This article reports on research that questions commonsense understandings of a bilingual pedagogy predicated on what Cummins (2005, 2008) refers to as the “two solitudes” assumption (2008, p. 65). It sets out to describe a flexible bilingual approach to language teaching and learning in Chinese and Gujarati community language schools in the United Kingdom. We argue for a release from monolingual instructional approaches and advocate teaching bilingual children by means of bilingual instructional strategies, in which two or more languages are used alongside each other. In developing this argument, the article takes a language ecology perspective and seeks to describe the interdependence of skills and knowledge across languages.

Cummins (2008) defined bilingual education as “the use of two (or more) languages of instruction at some point in a student’s school career” (p. xii). García, Skutnabb-Kangas, and Torres-Guzman (2006) referred to multilingual schools that “exert educational effort that takes into account and builds further on the diversity of languages and literacy practices that children and youth bring to school” (p. 14). This means going beyond acceptance or tolerance of children’s languages, to “cultivation” of languages through their use for teaching and learning. Cummins referred to research (August & Shanahan, 2006; Genesee, Lindholm-Leary, Saunders, & Christian, 2006) that demonstrates that considerable confidence can be placed in the positive outcomes of bilingual education.

Bilingual classroom contexts are hugely varied, with multiple models and structures existing in different education systems across the world. In this article, we describe one particular model common in many nations with linguistic and cultural diversity, that of complementary schools, also known as heritage language schools, supplementary schools, and community language schools. These schools are invariably established by community members and focus on language, culture, and heritage teaching. In the United Kingdom they are voluntarily run and outside the state sector of control. Since 2002, we have researched complementary schools and have investigated the language practices of their participants in Bengali, Chinese, Gujarati, and Turkish schools in Birmingham, Manchester, Leicester, and London, respectively (Creese, Barać, et al., 2008). The projects have aimed to explore the social, cultural, and linguistic significance of complementary schools both within their communities and in wider society and to investigate how linguistic practices of students and teachers in complementary schools are used to negotiate their multilingual and multicultural identities.
Complementary schools are institutions that endorse multilingualism as a usual and normative resource for identity performance (Creese, Bhatt, Bhojani, & Martin, 2006; Martin, Bhatt, Bhojani, & Creese, 2006) and strive to influence identity and cultural socializations, extending the bilingualism of their students (Creese, Bhatt, Bhojani, & Martin, 2008). Complementary schools’ particular concern with community values and the nature of affiliation to and expertise in the community language requires a pedagogy that responds to young people and teachers who have experience of the diaspora in particular and distinct ways (Anderson, 2008; Cummins, 2005). In the context of the classroom it is usually the case that the young people’s bilingualism is English dominant, whereas their teachers are often community language dominant. This article sets out to describe how teachers and students have developed and co-constructed pedagogic practices for participants in complementary schooling. We use a language ecology perspective to describe the ideological, interrelational, and interactional affordances of these linguistically diverse classrooms (Creese & Martin, 2003; van Lier, 2008).

CLASSROOM LANGUAGE ECOLOGIES

An ecological approach considers the already established with the new. van Lier’s (2008) ecological approach described the need to consider the development of new languages alongside the development of existing languages. He stressed the importance of the interrelationship between teacher and learners in making this connection salient. According to van Lier, the teacher engages the learner in pedagogic actions intended to develop “a wide panoramic view of self” (2008, p. 54). From this teacher–learner engagement, new identity positions associated with language learning processes can emerge, with the teacher showing the learner the possibilities of these. Creese and Martin (2003, 2008) described classrooms as ecological microsystems. They argued for the importance of exploring ecological minutaie of interactional practices in classrooms, linking these to the ideologies that pervade language choice and language policy. A similar point is made by Jaffe (2007), who described a need for “microecologies” (p. 225) of linguistic, social, political, and pedagogical practice.

The study of language ecology is the study of diversity within specific sociopolitical settings in which the processes of language use create, reflect, and challenge particular hierarchies and hegemonies, however transient these might be. An ecological perspective on multilingualism is “essentially about opening up ideological and implementational space in the environment for as many languages as possible” (Hornberger, 2002, p. 30). At its heart is the dialectic between the local interactional and the social ideological. An ecological perspective also warns against too easily reaching comprehensive, tidy findings. Kramsch (2002) suggested that we use an ecological framework to voice the “contradictions, the unpredictabilities, and paradoxes that underlie even the most respectable research in language development” (p. 8; see also Kramsch & Steffensen, 2008).

The language ecology metaphor offers a way of studying the interactional order to explore how social ideologies, particularly in relation to multilingualism, are created and implemented. The purpose of this article is to consider how the multilingual orientation of complementary schools frames bilingual pedagogy as an ideology and how teachers and students practise it locally and interactionally. In the larger macro-ideological order, which is increasingly hostile to multilingualism and multiculturalism through its insistence on monolingualism in society, and in the United Kingdom in particular (Blackledge, 2003; Rassool, 2008), complementary schools potentially provide an alternative (Mirza & Reay, 2000), safe (García, 2005; Martin, Creese, Bhatt, & Bhojani, 2004), and multilingual (Hornberger, 2005) space for institutional bilingualism. We consider the possibilities they present to challenge the monolingual macro-order.

