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Abstract

Flippin’ Scripts: Language Ideologies and Language Practices
In a Dual Immersion Bilingual Program

by

Luis Poza

Stanford Graduate School of Education
Professor Guadalupe Valdés, chair

In light of persistent inequalities in the education of students learning societally dominant languages in schools and their peers, this study explores the language ideologies and practices for a grade-level cohort at one particular dual immersion (DI) bilingual program. Dual immersion bilingual education, which pairs students learning English with an equal proportion of students learning Spanish (or another target language), has been touted as a useful remedy to some of the outcome disparities experienced by students classified as English Language Learners (ELL) and/or Latino within the school system. Despite a substantial amount of research supporting this claim (Collier and Thomas, 2004; Lindholm-Leary and Howard, 2008), there is also evidence that the implementation of DI programs varies tremendously (August and Hakuta, 2000) and in some cases perpetuates existing racial or linguistic stratification (Scanlan and Palmer, 2009). These circumstances create a need for further understanding of the processes and structures within DI that offer the greatest benefit and present the gravest threats.

As debates over the value, effectiveness, and ideal models of DI proceed, so too is the ground shifting in scholarship on language, bilingualism, and second language
acquisition (SLA). Informed by post-Structuralist approaches that view language as repertoires of social practice rather than bound sets of forms and rules (Makoni and Pennycook, 2007), scholarship in SLA and bilingual education is undergoing a *multilingual turn* (May, 2013), which emphasizes the social dimensions of language learning and prizes the communicative habits of bilinguals over paradigmatic monolingual “native speakers.” One salient feature of this multilingual turn is an emphasis on *translanguaging* (García, 2009), which recognizes the ways bilinguals draw from multiple communicative codes and modalities in making meaning.

Translanguaging as a stance proposes the treatment of language as a dynamic repertoire of practices adapting to social needs and functions, while translanguaging pedagogical practices encourage support of students’ full linguistic repertoires as assets to be leveraged in the development of academic skills and knowledge, as opposed to traditional practice which advocates rigid separations of languages in bilingual education and adherence to standardized varieties.

Seeking greater understanding of both the potential and pitfalls of DI education, and reconciling this task with the emerging discourses around translanguaging, this work explores four principal research questions:

1. What are the language ideologies and language attitudes expressed and made manifest by students, teachers, and parents at this particular DI program?
2. What language practices do students and teachers engage in during academic and social interactions?
3. How do the academic language practices, particularly teacher-led instruction, compare and contrast with the language practices that social-process oriented
conceptions of language and second language acquisition would propose for optimal learning and instruction?

4. What recommendations can be made for educators and DI program administrators to nurture opportunities for language and content learning more broadly and reconcile them with the demands of current testing regimes?

In order to answer these questions, the study undertakes a mixed methods approach. A yearlong ethnographic observation of a 5th grade cohort, with particular attention to eight focal students, provides insight into the day-to-day linguistic practices during teaching, collaborative student work, and students’ socializing. Semi-structured interviews with students, teachers, and parents provide glimpses into individuals’ opinions regarding language, language learning, and language proficiency in ways that likewise shed light on particular ideologies about languages and their speakers. Matched-guise tests in Spanish and English offer quantitative attitudinal responses to linguistic variables associated with particular forms of speech and their respective speech communities. Finally, a critical discourse analysis of the core curriculum used at the school to support English Language Development (ELD) elucidates the assumptions about language, language learning, and language learners embedded in the teaching of ELD at the school and the connections between these assumptions and broader social ideologies about language, race, and immigration.

The work shows that despite rhetoric praising and advocating for bilingualism and multiculturalism, students’ and teachers’ approaches to language learning and instruction reflect problematic views of language as static and necessarily adherent to standardized forms. Specifically, the study finds strong formal support for the separation of English
and Spanish, strong distinctions in the status of prestige and vernacular varieties of both English and Spanish, and a prevalent monoglossic conceptualization of language – that is, one that sees language as the sum and rule-based arrangement of language items such as words, verb forms, and grammatical constructions to be measured in comparison to the imagined monolingual ideal.

The work also shows, however, that in less regimented interactions such as loosely supervised student classroom collaboration and students at play during lunch or recess periods, Third Spaces (Bhabha, 1994) emerge in which normative scripts of unquestioned teacher authority, language standardization, and rigid language separation are challenged through translanguaging practices. In these interactional spaces, students and teachers do indeed draw from broader reaches of their linguistic repertoires than convention would allow through code-switching in speech, simultaneously consulting texts in Spanish and English and across modalities (for instance, magazine articles, PowerPoint slideshows, and online videos about a single topic), and using one language to discuss a text in another. Findings further show that the use of these translanguaging practices does not impede and may, in fact, support students’ meaning making activities and their development of academic skills as students deploy their hybrid language practices (Gutiérrez, Bacquedano-López, and Tejeda, 1999): (a) to ask questions and solicit clarification, (b) share their knowledge with peers and provide explanations, and (c) to jointly construct new knowledge or reach deeper understanding with peers.

Based on these findings, the work closes by examining various proposed sets of principles for more equitable education (Flores, 2013; Hawkins, 2004) and attaching to these specific pedagogical practices that align. The intention of these practices is to draw
attention to and challenge the ideological forces operating in policy, curriculum, and
teaching practices aimed at ELL students and others acquiring societally dominant forms
of language in schools, as well as to capitalize on the full breadth of students’ linguistic
repertoires as educational assets.
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Chapter 1
Introduction: Everyday Questions

The chatter in Maestro Quintara’s classroom hums persistently from pockets of students working in groups on one project or another. With rare exception, each group focuses on the task at hand even if the conversations themselves wander from time to time. While the noise level might frustrate some teachers or outside observers, it is exactly what Maestro Quintara wants to hear. Whether studying science, literature, or math, students in Maestro Quintara’s class are also, in theory, learning language – specifically Spanish – and extensive collaborative conversation between students labeled “native Spanish speakers” and “native English speakers” is a crucial ingredient of the pedagogical plan. Nevertheless, two ironic and seemingly oppositional concerns bedevil the man the children affectionately call “Maestro.” The first is the well-documented phenomenon of language loss among individuals that precedes a community’s language shift (Crawford, 1995; Fishman, 1968, 1972), whereby students’ increasingly forego Spanish in favor of English, the societally dominant language, in their conversations. The pattern emerges even in exchanges exclusively between students classified as English language learners (ELL). This creates the paradoxical circumstance of predominantly English speech in a “Spanish” class. The second concern specifically regards these ELL students, for whom there is great worry that failing to be reclassified as proficient in English before they enroll in middle school will stifle their academic achievement given restrictions on course enrollment or lowered teacher expectations that can go hand in hand with the ELL label (Callahan, 2005). This presents a second paradox, in which students who use English fairly consistently throughout their school
day remain identified primarily by their ascribed lack of English proficiency. Indeed, with the goal of getting all ELL students reclassified by the end of the year, the school has added a block of additional English language instruction for ELL students that focuses on vocabulary development, explicit teaching of grammatical forms, and test-taking skills.

Maestro thus finds himself in a bind. As a Mexican-American raised in a bilingual community within East Los Angeles, a Chicano Studies major as an undergraduate, and a resident of California’s Silicon Valley, he ardently believes in the value of bilingualism and dual immersion (DI) bilingual education. Like many of the parents who enroll their students in such programs, he sees bilingualism both as an economically and socially valuable commodity in an increasingly diverse and globally connected region. Moreover, for students from Spanish-speaking countries or in households or communities in which Spanish is the prevalent language, he sees DI programs as an effective tool to increase students’ sense of belonging and efficacy in school as well as their access to content in academic disciplines that would otherwise be incomprehensible, a belief strongly supported by research (Collier and Thomas, 2004; Ramirez et al. 1991; Thomas and Collier, 2002). He is frustrated by students’ reluctance to use Spanish, which they often vocalize when he insists upon the matter, and the removal of Spanish instructional time from the schedules of students taking the additional English instruction (a class simply called “Language” in this particular school). On the other hand, he knows from experience and from research that opportunities narrow for students who are not reclassified by middle school, and this burden along with the
pressures of high-stakes testing render English proficiency, defined in very particular ways, an essential objective.

Further complicating matters are ideological elements related to language standardization. For both Spanish and English, notions of correctness and propriety with respect to the language of the classroom conflict with students’ actual language practices, such as code-switching, borrowing, and what researchers have come to coin translanguaging (García, 2009; and for a thorough history of the term, see Lewis, Jones, and Baker, 2012a), referring to the dynamic way in which bilinguials use multiple languages and styles simultaneously in their cognitive processing and linguistic expression. Having grown up in bilingual speech communities, Maestro appreciates that students’ habitual language practices are useful in their acquisition and communication of new knowledge within the classroom. He must, however, reconcile this utility with the insistence of parents, school administrators, and the programmatic foundations of DI education that his students speak “proper” Spanish and English.

These challenges raise myriad questions, only some of which have been deeply addressed by prior research. What are students’ actual language practices in these dual immersion bilingual classrooms? How do they adhere to, or diverge from, the expectations of the program and its administrators? How do they adhere to, or diverge from, societal ideologies about language, language proficiency, and the role of language in the education of ELL students? How do these ideologies, and the practices that result from them, shape the educational experiences of language minority students? Are there alternatives to prevalent ideas about language and proficiency and, if so, how might they inform teaching practice and teacher preparation going forward? This study seeks to
highlight work that has already answered a number of these questions and, more importantly, tackle some of the unanswered questions in the hope that Maestro, his colleagues, his students, and all others wrestling with these paradoxes experience school as a site of opportunity rather than conflict, of building on growth rather than remedying deficiency, and of success for all rather than a few.

**Purpose of the Study**

**The initial challenge**

Answering these questions begins with placing them in the larger context, and that means acknowledging the struggles of language minority and immigrant students in American schools, along with the language ideologies that comprise part of these struggles. Latinos are the fastest growing segment of the American population, and this trend is especially true in terms of proportion of public school enrollments. Between 2000 and 2010, the Latino population grew by 43%, an increase of 15.2 million individuals, and accounting for 56% of the nation’s overall population growth in that period. Additionally, according to the National Center for Education Statistics (2011), over 22% of the enrollment in US schools in 2009 was Hispanic, up from 16% in 1999. Additionally, in a report prepared for the Educational Testing Service (ETS), Payán and Nettles (2008) note that over 10% of the nation’s students were classified as English Language Learners in 2005, and that 79% of this group spoke Spanish primarily. In
California specifically, this number increases dramatically, with 25% of all students being classified as ELL and 85% of these identifying Spanish as the primary language.

