

# Review of Research in Education

<http://rre.aera.net>

---

## U.S. Spanish and Education: Global and Local Intersections

Ofelia García

*REVIEW OF RESEARCH IN EDUCATION* 2014 38: 58

DOI: 10.3102/0091732X13506542

The online version of this article can be found at:

<http://rre.sagepub.com/content/38/1/58>

---

Published on behalf of



American Educational Research Association



<http://www.sagepublications.com>

Additional services and information for *Review of Research in Education* can be found at:

Email Alerts: <http://rre.aera.net/alerts>

Subscriptions: <http://rre.aera.net/subscriptions>

Reprints: <http://www.aera.net/reprints>

Permissions: <http://www.aera.net/permissions>

>> [Version of Record](#) - Mar 6, 2014

[What is This?](#)

## Chapter 3

### U.S. Spanish and Education: Global and Local Intersections

OFELIA GARCÍA

*City University of New York*

Spanish, as we know it today, made its debut as “a world language” at the very end of the 15th century in a highly heterogeneous languagescape—the newly constructed nation-state of Spain and the newly found Americas.<sup>1</sup> Spanish grappled with bringing together the many forms of Romance spoken in Castile and Aragon at the same time when it was brought to new shores where people spoke in other ways. Thus, what we know as Spanish today emerged from contact with people who languaged very differently, both within the Iberian Peninsula and in the overseas colonies. Interestingly, the spread of “Spanish” was not simply imposed by the Crown on its subjects by coercion but was rather a product of hegemony. It was the authority gained by the wealth in the colonies, its coloniality (Mignolo, 2000), that gave Spanish its power and prestige and the impetus to spread in the Peninsula itself. From its very beginning, Spanish became the language of Empire as a result of its colonial condition.

In much the same way, Spanish today has achieved global status<sup>2</sup> precisely because of its coloniality. It is the colonial relationship that Latin America has maintained with the United States that has resulted in the presence of 50.6 million Latinos in the United States, representing 16% of the U.S. population (U.S. Census Bureau, 2010). And it is the buying power of subaltern subjects, now in one of the most powerful countries in the world, that is giving Spanish its authority as it positions itself globally. However, as in the 16th century, it is not the *languaging* of colonial subjects—that is, their language practices—that are favored. As we will see, the language planning agencies of Spain, and those operating in Latin America, continue to attempt to impose certain language regimes on those they still consider colonial subjects. As the Spanish state exploits the great number of Spanish speakers in the United States to bolster the sociolinguistic situation of Spanish within its own national borders and

*Review of Research in Education*

March 2014, Vol. 38, pp. 58-80

DOI: 10.3102/0091732X13506542

© 2014 AERA. <http://rre.aera.net>

abroad, the United States imposes English on Latinos by constructing Spanish speakers as inferior subaltern subjects.

Much distance separates the 16th century from the 21st century. In the 21st century, as globalization and its new technologies have spurred the movement of people, information, and goods across the world, nation-states are caught simultaneously in acts of interrelationship and acts of self-protection. The diasporic people who are Spanish speaking today show, more than ever, the effects of dynamic and changing sociopolitical arrangements. Despite much early movement of people and transgression of borders (see, e.g., the Inca Garcilaso's *Comentarios Reales*), from the 16th century until the 20th century the language diversity of Spain and of what became Latin America was contained within political borders. Today, however, space itself has lost its territorial boundaries. It is individuals that embody space, and their interactions contain features associated with what we have learned to call different languages (see Blommaert, 2010; Makoni & Pennycook, 2007; Pennycook, 2010). In the past, the language diversity of Spain, Latin America, and the United States could be "hidden" from public view because the discourse was controlled by a single national power with a monoglossic discourse against diverse and heterogeneous practices. Today, however, language practices neither correspond to official national borders nor respond to a single center of power or express a unitary identity.

In the 21st century there has been increased recognition of a new sociolinguistic arrangement of mobile linguistic resources (Blommaert, 2010; Canagarajah, 2013). And yet there is little recognition of these new ways of languaging in education. It is precisely the clash between educational systems that have been designed to protect or promote the nation-state as the preferred form of political organization and its nationalist linguistic identity, and the ways in which speakers, now in mobile interactions across spaces use and embody language practices to break out from the control of nation-states, that results in much educational failure and the resulting academic inequity among groups.

This chapter will argue that the failure of Spanish language education policies in the United States to educate both Latinos and non-Latinos has to do with the clash between three positions—(a) the English language, characterized by U.S. educational authorities as the unique and powerful *lingua franca*; (b) the Spanish language, as defined by the language authorities in Spain and Latin America as a global language of influence; and (c) language as lived and practiced by bilingual Latino speakers. U.S. educational policies treat the "Spanish" of its Latino students as a problem to be eradicated because of negative attitudes toward bilingualism. At the same time, U.S. educational policies also view the "English" of "nonnative" Latinos as a problem, guaranteeing that monolingual English speakers conserve advantages (for a critique of the concept of "native," see especially Bonfiglio, 2010). The language authorities of Spain and Latin America also see U.S. "Spanish" as a problem, needing remediation. Yet, at the same time, Spain needs U.S. Spanish to bolster the status of Spanish as a global language. It is U.S. Spanish, as spoken in one of the most powerful nations in

the world, that is the dagger in the heart of global Spanish as constructed by Spain, as well as the motor driving what may be a global use of Spanish. It is also U.S. Spanish that pierces the bubble of U.S. English. The result of these irreconcilable positions has been the failure of Spanish language education policies in the United States to educate U.S. Latinos and promote their bilingualism.

Recently, there has been a marked increase in all Spanish language education programs in the United States. But as we will see in this article, Spanish language education programs in the United States have not been very successful. This chapter will argue that the failure of these Spanish as a “foreign” language programs also lies in their insistence that Spanish, the “target” language, be kept separate from English, which is linked tightly to a U.S. monolingual identity. Spanish is promoted as a global language of authority outside the United States, and at the same time, it distances itself from the practices of bilingual subaltern subjects. The result, as we will see, is the failure of Spanish language education in the United States for all.

Because language education policy is the purview of nation-states as they organize educational programs and curricula, this chapter starts by offering a historical perspective of how Spanish was linguistically constituted. It does so to help us understand the role that teaching Spanish, and in Spanish, has had in promoting the standardization and spread of Spanish from its origins in Castile to its global position today, especially in the United States.

The chapter then focuses on the teaching of Spanish in the United States and the relationship of ideologies and practices on Spanish language education policy, as carried out internally by federal, state, and local U.S. educational agencies, as well as by external agencies controlled by Spain. In bringing all these perspectives together, the chapter contributes to the understanding that the future of successful Spanish language teaching and learning in the United States, as well as the academic success of Latinos in U.S. schools, rests on the acceptance of practices that honor their fluid bilingual languaging—their *translanguaging* (García, 2009a). As we will see, teaching U.S. Latinos today without including their Spanish language practices restricts their voices, knowledge, opportunities, and imagination. But teaching Spanish today as *a* language without taking into account translanguaging does not support bilingual students’ advancement in the globalized world of the 21st century. The chapter ends with a description of how translanguaging in education can be used to create a U.S. bilingual trans-subject, able to appropriate Spanish language practices into their entire linguistic repertoire.

### CONSTRUCTING A SPACE FOR “SPANISH”: SPAIN, LATIN AMERICA, AND THE UNITED STATES

Spanish was linguistically constituted slowly. During the 10th and 11th centuries, the variety spoken in northern Old Castile and Burgos grew in importance, spurred by the military success of Castile in the *Reconquista* against the Moors (718–1492). Hall (1974) explains, “Concomitantly with the *Reconquista*, the Castilian dialect

became the standard for the regions which came under Castilian rule, gradually overlaying the other regional koinés such as Asturian, Leonese, Aragonese, and the conservative Mozarabic spoken in the central area” (p. 121). López-García (1985) has argued that Castilian emerged as a koiné, as a way to ensure that those who spoke Basque and Romance would understand each other. In the 13th century Alfonso X The Wise (1221–1284) compiled Castile’s legal tradition in his *Siete Partidas* (1265) and codified the orthography of Castilian, modeled on the speech of the upper class of Toledo. It was this orthography that became the expected medium in courtly writing during this time (R. Wright, 1997).

