A Heteroglossic Lens on Washington State's Growing Dual Language for Multilingual Learners

Chioma Ezeh, Elizabeth City State University, USA*

https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4489-4056

ABSTRACT

This article examines Washington State's growing dual language program through the lens of heteroglossia. A heteroglosic lens is significant to understanding the contemporary linguistic landscape and framing language policies that will equitably serve multilingual learners and communities. With the increasing multilingual complexities of today's classrooms and the history of academic achievement gaps between monolingual and multilingual learners, heteroglossia illuminates the contextual ways in which language practices and policies hegemonize certain groups and create educational and social inequities. The article argues that unless the state's language policy is structurally revised and informed with a heteroglossic ideology and theorization of language education, its aspirational goals of equitable education for its multilingual learners may never be attained. It offers an overview of the theoretical lens of heteroglossia that must guide the planning of an equitable language policy/program that reflects multilingual learners' authentic fluid language practices.

KEYWORDS

Dual Language Program, Heteroglossia, Language Policy, Multilingual Learners

INTRODUCTION

Through the theoretical lens of heteroglossia, this article examines language policy efforts of Washington State, particularly its current emphasis on Dual Language (DL) programs which is a model of bilingual education that has gained attention in the United States. DL programs are structured to develop and use two languages, English and a Language Other than English (LOTE), for instruction based on time allotments. The article reviews and offers a challenge to Washington State's current language policy that serves linguistically diverse students and proposes a structural shift towards heteroglossic foundations of bilingual education. Reframing the state's language policy with heteroglossic understandings is aimed at addressing the diversity and fluidity of language practices constituting today's classrooms. In what follows, the article presents an overview of heteroglossia as a theoretical lens, based on which it reviews Washington State's language policy efforts in general and more emphasis on its growing DL program. Practical examples from research are used to support its

*Corresponding Author

discussion of the state's DL program. This article argues that for Washington State to accomplish its goals of addressing educational equity and developing multilingual learners' (ML) bilingual, bicultural, and biliteracy skills for global competitiveness, its language policy must key into a heteroglossic underpinning of language education and language diversity.

Theoretical Lens of Heteroglossia

Heteroglossia is a theoretical lens to understand language diversity in relation to its historical, social, and political implications. It is an umbrella term for all policies, pedagogies, and practices that legitimize and support bilinguals to make meaning and understand their world using their whole language repertoires in ways that are explicitly connected with their socio-historical relationships (Blackledge & Creese, 2014; Canagarajah, 2011; García & Kleifgen, 2018; García & Kleyn, 2016; García et al., 2018). Theoretically, heteroglossia challenges structures, policies, and institutions that tend to enforce a unified language (Busch, 2014). Its framework illuminates the realistic and contextual ways by which language functions in an increasingly growing global world and its communicative complexities (Flores & Schissel, 2014). It draws our focus to how language and its practices are shaped by social, historical, and political factors. The linguistic repertoire is neither fixed geographically nor static but keeps evolving and is fluid depending on time and context (Blackledge et al., 2014; Busch, 2014).

A heteroglossic lens acknowledges the presence of different languages and codes as legitimate resources. While Bakhtin (1981) first theorized heteroglossia, it can be understood within three concepts used by Blackledge and Creese (2014) to describe it: indexicality, tension-filled interaction, and multivoicedness.

Indexicality

Indexicality explains Bakhtin's idea that language indexes a particular social class or position, ideology, and point of view. As heteroglossia refers to the simultaneous use of languages or features of languages, Bakhtin explained that heteroglossic resources, whether within a named national language or a set of complex linguistic repertoires, carry different ideological points of view. Besides the given names of languages, language is further stratified into socio-ideological categories such as social groups and positions, social practices, professions and genres, and generations (Blackledge & Creese, 2014). Using or normalizing a particular kind of language practice could imply establishing positions of power for a particular group by repeating or echoing their voices.

Tension-Filled Interaction

Language is inherently full of social tensions in any context or form of its use because a word does not make meaning in isolation from other words that could execute similar functions (Blackledge & Creese, 2014). Bakhtin (1981) used two concepts, "centrifugal and centripetal" to explain the forces that compete against each other in any instance of word usage: centrifugal forces incline towards the disunified heteroglossic aspect of language while the centripetal forces incline towards the unitary aspect of language that seeks homogeneity and standardization. In language use, these forces participate in each other as much as they compete against each other (Blackledge & Creese, 2014). Because language use indexes a particular social group and its societal position, Duran and Palmer (2014, p. 384) acknowledged that the "debate around language policy is about much more than language, it is also implicitly about identity, power relations, and ideology". The tensions in discourses are about the voice recognized and shared therein and whose socio-political and historical ideologies are projected (Blackledge & Creese, 2014).

Multivoicedness

Bakhtin (1981) called attention to the central place of linguistic diversity in discourse. That is, a word exists in relation to other words and their historical associations, and other people's words. We find

the meaning of words in any discourse by connecting the present with the past and the future as well (Bakhtin, 1981). In speech, we do not just use our own words independently, but the words of others, and as such, "we weigh, evaluate, refute, repudiate, celebrate, affirm, and so on not only the words of others but also the political/ideological position represented by those words" (Blackledge & Creese, 2014, p. 10). In other words, discourse not only opens itself up for a competition of "viewpoints, world views, trends, and theories" but also becomes a place where identities are constructed (Blackledge & Creese, 2014, p. 10). Hence, heteroglossia gives agency to the language user as a social actor negotiating the world using heteroglossic resources. Emergent bilinguals' repertoires comprise diverse social experiences and backgrounds, and linguistic abilities based on which "associating language with particular speech communities is insufficient to reflect the diversity of their language, knowledge and capabilities" (Stille & Cummins, 2013, p. 632).