Thus far, American schools have struggled to meet the needs of this group. Secondary achievement statistics for Latinos paint a grim picture. In *The Latino Education Crisis*, their comprehensive examination of Latino academic underachievement, the short-sighted policies that contribute to the problem, and programs that have bucked the dispiriting trend, Patricia Gándara and Frances Contreras (2009) note that at present, about half of Latino students fail to graduate high school while college graduation rates for Latinos have remained nearly stagnant over the last 30 years. As Figure 1 demonstrates, the percentages of Latinos attaining high school degrees or equivalents and bachelor’s degrees by age 25, slightly above 60% and 10% respectively, trail every other racial and ethnic group measured by the National Center for Education Statistics.

Figure 1 - Percentage of adults age 25+ completing high school or equivalent and bachelor's degree, 1996-2008 (NCES 2010, p. 140)

Although Gándara and Contreras (2009) note that the reasons for these disparities are extensive, including policies that engender residential segregation, income inequality,
and unequal access to highly qualified teachers and better school facilities, notions of language proficiency and its attainment also play important roles. Valdés (2004) reviews the working definitions of “academic language” (specifically regarding criteria for English proficiency) in various scholarly and professional spheres. She observes that across teaching communities of practice, these criteria differ markedly, as shown in Table 1. The result of this dissonance is that students classified as English learners are prepared in certain ways to demonstrate proficiency based on their initial circumstances but struggle to meet the contrasting criteria of other spheres. Thus, performance in classroom tasks, on tests of English proficiency level, and on state or national content assessments may present very different pictures of a student’s abilities and preclude that student’s academic progress. After all, it is conceptions of language and second language acquisition that inform the decision to place students in ESL tracks and determine how they will be taught in order to attain proficiency.

Table 1 - Definitions of Academic Language and English Proficiency across Professional Communities (Valdés, 2004)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community of Practice</th>
<th>Term for Academic Language</th>
<th>Definitions of Academic Language for English Proficiency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Teachers of English to native English speakers | Mainstream English | ▪ Involves presentation and explicit argumentation of opinions  
▪ Values explicitness, detachment, and appeal to authority  
▪ Is organized to allow particular reader interpretation  
▪ Is free of errors and adheres to stylistic conventions of grammar and usage (Valdés, 2004, p. 73) |
| TESOL (Teaching of English to Speakers of Other Languages), Tertiary education | Academic Language | ▪ The proficiency required for tertiary study in English  
▪ Language specific to academic disciplines or professions  
▪ Follows discipline-specific conventions for presenting |
information
- Characterized by specific formal features such as sentence length, complex noun and adjective phrases (p. 74)

| ESL (K-12 specific) | Academic Language | The language necessary for success in all content areas, including:
- English necessary for classroom interaction
- English necessary to obtain, process, construct, and provide subject matter information in written and oral forms (p. 75) |
|---------------------|-------------------|--------------------------------------------------|
| Bilingual Education | Cognitive Academic Language Proficiency (CALP) (Cummins, 1979, 1984) | Cognitively and linguistically complex language necessary for academic settings
- Conceptual-linguistic knowledge
- Ability to use and understand language in cognitively demanding, context-reduced texts and interactions (p. 76) |

Unfortunately, the current practices stemming from dominant conceptions and societal ideologies seem to be doing more harm than good. Valdés (2000) follows the high school experience of four Mexican immigrant students in American middle schools, while Callahan (2005) analyzes outcome data such as GPA, language test scores, and subject test scores to gauge the impact of ESL placement and language proficiency upon these variables. Both show that students classified as ELL are often subject to lower teacher expectations and less rigorous curriculum that fails to prepare them for college admission or coursework. Callahan, Wilkinson, and Muller (2010) review data for over 2,300 students in 523 schools in the nationally representative Educational Longitudinal Study. Their analysis finds that placement in ESL programs corresponds with dramatically reduced probability of enrolling in honors level courses and that, despite
some benefits for recent immigrant students, ESL tracking has slightly negative effects for native-born language minority students.

The pattern continues in higher education. Bunch (2009) finds numerous barriers to enrollment and persistence in community colleges for US educated language minority students. The maze of placement exams and ESL and compensatory English coursework often leads students into academic trajectories that do not match their linguistic needs and delay their enrollment in courses that count for transfer credit to four year colleges. Moreover, Bunch finds discordance between the measures of English proficiency on ESL tests and within classrooms in terms of what students are expected to do for their assignments and course participation. Clearly, there is great need for a consistent understanding across all educational levels of what constitutes language proficiency, students’ linguistic needs in light of this ideal, the processes of second language acquisition, and schooling pathways that meet these needs promptly to shed prohibitive labels as soon as possible.

**The Role of Dual Immersion Bilingual Education**

One option sought to remedy the marginalization and underperformance of Latino students is dual immersion (DI) bilingual education. Under a DI model, classrooms are comprised by relatively equal portions of native speakers of the societal majority language and those who speak a minority language (for the purpose of addressing the needs of Latino students in the US, this work will focus on Spanish-English DI programs). Instruction is carried out partially in the minority language (in some models,
Spanish accounts for 90% of the instructional day at the kindergarten level, with 10% shifts towards English every year until a 50% balance between English and Spanish is achieved, whereas other models simply rely on 50% allotments from the very outset).

The stated goals of DI programs include not only high achievement on standard measures such as testing and graduation rates, but also full bilingualism and biliteracy among students, as well as a high degree of multicultural understanding and equanimity among native English speakers and English Language Learners (ELLs) (Christian and Howard, 2000; Collier and Thomas, 2004; Thomas and Collier, 2002).

Relegating dual immersion to merely a remedial mechanism misses the promise of DI as an instructional model and of its students and obscures some of the very issues at the root of the aforementioned obstacles for language minority students. A typical DI classroom contains far more complexity than the linguistic designations “ELL,” “RFEP,” (Redesignated Fluent English Proficient, referring to students formerly classified as ELL but whose English proficiency has been deemed adequate to exempt them from special remediation needs), and “EO,” (English Only). As can be inferred by the presence of students from affluent families proficient in the majority language, DI clearly offers more than remediation and English language development for ELL students. Nevertheless, if DI programs and teachers operate with the same conflicting and problematic conceptions of language, language acquisition, and language proficiency, the goals of English language development and “balanced” or “full” bilingualism (Cummins, 1977; Fishman, 1970) seem mutually exclusive, as Maestro’s classroom exemplifies. This work elucidates the language ideologies and the conceptions of language, language proficiency, and language acquisition that inform teaching in one particular DI program. It
investigates how these ideologies and understandings are internalized and enacted by teachers, students, administrators, and parents in the program, with implications for teaching, learning, student classification, and academic outcomes.

Research Questions

This work thus seeks to answer four important questions. First, what are the language ideologies and language attitudes expressed and made manifest by students, teachers, parents, and staff at this particular DI program? Second, what language practices do students and teachers engage in during academic and social interactions? Third, insofar as these language practices presumably embody or reflect participants’ language attitudes and ideologies, how do they compare and contrast with the language practices that social-process oriented conceptions of language and second language acquisition would propose for optimal learning and instruction? Finally, seizing upon observed instances in the school and classroom in which flexible language practices facilitated learning, what recommendations can be made for educators and DI program administrators to nurture opportunities for such learning more broadly and reconcile them with the demands of current testing regimes?

Theoretical Framework

The presumed foundations yielding the positive outcomes ascribed to DI are extensive interaction among students from the two language groups and the use of target
languages as mediums of instruction, rather than simply as subjects of study. Students serve as language models for one another, and by extensive interaction provide not only plenty of comprehensible input (Krashen, 1981) for one another in the respective target languages but also extensive and multiple low-stakes opportunities for language production that allows students to experiment with language forms in less intimidating contexts than single-speaker, whole class formats (Ellis, 2008). These interactions among members of different linguistic (and by implication cultural, racial, and socioeconomic groups in the context of the selected site and many DI schools like it) theoretically promote intercultural understanding and the exchange of cultural capital from members of privileged groups to members of linguistic, cultural, or racial minorities so that they might access what Lisa Delpit dubs “codes of power” deemed essential for success in a stratified society (Delpit, 1988). Indeed, early research that highlights the relative effectiveness of DI models for ELL students notes the importance of this cultural capital flow (Acosta, 2007; Christian and Howard, 2000; Collier and Thomas, 2004; Thomas and Collier, 2002).

Nevertheless, and arguably because of the expected unidirectional nature of this cultural capital flow, DI programs are no certain panacea for language minority students in American schools. A review of the literature shows that language shifts towards disproportionate use of and more positive attitudes to English even in DI programs that dutifully promote use of the minority language (Benjamin, 1992; Potowski, 2007; Tarone and Swain, 1995; Valdés, 2011), as well as unequal achievement among Anglophones and native speakers of the minority language (Valdés, 1997).
This premise makes a number of assumptions about language and the way it is learned and used in bilingual settings. First, it presumes standardization of language forms. That is, when students are in “Spanish” class, it is supposed that they are acquiring one form of Spanish being simultaneously modeled by the teacher and Spanish-dominant peers as well as written text and other classroom materials. Secondly, it assumes that Spanish and English are held in equal regard such that there are motivations and need to develop full bilingualism and biliteracy, rather than with one language or variety overtaking learning opportunities from another. Simply put, this is not the case at this elementary school or in its surrounding community. The theoretical framework underlying this work seeks to contrast these faulty assumptions with accepted sociolinguistic knowledge. It begins with an exploration of conceptions of language, language variation, and the mythologies involved in language standardization. Subsequently, it explores how ideologies around propriety, ability, and identity emerge with respect to particular varieties of language to the detriment of those not socialized into standardized language practices. Finally, it considers links between language and social capital that reify these ideologies into social realities by privileging standardized-variety and dominant language speakers, and the implications of these considerations for teaching practices with regard particularly to language minority students. In brief, I argue that conceptions of language and language acquisition that prize standardized, monolingual norms without acknowledging the social processes of language learning inevitably hinder language minority students’ attainment of the proficiency benchmarks these norms establish.
Language and Language Acquisition as Social Processes

Underlying the most common ways that language is taught and assessed in schools are cognitivist perspectives of language and language acquisition. These perspectives emerged in the latter half of the 20th Century and are rooted in the work of Noam Chomsky (1965, 1972) and his proposition of *universal grammar* and an internal *language acquisition device* (LAD). These conclusions emerged from patterns Chomsky observed mainly in children’s language learning in experimental contexts that led him to presume innate, sequential, and rule-governed abilities and processes of language learning occurring within individuals, thus the label of cognitivism. Alongside Chomsky, Larry Selinker (1972) proposed the idea of *interlanguage* to describe the incomplete but incrementally increasing acquisition of a second language on the part of individuals. From such theories, conceptions of language as a static set of component parts (sounds, letters, words, sentences, clauses, parts of speech, etc.) and rules for their combination to communicate meaning emerged and dominated the way language is taught and proficiency assessed.

