Book Section:
Simpson, J orcid.org/0000-0002-2087-7008 (2018) Supporting bilingualism in first generation adults. In: De Houwer, A and Ortega, L, (eds.) The Cambridge Handbook of Bilingualism. Cambridge Handbooks in Language and Linguistics . Cambridge University Press , pp. 250-266. ISBN 9781316831922

https://doi.org/10.1017/9781316831922

Simpson, J. (2019) 'Supporting bilingualism in first generation adults.' In A. De Houwer and L. Ortega (eds.) *The Cambridge Handbook of Bilingualism*. Chapter 14. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

1 Introduction

A feature of 21st century globalisation is the mass movement of people from one country to another. Around 244 million people in the world are migrants, representing roughly 3.3% of the world's population (United Nations, 2016), and motives for their migration are far from uniform. People move because of a shortage of labour in certain sectors, or to be with their families, or as refugees to escape war, civil unrest, poverty, or fear of persecution. Host countries now accommodate multilingual and multicultural populations from potentially anywhere. Supporting bilingualism and multilingualism for adult migrants is therefore a complex global undertaking, though one treated inconsistently and unevenly in different parts of the world.

Bilingualism and multilingualism for new arrivals involves the learning of the dominant languages and varieties of the new home as well as the use of established first languages (L1s). This is in some respects a human rights issue. Article 2 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (United Nations, 1948) has language as one of its categories for equal rights; the issue of linguistic human rights is further advanced in internationally constituted documents such as the Universal Declaration of Linguistic Rights (Universal Declaration of Linguistic Rights Follow-up Committee, 1998). The two fundamental linguistic human rights that apply to adult migrants are that they should be allowed to maintain the languages they grew up speaking, even as they and their families settle in a new country, and that they be entitled to learn to communicate in the main language of their new country. Hence, supporting bilingualism in adult first generation migrants entails both L1 maintenance and enabling the development of competencies in a different language, a language of which, in many cases, they have no prior knowledge. Policy-makers, language educators and academics working in the area of adult migrant language education are typically concerned with the second of these: the right of newcomers to learn the new language and the provision of opportunities for them to do so. Addressing L1 maintenance and development in practice and theory is also important, however. L1 use (as part of a multilingual repertoire) remains fundamental in communication in the personal and social spheres of many adult first generation migrants, in the multilingual environments of

contemporary life. Moreover, enhancing L1 literacy can promote effective L2 literacy development. From a pedagogical perspective language education practitioners can use an understanding of their students' language backgrounds, including their earlier experience of schooled literacy, to inform their L2 learning experience.

This chapter is about adult first generation migrants, salient issues in their learning and life experiences, and how their learning is supported (or not), first in policy, and then in pedagogy. Adult first generation migrants are defined for the purposes of this chapter as people beyond school age who move from one (nation) state to another with the intention of staying more or less permanently and building a life in the new country. The term 'migrant' – to or from a country – is used throughout in preference to the term 'immigrant', to avoid the negative connotations taken on by the term 'immigrant' in public and media discourse in recent years. In the chapter the term L1 is used to indicate the language or, indeed, languages that migrants use to communicate with familiar people such as relatives and friends. The term L2 refers to the new language that migrants may learn after migration, although for many migrants this L2 may actually be a third or fourth (or more) language. In order to emphasize the possible plurality of languages migrants bring with them, this chapter prefers to refer to migrants and the contexts they find themselves in as multilingual rather than bilingual, although the terms are seen here as interchangeable.

The profiles of adult migrants are hugely varied: one might consider the affluent retired British couple who move to Spain, as well as the poor South Asian living and working in Saudi Arabia and supporting a family back home. One might think of the educated Syrian whose refugee journey takes her and her children to Northern Europe, or the affluent expat from France working in international business in Singapore. Likewise, people at different life stages face specific challenges, to which they bring their own singular life histories. A 20-year-old experiences arrival in a new country very differently from a 40-year-old, not least in terms of flexibility in language learning. Younger arrivals might have more recent experience of being a student to inform their current learning (see Gonçalves, this volume, for more on young adult migrants, or, as she calls them, global hybrids). On the other hand, older people might have developed a richer linguistic repertoire, given more extensive life experience. Some new arrivals might need to work straight away, and thus will not have the time to take classes: this is possibly more of an issue for younger than older migrants, without recourse to savings or financial resources. Often, newly arrived migrants experience a difficult time in settlement, but not all do, and often difficulties are only temporarily present.

This chapter discusses issues surrounding formal language education for migrants from poorer and possibly unstable regions of the world who have moved to the post-industrial nations of Europe and the English-dominant West (the United States, Canada, Australia and New Zealand, in addition to the United Kingdom and Ireland). This limitation is in part due to the paucity of studies of the language learning needs of migrants in other parts of the world, and on how these needs are being addressed. Following this introduction, Section 2 sketches out the broad contexts of life and language learning for adult first generation migrants at a time when increasing numbers of people are on the move. I relate the circumstances and challenges of migrant language learners' lives, as they become more multilingual, to the current (and contested) notion of super-diversity, and to intersectionality (to be explained below) as a framework for understanding complexities in the lives of adult migrant bilinguals. Section 3 describes policy support for adult bilingual development, typically understood as education in, and learning of, the dominant language of the new country, for purposes of integration. This section notes the close relation between language education and immigration policy, and the gatekeeping role that language testing for citizenship plays in many parts of the world. Section 4 considers pedagogy in adult migrant language education classrooms, with first a focus on interaction in the new environment generally and then on specific areas of language education which are also of particular relevance to migrants: language learning for (and in) employment, L2 literacy development, multilingual language pedagogy, and critical participatory approaches to adult migrant language education.