The idea of heteroglossia merges addressing language diversity with addressing social diversity and enlightens us on how issues of power relations engender educational and social inequities. A heteroglossic lens equips us to associate language practices with their real-world socio-political ideologies and histories rather than some idealized standards that can silence the voices of some users (Bailey, 2012; McKinney, 2016). The significance of this perspective is "that it focuses attention on subjectivity, agency, and social context" (Stille & Cummins, 2013, p. 631). Addressing social inequities goes along with understanding the fluid language practices of multilingual communities "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", building multiple linguistic identities, and increasing equal access to educational opportunities (Flores & Schissel, 2014, p. 461).

A Review of Washington State's Language Education Policy Efforts Through the Lens of Heteroglossia

Washington State has a language policy called "Transitional Bilingual Instructional Program (TBIP)". The program was supposedly developed to achieve its goal to "promote school environments that recognize language and cultural assets as valuable resources to learning that directly contribute to student success in college, career and life" (Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction [OSPI], 2020). All students identified as eligible through a home language survey and English Language Proficiency Assessment for the 21st Century (ELPA21) Screener are placed at the beginning, advanced beginning, intermediate, or advanced levels to receive TBIP services (OSPI, 2015). Washington State's TBIP is defined as a program that:

(a) Uses two languages, one of which is English, as a means of instruction to build upon and expand language skills to enable a student to achieve competency in English. (b) Teaches concepts and knowledge in the primary language of a student, while the student also acquires English language skills (c) Tests students in the subject matter in English. (OSPI, 2015, p.1)

While Washington seems to be a bilingual-friendly state, its TBIP could be referred to as what Ricento and Hornberger (1996) called layered and complex. In an OSPI report to the legislature, Malagon et al. (2011, p. 2) made a contradictory statement that TBIP "is intended to provide temporary support services until MLs can develop English language skills that will enable them to fully participate in an all-English classroom setting". The goal of TBIP reflects the heteroglossic views of bilinguals' languages as resources to validate and build upon. Contradictorily, the part of it that requires testing emergent bilinguals solely in English and the OSPI report that explains the program as temporary and transitional echoes English hegemony and a monoglossic ideology.

Washington State's TBIP has six optional program models for serving its MLs. TBIP has three bilingual program models: Dual Language (DL) program (also known as Two-Way Bilingual Education [TWBE]), Developmental Bilingual Education (DBE) or Late-Exit, and Transitional Bilingual

Education (TBE) or Early-Exit, and three Alternative Instructional Program models: Content-Based Instruction or Sheltered Instruction, Supportive Mainstream Model, also known as Pullout, and the Newcomer Program (OSPI, 2015). See appendix for full Washington States' TBIP guidelines. Hence, the bilingual description of the program cannot account for the three alternative instructional programs received by many MLs in the state. In the DL program model, language development is integrated into content instruction through a 50/50 instructional arrangement in English and the student's native language to support students to become biliterate, bilingual, and bicultural while simultaneously increasing academic achievement. The DL program has three models of implementation which are 90:10, 80:20, and 50:50 models. The 90:10 and 80:20 models begin with 90% or 80% of daily instruction in a native/home language for students in kindergarten and 1st grade and gradually reduce native language instruction to 50% or transition to the 50:50 model by 5th grade (OSPI, 2020). The 50:50 model allots 50% to the use of each of the two languages for instruction. The DL program model is mostly practiced with an initial 90% native language instruction and 10% English instruction and progresses through 50/50 instruction in the two languages until students transition into mainstream all-English classes (OSPI, 2020). The TBE model starts in the same arrangement as the DL program model but systematically transitions emergent bilinguals to all-English instruction earlier than in the DL program. The outline of program models in TBIP demonstrates that bilingual programs are only optional. Nothing in this TBIP is a requirement. The program models are only a guide for schools and districts to exercise their autonomy in selecting the model they deem suitable, considering their local contexts and situations (OSPI, 2020).

TBIP is not exclusively a bilingual education program as its goals and definition portend. Its bilingual program models are optional for districts/schools. That given, TBIP is not far-reaching to the concerns of addressing inequities in our modern-day linguistically diverse and dynamic classrooms. Nevertheless, there are recent efforts in the state to embrace dual language bilingual education for all students in the state. There has been a marked increase in DL program services across Washington State. Currently, there are 91 DL programs (i.e., 91 schools) across 41 school districts in Washington State (OSPI, 2020). This growth is quite expected given that the DL program has received support from different stakeholders in Washington State.

In 2017, the Washington State's superintendent, Reykdal stated a vision for Dual Language Acquisition for all K-12 students "to begin learning a second language in kindergarten, instead of middle or high school" (OSPI, 2017, p. 3). Reykdal rationalized that such an approach to education "can drastically close learning gaps for our English learners while simultaneously bringing native English speakers up to par with the rest of the world by having them learn a second language" (OSPI 2017, p. 3). Moreover, Reykdal acknowledgment that MLs "who have instruction in their primary language succeed academically and close opportunity gaps" justifies his vision and support for dual language programs (OSPI, 2017, p. 3). Washington State's dual language education for all initiative has received legislative support to continue incentives for bilingual teachers and paraeducators, K-12 dual language grant program, and grant support for Dual Language Lighthouses that shoulder new, expanding, and mentor programs. For instance, $1.425 million was allocated to the 2020-21 budget for the K-12 dual language grant program (OSPI, 2020).