Recently, scholars have called into question many of the assumptions of cognitivist perspectives on language and second language acquisition (SLA). These new approaches build on the work of social learning theorists such as Lev Vygotsky (1962) that argues that learning cannot be divorced from its social contexts, and that it is through interaction, conflict, and negotiation that learning occurs. In this vein, Lave and Wenger (1991) characterize learning processes as situated in apprenticeship within communities of practice. Through time, experience, and interaction, novices progress from peripheral
positions to more central roles in these communities. Linguists, anthropologists, and educators alike have lately applied these frameworks of interaction and locally situated practice to language learning.

Makoni and Pennycook (2007) propose viewing language as dynamic and locally situated practices, and taking care to convey that languages, metadiscursive regimes about language, and the political and social ideologies that follow from these metadiscursive regimes are all social constructions,

Metadiscursive regimes are representations of language which, together with material instantiations of actual occurring language, constitute forms of ‘social action, social facts and can function as agents in the exercise of social and political power.’” (Jaffe, 1999, p. 15 in Makoni and Pennycook, 2007, p. 2)

Similarly, Diane Larsen-Freeman (2011) proposes an approach to SLA rooted in Complexity Theory. This approach is marked by theoretical underpinnings positing that language is rooted in locally situated practices and that rules emerge from patterns of use among interlocutors in particular contexts and that these rules themselves are dynamic and contextually responsive. This approach closely resembles the work of De Bot, Lowie and Verspoor (2007), which applies the principles of Dynamic Systems Theory (DST) to SLA, asserting that SLA, like other dynamic systems, has variables that interact over time with sensitivity to initial conditions, interconnected subsystems, and variation among and between individuals. Presuming these dynamic and contextually responsive aspects of language and language learning, it logically follows that language varies across time, geography, social class, gender, and other factors that influence one’s speech community.
Language Variation

It is well documented in sociolinguistic literature that language varies across a host of identity characteristics such as sex (Eckert, 1989), race (Labov, 1972; Rickford and Rickford, 2000), ethnicity (Fought, 2006), nationality or region (Fishman, 1972; Mar-Molinero, 2000; Wolfram and Schilling-Estes, 1998), and social class (Ash, 2002), among others. The significance of this language variation for teaching and learning is that, naturally, students come to classrooms with a variety of language practices. Given inevitable variation in their personal experiences, notably the various speech communities and literacy practices to which they are exposed throughout their lives, students thrust together into classrooms must negotiate their own linguistic differences in the process of acquiring the language practices demanded by schools. In the United States, this means particularly that students must acquire proficiency in English, and that the measures of this proficiency are those described by Valdés (2004) and represented in Table 1, namely the abilities in English to participate in classroom interactions and to obtain, process, construct, and provide information pertinent to academic disciplines in written and oral forms. The high stakes attached to children’s ability to acquire these practices stems from pressures for language standardization, which itself is part of language planning projects on national scales that creates unfortunate hierarchies and inequities.
**Language Standardization**

The push to impose a standard language variety upon the multitude in existence in any given geographic space ties directly to nationalism and power relations. Benedict Anderson (2006), in accounting for the rise in popularity and power of the nation-state and subsequent nationalist sentiment, cites “the slow, geographically uneven, spread of particular vernaculars as instruments of administrative centralization by certain well-positioned would-be absolutist monarchs.” (p. 40) Anderson notes that the emergence of singular vernaculars within national boundaries took centuries in countries like England and France, but this delay was in part because of the imposition of Latin as a lingua franca in courts beforehand across Europe, and that it was not until later that Europe witnessed the emergence of “self-conscious language policies pursued by nineteenth-century dynasts confronted with the rise of hostile popular linguistic-nationalisms.” (p. 42) The gradual nature of this process only speaks to the authority that Latin and the Catholic Church already asserted. In either case, the privilege conferred upon those with the power to impose or use a standard language points to the hierarchies and marginalization that follow from such language planning. Indeed, some would argue that these language planning efforts inherently, if not deliberately, serve to marginalize sectors of any given population.

Pierre Bourdieu (1991) notes the authoritarian impulse of language standardization and the subsequent power of those whose language varieties comprise that standard.
It is inscribed, in a practical state, in dispositions which are impalpably inculcated, through a long and slow process of acquisition, by the sanctions of the linguistic market, and which are therefore adjusted, without any cynical calculation or consciously experiences constraint, to the chances of material and symbolic profit which are the laws of price formation characteristic of a given market objectively offer to the holders of a given linguistic capital. (p. 51)

Similarly, Tollefson (1991) points to the paradoxical circumstances of great investment and policy attention towards language teaching juxtaposed with economic and educational inequities that restrict access for many to the dominant language varieties they need. Lippi-Green (1997) reiterates the injustice behind such linguistic normativism, dispelling ideas that there is in fact a “proper” English and that anyone could indeed acquire this variety without having been socialized in a speech community that uses it as a primary means of communication.

**Language Ideologies**

These myths that Lippi-Green and Tollefson address point to the harmful language ideologies that emerge from the impulse towards standardization. Terry Eagleton (1991) describes ideology as a creative and agentive force in a social world while being understood deceptively as simply a description of that world. Michel Foucault echoes these ideas stating,
Each society has its regime of truth, its 'general politics' of truth: that is, the types of discourse which it accepts and makes function as true; the mechanisms and instances which enable one to distinguish true and false statements, the means by which each is sanctioned; the techniques and procedures accorded value in the acquisition of truth; the status of those who are charged with saying what counts as true. (Foucault, 1980, p. 131)

With respect to language, ideologies are manifest as a cultural common sense shared within a society about the value and propriety about certain language varieties. Kroskrity (2004) defines language ideologies as a “ubiquitous set of diverse beliefs, however implicit or explicit they may be, used by speakers of all types as models for constructing linguistic evaluations and engaging in communicative activity. They are beliefs about the superiority/inferiority of specific languages” (p. 497)

In the United States, prevalent ideologies prize the speaking of particular varieties of English over other languages and problematize bilingualism or bidialectalism (Crawford, 2008; Lippi-Green, 1997; Schildkraut, 2005), believing that the latter are indicative of lesser education and can be disruptive to national unity. Of course, similar hierarchies and ideologies exist with regard to Spanish in Spain, Latin America, and among American speakers of Spanish (Mar-Moliner, 2000). In the context of bilingual education, standardized varieties of Spanish and English are reified through curriculum materials and discourses of propriety and correctness, and become the paradigm of what it means to be fully bilingual. Nevertheless, such standardization and separation are illusory, and no bilingual individual conforms to the norm of two monolinguals in one mind (Grosjean 1989, 1998; Cook, 2002)."
Indeed, especially for Latino students classified as ELLs, there is a great deal of pressure to align with prevalent ideologies of language purity. García and Leiva (2013) point to two monolingual tensions. On the one hand, these students face the “Anglophone ideology” (p. 199) of English proficiency and monolingualism as correspondent to American identity, and on the other hand a “Hispaniphone ideology” (p. 199) that punishes emergent bilingual students for speaking “Spanglish.” Otheguy and Stern (2010) confirm this latter ideology by demonstrating that much of the lexical and syntactical variation in what gets derisively labeled “Spanglish” actually replicates much of the regional variation occurring in Spanish throughout Latin America and Spain, but that the particular variations emerging from contact with English receive far greater scrutiny and criticism.

Overturning Language Ideologies in the Classroom: Translanguaging and Translanguaging Pedagogies

These language ideologies hamstring students’ abilities in class. Previous research (Gutiérrez, Baquedano-López, and Tejeda, 1999; García 2009; García and Kleifgen, 2010; García and Leiva, 2013) and the observations for the present work confirm that bilingual students do not simply combine languages in their spoken or written expressions because of any lack of proficiency. Rather, they use information in both languages and in multiple modalities to obtain and create knowledge during learning tasks, and likewise draw upon both languages to communicate and elaborate upon that knowledge with bilingual peers. Recognition of this fact pushes one from a paradigm of code-switching and “Spanglish” in the classroom to a more comprehensive concept of
translanguaging (García 2009; García and Leiva, 2013), which in turn builds on the concept of hybrid language practices (Gutiérrez, Baquedano-López, and Tejeda, 1999). The distinction between these practices and simple code-switching is important.

Gutiérrez, Baquedano-López, and Tejeda (1999) note in their study of an after-school computer club for bilingual students that the students’ drawing on multiple linguistic cues for both inquiry and expression constitute more than simple speech, but rather practices of knowledge creation, negotiation, and identity formation.

For us, hybrid literacy practices are not simply code-switching as the alternation between two language codes. They are more a systematic, strategic, affiliative, and sense-making process among those who share the code, as they strive to achieve mutual understanding. (p. 88)

Expanding this concept, García (2009) offers the term translanguaging, which she uses to refer to pedagogical practice in which the language mode of a learning activity changes (for instance, reading in one language and writing in another), and which she defines as “multiple discursive practices in which bilinguals engage in order to make sense of their bilingual worlds. Translanguaging therefore goes beyond what has been termed code-switching.” (p. 45; emphasis in original).

To be sure, code-switching refers to more than simply the interspersing of multiple codes in single utterances, with a host of pragmatic uses and speaker intentionality attached to the act (Gumperz, 1977). Nevertheless, I offer that the term translanguaging refers as much to a sociolinguistic phenomenon as it does to an ideological stance, one that recognizes the dynamism of linguistic features in bilingual communities.
Acknowledgement of such practices among bilinguals and recognition of the social processes of language construction and second language acquisition demands teaching practices that nurture such translanguaging. Sunesh Canagarajah (in Makoni and Pennycook, 2007) lists dominant features of indigenous communication in India as a model for all language paradigms, referring to blurred language boundaries, fluid language identities, and complementarity between communication within groups and among them. Such a view of language rooted in the practices of a community rather than in an idealized standard acknowledges and invites the resourcefulness that I observed among the students at Rivera Elementary, and pedagogies rooted in this view offer promise for greater educational equity.

