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Abstract

The aim of this research report is to outline a preliminary guide of how to implement translingual language education. Currently, language education is based on modernist ideas about language. Learners are expected to master the same standard form as a native speaker does. Few language students achieve this goal. Minority language students are particularly disadvantaged, as this approach to education hinders their ability to access the majority language. Their home languages are often ignored or forbidden by teachers which has led to academic failure.

The translingual approach is grounded in the work of multilingual education researchers, and poststructuralist sociolinguistic scholarship. This report answers questions about how a translingual approach can support language minority and majority students to adopt new attitudes and skills in line with modern research. These skills include being resourceful speakers who are able to adapt to the communication needs of the moment. This report uses a literature review of published academic works describing the translingual teaching practices of teachers in Western contexts. The analysis revealed possible ways for teachers to model a new attitude towards languages, and utilise their students’ language resources. The report provides recommendations for facing future challenges in the field.
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## List of Abbreviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EAL</td>
<td>English as an additional language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELL</td>
<td>English language learner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESL</td>
<td>English as a second language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L1</td>
<td>First language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L2</td>
<td>Second language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLA</td>
<td>Second language acquisition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TL</td>
<td>Target language</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Introduction

In the winter of 2012, I began a new job working for one of the largest language schools in Japan. One of my fellow trainees asked if we might translate in the classroom if a student was having difficulty. The answer was a resolute "No". This was my induction to the monolingual classroom. Despite this rule being firmly impressed upon both teachers and students, Japanese was present in almost every lesson. Adult learners furtively whispered assistance to one another, younger learners shouted it across the room. Some covered their textbooks with translations of vocabulary, others clung to their electronic dictionaries. My employer's assertions that "the customer's native language is never used in the classroom" (Berlitz Japan, n.d.) did not reflect the reality of their classrooms.

Context

Berlitz is far from the first or only language school to maintain this pretence. The target language only approach has been common in the language teaching profession for over a century (Cook, 2001). It is promoted in peer-reviewed journals (Chambers, 2013; Littlewood & Yu, 2011) and by some researchers in the SLA area (Lightbown & Spada, 2013). This affects many learners, as English language teaching alone is a thriving billion-dollar global industry. The rationale for the target language approach is based on language teaching terminology that is no longer supported by newer, critical applied linguistic research (Stephen May, 2013). This includes the notions of 'native speaker' and 'language', which will be discussed in detail later in this report. Although there are differences in how learners are impacted by target language only policies, excluding the learner's first language from any classroom is incompatible with pedagogies that empower learners. This is what motivated me to undertake this research.

Theoretical Framework

This research report is grounded in work of poststructuralist sociolinguistic scholars, including (Blommaert, 2010; Canagarajah, 2013; Pennycook, 2010). Their work has shown that languages are not discrete systems but boundaries on the spectrum of the

1 In 2011, the industry was worth an estimated US$11.6 billion according to Study Travel Magazine (2012).
world's collective linguistic repertoire. These ideas about language are relatively new to Western scholarship, even though they are the norm in many places (Stephen May, 2013).

Language classrooms reflect the political environment of the wider society (Auerbach, 1993). I am adopting a critical lens in this report to reveal how teachers can engage with the political aspects of language teaching. This research is relevant to all areas of language education, and I will use teachers to refer to all language teachers.

**Research Rationale**

**Research problem**

In monolingual classrooms students are silenced, their cultural identities unwelcome (Auerbach, 1993). In bilingual classes, languages are divided in a way that does not reflect the realities of multilingualism (Cummins, 2007; Palmer; Martínez, Mateus, & Henderson, 2014). Language tests have not adapted to new understandings. Students are judged by the fictional native speaker proficiency, a notion that pretends all native speakers speak the same standard form (Kramsch, 2014; Pennycook, 2012b). Failing to properly emulate a native speaker can lead to feelings of failure, of illegitimacy and inauthenticity (Genesee & Cenoz, 1998). This is what Kramsch (2012) calls imposture. She warns that this feeling, far from having disappeared, has only grown invisible. All of this is bound up in issues of race and national identity.

**Gap in the research**

According to Kramsch (2014), language teaching is a modernist profession now being transformed by the forces of globalisation. Teachers are being forced to re-evaluate many of the practices that were transmitted to each generation unchallenged. The past thirty years have seen a sharp increase in global interdependence. The flows of financial and commercial resources, people, images and culture have intensified. They are often assisted by modern information technologies. Governments have also identified there is a growing need for language skills and intercultural understanding, particularly to meet the demand for a multilingual workforce (Australian Curriculum and Assessment Reporting Authority, 2014; British Council, 2013a; The British Academy, 2013; U.S. Department of Education, 2012). Contemporary students will not be able to assume everyone they meet shares their language or language norms. However, despite the recent research in multilingual language practices, language education does not reflect the multilingual realities outside the classroom (García & Li Wei, 2014).

Teachers need to address both the pedagogical and political aspects of the language classroom. Otherwise, minority language speakers learning English will continue to be degraded by education systems that position them as deficient, or even problems to be solved. All language learners need to value their language resources, even if those resources are not native-like. This model of translingual education is not controversial. However, much of the research in language education has focused on understanding or promoting multilingualism (Canagarajah, 2017; Carstens, 2016; French, 2016; Marshall
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& Moore, 2016; Pennycook, 2017) or building pedagogical resources (Celic & Seltzer, 2011; García, Ibarra Johnson, & Seltzer, 2017).

Research Aims

The aim of this report is to propose a preliminary outline of how translingual education can build resourceful speakers. Resourceful speakers have a critical, metalinguistic awareness that allows them to move between styles, discourses and genres (Pennycook, 2012b). They have the pragmatic ability to align with other people, rather than expecting a standard form of language (Canagarajah, 2013). I will link this model with the translingual practices of classroom teachers in Western English-speaking countries. Some academics are focusing on problematising monolingual education to bring about top-down changes (Hinton, 2016). However, the education system is conservative and rooted in the positivist paradigm (D. Nunan, personal communication, November 2, 2016). Researchers are indicating that change must come from the ground up (Eisenchlas, Schalley, & Guillemín, 2013; García, Flores, & Chu, 2011). To begin this change I will use a literature review of scholarly works, including peer-reviewed journal articles and an edited book.

Describing translingual practices

This report uses research from a number of related areas. In this report, the terms bilingual and multilingual will both refer to the use of more than one language. Pennycook (2010) describes metrolingualism as how urban people construct new identities through a playful approach language. Dynamic bilingualism involves fluid language practices, where the bilingual competencies are constantly evolving in response to their cultural contexts (García, 2009). García linked dynamic bilingualism to the European notion of plurilingualism. Plurilingualism refers to an individual’s use of multiple languages, esteeming them without regard to their economic value (Marshall & Moore, 2016).

Translanguaging is a term that has evolved considerably since its coining by Cen Williams (1996). It is used to refer to multilingual language practices, as well as pedagogical approaches that incorporate those practices (Flores & Schissel, 2014; García & Li, 2014). Creese and Blackledge (2010) described it as a flexible bilingual pedagogy, where the learning of both languages was supported by the other. Canagarajah refers to translanguaging as a complex shuttling between languages, which are treated as a unified system (Canagarajah, 2011). Furthermore, it explicitly acknowledge the political aspect of language, and the critical skills that can be developed through language learning (García & Li, 2014).

I chose use the term translingual, to continue Pennycook’s (2012b) question of what translingual education might look like. It refers to educational programs aiming to create resourceful speakers. I have included these terms and others in a glossary in Appendix A.
Research questions
1. How can a translingual approach to language teaching create resourceful speakers?
   a. How can it encourage students to adopt an attitude of alignment towards communication?
   b. How can it develop learners’ critical metalinguistic skills?
2. How does this approach support language minority students to become resourceful speakers?
3. How does this approach support language majority students to become resourceful speakers?