Other agencies like the Washington's Professional Educator Standards Board (PESB) and Office of Superintendent Instruction's (OSPI) Bilingual Education Advisory Committee (BEAC) have demonstrated commitment to validating and building on the language resources of emergent bilinguals. In the PESB (2015) outline of standards for teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages (ESOL), a whole section on culture and equity was added to Standard 5 (Knowledge and Skills) for all teachers in 2010. The section was devoted to addressing expectations for teachers on knowledgeability about the scope and complexities of the diversity within their student population, the relationship between culture and language and its pedagogical implications, and strategies for incorporating emergent bilinguals' linguistic and cultural resources into instruction to enhance equity (PESB, 2015). Some of the points in the outline that have implications for language policy planning

include "Candidates can demonstrate knowledge and application of strategies which incorporate cultural and linguistic." and "Candidates understand the diversity within the ML population (e.g., immigrant, migrant, refugee, and those born in the United States) and the impact of immigration status, socioeconomic status, race, religion, class, national origin, disability, and gender on student learning diversity to ensure equity in teaching and learning" (PESB, 2015, p. 1).

This list surely suggests an awareness of the changing demographics in schools and the dynamic bilingualism that comes along with it. From a heteroglossic stance, the diversity within the ML population does not only refer to place or race, but also actually implies the diversity, complexity, and fluidity of language practices that characterize their communities. However, the state's TBIP is yet to accommodate this perception of language diversity.

Likewise, the last call to action paper of OSPI's BEAC addressed major concerns related to equity and educational needs of bilingual students in the state. In the paper, BEAC reviewed research on bilingual education, academic performance, and demographics of MLs in Washington, teacher preparation for language diversity, and the TBIP program models (OSPI, 2016). Based on the review, BEAC identified areas that needed urgent action for designing and implementing effective programs. BEAC identified "challenges facing Washington school districts in seeking to implement bilingual programs that address the specific needs of MLs" including: "implementation of research-based bilingual ELL program models, effective assessments and student monitoring systems, and training and professional development for both preservice and in-service educators in ELL best practices" (OSPI, 2016, p. 1). According to BEAC, "these challenges are fundamentally policy issues" (OSPI, 2016, p. 1). Here, BEAC suggests the importance of having an overarching language policy that comes from a similar framework to guide the services rendered to MLs. This calls for consistency in framing all TBIP program models, which bringing insights from the framework of heteroglossia will be beneficial. Moreover, BEAC emphasized the importance of informing policies with research on effective program models for MLs. The goal of the policy cannot be to produce biliterates and bilinguals whereas the policy has optional program models that misalign with its goals. Addressing inequities in the state entails that every ELL is served with an equitable bilingual program. BEAC raised an important point that has implications for policy reforms. The committee stated:

In order to determine the appropriate instructional practice for students, educators must first identify the relevant learning needs of ELLs. Currently, the state of Washington groups all ELLs together into one single category. This is equivalent to placing all students with an Individual Education Plan (IEP) into one single category, obscuring individual students' learning needs and, as such, their personalized instructional needs. (OSPI, 2016, p. 8)

BEAC's emphasis on the importance of tailoring programs to the individual learning needs of MLs has a heteroglossic undertone. Within the ML population are diversity of dynamic and elastic linguistic repertoires. Each student's linguistic repertoire emerges from a range of experiences and linguistic abilities and has historical and social relations that must not be marginalized (Stille & Cummins, 2013). Moreover, understanding bilingualism and language education in this sense to inform language policy addresses power relations around language, in that it paves a way to close opportunity gaps. While no attempts have been made yet to incorporate BEAC's directions into the state's language policy, BEAC's acknowledgment of the emergent nature of bilingualism, a need to understand MLs' individual learning needs, and the inefficiency of uniformly categorizing them into top-down programs demonstrates a clear deviation from a monoglossic ideology.

Recent research on bi/multilingualism calls for heteroglossic policies, programs, and practices that match the day-to-day fluid language practices of MLs. The majority of the TBIP bilingual program models are quite unparalleled to bilinguals' complex fluid language practices and bilingual identities (Blackledge & Creese, 2014; Martin-Jones & Martin, 2017). More generally, the Washington state TBIP is bidirectional in that it makes goal statements concerning bilingualism and biliteracy that

augur well with ideal heteroglossic understandings of language education but outlines models and practices that reproduce English hegemony. This situation has consequences for the implementation of policies. While the implementation process of language policies is complex and dynamic, as schools and teachers exercise their agencies to reproduce new policies in practice (Canagarajah, 2005; Menken & Garcia, 2010), the unclarity of the direction of macro policies makes the process even more complex. Policies, ultimately have implementational spaces for negotiation which local agencies utilize to translate their language ideologies into practice (Hornberger, 2005; Menken & Garcia, 2010). However, when an overarching model or guide is lacking or has no guiding framework, there are bound to be many deviations from the overall goal of the language policy across the state.

