What is dual about bilingualism? From the point of view of monolingual people, everything; from the perspective of bilingual people themselves, nothing is dual, nothing is simply two, or just three, or even more. And yet, as more language minorities become bilingual through immigration and increased contact with others, and as more language majorities incorporate global language practices, especially English, more educators are constraining it to a duality. This ignores the enormous linguistic variation of bilingual speakers and constrains the possibilities of constructing an education that truly reflects the fluidity of language practices and identifications in the 21st century. Increasingly, educators and scholars talk about bilingualism in a 'dual way', referring to dual language learners, dual language classrooms, dual language teachers, dual language books and even dual language programs. But what is dual about bilingualism? And what does this shift in discourse, from bilingual to dual, mean? It is precisely the exploration of this question that is the topic of this chapter.

To do so, this chapter focuses on bilingual education in the US, describing how it is that the discursive shift – from bilingual education to dual language education – has been constructed. The chapter explores reasons for the shift, and considers how this naming change has constrained equal educational opportunities for language minority students in the US.

This chapter then explores how this discursive shift has had the effect of further normalizing monoglossic ideologies within studies of bilingualism and education in additional languages. Monoglossic ideologies perceive
bilingualism from a monolingual angle and see only the sum of two separate languages. By normalizing the ‘dual’ through a monolingual perspective, the language education field uses terms and concepts that have had the effect of negating the fluidity of bilingual language practices and furthering inequalities in the education of language minorities.

This chapter deconstructs the dual monoglossic concepts that have been so central in the field of language education and that may have contributed to some of the failures that can be observed today in the promotion of plurilingual practices for a global world. These concepts, named with a duality that comes from monoglossic understandings of bilingualism that were prevalent in the 20th century are (1) diglossia and (2) additive and subtractive bilingualism, with its concomitant concepts of L1/L2, mother tongue and native speaker. Data is then presented from a study of two bilingual classrooms – a kindergarten and a fifth grade classroom – to illustrate the dynamic bilingualism that is evidence of more heteroglossic language practices.

In countering the ‘dual’ in the language education field, this chapter argues for the use of translanguaging (García, 2009) as a bilingual pedagogy. Data from a study of a secondary school for emergent bilingual students are then presented to show how a pedagogy that builds on the fluid languaging of bilingual children holds much promise to meaningfully educate bilingual students, especially those from minority communities.

From Bilingual to Dual: The US Case

Histories and ideologies of US bilingual education

Bilingual education to educate immigrants is not new in the US, although its use has waxed and waned throughout the centuries. The contemporary bilingual education movement in the US has to be understood as a civil rights victory for the more equitable education of language minorities, and especially of Spanish-speaking Latinos. By the time the Bilingual Education Act was reauthorized in 1974, bilingual education was defined as transitional; that is, the use of the students’ home languages was authorized only until the children learned English, at which time they had to be transitioned to English-only classrooms. Nevertheless, the focus was on providing these children with equal educational opportunity, as was evident in the US Supreme Court decision of Lau v. Nichols (1974). During the 1970s, bilingual education programs, mostly of the transitional type, grew in school systems with high language minority enrollment.

The prevailing ideology about bilingualism in education was then based on the distinction that the Canadian scholar William Lambert (1974) had
made about two types of bilingualism — *additive bilingualism* and *subtractive bilingualism*. Lambert referred to additive bilingualism as the type fostered by bilingual education programs for majorities, based on Lambert’s substantive experience in the creation and development of Canadian immersion bilingual education, in which a ‘second language’ was added to a ‘first language’, and both languages were subsequently maintained and developed. Subtractive bilingualism, however, was the type involved in the transitional bilingual education of language minorities in the US, in which the child’s ‘first language’ was subtracted as the ‘second language’ was taught. US bilingual educators involved in the struggle for more educational opportunity for language minority students advocated strongly for additive bilingual programs, but programs other than transitional bilingual education programs, that is, ‘developmental maintenance bilingual education programs’ that were developed in the 1960s and early 1970s, started to be dismantled (for a history of bilingual education in the US, see especially Crawford, 2004).