**Review of the Literature**

**Language standardization and variation**

With the emergence of the nation-state and modernity, the urge to standardize language across governed territories became pressing. Language standardization, the effort to create uniform speech and writing styles throughout a state, involved extensive centralized planning. First and foremost, one variety had to be placed atop all others and selected as the exclusive variety for use in official channels. Secondly, this variety had to be diffused throughout the state’s population by way of media, schooling, and, in many cases, coercive measures. These measures can be both overt, such as restrictions and punishments on the use of other languages or varieties, and indirect, such as a lack of
access to material benefits accrued through use of dominant varieties, including better schooling, jobs, and political participation. A number of works delve into the broad processes of language standardization imposed upon societies (Anderson, 2006) recounts the standardization process for numerous European states as the power of the Catholic Church waned and national vernaculars gained official prestige. Eugen Weber (1976) offers the specific example of France, describing the gradual imposition of what is now standardized French over Breton and other regional varieties. James C. Scott (1998) similarly recaps the French experience and captures the carrot-and-stick philosophy behind language standardization stating,

The implicit logic of the move was to define a hierarchy of cultures, relegating local languages and their regional cultures to, at best, a quaint provincialism. At the apex of this implicit pyramid was Paris and its institutions: ministries, schools, academies (including the guardian of language, l’Academie Francaise)…Standard (Parisian) French and Paris were not only focal points of power; they were also magnets. The growth of markets, physical mobility, new careers, political patronage, public service, and a national educational system all meant that facility in French and connections to Paris were the paths of social advancement and material success. It was a state simplification that promised to reward those who complied with its logic and penalize those who ignored it. (p. 73)

Certainly these portrayals of 19th Century Paris embody the “sanctions of the linguistic market” that Bourdieu (1991) described, and these processes are equally represented in the standardization of Spanish and English historically and in modern bilingual education programs.
Variation in Spanish.

Stewart (1999) describes the Spanish standardization process as much more defuse than that in France, although Mar-Molinero (2002) notes that both the establishment of the Real Academia Española (RAE, Spain’s language planning body founded in 1713) and Charles III’s mandate in 1768 that Castilian would be the singular language variety of the realm were in imitation of French policies. She notes the eroding influence of Castilian Spanish and the dictates of the RAE in the face of increasing literary production and wealth in the Spanish-speaking countries of Latin America. She attributes this in large part to the great territorial expanse in which Spanish is the prevalent language and the national interests various states have in separating themselves from one another. Thus, standardization is far from complete and, rather, is frequently segmented without a panhispanic norm despite efforts at uniformity through the creation of the Asociación de Academias de la Lengua Española in 1961, which united the various national academies invested in the preservation and purification of the language, and the continuing publication of authoritative texts on Spanish grammar (Gramática de la Lengua Española, first published in 1771) and lexicon (Diccionario de la Lengua Castellana, or Diccionario de Autoridades, first published in six volumes in the early and mid-eighteenth century). On the other hand, Stewart echoes Scott’s observations of the French experience by situating the basis of most prestige varieties of Spanish, known as norma culta \(^\text{vii}\) (“Cultured norm”) used among the educated elite in the urban capitals of each given country, and reinforced through media and public administration. This is
especially true of written form, which is easier to standardize, especially in times of
global media reach and digital reproduction of print (Stewart, 1999).

The absence of any single hegemonic variety foreshadows the symphony of forms
that comprise global Spanish use. Even the RAE concedes this failure at wholesale
standardization. In a deviation from its stated mission of “Fija, limpia y da esplendor”
(“Affixes, purifies, and gives splendor”), the RAE created the Corpus de Referencia del
Español Actual (Corpus of reference of current Spanish, CREA) in 1992, to serve as a
descriptive language repository rather than a prescriptive manual. CREA collects written
journalism, literature, and science texts as well as recordings of naturally occurring and
broadcast oral language, and boasts a database of over 200 million words (Stewart, 1999).
Within this vast array, a number of variational factors can be considered. On the one
hand, there is the distinction between phonological variation (a principle focus of study in
variation within English) and morpho-syntactical variation, which concerns itself more
with lexical and structural differences.

In either case, regional variation is certainly an easy distinction to draw. Broadly
speaking, Spain itself can be divided into three dialectal varieties of mutual intelligibility,
with Castellano dominating the norther portions of the country, Andaluz the southern
parts, and Canario in the Canary Islands. In the Americas, varieties frequently
distinguished are Mexican, Central American, Caribbean, Andean highland, Chilean, and
Rioplatense (for the La Plata River region in Argentina and Uruguay) Spanish varieties.
Other noted varieties in the world are Filipino and Chavacano Spanish in the Philippines,
Guinean Spanish in Equatorial Guinea, Saharan in northwestern Africa, and Ladino
among descendents of Sephardic Jews expelled from Spain in the 15th Century (mostly
settled in Morocco). Of course, to suggest that these varieties are the only ones in the given region for which they are named, and that they are themselves static and homogeneous is a gross oversimplification. Lipski (1994), for instance, suggests no fewer than two and often as many as a half dozen varieties in any single Latin American country.

Regional varieties certainly differ from one another in morpho-syntactical and phonological forms, but there is also a great deal of divergence among speakers in the same regions. In fact, noting the concentration of resources and education among the wealthy in Latin America, especially during early periods of dialectological study, Lipski (1994) proposes subordinating regional classifications to other sociolinguistic variables. Lipski notes a host of panregional variables, captured in Table 2, that recur in Latin American Spanish and correspond largely with class differences. Lipski distinguishes between phonological variables and grammatical variables, and notes that while frequency of occurrence is the analytical unit for the former, mere presence or absence matters for the latter.

**Table 2 - Specific Variables of Sociolinguistic Variation in Latin American Spanish (Lipski, 1994; pp. 146-149)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Phonological Variables</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Retention vs. loss of syllable final /s/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavior of syllable-final liquids</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affricate vs. fricative pronunciation of /tʃ/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pronunciation of /y/, /ɾ/, /rr/, and final /n/</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Grammatical Variables</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Colloquial conjunctive <em>haiga</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Naide</em> or <em>nadien</em> for <em>nadie</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Asina</em>/<em>ansina</em> for <em>asi</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regularization of verb stems for uniform stress and diphthongization (eg: <em>vuelvemos</em> for <em>volvemos</em>)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
One pivotal study in the language practices and variation within a geographically bound bilingual community is Ana Celia Zentella’s *Growing Up Bilingual* (1997), which documents the language use of several generations of Puerto Ricans living in New York City. In the study, she notes differences across individuals based on age, gender, education, profession, and frequency of visits back to Puerto Rico, age of immigration to the United States (including noting those born in New York), among other elements. Just as importantly, however, Zentella points out variation within individuals based on interlocutors, topic of discussion, and the location of interactions. Urciuoli (1996) works with a similar population, conducting ethnographic observations of Puerto Ricans living in the Bronx and Lower East Side neighborhoods of New York City. She notes similar variation to that observed by Zentella, and extends her findings to arguments against the unjust marginalization of Puerto Ricans in American society based on unattainable paradigms of English and bilingual proficiency.

As this study looks at Spanish in a school in Northern California, I focus here on research about the varieties more commonly associated with Mexican and Mexican-American youth in the US and with contact varieties of recent immigrants. It is paramount to begin by distinguishing that the language practices of Mexican-Americans vary tremendously by the same predictable factors that affect variation in other communities – geography (rural or urban, located in a particular state), age, class, level of education, and so forth. Nevertheless, certain generalizations can be made about the variety known as *Chicano Spanish*, which refers to the language practices of Mexican-Americans raised in bilingual communities in the United States. Understandably, a predictable feature of Chicano Spanish is influence from English, which is evident in the
lexicon, morpho-syntax, and to a lesser extent, phonology. Findings from Stewart (1999) and Hernández-Chávez, Cohen, and Beltramo (1975) are summarized in Table 3 and present salient features in each respect. It is worth noting that many of these variables mirror those observed by Lipski (1994) for Latin American variation, reinforcing the importance that sociolinguistic factors can play over regionalism.

Table 3 - Lexical, Morpho-syntactical, and Phonological Features of Chicano Spanish (Hernández-Chávez, Cohen, and Beltramo, 1975; Stewart, 1999)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Phonology</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aspiration of unaccented onset vowels</td>
<td><em>Cordar</em> in place of <em>acordar</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aspiration of word endings</td>
<td><em>Pa</em> in place of <em>para</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aspiration of sibilant [s]</td>
<td>[<em>ehte</em>] for <em>este</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Morpho-syntaxis</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addition of [s] to second person singular</td>
<td><em>Fuistes</em> in place of <em>fuiste</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regularization of radical changing verbs</td>
<td><em>Vuélvamos</em> in place of <em>volvamos</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substitution of <em>mos</em> for <em>mos</em> as first</td>
<td><em>Nos juntábamos</em> in place of <em>nos juntábamos</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>person plural marker</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syntactical borrowings from English</td>
<td><em>Te llamo pa trás</em> for “I’ll call you back.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lexicon</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archaic subjunctive form <em>haiga</em> for <em>haya</em></td>
<td><em>Aunque no haiga/haya diferencia...</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of rural archaic <em>asina</em> for <em>asi</em></td>
<td><em>No me hables asina/asi.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of rural <em>nadien</em> for <em>nadie</em></td>
<td><em>No estaba hablando con nadien/nadie.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assimilation of English nouns and verbs with</td>
<td><em>Espelear</em> (for spelling), <em>dosteear</em> (for</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>–ar infinitive ending for verbs</td>
<td>dusting)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Troca</em> (for truck), <em>un ploga/una ploga</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(for a plug)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is worth noting that, with the exception of borrowings from English, many of the features listed in Table 3 as characteristic of Chicano Spanish also apply to vernaculars in areas not in contact with English, including Latin America and Spain. The
aforementioned work of Otheguy and Stern (2010) compares variation in popular Spanish in the United States to that in other areas of the world and undermines the disparaging label “Spanglish” for this particular variety. The authors note that many of the lexical borrowings resemble other locally specific terms in Spanish, with the availability of neutralizing terms that are commonly known but infrequently used (for instance, *bus*, *micro*, *guagua* as local terms and *autobús* as the neutralizer; p. 88). Moreover, the authors point to the disdainful attitudes of purists towards English borrowings in American Spanish as hypocritical and uninformed, ignoring a large body of borrowed items in other Spanish varieties that draw, for example, from indigenous languages (*chocolate*, *tomate*), German (*chop*, a term for lunch in Uruguayan Spanish), and Arabic (*alfombra*). Thus, distinguishing Chicano Spanish from other varieties of American Spanish is no simple task, and involves recognizing the presence of particular items of Mexican Spanish (such as borrowings from Nahuatl), or traces of Caló, a variety of Spanish spoken mainly among young men in the Southwestern US that combines Hispanicized gypsy speech with popular Mexican Spanish (Stewart, 1999).