A Closer Look Into Washington State's Growing Dual Language Program

The dual language (DL) program, which is the most popular of all the TBIP models, explicitly dismisses monolingualism (Garcia, 2009). Overall, this attribute of DL programs has clearly distinguished it so far as an ideal program for MLs in the state. The goal of the DL program model:

Is for students to become highly proficient in both their native language and their second language while simultaneously gaining high academic achievement in both languages. Additionally, dual language programs seek to foster student success in becoming bilingual, biliterate, and bicultural. (OSPI, 2015, p. 2)

This goal relates to heteroglossic ideas about the ideal bilingual instruction to empower bilinguals in the modern globalized multilingual world. However, this goal is undermined by some structural components of the program that misalign with contemporary linguistic realities. Its strict diglossic language arrangement that determines when and to what extent to use any language in a bilingual program obscures authentic opportunities to fully leverage emergent bilinguals' fluid linguistic repertoires and latent potentials that are resourceful for their language and literacy development (Fielding, 2016; Garcia, 2011; Garcia & Sylvan, 2011; Palmer & Martinez, 2016). Bilinguals demonstrate mastery of important skills that are equivalent to the state language standards when they are given the opportunity to creatively deploy different codes, registers, and genres to communicate meaning with diverse audiences and contexts (Martínez, 2010).

Majorly, the DL program model reflects a monoglossic language ideology as English is still hegemonically predominant and the goal is to transition emergent bilinguals into mainstream all-English classrooms. Rather than understanding language practice as a social practice that emerges from a range of experiences, the strict diglossic arrangement of the program restricts the multilingual discursive practices that characterize bilingual communities (Flores & Schissel, 2014; Henderson, 2017; Palmer & Martinez, 2016). In other words, the DL program model neglects the social aspects of language that go into its practice, undermining educational equity (García & Sylvan, 2011; García, Woodley, Flores, & Chu, 2013). As such, the program conceptualizes language as a unitary whole and bilinguals as double monolinguals who must be proficient in the two separate languages in their repertoire (García et al., 2011). This compartmentalization of languages is neither reflective of the normal fluid language practices of emergent bilinguals nor considerate of the natural way by which bilingualism develops and emerges along a continuum (Palmer & Martinez, 2016). New theorizations and understandings of linguistic diversity point out that these limits of the DL program derive from a monoglossic ideology (Flores & Schissel, 2014; Henderson, 2017).

The time allocation arrangement for languages in the DL program model prioritizes and accommodates only two languages. This structure is not embracive of the multilingual realities in classrooms in Washington State. In the 2015-2016 school year, the total number of home languages spoken by students who received TBIP services was 220 (OSPI, 2017). The structure of the DL program fails to capture the complex heteroglossic language practices that MLs bring to school, let alone the multilingual practices that characterize the 21st century (Flores & Garcia, 2013; Garcia,

2011; Garcia & Sylvan, 2011). In most cases, materials are only provided in the two languages. For instance, Washington State's Dual Language Steering Committee endorsed to "adopt Spanish Language Arts and aligned English and Spanish language proficiency standards" in the spring of 2020 (OSPI, 2020, p. 2). This arrangement often disfavors multilingual classrooms where more than two languages are represented. Wei (2011) reported a situation where students were dissatisfied with the imposition of two languages (English and Mandarin) that were not in their repertoires. This sort of arrangement could even be more stressful for students who are presented with two new languages, instead of building on their linguistic repertoires (Wei, 2011).

In the face of globalization, classrooms are prevalently characterized by "border-crossing communicative practices" for diverse purposes and in different contexts (Hornberger & link, 2012, p. 263). Using New York as an example, Garcia (2011) pointed out that immigration was quite low in the 20th century when Spanish was primarily the language other than English compared to the recent complex multilingualism represented in schools. Again, focusing on only two languages in the DL program model does not take cognizance of two major aspects of linguistic diversity. Any bilingual program in the twenty-first century must consider the bilingual complexity of modern classrooms, and the cultural, political, social, and historical factors that shape language practices (Bloommaert, 2010; Blommaert & Rampton, 2011; Garcia, 2011; Worthy et al., 2013). For the former, language programs must reflect fluid language practices that students bring to school. For the latter, the program must recognize language as a social practice that is shaped by, as well shapes other social practices. In other words, validating the MLs' fluid language practices validates their cultures and histories, addresses power relations that may arise in the implementation of language policies, and creates environments for equitable educational opportunities for all students.

The DL program model creates tensions, power dynamics, and ideological conflicts in the classrooms. These tensions stem from the structure of the model that allocates time to two standard languages (Henderson, 2017; Pratt & Ernst-Slavit, 2019; Valenzuela, 1999). Recent research suggests that teachers who observe and understand MLs' fluid bilingual practices either acknowledge the limitations of the DL program and implement heteroglossic practices or implement restrictive classroom practices that contradict their personal language ideologies. For the former, such teachers employ their agency to create spaces for heteroglossic/ fluid language practices despite the school DL program policy directives (e.g., Flores & Schissel, 2014; Hornberger, 2005; Johnson, 2010; Nguyen & Bui, 2016; Pratt & Ernst-Slavit, 2019). These studies have documented heteroglossic bilingual practices as effective for emergent bilinguals. For the latter, studies have shown that teachers either deploy classroom practices that are shaped by school policy but conflict with their personal ideological stance or assume that the restrictive classroom practices they implement are the ideal ways of educating MLs (e.g., Flores & Schissel, 2014; Henderson, 2017; Martínez et al., 2015). Flores and Schissel (2014) illustrate the two strands of teachers that the DL program model can generate and how conflicting ideologies manifest in DL program implementation. One of the teachers in their study demonstrated an understanding of MLs' fluid practices and addressed their needs by engaging them in conversations that helped them understand their fluid language practices and guided them on how to deploy translanguaging skills as test-taking strategies for the mandatory standardized assessments. In contrast, another teacher in the same school had an additive perspective of students' home languages but believed that the separation of languages was the best way to help them pass standardized assessments and that learning and using standard English was a way of empowering them. Such conflicting ideologies are expected when there is no framework guiding the overarching language policy.

