

Teaching Minoritized Students: Are Additive Approaches Legitimate?

JIM CUMMINS

University of Toronto and Åbo Akademi University, Finland

The emergence in recent years of heteroglossic conceptions of bi/multilingualism and the related construct of translanguaging has raised questions about how these notions relate to more traditional conceptions of additive bilingualism, biliteracy, and the overall academic achievement of minoritized students. In this article, Jim Cummins provides a critical examination of both additive bilingualism and additive approaches to language education to clarify the nature of these constructs and to elucidate their instructional implications. He proposes a synthesis of perspectives that replaces the term additive bilingualism with active bilingualism, that acknowledges the dynamic nature of bilingual and multilingual language practices and the instructional implications of this conceptualization, and that insists that education initiatives designed to promote academic achievement among minoritized students can claim empirical legitimacy only when they explicitly challenge raciolinguistic ideologies and, more generally, coercive relations of power.

Keywords: additive bilingualism, bilingual education, literacy, racism, translanguaging

There has been considerable debate about the most effective ways of promoting education achievement among language minority students (e.g., Takaniishi & Le Menestrel, 2017). Many researchers have argued that schools should support students in developing language and literacy skills in their home language in addition to the major school language (e.g., Bartlett & García, 2011; Cummins, 1986; May, 2011). The process and outcomes of this instructional orientation have frequently been referred to as *additive bilingualism*, where students add a second language (L2) while continuing to develop academic skills in their home language (L1). However, the construct of “additive bilingualism” has been problematized by García (2009), who argues that it represents a theoretical framework in which bilingualism is positioned as two separate, isolated languages rather than as an integrated linguistic system. According to García, the functional compartmentalization of the bilingual’s two languages

implied by the construct of additive bilingualism suggests that these languages should be kept separate for instructional purposes within bilingual programs. This “two solitudes” approach (Cummins, 2007) implies that the languages are taught in isolation from each other with no code-switching or translation between languages by either teachers or students. In opposition to conceptualizations of bilingualism as the sum of two monolingualisms, García (2009) presents the construct of translanguaging as both a description of the dynamic integrated linguistic practices of bilingual and multilingual students and a pedagogical approach to build biliteracy skills on the foundation of these linguistic practices.

More recently, Flores and Rosa (2015) have built on García’s (2009) critique of additive bilingualism to argue that not only is the construct of additive bilingualism flawed, but additive approaches to the education of bilingual students, Standard English learners, and heritage language learners (students raised in homes where a non-English language is spoken but who are not necessarily fluent in that language) are inherently problematic because discourses of linguistic appropriateness fueled by raciolinguistic ideologies lie at their core. For example, Standard English learners may be judged to suffer from linguistic deficits as a result of their use of nonconventional grammatical constructions; or the variety of the home language spoken by bilingual or heritage language students may be seen as inferior to the more formal, “literate” varieties of monolingual speakers of those languages. Flores and Rosa suggest that “additive approaches to bilingual education continue to interpret the linguistic practices of bilinguals through a monolingual framework that marginalizes the fluid linguistic practices of these communities” (p. 153).

In this article I argue that these conceptualizations of additive bilingualism load the construct with extraneous conceptual baggage that is not intrinsic to its basic meaning. Use of the term by researchers or educators does not imply endorsement of a two solitudes conceptualization of bilingual proficiency and bilingual instruction (Cummins, 2007). Furthermore, far from marginalizing bilingual students and communities, as Flores and Rosa (2015) claim, additive approaches to language education have explicitly challenged historical and current patterns of societal power relations that devalue, disparage, and exclude from schooling the language and cultural accomplishments and practices of minoritized communities.¹

I aim not simply to critique the arguments of García (2009) and Flores and Rosa (2015) but to build on the important insights these researchers have advanced regarding the nature of bilingualism and multilingualism and the operation of societal power relations in education contexts. These insights and their instructional applications are potentially undermined by their claims that both the construct of additive bilingualism and additive approaches to the education of minoritized students contribute to students’ marginalization and underachievement. Targeting these constructs is unnecessary because it adds nothing to their core arguments. Doing so also potentially undermines

the long-term efforts of educators who have challenged deficit orientations to minoritized students' language practices by implementing additive instructional approaches that promote biliteracy and/or continued development of students' home languages.²

I begin by examining how the constructs of additive and subtractive bilingualism have been defined and how they have been employed since the mid-1970s in policy discourse regarding the education of bilingual students. I then examine the case against additive bilingualism advanced by García (2009) (and Bartlett & García, 2011; García & Wei, 2014) and the claim made by Flores and Rosa (2015) that additive approaches to language education are permeated by raciolinguistic ideologies that further marginalize minoritized students. Finally, I propose a synthesis of perspectives that replaces the term *additive bilingualism* with the term *active bilingualism*; that endorses the legitimacy of dynamic heteroglossic conceptions of bi/multilingualism, or the understanding that languages are intertwined in complex ways in the minds of multilingual individuals, in ways that reinforce the importance of teaching for two-way transfer across languages; and that highlights the necessity for schools to challenge the operation of raciolinguistic ideologies, and societal power relations more broadly, as an essential condition for reversing patterns of underachievement among minoritized students.

Additive Bilingualism: Definition and Evolution of the Construct

The term *additive bilingualism* has been extensively used during the past forty years in research and policy documents related to language planning, second language teaching, and education of bilingual students. Introduced by Lambert (1974), the distinction between additive and subtractive bilingualism points to the contrasting forms of bilingualism that emerge under different societal and education conditions. The constructs are sometimes defined in terms of different types of bilingualism and sometimes in terms of the situations or conditions under which these forms of bilingualism develop. For example, Cummins (2001a) defines additive bilingualism as referring “to the form of bilingualism that results when students add a second language to their intellectual tool-kit while continuing to develop conceptually and academically in their first language” (p. 163). Baker and Prys Jones (1998) define the constructs in relation to the conditions of acquisition:

Additive Bilingualism: A situation where a second language is learnt by an individual or group without detracting from the maintenance and development of the first language. A situation where a second language adds to, rather than replaces the first language. (p. 698)

Subtractive Bilingualism: A situation in which a second language is learnt at the expense of the first language, and gradually replaces the first language (e.g. immigrants to a country or minority language pupils in submersion education). (p. 706)

With “submersion education,” Baker and Prys Jones (1998) refer to the common situation in which emergent bilingual students are instructed totally through the dominant school language (L2) with minimal effort on the part of the school to support or encourage students to develop their home language (L1).