In the midst of the growth and struggle over bilingual education programs to teach language minority children in the US, global and local shifts started to change the linguistic landscape. Responding to geopolitical as well as technological changes, there were changes in flows of information, goods and people, as well as ideologies. In the US, the nature of immigration was transformed, the consequence of a greater need for labor that was supported by changes to the Immigration and Naturalization Services Act of 1965. Quotas that restricted immigration, particularly of Latin Americans, Africans and Asians, were lifted. The result has been the greater linguistic diversity that we find in the US today, coupled with the greater resistance to bilingualism. I look at the greater linguistic diversity in the next section. I then describe the growing opposition to bilingualism and bilingual education in the US, coupled with the discursive shift that has taken place — from ‘bilingual’ to ‘dual’. I argue that this in turn had led to decreased educational opportunities for language minorities in the US. I propose that the arguments that advocates for bilingualism in education are using to resist the opposition are old and inadequate. While the geopolitical, technological and sociolinguistic terrain has shifted, many language education scholars and teachers continue to use instruments from the 20th century – linear conceptualizations of bilingualism that affirm a duality which has little to do with the fluid discursive practices of the 21st century.

**Language diversity in US classrooms**

Although census figures do not tell the whole picture, or even an accurate one, I start with what we know of the categorical counts made
by the US census. Although I argue against many of these categories and
deconstruct them later on, census figures offer a first approach to explor­ing diversity.

In the 21st century the US experienced not only a marked increase in its
foreign-born population, but also a new complexity in immigration.
Although in 1990 the foreign-born made up 8% of the total US population,
in 2009 that had increased to 17% (US Census Bureau, 1990, 2009). There
are many more children who are foreign-born in US classrooms today (and
parents of those children) than in 1990. The foreign-born make up almost
one-fifth of the US population (and most likely more, since many of the
undocumented are undercounted). But beyond the greater numbers there is
also more diversity of language, racial and ancestry backgrounds than ever
before. For example, Latinos, who often (although not always) speak Spanish,
make up 16% of the US population, and Asians, who often speak many lan­
guages, account for 4% (US Census Bureau, 2009).

The growth of the Latino and Asian populations in the United States,
coupled with the continued residential segregation of many US commu­
nities of color, means that many schools have overwhelming majorities
of, for example, Spanish speakers or Chinese speakers. But even within
this supposed homogeneity there is much language variation, as students
come from different national and local contexts, immigrate at different
times and for numerous reasons and have varied lengths of residency in
the US.

This greater linguistic complexity has consequences for how language
minorities are perceived and classrooms structured. Oftentimes teachers
confuse nationality for language. Teachers in classrooms often only notice
those children who speak English with difficulty, those that the federal
government refers to as 'limited English proficient', and US educators
often call 'English language learners'. And yet, many children whom
teachers notice only as monolingual English speakers come from very
diverse language backgrounds; and their home language practices are not
solely in English.

The more complex diversity of the US in the 21st century has been met
with increased opposition. As we will see in the next section, in some states
bilingual education has been simply outlawed. But in others the resistance has
been managed by a discursive shift — from 'bilingual' to 'dual'. It is to be
noted, however, that advocates of bilingualism themselves have many times
adopted this discursive shift, ignoring how this shift is enmeshed in social
systems of domination and subordination of groups, relating to language,
ethnicity, race and class (for more on language ideologies, see especially Irvine
& Gal, 2000).
US bilingual education under attack

Xenophobic ideologies have become more prevalent as the US linguistic landscape has grown to be more multilingual. US English was founded in 1983, claiming to preserve ‘the unifying role of the English language in the United States’ (http://www.usenglish.org/view/3) and lobbying for a constitutional amendment to make English the official language. And although efforts to pass a constitutional amendment at the federal level to make English the official language of the US have been abandoned, by 2010 28 states had passed English-only laws (García & Kleifgen, 2010).

As children and parents became increasingly multilingual, bilingual education as a way to teach immigrant children came under attack. English-only statutes that banned bilingual education were passed in two states with large Spanish-speaking populations – California in 1998 and Arizona in 2000. In 2002, Massachusetts also passed a proposition that replaced transitional bilingual education with ‘structured English immersion programs’. Bilingual educators were forced to give up the temporary ‘safe spaces’ (Pratt, 1991) offered to recent immigrants in transitional bilingual classrooms, and bilingual education programs were increasingly substituted with English-only spaces.

