Language Education and the Challenges of Globalisation

Language Education and the Challenges of Globalisation: Sociolinguistic Issues

Edited by

Martin Solly and Edith Esch

CAMBRIDGE
SCHOLARS

P U B L I S H I N G

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

LANGUAGE EDUCATION
AND THE CHALLENGES OF GLOBALISATION

MARTIN SOLLY AND EDITH ESCH

Introduction

In 2012 we jointly edited a volume, *The Sociolinguistics of Language Education in International Contexts* (Esch and Solly 2012), which turned a sociological lens on some of the key areas of concern for researchers and practitioners in language education: critical awareness of power and identity issues; competence in dealing with new sociolinguistic repertoires, modalities and literacies; ethical concerns for all who are involved. The volume drew attention to the complex and controversial nature of some of the theoretical aspects, contexts and practices relating to language education and language learning.

The Sociolinguistics of Language Education in International Contexts derived from a seminar held at the University of Turin on 24-28 August 2010 as part of the X Conference of the European Society for the Study of English, and the present volume is also centered on a series of papers first presented at a seminar we convened as part of the XI International Conference of the European Society for the Study of English held at Boğaziçi University, Istanbul, on 4-8 September 2012. The seminar provided a forum for reflection and discussion of sociolinguistic issues in language education, with a particular focus on theoretical issues such as concepts of communities and critical reflections on the issues of the presentation of self in discourse, as well as educational problems linked to language planning and the revitalization of indigenous languages, and the divide between English Medium Schools and Vernacular Medium School. Like *The Sociolinguistics of Language Education in International Contexts*, the present volume is a collection of peer-edited chapters written by an international group of scholars, engaged in the analysis of language

education from a sociolinguistics-oriented perspective. It can be seen as a kind of sequel or companion volume to that publication, given that it focuses on many of the themes looked at in *The Sociolinguistics of Language Education in International Contexts*; it also shares its case study approach.

Themes

A number of recent studies have highlighted uncomfortable sociolinguistic issues in language education stemming from the notion that the maintenance of social inequalities in *access to language education* has led to a picture whereby society would be stratified between economically powerful classes enjoying full access to language education, middle classes competing to gain access to education and social mobility, and dominated classes excluded from the benefits of education: such a picture is particularly evident in settings where the language of academic literacy and socio-economic power is that of the former colonial / current economic power (cf. Esch and Solly 2012).

Yet, to quote Blommaert (2010, 5) the established paradigm of "the sociolinguistics of distribution" focusing on language-in-place is rapidly giving way to "the sociolinguistics of mobility", focusing on "language-in-motion, with various spatiotemporal frames interacting with one another". New approaches to fundamental constructs such as 'communities', new conceptualisations of the social realities of constantly growing urban centres for individuals and their multiple identities require that such views be revised to take into account the multiple ways in which individuals discursively signal their belonging to linguistic communities which are sometimes in conflict with the educational context, thus defining new sociolinguistic spaces and configurations.

The realities of the role of English as a Lingua Franca in a globalized postcolonial world, of linguistic pluralism and multiculturalism, as well as of the expectations associated with the effects of recent mobile technologies and social networking have led to a reassessment of language education policies and the need to meet local / regional / global requirements to ensure language rights and to avoid the marginalization of linguistic groups.

Among the most controversial sociolinguistic issues are those related to power and (in)equality. Moreover, as Blommaert points out:

> Sociolinguistics is the study of language as a complex of resources, of their value, distribution, rights of ownership and effects. It is not the study of an abstract language, but the study of concrete language resources in which people make different investments and to which they attribute different values and degrees of usefulness. In the context of globalization, where

language forms are perhaps more mobile that before, such patterns of value and use become less predictable and presupposable. (2010: 28)

The various investigations presented in this volume are often united and interconnected in their approaches to these key areas of focus. Some of the contributors also share an interest in an ecological perspective. Leo van Lier emphasizes the centrality of ecology in educational linguistics, but also the complexity of such an approach:

Ecology is the study of the relationships between all the various organisms and their physical environment. It's a complex and *messy* field of study about a complex and *messy* reality. Its primary requirement is, by definition, that the context is central, it cannot be reduced, and it cannot be pushed aside or into the background. The context is the focal field of study. (2002, 144, our emphasis)

The concept of 'messy' is also taken up by Blommaert, who aptly titles the second chapter of his 2012 volume *The Sociolinguistics of Globalization*, 'a messy new marketplace', and who observes that "a sociolinguistics of globalization is perforce a sociolinguistics of mobility, and the new marketplace we must seek to understand is, consequently, a less clear and transparent and a *messier* one" (2012: 28, our emphasis). In this 'messy' field, alongside the concept of 'super-mobility' can usefully be set that of 'super-diversity' (Vertovec 2007) to describe the importance of the personal experience, language repertoires and life trajectories of individuals even within their language communities, as well as within and across the various spaces (including virtual spaces) where communication takes place. As Busch observes:

[…] the meanings that speakers attribute to languages, codes, and linguistic practices are linked with personal experience and life trajectories, especially with the way in which linguistic resources are experienced in the context of discursive constructions of national, ethnic, and social affiliation/non-affiliation. These meanings are subject to changes which involve both biographical discontinuities (through migration, for example) and socio-political reconfigurations (e.g. the establishing of boundaries). (2012: 520)

National, ethnic, local, family and social background all influence an individual speaker's personal language practices and trajectory, and can be subject to great changes and discontinuities in times of migration and the displacement / relocation of peoples. Research on multilingualism in the United Kingdom, for example, has shown how speakers code-switch into

language varieties not generally thought to be theirs, thus crossing and overcoming social or ethnic boundaries (Rampton 1995), and how young multilingual language users 'translanguage', creatively, going between and beyond different linguistic structures and systems, "[…] bringing together different dimensions of their personal history, experience and environment, their attitude, belief and ideology, their cognitive and physical capacity into one coordinated and meaningful performance, and making it into a lived experience" (Li Wei 2011, 1223).