Although the additive/subtractive distinction was originally formulated as a psycholinguistic construct, it rapidly evolved to intersect with issues of education equity and societal power relations (Cummins, 1986). Additive approaches to students’ language and culture (e.g., bilingual education programs) were proposed as a way of challenging L2-only submersion programs and the societal power structures they reflect. Elsewhere I have explicitly integrated the additive/subtractive distinction into a framework that identifies issues of education effectiveness as inseparable from the operation of societal power relations and their reflection in patterns of teacher-student identity negotiation (Cummins, 1986, 2001a, 2001b). I analyzed the (under)achievement of bilingual and minoritized students as a function of the extent to which schools reflect or, alternatively, challenge the power relations that exist in the wider society. In a societal context characterized by widespread ideological rejection of bilingual education and minoritized students’ bilingualism, I argued that the promotion of additive bilingualism within schools represents an explicit challenge to these essentially racist societal discourses and that an additive orientation does not require the actual teaching of the minority language: “Even within a monolingual school context, powerful messages can be communicated to students regarding the validity and advantages of language development” (Cummins, 1986, p. 26). In other words, I have argued that the construct of additive bilingualism is just as relevant to the education of the large majority of bilingual students in mainstream monolingual programs as it is to those in bilingual programs.

Yet, the institutional racism represented by subtractive orientations to minoritized students’ language and culture is still very much in evidence. It is common in many linguistically diverse school contexts for educators to reprimand or punish students for speaking their L1 within the school. In the examples that follow, I illustrate the pervasiveness of these discourses and the relevance of the additive/subtractive distinction not only in the United States but in education contexts around the world. For example, in a study of Turkish-background students in Flemish secondary schools, Agirdag (2010) reports:

Our data show that Dutch monolingualism is strongly imposed in three different ways: teachers and school staff strongly encourage the exclusive use of Dutch, bilingual students are formally punished for speaking their mother tongue, and their home languages are excluded from the cultural repertoire of the school. At the same time, prestigious languages such as English and French are highly valued. (p. 317)

In a more recent study, Pulinx, Van Avermaet, and Agirdag (2016) found that 77 percent of teachers in the Flemish-speaking regions of Belgium believe that immigrant-background students should not be permitted to speak their home languages at school, and almost a third of teachers agree that students should be punished for transgressing this rule. These beliefs reflect what Flores and Rosa (2015) term “raciolinguistic ideologies.” Similar beliefs and policies operate in the education systems of many postcolonial societies where the former colonial language is used as the medium of instruction (Obondo, 2008).

Bartlett and García (2011) describe the operation of these kinds of policies in the United States as reflecting “subtractive times,” which “are constituted by opposition to bilingual education, the intensification of education policies that undermine bilingual approaches and exclude newcomers from attaining diplomas, and track immigrant, working-class students largely into working-poor jobs” (p. 22). In their case study of a high school in New York City that explicitly set out to challenge this subtractive orientation by means of an additive approach, Bartlett and García describe additive schooling as “an approach that builds on and extends the social, cultural, and linguistic assets brought by multilingual, diverse student populations, and aims to prepare bicultural and bilingual students to negotiate their complex worlds” (pp. 21–22). Thus, despite their concerns with the construct of additive bilingualism, Bartlett and García, unlike Flores and Rosa (2015), have no difficulty endorsing an additive approach to the schooling of minoritized students.

In short, the construct of additive bilingualism has evolved from its psycholinguistic roots to reference a set of education practices and initiatives that challenge the operation of coercive power structures. These power structures have historically excluded minoritized students’ L1 from schooling with the goal of replacing it with the L2. Extensive research carried out within the context of the additive bilingualism construct has demonstrated that minoritized students’ L1 *can* be promoted through bilingual education programs at no cost to students’ academic development in the L2 (see August & Shanahan, 2006; Cummins, 2001a). The additive/subtractive distinction continues to be invoked by researchers, educators, and policy makers in language education contexts around the world, as illustrated in the following three examples.

The post-apartheid language-in-education policy adopted by the South African government in 1997 explicitly endorsed an additive bi/multilingualism goal in which schools were encouraged to support students’ home language development while they were learning the dominant language (English). The promotion of additive bi/multilingualism was conceived not only as a way of improving education achievement but also as a sociopolitical repudiation of the education policies of the racist apartheid regime. Unfortunately, however, as Plüddemann (2015) points out, the overt policy of additive bi/multilingualism has been subverted by a covert, replacive “straight for English” or “English-as-soon-as possible” orientation on the part of most schools. The continuation of subtractive approaches derives from the fact that many parents and educa-

tors view English as the language of economic success and assume (against all the evidence) that promotion of literacy skills in children's home languages will result in lower attainment in English (see Phillipson, 1992; Skutnabb-Kangas, 2000).

Another example of the pervasiveness of the construct of additive bilingualism comes from the New Zealand context. In critiquing the overwhelming monolingual bias in second language acquisition (SLA) and Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages (TESOL) research, May (2011) describes a professional development resource designed by the New Zealand Ministry of Education (2007) for teachers of Pasifika students.³ This resource, entitled *Language Enhancing the Achievement of Pasifika (LEAP)*, adopts an explicitly additive orientation to students' bilingualism, as evidenced in May's description:

A key theme throughout this section [Being Bilingual] is the importance of adopting an explicitly additive view of bilingual learners as the basis for their long-term educational success . . . Section 4 [Language and School] provides teachers with a wide range of SLA and TESOL principles and practices that [can] support language acquisition *and* use *within* an additive bilingual framework . . . LEAP thus provides a concrete exemplar of a major research informed, professional development resource that specifically incorporates an additive bilingual approach to the education of bilingual learners in English-medium contexts. (pp. 243–244)

May (2011) goes on to characterize this approach as a way of challenging, contesting, and disrupting “the subtractive bilingual orientation that still so permeates SLA and TESOL—a result of the ongoing dominance of cognitivist/psycholinguistic approaches to the discipline[s]” (p. 244). Canagarajah (2006) has likewise critiqued the dominant monolingual orientation in TESOL, arguing for teaching English “in a manner that complements rather than competes with local languages and local interests, leading to additive bilingualism” (p. 25).

In a later discussion of the “multilingual turn” in SLA and the additive orientation in the LEAP professional development resource, May (2014) notes that the construct of additive bilingualism has been criticized for inadvertently reinforcing a conception of languages, and their use by multilinguals, as distinct and compartmentalized. However, he points out that the notion of additive bilingualism “still presents a strikingly different basis for analyzing language learning than the monolingual norms, and related dismissal and/or subtractive views of bilingualism, found within mainstream SLA” (p. 9).

The final example comes from the longitudinal evaluation of an unusual Karen-English bilingual education program in Melbourne, Australia (Molyneux, Scull, & Aliani, 2016). The bilingual program focused on students from the Karen ethnic minority in Myanmar (formerly Burma) whose families were admitted to Australia on humanitarian refugee visas. The evaluation followed students from kindergarten through grade 2 and drew on a variety of data

(classroom observations, classroom-based assessment of progress in English and Karen, student self-assessments, teacher interviews, and parent questionnaires). What made this bilingual program unusual is the fact that less than half of the students in the program came from Karen language backgrounds. Approximately 24 percent came from English home backgrounds, while roughly 32 percent came from a variety of other language backgrounds. Two full days per week were allocated for Karen-medium instruction, with English-medium instruction occurring during the other three days of the school week. Instruction in each language took place in different classrooms, which allowed for the integrity of each language to be maintained. Molyneux and colleagues (2016) point out, however, that “while Karen was the clear focus of the Karen classroom (with English being similarly emphasized in the English language classroom), ‘the fuzziness of language boundaries’ (García, 2009, p. 157) was accommodated and recognized in teacher instruction and in opportunities for students to move in and out of the different languages when required” (p. 341).