Report Outline
The value of the translingual approach is best understood through the limitations of previous models of language education. This research report will outline a general narrative of language education so far and end with directions for future research. In Chapter 1, I will explore the reasons educators and governments adopt monolingual approaches. Chapter 2 will discuss how bilingual education research still struggles to meet the needs of the learners. In Chapter 3, I will discuss the theoretical underpinnings of this report in more detail to explain how I developed the research questions. In Chapter 4, I will illustrate what translingual education now looks like. Finally, in Chapter 5 I will outline the implications for future research and practice.
1 English Only Education for Minority Students

Students in Western Anglophone countries are typically educated monolingually. This choice is based on ideologies which link English with economic success (Auerbach, 1993). As this chapter will outline, language education policy decisions can be pragmatic choices made by politicians and are not always based on academic research. The fate of English language learners is often intermingled with anxieties about immigration or national identity. Monolingual English education creates social inequalities by making it difficult for learners to access the majority language. Immigrant and indigenous students are rarely encouraged to develop their home languages. Parents may discourage home language maintenance, fearing their children will not learn the majority language. Hornberger and Link (2012) noted the absurdity of state education seeking to transform bilingual children into monolingual English speakers, while unsuccessfully trying to teach monolinguals a foreign language.

First, I will describe how minority language children are positioned as a problem that the educational system must manage. Then I will illustrate why monolingual education is insufficient for educating language minority students. An understanding of what drove these countries to adopt monolingual approaches will show why a critical approach is necessary.

1.1 A Brief History of English Education

“The English language, as the national language, is an important unifying element of Australian society.”

(Department of Immigration and Border Protection, 2016, p. 5)

Although I will discuss a few of the developed English-speaking countries in detail, this can be generalised to the other countries. The similarities between them are more important than the differences (Edwards, 2004). All show similar patterns of tolerance towards migration in times of prosperity, and oppression in times of recession. Recognition of the cultural significance of indigenous or minority languages has grown, but it is certainly not universal.

Early in the years of colonisation, other languages were accepted and often used by missionaries teaching in schools. Bilingual schools were opened as a pragmatic response to the distribution of ethnic communities. A shift away from tolerance often led to oppressive educational practices, such as removal from families, corporal punishment,

---

2 This quote is taken from Life in Australia, a document for potential visa recipients, available in 37 languages other than English.
and ridicule. In the nineteenth century, the establishment of compulsory, public schooling shifted the responsibility for a child’s education to the state, which often imposed English onto the students (Edwards, 2004). In contrast, many now place the responsibility for home language maintenance on the parents.

### 1.1.1 Rising nationalism

English language education in the U.S. is one example of “cyclical fluctuations” in policies (Auerbach, 1993). In the 19th century, most urban schools educated children in their mother tongue until an influx of immigrants made many Anglo-Americans anxious. A number of states began to pass laws requiring English literacy to obtain the right to vote (Zimmerman, 2010). Early in the 20th century, fears of separatism surrounding the first World War led to the Americanization movement. This made monolingual education the norm. In 1915, Theodore Roosevelt famously claimed that “there is no room in this country for hyphenated Americanism” (Edwards, 1994, p. 166). Even now, the stamp of unity is used to mask anti-immigrant sentiment when the issue of English language education is publicly debated.

Bilingual education remained underfunded until the 1960s when the first post-World War II bilingual school was opened to accommodate Spanish-speaking children. Its success paved the way for the Bilingual Education Act of 1968 (García, 2009, p. 168). The act was soon amended to focus on undoing the disadvantages impoverished language minorities were facing.

Australia initially followed a similar trajectory to the U.S. Prior to the First World War, the public was tolerant of other languages and community language schools were abundant. However, the federation of colonies in 1901 preceded a period of “aggressive monolingualism” as part of the new national identity (Kipp, 2008, p. 70). In 1918 several states passed English-only laws. It was not until the 1970s that Australia returned to multilingualism (Lo Bianco & Slaughter, 2009). This continued through the economic rationalism of the late 1980s and 1990s, where the focus turned to learning Asian languages. However, this multilingualism is no longer part of the mainstream political agenda and there is now a heavy focus on English literacy (Heugh, 2014; Scarino, 2014). In the most recent Australian National Curriculum there is support for developing English language and literacy, but not bilingual language development (Hammond, 2012). This is the result of an approach to English language education which views bilingualism as a problem to be solved (Flores & Schissel, 2014).

### 1.1.2 The impact of standardised tests

In 1998, poor test scores of Indigenous students were blamed on bilingual programs, many of which were dismantled (Wigglesworth & Lasagabaster, 2011). They were completely discontinued following further poor standardised testing results ten years later. However, these tests have been criticised extensively for their cultural bias (Lo Bianco & Slaughter, 2017). Now most Indigenous Australian children in remote communities enter school with little knowledge of English, and yet they are educated in English. The NAPLAN standardised tests which test English literacy have presented a falsely rosy picture. This is because Language Background Other Than English (LBOTE)
students are included with the EAL learners. LBOTE includes students who have one English-speaking parent at home, and elite bilinguals such as the children of diplomats. The government has used these skewed test results to justify further cuts to EAL support programs (Creagh, 2014). The focus on English literacy has led to many English language learners being placed in a predominantly monolingual environment (Turner & Cross, 2016).

In the U.S., the recently-repealed Proposition 227 in California impacted the education of many students. The main proponent of this was Ron Unz, a multimillionaire software developer, who dressed his campaign as championing the rights of immigrant children to learn English. In 1998, this proposition mandated English-only classes for English language learners in California, requiring them to transition to mainstream classes within a year. It was widely opposed by teachers and members of the Latino community. Classes focussed on teaching English language rather than content, based on the idea that this would speed up the process. The justification for this change was the poor academic achievement of students in bilingual education. However, prior to 1998 only a third of ELLs were enrolled in bilingual programs (Matas & Rodríguez, 2014) and many early exit transitional programs were falsely labelled as bilingual (Hinton, 2016). After 1998, inappropriate use of assessment was used to falsely boost the program’s success (Goto Butler, Orr, Bousquet Gutierrez, & Hakuta, 2000). Four years after the proposition was passed, rates of English acquisition remained unchanged (García & Kleifgen, 2010, p. 31).

1.2 Reasons for Promoting Ineffectual Programs

Opponents of bilingual programs skew the data to justify anti-immigrant sentiment (Crawford, 1999; MacKay, 1990). The English-only movement in the U.S. is partially caused by larger cultural anxieties. Language is “a convenient and visible peg upon which to hang broader social concerns” (Edwards, 1994, p. 176). In the UK, politicians have paid little attention to the evidence for the success of bilingual education. They and the media have sought to frame minority languages as a problem, and there has been a recent increase in anti-immigrant sentiment (Blackledge & Creese, 2010). Ironically, English is a product of the diversity of England, with its roots in the Celtic languages, Latin, Anglo-Saxon, Norse and French (Edwards, 2004). There was no statistical evidence to back up the idea that the Australian indigenous bilingual programs were

---

3 California had roughly a third of the country’s ELLs, making up over 20% of the state’s total students in the 2013-2014 school year (U.S. Department of Education, 2015).
failing. However, the team-teaching approach many took was more expensive (Edwards, 2004) and suffered from staffing problems (Lo Bianco & Slaughter, 2017).

There have also been practical barriers to providing quality education for English language learners. There has been a push to equip all teachers with knowledge about how to best teach English languages learners. This includes the use of the learners’ L1 in the classroom (Harper & de Jong, 2009). Cummins (2000) identified this as key to reversing the idea that EAL students are problems to be fixed. However, subject area teachers are often left to interpret policy documents without support. Teachers are sometimes uncomfortable straying from monolingual practices (Turner & Cross, 2016).