2 Life and Language Learning Contexts of Bilingual Migrants

2.1 Super-diversity and Intersectionality

The movement of large numbers of people from diverse backgrounds from all over the world creates spaces where languages and cultures come into contact in new ways. Indeed, the mass movement of people associated with globalisation, coupled with the mobility of linguistic and semiotic messages in online communication, now indicate cultural and linguistic diversity of a type and scale not previously experienced, and renders the overall environment of adult migrant language learning inherently unpredictable. An understanding of adult migrant language education may benefit from new sociological and sociolinguistic tools that are equipped to cater for this unpredictability. For example, the concept of super-diversity, first coined by Stephen Vertovec as a description of the "diversification of diversity" (2006, p. 3), aims to capture the sense of mass, rapid and unpredictable movement

of people which characterises the current age. Super-diversity as a sociolinguistic concept is not without its critics, not least for its Anglocentric worldview (Piller, 2015; note that Vertovec was initially referring to the context of the United Kingdom in recent decades), and for its status in terms of its "unexamined normative assumptions about language" (Flores & Lewis, 2016). Nonetheless the term is retained in this chapter because it enables us to consider super-diverse practices that we might otherwise not have attended to. It also enables us to reconsider established understandings of language use and meaning-making, including those which occur in language learning contexts. As Blommaert (2015, p. 4) explains, the super-diversity perspective "enables us not just to analyse the messy contemporary stuff, but also to re-analyze and re-interpret more conventional and older data; now questioning the fundamental assumptions (almost inevitably language-ideological in character) previously used in analysis". Moreover, the concept of super-diversity also affords us an acceptance of a new paradigm of uncertainty, of movement, and of mobility, characteristic of the lives of adult migrants and their everyday language use.

Given conditions of super-diversity, groups of adult migrants learning the dominant language of their new country will themselves often be diverse. This diversity is notable not only in terms of language background and geographical origin, but also of educational trajectory and schooled experience, command of literacy in an expert language, immigration status and reasons for migrating, age and gender, and employment, inter alia. Individuals who share a similar background differ as well of course, in terms of personality, a sense of agency, motivation and investment in learning, and aspirations for the future. This suggests the relevance of an intersectional approach to the study of adult migrant language education. Block and Corona (2016, p. 507) discuss intersectionality in relation to the dilemma that those examining language and individual and collective identities are confronted with, asking: "how can scholars in applied linguistics take on so many factors at the same time?". They conclude that it is not possible to account for everything. Nonetheless, researchers need to show "sensitivity, awareness and, ultimately, attentiveness to the necessarily intersectional nature of identity" (Block & Corona, 2016, p. 507). Following Block and Corona, language education for adult migrants therefore cannot be considered in isolation from their ethnic and gendered positioning, their social status (often as poor and sometimes unwelcome migrants), the circumstances of their migration, the conditions in their new home, or the social, cultural and political contexts through which they make their trajectories.

2.2 Characteristics of Adult Migrants in L2 Classes

The characteristics of adult migrants who are developing their linguistic repertoires to encompass the dominant languages of their new homes vary from country to country (depending to an extent on global migration patterns), city to city, neighbourhood to neighbourhood, and of course from individual to individual. In the remainder of this section I sketch out intersecting features which impinge upon language education for adult bilinguals, and which relate to characteristics of migrants themselves: their language and educational background and pre-migration language capital, their political status, their age, and factors associated with gender, family status, and employment.

One clear difference between learners lies in the languages they speak. A study of adult learners of English (Baynham, Roberts, Cooke, Simpson, Ananiadou, Callaghan, McGoldrick & Wallace, 2007) found that 500 students in London and the north of England reported speaking over 50 languages between them. More recent studies have noted a similar range. A 'census' view of languages however does not encapsulate the full complex picture of language use amongst such students, nor that many of the learners are already multilingual and multi-literate when they arrive in a new home. Multilingualism, as well as multi-literacy (including literacy in more than one script) is taken for granted by most adult migrant language learners. They are often surrounded by many languages; they use several languages themselves in a multilingual repertoire; they move between them (translanguage) as a matter of course; and use a lingua franca (e.g., English or another global language) with other speakers from diverse backgrounds. Moreover, the modes and media of communication are likewise diverse. It is common for individuals' contemporary communication patterns to move fluidly between face-to-face communication and online communication using mobile wireless technology. For adult migrant bilinguals that online communication will often be transnational: people belong to globally-spread networks of diasporic populations.