The evaluation documented a variety of positive outcomes with respect to Karen and English language and literacy development, identity affirmation, and parental engagement for Karen-L1 students, English-L1 students, and students in the program who spoke other languages at home. Molyneux and colleagues (2016) summarized the outcomes:

While the levels of bilingualism and biliteracy for the students from English-speaking backgrounds were modest, the Karen EAL [English as an additional language] learners were key beneficiaries. Their home language, culture, and identity were supported and extended by this programme. However, in analysing the end-of-year programme results, the EAL students who were not Karen performed strongest as a cohort in this programme in both Karen and English. (pp. 353–354)

The authors attribute the strong performance of the students who came from other language backgrounds to the fact that these emergent *trilingual* students were able to tap into their reserves of metalinguistic awareness in ways that benefited their progress across both languages of instruction.

The relevance of this program in the present context is that Molyneux and colleagues (2016) repeatedly highlight its additive nature and its significance in challenging the hegemony of monolingual English instruction in the Australian context. They point out, for example, that the program was firmly underpinned by additive learning principles (p. 340) and that the additive nature of the bilingual program “broke the stranglehold that (English) monolingualism typically occupies in Australian schools” (p. 355). They see no contradiction in characterizing the program as additive while simultaneously acknowledging the dynamic interplay of languages in the lives and linguistic practices of emerging bilingual students. They note that the dynamic nature of bilingualism “has implications for additive bilingual programmes in that the

programmes should recognize the complex multilingualism of much of the world and refrain from seeing bilingual or dual language instruction as characterised by two bounded, autonomous systems” (p. 340).

In short, Molyneux and colleagues (2016) identify additive approaches to students’ bi/multilingualism as fully compatible with dynamic conceptions of bilingualism and not in any way locked into notions of bilingualism as two isolated, autonomous systems. Furthermore, they characterize the additive approach implemented in the Karen-English bilingual program as a repudiation of the monolingual ideologies characteristic of much EAL instruction in the Australian context. Clearly, their conception of additive approaches is very different than that of Flores and Rosa (2015), who claim that raciolinguistic ideologies and discourses of appropriateness permeate additive approaches to language education.

These international examples document how researchers and policy makers in diverse sociolinguistic contexts continue to employ the additive/subtractive distinction to frame education initiatives that promote dual language development and equitable school outcomes among minoritized students. However, both García (2009) and Flores and Rosa (2015) have called the legitimacy of this distinction into question.

Additive Bilingualism—Monoglossic or Heteroglossic?

Flores and Rosa (2015) provide a clear description of the distinction between monoglossic and heteroglossic language ideologies. They point out that in contrast to monoglossic language ideologies that treat monolingualism as the norm, heteroglossic ideologies position multilingualism as the norm and view languages as interacting in complex and dynamic ways in the linguistic practices and social relations of multilingual people. García (2009) argues that heteroglossic ideologies are exemplified in the construct of translanguaging, understood as both a description and affirmation of the linguistic practices of bi/multilinguals and bilingual instructional approaches that encourage students to use the totality of their linguistic resources in an integrated way rather than compartmentalizing these resources into separate linguistic silos.

Although the term *translanguaging* gained legitimacy primarily as a result of García’s (2009) detailed analysis, challenges to monoglossic orientations to bilingualism have been articulated by numerous scholars during the past twenty-five years (e.g., Cook, 1995; Grosjean, 1989; Herdina & Jessner, 2002). Common to these positions is the rejection of monolingualism as the norm and the conceptualization of multilingualism as a dynamically integrated system rather than a static accumulation of separate language skills. Researchers have also increasingly challenged monolingual instructional strategies both within bilingual programs and in mainstream programs that use the dominant language as a medium of instruction (Cenoz & Gorter, 2013; Chumak-Horbatsch, 2012; Creese & Blackledge, 2010; Cummins, 2007; Makalela, 2015).

García's (2009) rejection of monoglossic orientations to bilingualism and bilingual education led her also to reject categories such as first language and second language as "not in any way useful" (p. 53) since they are not actually distinct language systems. The argument that languages do not exist as discrete entities also led her to characterize the construct of additive bilingualism as a theoretical framework that conceptualizes biliteracy in terms of two single separate languages rather than as an integrated linguistic system. She also claims that additive bilingualism reflects a monoglossic ideology because it conceives of bilingualism as the addition of two separate languages (L1 + L2) and that this conception of bilingualism implies an instructional approach that keeps the bilingual's two languages rigidly separate.

I argue that García's analysis of additive bilingualism as a theoretical framework loads the construct with extraneous conceptual baggage that is not intrinsic to its basic meaning. This "extraneous conceptual baggage" is the assumption that the construct of additive bilingualism necessarily entails distinct language systems rather than functioning as an integrated system. The term itself emerged in opposition to the construct of subtractive bilingualism at a time when schools typically encouraged emergent bilingual students to *replace* their home languages with the dominant language of schooling. Within this discourse context, *additive bilingualism* challenged coercive relations of power by promoting instruction practices and policies that enabled students to develop their home languages rather than replace them with the dominant school language.

There is nothing sinister or problematic with this goal or with the construct that references this goal. There are many researchers who have invoked the notion of additive bilingualism as both a conceptual tool and an education goal while simultaneously endorsing constructs such as translanguaging and heteroglossic ideologies typical of dynamic models of bilingualism (Canagarajah, 2006, 2011; Cummins, 2007, 2017; May, 2011, 2014; Molyneux et al., 2016). In fact, numerous researchers have highlighted the interdependence of bilinguals' language repertoires, albeit before the full emergence of more dynamic conceptions of bilingualism. Conceptions of linguistic interdependence that incorporate both procedural and declarative knowledge—knowing how and knowing that—include common underlying proficiency (Cummins, 1981), common operating system (Baker, 2011), common underlying conceptual base (Kecskes & Papp, 2000), and common underlying reservoir of literacy abilities (Genesee, Lindholm-Leary, Saunders, & Christian, 2006). These conceptions of linguistic interdependence have highlighted the importance of teaching for transfer across languages in both bilingual and monolingual programs (e.g., Cummins, 2007).⁴

The problematic nature of loading the construct of additive bilingualism with extraneous conceptual baggage can be seen in the fact that the term is semantically empty outside of the discourse context of challenging subtractive orientations to minoritized students' bilingualism. Consider the semantic

equivalence of the following two sentences that a teacher of bilingual students might utter: “My instructional goal is to promote bilingualism and biliteracy among my students” and “My instructional goal is to promote additive bilingualism and biliteracy among my students.” The word *additive* adds virtually nothing to the basic meaning of the statement. If anything, it entails the connotation that the teacher sees herself as building on, or adding to, the language repertoires that students bring to school. This meaning is compatible with the position that García and other scholars have espoused and is also made explicit in the title of Bartlett and García’s (2011) book *Additive Schooling in Subtractive Times*.

