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Abstract

Looking at Bilingualism and L2/SLA (Second Language Acquisition) theory and practice are there points of convergence that reflect notions of global emerging bilingualism, and can be used in language learning. Giving an overview of the key theories within each field then using a literature review from June 2013 – June 2014 we see what approaches are suggested in 36 journals. The journals show an increase in discussion, but there is still a notable lack of both dialogue and experimental work. One possible approach Language as Social Semiotic approach (LASS) which builds on Halliday’s Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL) emphasises created meaning.
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1.0 Introduction

In Sweden, the government has strongly aligned itself to English as not simply a foreign language but as an alternate official language. This is reflected in language policy, such as Språklagen 2009:600, the Language Act 2009. This shows not merely in the publication of government documents, but also in school policy and the surrounding general culture, both formal and informal. Often in the literature we are seeing a change from L2 to ELL (English Language Learner) EB (Emergent Bilingual) and EAL (English as an additional language) being favoured (García, 2008). This paper will use L2/SLA. The paper asks how the teaching of English might benefit as much from adopting and applying bilingual knowledge.

1.1 English as Global in the new Millennium

The 2009 UNESCO report, Investing in Cultural Diversity and Intercultural Dialogue (UNESCO, 2009), states in its proposals on language diversity and development that all countries should:

Make provision — as appropriate — for the learning, alongside mother tongues, of a national and an international language. (ibid. p. 86)

Teaching bilinguals, who have naturally acquired two or more languages through the collation of a parent (mother tongue) and the society they live in (heritage language) shares both similarities and marked differences with standard L2/SLA. As Davis (2003) notes, the idea of any native speaker living in a monolingual culture is a “myth” (Davis, 2003, p. 3). Lemke (2002) goes further and challenges the very notion of “pure” languages as being a hegemonic construct, one where the political will of the dominant language, usually referred to, as above, as the heritage language, prevents or belittles any new paroles emerging through synthesis. Other authors (Macedo, 2003; Demont-Heinrich, 2012 pp 346 – 375; Watt, J. 2011.) support this view. Demont-Heinrich further notes:

The hegemony of English is defined as the social creation of a particular, hierarchical global linguistic order by actually existing human actors. In other words, language does not create a hegemonic linguistic order, the people who socially produce language do.
Moreover this weight that English brings is not confined to the real world. In online worlds, the blending of mother tongue with a global non-cultural specific form of English adds its own particular abbreviations and tags creating entirely new glossia. A clear example is found in a study of the use of Mandarin and English online in Taiwan where it was found that the glossia of the Mandarin users permanently adopted new words into their vocabulary (Hsieh, 2014). English has become, particularly in the period of globalisation and the birth of the internet from 1987-2000 (Crystal, 2003; Crystal, 2011), the *Lingua Franca* of the new millennium where speakers are moving from travel proficiency to near fluency. These factors of widespread usage and opportunity combine to produce new challenges in particular for the teaching of English. We need to ask whether the models used in L2 match the goals of many English learners who are looking not merely to have a basic understanding but are looking to have cognitive academic language proficiency (CALP).

Given this unique global coverage of English and these current approaches to teaching the convergence of the fields of bilingualism and multilingualism within English teaching is already happening (Sridhar K, 1986; Hultstijn, 2002; Treffers-Daller 2012). However, as May (2011) points out Weinreich’s claim “that *language contact* can be best understood only in a broad psychological and socio-cultural setting” (1953, p. 4, see § 2.1 below) is still not fully understood. A typical example is Muysken’s proposal (Muysken, 2000, revised 2013) that seems to resolve the issue, but in fact only highlights the problems. His quadrangle model calls for the four parts of the language experience: L1, shared L1/L2, Universal Principles (UP), Exploiting L2, to all work in conjunction. This model seems right – surely there are such Universal Principles at play in language – it refers to the Chomskian notion of Government and Binding, even after the Minimalist program (Chomsky, 1995), which suggest that language is itself a logical model that relies on order to exist, however it still begs the question, what exactly are these UPs of language learners. This papers contention is not to find that *lapis philosophorum*, but rather to simply contend that bilingualism and multilingualism have much to learn from each other.

Given that in Sweden the goal of English teaching stated in the National Curriculum, LGR11, (Skolverket, 2011) is that by aged 15, pupils develop “skills [that] involve understanding spoken and written English, being able to formulate one’s thinking and interact
with others in the spoken and written language, and the ability to adapt use of language to
different situations, purposes and recipients.” (ibid, p. 32), and “Teaching should also provide
pupils with opportunities to develop knowledge about and an understanding of different living
conditions, as well as social and cultural phenomena in the areas and contexts where English is
used.” (ibid) then we can see that the bilingual model may be a useful one.

Bilingualism is based on how much exposure, how early, how constant, and how much,
of two or more languages we use (Bhatia, 2013, p. 11 – 13). Therefore as Sweden’s pupils are
becoming exposed to more English than ever before via both the internet and media (Rehm,
2012, § 3.7, p. 51) and as a policy decision in their syllabus we might well wonder if emergent
bilingualism is the goal. The steps required to achieve that goal may involve a shift from L2
teaching to one involving the research and techniques of bilingualism. In order to understand
this convergence some background helps us to see where we currently are in each field.