Diversity extends beyond countries of origin and first languages claimed. Educational backgrounds and previous experiences of literacy are far from uniform amongst adult migrants. In some formal language learning contexts for migrants it is not unusual to find in the same classroom people who have received a university education together with people with very little schooling and therefore with little literacy in their first language(s). As explained in Section 4 below, the teaching of literacy for new readers and writers is considered by many teachers to be the most challenging area of adult migrant language pedagogy. This is not surprising considering that such students are learning to read and write for the first time, as adults, and this in a new language. In a review of published research

Collier (1989) established that a major factor correlating positively with learners' literacy in the L2 was whether they were literate in their L1. Learners who were not took seven to ten years to learn age-appropriate L2 literacy-related, context-reduced and cognitively demanding academic language skills.

A lack of foundational literacy also impacts upon other aspects of L2 language processing. In their studies of L2 development processes in non-literate second language learners, Tarone, Bigelow & Hansen (2009) note that access (or not) to L1 literacy affects short-term memory, order of L2 acquisition, and grammatical form used in L2 oral narratives. Pettitt and Tarone (2015) have corroborated some of these findings in a case study of one multilingual adult English learner's alphabetic print literacy development. They found that some syntactic elements of their participant's oral production became more complex with increasing alphabetic literacy, though the development of alphabetic literacy did not appear to relate to oral fluency, lexis or pragmatics. They conclude that limited formal school-based literacy instruction "is not necessarily a barrier to agency, to effective oral communication, nor to achieving lexical complexity comparable to that of L2 users at higher levels of education" (Pettitt & Tarone, 2015, p. 36).

The reasons for students not acquiring literacy when they were children vary. There are political, social, economic and cultural barriers to schooling. The upheaval caused by military conflict and war is a reason why some children do not attend school, even in societies where the literacy rate was previously relatively high. Others may come from societies which do not have a strong literate tradition, or from a tradition which does not prioritise the education of girls. Others still may have been deprived of an education because of poverty. Lack of access to literacy has implications in the literacy-saturated world of the adult migrant in the post-industrial west, if not everywhere; for example even the most unskilled manual work in northern Europe now requires an ability to read and write.

Students and potential students in language classes for migrants might be refugees (including those seeking political asylum), people from settled communities who may have been in the new country for many years, husbands or wives on spousal visas, so-called economic migrants, people who are joining family members, and people with work permits. In other words, adult migrant language learners represent a wide spectrum of people. The degree of welcome and the concomitant sense of belonging which is engendered upon settlement in a new country may depend on migrants' political status. For example, refugees seeking asylum are increasingly unwelcome in certain parts of the world, and might have an uncertain future in a hoped-for new home. As discussed in Section 3 below, a further factor in

the link between language and immigration policy is that many newcomers have to study a language specifically to fulfil language requirements for gaining naturalisation or permanent residence in the new country.

The length of time someone might have spent in a new country before gaining access to formal education is an important factor in learning. Baynham, Roberts et al. (2007) found that relative newcomers (those who had lived in the United Kingdom for five years or fewer) made more rapid progress than long-term residents. Long-term residents often had had little chance to learn the dominant language when they first arrived. One of the classes in the Baynham, Roberts et al. study was for Hong Kong Chinese women who had been living in the United Kingdom for up to thirty years, but who had only recently started learning English formally (despite wanting to for a long time), because work and family commitments and constraints had prevented them from gaining earlier access to classes.

A lack of childcare is a particularly acute problem for migrant women wishing to raise young children and attend regular language classes in the new country (Macdonald, 2013). Consequently migrant women's learning may happen in a piecemeal way, over a longer period of time. Indeed, migration and asylum affect women in different ways from men, and this extends to their experience of language education, typically a gendered field. Migrant women's chances of having received any formal education are generally lower than those of men. Aditionally, people trafficking as part of forced prostitution affects women and girls almost exclusively, and the trauma associated with it will usually not be shared by men. A less obvious but important issue is the change in family patterns associated with movement across borders. Traditional family patterns can go through many shifts during and after migration. These are sometimes to the benefit of women but sometimes not; for example, many women migrants are single mothers who have been widowed due to war and conflict in their home countries and are therefore living in situations at odds with their traditional norms.

It is clear, then, that L2 learning by migrants depends on a multitude of factors related to their specific circumstances and characteristics. One factor, age at the time of arrival in the host country, also distinguishes migrants from each other, but at this point it is not clear how age on arrival alone can explain any differences amongst adult migrants' L2 learning (see Singleton & Pfenninger and Biedroń & Birdsong, this volume, for extensive discussion).

2.3 Employment

A pressing reason for learners to engage with learning the new language is employment (see also Grin, this volume). There is no doubt that a country benefits from a multilingual workforce, and one with competencies in the new language. As explained further in Section 4, employment is a key plank in national immigration policies relating to integration. Adult migrants bring with them a wide array of qualities and attributes which would normally give them status in society, including previous education, language and literacy, a range of qualifications, skills, knowledge and prior experience. But the linguistic capital that multilingual adult learners bring with them to the new context relates in complex ways to their integration and ultimately their sense of belonging. Some migrants who find work in their new country might be employed below their professional level and may remain in this position for years. Bourdieu's (1991) work on the forms of social capital and its extension to language affords a link between the learning and the use of a new language and issues of power that are fundamental to the difficulties faced by bilingual language learners attempting to gain a foothold on employment ladders of their new country. Bourdieu's notion of social capital as an index of relative social power suggests that the same forms and amounts of capital may result in different positioning vis-à-vis different fields, so the forms of capital that are valued in one place (the home country, for example) may not be so in the new home.

