

# CONCEPTUALIZING TRANSLANGUAGING THEORY/ PRACTICE JUNTOS

*Ofelia García and Ricardo Otheguy*

## Introduction

The two of us have spent a lifetime studying language and education. Both of us have lived our lives as bilingual Latinx in New York City, and have brought our experience into our scholarship. Ricardo's doctorate was in theoretical linguistics within the functionalist framework of Columbia School Linguistics under the mentorship of Erica García and William Diver. Ricardo specialized in the Spanish language and started out his academic career teaching linguistics to teachers, and later bilingual teachers as Director of the Bilingual Education program at City College of New York, moving during the second part of his career to teaching doctoral students in linguistics at The Graduate Center of City University of New York (CUNY). Ofelia started out as a teacher who taught bilingually as she pursued graduate work in Spanish and education, and a doctorate in Latin American literature, focusing on semiotics. Ofelia did postdoctoral work on sociology of language under the mentorship of Joshua A. Fishman, and started out teaching in the Bilingual Education program at City College where she met Ricardo.

We start out by telling you something of our personal histories because translanguaging was something that was present from the start in our lives, our homes, and our work, from the time we were children in the United States. And although we experienced it as a linguistic practice of the U.S. Latinx community, we didn't find a theory that reflected it. We were blind to it, as we followed the scholarship about bilingualism that we read in the 1970s and 1980s. Although we learned much from that early scholarship, we often felt it did not represent the ways that the bilingual communities where we lived and worked

language. We were fortunate to have been taught by critical senior scholars who presented alternative visions of linguistics, and of language and society. But we still felt that the language of the bilingual Latinx community was not being described accurately, theorized correctly, or recognized as valid by much mainstream scholarship of the time, although there were, for sure, plenty of accounts of how it deviated from what was posited as the norm.

As the Portuguese decolonial philosopher Boaventura de Sousa Santos (2007) has said about knowledge in general, understandings about language, bilingualism, and multilingualism have been constructed through the epistemological perspective of those who are only on *one side of the line*, that is, the powerful in command of society. However, the language knowledge of bilingual and multilingual communities on the *other side of the line*, of those who have endured the injustices of colonialism and global capitalism, has most often been rendered invisible in scholarship. Theories about language and language education derived from the understandings and practices of those on the dominant side of the line have been then used to design educational policies, programs, and practices for those who language differently on the other side of the line, producing their educational failure.

For us, translanguaging disrupts the ways in which we were taught to envision language, bilingualism, and education from the powerful side of the line and guides us in trying to construct understandings from both sides of the line. Juntos we started naming what was always there, but had mostly, with very few exceptions, remained hidden in scholarship and especially in theoretical constructs. However, it was not until our work in CUNY-NYSIEB (City University of New York-New York State Initiative on Emergent Bilinguals) that we were able to develop, juntos with the CUNY-NYSIEB team, a theory of translanguaging that engaged with the practice of all and vice versa. Little by little, as the work with translanguaging in the action of CUNY-NYSIEB developed, theory and practice have been adjusted. For us, translanguaging as theory and practice works juntos, as we have worked juntos with each other and with all others.

We do not conceive of translanguaging theory in the abstract as separate from society, but as a theory/practice that can enable or hinder the potential of minoritized bilingual people, and especially of minoritized bilingual students in schools. We have been guided by the question: "What has been *the consequence* of viewing language in education through the lenses traditionally used to observe and theorize about language and bilingualism? Who has it hindered? Who has it helped?" And in conceptualizing translanguaging, we have focused on *its consequences* for minoritized bilinguals, and how it has shaped the dominance of monolinguals.

In what follows, we tell the story of how as more mature scholars we started to listen and view the language of bilingual minoritized communities without some of the theoretical blinders that we had accepted as doctoral students and

young scholars. We identify some of the established sociolinguistic and psycholinguistic concepts that translanguaging disrupts. We then describe the role of the CUNY-NYSIEB team in developing a translanguaging theory/practice juntos, as we struggled with reconciling our theoretical stance with the politics and pedagogical practices present in schools. This juntos work with the CUNY-NYSIEB team advanced our understandings of translanguaging, which we attempt to share here. Finally, we end by pointing out some of the challenges of inserting a different vision of language, bilingualism, and language education into a school system that is the product of nation-state ideologies of power and domination over its citizens.

Throughout this chapter, we focus on U.S. Latinx because it is easier to trace the developments of translanguaging theory/practice through our own personal experience with bilingualism as Latinx bilinguals. However, the theory/practice of translanguaging and the work of CUNY-NYSIEB, as we will see in the rest of this volume, encompass *all* minoritized bilingual children and *all* the educational programs in which they're taught.

### Removing theoretical lenses to see clearly

Both of us were involved in bilingual education efforts early on. We deeply supported the Latinx community efforts to voice the injustices and colonial oppression to which they had been subjected since the mid-19th century. In so doing, we also defended the Latinx community's right to use the Spanish language to participate in society and in education. This was a right of which the community was gradually deprived when the United States took over territories that were formerly Mexico, after the Guadalupe-Hidalgo Treaty that ended the Mexican American War in 1848 (Hernández-Chávez, 1995), and after the United States took possession of Puerto Rico from Spain at the end of the so-called Spanish-American war in 1898 (Meléndez, 2017). But the Latinx community's conception of their Spanish and their bilingualism, deeply connected to their struggles over discrimination in jobs, housing, and education (Flores & García, 2017), was eventually substituted by a conception of bilingualism that was said to be more objective and scientific, reducing the community's knowledge as something belonging to racialized peasants and indigenous peoples with little or no education. We trace below how these modifications took place, and how these changes transformed our understandings, first of the Spanish language and bilingualism, and then of bilingual education.

### Spanish and bilingualism: Early studies and our changing scholarship

As the study of Spanish and bilingualism in the United States moved to high schools and universities in the mid-20th century, the scholarship was built with

only one model in mind—that of Anglos becoming bilingual. Spanish had at first been dismissed as not worthy of study, like French and German (Nichols, 1945). And when it did start to be valued, the reference point was the language of Spain, or at best, occasionally, that of some Latin American countries (Espinosa, 1925). The Spanish of the U.S. Latinx community itself was either ignored or seen through linguistic and educational models that tended to devalue it and at times even to denigrate it (García, 1993).