LANGUAGE SEPARATION AS BILINGUAL PEDAGOGY

Bilingual education has traditionally argued that languages should be kept separate in the learning and teaching of languages. We see this explained in an early text on “language distribution in bilingual schooling” (Jacobson & Faltis, 1990):

Bilingual educators have usually insisted on the separation of the two languages, one of which is English and the other, the child’s vernacular. By strictly separating the languages, the teacher avoids, it is argued, cross-contamination, thus making it easier for the child to acquire a new linguistic system as he/she internalizes a given lesson . . . . It was felt that the inappropriateness of the concurrent use was so self-evident that no research had to be conducted to prove this fact. (p. 4)

Keeping the languages separate, it is argued, helps the child. This discussion is brought up to date
in the rationale behind the two-way bilingual immersion programs of the United States, which are described as "periods of instruction during which only one language is used (that is, there is no translation or language mixing)" (Lindholm-Leary, 2006, p. 89). According to Cummins (2005), an explanation for this separateness is the continuing prevalence of monolingual instructional approaches in our schools. He described the assumptions behind these approaches as follows:

1. Instruction should be carried out exclusively in the target language without recourse to the students' L1 [first language].

2. Translation between L1 and L2 [second language] has no place in the teaching of language or literacy. Encouragement of translation in L2 teaching is viewed as a reversion to the discredited grammar/translation method...or concurrent translation method.

3. Within L2 immersion and bilingual/dual language programs, the two languages should be kept rigidly separate: They constitute "two solitudes." (p. 588)

The "two solitudes" to which Cummins referred here are similarly captured by others in the research literature. Heller (1999) coined the term parallel monolingualism, in which "each variety must conform to certain prescriptive norms" (p. 271). Heller argued that students learn to become bilingual in particular ways (and therefore not others) and that these constructions of bilingualism advantage particular groups of students. Baker (2003), building on Fishman (1967), described bilingualism with diglossia in which each language is used for distinct and separate social functions; Swain (1983) used the phrase "bilingualism through monolingualism" (p. 4); Creese and Blackledge (2008) used the term "separate bilingualism" to describe language learning classroom contexts in complementary schools where teachers insist on the use of the target language only. Each term describes the boundaries put up around languages and represents a view of the multilingual/bilingual student/teacher as "two monolinguals in one body" (Gravelle, 1996, p. 11).

There are emotional implications for insistence on separate bilingualism in educational contexts. In 1981, Zentella recorded one of the teachers in her study saying, "When they don’t understand something in one language, they’ll go to the other, which is easier for them...and like, then sometimes I have to be bouncing from one language to the other, which is wrong" (Puerto Rican teacher participant).

The teacher in the Zentella (1981) study indicated her moral disapproval of "mixing" languages in the classroom. Shin (2005), in her study, described attitudes toward codeswitching as negative, noting that bilinguals themselves "may feel embarrassed about their code switching and attribute it to careless language habits" (p. 18). Setati, Adler, Reed, and Bapoo (2002) made reference to the "dilemma-filled" (p. 147, as cited in Martin, 2005, p. 90) nature of codeswitching in their study of South African classrooms. Martin (2005), describing codeswitching in Malaysia, shows how:

the use of a local language alongside the "official" language of the lesson is a well-known phenomenon and yet, for a variety of reasons, it is often lambasted as "bad practice," blamed on teachers’ lack of English-language competence...or put to one side and/or swept under the carpet. (p. 88)

These studies show that moving between languages has traditionally been frowned upon in educational settings, with teachers and students often feeling guilty about its practice. Research shows that codeswitching is rarely institutionally endorsed or pedagogically underpinned. Rather, when it is used, it becomes a pragmatic response to the local classroom context. Lin (2005) described student and teacher codeswitching practices as "local, pragmatic, coping tactics and responses to the socioeconomic dominance of English in Hong Kong, where many students from socioeconomically disadvantaged backgrounds with limited access to English resources struggled to acquire an English-medium education for its socioeconomic value" (p. 46; see also Lin, 1996). Martin (2005) spoke of codeswitching as offering classroom participants "creative, pragmatic and ‘safe’ practices...between the official language of the lesson and a language which the classroom participants have a greater access to” (p. 89). Arthur and Martin (2006) argued that codeswitching allows participants to better accomplish the lesson and is a pragmatic response used to annotate texts and provide greater access.