2.0 Bilingualism

Many of us are fascinated by this notion of speaking two languages without the fog that
normally accompanies use of L2. It is this inherent ease of bilingualism that is perhaps the most
perplexing contrast between the two. L2 adult users often struggle. Take for example the
process needed to ask even the simplest negative question in another language. Bilingual theory
is useful for understanding the applied techniques in the classroom. It shares much in common,
but also differs markedly from multilingual theory.

Bilingualism has focused on what makes bilinguals different from the rest of us. One
particular example of divergence is the use of neuroimaging. Not widely used with L2 learners,
it has been used in bilingual research since the techniques were established (for overview see
Kutas, 2007). This empirical approach with its use of fMRI, CRT, and tomography aims to
show how the bilingual brain works at different ages and in different contexts for both
conceptual and compound bilinguals (see § 2.2 below); for example, when they construct the
lemma-lexeme chain process (Jarvis, 2009, pp 99 – 122; Walters, 2005; Rodriguez-Fornells,
2005, pp. 422-433). Empirical evidence suggests that this difference in use of the brain is a key
determiner between bilingualism and even efficient multilingualists. While neuroimaging is
fascinating, it is only helpful in the classroom if it can lead to a methodology to awaken those
brain processes in all learners, and we are not there yet.
What is of more practical use is what processes bilinguals use firstly, in their pragmatic output, and secondly, their cognitive processes. And finally, to ask what all of this means when teaching.

2.1 Bilingualism: Our Current Understanding

Any current understanding cannot ignore Uriel Weinreich’s initial work on bilinguals, particularly among the Ashkenazy Chasidic community in Chicago, in the 1950s. His 1953 work, *Language in Contact: Findings and Problems* (1953), contains two important notions: firstly, that of Contact, and secondly, the processing of memorization by different classes of bilinguals. Contact is Weinreich’s term for the interlocution that occurs when speakers of different languages engage. Weinreich labels this as the *Socio-Cultural Setting* of the Language Contact (1953, Ch. 4). Weinreich was, incidentally, Labov’s supervisor and those notions of sociolinguistics can be seen clearly in its early form (ibid). He notes in Ch. 5.1 that understanding the combination of the socio-cultural and the cognitive requires a “broad approach” (1953, Ch. 5.1). He, himself, names influences, ranging from the work of the Prague school to the work of Boas and Sapir in the US, in beginning to understand how language is processed in bilinguals. He concludes that bilinguals do more than speak two languages when in contact: they rather select the parole and glossia that will not only give the best result, but also decreasing the likelihood of perceived incompetence (1953, Ch. 7). This selection therefore is not based on language skills such as vocabulary, but rather on social appropriateness.

2.2 Bilinguals and their Cognitive Process

Secondly then, we have Weinreich’s categorisation of the cognitive and cognitive processes (1953, Ch. 2.2-2.4, 3.1, 4.7.). In particular, bilinguals’ memorization and concept association (1953, Ch.3. see also, Potter et al, 1984, Paradis, 2004). It is based on the Saussurian model of signified (the concept) and signifier (the word). Weinreich provides us with a model of how different bilinguals store and conceptualize the words they use. The three modes of bilingualism are, firstly, subordinative (where the signified and the signifier are both translated from L1 to L2), secondly, compound (fused conceptual (signified), separate lexicon) and finally, coordinative (both languages have separated signifieds and signifiers, often termed pure
bilingualism). These three processes are ranked in terms of skill from left (basic) to right (advanced). It may be illustrated thus:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subordinate</th>
<th>Compound</th>
<th>Coordinative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>L1 → L2</td>
<td>L1 = L1 &amp; L2</td>
<td>L1 = u ≠ L2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig 1: Views of Signifier and Signified in Bilingual from Basic to Advanced according to Weinreich, 1953

These analogies are relevant to both bilingual and L2/SLA learners. The skill and ease with which we handle different signifiers and signified when coping with two or more languages matches well with the goals of both groups: we are all heading to a place where English learners are moving from simple conversations to advanced writing. This is formally expressed as developing from BICS (Basic Interpersonal Communication Skills) to CALP (Cognitive Academic Language Proficiency) (Cummins, J. 1979, 1981a).

Using Weinreich’s categorisation, we recognise that L2 speakers go through these three stages. They start as subordinatives using their L1 to construct their L2. They then may develop a CALP level that only involves a compound understanding, but, thirdly, some may even understand a coordinative understanding, where the lexical words are culturally bound other than their L1 heritage. As research in bilingualism has developed it has focused more on the cognitive than the pragmatic. The choices made regarding the choice of words, when, why, and how they are used has been fruitful. The three central tenets are the Complementarity Principle, Language Mode, and the Base-language Effect. These are important part of the contemporary understanding of bilingualism. Let us look at each briefly in turn.

2.3 The Complementarity Principle

The Complementarity Principle, first proposed in 1998, is defined by Grosjean as:

Bilinguals usually acquire and use their languages for different purposes, in different domains of life, with different people. Different aspects require different languages.