**Variation in English**

Work on language planning efforts and variation in English is equally rich, enhanced by the fact that the English language has no centralized planning authority and rather depends on dictionaries and grammar guides as officials of the standardized form. Work in the United States has considered predictable variables such as region (Wolfram and Schilling-Estes, 1998), gender (Eckert, 1989; Eckert and McConnell-Ginet, 2013),
race – particularly regarding African-Americans (Labov, 1972; Labov and Harris, 1986; Rickford and Rickford, 2000; Smitherman, 1998; 2000; Wolfram, 1987;) – and Whites (Bucholtz, 1999; 2001; 2011), social class (Labov, 1966), and Latino ethnicity – predominantly about Puerto Ricans on the East Coast – (Urciuoli, 1996; Wolfram, 1974; Zentella, 1997) – although increasingly about Chicanos as well (Bucholtz, 1995; Fought, 1999; 2003; 2006; Mendoza-Denton, 1997). Once more, for the purposes of this work I will emphasize the research in English variations most associated with Latino students in the Bay Area.

Fought (2006) distinguishes a range of English varieties spoken by US Latinos. Certainly, quite a few who have been born and/or prevalently socialized in the American middle class speak the standardized variety. Others predominantly speak some variety of Latino English (usually demarcated by ethnicity, such as Puerto Rican English, Cuban English, or Chicano English). Those with less schooling and socialization in English-dominant speech communities will rely on non-native Spanish-influenced English, also regarded as learner English. In addition, Hill (2007) notes the vernacular form Mock Spanish, a derisive combination of English and Spanish (usually English words with an “ó” at the end or Spanish words pronounced with English phonology), that she claims reinforces the normative Whiteness of public spaces and the associations of standardized English with national belonging, but that I have nevertheless observed among native Spanish speakers in this work and which will be discussed at greater length in Chapter 4. Briefly, Table 4 displays findings regarding Chicano English and non-native Spanish-influenced English, as these are of most concern for the present work.
Table 4 - Features of Chicano English and non-native Spanish-influenced English (Fought, 2006; pp. 81-85)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phonological Features</th>
<th>Explanation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less frequent vowel reduction</td>
<td>Fewer unstressed vowels reduced to <em>schwa</em>, as frequently occurs with American English vernaculars</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequent lack of glides</td>
<td>High vowels [i] and [u] realized as monophthongs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tense realization of /I/</td>
<td>[i] used as a phonetic variant of [I]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stops for interdental fricatives</td>
<td>Alveolar stops [t] and [d] substituted for interdental fricatives [θ] and [δ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grammatical Features</th>
<th>Explanation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extended use of modals and modal <em>would</em></td>
<td>Used with present-tense stative verbs (eg: If he’d be here now; If I woulda been taller…)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substitution of <em>tell</em> for <em>ask</em></td>
<td>Eg: If I tell her to jump, she’ll tell me how high (Fought, 2006; p. 83)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extended semantics of <em>barely</em></td>
<td><em>Barely</em> used to mean “just recently” or “for a short amount of time”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-standard use of prepositions</td>
<td>Preposition use linked to influence of Spanish</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Language Ideologies and Linguistic Capital

Although notions that language and power are intimately intertwined go back at least as far as the emergence of nation-states and efforts for standardization, language ideologies emerged as an object of study in themselves only toward the end of the 20th Century, combining scholarship about power and hegemony from Marxist origins with that of language variation and languages in contact (Blommaert, 2006; Kroskrity, 2004; Woolard and Schieffelin, 1994). Scholarship in this regard follows two principal avenues. For the present work both facets of the discussion are important, as bilingual and multidialectal students in American schools must simultaneously confront ideologies around the proper forms of language and those about how language exists in the world and is learned.
The first explores ideologies around the language practices of particular groups and how these operate within a broader array of power relations between groups. Notably, this vein of study concerns itself with how the language practices of groups in power in any given society assume a normative and unmarked position, with all other varieties somehow distinguished at a social, political, and economic cost to the communities from which they emerge. Michael Silverstein, an oft-cited figure in the study of language ideologies and one of the first to bring the complex theoretical body behind the concept of ideology into discussion of ethnography in linguistic anthropology, offers a useful metaphor in the consideration of the first sense of language ideologies. Silverstein’s initial work offered a neutral consideration of linguistic ideology as simply a metalinguistic element referring to shared indexical planes among members of a given speech community. Rumsey (1990) and others similarly posit ideology as a set of “shared bodies of commonsense notions about the nature of language in the world.” (p. 346) Nevertheless, Silverstein’s work evolves to ultimately propose a framework connecting the language practices and understandings of different groups and their power within a given culture.

At the very other extreme, there is the enveloping social space-time logic of metropolitan ethnolinguistic hegemony. Its terms are ambitious: a definition of oneself negatively and relationally with respect to every possible other, not-\(A\) and not-\(B\) and so on. This can be imagined as an \(n\)-dimensional conically shaped social space-time, with a top-and-center and various dimensions of moving down and out. Here, we can first locate those at the top-and-center, the spatial and temporal metropole of some permanently stratified and spatially conceptualized
cultural and linguistic imperium—think for example of the slogan “the West and the Rest”; think of the view of the “U.S. English” adherents with respect to ethno-linguistic minorities in the American nation-state. Top-and-center folks can look downward-and-outward, as it were, toward peripheries at various degrees of negatively valued deviation from their imagined full-time, default, or unmarked identity. People who are ethnolinguistically at the top-and-center can thus have knowledge of such differences as may constitute others’ ethnolinguistic identities, but they are all perceived to be elsewhere in relation to the apex, which alone sees itself as licensed for unproblematic—hence, hegemonic—24/7-and-everywhere expressibility. Those at the top-and-center never have to stop having their own identity, imagined, in a sense, to be invariant for all their stratified contact with others. (2003, p. 535)

Woolard and Schieffelin (1994) offer a particularly comprehensive review of literature on language ideologies. They note divergences in the literature between those who view ideology from neutral perspectives and those who view it more critically and analyze it with an eye towards its origins or functions in a society. They argue that “A naturalizing move that drains the conceptual of its historical content, making it seem universally and/or timelessly true, is often seen as key to ideological process.” (1994, p. 58) Similarly, Kroskrity (2004) embraces this more critical position on the role of ideology in language in his own review. He delineates five key elements of language ideologies:

- “Language ideologies represent the perception of language and discourse that is constructed in the interest of a specific social or cultural group. A member’s notions of what is ‘true,’ ‘morally good,’ or ‘aesthetically pleasing’ about
language and discourse are grounded in social experience and often demonstrably tied to political-economic interests. These notions often underlie attempts to use language as the site at which to promote, protect, and legitimate those interests.”

- “Language ideologies are profitably conceived as multiple because of the plurality of meaningful social divisions (class, gender, clan, elites, generations, and so on) within sociocultural groups that have the potential to produce divergent perspectives expressed as indices of group membership. Language ideologies are thus grounded in social experience which is never uniformly distributed throughout polities of any scale.

- “Members may display varying degrees of awareness of local language ideologies.”

- “Members language ideologies mediate between social structures and forms of talk. Language users’ ideologies bridge their sociocultural experience and their linguistic and discursive resources by constituting those linguistic and discursive forms as indexically tied to features of their sociocultural experience.”

- “Language ideologies are productively used in the creation and representation of various social and cultural identities (e.g. nationality, ethnicity).” (pp. 501-509, emphasis in original)

Kroskrity’s list of integral characteristics builds on the critical language ideology work of several others. Kathryn Woolard (1985) offers a critique of oversimplified connections between social power, formal institutions, and social reproduction of language ideologies by Bourdieu (1977), contending that linguistic marketplaces are
never fully integrated and that language ideologies, as Kroskrity reiterates, are open to contestation and various levels of acceptance. Woolard relies on sociolinguistic work carried out in Spain to demonstrate how users of non-prestige varieties or languages can nevertheless have more positive attitudes towards these varieties and their speakers than they do of the imposed standard (in this particular case, Catalán and Castilian in Barcelona). She argues for reduced attention to schools and other supposed loci of enculturation in favor of more consideration of lived experiences and economic arrangements for sustaining one’s livelihood, contending that in these informal spheres there is ample room for challenging or reification of hegemonic forms. These questions raise to the fore the dynamic and contestable nature of language ideologies in a society.

Similarly, Gal and Irvine (1995) trace the processes by which boundaries between groups are socially constructed and linguistic differentiation brought to bear on the reinforcement of those boundaries to highlight their flexibility and permeability. The authors specify three semiotic processes by which ideologies uphold group differences. The first is *iconicity*, which refers to the linking of linguistic features or practices to specific groups in such a manner that these variables become, in effect, iconic of the group they index. *Recursiveness*, meanwhile, entails projecting an opposition that exists at one level onto another. That is, it provides for subdivisions within categories or collective categories that incorporate otherwise opposed labels. Finally, *erasure* refers to the manner in which ideology simplifies linguistic differences or practices to the point of rendering certain individuals or practices invisible. That which does not conform to the ideological position is ignored, dismissed, or transformed, such as intra-group variation being disregarded for the sake of communicating group homogeneity. Through these
three processes, simplistic ascriptions of communicative practices can be attached to social groups, and all sort of other characteristics (about work-ethic, values, intelligence, ability, and so forth) likewise generalized.

