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What does the study of bilingualism and bilingual education gain from Deaf bilingualism and Deaf bilingual education? What does the “languaging” of the Deaf teach all of us about language practices, and especially about the bilingual education of language minorities as well as majorities? What can scholars of bilingualism gain from understanding deafness as an expression of linguistic diversity? What are the gains in understanding bilingualism for the hearing when looking at Deaf bilingualism? This chapter describes how the interactions of a hearing professor (Garcia) and a Deaf doctoral student (Cole) have reshaped the way in which we think about bilingualism in the twenty-first century.

We begin the chapter by positioning ourselves as representatives of diverse bilingual language-minority scholars and educators—one a hearing Latina immigrant, the other a Deaf, white, and American woman. Characterizing our collaboration as that of teacher and student, researcher and researcher’s assistant, and author and coauthor describes how our two-year-long collaboration led Garcia to reshape traditional theoretical frameworks about bilingualism and bilingual education. In so doing, the chapter repositions signed languages within the linguistic hierarchy in which spoken languages are traditionally seen as superior. The study of Deaf bilingualism has used theoretical frameworks mainly derived from research on the bilingualism of the hearing. In this case, however, it was studying the bilingualism of the Deaf that led to changes in theoretical frameworks about bilingualism and bilingual education for the hearing. Thus, following the conceptualization of H-Dirksen Bauman and Joseph Murray, this chapter details what we learned about bilingualism and bilingual education from focusing on the practices of the Deaf, beginning with a description of our own experiences of bilingualism as a hearing and a deaf professional, respectively.

Positioning Ourselves
Ofelia García was born in Cuba and, fifty years ago, at the age of eleven, immigrated to New York City. She started school in the United States in the seventh
grade, where she experienced English-only instruction. Because she had attended a private school in Cuba where English was taught in the afternoon, she had some receptive understanding of English. The family moved to a neighborhood where many other Spanish-speaking immigrants lived. Although she quickly developed speaking ability in English through school, she continued to use Spanish at home with family and friends. Upon her entering college, Spanish was still the language of friends and family, but English became the official language of school and the only one in which Ofelia read and wrote. It was in college where she started to recover and develop literacy in Spanish, taking course work in Spanish-language literature. She studied to become a teacher of Spanish as a foreign language and English as a second language, but she started teaching recently arrived Puerto Rican preadolescents in what was then known as Hell’s Kitchen. She quickly understood that neither Spanish as a foreign language nor English as a second language was an appropriate program of study for these students. Building on her bilingualism, she started to experiment with bilingual pedagogies even before bilingual education became a formal program of study. Eventually she left the classroom to become a bilingual teacher educator and a scholar of bilingualism. Ofelia’s experience with bilingualism as a student, teacher, and teacher educator has always been with two or more spoken languages.

Most of Ofelia’s experience with bilingualism was of a spoken majority language, English, and a spoken minority language, Spanish, specifically in the context of the United States. Sometimes, her emphasis focused on developing the English of immigrants who had recently arrived, whether from Puerto Rico, other countries in Latin America, Asia, or Africa. In other cases, the emphasis of her work was on studying the development of the Spanish language and especially Spanish literacy in students who, like Ofelia, had, through the course of high school, begun to shift to English. At yet other times, Ofelia studied the bilingualism of language majorities, as when English-speaking students learned Spanish as a “foreign language.” Although she gained extensive experience with international bilingual education, especially during her years as a professor of international education at Columbia University’s Teachers College, she remained profoundly ignorant of Deaf bilingualism; that is, until Debra Cole became her doctoral student at Teachers College.

Debra Cole was born in Puerto Rico while her New York City–raised American parents were living there. Upon discovering Debra’s deafness, her parents moved back to New York, where they immediately sought the help and advice of professionals. Her parents learned American Sign Language (ASL, which was against many professionals’ advice at the time) when Debra was two years old, teaching their daughter ASL in turn. Growing up, Debra saw speech therapists to develop speaking and listening skills in the English language. She subsequently attended an elementary school for the deaf and was mainstreamed with hearing students in
junior high and high school. In essence, Debra grew up bilingual; she used English (both spoken and written) and ASL.