TRANSLANGUAGING AS BILINGUAL PEDAGOGY

The educational issues around parallel monolingualism have led practitioners and researchers to question the stricture of separate bilingualism. Cummins (2005) challenged the squandering of bilingual resources in mainstream contexts. He argued for a need to articulate bilingual instructional strategies that teach explicitly for two-way
cross-language transfer. Anderson (2008) has recently called for flexible approaches to pedagogy to respond to bilingual contexts that do not fit easily into existing paradigms. Lin and Martin (2005) have argued for more multilingual pedagogic and curriculum research. The research documented in Lin and Martin (2005) and Arthur and Martin (2006) described the pedagogic potentials behind codeswitching. These include increasing the inclusion, participation, and understandings of pupils in the learning processes; developing less formal relationships between participants; conveying ideas more easily; and accomplishing lessons. They spoke of the “pedagogic validity of codeswitching” (Arthur & Martin, 2006, p. 197) and considered ways in which the research might contribute to a “teachable” pedagogic resource.

Important avenues of research have begun to question the validity of boundaries around languages. García (2007) showed in her work in New York schools that languages are not hermetically sealed units. García prefers the term translanguaging (p. xii) to codeswitching to describe the usual and normal practice of “bilingualism without diglossic functional separation” in New York classrooms (p. xiii). Makoni and Mashiri (2007) suggested that rather than developing language policies that attempt at hermetically sealing languages, we should be describing the use of vernaculars that leak into one another, but we understand all of this. Bailey showed that rather than confining signs to different languages as would be typical in an account of codeswitching, heteroglossia encompasses both monolingual and multilingual forms simultaneously, allowing for theorizing of social and historical contexts of the utterance. Moving beyond conventional codeswitching research, Bailey argued that:

Heteroglossia can encompass socially meaningful forms in both bilingual and monolingual talk; it can account for the multiple meanings and readings of forms that are possible, depending on one’s subject position; and it can connect historical power hierarchies to the meanings and valences of particular forms in the here-and-now. (2007, p. 267)

Bailey demonstrated that the perspective of heteroglossia allows one to distinguish between local functions of particular codeswitches and their functions in relation to their social, political, and historical contexts, in ways that formal codeswitching analysis does not. He convincingly argued that the perspective of heteroglossia “explicitly bridges the linguistic and the sociohistorical, enriching analysis of human interaction” (p. 269) and is “fundamentally about intertextuality, the ways that talk in the here-and-now draws meanings from past instances of talk” (p. 272).

LANGUAGE ECOLOGY AND PEDAGOGY

There are some examples of pedagogies that explicitly seek to develop bilingual strategies based on ecological perspectives. Hornberger (2002, 2005, 2008) described her work on the continua of biliteracy as an ecological model in the sense that language and literacy features are nested and intersecting. One change along one point of a continuum will cause potential changes along other continua, resulting in a reconfiguration of the whole educational picture (Hornberger, 2002). In terms of optimizing pedagogy, Hornberger (2005) suggested that “bi/multilinguals’ learning is maximized when they are allowed and enabled to draw from across all their existing language skills (in two+ languages), rather than being constrained and inhibited from doing so by monolingual instructional assumptions and practices” (p. 607).

Another ecological pedagogic approach was described by López (2008), who used the term concurrent approaches in training prospective indigenous teachers in Latin America. He described concurrent approaches as “generally untied but innovative use of languages used in the business of teaching and learning” (p. 143). López argued for a bilingual pedagogy that shows that “in indigenous everyday life, the two—or in some cases three or more—are interrelated and needed many times in connection to one another and not as discretely separate as is often supposed” (p. 143).
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Cummins (2005), too, made some explicit suggestions for developing bilingual strategies. He suggested:

(a) systematic attention to cognate relationships across languages; (b) creation of student-authored dual language books by means of translation from the initial language of writing to the L2; other multimedia and multilingual projects can also be implemented (e.g., creation of iMovies, PowerPoint presentations, etc.); (c) sister class projects where students from different language backgrounds collaborate using two or more languages. (p. 588)

In the United Kingdom, research has demonstrated that bilingual children do not view their literacies and languages as separate but rather experience them as “simultaneous” (Kenner, 2004; Robertson, 2006; Sneddon, 2000). However, there is also some caution expressed in the research literature regarding the development of bilingual strategies/pedagogies based on flexible methods. Martin (2005) wrote:

And yet we need to question whether bilingual interaction strategies “work” in the classroom context…Do they facilitate learning? Can classroom code-switching support communication, particularly the exploratory talk which is such an essential part of the learning process? A corollary to this is whether teacher-training programmes (both pre-service and in-service), in multilingual contexts take into account the realities and pragmatics of classroom language use in such contexts. (p. 90)

Lin (1999) acknowledged the switching between English and Cantonese in her study ensured understanding and motivation, but she warned against notions of easy transferability to other classrooms in other contexts and the danger of participating in the reproduction of students’ disadvantage. Further, the development of pedagogies that respond to the research literature will not work in any “mechanistic generalisable way” (Arthur & Martin, 2006, p. 197). The importance of responding to local circumstances is made clear in the literature reviewed here. Although we can acknowledge that across all linguistically diverse contexts moving between languages is natural, how to harness and build on this will depend on the sociopolitical and historical environment in which such practice is embedded and the local ecologies of schools and classrooms.

