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Introduction
A transdisciplinary perspective on translation and education

Sara Laviosa and Maria González-Davies

Applied translation studies and educational linguistics are being influenced by what has been named the ‘multilingual turn’ in applied linguistics. This orientation foregrounds “multilingualism, rather than monolingualism, as the new norm of applied linguistic and sociolinguistic analysis” (May 2014, p. 1). The multilingual turn is engendered by concerns raised in globalization, cosmopolitanism, and migration studies (cf. Bielsa 2016; Inghilleri 2017) and emphasizes the highly complex processes inherent in languages in contact as they unfold within an individual’s psychological and historical spaces, and among speakers of different languages when they engage in intercultural communication in their everyday social, academic, and professional lives. The paradigm shift in favour of multilingualism entails a re-evaluation of reflexivity in language and intercultural education (cf. Byrd Clark and Dervin 2014). It also entails a rethinking of the transmissionist model of learning in terms of mutual exchange of knowledge between teacher and students and among students themselves. In this sense, all the contributions to the volume highlight how learners are active participants in the development of what is taught, as envisaged by the American educational philosopher John Dewey (1938) and implemented in collaborative learning, which is inspired by Vygotskian sociocultural theory (Vygotsky 1978).

The multilingual turn is increasingly endorsed and promoted by such political forces as the Council of Europe. The CEFR Companion Volume with New Descriptors (Council of Europe 2018), in particular, underscores the importance of mediation in honing plurilingual and pluricultural competence, which is considered from various perspectives: “as a sociological or historical fact, as a personal characteristic or ambition, as an educational philosophy or approach, or – fundamentally – as the sociopolitical aim of preserving linguistic diversity” (p. 28). Cross-linguistic, social, cultural, and professional mediation are at the core of different types of translanguaging activities, namely relaying specific information, processing text, explaining data across languages and cultures in speech and writing, note-taking, expressing personal responses to creative texts, and translating a written text in speech and writing (p. 104). In a similar vein, the new Australian Curriculum for languages adopts an intercultural orientation and includes translation and interpreting as forms of intercultural mediation. These forms of mediation involve the analysis and understanding of language and culture as resources for interpreting and shaping meaning in intercultural exchange (ACARA 2014, in Scarino 2016, p. 480).
In unison with the multilingual paradigm are the recommendations made in the Ad Hoc Report on Foreign Languages issued by the Modern Language Association of North America (MLA 2007). This programmatic document states that the goal of languages education in the 21st century is to develop translingual and transcultural competence. In contrast to seeking to replicate the competence of an educated native speaker, “[t]he idea of translingual and transcultural competence places value on the ability to operate between languages”, and entails the capacity to reflect on the world and on ourselves through the lens of another language and culture (MLA 2007). The report also recommends the development of programmes in translation and interpretation because “[t]here is a great unmet demand for translators and interpreters, and translation is an ideal context for developing translingual and transcultural abilities as an organizing principle of the language curriculum” (MLA 2007). Against this backdrop, the aim of the handbook is twofold: to present the state of the art of the place and role of translation and its manifold manifestations in educational contexts worldwide, and to lay a sound foundation for the future interdisciplinary cooperation between translation studies and educational linguistics.

The handbook deals with a transdisciplinary subject area that focuses on the study of translation and education within a multilingual perspective. It is a burgeoning area of investigation which is attracting the interest of translation studies scholars and educationalists worldwide. The volume is addressed mainly to teacher trainers, teacher trainees, and researchers in translation studies and educational linguistics. It also addresses students embarking on MA courses or doctoral studies in this field, final year undergraduate students on degree courses in education, linguistics, applied linguistics, modern languages, communication studies, and cross-curricular studies (e.g. mediation and intercultural studies); students on second degrees or on short specialized courses for business people and other professions that require translation and/or basic interpreting skills and intercultural competence (e.g. journalism and localization); translation purchasers and agencies; administrators setting up new educational programmes; and any readers interested in translation and education.

As regards the structure of the book, the chapters in Part I provide the theoretical foundations for opening up a fruitful dialogue between translation studies scholars and educationalists. The chapters in Part II, III, IV, V, and VI examine the form and function of translation and interpreting in relation to the ways and contexts in which the purpose and process of learning are conceptualized in a particular pedagogical context. For ‘purpose’ we mean the kinds of knowledge and abilities that constitute the learning objectives. For ‘process’ we mean the procedures adopted to achieve these goals. These chapters cover educational contexts from early childhood and primary education (Part II), to secondary and higher education (Parts III and IV), special education (Part V), and, finally, teacher education (Part VI). After a brief introduction, each contribution provides an overview of the historical background to a given educational setting and outlines the development of pedagogical approaches, methods, assessment, and curriculum design. Next, it focuses on current research approaches and empirical findings. It then examines one or two examples of pedagogies that integrate translation in the curriculum, the teaching method’s approach, design, and procedure as well as assessment, depending on each individual case. In the last two sections the authors make general recommendations for practice and point to future directions, aiming to bring about beneficial changes in teaching approaches, methods, testing or curriculum design. The terminology is explained within each chapter. Each contributor has been asked to define the key terms at the beginning of their chapter in order to ensure both situatedness and clarity. Since the approach is transdisciplinary, various concepts of translation will emerge from the different educational contexts in which it is employed.
In this Introduction we outline the content of each contribution, highlighting commonalities and differences as well as propose avenues for future collaborative research inspired by the running themes that link together the papers selected for the handbook and are germane to both translation studies and educational linguistics. This transdisciplinary and transcultural perspective becomes self-evident as the chapters are written by a selection of contributors who come from different backgrounds and have been brought together for the first time in this volume.

The volume opens with a section dedicated to setting the theoretical background to the issues dealt with in the book. In Part I, Katie A. Bernstein and Laura Hamman-Ortiz present an overview of bi/multilingualism, focusing on historical and present perspectives, including the transdisciplinary “turns” of the past several decades divided into three central areas of scholarship – psychological, linguistic, and anthropological and sociolinguistic. They then outline bi/multilingual approaches to education and review key outcomes and current debates in bi/multilingual education. Finally, they discuss the role of translation in bi/multilingual learning, both as a practice in which many bi/multilingual children engage at home and as a useful pedagogical tool in the bi/multilingual classroom. Related to this chapter, Konrad Klimkowski follows with an overview and analysis of Educational Theory focusing around the pragmatic view of learning as a process, largely facilitated in social constructivist (Vygotsky) and democratic settings (Dewey). The author claims that these two early 20th-century conceptions are in many ways pertinent to contemporary language and translation classrooms. To illustrate this point from a pragmatic angle, a section presenting two classroom activities is provided. Another objective is to claim that interpreting educational conceptions requires the interpreter’s readiness to accept more than one interpretative path since the effort to interpret educational thought that is over a hundred years old calls for re-interpretation rather than for seeking interpretative equivalence. The last chapter in Part I, written by Michael Byram, Melina Porto, and Leticia Yulita, addresses the concept of intercultural citizenship by bringing together theory of the intercultural speaker in foreign language education and theory of citizenship education, in particular the notion that the latter should lead to critical thinking about societal issues and ‘action in the community’ to engage in collective political action for the promotion of human rights. This framework of concepts and theories is illustrated with examples from a project involving language learners in universities in England and Argentina.

