

# 1

## THEORETICAL FOUNDATIONS OF DUAL LANGUAGE BILINGUAL EDUCATION

*Ofelia García, Cristina Alfaro, Juan A. Freire*

### Introduction

At the end of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, many bilingual education programs in the United States were transformed into dual language programs (also called dual language immersion and two-way immersion) (Lindholm-Leary, 2001). The different naming for these programs signaled an ideological shift that reflected a distancing from the struggles of primarily Chicana, Puerto Rican, and Native American communities during the Civil Rights movement to develop educational programs for their children that reflected their own knowledge systems, histories, and cultural and linguistic practices. The word “bilingual” became the “B-word” (Crawford, 2000) and was eliminated from every piece of legislation and from federal and state departments of education following the No Child Left Behind Act of 2002 (García, 2009). In the erasure of the word “bilingual,” U.S. language-minoritized communities were dispossessed of their educational programs (Freire et al., 2021), now substituted by programs that were to teach two languages and *two groups* of children, that is, were to be “two-way,” rather than focusing on *educating language-minoritized children bilingually*.

True, since the 1980s, the developmental maintenance bilingual education programs that had been the vision of the Chicana, Puerto Rican, and Native American communities to improve the socioeconomic conditions of their communities had been slowly substituted by transitional bilingual education programs and in some cases by English as a second language (ESL) programs. Dual language programs held the promise of giving back the possibility of bilingual and biliterate development. But as these programs grew, a process akin to what David Harvey (2004) called “accumulation by

dispossession” occurred. Harvey used this term to refer to neoliberal capitalist policies that resulted in the centralization of wealth and power in the hands of a few by dispossessing others of their own resources. Similarly, Freire et al. (2021) used the term “expropriation” to illustrate how many dual language programs are engaged in “the act of co-opting or dispossessing language resources, opportunities, and rights of language-minoritized individuals ... to benefit majoritarian communities” (p. 28). As transitional bilingual education programs throughout the country were shut down, dual language programs, more palatable to the language majority, sprung up. These programs were also of benefit to the dominant English-speaking white communities who, keeping up with global neoliberal interests, became interested in their children’s bilingual and biliteracy development. The surge of dual language programs can then be seen as following the logic of neoliberalism to both serve the interests of the dominant class and pacify resistance by marginalized groups (Delavan et al., 2017). In addition, these programs also had a political purpose of bringing those who had previously been excluded into “global capitalism’s all-consuming framework and structure” (Mignolo & Walsh, 2018, p. 57).

The implementation of two-way dual language programs reduced program capacity for language-minoritized children by half and expropriated them of the right to be educated bilingually as a group. Half the seats were now reserved for those who were learners of the language other than English, most frequently Spanish, but also Mandarin, Cantonese, French, Arabic, and others. In so doing, the language other than English was curricularized (Valdés, 2018) to the same extent as English, slowly distancing it from the minoritized community and its language practices (Alfaro, 2019; Alfaro & Bartolomé, 2017; Freire & Feinauer, 2022), and in the process, making it acceptable to the dominant group. Spanish, for example, started to be taught as if it was a “language elsewhere” (Mena & García, 2020), and not used as the language of a U.S. Latinx community with a long history. As a result, dual language programs have led to the gentrification of communities and the takeover of bilingual education spaces by privileged populations (Valdez et al., 2016; Chapter 13 in this volume).

Dual language programs became a strategy of what Silvia Rivera Cusicanqui (2012), the Bolivian feminist decolonial scholar, calls “crossdressing,” which she describes as new forms of colonization that reproduce a conditional inclusion, “a mitigated and second-class citizenship that molds subaltern imaginaries and identities into the role of ornaments through which the anonymous masses play out the theatricality of their own identity” (p. 99). Language-minoritized children in some dual language programs became nothing more than enhancements for the benefit of language majorities eager to become bilingual (Valdez et al., 2016). The identities of language-minoritized children were not authentically performed but were dressed up

for a world stage. Crossdressing relates to the idea of gatopardismo, a term based on the 1954 novel of the Italian author Giuseppe di Lampedusa, which refers to a political strategy of advocating for change, but in practice only superficially modifying existing power structures (see also Freire et al., 2021; Martínez, 2017). Many dual language programs exert a form of crossdressing and gatopardismo under the dominance of majoritarian populations.

As two-way dual language programs spread, the growing language-minoritized communities started to perceive how these programs could also be beneficial for their own bilingual children. For example, in many communities across the United States where Latinx make up the overwhelming numerical majority, Latinx educational authorities and educators started advocating for dual language programs. These programs were a good alternative to the ESL programs or the very few Transitional Bilingual Education programs that were available for students classified as “English Language Learners.” These dual language programs also offered the opportunity to bilingually educate Latinx children who were fluent in English. Language-minoritized and racialized children whose bilingualism falls along all points of the bilingual continuum are educated in these dual language programs.

But regardless of the student composition of dual language programs, they traditionally were, for the most part, theoretically grounded in colonial theories of language that perceived *language as an object to be “had,”* and traditional sociolinguistic theories of *bilingualism as additive and of language separation*. In this chapter, we consider alternative theories of language and bilingualism that dual language-*bilingual* programs must take up to provide a socially and cognitively just education that is inclusive and equitable for all. We ask: How can we engage in a project of *dual language bilingual education* (DLBE) theoretically grounded from the ground up, from those who have been pushed to the margins, in ways that does not respond to colonial language constructions of dominance and power? How can we loosen restrictive worldviews in order to transform subjectivities and consciousness, and open up opportunities for change? In doing so, we take inspiration from the many examples of work already being done by committed and critical bilingual educators.

In this chapter, we first look at the past to move forward, as we make a call to commit to the origins of bilingual education for a transformed DLBE in the future. Then, we ground our theoretical framework on *decolonial theory and nepantlera theory*, as well as *raciolinguistic ideologies* (see [Chapter 14](#) of this volume for literature review on raciolinguistics in DLBE). These theoretical perspectives broaden the ways in which language, bilingualism and biliteracy are theorized within dual language education, and we describe how this is so. We show how through taking up these lenses, *language, bilingualism* and *biliteracy* can be reconceptualized in ways that reconstitute

DLBE. This then leads us to propose the adoption of a critical flexible dual language bilingual allocation policy at the program level and critical pedagogical practices at the classroom level.

