Farah Ali
DePauw University

A CRITICAL REVIEW OF MULTILINGUAL AND MULTIDIALECTAL APPROACHES TO HERITAGE AND L2 ARABIC INSTRUCTION

Abstract:

While Arabic instruction has traditionally focused heavily - and often exclusively - on the acquisition of Modern Standard Arabic (MSA) (Ryding, 2006), scholars and practitioners have become increasingly critical of instructional approaches that ignore colloquial dialects of Arabic, and have therefore proposed an integrated approach to Arabic instruction (Younes, 1990). Such an approach interrogates and prompts a reflection on different notions and practices related to multilingualism, and how these practices may be relevant for heritage language (HL) and second language (L2) learners. This article thus offers a comprehensive and critical review of research on multilingual/-dialectal approaches to Arabic instruction. Focusing primarily on HL/L2 instruction in the United States, this review is premised by a brief history of research and practices in HL and L2 Arabic instruction. I then discuss multilingualism and multidialectalism as it pertains to Arabic instruction, as well as how these notions provide a lens for reevaluating ideas about diglossia, monolingual ideologies, and exclusive MSA instruction. This also involves an examination of specific multilingual practices in the language classroom, including code-switching and translanguaging. I conclude with a discussion of the implications that current research has for classroom practices, as well as a note about areas of investigation that merit further attention.

Keywords: Arabic language instruction ◆ Arabic as a second language ◆ Arabic as a heritage language ◆ multilingualism ◆ multidialectism

Introduction

In the last few decades, there has been a stable increase in Arabic study in higher education, both in second language (L2) and heritage language (HL) contexts, particularly in the United States (Furman et al., 2010; Husseinali, 2006; Welles, 2004). Traditionally, Arabic instruction has focused heavily on the acquisition of Modern Standard Arabic (MSA) (Ryding, 2006), which has resulted in the paradoxical situation of excluding instruction on colloquial dialects while simultaneously instructing with monolingual ideologies, whereby native Arabic speakers (of colloquial Arabic varieties) are the yardstick for learner success. While some scholars have been proposing an integrated approach to Arabic instruction for quite some time (Younes, 1990), many instructors may be resistant, citing some of the many challenges that come with an integrated approach (Chekayri, 2014). Moreover, monolingual ideologies present in MSA-only instruction are, in fact, deeply ingrained in language teaching practices more broadly, and persist even in pedagogical models where multilingual/-dialectal approaches are incorporated (Ryding, 2009), which may be in part due to instructors' reluctance to accept such practices in the classroom (Azaz & Abourehab, 2021). This may also be due to the diglossic understanding of Arabic (Ferguson, 1959), as well as the effectiveness of mono-/multilingual pedagogies remaining a major question for scholars and educators of second and heritage language acquisition (hereafter S/HLA) (Macaro, 2014). Still, scholarship in Arabic pedagogy has become increasingly critical of both the MSA-only and monolingual standards of language teaching (Brown, 2023; Trentman, 2021) and there is a growing body of literature addressing this topic and advocating for integrated approaches that are multilingual/-dialectal (Al-Batal, 2018; Brown, 2023; Younes, 2014).

Given the growing research on this topic, and that both scholarship and practice are at a crossroads regarding instructional approaches in Arabic, this article aims to review existing research on multilingual/-dialectal approaches to Arabic instruction, not only to provide an overview of current discussions on this topic, but also to highlight research gaps that merit attention, as well as offer a discussion on practical applications of multilingual/-dialectal approaches to Arabic pedagogy. Relying primarily on HL/L2 instruction in a U.S. higher education context and focusing on both classroom and study abroad experiences, this review begins with a brief history of research and practices in HL and L2 Arabic instruction. In subsequent sections, I discuss multilingualism and multidialectalism as it pertains to Arabic instruction, as well as how these notions provide a lens for interrogating ideas about diglossia, monolingual ideologies, and exclusive MSA instruction. Next, I examine research that focuses on specific multilingual practices in the language classroom, including code-switching and

translanguaging. I conclude with a discussion of the implications for classroom practices, as well as observations about continuing research gaps that can inform future studies.

A brief history of HL and L2 Arabic instructional approaches

Instructional practices in Arabic have shifted a great deal in a short space of time. In this section, I aim to provide an overview of some of the major developments in HL and L2 research that have centered on Arabic acquisition and pedagogy. First, however, it is critical to distinguish between various varieties of Arabic that may be present in or absent from language curricula; namely: Classical Arabic, Modern Standard Arabic, and the broader category of colloquial Arabic. Classical Arabic, often described as Quranic Arabic, refers to the literary language of antiquity. Presently, it is associated with Islamic liturgy and is used in daily prayers. MSA is a contemporary derivative of Classical, and is similarly standardized, literary, and not spoken as a first language (L1). Unlike Classical Arabic, however, MSA is used for both written and oral communication, though typically in formal contexts (Kamusella, 2017). Often undistinguished from one another, these two varieties of Arabic are referred to as *fusha* (/fusħa/, فصحى) Arabic, or "pure"/"eloquent" Arabic. Colloquial Arabic, on the other hand, encompasses a variety of spoken dialects that are used in everyday communication. Referred to as *ammiyya* (/ʕamija/, عامية) or "slang"/"colloquial," these varieties are the L1 or HL of many Arabic speakers, and vary greatly across different regions in the Arabic-speaking world. Because Classical Arabic instruction is typically limited to religious education, this article will focus primarily on colloquial Arabic (hereafter, CA), and MSA.