(Grosjean, author’s website, 2004)
This seems initially to be the same as other established principles of sociolinguistics as typified by Dell Hymes S-P-E-A-K-I-N-G model (Hymes, 1974, p 53-60) – that we adapt and use different styles of speech according to the Speaker, the Participants involved, the End purpose, the speech Act, the tonality and Key, the Instrumentalities of prosody, the expected Norms, and the Genre. The notion of perceived intentional feedback (Mackey et al, 2000) gives additional support: they found it was not the feedback, but the perception of that feedback, including internal feedback (based on Færch, 1987). We can state that the Complementarity Principle governs not just utterance but also and significantly, thought processes. In L2/SLA the work has focused on the utterance through assessment with use of CAF (Complexity, Accuracy, and Fluency) paradigm (For overview see Housen, 2009). In bilingualism, research has focused on the cognitive process (For overview see Bhatia, 2013, Part II). There is a point of divergence here. We can talk in bilingualism of domains instead of simplistically, pragmatic use. Domains are defined not simply the choice of language or its vocabulary, but also the internal domain the user uses that choice in – this is both as simple as place and audience or as complex and nuanced as face issues and audience perception. As Grosjean (Grosjean, 2014) observes this is not merely a bilingual world it is also a bicultural one: therefore the use of domains is central to the choices the bilingual makes. These choices are grouped as the Language Mode (see § 2.4).

2.4 Language Mode

Grosjean (1992) on language mode:

The concept of language mode is critical and it helps to differentiate such things as interference, code-switching, borrowing, etc. which Weinreich never actually differentiated.

Language mode is concerned with activation. That is best illustrated as follows:

![Fig 2: Language Mode – Cognitive Activation (After Grosjean, 1992)]
The bilingual speaker makes choices that are not simply dependent on the circumstances, parole, or outcome, but rather, on what seems rights for that communication. Grosjean argues that this is a mechanism of the bilingual brain that will switch on and off dependent on the given parameters: code-switching is effective with another bilingual, but detracts with monolinguals.

2.5 Base-Language Effect

The base language is also called the recipient language or matrix language (Baker, 2008) and is the choice of the speaker – even as a bilingual they will choose a language to hold that conversation in, the language mode, and code-switch by adding to that base language. It is not the dominant language, rather is the language chosen to use for each conversation. We might ask if there are circumstances, particularly in input, such as watching films or even singing along to YouTube, that Swedish learners do use English as their base language.

We will now turn to look at L2/SLA theories which are the norm for teaching and have contributed much to our understanding of language learning.

3.0 L2/SLA Theories

SLA research has focused more on experimental science and a move from behavioural learning (e.g., repetition of grammar, and building glossia) to a more cognitive-based learning (metacognitive techniques for the recognition of patterns, for example). The experimental science includes interviews with learners and teachers, Action Research, field surveys, and qualitative questionnaires, which have given a lot of evidence that support and help teachers to better teach a foreign language in a formal setting. Its significant findings have centred around learners: in particular, whether input (expose to language) is as effective as output (the pragmatic use of language, particularly written).

Theories of L2/SLA were established some forty years ago in a fertile period in linguistics, culminating in the 1970s and 1980s with wide acceptance of three central figures’ writings: Stephen Krashen (1977, 1982), with insights that came from the input hypothesis, also known as the monitor model, Merrill Swain (also with Michael Canale, 1980, and Jim Cummins, 1986) on the importance of output as showing ability, and, and the translation of Lev
Vygotsky (1978) and the importance of the Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD) which stresses problem solving abilities rather than high stake testing. Looking at these in turn is useful. There is overlap and mix between these three central ideas and it is the teacher’s role to handle that mix for the benefit of each learner which enables comprehension rather than simply structural knowledge.

3.1 The Input Hypothesis / Monitor Model

The Input Hypothesis (Input) is made up of five three key stages. Firstly, learning requires that tasks be “a little beyond” (Kraschen, 1980) the current ability of the learner; this is commonly referred to as i(nput) + 1, or the input hypothesis. Secondly, when the learner is “ready” (ibid), speech emerges. This is speech is governed by the monitor hypothesis, which states explicitly that spontaneous speech in L2 is not possible, it is always monitored by the L1 brain. In bilingualism, however, such spontaneous speech is the sine qua non of true bilingualism. Thirdly, the necessary structures for grammar are naturally acquired and understood provided there is enough input and awareness, this is the natural order hypotheses. A good proven example is the ability to understand and answer simple yes / no questions before moving on to wh- questions (Krashen, 1983, Ch. 5.; Larsen-Freeman, 1991. p. 93). Finally, in addition to these three key stages Kraschen makes two further clear distinctions. The first is between acquisitions, which is a “purely subconscious” process and learning, which requires the conscious awareness of the learner, this he calls the acquisition-learning hypothesis. Finally, there is the affective filter hypothesis, those negative social factors that affect learning.

3.2 Swain and Output / Comprehensible Hypothesis

Output are comprehensible utterances, written or spoken, of L2/SLA learners. Krashen has challenged the purpose and effectiveness of output, however recent handbooks (Martin-Jones, 2012. Bhatia, Tej K. 2012) see both as part of the SLA process. Swain established three functions for the purpose of output. Firstly, she stresses the noticing stage – where the learners shows awareness that there is a gap between their language and the target language. This stage
requires that the student show problem solving ability. The development of awareness leads to the second stage of hypothesis-testing, where the learner tests their knowledge and receives feedback, and thirdly, the metalinguistic function, where both reflection and embedding of the new material occurs.

3.3 Vygotsky and the Zone of Proximal Development

The translation of Lev Vygotsky’s work from Russian to English in 1978 was significant. His own definition is:

The distance between the actual developmental level as determined by independent problem solving and the level of potential development as determined through problem solving under adult guidance, or in collaboration with more capable peers.