Each study in this volume brings its own relevance to the work as a whole and each reflects the complexities and practices of the particular contexts and speech communities examined. As regards speech communities, as Morgan has pointed out:

> […] describing speech community is no simple matter. It cannot be defined by static physical location since membership can be experienced as part of a nation-state, neighborhood, village, club, compound, on-line chat room, religious institution, and so on. What's more, adults often experience multiple communities, and one's initial socialization into a speech community may occur within a culture with communicative values that differ from those of other cultures and communities one encounters later in life. (2004: 4-5)

Moreover, there are many myths about language (Schiffman 1996), and these are often intertwined with issues of culture and identity (see for example Joseph 2004, Riley 2007). A current, extremely pervasive myth links proficiency in English to economic prosperity and upward social mobility, thus to prestige and status. Yet the reality is more complex as, for example, Jin He (2012) has shown in her study of what she describes as the 'four myths' underpinning the current drive for language proficiency (thus linguistic capital) as regards English in China. Nevertheless, in many countries quality education and socio-economic mobility are increasingly linked to proficiency in English and this has led to justified concern over its widening spread and the related issue of economic and social elitism. Another important thread running through the two volumes is linked to the constant changes that take place within languages and communities, which is well-evidenced by the work of Sihua Liang, in this volume, also as regards a Chinese context. It is also worth noting that while language communities and language use are sometimes constrained by political decisions and policies taken at a national level, this is not necessarily the case. Indeed, as Stecconi notes as regards the European context, language use often transcends borders:

[…] many Europeans, especially those living in smaller countries, tend to be familiar with the languages of larger neighbours. [thus] German is popular in the Slovak and Czech Republics, Hungary and Slovenia; Italian in Malta and Croatia: and Russian in the former Baltic Republics and Bulgaria. (2010: 156)

This observation is reiterated in the comments made here by Betáková in her chapter about cross-border language use.

Contributions

In her chapter **Androula Yiakoumetti** observes that globalisation and transnationalism are undoubtedly enhancing linguistic diversity in educational settings and have created a new and common classroom reality. She identifies this emerging reality as transglossia, the many language practices of transnational groups in functional interrelationship, and suggests that current educational approaches largely fail to harness it. Indeed, many act even to distinctly disadvantage students who are speakers of varieties other than that which is socially pre-eminent, while only a very few favour maintenance of languages and cultures which are associated with minority, indigenous, or nonstandard varieties. Yiakoumetti argues that only by building on the actual language realities found in today's globalised classrooms and by promoting linguistic diversity can we move closer to the ideal situation of equal linguistic rights. The chapter reconsiders current educational policies and approaches and offers some concrete recommendations for the promotion of what Yiakoumetti considers to be true plurilingualism. These recommendations focus on the role of language educators, the importance of teacher training which highlights current sociolinguistic challenges, the need for language planning to be informed by the specific linguistic landscape in which it is to be employed, and the place of English in today's world.

Genevoix Nana presents the results of a case study in his chapter on the medium of instruction policy and multilingual pupils' experience of learning to read and write in primary school in Cameroon. The study draws on the experience of 4-7-year-old Year 1 pupils learning to read and write in English and French for the first time in two Anglophone and two Francophone primary schools in Cameroon. It uses focus groups and individual interviews to elicit pupils' views about their experience of language learning in and out of the classroom and teachers' perception regarding children's language use in school. A participant observation

approach also proved useful in following up the pupils' language practice in the playground in the schools studied.

While a ban on using Pidgin English permeated English speaking pupils' perception of the relevant language to use in school, the teachers' insistence on the use of the school language contributed to the inhibition of the pupils' mother tongue and the misconstruction of its value. However, the pupils' views showed their attachment to these languages due to their using them at home with relatives.

Nana's study highlights a divide between home and school languages in a multilingual socialisation context and problematizes the official bilingualism construct of Cameroon at a time when an apparent language in education policy shift was still to be evidenced by a paradigm shift in teachers' perception of the appropriate language to be used in schools. The picture provided by Nana of the pupils' views in Cameroon is followed by a chapter which also looks at school pupils' perceptions, but in a Chinese, rather than an African context.

Indeed, recent studies on multilingualism have increasingly regarded notions such as identity, speech community and even 'multilingualism' itself as social constructions and problematised the assumed boundaries in such notions. However, important questions remain unanswered. For example, to what extent does language living at school echo such intellectual problematisation? And how do school pupils perceive and construct their ethnolinguistic identities in a large city with a multi-million and multidialectal population that is being rapidly transformed by modernisation and massive migration? Drawing on data from an ethnographic study in two primary schools in Guangzhou, South China, **Sihua Liang** examines how the pupils discursively construct multiple and shifting linguistic identities in interaction by making use of language choice, language crossing and other discursive strategies. It is in such interactions that the monolingual bias towards the links between linguistic proficiency, linguistic loyalty and linguistic identity become foregrounded and questioned. While the skills and flexibility of students in discursive and multidialectal negotiation of subject positions are worth school recognition, the tension and symbolic violence observed in the interactions reveals that the negative impacts of the monolingual norms also call for immediate educational responses.