### “Past-future” at a Time of Change and Theories “Otherwise”

Indigenous Aymara and Quechua groups appeal to the concept of *Pachakutik* to refer to a “change in the sun,” a moment that signals a new cycle and desire for substantive change in the political environment (Cusicanqui in Cacopardo, 2018). For us, the pandemic caused by COVID-19, and the movements associated with Black Lives Matter and #Me Too, have been Pachakutiks in our lives, enabling us to clearly see what Cusicanqui calls “past-future” that engages us in walking forward looking back because, as she says, looking at the past can orient us in the present world (Cusicanqui in Cacopardo, 2018) toward an “otherwise,” meaning “a transformation conceived and impelled from the margins, from the ground up, and for society at large” (Mignolo & Walsh, 2018, p. 59).

We find Cusicanqui’s notion of past-future necessary for dual language bilingual programs. As DLBE scholars we must look to the past and the commitment of the brave Latinx and Native American educators during the Civil Rights movement to educate their children bilingually, sustained by their own histories, knowledge-systems, cultural and linguistic practices, stories, songs, poetry, and desires for socioeconomic improvement (for more, see Blum Martínez & Habermann López, 2020; García & Sung, 2018; San Miguel & Valencia, 1998). It is instructive to listen to the words of a leading Mexican American educational anthropologist of the time, Henry T. Trueba. Bilingual-bicultural education, he says, “ultimately will *open the door to full Chicano participation in the socioeconomic opportunities*” (our italics, 1973, p. 2). And he defined a Chicano as someone who “perceives his *culture as unique*, that is, *different from the Mexican and the Anglo cultures*, and who *actively works to defend his cultural heritage* and his *social and civil rights* in order to improve his economic, political, social and religious life” (our italics, 1973, p. 2). Clearly bilingual-bicultural education was part of Chicano activism, a way to defend their civil rights and open doors to socioeconomic opportunities, to maintain Spanish, but also to assert unique cultural and linguistic practices, ones that didn’t quite fit either the Mexican or the Anglo cultures.

The theoretical foundations of traditional dual language programs of colonial language, additive bilingualism, and language separation were of benefit to the mostly white English-speaking majority that wanted to accumulate languages. Dual language *bilingual* programs must refocus their theoretical foundations about knowledge, language, and bilingualism to meet the social desires of the language-minoritized community first. The bilingualism

of the community and their lives in borderlands (Anzaldúa, 2012) must be repositioned as central (Alfaro & Gándara, 2021; Freire, 2016).

We will enter Pachakutik as we commence a new cycle in DLBE supported by theories “otherwise,” namely, theories that capture “an other thinking” (Mignolo, 2000, p. 69), those that are refocused on language-minoritized communities. The theories “otherwise” that are the focus of this chapter are decolonial theory, nepantlera theory, and raciolinguistic ideologies.

### *Decolonial Theory*

We draw from Latin American *decolonial theory* (Dussel, 1995; Espinosa-Miñoso, 2014; Grosfoguel, 2002; Lugones, 2008; Mignolo, 2000; Quijano, 2000; among others) to query mainstream epistemologies about standard named languages and additive double bilingualism and duality. Decolonial scholars have provided a roadmap of how to situate our epistemological perspective on what Boaventura de Sousa Santos (2007) has called “the other side of the line,” instead of always seeing with a “hegemonic eye” that renders otherwise thinking as nonexistent, incomprehensible, or magical, and that hides histories of domination. “The other side of the line” refers to the epistemologies and practices of colonized people that have been invalidated and are deemed as inferior or nonexistent. In order to make visible and recover colonized epistemologies and practices from the “the other side of the line,” de Sousa Santos (2007) makes a call for a “post-abyssal thinking” (Santos, 2007). Post-abyssal thinking requires acknowledging an *ecology of knowledges*, a concept that recognizes the heterogeneity and diversity of experiences as equal, as well as the proliferation of alternatives (Santos, 2007). Even though this *interknowledge* is important, “[p]reference must be given to the form of knowledge that guarantees the greatest level of participation to the social groups involved in its design, execution, and control, and in the benefits of the intervention” (Santos, 2007, p. 73). For DLBE programs to benefit marginalized bilingual communities, they must be aligned with theoretical perspectives that respond to the ideologies, the epistemologies, the practices, and the desires, of the minoritized group (Alfaro, 2019; García et al., 2021).

Dual language bilingual programs must delink from the abyssal and epistemic assumptions about language and bilingualism, as well as racist and heteropatriarchal oppression. That is, the theoretical grounding of these programs must engage instead with the subjective reconstitution of those seen as minoritized bilinguals. To *delink from this epistemological matrix of power*, one would need to take up a *different locus of enunciation* (Mignolo, 2000) other than that of the nation-state, its schools, and the dominant monolingual class. The loci of enunciation can be described as “border gnosis,” which refers to “the subaltern reason striving to bring to the foreground

the force and creativity of knowledges subalternized during a long process of colonization of the planet” (Mignolo, 2000, p. 13). Theoretically, we must move toward *another logic*, by drawing on the locus of enunciation of the marginalized group, thus changing the terms, not just the content, of the conversation that we have been having about bilingualism and schools (Mignolo, 2000). We align DLBE theoretically to the actual language and cultural experiences of diverse communities, rectifying histories of sociopolitical, linguistic, cultural and knowledge exclusions, while extending complex understandings of language and bilingualism.