At the same time, the word ‘bilingual’ was struck out of every single federal education office and project name, as well as legislation. For example, the Office of Bilingual and Minority Language Affairs came to be called the Office of English Language Acquisition. Even more significant was that the Bilingual Education Act itself was substituted by Title III of the No Child Left Behind Legislation of 2002, now named Language Instruction for Limited English Proficient and Immigrant Students. The word ‘bilingual’ had become the ‘B’ word (Crawford, 2007); that is, a word not to be named.

Some educators pointed to the linguistic complexity of classrooms and claimed that bilingual education was no longer possible in neighborhoods and communities that had become highly multilingual. On the other hand, through the renewed emphasis of No Child Left Behind, the education of immigrant students and of those whose English was developing became, rightly so, everyone’s concern. Bilingual students were renamed ‘limited English proficient students’ by the federal government, and ‘English language learners’ by educators and the general public. In so doing, bilingualism was further restricted because now teachers who were not bilingual were in control of the education of these children, and the bilingualism of the students could be ignored. Increasingly, bilingual teachers were substituted by English-as-a-second-language teachers.
While ceding many bilingual spaces to English-only instruction, the bilingual profession decided to accept the other discursive changes that were taking place. In an effort to rescue part of the bilingual education enterprise, they promoted the use of ‘dual language’ education, and favored it over what they learned to call ‘bilingual education’, that is, transitional bilingual education, something that had to be outlawed in some states because it was transitional, subtractive and simply ‘bad’.

In the beginning, the term ‘dual language’ referred to two-way bilingual education programs in which immigrant language minority children who were developing English were taught alongside children who spoke only English, with all becoming bilingual through education (Lessow-Hurley, 2005). But this type of bilingual education also became enmeshed in the flows of globalization, for it became no longer always possible to delineate one language group, or one ‘speech community’, from the other. For example, the Latino group, as we said before, had become highly heterogeneous, with many speaking English only or being bilingual. Thus, those who spoke English were now often Latinos, Asians and other immigrants whose home languages were not English. In some neighborhoods these ‘dual language’ programs became nothing more than developmental bilingual education programs in disguise, a way to provide the only means possible for Latino children with different bilingual proficiencies to be educated in both English and Spanish. And yet, as bilingual educators adapted to the discursive change that was being proposed in an effort to hold on to some bilingual instruction, bilingual education programs continued to be dismantled. Mostly abandoned, the ideologies, programs and pedagogies of bilingualism that remained were rooted in another era that had little to do with the complex language practices of the 21st century.

The Promise of ‘Dual Language’ Unfulfilled

As a way to survive, bilingual educators put all their eggs in the ‘dual language’ basket, and turned their backs on transitional bilingual education programs and on developmental maintenance bilingual programs. But as Guadalupe Valdés (1997) warned early on and many others have repeated (García, 2006), the dual language basket of two-way bilingual programs had a hole, and thus its promise remains unfulfilled. The intent of ‘dual language’ was to promote bilingualism among all children, language majorities and language minorities. But in the growing anti-bilingual, xenophobic climate, only a few enlightened parents recognized its potential.

‘Dual language’ also became associated with a particular type of bilingual education where, regardless of language profile, students were instructed,
at least 50% of the time, in the language other than English. Additionally, ‘dual language’ also meant that bilingual education could continue beyond the time in which a child was declared English proficient, usually through elementary school. But again, in the growing anti-bilingual education climate, few ‘dual language’ programs of any kind were developed.

Eventually, ‘dual language’ began to mean a type of bilingual education that led to bilingualism, whereas ‘bilingual education’ began to mean transition to English-only monolingualism. Study after study declared the supremacy and effectiveness of ‘dual language’ over transitional bilingual education programs (Collier, 1995; Ramírez, 1992; Thomas & Collier, 2002). In the way that it was not named, bilingual education was silenced. How could all parents be convinced of the value of bilingualism when even advocates declared that ‘dual language’ was good and ‘bilingual’ was bad? Little by little, transitional bilingual education lost ground, but these programs were replaced not by ‘dual language’ programs, but by English-only programs. Whereas at the elementary level some efforts were made to develop these ‘dual language’ programs, at the secondary level they remain mostly nonexistent, leaving adolescent immigrant students with only one option – English-only. For example, in New York City in 2010–2011 these ‘dual language’ programs represented only 3.8% of the programs used to teach immigrant children who were developing English (New York City Department of Education, 2011), and there was only one ‘dual language’ education program at the secondary level. In this way, bilingual students have been increasingly robbed of the opportunity to use their bilingualism to construct meaning and to acquire deep understandings and knowledge.