These less than positive approaches provided a good fit with the scholarship on bilingualism being developed at the time. The pioneers of bilingual studies in the United States, Uriel Weinreich (1953) and Einar Haugen (1953), focused on the “interferences” in the languages of bilingual immigrant communities (Yiddish-speaking in Weinreich’s case, Norwegian-speaking in Haugen’s case), interferences that became noticeable when these U.S. ways of speaking were compared to those of the communities of origin. This work helped to establish the categories used to describe the language of bilinguals: Loan words, calques or loan shifts, and code-switching, which we ourselves have used in our earlier work (Otheguy, García & Fernández, 1989). Even though we thought that these linguistic descriptions would help normalize U.S. Spanish, showing it to the world as just another local form of language, in reality these features of bilingual speech came to be seen as speaker “mistakes,” instances of “random mixing,” thus helping to perpetuate negative attitudes about the community’s language.

During the 1980s, we followed the work of the Language Policy Task Force of the Centro de Estudios Puertorriqueños under the leadership of Pedro Pedraza. Traditional scholarship on bilingualism claimed that the only way for a community to maintain a minoritized language was through a diglossic arrangement, with one language used in territorial or functional compartmentalization with the other (Fishman, 1966a). However, Pedraza and his team argued that this did not happen in the East Harlem Puerto Rican community that they studied (Pedraza, Attinasi & Hoffman, 1980). We started to question the concepts of language maintenance and shift that were prevalent in the sociolinguistic literature (Fishman, 1966b). In a contribution to a volume edited by Joshua A. Fishman (2001), García, Morín and Rivera (2001) argued that the supposed language shift of the Puerto Rican community was with “vaivén.” That is, the community was not simply shifting to English, but staying in place while motioning their language practices back and forth like a cha-cha-chá.

As the scholarship on bilingualism grew, many scholars focused on the orderly or rule-governed character of the language practices of bilinguals. These well-meaning scholars pointed, for example, to the grammatical constraints of what they called code-switching (see, for example, Poplack, 1980). We ourselves used and taught that type of scholarship to teachers, and saw it, as did these scholars, as serving to legitimate the bilingual community and its language practices. We

then started to compare the tokens of, for example, orderly code-switching that were being offered in the literature with the ways that language was used in the Latinx community of New York and in our own homes. More and more, we found that the order and constraints, well-meaning as they were, did not correspond to our local observations. This added to our unease with the traditional scholarship on bilingualism generally and on code-switching in particular.

The term “Spanglish” was often used in those days, even by many Latinx bilinguals themselves, to talk about what they considered “incorrect” Spanish. And there were, and are, many bilingual scholars who have claimed the term, in parallel to the claim by the gay community, of “queer” (see, for example, Martínez, 2010; Zentella, 1996, 2016). Ricardo, however, warned that such use is intellectually indefensible because it represents yet another reification of a “dialect” or a “variety,” terms that survive in the teeth of widespread and longstanding criticisms that show their invalidity (Otheguy, 2008). Besides being intellectually unsustainable, the notion of Spanglish is dangerous because it confirms for consumers of the term the odd nature of an entity that despite efforts of committed Latinx educators to see it otherwise is stigmatized as mixed and therefore corrupt (Otheguy, 2007, 2009, 2016a; Otheguy & Stern, 2011; see the 2009 debate between Otheguy and Zentella, <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=N6f9UdSDYw>).

As the number of U.S. Latinx bilinguals increased, second language acquisition scholars turned their attention to the U.S. Latinx children’s acquisition of Spanish, but always using as frame of reference the acquisition of Spanish by children in monolingual settings in Latin America or Spain. These comparisons fueled the idea that Latinx children had an incompletely acquired form of Spanish (see, for example, Montrul, 2008). Ricardo pushed back on this concept, pointing out that there is no notion of completeness against which to assess any natively acquired grammar as incomplete. He also noted that the apples-and-oranges comparison of the language of working class Latinx students in the United States with elite college students from Latin America or Spain was a form of prescriptivism passing as science. Language acquisition and socialization among Latinx takes place in local U.S. communities and homes, rendering irrelevant comparison with dominant monolingual communities elsewhere (Otheguy, 2016c).

### *Bilingual education: Early studies and our changing scholarship*

Throughout the mid-1960s and 1970s, and as a consequence of attention to civil rights, the Latinx community managed to establish bilingual education programs that educated Latinx children with histories, stories, poems, songs, and

language that reflected their own lives. But as bilingual education became more institutionalized through the Bilingual Education Act (1968) and subsequent reauthorizations (García & Sung, 2018), the practice of bilingual education and the scholarship related to it tended to also adopt the theoretical lens developed for the one model that counted in the United States—that of Anglos endeavoring to become bilingual.

The early scholarship on bilingual education around the world had focused on the education of a few elite students who were taught what was considered a prestigious “foreign language” (FL) that was added to a “first language” (L1). Attention, however, became focused on the new immersion programs in Québec, Canada, as political power there shifted from the Anglophone majority to the Francophone minority (Lambert & Tucker, 1972). These immersion programs were designed as a way for majority Anglophone children to acquire French, it being especially relevant that the social and economic dominance of these children, as well as their identities, language and cultural practices, were in no way threatened by a language of instruction in school that was different from that of home.

In these Canadian immersion programs, each language was considered an autonomous structural entity that corresponded neatly to a different culture. Wallace Lambert (1974) described education programs for dominant majorities that elected to have their children become bilingual as fostering “additive bilingualism.” Lambert also posited that, at the same time, the children of nondominant groups were subjected to educational programs that promoted “subtractive bilingualism.”

Many bilingual educators in the United States reacted to scholarship like Lambert’s by rightly wanting to emulate those powerful groups whose schools had provided their children additive bilingualism in what was described as an enrichment program. In so doing, Latinx bilingual educators started to pay attention to educational models that kept English strictly apart from Spanish. This ideology of language separation, designed for language majority students, started to become prevalent even in the transitional bilingual education programs that the U.S. government was then supporting. Some of us embraced it too; for example, Ricardo’s work with Public School 84 in Manhattan advocated language separation.

The strict language separation in bilingual education programs was also based on the concept of diglossia. As we stated before, diglossic arrangements, with each language being used in different domains or for different functions, were considered the only way that minoritized communities could maintain their language (Fishman, 1966a). The Latinx bilingual community was justly concerned with ensuring that they remained Spanish-speaking, something that had been restricted. But although diglossia described well the sociolinguistic situations of

bilingual minoritized communities around the world, it did not engage with the political and economic reasons why the minority community’s language was restricted to the home and family domains and functions considered “Low” (García, 2009a; Martín-Rojo, 2017). As language-minoritized communities emulated the ways of bilingually educating children of the dominant majority through diglossic arrangements, the analysis of how power impacted language and educational practices was dismissed.