However, English and ASL were not the only languages Debra grew up with. At school, she studied Spanish, Latin, Chinese Sign Language, and Chinese, as well as Italian Sign Language and Italian while living in Italy for two years. Studying foreign languages was a challenge for Debra, mainly because the classes were usually designed with the objective of attaining fluency in both written and spoken aspects—the latter of which did not meet her communicative needs. Based on her experience, she developed a curriculum and established a foreign-language program in which Deaf students could study a foreign language and explore both written- and signed-language practices.

Debra gained extensive formal and academic experience with bilingualism in ASL and English, especially during her years at Gallaudet University. At the same time, she developed an interest in studying the Deaf's acquisition of written languages other than English, and taught English to deaf foreign students in the English Language Institute at Gallaudet. It was her interest in multilingual development and her research in language education for the Deaf in various countries that led her to enroll in a doctoral program in international education development at Teachers College. It was there that she took a course on bilingualism and bilingual education taught by Ofelia.

**Deaf–Hearing Collaboration**

Ofelia García's course on bilingualism and bilingual education included, up to the time that Debra enrolled in her course, solely readings that addressed spoken languages, and focused mostly on the bilingualism of immigrant minorities. As part of her course, Ofelia used a process for teaching that she calls "collaborative descriptive inquiry," derived from the work of the Prospect Center for Education and Research. Driven by story, image, and detail, descriptive inquiry makes the complexity of academic texts and the lived reality of people more visible. Each participant in the class, including the teacher, takes a turn describing fully why a particular idea or sentence in an academic text is meaningful to him or her by recounting a connection to his or her personal life or to other texts, while withholding judgment or interpretation. The other students and the teacher do not interrupt or raise questions. Class participants listen carefully and take notes, so that they can ask questions when all individuals in the group have taken a turn. Turns are taken in the order in which the group members sit. The teacher then pulls together the main threads and subsequently leads a class-wide discussion in which various questions are raised and issues explored. As a result, individual understandings are expanded and supposedly "expert" knowledge is called into question. Over time, a collaborative, generous, and "safe" space is cultivated in which ideas for action are generated.
Debra Cole attended class with two interpreters and was given the opportunity to describe her experiences as a Deaf person with bilingualism and education, alongside hearing students in the class from a variety of backgrounds. These included immigrants from Latin America, Asia, and Africa; Native Americans; children of immigrants; and students of language majorities. The class, including Ofelia, raised questions about bilingualism that related to two of Debra’s own languages: American Sign Language and Italian Sign Language. Ofelia had to enlarge her understanding of the bilingualism of immigrants by incorporating newly acquired insights from the bilingualism of all her students. For example, during the same semester in which Debra was enrolled in Ofelia’s class, there was also a student of Wanka Quechua origin, an African student from Cameroon, and a Pakistani student whose home language was Punjabi, among others. Thus, Debra’s bilingualism was but one example of the linguistic diversity and type of bilingualism that is prevalent in the United States.

But whereas only small adjustments had to be made to traditional conceptualizations of bilingualism when incorporating the languages of indigenous minorities or the complex multilingualism of Africa, Debra’s Deaf bilingualism called into question many of the traditional concepts themselves that made up the canon of bilingual studies. Together, and with the help of the entire class, we began to question the fundamental assumptions we had made about language and bilingualism.

Debra subsequently took a second course with Ofelia that explored language policies in education in different global contexts. The course had been organized geographically, with little attention paid to Deaf language education policy. However, Debra’s presence in the course started to disrupt assumptions about direct links between language and territory, as well as between language and identity. We also started to call into question language-education policies that are enacted top-down without regard to the complex and dynamic language practices evident among students and teachers as they create meaning in classrooms.