Transgressing the Duality of Diglossia and Additive/Subtractive Bilingualism: The Power of Transglossia and Dynamic Bilingualism

Throughout the 20th century the concept of diglossia dominated the ways in which we viewed the bilingualism of groups. Diglossia, according to Fishman (1967), who extends Ferguson’s original 1959 definition, refers to the idea that the stable bilingualism of societal groups could only respond to the functional allocation of languages, with one language (a ‘High’ language) used for specific purposes in a certain domain of more prestige, and the other one (a ‘Low’ language) used for others. Diglossia was developed when a ‘speech community’ was understood as stable and homogeneous and when power was not distinctly explored as a sociolinguistic dimension.
Diglossia paved the way for our understanding of individual bilingualism as linear, with languages added. The norm described was either monolingualism or a monoglossic bilingualism with a High and a Low language functionally distributed. Thus, bilingualism could not be anything but a 'second language' added to a 'first language' (additive bilingualism), or, in language minority situations, a 'first language' subtracted and replaced by a 'second language' (subtractive bilingualism).

The normalization of the power differentials of the languages involved in societal diglossia, combined with the conceptualization of emergent bilinguals as simply learners of a 'second language', and having a 'first language', a 'native language', a 'mother tongue', has meant that a more flexible bilingualism in itself has not been recognized. One could be a 'language learner', but one could not be a 'bilingual' with a complex linguistic repertoire that has features that cannot be simply assigned to one language or another. By reifying the concept of a 'second language', the language education field has negated the idea that it is possible to be simply bilingual, and that we are all emergent bilinguals (for more on the concept of emergent bilingualism, see García, 2009; García & Kleifgen, 2010). In schools in the US, for example, teachers are well aware of 'English language learners' for whom English is a 'second language'. And teachers are equally ignorant of the fact that by developing language practices that are seen as English, students are becoming bilingual. Once they pass an examination that declares them 'English fluent', their bilingualism is completely ignored.

On the other hand, by reifying the concept of a 'High', 'first' or 'native language', privilege or exclusion is assigned. For example, 'native' English speakers are often sought-after in Asian countries as English teachers, often meaning monolingual Americans, English and Australians, preferably white, with other bilinguals excluded.

Speaking of 'mother tongue', Skutnabb-Kangas (1981) points out that depending on the criteria used, the term could mean different things for any bilingual person. It could mean, as with 'first language', first learned. But even order of acquisition is problematic for bilinguals, since many bilinguals grow up with complex language practices that cannot be easily assigned to a 'first' or 'second language'; that is, there is bilingual first language acquisition (BFLA) (for more on this topic, see Genesee, 2003; see also De Houwer, 2009). According to Skutnabb-Kangas (1981), a mother tongue could also be, as with 'first language', the language one uses most, or the language one knows best, or the language with which one identifies, or the language with which others identify the speaker. But for bilinguals, all of these different criteria could result in a different answer or in no answer at all, since it is often impossible for bilinguals to view their language practices according to
monolingual views of autonomous languages. Regardless of the complexity of criteria, the problem with all of these terms is that they insist on shaping bilingualism according to monolingual monolingual classifications of one or another autonomous language, when bilingual practices are a lot more complex and interrelated, especially in the globalized world of the 21st century.

In the 21st century, the concept of diglossia has been called into question, as more situations of stable societal multilingualism without functional allocation are described, and as critical sociolinguistics has explored aspects of power. Many have used the complex and stable multilingualism of India and many African countries to question diglossic arrangements as the only way to achieve stable social bilingualism (see, for example, Makoni & Pennycook, 2007; Mohanty, 2006). In the European Union, the promotion of plurilingualism has posited that it is possible for citizens to acquire and use different language practices to varying degrees and for specific purposes (Council of Europe, 2000: 168), even if within the same space and for the same function, and without threatening home language practices. The spread of English throughout a globalized world has also meant that more groups of people use English without giving up their language practices, and most often use English language practices and other language practices in interrelationship, as the multimodalities made possible through advanced technology present us with different language practices simultaneously.