Part II presents how translation and interpreting are embedded in early childhood and primary education contexts. Cristina Corcoll López and Jane Mitchell-Smith start this section by introducing an approach based on a ‘Pedagogy of Diversity’, which entails the introduction to the plurilingual and pluricultural paradigm in a way that is coherent and respectful with the young learners’ needs and abilities. This approach suggests that practitioners should create opportunities for young learners to experience linguistic and cultural diversity in their settings which, in turn, will lead to awareness of otherness, concept exploration, and form a basis for future learning. Several strategies that range from language and culture sensitizing to more specific didactic classroom-based approaches are discussed and exemplified. Ofelia García, Gladys Y. Aponte, and Khanh Le examine the use of translation in primary classrooms and distinguish translation from the concept of translanguaging. To draw a distinction between the two concepts, the authors present examples of teachers in translanguaging primary classrooms who use translation differently from teachers who use translation just to promote the children’s intercultural communication with language that is ‘appropriate’ for the other group. Instead, teachers in translanguaging primary classrooms are not looking for ways of saying things in the language of the other, but in the children’s own language and through the children’s own experiences and lives. In the same educational contexts, Esa Hartmann and Christine Hélot...
Sara Laviosa and Maria González-Davies present a research project at the Graduate School of Education of the University of Strasbourg with 25 bilingual teachers completing their first year of teaching practice in bilingual preschools and primary classrooms. Analysis of the teachers’ discourses shows the extent to which the one language one teacher policy and the resulting separation of languages in bilingual education in Alsace exert a considerable influence on the ideological representation of translation and its possible pedagogical implementation. However, the analysis of the multilingual reading project demonstrates that translingual activities foster integrated and translingual learning, as well as the development of biliteracy and metalinguistic awareness. In the final chapter in this section, Sarah Ardizzone and Sam Holmes talk about establishing collaborative networks between professional translators and schools to boost students’ linguistic skills. Their goal is to adopt a sociolinguistic framework for developing a critical approach to creative multilingual translation projects and programmes in primary schools. By way of example, they report on two translation projects aimed at primary age pupils – Translation Nation and The Big Translate – the aim of which is twofold: affirming pupils’ sense of legitimacy and belonging in the classroom and enhancing pupils’ existing linguistic skills.

Part III of this volume deals with how translation and education come into contact in secondary education contexts. First, Sara Laviosa traces the evolution of the principles underpinning Content-Based Instruction (CBI), also named Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) in Europe. Next, she surveys the main research styles and findings of empirical studies that have explored the bilingual procedures used by secondary and high school teachers in educational settings that adopt a content-based language teaching approach and focuses on a case study undertaken during the teaching of a CLIL biology module in Italy. The author finally draws some conclusions on the functions fulfilled by different forms of translation and translanguaging in the CBI and the CLIL classroom. In a similar vein, BethAnne Paulsrud and Jeanette Toth explore the role of translation and translanguaging in the context of English as a medium of instruction (EMI) in secondary schools. Studies have found that students lacking sufficient proficiency in the instructional language may struggle with content. Hence, in order to promote the learning of content as well as languages, these programmes require approaches that can involve translanguaging and translation practices, such as bilingual students providing support for their classmates by translating the teacher’s statements, thereby connecting content knowledge in the L1 with content knowledge in other languages, thus also offering the potential to challenge language hierarchies. Finally, Anna M. Beres follows the evolution of bilingual education practices to date, focusing on how bilingual education was seen as desirable for hundreds of years, up until the 15th century, when the changing socioeconomic perspective and the development of the printing press prompted the drive to make uniform the language used and make education homogenous. In the 20th century the overarching aim remained to educate all children with the hope of them mastering the ‘target’ language of the school and then facilitating essentially monolingual education. Other programmes, which aimed at gaining proficiency in both languages, kept them strictly separate, dedicating private lessons, teachers, or even days of the week to one language or the other.

In Part IV, issues related to higher education are examined. Michael Huffmaster and Claire Kramsch acknowledge that globalization and increasing multilingualism are contributing to a reassessment of the role of translation in language learning and teaching. In this context translation is intended broadly not only as a text-centred activity involving the process of relaying the meaning of a text written in one language into a text written in another language, as well as the product of such a process, but also as an integral part of bilingual exchanges between the teacher and their students to facilitate comprehension of abstract vocabulary or unfamiliar concepts. With this definition of translation in mind, the authors illustrate their
translation-oriented pedagogic approach adopted in a module for elementary learners of German who were introduced to the concepts of overt versus covert translation and were assigned the task of producing two different translations of Paul Celan’s “Todesfuge”, a canonical poem of 20th-century world literature. From language learning to multilingual writing, Margarida Vale de Gato points out that the turn to creativity in translation studies, underlying translator’s subjectivity, voice, and style, has given a new impetus to literary translation in language and writing curricula. She then discusses the rationale of her proposed model for collaborative literary translation education that adopts a socio-constructivist approach and aims to integrate creative writing in the teaching of literary translation, thus creating a continuum between translating, writing the self, and self-translation.

Still in higher education, Alejandro Bolaños-García-Escribano and Jorge Díaz-Cintas focus instead on the pedagogic specificities and challenges that characterize audiovisual translation (AVT), with particular emphasis on subtitling and revoicing. They explore, with illustrative examples from current practices, the potential benefits that teaching paradigms such as socio-constructivism and situated learning can bring about in the AVT classroom. Based on the premise that worldwide mass migration and asylum seeking is creating a need for interpreter training in new settings and in a broad range of languages, Ludmila Stern and Xin Liu assess the state of the art in conference and community interpreter education as regards teaching methodology, assessment, and curriculum design, and discuss the current shift from the traditional natural interpreter and apprenticeship approach to a more evidence-based training approach. More specifically, Ineke Crezee, Jo Anna Burn, and Wei Teng discuss some of the features of community translation (CT) in New Zealand and propose ways in which pragmatic equivalence may be assessed. Second, they present a comparative analysis of two English to Chinese translations to assess in what ways they may help or hinder social inclusion. Third, they discuss student translators’ reflections on pragmatic equivalence. And finally, they introduce a non–language-specific pedagogical approach which encourages translation students to incorporate proofreader comments on pragmatic, sociocultural, and language issues so that student translators develop a connection between translation practice and social inclusion.

Given the extent to which the translation profession is more and more technologized, Sharon O’Brien and Silvia Rodríguez Vázquez stress the importance of embedding translation technology in the translator training curriculum, and discuss the challenges this poses for curriculum designers, given the fast pace at which technology is continually developing. The teaching methods they analyze are framed within the social constructivist approach and the procedures are based on collaborative learning experiences. The objective of these methods is to hone the ability to critically use and evaluate computer-aided translation (CAT) tools on the basis of suitable translator competence models. At the end of Part IV, Vanessa Enríquez Raído, Frank Austermühl, and Marina Sánchez Torrán explore ways in which the use of technology such as computer corpora and machine translation (MT) can serve as an educational bridge in the training of both L2 translators and L2 learners in an increasingly multilingual and digital world. To this end, they propose to introduce the term computer-assisted L2 learning and translation (CAL2T). Their aim is twofold: re-conceptualizing L2 translation as a core skill in contemporary translator training, and re-evaluating the pedagogical potential of L2 translation to further foster linguistic and intercultural mediation skills in other learning contexts involving the use of a second, or additional, language.

Part V deals with the role of translation in special education. The first chapter in this section, written by Jenna Cushing-Leubner, highlights social, historical, and political factors that shape concepts, approaches to research, and pedagogic approaches to heritage language education. Due to the overrepresentation of Spanish heritage language education in the already
US–centric literature, Spanish is used as a case example of how these elements come to bear on the complexities of heritage language education research and teaching methods. The chapter closes with the wide range of future directions for heritage language education that might push the field towards more intentional and socio-politically conscious teacher education and identity turns in language acquisition. This is followed by a chapter on gifted education by Eva Reid where the author first introduces different understandings of the concept of giftedness in different cultures and then examines the role of translation in the teaching of modern languages for gifted children. As regards deaf education, Ingela Holmström and Krister Schönström deal with translation as a language teaching practice in sign bilingual education settings, where written language is often considered to be the pupils’ second language because they often learn to read and write later in childhood. The focus of this chapter is on translation between sign language(s) and written language(s) as a pedagogical approach in sign language-based education concerning syllabus design, classroom practice, and assessment. In the next chapter, Edit H. Kontra discusses the most salient issues in sign bilingual education with special attention to implementing a bilingual-bimodal approach in the teaching and learning of foreign languages. In order to help the reader appreciate the complexity of teaching and learning a foreign language in such contexts, this chapter starts with a brief overview of general issues in deaf education, and a detailed discussion of deaf bilingual education. The last part of the chapter looks into the problems encountered when a sign language interpreter is used, and the question of incorporating the foreign sign language in the teaching-learning process. In the last chapter in this section, Christopher Stone and Jeremy L. Brunson examine the different aspects of the role played by a special brand of sign language interpreters in deaf education, i.e. those who work specifically for primary and secondary school pupils. They are referred to as educational interpreters. The authors suggest that, since interpreting has always been seen as a social event, research into educational interpreting must examine larger social processes as well as the everyday of interpreters so as to unearth the various social relations in which the educational interpreter is embedded.