While the Arabic language has a long history in U.S. higher education, some of the traditional pedagogical approaches may be rooted in its origins, which were both theologically and philologically motivated, particularly in the context of comparative studies in Semitic languages (McCarus, 1987), which often entailed a focus on Classical Arabic grammar and text reading (Palmer, 2007). Nowadays, teaching MSA with a communicative emphasis is the norm in many Arabic programs. This is evident alone from the array of scholarly research focusing on L2 learning that examines MSA acquisition (Al-Aloula, 2018; Al Tubuly, 2018; Benati, 2021; Jaradat & Al-Khawaldeh, 2015; Maamoun, 2018; Redouane, 2001; Tsukada, 2012). Still, Arabic curricula have begun to see a shift, as shown in survey data collected for an attitudinal study of Arabic instructors in the U.S in which 45% of survey responses indicated that instructors taught MSA exclusively, and 34% reported having Arabic programs with dialect classes. However, most of these CA courses required 1-2 years of MSA coursework as a prerequisite. Among these programs, 20.4% instructors said that these courses were only sometimes available (Abdalla and Al-Batal, 2011). The gradual incorporation of CA courses

may be largely due to hesitation rooted in various beliefs about combining CA and MSA, as well as about CA itself. For example, CA dialects may be viewed as limited or insufficient for fulfilling all of one's linguistic needs, particularly in the case of formal contexts and academic topics of discussion (Mansoor, 1960), a view that is not uncommon in the Arabic-speaking world as well (Versteegh, 2004). Other stances rely on pedagogical philosophies, such as the possibility of confusion for learners if exposed to MSA and CA simultaneously (Parkinson, 1985), and that instruction in each of these varieties should be separated, with a priority given to developing MSA foundations first (Mansoor, 1960).

Yet these beliefs that may continue to inform curricular programming are at odds with both learner and instructor beliefs. Palmer (2007) notes that many U.S. learners in fact express an interest in learning CA, but do not necessarily receive the support to do so from their instructor. Abdallah and Al-Batal (2011) similarly observe that - despite the limited availability of CA courses in existing Arabic programs - many Arabic instructors strongly agreed that CA merited inclusion in their university curricula. In particular, their study showed that Egyptian and Levantine Arabic were reportedly the most commonly taught varieties, while Egypt and Morocco were the most popular destinations for study abroad programs. This acceptance and interest in studying CA alongside MSA may also be tightly connected to the realities of the linguistic situation in the Arabic-speaking world that many learners wish to prepare for: learners who have only been exposed to MSA may encounter great difficulty in functioning in many everyday and informal situations, where CA is the norm (Parkinson, 1985). Additionally, in many programs where MSA and CA form part of the curriculum, they are often taught separately, where MSA is the default language of instruction, and CA plays an additive and limited role in serving specific communicative needs (Younes, 1990).

This separation between CA and MSA (and in many situations, complete exclusion of CA) cannot be understood without a brief discussion of diglossia as it relates to the Arabic-speaking world, as well as how this notion has become relevant in Arabic classrooms. Diglossia refers to the co-existence of two language varieties in a language community, whereby the everyday, colloquial variety is considered "low," (L) while the codified, formal variety is labeled as the "high" (H) variety (Ferguson, 1959). In the case of Arabic, which was the language of focus in Ferguson's work, the distinction is thus formed as MSA-H and CA-L. However, the notion of diglossia has been problematized and reanalyzed over the years, especially as it pertains to Arabic. One of the major points of contention has to do with the historical, political, and social structures that have helped construct diglossia, as well as maintain and even naturalize the linguistic and social inequities that often accompany H-L distinctions. For instance, in Egypt, Bassiouney (2014) notes that British occupation introduced

diglossia (rather, triglossia, in this case) through its imposition of English/French as H-varieties, and Egyptian Arabic as the L-variety. Similarly, Ready (2018) notes that language policy in Ceuta, a Spanish enclave in Morocco, denies official recognition of Ceuti Arabic - a widely spoken variety in this locale - thus maintaining the hierarchical relationship between Spanish-H and Ceuti Arabic-L. Such rigid distinctions, however, separate H and L varieties like MSA and CA, such that they are seen as disconnected and independent communicative systems, when in reality, they are one in the same system with complementary roles (Younes, 2018). What's more, this distinction may be beginning to see some degree of reconfiguration: in a study of young Arabic speakers on social media, Alkhamees et al. (2019) note that individuals engage in translingual practices where - rather than limiting themselves to one variety or written script in a specific situation - they instead choose to engage their entire linguistic repertoire, thus breaking away from diglossic boundaries. Such linguistic practices - often viewed from a deficit perspective and labeled as *linguistic interference* in a learner context (Valdés, 2020) - are contrary to traditional pedagogical approaches that have centered around monolingual ideologies. However, current research strives to critique these beliefs, explore multilingual and multidialectal practices in the language classroom, and identify some of the advantages to adapting language pedagogy to better align with learners' multilingual abilities and identities. In the sections that follow, I highlight some of the recent research that examines multilingual and multidialectal practices in an Arabic classroom context.

