

Dynamic Bilingualism as the Norm: Envisioning a Heteroglossic Approach to Standards-Based Reform

By: Nelson Flores, [Jamie L. Schissel](#)

This is the accepted version of the following article:

Flores, N., & Schissel, J.L. (2014). Dynamic Bilingualism as the Norm: Envisioning a Heteroglossic Approach to Standards-Based Reform. *TESOL Quarterly*, 48(3), 454-479. doi: 10.1002/tesq.182,

which has been published in final form at <http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/tesq.182>.

*****© TESOL International Association. Reprinted with permission. No further reproduction is authorized without written permission from TESOL International Association & Wiley. This version of the document is not the version of record. Figures and/or pictures may be missing from this format of the document. *****

Abstract:

Standards-based reforms in many Anglophone nations have been informed by monoglossic language ideologies that marginalize the dynamic bilingualism of emergent bilinguals. Recent developments in applied linguistics that advocate for heteroglossic language ideologies offer an alternative for standards-based reform. This article argues that standards-based reform initiatives will not be able to address the needs of emergent bilingual students unless they create ideological spaces that move away from monoglossic language ideologies toward heteroglossic language ideologies and implementational spaces that provide concrete tools for enacting this vision in the classroom. With a particular focus on the Common Core State Standards in the U.S. context, the article develops a vision for standards-based reform that begins to affirm and build on the dynamic bilingualism of emergent bilingual students. Specifically, the article explores two classrooms and the New York State Bilingual Common Core Initiative as starting points for theorizing how to develop ideological and implementational spaces that infuse heteroglossic language ideologies into standards-based reform initiatives while also emphasizing the role of monoglossic approaches to assessments in ultimately undermining the attempts that are currently being made.

Keywords: Education | Curriculum | Instruction | Standards-based Reform | Monoglossic Language Ideologies | Bilingualism

Article:

Many Anglophone nations have adopted standards-based educational reform initiatives that include English language learners (henceforth referred to as emergent bilinguals¹). These reform initiatives are often framed as necessary for preparing students for our increasingly globalized

world. Yet, these reforms have either remained silent on issues related to bilingualism² or have conceptualized bilingualism from a monolingual perspective. This limited view of bilingualism is important to challenge because global citizens, in addition to needing to meet standards in mathematics and language arts, need to be able to negotiate bilingual spaces that do not conform to monolingual norms (Canagarajah, 2013; García, 2009). Though making bilingualism central to standards-based reform is necessary for all students, in this article we challenge dominant, monolingual approaches by theorizing a standards-based reform initiative that focuses specifically on emergent bilingual students.

To conceptualize our vision of standards-based reform we draw on Hornberger's (2005) distinction between ideological and implementational spaces. Ideological spaces are the dominant ways of understanding language in local settings while implementational spaces are the ways that these understandings are enacted in classroom practice. We argue that standards-based reform initiatives will not be able to address the needs of emergent bilingual students unless they support the creation of ideological spaces that move away from monoglossic language ideologies that treat monolingualism as the norm toward heteroglossic language ideologies that treat bilingualism as the norm. This heteroglossic ideological space must be complemented by the creation of heteroglossic implementational spaces that provide concrete tools for enacting this vision in the classroom. With a particular focus on the Common Core State Standards (CCSS) in the United States, we develop a theoretical foundation for a standards-based reform initiative that affirms and builds on the bilingualism of emergent bilingual students.

This article begins by offering a brief history of the emergence of monoglossic language ideologies as part of the rise of European national and colonial projects. It then examines how these monoglossic language ideologies inform current standards-based reform initiatives in the United States, England, and Australia. We demonstrate how these monoglossic standards-based reform initiatives push emergent bilinguals to assimilate to an idealized monolingual norm and fail to build on their dynamic bilingualism—the fluid language practices in which they engage to make meaning and communicate in the many cultural contexts that they inhabit on a daily basis (García, 2009).

In the second part of the article, we challenge these monoglossic models of standards-based reform by engaging with recent developments in applied linguistics that advocate for heteroglossic language ideologies that build on the dynamic bilingualism of emergent bilingual students. As starting points for theorizing how to develop ideological and implementational spaces that infuse these heteroglossic language ideologies into standards-based reform initiatives, we look at how teachers and emergent bilingual students negotiate the monoglossic language ideologies of current standards-based reforms initiatives. After exploring the ways that the CCSS continue to provide few heteroglossic ideological and implementational spaces that would support these teachers, we examine the New York State Bilingual Common Core Initiative—an initiative that we argue offers a starting point for reinterpreting the CCSS from a heteroglossic perspective. Though this initiative has great potential, we posit that it can be pushed even further

in embracing a heteroglossic perspective. We conclude with the claim that until assessments are aligned with a heteroglossic perspective, the full potential of such initiatives to embrace a heteroglossic perspective will not be achieved.

A BRIEF HISTORY OF MONOGLOSSIC LANGUAGE IDEOLOGIES

Monoglossic language ideologies emerged alongside the rise of nation-states in Europe. Within this context, European nationalist grammarians began to see heterogeneity in language practices as an impediment to the creation of national subjects (Gal, 2006). It was, therefore, deemed necessary to create a codified, standardized language to cleanse the language of perceived impurities. Bonfiglio (2010) argues that the codification of a particular grammar and pronunciation produced the bourgeoisie as speakers of a more correct and perfect language than the lower classes. The idealized language practices of the bourgeoisie were codified and named “a language” that represented “a people” with rights to “a land,” and all other language varieties were deemed to be improper “dialects.” These nationalist language ideologies positioned monolingualism in the standardized variety as the expectation for full citizenship and connected this monolingualism to a homogenous ethnic identity (Bonfiglio, 2010). As European settlers colonized the American continent, they brought this same nationalist language ideology with them. Beginning with the work of Noah Webster, U.S. society began to mold the population to speak Standardized American English—a language form said to represent the unique democratic spirit of U.S. society despite an antidemocratic imposition on language-minoritized populations (Flores, 2014).

Yet monoglossic ideologies extend beyond overt nationalist language ideologies because they assume “that legitimate practices are only those enacted by monolinguals” (García, 2009, p. 115). Taking monolingualism as the norm has led to two different approaches to addressing linguistic diversity. The first approach, subtractive bilingualism, makes an explicit case in support of monolingualism by arguing that emergent bilinguals should replace their home language with the standardized national language of the society in which they reside (García, 2009). The second perspective is additive bilingualism, which explicitly rejects monolingualism but continues to reproduce monoglossic language ideologies by advocating the development of balanced bilingualism—equal competencies in two languages.

Though additive bilingualism ostensibly advocates bilingualism, it nevertheless continues to assume monolingualism as the norm and is based on an ideal conceptualization of bilingualism as double monolingualism in two distinct, standardized national languages (García, 2009; Heller, 2006). At its core is an enumerative strategy that conceptualizes languages as countable objects that can be objectively named (Mühlhäusler, 2000), with bilingualism becoming a “pluralization of monolingualism” (Makoni & Pennycook, 2007, p. 22). In short, bilingualism is understood only in relation to monolingualism. Therefore, when examining standards-based reform, looking for a discussion of bilingualism is not enough, because even educational reform initiatives that advocate the development of bilingualism can do so through the use of monoglossic language

ideologies that may marginalize the fluid language practices of bilingual communities that do not conform to the idealized language practices of double monolingualism.