A number of authors have considered this in the specific case of Spanish in the US, or for Latinos and their language practices. Rosa (2010) conducted ethnographic observation in a Chicago secondary school and showed that prevalent ideologies about Latinos’ intelligence, ability, and values were deeply intertwined with notions of their communicative repertoires, including boisterousness, mixing Spanish and English, and reliance on non-standard forms. Santa Ana (2002) tracks the use of metaphor in public discourse with regard to Latinos over the course of the discussion, voting upon, and implementation of policies targeting California’s Latino population. In his exploration of the discourse surrounding the passage of Proposition 227, which banned bilingual education throughout the state, he notes parallel metaphors of schooling as a path and Latinos’ language practices as a barrier or impediment along that path. Concurrently, negative ideologies around Spanish accompany negative ideologies and metaphors around the social groups to which the language is linked, as Santa Ana points to metaphors such as “flood,” “invasion,” and “tidal wave” in media descriptions of immigration rates from Mexico. Richard Benjamin (2009), in his analysis of “whitopias,” – exurb communities comprised mainly of white Americans and experiencing population growth and increasing racial homogenization - similarly considers the rhetoric around Latinos and immigration in such communities. Through participation in meetings of community organizations and meetings with directors of groups such as Numbers USA, which presses for restrictive immigration policies,
Benjamin finds many of the metaphors that Santa Ana observed in his analysis of LA Times writings that posit Latinos as a scourge, invasion, or flood. Closely tied into these ideologies are views of Spanish as an impediment to Latinos’ incorporation to the American milieu, to children’s academic success, and as closely associated with criminality as a “code” unknown to law enforcement officials but shared among coordinated delinquents across state and national borders. Clearly, language ideologies that peg languages or language varieties to particular people can prove damaging in the context of policymaking and navigating formal institutions, but ideologies about language itself and language acquisition can be just as harmful.

**Ideologies about Language and Second Language Acquisition**

This second area of inquiry with regard to language ideologies refers to societal or group beliefs about language in general and the processes of language learning, rather than to particular languages or varieties and the groups with which they are associated. For instance, this avenue of research considers popular or official notions of proficiency and expectations for what it means to know a language or to qualify as “bilingual.” Indeed, it is the underlying ideology of language as a static, bounded body of symbols, sounds, words, and conventions that enables the ideologies linking languages to groups.

Numerous authors in recent decades have explored this fundamental ideological position. Woolard and Schieffelin (1994), in their review of the literature around language ideologies, trace much of this ideology to the imposition of standards, particularly in the European imperial furor. They note that standardization, and its
accompanying notions of correctness and purity, relies on conceptualizations of languages as unitary and fixed, unaffected by “non-native sources of innovation.” (p. 64) Blommaert (2006), likewise critiques this fallacious ideology by noting “that a uniformizing, singularized notion of language obscures the crucial sociolinguistic differences that occur within that language.” (p. 511) He continues by in turn citing Hymes (1996) to point to the error in “equat[ing] the resources of language with the resources of (all) users.” (p. 213, in Blommaert, 2006; p. 511) Makoni and Pennycook (2007) similarly highlight the socially constructed and ideological nature of language and language hierarchies stating, “Alongside, or, rather, in direct relation with the invention of languages, therefore, an ideology of languages as separate and enumerable categories was also created […] In its most common guise, this metadiscursive regime treats languages as countable institutions, a view reinforced by the existence of grammars and dictionaries.” (p. 2) Countering these conceptualizations of language as static and bounded are views of language as dynamic, locally situated, and socially constructed (Blommaert, 2006; Canagarajah, 2007; De Bot, Lowie, and Verspoor, 2007; García, 2011; Larsen-Freeman, 1997, 2011). It follows that initial conceptualizations about language in turn inform conceptualizations of language acquisition, and when this particularly refers to the development of English on the part of Latino students, these views can be doubly impactful as they interact with the aforementioned nativist ideologies in American discourse and monolingual biases rooted in standardization of both English and Spanish speakers.

A great deal of early literature on second language acquisition suffers from two simultaneous shortcomings. The first stems from the ideological position of language as
a fixed, discrete entity with very specific correct forms based on an orthographic standard. The second hinges on reliance on the aforementioned cognitivist perspectives that situate language learning in the individual mind, rather than in social processes. In his analysis of the discourse around Latinos and Spanish during the passage of California’s ban of bilingual education, Santa Ana (2002) points to three important misconceptions about second language acquisition that backers of Proposition 227 advanced in favor of their cause. First and foremost, they argued that students could acquire conversational English proficiency within a year even as passive recipients of English language instruction. Santa Ana notes the interweaving of this erroneous statement with the metaphor of language as water, in which students can be immersed and carried on a current of English to fluency. Second, Santa Ana points to the problematic reflexive norming of the English language skills of ELL students to that of middle class monolingual English speakers. As Lippi-Green (1997) and many others would argue, one’s language practices result from socialization within speech communities. Third, Santa Ana points to the complex and additive nature of language development which is supported by building on foundations of students’ L1, which proponents of Prop 227 denied in favor of English immersion.

Quite a few scholars have undertaken research that debunks these popular misconceptions about language and language acquisition. These scholars view second language acquisition through sociocultural perspectives, noting the importance of interaction and socialization in learning. These ideas build on the work of Piaget (1959) and Vygotsky (1962) who view learners as active agents inquiring and making hypotheses about their environments, using language to self-regulate and negotiate with
others in the process. Schieffelin and Ochs (1986) distinguish language socialization from language acquisition but nevertheless recognize one avenue of language socialization research as the investigation of how users acquire appropriate uses of language for social competence. Indeed, in discussions of ELL students’ acquisition of English, especially the elusive construct of academic English, socialization seems an optimal framework through which to view acquisition. Similarly, Frawley and Lantolf (1985) and Lantolf (2011) specifically outline a sociocultural theory approach to second language acquisition noting the mediated nature of language acquisition, as linguistic forms are internalized as means to social ends rather than as means to themselves in many instances. De Bot, Lowie, and Verspoor (2007) elaborate on this sociocultural framework and analogize second language acquisition to Dynamic Systems Theory, pointing to learners’ responsiveness to initial conditions (such as linguistic resources in other languages) and non-linear learning trajectories. Larsen-Freeman (1997; 2011) similarly likens second language acquisition to Complexity Theory. While she acknowledges the importance of learners’ agency in linguistic interactions and learning opportunities, she outlines eight basic parallels (Larsen-Freeman, 2011).

- Language is a dynamic set of patterns, and the only stability that emerges is in the patterns that recur frequently and reliably.
- Language is adapted to the contexts in which it is used, and patterns of language use are heterochronous, that is, changes in language use patterns in local timescales can also be indicative of long-term language change.
- Language development proceeds through co-adaptation and soft-assembly, which is to say learners’ language resources change as they interact with other learners,
and that learners marshal their various language resources in response to the communicative pressures posed by their interlocutors.

- Stable patterns emerge from frequent instances of co-adaptation and soft-assembly in bottom-up fashion.
- Learners respond to positive and negative feedback from their environments to play an active role in language development.
- Frequency of exposure and practice in language use patterns is important, but language learning also depends on the saliency of particular instances and patterns to learners.
- Language development trajectories vary greatly, not only across individuals, but also in single learners who at different times display mastery of different skills and functions.
- Influence from learners’ L1 (and other linguistic resources) manifests itself in varied forms. (pp. 52-57)

**Bilingualism and Bilingual Development**

With these underlying conceptualizations of language and language acquisition challenging traditional cognitivist views (or worse yet, the preceding behaviorist impulses behind students unquestioningly parroting phrases and verb conjugations from basal texts), understandings about bilingualism and educating bilingual children must also be revisited. Indeed, we must even throw into question the very concept of *bilingualism* if we are effectively to do away with bounded and static conceptualizations
of language that would render them countable and separable (Flores, 2013), but for the purposes of clarity I will remain with this accepted terminology for now. García and Leiva (2013) draw attention to the monoglossic ideologies that ELL students, whom she terms emergent bilinguals to emphasize their existing repertoires as assets, encounter. On the one hand, they are victimized by the ideologies that prize English, particularly in its standardized forms and in the specific competencies of school demands. Simultaneously, they are criticized for their use of local varieties of Spanish that do not adhere to popular notions of purity and propriety, in much the same way that Otheguy and Stern (2010) describe in their critique of the term “Spanglish” and their defense of American popular varieties of Spanish. Views of bilingualism that correspond to these ideologies of uniform and pure languages echo the statements of Bloomfield (1935), “In […] cases where […] perfect language learning is not accompanied by loss of the native language, it results in bilingualism, native-like control of two languages.” (p. 55-56, cited in Baetens-Beardsmore, 1986; p. 1) Of course, such stipulations ignore the accepted realities that any bilingual or multilingual individual develops different repertoires in each respective language and meshes elements from both in accordance the particular language domains (Fishman, 1965) he/she encounters, that is, with the contexts in which language patterns are deployed and learned and the functions language must serve.

Thus, definitions of bilingualism increasingly revolve around language use, rather than on language per se. Mackey (2000) stresses the need to consider four aspects of bilinguals’ language use in assessing one’s bilingualism, outlined in Table 5.
Table 5 - Measures of Bilingualism (Mackey, 2000, p. 23)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic of Use</th>
<th>Explanation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Degree</td>
<td>The levels of proficiency an individual achieves in each language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Function</td>
<td>The purposes for which a bilingual uses any given language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternation</td>
<td>The extent to which a bilingual alternates between his/her languages, under what conditions, and how these alternations are managed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interference</td>
<td>The measure of a bilingual individual’s ability to keep languages separate, or the extent to which they are fused.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These positions, nevertheless, demonstrate remnants of conceptualizations of language as unitary and bounded. Not only do Mackey’s criteria prize the separation of languages, they also propose that proficiencies in each language can be assessed in isolation from one another and that there is a static alignment of language and function. Wei (2000) engages the challenge of defining bilingualism by first offering a typology of bilinguals in linguistic literature. She notes multiple classifications that uphold the unrealistic standard of a “balanced bilingual,” “maximal bilingual,” “symmetrical bilingual,” or “ambilingual,” referring to a single individual with two distinct repertoires comparable to those of monolinguals in each respective language. Cook (1997; 1999) and Grosjean (1989; 2010) both specifically caution linguists and teachers of language from upholding a monolingual paradigm for bilinguals noting the impossibility of such demands. Instead, they note the locally responsive and individually variable conditions of language development to argue that bilingual repertoires should best be considered dynamic and interacting sets of communicative practices. A host of researchers in applied linguistics have extended this understanding of bilingual repertoires to specific fields of practice.
Code-switching, Translanguaging, and Dual Immersion Bilingual Education

For those operating under monolingual paradigms, the interspersing of elements from one language within another at the word, phrase, clause, or sentence level demonstrates a lack of sufficient proficiency in any single language or reflects laziness and impropriety on the speaker’s part. Quite on the contrary, work on code-switching suggests there are quite a few purposes for the practice, and that bilinguals draw upon these practices agentively. Gumperz (1977) draws from transcripts of bilingual speakers’ conversations to outline specific functions that code-switching accomplishes: quotation, addressee specification, interjection, repetition, message qualification, and distinguishing subjective from objective statements. Similarly, Baker (1993) lists ten purposes for code-switching: emphasis, unfamiliarity with a word in a particular language, ease and efficiency of expression, repetition for clarification, expression of group identity and/or status as well as bidding for group acceptance, quotation, interjection, exclusion of others from the conversation, crossing social or ethnic boundaries, and easing tension in a conversation. Nevertheless, new scholarship goes beyond these descriptions of code-switching to push past ideas of languages as bound entities.