It is often the case that the ideological agenda of education, aligning typically with the ideals of democracy and inclusion, undergoes a process of "degeneration" in the course of its translation into practice. This is particularly evident in the domain of language education which, more often than not, becomes transformed into an arena that nurtures inequality

and exclusion. In her chapter which focuses specifically on the language education of immigrant students **Filio Constantinou** discusses how certain language education policies assist the perpetuation of social inequalities and, through a holistic examination that extends from the macro-level of educational ideology to the micro-level of classroom practice, identifies instances of such degeneration.

Taking the position that language education pathways can lead to social inequality, she exposes, in particular, the underlying role of national ideologies in the formation of such policies by drawing on data from a study on second language writing conducted in Greek Cypriot schools on the bidialectal island of Cyprus, a country which hosts an increasingly large immigrant population but has relatively limited experience in dealing with linguistic diversity in the context of education and where the language of instruction (i.e. Standard Modern Greek) does not coincide with the children's mother tongue (i.e. Greek Cypriot Dialect). The source of this discrepancy is mainly ideological and derives from the strong identification of Greek Cypriots with Greece and the Greek culture. This has given rise to the monodialectal orientation of the Cypriot educational system which, as the findings of the study suggest, tends to affect the writing performance of pupils, especially those of immigrant background. Specifically, immigrant pupils appear to incorporate significantly more dialectal forms in their writing compared to their Cypriot peers, as a result of their lower awareness of the differences which exist between the two language varieties. Given that formal writing is not very tolerant to the presence of non-standard forms, it can be argued that the ideologically-driven language planning as carried out in Cyprus victimises specific groups of pupils.

Tayyaba Tamim's chapter looks at languages in education and the dual system of education in Pakistan, which is marked by the use of English in private education and vernacular in government schools. Her research is based on the findings of two different qualitative studies carried out in Pakistan, where she conducted 45 interviews (16 secondary school final year students and 29 graduated with at least 2 years of college education), in two of the country's provincial capitals. Her findings reveal a projection of shame and guilt in the participants' discursive construction of self and local identity, and she argues that the dual system of education in the country perpetuates symbolic violence which cuts into the very existence as human beings of those involved.

Tamim's research exemplifies Bourdieu's 'logic of dominance', whereby those who succumb to domination are more successful, yet the success comes at the cost of self-derision and dislocation of self. Indeed,

although there was unofficial use of Urdu, the national language, within private education classrooms for pragmatic reasons both teachers and students conveyed a strong sense of conflict as they found it useful but rejected its utility. Thus the dual education system of private and government education added yet another dimension of language to the class divided society, where the participants discussed fear and inhibition in the use of local languages in their struggle for 'distinction'.

In her chapter, **Lucie Betáková** looks at the role of English in the Czech Republic, a country that has recently undergone a curricular reform at the primary and secondary school levels. English has become the only compulsory language for all school children in the third form, i.e. from the age of nine or ten. Other languages like German or French can be studied as a second foreign language if there are enough children interested in the particular language. The school, however, does not guarantee that the children will have a chance to continue the study of the language when they finish their primary education. On the other hand, the state schools guarantee that the school leavers will be able to continue the study of English at their level.

Betáková compares this policy to that of the Council of Europe and assesses the disadvantages (and also possible advantages) of all children learning English. She also relates the current sociolinguistic situation in the Czech Republic and in the EU to the ideas of the famous Czech philosopher Jan Ámos Komenský (Comenius, 1592-1670) who advocated, apart from learning Latin as a lingua franca, learning the languages of the neighbouring states.

What is 'acceptable'? is the question that **Bettina Beinhoff** faces in her chapter on the role of acceptability in English non-native speech. Studies in the domain of English as a Lingua Franca stress that non-native speaker (NNS) accents of English should become increasingly acceptable as our social realities change towards a world of linguistic pluralism. More recent developments, such as the increase in mobile technologies and social networking, seem to accelerate this process, thereby increasing the likelihood of contact between NNS of English from different cultural backgrounds.

Because her findings indicate that the concept of acceptability is very complex and needs further investigation, Beinhoff develops a more detailed definition of 'acceptability' for sociolinguistics in language education which is also based on studies from the wider field of social science research. Her chapter then looks at NNS' and native English speakers' attitudes towards their own (ingroup) and other (outgroup) accents of English. Participants rated English speech samples on their

'acceptability' and on traits representing the solidarity dimension (i.e. how much a person identifies with an accent) and the status dimension (i.e. how much prestige is assigned to an accent). Beinhoff's results suggest that the perceived prestige and status of an accent is considered more important than solidarity and, also, that 'acceptability' is closely linked to status traits.

In his chapter, **Pedro Luis Luchini** also looks at acceptability, in particular with the aim of identifying aspects of speech which decrease intelligibility in spoken interactions between non-native English speakers. Nowadays, communication in English is not restricted to interactions only between native speakers (NSs) and native speakers of other languages. Indeed, English is most commonly used worldwide as a lingua franca in interactions between non-native speakers (NNSs). This use of English for the most part as a lingua franca has been largely ignored in research on the use and/or learning of English as a second or foreign language (L2). A relevant example is research on the pronunciation and intelligibility of NNSs, where the great majority of the research has used native speakers of English as the frame of reference for the acceptability and intelligibility of NNSs' speech. However, it is also essential to investigate how intelligible NNSs are to each other, and the main purpose of Luchini's study is to evaluate how intelligibility between NNSs is affected by particular L2 phonological variations in NNS speech. His analysis is framed in a set of phonological features which recurrently bring about unintelligibility in interactions between NNSs (Jenkins 2000), and the study also aims to identify a set of speech sounds and syllabic and prosodic elements which are essential for mutual intelligibility between NNSs. Luchini examines four speech samples drawn from three non-native speakers of English (ENNSs): two from Hindi background and one from Spanish background. His findings suggest that segmental deviations along with misplacement of nuclear stress constitute the major obstacle for the attainment of mutual intelligibility in interactions of this type.