To bring our voyage to a close, Part VI shifts the spotlight from student to teacher education. Here, after drawing together selected approaches and research findings, and presenting results from a previously unpublished survey, Gary Massey considers some of the key pedagogic approaches and models applied in teacher training and suggests that a viable, systematic approach to translation teacher training can be most effectively achieved at organizational level within a coherent organizational learning framework. This chapter ends by proposing a framework based on emergentist and organizational learning models operationalized by appropriate institutional incentives and structures. In the following chapter, David B. Sawyer moves to teacher training for conference interpreting in the spoken languages. He begins with the development of conference interpreting training since the mid-20th century, describing the roles of educational institutions, employer organizations, and professional associations and the emergence of dedicated teaching training programmes. He then addresses approaches to researching interpreting teacher training and presents key conclusions for interpreter education. He ends with an analysis of select contributions to the literature on interpreter education and AIIC’s quality criteria for programmes revealing areas of knowledge and skills expected of effective interpreting teachers. A key element in teacher education is teacher agency, which is take in hand by Olga Esteve. The author explores how embracing a plurilingual language teaching perspective involves deeply reconceptualizing current, mostly monolingual, classroom practices. This chapter outlines the benefits of adopting teacher agency-driven formative interventions to promote teachers’ professional development efficiently. Through this kind of intervention, teachers’ own beliefs about language and the way they teach it are challenged.
by confronting them with a new perspective. This confrontation should help them see language learning and teaching through a new lens that should enable them to reframe their current monolingual classroom practices and engage in plurilingual ones. The last chapter has been written by Maria González-Davies, who first briefly outlines how ideas regarding the integration of previously known languages in foreign language learning have evolved from the grammar-translation method and the communicative approach to an informed Integrated Plurilingual Approach (IPA). She then explores how the students’ linguistic repertoire can be integrated in the language learning process and finally focuses on translation as a key skill and a strategy for advancing mediation competence and respecting identity issues.

Some divergences notwithstanding, such as the different epistemologies of translation and translinguaging highlighted by García et al., on the whole trends are converging as is evidenced by the fact that educationalists have begun to quote representative scholars in translation studies and vice versa. Another converging trend concerns common pedagogic techniques such as the one advocated by García et al. and those adopted by Ardizzzone and Holmes, or González-Davies. Also, the growing interest in teacher and student agency in situated community practices following socio-constructivist and situated learning premises is evidenced in all the chapters. Translation is used across all educational levels and is regarded as an indispensable tool to smooth, enable and advance social contacts adopting a mediation role.

By adopting a transdisciplinary perspective, such as the one expounded and embraced by the authors of this handbook, we intend to bring together the various fields of scholarly enquiry and pedagogic practice that have been shown to make a valuable contribution to enlarging the notion of translation and diversifying its uses in education. The long-term goal is to extend the boundaries of translation studies and forge close interdisciplinary relationships with neighbouring disciplines that value translation in a broad array of educational contexts. Based on a multilingual and applied-oriented approach, the handbook is principally aimed at educationalists and educators in the 21st-century post-global era. We would be pleased to hear from readers who may wish to share their thoughts on any of the topics addressed in this volume with a view to exchanging and enriching our mutual knowledge and expertise in this burgeoning field of trans- and interdisciplinary research and practice. Once we have closed the chapters, we think that the original idea of opening a trans- and interdisciplinary dialogue in both directions is bearing fruit. Or at least we would like to think it is.
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Part I

Theoretical foundations
Introduction

Bi/multilingualism is the phenomenon of using more than one language. While some researchers treat bi/multilingualism as something marked and remarkable, in reality, much of the world is bi/multilingual. In the European Union, for example, 54% of people report being able to hold a conversation in at least one other language (European Commission 2015). Researchers estimate that the same is true for over half of the world (Grosjean 2010).

People become bi/multilingual in a variety of contexts – homes, schools, jobs, communities – and on a variety of timelines – some from birth (simultaneous bilinguals), others in childhood, as adolescents, or as adults (sequential bilinguals). People also become bi/multilingual to varying degrees, as needed for their context(s) of use. Despite the folk definition of bilingualism as the union of two perfect monolinguals, multilingual people often have different kinds of expertise in each of their languages. They often use their languages for different purposes, sometimes one at a time and sometimes in combination, as they encounter others with linguistic repertoires that overlap with parts of theirs (Rymes 2014).

As Valdés (n.d.) points out, the utility of categorizing bi/multilinguals by when, where, or how they learned and use their languages really depends on the question a researcher is asking. For our purposes here, bi/multilinguals are “those who use two or more languages (or dialects) in their everyday lives” (Grosjean 2010, p. 4), regardless of where, when, and how they learned and use those languages.

In addition to examining bi/multilingualism from an individual perspective, it is also possible to examine the ways in which societies are bi/multilingual. From a societal perspective, researchers have studied the functions of societal languages, their statuses (both official and unofficial), their relationships to groups of speakers, and their relationships to power. In this chapter, we primarily focus on individual bi/multilingualism, but address some of the research on societal bi/multilingualism as well. We begin with an overview of historical perspectives on bi/multilingualism, then turn to current issues in research, followed by approaches to bi/multilingual education. We conclude with new directions in the study of bi/multilingualism.
Historical perspectives

Bi/multilingualism has existed in some form or another in every human society since the earliest civilizations (Baker and Wright 2017). The study of bi/multilingualism, however, emerged as a formal area of inquiry in tandem with the construction of the monolingual nation state in 19th–20th-century Europe (Baker and Lewis 2015; Gramling 2016). At that time, linguistic heterogeneity was perceived to be an impediment to the aims of the nation. National languages were framed as markers of unity, and their use was encouraged, incentivized, and in some cases, mandated (Irvine and Gal 2000; Gal 2006). Colonization spread these language ideologies throughout the world and, in spite of the multilingual reality of most human societies, normalized monolingualism for the national subject (Flores 2013). Ironically, this “invention” of monolingualism (Gramling 2016) and of the “native” speaker enabled the framing of bi/multilingualism as marked and therefore worthy of study.

These perspectives have had a lasting impact on how bi/multilingualism is understood, contributing to a tradition of language research that views language as separate from speakers and from contexts of use. Ferdinand de Saussure (1916), often called the father of modern linguistics, distinguished between language use (parole) and the linguistic system (langue), declaring parole too unruly for study and, instead, sought to identify stable patterns and structures of langue. Based on his work, structuralist theories dominated linguistics for the next half century. For instance, Chomsky (1965), another foundational figure in the field of linguistics, framed language as a system of abstract structures in the mind of “an ideal speaker-listener, in a completely homogeneous speech community” (p. 3). Within this framework, bilingualism could not be seen as anything but the mastery of two (or more) separate systems.