The greater movement of peoples and communication in the 21st century has also made us realize that the concept of a homogenous speech community tied to a national territory is flawed. Instead of ‘speech communities’ what we have are ‘communities of practices’, groups of people who interact and communicate regularly.

I have argued elsewhere (García, 2009) that a societal stable, and yet dynamic, communicative network in the 21st century, with many languages in functional interrelationship, might be better called ‘transglossia’. Transglossia has the potential to release ways of speaking of subaltern groups that have been previously fixed within static language identities and hierarchical language arrangements and that are constrained by the modern/colonial world system. Transglossia can develop what Mignolo (2000: 249) calls ‘an other tongue’, ‘the necessary condition for “an other thinking” and for the possibility of moving beyond the defense of national languages and national ideologies ...’. Whereas diglossia was said to rely on static language patterns in different domains to achieve stability and preservation of group bilingual practices, transglossia refers to the fluid, yet stable, language practices of bilingual and multilingual societies that question traditional descriptions built on national ideologies, and that also interrogate the notion of bilinguals.
possessing two autonomous systems of languages (for a critique of the autonomous position of language, see Makoni & Pennycook, 2007).

The language practices of today's bilinguals are not additive, and do not respond to an additive or a subtractive model of bilingualism. In today's flows, language practices are multiple and ever adjusting to the multilingual multimodal terrain of the communicative act. I have referred to this type of bilingualism as dynamic.

A dynamic conceptualization of bilingualism (García, 2009) goes beyond the notion of two autonomous languages, of a first and a second language, and of additive or subtractive bilingualism. Instead, dynamic bilingualism suggests that the language practices of all bilinguals are complex and interrelated; they do not emerge in a linear way. As García (2009) has said, they do not result in either the balanced wheels of two bicycles (as in additive bilingualism) or in a unicycle (as in subtractive bilingualism), but instead bilingualism is the all-terrain vehicle that results when individuals adapt their language practices to both the ridges and craters of communication in uneven terrains (see also, García & Kleifgen, 2010). Dynamic bilingualism sees languages not as monolithic systems made up of discreet sets of skills, but as a series of social practices that are embedded in a web of social relations (for a similar view on literacy practices, see Pennycook, 2010; Street, 1984).

Within a dynamic conceptualization of bilingualism, bilinguals are valued for their differing multi-competence (Cook, 2008) because their lives, minds and actions are different from those of monolinguals. As Herdina and Jessner (2002) have pointed out, the interactions of bilinguals' interdependent language systems create new structures that are not found in monolingual systems. Learning is then not just the 'taking in' of linguistic forms by learners, but 'the constant adaptation of their linguistic resources in the service of meaning-making in response to the affordances that emerge in the communicative situation, which is, in turn, affected by learners' adaptability' (Larsen-Freeman & Cameron, 2008: 185). We turn now to exploring the more transglossic relationship of Spanish and English among US Latinos, and their dynamic bilingualism. To do so, we focus on a kindergarten class where young five-year-old Latinos are becoming bilingual; and on a fifth grade class where bilingual Latinos speak out about their own bilingualism.

Transglossia and dynamic bilingualism in a kindergarten

In this bilingual kindergarten, of the type known as 'dual language', all five-year-olds are emergent bilinguals; half of the children are learning Spanish, whereas the other half are learning English. The program supposedly compartmentalizes the use of the two languages by having a 'side-by-side'
arrangement in which one teacher teaches only in Spanish, while the other teacher teaches only in English and vice versa. The sociolinguistic reality of student language use in the classroom is very different.

On one occasion, Maia Starcevic, the English teacher, has taken the children who are new to English outside, for a lesson on comparisons. The children are sitting in a circle and I’m sitting next to a girl, Angélica, who is mumbling under her breath. The teacher is asking the students to repeat: ‘This tree is bigger. That tree is smaller.’ Angélica is trying out under her breath what she knows. ‘This tree is…’, and then she stops, and grins to herself as she says: ‘grander’ (Observation, 23 September 2007). Angélica draws ‘grande’ from her home language practices to make sense of the new language practices that she is confronting in school. She does not keep the ‘grande’ at home, and she does not attach ‘er’ to words she learns in school, but draws on her entire linguistic repertoire to appropriate and integrate into her life the new words and sounds she is hearing at school for the first time.