Monoglossic Language Ideologies and U.S. Standards-Based Reform

Though modern U.S. standards-based reform initiatives were created as a direct response to the release of “A Nation at Risk” (National Commission on Excellence in Education, 1983), their origins go back much further. The earliest example of what might now be called standards-based reform was the development of standardized intelligence testing at the turn of the 20th century. These standardized assessments were both explicitly racist and monoglossic. They were racist in that, although based on the cultural knowledge of the dominant White population, they were treated as objective measures of intelligence and were used to justify the eugenic belief that intelligence is fixed, hereditary, and racially determined (Selden, 1999). They were monoglossic in that they were used to assess the intellectual aptitude of immigrants but were normed on monolingual English speakers (Stoskopf, 2002).

Though the biological racism of eugenics was discarded by the 1930s in U.S. education, monoglossic language ideologies continued to hinder educational programming for emergent bilinguals by relying on a new cultural racism that framed these populations as culturally deprived. For example, Blanton (2003), in his study of Mexican Americans in the Southwest, notes that “the newer, more sophisticated methods of testing still came to justify the segregation of Mexican American children, this time as a means to correct the alleged cultural deficiency of language through ‘special’ instruction” (pp. 39–40). This shift from biological racism to cultural racism continued into the 1960s with the passage of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) that framed emergent bilinguals as culturally deprived and in need of remediation (Souto-Manning, 2010).

It was within this context of a long history of exclusion and marginalization of emergent bilinguals that modern standards-based reform emerged. A recent iteration of standards-based reform in the United States is the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (NCLB). Building on the discourse first introduced in “A Nation at Risk” in the 1980s and in policies in the Improving American Schools Act of 1994, NCLB is situated within a discourse of excellence for all. Specifically, in addition to raising standards for all U.S. students, NCLB seeks to improve the achievement of students in a variety of demographic subgroups, including “English language learner” (Gamoran, 2007), and it follows a worldwide trend that links equity in education with inclusion in accountability systems (Leung & Rea-Dickins, 2007).

Unfortunately, NCLB has continued to reproduce monoglossic language ideologies through a complete silence on issues of bilingualism —indeed, the word bilingualism was systematically eliminated from the legislation and from the names of government entities charged with its implementation (Hornberger, 2005). García (2009) documents this shift in discourse at the federal level. For example, Title VII of the ESEA, known as the Bilingual Education Act, was

repealed and replaced with Title III of NCLB, known as Language Instruction for Limited English Proficient Students. Further, the Office of Bilingual Education and Minority Languages was renamed the Office of English Language Acquisition, Language Enhancement and Academic Achievement for Limited English Proficiency Students (among multiple name changes). In short, NCLB not only ignores issues of bilingualism but has also systematically erased any mention of the term from educational discourse.

This erasure of any discussion of bilingualism has had a detrimental effect on the education of emergent bilinguals. For example, Menken (2008; see also Menken, Hudson, & Leung, 2014) notes that NCLB has become a de facto language education policy that has pressured states to shift from bilingual education to English-only instruction so that students can pass state-required tests. In addition, the NCLB-mandated push to increase reading achievement scores for emergent bilinguals has led some schools to place emergent bilingual elementary school students in reading programs developed for English-dominant students that focus exclusively on the acquisition of phonemic awareness with little to no focus on meaning-making skills associated with reading comprehension (Gutiérrez, Asato, Santos, & Gotanda, 2002). At the high school level, NCLB mandates have pressured teachers of English as a second language (ESL) to focus solely on literacy skills that students need to pass state-mandated assessments, leaving little classroom time for oral language development (Menken, 2008). As these examples illustrate, NCLB has led to instruction for emergent bilinguals that does not build on their dynamic bilingualism or consider their unique language needs.

As this brief history makes clear, standards-based reform in the United States has both ignored and marginalized the bilingualism of emergent bilingual students. Yet this phenomenon is not isolated to the U.S context. In the next section we examine the experiences of England and Australia to demonstrate how these ideologies inform approaches to standards-based reform in many Anglophone societies.

Monoglossic Language Ideologies in England and Australia

In England, standards-based reform has focused on mainstreaming emergent bilingual students. Steps to centralize British education began with the passage of the Education Reform Act in 1988. This led the way for the National Curriculum, which advocated having emergent bilingual students learn in mainstream, English-only classrooms (Leung & Franson, 2001). Before the introduction of the National Curriculum, it was common for emergent bilingual students to be separated from the general school population. With the reforms in the 1980s, mainstreaming became common practice, and certain interpretations of the policies held emergent bilinguals to the same National Curriculum standards as all students. These policies surrounding the standards-based movement in England emphasize that content teaching in mainstream classrooms is made accessible to all students without any specific attention paid to the unique needs of emergent bilingual students (Leung, 2005; Menken et al., 2014). The result has been that the needs of emergent bilinguals have been ignored by policymakers, with teachers left to

navigate their increasingly diverse classrooms with little support (Costley, 2014). As in the United States, mainstreaming practices render emergent bilingual students in England all but invisible, leaving their bilingualism unacknowledged.

Australia offers an example of an approach that does acknowledge the needs of emergent bilinguals (see Hammond, 2014), albeit through a monoglossic lens. The National Curriculum was introduced in Australia in 1987. Not long thereafter, it became clear that the standards were not appropriate for emergent bilinguals. In response, in 1994 the ESL band scales were created and adopted into the National Curriculum. The scales focus on the learning of English and content simultaneously, and they adopt a largely monoglossic perspective, viewing the languages of emergent bilinguals as distinct and akin to double monolingualism (Heller, 2006). Davison (1999) describes the band scales as “assum[ing] that the developmental path for ESL literacy is the same as that for mother tongue English, and, hence, can be evaluated by the same standards and in the same sequence” (pp. 68–69). That is, the band scales treat monolingualism as the norm that all students should follow. Davison (2001) argues that, as a result of this monoglossic perspective, the strengths that emergent bilinguals bring to school are commonly defined as deficiencies. This phenomenon has continued with the most recent work toward the development of a new Australian National Curriculum. As with the current curriculum, the new curriculum currently under development offers support for English language and literacy development but no support for bilingual language development (Hammond, 2012).

The predominance of monoglossic ideological spaces in standards-based education reforms in the United States, England, Australia, and elsewhere has marginalized emergent bilingual students through the creation of monoglossic implementational spaces despite the fact that all of these reform initiatives claim to support the needs of emergent bilinguals. Fortunately, an alternative has surfaced in the field of applied linguistics. Researchers examining language practices of bilingual communities have begun to challenge the positioning of monolingualism as the norm. It is to these alternative ideologies that we now turn.