In the following sections we look at particular examples of flexible bilingualism in the context of complementary schools and consider some of the bilingual strategies used in complementary school classrooms. Before this, we briefly describe the design of the study and the nature of the data collected.

METHODS

The research project consisted of four interlocking case studies with two researchers working in two complementary schools in each of four communities. The case studies focused on Gujarati schools in Leicester, Turkish schools in London, Cantonese and Mandarin schools in Manchester, and Bengali schools in Birmingham (Creese, Baraç, et al., 2008). Each case study identified two complementary schools in which to observe, record, and interview participants. After 4 weeks observing in classrooms using an ethnographic team approach (Creese, Baraç, et al., 2008), two key participant children were identified in each school. These children and their teachers were audio-recorded during the classes observed, during break times, and, where possible, as they entered and left the complementary school site. We interviewed stakeholders in the schools, including teachers and administrators, and the key participant children and their parents. We also collected key documentary evidence and took photographs.

TRANSLANGUAGING IN COMPLEMENTARY SCHOOLS

This article describes two case studies from our larger project on complementary schools in the United Kingdom: Gujarati and Chinese. The classes at the four schools described are held on different days of the week (Saturday, Sunday, and Thursday evening) and meet for around 2–3 hours weekly. The number of students attending the Chinese and Gujarati schools varies between 200 and 350, with the number of volunteer teachers somewhere between 15 and 35 (including teaching assistants). Teacher qualification and experience also varies, with some teachers possessing qualified teacher status to work in the state sector and others having many years of experience working voluntarily in the complementary school setting but with few formal teaching qualifications.

We start with an assembly at Jalaram Bal Vikasma, one of the Gujarati schools in the study. Assemblies are held at the end of each Saturday morning session so that parents picking up their children can attend. Assemblies are always very well attended by parents. The teachers sit at the front and the side. Children sit on the floor facing the front, with younger children (aged 5)
nearest the teachers and older children (aged 16–18) nearest parents. Parents are at the back of the hall. Each week, one particular class and its teacher lead the assembly. It is also an opportunity for the head teacher to address the whole school: young people, teachers, and parents. There are 200 children on roll at the school, and the assembly is a busy event that requires teachers to move furniture to accommodate all participants. In Extract 1, we see that SB, the head teacher, uses both Gujarati and English to speak to the audience. The translation is given after the text to show the use of both English and Gujarati. 3

EXTRACT 1
Assembly Audio Transcript, Gujarati

…what’s going to happen here Jalaram Bal Vikasma? Holiday nathi…awata Shaniware apne awanu chhe. we’re coming here awta shaniware…[several students put up their hands]…Amar?…[picks on Amar or Amit to reply]…Amare kidhu ne ke GCSE presentation chhe…awanu chhe. I know that we’re finishing on Friday in mainstream school, pun alyaagal badhayne awanu chhe….I know, it’s a surprise. Khawanu etlu fine chhe, K warned me today…it’s something all of you will like, teachers will like…something for all of us…. [points to the class sitting in front of her] a balko a varshe GCSE karwana chhe etle next year a badha awshe mehman thayne, mota thayne!…we’re not going to take much time, ‘cause I’ve got few other things to tell you as well…

Assembly Audio Transcript, English

…what’s going to happen here in Jalaram Bal Vikasma? It’s not a holiday, we’ve to come here next Saturday…we’re coming here next Saturday…[several students put up their hands]…Amar?…[picks on Amar or Amit to reply]…As Amar said, there’s GCSE presentation, you have to come. I know we’re finishing on Friday in mainstream School, but you all have to come here… I know, it’s a surprise, lovely food, K [a parent] warned me today, it’s something all of you will like, teachers will like…something for all of us…. [points to the class sitting in front of her] these children are doing GCSE this year so next year they will come as guests, all grown up!…we’re not going to take up much time ‘cause I’ve got a few other things to tell you as well…

If we break down the interaction further, we are able to identify more specifically some of the bilingual strategies SB uses to engage her audience. The following show which utterances are said in English and which are said in Gujarati. We do this not because we wish to argue that each language is delivering different functions but rather because in classifying them into language groups, we can argue that such classification is meaningless for the speaker, SB.

EXTRACT 1a
Phrases Spoken in English

what’s going to happen here in Jalaram Bal Vikasma?