In the late 1970s and 1980s, the United States started receiving many more diverse immigrant students, an outcome of changes in the immigration law of 1965. The Latinx community grew exponentially, with people coming now not just from Mexico, Puerto Rico, Cuba, but increasingly from the Dominican Republic and Central and South America, and often speaking languages other than Spanish. At the same time, immigration increased from countries other than Europe, bringing many more children considered by the federal government “Limited English Proficient” or later “English Language Learners.” English as a Second Language (ESL) programs flourished, accommodating the more linguistically heterogeneous students by paying attention only to English. The backlash against bilingual education was promoted by the presidency of Ronald Reagan and the growth of the English Only movement around the same time (Crawford, 2007; García, 2009a; Otheguy, 1982).

As a result of these trends, bilingual education programs, as the Latinx community had originally envisioned them, were wrestled from their hands. By 2000, bilingual education had been declared illegal in California, Massachusetts, and Arizona (for more on this history, see García & Kleifgen, 2018). The wave of restrictions toward bilingual education for the Latinx community only came to an end when it had been redefined as *dual language* education, reinforcing the idea of teaching two *separate* languages, and now again centered on the one model that counted—that of Anglos becoming bilingual.

Many dual language programs are two-way, meaning that half of the children have to be learners of English, and the other half learners of the other language of instruction. These dual language education programs now have little to do with the ways in which bilingualism is actually practiced in the Latinx community. The Latinx community still includes many recent immigrants who could be considered learners of English, although most Latinx children are simultaneous bilinguals, that is, they grow up in homes characterized by bilingual practices. But with its emphasis on teaching *languages*—the language other than English, the English language—the dual language model was never meant to teach *bilingual children*, never meant, in the case under discussion, to educate Latinx children.

Our understanding of the lack of fit between dual language programs and the bilingualism of the community came to a head one day when Ofelia was

observing a dual language 1st grade classroom. For a week, she had observed how some, perhaps most, English-speaking six-year-old children remained silent during the Spanish week, and how silence also characterized the Spanish-speaking children during the English week. The idea of these dual language programs was to have the children who were seen as learners of a “second language” have an immersion experience (this is why these programs are also called double immersion). In this classroom, there were also many Latinx children who were bilingual. But their bilingualism remained invisible, since teachers had been instructed to categorize their students as learners of one language or the other, and when these categories did not work, as dominant in one language or the other.

One day Ofelia was visiting another dual language 5th grade classroom. As Ofelia talked to one 10-year-old Puerto Rican child, he said, “Even though Spanish runs through my heart, English rules my veins.” As we thought about what the child said, we realized that he was describing a unitary circulation system, where the blood flows uninterrupted from the heart to the veins, even if there are separate organs and one organ rules. We realized that the separate language allocation policies in dual language classrooms stopped the flow from the heart (Spanish) to the veins (English). Rather than helping this bilingual child develop and grow, the separate languages arrangement was stifling his growth and was responsible for much of his academic failure. The seeds of translanguaging as a unitary system that works in concert were firmly planted by this eloquent child’s metaphor (see García, 2009a).

### From the ground up: Developing a theory/practice

At the same time, some scholars around the world had started to shift their understandings of the bilingualism and the bilingual education of minoritized communities. Colin Baker (2001) first described an instructional approach that Cen Williams (1996) was trying out in Welsh classrooms. Unlike the many other programs where Welsh was used only in Welsh-language spaces, Williams asked students to use one language for input and another for output. He argued that the use of both Welsh and English within the same instructional space provided students with an opportunity to deepen their meaning-making. Williams coined the term *trawsieithu* in Welsh to describe this instructional approach, a term later translated into English by Colin Baker as translanguaging. And Baker and Williams dialogued extensively with Ofelia during this time.

Although this was the first time that the term translanguaging was used, it was not the first time that a bilingual pedagogical approach that did not strictly separate languages was used. We had often witnessed teachers of emergent

bilingual students using flexible bilingual pedagogical practices, even if they had been taught to think of them as “wrong.” And there had been many scholars who had described these practices in teaching language minoritized communities (see García & Li Wei, 2014, pp. 56–60 for many sources). For example, Fu (2003) used what she called “a bilingual process approach” to teach writing to Chinese emergent bilingual students.

But even though the original use of the term translanguaging, as well as these more flexible bilingual pedagogical practices, referred to an instructional approach that honored students’ bilingualism by using it within one space, it still referred to two separate languages. It was the reading around this time of the manuscript of what became Sinfree Makoni’s and Alistair Pennycook’s book, *Disinventing and Reconstituting Languages* (2007), that allowed us to conceptualize the bilingual practices we had observed our entire lives in a different way.

Of course, this was not the first time that we had read about the invention of languages, implicit in the often-quoted commonplace, attributed to Max Weinreich, that a language is a dialect with a navy. We also knew of Romaine (1994), who had said that “the very concept of discrete languages is probably a European cultural artifact fostered by procedures such as literacy and standardization” (p. 12), and of Khubchandani (1997), who described the essence of Indian plurality in terms of “fuzziness of language boundaries” and “fluidity in language identity” (p. 87). We had also taken note of Bauman and Briggs (2003), who had documented how language was invented by European elites as “reductionist, atomistic, and individualistic” and that this “then became a model not just of communication but of thought, rationality, and sociability” (p. 299). And we knew all along that the same point had been made at the dawn of the study of synchronic linguistics when Saussure (1916) warned that languages were not natural categories (and that neither were dialects). All these authors helped us to see how the concept of the discrete named language has operated as an instrument of colonialism and nation-building to produce and naturalize forms of social inequality in the construction of modernity. But except for Khubchandani (1997), these authors had concerned themselves less with bilingual and multilingual communities.

We started to then understand that the traditional theories of language and bilingualism, and the description of those practices, had not taken into account the knowledge and practices of bilingual communities. Inspired by the work done in Wales, some scholars started to use the term “translanguaging” to try to open up a space in the bilingual literature for these community understandings. For example, Ofelia attempted to tie together the understandings of traditional bilingualism and education with translanguaging when writing about bilingual education (García, 2009a). Creese and Blackledge (2010) wrote about students’ translanguaging in the complementary schools they studied in the United Kingdom. And early on, Li Wei (2011) advanced the idea that translanguaging

developed the creativity and criticality of bilingual students. Li Wei (2011) described how translanguaging

creates a social space for the multilingual user by bringing together different dimensions of their personal history, experience and environment, their attitude, belief and ideology, their cognitive and physical capacity into one coordinated and meaningful performance. (p. 1222)

Although this early translanguaging work validated the minoritized communities' bilingual practices, it still fell short of articulating a coherent theory of language, bilingualism, and language education that took these practices into account.