With regard to language in education and other social spheres, a number of terms have emerged to capture the dynamic and locally-situated practices that bilingual and multilingual individuals engage. A particularly salient term is translanguaging, coined by Cen Williams in the 1980s to refer to the use of Welsh and English in the same lesson in Welsh schools (Lewis, Jones, and Baker, 2012a). The term appears repeatedly in work about bilingual education by Williams as well as others (Baker, 2011; Wei, 2011) but has
nevertheless been most popularized recently by the work of Ofelia García (2009), which refers to the networking and recursive use of multiple language systems into a single integrated system for gathering information and communicating. She likewise refers to this language use pattern as *dynamic bilingualism* and represents it visually with the diagram in Table 6, contrasting it with other models of bilingualism advanced by schools and social ideologies.

Table 6 - Models of Bilingualism (García, 2009; pp. 52-53)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model of Bilingualism</th>
<th>Explanation</th>
<th>Visual Representation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subtractive</td>
<td>Speakers of languages other than that of the state are encouraged to abandon their L1 in favor of the dominant language.</td>
<td>L1 + L2 – L1 -&gt; L2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additive</td>
<td>Speakers of non-dominant languages and varieties are encouraged to maintain their L1, but the L1 and L2 are viewed through the lens of a monolingual norm.</td>
<td>L1 + L2 -&gt; L1 + L2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recursive</td>
<td>Bilingualism emerges from speakers of a socially dominant language with a heritage in a suppressed language revitalizing the suppressed language for traditional functions, and reconstituting it for new functions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dynamic</td>
<td>Language practices are multiple and responsive to the multilingual and multimodal terrain of communication.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
With respect to classroom implementation, the term has been adopted by others as well or linked to other practices of similar name. Creese and Blackledge (2010) provide examples of translanguaging in practice through a case-study analysis of four community language schools (schools that emphasize the teaching of a minority language, culture, and heritage, and that students attend in addition to their usual schooling). In these sites, the authors note that while students use their languages (either Gujarati or Mandarin Chinese in combination with English) to perform separate functions within utterances, it is only the combination of the two that conveys the full message of a communication. Canagarajah (2011) provides another instance of pedagogical translanguaging in analyzing the writing across contexts of one undergraduate student. He notes that the student engages a translanguaging strategy of codemeshing, which not only treats the student’s two languages as part of a single integrated system, but also allows for the mixing of communicative modes. Through this codemeshing, the young writer recontextualizes her work for a diverse group of peers, navigates the social relationships of the course in both writing and exchanges about revisions to the writing, and to position herself in various ways relative to her peers. Establishing an oft-cited foundation for translanguaging work, Gutiérrez, Baquedano-López, and Tejeda (1999) and Gutiérrez, Baquedano-López, Álvarez, and Chiu (1999) refer to hybrid language practices, which capture the multiple ways that bilingual students in the particular after-school program the researchers observed interacted with each other and with the computer program that intended to foster literacy skills. Using these multiple modalities and codes, students are able to take in and likewise communicate information from the computer program, peers, and the program directors, as well as fostering a collaborative culture within the program.
based on bilingual and bicultural identities. Despite the promise that such work portends, it only superficially enters the literature around DI practice and implementation.

DI programs have existed in their current form since the 1960’s, when Cuban exiles settled in Miami-Dade County in Florida. The combination of the supposed brevity of their exile before the overthrow of the Revolution and their return to Cuba as well as the privileged professional backgrounds of many made bilingual education in the DI model politically tenable. Much of the scholarship underlying these schools came from the Canadian French-immersion experience, in which speakers of the socially dominant English were immersed in French instruction. Findings from this work demonstrated the development of bilingual skills, albeit with non-native features in students’ French, as well as increased sensibilities to interlocutors in interpersonal communication (Genesee, Tucker, and Lambert, 1975). Such findings were bolstered by the work of Jim Cummins (1976, 1978, 1979a), whose argument for linguistic interdependence offered that students’ skills in their L1 could transfer and support learning in the L2. Nevertheless, Cummins work also hinged on cognitivist perspectives of language and language learning. While advocating for bilingual education, the work also advanced the *threshold hypothesis*, which posited that for students’ L1 to be useful in L2 development, it required a certain baseline of proficiency. Falling short of that threshold, students risked *semilingualism* (Cummins, 1979a), a highly problematic and contested label for students with non-native-like abilities in either of two languages, which Cummins associated with cognitive and academic difficulty. Moreover, Cummins (1979b) introduced the distinction between Basic Interpersonal Communication Skills and Cognitive/Academic Language Proficiency (CALP), arguing that students acquired
conversational ability before mastering the supposedly decontextualized and abstract language of academic disciplines. While modern sociocultural conceptualizations of language argue that the language practices and demands of school are indeed quite contextualized and necessitate socialization (Aukerman, 2007), the distinction between academic and social language, as well as the supposed need to maintain separation of L1 and L2 during instruction, pervade the literature of DI implementation and practice.

The problematic assumptions underlying much of DI program implementation rest on these cognitivist understandings of language acquisition and essentialist ideologies of language as a static and bounded amalgam of lexicon and syntax. Cummins (2005) points to some of these assumptions in his advocacy for bilingual teaching methods for heritage language learners.

1. Instruction should be carried out exclusively in the target language without recourse to the students’ L1.

2. Translation between L1 and L2 has no place in the teaching of language or literacy. Encouragement of translation in L2 teaching is viewed as a reversion to the discredited grammar/translation method […] or concurrent translation method.

3. Within L2 immersion and bilingual/dual language programs, the two languages should be kept rigidly separate: They constitute “two solitudes.” (p. 588)

A wealth of research exists on the effectiveness of DI education models for ELL students across a range of outcomes, including standardized testing scores (including measures of
English language proficiency) (Collier and Thomas, 2004; Cummins, 1992; Freeman, 1996; Greene, 1997; Lindholm-Leary, 2005; Lindholm-Leary and Block, 2010; Lindholm-Leary and Hernández, 2011; Ramírez, Yuen, Ramey, and Pasta, 1991; Quintanar-Sarellana, 2004; Thomas and Collier, 1997), attitudes towards schooling (Lindholm-Leary, 2005; Lindholm-Leary and Borsato, 2001; Potowski, 2007), attitudes towards college (Lindholm-Leary and Borsato, 2001), and multicultural disposition (Acosta, 2007; Freeman, 1996; Lindholm-Leary, 2005). Nevertheless, most of this work leaves these underlying assumptions unquestioned, or in fact reinforces them. Indeed, Howard, Lindholm-Leary, Sugarman, Christian, and Rogers (2007), in their extremely comprehensive review and recommendations on dual language instruction state,

Monolingual lesson delivery (i.e., different periods of time devoted to instruction in and through each of the two languages) seems to be superior to designs that rely on language mixing during a single lesson or time frame (Dulay & Burt, 1978; Legaretta, 1979, 1981; Swain, 1983). […] Because teachers need to refrain from language switching, they must have high levels of academic language proficiency in the language they use for instruction. Teachers, instructional assistants, and others who help in the classroom should not translate for children. Some children in immersion programs have developed the strategy of looking confused when they have to respond in the second language because it results in some well-meaning adult translating for them. Instructors who react in this manner discourage students from developing listening strategies in the second language. (p. 15)
Similarly, Howard and Christian (2002) extol the promise of DI programs and offer their own guidelines for program implementation with language separation as an integral element of teaching practice. Not only do the authors advocate teachers adhering to a single code for instruction, but in fact argue that the same should apply for environmental print in the classroom and for students’ language production as well (p. 10). Such guidelines do little to undermine the dominant language ideologies in society. While the aforementioned program evaluation studies look within schools and districts, or across districts, finding greater gains for ELL students in DI programs relative to their peers in English-only environments, they neglect the interactions and teaching practices taking place in DI classrooms. Studies that consider this element reveal a much more problematic picture.

Ethnographic work in DI classrooms shows tendencies towards language loss and the perpetuation of dominant language ideologies alongside students’ gains and emergent bilingualism. Freeman (1996) observes challenges at one particular DI school in promoting intercultural interactions among the students of different linguistic backgrounds. Palmer (2007) and Scanlan and Palmer (2009) investigate a DI strand within a school and find that discourse practices reinforce deficit perspectives of Latino and African American students within the school and, correspondingly, lowered expectations and watered down curriculum prevent the school from achieving its ambitious goals of student achievement and hinder efforts at recruiting and retaining African American students. Valdés (1997) raises a number of questions for those implementing DI programs, including how to ensure rigorous instruction in the minority language despite the accommodations necessary for native English speaking students,
how staff can overcome social ideologies that impact cross-cultural and cross-linguistic interactions among students, and how schools address the different expectations of second language acquisition (necessary for ELL students, a luxury for native English speakers) given the relative power that English holds over other languages in the US. Potowski (2004, 2007), in a longitudinal ethnography at a DI school in Chicago, finds that as students progress within the program they identify less with Spanish and use it less frequency across domains and functions. Studies that examine translanguaging practices and particular teaching interventions that rely on translanguaging pedagogies address these specific areas of need for current DI models.