Likewise, Henderson and Palmer (2015) studied two third-grade DL classrooms where the teachers had multiple and conflicting ideologies. The findings revealed that classroom language policy espoused both hegemonic and counter-hegemonic ideologies which manifested in the classroom practices. While the teachers created spaces that allowed students some freedom to engage their full linguistic repertoires in meaning-making outside literacy activities, they maintained strict separation

and time allocation to Spanish and English during literacy events and firmly believed that the language separation policy was the best way that students could develop standard English and Spanish and pass their standardized tests. Also, Martinez (2014) found that teachers' ideologies about dynamic bilingualism in two DL classrooms were both hegemonic and counter-hegemonic, as they valued bilingualism but held on to the separationist bilingual model. An important concern about these implementational issues with DL programs is the power tensions they create which are inconducive for MLs' sociocultural and identity development and educational success.

The power tensions that emanate from the conflicting ideologies in DL classrooms are even more worrisome. Pratt and Ernst-Slavit (2019) studied the tensions in a DL classroom. One of the teachers who understood dynamic bilingualism and the power dynamics of language due to her experiences as a bilingual student in the US created a space for translanguaging during English time. However, the tensions that the DL program model creates in the classroom which also imply a conflict between monoglossic and heteroglossic ideologies were evident in her practice. She partially practiced language separation with reasons to guard Spanish time and help her Latina students develop a voice and sense of worth. She insisted on the sole use of Spanish during Spanish time because Spanish time was mostly violated by the dominant English speakers. While this teacher is strategically confronting English hegemony by following time allocations that she deemed ideal to give Spanish visibility and help her Latina students construct their bilingual identities, she was unknowingly undermining her Latina students' fluid discursive practices.

Likewise, Henderson (2017) reported the ideological tensions that arise in implementing DL programs. One of the teachers in the study who was Latina and bilingual believed that America should have one official language and that learning English was important to addressing educational inequities but supported bilingualism with the belief that emergent bilinguals should not be denied the opportunity to learn their native language. In her classroom, she strictly allocated time for using English and Spanish for instruction and mostly used English, especially for the instruction materials (e.g., videos) while hybrid language practices were only allowed outside instruction. On the other hand, another teacher who was white but bilingual had a heteroglossic ideology and welcomed the use of diverse linguistic resources during instruction. He pointed out the differences he had with the program and policy that encouraged quick transition of students to English and strict separation of languages. He believed that language mixing was normal and that activities that draw from students' multiple linguistic resources were great pedagogical tools in the classroom. On one hand, these examples demonstrate the power of teacher ideology and agency in classroom practice and its implications for emergent bilinguals who are ideologically situated in all policy (re)negotiations in the classroom. On the other hand, it raises awareness of the consequences that macro language policies, such as the Washington state TBIP, could engender when there are no overarching clear goals and directions for bilingual education programs that are heteroglossic ideologically informed.

Possibilities and Conclusion

So far, Washington State TBIP is a language additive policy in that it validates and supports MLs' languages as legitimate resources to increase their academic success. Although there is a transitional aim to using ML's native language to educate them as outlined in the state's TBIP, it is definitely a great step away from subtractive views of language. Moreover, the growth of DL programs across the state signals a significant shift from a subtractive view of bilingualism as a problem for learning. This growth is spurred by the belief that it is the ideal program to equip MLs with bilingual, bicultural, and biliteracy skills for 21st-century global economic competitiveness. However, to achieve the state's vision, the limitations of TBIP bilingual education models, particularly the DL program must be addressed. The DL program initiative can be taken as a stepping stone to developing an ideal program to serve MLs' language, sociocultural, and educational needs. The Washington State Advisory Agency, BEAC, directives that quite align with heteroglossic understandings of language diversity and bilingual education can be taken into action.

From a heteroglossic basis, a befitting language policy or program for MLs must focus on supporting their expanding linguistic repertoires and dynamic bilingualism. To provide MLs equitable education, their fluid discursive practices must be engaged and used as resources to support their literacy, sociocultural, and language development (Creese & Blackledge, 2010; 2011; Palmer & Martinez, 2013). This approach allows their dynamic bilingualism to progressively emerge along a continuum. Moreover, it provides MLs opportunities to construct bilingual identities and negotiate bilingual contexts (Flores & Garcia, 2013; Hornberger & Link, 2012). MLs' language practices are heteroglossic resources that could help alleviate gaps in educational opportunities and social strata when used. Hence, a bilingual education language policy/program that will address MLs' needs must be dynamic. Moreover, the power tensions and ideological conflicts that arise in DL classrooms are unconducive for MLs' educational success. The limitations of program models in the policy, like DL programs, call for revision. Rather than separate languages, as in DL programs, policies and programs should structurally provide MLs opportunities to creatively negotiate their fluid language practices and complex bilingual identities.