1.3 Problems with Monolingual English Education

Despite attempts to hide the problems, many English language learners are languishing without the required support. Newly-arrived migrant students are expected to attend mainstream classes after six months of intensive English language schooling (twelve if they have experienced disrupted schooling). The English provision in Australia and Proposition 227 are examples of early-exit bilingual education. It is underpinned by the idea that literacy in English can only be bought at the cost of the student’s home language. These programs tend to be unsuccessful because they do not allow sufficient time for children to develop their English skills. Acquiring English takes years, too long to wait until they reach a level to continue their academic progress (Cummins, 1981; Hakuta, 1999). This is supported by research such as Collier’s (1989) synthesis, which indicated that uninterrupted development in all content areas is more important that increasing the hours of English instruction.

Exclusively measuring the success of educational programs by linguistic outcomes will not give a complete picture (Baetens-Beardsmore in García, 2009, p. 155). Education that frames the minority students’ L1 as a resource can help them to develop a sense of pride and identity as member of their minority group. The English-only dictum mirrors the power relations of the wider society which devalue language minority students and so they benefit from identity affirmation in the school context (Auerbach, 1993; Cummins, 2012). Bilingual education supports the cultural and linguistic identities of the students, boosting their self-confidence and school performance (García, 2009, p. 391). When minority students are not allowed to make use of their L1 resources, it has detrimental effects on their academic achievement and language proficiency (Skutnabb-Kangas, 2008).

As I have discussed in this chapter, English language learners are not always well-supported by formal educational institutions. Although research shows they benefit from being allowed to use their home languages, educators and policy-makers often choose not to provide this. The data used to justify these decisions does not always hold up to close scrutiny. A critical approach can help educators understand their role in this system.
Translingual Language Education: Towards the Resourceful Speaker

2 Bilingual Education

The monolingual approach to language teaching does not meet the needs of language minority students. In this chapter, I will begin to broaden my focus to include all language learners, not only English language learners. As the translingual model builds on the bilingual one, it is necessary to understand this body of research. First, I will describe how bilingual education can remedy some of the problems of monolingual education. I will evaluate some proposals on how to support home language development. Next, I will give an overview of psycholinguistic research included in many guides to bilingual education.

2.1 Access to English

“To reject a child’s language in the school is to reject the child.”

(Cummins, 2001)

Bilingual education prevents social disadvantage and promotes academic achievement in language minority students. It is self-evident that acquiring new knowledge means building on what we already know. In the language classroom, the L1 acts as scaffolding for learning L2. Some teachers still believe that the L1 impedes learning. Hinton (2016) asked teachers to reject this notion and labelled English-only classrooms “monolingual” in an attempt to problematise this view. It is difficult to find a truly monolingual classroom as the L1 has a way of creeping back in even when there is an English-only dictum in place (Cook, 2001). The monolingual edict can serve to make teachers feel guilty and learners feel deficient.

The parents of language minority children face more barriers to school participation (Crawford, 1997, p. 41). However, using the learner’s home language can allow the parents to be more actively involved (Hakuta, 1999). It can also reinforce using the home language outside the classroom. Some parents believe the English-only dictum should extend to the home, even if they are not able to communicate well in English. If they are not able to communicate meaningfully with their child this can have a detrimental effect on the child’s overall language development (Cummins, 1981). The home language needs to be recast as an educational resource, not detriment (García & Kleifgen, 2010).

2.1.1 Different bilingual programs

There are many types of bilingual programs, with the ‘stronger’ bilingual programs typically showing better results. In the Anglophone countries, most bilingual programs are ‘weak’. They aim to place the English language learners in mainstream classrooms as soon as possible. The sometimes provide the learners with support from specialist teachers or aides. These weaker programs have received a great deal of criticism. English language learners are kept separate and stigmatised from the majority language students. In some situations, the programs prevent them from the very meaningful communicative situations needed to develop their English. Kanno (2003) described the stigma faced by Japanese students in Canada. One unsuccessful communication between
two students ended with the derogatory question, “Are you deaf or ESL!” (p. 35). It is important to remember that students want social participation, not merely academic learning.

2.1.2 The moving target
Early-exit transitional programs are sometimes justified by the common belief that young children learn languages quickly. However, García (2009) laid out evidence that children do not learn language differently based on their age. There is little indication of a “critical period” (with the exception of developing a native-like accent). A review of the findings in psychology and neuroscience also showed that phonology was affected by age, although syntax was affected to a lesser degree and vocabulary not at all (Wong, Yin, & O’Brien, 2016). Children learn more quickly when they have developed home language resources to draw on. This is why older children and teenagers show the fastest progress when learning languages. Young children are expected to perform simpler linguistic tasks, often with a great deal of contextual clues to help them. On the other hand, older school-age learners must navigate complex social and academic situations where language is increasingly decontextualized (Cummins, 1981). As older learners have further to go before they reach grade proficiency, it still takes them the same amount of time as younger children (Krashen, 1996).

2.1.3 Language acquisition time
A large body of research into strong bilingual programs resolutely shows that the home language does not hinder language acquisition. Even substantial amounts of instruction in the native language does not interfere or delay the acquisition of English language skills (Crawford, 1997; Cummins, 2007; Molyneux, 2009; Ramirez, Yuen, Ramey, & Pasta, 1991; Thomas & Collier, 1997). When students are taught in more than one language, lessons are more meaningful. It affirms that the language and culture of the minority students is valued in the classroom and has a positive effect on their academic achievement (Cummins, 2001, 2006).

2.2 What Successful Bilingual Programs Look Like
One type of strong bilingual programs is dual or two-way bilingual programs. These allow all students, not only the language minority students, to further develop their language skills. In her in-depth study of dual language educational programs, Lindholm-Leary compared what she called the ‘90:10’ (initially using roughly 10% of the class time in English) programs to ‘50:50’ ones. English proficiency did not decrease despite the decreased class time spent using English (Lindholm-Leary, 2001, p. 311). The English-speaking children also suffered no academic or English proficiency losses from spending more time in a Spanish environment.

2.2.1 Literacy is transferable
A widespread belief about language learning is that immersion leads to faster language acquisition. As stated in Chapter 1, in these programs language minority children do not do well. Kanno (2003) condemned this style of learning based on her negative experience as a Japanese exchange student in the UK. However, this belief is not entirely
When the child’s home language is valued by the wider society, such as Anglophone children in Canada, immersion education can be quite effective. Studies of French immersion programs there showed that starting the immersion in elementary school did not speed up the acquisition compared to starting in secondary school (Genesee, 2004). This was attributed to the fact that beginning the immersion in secondary school meant the children were literate in their first language before they began to learn their second. The idea that literacy is a transferable skill is well supported. Conceptual knowledge such as literacy can be transferred across languages (Cummins, 1981).

2.2.2 Heritage language programs
The aim of heritage language programs is to revitalise or maintain the learner’s home language. In New Zealand pressure from activist groups led to the establishment of bilingual schools, available to all children. In the early 1980s, the Maori community established immersion education pre-schools, with a curriculum based on indigenous knowledge and learning styles (Edwards, 2004). Although these programs were initially controlled and funded by the Maori community, the Education Act of 1989 gave them full funding (Hill, 2017). The success of this language revitalisation program saw it eventually spread all the way to the tertiary level (García, 2009). However, only a small percentage of Maori students graduate with high levels of bilingual proficiency, as most are not in full immersion programs throughout their schooling (Hill, 2017).

2.3 Dealing with Diversity
Formal education systems have struggled to adequately serve the needs of bilingual children, whether they are immigrants, indigenous or heritage language learners. It is not always feasible to provide bilingual programs as they depend on the availability of bilingual teachers and student numbers. Language minority communities may not need or want formal education to maintain their languages. There have been grass-roots movements proven to create valuable multilingual spaces for immigrant children in community language schools (Blackledge & Creese, 2010). These community schools are being promoted as an immediate alternative to formal bilingual education (Eisenchlas et al., 2013). Kanno described Japanese language schools as central in the community. They function as a place where students can develop another public identity. She believed this was essential to their successful L1 maintenance. However, separate “ethnic” schools demand more of the students’ time and effort. Links can be made between formal schools and community-based language schools by providing students credit for their study there.