Interestingly, whether or not an individual newcomer has a partner from the new country also makes a difference to their economic as well as social position. Meng & Meurs (2009) studied the role of intermarriage in the process of what they term migrant economic assimilation in France. They examined the extent to which migrants who have intermarried (i.e., married someone born and brought up in France) have successfully joined the labour market, as measured by earnings, compared to their non-intermarried counterparts. They found that people who had intermarried earned around 25% more than those who had not. Moreover, the "intermarriage premium" appears to be higher for individuals who already have a strong grasp of the French language before migration than for those who do not.

3 Policy Support for Adult Bilingual Development

From the perspective of the nation state, migration typically outpaces the development of policies and infrastructure which address the presence of new migrants and the linguistic diversity that their arrival entails. That said, national governments generally accept that new arrivals should use the dominant language(s) and language varieties of their new country. In

language policy, understanding and using the dominant language of the new country is not only a proxy for national unity, but is often seen as a sine qua non of integration (the term 'linguistic integration' is often invoked) and social cohesion. This understanding is shared by policy makers, language educators and migrants themselves: Acquiring good communicative abilities in the standard variety of a language is felt to equip newcomers with the means for navigating a fresh social context (see Treffers-Daller, this volume, on bilingual abilities). This extends to competencies in reading and writing: an assumption is easily made that literacy in the standard variety is essential for getting by and is the route to a successful future.

It is perhaps not surprising, then, that language education for migrants at the scale of national policy rarely embraces bilingualism or mutilingualism, that is, the development of competencies in the dominant language as part of a multilingual repertoire. On the other hand, there is some supranational policy interest in multilingual education, and in language education that recognises languages other than the new language. For example, UNESCO (2003) stresses the importance of L1 instruction, and encourages United Nations member states to view such instruction as a strategy for promoting quality in education. The Council of Europe's Linguistic Integration of Adult Migrants (LIAM) project is perhaps the most comprehensive supranational policy initiative concerning adult bilingual language support (see Beacco, Little & Hedges, 2014). On the project website, the guiding principles are set out as follows:

> Languages are an essential instrument for building intercultural understanding and social cohesion. The language or languages of the host society into which migrants are seeking to integrate (emphasis in original), and the languages which are already part of their individual linguistic repertoire (emphasis in original), shape their identities as active, democratic citizens. A plurilingual and intercultural approach to the teaching of the language of the host society ensures that languages become instruments of inclusion that unite rather than segregate people.
>
> (Council of Europe, n.d.)

In their introduction to the LIAM guide to language policy development and implementation endorsed by the Council of Europe, Beacco et al. (2014, p. 12) propose that language programs designed to support linguistic integration should take into account the following:

(1) the languages that adult migrants already know: programs should acknowledge these to help migrants learn the new language; programs should encourage migrants to value their L1(s), because this may help their self-esteem; and programs should encourage migrants to speak their L1(s) within the family, the reason being that these L1(s) will enrich the host societies;
(2) the language needs of adult migrants: these should be identified but also discussed with the migrants themselves; and
(3) the diversity of migrant populations: language education programmes should adjust their approach to the particular situations of individual migrants (see discussion in Section 2).

The LIAM project does not propose that there be L1 instruction. Others have made arguments for this. However, such L1 instruction programmes are instituted for linguistic integration, chiefly as a pathway to the dominant language, and to literacy in that language. As Rivera & Huerta-Macías (2008) explain, L1 literacy programmes are typically devised as a stepping stone to the target language, on the understanding that the development of L1 literacy will equip students with the skills and abilities to transfer to L2 literacy acquisition. However, L1 education is generally seen as too expensive and impractical to attract central government funding.

Indeed, generally, policy discourses about migrant integration stress that it is the societally dominant (i.e. the new) language in which competencies should be developed. This is seen as crucial for employment. Policy arguments relating linguistic capital to migrant integration suggest that being able to communicate in the host country language is one of the main drivers of successful economic and social integration of migrants (e.g., Isphording, 2015).

Immigration policies as they relate to who may or may not enter a country are tightly intertwined with labour market mechanisms and language requirements. High-skilled migrants with demonstrated competencies in the L2 tend to be welcomed, while those without accredited skills or certified L2 language capability tend not to be (see Treffers-Daller, this volume, for discussion of issues related to measuring bilingual abilities). In some countries, including Australia, Canada and the United Kingdom, a points-based system is in place for the granting of visas. For example, hopeful entrants to the United Kingdom are

awarded points for qualifications, expected earnings, available funds for maintenance and English language skills.

Demonstration of proficiency in the L2 on a test and/or in an interview is also used as a key gatekeeper for the attainment of citizenship, naturalisation or permanent residence as part of the process of settlement in the new country once people are there. In this sense, language is a pre-requisite for integration, rather than (as most language educators would see it) an outcome. Policies vary, though there has been a rising trend since the beginning of the 21st century for continued residence in a new country to be dependent upon reaching a certain level of language proficiency. For instance, in Europe by 2016, 28 of the 36 Council of Europe member countries (78%) had some kind of language requirement for migration purposes, up from 58% in 2007 (ALTE , 2016, p. 9). Proficiency is typically measured by a standardised language exam or a de facto language and literacy assessment in the shape of a citizenship test.