In the last few decades, however, the study of bi/multilingualism has embraced a series of transdisciplinary turns. The social turn (Block 2003) and the practice turn (Schatzki 2001) marked shifts in the field toward understanding language as inseparable from specific speakers, situated contexts, and relations of power (Bakhtin 1981; Heller 2007). The multilingual turn (May 2013) marked a move away from studying multilingualism from a monolingual perspective, instead viewing the use of multiple languages as authentic bi/multilingual practice. Most recently, the trans-turn (Hawkins and Mori 2018) has meant a “softening of boundaries between languages” (Cenoz and Gorter 2013, p. 594) and even the more radical “disinventing” of languages (Makoni and Pennycook 2007). This conceptual shift has facilitated the theorizing of the fluid language practices of bi/multilinguals as translanguaging (García 2009; Wei 2018), translingual practice (Canagarajah 2013), polylingual language (Jørgensen 2008), and metrolingualism (Otsuji and Pennycook 2010). Common across these terms is an acknowledgement of the hybrid and dynamic ways that bi/multilingual individuals leverage their linguistic repertoires to communicate across multiple communities (Garcia and Li Wei 2014). Thus, while many policies and ideologies around the globe continue to promote monoglossic framings of language – at times even weaponizing monolingualism as part of nativist rhetoric – for those who study language, there has been a shift in how bi/multilingualism is understood.

Research approaches and key findings

Research on bi/multilingualism is vast and increasingly interdisciplinary. While recognizing the overlap among approaches, we frame our review around three broad areas of scholarship: psychological approaches, linguistic approaches, and anthropological and sociolinguistic approaches.
Insights from psychology: bilingualism and the mind

Psychological and psycholinguistic approaches to studying bilingualism focus primarily on the relationship between bilingualism and cognition. Early scholarship (1900–1950) linked bilingualism to “language handicap” or “mental confusion” and cautioned against exposing young children to more than one language (Yoshioka 1929; Smith 1931, 1939). Other research during this era drew correlations between bilingualism and low intelligence (Goodenough 1926; see Hakuta 1986 for a review). Much of this early research, however, suffered from serious methodological issues. For instance, Goodenough (1926) used English-language IQ tests as the central measure of intelligence and compared the scores of recently arrived immigrants and monolingual US citizens, while ignoring the immigrants’ English proficiency or the test’s reliance on US cultural knowledge (e.g. “Why should a married man have his life insured?” [Alpha Test 3, Question 13, in Hakuta 1986]).

Much research today focuses instead on the cognitive benefits of bilingualism (Baker and Wright 2017). Peal and Lambert’s (1962) study of 110 middle-class, bilingual and monolingual Canadian elementary students, for example, found that bilingual students demonstrated more abstract thinking, better mental flexibility, and higher verbal IQ scores. While the study had methodological weaknesses (e.g. small sample size, focus on middle-class students, ignoring some home and environmental factors), it marked a turning point in cognitive studies of bilingualism. Recent meta-analyses highlight many cognitive benefits that are now associated with bilingualism, such as increases in working memory and metalinguistic awareness and improved attention and executive control (Bialystok 2005, 2009; Adesope et al. 2010). Other research has found that bilinguals demonstrate more divergent or creative thinking (Ricciardielli 1992; Leikin 2013; Kharkhurin 2015) and are more adept at solving complex problems in mathematics and science (Kessler and Quinn 1982; McLeay 2003).

When contemporary scholarship has identified a monolingual advantage, it is often the result of monolingual measurement. For example, bilingual children have been found to have a smaller vocabulary in a given (single) language when compared to that of their monolingual peers, and bilingual adults perform worse than monolinguals on tasks involving rapid lexical retrieval, or naming as many words as possible within a given time frame and category (Bialystok 2009). However, it is important to note that these differences are often statistically significant rather than clinically significant – meaning they do not create noticeable practical effects – and that these studies assess in only one language, which does not account for vocabulary knowledge distributed across languages (Umbel et al. 1992; Pearson 1998).

In addition to questions of assessment, research on cognitive differences between monolinguals and bilinguals must also account for factors such as socio-economic status, which affects performance on vocabulary assessments for both monolinguals and bilinguals (Umbel et al. 1992). Moreover, speakers’ degree of bilingualism can affect outcomes (Thomas-Sunesson et al. 2018) and make it difficult to assign speakers to categorical groups, like “bilingual” and “monolingual” (Luk and Bialystok 2013).

Insights from linguistics: the language practices of bi/multilingual individuals

Research from linguistics and related fields (e.g. second language acquisition, applied linguistics, educational linguistics) primarily explores the language features, practices, and learning of bi/multilingual individuals. While early scholarship drew from structuralist understandings of bi/multilingualism – considering languages as isolated objects of study – in the 1970s,
scholars interested in bi/multilingualism began to focus on the social and pragmatic functions of language. One area of scholarship that emerged during this time explored code-switching, or the alternation of two or more languages within the same utterance (intrasentential code-switching) or between utterances (intersentential code-switching; see MacSwan 2013 for a comprehensive review). Some scholars have examined the formal and informal functions of code-switching, such as Blom and Gumperz’s (1972) study of dialects in a Norwegian fishing village. Others have sought to identify structural boundaries of code-switched speech. For example, Timm (1975) identified constraints on Spanish-English code-switching, distinguishing sentences that bilinguals considered well-formed (e.g. The students *habian visto la película italiana*) from those considered ill-formed (e.g. *The student had visto la película italiana*). The substantive body of scholarship that followed (e.g. Poplack 1980; Myers-Scotton 1993; MacSwan 2000) convincingly demonstrated that code-switching, like other linguistic behaviour, is rule-governed. As contemporary linguistic scholarship has shifted toward poststructuralist understandings of language, researchers have begun to explore the flexible ways that bi/multilingual individuals use language beyond code-switching (Baker and Wright 2017). In particular, translanguaging – the “multiple discursive practices in which bilinguals engage in order to make sense of their bilingual worlds” (García 2009, p. 45) – has become a popular construct for research on bi/multilingualism. Research on translanguaging tends to focus on two central arguments: (1) translanguaging is an authentic communicative practice for bi/multilinguals (see the TLANG project, https://tlang.org.uk/) and (2) translanguaging has pedagogical affordances that can be leveraged to support student learning (e.g. Creese and Blackledge 2010; Palmer et al. 2014; Gort and Sembiante 2015).

Linguistic perspectives have also examined the relationship between language and identity. Bonny Norton is credited with bringing identity to the forefront of second language acquisition research, revealing the multiple sociological factors that shape a learner’s investment in acquiring a new language (Norton Pierce 1995; Norton 2013). Others have explored the intimate relationship between language and identity in relation to group membership (Bucholtz and Hall 2004). Le Page and Tabouret-Keller (1985), for example, found that individuals adopt linguistic behaviour to resemble the group(s) they want to identify with or to differentiate themselves from the group(s) from which they wish to be distinguished. While much of early identity scholarship has focused on second language learners, research has also illustrated how bi/multilinguals’ identities are tied to dynamic language practices, often in hybrid and complex ways (Anzaldúa 1987; Pavlenko and Blackledge 2004). This work highlights the need for continued research on how bi/multilinguals experience their diverse linguistic worlds.

**Insights from sociology and anthropology: bi/multilingual societies and communities**

Anthropological and sociological approaches to bi/multilingualism consider the relationship between language, social contexts, and social groups. They have been influential in a wide range of disciplines, including education, political science, policy studies, social psychology, sociolinguistics, and geography. One line of this research explores how languages and language varieties are used and perceived in multilingual contexts. For example, Ferguson (1959) developed the concept of diglossia to describe societal differentiation between varieties of language, such as in Switzerland where Swiss German is used primarily in the home and Hochdeutsch is used in education and professional settings. Fishman (1964) also investigated diglossia and went so far as to argue that “socially patterned bilingualism can exist as a stabilized phenomenon only if there is functional differentiation between two languages” (Fishman
et al. 1971, p. 560). More recently, the notion of diglossia has been critiqued for naturalizing linguistic hierarchies and ignoring relations of power that perpetuate these dynamics (Woolard and Schieffelin 1994; Romaine 2006).