Although formal bilingual education is desirable for the opportunities to develop all (majority and minority) students’ language abilities, there are other options. In the mainstream classroom, it is not necessary for the teacher to speak the students’ languages to provide some degree of bilingual education. García and Kleifgen (García & Kleifgen, 2010) outlined numerous ways bilingual practices can be used in all
classrooms, such as using bilingual pairings for group presentations or Cummins' identity texts (Cummins, 2006).

2.4 Cognitive Benefits of Bilingualism

Psycholinguistic research on the cognitive benefits of bilingualism is used to promote bilingual education programs. Research on the effects of bilingualism on cognitive and intellectual development has been heavily influenced by methodology in earlier studies. For example, studies usually looked at children from disadvantaged backgrounds and generally found negative effects (Cummins, 1976; Hakuta, 1986). A key study by Peal and Lambert (1962) criticised previous work for not selecting children with equal ability in both languages. They coined the term balanced bilinguals to refer to such children, who outperformed monolinguals on intelligence tests. Although this study suggested that bilinguals are more intelligent, it is now understood that they outperform monolinguals in quite specific areas, such as metalinguistic awareness and executive control (Bialystok, 2015).

2.4.1 Implications for teaching

Psycholinguistic research is often used to promote bilingual education (García, 2009), but it is more useful for challenging assumptions about language learning. It can help to remove some of the stigma of not being a balanced bilingual. Bilinguals show improved metalinguistic awareness related to the degree of similarity between the languages (Barac & Bialystok, 2012). They also found that metalinguistic awareness increased slightly when learning a new language, but did not continue to increase as they mastered the language. In a study on children in immersion programs, Bialystok and Barac (2012) found balanced bilingualism from birth was not necessary to improve executive functioning. They also found that it could be developed in both children and adults as they became bilingual.

Even in monolingual situations, both of a bilingual's languages are active all of the time, even for bilinguals who are not ‘balanced’ (Kroll, Bobb, & Hoshino, 2014). This is the proposed reason (Bialystok, 2015) for their improved executive control – constantly having to select the appropriate language improves their ability to regulate their overall cognition. The executive control system gets recruited into the task of language processing, leading to it becoming stronger and more efficient. All areas of the brain for different languages are active, even when only one language is being used (Kroll & Bialystok, 2013). Notably, this was the case even for highly proficient bilinguals.

There is further evidence for cross-linguistic influence at multiple levels, which is the foundation for Cook's theory of multi-competence (Cook, 2015; Cook, Bassetti, Kasai, Sasaki, & Takahashi, 2006). Although there was once thought to be a distinct difference between a person's L1 and any subsequently learned language, the bidirectional nature of cross-linguistic influence questions that difference.

Bilingual education is often insufficient for fully developing students' language capabilities. Bilingual programs may be too short, or based on unsupported ideas about
language learning. Psycholinguistic research in the field challenges these ideas, and indicates that a different perspective on language is needed to design effective educational programs. In the next chapter I will discuss these perspectives.
3 Theoretical Basis for Translingual Education

Currently, language education institutions treat languages as discrete systems. However, for the learner they are a single set of resources (García & Kleyn, 2016). In this chapter I will prove a theoretical grounding for translingual education. I will begin by looking at how globalisation revealed the problems with modernist ideas about language. I will also discuss how assessment and ideas about competence have been based on an imaginary standard that all native speakers use. I will describe the theoretical lenses needed to address all the issues of language education discussed in Chapters 1 and 2, both political and pedagogical.

3.1 Globalisation and Language

“The traditional concept of ‘language’ is dislodged and destabilized by globalization.”

(Blommaert, 2010, p. 2)

3.1.1 The monolingual orientation

18th-century Western European modernist ideas about language created what Canagarajah (2013) calls the monolingual orientation. Nation-states wanting to consolidate their power attempted to create a sense of unity through language. Monolingual nations were portrayed as “more natural, more desirable, more efficient and more productive” (García, 2009, p. 26) than they actually were. It was a self-perpetuating idea (Canagarajah, 2013) – England is the country that speaks English, English is the language of England. This notion, coupled with standardisation efforts by the state, has strengthened the monolingual orientation.

The monolingual orientation is prevalent in language education, even though multilingualism is the normal way of life for the majority of people (Edwards, 2009). Students are expected to use one language when constructing a text, reflecting the idea that different languages are distinct systems. These languages are bound to a particular place and people, and legitimate use is defined by the monolingual native speaker (García, 2009). Mainstream linguistics has also been conservative (Stephen May, 2013), ignoring the social context of language (Bailey, 2007).

3.1.2 Increased intensity of globalisation

Globalisation has affected how people live, work, and understand the world and there is widespread decentralisation and fragmentation (Pennycook, 1995). The past thirty years have seen a radical transformation in the spatial organisation of trade and financial networks and increased interdependencies between national governments and international agencies. Furthermore, there have been increases in the mobility of people (as tourists, migrants or representatives of business or government) and the flow of images and representations (Fairclough, 2006). This phenomenon preceded the late modern period (since the mid-1980s) but there has been a recent surge in its processes.
Modern technologies mean people are communicating more outside their language group in increasingly multimodal ways. Migration is no longer seen as a one-way trip as people migrate back and forth between countries (Castles, 2000). This increase in transnational contact means more and more places (both real and virtual) are becoming places of language contact. This migration has revealed how artificial the boundaries between languages and nations are (Bailey, 2007). Globalisation requires teachers and policy-makers to question the changing role of English in transnational workplaces, where it is used with speakers of other languages and varieties of English (Nunan, 2001). Some scholars believe the increased interdependence between groups of people requires competence in an international language, such as English (Yano, 2009). However, Kubota’s (2015) work with transnational workers found the language choices were based on capabilities of the workforce. In some situations, English was not necessary at all.

3.2 Poststructuralist Turn

Globalisation began over a century ago, but the late modern intensity of change led to a poststructuralist paradigm shift for scholars of sociolinguistics. Increasingly, the notion of discrete languages became inadequate for describing the actual language practices of people, particularly those in language contact areas (Bailey, 2007; Blommaert, 2010; Canagarajah, 2013; Pennycook, 2003, 2010). These language practices are constantly adjusting to their modern environment (García, 2009). According to this approach a synchronic picture of language will always be incomplete. The meanings of language forms are not essential properties. Instead, they index past usages and associations (Bailey, 2007; Blommaert, 2010). The illusion of a stable system of language is created by the sedimentation of frequently used forms (Pennycook, 2003).

This idea was also the foundation of Bailey’s (2007) heteroglossia, which views the distinctions between language as strictly a socially constructed phenomenon. According to Bailey, acknowledging this fact will not change subjective experiences of bilingualism, but it will change the perception that bilingualism is based on inherent linguistic differences. The whole concept of language originates in Western cultural and linguistic assumptions, invented as part of nation-building and colonial expansion (Makoni & Pennycook, 2007). Although languages are convenient fictions for describing the world, they perpetuate a limiting world view that has very real effects. According to poststructuralists, codeswitching is not using two languages in the same sentence but as the construction of meaning through the indexing of social histories. Bilinguals are not speakers of two (or more) languages, but instead possess one integrated linguistic repertoire. To contrast with the idea of heteroglossia, I will refer to the idea of discrete languages as monoglossic following García (2009).