FROM MONOGLOSSIC TO HETEROGLOSSIC LANGUAGE IDEOLOGIES

With rising awareness of the limits of monoglossic language ideologies in describing the fluid language practices of bilingual communities, applied linguists have begun theorizing new conceptualizations of language. Several terms have emerged in recent years that attempt to challenge the deficit framing of bilingual communities associated with the double monolingualism of monoglossic language ideologies. Some of these terms include translanguaging (Blackledge & Creese, 2010; García, 2009), polylinguaging (Jørgensen, Karrebaek, Madsen, & Møller, 2011), metrolingualism (Otsuji & Pennycook, 2010), transidiomatic practices (Jacquemet, 2005), and translingualism (Canagarajah, 2013). Though emerging from diverse disciplinary perspectives, all of these scholars are moving away from viewing languages as discrete objects and are instead conceptualizing languaging as a fluid, complex, and dynamic process.

García (2009) is representative of this shift in thinking. She rejects monoglossic language ideologies and advocates replacing them with heteroglossic language ideologies that acknowledge the dynamic language practices of bilingual speakers. García (2009) refers to the dynamic meaning-making discursive processes of bilingual populations as translanguaging, and she uses this concept to argue for a move away from an additive approach to bilingualism toward a dynamic approach to bilingualism, which she describes as one that

. . . allows the simultaneous coexistence of different languages in communication, accepts translanguaging, and supports the development of multiple linguistic identities to keep a linguistic ecology for efficiency, equity and integration, and responding to both local and global contexts. (p. 119)

Rather than expecting emergent bilinguals to perform idealized monolingual language practices, a dynamic approach to bilingualism takes as its starting point the fluid language practices or translanguaging that bilingual communities engage in on a daily basis. In other words, instead of seeing language blending, mixing, and co-existing as a problem that needs to be eliminated, dynamic bilingualism positions these fluid language practices as legitimate forms of communication that enable emergent bilinguals to develop metalinguistic awareness that can be used as a starting point in adding new language practices to their linguistic repertoires. In short, translanguaging can be understood on two different levels. From a sociolinguistic perspective it describes the fluid language practices of bilingual communities. From a pedagogical perspective it describes the process whereby teachers build bridges between these language practices and the language practices desired in formal school settings.

Alongside this theoretical shift in applied linguistics has been an empirical shift in research into language use inside and outside the classroom. One strand of this research has focused on the ways that teachers use and encourage fluid language practices in their classrooms (Cummins, 2007; Flores & García, 2013; Lin, 2006; Sayer, 2013). Other researchers have focused on documenting the fluid language practices of students themselves both inside and outside the classroom (Bigelow, 2011; Blackledge & Creese, 2010; Reyes, 2012; Rymes, 2010; Sanchez, 2007). This research documents how both teachers and students transcend monoglossic language ideologies on a daily basis whether they share the same home language or not. That is, teachers and students are already developing heteroglossic implementational spaces either reflexively or with conscious aims. Yet, they face many challenges in enacting these practices in their classrooms—one of them being the lack of institutional support for creating these implementational spaces. In particular, major barriers to the development of these implementational spaces include the focus on preparing students for assessments that are informed by monoglossic language ideologies.

In the next section, we provide data from an ethnographic study that examines ways that teachers attempt to create heteroglossic implementational spaces within a monoglossic climate. We see this as a point of entry for theorizing a standards-based reform that can support and encourage

teachers to engage in heteroglossic practices that build on the fluid language practices of their emergent bilingual students.

CHALLENGES IN CREATING HETEROGLOSSIC IMPLEMENTATIONAL SPACES

Before examining ways that standards-based reform can develop heteroglossic ideological spaces that support teachers in developing heteroglossic implementational spaces, it may be helpful to examine the successes and challenges that current teachers confront when trying to develop heteroglossic implementational spaces under current monoglossic standards-based reform initiatives. In this section, we provide case studies of two teachers as examples of the impact of monoglossic standards-based reform initiatives on the language decisions of teachers working with emergent bilingual students. Although the data from these two classrooms cannot be generalized to other contexts, we do believe that they offer useful illustrations of the ways that current monoglossic standards-based reform initiatives affect, and in many ways limit, the ways that teachers can use heteroglossic language ideologies to produce heteroglossic implementational spaces that meet the needs of their emergent bilingual students.

Participants

The ethnographic data presented in the illustrations that follow were developed as part of a larger 6-month comparative ethnographic case study in Grades 3 and 5 in two urban schools in the northeast United States, conducted by the second author. The different schools, one Spanish and English bilingual and the other more linguistically diverse, were meant to represent the current overall picture of emergent bilinguals in U.S. public schools, approximately 70% of whom speak Spanish at home and 30% of whom speak a wider variety of languages at home than at any other time in U.S. history (Suárez-Orozco & Boalán Qin-Hilliard, 2004).

The examples we analyze in this article come from one of the two schools: Olga Nolla Charter School, a K–8 charter school with a large population of Spanish/English bilingual students.³ We have chosen to focus solely on Olga Nolla because the teachers at Olga Nolla engaged in translanguaging with students in instructional as well as noninstructional situations, whereas translanguaging at Westerville occurred solely among students. Therefore, to emphasize how teachers and students can mutually engage in translanguaging practices within a monoglossic context, we provide two examples from Olga Nolla.

Data Collection

Once consent was received from all participants, the researcher spent 2–3 days every other week in different Olga Nolla classrooms. The primary means of data collection was participant observation. During these observations detailed field notes were compiled that focused on teacher and student language usage and assessment practices. Also included in the analysis were recorded semistructured interviews with the teachers and administrators and follow-up interviews with a district official from the school district. All interviews were transcribed and

coded with the field notes. Informal, nonrecorded interviews also occurred with the teachers and students. The researcher drew on classroom artifacts, such as pictures of the rooms and of student work, in addition to publicly available documents and data on school policies, test performances, and other information about the general background of the school and district. Data events were classified as occurring during three different situations: practice-standardized-testing, classroom assessment, and classroom instruction. Within each of these events, interactions among administrators, teachers, and students were coded using a classroom discourse analytic framework identifying the initiation, response, and feedback or evaluation offered by participants. Analytic memos served as initial entry points for data analysis from which themes emerged that both challenged and supported the information learned from formal and informal assessment procedures.

The cases presented below, first from a classroom instruction situation and second from a practice-standardized testing situation, illustrate teacher-initiated interaction where both teachers navigate the use of heteroglossic practices within a largely monoglossic educational space. Although neither example represents an ideal of how heteroglossic language ideologies can be realized in schools, they demonstrate the beginning work that teachers and students have done to recognize dynamic bilingualism.

Ms. García's Third-Grade Classroom

Ms. García was given the task of teaching Spanish as a content-area subject in her third-grade classroom. Third graders at this school had not received formal, school-based instruction in the medium of Spanish before, and the availability of Spanish lessons was limited. The Spanish lessons in Ms. García's classroom typically lasted 10–20 minutes and were conducted weekly or biweekly before lunch. There was no set curriculum, and Ms. García generally used personal and publicly available resources as teaching materials. The school's lack of time and resources allocated to the teaching of or in Spanish in this classroom can be seen to indicate the monoglossic ideologies that were present even in a school that was transitioning into a bilingual program, perhaps in part due to the lack of standards-based educational initiatives supporting the instruction of Spanish.