With the marriage of the Catholic Monarchs, Isabella I of Castile and Ferdinand of Aragon in 1469, the crowns of Aragon/Catalonia and Castile/Leon/Galicia were united. Through that political union, the dialectal group that became known as Castilian gained power and authority. In 1492, as the Moorish kingdom of Granada surrendered, Antonio de Nebrija published his *Gramática de la Lengua Castellana*, the first grammar of any Romance language. Nebrija dedicates the grammar to Queen Isabella: “*Siempre la lengua fue compañera del imperio*” [“Language always was the companion of empire”]. A single “Spanish” language was needed to rule its subjects.

It was the nascent Spanish of the 16th century that was used by missionaries in the *catequización* of the indigenous population to Catholicism (Briceño Perozo, 1987). On June 7, 1550, Charles V issued an edict that Spanish be used in evangelization in the Viceroyalty of New Spain, including most of what is today the United States west of the Mississippi River, and the Floridas. A great number of pedagogical material in Spanish, including textbooks, dictionaries, and grammars (called *artes*), were shipped to the Americas. But the failure of teaching Catholicism in a language that was not understood led to a change in policy. In 1570, King Phillip II authorized the use of the indigenous languages of vast territories, what became known as *lenguas generales*, to evangelize. And in 1596, he formalized the diglossic compartmentalized arrangement between the languages of its territories that was to remain in force until the 21st century—Spanish for administration and for the elite, and the local indigenous languages for daily communication within indigenous communities and for evangelization (García, López, & Makar, 2010; Hamel, 1994).

Although Castilian remained the language of White European *conquistadores* in the dominions of the Spanish Empire and was not taken up by most of the indigenous population during the 16th and 17th century, a similar sociolinguistic situation existed within Spain. When the border with Portugal was drawn in 1640, and the one with France in 1659 after the Thirty Years War, Castilian was not, by any means, the language of the territory among all social classes. Promoting Castilian became a priority of the state (S. Wright, 2004).

In 1713, the Real Academia Española was founded on instructions of Philip V, the first Bourbon ruler of Spain, to guarantee a Spanish norm and to “*velar por que los cambios que experimente [ . . . ] no quiebren la esencial unidad que mantiene en todo el ámbito hispánico*” [“to watch that the changes that it undergoes [ . . . ] do

not disrupt the essential unity that it maintains in the entire Hispanic context”] ([http://noticias.juridicas.com/base\\_datos/Admin/rd1109-1993.html#a1](http://noticias.juridicas.com/base_datos/Admin/rd1109-1993.html#a1)). That is, the Academy’s principal task was to ensure the unity of Spanish throughout a highly multilingual Spanish-speaking world. Thus, the motto of the Academy was “*limpia, fija y da esplendor*” [“cleans, fixes, and gives splendor”]. A year later, in 1714, Castilian was declared the language of the state, and in 1768, King Charles III of Spain decreed that there should be one language and one currency in his kingdom, including its colonies. At that time, 78% of the population of New Spain spoke indigenous languages (Cifuentes & del Consuelo Ros, 1993). Monolingual education for indigenous minorities in the dominions of the Spanish Empire became the policy and has remained so today, for the most part.

After four centuries of colonial relations, Spain lost much of the territories that had been part of its Empire, as King Charles IV abdicated to Napoleon Bonaparte, bringing an end to Spain’s “sovereign power.” As we will see, the democratic discourses of Enlightenment thinking were produced as part of new relations of power, which included the growing imperialist designs of the newly constituted United States and the independence of Latin American countries.

The weakened status of the Spanish state led, on one hand, to the aggressive moves of the United States to acquire what had been part of the Spanish Empire and, on the other, to the independence movement of Latin American countries. In 1803, the United States purchased Louisiana from France, and in 1819, it acquired Florida under the Adams–Onís treaty, renouncing claims to Texas. As the Spanish Empire crumbled in the early 19th century, Latin American countries gained independence.

In 1845, the United States annexed Texas. This led to the Mexican American War, which resulted in the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo (February 2, 1948), by which Mexico ceded territory amounting to 500,000 square miles that today encompasses California, Nevada, New Mexico, Utah, most of Arizona and Colorado, and parts of Texas, Oklahoma, Kansas, and Wyoming, beside giving the United States undisputed control of Texas (Rives, 1918).

To carry out the policy of Manifest Destiny, the United States adopted an attitude of Protestant superiority, arguing that its imperialist designs improved the lives of those who were “ignorant” and “backward” (García, 2011a). Only Mexicans considered to be White were permitted citizenship and allowed to attend schools with Anglo Whites in the Southwest territories.

Almost from the beginning of the creation of independent Latin American states, as well as the annexation of Spanish-speaking territories to the United States, the Spanish language and its teaching in schools was a topic of great concern. In the newly formed Latin American countries, Spanish, spoken by the ruling elite of European descent, served to form a sense of nation, ignoring the many other languages (del Valle & Stheeman, 2002). The affirmation of American Spanish, continued from Castilian despite some differences, became an important consideration.

In 1847, Andrés Bello (1781–1865), born in Caracas before independence, published his *Gramática de la lengua castellana destinada al uso de los americanos* [Castilian Grammar Intended for Use by Americans]. In the prologue, Bello argues that the Spanish language should conserve what he calls “*su pureza*” [“its purity”] so as to ensure a common language between the two continents. And yet Bello argues that Latin American countries have as much right as regions of Spain to have their own differences but adds that this is so only “*cuando las patrocina la costumbre uniforme y auténtica de la gente educada*” [“when it is sponsored by the regular and authentic use of people who are well educated”]. A diglossic relationship was once more established between the Spanish of the White European-descent elite and the languages of the indigenous groups or African slaves. Only the Spanish of the White elite was accepted for use in government and education, with the languages of the Others remaining outside of official domains.

In 1870, the Real Academia Española authorized the establishment of what became known as *Academias Correspondientes* in the Americas. The agreement talked about “*repúblicas americanas españolas, hoy independientes, pero siempre hermanas nuestras por el idioma*” [“American republics of Spain, independent today, but always our sisters because of the language”] because “*una misma lengua hablamos*” [“we speak one language”] (quoted in Lázaro, 1994). It warned that unless there was a strong defense of the Castilian language, “*llegará la lengua en aquella tan patria como la nuestra a bastardearse . . .*” [“the language will become bastardized in that which is as much fatherland as ours”]. The *Academias Correspondientes* were finally able to “*oponer un dique, más poderoso tal vez que las bayonetas mismas, al espíritu invasor de la raza anglo-sajona en el mundo por Colón descubierto*” [“oppose a dike, perhaps more powerful than even the bayonets, to the invading spirit of the Anglo-Saxon race in the world that was discovered by Columbus”]. And perhaps it is this last statement that better reveals the difficulties of teaching Spanish in the Americas, with Spanish seen as a bayonet that must divide languages into hierarchical camps and as a dike that stops the flows not only between Spanish and the languages of Indigenous peoples but also between Spanish and the language of the great U.S. Empire—English. As a result, 19 *Academias Correspondientes* were established after 1871 in Latin America. As Spanish spread in the Americas north of the Rio Grande and beyond its original territories, the Spanish of the United States also had to be reined in. Thus, in 1973, the *Academia Norteamericana de La Lengua* was established in New York. As we will see, maintaining the dike between Spanish and English so as to stop the flow from English became an obsession in U.S. Spanish language teaching, the subject of the next section.

## THE ROLE OF SPANISH TEACHING IN NATIONAL CONSTRUCTIONS

A standardized Spanish, referred to as “Castilian” in most of Spain and “Spanish” in most of the Americas (with the exception of the Southern Cone), was upheld with a heavy hand in schools in Spain and Latin America and imposed in the few

spaces in the United States where Spanish was taught, always in an inferior position to English. The Black Legend, promoting tales of cruelty of the *conquistadores* and the Inquisition to justify the U.S. imperialistic designs, meant that the learning of Spanish was never much valued.