That the bilingualism that these young children display is dynamic, and not simply additive or subtractive, is evidenced by a conversation between young children who are more bilingual with those who are less so. One day, Eric, who is bilingual, is helping Enrique in an art project. Enrique is a talented artist who is learning English. I reproduce below the dialogue in which they were engaged:

**Eric:** ¿Quieres deste así?
[Do you want this one this way?]

**Enrique:** OK

**Eric:** Cortando algo ... Pa pegar ... Ahí.
[Cutting something ... To glue ... There!]
And now we’re going to put a line.

**Teacher:** Enrique, are you writing your name?

**Eric:** Tu nombre. Así Enrique ... [Writes Enrique’s name across the paper] Mira.
This way.

[Your name. This way Enrique ..., look ...]

**Enrique:** Ohhhhh.

**Eric:** ¿Quieres más ...?
[Asking Ofelia as he searches for the word for ‘glue’.]
How do you say in Spanish [pointing to the bottle of glue]?
Clearly Eric displays a dynamic bilingualism that allows him to use his entire linguistic repertoire flexibly to make sure that Enrique, as well as the teacher, understands him. He uses an entire semiotic system meaningfully and competently, knowing when what he is saying has to be said in one or the other language, and understanding that if accompanied by an action or gesture, Enrique will understand. For example, as he draws a line he uses English to tell Enrique: ‘And now we’re going to put a line.’ And as he starts to color he adds: ‘now we got to just color’. For Eric, Spanish and English do not exist in different worlds, or even domains, they function as part of an entire linguistic repertoire, in interrelationship, to make meaning.

Transglossia and dynamic bilingualism in a fifth grade classroom

In a fifth grade bilingual classroom, Rodolfo is telling me about his bilingualism, as he explains his complex language use:

Yo tengo una vida muy loca porque yo sé cómo rezar en español pero no en inglés, pero sé como más de inglés que español. [...] For me it’s easier in English, well because I feel more comfortable in English, but when I talk to my parents I speak in Spanish. And sometimes I only speak in Spanish, then Spanish and a little bit of English. (Interview, 5 November 2007)

[I have a crazy life because I know how to pray in Spanish but not in English, but I know, like, more English than Spanish.]

Rodolfo knows that his bilingualism must respond to the many situations in which he finds himself, with features from Spanish and English in interrelationship because his bilingualism must address the complex social worlds of Latinos in the US.

But it is perhaps what his classmate Antonio tells me that most explicitly explains the dynamic bilingualism that characterizes the language use of these US Latino bilingual students: ‘Even though Spanish runs through my heart, English rules my veins’ (Interview, 22 October 2007). Clearly it is English that rules, but Spanish is what keeps life going, the motor that pumps the English. Without either, life for these bilingual students would stop.

A model of societal transglossia and of individual dynamic bilingualism needs a different pedagogy. In the next section we develop what we consider to be the key to an effective bilingual pedagogy – translinguaging as pedagogy.
Countering the Duality of L1/L2 Pedagogies: Translanguaging as Pedagogy

Learning another language cannot be the result of a simple transmission of knowledge from teacher to students, but of collaborative social practices in which students try out ideas and actions (Lave & Wenger, 1991), and thus socially construct their learning and language practices (Vygotsky, 1978). A constructivist bilingual pedagogy by which students socially negotiate their learning in interaction with others, while teachers facilitate it, must rely on bilingual strategies.

Jim Cummins' interdependence hypothesis posits that ‘to the extent that instruction in Lx is effective in promoting proficiency in Lx, transfer of this proficiency to Ly will occur provided there is adequate exposure to Ly’ (Cummins, 2000: 38). Resting on the interdependence of the languages of bilinguals, Cummins has moved away from discussing an L1/L2 dichotomy, characterizing the way in which languages had been conceptualized in Canadian immersion bilingual classrooms in the 20th century as ‘two solitudes’ (Cummins, 2007), and calling for bilingual instructional strategies in the classroom as a way of promoting ‘identities of competence among language learners from socially marginalized groups, thereby enabling them to engage more confidently with literacy and other academic work in both languages’ (Cummins, 2007: 238).