During a lesson about classroom vocabulary and phrases, Ms. García had the students do a warm-up activity in which she instructed the students to write a Spanish translation for a word that she said in English. During these short lessons, she worked to first recognize the linguistic resources that students were bringing to the classroom. She told the class that her expectations were not about getting a "correct" answer in terms of spelling, and she used her own experiences of learning Spanish as an example for the class. Students were engaged and eager to participate. The following field notes excerpt details how Ms. García communicated these expectations to her class:

“I’m also working on my Spanish so I don’t care about spelling. I just need to know you get the idea.” After saying this to the class, Ms. García stated directly to a social worker and the researcher who were both observing the class: “I learned more street Spanish from New York. Like Spanish in Spain and English in England to us it’s like this. Like the same thing.” She called it a mix of proper and improper language varieties and compared it to the different varieties of Spanish that are used in Chile and Argentina. (Field notes, January 12, 2010)

In this exchange, the teacher recognized her own progress in language learning as dynamic rather than static and positioned herself as a language learner like her students. Rather than focus on standard spelling conventions, she created an implementational space where the students’ knowledge of Spanish—whether they had proficiency in the standard written form or if they were more orally proficient—was valued and appropriate to use. This targeted use of Spanish and emphasis on the language-learning process was small in scale and wrought with restrictions on time and resources that did not privilege the purposeful integration of Spanish lessons in this classroom. Though this was not an ideal pedagogical lesson, we want to stress Ms. García’s actions point to a heteroglossic ideological stance that led her to establish a heteroglossic implementational space where she could encourage her students to demonstrate their dynamic bilingualism. Though in many ways her approach may seem minimal, the creation of this heteroglossic implementational space not only affirmed the dynamic bilingualism of the students in the classroom, but was also successfully aimed at increasing their engagement in the lesson.

Ms. Pedroza’s After-School Test Prep

Ms. Pedroza, another teacher at Olga Nolla, also attempted to develop heteroglossic implementational spaces, but she discussed with students how monoglossic standards-based reform and the corresponding assessment practices hindered these efforts. She was observed teaching a practice–standardized-testing group for emergent bilingual third graders who had recently enrolled in this school. Together, they had many conversations about language practices. The group was held twice a week after school for the 2 months preceding the administration of the state standardized tests.

During these practice sessions, students usually arrived early and spoke in Spanish with each other while walking around the room. Ms. Pedroza used Spanish and English to instruct students to take their seats. On different occasions, Ms. Pedroza made different comments about the use of Spanish and English for standardized testing. She encouraged students to use translanguaging but also provided caveats about the nature of the testing situations. She told students that they could think in Spanish but had to write their answers in English. She explained that test raters would not be able to tell that the students used some Spanish to understand the task and that overall it did not matter which language they thought in. She told the students, “Numbers are numbers, money is money—in Spanish or English. It’s the same” (Field notes, January 21, 2010).

In this and other meetings, Ms. Pedroza provided spaces for translanguaging to occur, but she emphasized the role that English held for standardized testing. She told students, “If you don’t understand something you can ask for clarification in Spanish. But remember the test is in English” (Field notes, January 21, 2010). In another session she stressed to the group that “we are not here to learn to read and write in Spanish” because the English language arts exam was available only in English (Field notes, February 2, 2010). While emphasizing English, she continued to support the use of Spanish by providing instructions in Spanish and English. Students generally responded with one or two simple exchanges in Spanish, such as when one student pointed to his paper and said *aquí* to show that he knew where to start answering questions (Field notes, February 2, 2010). But as the sessions progressed and students began reading test items aloud, there was an overall switch to English during the afterschool meetings.

Ms. Pedroza and her students’ experiences working with practice-standardized tests illustrate some of the challenges in creating heteroglossic implementational spaces. The monoglossic language ideologies associated with standardized testing and the current U.S. approach to standards-based reform limited the ways that Ms. Pedroza could build on the dynamic bilingualism of her students. Yet, even within this monoglossic context of standardized-testing preparation, Ms. Pedroza created heteroglossic implementational spaces for students that encouraged translanguaging, drawing from one language to engage in activities in another language. Table 1 provides an overview of how ideological and implementational spaces interacted with monoglossic and heteroglossic ideologies in these classroom examples.

Table 1. Constrained Heteroglossic Ideological and Implementational Spaces

	Ideological Spaces	Implementational Spaces
Ms. García’s Spanish Lesson	The Spanish lesson built on Ms. García’s personal experiences and views about language learning, which were dynamic and heteroglossic in nature.	The teacher encouraged students to write with nonstandard spelling in Spanish.
Ms. Pedroza’s afterschool practice for standardized testing	Explicit statements and actions that showed support for heteroglossic ideologies with the recognition of how monoglossic norms were valued for the tests.	Teacher and students used both Spanish and English; however, English monoglossic language practices dominated.

Implications of the Case Studies

In a content area that was not subject to standardized tests and so, in this sense, was outside of current standards-based reform, the teacher used heteroglossic language ideologies to create heteroglossic implementational spaces, though she was constrained by the low status given to

Spanish instruction produced by a monoglossic educational context. Similarly, in an after-school program meant to increase test scores and where all students spoke the same home language, heteroglossic implementational spaces remained, though they were constrained by the monoglossic ideological spaces produced by monoglossic standardized assessments. The biggest barrier in both of these examples was the limitations imposed by monoglossic standards-based reform. That is, if standards-based reform developed heteroglossic ideological and implementational spaces, it would no doubt impact the ways that teachers address issues of bilingualism in their classrooms. This is not to say that teachers cannot do more to create heteroglossic implementational spaces. However, if standards-based reform initiatives became more grounded in heteroglossic language ideologies, these initiatives could institutionalize transformative educational practices for emergent bilinguals by providing teachers with tools to develop more robust heteroglossic implementational spaces. Unfortunately, as we discuss in the next section, this does not seem to be occurring in the most recent iteration of standards-based reform in the United States—the Common Core State Standards.

THE COMMON CORE STATE STANDARDS

As noted above, it is within a long history of exclusion of emergent bilinguals through the use of monoglossic language ideologies both in the United States and abroad that the CCSS—the latest initiative in the United States to implement standards-based reform—have emerged. The CCSS were developed under the leadership of the National Governors Association, an organization of state governors, and the Council of Chief State School Officers, an organization of public officials who head departments of elementary and secondary education in the states. Deville and Chalhoub-Deville (2011) explain that the CCSS mark a significant shift from the historically decentralized nature of the U.S. education system toward de facto national standards from which curricula, assessment, and instruction must be based (see introduction to this issue).

The CCSS consist of standards in (1) English language arts and literacy in history/social studies, science, and technical subjects and (2) mathematics. The English language arts standards include performance indicators in all four modalities—speaking, listening, reading, and writing—organized by grade level. Reading is further divided into performance indicators related to the reading of literature and of informational texts. In addition, there are standards and performance indicators for the development of foundational reading skills for students in Grades K–5 and performance indicators for the development of content-area literacy in social studies and science for students in Grades 6–12. The mathematics standards include performance indicators organized by grade level in Grades K–8 and by conceptual category (e.g., number and quantity, algebra, functions) at the high school level.