Spanish for trade, and as spoken by White Europeans, was judged positively at the beginning of U.S. history. For example, Thomas Jefferson suggested to his nephew: “Bestow great attention on Spanish and endeavor to acquire an accurate knowledge of it. Our future connections with Spain and Spanish America will render that language of valuable acquisition” (quoted in García, 1993, p. 73).

Spanish was first introduced in U.S. higher education at Harvard University in 1816, but it was only taught through reading-translation, and mostly as a way to develop linguistic discipline in English. The Modern Language Association, which came into being in 1883, paid little attention to the Spanish spoken in the Southwest territories (García, 1993). The American Association of Teachers of Spanish and Portuguese (AATSP) was established in New York in 1917, to counteract the teaching of German in secondary schools, now the enemy in World War I. But “foreign” language study was not in any way encouraged in elementary schools, and the position of AATSP was that “the best modern Spanish . . . is that spoken by the educated people of Old and New Castile” (Espinosa, 1923, p. 244). The Modern Foreign Language Study of 1929 recommended that language study be limited to 2 years and that students be taught only to read (Huebener, 1961).

The late 19th and early 20th centuries were years of restriction of languages other than English in the United States. However, these were years of intensive immigration, especially from southern and eastern Europe. Theodore Roosevelt recommended that immigrants who had not learned English after 5 years should be returned to their countries (García, 2009a) and in 1915 said,

We have room for but one language here, and that is the English language, for we intend to see that the crucible turns our people out as Americans, of American nationality, and not as dwellers in a polyglot boarding house. (quoted in Edwards, 1994, p. 166)

The melting pot, the metaphor made popular in Israel Zangwill’s 1908 play, was in full force, and U.S. schools reacted accordingly.

By 1923, 34 states had passed laws requiring that English be the sole language of instruction in U.S. public schools. In 1855 in California, English had been declared the only language of instruction (Castellanos, 1983), and in New Mexico an 1891 statute required all schools to teach in English. The tide, however, started to turn in 1923 when the U.S. Supreme Court struck down language-restrictive laws in Nebraska, Idaho, and Ohio in *Meyer v. Nebraska*. But in 1949, the report *What the High Schools Ought to Teach* characterized foreign-language study as useless and time-consuming. And Harvard’s *General Education in a Free Society* report declared that foreign-language study was only useful “to improve one’s English” (Huebener, 1961, p. 14).

In the meantime, the Mexican American community in the southwest became more excluded from Spanish language education, and those who continued to arrive were placed in segregated schools where the focus was the learning of English. In 1942, the Bracero program allowed the entry of short-term Mexican contract laborers for agricultural work. They joined not only other Mexican Americans but also the growing number of Puerto Ricans who, as U.S. citizens since the Jones Act of 1917, were headed to the factories of the northeast. Spanish was increasingly seen as the language of conquered or dominated people of color. These Spanish-speaking Latinos were now coming into a depressed U.S. economy that was rapidly changing, and the public schools that were meant to educate the population were failing Latinos in large numbers. In the early 1940s, Texas, New Mexico, and Florida introduced Spanish into some elementary classrooms to help Latino children. In 1953, the New York City Board of Education commissioned a study, "Teaching Children of Puerto Rican Background in New York City Schools," which recommended that the Spanish language be used in the education of Puerto Rican children. Increasingly schools started to experiment with using Spanish in the education of Latino children with the purpose of ensuring not only their comprehension of academic content but also their shift to English (García, 2009a).

### KEEPING IT SEPARATE

The two positions—one reluctantly favoring the teaching of Spanish as a "foreign language" to White Anglo students and the other grudgingly supporting the use of Spanish to teach Spanish-speaking children—came to the forefront during the 1960s, although they remained strictly separate. On the one hand, Russia's launch of Sputnik resulted in considering "foreign" language study as a possible instrument for defense. The National Defense and Education Act, passed in 1958, provided financial assistance for the teaching of foreign languages. For the first time, language education programs were introduced into elementary schools (Foreign Language in the Elementary Schools), countering attitudes held in the early part of the century. On the other hand, the Civil Rights Era brought to the forefront the racial and language discrimination that Latino students were experiencing in U.S. schools. Mexican Americans and Puerto Ricans joined African Americans in demanding equal rights, and during this brief period, Latinos were effective in asserting the importance of the use of Spanish in their education. Many bilingual education programs were established. In 1963, the Coral Way Elementary School started a two-way bilingual education program that included Cuban American children whose parents wanted to ensure that they continued to develop academic Spanish, as they acquired English, as well as Anglo-Miamians who wanted their children to learn Spanish to deal with the growing Cuban population. Mexican American communities also established bilingual education programs to maintain and develop the Spanish of their children in Texas, New Mexico, California, and Arizona (Castellanos, 1983, García, 2009a). For the first time, in 1965, the American Association of Teachers of Spanish and Portuguese

acknowledged that U.S. Latinos might make good Spanish teachers (García, 1993). But despite the greater acknowledgement of the importance of Spanish language teaching both for Anglos and Latinos, the two traditions remained separate.

As a result of much lobbying by civil rights groups and Latino advocacy groups, the Bilingual Education Act (Title VII of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act) was passed in 1968, granting federal funds to school districts that had a large number of students who were not proficient in English—mostly, at that time, Spanish speakers and Native Americans. In 1965, the Immigration and Naturalization Act was amended, abolishing national-origin quotas and ushering in immigration especially from Latin America but also from Asia and other non-Western nations.

By the time the Bilingual Education Act was reauthorized in 1974, it limited the use of Spanish (and other languages other than English) in education until children learned English. That is, bilingual education was defined as transitional, with the explicit goal being the “mainstreaming” of children into English-only classrooms. In 1974, the U.S. Supreme Court ruled in *Lau v. Nichols*: “There is no equality of treatment merely by providing students with the same facilities, textbooks, teachers and curriculum; for students who do not understand English are effectively foreclosed from any meaningful education.” Something had to be done for Latino students.

Although the federal U.S. bilingual education policy was now transitional, Latino educators continued to organize “developmental maintenance bilingual education” for their children in which interactive language practices were used. Because of the suspicion of the so-called stigmatized code-switching, bilingual teachers were not taught to use these linguistic interactions strategically. Although some early efforts were made to call attention to the possible value of using languages flexibly (what Jacobson, 1981, called “concurrent translation”), the educational authorities started to call for language separation, valuing educational success only from a monolingual perspective.

In the meantime, the “foreign-” language profession was progressing without much contact with the bilingual education field. Teachers of Spanish as a “foreign” language continued to be mostly Anglos. In 1979, President Carter established a Presidential Commission to study the status of foreign-language study in the United States. The recommendations of the Commission of Foreign Languages and International Studies pointed to the “scandalous incompetence in foreign languages” of the United States and recommended more study abroad programs, international exchanges, and overseas experiences. Little mention, however, was made of the language resources of the ethnic community. The U.S. Spanish “foreign-” language education profession entered a period of increased isolation, precisely as globalization was moving the dike that had kept Spanish and English, as well as the foreign language and the bilingual education professions, separate and distinct. The United States reacted to the greater number of Spanish speakers in their midst and their greater multilingualism by drawing tighter its linguistic borders, using English only, especially in education, as its instrument of Empire.

## U.S. ENGLISH RESTRICTIONS OF U.S. SPANISH

In 1981, Senator Hayakawa introduced a Constitutional Amendment to make English the official language of the United States. The perfect storm was now enveloping the U.S. language education field itself—on one hand, there was a call to learn “foreign” languages made by a Presidential Commission, but on the other, there was a strong demand that schools pay attention only to English and that Spanish as a U.S. language be restricted. Caught in the eye of this storm were the many U.S. Latinos, with much needed bilingual expertise but enveloped in an English-only climate.