Shifting pedagogical approaches: Multilingualism and multidialectalism in the classroom

Given the important role that CA has in everyday communication in the Arabic-speaking world, many Arabic instructors have encouraged the implementation of integrated approaches to teaching Arabic, where CA is included in the curriculum alongside MSA. While teaching multiple varieties of Arabic presents its challenges, as noted above, an array of scholarship supports the efficacy of integrated approaches, most notably because MSA-only approaches fail to teach learners sociolinguistic and pragmatic competence, since MSA has limited uses for interpersonal communication (Al-Batal, 2018). Moreover, learners appear to recognize this. In a study of learner perspectives of integrated Arabic programs, Al-Batal and Glakas (2018) report that students believe that Arabic instruction that includes MSA and CA is both necessary and realistic as a pedagogical goal. These beliefs may tie into learners' own language learning goals, such as being able to communicate with native speakers and develop an appreciation for Arab cultures, which Zaki and Palmer (2018) also note as being part of students' motivation to support integrated teaching approaches, a finding that is particularly evident among advanced learners (Al Zahrani, 2017). Ultimately, however, it is instructors that perhaps play the most vital role in the productive implementation of multidialectal pedagogy, and it is crucial that

instructor and learner goals and attitudes align with one another. Multiple studies, for instance, show that instructors' positive attitudes towards the inclusion of CA can have a positive correlation with learners' motivation and outcomes (Isleem, 2018; Najour, 2018). Yet this instructor-student alignment is not always the case where multidialectal instruction is concerned: findings from Isleem's (2018) study suggest that learners appear to want more dialect instruction than what is typically allotted in the curriculum.

Much of the above cited research focuses heavily on the role of CA/MSA instruction in L2 and classroom contexts. However, integrated approaches are also advantageous for HL learners, many of whom study Arabic in separate HL courses or - more typically - alongside L2 learners in mixed classes. Albirini (2018) argues that - while HL instruction should not mirror that of L2/L3 instruction - a combination of CA and MSA instruction can be just as beneficial to HL learners, in that their knowledge of a CA can serve as a useful tool to help HL learners develop their proficiency in MSA, and as such, the former is a predictor for the latter. However, benefits to HL learners go beyond proficiency, and can have a personally empowering effect. Hillman (2019) points out that Arabic programs that support and recognize spoken varieties have the potential to eliminate the social stigmas that are often tied to any colloquial varieties of a given language, which in turn can encourage HL learners to not only invest in their learning experience, but to also take pride in their dialects and cultures. Such outcomes may very well correspond to HL learner goals: survey results from Husseinali's (2012) study show that HL learners are especially motivated to study Arabic out of a desire to connect with their identities and cultures, which cannot be realized if CA dialects are excluded from the curriculum.

Branching away from a strictly MSA-only curriculum can also be beneficial to both HL and L2 learners for the purpose of study abroad experiences. Given that among the many possible reasons for studying abroad, many do so for the linguistic and cultural contact, and so having a working knowledge of a CA variety beforehand can be helpful for learners. Palmer's (2008) attitudinal study, for instance, focuses on learners who had studied Arabic for two semesters before traveling abroad. Findings show that, having spent some time in the Arabic-speaking world, the majority of learners indicated that they would have preferred to learn a CA variety prior to their sojourn abroad. Not only that, but those who were able to use CA had an easier time of integrating into the culture during their time abroad. Similarly, Trentman (2013) indicates that contact with native Arabic speakers does not alone guarantee the use of Arabic during a study abroad program, as their lack of proficiency (which can include the appropriate use of MSA and CA) may prevent them from effectively communicating in Arabic, resulting

in an overreliance on English.[1] Additionally, developing proficiency in a spoken dialect and being able to successfully use it in the cultural contact experiences that are an integral part of study abroad programs can motivate students to not only learn other varieties, but also further their knowledge of MSA (Belnap, 2018), which may afford L2 learners the ability to leverage their CA skills towards developing their MSA skills, much in the same way that Albirini (2018) notes that HL learners can do. Ultimately, to improve these study abroad experiences and maximize their effectiveness, an integrated CA/MSA curriculum during their formal classroom learning can be advantageous. As Trentman (2013) points out, without such an approach, learners in a study abroad program may "struggle and use English instead. This is a problem that cannot be solved if Arabic programs continue to teach MSA only and promote the misleading myth that it is a supra-regional standard appropriate in any context" (p. 469).

While the above scholarship mostly focuses on attitudinal studies that support the use of integrated approaches to Arabic instruction, there has also been a good deal of work that has centered around testing the efficacy of CA/MSA curricula, as well as offering specific recommendations for how to implement an integrated curriculum. First, several studies show that L2 learners are capable of simultaneously acquiring both MSA and CA and that exposure to both does not hinder learning. This is evident from Ebner and Watson's (2018) study that compares the results of standardized proficiency tests between MSA-only and MSA/CA learners. Their findings show that test results were quite similar and did not show statistically significant variation, suggesting that - at the very least - simultaneous exposure to more than one variety does not hinder proficiency development. Far from being a hindrance, balanced instruction in both CA and MSA has been shown to improve learners' sociolinguistic competence. In an examination of specific linguistic output, Nassif (2018) explores speech productions of L2 learners who were enrolled in an integrated program that exposed them to either Levantine or Egyptian Arabic. Here, Nassif found that learners produced morphological features of both MSA and CA, code-switching between these varieties in socially appropriate contexts. Moreover, the simultaneous acquisition process of two varieties does not appear to be all that different from just one: Leddy-Cecere (2018)'s study uses output from classroom observations and interviews with L2 learners, and observed that there appeared to be developmental stages among learners in terms of the complexity of their MSA/CA usage and mixing, suggesting that there may be a relatively predictable trajectory for proficiency