Researchers using sociological and anthropological perspectives have also studied language ideologies, or beliefs and attitudes toward language, language practices, and speakers of particular languages (Silverstein 1979; Gal 1989; Woolard and Schieffelin 1994; Kroskrity 2004). This work has shown how language ideologies intertwine with power and power relations between groups, such as the ways that ideologies about language (what counts as “slang”; who gets called “articulate”) are always bound up with ideologies about race (Alim et al. 2016; Rosa and Flores 2017). Language ideologies also intersect with language policy, shaping how policies around bi/multilingualism are created and enacted, for whom and toward what end (Ovando 2003; Shohamy 2006).

Anthropological and sociolinguistic approaches have also been used to explore language displacement, a phenomenon that occurs when populations transition from using one language to another. These shifts, frequently connected to unequal relations of power, can result in language endangerment (De Korne and Leonard 2017). In North America, Siberia, and Latin America, for example, colonization of these places and of the people living in them resulted in endangerment of many indigenous languages and the dominance of English, Russian, and Spanish (Garcia 2009). Scholarship on language maintenance and revitalization has aimed at preserving and growing endangered languages through documentation, description, and teaching (e.g. Nettle and Romaine 2000; Hinton and Hale 2001; King 2001; Hinton 2003.) Critical scholars have argued, however, that the notion of “revitalization” of dormant languages is inadequate, focusing solely on language and ignoring the social conditions and relations of power that led to linguistic endangerment in the first place (De Korne and Leonard 2017). Instead, this work might be viewed as reclamation, or “effort by a community to claim its right to speak a language and to set associated goals in response to community needs and perspectives” (Leonard 2012, p. 359, italics ours), and include a focus on shifting power, rather than just language use.

Finally, a substantive body of anthropological scholarship seeks to document the dynamism of lived bilingualism within particular communities. For example, Zentella’s (1997) longitudinal work in a bilingual Puerto Rican community in New York found that children’s code-switching was “more than a convenient way to handle linguistic gaps” (p. 99). Instead, code-switching or Spanglish (as she termed it) was part of the active and creative way that the bilingual children communicated to negotiate meaning, establish social identities, and reaffirm community membership. Similarly, Sayer (2013) identified TexMex, which draws on elements of both Spanish and English, as the authentic way that bilingual teachers and children in San Antonio, Texas communicate. He showed how TexMex could be leveraged to support content and language learning and to legitimize students’ linguistic identities. As a whole, anthropological and sociological research on bi/multilingualism has provided insights into how languages are used and viewed within a given community.

**Pedagogic approaches and methods**

**What is a bi/multilingual approach to education?**

Not all approaches to teaching language are multilingual. In fact, many approaches to language teaching are explicitly monolingual, asking teachers and students to engage in collective make-believe that they are all monolingual speakers of the target language (Cummins 2008;
Bi/multilingual approaches instead meet two criteria: first, two or more languages are used for instruction, by both teachers and students; and second, these languages are used to teach not just language but also content (Anderson and Boyer 1970).

**Types of bi/multilingual programmes: weak bilingual programmes**

Within bi/multilingual approaches, however, there can be a range of aims. Some bilingual programmes, especially those serving linguistically minoritized children, are ultimately focused on assimilation into the dominant language (DL) of the society in which those children live (Skutnabb-Kangas and McCarty 2008). These programmes, known as transitional bilingual education (TBE) or early exit bilingual programmes, use instruction in the home language as a temporary crutch to support the transition to the DL (Wright and Baker 2017; García and Kleifgen 2018). In TBE programmes for US Spanish speakers, for instance, students begin kindergarten with substantive support in Spanish. This support gradually tapers off, with students using only English by third grade. In China, similar programmes can be found for speakers of ethnic languages, who have a legal right to mother tongue education, but with the ultimate goal of assimilating to the national language, Putonghua (Mandarin), by the end of elementary school (Postiglione et al. 2007; Gao and Wang 2017).

Although weak bilingual programmes are ultimately aimed at subtractive bilingualism (Lambert 1974), or acquisition of the DL at the expense of the home language (Skutnabb-Kangas and McCarty 2008), these programmes still provide benefits. Students in TBE programmes, for example, are able to begin learning grade-level content in their first language while they work to gain proficiency in their new language. In places where TBE programmes are not an option, such as in the US state of Arizona, language minoritized students may spend years in isolated classrooms focusing on English acquisition without engaging with academic content. For older students, this programme design may mean that they never catch up on content learning or on credits required to graduate (Lillie et al. 2010). In 2017, for instance, the graduation rate for English learners in Arizona was 18%, while for non-English learners it was 75% (Jung 2017).

**Types of bi/multilingual programmes: strong bilingual programmes**

Like weak bilingual programmes, strong bilingual programmes, or late exit bilingual programmes, teach content in students’ home languages while supporting target language acquisition. The aim of these programmes, however, is additive bilingualism, or the development of proficiency in the home and societal languages. Strong bilingual programmes provide continued support for both languages across the duration of the programme, often 5–6 years. There are several types of strong bilingual programmes, including one-way immersion, developmental/heritage programmes, and two-way immersion, which are primarily differentiated by the populations they serve.

One-way immersion programmes are for students who speak the societal DL. These students learn content through both the DL and a second language, with the aims of bilingualism and biliteracy by the end of elementary school (Skutnabb-Kangas and McCarty 2008). An early model of one-way immersion education began in Quebec in the 1950s. English-speaking children were taught predominantly in French, with English reintroduced into the curriculum gradually across elementary school (Lambert and Tucker 1972; Genesee 1995). In the US, programmes in which English-speaking children learn content through both a
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non-dominant language, such as Spanish or Mandarin, and English are one-way immersion programmes.

Developmental bilingual or heritage language programmes take a similar approach but serve students from non–DL backgrounds. These models of bilingual education are often termed maintenance programmes, as students are taught in their home language as well as the DL, with the aim that they will maintain and strengthen both languages (May 2017). In Ethiopia, for example, non–DL students’ home languages are used for all eight years of primary schooling (Heugh et al. 2012; Bunyi and Schroeder 2017). The national language, Amharic, is introduced in grade three and English is taught as an additional, foreign language before becoming a medium of instruction in secondary school. The result is students who are strongly bi/multilingual. Similar programmes have been used for the revival of indigenous languages in the US through programmes that immerse native students in the heritage language of their community or tribe (McIvor and McCarty 2017). For instance, Navajo immersion programmes like Tséhootsooi Diné Bi’ólta’ in Fort Defiance, Arizona and Puente de Hózhǫ́ in Flagstaff, Arizona have been successful in re-introducing Navajo to young speakers (Johnson and Legatz 2006).

A final type of strong bi/multilingual education, two-way immersion (TWI), brings together students proficient in the societal DL and students proficient in another language, like Spanish (as well as students bilingual in both). Students receive instruction in both languages and learn together and from each other, with the goals of biliteracy, bilingualism, and sociocultural competence for all (Howard et al. 2018). TWI programmes may balance the two languages throughout the school day (50/50 models) or may start as immersion in the non–DL and gradually increase the percentage of instruction in the DL throughout elementary school (90/10 or 80/20 models). TWI programmes are increasingly common in the US but can be found around the world. In Basque-speaking areas of Spain, for instance, Basque-Spanish TWI schools have contributed to developing a new generation of Basque speakers (Gorter and Cenoz 2011).

Other types of bi/multilingual programmes

CLIL and the European Schools movement are bi/multilingual approaches that do not fit neatly into the preceding categories. CLIL, or Content and Language Integrated Learning, refers to any programme in which a language is used to teach content at the same time that the language is being acquired. Because this is true of all bi/multilingual approaches and because CLIL does not specify whether the languages used are indigenous, heritage, regional, national, or foreign, it is difficult to situate CLIL within – or differentiate it from – the approaches outlined so far (Cenoz et al. 2014). CLIL’s strongest distinction may be that the term itself is commonly associated with Europe. Another model that overlaps with those discussed so far is the European Schools Movement. In European Schools, students learn through their first language while being introduced to a second language in early grades. In upper elementary grades, they begin to learn content in the second language while being introduced to a third language. The major distinction between this approach and other bi/multilingual approaches is that languages are taught as subjects before being used to teach content (Baker and Wright 2017).