During this time, the bilingual education profession struggled with reauthorizations of the Bilingual Education Act every 4 years, attempting to protect the spaces for using Spanish in the education of those Latino children whom the federal government called “limited English proficient.” With the 1984 reauthorization, bilingual education funds became available for the first time for programs known as Special Alternative Instructional Programs where English only was used. Programs that became known as “structured immersion” or “sheltered English” were developed during this time. Although only 4% of the funding was reserved for these kinds of programs, the 1988 reauthorization expanded the funding of these English-only programs to 25% of the total. The last time the Bilingual Education Act was reauthorized, in 1994, the quota for these English-only programs was lifted, although, as we will see, under the guise of bilingual education, another attempt to distance Spanish as a sign of identity of the Latino community was begun—the so-called dual-language programs.

As English-only was given more attention, there were more Latino students entering middle schools, high schools, and universities. In this anti-Spanish climate, and spearheaded by Guadalupe Valdés, the movement to teach Spanish to Latinos in secondary and tertiary programs in ways that differed from teaching Spanish as a foreign language to monolinguals started to gain ground (Valdés, 1997; Valdés, Lozano, & García Moya, 1981). Spanish language classes were now full of Latino students in whose homes Spanish was spoken. The communicative language approach followed in “foreign-” language classes was simply not adequate for these students. Very little, however, was done by educational authorities to advance these programs.

In 2001, the Bilingual Education Act (Title VII of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act) was repealed. In its place, Title III of the No Child Left Behind Act (Pub. L. No. 107-110) was now titled “Language Instruction for Limited English Proficient and Immigrant Students.” The No Child Left Behind Act turned attention toward the teaching and assessment of English proficiency and academic standards met through English only. Although “Hispanic students” was one of the categories of attention under No Child Left Behind, Latino students were only deemed to do well depending on their English language proficiency. Attention was turned from the teaching of Spanish to raising standards in English only. Economic resources were taken from Spanish language education to strengthen the teaching of English

and Math (Dillon, 2010). If in 1979 the U.S. competencies in languages other than English were “scandalous,” they now became increasingly absent, as globalization made full entry.

### ENGLISH MONOLINGUALISM OVER SPANISH LANGUAGE EDUCATION AND BILINGUAL EDUCATION

Despite the ubiquitous presence of Spanish in U.S. society today, the quality of Spanish language education, for both non-Latinos and Latinos, has not improved substantially. It is true that the teaching of Spanish is faring better than the teaching of other languages. In 2008, 93% of high schools that taught “foreign” languages taught Spanish. And even though in 1960 there were only 178,689 Spanish language students in U.S. universities, in 1998 there were 656,590, and by 2006 there were 822,985 students of Spanish (Furman, Goldberg, & Lusin 2007). The same can be said of the growth of Spanish language students in secondary schools. In 2000, there were 4,057,608 students of Spanish in high school, compared to 1958 when there were only 691,024 students of Spanish (Draper & Hicks, 2002). But in 2000, there were only 699,765 Spanish language students in intermediate schools (seventh and eighth grades) and 304,882 students in elementary schools (K–6). Eighty percent of Spanish students in 2000 were in secondary schools, and these programs continue to focus on academic skills that have little to do with the language practices of U.S. Latinos. In 1997 at the elementary level, 79% of schools offering language programs taught Spanish, and this figure increased to 88% in 2008 (Rhodes & Pufahl, 2010). But the Spanish language programs at the elementary level are mostly of the language experience type, not truly focusing on Spanish language development. Spanish language education programs have more students than ever, but are they making a difference in promoting bilingual Americans?

Today Spanish language teaching in the United States continues an elitist tradition, taught mostly at the secondary and tertiary levels, with an academic emphasis, and not in relationship with the Spanish spoken by the 50.6 million Latinos in the United States. Spanish taught in secondary and tertiary institutions continues to be billed as a “foreign” language, the language of Spain and of Latin American countries, kept separate from the Spanish of the Other, of subaltern minorities who continue to be relegated to inferior positions. Many would agree with Dame Edna, the character created by the comedian Barry Humphries who, when asked if Spanish should be learned, replied,

Forget Spanish. There's nothing in that language worth reading except Don Quixote . . . There was a poet named García Lorca, but I'd leave him on the intellectual back burner if I were you. As for everyone's speaking it, what twaddle! Who speaks it that you are really desperate to talk to? The help? Your leaf blower? (Dame Edna, 2003, p. 116)

Although Spanish classes for bilingual Latinos have proliferated in both universities and secondary schools, they have not gone far enough in developing Latino

bilinguals. In the year 2000, only 141,212, that is, 1.9% of secondary school students who took Spanish were in Spanish classes for Spanish speakers (Draper & Hicks, 2002). Compared to the 4 million Latino students who were between 15 and 17 years of age in 2000, this number is clearly insufficient (see Valdés, Fishman, Chávez, & Pérez, 2006). Beaudrie (2012) estimates that in 2010, 40% of Spanish language programs at the secondary level had some program of Spanish for Spanish speakers. This is a remarkable growth from 1997 when only 9% of schools offered such courses (Rhodes & Branaman, 1999). But the quality of these programs differs, and the number of programs is insufficient for the many Latino secondary school students.

Rather than recognizing that the students in these programs are Spanish speaking or bilingual, the field has recently taken up the term *heritage language*. Spanish is now relegated to a past that is “foreign,” the Spanish of Latin American countries or Spain, but not recognized as an indigenous language practice of the United States. In addition, the term *heritage language* contributes to the silencing of U.S. bilingualism (for this critical perspective, see García, 2005).

The “heritage” language movement has done little to stop the erasure of the bilingualism of the Latino community. Although English-only constitutional amendment efforts were abandoned at the federal level, English-only laws were passed by 28 states as of this writing, and 3 states have banned bilingual education (California, Proposition 227, 1998; Arizona, Proposition 203, 2000; Massachusetts, Question 2, 2002; García, 2009a). The word *bilingual*, what Crawford (2004) has called “the B-word” (p. 35) has been progressively silenced (García, 2008; Wiley, 2005; Wiley & Wright, 2004). Every federal office with the word *bilingual* in its name has been renamed, substituting *bilingual* with *English language acquisition*. At the same time that bilingual education programs of the transitional and the developmental kind have been eliminated in state after state, one type of bilingual education has grown—the so-called dual-language programs.

As with the term *heritage language* program, the phrase “dual language” says something about the silencing of bilingualism in the United States and the distancing of these programs from the Latino community. Early on, Guadalupe Valdés (1997) warned about the lack of attention that “dual-language” education paid to Latino students. Many others have since become critics of the language separation, the “parallel monolingualism” found in these programs (Cummins, 2008; Fitts, 2006; García, in press-a; Gort, 2012; Palmer, 2007). “Dual-language” programs protect an authoritative standardized “Spanish” from “U.S. English.” These “dual-language” programs in no way give any space to the language practices of the bilingual Latino community, stigmatizing their practices and compartmentalizing English and Spanish strictly. On one hand, Spanish and English are separated rigorously, with one language used at different times or spaces, or by different teachers and for different subjects; on the other hand, children who speak Spanish and English are brought together. But although children are recognized as “English language learners” or “speakers of English,” no

one is recognized as “bilingual”; and yet the majority of these students are bilingual (García, 2011b). Lee, Hill-Bonnet, and Gillispie (2008) suggest that in these “dual-language” programs, children experience “thickening identities” as either speakers of English or speakers of Spanish that may not lead to development as bilingual speakers. In the compartmentalized monolingual programming of “dual-language” education programs, bilingualism as a possibility is erased, with teachers, and even children, reminding others, “Speak English here” or “Speak Spanish here” (Angelova, Gunawardena, & Volk, 2006).

Even in their naming as “dual,” these programs shy away from bilingualism, promoting instead a monoglossic view of bilingualism, an outdated additive conception of  $1 + 1 = 2$  (García, 2009a). Instead of promoting a dynamic bilingualism more in tune with 21st-century practices, these “dual-language” programs continue the old tradition of compartmentalizing the two languages, enforcing a diglossic relationship that keeps the hierarchy of English over Spanish and that keeps Spanish away from the bilingual practices that characterize Spanish speakers in the United States. Standardized exams continue to insist on English only, and Spanish is robbed with Otherness, alienating it, therefore, from a position of being part of U.S. language practices.