---

[1] It is worth noting that multilingual practices can certainly be useful to the language learning experience: Dewey at al. (2013) note that English use can be helpful to presenting opportunities to use Arabic, such as through tandem tutoring opportunities (i.e. tutoring in English and being tutored in Arabic). However, in this context, English is used in an intentional exchange, rather than a strategy for avoiding Arabic use.

development that is not unlike the patterns observed in single-variety L2 acquisition. This is further supported by Al Masaeed et al.'s (2020) study that examines L2 learners' appropriate construction of refusals. Their findings show that - in situations where native speakers would rely entirely on CA - beginner and intermediate L2 learners used very little CA compared to their advanced counterparts. It merits mention, however, that this variance appears to be more prominent in production tasks, and may be less pronounced when observing other skills. Trentman & Shiri (2020) look at the mutual intelligibility of different CA varieties as they appear in intermediate-level texts, and note that both native and non-native speakers are generally able to comprehend unfamiliar dialects. This finding not only supports the effectiveness of including CA in language instruction, but also addresses what is a widely held misconception regarding challenges to Arabic instruction: that choosing to focus on one CA variety alongside MSA does little to help learners if they are to be exposed to different CA varieties. Instead, Trentman's and Shiri's work shows that knowledge of one CA variety can in fact facilitate the learning of others.

Current research strongly supports the inclusion of CA in language curricula. However, implementing this integrated approach may still be a challenge, particularly to any instructor who has previously taught and/or learned Arabic with an MSA focus. Various S/HLA scholars have attempted to delineate possible strategies for incorporating one or more dialects into Arabic instruction. While there is some variation in these curricular designs, one common recommendation is to implement CA early on, rather than delaying exposure until the advanced levels, which has traditionally been the practice in many Arabic programs. While a common belief is that learning more than one variety from the beginning can be overwhelming for beginners, Huntley (2018) argues implementing multidialectal instruction in fact avoids the confusion that learners may otherwise encounter if they were to become accustomed to MSA-only instruction for multiple semesters before having their first exposure to CA. Younes (1990) suggests an integrated approach in which learners begin with CA, focusing on using this variety to develop listening and speaking skills, while gradually introducing MSA components through written texts. Other scholars have since proposed similar systematic approaches to incorporating multiple varieties. For example, Shiri and Joukhader (2018) propose a model that designates separate times to use MSA and CA within the same course, with the rationale that learners will then have the opportunity to notice the distinctions between the two varieties, as well as differentiate between their specific uses. Others have similarly suggested carving out distinctive space for MSA and CA, but approach these assignments based on how each variety works within broader pedagogical approaches. For instance, Giolfo and Salvaggio (2018) have put forward a model based on a task-based curriculum. Through this approach, learners may

engage with CA and MSA through a range of tasks that could draw on any mix of language skills (listening, speaking, reading, writing). Another approach focuses on genre-based instruction, where genres are built around texts (any medium of language) that fulfill specific social processes (Trentman, 2018). Such an approach, Trentman argues, is efficacious for diglossic linguistic situations like Arabic, because variation between MSA and CA among Arabic speakers may be based on a variety of contextual and social elements. Focusing specifically on genre-based instruction as it applies to writing, Azaz (2016) offers guiding principles for this approach, including: (1) early integration of genres at the beginner level; (2) working with authentic texts; (3) developing pedagogical interventions and treatments through research and/or pedagogical studies; (4) explicit teaching of rhetorical moves and lexico-grammatical features treatments, giving learners the opportunity to connect form to function. Ultimately, all of these approaches to integrated, multidialectal instruction are tightly structured in such a way that learners receive balanced exposure to MSA and CA, thus putting them in a better position to develop sociolinguistic competence in Arabic.

Code-switching and translanguaging practices

As noted above, an integrated approach to Arabic instruction requires considerable organization and planning. However, spontaneous multilingual and multidialectal practices may also form an important part of the language classroom. In this section, I highlight current work that focuses on such practices, including code-switching and translanguaging. While both processes broadly involve a speaker's use of more than one language variety, code-switching models have traditionally centered around the idea that individuals perform switches between non-overlapping linguistic systems. Translanguaging, on the other hand, assumes this process to come out of an integrated linguistic system (García & Li, 2013). The latter also has its origins in language pedagogy, and was originally conceptualized as a classroom practice in bilingual education (Williams, 1994). Still, there is substantial overlap between these two concepts, and some models of translanguaging consider code-switching to be a translingual process (MacSwan, 2017). However, others place code-switching as separate from or even incompatible with translanguaging, since the former often assumes equal proficiency in the varieties being used (García, 2009). In a classroom setting, these concepts are particularly relevant to the discussion of whether the presence of a variety other than the target language can be helpful or harmful. In the case of Arabic, various studies call attention to the presence and advantages of code-switching and translanguaging, among both instructors and learners. Here, I employ both terms in accordance with the terminology chosen by the cited authors, most of whom examine the combined use of MSA and CA in classes where both varieties are intentionally incorporated.