### *Nepantleras Theories: Beyond Borders*

In 1987, the Chicana scholar Gloria Anzaldúa published *Borderlands/La Frontera*. The concept of borderlands referred to a geopolitical and psychic space, the “lifeblood of two worlds merging to form a third country, a border culture” (Anzaldúa, 2012, p. 25). This space was defined by the border itself, and yet it enabled becoming a “crossroads.” In later work, Anzaldúa moved beyond borderlands by appealing to the Nahuatl word, nepantla. Nepantla refers to “el lugar entre medio.” It transcends duality and recognizes the in-between spaces in which minoritized communities dwell and where possibilities and transformations can occur. In this nepantla, one can tap into what Anzaldúa calls “el cenote,” “an inner underground river of information” (2002, p. 6), “a subterranean reservoir of personal and collective knowledge” (p. 66). This cenote pushes against linguistic, cultural, national, and any other boundaries, “[r]igid borders [that] hinder communication and prevent us from extending beyond ourselves” (p. 66).

Anzaldúa calls for nepantleras who function disruptively. Anzaldúa adds: “Like tender green roots growing out of the cracks, they eventually overturn foundations, making conventional definitions of otherness hard to sustain” (2002, p. 84). Educators and scholars studying dual language bilingual programs must become nepantleras, overturning the foundations of privilege upon which these programs were built, ensuring that everyone is included. To do so, Anzaldúa recommends activism, a notion that she describes as “putting our hands in the dough and not merely thinking or talking about making tortillas. It means creating spaces and times for healing to happen, espacios y tiempos to nourish the soul” (p. 89). What are the spaces and times that we can create in dual language bilingual programs to ensure that the soul of language-minoritized children is nourished? How do we put our hands in the theoretical dough that has shaped them in ways that minoritize them, not simply to make tortillas, but to transform reality?

To transform dual language bilingual programs we must take up a perspective from the cracks/rajaduras “[that] enable us to reconfigure ourselves as subjects outside the us/them binary ... to construct alternative roads,

create new topographies and geographies ... Look at the world with new eyes, use competing and global systems of knowledge, and rewrite identities. Navigating the cracks is the process of reconstructing life anew” (Anzaldúa, 2002, p. 79). Dual language bilingual programs must reconfigure themselves to be free from linguistic and cultural artificial borders. Dual language bilingual programs need to be inclusive and go beyond the binary of us/them, opening up interstices that reflect that in-between space capable of connecting language-minoritized people with our cenote—the source of water and freshness in an unjust world.

### *Raciolinguistic Ideologies*

The study of how race and racism in the United States has impacted the lives of racialized people developed throughout the 20<sup>th</sup> century and culminated with the work of legal scholars around the systemic structural racism that was built into the legal foundations of the country to exclude and deprive racialized people of societal and educational opportunities (Bell, 1980; Crenshaw, 1988). The study of language ideologies has focused on the processes through which language has been constructed in ways that serve the interests of the dominant class, limiting access to minoritized communities that are rendered without human agency (Alfaro & Bartolomé, 2017; Irvine & Gal, 2000). Even though language-minoritized groups have been also racialized, the study of the two categories of exclusion—race and language—had never been addressed jointly. Traditionally, issues of educating racialized bilinguals were simply considered issues of language. This changed with the work on raciolinguistic ideologies by Nelson Flores and Jonathan Rosa (Flores & Rosa, 2015; Rosa & Flores, 2017; see Chapter 14 in this handbook). Dual language bilingual scholars and educators need to pay attention to how raciolinguistic ideologies inform how language operates in DLBE classrooms.

Raciolinguistic ideologies hold that it is not language itself, but the social categories (white/non-white, monolingual/bilingual, native-non-native, or immigrant) that produce the *perception* of signs that are in turn negatively evaluated by those Rosa and Flores call “white listening subject,” listeners with institutionalized power. As Flores and Rosa (2015) say: “No language variety is objectively distinctive or nondistinctive, but rather comes to be enregistered as such in particular historical, political and economic circumstances” (p. 632). By separating languages strictly, traditional dual language programs deem the language practices of minoritized bilinguals as inferior and non-academic (Alfaro & Bartolomé, 2017; Freire & Feinauer, 2022). The work on raciolinguistic ideologies makes it obvious that these perceptions are product of a subjectivity based on claimed racial superiority. Rather than protect separations that tend to reify superiority of language practices of those deemed racially superior, DLBE programs must make

students conscious of the raciolinguistic ideologies that operate and work against them by normalizing minoritized knowledge systems and cultural and linguistic practices.

### DLBE Taking Notice of Decolonial/Nepantlera Theories and Raciolinguistic Ideologies

We have proposed decolonial theory, nepantlera theory, and raciolinguistic ideologies to reframe the theoretical foundations of DLBE. Now, the reader might be wondering, how do scholars and educators engaged in DLBE take up position as nepantleras? Where are the rajaduras in the traditional theoretical foundations of dual language bilingual programs? What do we need to crack in order to see through the realities of children, and especially minoritized bilingual children, in dual language bilingual programs?

We need to crack the notion of *language*, unbind it as an object of study, and situate it in the sociocultural complexity that surrounds speakers' real language use, in its heteroglossia (Bakhtin, 1981). In the field of bilingual education, heteroglossia can be understood as the acknowledgment of the languaging practices of bi/multilingual communities as fluid, interacting, and dynamic, without strict boundaries (García, 2009). Hence, as we crack the notion of *language*, we also need to crack the concept of *bilingualism* as double monolingualism/additive bilingualism. We need to drive away from colonial and raciolinguistic approaches in DLBE and perceive the dynamic *translanguaging* of bilingual speakers (García & Li, 2014; Otheguy et al., 2015; Li, 2018; Chapter 26 in this volume), understanding students' positionality in nepantla spaces (Freire, 2016) and referring to bilingual speakers' and learners' agentive use of their entire linguistic/semiotic repertoire to communicate and learn. Through this translanguaging perspective, *biliteracy* is theorized as the agency exerted by bilinguals to make meaning around print and texts by bringing forth their entire life experience, including all their linguistic/semiotic resources (García & Kleifgen, 2019). Taking up a decolonial/nepantlera theoretical perspective and a raciolinguistic lens that shifts our perspective to the actual practices of minoritized bilinguals from the ground up, we consider next the theoretical foundations to understand language, bilingualism, and biliteracy "otherwise."