Our readings of decolonial Latin American philosophers had enabled us to understand that what was needed was to decenter our knowledge of bilingualism from what Walter Mignolo (2000, 2002) had called the "colonial matrix of power." We were then guided by what Boaventura de Sousa Santos called the "epistemology of the South" (2009, 2014). Santos clarifies that the epistemological South is not geographical but stands as a metaphor of systemic and unjust human suffering caused by colonialism and global capitalism. If we wanted to bring to the foreground the epistemologies of bilingualism that operated in the minoritized Latinx bilingual community, then translanguaging needed to encompass an ecology of knowledges from, in Santos's terms, both sides of the line. But as Santos had also explained, the delinking from an epistemology of power takes a gigantic decentering effort, and no one can do it individually. We were fortunate that there were scholars around the world that dialogued with us. Among one of the most fruitful early conversations was that which engaged Ofelia and Li Wei and resulted in their 2014 book.

As we were pondering how to think/do translanguaging in ways that had real and just social consequences for minoritized bilingual communities, we came upon the opportunity to engage with schools educating large number of students who were developing English. As the project Ricardo named CUNY-NYSIEB, came into being, we juntos dialogued, discussed, worked, presented, researched, and wrote with different members of the entire team as well as with others, so as to expand our understandings of translanguaging theory/practice. The next section describes the joint effort made with the CUNY-NYSIEB team to clarify how to theorize/do translanguaging in ways that allow bilingual minoritized communities, and especially young people in schools, to re-exist with dignity.

### CUNY-NYSIEB beginnings and development of a theory/practice

In 2011, as New York State was confronting what was seen as the failure of many schools with a large number of students they classified as English

language learners, Arlen Benjamin-Gómez and Angélica Infante-Greene from the New York State Education Department came to discuss the issue with us. When we agreed to work with New York State to support these schools, we knew we could not continue to act with the same theoretical constructs and pedagogical practices that had resulted in so much academic failure for these children. We also knew that to make an impact, we needed to engage younger scholars who could continue the work for years to come. We reached out to Kate Menken who became the co-principal investigator of the project. The three of us worked on firming up the Vision for CUNY-NYSIEB, articulating translanguaging as a theory based on practices that Ofelia had written about, but that still needed to be formulated in an articulated manner. We were fortunate to then hire Nelson Flores as our first Project Director. We then articulated the two nonnegotiable principles for participating schools (engaging with bilingualism as a resource and with a multilingual school ecology), in this way identifying the commitments that schools needed to make in order to participate in the project.

Ofelia, Ricardo, Kate, and Nelson dialogued frequently about how to implement the vision. One of our first decisions was to engage the CUNY teacher education faculty in ESL and Bilingual Education so that we together could learn more about translanguaging as theory/practice. We knew that changing the teachers' stance toward their bilingual students was most important. And we also knew that for these shifts to occur, we needed time, longer than the year in which we would be engaged with the schools. By engaging teacher education faculty, we hoped not only that we would learn together, but also that they would then carry out the work with future ESL and bilingual teachers (see Chapters 16–18, this volume).

The school teams and school principals of our first cohort of schools had uneven understandings of bilingualism. Our task was then to inform them of traditional bilingual scholarship and to go beyond it. We engaged them in difficult conversations, as we questioned and made visible the practices of racialization, exclusion, and marginalization that were taking place in many schools. The dialogue was not one-way, for we also worked on seeing the realities that teachers and administrators were facing in their schools, and on adjusting translanguaging theory/practice so that it could be implemented.

We started out by proposing to them that what they called English language learners were what we called *emergent bilinguals* (García, 2009b). We impressed upon them the idea that it was impossible to put children into categories, and that we were all emergent bilinguals when confronted with tasks for which we have not used language before. We worked with the idea of *emergence*, that we derived from the work of Chilean biologist Francisco Varela, to ensure that the present possibilities for these children were opened *now* (and not in the future) by



having teachers offer them the right type of affordances. We discussed the concept of dynamic bilingualism and how bilingual children used language without regard for the boundaries of what were regarded externally as two languages; and we introduced the term translanguaging.

Because it was important for the CUNY-NYSIEB teams to provide teachers with strategies to implement a translanguaging pedagogical approach, two very seasoned teachers of emergent bilinguals—one in elementary school (Cécile), the other in high school (Seltzer)—were contracted to write the first translanguaging guide (Cécile & Seltzer, 2012/2013). We wanted the guide to be used by school teams in collaborative ways. The guide was accompanied by a *How to Use* section, as well as *Questions and Answers*, based on our dialogue with schools.

As the project grew under the leadership of its long-standing project director Matte Sánchez, followed by that of project directors Kate Seltzer and Ivana Espinet, different members of the CUNY-NYSIEB team developed material for teachers to use (see Chapter 7, this volume). We as a team also engaged in much collaborative writing (see, for example, García & Kleyn, 2016). And many of us have individually gone beyond the collective understandings that we have held, coming up with positions that have further impacted our collective work on translanguaging. Among this extended scholarship, our collective understandings of translanguaging have benefited from Nelson Flores' recent work on raciolinguistic ideologies (Flores & Rosa, 2015). Our published scholarship as articles and book chapters has demonstrated how our understanding of translanguaging theory/practice continues to grow and change, as we call attention to different aspects, some represented throughout this volume.

Despite our differences, and our many emphases, we have developed an understanding of translanguaging that attempts to be informed by what Santos (2007) has called *post-abysmal thinking*. That is, we work in schools that are state institutions and that as such tend to reproduce colonial differences by adopting the epistemological perspective of dominant groups. But we work with students who have suffered the systemic and unjust consequences of colonialism and global capitalism. Translanguaging for us, then, situates our epistemological perspective on the social experience of those whose knowledge/practice has been left out. But as we bring forth these other epistemologies to decenter the universal emancipating claims of much educational policies and practices, we also cross the line the other way. We recognize a plurality of heterogeneous knowledges, forever incomplete in different ways. For us, translanguaging theory/practice as defined in the next section is not only a political act, as Nelson Flores said in 2014 (Flores, 2014), as it questions the construction of language and bilingualism that has negatively impacted the Latinx bilingual community. Translanguaging theory/practice is also a way of caring for that

community by validating their own knowledge/practice and leveraging it in their education.

### Conceptualizing translanguaging theory/practice

Translanguaging is not an easy concept to understand because all of us think we know what language is. Language is English; language is Spanish; language is Arabic; language is Chinese. But when we conceive of language in these terms, we reveal that our understanding of language is the one that nation-states and their institutions have foisted upon us.