The danger of language testing for citizenship and naturalisation is that rather than fostering a sense of integration and inclusive citizenship, such testing regimes promote a feeling of exclusion and a message that some migrants belong more than others. To address this, and to ensure that testing does not impinge upon the civil and human rights of the test-taker, the purpose of language testing for citizenship should be clear, fair and commonly understood.

Once adult migrants have arrived in their new country and are settling in, education - including language education - is considered in social policy to be an effective tool to assure their better integration into their host countries. In their collection of studies of policy and practice in adult migrant language education in eight countries, Simpson & Whiteside (2015, p. 1) noted however that "national policies concerning language education for new arrivals in most states [..] are inconsistent, contentious and contradictory, responding in uneven ways to the dynamic diversity associated with migration". How then can adult bi- and multilingualism be supported in pedagogy, given the multi-faceted concerns of migrants' lives and the complexities and inconsistencies of policy frameworks? This question is addressed in the next section.

4 Support in Pedagogy

The advantages of having access to the dominant language(s) and the privileged varieties of the new home, and of developing a measure of competence in these, are more than apparent to the majority of migrants. Many (though not all) are highly motivated to

learn. Key to successful learning is interaction: from a cognitive perspective, interaction is crucial in providing input, opportunities for negotiation of meaning, and the requirement to produce language output. Socially-oriented perspectives on language learning view it as occurring through interaction as social participation, seen as central in the successful development of new identities and a sense of belonging. Success in this sense can be identified in many different ways. For example, in her analysis of interviews with 76 UK-based adult migrants about their language learning needs Cooke (2006) notes that a feeling commonly reported by beginner migrant language learners is discomfort at their dependence on interpreters, friends or even their own children to help with bureaucratic and medical encounters. Many of Cooke's participants talk of their language learning achievements in terms of breaking this dependency.

Drawing on her research with adult migrants in Canada, Norton (2006) proposes the construct of investment as appropriate to describe migrants' language learning, to complement more established understandings of language learner motivation. Investment signals the relationship of learners to the target language and their desire to learn and practice it. For adult migrants, investment in language learning can be tinged with ambivalence, relating to the way they settle into life in a new country. As Norton writes (2006, p. 96), while adult learners (of English, in her case) "may strive to make a productive contribution to their new societies, unless the host community is receptive to their arrival, they will struggle to fulfil their potential". This view is echoed in Yates' (2011) study of interaction and social inclusion for 152 new arrivals to Australia in the early months of settlement. Yates found that newly arrived migrants have very limited interactions in English outside classrooms in either social situations or in the workplace, and argues that:

> where social connections are not made through English, immigrants can lack a sense of affiliation and remain isolated and insulated in their 'ethnic bubbles'. While such bubbles may support a sense of belonging to their ethnic community, they do not facilitate either the development of proficiency in English or access to broader social networks that will provide much needed connections to the local and global English-speaking communities
>
> (Yates, 2011, p. 469)

Yates' conclusions point to the importance of formal language lessons to equip new migrants with the language and cultural skills to participate in dominant language

interactions. At the same time, Yates notes that interaction, like integration, is a two-way street, maintaining that it is also crucial to "equip speakers of the dominant language with the awareness, attitudes and skills that will help them to engage and communicate more successfully with new arrivals" (Yates, 2011, p. 469).

How best then to address the language and interactional concerns of a diverse population of language learners in pedagogy? In the remainder of this section I focus on four disparate areas of concern where adult migrant language education can make a difference: (1) language learning for employment, (2) literacy development (3) multilingual pedagogy, and (4) critical and participatory approaches in adult migrant language education. Each sub-section includes illustrative examples of resources or programmes that might be employed as models of practice.

4.1 Language Learning for Employment

Migrants in language classes who are already workers need a complex set of competencies, including the specific institutional and occupational discourses of their jobs. In addition, as the work of the UK Government-funded Industrial Language Training Unit (1974-1989) showed, workers need the interactional competence to form relationships with their colleagues and negotiate their rights. Language for work courses do not necessarily provide such richness and breadth however. Sandwall (2010) describes a work placement scheme for adult migrants in Gothenburg, Sweden, the intention of which was to enable new arrivals to develop their competencies in Swedish as part of the basic Swedish language programme for adult immigrants, Svenska for invandrare (Sfi). The student in Sandwall's case study maintained very firmly that she learned more at school, highlighting "the need to discuss assumptions about language learning at work placements in relation to the student's trajectory and the workplace on offer" (Sandwall, 2010, p. 542). A more critical concern is that practical work placements such as the one described in Sandwall's study can be used as a mechanism for social exclusion, introducing migrants to low-grade work, whatever their educational background or work experience prior to migration.

Companies with employees who are migrants might nonetheless enrol them in specially designed language learning courses. There are many examples of employment-oriented language programs worldwide which have been evaluated as successful. For example, partnerships between employers and professional educators are crucial for the success of the Deutsch am Arbeitsplatz (German at Work) initiative in Germany, whereby trained teachers work with employers and labour unions to develop appropriate workplace

language instruction programs (McHugh & Challinor, 2011). McHugh and Challinor (2011) recommend expanding language instruction to be contextualised for workplace use, to combine language pedagogy with work skills training, to encourage partnerships and to work with employers and unions.