Instructor-learner interactions make up a considerable part of the classroom experience, and can play an important role in facilitating multilingual practices, since instructors are often the primary source of input for learners. Najour's (2018) study focuses on code-switching practices and triggers among instructors in an integrated classroom setting, and shows that instructors not only code-switch between MSA and CA, but may also include CA switches in both their native CA and another non-native CA that serves as the target CA variety. Additionally, code-switching appeared to be more CA-heavy in first year courses, while more MSA-heavy in advanced courses, in part owing to the more abstract and (often formal) content-driven topics being discussed in the latter, such as studying political speeches delivered in MSA. Additionally, it is often the case that switches between varieties can serve specific purposes: Najour found that code-switching was most frequently triggered by questions, repetition, and transitioning between activities. In addition to these triggers, instructors may opt to code-switch between Arabic and learners' L1 to communicate emotional states or express solidarity with their students, such as in the case of Youssef's (2016) study of instructor code-switching between Cairene Arabic and English in an L2 classroom. Similar results can also be seen in other learning contexts, such as that in Abourehab and Azaz (2020), where the focus was an Arabic language school within a local Muslim community center. While this school had a strict MSA-only policy, the authors found that translanguaging practices involving CA, MSA, and English were still common, and often for the purposes of negotiating linguistic knowledge and centering heritage learner identities. Such practices, however, do not necessarily align with instructor attitudes towards translanguaging. In another study that examines interviews with instructors teaching Arabic as an L2, Azaz and Abourehab (2021) note that instructors appear to practice translanguaging more than their awareness and attitudes would suggest.

Though certainly relevant to understanding multilingual practices in the classroom, instructor-focused studies are few in number, with most research on this topic centering on the practices of learners. In scholarship examining switches between CA and MSA, Nassif & Al Masaeed (2020) focus on the multidialectal practices of intermediate high/advanced low L2 learners enrolled in upper level Arabic courses that formed part of an integrated curriculum. Code-switching in this study was examined as part of a repairing strategy, where learners would begin speaking in one variety and then start over in another. Specifically, in their study, learners made repair-type switches, both during their MSA-dominant formal presentations (switching from CA to MSA), and during CA-dominant informal skits (switching from MSA to CA). This, the authors argue, demonstrates learners' sociolinguistic awareness and ability to regulate their repertoire. This regulatory tendency is exhibited among learners of all levels, as noted in Nassif (2021), which focuses on the switches of first-, second- and third-year L2 Arabic students.

While these switches were present across learners of all three levels, the switches became more nuanced and associated with a wider range of social functions among third-year learners. Similar results can also be seen in a completely different learning context: Al Masaeed (2020) examines translanguaging practices among L2 learners in a study abroad program that promoted MSA-only ideologies and policies. While this meant comparatively less formal and intentional instruction in CA, interactions between L2 learners and their native speaker conversation partners showed that learners challenged monolingual-centric attitudes, and would practice translanguaging with MSA and CA in order to negotiate meaning-making and identity.

Besides CA and MSA, English is also notably present in learners' multilingual language practices. Often, L2 learners rely on English when there is a linguistic (typically lexical) gap in the target language. This is evidenced in study abroad settings, such as those in Al Masaeed (2016, 2018). In these studies, lower proficiency learners working with native speaker conversation partners would switch to English in order to keep the conversation moving forward and maintain mutual understanding with their partners. Reliance on English may also extend to more advanced learners, such as in Al Masaeed et al. (2018), where learners of varying levels were tasked with producing apologies in Arabic. Findings showed that while intermediate-level students generally had more diverse strategies for apologies than beginner-level students, both groups switched to English at times when confronted with lexical gaps. Although the use of the L1 in the L2 classroom is often viewed as a crutch that instructors must eliminate from learners' repertoire while communicating in the classroom or abroad, these studies collectively demonstrate that the strategic use of the L1 can actually be a resource that supports learners' L2 development, rather than impeding it. Furthermore, Isleem (2021) argues that incorporating English (as the learner L1) alongside MSA and CA in the Arabic classroom is in fact a more accurate representation of the sociolinguistic reality of the Arab world, where English plays a vital role in daily communication. This is further supported by Trentman (2021), who notes that translanguaging is a linguistic reality and a norm, yet learners may interpret this inevitable form of communication from a monolingual perspective and therefore have a negative evaluation of using their L1 as a "crutch." As such, Trentman asserts that plurilingual pedagogies that recognize multilingual practices like translanguaging can actually enable learners to make full use of their linguistic repertoires and, as a result, enhance their overall learning experiences and outcomes.

Conclusion and Future Directions

This article has highlighted some of the recent scholarship and current dialogues that relate to multidialectalism and multilingualism as they apply to Arabic language teaching and learning.

Many of these studies have made discernable the integral role that linguistic diversity plays in language learning experiences of HL and L2 students, whether they take place in or outside the classroom. The efficacy of curricula that simultaneously spotlight both CA and MSA is especially apparent when taking together scholarship focusing on attitudes, practices, and outcomes that have been reported from programs with integrated approaches to Arabic instruction. While there is clearly a good deal of scholarship available on this topic, it is only more recently that this discussion has gained momentum in Arabic pedagogy, and so continued investigation on integrated approaches to Arabic instruction is essential, particularly studies that can offer insights into learning outcomes at all levels of proficiency. Additionally, while this article described code-switching and translanguaging as the primary multilingual practices relevant to language learning, there is also a need for research that looks at other practices. For instance, studies that look at the use of Arabizi in a language learning context are virtually nonexistent (Farrag, 2012). This Romanized alphabet used in informal (primarily online chat) settings has become increasingly popular among young Arabic speakers, and is quite prominent in the linguistic landscapes in Arab countries and in mass media (Yaghan, 2008). Given the exposure that learners might have to Arabizi, this form of communication would be worth further exploration, especially since it is a written representation more closely linked to CA than to MSA.