### *Language and Languaging*

As Makoni and Pennycook (2007) have shown, language has been an ideological invention that has operated as an instrument of colonialism and nation-building to produce and naturalize forms of social inequality. As explained by the Peruvian sociologist Aníbal Quijano (1991, 2000) and

the Brazilian Lynn Mario Menezes de Souza (2007), language, as normalized today, was a product of colonialization. At the point of the Encounter in the Americas, language, as well as race, gender, religion, and culture were created as categories that justified the superiority and dominance of the white Europeans. The biologization of race then created a category of “non-humans” who did not have a valid language and were unable to enter into legitimate dialogue (Flores & Rosa, 2022). In coining the concept of “coloniality,” Quijano points out that the exploitation and domination of racialized groups continues after the colonizers left, and is now carried out not solely through labor, but through the structuring of knowledge-systems, language, race, and gender into superior and inferior. Language is a product of a particular colonial epistemology, yet it appears to be, and is accepted as, a natural object, required to be educated.

The construction of a named language, that is, what we have learned to call English, Spanish, Chinese, Vietnamese, etc., has little to do with the *linguaging* of people. The Chilean biologists Maturana and Varela (1984) coined the term “*lenguajear*” [linguaging] to refer to what differentiates human beings from other organisms. Human beings do more than simply communicate and interact, they language (as a verb) to also observe, reflect, and describe their interactions. This linguaging process of human beings engages the histories, the social, the cognitive, the emotional, the affective, and the lived ethnographies of all interlocutors, involving the subjectivities of speakers. This linguaging is, of course, very different from the ways in which language has been constructed as an object by the writing of grammars supported by empires and nation-states for domination (Mignolo, 2000). Mignolo adds that this constructed language then “becomes the point of reference to measure and rank linguaging practices that do not comply with the regulatory force of language” (Mignolo, cited in Delgado & Romero, 2000, p 17). Critical approaches in sociolinguistics have shown how named languages were, and continue to be, constructs of nation-state building and colonial expansion to support an ideology of racial, class, and gender superiority in multilingual societies.

Dual language bilingual programs must then center the linguaging of its students, rather than simply the named language which has been increasingly narrowly conceived as “academic.” Increasingly, educators appeal to the concept of academic language as the reason for the failure of racialized students. Many scholars have worked to identify the features of academic language, without questioning the nature of what they are describing (García & Solorza, 2020). Their descriptions reflect the features found in texts and ways of speaking produced by dominant white monolingual people, making it “academic” simply because of the power held by that group (Alfaro & Bartolomé, 2017; Poza, 2016). This dominant group monopolizes how language is used in schools, branding as “deficient” all other ways of linguaging

by bi/multilingual communities, speakers of African American English, and other language-minoritized communities. These language practices are portrayed from a raciolinguistic approach as non-academic, inferior, conceptually deficient. Linguaging goes beyond the borders of language drawn by the dominant group that emphasizes linguistic practices that have been normalized as the only standard and, instead, includes all the language practices of people, as they live, communicate, and desire differently. It pays attention to the heteroglossic nature of language (Bakhtin, 1981) and to the right of all speakers/language users to *do* language in ways that fit their different ecologies of knowledge and lives.

### *Bilingualism and Translanguaging*

The sociolinguistic study of bilingualism in the second half of the 20<sup>th</sup> century focused on the difference between the ways in which bilingual speakers and monolingual speakers used language. The study of “language contact” was pioneered by Uriel Weinreich (1953/1979), focusing on the linguistic phenomena that were said to characterize bilingual ways of using language—the presence of loans and calques, and the use of code-switching. In comparison to monolingual ways of using language, bilingual language was full of what were seen as interferences.

To control what were said to be interferences from the point of view of dominant monolingual speakers, strict boundaries had to be drawn between named standard languages. The education of bilinguals developed around the idea that true bilingualism was *additive*, with one separate “second language” being added to the bilingual speakers’ “first language” (Lambert, 1974). This ranking of languages relates to the sociolinguistic concept of *diglossia*, that is, the idea that for societal bilingualism to be stable, the two named languages need to be compartmentalized and kept strictly separate (Fishman, 1967). One language had to be used for what were seen as “high” functions in “formal” domains, and the other for “low” functions in “informal” domains. These diglossic descriptions of bilingual use never considered the power differentials that were responsible for enforcing a strict linguistic hierarchy.

The ways of knowing and languaging of bilingual-minoritized speakers in the United States is, as Trueba said a long time ago, unique, and is not limited by the national borders that they have gone across—physically, spiritually, or emotionally. Their languaging cannot be compared to those who are monolingual, dominant, and white, neither in the United States nor in the countries from which they or their ancestors originate. The reality of multilingual practices is more complex than that described from the point of view of white scholars who are still holding up the model of a monolingual. Many multilingual speakers have grown up with different language practices that

make it difficult to categorically name a language as first, second, or third. There is nothing diglossic about their language use, which reflects their own dynamic language practices. As Ndhlovu and Makalela (2021) have said, the mainstream understanding of multilingualism was pre-eminently colonial and needs to be decolonized.

In the 21<sup>st</sup> century, language education policies and practices in the Global North were suddenly impacted by the complexity of identities and language practices that were present in classrooms. The negative raciolinguistic reaction to this greater heterogeneity in schools was violent, with policies and practices controlling even more the boundaries that had been drawn around named languages. Traditional dual language programs are a case in point. The dynamic language practices of bilingual students were severely policed, so that their language did not contain “interferences.” But in doing so, not only were language-minoritized communities expropriated of the academic value of their dynamic language practices to learn but they also became the possessors of the achievement gap, of the word gap, of the lack of academic language, of the inability to meet language standards that were evaluated with monolingual assessments.