To minoritize Spanish, U.S. educational authorities insist on the needs and poverty of Spanish-speaking Latinos, highlighting, for example, that the median income of U.S. Latinos was \$36,000, compared to \$50,000 for White non-Latinos in 2005. But U.S. educational authorities hardly ever speak about the fact that bilingual Latinos actually do better than those who are English monolinguals. Linton (2003), for example, found a “positive relationship between upward mobility and bilingualism” (p. 24). Bilingualism in education only enters the picture officially when Latino children are still acquiring English. That is, once Latino students learn English and become bilingual, there is never any use of bilingualism as a resource in their education (García & Kleifgen, 2010). Latino students’ bilingual language practices at home are much more complex than those in U.S. monolingual schools; and yet these practices are stigmatized and ignored by schools, intent on teaching “English,” separately from language practices associated with “Spanish,” and intent on teaching “Spanish,” separately from “academic English.”

The Swiss economist, François Grin (2003) has explained that if one language is promoted to prominent status, then its “native” speakers will have social and economic advantages precisely because of their competence in the prestigious language. By constructing Spanish as a language of poverty, silencing the bilingualism of U.S. Latinos, and insisting that English is Latinos’ “second” language, White English monolinguals enjoy privilege. At the same time that U.S. schools insist on devaluing the Spanish of Latino students, other political hegemonic forces have started to promote Spanish as a global language. The next section considers how this shift has been constructed, so that we can later analyze the repercussions that this new position has had in U.S. Spanish language education policy.

## GLOBAL SPANISH AND U.S. SPANISH

What is global about Spanish today, and what is it that business interests in Spain and Latin America want from U.S. Latinos? Language, as we have seen, has always been a marker of national and ethnic identity, as well as a form of economic and social capital (Bourdieu, 1991), but in the 21st century, global languages have been commodified more than ever. Ammon (2003) has determined that to be a global language, a language not only has to be spoken by many, but it must also have economic, political, and cultural power. The 16th edition of *Ethnologue* (M. P. Lewis, 2009) reports that Spanish is spoken “natively” by 329 million people. Of these, 28 million live in Spain, accounting for 11% of the Spanish-speaking population worldwide. As the French sociolinguist Louis-Jean Calvet (1999) has said, without Latin America—and Spanish speakers in the United States—Spanish would be considered only a regional language in Spain. Moreno-Fernández and Otero (2008) are more optimistic in their estimates, indicating that there are 359 million speakers in countries where Spanish is official or national and 41 million “native” speakers in places where Spanish is not official, bringing the total of Spanish “native” speakers to almost 400 million. If we add those whom Moreno-Fernández and Otero claim speak Spanish as a “second” language (24 million) and others who are learning Spanish (15 million), there are 439 million potential users of Spanish, making Spanish one of the most widely spoken languages, after English and Chinese.

Spanish is also the official or national language of 20 countries. Only English, French, and Arabic are spoken in more nation-states than Spanish. And Spanish is the official language in many international bodies, including the United Nations, UNESCO, and the European Union.

The economic power of Spanish comes, interestingly enough, mostly from Latinos in the United States, in what is the fourth-largest Spanish-speaking country. U.S. Latinos numbered 50.6 million in 2010, comprising 16% of the entire U.S. population. Of these, 34 million spoke Spanish at home in 2010 (U.S. Census Bureau, 2010). Eighty-nine percent of those who speak Spanish at home are bilingual, speaking English very well, well, or not well. Only 11% do not speak English.

The U.S. Latino market of \$951 billion in 2008 was larger than that of the economies of all but 13 countries in the world. Humphreys (2008) estimates that the Latino economic clout will be \$1.4 trillion in 2013, having risen from \$212 billion in 1990. In 2008, Latinos accounted for 8.9% of all U.S. buying power, up from 5% in 1990. The U.S. Latino consumer power is 3 times that of the rest of the Spanish-speaking world (Carreira, 2002; Villa, 2000). The economic volume produced by Spanish in U.S. television, radio, movies, newspapers, and magazines is superior to that of any other Spanish-speaking country in the world (Marcos Marín, 2006). The words of David Graddol (2006) may be instructive in this regard:

Spanish has grown to be roughly the same size as English in terms of its native-speaker base, and may overtake it. Spanish is challenging English in some parts of the USA, where a number of towns have

predominantly Spanish-speaking populations. The language is growing in economic importance in both Latin America and the USA. Spain is active in promoting itself as the global centre of authority for the language. (p. 61)

According to De Swaan (2001), languages that can detach themselves from specific territories raise their Q-value (communication value), with the possibility of becoming a lingua franca. Thus, Spain has mounted a campaign to make visible the fact that Spanish users live beyond Spain and Spanish-speaking Latin America, especially as the financial crisis broadens. To raise the Q-value of Spanish, Spain has adopted an aggressive policy of Spanish language promotion, accompanied with a more flexible attitude toward the Spanish spoken elsewhere.

On May 11, 1990, Spain's Ministry of Foreign Affairs created the Instituto Cervantes with a clear mission: "*agrupar y potenciar los esfuerzos en la defensa y promoción del español en el extranjero*" ["to group and build capacity for the efforts in the defense and promotion of Spanish outside of Spain"] (Sánchez, 1992). The Instituto Cervantes offers Spanish language courses and professional development for teachers of Spanish and certifies teachers of Spanish as a foreign language through its DELE (*Diploma de español como Lengua Extranjera*). It also maintains a virtual Spanish language classroom, which claims to use "*el español peninsular central*" ["central peninsular Spanish"] (www.cervantes.es). To promote and defend this "central peninsular Spanish," 77 centers have been established to date, 5 of them in the United States: in Albuquerque, Boston, Chicago, Seattle, and New York.

To promote Spanish as a global language, a language that is "fashionable," a chic language of "Latinidad," trendy singers, actors, and fashions, as well as promising financial returns in an expanding market (García, 2008, 2009b; Mar-Molinero, 2008), an ideology of *Hispanofonía* is being constructed (del Valle, 2006; "Interview With Rainer Enrique Hamel," 2004). About this ideology, Hamel says that it is

*basado en una política de diversidad piramidal. [España] ya no intenta exportar, como en sus primeros años, el español con la "zeta." Admite la diversidad del español [based on politics of pyramidal diversity. [Spain] doesn't try to export, as it did during its first years, Spanish with the "zed." It allows the diversity of Spanish.]*

With peninsular Castilian at the top of the pyramid, at the top of the "orders of indexicalities," as Blommaert (2010) would say, the diverse national Spanish varieties are given entry. García Canclini (2001) has called this process of Spain's linguistic imperialism "*rehispanización*," a rehispanization that claims Latin Americans and U.S. Latinos as speakers of Spanish but does not quite acknowledge their bilingual language practices.

Another example of the growing attention to global Spanish has been the fact that since 1997, with the support of the Instituto Cervantes and of the Real Academia Española, there have been international conferences on behalf of Spanish, the so-called *Congreso Internacional de Lengua*. The third conference took place in Rosario, Argentina, in 2004, and was accompanied by a counterconference organized mostly

by indigenous Latin Americans that called for the recognition of multilingual identities. The last *Congreso Internacional de Lengua* took place in Cartagena, Colombia, in 2007. Significantly, there were no contributions from the U.S. Spanish-speaking community. The complicity of Latin American cultural agencies and governments, as José del Valle (2009) has argued, has been of paramount importance in the Hispanofonía ideological construct.

In 2004, the Real Academia Española issued their new language policy for the Pan-Hispanic world. *La Nueva Política Lingüística Panhispánica* says, in part, that its policy had been in the past to maintain language purity, based on the linguistic habits of a very small number of its speakers. It adds the following, however:

*En nuestros días, las Academias, en una orientación más adecuada y también más realista, se han fijado como tarea común la de garantizar el mantenimiento de la unidad básica del idioma, que es, en definitiva, lo que permite hablar de la comunidad hispanohablante, haciendo compatible la unidad del idioma con el reconocimiento de sus variedades* [In our days, the Academies, with a more adequate and realistic orientation have agreed to guarantee the basic unity of the language; that is, in reality, what allows us to speak about the Spanish-speaking community, making the unity of the language compatible with the recognition of its varieties]. (del Valle, 2008, p. 11)

This statement already shows the Academies' linguistic strategies—expanding the idea of global Spanish, ensuring that Latin American varieties patronized by nation-states are recognized, while holding the reins on the practices of bilinguals, whether they are indigenous Latin Americans or U.S. Latinos. What has been the consequence of the construction of Spanish as a global language on U.S. language education policies? The next section considers this.