3.2.1 Part of the linguistic repertoire: pragmatic skills

One important aspect of this repertoire is pragmatic skills, specifically the ability to communicate without the need for uniform languages. In communication situations, speakers aim for ‘alignment’, each adjusting their speech in deference to the other
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(Canagarajah, 2007, 2013). These pragmatic skills are ignored, or even discouraged in monolingual educational institutions. They are essential for communication in today’s globalised world, where areas of language contact are spreading and shifting. They are also the norm in South Asia.

Canagarajah (2013) contrasted Western European monolingual ideals with the complex linguistic practices in South Asia. Community is based around a shared place, not a shared language and culture. When South Asians wish to communicate, they cannot assume the other person will share their set of language conventions. Grammatical norms emerge during communication. Meaning is constructed collaboratively and speakers must be alert and other-centred. In these linguistically diverse places, ideas such as ‘mother tongue’ and ‘language purity’ are irrelevant. Language is viewed as a resource for communication rather than a badge of nationality. Much like Blommaert’s (2010) description of migrant linguistic repertoires, people in South Asia may know only ‘bits’ of languages. People are not expected to become fully competent in all their languages, only as much as they need to express meaning.

3.3 Implications for Notions of Competence

The practices in these language zones might require negotiation, but they are far from equal. Prestige varieties of language are valid in many situations, but a vernacular may have very limited currency. This reflects what Silverstein (1996) calls ‘speech communities’, which have norms for interaction through language, without requiring everyone to speak the same language. In contrast ‘linguistic communities’ classify people through language, believing there to be a “best” way to use the language. In these communities, monolingualism is the norm and language testing is prominent.

However, no one learns all of a language, even their native one. People might only know bits of language for very specific situations, called ‘truncated repertoires’ by Blommaert (2010). Unfortunately, language tests do not account for this. They rarely consider the fact that bilinguals may allocate their linguistic resources to different social functions (Grosjean, 2008). Educational institutions often impose their strict, exclusive views of language onto migrant or language minority children. The children can resist attempts to position them as language-less and deficient but, as Blommaert’s analysis of immigrant children’s writing shows, understanding how they do this requires a deeper understanding of languages than the monolingual orientation allows.

3.3.1 The native speaker myth

The superiority of native speakers was criticised through the work of mainly non-native scholars. Kachru (1992) outlined that members of the ‘outer circle’ countries (where English is used intranationally) do not always desire to adhere to native speaker norms. Research into World Englishes and English as lingua franca has made it unclear exactly what native speakers were native speakers of (Pennycook, 2012a). Particularly for highly multilingual societies, determining a person’s mother tongue can be impossible, especially since the definition has varied over the past century. Furthermore, people often speak several versions of their mother tongue (Piccardo, 2013).
Although the World Englishes movement did much to legitimise less privileged forms of English, it still assumed that national borders and the languages within them are real and discrete. Because of this, it failed to describe the complexities of language use within a country, such as those between urban and rural speakers. (Pennycook, 2003). This has also been a central problem in the notion of English as a lingua franca or international language. This area of scholarship often assumes some impossible politically neutral form of English will emerge, dissolving the current divide between native and non-native speakers. All that will matter is how proficient a speaker is, not their country of origin (Yano, 2009). Everyone will need to acquire the pragmatic competencies monolingual speakers of English often ignore and the global varieties of English will homogenise. These views cannot explain the diversity of how English speakers use the language (Pennycook, 2009).

3.4 Implications for Language Teaching

The language teaching profession has been deeply rooted in modernism and is now undergoing a major shift (Kramsch, 2014). One shift is from the native speaker fallacy, which is the idea that the best teachers of English are native speakers (Phillipson, 1992). This idea is still upheld in many language teaching institutions. It has been linked to the Chomskyan idea of a standard form used perfectly by all native speakers (Canagarajah, 1999). Some scholars have argued for differentiated goals and roles for native and non-native teachers (Cook, 1999; Medgyes, 1992, 2001). Nevertheless, there remains a privileged standard which students need to capitalise on education and employment opportunities. Kramsch (2014) suggested that teaching the standard can be useful, but pretending everyone speaks that way all of the time is not.

How we use language has changed, but more significant is the shift in how we understand language. Language teachers are struggling to address the challenges that globalisation has presented to what were once trusted ideas about teaching. How to transform noble ideas into actual transformative practices is something all teachers must grapple with. Languages are always in flux, and the demands on the modern global citizen come from many directions. Eventually, students leave language classrooms to venture into the wide world. A critical approach to language teaching will help them to adapt to and resist these demands (Canagarajah, 2013).

3.5 The Hegemony of English

“Whereas once Britannia ruled the waves, now it is English which rules them.”

(Phillipson, 1992, p. 1)

A critical approach to teaching languages requires an understanding of the relationship between language and power. In this section, I will show that language is deeply political. Educational institutions contribute to the power struggles of wider society, perpetuating ideological power through discourse practices (Auerbach, 1995). Often, knowledge is portrayed as neutral, apolitical. Students are not encouraged to question the knowledge they are taught, merely assimilate it. Language teaching in particular
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needs to question the role of power relations in the classroom, as language is an essential part of how we understand ourselves and the world (Pennycook, 1995). I will focus on English, as it is the dominant language in the contexts of this report. Many governments worldwide also see this as valuable. They invest large amounts of resources, often to the detriment of other parts of the curriculum (Nunan, 2003). English has its roots in colonialism, as we have seen all languages do, and as the language of colonising nations.

3.5.1 Linguistic imperialism
The monolingual orientation has played a part in reinforcing the hegemony of English. This view portrays dominated languages as baggage to be discarded on the road to mastery of English. In his famous outline of linguistic imperialism, Phillipson (1992) describes how the English teaching profession contributes to shoring up the political power of English. This power is then used to reinforce the dominant ideas as implicit truths, such as that English is best taught monolingually by native speakers. This self-perpetuating power is one of the reasons English has reached further and deeper across the world than any other lingua franca before it. Power disparity is a persistent feature of colonial language contact. Colonial languages like English are made more powerful by their monolingualism, imposing themselves on conquered languages (Canagarajah, 2013).

According to Phillipson, English has been spread by Anglo-Americans, ignorant of the multilingual nature of most people in the world. They have benefited politically and economically. By 2020, it is predicted that international students will bring in £21.5 billion annually to the UK, £3 billion of which will be the English language education sector (British Council, 2013b). The U.S. figures are similar (NAFSA: Association of International Educators, n.d.). In Australia, international education is also a billion-dollar industry, and the third-largest export (Deloitte Access Economics, 2013). The number of speakers of English increased tenfold over the 20th century. Although the incredible scale of English’s spread was not problematic, the view that it spread naturally is (Pennycook, 1995).

3.5.2 Critiques of linguistic imperialism
Blommaert (2010) critiqued Phillipson’s linguistic imperialism as perpetuating the modernist chaining of language to a single place and culture. He describes this area of scholarship as “a discourse of strict locality” (p.44). Not all scholars see the introduction of new languages as a sinister phenomenon. Pennycook and Makoni’s (2007) account of how languages were invented called into question the notion of language endangerment. They and Blommaert (2010) noted that people sometimes use language shift as a tool to access employment and educational opportunities.

Pennycook (2003) noted that linguistic imperialism points to the problematic aspects of English’s dominance, but could not explain local appropriations of English. He showed how globalisation did not entail homogenisation through a study of how English was taken up by Japanese hip hop artists. This was not as an expression of their ‘international’ or ‘Japanese’ identities, as the very notion of pre-given identities could
not explain their language practices. There is a dynamic tension in power struggles. Social systems may have a significant impact on the people’s lives, but they also have the capacity to resist (Tollefson, 1995). These critiques of linguistic imperialism do not negate its description of the political structures supporting the spread of English, but show that Phillipson’s ideas do not always hold up on a local scale.