Many educators and scholars have simply understood the *trans-* in translanguaging as going *across* from one language to another. In thinking about how to do translanguaging in classrooms, many have gone back to the idea that any use of what is considered a child's home language in instruction (understood as the child's L1) is considered translanguaging. This was an advance back at the time when there were no bilingual programs at all, or in the more recent times when bilingual education programs were closing, and English as a Second Language programs were flourishing.

But the *trans-* in translanguaging is about going *beyond* the traditional understandings of language that have been given to us by countries, schools, and prescriptive grammar books (García & Li Wei, 2014; Li Wei, 2011; Otheguy, García & Reid, 2015, 2019). Translanguaging honors and acknowledges the languaging of people, their language practices (Becker, 1995; Maturana & Varela, 1984). And yet, translanguaging theory does not just accept the languaging of people as practices; it engages with it as the basis for an alternative conception of language. Translanguaging is theory/practice; it does not simply posit that these practices are language because as we have said, our conception of language has been constructed or "invented" as Makoni and Pennycook (2007) have said. It is not simply that all translanguaging is language; it is more that all language is translanguaging.

Otheguy, García and Reid have argued (2015, 2019) that all speakers translanguaging, including monolinguals. That is, all speakers select features from their linguistic repertoire that seem to be most appropriate for the communicative task at hand. When monolinguals of the same racial and social class interact with one another, they are free to make use of most of the features in their repertoire, with a few exceptions having to do with the context in which the interaction takes place. For example, in situations considered formal, monolinguals do not usually curse, nor use lexical items that they might use when speaking with children. Likewise, when Latinx bilinguals interact with each other, in homes and communities, they often use more or less their entire linguistic repertoire, without being bound by what society considers English or Spanish. Otheguy,

García and Reid (2015) have defined the translanguaging of bilinguals saying, "Translanguaging is the deployment of a speaker's full linguistic repertoire without regard for watchful adherence to the socially and politically defined boundaries of named languages" (2015, p. 281).

The reason why translanguaging is especially pertinent for bilingual communities is that they are usually expected to behave linguistically as if they were monolinguals. That is, in interacting with monolinguals, bilinguals are often restricted to half or less of their linguistic repertoire. Thus, although all people engage in translanguaging, it is speakers of bilingual minoritized communities for whom the fact of translanguaging has the most relevance and the most tangible consequences. Translanguaging theory/practice makes visible the *injustice* of requiring bilingual people, and especially students, to use less than half of their linguistic repertoire, while comparing them to monolinguals who can use almost their entire repertoire to perform the same task.

When translanguaging theory/practice is brought into schools, as we have done in CUNY-NYSIEB, we are immediately confronted with the reality that for schools, language is considered the so-called standard language found in school texts. It has been important then to simultaneously hold these different knowledges/practices of language—those of school texts, and those of the bilingual students who interact with the texts. Translanguaging, as we have said, refers to the processes and actions whereby bilinguals select and deploy particular features from their *unitary communicative repertoire* that goes beyond the simple addition of two named languages in order to make meaning (Otheguy, García & Reid, 2015, 2019). What is then important is for teachers to simultaneously understand language from both perspectives (Otheguy, 2016b) or as Boaventura de Sousa Santos posits (2007), from both sides of the line—that of the dominant school texts and that of the minoritized bilingual students.

When children, all children, acquire language, they engage in the process of adding features to a unitary linguistic repertoire. Bilingual children acquire language in the same way, whether this is in done simultaneously from infancy at home or sequentially in school. When immigrant children come into schools where the language of instruction is seen as different from the home language, the impression of educators may be that they are acquiring a new language. However, translanguaging theory proposes that what they are acquiring are new linguistic features, to be integrated into their unitary repertoire, one that is unique to them. Only by making the new features part of a valid repertoire that is their own and that includes their own individual and community markings will minoritized children be able to engage in competent performances at schools. Even if the school texts with which Latinx children are expected to interact, orally or in writing, are in the standard language of school, children,

if they are to succeed, need to be able to leverage their translanguaging. That is, bilingual children need to utilize all their background knowledge, which includes their own translanguaging. Note well that we haven't said, as we did in years past, knowledge which includes their own language; we've said: Which includes their own translanguaging.

The education of Latinx bilinguals in the United States has focused on literacy because schools' accountability to the government involves reading and writing assessments (see Chapter 13, this volume). But to do school literacy, whether reading or writing, Latinx bilinguals need to enter the text with their full meaning-making repertoire (García, 2020; García & Kleifgen, 2019; see also Chapters 8, 10, 11, and 12, this volume). Many teachers of bilingual students understand this concept, but for them to implement it, they need to develop what García, Johnson and Seltzer (2017) have called a translanguaging stance. To develop such a stance, teachers need to experience translanguaging and how it works in teaching and learning. That is why, very early on, we shared with school principals and teachers Martin Luther King's quote: "You do not have to see the whole staircase, just take the first steps." And to take the first step, our first translanguaging guide (Celic & Seltzer, 2012/2013) includes a section on how a team of teachers can conduct a collaborative descriptive inquiry session using one of the translanguaging pedagogical strategies.

Translanguaging emphasizes the actions of emergent bilinguals as they engage in assemblages of the forms of meaning-making that are available at the moment (Pennycook, 2017). Correctly, Li Wei (2017) and Li Wei and Lin (2019) have emphasized the moment-to-moment nature of translanguaging. Because of the emergent nature of translanguaging, pedagogical translanguaging should respond to these emergent actions, to this process of languaging and learning. Thus, when García, Johnson and Seltzer (2017) laid out the three components of a translanguaging pedagogy, they not only included a translanguaging stance, and a translanguaging design, but they also added translanguaging shifts. These shifts are what teachers need to do to adjust to the moment-to-moment translanguaging of bilingual students in classrooms.

The work of CUNY-NYSIEB has focused on school literacies because it has responded to the priorities of the Education Department of a State. However, by foregrounding the actions of people, translanguaging takes into account participants' simultaneous use of multiple semiotic resources that mutually elaborate each other. Angel Lin (2019) refers to the *trans-semiotizing* aspects of translanguaging, a way to broaden the focus of language as intertwined with many other semiotic resources (for example, visuals, gestures, bodily movement). Translanguaging, Lin (2019) points out, is a whole-body sense-making process. Translanguaging theory/practice includes not only aspects of the spoken and written language but also the sights, the sounds, the objects, and instruments at their disposal, as well as



how these are deployed (Hua, Li Wei & Jankowicz-Pytel, 2019; Li Wei, 2017; Lin, 2019; Moore, Bradley & Simpson, 2020).