Bilingual-minoritized speakers engage in *translanguaging*, a term that has been coined by sociolinguists to refer to the languaging of bilingual people that transcends, goes beyond, the concept of two named languages (García & Li, 2014; Li, 2018; see also Chapter 16 of this volume). Otheguy et al. (2015) have defined translanguaging as “the deployment of a speaker’s full linguistic repertoire without regard for watchful adherence to the socially and politically defined boundaries of named (and usually national and state) languages” (p. 283). Bilinguals do not “have” two languages; they “do” language with a *unitary language/semiotic repertoire*, a network of features and meanings from which they select those that are more fitting to their situations (Otheguy et al., 2019). Translanguaging points to this *emergent unitary network* of linguistic/semiotic features. The language performances of bilinguals are never dual and separate; instead, they do the opposite—they *assemble* (Pennycook, 2017) and bring together all of their languaging with all multimodalities, their emotions, their lives, their experiences, their funds of knowledge, their bodies, and relevant objects, including technology, as they engage in meaning-making. In supporting this unitary repertoire, translanguaging is a political act (Flores, 2014), disrupting the linearity with which second language acquisition and bilingual studies have proceeded, and going beyond the coloniality of language that nation-states and their schools have defended. Translanguaging theory has enormous repercussions for DLBE programs, and many scholars have called for its inclusion (see, for example, Freire & Feinauer, 2022; García-Mateus & Palmer, 2017; Hamman, 2018; Martínez, 2017; Palmer et al., 2014; Sánchez & García, 2022; Tian & Link, 2019).

It is true that named languages have had real and material effects in our lives. It is also true that named languages are important for the identity purposes of many. Language and bilingualism are important concepts, but they have *social* reality, not a *psycholinguistic* one. That is, there is no dual correspondence in the minds of bilinguals of one language and the other, although one learns the social mores of when to use features that are externally and socially defined as belonging to one language or another. Translanguaging takes the *internal* perspective of what bilinguals *do* with language, instead of the *external* perspective of named languages associated with nation-states that speakers are said to “have.”

There is no such thing as learning an additional language or acquiring a second language. Bilingual children acquire new linguistic features that they then integrate into a unitary repertoire, as all children do. The repertoire of bilingual children has more features than that of monolinguals, that is, it is more extensive. Yet, in schools, even in most dual language programs, bilingual students are allowed to use only less than half of the features of their repertoire in class and in assessments. This creates the illusion that bilingual children can be two monolinguals in one. And beyond the illusion is the reality that insisting that bilingual children act like monolinguals only produces failure—failure that they cannot meet the standards that systems have artificially set up, and that then produce subjectivities of inferiority that keep them in subordinate positions.

Translanguaging focuses on redressing the asymmetry of languages and denouncing the coloniality of power and knowledge (Mignolo, 2000, p. 231). The South African scholar Leketi Makalela (2017) appeals to the concept of ubuntu, “I am because you are. You are because I am,” to describe what he calls *ubuntu translanguaging*. Multilingual South African speakers use an interwoven network of language because no language is complete without the other, and all depend on each other for the total sum of meaning (Ndhlovu & Makalela, 2021). Édouard Glissant, the Martiniquais philosopher once said: “To understand [opacities] one must focus on the texture of the weave and not on the nature of its components” (1990, p. 190). Translanguaging theory keeps the epistemological eye on the ways in which bilingual people weave their languaging, and not on the separate components of what are seen as languages. The weave is where DLBE needs to focus. Bilingualism as two named languages is of value. But to educate for social and cognitive justice, *the focus has to be on the weave*, how learners interlace their linguistic/semiotic features to learn, to make meaning, to create, to produce, to imagine, to have ideas, and to be creative.

Translanguaging in dual language bilingual programs has much to do with what W.E. du Bois (1903) has called “lifting the veil” (1903). The borders around named languages are abolished as we lift the veil to truly see and center minoritized bilingual students in DLBE. Racialized bilingual students

must learn to see and hear themselves without any reference to monolingual students. Students in dual language bilingual programs must understand that what is natural in bilingualism is translanguaging, suppressed by the monolingual ideology of modernity and nationalism, as well as the enduring coloniality of dominance. And yet, they must also see language and bilingualism as important social realities that need to be extended to include their languaging and translanguaging.

### *Biliteracy and Translanguaging*

One of the most important functions of school has been the development of literacy. But as scholars of what is known as New Literacy Studies have consistently shown, literacy is a practice that is socially constructed and locally negotiated (Street, 1984). Similarly, biliteracy needs to be locally negotiated to meet the needs and desires of language-minoritized communities. Nancy Hornberger (1990) has defined *biliteracy* as “any and all instance in which communication occurs in two or more languages in or around writing” (p. 213), which theoretically can be inclusive of the language practices of bilingual students. However, traditional biliteracy approaches in the education of bilingual students have adhered to the “one-named-language as input and the same-named-language as output” principle (García, 2009). In traditional dual language classrooms, bilingual students are asked to make meaning only with the authorized language of the written text, preventing them from bringing to bear their whole meaning-making repertoire. These borders of literacy disadvantage language-minoritized students, expropriate their linguistic resources, and raciolinguistically position them as inferior. Nancy Hornberger’s continua of biliteracy has posited that biliteracy is better obtained when learners can draw on all their practices and not just those that are privileged in schools (Hornberger & Skilton-Sylvester, 2000). When literacy performances of bilingual students are viewed through translanguaging, the literacy act is no longer located in, and limited by, the printed page, but in the relations formed across signs, texts, images, languages, objects, bodies, thoughts, and emotions.

A translanguaging approach to biliteracy would not only pair the literacy in the two languages closer together as in the approach known as biliteracy squared (Escamilla et al., 2013, see Chapter 29 in this volume), it would also leverage the students’ translanguaging to make meaning in all their encounters with written texts. Rather than keeping the spoken/written/signed/linguistic modes separate from other meaning-making modes, it would bring down these barriers. It is important for DLBE programs to have spaces for students to hear, speak, read, and write in one language or the other. But even more important is to encourage students to always leverage their translanguaging so that they can liberate themselves from artificial borders

and the policing of those who impose named languages and bilingualism as colonial apparatus. As dual language bilingual students enter this process, biliteracy efforts need to extend “reading the world” (Freire & Macedo, 1987), to a nepantla world. This sociopolitical act can help bilingual students become socially and politically repositioned as they encounter raciolinguistic discourses and fight colonization.