Anna V. Sokolova G. and **Maria del Carmen A. Hernández y Lazo** present some of the findings of their survey of university students' perception of the role of English in Mexican society. The study was carried out with the aim of examining what Mexican university students as social actors thought about the role of English in their country and how they came to hold these views. The researchers conducted semi-structured interviews and group discussions with university students in order to investigate their opinions and beliefs as regards a number of questions, including two main ones. First, is it possible that at some moment in the future the Mexican population will be bilingual; that is, will the Mexican

population use both Spanish and English in their everyday life? Second, to what extent would such a situation affect the Mexican national identity? The study shows in discourse analysis terms how the students as language learners constructed their group reality and also how they represented themselves in this respect. Their sociocultural, academic and demographic features, together with the place conferred to English in the national arena, would seem to be of great importance in the construction of their representations of this language. Although the investigation is a case study, the researchers suggest that it can also provide a helpful picture of the perceptions of students in other Mexican higher education institutions.

Reflections

A number of themes run through this volume, some of them complex and controversial. Language education is focused on at the various levels of schooling: primary (Nana), secondary (Tamin) and tertiary (Sokolova and Hernández y Lazo, Tamin) and in different contexts of immigration (Constantinou) and superdiversity (Liang). Moreover, language policy issues run through and across the different levels of education (Yiakoumetti, Constantinou, Betáková). Two of the papers make suggestions as to how to improve language education (Yiakoumetti and Betáková), while the issues raised by the 'native speaker' construct (Liang), bilingualism (Nana) and non-standard forms (Constantinou) are explored, as well as the role of acceptability in non-native speech (Beinhoff, Luchini).

We suggest that the insights presented here provide an extremely useful way of looking at the current state of the art of language education across the different levels of schooling and also within the various contexts analysed. Because of the increasing interest in language education as a result of the growing number of migrant children in schools and globalization associated with the rapid spread of English (Yiakoumetti 2012) the volume is likely to be of interest to a wide international readership, including scholars and students of sociolinguistics and language education.

As this second volume of our ongoing project goes to press, we would like to thank very warmly all those who have contributed to the two seminars and the volumes. Finally, we would also like to draw our readers' attention to an exciting and innovative new research initiative, which has recently been set up by the second language education group at the University of Cambridge Faculty of Education. The CRiCLE-Net (Cambridge Research in Community Language Education Network) <http://www.educ.cam.ac.uk/centres/networks/cricle/> provides a research

forum where policy makers, academics, practitioners and research students in Cambridge and East Anglia, and more broadly at national and international levels, can engage in critical debates on research in community language education. Such initiatives are likely to prove extremely valuable in helping sociolinguists in their continuing endeavour to make sense of changing language use in the increasingly messy but fascinating new marketplace.

References

Blommaert, J. 2010. *The Sociolinguistics of Globalization*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

Busch, B. 2012. The Linguistic Repertoire Revisited. *Applied Linguistics* 33(5), 503–523.

Esch, E. and M. Solly. eds. 2012. *The Sociolinguistics of Language Education in International Contexts*. Bern: Peter Lang.

Jin He. 2012. The Myths of English Proficiency: The Socially Constructed Ideas about English in China. In *The Sociolinguistics of Language Education in International Contexts*, ed. E. Esch and M. Solly, 47-68.

Joseph, J. 2004. *Language and Identity: National, Ethnic, Religious*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Li Wei. 2011. Moment Analysis and translanguaging space: Discursive construction of identities by multilingual Chinese youth in Britain. *Journal of Pragmatics* 43, 1222–1235.

Morgan, M. 2004. Speech Community. In *A Companion to Linguistic Anthropology*, ed. A. Duranti, 3-22. Oxford: Blackwell.

Rampton, B. 1995. Language crossing and the problematisation of ethnicity and socialisation. *Pragmatics* 5(4), 485–513.

Riley, P. 2007. *Language, Culture and Identity*. London: Continuum.

Schiffman, H. 1996. *Linguistic Culture and Language Policy*. London: Routledge.

Stecconi, U. 2010. Multilingualism in the EU: a developing policy field. In *Political Discourse, Media and Translation*, ed. C. Schaffner and S. Basnett, 144-163. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

van Lier, L. 2002. An ecological-semiotic perspective on language and linguistics. In *Language Acquisition and Language Socialization: Ecological Perspectives*, ed. C. Kramsch, 140-164. London: Continuum.

Vertovec, S. 2007. Super-diversity and its implications. *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 29(6), 1024–54.

Yiakoumetti A. 2012. *Harnessing Linguistic Variation for Better Education*. Berlin: Peter Lang.

CHAPTER ONE

LANGUAGE EDUCATION
IN OUR GLOBALISED CLASSROOMS:
RECOMMENDATIONS ON PROVIDING
FOR EQUAL LANGUAGE RIGHTS

ANDROULA YIAKOUMETTI

Introduction

We are now, in late post-modernity, experiencing the effects of globalisation and transnationalism on societies in general and on education in particular. As we continue to travel and/or migrate, there is a heightened interconnectivity between people which breaks the traditional boundaries associated with national states. For many, the congruence of social and geographic spaces has become blurred because of their transnational ties to multiple spaces. These ties are, no doubt, facilitated by increased global transportation and telecommunication technologies. Inevitably, the coming together of peoples has led to enhanced levels of linguistic diversity in education which is manifested in the co-occurrence of multiple linguistic varieties in the classroom. This emerging reality is characterised by new opportunities and also by new challenges: opportunities because multiple varieties gain voices in educational settings which were once less linguistically diverse and challenges because new pedagogical approaches are called for to better serve today's speakers. Perhaps most importantly, the challenge is for the co-occurrence of multiple languages not to be suppressed but to be promoted such that monolingual students, emerging bilingual students, and multilingual students alike can be equipped with multilingual competences. Students who arrive at school as monolinguals should have opportunities to learn additional languages from their multilingual counterparts and from the curriculum while students who

arrive at school as multilinguals should have the right to use, maintain, and develop their multiple languages.