4.2 Literacy Learning for Adult Migrants

As mentioned in the discussion of learners' life and learning contexts above, L2 literacy acquisition is a special concern for many adult migrant bilinguals. Meeting the needs of adult migrant language learners without well-developed access to literacy creates several challenges for teachers and organisations providing instruction. In their practical guide to teaching basic literacy to adult migrants in the United Kingdom, Spiegel & Sunderland (2006) point to a number of factors which complicate matters for teachers of basic ESOL literacy to bilingual students (ESOL refers to English for Speakers of Other Languages). Some students come to language classes with an ability to read and write another language which uses the same script. Others might be familiar with an ideographic writing system, a syllabary, or a non-Roman alphabet. Others still may have little or no knowledge of any writing system at all. Thus, students of basic literacy arrive in their classes with different starting points, and classifying students according to their literacy needs becomes problematic for teachers.

One distinction that teachers find helpful is between those students with some foundational literacy in the L1 and those with none. Because of the circumstances which drove them to relocate in the first place, some migrants may have missed out on formal education as children, and consequently did not learn to read and write well. Those with some L1 literacy can be viewed as having skills to transfer onto literacy in their new language (see Section 3). In migrant language classrooms, teachers appreciate that progress is slower among those with no literacy skills to transfer (Bell, 1995). Teachers also recognise that people are able to transfer fundamental knowledge that they have about literacy, regardless of script. For example, people may realize that writing may depend on specific sound-symbol links (Spiegel & Sunderland, (2006). Building on this position, Vinogradov (2009) suggests a range of activities for beginner adult L2 literacy learners, based on their own learner-generated texts, and with a focus on their bottom-up reading skills. These include sequencing, word-recognition, phonemic awareness and phonics tasks.

4.3 Multilingual Pedagogy

Some researchers in bilingualism and biliteracy maintain that adults acquiring literacy for the first time will learn more effectively if literacy is taught in their L1: the stepping stone described above. This belief is based largely on a body of research carried out on children in the early grades of school. Furthermore, researchers taking a critical stance towards L2 literacy learning maintain that teaching students literacy in the L2 rather than the L1 is actually unlikely to be effective. For example, writing about the American context, Auerbach (1993, p. 18) suggests:

> The result of monolingual ESL instruction for students with minimal L1 literacy and schooling is often that, whether or not they drop out, they suffer severe consequences in terms of self-esteem; their sense of powerlessness is reinforced either because they are de facto excluded from the classroom or because their life experiences and language resources are excluded.

In most places L1 or bilingual literacy education for adults is controversial and is hardly ever used. In the United States, for example, the 'English Only' movement fiercely lobbies against L1 literacy education. Teachers, however, are often aware of the massive task facing students with a low level of oral proficiency in the L2 who are attempting to learn literacy at the same time, and in places where there are large numbers of people from the same linguistic background it would seem sensible to at least consider bilingual instruction as an option.

In principle, there would also seem to be no necessary contradiction between supporting the maintenance and development of migrants' L1s on the one hand and helping them to acquire the dominant languages and varieties of the new country on the other. In a publication supported by the Council or Europe's LIAM project (see Section 3), Beacco, Krumm & Little (2017, p. 2) argue that both the L1 and the L2 may support each other through teaching activities "that give legitimacy to migrants' linguistic repertoires" and that rely on students' languages. Such a position creates a space for language pedagogy based on current sociolinguistic understandings of contemporary language use that are commensurate with life in super-diverse environments. A traditional view of bilingualism rests on the idea of two languages with two separate linguistic systems (an L1 and an L2). Sociolinguistically informed theories of translanguaging, however, take a different starting point, viz., they take a 'speaker's view' whereby mental grammar has developed in social interaction with others. Such a translanguaging perspective assumes that from a user perspective there is just one

linguistic system with features of two or more societally defined languages that are integrated throughout (García & Li, 2014). When people translanguage they sometimes use these features - which are simply their own - in ways which align with constructions of 'a language'. Often though they use them differently, for example to produce new practices in ways which emphasise the artificiality of boundaries between languages. This is most evident when languages and cultures come into contact, as in many if not most migration contexts. If multilingualism is seen as a resource, the inclusion of languages other than the dominant one in education can be viewed as productive (see García & Tupas, this volume).

There has as yet been little research on translanguaging in adult bilingual learning contexts. An example from Higher Education involving multilingual academic sojourners in France, however, suggests the potentially broad applicability of a translanguaging approach. Mathis (2015) describes a literacy project in a French university that focuses on the expression of students' plurilingual identities. Students from Lebanon, Morocco, Canada and France were asked to carry out reflective writing activities where they concentrate on their own personal experiences with languages and migration journeys. They mostly wrote in French but also used other languages. In thus using their plurilingual abilities, "social actors take up, in their literacy practices, the positioning of learners to those of experts, and of being monolingual to plurilingual, while expressing tensions and creating new ways of conveying who they are in the world" (Mathis, 2015, p. 147).