As a result of Debra’s collaboration with Ofelia during this year, Ofelia completely revamped conceptualizations for a book she was planning to write on bilingual education. Instead of writing a text in which there was simply a separate section on Deaf bilingualism derived from hearing bilingualism, she decided to put the Deaf bilingual experience on equal footing with that of the hearing. Ofelia was collaborating with a well-known European scholar of bilingualism and bilingual education, Hugo Baetens Beardsmore, to ensure that her lens was broad enough to capture the global complexity. Ofelia then asked Debra to become her research assistant, requesting that, at times, she coauthor specific texts and thus change the traditional locus of enunciation held by hearing monolinguals. The result, Bilingual Education in the Twenty-First Century: A Global Perspective, may be considered an example of what Walter Mignolo calls “border thinking” and “subaltern knowledge,” that is, “knowledge conceived from the exterior borders of the
modern/colonial world system." Produced collaboratively by a hearing Latina im­
migrant; a Deaf, white, native-born American woman; and a hearing European
man, the book challenges dominant twentieth-century understandings about bi­
lingualism and bilingual education.

The rest of this chapter describes how the collaboration between García and
Cole enlarged understandings of traditional concepts in the field of bilingualism
and bilingual education and points to the gains that have been made through in­
corporating a Deaf lens into this field. The five enlarged concepts entail the fol­
lowing shifts:

1. From language and identity to languaging and identifying
2. From separate language skills to expanded and interrelated
   language practices
3. From linear bilingualism to dynamic bilingualism
4. From diglossia in schools to transglossia
5. From code-switching and monolingual pedagogies to translanguaging
   as a process and a pedagogy

Each of these concepts will be discussed in this chapter.

Enlarged Understandings: Languaging and Identifying
Writing about bilingualism from a “border” perspective means that essential con­
cepts, such as language and culture, become questionable. We begin this section
by first considering language and then looking at its relationship with identity,
exploring these concepts from a perspective that puts the Deaf at the center.

Language has generally been understood as an autonomous system that is spo­
ken in some geographical territory, most often a nation-state that has spent much
energy developing grammars, dictionaries, and other material to ensure its stan­
dardization. Likewise, signed-language scholars, especially since William Stokoe
and his followers, have consistently argued that signed language is, like any other
language, an autonomous system, with its own standardized grammar. Edward
Klima and Ursula Bellugi convincingly showed that ASL is a structured linguistic
system, yet sign linguistics has continued to be subordinate to the linguistics of
spoken languages, both written and unwritten.

Postmodern sociolinguists have questioned the idea of language as a completely
autonomous system, pointing to its social construction. Pierre Bourdieu argued
that “what circulates on the linguistic market is not ‘language’ as such, but rather
discourses that are stylistically marked.” More than any other scholars, Sinfree
Makoni and Alastair Pennycook have argued that “languages, conceptions of lan­
guageness and the metalanguages used to describe them are inventions.” Makoni
and Pennycook add that our present conception of language was constructed by
states that wanted to consolidate political power, thereby forcing standardization
in order to spread a specific way of languaging to control the population. In Ma-
koni and Pennycook's view, languages were constructed and constituted "outside
and above human beings," as Victor Yngve has also said. Peter Mühlhäusler
and Suzanne Romaine have also shown that in the traditional societies of the Pa-
cific, the notion of discrete languages that can be enumerated makes little sense
and has little to do with the communicative practices of their speakers. Languages,
as objectively described, often bear little resemblance to the ways in which
people use language, or what Yngve and Makoni and Pennycook call their
"languaging."

In the discussion of whether signed languages are "real" languages, many con-
tinue to side with Helmer Myklebust in the belief that "[t]he manual sign lan-
guage must be viewed as inferior to the verbal as a language." But it turns out
that it is not that signed language is different or exceptional with regard to other
languages; rather, it is that all languages, including signed languages, are social
constructions. Stokoe suggested that a different way of looking at signed lan-
guage might reform the linguistics of spoken languages. Deaf languaging, with
its multimodal, spatial nature, enables us to better understand the construction of
all languages, both spoken and signed, and thus to invert the relationship in which
sign linguistics has been subordinated to the linguistics of spoken language.