Current research in many educational settings worldwide points to the fact that, when supported, transnational learners employ language practices which resist homogenising tendencies (García *et al.* 2006): despite the usual stipulation to use a single standard linguistic variety exclusively, these learners use their different varieties concurrently to serve their learning purposes. Nevertheless, current educational policies largely fail to acknowledge and to subsequently harness the emerging reality of linguistic variation. Although the rhetoric of these policies seems to reflect positivity towards multilingualism and multiculturalism, on closer examination, only a very few favour maintenance of languages and cultures which are associated with minority, indigenous or nonstandard varieties. Even fewer favour promotion of these languages and cultures. The majority of policies demonstrate a sociolinguistically ill-informed attachment to linguistic and cultural homogeneity which is almost always manifested in the classroom use of a prescribed power-associated single linguistic variety.

Unfortunately, the schism between what should ideally happen in today's multilingual classrooms and what policies prescribe tends to disadvantage mostly those who need to be protected in the educational system. Minority- and indigenous-language speakers are such peoples because, very often, their languages and cultures are threatened by the majority and/or power-associated languages and cultures. As Cummins (2001) explains, assimilationist policies in education discourage students from maintaining their mother tongues because such retention is viewed as inability to identify with the mainstream language and culture. He argues that linguistic and cultural diversity is very often seen as a problem which many educational policies aim to eradicate. However, it is clear that banning or discouraging native voices in education inhibits learners' access to a meaningful education.

This chapter argues that only by building on the actual emerging language realities found in today's globalised classrooms and by promoting linguistic diversity can we move towards the ideal situation of equal language rights. After reviewing research carried out around the world, this chapter makes the case that multilingual competence be seen as an essential goal of education. This exhortation accords well with UNESCO's strong commitment to quality education for all and, indeed, to cultural and linguistic diversity in education (UNESCO 2003a).

This recommendation comes at a time when, as May (2012a) astutely notes, a rapid and significant retrenchment of multilingualism and

multiculturalism within education can be observed. In the United States, for example, one can see that, despite the linguistic landscape's having become demonstrably more multilingual, English-only ideals are promoted (Crawford 2007; García and Kleifgen 2010; May 2012b): English-only statutes that banned bilingual education in states with large Spanish-speaking populations were passed in California in 1998 and Arizona in 2000. In addition, the word "bilingual" was struck out of federal education and legislation: the Office of Bilingual and Minority Language Affairs came to be called the Office of English Language Acquisition and the Bilingual Education Act itself is now named Language Instruction for Limited English Proficient and Immigrant Students (García *et al*. 2012). In Europe, bilingual educational programmes also face significant devaluation as minority groups are increasingly urged to strive towards dominant cultural and linguistic mores (May 2012a; Modood 2007).

In taking stock of these regrettable developments, it is clear that language education policies ought to be reassessed to meet the local, regional, national, and global needs of today's citizens. There is no doubt that linguistic diversity becomes more complex as a result of globalisation, technology, and transnationalism: it is time to eliminate the linguistically-intolerant language policies and to embrace educational frameworks that reflect today's realities, ensure language rights, and avoid marginalisation of linguistic groups.

Language rights and education

Language is not simply a means of communication. It is a fundamental attribute of cultural identity and empowerment, both for the individual and the group. Majority-language speakers, minority-language speakers, and indigenous-language speakers all have the right to have their varieties respected and promoted. We are our languages and so it is not surprising that claims for language are among the first rights that minorities have voiced in cases of political change (May *et al*. 2004). Skutnabb-Kangas (2001) convincingly argues that granting education-based and language-based rights to minorities can be part of conflict prevention.

UNESCO has a central role to play in providing international frameworks for educational policy on the important issue of which language should be used as the medium of instruction. Throughout the last sixty years, a number of declarations on children's rights in early education, the role of the mother tongue, and linguistic diversity have been adopted. UNESCO is strongly committed to promoting the use of a child's

own language as the medium of instruction in the early years of formal schooling (UNESCO 1953, 2003a, 2003b). International Mother Language Day, proclaimed in 1999 and marked on 21 February each year, is an example of UNESCO's recognition of the key role of the mother tongue. In addition, UNESCO's Universal Declaration of Cultural Diversity (2001) addresses the significance of languages for cultural diversity and emphasises the benefits of linguistic diversity at all levels of education and the promotion of multilingualism from an early age.

As far as educational language rights are concerned, the following have been framed for minority and indigenous groups: schooling in the minority and indigenous languages, if desired; access to the language of the larger community and to that of national educational systems; inter-cultural education that promotes positive attitudes to minority and indigenous languages and the cultures they express; and access to international languages (Ball 2011). The ultimate rationale for the promotion of mother-tongue education is the empowerment of underprivileged groups.

In Europe, commendable efforts to promote linguistic diversity and language learning in the field of education have been made. The Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities (1995) and the European Charter for Regional or Minority Languages (ECRML) (1992), both prepared under the auspices of the Council of Europe, aim to protect regional and minority languages as they see them to be an integral part of European cultural heritage. The ECRML's contribution to linguistic diversity is considerable as it is the first legal instrument devoted to the protection of minority languages (Arzoz 2007; Hogan-Brun and Wolff 2003).