In a very different adult migrant language learning context, Garrido & Oliva (2015) describe a multilingual workshop approach to teaching Catalan to migrants without official status, who are not entitled to state support, with a focus on translanguaging and intercultural debate. They explain how translanguaging as a pedagogic approach is appropriate in Barcelona, especially with learners who:

> have mainly learned languages in naturalistic contexts characterised by hybridity. In the host society, it is necessary to learn how to move between Castilian Spanish and Catalan to fully participate in bilingual, sometimes hybrid, playful and polivalent, communicative events, genres and registers. Within our multilingual workshops and classes, translanguaging serves two main purposes: to maximise learning and comprehension for a heterogeneous group and to construct continuity with their daily, multilingual lives.
>
> (Garrido & Oliva, 2015, p. 102)

Understandings of notions such as multicultural education, culturally responsive teaching and culturally relevant pedagogy have much in common: they all refer to the use - and recognition of the value - of more than a single language in teaching and learning, to an awareness of different lived experiences and cultural worldviews of students, and to the importance of drawing upon prior knowledge of students with various linguistic, cultural and ethnic backgrounds. There appears to be a critical flavour to the nascent research and pedagogic activity around translanguaging in adult migrant language learning contexts, and it is to critical and participatory pedagogy that we finally turn.

4.4 Critical and Participatory Pedagogy

If a multilingual turn has yet to reach mainstream adult migrant language education, language pedagogy for adult migrants still requires innovative responses to linguistic and cultural diversity and to the new mobilities of the 21st century. Critically-oriented teachers recognise that many migrants are not only concerned with a wish to access the new language to enable them to operate effectively in daily life, but are also engaged in a struggle for recognition and equality. Inspired by the writings of the Brazilian Marxist educator Paulo Freire in books such as Pedagogy of the Oppressed (Freire, 1970), participatory pedagogy has been practised by some educators in Europe and North America since the 1970s, particularly in the teaching of adult literacy. Participatory pedagogy advocates that participants set their own agenda, devise their own learning materials, take action on the issues which they identify as important, and evaluate their progress and the effectiveness of their programmes as they go. The syllabus, therefore, is not brought along by the teacher but rather emerges from class to class, driven not by an external curriculum defined a priori but by the students themselves.

An example of a participatory teaching initiative is the Whose Integration? project (Cooke, Winstanley & Bryers, 2015), whereby teacher-researchers explored critical participatory ESOL pedagogy with their adult migrant students in London, England. The aim was to relate language and literacy learning to the critical concerns of students' lives, on the students' own terms. This can equip students with critical skills which can be transferred beyond the classroom to effect social action. Drawing on cognitively-oriented understandings of interaction for language development, the project recognised firstly that adult migrants' progress in speaking required the production of turns of talk that were longer and more sophisticated than are typical in many ESOL classrooms. At the same time, the content of classroom discussions needed to suit students' out-of-class needs and interests on a personal,

social and political level. Whose Integration? addresses a contemporary concern – integration into a new society – of which 'ESOL students are often the referents, but about which they are rarely asked their opinions' (Cooke et al., 2015). The authors hold that the 'intensity of discussion in the classroom led some students to stimulate the same debates at home and with friends, and as teachers we found ourselves discussing the issues which arose in class long after the sessions were over' (2015: 223).

5 Conclusion

This chapter began by noting that supporting bilingualism in adult first-generation migrants entails two things: the development of competencies in the dominant language of the new country, and the maintenance of, and possibly literacy develoment in, the L1(s), both as part of a multilingual repertoire. The diversity inherent in the adult migrant student body was then sketched out, noting that many adult migrant language learners are developing their bi- and multilingualism in conditions of super-diversity, and bringing in the notion of intersectionality as an appropriate empirical approach to the study of migrant language education. A number of characteristics of adult migrant bi- and multilinguals were covered, across a range of dimensions, stressing how each of these in their different ways has implications for their language development. Two areas of support were discussed. First, policy support for adult migrant language learners, where the suggestion was that there are gaps and contradictions in policy worldwide. Second, the chapter discussed how adult migrant bilingualism can be supported in practice, by focusing on language learning for employment, literacy learning, the use of multilingual pedagogies and the use of critical participatory pedagogy.

References

ALTE (2016) Language Tests for Access, Integration and Citizenship: An Outline for Policy Makers. Cambridge: Association of Language Testers in Europe.

Auerbach, E. R. (1993). Reexamining English Only in the ESL classroom. TESOL Quarterly, 27(1), 9-32.

Baynham, M., Roberts, C., Cooke, M., Simpson, J., Ananiadou, K., Callaghan, J., McGoldrick, J., & Wallace, C. (2007). Effective teaching and learning: ESOL. London: NRDC.

Beacco, J.-C., Krumm, H.-J., & Little, D. (Eds.) (2017). The linguistic integration of adult migrants: Some lessons from research. Berlin: De Gruyter.

Beacco, J.-C., Little, D., & Hedges, C. (2014). Linguistic integration of adult migrants. Guide to policy development and implementation. Strasbourg: Council of Europe Publishing.

Bell, J. S. (1995.) The relationship between L1 and L2 literacy: Some complicating factors. TESOL Quarterly, 29(4), 687-704.

Block, D., & Corona, V. (2016). Intersectionality in language and identity research. In S. Preece (Ed.), The Routledge handbook of language and identity (pp. 507-522). London: Routledge.