However, the CCSS do not acknowledge bilingualism in any substantive way, and the standards devote only two-and-a-half pages to “English language learners” (ELLs). Specifically, they acknowledge that “these students may require additional time, appropriate instructional support, and aligned assessments as they acquire both English-language proficiency and content area

knowledge” (Common Core State Standards, n.d., para. 1). There is also a brief nod to issues of bilingualism:

ELLs who are literate in a first language that shares cognates with English can apply first-language vocabulary knowledge when reading in English; likewise ELLs with high levels of schooling can often bring to bear conceptual knowledge developed in their first language when reading in English. (Common Core State Standards, n.d., para. 2)

Though still coming from a monoglossic perspective that sees languages as separate objects, this statement is an important first step in bringing bilingualism into the standards-based reform dialogue. The document also acknowledges that the CCSS can be met without the development of native-like proficiency—an idea that is very much in line with heteroglossic critiques of idealized monolingualism. Yet this brief document does not offer any coherent plan for the development of heteroglossic implementational spaces that build on the dynamic bilingualism of emergent bilingual students. On the contrary, as with previous standards-based reform initiatives, emergent bilinguals continue to be positioned as an afterthought and bilingualism as tangential to the learning process.

An additional effort has created national English language proficiency standards that are aligned with the CCSS. Specifically, states have been provided a framework (henceforth referred to as the Framework) developed by the Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO) and the English Language Proficiency Development Framework Committee, which includes the Council for Great Schools, the Understanding Language Initiative at Stanford University, and World-Class Instructional Design and Assessment. The Framework explains the language demands in the CCSS and the Next Generation Science Standards in order to clarify the language practices necessary for emergent bilingual students to meet the standards while also acquiring English (CCSSO, 2012).

The Framework aids states in articulating (1) foundations on which the language-development standards are based, (2) progressions that offer a sequence of language development grounded in this theoretical foundation, (3) standards match between the language expectations of the CCSS and the language developments needs of “English Learners,” and (4) classroom match between the language standards and classroom practice. The progressions are particularly noteworthy in that they are intended to be “attuned to the varying language growth trajectories of different ELLs” (CCSSO, 2012, p. 4). This aspect of the progressions, as well as the Framework’s emphasis that emergent bilinguals do not need to reach native-like proficiency to demonstrate attainment of standards, can be linked to heteroglossic ideologies. Yet throughout the document, there is no mention of bilingualism or bilingual language development. Instead, the document refers to the development of English and students’ first language (L1).

Additional statements about the transfer of skills from languages are perhaps some of the closest that standards in the United States have come to recognizing the utility of multiple languages, but

they fall short of viewing bilingualism as the norm. The Framework, as a document that begins to lay the groundwork for understanding the language demands embedded in the CCSS, does not specifically discuss the role that translanguaging plays in the language practices of emergent bilingual students. If it were to embrace a heteroglossic view, then the Framework would need to address how translanguaging functions not only as students are acquiring English, but as a legitimate discursive practice that naturally exists in bilingual communities. The focus on understanding English proficiency as somewhat separate from bilingual proficiency places the Framework in an in-between space that could be used to support either heteroglossic or monoglossic implementational spaces, depending on the ideological interpretation of the standards alignment. Table 2 illustrates the ways that both CCSS and the Framework support the development of heteroglossic ideological spaces but fall short of developing heteroglossic implementational spaces.

In summary, in their relative silence on issues of bilingualism, the CCSS and the Framework have followed the path of most other standards-based reform initiatives. Emergent bilingual students were for the most part ignored during the inception of the CCSS and have begun to be considered through initiatives such as the Framework only after the standards were already developed. And yet, the potential of bilingualism to enable students to develop more appreciation of text function, greater comprehension of complex texts, more intricate text structures, and greater familiarity with sentence structures and vocabulary, has been well recognized (Brisk & Proctor, 2012; García & Flores, 2013). With the CCSS now in the initial stages of implementation, we are running out of time to create a coherent alternative that embraces the development of both heteroglossic ideological and implementational spaces.

Table 2. Constrained Heteroglossic Ideological Spaces and Monoglossic Implementational Spaces in Standards-Based Reform Initiatives

	Ideological Spaces	Implementational Spaces
CCSS	Some connection to heteroglossic ideologies in its 2½ page document about “English language learners.”	Standards themselves ignore issues of bilingualism and the needs of emergent bilinguals and create monoglossic spaces by default.
Framework	Some connection to heteroglossic ideologies but vague in taking a stand as to whether monoglossic or heteroglossic ideologies should be prioritized.	Focus on attaining fluency in academic standard English creates monoglossic spaces where one’s complete linguistic repertoire aids solely in the learning of English.

An initiative that holds potential for infusing heteroglossic language ideologies into the CCSS is the New York State Bilingual Common Core Initiative (NYSBCCI). This initiative seeks to

place the dynamic bilingualism of emergent bilingual students at the center of the ideological foundation and implementation of the CCSS; that is, the goal of the NYSBCCI is to “embrace a dynamic view of bilingualism” that encourages the use of “the home language as a springboard to understand and produce in the new language” (New York State Bilingual Common Core Initiative, 2013, p. 1). This use of the first language, left up to interpretation, could support heteroglossic language practices but could also be used to support monoglossic ideologies that privilege the use of English over dynamic bilingualism. Below we lay out the possibilities that this initiative offers for developing both ideological and implementational spaces for heteroglossic practices as well as the ways that the initiative could be pushed even further in building on the dynamic bilingualism of emergent bilingual students.

One component of the initiative is the new-language progressions. These progressions begin with the assumption that while the CCSS are moving all students toward a common benchmark, there must be spaces built for differentiating the types of supports that are required by emergent bilinguals at different levels of new-language proficiency as they are socialized into mastery of the CCSS. Thus, these progressions do not lay out a developmental process for how students should develop a new language. Instead, they are informed by a sociocultural approach to language learning that starts from the premise that “when provided appropriate scaffolding, language learners can start developing language for academic purposes at the same time that they are developing basic communication skills in their new language” (New York State Bilingual Common Core Initiative, 2013, p. 3). In other words, emergent bilinguals are expected to engage in academic tasks from the earliest level of newlanguage development and will receive appropriate scaffolding to assist them in these academic tasks. The progressions are not about developing language per se but rather about how to support students at different levels of new-language proficiency in engaging in grade-level activities.

Specifically, the progressions take each standard and develop performance indicators for students at five different levels of English language proficiency: (1) entering, (2) emerging, (3) transitioning, (4) expanding, and (5) commanding. Each performance indicator includes the types of scaffolding that students at each level of new-language proficiency should receive to be able to engage with grade-level texts. Importantly, they explicitly incorporate translanguaging as a pedagogical tool for supporting students in the development of their new language. In short, the new-language progressions are informed by heteroglossic language ideologies that build on the dynamic bilingualism of emergent bilinguals and provide a roadmap for teachers to follow in implementing these ideologies in their classrooms.