If Deaf languaging transformed the way in which we think about language
in general, the same can be said about identity and its relationship to language.
Since at least the eighteenth century and the contributions of the German roman-
tics, language and identity have been viewed as naturally linked. Johann Gottfried
Herder (1744–1803) defined ethnic identity as natural and immovable and closely
connected to the language of a people. Although throughout the late nineteenth
and the early twentieth centuries many thinkers offered nuanced critiques of
the primordialist positioning on language and identity of the German romantics
(see, for example, Frank Boas [1858–1942] and Max Weber [1864–1920]), others
(for example, Edward Sapir [1884–1939] and his student Benjamin Lee Whorf
[1897–1941]) asserted that language, culture, and identity are interconnected and
that an individual's thoughts and ways of understanding the world and behav-
ing are influenced by the language(s) he or she speaks. In the twentieth century,
Joshua A. Fishman has continued the Whorf-Sapir tradition, stating that, for ex-
ample, "[l]anguage is the recorder of paternity, the expresser of patrimony and the
carrier of phenomenology."

Recent postmodern scholarship, however, has signaled the situational and sub-
jective construction of identity, shifting attention from an immovable identity to
more fluid identities and to the mestizaje, the fluidity and plurality of identities
affected by new local and global ones. This nonessentialist positioning of the
language-and-identity link is perhaps best understood in thinking about the cul-
ture of the deaf.

Deaf culture is complex, because it includes some who are profoundly deaf;
others who are hard of hearing to different degrees; family members of the deaf, especially CODAs (children of deaf adults); and sign-language interpreters. Some come into deafness at birth, whereas others acquire it much later. Since the advent of amplification technology, especially cochlear implants, Deaf identity has become more fluid, with some opting for such implants and others against, with much opposition to the implants coming from the Deaf community itself. As Ila Parasnis explains, "[Deaf] bilingualism can be viewed as a continuum that includes people who may vary considerably in their linguistic knowledge, fluency and age at which they acquire each language." The flexible ways in which Deaf language and identity practices operate bring to the forefront the fact that people do not use language based simply on their identity but instead perform their identity by using language in certain ways. Deaf people are agentive beings who are perhaps the best example of what Aneta Pavlenko and Adrian Blackledge describe as "constantly in search of new social and linguistic resources that allow them to resist identities that position them in undesirable ways, produce new identities, and assign alternative meanings to the links between identities and linguistic varieties." Deaf communities convincingly show us that it is language users who decide who they want to be, and who choose their languaging and identifying accordingly.

Although the languaging and identifying ideas of postmodern scholars circulate broadly in the literature for spoken languages, it is the Deaf, who are less constrained by the impositions of nation-states with regard to language use and identity, who convincingly demonstrate another angle. Viewing language and identity from the point of view of the users of a language (especially in the case of the Deaf), and not from that of a nation-state, argues for a languaging and identifying approach to the study of bilingualism in the twenty-first century, and for the challenging of dominant concepts such as "language skills," which is the subject of the next section.

Enlarged Understandings: Expanded and Interrelated Language Practices

Although there are more bilingual than monolingual people in the world, bilinguals, especially bilingual students, are often considered an anomaly in society and in schools. Thus, much attention has been paid to their "language skills." This section looks at four characteristics of the language of the Deaf that enabled us to shed our past understandings of language skills: expanded language practices, developmental complexity, different degrees of proficiency, and simultaneity of modalities. Each of these characteristics will be separately considered.

Expanded Language Practices

When speaking of bilinguals, a concern for their "language skills" figures prominently. Language skills are usually described as having two separate components: oracy (listening and speaking) and literacy (reading and writing). But this
definition is insufficient to capture the added dimension of languaging that the Deaf have—that of signacy; that is, the ability to attend to signs, as well as to produce signs. Signacy further means that languaging capacities are expanded, now encompassing not only the modalities of sound of spoken language and visual images of written language but also visual movement that makes up signed languages by simultaneously combining hand configuration, location of the sign, motion of the hand, orientation of the hand, and facial expression. Of course, we know that these skills are interrelated and that literacy is not an autonomous skill. Literacy, as Brian Street has shown, varies by situation and entails complex social interaction that draws on all aspects of communication.