Beyond the work of UNESCO and the Council of Europe, language rights as an academic paradigm is also well established in the discipline of sociolinguistics. As May (2005) explains, its presence is demonstrated by three academic movements: the language ecology movement which situates the loss of many of the world's languages within a wider ecological framework (Mühlhäuser 1996, 2000, Nettle and Romaine 2000); the linguistic human rights movement that argues for the greater institutional protection and support of minority languages and their speakers (Skutnabb-Kangas 1998, 2000, 2002; Skutnabb-Kangas and Phillipson 1995); and the academic legal discourse associated with minority language rights law (de Varennes 1996a, 1996b; Henrard 2000).

It is beyond the scope of this chapter to further review the literature on educational language rights. However, some bleak estimations about the world's spoken languages are provided here to highlight the importance of

actively pursuing the maintenance of linguistic diversity in education. Education receives special emphasis here as it remains one of the most powerful institutionally-organised environments that linguistically positions novices into society (Stroud 2003). It is estimated that, by 2100, there may remain only 300-600 (out of the currently spoken c.7000) oral languages transmitted by the parent generation to children (Krauss 1992; Skutnabb-Kangas 2009). Using emotive language, Skutnabb-Kangas (1994) argues that linguistic genocide is committed in relation to minorities when educational systems do not build on linguistically-diverse children's rich repertoires but instead suppress them. Other similarly powerful terms sometimes used are those of glottophagie and linguistic cannibalism (Calvet 1974; Brenzinger 1992; Phillipson and Skutnabb-Kangas 1995). It is clear that, if we are to slow down the exponential loss of the world's languages, education needs to start delivering support for language diversity. Education should not result in the exclusion of some groups based on language criteria.

The importance of the mother tongue

No discussion of language education should overlook the immeasurable importance of people's mother tongues. The theoretical justification for the role of incorporating the mother tongue in education is well developed and supported (Cummins 2000). In addition, there is abundant empirical evidence which demonstrates that utilising the mother tongue in formal (monolingual as well as bi/multilingual) education is beneficial. For instance, when children are given the chance to be educated in their mother tongue, they are more likely to enrol and succeed in school (Kosonen 2005). Importantly, studies have demonstrated that instruction in the mother tongue is beneficial to literacy in the first language, achievement in other subjects, and learning of a second language (Dutcher and Tucker 1997; Dutcher 2004). It has been argued that mother tongue-based education is especially beneficial for disadvantaged groups, such as children from rural communities (Hovens 2002). It has also been shown that, in developing countries with unequal sex-based opportunities, girls achieve better when they are taught in their mother tongue (UNESCO 2005).

A few examples from the literature will be briefly presented here in order to demonstrate some of the benefits (outlined above) of incorporating the mother tongue into education. It has been documented that, when minority-language students' mother tongues are part of education, more such students enrol and achieve learning at high levels

(Ding and Yu 2013). Drawing on Yi (the seventh largest of the 55 officially recognised ethnic minority groups in China), Ding and Yu (2013) argue that, despite the battle between maintaining and developing Yi and spreading Putonghua, it is clear that a bilingual educational model that utilises students' native variety is beneficial. The authors compared two models of bilingual education adopted in Liangshan (China): the first model represents a strong form of bilingual education (Baker 2011) in that students are required to use the Yi language and learn standard Chinese as a school subject; and the second model represents a weak form of bilingual education as cultivation of specialised knowledge in the Yi language is not a priority. In comparing these two models, the authors explain that students who participate in education based on the first model have better prospects for going to colleges, compared to students who participate in education based on the second model. This is mainly because of preferential higher-education policies towards students who develop expertise in more than one language.

Beyond improved attendance, benefits have been shown with regard to literacy. The Foyer programme is testament to the fact that educating students in their native minority languages improves literacy in both the minority and the majority languages (Cummins 2000). This programme which commenced in Belgium in 1981 embraces linguistic diversity and promotes multiliteracy in students' mother tongues (Arabic, Italian, Spanish or Turkish) as well as Dutch and French. The programme is successful as students (i) develop better mother-tongue knowledge compared with students in monolingual Dutch schools and (ii) develop a level of Dutch that enables them to keep up with subsequent education in secondary school. It thus serves as evidence of the benefits of multilingual education.

Benefits have also been recorded beyond literacy, in subjects such as mathematics. For instance, Mohanty and Saikia (2008) examined the school achievement of Bodo tribal children in Assam (India) by comparing children educated in Bodo (the tribal mother tongue) and children educated in Assamese (the regional majority language). They found that the mother-tongue-educated children performed better in language and mathematics compared to their Assamese-educated counterparts.

As far as the role of the mother tongue in second and/or foreign language learning is concerned, there have been numerous studies that report on the advantages of using students' familiar languages (alongside the targeted second/foreign languages) in education (Brooks-Lewis 2009; Auerbach 1993). Indeed, over the last three decades, a number of scholars

including Atkinson (1987, 1993), Harbord (1992), Butzkamm (1998, 2003) and Cook (2001) have made the case that the mother tongue has a variety of beneficial roles to play in monolingual foreign-language education.

As evidenced above, the potentially huge benefits that can be gained when the mother tongue is utilised in education cannot be overstated. This is especially relevant when we consider that about 476 million of the world's illiterate people speak minority languages and live in countries where children are mostly not taught in their mother tongue (UNESCO 2003b). Given that the evidence suggests that speakers are better off when their minority languages are present in education, how do we ensure that linguistic diversity and multilingualism are promoted in schools? Furthermore, does allowing minority languages into formal schooling mean that majority and/or power-associated varieties are out of reach for minority-language speaking students? An educational sociolinguist would readily reply in the negative. However, huge political and economic obstacles are ever-present when considering language education for minority pupils. Indeed, such obstacles have been the reason for the failure of some mother-tongue programmes which did manage to get the green light for implementation.