An example illustrates this point. Standard 3 for Reading Literature for third grade says, “Describe characters in a story (e.g., their traits, motivations, or feelings) and explain how their actions contribute to the sequence of events.” The draft of the new-language progression—available as of February 2014 on the NYSBCCI website (www.engageny.org/resource/new-york-state-bilingual-common-core-initiative)—first breaks this down into the four modalities of listening, speaking, reading, and writing. For each of these four modalities, the progressions lay

out appropriate scaffolding for the five different levels of new-language progressions that we describe above. For example, the reading performance indicator for an entering student (Level 1) states that the student will be able to “organize pre-taught words on a story map to identify characters and their actions in the new and/or the home language” (italics in original, here and below). In contrast, a transitioning student (Level 3) is expected to “organize a bank of phrases and short sentences on a story map to identify characters and their actions in the new and, occasionally, in the home language” while a commanding student (Level 5) is expected to “organize sentences independently on a self-created story map to identify characters and their actions in the new language.” As these examples illustrate, the new-language progressions do not lay out how students should develop their new language but rather provide a blueprint for the type of scaffolding students should receive at different levels of language proficiency in order to effectively engage as participants in academic communities of practice (Walqui & Heritage, 2012). Yet, as will be discussed in more detail below, one possible limitation to this framing is that translanguaging becomes reconceptualized as solely a form of scaffolding rather than as the legitimate discursive practice of bilingual communities.

The second component of the bilingual progressions is the home language arts progressions. Though these progressions are of most relevance to the many bilingual education programs in New York and around the country that seek to develop home-language literacy skills, they are relevant in any context where home-language literacy instruction is offered. These progressions require just as much differentiation as the new-language progressions, but they focus on academic literacy rather than general language proficiency. This is because many emergent bilingual students who are new to English are also emerging in their academic-literacy development in their home language because of failing school systems abroad that often lead to interrupted (or at best inadequate) formal education (DeCapua & Marshall, 2011). In addition, many emergent bilingual students who have gone to school in the United States have had their home-language academic-literacy development interrupted by the U.S. school system’s monolingual approach (Menken & Kleyn, 2010). Thus, as with the new-language progressions, the home language arts progressions require differentiation and scaffolding. To this effect, the home language arts progressions take the English language arts performance indicators and divide them into the same five stages of development as the new-language progressions: (1) entering, (2) emerging, (3) transitioning, (4) expanding, and (5) commanding. As with the new-language progressions, scaffolding is built into the performance indicators—though in this case it is based on the level of the student’s home-language academic literacy rather than his or her new-language proficiency.

The home-language progressions can be used as a tool for reading the CCSS through a heteroglossic framework that assumes dynamic bilingualism as the norm. For example, Standard 1 for Reading Literature and Reading Informational Text in the sixth grade says, “Cite textual evidence to support analysis of what the text says explicitly as well as inferences drawn from the text.” The details cite grappling “with works of exceptional craft and thought whose range

extends across genres, cultures, and centuries.” Although it also mentions “seminal U.S. documents, the classics of American literature, and the timeless dramas of Shakespeare,” which would indicate the need for an English-only approach, taking a heteroglossic perspective opens up the possibility to read these in translation, gaining, as the standard continues, “a reservoir of literary and cultural knowledge, references, and images; the ability to evaluate intricate arguments; and the capacity to surmount the challenges posed by complex texts.” (For more on text complexity in the CCSS, see Bunch, Walqui, & Pearson, 2014.) In other words, it is not necessary to wait until the English language is developed in order to meet this standard. That is, students can use translanguaging to build on the skills that they already have in their home language as they master content that will eventually transfer to English. The home language arts progressions go even further by providing a blueprint for teachers to differentiate instruction and provide appropriate scaffolding for students with varying levels of academic literacy in their home languages. Rather than assuming an idealized monolingualism, the home language arts progressions embrace and build on the dynamic bilingualism of actual classrooms, positioning translanguaging as central to the language development of emergent bilinguals across the continuum of bilingualism.

Though the NYSBCCI offers a great deal of promise in supporting the development of heteroglossic ideological and implementational spaces, there are still some issues that need to be addressed. One issue already alluded to is that NYSBCCI fails to explicitly acknowledge that translanguaging is not simply a discursive scaffold for emergent bilinguals that disappears as bilingualism develops. On the contrary, translanguaging is the norm for bilingual communities (Canagarajah, 2013; García, 2009). Therefore, in order for the NYSBCCI to reach its full potential as a blueprint for the development of heteroglossic language ideologies in the era of the CCSS, we must encourage the use of translanguaging as scaffolding while also explicitly encouraging students to practice it as a rhetorical choice for authentic communication (Canagarajah, 2013). This means that the NYSBCCI and other initiatives that seek to adopt a heteroglossic perspective must explicitly build translanguaging rhetorical models into their performance indicators. This would support teachers in positioning bilingual students as bilinguals and enabling them to use their linguistic and cultural backgrounds as a resource to enhance their learning. The goal should not be for students to exclusively use English once they are deemed proficient but rather for students to strategically use their entire linguistic repertoire and develop unique voices that express their U.S. bilingual identities (Flores & García, 2013). In short, while the NYSBCCI makes great strides in moving toward the development of heteroglossic ideological and implementational spaces, incorporating translanguaging rhetorical models would provide truly heteroglossic spaces where bilingualism is treated as the norm and the fluid language practices of emergent bilinguals are seen as legitimate discursive practices.

One of the most effective ways to incorporate translanguaging rhetorical models is to work with students to analyze texts by authors who use translanguaging for stylistic purposes. Students can explore the ways that translanguaging allows bilingual writers to create identities that embrace

the fluid language practices of bilingual communities. A culminating project can be for students to produce a piece of writing which experiments with language in ways that parallel the language choices of these bilingual writers. The ultimate goal would be for emergent bilingual students to become aware of how language can be consciously used to express their unique bilingual identities. This translanguaging rhetorical model requires the type of meta-language embedded within the CCSS (Brisk & Proctor, 2012; Garcia & Flores, 2013). Indeed, this translanguaging model would support all students in meeting the language demands of the CCSS ELA and Literacy Standards and should not be reserved for emergent bilinguals.

However, the development of these truly heteroglossic ideological and implementation spaces within the context of the CCSS are threatened by the potential development of assessments based on monoglossic language ideologies that will be used to measure student mastery of the standards (see also Mislavy & Durán, 2014, and Menken et al., 2014). Two testing consortia have formed to create standards-based tests that are aligned with the CCSS: the Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium (SBAC) and the Partnership for Assessment of Readiness of College and Careers (PARCC). Both consortia have taken similar approaches in making these tests accessible to emergent bilinguals, developing the tests from the available research evidence on test accommodations (see Abedi & Ewers, 2013, and PARCC, 2013, for the complete draft guidelines and recommendations for test accommodations for SBAC and PARCC). However, through various constraints on using languages other than English, test accommodations can be understood as ultimately following monoglossic language ideologies that promote a transition to English only rather than valuing an emergent bilingual's complete linguistic repertoire (see Schissel, 2014, for an overview of test accommodation policies reflected in classroom practices). Unless assessments informed by a heteroglossic perspective are developed, teachers will be constrained in their attempts to create heteroglossic implementational spaces in their classrooms (Shohamy, 2011).