Much of the current scholarship that I have cited here has problematized various traditional linguistic ideologies. Diglossia is perhaps the most relevant concept when discussing the complementary roles of CA and MSA. While many scholars may construct and describe CA and MSA usage as a diglossic practice, much of the work cited in this article in fact critiques this notion. Traditional, MSA-only ideologies support the hierarchical nature of diglossia, with MSA as the "high" variety, and CA as the "low" variety that does not belong in educational contexts. Yet when CA is included, not merely as an additive element, but as an integral part of developing one's proficiency in Arabic, it is also recognized as a valid and legitimate language variety. Through this inclusion, the presence of CA can serve to break down the linguistic hierarchy that diglossia perpetuates. Another point of departure that is apparent in current research is the shift away from monolingual ideologies. This is clear not only in combined CA/MSA instruction, but also through validating learners' usage of their L1 (typically English in the context of this article) and recognizing that - when used thoughtfully - the L1 can be a useful tool that pushes learners forward in their L2 development. However, monolingual and diglossic ideologies run deep in language pedagogy, and significant work remains in dismantling these tenets from our language curricula. This is arguably necessary work, first, because multilingualism and multidialectalism - in the Arabic-speaking world and beyond - are

realities that should not be hidden from learners for the sake of creating the illusion of a monolingual environment, and secondly, because these ideologies - particularly those of diglossia - construct and maintain linguistic inequality, which in turn are strongly tied to social inequality. While proficiency development is certainly a central goal in any language program, is it also crucial that we reorient our curricula through a social justice lens and address the inequitable social structures that inform not only the role and status of different languages varieties, but their subsequent (in)visibility in language curricula.

References

Abdalla, M. & Al-Batal, M. (2011). College-level teachers of Arabic in the United States: A survey of their professional and institutional profiles and attitudes. *al-'Arabiyya*, 44/45, 1-28.

Abourehab, Y. & Azaz, M. (2020). Pedagogical translanguaging in community/heritage Arabic language learning. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 41, 1-14. https://doi.org/10.1080/01434988.2019.1639222

Al-Aloula, M. (2018). Production of Modern Standard Arabic lexical stress cues by native speakers of American English. In M. Alhawary (Ed.), *The Routledge handbook of Arabic second language acquisition* (pp. 38-55). Routledge.

Al-Batal, M. (Ed.). (2018). *Arabic as one language: Integrating dialect in the Arabic language curriculum*. Georgetown University Press.

Al-Batal, M. & Glakas, C. (2018). Dialect integration: Students' perspectives within an integrated program. In M. Al-Batal (Ed.), *Arabic as one language: Integrating dialect in the Arabic language curriculum* (pp. 260-278). Georgetown University Press.

Albirini, A. (2018). Proficiency in Standard Arabic and its predictors: The case of heritage speakers in college-level elementary Arabic classrooms. In M.T. Alhawary (Ed.), *The Routledge handbook of Arabic second language acquisition* (pp. 331-361). Routledge.

Alkhamees, A., Elabdali, R., Walters, K. (2019). Destabilizing Arabic diglossia? New media and translingual practice. In A. Khalfaoui, Y. Haddad (Eds.), *Perspectives on Arabic Linguistics XXXI*. (pp. 103-144). John Benjamins. https://doi.org/10.1075/sal.8.05alk

Al Masaeed, K. (2016). Judicious use of L1 in L2 Arabic speaking practice sessions. *Foreign Language Annals*, 49(4), 716-728. https://doi.org/10.1111/flan.12223.

Al Masaeed, K. (2018). Code-switching in L2 Arabic collaborative dyadic interactions. In M.T. Alhawary (Ed.), *The Routledge handbook of Arabic second language acquisition* (pp. 289-302). Routledge.

Al Masaeed, K. (2020). Translanguaging in L2 Arabic study abroad: Beyond monolingual practices in institutional talk. *The Modern Language Journal*, 104(1), 250-266. https://doi.org/10.1111/modl.12623

Al Masaeed, K., Taguchi, N., Tamimi, M. (2020). Proficiency effects on L2 Arabic refusals Appropriateness, linguistic strategies and multidialectal practices. *Applied Pragmatics*, 2(1), 26-53. https://doi.org/10.1075/ap.19007.mas

Al Masaeed, K., Waugh, L., Burns, K. (2018). The development of interlanguage pragmatics in L2 Arabic: The production of apology strategies. *System*, 74, 98-108. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2018.03.001

Al Tubuly, S. (2018). The perception and production of Arabic consonants: A cross-linguistic Study. In M. Alhawary (Ed.), *The Routledge handbook of Arabic second language acquisition* (pp. 70-92). Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315674261-5

Al Zahrani, M. A. A. H. (2017). A study on the impact of Arabic diglossia on L2 learners of Arabic: Examining motivation and perception. Masters Thesis. Bangor University, Wales, UK, 1-70. https://dx.doi.org/10.24093/awej/th.190

Azaz, M. (2016). Integrating the Genre-Based approach into teaching writing in Arabic as a foreign language. *Journal of the National Council of Less Commonly Taught Languages*, 19, 31-60.

Azaz, M. & Abourehab, Y. (2021). Should Standard Arabic have" the lion's share?": Teacher ideologies in L2 Arabic through the lens of pedagogical translanguaging. *Intercultural Communication Education, 4*(1), 90–105. https://doi.org/10.29140/ice.v4.n1.442.

Bassiouney, R. (2014). *Language and Identity in Modern Egypt*. Edinburgh University Press.