3.5.3 Critiques of language ecology

According to a related idea of language ecology, a non-local language is an invader that disturbs the ecological balance and endangers languages. Crawford (2001) also had problems with attempts to align language with the ecology of natural species. According to this idea, some languages are fitter or more ‘developed’ than others, and so survive better. This comparison is not accurate as languages have no genes, so their survival is purely determined by social forces. Crawford, however; still had a problem with the loss of languages from a position of social justice, claiming the human cost of language loss was worth the effort to prevent it.

This assessment of language ecology likewise does not entail that language shift is acceptable, particularly for the minority communities for whom language shift means language death. Immigrant communities universally experience language shift, in part because their bilingualism is rarely maintained through state education (Eisenchlas et al., 2013; Lo Bianco & Slaughter, 2009). Language shift is related to the idea of subtractive bilingualism – students whose home language was not valued or taught in schools. This subtractive bilingualism is often imposed on new immigrants from a different culture and indigenous minorities, which has led to the establishment of heritage language programs (Stephen May, Hill, & Tiakiwai, 2004). However, as discussed in Chapter 2 these heritage language programs have had varied levels of success (Hill, 2017; McIvor & McCarty, 2017). This was linked with the large commitment required from the parents, who are often concerned bilingual education will interfere with English language development.

3.6 What A Critical Approach to Language Teaching Looks Like

“Access to power in the United States is often granted through knowledge of the English language.”

(Zimmerman, 2010, p. 18)

Pedagogical choices are not apolitical and education is a conservative field. There is a gap between academic theory and educational policy. This is because of the prevalence of positivism in language planning and learning, a prevailing problem in educational theory (Pennycook, 1995). Kanno (2003) stated that educational institutions do not adapt to the needs of students, instead expecting the students to adapt. Edwards (1994) also stated that schools rarely make many changes to accommodate classroom heterogeneity. This has implications outside of the classroom, as the school is often a powerful extension of state power that reflects wider social contexts. Thus, the school context can become a place to begin transformative work. We need to question what
knowledge is subjugated in dominant discourses and construct “counter-discourses” (Pennycook, 1995).

3.6.1 A focus on the learner
A learner-centred approach relates learning to students’ lives outside the classroom (Nunan, 2013, 2015). Cummins’ (2000) transformative pedagogy begins from the students’ experiences and focuses on social change through collaborative critical inquiry. This collaboration was the key to creating an alternate power structure to that of wider society. A Freirean social justice approach means collaborating with students for transformative purposes, allowing students to write and rewrite the world using their unique voices. Freire (2000) made critique the centre of education, which has remained the foundation of critical pedagogies (Luke, 2012). Critical literacy is a practical, transformative approach that uses communication media to analyse the norms governing the social fields of everyday life (Luke, 2004, 2012). Successful implementations of this approach can allow marginalised students to use their outsider insights to critically deconstruct a text (Janks, 2008). This approach recognises that language is not a neutral tool for communication.

3.6.2 A focus on social change
School language policies are intimately related to the inequalities of social opportunity (Lo Bianco & Aliani, 2013). Schools are ideological institutions and their position towards minority languages can grant legitimacy and recognition (Fishman, 1997). The use of language in schools is built on the inequalities of the speaker’s social position. A flexible policy towards language use opens these power relations to discussion (García et al., 2017). Bilingualism has historically been treated as a problem and associated with poverty and powerlessness. English language teaching was portrayed as the solution (Phillipson, 1992). However, poverty is a complex problem which cannot be solved by English alone (Hakuta, 1999). On the other hand, encouraging bilingualism in disadvantaged groups can challenge the notion of the elite speaker of foreign languages. Teachers must resist these inequalities, and offer alternatives rather than accepting curricula as “timeless truths” (Pennycook, 2001).

3.7 Language and Power: Why Critical Pedagogy Is Necessary
A critical approach to language teaching is fundamentally social. It centres on the learner and creates a collaborative space for them to analyse their own experiences. Researchers in language teaching who do not adopt a critical approach stress the importance of using the target language as much as possible (Littlewood & Yu, 2011; Turnbull & Arnett, 2002) to demonstrate its usefulness and thus motivate students to learn it. They assert that the home language must be used “judiciously” (Turnbull, 2001, p. 533). This approach ignores the political and social aspects of language use.

3.7.1 Assessment
One of the most difficult areas to transform from modernist ideas about language is assessment. The challenge for the formal education system is how to appropriately assess learners’ truncated repertoires. As Blommaert (2010) described with the
language of immigrant schoolchildren, their language practices require more effort to understand but it is not impossible. Language tests have status in society, this power causes people to change their behaviour so to succeed on them. All test constructs embody social values (McNamara, 2012). A critical approach to language testing can reveal the hidden agendas of the test makers (Shohamy, 2001, 2017). One example given by McNamara (2012) is that of Australian universities different treatments of scores on language exams. They give higher scores to non-native speakers of a language, privileging the dominant monolingual portion of the population. Without a critical approach, teachers will miss opportunities to reveal and transform inequalities like this.

Clearly, the language teaching needs to better address the new understandings of language practices, particularly the pragmatic aspects of communication. However, it is not enough to merely add ‘pragmatic competence’ to the list of criteria required to ‘speak’ a language. Language is inherently political. People are capable of subverting tools being used to oppress them, and critical approach can be a way to address this in the English language classroom. However, this requires teachers to question the very goal of English language education. Bilingual approaches to language education ultimately aim for equal levels of competence in both languages. This is why a translingual approach is required.

In this chapter, I have discussed how perspectives on language have changed in response to increasingly visible fluid language practices. These ideas about language are important to educators, as they challenge the standard which is taught to students. They also reveal the importance of pragmatic skills to the goal of creating successful communicators. I also reviewed debates about the global role of English. Although there is not consensus about whether the spread of English is problematic or not, there is a clear link between language and power. Educators can adopt a critical stance to challenge how these power relations impact their classroom, particularly through formal assessment.
4 Translingual Classrooms of Today

4.1 Methods

To better illustrate the translingual model of language education, I will focus on current classrooms in English-speaking countries. There are more accounts of translingual pedagogies published, for example (Carstens, 2016; Mazak & Herbas-Donoso, 2015) but I chose to focus on countries with similar language education contexts. I performed a literature review of four published examples through the theoretical lenses described in Chapter 3. They were selected to provide snapshots across countries, levels of schooling and social contexts.

4.1.1 Literature selection

To answer the research questions, I focused my search on published scholarly texts containing a few terms: translanguaging or translingual with pedagogy or education. These two terms were the most prevalent in the region of focus. I determined this by comparing the number of search results on Google Scholar. Using my university’s multi-database search tool, I compiled a shortlist of texts to include. The final choices were made based on the following criteria:

- The focus was on the pedagogy, rather than the language practices and the author gave extensive description of the pedagogical rationale. This was necessary to achieve the aim of providing a guide for teachers.
- It included some direct or reported feedback from the students. This was to understand how they were supported by the teacher’s translingual approach.

4.1.2 Literature Interpretation

My first level of interpretation was through the research questions. I attempted to answer them through each text individually, and then the literature as a whole. Next, I examined the critical pedagogy aspects of each classroom and whether the teacher was attempting or supporting any transformative work.

4.2 Context of Analysis: Translingual Classrooms

4.2.1 Learning through rap

A primary heritage language class (majority and minority students)

Moriarty (2016) described the translanguaging strategy of a primary school teacher teaching Irish to her multilingual class. Despite efforts of the educational system Irish is rarely used outside of classrooms. To encourage the pupils to develop their oral proficiency, students composed and performed a rap (mostly in Irish) on a topic of their choice. In contrast with Irish lessons prior to the rap unit, the students were active in their work and spontaneously translanguaged during the composition process. Multilingual pupils could and did use their home languages. Interestingly, the teacher positioned herself as the curator of Irish language and yet her translanguaging lesson opposes the idea of Irish as an artefact to be preserved. The Irish learners performed
their rap for their families, helping to dispel the stigma that Irish was a waste of class time.