### **Decolonizing, Nepantlerizing, and Disrupting Raciolinguistic Bilingual Allocation Policies and Pedagogical Practices**

The decolonial/nepantlera/raciolinguistics theoretical foundations of language, bilingualism, and biliteracy that we have been considering have repercussions for theorizing language allocation policies and pedagogical practices in DLBE. This section considers how these theoretical foundations can transform the rigid language allocation policies of traditional dual language programs, as well as traditional pedagogical practices.

#### ***Critical Flexible Dual Language Bilingual Allocation Policy***

Programmatic planning for dual language bilingual programs often includes a language allocation policy in which a designated time is given to each one of the named languages. The typical types are 90:10 and 50:50. Decolonizing, nepantlerizing, and disrupting raciolinguistic ideologies unsettle these traditional language allocation policies (Freire & Delavan, 2021). *Critical flexible dual language bilingual allocation policies* then emerge (Freire & Delavan, 2021; Sánchez et al., 2018), since strictly binary categorization principles do not hold. A critical flexible dual language bilingual allocation policy positions children not as learners of one named language or another, but as *emergent bilinguals*, positioned along different points of a bilingual/multilingual continuum, all engaging with translanguaging practices. Although spaces for the two languages of instruction may be observed, these do *not follow diglossic principles* of strict separation or blindly fit a quantifiable “model” prescribed by external authorities. Instead, the allocation of languages in instructional spaces is *localized* and responds to the different characteristics of local students, as well as the community/family wishes for the bilingual education of their own children. A language policy that is attentive to the power differentials in the coloniality of language and schooling, and the raciolinguistic ideologies that have created subjectivities of inferiority, needs to create cracks in rigid language allocation policies and strict language separation policies.

In order to combat language separation policies, dual language bilingual programs need to provide translanguaging spaces (García et al., 2017; Li, 2011), which function as ways for students to breathe, to act on their agency

to assemble all their meaning-making resources, to learn generatively. To do so, teachers must offer flexibility within instructional spaces allocated to one language or the other so that students can use all their repertoire during the *process* of learning and languaging. With consciousness and care, teachers can, of course, encourage students to generate *products* in one named language or another, but always drawing from their entire linguistic/semiotic repertoire. These translanguaging spaces encourage *collaboration, co-learning, and co-laboring* among students and teachers. *Critical engagement across difference* is possible in these translanguaging spaces, encouraging bilingual children and teachers with different histories of settlement and immigration, diverse raciolinguistic and sociopolitical/socioeconomic experiences, and various complex language and cultural practices to not only understand each other's subjectivities, but to potentially transform their own subjectivities and those of bilingual communities.

### *Critical Pedagogical Practices in Dual Language Bilingual Programs*

Critical/sociopolitical *consciousness* is necessary to transform pedagogical practices in DLBE (Alfaro, 2018, 2019; Freire, 2016, 2021; Palmer et al., 2019, see Chapters 3 and 12 in this volume) in ways that emanate from decolonial, nepantlera, and raciolinguistic theories. Freire (2016) proposed that as dual language bilingual educators understand how language-minoritized students operate in nepantla spaces, these teachers need to contest restrictive language policies in tandem with supporting students' critical/sociopolitical consciousness as one of the goals of DLBE. Dual language programs have proliferated, and many times have served as instruments of gentrification that have kept educators and communities ignorant of histories and theories that hurt. As Anzaldúa (2002) says, "conocimiento hurts, but not as much as desconocimiento" (p. 557). Critical pedagogical practices in DLBE must be grounded in language-minoritized people's histories, struggles, and subjectivities and focus on regenerating the "broken weave" that language separation has produced.

Freire and Feinauer (2022) suggested that leveraging bilingual-minoritized students' full repertoire, their translanguaging, can promote the goal of critical consciousness in DLBE. García et al. (2017) have argued that teachers need to develop a *juntos/together* translanguaging stance with students' practices and understandings at the center, before they can develop equitable pedagogical practices. Sánchez et al. (2018) have identified three ways in which teachers' pedagogical practices can incorporate translanguaging: (1) translanguaging documentation, which refers to leveraging the students' translanguaging to assess and document what students know and are able to do; (2) translanguaging rings, which uses translanguaging to scaffold

instruction for students whose language performances fall at different points of the bilingual continuum; (3) translanguaging transformation, which provides transformative spaces to shift students' subjectivities about themselves and their language practices as valuable. These translanguaging pedagogical practices legitimize minoritized bilingual students' full linguistic repertoires as academic.

### Conclusion

The theoretical perspectives laid out in this chapter draw from decolonial theory, nepantlera theory, and raciolinguistic ideologies. These perspectives help explain how language, languaging, translanguaging, bilingualism, and biliteracy work for bilingual-minoritized students. This theoretical grounding also contributes to transforming policies and pedagogical practices in ways that support the struggles of bilingual education activists of the past (Alfaro, 2019; Blum Martínez & Habermann López, 2020; Delavan et al., 2017; Rosa & Flores, 2017).

As Gloria Anzaldúa (2002) has said: "Our task is to light up the darkness" (p. 8), a darkness that has been produced by conceptualizing language solely as a colonial apparatus, what Mignolo (2000) calls "the darker side of modernity." For dual language bilingual programs to fulfill their promise, we must return to Anzaldúa's calls to the activism of nepantleras that have the potential to normalize our language practices. Dual language bilingual programs cannot just make tortillas, especially if they're going to be consumed by the dominant group. Dual language bilingual teachers have to crack the shell, break the eggs, and cook up new subjectivities for their minoritized bilingual students in ways that will move the programs toward social equity (Alfaro & Hernández, 2016; Sánchez & García, 2022). Educators must put their hand in the dough to mix, to juntar, to shape differently for diverse children, to heal and nourish each of them, to create translanguaging spaces where other knowledges, other languaging, other literacies can be valued. Only then, will these transformed DLBE programs, become all that they could and should be.

### References

- Alfaro, C. (2018). The sociopolitical struggle and promise of bilingual teacher education: Past, present, and future. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 41(4), 413–427.
- Alfaro, C. (2019). Preparing critically conscious dual language teachers: Recognizing and interrupting dominant ideologies. *Reimagining dual language education in the U.S. Theory into Practice Journal*, 58(2), 194–203.
- Alfaro, C., & Bartolomé, L. (2017). Preparing ideologically clear bilingual teachers: Honoring working-class non-standard language use in the bilingual education classroom. *Issues in Teacher Education*, 26(2), 11–34.