The potential of leveraging translanguaging to educate bilingual students has been explored by members of the CUNY-NYSIEB group who are represented in this volume, sometimes with others (see the CUNY-NYSIEB website for examples). Our work on translanguaging intersects with the growing scholarship of many others, too numerous to mention, in the United States and in the world (for examples of how translanguaging has been used in the United States, see Teacher/Researcher Box #16.1, and in other parts of the world, see Teacher/Researcher Box #17.1 and #18.1). With regard to translanguaging and Latinx bilingual students, we have benefited especially from the scholarship of many other Latinx scholars (see, for example, among many others, De los Ríos & Seltzer, 2017; García-Mateus & Palmer, 2017; Gort & Sembriante, 2015; Martínez, Hikida & Durán, 2019).

### Challenges

It will not have escaped readers of this volume that our biggest challenge has been to ensure that schools that tend to think of language in the ways of the state can imagine their bilingual students and their language differently. In many ways, we have been constrained by many of the mandates from New York State that were in turn the result of federal government mandates. For example, we were restricted originally to work with students who had been classified as English language learners. However, many times these classrooms had other children, sometimes those with disabilities, and many times other racialized students as well (see, for example, the case of Ms. Ardizzone, Teacher/Researcher Box #6.1). We negotiated our work with the State because we were certain that the alternative would have been to leave the children and their teachers behind, when they needed so much help. We were also confident that we could transform the stances of some teachers who would then be able to implement instructional changes, becoming local policy-makers (see Menken & García, 2010).

In order to do this work, we needed, what Walter Mignolo (2002) has called a *language-otherwise*, so as to point to a more inclusive and socially just position. We had to include those who had suffered the injustices caused by what Quijano (2000) has called the *persistent coloniality* of discrimination, racism, linguisticism, and classism, reflected in the educational system. At the same time, we had to include the educational reality formulated by the state. We repositioned English language learners as emergent bilinguals. And we refashioned dual language education programs as dual language *bilingual* education programs, providing translanguaging alternatives to the program's strict language allocation policies (Sanchez, García & Solorza, 2017; Seltzer & García, 2018).

In 2014, New York State changed the student designation from simply "English language learner" to "English Language Learner/Multilingual Learner." We were pleased with the change, although for us the term multilingual learner still contained several problematic features: (1) It continued the silencing of the word *bilingual*, which had signaled so much of the Latinx community struggle for self-determination. (2) It omitted the concept of *emergence* which for us had to do with the shifting nature of bilingual interactions. (3) Although it acknowledged the multilingual nature of New York State's student body, the students' multilingualism was not in any way included in the actual teaching. During the time of our work, New York State also changed the designation of the "English as a Second Language" program to "English as a New language." We understood also the limitation of this new term, since for many of our bilingual students, English was not a new language; in fact, many of them had spoken it from birth. Our formulations in the chapters that follow often demonstrate the ways we negotiated these state terminologies, sometimes adopting them wholesale, other times not, depending on who was our audience.

A lot of our translanguaging work has been used by teachers all over the United States and the world. However, the New York State Education Department has not always been ready to accept it as their own, even after supporting us with generous funding for all these years. A lot of our translanguaging work never made it to their website. For example, at the request of the New York State Education Department, Seltzer and García (2018) authored a Topic Brief about translanguaging and dual language education programs. Although the other Topic Briefs authored that year were uploaded to the NYSED website, that one was excluded. The term "translanguaging" continued to be seen as somewhat threatening, even though we were opening up educational spaces for bilingual students and we remain ardent supporters of bilingual education.

Our relationship with New York State has been cordial and friendly. And we are grateful for their support and their hard work on behalf of emergent bilinguals. Yet, we have not always seen eye to eye on how to publicly address the challenges and opportunities of teaching minoritized bilinguals.

We position our translanguaging CUNY-NYSIEB work within what Gloria Anzaldúa (2015) refers to by the Nahuatl word of *Nepantla*, the lugar entre medio. We believe that a translanguaging theory/practice provides a liminal space that allows us to look at things from both sides of the line. And yet all of us, members of the CUNY-NYSIEB team and working for the New York State Education Department, often fall prey to the intellectual and emotional allure of a single side of the line, as some of the work in this volume makes evident. Our challenge continues to be to attempt to stay firm within that lugar entre medio that pushes against boundaries that have outlived their usefulness and

have caused so much pain and educational failure. Much of our work has been about navigating the cracks between worldviews and epistemologies that have produced the minoritization, racialization, and failure of so many students in New York, the country, and the world.

The translanguaging work of the CUNY-NYSIEB team has taken many forms and will continue to do so in the future. It has been, and remains, a forever challenge, to balance translanguaging theory/practice within a school system that has not always been receptive, but whose mission should always be, and in some fortunate cases indeed is, to provide the best possible education to all children, very much including bilingual children who have been often racialized through their language practices.

## References

- Anzaldúa, G. (2015). *Light in the dark/Luz en lo oscuro. Rewriting identity, spirituality, reality*. A.L. Keating (ed.). Durham, NC & London: Duke University Press.
- Baker, C. (2001). *Foundations of bilingual education and bilingualism* (3rd ed.). Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Bauman, R. & Briggs, C.L. (2003). *Voices of modernity: Language ideologies and the politics of inequality*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Becker, A.L. (1995). *Beyond translation: Essays toward a modern philosophy*. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.
- Celic, C. & Seltzer, K. (2012/2013). Translanguaging: A CUNY-NYSIEB Guide for Educators. <http://www.cuny-nysieb.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/04/Translanguaging-Guide-March-2013.pdf>
- Crawford, J. (2007). The decline of bilingual education in the USA. How to reverse a troubling trend? *International Multilingual Research Journal*, 1(1), 33–37. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19313150709336863>
- Creece, A. & Blackledges, A. (2010). Translanguaging in the bilingual classroom: A pedagogy for learning and teaching? *Modern Language Journal*, 94(1), 103–115. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.2009.00986.x>
- de los Ríos, C. & Seltzer, K. (2017). Translanguaging, coloniality and English classrooms: An exploration of two bicoastal urban classrooms. *Research in the Teaching of English*, 52(1), 55–76.
- Espinosa, A. (1925). Where is the best Spanish spoken? *Hispania*, 4, 269–284.
- Fishman, J.A. (1966a). Bilingualism with and without diglossia, diglossia with and without bilingualism. *Journal of Social Issues*, 23(2), 29–38. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4560.1967.tb00573.x>
- Fishman, J.A. (1966b). Language maintenance and shift. *Sociologus*, 16(1), 19–39. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/43644960>
- Fishman, J.A. (Eds.). (2001). *Can threatened languages be saved?* Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Flores, N. (2014). Let's not forget that translanguaging is a political act. [Online] Educational Linguist. Available at: <https://educationallinguist.wordpress.com/2014/07/19/lets-not-forget-that-translanguaging-is-a-political-act/> [Accessed 26 Nov. 2018].