Belnap, K. (2018). Lessons learned and empirical data from twenty-five years of using an integrated approach. In M. Al-Batal (Ed.), *Arabic as one language: Integrating dialect in the Arabic language curriculum* (pp. 36-53). Georgetown University Press.

Benati, A. (2021). *Input processing and processing instruction: The acquisition of Italian and Modern Standard Arabic*. John Benjamins. https://doi.org/10.1075/bpa.11

Brown, A. (2023). Monolingual versus multilingual foreign language teaching: French and Arabic at beginning levels. *Language Teaching Research, 27* (6), 1349-1351. https://doi.org/ 10.1177/1362168821990347

Chekayri, A. (2014). The challenges of the shift from a Modern Standard Arabic only approach to an integrative approach. In V. Aguilar, M. Ángel Manzano, L.M. Pérez Cañada, W. Saleh and P. Santillán Grimm (Eds), *Teaching and learning the Arabic language* (pp.45-70),   Universidad de Murcia.

Dewey, D., Belnap, K., Hillstrom, R. (2013). Social network development, language use, and language acquisition during study abroad: Arabic language learners' perspectives. *Frontiers: The Interdisciplinary Journal of Study Abroad*, 22(1), 84-110. https://doi.org/10.36366/frontiers.v22i1.320

Ebner, G. & Watson, J. (2018). Effects of integrated Arabic on written language skills at West Point: A longitudinal study. In M. Al-Batal (Ed.), *Arabic as one language: Integrating dialect in the Arabic language curriculum* (pp. 221-234). Georgetown University Press. https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctv1fj85jd.16

Farrag, M. (2012). Arabizi: a writing variety worth learning? an exploratory study of the views of foreign learners of Arabic on Arabizi. Unpublished Master's Thesis. American University in Cairo.

Ferguson (1959). Diglossia, *Word*, 15(2), 325-340. https://doi.org/10.1080/00437956.1959.11659702

Furman, N., Goldberg, D., & Lusin, N. (2010). Enrollments in languages other than English in United States institutions of higher education, Fall 2009. In *Modern Language Association*. Modern Language Association. New York, NY.

García, O. (2009). *Bilingual education in the 21st Century: A global perspective*. Blackwell.

García, O. and Li, W. (2014). *Translanguaging: Language, bilingualism, and education*. Palgrave Macmillan UK. https://doi.org/10.1057/9781137385765

Hillman, S. (2019). "I'm a heritage speaker of the Damascene dialect of Arabic": Negotiating the identity label of Arabic heritage language learner. *Heritage Language Journal*, 16(3), 296-317. https://doi.org/10.46538/hlj.16.3.2

Husseinali, G. (2006). Who is studying Arabic and why? A survey of Arabic students' orientations at a major university. *Foreign Language Annals*, *39*(3), 395-412. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1944-9720.2006.tb02896.x

Isleem, M. (2018). Integrating colloquial Arabic in the classroom: A study of students' and teachers' attitudes and effects. In M. Al-Batal (Ed.), *Arabic as one language: Integrating dialect in the Arabic language curriculum* (pp. 237-259). Georgetown University Press.

Isleem, M. (2021). Integrating L1 in L2 Classrooms: The case of Arabic as a foreign language in US Universities. *Revista de Educación de la Universidad de Granada*, 27, 155-174. https://doi.org/10.30827/reugra.v27i0.18006

Najour, C. (2018). Teachers' voices: Analysis of teachers' speech and teachers' perspectives in integrated Arabic classrooms. In M. Al-Batal (Ed.), *Arabic as one language: Integrating dialect in the Arabic language curriculum*. (pp. 298-317). Georgetown University Press.

Jaradat, A. A., & Al-Khawaldeh, N. N. A. (2015). Teaching Modern Standard Arabic for non-native speakers as a lingua franca. *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences*, 6(5), 490-490. https://doi.org/10.5901/mjss.2015.v6n5p490

Kamusella, T. (2017). The Arabic Language: A Latin of Modernity? *Journal of Nationalism, Memory, & Language Politics*, 11(2), 117-145. https://doi.org/10.1515/jnmlp-2017-0006

Leddy-Cecere, T. (2018). Diverse speaker output in the integrated Arabic classroom: Trends and interpretation. In M. Al-Batal (Ed.), *Arabic as one language: Integrating dialect in the Arabic language curriculum*. (pp. 199-220). Georgetown University Press. https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctv1fj85jd

Maamoun, M. (2018). The L2 acquisition of Modern Standard Arabic final consonant clusters by L1 Chinese speakers. In M. Alhawary (Ed.), *The Routledge handbook of Arabic second language acquisition* (pp. 113-136). Routledge.

Macaro, E. (2014) Overview: Where should we be going with classroom codeswitching research? In Barnard, R., & J. McLellan (Eds.), *Codeswitching in university English-medium classes*, (pp. 10–23). Multilingual Matters. https://doi.org/10.21832/9781783090914-004

Mansoor, M. (1960). Arabic: What and when to teach. In R. Harrell (Ed.), *Report of the Tenth Annual Round Table Meeting on Linguistics and Language Studies* (pp. 83-96). Georgetown University Press.

McCarus, E. (1987). The study of Arabic in the United States: A history of its development. *Al-'Arabiyya*, 20(1/2), 13-27.

Najour, C. (2018). Teachers' voices: Analysis of teachers' speech and teachers' perspectives in integrated Arabic classrooms. In M. Al-Batal (Ed.), *Arabic as one language: Integrating dialect in the Arabic language curriculum*. (pp. 298-318). Georgetown University Press.