4.2.2 Learning through translation.

A university writing class (minority students)
The second example is from another English class, this one specifically for English language learners in Australian university context. Heugh and her colleagues (2017; X. Li et al., 2016) expanded students’ linguistic repertoires (English, home language and additional languages) through translation writing tasks. The class was student-directed and based on an iterative writing process. The aim was for students to scaffold their own language learning and develop the critical metalinguistic skills they would need in their mainstream classes. Although students were encouraged to use translanguaging during the drafting and notetaking stages, the final product was a monolingual text. The teacher of this class observed students engaged in more critical thinking, peer-to-peer learning and were more involved in the class.

4.2.3 Learning through the home language

A secondary English class (majority and minority students)
The next example is taken from Translanguaging with Multilingual Students (García, 2016) and describes a lesson from an 8th-grade English Language Arts class in the U.S. The researcher and teacher described a lesson aligned with the Common Core standards which allowed the entire class of mostly multilingual students to access the text (Ebe & Chapman-Santiago, 2016). Through online translation software and their peers, students of varying English abilities could read and analyse a multilingual free verse narrative before drafting their own writing. The text was notable for being culturally relevant, an immigration story many of the students could relate to. The theme of the poem was universally accessible, allowing the students to feel their culture and language practices was affirmed in school. The language majority students in the class reacted positively to the classroom environment, enjoying the chance to enrich their cultural knowledge. The teacher used translanguaging to forge connections with the home. The 8th-graders were encouraged to get feedback and input from their family members.

4.2.4 Learning through codemeshing

A university writing class (majority and minority students)
Canagarajah’s (Canagarajah, 2011, 2013) description of codemeshing, translanguaging in writing, is one of the most widely cited examples of a translingual pedagogy. He focused on the writing of a Saudi Arabian student, Buthainah, in his writing class at a university in the US. The project required Buthainah to write a linguistic autobiography, a student-directed task that involved multiple drafts based on peer and teacher feedback. Canagarajah used the evolution of these drafts and Buthainah’s self-reflections to assess her for critical, creative and consistent choices in writing. The focus was on developing rhetorical strategies. Students demonstrated their competence with standard academic English, whilst simultaneously challenging the definition of that standard. This required Canagarajah to adopt a dialogic pedagogy, with open interactions among students and teachers.
4.3 Analysis: How A Translingual Pedagogy Creates Resourceful Speakers

Encouraging an ‘alignment’ stance
For the purposes of this analysis, I thought of alignment as an attitude rather than the skill. In the codemeshing example, Buthainah was encouraged to explore unconventional ways of expressing meaning in an academic context, such as mixing languages. This challenged both her and the other students’ expectations about communication. It is likely that Canagarajah has more control over assessment than teachers in compulsory schooling contexts. Even in such a restricted setting, Chapman-Santiago promoted the idea that her students “will have many encounters with people from all walks of life” (p. 80) and therefore no one should expect shared language norms.

In all these examples, students were encouraged to disregard the conventional divide between languages. Teachers can use translation to show that languages are not separate (Creese & Blackledge, 2010), as teachers in this analysis did. This was extended when students were not restricted to monolingual performance assessment. As students learn that the boundaries between languages are arbitrary, they can choose to conform or push those boundaries for rhetorical purposes.

4.3.1 Developing critical metalinguistic skills
The students’ metalinguistic abilities were developed through translation and the fluid use of languages. An awareness that there are multiple ways to express one idea reinforced this. In Chapman-Santiago’s classroom, this was strengthened through the classroom environment. For example, her use of translation in classroom materials and a multilingual word wall. However, the critical approach to language use was much less evident. This was noticeably missing from the 8th-grade class where the teacher stated that her minority students do not perform well on standardised tests. Criticality was also absent from Heugh et al.’s approach, even though their class consisted entirely of minority students. Only the very advanced English student, Buthainah, was able to challenge the educational system and attitudes that positioned her as deficient.

It is probable this was because of clashes with formal assessments, which are designed to measure one language at a time. Inevitably students must master a standard based on monolingual speakers to succeed. The teacher of Irish was worried about whether her students would meet achievement standards. The 8th-graders will also have to move into producing strictly monolingual texts as they advance through the school system.

4.3.2 Supporting language minority students
The teachers in this analysis all positioned multilingualism as a benefit, and made space for all their students’ languages. Students were not only allowed, but encouraged to build on their existing language resources rather than ignore them. The students in the Australian university specifically spoke of their experiences being silenced in other classrooms, where their home language was forbidden even in the early stages of projects. Chapman-Santiago framed her students’ multilingualism as an asset. She allowed them to use their home languages both in language-group discussions and class
discussions. In the Irish classroom, the language minority students were also excited by the chance to use their home languages.

**4.3.3 Support language majority students**
The language majority students expanded their understandings of language and culture. In the 8th-grade classroom, the monolingual students were the minority and yet they appreciated the opportunity to broaden their knowledge of other cultures, languages and religions. This is evidenced by their responses to their classmates’ translinguaging. Buthainah’s peers felt drawn to her writing and adopted heteroglossic positions to her text. The translingual approach also made students in the Irish classroom feel comfortable. The shyer students gained the confidence to speak in Irish. Prior to the translinguaging unit, many of the students viewed the language as useless, reflecting community sentiment. The translingual approach had a marked change in attitude towards Irish, but also languages and the idea of ‘correctness’.

**4.4 Findings**
Work has also been done to look at how teachers can adopt translinguaging, even in places with language separation policies (Palmer et al., 2014). These four teachers have found also ways to bring translinguaging into monolingual education systems. However, only Canagarajah explicitly encouraged his students to take a critical stance. There are questions about students’ agency to subvert the norms and practices of educational institutions that view languages as resources for future employers to exploit (Marshall & Moore, 2016). This position ignores the value that criticality brings an individual. It is a tool that can be used to express their voice and their position in the world. Using language fluidly is a natural state of the multilingual classroom, but in itself will not push students to shed monoglossic views. Teachers need to ask students to view language “not so much in terms of system as in terms of practice, as something we do,” (Pennycook, 2012b, p. 12)

**4.4.1 Limitations**
The main limitation of my approach was the inconsistent ways the four texts presented their data. It was difficult to find four samples that met all the criteria and so the sample size is small. In some texts, what the author labelled translingual or translinguaging pedagogies did not contain evidence matching the literature. Furthermore, the majority of literature that I screened had limited evaluation from the students’ perspectives. This is a consistent problem in educational research (Kanno, 2003). A final problem is that I approached the concept of ‘alignment’ as a stance, that is, an attitude to language practices. Alignment could also be thought of as a skill, which would require a different approach to build.
5 Creating Resourceful Speakers

There is no a one-size-fits-all answer to the problems in language education (Genesee, Lindholm-Leary, & Christian, 2005). In this chapter, I will discuss how my report builds on previous research. First, I will examine some recent discussions about whether a heteroglossic approach is necessary in language education. The teachers in my analysis did not encourage their students’ criticality, for the most part. I will discuss some of the challenges to adopting this approach. Finally, I will outline how teachers can address the various issues raised in this report.

5.1 Discussion

“Bilinguals are not double monolinguals.”

(García, 2009, p. 48)

5.1.1 Heteroglossia in language teaching

Even though the concept of ‘language’ lacks a linguistic reality, it has a social reality. Cummins (2017) stated that the arbitrariness of language boundaries is not reason enough to do away with them. Cummins’ views on this are understandable – language testing, particularly on a national scale, would be difficult to implement. If minority languages can be named, they can be protected. However, this approach can hamper minority language revitalisation programs. They become efforts to resurrect dead language practices rather than acknowledging the vitality of a language as it is taken up by a new generation of speakers. An alternative approach means language teachers use or critique language boundaries depending on the situation. They can teach students to understand the invented aspects of language, and question the political inequalities between various languages and ways of speaking. This idea is what García & Lin (2017) called strong and weak translanguaging, which frames the necessary use of named languages as problematic. The teachers in my analysis were all able to adopt translingual pedagogies which challenged the boundaries between languages. This demonstrates it is possible and useful to adopt a heteroglossic approach.