- Flores, N. & García, O. (2017). A critical review of bilingual education in the United States: From basements and pride to boutiques and profit. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 37, 14–29. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190517000162>
- Flores, N. & Rosa, J. (2015). Undoing appropriateness: Raciolinguistic ideologies and language diversity in education. *Harvard Educational Review*, 85(2), 149–172.
- Fu, D. (2003). *An Island of English: Teaching ESL in Chinatown*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- 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. (2009a). *Bilingual education in the 21st century: A global perspective*. Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.
- García, O. (2009b). Emergent bilinguals and TESOL: What's in a name? *TESOL Quarterly*, 43 (2), 322–326.
- García, O. (2020). Translanguaging and Latinx bilingual readers. *The Reading Teacher*, 73(5), 557–562. <https://doi.org/10.1002/trt.1883>
- García, O., Johnson, S., & Seltzer, K. (2017). *The Translanguaging classroom. Leveraging student bilingualism for learning*. Philadelphia: Caston.
- García, O. & Kleifgen, J. (2018). *Educating emergent bilinguals: Policies, programs and practices for English Learners* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- García, O. & Kleifgen, J.A. (2019). Translanguaging and literacies. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 55(4). <https://doi.org/10.1002/trq.286>
- García, O. & Kleyn, T. (Eds.). (2016). *Translanguaging with multilingual students: Learning from classroom moments*. New York and London: Routledge.
- García, O. & Li, Wei. (2014). *Translanguaging: Language, bilingualism and education*. London/ New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- García, O., Morín, J.L., & Rivera, K. (2001). How threatened is the Spanish of New York puerto ricans? Language shift with vaivén. In J.A. Fishman (Ed.), *Can threatened languages be saved? Reversing language shift revisited* (pp. 44–73). Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- García, O. & Sung, K.K.-F. (2018). Critically assessing the 1968 Bilingual Education Act at 50 years: Taming tongues and Latinx communities. *The Bilingual Review Journal*, 4(4), 318–333. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15235882.2018.1529642>
- García-Mateus, S. & Palmer, D. (2017). Translanguaging pedagogies for positive identities in two-way dual language bilingual education. *Journal of Language, Identity & Education*, 16(4), 245–255. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15348458.2017.1329016>
- Cort, M. & Sembante, S. (2015). Navigating hybridized language learning spaces through translanguaging pedagogy: Dual language preschool teachers' languaging practices in support of emergent bilingual children's performance of academic discourse. *International Multilingual Research Journal*, 9(1), 7–25. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19313152.2014.981775>
- Haugen, Einar. (1953). *The Norwegian language in America: The bilingual community*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Hernández-Chávez, E. (1995). Language policy in the United States. A history of cultural genocide. In T. Skutnabb-Kangas & R. Phillipson (Eds.), *Linguistic human rights. Overcoming linguistic discrimination* (pp. 141–158). New York, NY: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Hua, Z., Li, Wei., & Jankowicz-Pytel, D. (2019). Translanguaging and embodied teaching and learning: Lessons from a multilingual karate club in London. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 23(1), 65–80. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050.2019.1599811>