In conjunction with a growing focus of research on social, cultural, and linguistic changes that came along with globalization, there is an ongoing call in the field of applied linguistics for heteroglossic-oriented policies and programs that reflect changing modern societies and the multilingual classrooms of the 21st century (Blackledge & Creese, 2014; Martin-Jones & Martin, 2017). Such program structures give students agency to negotiate their linguistic repertoires and identities (Flores & Garcia, 2013). Beyond matching language policies with recent classroom realities are interests in consolidating local discourse practices with social and ideological processes. While linguistic changes and language practices have their sociocultural, historical, and political relationships, language policies could construct and reconstruct cultural and linguistic identities and address educational and social inequities faced by linguistically diverse communities (Blommaert, 1999; Gal & Woolard, 1995; Heller, 1999; Martin Jones & Martin, 2017; Martin-Jones & Heller, 1996). A heteroglossic ideology understands language diversity as an inherent aspect of language, while MLs' natural fluid language practices are not only normal but also composed of sociocultural and political histories that must be legitimized and supported to empower them socioculturally and educationally. For Washington State language policy to address educational and social inequities in contemporary times, it must be reconceptualized to accommodate the full range of bilinguals' fluid language practices that help them to make sense of their world.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

Competing Interests

Funding Agency

REFERENCES

Bailey, B. (2012). Heteroglossia. In M. Martin-Jones & A. Blackledge (Eds.), *The Routledge Handbook of Multilingualism* (pp. 499–507). Routledge.

Bakhtin, M. M. (1981). *The dialogic imagination: Four essays*. University of Texas Press.

Blackledge, A., & Creese, A. (2014). Heteroglossia as practice and pedagogy. In A. Blackledge & A. Creese (Eds.), *Heteroglossia as practice and pedagogy* (pp. 1–20). Springer. doi:10.1007/978-94-007-7856-6_1

Blackledge, A., Creese, A., & Takhi, J. K. (2014). Beyond multilingualism: Heteroglossia in practice. In S. May (Ed.), *The multilingual turn: Implications for SLA, TESOL, and bilingual education* (pp. 191–215). Routledge.

Blommaert, J. (2010). *The sociolinguistics of globalization*. Cambridge University Press. doi:10.1017/CBO9780511845307

Blommaert, J., & Rampton, B. (2011). Language and superdiversity. *Diversities*, *13*(2), 1–22.

Busch, B. (2014). Building on heteroglossia and heterogeneity: The experience of a multilingual classroom. In A. Blackledge & A. Creese (Eds.), *Heteroglossia as practice and pedagogy* (pp. 21–40). Springer. doi:10.1007/978-94-007-7856-6_2

Canagarajah, A. S. (2005). *Reclaiming the local in language policy and practice*. Lawrence Erlbaum. doi:10.4324/9781410611840

Canagarajah, A. S. (2011). Translanguaging in the classroom: Emerging issues for research and pedagogy. *Applied Linguistics Review*, *2*(2011), 1–27. doi:10.1515/9783110239331.1

Creese, A., & Blackledge, A. (2010). Translanguaging in the bilingual classroom: A pedagogy for learning and teaching? *Modern Language Journal*, *94*(1), 103–115. doi:10.1111/j.1540-4781.2009.00986.x

Creese, A., & Blackledge, A. (2011). Separate and flexible bilingualism in complementary schools: Multiple language practices in interrelationship. *Journal of Pragmatics*, *43*(5), 1196–1208. doi:10.1016/j.pragma.2010.10.006

Durán, L., & Palmer, D. (2014). Pluralist discourses of bilingualism and translanguaging talk in classrooms. *Journal of Early Childhood Literacy*, *14*(3), 367–388. doi:10.1177/1468798413497386

Fielding, R. (2016). Students' use of their plurilingual resources in Australian schools. *Language and Education*, *30*(4), 361–377. doi:10.1080/09500782.2015.1114631

Flores, N., & García, O. (2013). Linguistic third spaces in education: Teachers' translanguaging across the bilingual continuum. In D. Little, C. Leung, & P. Van Avermaet (Eds.), *Managing diversity in education: Key issues and some responses* (pp. 243–256). Multilingual Matters. doi:10.21832/9781783090815-016

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

García, O. (2009). Education, multilingualism, and translanguaging in the 21st century. In Social Justice through multilingual education (pp. 140–158). Multilingual Matters.

García, O. (2011). Educating New York's bilingual children: Constructing a future from the past. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, *14*(2), 133–153. doi:10.1080/13670050.2010.539670

García, O., & Kleifgen, J. A. (2018). *Educating emergent bilinguals: Policies, programs, and practices for English learners* (2nd ed.). Teachers College Press.

García, O., & Kleyn, T. (Eds.). (2016). *Translanguaging with multilingual students*. Routledge. doi:10.4324/9781315695242

García, O., Seltzer, K., & Witt, D. (2018). Disrupting linguistic inequalities in US urban classrooms: The role of translanguaging. In *The multilingual edge of education* (pp. 41–66). Palgrave Macmillan. doi:10.1057/978-1-137-54856-6_3

García, O., & Sylvan, C. E. (2011). Pedagogies and practices in multilingual classrooms: Singularities in pluralities. *Modern Language Journal*, *95*(3), 385–400. doi:10.1111/j.1540-4781.2011.01208.x

García, O., Woodley, H. H., Flores, N., & Chu, H. (2013). Latino emergent bilingual youth in high schools: Transcaring strategies for academic success. *Urban Education*, *48*(6), 798–827. doi:10.1177/0042085912462708

Henderson, K. I. (2017). Teacher language ideologies mediating classroom-level language policy in the implementation of dual language bilingual education. *Linguistics and Education*, *42*, 21–33. doi:10.1016/j.linged.2017.08.003

Henderson, K. I., & Palmer, D. K. (2015). Teacher and student language practices and ideologies in a third-grade two-way dual language program implementation. *International Multilingual Research Journal*, *9*(2), 75–92. doi:10.1080/19313152.2015.1016827

Hornberger, N. H. (2005). Opening and filling up implementational and ideological spaces in heritage language education. *Modern Language Journal*, *89*(4), 605–609.