In short, the construct of additive bilingualism, understood as an instructional orientation to build on minoritized students’ multilingual repertoires, is totally compatible with heteroglossic notions of bilingualism despite the fact that it was employed long before the theoretical landscape shifted to highlight the dynamic nature of bilingual cognitive processes. The *appearance* of conflict between notions of additive bilingualism and dynamic models of bilingualism is based on the fact that researchers who invoke the former construct also typically ascribe legitimate meaning to terms such as *home language* and *school language*, whereas the legitimacy of these referents is dismissed by García and Wei (2014). As discussed in the next section, the rejection of concepts such as home language and school language entails some highly problematic implications for instructional practice.

Is Teaching for Cross-Linguistic Transfer Legitimate?

In challenging two solitudes orientations to bilingual instruction, I have highlighted the missed opportunities that such an approach entails (e.g., neglect of cognate relationships between languages) and argued that teaching for cross-lingual transfer is intrinsic to effective instruction of bilingual students (Cummins, 2007, 2017).⁵ However, this pedagogical approach has been challenged by García and Wei (2014) on the grounds that the construct of language/languages is illegitimate. They question the notion of a common underlying proficiency, because, in their estimation, it still constructs students’ L1 and L2 as separate: “Instead, translanguaging validates the fact that bilingual students’ language practices are not separated into . . . home language and school language, instead transcending both” (p. 69). They also argue that we can now “shed the concept of *transfer* . . . [in favor of] a conceptualization of *integration* of language practices in *the person of the learner*” (p. 80). Their rejection of cross-lingual transfer is not surprising, because if languages don’t exist, then it is meaningless to talk about transfer from one language to another or teaching for cross-lingual transfer.

But what does the claim that languages don’t exist, at least as linguistic entities, imply for the work of teachers who are mandated to teach language arts and literacy skills to bilingual students? Carried to its logical conclusion, Gar-

cía and Wei (2014)'s critique of the construct of language/languages would mean that it would be illegitimate for a child to express an utterance such as "My home language is English, but my school language is French." It would also be illegitimate for websites such as Ethnologue (www.ethnologue.com) to refer to and provide information about the 7,106 languages and dialects that humanity has generated. The claim that languages exist as social constructions but have no legitimacy "in reality" raises the issue of what "reality" and "social construction" are. Also unclear is the meaning of the claim that languages don't exist as linguistic entities but do exist in the social world.

García and Wei's (2014) dismissal of the construct of language/languages as illegitimate goes beyond the generally accepted claim that languages are socially constructed with fluid, permeable, and arbitrary boundaries. Although languages are certainly processed cognitively in dynamic and integrated ways, languages, as social constructions, *do exist* in the lives and experiences of teachers, students, governments, politicians, and countless agencies, and they generate an immense material and symbolic reality (e.g., dictionaries, school curricula, government policies, territorial conflicts, profits for corporations that teach and test languages, etc.). It is not at all clear that anything is gained conceptually or pedagogically by claiming that languages don't exist in reality and that teaching for cross-linguistic transfer is illegitimate. It is entirely possible to reconcile the construct of translanguaging, which highlights the integrated conceptual/linguistic system through which multilingual individuals process and use language, with the social reality of different languages, understood as historical, cultural, and ideological constructs that have material consequences and determine social action (e.g., language planning, bilingual programs, etc.). Similarly, the argument that languages don't exist in reality is unhelpful in promoting effective bilingual pedagogy. If not teaching for transfer, how should teachers in a Spanish/English bilingual program conceptualize what they are doing when they draw students' attention to similarities between *encontrar* and *encounter*, or when they remind students about the similarities between Spanish and English in conventions for paragraph formation?

In summary, it is conceptually unnecessary and instructionally unhelpful to characterize reference to distinct languages (Spanish/English, home language/school language) as well as teaching for cross-lingual transfer as inconsistent with heteroglossic orientations to language education. This characterization is likely to be confusing to educators committed to promoting students' biliteracy, and it distracts from the important insights generated by the construct of translanguaging. The essence of this construct can be maintained by acknowledging that (a) the boundaries between languages/dialects are fluid and socially constructed; (b) as emergent bilinguals gain access to their two languages, these languages become fused into a single integrated system (common underlying proficiency); (c) languages and languaging are socially contested sites and encounters where the legitimacy of cultures and identities are negotiated; and (d) school programs serving emergent bilingual students

should connect instruction with students' lives, including their multilingual repertoires, and teach for transfer and greater integration across languages.

Are Additive Approaches Infused with Raciolinguistic Ideologies?

Flores and Rosa (2015) explain the construct of raciolinguistic ideologies as follows: "Our conception of raciolinguistic ideologies links the white speaking and listening subject to *monoglossic language ideologies*, which position idealized monolingualism in a standardized national language as the norm to which all national subjects should aspire" (p. 151). The construct presents language and race as inextricably interrelated. People's racialized status determines how their language use is perceived. In Flores and Rosa's terms, raciolinguistic ideologies "conflate certain racialized bodies with linguistic deficiency unrelated to any objective linguistic practices" and "produce racialized speaking subjects who are constructed as linguistically deviant even when engaging in linguistic practices positioned as normative or innovative when produced by privileged white subjects" (p. 150).

Although other scholars have discussed the role of language ideologies in fostering discrimination and have challenged the mythical nature of standard language (e.g., Lippi-Green, 1997), Flores and Rosa's (2015) theorization of raciolinguistic ideologies allows for an examination of a range of different education phenomena through this explanatory lens. For example, their analysis connects long-term English learners, heritage language learners, and Standard English learners who "can be understood to inhabit a shared position as raciolinguistic Others vis-à-vis the white listening subject" (p. 151).

As illustrated in the examples Flores and Rosa (2015) discuss, there is no question that the processes involved in raciolinguistic ideologies are real and pernicious in their effects on students' academic engagement and achievement. Their analysis highlights a number of problematic ways in which minoritized students are positioned within the normalized structures of schooling (e.g., through labels such as "long-term English learners" that fail to identify students' fluent abilities in two or more languages).

Unfortunately, the useful contribution of the Flores and Rosa (2015) analysis to our understanding of the academic development of minoritized students is undermined by their claim that raciolinguistic ideologies and discourses of appropriateness permeate and lie at the core of additive approaches to language education. I argue that far from being permeated by raciolinguistic ideologies and discourses of appropriateness, instructional promotion of additive forms of bilingualism can challenge prevailing societal power structures and can position teachers as agents of biliteracy. I also assert that the Flores and Rosa analysis is weakened by their apparent rejection of instructional strategies to extend students' academic language repertoires in both their home language and the dominant school language. The explicit teaching of academic language, or what Delpit (1988) calls the "codes of power," is not

inherently infused with discourses of appropriateness or raciolinguistic ideologies (although in some specific classroom contexts it may be). Furthermore, instructional attempts to develop biliteracy and academic language proficiency in bilingual students' two languages are entirely consistent with notions of translanguaging and heteroglossic orientations to linguistic diversity.