Garcia (2009), extending Williams (cited in Baker, 2001), takes up translanguaging as a constructivist pedagogy, referring to the ways in which bilingual students and teachers engage in complex discursive practices that include, at times, the home language practices of students in order to ‘make sense’ of teaching and learning, to communicate and appropriate subject knowledge, and to develop academic language practices. In conceptualization, translanguaging differs from code-switching in that it refers not simply to a shift between two languages, but to the use of complex discursive practices that cannot be assigned to one or another code. Bilingual students use these complex and fluid discursive practices to perform their learning – reading, writing, listening, discussing, taking notes, writing reports and essays, taking exams – by drawing on their entire linguistic repertoire (for more on the use of translanguaging, see especially, Blackledge & Creese, 2010; and Creese & Blackledge, 2010).

Translanguaging as a pedagogy refers then to the use of bilingual students’ language practices flexibly in order to develop new understandings and new language practices, including academic language practices. Translanguaging pedagogies are particularly important for immigrant students
who are emergent bilinguals because they build on students' strengths. They also reduce the risk of alienation at school by incorporating languaging and cultural references familiar to immigrant students.

Translanguaging in the bilingual classroom is precisely a way of working in the gap between, on the one hand, the global designs of nation states and their education systems that set up bilingual programs with strict compartmentalization between languages, and on the other, the local histories of peoples who language differently, especially in bilingual situations. Translanguaging in US classrooms shows the tensions between the global design of the US in educating immigrants and language minorities and the local histories of those students. In their design, classrooms separate languages and are sometimes supposed to exclude the minority language. In reality, students and teachers violate these compartmentalizations, acting on the new meanings of what it is to be an American bilingual.

Translanguaging as pedagogy in secondary schools

To contextualize a translanguaging pedagogy, we draw from one example of a high school in a study on Latino emergent bilinguals in New York City high schools (García, forthcoming; García et al., 2012). This is a high school for Spanish-speaking newcomer immigrants, part of a network of high schools for newcomers in New York City known as International High Schools (for more on these schools, see García & Sylvan, 2011).

Camila Leiva is a teacher of ‘English’. On this particular Monday, Camila is working on the theme of literary conflicts. First she plays for the students the rap ‘Si se Puede’, by El Chivo of Quinto Sol. ‘Si se Puede’ communicates the idea that ‘Yes, we can’, as issues of racism and discrimination against immigrants are identified. Camila provides the students with a worksheet where they are asked to translate the lyrics, which are printed in Spanish, into English, as well as to identify key words, the type of conflict there is and the reasons for the conflict. After an extensive discussion with the students, she then plays the rap ‘Mosh’ by Eminem. Again, she provides the students with the lyrics, this time in English and asks them to translate them into Spanish.

The transcript that follows is from the classroom dialogue after the listening of ‘Si se Puede’ (C stands for Camila, S for students):

C: Four million US citizens are being separated from their fathers and mothers because their parents are being deported.
S1: Que los niños nacieron aquí. Legalmente son ciudadanos. Pero los padres no.
S2: Entonces esta es la preocupación de que los separen ...
C: It's a very worrying situation. So, because we don't have that much time and I want to get to the Eminem video ... What are four keywords? Las palabras importantes, palabras claves?

S3: Deportar.
S4: Families together.
S5: Protection.
S6: Discrimination.

C: I love how even though the song is in Spanish, we're choosing words in English. Quinto Sol grew up in the US but they do hip-hop in Spanish, and we're doing the same.

C: What problem do you see in the song?
S7: That many white people don't like Spanish people.
S8: It's the voice of the people.

C: The chivo, the rapper, says that some people don't like Latinos but ...

S1: No sé cómo decirlo en inglés, pero ... que los latinos tenemos que pagar lo que otras personas ...

Ss: ... Don't shoot her down. We're respecting each other’s opinions. What else do we see?

S1: Que las familias, this guy, every time he has problem. Taking care something. It's a Latino that help. [...] 

C: The custodian is a Latino person. And who takes care of his daughter?

Ss: Latinos!
S2: Miss, ¿yo puedo poner que muchas familias están separadas?
C: A causa de qué?
S2: Deportan los inmigrantes.