Outcomes and issues in bi/multilingual programmes

In the US, one of the most noteworthy outcomes of strong bilingual programmes is high achievement for linguistically minoritized students. In addition to maintaining their heritage language – or, in the case of indigenous language education, acquiring it – linguistically
minoritized students in strong bilingual programmes consistently outperform their peers in monolingual (societal language) programmes on a range of outcomes — including writing skills, maths achievement, graduation rates, and standardized test scores — and also develop pride in their culture and heritage (Holm and Holm 1995; August and Shanahan 2006; Johnson and Legatz 2006; Howard and Sugarman 2007; Lindholm-Leary and Block 2010; McField and McField 2014). A recent four-year study in the Portland Public Schools (Steele et al. 2017) found that of 1,600 students randomly chosen by lottery for two-way immersion or English-only, English learners who participated in the bilingual programmes were significantly more likely to be classified as English-proficient by sixth grade than English learners in English-only classrooms. Perhaps most convincing is Collier and Thomas’s (2017) 32-year longitudinal study of English learners in 36 school districts across 16 US states, which compared outcomes for English learners in strong bilingual, weak bilingual, and English-only programmes. Their research found that, after five to six years, English-only programmes did little to close the academic achievement gap between non–DL and DL speakers, weak programmes closed about half of the gap, and strong bilingual programmes succeeded in closing the gap completely.

There have been some critiques of even strong bilingual programmes, however. Scholars have asked who benefits when speakers of a DL and non–DL are brought together in a two-way dual language programme. In the US, bilingual education was originally a response to calls for equal educational access for linguistically (and racially) minoritized populations (Flores 2017; Gándara and Escamilla 2017). Many TWI programmes, however, are framed around providing all students, including English-speaking children, with a linguistic edge in a globalizing world (Flores and García 2017; Valdez et al. 2016). This has led scholars to worry that new programmes will fail to meet the needs of language minoritized students, thereby perpetuating inequities (Lu and Catalano 2015; Valdez et al. 2016; Cervantes-Soon et al. 2017). Others point out that when programmes frame language as a neutral tool, separate from culture and available to all, heritage speakers risk losing any advantage their bilingualism may have once conferred (Valdés 1997; Flores 2017). Finally, some scholars worry that, in schools where students from dominant social groups participate in TWI, linguistically minoritized speakers of the non–DL become commodities themselves, serving as language models for DL students (Valdés 1997; Cervantes-Soon 2014).

Thus, while the interest of DL–speaking families has been helpful in successfully establishing and restoring bi/multilingual programmes, particularly in the US (Kelly 2018; Katznelson and Bernstein 2017), any bi-/multilingual programmes that bring together speakers of DL and non–DL must attend to power relations between languages, students, and families. Palmer et al. (2019) propose that programmes should support the development of not just bilingualism, biliteracy, and biculturalism, but also critical consciousness, or the ability “to reflectively discern the differences in power and privilege rooted in social relationships that structure inequalities and shape the material conditions of our lives” in addition to “recognizing one’s role in these dynamics” (p. 3).

Another critique of bi/multilingual education, spanning all programme types, is the separation of languages. Traditionally, bi/multilingual programmes allocate language use by time (Spanish in the morning, say, and English in the afternoon), subject area (maths and science in Spanish; social studies in English), or teacher. Yet, scholars argue that language separation is rooted in a view of bilingualism as double monolingualism (Heller 2007) and does not reflect the ways that bilingual speakers actually use language (Palmer et al. 2014; Flores and Bae tens Beardsmore 2015; Sánchez et al. 2018). They point out that when programmes ignore or negatively sanction multilingual children’s translanguaging (García 2009), it may limit their possibility of holding a bilingual identity, instead reifying identities such as “English speaker”
or “Spanish speaker” (Lee et al. 2008; Martínez et al. 2015; de Jong 2016). At the same time, other researchers have found that when schools do not protect time and space for the non–DL, students often default to the DL and may not achieve high levels of proficiency in the partner language (Potowski 2004; Fitts 2006; Ballinger et al. 2017; Cenoz and Gorter 2017). Additionally, in classrooms where teachers do permit flexible language practices, these practices may be imbalanced, with students translanguaging most during non–DL time and rarely during DL time (Palmer 2008; Hamman 2018). Hamman (2018) proposes that one solution may be the creation of critical translanguaging spaces, in which teachers design spaces for and model translingual practices but also attend to power dynamics between languages and speakers and maintain some focused learning spaces for the non–DL.

**Translation in bi/multilingual approaches**

Another promising approach to intentionally bridging languages, applicable to all bi/multilingual programme types, is translation. Translation is often something that bilingual children already engage in outside of school, helping family members who may not speak the DL to carry out everyday tasks like reading mail, making appointments, and speaking with professionals such as doctors and teachers (Dorner et al. 2007). This informal translation work, or what McQuillan and Tse (1995) call “language brokering”, supports family members’ access to English-only institutional resources, such as medical care, housing, community events, and school information (Orellana 2009), and has also been shown to support children’s own academic success, such as higher scores on standardized reading tests (Dorner et al. 2007).

Additionally, these language brokering skills can be leveraged to help students with other academic skills (Orellana et al. 2003). In one example, Martínez et al. (2008) asked bilingual middle school students in Los Angeles to reflect on and re-enact the ways that they translate outside of school to help others. Students analyzed the translation scenes for ways that translator varied not only the code (English/Spanish), but elements like grammar, vocabulary, and structure. Students were then able to apply the same idea of shifting voice to writing for different audiences.

Translation itself can also serve as a useful pedagogical tool in the classroom. Researchers have found that translation tasks support students’ growth in and fluid use of all of their linguistic resources (Cummins et al. 2005), encourage new language learners to maintain a first language identity as they begin to construct a new bilingual identity (Cook 2010), and direct learners’ attention to form, meaning, and aesthetics across languages (Witte et al. 2009; Laviosa 2014). Kultti and Pramling’s (2017) research in a bilingual Finnish-English school showed that translation can support attention to form even in very young children. As six- and seven-year-olds collaborated with their teachers to orally translate a song, they engaged in a range of high-level linguistic and metalinguistic practices such as “rephrasing, attending to meaning, attending to sound . . . differentiating an expression into its constituent parts, and distinguishing between sound and sense” (p. 723).

High school teacher Carol McCarthy has proposed a similar approach for older students. In her “Poetry in Translation” unit (www.poets.org/poetsorg/lesson/poetry-translation), she invites her multilingual students to translate published poems from their home languages into English and to compare these with professional translations for differences in how language is used and the meaning it conveys. Students also research poets’ lives and the cultural, social, and political context in which the poems were written. Finally, students write and translate their own poems. Similarly, the “Poetry Inside Out” programme (www.catranslation.org/education/), created by the Centre for the Art of Translation in San Francisco, uses translation
of poetry to draw students’ attention to relationships between form and meaning. As the program’s creators describe, “The translation of poetry by its nature offers multiple possibilities: since there is no single ‘correct’ rendering of a poem, students must defend their language choices, which inevitably require a deep immersion into a literary work”. In her study of Poetry Inside Out’s implementation, Park (2015) found that English learners in a US high school developed metalinguistic awareness and engaged in collaboration to construct meaning. Additionally, translation required them to attend to not just semantics and syntax, but also the ways that language is both cultural and political.