In the next section, I outline in more detail the claims articulated by Flores and Rosa (2015) and then critique their analysis, highlighting the shortcomings of their interpretation of additive approaches to educating minoritized students. My goal in this critique is constructive. I believe that the important insights Flores and Rosa have advanced relating to discourses of appropriateness and raciolinguistic ideologies are weakened and potentially undermined through their linkage, in unnecessary and problematic ways, to a critique of additive approaches to teaching minoritized students

Flores and Rosa's Case Against Additive Approaches to Language Education

Flores and Rosa (2015) focus on the scholarly discourse associated with three categories or groups of students: long-term English learners, heritage language learners, and Standard English learners. With respect to long-term English learners, they critique Olsen's (2010) description of these students as having high-functioning social language, weak academic language, and significant gaps in reading and writing skills. They claim that Olsen depicts long-term English learners as "deficient in the academic language that is appropriate for a school context and necessary for academic success" (p. 157). Also problematic for them are Olsen's pedagogical recommendations that instruction for these students should focus on developing students' ability to use oral and written language in powerful ways, promoting extensive reading of relevant texts, and extending their access to and ability to use complex academic vocabulary. Finally, they dispute Olsen's recommendation that long-term English learners should receive additive instruction that develops their home language literacy skills. Flores and Rosa summarize their critique by claiming that Olsen's recommendations for supporting long-term English learners' academic development are "squarely focused on molding them into white speaking subjects who have mastered the empirical linguistic practices deemed appropriate for a school context" (p. 157).

Flores and Rosa (2015) extend Valdés's (2001) critique of the hegemony of prestige varieties of heritage languages that devalue the linguistic accomplishments of minoritized speakers of nonprestige varieties by identifying this distinction as a reflection of raciolinguistic ideologies. However, they also critique Valdés's endorsement of an additive approach to heritage language education that would expand the linguistic repertoires of heritage language speakers on the grounds that an additive approach is rooted in a rigid distinction between linguistic practices appropriate for academic use and those appropriate for social use. They argue that this orientation is not sufficient to address the raci-

olinguistic ideologies produced by the white speaking subject, which, in many cases, is the teacher. The white speaking subject positions the nondominant language repertoire of heritage language speakers as inferior to the more formal standard language taught in school. As a result, the language dexterity of fluent speakers of a language such as Spanish, which they have learned in the home, is often stigmatized in formal academic contexts, thereby illustrating the operation of raciolinguistic ideologies and discourses of appropriateness.

The third focus of Flores and Rosa's (2015) critique is Delpit's (1988, 2006) additive approach to educating African American Standard English learners. Delpit (2006) advocates explicit teaching of the linguistic "codes of power," where "the point must not be to eliminate students' home languages, but rather to add other voices and discourses to their repertoires" (p. 163). Flores and Rosa note that Delpit endorses a critical additive approach where students learn the codes of power while they are also "helped to learn about the arbitrariness of those codes and about the power relationships they represent" (Delpit, 2006, p. 45). However, they also claim that it is "clear that Delpit views the codes of power as a discrete set of practices [and as] objective linguistic practices rather than ideological phenomena" (Flores & Rosa, 2015, p. 165).

In order to undo appropriateness in language education, Flores and Rosa (2015) suggest shifting the focus of scrutiny to the white listening subject who is in a position of power or authority in relation to the minoritized student. They advocate a critical heteroglossic perspective that both "legitimizes the dynamic linguistic practices of language-minoritized students while simultaneously raising awareness about issues of language and power" (p. 167). A pedagogical focus on critical language awareness, combined with a heteroglossic rather than a monoglossic perspective on students' languages, has the potential to open up space for unmasking the racism inherent in dominant approaches to language education.

Critique of Flores and Rosa's Case Against Additive Approaches

Flores and Rosa (2015) state that they stand in solidarity with critiques of subtractive approaches to language education, which they characterize as stigmatizing and contributing to the reproduction of education inequality. However, they also critique additive approaches, which they characterize as promoting "the development of standardized language skills while encouraging students to maintain the minoritized linguistic practices they bring to the classroom" (p. 150). These approaches emphasize respect "for the home linguistic practices of minoritized students while acknowledging the importance of developing standardized language skills" (p. 150).

I contend that the authors misrepresent additive approaches when they characterize them as requiring the insertion of "standardized language skills" into the description of additive bilingualism. To my knowledge, no researcher

who has discussed the notion of additive bilingualism has defined the construct in these terms. Flores and Rosa (2015) do not define what they mean by “standardized language skills,” yet they repeatedly use this and other undefined terms (e.g., “objective linguistic forms,” “empirical language practices”) and associate them with the development of literacy skills in both the dominant and nondominant languages.

The insertion of this descriptor into the construct of additive bilingualism implicates additive approaches in discourses of appropriateness, which Flores and Rosa (2015) convincingly characterize as fueled by raciolinguistic ideologies. When the development of biliteracy skills and additive bilingualism are conflated with the development of standardized language skills, it appears reasonable to argue, as Flores and Rosa do, that an additive approach to educating language-minoritized students “places the brunt of the responsibility on these students to mimic the linguistic practices of the white speaking subject while reifying the white listening subject’s racialization of these students’ linguistic practices” (p. 156). But what empirical evidence or theoretical logic is there to support the insertion of standardized language skills into the constructs of additive bilingualism and biliteracy? I find that Flores and Rosa present insufficient evidence to support the conflation of these constructs. They do assert, following García (2009), that additive bilingualism reflects a monoglossic ideology, but the construct of additive bilingualism as it has been employed by researchers and policy makers around the world is consistent with heteroglossic conceptions of bilingual and multilingual practices. Certainly, the teaching of language arts (in L1 and/or L2) in many school systems may be prescriptive in orientation, and standards documents, such as the Common Core State Standards in the United States, operate with prescriptive intent. However, there is no unique or inherent linkage between the construct of additive bilingualism and prescriptive discourses of appropriateness beyond what is common to all school contexts, whether mainstream monolingual or bilingual in nature.

Flores and Rosa (2015) also conflate standard language with academic language, claiming that both are embedded in discourses of appropriateness that reflect “racialized ideological perceptions rather than objective linguistic categories” (p. 152). They question the distinction between linguistic practices that are appropriate for academic and social uses.

In equating standard language with academic language and implying that there is no empirically credible distinction between the language people use in social interactions and the language students encounter in academic contexts, Flores and Rosa (2015) ignore a significant amount of research evidence pointing to characteristics of written/academic language that differ significantly from the language we typically use in interpersonal, face-to-face social interactions (e.g., Biber, 1986; Cummins, 2000; Gutiérrez, 1995). Bailey (2007), for example, notes that differences between social and academic lan-

guage lie in “the relative frequency of complex grammatical structures, specialized vocabulary, and uncommon language functions” (p. 9).