## U.S. SPANISH AND TEACHING LATINOS FOR SOCIAL JUSTICE

The language practices of U.S. Latino communities have little to do with the global image of Spanish projected by the language authorities in Spain or Latin America, and also little to do with the English-only emphasis in U.S. schools or even with many programs to teach “Spanish” to both Anglos and Latinos. U.S. Latinos, living in social, cultural, and linguistic *fronteras* or *borderlands*, populate their discourse with practices that some may identify as “English” or “Spanish” but, seen from their perspective as bilingual speakers, are simply different features of their linguistic repertoire that they use to perform appropriately in their homes and community as well as in their schools (see García & Otheguy, in press). As Paris (2010) has remarked, there are centrifugal forces (Bakhtin, 1981) pulling Latinos of all backgrounds toward more prestigious Spanish language practices and centripetal forces pushing them toward more dominant English practices. The result is the flexible language practices that U.S. Latino students perform every day to meet their communicative and academic needs.

The flexible language practices of Latino bilinguals are further stigmatized as, on one hand, simply “Spanglish”<sup>3</sup> and, on the other, English “fossilization.” The flexible

language practices of U.S. Latino bilinguals are not validated, relegating them to an inferior position below the Spanish or English of those who are said to speak these languages “natively.” Diasporic Latino communities, communicating through dynamic technologies and with more agency than in the past, do not have linguistic systems that are unique and separate, as nation-states would wish. Bilingual Latinos are not simply two monolinguals in one (Grosjean, 1982). Rather, their bilingualism is dynamic (García, 2009a), and they use their entire linguistic repertoire to signify and construct meaning. I have referred to the dynamic bilingual use that guarantees that Latino bilinguals learn and lead their lives with dignity and justice as “translanguaging” (García, 2009b). To educate bilingual Latino students, U.S. educators would have to stop treating the interdependent practices of their bilingual Latinos as those of racialized, subaltern “Others,” separating them into two untouchable “global” languages that schools then evaluate as “incomplete.” Instead, schools would have to recognize Latino translanguaging as a discursive practice of true bilingual North Americans, in order to extend their language practices to those recognized as “standard academic language,” whether “English” or “Spanish.”

Translanguaging refers not only to the complex discourse practices of bilinguals but also to the pedagogies that use these practices to release ways of speaking, of being, and of knowing of subaltern peoples. The term *translanguaging* was coined in Welsh (*trawsieithu*) by Cen Williams (1997) to refer to a bilingual approach in which one language is used as input and the other as output. Many have now extended the term to mean all flexible bilingual use, especially in language teaching (Blackledge & Creese, 2010; Creese & Blackledge, 2010; García, 2009a, 2011b; Hornberger & Link, 2012; G. Lewis, Jones, & Baker, 2012a, 2012b; Wei, 2011). Used as pedagogy, translanguaging has the potential to release ways of speaking of Latinos that have been constrained by national languages and ideologies of the modern/colonial world system in which both the United States and Spain participate. In so doing, translanguaging as pedagogy can redress the power of “English” and “Spanish,” as constructed by the United States, Spain, and Latin America, at the same time that it denounces the “coloniality of power and knowledge” (Mignolo, 2000, p. 231) and enacts a bilingual subjectivity. Many other scholars have recently called for a flexible translanguaging pedagogy to educate Latino students (García, in press-b; Sayer, 2013), although many are still using old terms such as *code-switching* in order to refer to what amounts to this flexible language use (see, e.g., Martínez, 2010; Sayer, 2008).

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 and that gives voice to oppressed and minoritized language practices (for more on translanguaging, see García & Li Wei, in press). Bilingual students use these complex and fluid discursive practices to perform their learning—reading, writing, listening, discussing, taking notes, writing reports and essays, and taking exams. By incorporating languaging and cultural practices familiar to Latino bilingual students, a translanguaging pedagogical approach

reduces the risk of alienation and “Otherness” that monolingual education systems create. Instead, it validates the translanguaging practices of Latino students as those of bilingual North Americans who have a more expanded linguistic repertoire than that of monolingual students.

Although U.S. language education policies have become more restrictive than ever (Arias & Faltis, 2012; Gándara & Hopkins, 2010), it turns out that teachers, anxious to meet the needs of the growing Latino bilingual population in schools, many times negotiate the English-only education policies by incorporating translanguaging into their pedagogical practices. This is something we have observed again and again, especially in schools that are successful with Latino students (see, e.g., García, Flores, & Woodley, 2012). Despite the silencing of bilingualism, and of Spanish in the face of English, both students and teachers in classrooms are, more than ever, using translanguaging as a resource to both learn and teach. This is especially so as the Common Core State Standards, adopted by 45 of the 50 states and the District of Columbia as of this writing, demand more complex language use. Translanguaging is needed more than ever, recognized as a discursive ability of Latino bilinguals, a pedagogical approach to academically challenge the growing number of bilingual Latino students, and a way to extend their use of standard academic “English” as well as standard academic “Spanish.” In classrooms with bilingual students (see García, Zakharia, & Otcu, 2013) translanguaging is being used to also extend Latino’s use of “Spanish,” going beyond the static definitions of “Spanish” assigned by some Spanish language educators who do not accept the bilingual language practices of U.S. Latinos. To teach Spanish as U.S. Spanish, as the language of Latinos, and not simply as a hegemonic global language, Spanish language educators, as well as bilingual educators, must build on the flexible translanguaging of bilingual Latinos.

## CONCLUSION

This chapter has reviewed the language education policies that have contributed to the continued failure of Spanish language education in the United States, and of U.S. Latinos in the nation’s schools. As the review shows, both English and Spanish were constructed as instruments of nation-states to protect their Empires and exercise power. The construction of “academic English” and “academic Spanish” is used in the same way today. Educational systems today are enmeshed in the movement of people that globalization has brought and in the dynamism of information that new technologies have produced. The result is a clash between the rigidity with which schools approach language, both “English” and “Spanish,” and the practices of the increasingly bilingual Latinos that make up the United States.

U.S. Latinos, caught between the imperial designs of the United States and Spain, have much to show the world, for increasingly their translanguaging gives them a social advantage in an increasingly multilingual U.S. society, enabling them to negotiate multiple interactions. Educational authorities would do well to build on this translanguaging, rather than stigmatize it and attempt to extinguish it. In taking up

translanguaging as a pedagogy, educators would have a better chance of developing U.S. Latinos as confident users of standard English and standard Spanish, as they learn from their students about the complexity and richness of bilingual language practices. The success of teaching Spanish in the United States resides precisely on recognizing U.S. Spanish practices as important locally for Latinos and non-Latinos, as well as for the global success of “Spanish” throughout the world. Rather than keeping “Spanish” and “English” separate, it is time for educators to understand that only the interrelationship of new and old language practices will sustain a future in which Spanish is not billed as “heritage,” but recognized as an authentic “American” language practice.

### ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I’m grateful to José del Valle for his very thoughtful comments on an earlier version of this chapter, and to Kate Seltzer for her careful reading.

### NOTES

<sup>1</sup>The first attempts to standardize Spanish can be traced to Alfonso the Sage’s work on the development of *castellano drecho*.

<sup>2</sup>Referring to Spanish as a “global language” and not merely an “international language” focuses not simply on the number of Spanish speakers in different countries but on its colonial condition, which has in turn enabled its ability to compete in global markets because of economic, political, and cultural power.