Figure 6.1 displays the possibilities of the full languaging abilities of a bilingual hearing person. The abilities of oracy are usually developed in the home, as a home language, whereas the abilities of literacy, when they exist, are usually developed in school, as an additional language. Of course, the additional language can also be developed at home, in interaction with siblings, family, and media, and the home language can also be developed in school, when a child attends a bilingual education program. The idea is that a full, balanced bilingualism can be developed if the home and the school work together.

Figure 6.2 shows the abilities that a Deaf bilingual American may develop, if he or she is fortunate enough to attend a bilingual school for the Deaf, an even more rare occurrence than attending a bilingual school for the hearing.

It is evident from contrasting Figure 6.2 with Figure 6.1 that a Deaf bilingual child may develop more languaging than a hearing bilingual child because of the possibility of another semiotic resource, that of signacy. Figure 6.2 captures the bilingualism of a Deaf child whose semiotic repertoire is always richer and more complex than that of a hearing child simply because of its signacy capacity. If the Deaf child is exposed to another spoken language, Deaf bilingualism is the same as that of a bilingual hearing child and much more; the Deaf child not only has

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Bilingual Ability</th>
<th>Oracy (in the home)</th>
<th>Literacy (in the school)</th>
<th>Signacy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Receptive</td>
<td>Listening:</td>
<td>Reading:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>home language</td>
<td>home language</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>additional language</td>
<td>additional language</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Productive</td>
<td>Speaking:</td>
<td>Writing:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>home language</td>
<td>home language</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>additional language</td>
<td>additional language</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 6.1. Hearing bilingualism: example of possible languaging abilities of a hearing bilingual.
more language abilities but also can use them much more dynamically. In essence, these figures call into question the static categories of language skills that studies of bilingualism have long held dear.

**Developmental Complexity**

Although, as we saw in Figure 6.1, oracy for hearing children develops at home and literacy develops in school, the same direct skill–domain relationship cannot be claimed for the Deaf. The positioning of the Deaf child as a child of hearing parents or of deaf parents means that signacy may be acquired either at school or at home. Whether a person is prelingually or postlingually deaf—that is, born with little or no hearing or having acquired skills in a spoken language before losing hearing—also affects when and where the Deaf person might have acquired the specific language skill, as well as the person’s proficiency and use of the different skills. Also, depending on whether the child is hard of hearing or profoundly deaf, oracy in the form of lipreading, and even speaking, may occur either at home or at school. This is evident in Figure 6.2.

It turns out that not only is the linguistic repertoire of a deaf child much richer than that of a hearing child, but its development is also more complex and relies heavily on at least three dimensions: the family context, the age at which the person became deaf, and the person’s degree of deafness. The realization of the developmental complexity of Deaf bilingualism led us to question the concept of exclusive “domains” of use and acquisition that are often the basis for what is considered appropriate bilingual development for the hearing (more on this in the section on transglossia).

**Different Degrees of Proficiency**

When speaking about bilingualism, we often speak of receptive ability (listening, reading, and, for the Deaf, attending to signs) and productive ability (speaking, writing, and, for the Deaf, producing signs). When bilingual-education programs
for spoken languages are available, the goal is most often to educate people who will be both receptive and productive bilinguals. The emphasis is on fully acquiring all four of the oracy and literacy abilities. But the fluid languaging and identifying of the Deaf means that their languaging components—signacy, literacy, and especially oracy—are always developed to different degrees.

As we have indicated, as a result of a person's family and social context, the age at which deafness originated, and the relative degree of deafness, Deaf languaging varies significantly. Furthermore, as in other communities in which members of two distinct language groups are in close proximity, there is much language contact in Deaf languaging. For all these reasons, full bilingualism and "ultimate" attainment of all language skills are not always achieved for Deaf children.