Another promising translation activity is children’s collaborative writing and translation of their own stories. Dworin’s (2006) study described how bilingual fourth graders collected family stories (mostly in Spanish), wrote them down, revised them with peer assistance, and then collaboratively translated them. In his analysis of this process, he found that translation – “a sophisticated process that demands that young writers use all that they know about oral and written language” (p. 511) – supported metalinguistic awareness, the ability to write for multiple audiences, and literacy development in both languages. Cummins (2017) proposed similar work using bilingual identity texts, or multilingual and multimodal books in which students represent themselves and their lives using their full linguistic repertoires. He described how three seventh-grade students in the US discussed ideas for their book using their first language, Urdu, then wrote the book using English, and finally translated it back to Urdu, all while engaging in deep discussions about how best to translate certain expressions. In addition to supporting metalinguistic awareness, the activity affirmed students’ multilingual identities and enabled them to share their work with multiple audiences – monolingual English-speaking classmates, Urdu-speaking parents. Research on identity texts has been carried out around the globe (including in Canada, the US, Greece, Italy, China, Spain, and Mexico) with similarly positive findings (see Cummins and Early [2011] for case studies).

Martínez (2017), however, provides a useful caution about translation pedagogies. He reminds us that framing translation only as a tool to help monolingual audiences (for instance, by allowing both Spanish and English speakers to read students’ work) erases bi- and multilingual audiences. As he put it in his work with bilingual youth in California (p. 86):

By only imagining two sets of monolingual audiences, we fail to prepare bilingual Chicanx and Latinx students to engage with audiences that look and sound like them, like their siblings, like their friends and neighbors. . . [which] signal[s] to students that people like them, their siblings, and their friends and neighbors are not worth preparing to communicate with – that they are not a group of people that matters.

When using translation pedagogies, teachers and researchers should be careful not to contribute to the reification of monolingual identities or the centring of monolingual audiences.

**Conclusions and future directions**

The past decades have witnessed a multilingual turn, and more recently, a translingual turn, in both teaching and research. Scholars across sub-disciplines and approaches – linguistic, anthropological, psychological, sociological, educational – have critiqued the presumption of monolingualism as the natural, unmarked human condition. Recent scholarship has also made clear that multilingualism cannot be studied without considering its intersection and interaction with other social phenomena. While beyond the scope of this chapter, emerging research in areas such as race (Alim et al. 2016; Rosa and Flores 2017), space (Canagarajah 2018),
disability (Hernández-Saca et al. 2018), aging (Bialystok and Sullivan 2017), and multiple modalities (Hawkins 2018) points to a future of bi-/multilingual research and teaching that is both intersectional and interdisciplinary.

Further reading

This book provides an introduction to bi/multilingualism and bilingual education. The authors helpfully begin with definitions, then draw on research from across disciplines and paradigms to explore key issues, which range from policy and politics to programmes and assessment to learners with disabilities.

In this seminal text, García engages with a range of topics related to bilingual education and introduces the notion of translanguaging. She outlines different bilingual education models, policies, and pedagogies, with attention to sociopolitical concerns and the nature of contemporary bilingualism and bilingual education around the globe.

This volume, part of the Encyclopedia of Language and Education, provides key concepts and research findings in bilingual and multilingual education, before presenting case studies from around the globe, organized by region – Asia and the Middle East, Africa and the Pacific, the Americas, and Europe. Each chapter focuses on one country, providing both an overview of bi/multilingual education in that country as well as raising issues relevant to bi/multilingual education writ large.

This text provides an accessible introduction to social, political, and educational issues in bilingualism, including bilingual identity, code-switching, and language shift. Shin addresses bilingualism within multilingual societies and families, debunks common myths about bilingualism, and considers some of the major policies, pedagogies, and programme models for bilingual students. The text is primarily focused on US contexts, but also leverages research and examples from around the world.
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Introduction

This chapter is an outline of pedagogical ideas drawn by two prominent theorists of education, John Dewey and Lev S. Vygotsky. When discussing the latter, I also refer to Jean Piaget. Even though the influence that the three figures had on education theory is enormous and indisputable, it is my conscious choice in this chapter to refer to Piaget only as auxiliary, serving a better illustration of Vygotsky’s views. This is not to imply any kind of inferiority in Piaget’s thought.

Dewey and Vygotsky are considered influential for 20th- and the 21st-century education since the educational problems they underscored at the turn of the 20th century are – in many ways – topical in the classrooms of today. Despite geographic, social, and political distance, both thinkers found themselves in a position to react to the then-classical way of understanding knowledge, learning, and development, and to change pedagogy so that it takes into account the dynamism of social change and cultural embeddedness. The complexity of thought displayed by both scholars is impressive and overwhelming. In as short a contribution as this one, I can focus only on few concepts that are associated with the two theorists. Such an approach must be considered an inevitable oversimplification of what Dewey and Vygotsky thought and wrote. The choice of these concepts is dictated by their relevance to the main line of argument in this chapter, and I hope that the reader finds this chapter inspiring to take on her own studies of these two prominent figures of education theory.

This chapter has a few objectives to accomplish. Primarily, it is to show that there is no educational approach without – overt or covert – philosophy behind it. If this is so, being a reflective teacher means being aware (to the extent possible) of one’s own epistemological options, methodological preferences, and the cultural embeddedness of everyday educational choices. Another objective is to attract the reader to the claim that thinking about contemporary teaching practices in one, dogmatic way is both unjustified and impractical. The multiplicity of ideas about education and development created by Dewey and Vygotsky gives ample evidence in favour of the claim that pedagogy does not have to – or in fact cannot – subscribe to only one epistemological or methodological outlook. Therefore, another objective posed here is to inspire the reader’s reflection on what she finds acceptable and attractive or unacceptable and problematic in this chapter when considered in her own educational contexts.
The chapter begins with an outline of John Dewey’s and Lev Vygotsky’s educational thought. It focuses around three key concepts of Dewey’s educational philosophy: pragmatism with its vision of learning as a process, democracy, and embodied mind. The subsection devoted to Lev Vygotsky is arranged to discuss the notions of social constructivism, internalization, and Zone of Proximal Development. The second section shows how the main concepts advocated by Dewey and Vygotsky have been represented and further developed in recent educational theories and approaches – with main emphasis on translator and interpreter education. The next section moves us from the predominant theoretical orientation of the chapter towards a demonstration of how the concepts discussed can influence educational practices, and how to make them work for us as learners and teachers. I present two activities for a multilingual classroom to show how Dewey’s and Vygotsky’s legacy can find practical application. The fourth section draws conclusions and is also intended as inspiration and elementary guidance for readers who wish to explore the subject matter of the chapter. It is followed by a list of suggested publications and topics for further research.

Historical perspectives

John Dewey’s views of learning

Pragmatism

John Dewey needs to be seen as a philosopher rather than an education theorist alone. This claim is not intended to undermine the importance of his educational thought, but to show its complex relationship with the other domains of his reflection (metaphysics, logic, epistemology, ethics, and aesthetics). Pragmatism (in its American strand) is one of the philosophical concepts Dewey is related to – along with William James, George Herbert Mead, and Charles Sanders Pierce. Epistemologically speaking, pragmatism is a position under which knowledge is an experiential phenomenon – it results from human experience. Theorizing comes as reflection upon experiencing, not the other way around. Educationally speaking, action (doing things) is a starting point in learning – rather than memorizing rules and developing principles. The principles come if action has proved them meaningful to the learner through experience.