<sup>3</sup>The term *Spanglish* is contested. Whereas some Latino scholars actively defend it as a way to appropriate a derogatory term (see, e.g., Rosa, 2010; Zentella, 1997), Otheguy and Stern (2010) have argued against its use on the grounds that it prevents Latinos from sustaining Spanish language practices.

### REFERENCES

- Ammon, U. (2003). The international standing of the German language. In J. Maurais & M. A. Morris (Eds.), *Languages in a globalizing world* (pp. 231–249). Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Angelova, M., Gunawardena, D., & Volk, D. (2006). Peer-teaching and learning: Co-constructing language in a dual language first grade. *Language and Education, 20*, 173–190.
- Arias, B. M., & Faltis, C. (Eds.). (2012). *Implementing educational language policy in Arizona: Legal, historical and current practices in SEI*. Bristol, England: Multilingual Matters.
- Bakhtin, M. (1981). *Dialogic imagination: Four essays*. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Beaudrie, S. (2012). Research on university-based Spanish heritage language programs in the United States: The current state of affairs. In S. Beaudrie & M. Fairclough (Eds.), *Spanish as a heritage language in the US: State of the field* (pp. 203–222). Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.
- Blackledge, A., & Creese, A. (2010). *Multilingualism*. London, England: Continuum.
- Blommaert, J. (2010). *The sociolinguistics of globalization*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Bonfiglio, T. P. (2010). *Mother tongues and nations: The invention of the native speaker*. Berlin, Germany: Walter de Gruyter.

- Bourdieu, P. (1991). *Language and symbolic power*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Briceño Perozo, M. (1987). *La obligación de enseñar el castellano a los aborígenes de América* [The obligation to teach Spanish to the Indigenous peoples of the Americas]. Caracas, Venezuela: Colección Logos.
- Calvet, L. J. (1999). *La guerre des langues et les politiques linguistiques* [The war of languages and language policies] (2nd ed.). Paris, France: Hachette.
- Canagarajah, S. (2013). *Translingual practice: Global Englishes and cosmopolitan relations*. London, England: Routledge.
- Carreira, M. (2002). The media, marketing and critical mass: Portents of linguistic maintenance. *Southwest Journal of Linguistics*, 21, 37–54.
- Castellanos, D. (1983). *The best of two worlds: Bilingual-bicultural education in the U.S.* Trenton: New Jersey State Department of Education.
- Cifuentes, B., & del Consuelo Ros, M. (1993). Oficialidad y planificación del español: Dos aspectos de la política del lenguaje en México en el siglo XIV [Officialdom and the planning of Spanish: Two aspects of language policy in Mexico in the XIV century]. *Iztapalapa*, 13(29), 135–146.
- Crawford, J. (2004). *Educating English learners: Language diversity in the classroom* (5th ed.). Los Angeles, CA: Bilingual Educational Services.
- Creese, A., & Blackledge, A. (2010). Translanguaging in the bilingual classroom: A pedagogy for learning and teaching? *Modern Language Journal*, 94, 103–115.
- Cummins, J. (2008). Teaching for transfer: Challenging the two solitudes assumption in bilingual education. In J. Cummins & P. Corson (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of language and education: Vol. 5. Bilingual education* (2nd ed., pp. 65–75). New York, NY: Springer.
- Dame Edna (Barry Humphries). (2003). Ask Dame Edna. *Vanity Fair*, February, 116.
- De Swaan, A. (2001). *Words of the world*. Malden, MA: Polity.
- del Valle, J. (2006). US Latinos, la hispanofonía, and the language ideologies of high modernity. In C. Mar-Molinero & M. Stewart (Eds.), *Globalization and language in the Spanish-speaking world: Macro and micro perspectives* (pp. 27–46). Hampshire, England: Palgrave.
- del Valle, J. (2008). The Pan Hispanic community and the conceptual structure of linguistic nationalism. *International Multilingual Research Journal*, 2, 5–26.
- del Valle, J. (2009). Total Spanish: The politics of a Pan-Hispanic grammar. *PMLA*, 124, 880–887.
- del Valle, J., & Stheeman, L. G. (Eds.). (2002). *The battle over Spanish between 1800 and 2000: Language ideologies and Hispanic intellectuals*. London, England: Routledge.
- Dillon, S. (2010, January 20). Foreign languages fail in class, except Chinese. *New York Times*, p. A18.
- Draper, J., & Hicks, J. H. (2002). *Foreign language enrollments in public secondary schools, Fall 2000*. Retrieved from <http://www.actfl.org/sites/default/files/pdfs/public/Enroll2000.pdf>
- Edwards, J. (1994). *Multilingualism*. London, England: Routledge.
- Espinosa, A. (1923). Where is the best Spanish spoken? *Hispania*, 6, 244–246.
- Fitts, S. (2006). Reconstructing the status quo: Linguistic interaction in a dual-language school. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 30, 337–365.
- Furman, N., Goldberg, D., & Lusin, N. (2007). *Enrollment in languages other than English in United States institutions of higher education, Fall 2006*. New York, NY: Modern Language Association of America. Retrieved from [http://www.lpri.coh.arizona.edu/classes/ariew/slat583/enrollmentsurvey\\_final.pdf](http://www.lpri.coh.arizona.edu/classes/ariew/slat583/enrollmentsurvey_final.pdf)
- Gándara, P., & Hopkins, M. (Eds.). (2010). *Forbidden language: English learners and restrictive language policies*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- García, O. (1993). From Goya portraits to Goya beans: Elite traditions and popular streams in U.S. Spanish language policy. *Southwest Journal of Linguistics*, 12, 69–86.

- García, O. (2005). Positioning heritage languages in the United States. *Modern Language Journal*, 89, 601–605.
- García, O. (Ed.). (2008). Spanish as a global language [Special issue]. *International Multilingual Research Journal*, 2(1).
- García, O. (2009a). *Bilingual education in the 21st century: A global perspective*. Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.
- García, O. (2009b). Livin' and teachin' la lengua loca: Glocalizing U.S. Spanish ideologies and practices. In R. Salaberry (Ed.), *Language allegiances and bilingualism in the United States* (pp. 151–171). Clevedon, England: Multilingual Matters.
- García, O. (2011a). Planning Spanish: Nationalizing, minoritizing and globalizing performances. In M. Díaz-Campos (Ed.), *The handbook of Hispanic sociolinguistics* (pp. 665–685). Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.
- García, O. (with Makar, C., Starcevic, M., & Terry, A.). (2011b). Translanguaging of Latino kindergarteners. In K. Potowski & J. Rothman (Eds.), *Bilingual youth: Spanish in English speaking societies* (pp. 33–55). Amsterdam, Netherlands: John Benjamins.
- García, O. (in press-a). Dual or dynamic bilingual education? Empowering bilingual communities. In R. Rubdy & L. Alsagoff (Eds.), *The global-local interface: Language choice and hybridity*. Bristol, England: Multilingual Matters.
- García, O. (with Leiva, C.). (in press-b). Theorizing and enacting translanguaging for social justice. In A. Creese & A. Blackledge (Eds.), *Heteroglossia as practice and pedagogy*. New York, NY: Springer.
- García, O., Flores, N., & Woodley, H. H. (2012). Transgressing monolingualism and bilingual dualities: Translanguaging pedagogies. In A. Yiakoumetti (Ed.), *Harnessing linguistic variation for better education* (pp. 45–76). Bern, Germany: Peter Lang.
- García, O., & Kleifgen, J. (2010). *Educating emergent bilinguals. Policies, programs and practices for English Language Learners*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- García, O., López, D., & Makar, C. (2010). Language and identity in Latin America. In J. A. Fishman & O. García (Eds.), *Handbook of language and ethnic identity* (pp. 353–373). Oxford, England: Oxford University Press.
- García, O., & Otheguy, R. (in press). Hispanic bilingualism. In M. Lacorte (Ed.), *The Routledge handbook of Hispanic applied linguistics*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- García, O., & Li Wei (in press). *Translanguaging: Implications for language, bilingualism and education*. Basingstoke, England: Palgrave Macmillan.
- García, O., Zakharia, Z., & Otcu, B. (Eds.). (2013). *Bilingual community education and multilingualism: Beyond heritage languages in a global city*. Bristol, England: Multilingual Matters.
- García Canclini, N. (2001). *Consumers and citizens: Globalization and multicultural conflicts*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Gort, M. (2012). Code-switching patterns in the writing-related talk of young emergent bilinguals. *Journal of Literacy Research*, 44, 45–75.
- Graddol, D. (2006). *English next: Why global English may mean the end of "English as a foreign language"*. London, England: British Council. Retrieved from <http://www.britishcouncil.org/learning-research-englishnext.htm>
- Grin, F. (2003). *Language policy evaluation and the European charter for regional or minority languages*. Basingstoke, England: Palgrave.
- Grosjean, F. (1982). *Life with two languages*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Hall, R. (1974). *External history of the romance languages*. New York, NY: Elsevier.
- Hamel, R. E. (1994). Linguistic rights for Amerindian peoples in Latin America. In T. Skutnabb-Kangas & R. Phillipson (Eds.), *Linguistic human rights: Overcoming linguistic discrimination* (pp. 289–303). Berlin, Germany: Mouton de Gruyter.