Blommaert, J. (2015). Commentary: Superdiversity old and new. Language and Communication, 44(1), 82-89.

Bourdieu, P. (1991). Language and symbolic power. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Collier, V. (1989). How long? A synthesis of research on academic achievement in a second language. TESOL Quarterly, 23(3), 509-532.

Cooke, M. (2006). "When I wake up I dream of electricity." The lives, aspirations and "needs" of adult ESOL learners. Linguistics and Education, 17(1), 56-73.

Cooke, M., Winstanley, B., & Bryers, D. (2015). Whose integration? A participatory ESOL project in the UK. In J. Simpson & A. Whiteside (Eds.), Adult language education and migration: Challenging agendas in policy and practice (pp. 214–224). London: Routledge.

Council of Europe (n.d.). *Linguistic Integration of Adult Migrants' (LIAM) Guiding* principles. http://www.coe.int/en/web/lang-migrants/guiding-principles, last accessed Dec. 8, 2017.

Flores, N., & Lewis, M. (2016) From truncated to socio-political emergence: A critique of superdiversity in sociolinguistics. International Journal of the Sociology of Language, 241, 97-124.

Freire, P. (1970). Pedagogy of the oppressed. New York: Seabury Books.

García, O. & Li, W. (2014). Translanguaging: Language, bilingualism and education. New York: Palgrave.

Garrido, M. R., & Oliva, X. (2015). A multilingual, collaborative and functional approach to nongovernmental Catalan classes. In J. Simpson & A. Whiteside (Eds.), Adult language education and migration: Challenging agendas in policy and practice (pp. 94-106). London: Routledge.

Gumperz, J. Jupp, T. & Roberts, C. (1979) Crosstalk: A Study of Cross-Cultural Communication. London: National Centre for Industrial Language Training, in association with the BBC.

Isphording, I. E. (2015). What drives the language proficiency of immigrants? IZA World of Labor, 2015, 177.

Macdonald, S. (2013). Migration and English language learning in the United Kingdom: towards a feminist theorising. Power and Education, 5(3), 291-303.

Mathis, N. (2015). Plurilingual literacy practices in a creative writing workshop with adult second language learners. In J. Simpson & A. Whiteside (Eds.). Adult language education and migration: Challenging agendas in policy and practice (pp. 138-148). London: Routledge.

McHugh, M., & Challinor, A. E. (2011). *Improving immigrants' employment prospects* through work-focused language instruction. Washington, DC: Migration Policy Institute.

Meng, X., & Meurs, D. (2009). Intermarriage, language, and economic assimilation process. International Journal of Manpower, 30(1), 127-144.

Norton, B. (2006). Not an afterthought: Authoring a text on adult ESOL. Linguistics and Education, 17(1), 91-96.

Pettitt, N., & Tarone, E. (2015). Following Roba: What happens when a low-educated multilingual adult learns to read. Writing Systems Research, Special Issue: Initial L2 Literacy Development in Adolescents and Adults, 7(1), 20-38.

Piller, I. (2015). Monolingual ways of seeing multilingualism. Journal of Multilingual Discourses, 11(1), 25-33.

Rivera, K. M., & Huerta-Macías, A. (2008). Adult bilingualism and biliteracy in the United States: Theoretical perspectives. In K. M. Rivera & A. Huerta-Macías (Eds.), Adult biliteracy: Sociocultural and programmatic responses (pp. 3-28). New York: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Sandwall, K. (2010). "I learn more at school": A critical perspective on workplace-related second language learning in and out of Sschool. TESOL Quarterly, 44(3), 542-574.

Simpson, J., & Whiteside, A. (Eds.) (2015). Adult language education and migration: Challenging agendas in policy and practice. London: Routledge.

Spiegel, M., & Sunderland, H. (2006). Teaching basic literacy to ESOL learners. London: LLU+.

Tarone, E. M., Bigelow, M., & Hansen, K. (2009). Literacy and second language oracy. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

UNESCO (2003). Education in a multilingual world. Paris: United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization. http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0012/001297/129728e.pdf, accessed Dec. 10, 2017

United Nations (1948). Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR). http://www.un.org/en/universal-declaration-human-rights/index.html, accessed Dec. 10, 2017

United Nations (2016). Sustainable Development blog. http://www.un.org/sustainabledevelopment/blog/2016/01/244-million-international-migrants-living-abroad-worldwide-new-un-statistics-reveal/, accessed Dec. 10, 2017

Universal Declaration of Linguistic Rights Follow-up Committee (1998). Universal declaration of linguistic rights. http://www.culturalrights.net/descargas/drets_culturals389.pdf, accessed Dec. 10, 2017

Vertovec, S. (2006). The emergence of super-diversity in Britain. University of Oxford: Centre on Migration, Policy & Society.

Vinogradov, P. (2009). Balancing top and bottom: Learner-generated texts for teaching phonics. In I. van de Craats & J. Kurvers (Eds.) Low-educated second language and literacy acquisition: Proceedings of the 4th symposium (pp. 133-144). Utrecht: LOT.

Yates, L. (2011). Interaction, language learning and social inclusion in early settlement. International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism, 14(4), 457-471.