CONCLUSION

Standards-based reform has a long history of using monoglossic language ideologies that have excluded emergent bilingual students by marginalizing their fluid language practices. While the CCSS, as the most recent iteration of standards-based reform in the United States, has failed to create strong heteroglossic ideological and implementational spaces, some states, including New York, have taken it upon themselves to create these spaces. However, until assessments are aligned with a heteroglossic perspective, these standards will continue to be an obstacle for teachers as they work to build on the dynamic bilingualism of their students. It is only when assessments are designed in ways that affirm the dynamic language practices of emergent bilingual students that teachers can truly begin to provide spaces that allow and even encourage students to use their entire linguistic repertoire in ways that empower them while providing them with the skills they need to succeed in the 21st century.

Yet, it is not too late to change the conversation about the CCSS. We believe that the NYSBCCI is an important first step, though as indicated above we believe that it can be pushed further. One possibility in pushing this important initiative further is to connect this work with the growing national shift in support of bilingual education. Though the United States has experienced a strong anti-bilingual backlash, recent years have witnessed the pendulum moving back in the other direction. For one, the number of two-way immersion programs that seek to develop bilingualism for students of all backgrounds have consistently increased in recent years (Center for Applied Linguistics, 2012). In addition, a lawmaker in California, a state that was a leader in the anti-bilingual crusades at the turn of the century, has recently proposed the repeal of the initiative that has outlawed bilingual education in the state (McGreevy, 2014). These shifting attitudes toward bilingual education can provide a starting point for building momentum for more initiatives like the NYSBCCI to emerge as well as to provide pressure that moves these initiatives to a more explicit acceptance of bilingualism as the norm for all students.

That being said, we do not have to wait until a policy shift occurs to begin to work toward enacting heteroglossic ideological and implementational spaces in U.S. classrooms. Indeed, working directly with school leaders and teachers in professional learning communities is likely to offer the most immediate and effective way to infuse a heteroglossic perspective into educational programming for emergent bilingual students. This is no substitute for the need to continue the policy-related struggle against the current monoglossic testing regimes. However, working directly with teachers can begin to open spaces of resistance where the dynamic bilingualism of emergent bilinguals is affirmed and built upon. Having teachers embrace a heteroglossic approach is transformative on its own. In addition, sustained work with teachers may eventually coalesce into a bottom-up movement against monoglossic language ideologies that brings about a national transformation where bilingualism truly does become the norm for all students.

Notes

¹ Following the lead of García and Kleifgan (2010) we use the term emergent bilingual in place of traditional terms such as English language learner and second language learner. The term emergent bilingual is more appropriately aligned with our ultimate goal of making bilingualism central to conversations about the education of this population of students.

² For the sake of simplicity, bilingualism is used throughout the article as an umbrella term that also includes multilingualism.

³ All names in reference to this research site are pseudonyms.

REFERENCES

Abedi, J., & Ewers, N. (February, 2013). Accommodations for English language learners and students with disabilities: A research-based decision algorithm. Smarter Balanced Assessment

Consortium. Retrieved from <http://www.smarterbalanced.org/wordpress/wp-content/uploads/2012/08/Accomodations-for-under-representedstudents.pdf>

Bigelow, M. (2011). (Con)texts for cultural and linguistic hybridity among Somali diaspora youth. *The New Educator*, 7, 27–43. doi:10.1080/1547688X.2011.551732

Blackledge, A., & Creese, A. (2010). *Multilingualism*. London, England: Continuum.

Blanton, C. (2003). From intellectual deficiency to cultural deficiency: Mexican Americans, testing, and public school policy in the American southwest, 1920–1940. *Pacific Historical Review*, 72, 39–62. doi:10.1525/phr.2003.72.1.39

Bonfiglio, T. (2010). *Mother tongues and nations: The invention of the native speaker*. New York, NY: Walter de Gruyter.

Brisk, M., & Proctor, C. (2012, January). Challenges and supports for English language learners in bilingual programs. Paper presented at the Understanding Language Conference, Stanford, CA.

Bunch, G. C., Walqui, A., & Pearson, P. D. (2014). Complex text and new common standards in the United States: Pedagogical implications for English learners. *TESOL Quarterly*, 48(3), 533–559. doi:10.1002/tesq.175

Canagarajah, S. (2013). *Translingual practice: Global Englishes and cosmopolitan relations*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Center for Applied Linguistics. (2012). *Directory of two-way bilingual immersion programs in the U.S.* Retrieved from <http://www.cal.org/twi/directory>

Common Core State Standards. (n.d.). *Application of Common Core State Standards for English language learners*. Retrieved from corestandards.org/assets/application-for-english-learners.pdf

Costley, T. (2014). English as an additional language, policy and the teaching of learning of English in England. *Language and Education*, 28, 276–292. doi:10.1080/09500782.2013.836215

Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO). (2012). *Framework for English Language Proficiency Development Standards corresponding to the Common Core State Standards and the Next Generation Science Standards*. Washington, DC: CCSSO. Retrieved from <http://www.ccsso.org/Documents/2012/ELPD%20Framework%20Booklet-Final%20for%20web.pdf>

Cummins, J. (2007). Rethinking monolingual instructional strategies in multilingual classrooms. *Canadian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 10, 221–240.

- Davison, C. (1999). Missing the mark: The problem with the benchmarking of ESL students in Australian schools. *Prospect: The Journal of the Adult Migrant Education Program*, 14, 66–76.
- Davison, C. (2001). Current policies, programs and practices in school ESL. In B. Mohan, C. Leung, & C. Davison (Eds.), *English as a second language in the mainstream: Teaching, learning and identity* (pp. 30–50). London, England: Pearson Education.
- DeCapua, A., & Marshall, H. (2011). Reaching ELLs at risk: Instruction for students with limited or interrupted formal education. *Preventing School Failure*, 55, 35–41.
doi:10.1080/10459880903291680
- Deville, C. & Chalhoub-Deville, M. (2011). Accountability-assessment under No Child Left Behind: Agenda, practice, and future. *Language Testing*, 28, 307–321.
doi:10.1177/0265532211400876
- Flores, N. (2014). Creating republican machines: Language governmentality in the United States. *Linguistics and Education*, 25, 1–11. doi:10.1016/j.linged.2013.11.001
- Flores, N., & García, O. (2013). Linguistic third spaces in education: Teachers' translanguaging across the bilingual continuum. In D. Little, C. Leung, and P.
- Van Avermaet (Eds.), *Managing diversity in education: Key issues and some responses* (pp. 243–256). Clevedon, England: Multilingual Matters.
- Gal, S. (2006). Contradictions of standard language in Europe: Implications for the study of practices and publics. *Social Anthropology*, 14, 163–181. doi:10.1111/j.1469-8676.2006.tb00032.x
- Gamoran, A. (2007). Introduction: Can standards-based reform help reduce the poverty gap in education? In A. Gamoran (Ed.), *Standards-based reform and the poverty gap: Lessons for No Child Left Behind* (pp. 3–16). Washington DC: Brookings Institute.
- García, O. (2009). *Bilingual education in the 21st century: A global perspective*. Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.
- García, O., & Flores, N. (2013). Multilingualism and the Common Core Standards in the US. In S. May (Ed.), *The multilingual turn: Implications for SLA, TESOL, and bilingual education* (pp. 147–166). New York, NY: Routledge.
- García, O., & Kleifgan, J. (2010). *Educating emergent bilinguals: Policies, programs, and practices for English language learners*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- Gutiérrez, K., Asato, J., Santos, M., & Gotanda, N. (2002). Backlash pedagogy: Language and culture and the politics of reform. *Review of Education, Pedagogy, and Cultural Studies*, 24, 335–351. doi:10.1080/10714410214744