Several African countries (in which economic, political, cultural, and social aspects all affect education) serve as ideal vantage points from which to discuss this failure. Stroud (2001, 2003) explains that attempts to use mother tongues in schools are plagued by curricula skewed towards metropolitan languages (such as English, French, and Portuguese). Language policies enacted to promote local varieties are seen as futile by lay persons. It is therefore natural that mother-tongue based programmes remain illusive when policy makers undermine non-metropolitan languages and emphasise the utility of metropolitan languages. Indeed, many parents wish for their children to be educated in the metropolitan languages and consider instruction through national languages to be a waste of time (Banda 2000).

Kamwangamalu (2012) questions the two extreme ideologies associated with African countries, namely the ideology of decolonisation and the ideology of development. The former favours the use of indigenous African languages as media of instruction and the latter favours instruction in the languages of former colonial powers. Kamwangamalu (2012) calls for new policies which assign to indigenous African languages some of the advantages that are currently associated only with colonial languages.

English: a threat to linguistic diversity?

Globalisation is inextricably linked to the dominant role of English and the growing literature on English as an international language (Crystal 2003; McKay 2002; Sharifian 2009) attests to the widespread recognition that English is the world's lingua franca. A number of factors offer English unprecedented power including (i) the economic and political dominance of English-speaking countries (United States, United Kingdom, Australia, Canada), (ii) the employment of English as the lingua franca on the internet, and (iii) the retaining of English as a working language in many postcolonial countries. English is the language of business and the language in which most of the technical and scientific knowledge is distributed. English is perceived as the language of mobility and its presence in educational systems all around the globe is hence immensely prominent.

English today is unique: when L1 and L2 speakers are taken together, English is the language with the greatest number of speakers and, at the same time, the language with the widest geographical distribution (McKay 2012). In addition, English is used by many kinds of speakers for diverse purposes. Some learn English as a foreign language (as part of their compulsory education) but do not use it in their daily lives. Others are motivated to learn English because they believe that English is associated with economic and technological advancement. Others yet strive for English acquisition because, as a South African teacher bluntly put it, "English puts bread on the table" (Probyn *et al.* 2002). The fact that English has many types of speakers who employ the language for diverse purposes has pedagogical implications. Briefly, this means that context-dependent socially-sensitive pedagogies are required when teaching English. As each context is unique, with learners having particular needs and expectations relating to English learning and proficiency, pedagogies that are tailor-made to suit these needs and expectations are required.

As English continues to spread, concerns have been voiced as to its undermining linguistic and cultural diversity (Phillipson 1992, 2003; Skutnabb-Kangas 2000). Mohanty (2006, 2010), for instance, argues that the powerful presence of English has obliterated the language tolerance that once characterised India. The author explains that English pushes the major languages (including Hindi) into positions of relative weakness and that these languages, in turn, further marginalise the minor and tribal mother tongues.

However, I argue that English and linguistic diversity can co-exist and that the ever-growing English language does not necessarily pose a threat

to multilingualism. Other researchers (McKay 2012; House 2003) have also taken this stance. McKay (2012) suggests that English can continue to spread in a manner that preserves linguistic and cultural diversity worldwide when the value of multilingualism is concomitantly affirmed. This affirmation can be achieved by building on students' existing linguistic repertoires and by developing curricula that accurately reflect the local linguistic landscape. It is imperative that curricula have an appropriate interpretation of the role of English in the context at hand because, as stated above, English is used by different types of speakers and for diverse purposes (which makes each context unique). Learning and using English should not be seen as an activity that necessarily displaces national, indigenous or nonstandard linguistic varieties. In fact, English can contribute towards multilingualism in that, when English is presented and taught appropriately, it can add to people's linguistic repertoires.

In a study carried out in the Norwegian higher-education context, Ljosland (2011) argues that both Norwegian (the mother tongue of the students) and English (the language of the study programme that was investigated) co-existed harmoniously. The author explored the language use and language attitudes of students studying for a course which introduced English (as opposed to Norwegian) as the medium of instruction. The findings revealed that students displayed a dualistic attitude in that Norwegian was seen as part of their identity and English was seen as the language of research in their subject field. Students did not express the view that English took over from Norwegian. As the author explains, their frequent switching between Norwegian and English allowed them to be both themselves, as well as aspiring experts in their field. This bilingual and bicultural identity is precisely what Arnett (2002) describes as a positive consequence of globalisation: one part of the identity of these learners is rooted in their local culture and language while another stems from their relation to the global culture and language.

House (2003) is another researcher who argues against the widespread assumption that English, in its role as a lingua franca, is a serious threat to linguistic diversity. She makes a distinction between languages for communication and languages for identification and explains that using English for instrumental purposes does not necessarily displace local languages as these are used for different purposes. She makes the case that English can stimulate speakers of minority languages to revive their languages such that they can balance out the spread of English. Drawing on her native Germany, she notes that, paradoxical as it may sound, the spread of English in Germany brought about the revival of songs in local dialects such as Bavarian to counteract pop music in English only.

English as an international language need not be a threat: mother tongues, regional, and national varieties can thrive alongside English. A meaningful multilingual education that promotes multilingual competence, supports and maintains indigenous languages, and offers access to English as an international language should be the aim of today's societies.