It was precisely the understandings of the different degrees of Deaf bilingualism that enabled us to adopt a more flexible position regarding the bilingualism of all children. This led us to challenge the traditional concepts associated with the field of second-language acquisition. The concept of moving learners toward "ultimate attainment," which is prevalent in second-language-acquisition studies, means that learners are viewed as incomplete, as if a static and complete set of grammar rules were available for acquisition. Focusing on Deaf bilingualism enabled us to better understand the fact that bilinguals are not simply two monolinguals in one and that ultimate attainment is not a realistic representation of actual communicative practice.

Simultaneity of Modalities

Another characteristic of Deaf bilingualism that moved our traditional understandings of bilingualism is the influences and concurrent uses of the different modalities of Deaf languaging. It is possible for a Deaf person, for example, to sign and use the silent mouthing for a given word simultaneously, what Ceil Lucas and Clayton Valli have called "contact signing," an effect that makes the interrelated languaging of the Deaf even more complex. Traditionally the modalities of the language of the hearing are thought about separately, and it is said that one cannot speak English and Spanish simultaneously. But this is true only if one accepts that bilinguals speak two autonomous languages. If one instead sides with Makoni and Pennycook, it is easy to see that all bilinguals language simultaneously. It is equally true that hearers make meaning by using different modalities simultaneously. For example, hearers may listen to a lecture and take notes simultaneously, or write and speak at the same time. Since the advent of New Literacy Studies, literacy is considered to be any interaction with print, including speaking, signing, listening, or attending to signs as words are read or written. Furthermore, advanced technology has enhanced the capabilities for simultaneous languaging of all these modalities. Indeed, we became convinced that all competent users of language, not just the Deaf, must engage in "contact languaging" in the twenty-first century.
The four characteristics of Deaf bilingualism that we have been considering—the expanded practices provided by signacy; its developmental complexity; its different degrees of proficiency; and its capacity for simultaneity of modalities—led us to question traditional linear types of bilingualism and to find them insufficient. The next section describes how the conceptualization of dynamic bilingualism, a new type of bilingualism conceptualized by García was fueled, in part, by understandings gained from Deaf bilingualism.

### Enlarged Understandings: Dynamic Bilingualism

In 1974, Wallace Lambert proposed two types of bilingualism: subtractive and additive. Subtractive bilingualism refers to the type of bilingualism to which most language minorities are subjected; that is, the home language is “subtracted” as the school language is added. But subtractive bilingualism doesn’t quite fit the Deaf. Sign language is not, in many cases, either their “mother tongue” or their “home” language, given that 90 percent of Deaf students are born to hearing parents. As we said before, Deaf children usually acquire signacy, alongside literacy and sometimes oracy, in school and not at home.

Additive bilingualism refers to situations in which the second language is “added” in school, with the result that the child subsequently becomes a speaker of two languages. The suggestion is that the child can become a “balanced” bilingual, able to use the two languages to the same extent. But as we said before, the fluid languaging and identifying of the Deaf mean that signacy, literacy, and even oracy are part of the languaging practices of the Deaf to different degrees.

It was thinking of Deaf bilingualism that eventually led García to finally shed the image of the balanced bilingual and the linear models of bilingualism as either additive or subtractive. Bilingualism goes beyond the notion of two autonomous languages and of additive or subtractive bilingualism, and instead suggests that the language practices of all bilinguals are complex and interrelated; they do not emerge in a linear way. Bilingualism does not result in either the balanced wheels of a bicycle (as the additive bilingual model purports) or the single wheel of a monocycle (as the subtractive bilingual model suggests). Instead, bilingualism is like an all-terrain vehicle, with individuals using it to adapt to the ridges and craters of communication in uneven terrains. Like a banyan tree, bilingualism is complex, as it adapts to the soil in which it grows.