Nassif, L. (2018). Integrating Colloquial Arabic into the Arabic L2 curriculum: An analysis of learner speech. In M. Al-Batal (Ed.), *Arabic as one language: Integrating dialect in the Arabic language curriculum*. (pp. 175-198). Georgetown University Press.

Nassif, L. (2021). Codeswitching between Modern Standard and Colloquial Arabic as L2 sociolinguistic competence A cross-sectional study from an integrated approach Curriculum. *Applied Pragmatics*, 3(1), 26-50. https://doi.org/10.1075/ap.19022.nas

Nassif, L. & Al Masaeed, K. (2020). Supporting the sociolinguistic repertoire of emergent diglossic speakers: Multidialectal practices of L2 Arabic learners. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 43(1), 1-15. https://doi.org/10.1080/01434632.2020.1774595

Palmer, J. (2007). Arabic diglossia: Teaching only the standard variety is a disservice to students. *Arizona Working Papers in SLA & Teaching*, 14, 111-122.

Palmer, J. (2008). Arabic diglossia: Student perceptions of spoken Arabic after living in the Arabic-speaking world. *Arizona Working Papers in SLA & Teaching*, 15, 81-95.

Parkinson, D. (1985). Proficiency to do what? Developing oral proficiency in students of Modern Standard Arabic. *Al-'Arabiyya,* 18(1/2), 11-44.

Ready, C. (2018). Maintaining the status quo: Diglossia and the case of Arabic language policy in Ceuta. *Language Problems and Language Planning*, *42*(2), 173-195. https://doi.org/10.1075/lplp.00018.rea

Redouane, R. (2001). The use of Modern Standard Arabic word formation processes by English-speaking and French-speaking adult L2 learners and native speakers (Doctoral dissertation). University of Toronto. https://hdl.handle.net/1807/15327

Ryding, K. C. (2006). Teaching Arabic in the United States. In K.M. Wahba, Z. A. Taha, L. England (Eds.), *Handbook for Arabic language teaching professionals in the 21st century*, (pp. 13-20). Routledge.

Ryding, K. C. (2009). Educated spoken Arabic: A flexible spoken standard. *The NECTFL Review*, 64, 49–52.

Trentman, E. (2013). Arabic and English during study abroad in Cairo, Egypt: Issues of access and use. *The Modern Language Journal*, 97(2), 457-473. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.2013.12013.x

Trentman, E. (2018). Developing a genre-based curriculum to teach Arabic diglossia. In M. Al-Batal (Ed.), *Arabic as one language: Integrating dialect in the Arabic language curriculum*. (pp. 114-133). Georgetown University Press.

Trentman, E. (2021). Reframing monolingual ideologies in the language classroom: Evidence from Arabic study abroad and telecollaboration. In B. Dupuy & K. Michelson (Eds.),

Pathways to paradigm change: Critical examinations of prevailing discourses and ideologies in second language education (pp. 108-132). Cengage Learning.

Trentman, E. & Shiri, S. (2020). The mutual intelligibility of Arabic dialects: Implications for the language classroom. *Critical Multilingualism Studies*, 8(1), 104–134.

Tsukada, K. (2012). Non-native Japanese listeners' perception of vowel length contrasts in Japanese and Modern Standard Arabic (MSA). *Second Language Research*, 28(2), 151-168. https://doi.org/10.1177/0267658311435870

Valdés, G. (2020). Sandwiching, polylanguaging, translanguaging, and codeswitching: Challenging monolingual dogma in institutionalized language teaching. In J. McSwann and C. Faltis (eds) *Codeswitching in the classroom: Critical perspectives on teaching, learning, policy, andiIdeology*. (pp. 114-147). Routledge.

Versteegh, K. (2004). *The Arabic language*. Edinburgh University Press.

Welles, E. (2004). Foreign language enrollments in the United States institutions of higher education. *ADFL Bulletin*, 35(2–3), 7–26.

Williams, C. (1994). Arfarniad o Ddulliau Dysgu ac Addysgu yng Nghyd-destun Addysg Uwchradd Ddwyieithog, [An evaluation of teaching and learning methods in the context of bilingual secondary education], Unpublished doctoral thesis, University of Wales, Bangor.

Yaghan, M. (2008). Arabizi: A contemporary style of Arabic slang. *Design Issues* 24(2): 39-52. http://dx.doi.org/10.1162/desi.2008.24.2.39

Younes, M. A. (1990). An integrated approach to teaching Arabic as a foreign language. *al-'Arabiyya*, 23(1-2), 105-122.

Younes, M.A. (2014). *The integrated approach to Arabic instruction*. Routledge.

Younes, M.A. (2018). To separate, or to integrate, that is the question: The Cornell Arabic Model. In M. Al-Batal (Ed.), *Arabic as one language: Integrating dialect in the Arabic language curriculum*. (pp. 23-35). Georgetown University Press.

Youssef, I. (2016). English-Cairene Arabic classroom code switching: An interactional-Sociolinguistic Approach. *International Journal of Arabic-English Studies*, 16(1), 7-28. http://doi.org/10.33806/ijaes2000.16.1.1

Zaki, M. & Palmer, J. (2018). Integration and students' perspectives in a multidialect environment. In M. Al-Batal (Ed.), *Arabic as one language: Integrating dialect in the Arabic language curriculum*. (pp. 279-297). Georgetown University Press.