(Vygotsky, 1978, p. 86)

Wood and Middleton (1975) showed that a task too difficult for a group of 4 year olds involving building blocks once demonstrated became achievable, proving that the ZPD is an adequate method to help learners through support, or, scaffolding, in order to achieve what under independent learning would be too challenging.

4. Emerging Bilingualism in Sweden

In Sweden, the teaching of multilingualism has moved from EFL to ESL to L2 in both policy and practice. The protection of Swedish as shown in the Language Law passed 1st July 2009 is balanced by the same law guaranteeing the right to multilingual education. This guaranteed right reflects both bilingual and multilingual convergence in emergent bilingualism.

We can state with some measure of certainty from the literature and experimental evidence that this convergence between bilingualism and multilingualism is happening globally (for an extensive review see, Oterga. 2013). Ortega attributes this to a “social turn” (ibid, p. 3-5) at the beginning of the Millennium in in SLA research that acknowledged variation rather than universalities; the emphasis includes the “sense of self” (ibid. p. 4). This acknowledgement of individual variation as vital has always been a part of bilingualism (Weinreich, 1953. Ch. 1, Ch. 5. Bialystock, 2001. Ch. 3. Grosjean, 1982. p. iii, and, pp. 27-29).
If we take Grosjean’s opening remarks in his landmark book on bilingualism that it is “about people who use two or more language in daily life” (1982, p. vii), then the line between L2 and bilinguals is blurring in Sweden: daily use online is an observable norm (Findahl, 2010). It is important to state in Sweden that English is not used as a home language and fluency is based on schooling and use of the internet and media (Rehm, 2012 p. 49 - 51).

5. Research Question

Hulstijn (2013) argues against DeKeyser’s claim (2010) that the field of SLA is disintegrating as there are too many theories and not enough applied practice (case studies), that theory must be allowed to flourish, but must never outnumber the applied. The research question takes this viewpoint: that theory is only useful if it can be applied to real-world teaching, and create a model that both works and benfits the learners.

With bilingualism and L2/SLA we have two fields with rich traditions both involved in educating and understanding how English is being learnt and used. However, finding research and authors who specialise in the similarities and differences by joining the two fields in a cross-discipline specialism is interesting. This author thesis was to ask if the two fields can learn from each other and what convergence might look like. This gave rise to a research question:

Where is there convergence between bilingualism and L2/SLA?

6.0 Methodology: Literature Review

In order to conduct a literature review both books and journals were surveyed. The original purpose of the methodology was threefold: firstly, to understand, secondly, to discover, and thirdly, to see what alignment is suggested. Firstly, to see if it possible to understand the current trends and directions of research in the two fields. It should be stated immediately that an original idea of collating keywords to identify trends was problematic. The abstracts, as well as titles, describe the content of the paper well and were useful in deciding relevance; not so keywords. Even with use of CrossRef and an understanding of the nature of keywords through reading the publishers’ own guides (Taylor & Francis, 2014. SAGE, 2013.) the criteria was still
unclear as to how keywords were selected by authors, and whether they based on field and/or frequency. Rodriguez (Rodriguez, V. 2013) agrees that the current system of keywords and tags is not as helpful as it should, often being “being typed out on-the-spot in a journal’s submission system”. Keywords served to broadly categorize selection but did not necessarily help research questions better than either use of a well-constructed Boolean search or the LLBA category numbers. It was found to be better to show care selecting journals and then narrow the selection by using a parameter, in this case publication date, then simply read the abstracts for each issue of each journal. Reading abstracts was helpful. The second purpose was to engage fully in the subject, i.e. to confirm discoveries and to discover approaches that had not occurred to the author, and so both remove bias, as well as broaden the horizon and then focus it. This is discussed below. Thirdly, to see where bilingualism and L2/SLA meet in current research.

6.1 Recent Publication

The most substantial publication of bilingualism and L2/SLA of note is a substantial survey by Bhatia & Ritchie (2012). While there have been others (e.g. Sanz & Leow, 2011. Schwieter & Klassen, 2013.) no other volume has focused so completely on the two fields rather than separation. In four sections, over 27 chapters, there is a comprehensive look at contemporary thinking around the subject. The four sections are an overview, then neurological and psychological aspects, societal bilingualism (including contact and maintenance), and finally, global bilingualism. These reflect the field’s major concerns.

In order to understand where both fields are heading it was useful to look at contemporary articles in contemporary journals. This abstract reading proved useful. It gave three benefits. Firstly, on a purely academic level reading 19 journals, 76 issues, and some 300 plus abstracts, as an exercise in immersion alone, proved invaluable. Secondly, succinct terminology and the meaning and definition of specialist words became clearer and better defined. Thirdly, it showed the occurrence of the theoretical and the applied.

Combined totals for both bilingualism, L2/SLA, and language teaching that were available with abstracts: 19 journals, 76 issues, with 304 articles published between June 2013 and June 2014. Of these, only 7 journals (40% of the total) had any articles covering both aspects of both bilingualism and L2/SLA. These 28 combined issues gave 104. Of these 104, there were 4 articles (3.9%) in bilingual journals looking at bilingualism and L2/SLA and 7
articles (6.4%) in the L2/SLA journals looking at L2/SLA and bilingualism. Of these 11 articles, 7 articles covered social aspects of language, and 4 covered linguistic aspects. The subject of L2 learners in the Bilingual journals was double at 12.5% as the subject of Bilingualism in the L2/SLA journals at 5%. All the bilingual articles selected reflect concerns the subject convergence between the bilingual learner and their L1/L2 counterparts.