The claim that notions of academic language are embedded in discourses of appropriateness raises a number of theoretical and instructional issues that are not addressed by Flores and Rosa. For example, are all academic registers infused with discourses of appropriateness and raciolinguistic ideologies? If not, what are the criteria for deciding whether a textbook, novel, or article is problematic in this regard? Are teachers who provide conceptual and linguistic feedback on students’ writing complicit with “discourses of appropriateness”?

Flores and Rosa’s (2015) characterization of instructional attempts to extend students’ academic repertoires as a raciolinguistic enterprise raises some significant instructional issues. For example, they dispute the legitimacy of the L1 and L2 literacy instructional directions proposed by Olsen (2010), namely that instruction for all students should focus “on powerful oral language, explicit literacy development, instruction in the academic uses of English, high quality writing, extensive reading of relevant texts, and emphasis on academic language and complex vocabulary” (p. 33). They claim that these instructional approaches are designed to mold minoritized students into “white speaking subjects,” but they tell us nothing about what teachers should do to avoid this outcome. If it is problematic for teachers to focus on powerful oral language, what should they focus on instead? If extensive reading of relevant texts is a problematic instructional goal, how should teachers expand their students’ literacy skills? Clarification of the instructional implications of the Flores and Rosa analysis is required if the insights embedded in their theorization of raciolinguistic ideologies are to affect the lives of students and teachers in positive ways.

Similar questions about classroom implications can be raised around their critique of Delpit’s (1988, 2006) argument that instruction should attempt to demystify the arbitrary nature of codes of power and help students understand the power relationships these linguistic forms represent. Their claim that Delpit views the codes of power as a discrete set of objective linguistic practices does not appear consistent with Delpit’s statement that the codes of power are arbitrary. And their claim that she doesn’t view the codes of power as ideological phenomena is hard to reconcile with her statement that the codes of power are embedded in societal power relations. These apparent contradictions do not help identify instructional approaches that will, as Flores and Rosa advocate, legitimize the dynamic linguistic practices of minoritized students while simultaneously raising awareness about issues of language and power, goals that are also clearly endorsed in Delpit’s analysis.

Much of Flores and Rosa’s (2015) analysis focuses on abstract theoretical constructs such as raciolinguistic ideologies, discourses of appropriateness, and objective linguistic forms without connecting these constructs to the actual instructional work of teachers. They note that their analysis focuses on racial

hierarchies rather than individual practices; however, racial hierarchies find expression only through individual practices. Few researchers would dispute a claim that teachers who encourage minoritized students to replace their L1 with English are complicit with, and agents of, raciolinguistic ideologies, albeit unintentionally in many cases. By the same token, if the pernicious effects of racial hierarchies are to be resisted or undone, it will surely be through the actions of teachers, students, and community members. Their analysis would have been strengthened by considering teacher agency. In light of the pervasiveness of raciolinguistic ideologies and problematic labels applied to minoritized students, what is required is a focus on the fact that educators have considerable power to affect student identity construction in positive (as well as negative) ways. Teachers' instructional choices within the classroom play a significant role in determining the extent to which students will emerge from an identity cocoon defined by their assumed limitations (e.g., "ELL student") to an interpersonal space defined by their talents and accomplishments, both linguistic and intellectual. For this to happen, teachers must see through the institutional labels to the potential within. They must also be prepared, through their instruction, to challenge the raciolinguistic ideologies and coercive power structures that devalue student identities.

In short, Flores and Rosa (2015) do not address the instructional implications of their claims that raciolinguistic ideologies permeate teachers' attempts to promote additive bilingualism and expand the range of registers students can use in academic contexts. My critique intends to be constructive and in the spirit of critical dialogue. Given the significance of the construct of raciolinguistic ideologies for interpreting how societal power relations infuse patterns of teacher-student identity negotiation, it is imperative to specify in as much detail as possible the instructional directions that are implied by this theoretical construct. The relevance of this construct for teaching minoritized students will emerge in much more powerful ways when the authors address the apparent contradictions I identify and specify alternative instructional approaches to expand students' academic registers in place of the approaches advocated by Delpit (1988, 2006) and Olsen (2010), which they reject. Additionally, it would be helpful to address the apparent inconsistency between the endorsement of additive approaches in the work of Bartlett and García (2011) and the rejection of additive approaches in the Flores and Rosa analysis.

Toward a Synthesis of Perspectives

The synthesis I propose involves removing the distraction of the term *additive bilingualism*, endorsing the legitimacy of dynamic heteroglossic conceptions of bi/multilingualism in ways that reinforce the importance of teaching for two-way transfer across languages, and highlighting the impact of societal power relations and their reflection in patterns of teacher-student identity negotiation as determinants of the achievement gap between social groups.

With respect to additive bilingualism, the construct is legitimate in the contexts within which it has been used and is compatible with dynamic models of bilingualism. However, it is not difficult to see how the L1 + L2 connotation of the term could be interpreted as implying compartmentalization of the bilingual's two languages. In order to avoid this interpretation, it makes sense simply to drop the term rather than engage in unproductive discussions about its legitimacy. A potentially useful alternative is *active bilingualism*, or *active multilingualism*, which has been a core concept in Sweden's home language teaching policy since 1975 (Axelsson, 2006). This term also forms a major pillar of the preschool language and multicultural policy in Reykjavik, Iceland (Jónsdóttir, 2014). Nothing is lost semantically by this proposed change. Active bilingualism fits easily into current dynamic heteroglossic frameworks, and it retains its power to challenge the undermining of minoritized students' bilingual and biliteracy development. The argument that additive bilingualism reflects a monoglossic ideology simply disappears with the elimination of the term.

A second move toward a synthesis of perspectives is to acknowledge the dynamic nature of bilingual and multilingual language practices and the instructional implications of this conceptualization. These instructional implications entail a challenge both to the exclusion of minoritized students' L1 from most mainstream monolingual programs and the rigid separation of languages that currently characterizes many bilingual programs. Numerous educators, working with researchers, have begun the process of articulating, through their practice, the affordances of translanguaging and bilingual instructional strategies not only in bilingual instructional contexts but also in monolingual contexts characterized by linguistic diversity (e.g., Celic & Seltzer, 2011; Chumak-Horbatsch, 2012; Cummins & Early, 2011). These instructional affordances include the opportunity to teach for two-way transfer across languages as well as to deepen students' metalinguistic awareness of how language works and how power and language intersect.