- Alfaro, C., & Gándara, P. (2021). Binational teacher preparation: Constructing pedagogical bridges for the students we share. In P. Gándara, & B. Jensen (Eds.), *The students we share: Preparing US and Mexican educators for our transnational future* (pp. 45–69). SUNY Press.
- Alfaro, C., & Hernández A. M. (2016). Ideology, pedagogy, access and equity (IPAE): A critical examination for dual language educators. *The Multilingual Educator*, 8–11.
- Anzaldúa, G. (2002). (Un)natural bridges, (un)safe spaces. In G. Anzaldúa, & A. L. Keating (Eds.), *This bridge we call home: Radical visions for transformation* (pp. 1–5). Routledge.
- Anzaldúa, G. (2012). *Borderlands/La frontera. The new mestiza* (2nd ed.). Aunt Lute Books.
- Bakhtin, M. M. (1981). *The dialogic imagination: Four essays* (M. Holquist, Ed.; C. Emerson & M. Holquist, Trans.). University of Texas Press.
- Bell, S. (1980). Brown v. Board of Education: The interest-convergence dilemma. *Harvard Law Review*, 93(3), 518–533.
- Blum Martínez, R., & Habermann López, M. J. (2020). *The shoulders we stand on: A history of bilingual education in New Mexico*. University of New Mexico Press.
- du Bois, W. E. (1903). *The souls of Black folk*. A.C. McClurg & Co.
- Cacopardo, A. (2018). “Nada sería posible si la gente no deseara lo imposible.” Entrevista a Silvia Rivera Cusicanqui. *Andamios*, 15(37), 179–193.
- Crawford, J. (2000). *At war with diversity. U.S. language policy in an age of anxiety*. Multilingual Matters.
- Crenshaw, K. (1988). Race, reform and retrenchment: Transformation and legitimation in anti-discrimination law. *Harvard Law Review*, 101(7), 1331–1387. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1341398>
- Cusicanqui, S. R. (2012). Ch'ixinakax utxiwa: A reflection on the practices and discourses of decolonization. *The South Atlantic Quarterly*, 111(1), 95–109. <https://doi.org/10.1215/00382876-1472612>
- Delavan, M. G., Valdez, V. E., & Freire, J. A. (2017). Language as whose resource?: When global economics usurp the local equity potentials of dual language education. *International Multilingual Research Journal*, 11(2), 86–100. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19313152.2016.1204890>
- Delgado, E., & Romero, R. (2000). Local histories and global designs: An interview with Walter Mignolo. *Discourse*, 22(3), 7–33.
- Dussel, E. (1995). *The invention of the Americas: Eclipse of “the other” and the myth of modernity*. Continuum.
- Escamilla, K., Hopewell, S., & Butvilofsky, S. (2013). *Biliteracy from the start: Literacy squared in action*. Caslon.
- Espinosa-Miñoso, Y. (2014). Una crítica descolonial a la epistemología feminista crítica. *El Cotidiano*, 184, 7–12.
- Fishman, J. A. (1967). Bilingualism with and without diglossia: Diglossia with and without bilingualism. *Journal of Social Issues*, 23(2), 29–38.
- Flores, N. (2014). Let's not forget that translanguaging is a political act. [Online] *Educational Linguist*. <https://educationallinguist.wordpress.com/2014/07/19/lets-not-forget-that-translanguaging-is-a-political-act/>
- Flores, N., & Rosa, J. (2015). Undoing appropriateness: Raciolinguistic ideologies and language diversity in education. *Harvard Education Review*, 85(2), 149–171. <https://doi.org/10.17763/0017-8055.85.2.149>

- Flores, N., & Rosa, J. (2022). Undoing competence: Coloniality, homogeneity, and the overrepresentation of whiteness in applied linguistics. *Language Learning*. Advance online publication. <https://doi.org/10.1111/lang.12528>
- Freire, J. A. (2016). Nepantleras/os and their teachers in dual language education: Developing sociopolitical consciousness to contest language education policies. *Association of Mexican American Educators Journal*, 10(1), 36–52.
- Freire, J. A. (2021). Conscientization calls: A white dual language educator's development of sociopolitical consciousness and commitment to social justice. *Education and Urban Society*, 53(2), 231–248.
- Freire, J. A., & Delavan, M. G. (2021). The fiftyfication of dual language education: One-size-fits-all language allocation's "equality" and "practicality" eclipsing a history of equity. *Language Policy*, 20(3), 351–381.
- Freire, J. A., & Feinauer, E. (2022). Vernacular Spanish as a promoter of critical consciousness in dual language bilingual education classrooms. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 25(4), 1516–1529.
- Freire, J. A., Gambrell, J., Kasun, G. S., & Dorner, L. M. (2021). The expropriation of dual language bilingual education: Deconstructing neoliberalism, whitestreaming, and English-hegemony. *International Multilingual Research Journal*, 16(1), 27–46.
- Freire, P., & Macedo, D. (1987). *Reading the word and the world*. Bergin & Garvey.
- García, O. (2009). *Bilingual education in the 21st century: A global perspective*. Wiley.
- García, O., Flores, N., Seltzer, K., Wei, L., Otheguy, R., & Rosa, J. (2021). Rejecting abyssal thinking in the language and education of racialized bilinguals: A manifesto. *Critical Inquiry in Language Studies*, 18(3), 203–228.
- García, O., Johnson, S., & Seltzer, K. (2017). *The translanguaging classroom: Leveraging student bilingualism for learning*. Caslon.
- García, O., & Kleifgen, J. A. (2019). Translanguaging and literacies. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 55(4). <https://doi.org/10.1002/rrq.286>
- García, O., & Li, W. (2014). *Translanguaging: Language, bilingualism and education*. Palgrave Macmillan Pivot.
- García, O., & Solorza, C. (2020). Academic language and the minoritization of U.S. bilingual Latinx students. *Language and Education*, 35(6), 505–521. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09500782.2020.1825476>
- García, O., & Sung, K. K. (2018). Critically assessing the 1968 bilingual education act at 50 years: Taming tongues and Latinx communities. *The Bilingual Research 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 bilingual education. *Journal of Language, Identity, and Education*, 16(4), 245–255. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15348458.2017.1329016>
- Glissant, E. (1990). *Poetics of relation*. University of Michigan Press.
- Grosfoguel, R. (2002). Colonial difference, geopolitics of knowledge and global coloniality in the modern/colonial capitalist world-system. *Review*, 25(3), 203–224.
- Hamman, L. (2018). Translanguaging and positioning in two-way dual language classrooms: A case for criticality. *Language and Education*, 32(1), 21–42. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09500782.2017.1384006>
- Harvey, D. (2004). The "New" imperialism: Accumulation by dispossession. *Socialist Register*, 40, 63–87.
- Hornberger, N. (1990). Creating successful learning contexts for bilingual literacy. *Teachers College Record*, 92(2), 212–229.