Holiday

we’re coming here

GCSE presentation

I know that we’re finishing on Friday in mainstream school,

I know, it’s a surprise

warned me today…it’s something all of you will like, teachers will like…something for all of us…

next year

we’re not going to take much time, ‘cause I’ve got few other things to tell you as well…

Phrases Spoken in Gujarati

we’ve to come here next Saturday

next Saturday…As Amar said, there’s but you all have to come here…

lovely food, K

something for all of us…these children are doing GCSE this year so they will come as guests, all grown up

We wish to make the following points from classifying the utterances into two languages. First, both languages are needed simultaneously to convey the information about school openings and closings; that is, each language is used to convey a different informational message, but it is in the bilingualism of the text that the full message is conveyed. As López (2008) argued, both languages are “needed” in connection to one another. The meaning of the message is not clear without both languages. Second, it is in the movement between languages that SB engages with her diverse audience. The teachers, children, and parents have different levels of proficiency in both Gujarati and English. SB uses her languages to engage her audience. However, her “languages” do not appear separate for her in this social act but rather a resource to negotiate meanings and include as much of the audience as possible. SB’s language indexes her knowledge of the social and linguistic complexity of the community she addresses. We would argue that SB’s utterances
are examples of translanguaging in which the speaker uses her languages in a pedagogic context to make meaning, transmit information, and perform identities using the linguistic signs at her disposal to connect with her audience in community engagement. Gujarati and English are not distinct languages for the speaker in this context. SB does not confine signs to different languages; rather, her heteroglossia encompasses language forms simultaneously.

In the second extract from a different Gujarati class in another school, we see another example of flexible bilingualism as an instructional strategy to engage students. PB, the teacher, has given the class some pair work, and in the extract the students are clarifying the task with their teacher before going on to do the task in pairs. In the following transcripts, it is not always possible to indicate which student is speaking. However, the key participant (KP) child is often the one the microphone picks up most clearly.

**EXTRACT 2**

1 PB: . . . have discussion karie, ek ek topic apu chhu badhyane, tame sharema karo . .
2 ok . . . ssh . . . topic apu chhu . . . mari dincharya, daily routine, tame decide
3 karo kon bolshe . .
4 <Now let's discuss, I will give a topic each to all, you share them, I'm giving
5 the topics . . . daily routine . . . you decide who speaks . . .>
6 Ss: what does it mean?
7 PB: mari dincharya, daily routine . . . Medha ane Jaimini, mane shu thawu game
8 <my daily routine . . . Medha and Jaimini, what I'd like to be>
9 Ss: what is it? [chat]
10 PB: . . . bai jana decide karo . . . only 5 minute
11 j apu chhu . . . je awde e bolwanu
12 <both of you decide . . . giving you only 5 minutes . . . speak what you can>
13 Ss: miss, basically shu karwanu . . . discussion karya pachhi?
14 <miss, basically what do we have to do? After discussion, what?>
15 PB: bolwanu
16 <speak>
17 Ss: shu bolwanu?
18 PB: je discuss karyu hoi
19 <what you discussed>
20 Ss: oh . . . [chat] . . . etle we discuss it and
then decide what we gonna say . . . miss ame
21 ek bijanu kaie ke ek ek . . .

Here both languages are used by teacher and students to establish and clarify the pedagogic task. The task involves getting students to discuss topics such as daily routines and what they would like to be in the future. The phrase mari dincharya ‘daily routine’ occurs twice early on in the extract and shows the teacher using both languages to focus the students on one of the assigned
topics. Both languages are also used to establish the procedural knowledge about the task with “discussion/discuss” and “decide” repeated multiple times in English, whereas the focus on the speaking skill is given in Gujarati. Both languages are needed to understand what is expected from the task. The students, too, ask the teacher to clarify the task in both languages (lines 12, 16, 20). Once the students are working in pairs, we see that English is used to joke, tease, and play around (lines 46–47). While doing pair work, students use both Gujarati and English to describe who they want to be (lines 31–35). It is the combination of both languages that keeps the task moving forward. We suggest that the teacher and students are finely tuned to the normative pattern of this classroom ecology—that is, they sense the limits of what is acceptable in terms of the use of one language in relation to the other. This is because the teacher is aware of her learners’ bilingualism—its range and limitation and the identities that make use of it. The students, too, are aware of their teacher’s expectations and identity positioning, which are played out through bilingualism. In Extract 3, rather unusually, the teacher requests English and a student insists on Gujarati.

EXTRACT 3
1 Pb: pachhi?
2 <then?>
3 Ss: [doesn’t answer]
4 Pb: OK, to Englishma boli nakh, chal bol
5 <OK, speak in English, come on>
6 Ss: I wake up in the morning, then do my brush . . . and I have bath, then
7 I go to school
8 Pb: ketla wage?
9 <at what time?>
10 Ss: eight o’clock
11 Pb: shema ja, chaline, gadima?
12 <how do you get there, walking, in a car?>
13 Ss: I walk it
14 Pb: hului? Chaline
15 <walking>
16 Ss: [interrupting] ude
17 <he flies>
18 Pb: tari najikma thay tari school gharthi?
19 <is your school near your house?>
20 Ss: yah
21 Pb: oh, pachhi?
22 <then?>
23 Ss: I do my lesson
24 [Ss laugh]
25 Pb: ketla wage tari nishal sharu thai?
26 <when does your school start?>
27 Ss: eight forty
28 Pb: ketla wage puri . . .