This was not a meta-analytical approach; each abstract was treated and classified individually.

6.2 Methodology: Journals within *Bilingualism* publishing between June/July 2013 – June/July 2014 as listed on LLBA

The full abstracts for the articles listed in § 6.2 and § 6.3 are given in Appendix A.

International Journal of Bilingualism (IJB, Sage), International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism (IJBE, Taylor & Francis)

*Totals for June 2013 – June 2014: 2 Journals, 8 issues, 32 articles / 4 articles selected. 9% of total.*

|---|

6.3 Methodology: Journals within *L2/SLA* publishing between June/July 2013 – June/July 2014 as listed on the LLBA site

The full abstracts for the articles listed in § 6.2 and § 6.3 are given in Appendix A.
7.0 What the Abstract Review Showed: Linguistic vs Semiotic Approaches

In order to understand the information presented common research themes were sought in the abstracts. There are two main points of research interest between bilingualism and L2/SLA. Firstly, the four papers focusing on the linguistic (Mandalios, 2013. Kalashnikova, 2013. Schmid, 2013. Zhisheng, 2014), share a common theme, through different approaches, of understanding if L2/SLA learners can acquire bilingual ease. Schmid (2013) is particular studied “very advanced” L2 Dutch academic teachers and noted that collocation and verbal ease is still “a process” (Schmid, 2013, p. 157). All conclude that this is still a problematic area. The second common area of research lies in social linguistics (Budach, 2014. Hult, 2014. Gort, 2013. Larsen, 2013. Rhys, 2013.). Gort (2013) and Budach (2013), in particular offered avenues worth exploring. Gort (2013) argues that teaching bilinguals involves a “flexible and strategic use of language to support each child’s developing bilingual competences”, and further, that a “strict language separation approach…may be at odds with the natural social interaction of bilinguals.” (Gort, 2013, p. 224). Explicitly naming both Vygotsky and Swain they use an input-interaction-output model that provides strong academic evidence that language separation is not helpful for learners but there is still “widespread suspicion and conflict remains on the part
of school leaders” (Gort, 2003, p. 227) to translanguaging in the classroom and helps students “make sense of their bilingual world” (ibid, p. 240). Gort (2013) concludes firstly by acknowledging that bilinguals are bilinguals and strict language separation is not always the optimal approach, and secondly, that tasks should be real-world based and stress that sociocultural factors matter. Budach (2013) builds on the work of Pahl and Rowsell (2010) who developed the notion of language artefact, or artifactual (sic) in language. A language artefact is the semiotic knowledge that allows us to imbue meaning into objects – give mental value, story, and social value – to our vocabulary. This is taken by Budach and applied to bilinguals. She talks of “the creation of semiotic space” (Budach, 2013. p. 329). This semiotic space occurs when multimodalities, the daily reality of bilinguals, are applied. They live in a world of multiple “layers of meaning” (Budach, 2013. p. 340). This is a possible point of convergence – the shared semiotic space of meaning that would allow for L1 & L2 to create meaning together and separately. Further reading and research focused on finding an approach that aligned L1 & L2 together with a social linguistic understanding of semiotic space.

In June 2014, Language Learning, published a monograph, (2014, vol. 64 issue s1) dedicated to Language as Social Semiotic (LASS) approaches. This covered both the theoretical foundations (Coffin, 2014) and the practical use in the classroom (Coffin, 2014).

7.1 A possible synthesis: Language as Social Semiotic Approach - LASS

The Language as Social Semiotic Approach (LASS), “calls for making a connection between the meanings to be developed and the forms of language through which those meanings are enabled.” (Schleppergrell, M. 2014. p. vii.). It is built on Michael Halliday’s Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL) which looks at Saussurian models and place the paradigmatic use of language at their center – rather than the syntagmatic – this functional system relies on choices when in use, rather than on planning of vocabulary. This in turn gives three functions: meaning (internal and external), social relationships, and their mixing, which combined make “text”. These combine to form the “metafunction” of the system (Halliday. 1977. pp. 25 – 83.) The authors looked at its use for L2/SLA learners.

LASS in particular takes the notion of register from SFL to “explore the ideational, interpersonal, and textual meanings that are at stake” (Schleppergrell, M. 2014. p. vii.) They explicitly draw on Halliday (1977) and Vygotsky (e.g. 1978). Coffin (2014) then produces five
case studies that look at the use of the LASS model in action. The model relies on establishing a mutual understanding between the instructor and the pupils. This democratic approach is based on listening and comprehension to produce a mutual “process of inquiry” (Schleppergrell, p. vii) that produces metasemiotic mediation “explicit interaction about language that enables mutual understanding, and scaffolding of the new knowledge to be learned.” (ibid, p. viii.). Simply put, meaning comes not from language alone, but from context – and context is complex.