Dynamic bilingualism is a type of bilingualism that refers to the development of different language practices to varying degrees. In some ways, dynamic bilingualism is related to the concept of “plurilingualism,” as defined by the Council of Europe: the ability to use several languages to varying degrees and for distinct purposes; and an educational value that is the basis of linguistic tolerance. The difference is that within a dynamic bilingual perspective, languages are seen not as autonomous systems that people “have” but as practices that people “use.”
Unlike additive and subtractive types of bilingualism, dynamic bilingualism proposes that complex and interrelated plurilingual practices are both the center of how language occurs and the goal of communication in an increasingly multilingual world.

The expanded and interrelated language practices of the Deaf led us to understand that the bilingualism of all groups in the twenty-first century is not linear but dynamic. Dynamic bilingualism goes beyond the linearity of additive and subtractive bilingualism and encompasses a plurilingualism in action, a “plurilinguaging” that puts at the center the meaning-making practices that people use in order to communicate. Dynamic bilingualism calls into question venerable assumptions of how language is used in society, including the concept of diglossia, which we discuss in the next section as we introduce our enlarged understanding of what we call “transglossia.”

Enlarged Understandings: Transglossia

Conceptualizations of bilingualism in education have traditionally rested in understandings of diglossia; that is, the idea that in order for stable bilingualism to exist, there must be functional differentiation between two languages. Thus, separating languages clearly and developing them fully have become the gold standard for bilingual-education programs. As a result, traditional bilingual-education programs have separated languages by allocating one language to a specific time, a specific teacher, a specific subject, and/or a specific place.

But in thinking about the complex and dynamic languaging of the Deaf, it became clear that separating the languages of bilinguals in this way is unnatural and does not reflect the languaging of any bilingual individual. For example, in the program that Cole set up in Italy, it was important to have students develop both written and signed abilities, for both were needed to communicate with other Deaf communities. In teaching language minorities, the strict insistence on separating languages as a way to “protect” or isolate the weaker, nondominant language from that of the majority means that bilingual people are restricted in their languaging choices, given that, as we have seen, all bilinguals use their languages in interdependent ways. In the search to neutralize the power dimensions of two languages, that is, to work against the linguistic hierarchy of a majority and a minority language, or a spoken and a signed language, the sociolinguistic arrangement of putting two languages on equal but separate footing overlooks the complex language practices of all bilingual students. Keeping one language out of reach of the other works against developing bilingualism and appropriating an identity as a bilingual person.

As a result of this realization, García proposed the concept of “transglossia,” that is, a stable and yet dynamic communicative network, with multiple languages operating in functional interrelationship. Transglossia rests on, but also goes be-
yond, the important concept of heteroglossia posited by Bakhtin. Bakhtin speaks of the differences of language practices and the different social forces that move them. Transglossia builds on these heteroglossic practices but adds an additional dimension that has much to do with the concept of transculturación coined by the Cuban ethnologist Fernando Ortiz in explaining the complex processes of cultural transformation in Cuban society. Transculturación questions the linear and simple directionality of cultural impact from one source, Europe, to Cuba, and in so doing problematizes the epistemological purity of traditional descriptions. In the same manner, by changing the directionality of conceptualizations from those about spoken languages to signed languages, and from those about hearing bilingualism to Deaf bilingualism, transglossia questions traditional diglossic descriptions that often neutralize and render as normal the imposition of the language practices of dominant majorities over those of others.

Transglossia has little to do with the static maintenance of two or more languages of nation-states and other societal groups, a practice that preserves the asymmetry of language practices. The focus of transglossia is, instead, to question and transgress the power and knowledge of majority populations and also of hearers. Thus, the study of bilingualism moves beyond the defense of national languages and national ideologies and focuses instead on the fluid language practices of bilingual people, whether Deaf or not.