I can now hypothetically hear a teacher colleague asking me: but how can I imagine expecting a student to act without giving him/her an introductory (a priori) instruction, which they must understand (conceptualize) and remember (ability to repeat or divide action into stages)? The question is more than practically valid, and it must be noted that curriculum (educational content) plays a crucial role in Dewey’s view of an effective learning environment (cf. Kliebard 2006; Page 2006). Yet the point he makes is that, irrespective of the environment, learning as such starts with a learner who has a problem to solve: a question she faces, a choice she has to make, an alternative she has to find. This experienced problem is an “indeterminate situation” of the learner to which she responds by inquiry, i.e. “controlled or directed transformation of an indeterminate situation into the one that is so determinate in its constituents distinctions and relations as to convert the elements of the original situation into a unified whole” (Dewey [1938] 1986, p. 108). Thus, in other words, the point made by Dewey is that learning is solving a problem that a learner has defined for herself as significant (meaningful to her system of values, needs and objectives, cf. Rogers 1951) and hence challenging. Thus, the main task of the teacher is not to instruct on performance, but to attract learners to learning by delineating significant problems together with the learners and empowering them to pursue problem-solving trajectories.
**Learning as a process**

Dewey views inquiry as taking place in cycles. Thus, he departs from a linear, simplistic “action-reaction” view of educational intervention (cf. Dewey 1896). If inquiry is cyclic, its outcomes are unlikely to be definitive or exhaustive: solving one problem (or failing to solve it) leads to another problem that becomes a new motive for learning. This view emphasizes the role of experience in initiating learning and pinpoints the ultimately intrinsic nature of the factors motivating learning and growth – with no disregard to their social aspects. The cyclic approach to learning implies that knowledge is a process rather than an end product of learning. What we attain through learning is not the ultimate “truth”, but “warranted assertions” (Dewey [1938] 1986, p. 15). Thus, learning gives potential, yet not necessarily finite solutions to our problems. These solutions are “parts of an enterprise that is continually renewed” (Dewey [1938] 1986, p. 16).

**Learning as democratic**

Dewey’s theory of learning is instrumentalist (learning is necessarily purposeful) and ameliorative (learning is never a mere exploration of reality but is always meant to improve the existing situation): “We use our past experiences to construct new and better ones in the future. The very fact of experience thus includes the process by which it directs itself in its own betterment” (Dewey [1920] 1982, p. 134).

The concepts of learning as instrumental and ameliorative are in close link with the idea of democracy as promoted by Dewey. His concept of democracy is much wider than the common, sociopolitical understanding of the term. As observed by Westbrook, for Dewey democracy was a moral ideal to which he devoted all his life (Westbrook 2010, p. 18):

Dewey was the most important advocate of participatory, deliberative democracy: that is, of the belief that democracy as an ethical ideal calls upon men and women to build communities in which the necessary opportunities and resources are available for every individual to realize his or her particular capacities and powers through participation in political, social, and cultural life.

Therefore, democracy provides a space where processes of individual and social growth can take place in the most effective and most egalitarian of ways (Westbrook 2010, p. 18):

[e]very human being, independent of the quantity or range of his personal endowment, has the right to equal opportunity with every other person for development of whatever gifts he has . . . the task of democracy is forever that of creation of a freer and more humane experience in which all share and to which all contribute.

**Learning as embodied**

There is yet another fundamental aspect of Dewey’s philosophical and educational thought that also explains his fascination with democracy as an environment for self-realization, participation, and growth. Dewey was an ardent critic of the Cartesian divide between the mind of the learner and the world that her mind explores (cf. Damasio 1994). He referred to this epistemological stand as “intellectualism”. An “intellectualist” learner is “a spectatorial ‘knower’ detached from the rest of nature” (Westbrook 2010, p. 15). For the intellectualist view of
learning “object and subject, mind and matter . . . are separate and independent” (Dewey [1925] 1981, p. 20). As diagnosed by Dewey, the intellectualist epistemology “has upon its hands the problem of how it is possible to know at all; how an outer world can affect an inner mind” (Dewey [1925] 1981, p. 20). Instead, Dewey decides to see the learning mind as embodied. As observed by Johnson (2010, p. 130):

Dewey attempts to explain “mind” and all its operations and activities non-dualistically, as grounded in bodily operations of living human creatures, who are themselves the result of prior evolutionary history and who have typically passed through a crucial sequence of developmental stages that have shaped their cognitive capacities and their identity.

The attempt to avoid the body versus mind dualism is also signalled by Dewey’s use of the notion body-mind (Dewey [1925] 1981, p. 217):

Body-mind simply designates what actually takes place when a living body is implicated in situations of discourse, communication, and participation. In the hyphenated phrase body-mind, “body” designates the continued and conserved, the registered and cumulative operation of factors continuous with the rest of nature, inanimate as well as animate; while “mind” designates the characters and consequences which are differential, indicative of features which emerge when “body” is engaged in a wider, more complex and interdependent situation.

Johnson (2010, p. 130) underlines Dewey’s appeal for us to abandon our perspective of thinking, as “disembodied, transcendent activity and instead see it only as one of several very remarkable processes of embodied experience”. This embodied view of thinking implies a related view of inquiry (learning), since “[t]he experiential prompt for human thinking is our human need for inquiry to help us resolve problematic situations” (Johnson 2010, p. 130).

**Lev S. Vygotsky’s view of learning**

**Interpretative controversies**

Even though according to the critics John Dewey’s thought is often self-contradictory or ill-expressed, its general outline – particularly in the field of education – is relatively easy to construe. The researchers of Lev Vygotsky’s legacy point out that the way in which he worked and in which his works were published makes comprehending his oeuvre a venturesome enterprise. Commenting on this state of affairs, Daniels et al. (2007, p. 2) observe:

A close reading of Vygotsky’s work shows how his ideas developed and were transformed over a very brief period of time. It is difficult to reconcile some of the writing from the early 1920s with that which was produced during the last 2 years of his life. These rapid changes, coupled with the fact that his work was not published in chronological order, make synthetic summaries of his work difficult.

To make the picture even more complex, researchers admit that understanding Vygotsky nowadays is thwarted by a confusion caused by diverse interpretations of his thought. This is why researchers often ask: “So who was the ‘real’ Vygotsky?” (Daniels et al. 2007, p. 9). In this chapter, only two opposing cases are considered: one concerns the question whether Vygotsky
should be interpreted as a behaviourist or as a constructivist. The other opposition found in the literature of the field is between Piaget interpreted as a (radical) constructivist and Vygotsky read as a social constructivist. Bruner (1984, p. 96, as quoted in van der Veer 2007a, pp. 3–4) accused Piaget of picturing “the learning child as a solitary being divorced from the social surroundings and institutions”. Vygotsky, on the other hand, is often interpreted as a social constructivist, owing to his major pedagogic assumption that “in order to understand the inner mental processes of human beings, we must look at human beings in their sociocultural context” (van der Veer 2007b, p. 21).

**Vygotsky: a behaviourist or a constructivist?**


> any new form of cultural experience does not simply come from outside, independently of the state of the organism at a given point of development. The fact is that the organism that is mastering external influences masters a number of forms of behavior or assimilates these forms depending on its level of mental development. . . . these external materials are reprocessed and assimilated in the organism.

What DeVries interprets as a constructivist stance in Vygotsky’s pedagogy may well be understood as a form of behaviourism: one in which the process of “assimilation” is a mere marker of how the organism adapts to stimuli. At least from the current perspective, under which constructivist education is extensively reliant on such notions as learner’s autonomy (e.g. Grow 1991), empowerment (e.g. Kiraly 2000), autopoietic, co-emergent learning (e.g. Kiraly 2013, 2016), self-regulation (e.g. Moser-Mercer 2008) or heutagogy (e.g. Hase and Kenyon 2000), Vygotsky’s notion of assimilation does not seem truly constructivist. My intention here is not to decisively solve the dilemma expressed in the title of this section. Instead, I intend to illustrate the point that, as observed by DeVries (2000), reading Vygotsky can pose an interpretative challenge.

**Is internalization a constructivist notion?**

Assimilation, as briefly discussed earlier, relates to its kin notion of internalization – one of the key concepts associated with Vygotsky. Internalization is a fundamental assumption in Vygotsky’s theory of development. It is a vital part of his general pedagogic position stating that sociocultural context is an indispensable condition for the development of the human brain (Vygotsky 1931, p. 106, quoted after Bakhurst 2007, pp. 53–54):

> Every function in the cultural development of the child appears on the stage twice, in two planes, first, the social, then the psychological, first between people as an intermental category, then within the child as an intramental category. This pertains equally to voluntary attention, to logical memory, to the formation of concepts, and to the development of will.