8. Applying LASS in Teaching

It is this notion of a social semiotic approach that is well-suited to bilingual and L2/SLA users. As discussed earlier (§ 2.4) bilinguals use different modes in different contexts. But that is only half the picture. The other half is the presentation of language for both the bilingual and the L2/SLA user – the semiotic. Take for example the adjective “red”. For the American speaker it will have attached a wide variety of images: Red, white, and blue; in high culture: Stephen Crane, or films as diverse as The Hunt for Red October (McTiernan, 1990), The Woman in Red (Wilder, 1984), or influential foreign films, The Red Shoes (Powell & Pressburger, 1948), or simply collocations “see red”, “red meat” and so forth. For the Swede, red might be the colour of wild strawberries (smultron) or the 1957 film of the same name (Bergman, 1957), inte ett rött öre (lit: not even a red farthing, so, to be penniless), or, the 1076 name places in Sweden that use the suffix röd (red) in their nomenclature and so on. These different cultural frames create meaning, and there is evidence (Bhatia, 2012, Ch. 5 pp. 114 – 44) that the interaction and modality of bilinguals is a choice that is determined by the semiotic space. We need to understand the cultural tags that L2 learners lack – these cultural tags are important in creating meaning.

Learners need as much, if not more, than a dictionary definition, to simply dive into culture and explore the semiotic meaning. This adding of layers of association imbeds the words in ways that even collocation and corpus work may not. It is the separateness of semiotic association for each language that Weinreich identified (1953) as being the best indication of more developed bilingualism: the coordinative (see § 2.2 above). A semiotic model suggests that the meanings of words, the images, pictures, values that they create are the lifeblood of the
language, not just the words and their associated synonyms and antonyms. It is possible to find tools that help expand the learner’s semiotic associations. The internet of things currently does have tools like ThinkMaps’ Visual Thesaurus, Shematix’s Wordflex Touch Dictionary, which is a massive mobile app developed with the OED, and, Visuwords, all of which use mind maps to show use of words. They work by association which is part of the semiotic picture, but do not then go that step of placing the word into culture, text, and usage. Visuwords does some semiotic association:

Fig 3: Mind Map of Red as represented by Visuwords

In Fig 3, the input word, red, was entered into the Visuwords online application. We can see, bottom left, that red is associated with Red River, Howard Hawk’s and Arthur Rosson’s classic Western (Hawk, 1948), and from there into more Americana, whereas bottom right is associated with financial loss, and so on. Further each link will lead to other associations. While
this is mainly positive there is a danger of information overload or picking up an obscure association and so forth.

Perhaps a better place to start these semiotic conversations lies in text. The use of both written and media based texts provides a firm framework that allows us to draw on established use. This requires a method to make the semiotic framework, the cultural references including humor and irony, understandable. That in turn requires not an understanding of the philosophies behind semiotics but rather good written and visual tools to illustrate cultural associations. Here filtering the massive amount of information available can be done with the use of available tools such as mind maps and I-Search (Macrorie, 1998).

9. Conclusion

Both fields of bilingualism and L2/SLA have rich critical traditions. However, from the evidence presented we can see that there has been a lack of dialogue between these two fields which share common goals: language learning and language use. This lack of dialogue between the two fields of bilingualism and L2/SLA is still current, but is happening. From the survey of 112 articles surveyed in 7 journals published in the 12 months from June 2013 – June 2014 only 10 articles (9%) had relevance to both fields. The area of shared approaches to teaching English to both groups is still contentious – in particular, notions of complexity, accuracy, and fluency (CAF). Instead then, where there is dialogue it centres around not the language process itself, but on what words and their associations mean to both the bilingual and the L2.

The LASS approach which builds on Halliday’s Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL) seems to suggest a valid approach worth exploring as it creates a semiotic space that enables language encounters with meaning. It notes that language is made of syntagmatic choices and that it is this lack of choice that impoverishes L2 conversations. This impoverishment is not vocabulary or even collocation it is cultural association that leads to mutual meaning. The process of creating meaning can be helped through learning tools. There are massive online tools available to help learners develop association, not only through visual thesaurus, but in allowing I-Search investigations that help learners understand the cultural signifiers and significance of words. The research suggests that these cultural tags are useful to L1, L2, and
bilingual learners but text, both visual and written, are good at establishing meaning for both bilinguals and L2/SLA learners.

Given the massive amount of information available, filtering is useful. Here, texts are good. The usefulness of texts remains relevant. Either written or visual text give cultural clues to the learners. However, given the emergent status of English globally the use of texts simply as tools for improving basic language skills is becoming less relevant. In order for learners to move towards the bilingual categories where the L1 is no longer simply being translated into L2 they need to establish greater cognitive images and semiotic associations with the word choices they make. This makes the classroom a place to explore cultural meaning rather than simply pragmatic language.

Finally, the research reviewed acknowledges that bilinguals and L2 learners share not only the common goal, but may also share more approaches than previously realised. As global English shifts to emergent bilingualism so there may be much to learn from each field that can then be applied to all learners irrespective of their level or background.

We talk of emergent bilingualism as part of the Swedish school policy (Skolverket, 2011, pp. 32-34). One where English is not merely in the classroom but is widely seen and heard throughout the individual’s identity and their understanding of society. This provides those broad cultural tags that enrich the semiotic meaning of words. Further, this offers ways to understand the PDP and Individual Planning by acknowledging that meaningful language requires meaningful encounters, both individually and at a group level: here we need to create semiotic spaces.