- Khubchandani, L.M. (1997). Language policy and education in the Indian subcontinent. In R. Wodak & D. Corson (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of language and education* (pp. 179–187). Dordrecht: Springer. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-011-4538-1\\_17](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-011-4538-1_17)
- Lambert, W.E. (1974). Culture and language as factors in learning and education. In F.E. Aboud & R.D. Meade (Eds.), *Cultural factors in learning and education* (pp. 91–122). Bellingham, Washington: 5th Western Washington Symposium on Learning.
- Lambert, W.E. & Tucker, G.R. (1972). *The bilingual education of children*. Rowley, MA: Newbury House.
- Li, Wei. (2011). Moment analysis and translanguaging space: Discursive construction of identities by multilingual Chinese youth in Britain. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 43(5), 1222–1235. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2010.07.035>
- Li, Wei. (2017). Translanguaging as a practical theory of language. *Applied Linguistics*, 39(1), 9–30. <https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/axm039>
- Li, Wei & Lin, A.M.Y. (2019). Translanguaging classroom discourse: Pushing limits, breaking boundaries. *Classroom Discourse*, 10(3–4), 209–215. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19463014.2019.1635032>
- Lin, A.M.Y. (2019). Theories of trans/languageing and trans-semiotizing: Implications for content-based education classrooms. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 22(1), 5–16. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050.2018.1515175>
- Makoni, S. & Pennycook, A. (2007). *Disinventing and reconstituting languages*. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Marín-Rojo, L. (2017). Language and power. In O. García, N. Flores & M. Sporti (Eds.), *The Oxford handbook of language and society* (pp. 77–102). New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Marínez, R., Hikida, M., & Duvañ, L. (2019). In Pacheco, M., Morales, P.Z. & Hamilton, C. (Eds.), *Transforming schooling for second language learners* (pp. 181–198). Charlotte, North Carolina: Information Age Publishing.
- Marínez, 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(2), 124–149.
- Maturana, H. & Varela, F. (1984). *El árbol del conocimiento. Las bases biológicas del entendimiento humano*. Santiago de Chile: Lumen, Editorial Universitaria.
- Meléndez, E. (2017). *Sponsored migration: The state and Puerto Rican postwar migration to the United States*. Columbus, OH: Ohio State University Press.
- Menken, K. & García, O. (Eds.). (2010). *Negotiating language politics in schools: Educators as policymakers*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Mignolo, W. (2000). *Local histories/global designs: Essays on the coloniality of power, subaltern knowledges and border thinking*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Mignolo, W. (2002). The geopolitics of knowledge and the colonial difference. *The South Atlantic Quarterly*, 101(1), 57–96.
- Monrual, S. (2008). *Incomplete acquisition in bilingualism*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Moore, E., Bradley, J., & Simpson, J. (Eds.). (2020). *Translanguaging as transformation: The collaborative construction of new linguistic realities*. Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Nichols, M.W. (1945). The history of Spanish and Portuguese teaching in the United States. In H. Grattan-Doyle (Ed.), *A Handbook in the teaching of Spanish and Portuguese* (pp. 99–146). Boston: D.C. Heath.
- Otheguy, R. (1982). Thinking about bilingual education: A critical appraisal. *Harvard Educational Review*, 52(3), 301–314. <https://doi.org/10.17763/haer.52.3.g8187157520v0081>
- Otheguy, R. (2007). La filología y el unicornio: El verdadero referente del vocablo *spanglish* y su función como adjudicador de posiciones de poder en la población de origen hispano en los EEUU. In E.S. Alegre (Ed.), *La incidencia del contexto en los discursos* (Lynx, Annexa 14) (pp. 5–20). Valencia: Universitat de València.
- Otheguy, R. (2008). Affirming differences, valuing variation and dismissing dialects in modern linguistics. *Studies in Hispanic and Lusophone Linguistics*, 1(1), 223–234.
- Otheguy, R. (2009). El llamado español. In H. López-Morales (Ed.), *Enciclopedia del español en los Estados Unidos* (pp. 222–247). Madrid: Instituto Cervantes & Editorial Santillana.
- Otheguy, R. (2016a). Spanglish. In J. Gutiérrez-Rexach (Ed.), *Enciclopedia de lingüística hispanita* (pp. 454–462). London & New York: Routledge.
- Otheguy, R. (2016b). Foreword. In O. García & T. Kleyn (Eds.), *Translanguaging with multilingual students. Learning from classroom moments* (pp. ix–xii). New York: Routledge.
- Otheguy, R. (2016c). The linguistic competence of second-generation bilinguals: A critique of ‘incomplete acquisition.’ In C. Tortora, M. den Dikken, I.L. Montoya & T. O’Neill (Eds.), *Romance linguistics 2013. Selected papers from the 43rd linguistic symposium on romance languages (LSRL), New York, 17–19 April, 2013* (pp. 301–320). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Otheguy, R., García, O., & Fernandez, M. (1989). Transferring, switching, and modeling in West New York Spanish: An intergenerational study. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 79, 41–52.
- Otheguy, R., García, O., & Reid, W. (2015). Clarifying translanguaging and deconstructing named languages: A perspective from linguistics. *Applied Linguistics Review*, 6(3), 281–307. <https://doi.org/10.1515/applirev-2015-0014>
- Otheguy, R., García, O., & Reid, W. (2019). A translanguaging view of the linguistic system of bilinguals. *Applied Linguistics Review*, 10(4), 625–651. <https://doi.org/10.1515/applirev-2018-0020>
- Otheguy, R. & Stern, N. (2013). Scholars and citizens: Judging the unfortunate term “Spanglish.” *Anthropology News*, December 2013.
- Otheguy, R. & Stern, N. (2011). On so-called Spanglish. *International Journal of Bilingualism*, 15(1), 85–100. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1367006910379298>
- Pedraza, P., Aminasi, J., & Hoffman, G. (1980). *Rethinking diglossia*. New York: Language Policy Task Force, Centro de Estudios Puertorriqueños.
- Pennycook, A. (2017). Translanguaging and semiotic assemblages. *International Journal of Multilingualism*, 14(3), 269–282. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14790718.2017.1315810>
- Poplack, S. (1980). Sometimes I’ll start a sentence in English y termino en español: Toward a typology of code-switching. *Linguistics*, 18(7–8), 581–618.
- Quijano, A. (2000). Coloniality of power, ethnocentrism, and Latin America. *Nepantla*, 1(3), 533–580.
- Romaine, S. (1994). *Language in society. An Introduction to sociolinguistics*. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press.
- Sánchez, M.T., García, O., & Solorza, C. (2017). Reframing language allocation policy in dual language bilingual education. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 41(1), 37–51. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15235882.2017.1405098>
- Santos, B. de S. (2007). Beyond abyssal thinking: From global lines to ecologies of knowledges. *Review (Fernand Braudel Center)*, 30(1), 45–89.

- Santos, B. de S. (2009). *Una epistemología del sur: La reinvencción del conocimiento y la emancipación social*. Buenos Aires: Siglo XXI Editores, CLACSO.
- Santos, B. de S. (2014). *Epistemologies of the South: Justice against epistemicide*. New York: Routledge Publishers.
- Saussure, Ferdinand. (1916 [1972, 1986]). *Cours de linguistique générale*. Publié par Charles Bally et Albert Séchéhaye. Avec la collaboration de Albert Riedlinger. Edition critique préparée par Tullio de Mauro. Paris: Edition Payot. Translated by Roy Harris as *Course in general linguistics*. La Salle, Illinois: Open Court Classics.
- Seltzer, K. & García, O. (2018). *Translanguaging and dual language bilingual education classrooms*. <http://www.cuny-nysieb.org/wp-content/PDFs/Clarifying-Translanguaging-in-DLE.pdf>
- Weinreich, Uriel. (1953/1974). *Languages in contact: Findings and problems*. The Hague: Mouton.
- Williams, C. (1996). Secondary education: Teaching in the bilingual situation. In C. Williams, G. Lewis & C. Baker (Eds.), *The Language policy: Taking stock* (pp. 39–78). Llangefni, UK: CAI.
- Zentella, A.C. (1996). *Growing up bilingual: Puerto Rican children in New York*. Malden, MA: Wiley.
- Zentella, A.C. (2016). Spanglish. Language politics vs. el habla del pueblo. In R.E. Guzzardo Tamargo, C.M. Mazak & M.C. Parafita Couto (Eds.), *Spanish-English codeswitching in the Caribbean and the U.S.* (pp. 11–35). New York: John Benjamins.

## 2

# CONSTRUCTING TRANSLANGUAGING SCHOOL POLICIES AND PRACTICES

Kate Menken and Ofelia García

## Introduction

CUNY-NYSIEB (City University of New York-New York State Initiative on Emergent Bilinguals) offered an opportunity to develop a theory and practice of translanguaging in schools across New York State, as was discussed in Chapter 1 (this book). In this chapter, we describe how our efforts to do so challenged traditional practices and structures in schools for emergent bilingual students in fundamental ways. In accordance with translanguaging theory, we adopted the position that for schools to be successful at meeting the needs of emergent bilingual students, they would need to develop broad ecologies of multilingualism that built on the home language practices of their students. Specifically, schools participating in CUNY-NYSIEB were required to adhere to the two guiding principles of the project: (1) a multilingual ecology for the whole school and (2) bilingualism as a resource in education. Embracing these CUNY-NYSIEB principles required that schools leave behind monolingual and monocultural ideologies that had limited their ability to meet the academic, emotional, and social needs of emergent bilinguals (EBs). Instead, the schools needed to adopt policies and practices that would support the emergence of students' dynamic bilingual development.

## Context: Language education policies and practices in New York

*Language policies* refer to “formal and informal decisions about language use” such as “laws, regulations, and statutes, as well as practice” (de Jong, 2011) and *language education policies* determine how, why, and which language practices are