The teacher is willing to accept the students’ English as long as the task is completed bilingually. At each turn she returns to Gujarati or a combination of the two languages. Rather unusually, we also see a student insist on Gujarati rather than the English used in student answers. The longer extract (not shown here) shows that despite the student’s insistence on the use of Gujarati (line 30), the student(s) continue(s) to reply to the teacher in English. The interactional pattern of teacher/Gujarati and student/English is a common phenomenon in Gujarati complementary schools (Martin et al., 2006). It is perhaps a way to save face with regard to the different levels and proficiencies in the two languages. Certainly in the wider study we found that generally students’ English proficiency was greater than their community language proficiency. In contrast, we found that teachers’ community language proficiency was higher than their English. However, we suggest that this is much more than a face-saving act to hide a lack of proficiency. Rather, we suggest that the bilingual participants in the classroom are also using their bilingualism as a style resource (Androutsopoulos, 2007) for identity performance to peers. Thus, their bilingualism in the classroom is not so much about which languages but which voices are engaged in identity performance.

A final point to note from these extracts is the use of heteroglossic terms such as sharema and Englishma. These are common in this teacher’s discourse. In the same lesson, the teacher uses the following terms: junglema ‘in the jungle,’ bookma ‘in the book,’ yearma ‘in the last year,’ schoole ‘to school,’ and daddyne ‘to daddy.’ Rather than describing these as either Gujarati or English or as English with a Gujarati suffix, we would describe them as heteroglossic. They are usually coined by the teacher but taken up and used by the students, too, as a seemingly acceptable form. These heteroglossic phrases appear to serve as a linguistic resource that the teacher uses to keep the task moving forward. They are also likely to reflect the linguistic practices of PB beyond the classroom, indexing other language ecologies.

The next extract comes from the Mandarin school in the Chinese case study. The teacher has been working on a folk story with the students, “Houyi shoots the suns and Chang’e flies to the moon.” At the time this interaction takes place, the class is involved in learning key vocabulary and reading aloud the textbook dialogue,
which introduces festivals and the stories associated with them. The teacher then embarks on a long process of narrating and explaining the story. Extract 4 is one brief sample from this literacy event.

**EXTRACT 4**

1. T: ...<Someone stole the arrow>... for< because> people, they know that  
2. they will not survive if there was no sun right? If there is no sun, they will not  
3. survive either. So people took the arrow...  
4. Zhang: (interrupting and expressing doubt)  
   这个后羿不懂啊。<And this Houyi didn't know/understand?>  
5. T: It's a legend.  
6. Zhang: Oh it’s a legend. Let’s just let it go.  
   Hey...  
7. T: ...<Then> ...发现他后一<支箭不见了>  
   <Houyi found that his last arrow disappeared>

The storytelling provides much student laughter and opportunities to question. The students are animated. There is student consensus about the implausibility of the story. Students think it absurd that Houyi could not understand that people need the sun to live. There is ridicule, but there is also engagement. In terms of bilingual pedagogy, there are several points to make. First, the teacher allows the interruption of the usual classroom discourse routine of “initiate, respond, feedback” (IRF) moves. The interruption from Zhang (line 4) happens in Mandarin, whereas the teacher’s previous utterance is in English. As with the earlier Gujarati example, we argue that because the student questioning and challenging is done bilingually, it is accepted by the teacher. It appears that in the pacing of the bilingual interaction playful naughtiness is allowed because students are still involved in the learning of folk stories, which is the pedagogic task in hand. The translanguageing that the teacher and students engage in keeps the task moving and interrupts the usual IRF discourses of classroom life. A second point, as with the other data sets presented here, is that both languages are needed for the story to be understood; that is, the teacher uses and allows the student’s bilingualism for the story to be made complete. Each language individually is not sufficient to convey the full narrative. As shown in our field notes from one of the non-Mandarin-speaking researcher’s records: “Children seem to have got the point of the story, which I have failed to. They must do this through the teacher’s code switching as it is not achievable through the English only.” A third point is that the teacher skillfully uses her bilingualism to involve students. She narrates the story in Mandarin, keeping to the storyline. She explains the story in English, emphasizing the story’s moral tale. A final point to be made in regard to bilingual strategies is the importance of identity work for both students and teachers. The student in Extract 4 is able to use his bilingualism to question and challenge the story, displaying his linguistic knowledge and sophistication but also using the movement between languages to distance himself from the storyline and some of what it indexes. The teacher, too, is able to use her bilingualism for identity work, in her case to move between endorsing the folk story message but also to “side” with her students’ notion of the ridiculous nature of the storyline. She uses her bilingualism to pace the teaching and enable the lesson to be accomplished.

Extract 5 comes from the same Chinese school. Here, we see the classroom participants negotiate an interaction bilingually, through “bilingual label quests.” Martin (2005) attributed the concept of label quests to Heath (1986) but extended the definition to describe bilingual label quests in which the teacher elicits labels from the students, allowing for the teaching to be “accomplished bilingually” (Martin, 2005, p. 83). Martin (2003) described this as a common feature of bilingual classrooms. In Extract 5 we see an example from the Chinese data from the Mandarin school. A new vocabulary item is being taught, 作品, which means “to look forward to/long for.” To capture the “cloze” nature of this teaching interaction, we do not provide a translation directly against 作品 until the teacher herself does.