The research suggests that bilingualism and L2/SLA approaches do have common ground both theoretically and empirically. The problem of modality, how bilinguals are able to transition from one language to another with clarity is one which still poses genuine questions, and is of particular relevance for L2 learners. More research and experimentation is needed with joint co-operation from both fields to understand which approaches are most helpful for learners and lead to good learning outcomes. The use of LASS is one approach that encourages the learner to immerse themselves in rich contexts, and as such, may offer useful and pragmatic tools, and hold clues to possible alignment between the bilingual and L2/SLA fields.
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11. Appendix A – List of Articles Analysed for Keywords

Table of Articles
chosen based on the criteria
published between July 2013 and July 2014

Table A: Bilingual Articles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Journal</th>
<th>Author / Article</th>
<th>Abstract</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>International Journal of Bilingualism</td>
<td>Rhys, M., &amp; Thomas, E. M. 2013. Bilingual welsh-english children’s acquisition of vocabulary and reading: Implications for bilingual education. International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism, 16(6), 633-656</td>
<td>Previous studies have highlighted early differences in bilinguals’ rate of language acquisition in comparison with monolinguals. However, these differences seem to disappear with increasing age and exposure to the language, and do so quicker in dominant community languages than in minority status languages. The implications of these findings for bilingual education strategies, particularly in relation to the development of bilingual language competence in minority language situations, are discussed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism</td>
<td>Thompson, A. S., &amp; Lee, J. 2013. Anxiety and EFL: Does multilingualism matter? International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism, 16(6), 730-749.</td>
<td>The current study is motivated by the gap in the current literature about foreign language classroom anxiety, namely the underlying construct of FL anxiety with regard to the understudied relationship between anxiety, proficiency, and multilingualism. The evidence for the effect of language anxiety on achievement is well-documented. More recently, there has been evidence that anxiety is inversely proportional to the number of languages studied; however, this notion of the relationship between multilingualism and anxiety is under-researched. This study analyzes the anxiety profiles of low-level multilingual (LLM) versus high-level multilingual (HLM) learners of English, using 123 EFL college students in Korea. The participants completed the Foreign Language Classroom Anxiety Scale (FLCAS); a factor analysis, and subsequently discriminant function analyses show the differences in language learning anxiety from a variety of perspectives. An intriguing new factor emerged from the data: fear of ambiguity in English, a factor which has previously not been discussed in the language anxiety research. Additionally, the English language anxiety profiles of the LLM versus the HLM participants were also distinct, answering the question of the effect of various levels of multilingualism on language learning anxiety.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Journal of</td>
<td>Laursen, H. P. 2013. Umbrellas and angels standing straight - a social semiotic perspective</td>
<td>In a Danish context, the acquisition of literacy by the ‘bilingual student’ is embedded in an education policy discourse in which literacy is seen as a cognitive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bilingual Education and Bilingualism</td>
<td>on multilingual children's literacy. <em>International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism, 16</em>(6), 690-706.</td>
<td>Competence that can be quantified by measuring a number of specific skills in a defined language and in a defined written language. On the basis of empirical data from the research project Signs of Language, in this article I will focus on how a social semiotic perspective on literacy can contribute to adding new dimensions to research in literacy acquisition by bilingual students. I will do this by focusing on how the interpretation and interaction processes of the child affect the child’s meaning-making, and by focusing on the discursive macro-histories in which this meaning-making is embedded.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism</td>
<td>Kalashnikova, M., &amp; Mattock, K. 2014. Maturation of executive functioning skills in early sequential bilingualism. <em>International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism, 17</em>(1), 111-123.</td>
<td>Previous research has demonstrated that being bilingual from birth is advantageous for the development of skills of social cognition, executive functioning, and metalinguistic awareness due to bilingual children’s extensive experience of processing and manipulating two linguistic systems. The present study investigated whether these cognitive advantages are also evident in sequential bilinguals, i.e., children who began the acquisition of their second language later in childhood. Monolingual English- and English-speaking children acquiring Welsh as a second language matched in age (M age = 4.6), and English receptive vocabulary completed three tasks of attentional control, metalinguistic awareness, and metarerepresentation. Sequential bilinguals outperformed monolinguals in the task of attentional control, while no differences were found in the metalinguistic awareness and metarerepresentation tasks. These findings suggest that attentional control is the first cognitive component advantaged by early sequential bilingualism and further highlight the benefits of second language exposure in the context of early formal education.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table B: L2/SLA Articles