Finally, the role of societal power relations, which include raciolinguistic ideologies, in determining education outcomes for minoritized students is explicitly acknowledged within this synthesis of perspectives. The claim that societal power relations are fundamental to understanding the nature of the achievement gap between social groups is not just a statement of education philosophy. It is supported by a wide range of empirical data from around the world (e.g., Bartlett & García, 2011; Bishop & Berryman, 2006; Ladson-Billings, 1995; Ogbu, 1978; Steele, 1997). One of the major reasons why mainstream initiatives aimed at closing the achievement gap have produced such meager results is that issues related to societal power relations and identity negotiation in schools have been largely ignored. The claim that effective instruction of minoritized students *requires* educators to challenge coercive relations of power (Cummins, 2001a) is fully compatible with Flores and Rosa's (2015) call for educators to challenge the pervasive influence of raciolinguistic ideologies in constricting students' educational development. Both of these theo-

retical orientations are also fully compatible with Bartlett and García's (2011) documentation of the transformative power of additive approaches to teaching minoritized students.

In conclusion, my analysis builds on the important insights advanced by García (2009) and Flores and Rosa (2015) that have highlighted the dynamic nature of children's bi/multilingualism and the insidious impact of raciolinguistic ideologies operating in schools and other societal institutions. I suggest that these researchers' rejection of additive bilingualism (García) and additive approaches to language education (Flores & Rosa) undermine the impact of their central message: educators who are committed to social justice and aspire to promote strong academic development among minoritized students will achieve their professional and personal goals more successfully when they encourage their students to develop biliteracy and when they actively challenge the devaluation of identity in classrooms and broader societal institutions. These goals are entirely consistent with those of socially committed educators who have advocated for many years that schools serving minoritized students should actively promote additive bilingualism (reconstituted here as active bilingualism). In light of the strident antibilingual and anti-immigrant rhetoric that characterizes education discourse, these educators are under no illusion that their advocacy of bilingualism and biliteracy constitutes a challenge to societal power relations.

Notes

1. I use the term *minoritized* to signal that societal power relations are operating to devalue the status of individuals or groups of people. Bishop (2013) notes that the term refers to a people who have been ascribed the characteristics of a minority and that, to be minoritized, "one does not need to be in the numerical minority but only treated as if one's position and perspective are of less worth; to be silenced or marginalized" (p. 74). Flores and Rosa (2015) likewise use the term to highlight the processes through which linguistic valuation and devaluation take place.
2. Among these additive approaches is the Seal of Biliteracy, which is awarded to US high school students in numerous states and school districts who meet explicit criteria with respect to their literacy skills in two or more languages. See <http://sealofbiliteracy.org>. More than forty thousand high school students in California were awarded the Seal of Biliteracy in the 2015–2016 school year. See <http://www.cde.ca.gov/nr/ne/yr16/yr16rel66.asp>.
3. *Pasifika* is commonly used in New Zealand to refer to both peoples who have migrated from Pacific nations and territories and those born in New Zealand of Pacific ancestry.
4. Teaching for transfer is designed to enable bilingual students to become aware of conceptual and linguistic connections between their languages. For example, a student who understands the concept of photosynthesis in her L1 does not need to relearn this concept in English, as it already exists in her common underlying conceptual base. But she does need to learn the English vocabulary and expressions required to talk and write about this concept in English. Teaching for transfer in this instance would involve activating the student's prior L1 knowledge of the process of photosynthesis and enabling her to link this knowledge to classroom instruction. In the case of languages

that have extensive cognate connections (e.g., English and Spanish), teaching for transfer will involve pointing out or encouraging bilingual students to notice these connections (e.g., acceleration/aceleración).

5. This section draws on Cummins (2017). I am grateful to Dr. Ofelia García for feedback and discussion of these issues.

References

- Agirdag, O. (2010). Exploring bilingualism in a monolingual school system: Insights from Turkish and native students from Belgian schools. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 31(3), 307–321. doi: 10.1080/01425691003700540
- 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.
- Axelsson, M. (2006). Mother tongue teaching and programs for bilingual children in Sweden. In J. Söhn (Ed.), *The effectiveness of bilingual school programs for immigrant children*. AKI Research Review 2 (pp. 108–122). Berlin: Programme on Intercultural Conflicts and Societal Integration (AKI), Social Science Research Center. Retrieved from <http://www.ssoar.info/ssoar/handle/document/11029>
- Bailey, A. (2007). Introduction: Teaching and assessing students learning English in school. In A. Bailey (Ed.), *The language demands of school: Putting academic English to the test* (pp. 1–26). New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Baker, C. (2011). *Foundations of bilingual education and bilingualism* (5th ed.). Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Baker, C., & Prys Jones, S. (1998). *Encyclopedia of bilingualism and bilingual education*. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Bartlett, L., & García, O. (2011). *Additive schooling in subtractive times: Bilingual education and Dominican immigrant youth in the Heights*. Nashville, TN: Vanderbilt University Press.
- Biber, D. (1986). Spoken and written textual dimensions in English: Resolving the contradictory findings. *Language*, 62(2), 384–414. doi: 10.2307/414678
- Bishop, R. (2013). Indigenous and other minoritized students. In J. Hattie & A. M. Anderman (Eds.), *International guide to student achievement* (pp. 74–76). New York: Routledge.
- Bishop, R., & Berryman, M. (2006). *Culture speaks: Cultural relationships and classroom learning*. Wellington, Aotearoa/NZ: Huia.
- Canagarajah, A. S. (2006). TESOL at forty: What are the issues? *TESOL Quarterly*, 40(1), 9–34. doi: 10.2307/40264509
- Canagarajah, A. S. (2011). Translanguaging in the classroom: Emerging issues for research and pedagogy. *Applied Linguistics Review*, 2, 1–28. doi: 10.1515/9783110239331.1
- Celic, C., & Seltzer, K. (2011). *Translanguaging: A CUNY-NYSIEB guide for educators*. New York: CUNY-NYSIEB. Retrieved from <http://www.nysieb.ws.gc.cuny.edu/files/2012/06/FINAL-Translanguaging-Guide-With-Cover-1.pdf>
- Cenoz, J., & Gorter, D. (2013). Towards a plurilingual approach in English language teaching: Softening the boundaries between languages. *TESOL Quarterly*, 47(3), 591–599. doi: 10.1002/tesq.121
- Chumak-Horbatsch, R. (2012). *Linguistically appropriate practice: A guidebook for early childhood practitioners working with immigrant children*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Cook, V. (1995). Multi-competence and learning of many languages. *Language, Culture and Curriculum*, 8(2), 93–98. doi: 10.1080/07908319509525193
- Creese, A., & Blackledge, A. (2010). Translanguaging in the bilingual classroom: A pedagogy for learning and teaching? *Modern Language Journal*, 94(1), 103–115. doi: 10.1111/j.1540-4781.2009.00986.x