Hornberger, N. H., & Link, H. (2012). Translanguaging and transnational literacies in multilingual classrooms: A biliteracy lens. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, *15*(3), 261–278. doi:10.1080/13670050.2012.658016

Johnson, D. C. (2010). Implementational and ideological spaces in bilingual education language policy. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, *13*(1), 61–79. doi:10.1080/13670050902780706

Malagon, H., & Chacon, A. (2009). *Washington state transitional bilingual instruction program guidelines.* Report prepared for: Special Programs & Federal Accountability, Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction, Migrant & Bilingual Education. Retrieved on 29 October, from www.k12.wa.us/migrantbilingual/pubdocs/TBIPProgramGuidelines.pdf

Martin-Jones, M., & Martin, D. (Eds.). (2017). *Researching multilingualism: Critical and ethnographic perspectives*. Routledge.

Martínez, R. A. (2010). Spanglish" as Literacy Tool: Toward an Understanding of the Potential Role of Spanish-English Code-Switching in the Development of Academic Literacy. *Research in the Teaching of English*, 124–149.

Martínez, R. A. (2014). "Do they even know that they do it?": Exploring awareness of Spanish-English code-switching in a sixth-grade English language arts classroom. *Bilingual Research Journal*, *37*(2), 195–210. doi:10.1080/15235882.2014.934972

Martínez, R. A., Hikida, M., & Durán, L. (2015). Unpacking ideologies of linguistic purism: How dual language teachers make sense of everyday translanguaging. *International Multilingual Research Journal*, *9*(1), 26–42. doi:10.1080/19313152.2014.977712

McKinney, C. (2016). *Language and power in post-colonial schooling: Ideologies in practice*. Routledge. doi:10.4324/9781315730646

Menken, K., & García, O. (2010). *Negotiating language policies in schools: Educators as policymakers*. Routledge. doi:10.4324/9780203855874

Nguyen, H. T. M., & Bui, T. (2016). Teachers' agency and the enactment of educational reform in Vietnam. *Current Issues in Language Planning*, *17*(1), 88–105. doi:10.1080/14664208.2016.1125664

Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction. (2015). *Program Models and Services*. Retrieved on 24 January, from https://www.k12.wa.us/sites/default/files/public/migrantbilingual/pubdocs/programmodels.pdf

Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction. (2016). *Bilingual Education Advisory Committee: A call for equity and excellence for English language learners in Washington*. Retrieved on 17 April, from https://www.k12.wa.us/about-ospi/workgroups-committees/currently-meeting-workgroups/bilingual-education-advisory-committee

Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction. (2017). *Report to the Legislature. UPDATE: Transitional Bilingual Instruction Program (TBIP)*. Retrieved on 24 January, from https://www.k12.wa.us/sites/default/files/public/legisgov/2017documents/2017-03-updatetransitionalbilingual.pdf

Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction. (2020). *Bilingual education program*. Retrieved on 13 February, from https://www.k12.wa.us/student-success/access-opportunity-education/migrant-and-bilingual-education/bilingual-education-program

Palmer, D., & Martínez, R. A. (2013). Teacher agency in bilingual spaces: A fresh look at preparing teachers to educate Latina/o bilingual children. *Review of Research in Education*, *37*(1), 269–297. doi:10.3102/0091732X12463556

Palmer, D. K., & Martínez, R. A. (2016). Developing biliteracy: What do teachers really need to know about language? *Language Arts*, *93*(5), 379.

Pratt, K. L., & Ernst-Slavit, G. (2019). Equity perspectives and restrictionist policies: Tensions in dual language bilingual education. *Bilingual Research Journal*, *42*(3), 356–374. doi:10.1080/15235882.2019.1647900

Professional Educator Standards Board. (2015). *English to speakers of other languages – all levels*. Retrieved on 14 January, from https://www.pesb.wa.gov/preparation-programs/standards/endorsement-competencies/ell/

Stille, S., & Cummins, J. (2013). Foundation for learning: Engaging plurilingual students' linguistic repertoires in the elementary classroom. *TESOL Quarterly*, *47*(3), 630–638. doi:10.1002/tesq.116

Valenzuela, A. (1999). *Subtractive schooling: U.S.-Mexican youth and the politics of caring*. State University of New York Press.

Wei, L. (2011). Multilinguality, multimodality, and multicompetence: Code-and-mode switching by minority ethnic children in complementary schools. *Modern Language Journal*, *95*(3), 370–384. doi:10.1111/j.1540-4781.2011.01209.x

Worthy, J., Durán, L., Hikida, M., Pruitt, A., & Peterson, K. (2013). Spaces for dynamic bilingualism in read-aloud discussions: Developing and strengthening bilingual and academic skills. *Bilingual Research Journal*, *36*(3), 311–328. doi:10.1080/15235882.2013.845622

APPENDIX

Table 1. Washington State's Transitional Bilingual Instructional Program Guidelines