- Hornberger, N., & Link, H. (2012). Translanguaging and transnational literacies in multilingual classrooms: A bilingual lens. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 15, 261–278.
- Huebener, T. (1961). *Why Johnny should learn foreign languages*. Philadelphia, PA: Chilton.
- Humphreys, J. M. (2008). The multicultural economy 2008. *Georgia Business and Economic Conditions*, 68(3), 1–16.
- Interview with Rainer Enrique Hamel. (2004, November 15). *Reforma*. Retrieved from <http://www.hamel.com.mx/Archivos-PDF/Work%20in%20Progress/2004%20Hamel%20Entrevista%20Reforma.pdf>
- Jacobson, R. (1981). The implementation of a bilingual instructional model: The new concurrent approach. In P. Gonzalez (Ed.), *Proceedings of the Eighth Annual International Bilingual Bicultural Education Conference at Seattle*. Rosslyn, VA: National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education.
- Lázaro, F. (1994). *La Real Academia y la unidad del idioma: Actas del congreso de la lengua Española de 1992* [The Royal Academy and language unity: Proceedings of the Conference on the Spanish Language of 1992]. Madrid, Spain: Instituto Cervantes. Retrieved from [http://cvc.cervantes.es/obref/congresos/sevilla/apertura/Aper\\_Laz\\_Car.htm](http://cvc.cervantes.es/obref/congresos/sevilla/apertura/Aper_Laz_Car.htm)
- Lau v. Nichols, 414 U.S. 563, 39 L. E.D. 2d 1 (1974).
- Lee, J. S., Hill-Bonnet, L., & Gillispie, J. (2008). Learning in two languages: Interactional spaces for becoming bilingual speakers. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 11, 75–94.
- Lewis, G., Jones, B., & Baker, C. (2012a). Translanguaging: Developing its conceptualisation and contextualisation. *Educational Research and Evaluation*, 18, 655–670.
- Lewis, G., Jones, B., & Baker, C. (2012b). Translanguaging: Origins and development from school to street and beyond. *Educational Research and Evaluation*, 18, 641–654.
- Lewis, M. P. (Ed.). (2009). *Ethnologue: Languages of the world* (16th ed.). Dallas, TX: SIL International.
- Li Wei (2011). Moment analysis and translanguaging space: Discursive construction of identities by multilingual Chinese youth in Britain. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 43, 1222–1235.
- Linton, A. (2003). *Is Spanish here to stay? Contexts for bilingualism among U.S.-born Hispanics*. University of California, San Diego, Center for Comparative Immigration Studies. Retrieved from <http://escholarship.org/uc/item/4rf0c6k7>
- López-García, A. (1985). *El rumor de los desarraigados. Conflicto de lenguas en la península Ibérica* [The rumor of the uprooted: Conflict of languages in the Iberian Peninsula]. Barcelona, Spain: Anagrama.
- Makoni, S., & Pennycook, A. (2007). *Disinventing and reconstituting languages*. Clevedon, England: Multilingual Matters.
- Marcos Marín, F. (2006). *Los retos del español* [The challenges of Spanish]. Madrid, Spain: Iberoamericana/Vervuert.
- Mar-Molinero, C. (2008). Subverting Cervantes: Language authority in global Spanish. *International Multilingual Research Journal*, 2, 27–47.
- Martínez, R. A. (2010). Spanglish as literacy tool: Toward an understanding of the potential role of Spanish-English code-switching in the development of academic literacy. *Research in the Teaching of English*, 45, 124–149.
- Mignolo, W. D. (2000). *Local histories/global designs*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Moreno-Fernández, F., & Otero, J. (2008). The status and future of Spanish among the main international languages: Quantitative dimensions. *International Multilingual Research Journal*, 2, 67–83.
- Otheguy, R., & Stern, N. (2010). On so-called “Spanglish.” *International Journal of Bilingualism*, 15, 85–100.

- Palmer, D. (2007). A dual immersion strand programme in California: Carrying out the promise of dual language education in an English-dominant context. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism, 10*, 752–768.
- Paris, D. (2010). The second language of the United States: Youth perspectives on Spanish in a changing multiethnic community. *Journal of Language, Identity, and Education, 9*, 139–155.
- Pennycook, A. (2010). *Language as a local practice*. London, England: Routledge.
- Rhodes, N. C., & Branaman, L. E. (1999). *Foreign language instruction in the United States. A national survey of elementary and secondary schools*. McHenry, IL: Delta Systems.
- Rhodes, N. C., & Pufahl, I. (2010). *Foreign language teaching in US schools: Results of a national survey*. Washington, DC: Center for Applied Linguistics.
- Rives, G. L. (1918). *The United States and Mexico, 1821-1848: A history of the relations between the two countries from the independence of Mexico to the close of the war with the United States* (Vol. 2). New York, NY: Scribner.
- Rosa, J. D. (2010) *Looking like a language, sounding like a race: Making Latin@ panethnicity and managing American anxieties* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of Chicago, Chicago, IL.
- Sánchez, A. (1992). Spanish language spread policy. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language, 95*, 51–69.
- Sayer, P. (2008). Demystifying language mixing: Spanglish in school. *Journal of Latinos and Education, 7*, 94–112.
- Sayer, P. (2013). Translanguaging, TexMex, and bilingual pedagogy: Emergent bilinguals learning through the vernacular. *TESOL Quarterly, 47*, 63–88.
- U.S. Census Bureau. (2010). *The Hispanic population: 2010* (2010 Census Brief). Washington, DC: Author.
- Valdés, G. (1997). Dual-language immersion programs: A cautionary note concerning the education of language-minority students. *Harvard Educational Review, 67*, 391–429.
- Valdés, G., Fishman, J. A., Chávez, R., & Pérez, W. (2006). *Developing minority language resources: The case of Spanish in California*. Clevedon, England: Multilingual Matters.
- Valdés, G., Lozano, A., & García-Moya, R. (1981). *Teaching Spanish to the Hispanic bilingual: Issues, aims, and methods*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- Villa, D. (2000). Languages have armies, and economies, too: The presence of U.S. Spanish in the Spanish-speaking world. *Southwest Journal of Linguistics, 19*, 143–154.
- Wiley, T. (2005). *Literacy and language diversity in the United States* (2nd ed.). Washington, DC: Center for Applied Linguistics.
- Wiley, T., & Wright, W. (2004). Against the undertow: Language minority education policy and politics in the “age of accountability.” *Educational Policy, 18*, 142–168.
- 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 dissertation). University of Wales, Bangor, Wales.
- Wright, R. (1997). Linguistic standardization in the Middle Ages in the Iberian peninsula: Advantages and disadvantages. In S. Gregory & D. A. Trotter (Eds.), *De mot en mot: Aspects of medieval linguistics: Essays in honour of William Rothwell* (pp. 261–275). Cardiff, Wales: University of Wales Press.
- Wright, S. (2004). *Language policy and language planning: From nationalism to globalization*. New York, NY: Palgrave.
- Zentella, A. C. (1997). *Growing up bilingual*. Malden, MA: Blackwell.