**EXTRACT 5**

T: 第四个词？<The fourth term? > 盼望.<'panwang,'> 盼望什么?<How do you say 'panwang'?> 比如说,我们都盼望什么?<For example, what do we 'panwang'?> 作品 conect, <'panwang.'> Expect, look forward to. Write down the explanation beside the words, in case you forget it later. 盼望,<'panwang'>, the fourth one, means look forward to.比如说,我们都盼望什么?<For example, what do we long for?>

The teacher introduces a key vocabulary item, which will later appear in a dialogue to be read to the class by a pair of students. The teacher repeats the new term 作品 four times, asking students to consider how it is said before giving a clue in Chinese that it is a verb: “What do we 作品?” She then uses English to give the definition “expect, look forward to.” We see that the term is
given in one language and explained in another language. The “translation” performs a pedagogic strategy of accomplishing one task (new vocabulary teaching) before moving to the next (storytelling). There are many variations of bilingual label quests in complementary school classrooms. The teacher asks in one language and expects the students to provide the answer in the other language. We have suggested that as participants engage in flexible bilingual pedagogy, the boundaries between languages become permeable. We have used the terms translanguaging (Garcia, 2007) and heteroglossia (Bailey, 2007; Bakhtin, 1984, 1986) to describe language fluidity and movement. We wish to emphasize the process by which bilingual language and also from the community language into English (for further examples, see Martin et al., 2006).

In Extract 6, we see a further example of bilingual label quests. This time, it is student-initiated and the data come from the Cantonese complementary school. KP is one of the key participant children in the study. The vocabulary item is hang, which in English means “to navigate.”

**EXTRACT 6**

1. KP: I’ve got, I’ve got one, ‘航’, I’ve got ‘航’ wrong. <I’ve got, I’ve got one,>
2. ‘hang’. I’ve got ‘hang’ wrong.>
3. T: [对. <That’s right.>
5. T: ‘航’字 <The word ‘hang’>,有的人’航’字写错了 <Some of you had>
6. written the word ‘hang’ incorrectly.>
7. ‘航’字怎么写? <How do you write the>
8. word ‘hang’?>

Here the students check their test scores. As earlier, this is a bilingual classroom with young people bringing in their different voices in identity performance. We see KP isolate the Chinese term hang ‘to navigate.’ The teacher picks up on this, and in the longer extract (not shown here), the teacher uses the students’ concern with their incorrect answer to teach other vocabulary items from the text, focusing the students on their writing and literacy practices.

**DISCUSSION**

Teachers and students construct and participate in a flexible bilingual pedagogy in assemblies and classrooms. This pedagogy adopts a translanguaging approach and is used by participants for identity performance as well as the business of language learning and teaching. This approach to a bilingual pedagogy allows complementary schools an avenue for the reproduction of social, community, and pedagogic values and goals.

In Extract 6, we see a further example of bilingual label quests. This time, it is student-initiated and the data come from the Cantonese complementary school. KP is one of the key participant children in the study. The vocabulary item is hang, which in English means “to navigate.”

**EXTRACT 6**

1. KP: I’ve got, I’ve got one, ‘航’, I’ve got ‘航’
2. wrong. <I’ve got, I’ve got one,
3. ‘hang’. I’ve got ‘hang’ wrong.>
4. T: [对. <That’s right.>
5. KP: ‘航’. ‘<hang.’>
6. T: ‘航’字 <The word ‘hang’>,有的人’航’
7. 字写错了 <Some of you had>
8. written the word ‘hang’ incorrectly.>
9. ‘航’字怎么写? <How do you write the>
10. word ‘hang’?>

Here the students check their test scores. As earlier, this is a bilingual classroom with young people bringing in their different voices in identity performance. We see KP isolate the Chinese term hang ‘to navigate.’ The teacher picks up on this, and in the longer extract (not shown here), the teacher uses the students’ concern with their incorrect answer to teach other vocabulary items from the text, focusing the students on their writing and literacy practices.

**DISCUSSION**

Teachers and students construct and participate in a flexible bilingual pedagogy in assemblies and classrooms. This pedagogy adopts a translanguaging approach and is used by participants for identity performance as well as the business of language learning and teaching. This approach to a bilingual pedagogy allows complementary schools an avenue for the reproduction of social, community, and pedagogic values and goals.

We have suggested that as participants engage in flexible bilingualism, the boundaries between

languages become permeable. We have used the terms translanguaging (Garcia, 2007) and heteroglossia (Bailey, 2007; Bakhtin, 1984, 1986) to describe language fluidity and movement. We wish to emphasize the process by which bilingual participants in complementary schools “encompass socially meaningful forms in both bilingual and monolingual talk” (Bailey, 2007, p. 267). In other words, we think the bilingual teachers and students in the complementary schools in this study used whatever signs and forms they had at their disposal to connect with one another, indexing disparate allegiances and knowledges and creating new ones.