- Hammond, J. (2012). Hope and challenge in the Australian curriculum: Implications for EAL students and their teachers. *Australian Journal of Language and Literacy*, 35, 223–240.
- Hammond, J. (2014). An Australian perspective on standards-based education, teacher knowledge, and students of English as an additional language. *TESOL Quarterly*, 48(3), 507–532. doi:10.1002/tesq.173
- Heller, M. (2006). *Linguistic minorities and modernity*. London, England: Continuum.
- Hornberger, N. (2005). Opening and filling up implementational and ideological spaces in heritage language education. *Modern Language Journal*, 89, 605–612. doi:10.1111/j.1540-4781.2005.00331.x
- Jacquemet, M. (2005). Transidiomatic practices: Language and power in the age of globalization. *Language and Communication*, 25, 257–277. doi:10.1016/j.langcom.2005.05.001
- Jørgensen, J., Karrebaek, L., Madsen, M., & Møller, J. (2011). Polylinguaging in superdiversity. *Diversities*, 13(2), 23–38.
- Leung, C. (2005). English as an additional language policy: Issues of inclusive access and language learning in the mainstream. *Prospect*, 20(1), 95–113.
- Leung, C., & Franson, C. (2001). Mainstreaming: ESL as a diffused curriculum concern. In B. Mohan, C. Leung, & C. Davison (Eds.), *English as a second language in the mainstream: Teaching, learning, identity* (pp. 165–176). London, England: Pearson Education.
- Leung, C., & Rea-Dickins, P. (2007). Teacher assessment as policy instrument: Contradictions and capacities. *Language Assessment Quarterly*, 4, 6–36. doi:10.1080/15434300701348318
- Lin, A. (2006). Beyond linguistic purism in language-in-education policy and practice: Exploring bilingual pedagogies in a Hong Kong science classroom. *Language and Education*, 20, 287–305. doi:10.2167/le643.0
- Makoni, S., & Pennycook, A. (2007). Disinventing and reconstituting languages. In S. Makoni & A. Pennycook (Eds.), *Disinventing and reconstituting languages* (pp. 1–41). Clevedon, England: Multilingual Matters.
- McGreevy, P. (2014, February 20). California senator proposes restoring bilingual education. *Los Angeles Times*.
- Menken, K. (2008). *English language learners left behind: Standardized testing as language policy*. Clevedon, England: Multilingual Matters.
- Menken, K., Hudson, T., & Leung, C. (2014). Symposium: Language assessment in standards-based education reform. *TESOL Quarterly*, 48(3), 586–614. doi:10.1002/tesq.180

- Menken, K., & Kleyn, T. (2010). The long-term impact of subtractive schooling in the educational experiences of secondary English language learners. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 13, 399–417. doi:10.1080/13670050903370143
- Mislevy, R. J., & Durán, R. P. (2014). A sociocognitive perspective on assessing EL students in the age of Common Core and Next Generation Science Standards. *TESOL Quarterly*, 48(3), 560–585. doi:10.1002/tesq.177
- Mühlhäusler, P. (2000). Language planning and language ecology. *Current Issues in Language Planning*, 1, 306–367. doi:10.1080/14664200008668011 National Commission on Excellence in Education. (1983). *A nation at risk: The imperative for educational reform*. *The Elementary School Journal*, 84, 113–130. doi:10.1111/j.1749-6632.1987.tb52779.x
- New York State Bilingual Common Core Initiative. (2013). *NYS bilingual common core initiative: Theoretical foundations*. Albany: New York State Department of Education. Retrieved from <http://www.engageny.org/sites/default/files/resource/attachments/nysbccci-theoretical-foundations.pdf>
- Otsuji, E., & Pennycook, A. (2010). Metrolingualism: Fixity, fluidity and language in flux. *International Journal of Multilingualism*, 7, 240–254. doi:10.1080/14790710903414331
- PARCC. (2013). *Draft: PARCC test accommodations manual*. Retrieved from <http://ca539dfd55636c55e922-fd4c048d1c793e15a27f954b34a49d25.r49.cf1.rackcdn.com/PARCCDraftAccommodationsManualforSWDEL.pdf>
- Reyes, M. (2012). Spontaneous biliteracy: Examining Latino students' untapped potential. *Theory into Practice*, 51, 248–255. doi:10.1080/00405841.2012.726052
- Rymes, B. (2010). Classroom discourse analysis: A focus on communicative repertoires. In N. Hornberger & S. McKay (Eds.), *Sociolinguistics and language education* (pp. 528–548). Clevedon, England: Multilingual Matters.
- Sanchez, P. (2007). Urban immigrant students: How transnationalism shapes their world learning. *The Urban Review*, 39, 489–517. doi:10.1007/s11256-007-0064-8
- Sayer, P. (2013). Translanguaging, TexMex, and bilingual pedagogy: Emergent bilinguals learning through the vernacular. *TESOL Quarterly*, 47, 63–88. doi:10.1002/tesq.53
- Schissel, J. L. (2014). Classroom use of test accommodations: Issues of access, equity, and conflation. *Current Issues in Language Planning*. doi:10.1080/14664208.2014.915458
- Selden, S. (1999). *Inheriting shame: The story of eugenics and racism in America*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press. Shohamy, E. (2011). *Assessing multilingual competencies*:

Adopting construct valid assessment policies. *The Modern Language Journal*, 95, 417–429.
doi:10.1111/j.1540-4781.2011.01210.x

Souto-Manning, M. (2010). Teaching English learners: Building on cultural and linguistic strengths. *English Education*, 42, 249–263.

Stoskopf, A. (2002). Echoes of a forgotten past: Eugenics, testing, and education reform. *The Educational Forum*, 66, 126–133. doi:10.1080/00131720208984814

Suárez-Orozco, M.M., & Boalian Qin-Hilliard, D. (2004). Culture and education in the new millennium. In M. M. Suárez-Orozco and D. Boalian Qin-Hilliard (Eds.) *Globalization: Culture and education in the new millennium* (pp. 1–37). Berkeley: University of California Press.

Walqui, A., & Heritage, M. (2012, January). Instruction for diverse groups of English language learners. Paper presented at the Understanding Language Conference, Stanford, CA.