- Hornberger, N., & Skilton-Sylvester, E. (2000). Revisiting the continua of biliteracy: International and critical perspectives. *Language and Education*, 14(2), 96–122.
- Irvine, J. T., & Gal, S. (2000). Language ideology and linguistic differentiation. In P. V. Kroskrity (Ed.), *Regimes of language: Ideologies, politics, and identities* (pp. 35–84). School of American Research Press.
- 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). Western Washington University.
- Li, W. (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, W. (2018). Translanguaging as a practical theory of language. *Applied Linguistics*, 39(1), 9–30. <https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/amx039>
- Lindholm-Leary, K. J. (2001). *Dual language education*. Multilingual Matters.
- Lugones, M. (2008). Colonialidad y género. *Tabula Rasa*, 9, 73–10.
- Makalela, L. (2017). Bilingualism in South Africa: Reconnecting with ubuntu translanguaging. In O. García, A. Lin, & S. May (Eds.), *Bilingual and multilingual education* (pp. 297–310). Springer.
- Makoni, S., & Pennycook, A. (2007). *Disinventing and reconstituting languages*. Multilingual Matters.
- Martínez, R. A. (2017). Dual language education and the erasure of Chicanx, Latinx, and indigenous Mexican children: A call to re-imagine (and imagine beyond) bilingualism. *Texas Education Review*, 5(1), 81–92.
- Maturana, H., & Varela, F. (1984). *El árbol del conocimiento: Las bases biológicas del entendimiento humano*. Lumen/Editorial Universitaria.
- Mena, M., & García, O. (2020). ‘Converse racialization’ and ‘un-marking’ language: The making of a bilingual university in a neoliberal world. *Language in Society*, 50(3), 343–364. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404520000330>
- Menezes de Souza, L. M. T. (2007). Entering a culture quietly: Writing and cultural survival in indigenous education in Brazil. In S. Makoni & A. Pennycook (Eds.), *Disinventing and reconstituting languages* (pp. 135–169). Multilingual Matters.
- Mignolo, W. (2000). *Local histories/global designs: Essays on the coloniality of power, subaltern knowledges and border thinking*. Princeton University Press.
- Mignolo, W., & Walsh, C. (2018). *On decoloniality: Concepts, analytics, praxis*. Duke University Press.
- Ndhlovu, F., & Makalela, L. (2021). *Decolonising multilingualism in Africa*. Multilingual Matters.
- 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>
- Palmer, D. K., Cervantes-Soon, C. G., Dorner, L., & Heiman, D. (2019). Bilingualism, biliteracy, biculturalism, and critical consciousness for all: Proposing a fourth fundamental goal for two-way dual language education. *Theory into Practice*, 58(2), 121–133.
- Palmer, D. K., Martínez, R. A., Mateus, S. G., & Henderson, K. (2014). Reframing the debate on language separation: Toward a vision for translanguaging

- pedagogies in the dual language classroom. *The Modern Language Journal*, 98(3), 757–772. <https://doi.org/10.1111/modl.12121>
- Pennycook, A. (2017). Translanguaging and semiotic assemblages. *International Journal of Multilingualism*, 14(3), 269–282. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14790718.2017.1315810>
- Poza, L. (2016). *Barreras*: Language ideologies, academic language, and the marginalization of Latin@ English language learners. *Whittier Law Review*, 37(3), 401–421.
- Quijano, A. (1991). Colonialidad y modernidad/racionalidad. *Perú Indígena*, 29, 11–21.
- Quijano, A. (2000). Coloniality of power, ethnocentrism, and Latin America. *Nepantla*, 1(3), 533–580.
- Rosa, J., & Flores, N. (2017). Unsettling race and language: Toward a raciolinguistic perspective. *Language in Society*, 46(5), 621–647. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404517000562>
- San Miguel, G. Jr, & Valencia, R. (1998). From the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo to Hopwood: The educational plight and struggle of Mexican Americans in the Southwest. *Harvard Educational Review*, 68(3), 353–412.
- Sánchez, M. T., & García, O. (Eds.) (2022). *Transformative translanguaging Espacios: Latinx students and teachers rompiendo fronteras sin miedo*. Multilingual Matters.
- Sánchez, M. T., García, O., & Solorza, C. (2018). Reframing language allocation 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.
- Street, B. V. (1984). *Literacy in theory and practice*. Cambridge University Press.
- Tian, Z., & Link, H. (Eds.). (2019). Positive synergies. Translanguaging and critical theories in education. *Translation and Translanguaging in Multilingual Contexts*, 5(1), entire issue.
- Trueba, H. T. (1973). Bilingual bicultural education for Chicanos in the Southwest. ED 084 073.
- Valdés, G. (2018). Analyzing the curricularization of language in two-way immersion education: Restating two cautionary notes. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 41(4), 388–412. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15235882.2018.1539886>
- Valdez, V., Freire, J. A., & Delavan, M. G. (2016). The gentrification of dual language education. *The Urban Review*, 48: 601–627. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11256-016-0370-0>
- Weinreich, U. (1953/1979) *Languages in contact: Findings and problems*. Mouton.