<p>| Applied Linguistics | Hult, F. M. 2014. Covert bilingualism and symbolic competence: Analytical reflections on negotiating Insider/Outsider positionality in Swedish speech situations. Applied Linguistics (Oxford), 35(1), 63-81. | Bilinguals often face the challenge of negotiating a range of insider/outside subject positions when interacting in transnational and intercultural settings. This article takes up the concept of symbolic competence, the awareness of socially situated symbolic resources and the ability to use them to shape interactional contexts, to examine how the author, a Swedish–English bilingual, manages this negotiation. Drawing on principles of the ethnography of communication in concert with the complementary discourse analytic perspective of nexus analysis, ethnographic vignettes are analyzed to explore strategic language choices the author made during specific speech situations in Sweden. It is shown that the concealment of linguistic abilities, or covert bilingualism, served as a resource to support the symbolic competence needed to facilitate the presentation of self during social encounters while mitigating the ambiguity of being simultaneously insider and outsider. |
| International Journal of Applied Linguistics | Mandalios, J. 2013. Power and pedagogy in ELT: Native-speaker teachers and the case of bilingual dictionaries and L1. International Journal of Applied Linguistics, 23(2), 202-225. | This interpretive study explored native-speaker ELT teachers’ beliefs and practices regarding bilingual dictionaries, both as language learners and teachers. Evidence emerged of a significant discrepancy: while respondents reported that bilingual dictionaries were indispensable in their own language-learning, they felt constrained from encouraging their use among their own students because they felt bilingual dictionaries are viewed negatively by current ELT theory, which they perceive that continues to support the monolingual approach. The study indicates an imbalance of power within ELT, as respondents felt obliged to follow certain pedagogical approaches, which may conflict with their own instincts and experiences. It offers support for recent calls for the reinstatement of the L1, a reappraisal of the role of bilingual dictionaries, and investigation into the distribution of pedagogical power. |
| Language Teaching | Menken, Kate. 2013. Emergent bilingual students in secondary school: Along the academic language and literacy continuum Volume 46 / Issue 04 / October 2013, pp 438-476 | This article offers a critical review of research about emergent bilingual students in secondary school, where the academic demands placed upon them are great, and where instruction typically remains steadfast in its monolingualism. I focus on recent scholarship about the diversity within this student population, and center on ‘students with interrupted formal education’ (SIFE, new arrivals who have no home language literacy skills or are at the beginning stages of literacy learning) and ‘long-term English language learners’ (LTELLs, primarily educated in their receiving country yet still eligible for language support services). Little has been published about these students, making this a significant area of inquiry. Moreover, both groups are characterized by poor performance and together illustrate the characteristics of secondary students at various points along an academic language and literacy continuum. While existing research provides important information to help us improve secondary schooling for emergent bilinguals, it has also perpetuated deficit views of these students by focusing solely on their perceived academic shortcomings. Grounded in a new body of research in applied linguistics that examines the students’ complex, creative, and dynamic language and literacy practices, I apply a translinguaging lens to critique the positioning of such students as deficient, with implications for research and practice. |
| Language Teaching | Zhisheng, Wen. 2014. Theorizing and measuring working memory in first and second | Working memory (WM) generally refers to the human ability to temporarily maintain and manipulate a limited amount of information in immediate consciousness when carrying out complex cognitive tasks such as problem-solving. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Journal</th>
<th>Authors</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Abstract</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Language and Education</td>
<td>Gott, Mileidis Pontier, Ryan W.</td>
<td>2013. Exploring bilingual pedagogies in dual language preschool classrooms</td>
<td>In this paper, we present an analysis of the language practices of four Spanish/English dual language (DL) preschool teachers, focusing on the ways in which the teachers mediate bilingual interactions with students and distribute Spanish and English across different classroom discourse functions. Findings reveal teachers’ flexible and strategic use of each language to support children's developing bilingual competencies as well as to negotiate several communicative, academic, and management functions. Findings further illuminate the utility of bilingual speech/interaction as a communicative and academic resource and suggest that a strict language separation approach, as traditionally implemented in DL programs, may be at odds with the natural social interactions of bilinguals who draw on a number of communicative strategies, including codeswitching and tandem talk, to construct meaning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language and Education</td>
<td>Budach, Gabriele</td>
<td>From language choice to mode choice: how artefacts impact on language use and meaning making in a bilingual classroom.</td>
<td>This paper investigates the interplay of languages and artefacts as resources for meaning making in bilingual education. While previous research on classroom interaction concentrated on either code switching or multimodality, here, I integrate both perspectives and propose a framework for the study of multimodal interaction embedded in a multilingual environment. The paper draws on research in a German–Italian two-way-immersion classroom in Frankfurt, Germany. The focus of the analysis is on objects and their role in shaping language practices and social interaction. The analysis sheds light on two dimensions of a biliteracy teaching and learning event that centres on objects brought to class by learners: first, it shows how the presence of objects intersects with the conventionalised language choice practices of this classroom. Second, it looks at how interactions around objects alter habitual ways of using languages for both the purpose of teaching and for identifying people, material culture and bodies of knowledge. To conclude I argue that interactions around learner-centred objects can modify pedagogical practice and thereby challenge monolingualising language ideologies. Rather than reifying monolithic identities, social roles and bodies of knowledge, learner-centred objects invite the creation of semiotic spaces in which the multiple life worlds of multilingual learners can thrive.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Language Research</td>
<td>Schmid, Monika Gilbers, S. Steven Nota, Amber</td>
<td>Ultimate attainment in late second language acquisition: Phonetic and grammatical challenges in advanced Dutch–English bilingualism.</td>
<td>The present article provides an exploration of ultimate attainment in second language (L2) and its limitations. It is argued that the question of maturational constraints can best be investigated when the reference population is bilingual and exposed on a regular basis to varieties of their first language (L1) that show cross-linguistic influence. To this end, 20 advanced Dutch–English bilinguals are compared to 9 English native speakers immersed in a Dutch environment. All participants are teachers or students of English at a Dutch institution of higher education. The populations are shown to be at similar global proficiency levels. Two phonetic variables (voice onset time or VOT and vowel discrimination) and one grammatical variable (verb phrase ellipsis), which are assumed to present particular challenges to Dutch learners of English, are explored, and speakers are furthermore rated for their global nativeness. The findings show no differences between populations on VOT but some variance on the production of a vowel that has no correlate in Dutch (the English trap vowel). However, all but one of the L2ers are rated outside the range of the natives on perceived foreign accent. There are also differences between groups where acceptance of different sentence types with verb phrase ellipsis are concerned. We interpret these findings to indicate that there are areas of L2 knowledge and production that are persistently difficult to acquire even under circumstances that are highly favourable for L2 acquisition.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>