We have focused on how this is achieved pedagogically and have argued that flexible bilingualism is used by teachers as an instructional strategy to make links for classroom participants between the social, cultural, community, and linguistic domains of their lives. Pedagogy in these schools appears to emphasize the overlapping of languages in the student and teacher rather than enforcing the separation of languages for learning and teaching. We acknowledge, however, that within complementary schools ideologies often clash, with as many arguments articulated for separate bilingualism as for flexible bilingualism (Creese & Blackledge 2008; Creese, Baraç, et al., 2008).

Our data find much in keeping with the language ecology and bilingual pedagogy literature reviewed earlier in this article. In our research, we also find examples of the need for both languages, for the drawing across languages, for the additional value and resource that bilingualism brings to identity performance, lesson accomplishment, and participant confidence. We have attempted to identify some of these through the data presented here.

Some of the specific knowledge and skills shown by classroom participants in practising flexible bilingualism and flexible pedagogy included the following:

1. Use of bilingual label quests, repetition, and translation across languages;
2. Ability to engage audiences through translanguaging and heteroglossia;
3. Use of student translanguaging to establish identity positions both oppositional and encompassing of institutional values;
4. Recognition that languages do not fit into clear bounded entities and that all languages are “needed” for meanings to be conveyed and negotiated;
5. Endorsement of simultaneous literacies and languages to keep the pedagogic task moving;
6. Recognition that teachers and students skillfully use their languages for different functional goals such as narration and explanation;
7. Use of translanguaging for annotating texts, providing greater access to the curriculum, and lesson accomplishment.

If we are to move beyond “squandering our bilingual resources” (Cummins, 2005, p. 585) and easing the burden of guilt associated with translanguaging in educational contexts, further research is needed on classroom language ecologies to show how and why pedagogic bilingual practices come to be legitimated and accepted by participants. An ecological perspective requires us to question the pedagogic validit (Arthur & Martin, 2006) of separate bilingualism. Like Lin and Martin (2005), we see the need for further research to explore what “teachable” pedagogic resources are available in flexible, concurrent approaches to learning and teaching languages bilingually.

NOTES
1. We use the term complementary school to acknowledge the work these schools do to complement the education of the young people attending them in relation to statutory education. We prefer the term complementary to supplementary, which we argue carries a “deficit” connotation of educational failure. Following García’s (2005) critique of heritage language as a term to replace bilingualism, we are also mindful of the difficulties associated with this term. We settle here on complementary schools.
2. Pseudonyms are used for purposes of confidentiality.
3. Transcription conventions: In keeping with the theoretical approach to linguistic practice that emerged from this work, we make no distinction between different “languages” in the transcribed data. We use romanized transliteration for all languages other than Cantonese and Mandarin, where we retain Chinese orthography.
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Prof. Elana Shohamy: Winner of the UCLES/ILTA Lifetime Achievement Award

Professor Elana Shohamy has been selected to receive the Lifetime Achievement Award to be presented at the 32nd International Language Testing Association/Language Teaching Research Colloquium (ILTA/LTRC) meeting, which will be held in Cambridge, UK in April 2010.

Over a long career, Elana has maintained her program of empirical research, her insider critical critique of the basis of language assessment and her concern for understanding the interaction between language assessment and language policy. After completing her PhD at the University of Minnesota in 1978, she soon started to raise questions about the nature and use of tests. It is particularly in this area that her influence has been most felt: Her recognition of the power of tests, whether in education or in immigration, built the critical link between testing and language policy, showing language tests to be one of the most common instruments for enforcing language policy; her influence was the core of the growing emphasis on ethics.

In her career, she has built a number of significant tests and has made major contributions to the understanding of washback and other key research areas. The quality of her research and scholarship has built her a major place as a leader in the field, combining academic and professional activities. Furthermore, her example and teaching have built a generation of language testers who look to her as a leader. She is Professor of Language Education at Tel Aviv University, but she has taught at a large number of universities in various parts of the world, was the research director at the National Foreign Language Center in Washington, DC, and is affiliated with CALPER (Center for Advanced Language Proficiency Education at Research) at the Pennsylvania State University.

She was one of the founders of an early national language testing group (ACROLT), chaired the AILA Commission on Language Testing and Evaluation, and served as President of ILTA in 1999. Apart from her own extensive list of publications, she has played a major role in editing, serving on the editorial boards of Language Testing, Language Assessment Quarterly, and The Modern Language Journal and as founding co-editor of Language Policy.

Because of her many significant contributions over the years, the committee is pleased to announce that Professor Elana Shohamy has been selected to receive the 2010 University of Cambridge Local Examinations Syndicate (UCLES)/ILTA Lifetime Achievement Award.

From the 2010 UCLES/ILTA Lifetime Achievement Award Committee