international nongovernmental organizations—to meet international "Education for All" goals by adopting and expanding bilingual education programs for indigenous ethnic minorities in the remote regions of Cambodia's Northeastern provinces. In Chapter 33 Gary Jones compares and contrasts bilingual and multilingual education policies and practices in Brunei and Malaysia, including the differing impact of British colonialism and recent developments, which, he argues, represent a change from nationalistic issues to economic issues that further privilege English.

Onward to South Asia, in Chapter 34 Minati Panda and Ajit Mohanty describe multilingual education as a "double divide." Despite progressive-looking policies inclusive of the region's many Indigenous and tribal minority (ITM) languages, Panda and Mohanty argue that, in practice, the languages-in-education polices in South Asian countries place English in the dominant position "with almost total neglect of ITM languages."

Moving next to Africa, in Chapter 35 Sinfree Makoni and Busi Makoni provide a more critical view of what many have viewed as progressive and inclusive multilingual education policies in South Africa, designed to make African languages as prominent as English and Afrikaans. Makoni and Makoni focus on the tensions and conflicts between language "entrepreneurs" working for various institutions, arguing that "too many cooks spoil the broth." They provide many examples illustrating that bilingualism "is not inherently progressive or conservative" and that, in South Africa, "bilingual education has been a space where political scores were settled." They predict that bilingual/multilingual education will continue to be used "in both war and peace." In Chapter 36 Leketi Makalela provides an historical account of bilingual education policies and practices in sub-Saharan Africa, from the precolonial era to present. Makalela focuses on the "tensions between monolithic policies and fluid classroom language practices that are curtailed by such policy impositions." He argues for true heteroglossic policies and practices within a plural vision of a translanguaging framework that affirm multiple identities and the holistic development of multilingual African children.

Back to the Americas, in Chapter 37, Peter Sayer and Mario López Gopar provide case studies of three schools representing some of the different forms of bilingual education common in Mexico: a private Spanish-English bilingual school, a public primary school with an English program, and an Indigenous bilingual school with classes in Spanish and Náhuatl. Through these case studies, Sayer and Gopar argue that "bilingual education is a means of propagating both global and local languages, and in its various forms has the effect of both

accentuating and redressing social inequities.” Luis Enrique López focuses on indigenous youth and adult education in the larger scope of Latin America in Chapter 38. Through research conducted across seven countries in North, Central, and South America (Bolivia, Brazil, Ecuador, Guatemala, Mexico, Nicaragua, and Peru), López found politically and theoretically sound educational laws relevant to Indigenous cultures, languages, and identity aligned with ideals of diversity and cultural pluralism. However, he described the wide gaps between policy and practice as “abysmal,” as administrators and teachers in Indigenous schools “continue working towards monoculturalism and monolingualism.” Furthermore, López found the emphasis on education for all has led to the privileging of formal education programs for children and youth to the neglect of adult education and other alternative forms of education. To address these issues, López argues for the need to develop critical language awareness among Indigenous peoples and ensure their direct involvement in participatory planning process of intercultural and bilingual literacy education efforts in the larger pursuit of greater democracy, equality, and social justice.

Moving now to the vast region of the Pacific Ocean with its innumerable islands, Joseph Lo Bianco in Chapter 39 describes and critically analyzes multilingual education policy and practice across Oceania. Lo Bianco notes that Oceania’s fifteen main polities—dominated by the sovereign Europeanized states of Australia and New Zealand—include thousands of languages, including Indigenous, creoles and pidgins, colonial, immigrant, and international languages. Practically all children receive some of their education bilingually, usually with vernacular instruction at preschool and primary school levels, with transition to literacy-based content-area instruction in languages of wider communication. He further notes that “maintenance bilingual education is common in Polynesian settings with long-established political sovereignty.” Lo Bianco provides a more detailed analysis of the policies and practices in Australia, New Zealand/Aotearoa, Papua New Guinea, and Samoa with each case highlighting the historical, political, economic, sociocultural factors and pragmatic constraints in these multilingual contexts that shape schooling for children.

We then go to the Middle East and North Africa (MENA) region in Chapter 40, where Zeena Zakharia describes issues of language, conflict, and social change related to Arabic bilingual education, which, she notes, has a rich and contested history. She argues that children and youth in MENA countries have experienced bilingual education differently as it has been mediated by conflict, political violence, and inequality “against a backdrop of colonial legacies and nationalist agendas in education, and contemporary global political and economic pressures.” Based on observations of political conflicts leading to disputes about language policy and bilingual education, and through interviews with students, Zakharia, found a “pull towards Arabic that is articulated in terms of patriotic ideals,” but she also found that these conflicts create “an impetus for youth to learn foreign languages as a pathway to security.” She makes a case for understanding youth perspectives about language learning, inequality, and social change as critical to the promotion of strong bilingual education models.