C: How did you start the answer?
S2: They want the Latinos to get out of America.
C: What do you think the problem is? What is the type of literary conflict?

Ss: Me, me, me ...

C: I like the enthusiasm. What type do you think it is?
S3: I have three. Because he has a problem with other people, and cuando fueron reparar el carro; no es, pero que tiene un problema, pues así, character vs. character.

C: What else can he say? Good ... new hands. People who haven't spoken.

S4: Porque tiene un problema consigo mismo: character vs. himself.
S5: Porque los Latinos es una sociedad, y él es un character.

C: Why do you think ...
S5: que lo quieren matar?
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C: Ramón, cuéntanos en español.
C: Latinos, are we the majority or the minority?
Ss: Majority/minority! Somos mayoría en números! No minoría!
C: They call us a minority, even though we’re a majority in many places. I’m going to give you some time before you finish. Si ya terminaron, avancen a la segunda parte a la canción de Eminem ...

(Observation, 28 February 2011)

Camila translanguages to involve students, to extend what she is saying, to clarify, to ask questions, to reinforce what has been said, and to advance the pace of the lesson. But beyond the discourse functions enabled by translanguaging, this pedagogy makes possible a social criticality that is important for immigrant students. For example, Camila uses translanguaging as a way to implement a social justice curriculum. Through translanguaging she gives voice to those who do not speak, she problematizes social situations, and she works through the tension that exists between minority and majority society. Translanguaging also enables her to construct her students’ fluid identifications, as she encourages the students to use their entire linguistic repertoires. She explicitly tells them: ‘Even though the song is in Spanish, we’re choosing words in English. Quinto Sol grew up in the US but they do hip-hop in Spanish, and we’re doing the same.’ Camila encourages these ‘crossings’ (Rampton, 1995) as ways of building a US Latino group pan-ethnicity, for she tells the students: ‘Los Latinos es una sociedad.’ And for this US Latino society to develop, a tranglossic interfunctionality that draws from the entire linguistic repertoire of their dynamic bilingualism is most important.

Translanguaging as a pedagogy thus offers the alternative of developing dynamic bilinguals. For US Latinos this means the possibility that they will be released from the constraints of both an ‘Anglophobic’ ideology that demands English monolingualism for US citizens, and a ‘Hispanophobic’ ideology that blames US Latinos for speaking ‘Spanglish’ (Otheguy & Stern, 2010), or for their ‘incomplete acquisition’ of their ‘heritage’ language. Translanguaging as a pedagogy holds the promise of developing US Latinos who use their dynamic bilingualism in ways that develop a transglossic repertoire, able to meet the global, national and social needs of a multilingual future.

Conclusion

This chapter has considered how theoretical frameworks that have been used to study bilingualism in the past may be responsible for the
misunderstandings and misconstructions of bilingualism that are prevalent throughout the world today, and most especially in the United States. By countering the dual in bilingualism, this chapter offers possibilities of different theoretical lenses to study the complex discursive practices of bilinguals, especially in schools — transglossia, dynamic bilingualism and translanguaging.

The chapter suggests that the global designs of nation states and their education systems have much to do with social systems of domination and subordination of groups relating to language, ethnicity, race and class. By focusing on the local positionality of bilingual speakers, and especially of emergent bilingual students, it is possible to break out of the duality that strictly separates the dominant language of the state, and especially the academic standard language, from the language practices of people and students. It is by encouraging the use of the complex discursive practices of bilingual citizens; that is, their translanguaging, that linguistic repertoires will be extended to also encompass the standard languages that states often require for the full participation of its citizens.

Especially in classrooms of language minorities, and particularly in those where students are emergent bilinguals, translanguaging as a pedagogy offers the possibility of producing integrated knowledge, deep understandings and coherent identifications. To do so, schools must build transglossic spaces where students’ multiple language practices are acknowledged and used. These transglossic spaces will no doubt often exist alongside the diglossic curricular language arrangements of many bilingual education programs. But until we design classroom spaces where bilingual students’ complex discursive practices are at the center of instruction, the promise of bilingual education to empower all students, and especially language minorities, will remain unfulfilled.

Note:
(1) This data comes from a study of this kindergarten class which was reported in García (2011).
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