Program Models	Guidelines
Dual Language Program (Two-Way Immersion or Two-Way Bilingual Education)	Dual Language Programs integrate language development with academic instruction for both native speakers of English and new speakers of English (ELL students). The goal is for students to become highly proficient in both their native language and their second language while simultaneously gaining high academic achievement in both languages. Additionally, dual language programs seek to foster student success in becoming bilingual, biliterate, and bicultural. Dual Language Programs typically balance native language (L1) and English language (L2) instruction 50/50 by means of content areas, unit of study, or by instructional time such as class period or day. This model differs from a Developmental Bilingual Education model in that instruction is provided to both native English speakers and English language learners in the same instructional setting simultaneously. Teachers use techniques and strategies to make content accessible regardless of the language being used for instruction. Students in a Dual Language Program may continue to be enrolled in the program after they have exited TBIP on the annual English language proficiency test. However, once the student exits TBIP based on the annual English language proficiency test, they are no longer counted for TBIP funding. Such exited students would then be counted as "Exited TBIP Students" for up to two years.
Developmental Bilingual Education (DBE or Late-Exit)	Developmental Bilingual Education (DBE) programs are similar to Dual Language programs in that instruction is carried out in both English and the student's native language. Typically, Late- Exit programs begin in kindergarten or first grade with 90% of instruction occurring in the native language and 10% in English. Instruction in English incrementally increases, while instruction using the native language gradually decreases until there is an equal balance of instruction occurring in both languages. The 50/50 division of instructional time continues through the completion of the program, which is usually in the 6th grade. Students then transition into regular mainstream instruction in English. Developmental Bilingual Programs typically divide native language (L1) and English language (L2) instruction by means of content areas, unit of study, or by instructional time such as class period or day. As with Dual Language programs, students may continue in the Late-Exit program after they exit TBIP on the annual English language proficiency test. However, once the student exits TBIP based on the annual English language proficiency test, they are no longer counted for TBIP funding. Such exited students would then be counted as "Exited TBIP Students" for up to two years after scoring at exit level on the annual English language proficiency test.
Transitional Bilingual Education (TBE or Early-Exit)	The purpose of a Transitional Bilingual Education is to use the student's native language as a foundation to support English language development. TBE models generally begin by initially providing 90% of instruction in the native language and 10% in English, increasing English instruction systematically until all instruction is provided in English. TBE (Early-Exit) models differ from Developmental Bilingual (Late-Exit) models in that students move to English-only instruction more quickly, with students generally moving into mainstream English-only classes within three or four years. When a student exits TBIP on the annual English language proficiency test, the student may or may not continue to be served in a TBE model. However, once the student exits TBIP based on the annual English language proficiency test, they are no longer counted for TBIP funding. Such exited students would then be counted as "Exited TBIP Students" for up to two years after scoring at exit level on the annual English language proficiency test.
Content-Based Instruction (CBI) or Sheltered Instruction (SI)	Content-Based Instruction (CBI) and Sheltered Instruction (SI) models both integrate English language development with academic content learning using English as the language of instruction. CBI and SI models are used in classes comprised predominantly of English language learners with instruction delivered by teachers specially trained in the field of second language acquisition and instructional strategies to support both English language development and academic grade-level content. CBI and SI classes can be designed to meet core content credit requirements or to serve as language development support classes. OSPI recommends that teachers be endorsed in both: ELL, ESOL, or Bilingual Education, and the content area of instruction. Alternatively, SI and CBI courses may be team taught by ELL /ESOL teachers and content area teachers. CBI and SI vary slightly in their focus. SI models focus primarily on content learning with a secondary focus on language development. CBI models focus primarily on English language development, using academic content as the vehicle of instruction. While the state recognizes the distinction between SI and CBI models, the terms Sheltered Instruction or SI will be used in CEDARS reporting and the LEP application for EDS.

Table 1. Continued

Program Models	Guidelines
Supportive Mainstream	Consistent, focused, and effective language development instruction is provided through ELL pull-out/push-in instruction or through small group work with the classroom teacher. Language instruction is delivered in English by teachers who have been specifically trained in the field of second language acquisition and strategies. Instruction may occur either individually or in small groups within the mainstream classroom (Push-in) or separate from the mainstream classroom (Pull-out) with the focus of supporting English language development. Students in this model access grade-level academic content through participation in their mainstream classrooms. It is therefore imperative that districts employing this model ensure that sufficient time and resources are allocated for professional development of classroom teachers who will be responsible for providing access to grade-level curriculum for the English language learners in their classrooms.
Newcomer Programs	Newcomer Programs provide specialized instruction to beginning level English language learners who have newly immigrated to the United States and are especially useful for districts with large numbers of students with limited or interrupted formal education who may have low literacy in their native language. Such programs typically are employed at the secondary level but could go as low as 3rd grade to provide a foundation of both basic English language skills and content instruction to facilitate students' transfer into a district's regular TBIP program while additionally serving to familiarize newcomers with American culture and educational settings. The amount of time that students spend in a Newcomer Program varies both in daily schedule and program length depending on the particular district model. Districts must establish clear criteria for when students are to move out of the Newcomer Program and into the regular English language development program. Such criteria should be based on a combination of English language ability and length of time in the Newcomer Program. Individual student factors should also be considered regarding a student's preparedness to receive services through another program model. Program length is typically one semester to one year but may be more or less time depending on individual student needs.

Chioma Ezeh is an Assistant Professor of Education in the Department of Education at Elizabeth City State University. She earned her Ph.D. in Language, Literacy, and Technology and her Master's in English Language Learners' Education from Washington State University. Her research interests include multilingual literacy practices in linguistically and culturally diverse schools, sociocultural contexts of literacy education, and sociocultural capital in literacy teacher preparation and early career literacy teachers' practice. She is currently exploring literacy teacher preparation to understand minoritized pre-service teachers' sociocultural capital to center their needs in their preparation programs. She is also researching literacy teachers' sociocultural capital in their contexts of practice to understand their professional development needs, growth, and success in schools. Her work has been disseminated through over 20 international and national conference presentations, six peer-reviewed journal articles, and two book chapters.