The interrelationships of the language practices of the Deaf leave us little doubt that restricting the language of bilinguals to separate-language practices is artificial. Traditionally, scholars of bilingualism for the hearing have talked about code-mixing or code-switching between languages as a pragmatic choice that serves specific purposes in particular contexts. In speaking about Deaf bilingualism, however, Ira Gawlitzek-Maiwald and Rosemarie Tracy suggest that the fluidity of language practices of the Deaf, unlike the situation for hearers, constitutes not a pragmatic choice but a “pooling of resources” to make meaning. Bruno Menéndez adds that for the Deaf, this “language mixing” is “a valuable tool that triggers the engine of bilingual development through metalinguistic reflection, implying contrastive teaching methods.” It was this idea, coupled with our observation that hearing bilinguals behaved in much the same way, that led García to shed the constraints of code-switching for all bilinguals and speak instead of translanguaging.

Extending the term used to describe a pedagogy developed by a Welsh bilingual teacher, Cen Williams, translanguaging, for García, refers to the process by which bilinguals engage in complex discursive practices. It is conceived from a bilingual position that includes all the complex language practices of bilinguals, including those of the Deaf. Translanguaging transgresses the reified categories of language, exposing meanings and histories buried within fixed language systems and identities.
Bilingual-education programs are frequently involved in separating languages that are often used by bilinguals simultaneously. Translanguaging as a pedagogy is precisely a way of working in the gap between, on the one hand, the global designs of nation-states for their educated citizens and, on the other hand, the local histories of all peoples who language differently. The insistence that the many language practices of bilinguals be performed in isolation in schools has worked against bilinguals' plurilingual development, as well as their education. It is clear that, as many scholars have started to recognize, translanguaging as a bilingual pedagogy is important in order both to make sense of language and content and to build on the complex and multiple language practices of students and teachers. By including the Deaf perspective, it became even clearer to us that educators meaningfully educate when, as Nancy Hornberger and Ellen Skilton-Sylvester have said, they draw upon the full linguistic repertoire of all bilingual students.

Conclusion

This chapter has described how the collaboration between a Deaf doctoral student of bilingualism and her teacher profoundly changed the ways in which her teacher thought about bilingualism and bilingual education. As she began to understand the bilingualism of the Deaf and issues in their education, Garcia started realizing that these were the same issues faced by hearing bilinguals. The Deaf case simply reframed bilingualism from an angle that put bilingual language minorities, both Deaf and hearing, at the center, and thus changed the locus of enunciation. Rather than repeat traditional descriptions of bilingualism and bilingual education, Garcia, through the collaboration with Cole as well as with Baetens Beardsmore, was able to generate “an other tongue” to describe bilingualism from a minority perspective.

These newly generated descriptions questioned traditional concepts of language and identity: language skills, types of bilingualism, diglossia, code-switching, and separate-language bilingual pedagogies. In their place, we were able to generate five concepts that are more appropriate to studying bilingualism and bilingual education in the twenty-first century:

1. Language and identity are not necessarily linked for bilinguals. Instead, bilinguals perform their identities by acts of languaging and identifying.
2. The languaging of bilinguals is complex, interrelated, simultaneous, and never in any way balanced.
3. Bilingualism is not linear but dynamic.
4. Diglossia does not neutrally describe stable bilingual situations. A dynamic yet stable transglossia might be a more neutral description.
5. Separate language practices and code-switching are ways of describing bilingualism from a monolingual point of view. From a more heteroglossic point of view, what we see is translanguaging.
Besides transforming traditional concepts with regard to bilingualism, thinking about languaging abilities for the Deaf in relationship to schooling leads us to question the ultimate goal of schooling. Is it to educate? or is it to stamp out cultures and people who are different? It is clear that the neglect on the part of schools of the signacy ability that is at the core of Deaf identity signals an attempt to eradicate the languaging and identification possibilities of that identity. More than with hearing examples, the ways in which schools tend to the language abilities of the Deaf give clear evidence that the goal of schooling is not just to educate but also to force minorities into conforming to the ways of being, and of languaging, of the majority. Thus, Deaf bilingualism has taught us not only to enlarge our concepts but also to renew our struggles to ensure that all language minorities be given an equitable education in which their language practices are not only used but also valued for what they really are.
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