Our journey ends in the former Soviet Republics in Chapter 41, where Gatis Dilāns and Brigita Zepa provide a brief historical overview of titular-Russian bilingualism. They describe the use of bilingual education to increase the knowledge of new official languages among formerly dominant Russian speakers. Dilāns and Zepa then focus on the case of bilingual education in Latvia, which “once had the highest rate of Russian knowledge among the non-Slavic titular populations of the former Soviet republics.” They reveal that the goal of bilingual education “has not been to maintain Russian as a minority language,” but rather to “dismantle the Russian school model inherited from the USSR by instituting a common education system for all children in Latvia.”

Conclusion

Bilingual and multilingual education is a strong, dynamic, interdisciplinary academic field, with real consequences for real students, families, and communities around the world. Our hope is that this handbook helps solidify the field with historical and contemporary understandings of theory, research, policy, and practice, and enables parents, teachers, administrators, policymakers, researchers, and others to recognize the need for effective bilingual and multilingual education policies and practices that best prepare ALL students for the linguistic realities of local and global contexts.

The handbook also makes evident that not all bilingual education looks the same. The academic, social, cognitive and psychological foundations of bilingual education are here clearly delineated, as we explore its many benefits. But the contributions in this handbook also make clear that bilingual education around the world has many different structural and pedagogical manifestations, as it adapts to the students it serves and the societal goal it pursues. We hope that the many cases here considered give the reader a more clearly defined vision of both the potential and the complexity of bilingual education. Armed with these understandings, we hope that scholars, policy-makers, and educators will continue to develop bilingual and multilingual education to give ALL students the learning possibilities they deserve.

REFERENCES

- 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 Associates.
- Baker, C. (1993). *Foundations of bilingual education and bilingualism* (1st edn.). Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Baker, C. (2011). *Foundations of bilingual education and bilingualism* (5th edn.). Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Baker, C., & Jones, S. P. (1999). *Encyclopedia of bilingualism and bilingual education*. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Crawford, J. (1989). *Bilingual education: History, politics, theory, and practice* (1st edn.). Los Angeles: Bilingual Educational Services, Inc.

- Crawford, J. (2004). *Educating English learners: Language diversity in the classroom* (5th edn.). Los Angeles: Bilingual Education Services, Inc.
- Edelsky, C. (2006). *With literacy and justice for all: Rethinking the social in language and education* (3rd edn.). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- García, O. (2009). *Bilingual education in the 21st Century: A global perspective*. Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Genesee, F., Lindholm-Leary, K., Saunders, W. M., & Christian, D. (2005). English language learners in U.S. schools: An overview of research findings. *Journal of Education for Students Placed at Risk*, 10(4), 363–385.
- González, J. M. (Ed.). (2008). *Encyclopedia of Bilingual Education*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Hakuta, K. (1986). *The mirror of language: The debate on bilingualism*. New York: Basic Books.
- Kloss, H. (1998 [1977]). *The American bilingual tradition*. Washington, DC: Center for Applied Linguistics and Delta Systems.
- Lewis, M. P., Simons, G. F., & Fennig, C. D. (Eds.). (2013). *Ethnologue: Languages of the world* (17th edn.). Dallas, TX: SIL International.
- May, S., & Hornberger, N. (2008). *Encyclopedia of language and education*. New York: Springer.
- McField, G. P. (Ed.). (2014). *The miseducation of English learners: A tale of three states and lessons to be learned*. Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing.
- McField, G. P., & McField, D. R. (2014). The consistent outcome of bilingual education programs: A meta-analysis of meta-analyses. In G. P. McField (Ed.), *The miseducation of English learners: A tale of three states and lessons to be learned*. Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing.
- McGreevy, P. (2014). California senator proposes restoring bilingual education. *Los Angeles Times*. Retrieved from <http://articles.latimes.com/2014/feb/20/local/la-me-pc-california-senator-proposes-restoring-bilingual-education-20140220>
- Menken, K. (2008). *English learners left behind: Standardized testing as language policy*. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- New London Group. (1996). A pedagogy of multiliteracies: Designing social futures. *Harvard Educational Review*, 66(1), 60–92.
- Ovando, C., & Collier, V. P. (1985). *Bilingual and ESL classrooms: Teaching in multicultural contexts* (1st edn.). New York: McGraw Hill.
- Ovando, C., & Combs, M. C. (2011). *Bilingual and ESL classrooms: Teaching in multicultural contexts* (5th edn.). New York: McGraw Hill.
- Paulston, C. B. (Ed.). (1988). *International handbook of bilingualism and bilingual education*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.
- Ramirez, J. D., Yuen, S. D., Ramey, D. R., Pasta, D. J., & Billings, D. K. (1991). *Final report: Longitudinal study of structured English immersion strategy, early exit and late-exit bilingual education programs for language minority children. Vol. 1 (Publication no. 300-87-0156)*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education.
- Rolstad, K., Mahoney, K., & Glass, G. (2005). The big picture: A meta-analysis of program effectiveness research on English language learners. *Educational Policy*, 19(4), 572–594.
- Slavin, R. E., & Cheung, A. (2005). A synthesis of research on language of reading instruction for English-language learners. *Review of Educational Research*, 75(2), 247–284.
- Williams, C. (2012). *The national immersion scheme guidance for teachers on subject language threshold: Accelerating the process of reaching the threshold*. Bangor, Wales: The Welsh Language Board.