5.1.2 Critical language teaching

The idea of double monolinguals was coined to describe expectations for language learning based on the native speaker. However, learners rarely achieve native-like proficiency and it is incorrect to assume that should be the goal of all learners (Cook, 2001; García, 2009). A person’s language skill levels often rise and fall over their lifetime. Barring periods of language learning, people are as bilingual as their environment demands (Grosjean, 2008). Learners may not need to be competent in all different domains or social levels of a language – they can develop the competencies they need (Edwards, 1994). Expecting students to become double monolinguals not only creates unrealistic expectations and a sense of failure in those that cannot reach that level (Genesee & Cenoz, 1998).
A curriculum that can accommodate this would have to be based on the students’ lives outside of class, and involve the students in decisions about learning. However, learner-centred curriculums are more demanding on the teachers, who must learn new skills (Nunan, 2013). Teachers would require support to mediate between the students and the curriculum. The current political climate also means formal education and university entrance will remain monoglossic for the time being (Pennycook, 2012b). Teachers in school settings cannot ignore the demands of formal language assessments. However, assessment is a fundamentally social activity and it should be critically evaluated to determine the political context (McNamara, 2012; Shohamy, 2001, 2017). Even if teachers must assess students in one language, they can encourage a critical approach to the monoglossic practices of educational institutions. Children already do this. In Li Wei and Wu’s (2009) study of British Chinese children, they found the children used translanguaging to challenge the traditional Chinese teaching style they found irrelevant. A critical, transformative approach will begin change from the ground up.

5.1.3 Neoliberalism
There has been some debate in the literature about the link between neoliberal ideologies and language education. Neoliberalism serves the market economy, and refers to the idea that individuals should be enterprising and adapt themselves for the job market (Canagarajah, 2017). In many contexts bilingualism is upheld because of its market value (Heller, 2002) and this is often used by its advocates to sway policy makers. For example, (McPake, Tinsley, & James, 2007) describe the benefits of a linguistically diverse society to promote investment in formal bilingual education. Kubota (2015) attacked this ideology, and linked it to the myth that ideal language use means mastery of the NS standard through monolingual instruction, Instead she suggested that people obtain functional repertoires, based on the demands of the workplace. A critical approach to language teaching can raise awareness of these issues, as resourceful speakers know when it is appropriate to speak the standard (Canagarajah, 2017).

5.2 Recommendations for Language Teachers

5.2.1 How to build resourceful speakers
Curricula should be designed to teach students how to master negotiating communication situations rather than some “correct” form of the standard. Teachers should build bridges between students’ existing linguistic repertoires and those desired in formal educational settings (Flores & Schissel, 2014). This approach focuses on helping students to “shuttle” between communities (Canagarajah, 2007) rather than attempting to join a closed community of native speakers. According to Pennycook (Pennycook, 2012a) we should replace the native speaker standard with locally accepted language practices. The generic standard should only be taught as a preliminary way to access the language, a base for later local learning.
5.2.2 How to do the critical
First, learners should master the linguistic code well enough to assume responsibility for their linguistic choices and respond to other’s choices (Kramsch, 2014). We need to reflect on language and language use, and return to using translation. My research shows examples of the pedagogical approaches such as translation, using translingual texts, allowing translingual assessment. However, the most important aspect is modelling new critical positions towards language to build an alignment stance. Teachers can do this by adopting collaborative pedagogies where teachers position themselves as language learners also (Canagarajah, 2013; Flores & Schissel, 2014). This can open discussions about how language forms have socially-contingent meanings (Kramsch, 2014).
Conclusion

This report proposes a preliminary, bottom-up guide of how translingual education can build resourceful speakers in Western English-speaking countries. Ten years ago García (2007, p. xii) asked “What would language education look like if we no longer posited the existence of separate languages?”. In this report, I have begun the work of answering that question.

To return to my research questions, I first showed how a translingual approach creates resourceful speakers. It does this by incorporating poststructuralist views on language into learning. An alignment attitude can be encouraged by allowing students to use their language in the classroom, even if it is not understood by everyone. Teachers can encourage their students to view the boundaries between languages as permeable, and to experiment with unconventional language use. This view positions the students to master and then challenge the standard form of a language. Second, this report revealed that language minority students are motivated and supported by the translingual approach. They can access the majority language, and feel their home language is valuable. Finally, I found that language majority students also benefited from this approach. In the English classes, they expressed positive attitudes towards translingual education. The research indicated a translingual approach allows both language minority and majority students to escape the feeling of being silenced.

Language teaching has been a modernist profession. The poor academic achievement of English language learners, failures to create the desired bilingual workforces, and sociolinguistic research have shifted the field out of modernism. The shortcomings of monolingual education show that language teachers need to adopt a transformative position. This will change the idea that English language learners are a problem to be dealt with. Bilingual education was reframed from a remedy for the problem of bilingualism or a privilege of the wealthy. Advocates have pushed for all children to have a right to bilingual education. However, this approach ignores the fact that language is fluid, and changes with each generation. Teachers need to adopt a translingual approach to language teaching. This is beginning in classrooms already, as this report demonstrates. Teachers are modelling and encouraging new attitudes towards languages. Assessment and curricula to match the linguistic realities of multilingualism will take time to design. However, teachers can begin the work from their own classrooms. Some teachers might see the work of adopting a translingual mindset as trivial, and the goal of creating resourceful speakers as too lofty. Although it is true that educational policy changes are slow, they cannot be built without a good theoretical foundation. Change from the ground up will provide the empirical evidence policymakers need.

The analysis in this report is based on secondary data from Western English-speaking countries. Further research is needed to understand how translingual education will look like in a variety of contexts. This approach requires teachers to ask questions, but the goal is an important one. Learners will have a language education that adapts to
their language goals and resources, rather than expecting them to fit pre-existing forms of language.

I only wish I had questioned the limiting language policies of my former employer. There is one particularly inefficient interaction I recall at the end of one young girl’s first lesson with Berlitz. Although she had dutifully followed the English-only rule, she asked a few questions about her homework in Japanese as the lesson was ending. I, being a loyal employee, stuck to the rule and answered her in English. To her final question, “日本語わかるの？” (Do you understand Japanese?), I shook my head and replied with a lie. I wanted to discourage her from the bad habit of using Japanese. I don’t particularly regret this pedagogical choice, even though I now believe it was the wrong one. I do regret making it uncritically. Language teachers must consider more than the classroom.
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Appendix A: Glossary

**Bilingual**
The use of two languages by a person or community. Dynamic bilingualism refers to the fluid use of these two languages.

**Heteroglossia**
The presence of two or more languages in any linguistic field, such as a text, specific conversation or a language curriculum.

**Metrolingualism**
The fluid use of language by urban people, used to construct new identities.

**Monoglossia**
A situation where a homogenous standard dominates a culture. This is linked with a ruling class trying to maintain their privileged position.

**Multilingual**
The use of two or more languages by an individual or community of speakers.

**Plurilingual**
The fluid use of two or more languages by an individual. In contrast with the term 'multilingual', this term generally focuses on the individual rather than the social use of multiple languages.

**Poststructuralism**
In the field of sociolinguistics, poststructuralism posits that language plays a crucial role in the perpetuation of social inequalities. This is understood by a reflective approach to the analysis of language and society in contemporary, globalized contexts.

**Translanguaging**
The fluid, critical use of two or more languages. Also refers to pedagogical practices which incorporate this fluidity and criticality into language learning.

**Translingual**
Refers to an individuals’ movement or “shuttling” between different languages, in order to align their language with their interlocutor.