Reconsidering language education in our globalised classrooms

Education is a key environment for conferring legitimacy on specific practices of language (Stroud 2003). Traditionally, in most educational contexts in the world, the teaching of the majority language and, subsequently, the reproduction of the cultural capital of the dominant group have been the norm. Such education is a long way from respecting and promoting minority children's linguistic and cultural diversity. Indeed, such education does not allow children who speak non-dominant varieties to enjoy education that goes beyond monolingual boundaries, purity, and correctness. Children are being constrained to employing just one 'legitimate' variety and are being subjugated to ideologies of nation states. A subtractive ideology is encouraged whereby students end up losing their other languages such that they can come closer to 'one pure' national language.

This chapter calls for multilingual competence to be seen as an aspiration, given the nature of most societies where multi-languages are a reality at both the local and national levels. As Shohamy (2006) convincingly argues, our reality does support a multilingual ideology. Indeed, looking at the discourse of today's speakers, it is clear that daily language use takes place in complex multilingual ecologies and is characterised by linguistic practices that employ a multilingual mix and fusion of form and function. To re-iterate the sentiment of other authors such as García *et al.* (2006), how can we create an education that can support the multiplicity of languages and literacies in our globalised world? How can we make sure that linguistically-diverse children can have both their mother tongues and a future? Where it is legitimate to use and develop multiple languages, how can we do it meaningfully, creatively, inclusively, and objectively?

Below, I offer some recommendations:

Use language awareness to achieve a meaningful and sociolinguistically-informed education: Language approaches/policies which promote language awareness, build on the sociolinguistic context at hand, and promote a

collaborative partnership between teachers and parents have been shown to lead to linguistic and cultural empowerment. For instance, a language awareness project in a primary school in Alsace (France) transformed the traditional monolingual habitus of the school and paved the way for multilingual education (Hélot and Young 2006). This was achieved by making all pupils, monolingual and bilingual alike, aware and respectful of the regional and immigration languages of the pupils in that school. Children were thus in the fortunate position of learning about the wealth of linguistic and cultural diversity that surrounded them before they formally commenced learning a foreign language. Similarly, many other language-awareness projects have provided empirical evidence that, when students are made aware of the richness of the linguistic varieties spoken within their homes and broader communities and when their first language is seen as a resource, they perform linguistically better and have positive attitudes towards linguistic variation. Such projects have been carried out worldwide, including in Australia (Malcolm and Truscott 2012), Canada (Ball and Bernhardt 2012), the Caribbean (Siegel 2012), Europe (Yiakoumetti 2006, 2007), and the United States (Adger *et al.* 2007) and had various aims including contrastive analysis between the native and the target varieties, awareness of variation in language (*e.g.* regional and social varieties, pidgins and creoles), and awareness of equality of linguistic varieties.

Use the pedagogy of translanguaging for a creative education: Minority-language speakers worldwide are most often educated within pedagogical frameworks which have been designed for majority-language speakers. This translates to education in usually one language, the dominant state language. As García *et al.* (2012) note, even when minority-language speakers are given the opportunity to be educated bi/multilingually, they are exposed to frameworks which are still diglossic in nature. (This diglossic nature means that one language (Fishman 1967), or one linguistic variety (Ferguson 1959), or one feature (Labov 1966) is used for unique purposes and the other language/linguistic variety/feature is used for different functions.) The authors challenge such frameworks and argue for the creation of different educational designs which would better cope with the emergent linguistically-diverse classrooms of today. The solution they offer transgresses monolingualism and bilingual dualities and acknowledges that the language practices of today's bilinguals do not respond to an additive or a subtractive model of bilingualism. These language practises need a different pedagogy if they are to thrive: the recommended pedagogy is translanguaging.

Translanguaging as pedagogy refers to building flexibly on bilingual students' language practices in order to develop new language practices, including academic language practices. It is important to differentiate between translanguaging and codeswitching: the former goes beyond a shift between two languages and refers to the use of original and complex discursive practices that cannot be easily assigned to one code or another. Translanguaging is particularly important for minority-language students who are emergent bilinguals because it builds on students' strengths by allowing them to create language hybrids and fusions whereby different codes are used for communication and expression. It is especially important to note that, in classrooms where the translanguaging pedagogy is employed, teachers need not be fluent in students' native varieties. Teachers draw on students' entire linguistic repertoire and translanguaging practices by encouraging them to make sense of their knowledge and expertise.

It should become obvious that a pedagogy like translanguaging best suits the ever-growing linguistically-diverse classrooms of today. Policies worldwide ought to respond to the demands posed by globalisation, global mobility, technology, and transnationalism. Learners today are not being served efficiently when their various linguistic varieties are separated or, worse, restricted to one dominant standard language discourse. As Herdina and Jessner (2002) explain, the interactions of bilinguals' interdependent language systems create new structures that are not found in monolingual monolithic systems created by nation-states.

Involve parents to achieve an inclusive education: The role of the parents in maintaining their children's linguistic heritage has been highlighted in the literature. Baker (1992) cautioned that parents' stated attitudes regarding their child's acquisition/education in a minority language do not necessarily match their behaviour. Most minority-language parents wish to see their children succeed in the majority school language. At the same time, many also want their children to learn and be proud of their cultural and linguistic heritage. When it comes to practice, these dual language desires tend to lean towards promoting the majority language rather than towards parents' expressed desire for mother-tongue learning. It is important therefore for language policies to include parents in their children's education so that parents feel confident to promote multilingualism. It has been demonstrated that, when the help of parents is enlisted, parents are more likely to collaborate with teachers and participate in their children's learning (Benson 2002). Fettes (1998) suggests that acknowledgement of the importance of community ownership