- Cummins, J. (1981). The role of primary language development in promoting educational success for language minority students. In California State Department of Education (Ed.), *Schooling and language minority students: A theoretical framework* (pp. 3–49). Los Angeles: Evaluation, Dissemination and Assessment Center, California State University.
- Cummins, J. (1986). Empowering minority students: A framework for intervention. *Harvard Educational Review*, 56(1), 18–36. doi: 10.17763/haer.56.1.b327234461607787
- Cummins, J. (2000). *Language, power, and pedagogy: Bilingual children in the crossfire*. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Cummins, J. (2001a). *Negotiating identities: Education for empowerment in a diverse society*. 2nd ed. Los Angeles: California Association for Bilingual Education.
- Cummins, J. (2001b). Author's introduction: Framing the universe of discourse: Are the constructs of power and identity relevant to school failure? *Harvard Educational Review*, 71(4), 649–655. doi: 10.17763/haer.71.4.j261357m62846812
- Cummins, J. (2007). Rethinking monolingual instructional strategies in multilingual classrooms. *Canadian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 10(2), 221–240.
- Cummins, J. (2017). Teaching for transfer in multilingual educational contexts. In O. García & A. Lin (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of language and education: Vol. 5. Bilingual education* (3rd ed., pp. 103–115). New York: Springer Science + Business.
- Cummins, J., & Early, M. (2011). *Identity texts: The collaborative creation of power in multilingual schools*. Stoke-on-Trent, UK: Trentham Books.
- Delpit, L. (1988). The silenced dialogue: Power and pedagogy in educating other people's children. *Harvard Educational Review*, 58(3), 280–298. doi: 10.17763/haer.58.3.c43481778r528qw4
- Delpit, L. (2006). *Other people's children: Cultural conflict in the classroom*. New York: New Press.
- Flores, N., & Rosa, J. (2015). Undoing appropriateness: Raciolinguistic ideologies and language diversity in education. *Harvard Educational Review*, 85(2), 149–171. doi: 10.17763/0017-8055.85.2.149
- García, O. (2009). *Bilingual education in the 21st century: A global perspective*. Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.
- García, O., & Wei, L. (2014). *Translanguaging: Language, bilingualism and education*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan. doi: 10.1057/9781137385765
- Genesee, F., Lindholm-Leary, K., Saunders, W. M., & Christian, D. (Eds.). (2006). *Educating English language learners: A synthesis of research evidence*. New York: Cambridge University Press. doi: 10.1017/CBO9780511499913
- Grosjean, F. (1989). Neurolinguistics, beware! The bilingual is not two monolinguals in one person. *Brain and Language*, 36(1), 3–15. doi: 10.1016/0093-934x(89)90048-5
- Gutiérrez, K. D. (1995). Unpackaging academic discourse. *Discourse Processes*, 19(1), 21–37. doi: 10.1080/01638539109544903
- Herdina, P., & Jessner, U. (2002). *A dynamic model of multilingualism: Changing the psycholinguistic perspective*. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Jónsdóttir, F. B. (2014). *Working with diverse languages and cultures in Reykjavik playschools*. Retrieved from http://www.slideshare.net/Modurmal/namskei-mourmal-ogholt2?qid=46229b73-043b-452b-9340-15b29b4a0903&v=&b=&from_search=5
- Kecskes, I., & Papp, T. (2000). *Foreign language and mother tongue*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Ladson-Billings, G. (1995). Toward a theory of culturally relevant pedagogy. *American Educational Research Journal*, 32(3), 465–491. doi: 10.3102/00028312032003465
- Lambert, W. E. (1974). Culture and language as factors in learning and education. In F. E. Aboud & R. D. Meade (Eds.), *Cultural factors in learning and education. Proceedings of the Fifth Western Washington Symposium on Learning* (pp. 99–122). Bellingham, WA: Western Washington University.

- Lippi-Green, R. (1997). *English with an accent: Language, ideology, and discrimination in the United States*. New York: Routledge.
- Makalela, L. (2015). Moving out of linguistic boxes: The effects of translanguaging strategies for multilingual classrooms. *Language and Education*, 29(3), 200–217. doi: 10.1080/09500782.2014.994524
- May, S. (2011). The disciplinary constraints of SLA and TESOL: Additive bilingualism and second language acquisition, teaching and learning. *Linguistics and Education*, 22(3), 233–247. doi: 10.1016/j.linged.2011.02.001
- May, S. (2014). Disciplinary divides, knowledge construction, and the multilingual turn. In S. May (Ed.), *The multilingual turn: Implications for SLA, TESOL and bilingual education* (pp. 7–31). New York: Routledge.
- Molyneux, P., Scull, J., & Aliania, R. (2016). Bilingual education in a community language: Lessons from a longitudinal study. *Language and Education*, 30(4), 337–360. doi: 10.1080/09500782.2015.1114630
- New Zealand Ministry of Education. (2007). *Language enhancing the achievement of Pasifika (LEAP)*. Wellington: Author. Retrieved from <http://leap.tki.org.nz>
- Obondo, M. A. (2008). Bilingual education in Africa: An overview. In J. Cummins & N. H. Hornberger (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of language and education: Vol. 5. Bilingual education* (2nd ed., pp. 151–164). New York: Springer Science + Business.
- Ogbu, J. U. (1978). *Minority education and caste*. New York: Academic Press.
- Olsen, L. (2010). *Reparable harm: Fulfilling the unkept promise of educational opportunity for California's long term English learners*. Long Beach: Californians Together.
- Phillipson, R. (1992). *Linguistic imperialism*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Plüddemann, P. (2015). Unlocking the grid: Language-in-education policy realisation in post-apartheid South Africa. *Language and Education*, 29(3), 186–199. doi: 10.1080/09500782.2014.994523
- Pulinx, R., Van Avermaet, P., & Agirdag, O. (2016). Silencing linguistic diversity: The extent, the determinants, and consequences of the monolingual beliefs of Flemish teachers. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*. doi:10.1080/13670050.2015.1102860
- Skutnabb-Kangas, T. (2000). *Linguistic genocide in education—or worldwide diversity and human rights?* Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Steele, C. M. (1997). A threat in the air: How stereotypes shape intellectual identity and performance. *American Psychologist*, 52(6), 613–629. doi: 10.1037//0003-066x.52.6.61
- Takanishi, R., & Le Menestrel, S. (Eds.) (2017). *Promoting the educational success of children and youth learning English: Promising futures*. Washington, DC: The National Academies Press. doi: 10.17226/24677
- Valdés, G. (2001). Heritage language students: Profiles and possibilities. In J. Kreeft Peyton, D. Ranard, & S. McGinnis (Eds.), *Heritage languages in America: Preserving a national resource* (pp. 37–80). Washington, DC: Center for Applied Linguistics.

Acknowledgments

I thank the following colleagues who provided valuable feedback on earlier versions of this paper: Margaret Early, Eithne Gallagher, Christine Hélot, Amir Kalan, Rahat Naqvi, Gail Prasad, Tove Skutnabb-Kangas, Saskia Stille, Shelley Taylor, Lily Wong Fillmore.

This article has been reprinted with permission of the *Harvard Educational Review* (ISSN 0017-8055) for personal use only. Posting on a public website or on a listserv is not allowed. Any other use, print or electronic, will require written permission from the *Review*. You may subscribe to *HER* at www.harvardeducationalreview.org. *HER* is published quarterly by the Harvard Education Publishing Group, 8 Story Street, Cambridge, MA 02138, tel. 617-495-3432. Copyright © by the President and Fellows of Harvard College. All rights reserved.