The nascent literature on translanguaging pedagogies portrays learning environments that more aptly include and build upon the linguistic resources of emergent bilinguals and allow for critical consideration of prevalent language ideologies. García and Leiva (2013) reflect on the practices of a particular teacher who engages her students in critical, profound conversations in a language arts class to teach about literary conflict. She argues that translanguaging specifically addresses and escapes prevalent language ideologies that entrap many Latino students, stating,

For US Latinos, translanguaging offers the alternative of performing a dynamic bilingualism that releases them from the constraints of both an “Anglophone” ideology that demands English monolingualism for US citizens, and a “Hispanophone” ideology that blames US Latinos for speaking “Spanglish.” (p. 200)

In the described class, the teacher uses a rap video in which the artist translanguages Spanish and English to critique English-only and deportation policies in the US, as well
as a worksheet on which students can translate and annotate lyrics from the rap and connect it to ideas of conflict in literature. The students themselves translanguage in their discussion of conflict and the rap video, extending their academic knowledge while simultaneously critically engaging American ideologies about national identity with racial and linguistic subtexts. García thus points out the liberating potential of translanguaging, noting,

Translanguaging refers to social practices and actions that enact a political process of social and subjectivity transformations which in turn produces translanguaging. Besides challenging the view of languages as autonomous and pure, translanguaging, as a product of border thinking, of subaltern knowledge conceived from a bilingual-in between position, changes the locus of enunciation and resists the asymmetries of power that “bilingual codes” often create. (pp. 9-10)

Hornberger and Link (2012) similarly argue that translanguaging pedagogies offer spaces for critique of dominant language ideologies and far greater opportunities to capture students’ linguistic knowledge and resources as foundations for future learning. To do so they draw upon their own and others’ work in classrooms and schools in the US, UK, and South Africa to provide examples of translanguaging in learning tasks and in social relations. The aforementioned work of Canagarajah (2011) demonstrates how translanguaging allows one particular student to improve her writing as well as think critically about matters of nationality, identity, and language along with her classmates. Martin-Beltrán (2009), meanwhile, looks at student interactions in a California DI classroom to show how translanguaging practices allow emergent bilingual students to
enhance their linguistic and conceptual understanding by harnessing their two languages simultaneously as academic tools.

Clearly, the potential of translanguaging practices not only to support academic achievement but to undermine prevalent ideologies that hinder linguistic minority students in schools deserve attention and consideration. This work seeks to add to this emerging field by specifically probing for information about language attitudes and ideologies as they are understood and maintained by students and staff at the school. Moreover, the work pairs consideration of instances in which monoglossic pressures exert themselves on teachers and students with moments in which language use is less regulated, what Gutiérrez, Baquedano-López, and Tejeda (1999) would consider a third space, to show the benefits of post-structuralist understandings of language and sociocultural notions of language acquisition can offer to the preparation of teachers of linguistic minority students and design of DI programs.
Chapter 2: 
Data Collection and Analytical Methods

To understand the methods used to collect and analyze data, we revisit the research questions that the study undertakes:

1. What are the language ideologies and language attitudes expressed and made manifest by students, teachers, and parents at this particular DI program?
2. What language practices do students and teachers engage in during academic and social interactions?
3. How do the academic language practices, particularly teacher-led instruction, compare and contrast with the language practices that social-process oriented conceptions of language and second language acquisition would propose for optimal learning and instruction?
4. What recommendations can be made for educators and DI program administrators to nurture opportunities for language and content learning more broadly and reconcile them with the demands of current testing regimes?

Answering these questions necessitated extensive and varied data collection methods, yielding of course, varied forms of data. Principally, these methods drew from the fields of linguistic anthropology, quantitative sociolinguistics, and educational sociology. Specifically, data collection included the procedures captured in Table 7.

Table 7 - Methods and Data Collection Procedures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Methodology</th>
<th>Component Data Collection Procedures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ethnography and participant observation</td>
<td>• School observations of students, teachers, administrators, and parents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Conversations and semi-structured interviews with students,</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Ethnography in School and Participant Observation

The principal methods of data collection in this study were ethnographic observation and participant observation. Observation of interactions among students, teachers, and parents provided a great deal of insight about language practices and language attitudes, the first two items in question in this study, with the help of extensive field notes and digital audio and video recordings. A rich body of school and classroom ethnographic work informed this methodological decision.

Heath and Street (2008) offer a useful guide to ethnographic work in classrooms. They recognize that “every speaker reflects habits, loyalties, and ideologies of language forged in cultural patterns that existed before they were born,” (p. 6) implying that diligent ethnography “means not only describing what is currently happening at the local level but also documenting how organizational and institutional forces select and shape their preferred cultural patterns and imbue them with particular values.” (p. 7) Thus,
Heath and Street note that ethnography relies on a *constant comparative perspective* (p. 32), with a recursive inquiry cycle between data from observations, hunches and curiosity based on observed events and patterns, and theories and concepts established in the literature (p. 34). To be sure, these guidelines help inform methods for observing, describing, and making sense of participants’ behaviors, including language use, but greater depth is needed for the specific inquiry of speech, its meanings, and its functions within a community.

John Gumperz and Dell Hymes (1972; Hymes, 1974) spearheaded scholarship in the ethnography of speech, noting that language in any society depended not only on phonological and syntactical knowledge, but also on knowledge of the given society’s rules for communication. Hymes referred to this interaction of social and linguistic knowledge in individuals as *communicative competence*, offering that “communicative conduct within a community comprises determinate patterns of speech activity, such that the communicative competence of persons comprises knowledge with regard to such patterns.” (Hymes, 1974; p. 45) He proposed drawing from anthropological methods and capturing language in naturally occurring social spaces rather than in the highly structured elicitation tasks sociolinguists often relied upon. Gumperz and Hymes further proposed relying on participants’ own understandings and input in making sense of observations and generating categories to describe patterns, as well as relying on rich, qualitative presentations of findings in contrast to quantitative formats used in other descriptive linguistic studies. From these rich descriptions, Gumperz and Hymes offered that speech communities could be compared to one another and from these comparisons could be derived the norms and rules for speaking, interpretation, and interaction of any
given speech community, as well as a general theory of the interaction of language and social life encompassing “the multiple relations between linguistic means and social meaning.” (Gumperz and Hymes, 1972; p. 39) Towards the generation of this knowledge, Hymes proposed mindfulness of particular components of speech, interaction, and context, encapsulated in the mnemonic SPEAKING, outlined in Table 8.

Table 8 - SPEAKING mnemonic (Gumperz and Hymes, 1972; Hymes, 1974)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mnemonic Character</th>
<th>Speech Component</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>Setting and scene</td>
<td>The setting refers to the time, place, and physical circumstances of a speech act (1972; p. 60), while scene refers to the “‘psychological setting,’ or the cultural definition of an occasion as a certain type of scene,” (p. 60), including the formality, gravity, and so on of any given occasion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>Participants</td>
<td>The speaker/sender, addressee, hearer/receiver/audience, and addressee of a speech act. Importantly, this category serves to challenge the previously understood dyad of speaker-hearer in describing speech acts. (1972; p. 59)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Ends</td>
<td>The purposes of a speech act, both in terms of realized outcomes and participant goals, both from the individual and community level. (1972; p. 61)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Act sequence</td>
<td>The message form and message content of a speech act. The former regards the embedded shared way of speaking within a group such that how something is communicated matters to what is actually communicated. (1972; pp. 54-55) The latter refers to the topic of communication as well as the management of topic changes. (p. 55)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>Key</td>
<td>“Key is introduced to provide for the tone, manner, or spirit in which an act is done.” (1972; p. 62) Key is important in that it can emphasize the content of an act, such as yelling a reprimand, but it can also override it if the two are in conflict, as when statements are made sarcastically.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Instrumentalities</td>
<td>This includes the channels of speech, which entails the choice of oral, written, telegraphic, or other medium of transmission, as well as modes within these mediums such as</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Instrumentalities also captures the *forms* of speech, which refers to the “organizations of linguistic means at the scale of languages, dialects, and widely used varieties.” (1972; p. 59) The term also accounts for registers and speech styles.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N</th>
<th>Norms</th>
<th>Norms is comprised of <em>norms of interaction</em> and <em>norms of interpretation</em>. The former are the behaviors attached to rules governing speaking, such as those around turn taking and interruption or tone of voice. The latter refers to how one is to interpret observed norms of interaction. (1972; pp. 63-64)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>Genre</td>
<td>The particular category of speech, such as poems, myths, proverbs, prayers, curses, and so on. (1972; p. 65)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Additionally, McDermott and Tylbor (1995) offer a framework for analysis based on communicative collusion, whereby speakers and their interlocutors must collaborate to make meaning of individual utterances, and especially to make extensive exchanges fluid, coherent, and substantive. Without collusive work, McDermott and Tylbor argue, all communication is doomed to fail because of the countless possible meanings that individual utterances may have. Thus, any study of students’ language choices must be sensitive to these instances of collusion, as well as to the structural and historical forces acting on participants as they make their language choices and upon which they act through said choices. This is especially the case insofar as dialogic speech acts may demonstrate a shared identity among interlocutors, as well as *rich points* (Agar, 1994) where collusion does not occur, frames are not shared, and the meaning or identifying signals of speech are not successfully conveyed, often resulting in the marginalization or indexed denigration of one or more conversation participants (Goodwin and Alim, 2010).
Critical Discourse Analysis

The levels of discourse analyzed herein are multiple. First, there are the general conversations and communications in multiple modes – instances of connected speech or text (Hall, 2001)- comprised in this study by overt statements in interviews and interactions or in written work by students. In addition, and of greater importance, there is discourse as it is defined by Foucault, as a “a group of statements which provide a language for talking about – a way of representing the knowledge about – a particular topic at a particular historical moment.” (Hall, 2001, p. 72) In this respect, discourse is comprised not only by linguistic elements and produced language, but by the interaction between language and practice – language and what it does – that produces objects of knowledge and orients behaviors around these constructed meanings (Hall, 2001).

Foucault notes this relationship by stating,

What I mean is this: in a society such as ours, but basically in any society, there are manifold relations of power which permeate, characterize and constitute the social body, and these relations of power cannot themselves be established, consolidated nor implemented without the production, accumulation, circulation and functioning of a discourse. There can be no possible exercise of power without a certain economy of discourses of truth” (Foucault, 1980, p. 93)

Similarly, Bloome (2008) situates discourse analysis within a linguistic turn in the social sciences by noting “that language is implicated in constructions of knowledge, in configurations of cultures and cultural processes, in power relations, and in relationships among nation-states (including colonialism), classes, ethnic and racial groups, genders,
sexual identities, and so on.” (p. 17) Thus, discourse also substantively encompasses relations of power and accounts for many of the contextual elements that Hymes (1972; 1974) considers important in the analysis of speech.

With this in mind, Fairclough (2001) outlines rigorous methods for effective critical discourse analysis by heeding the vocabulary, grammar, and textual structures of text (considering both written and verbal language as text) and examining the expressive, experiential, and relational dimensions within each (clarifications of these three dimensions to textual features are in Table 9 below). This method draws attention to ideologically contested terms, to the classification schemes relied upon or put in place, to the processes and participants emphasized, and to interactional conventions, among other elements. Such criteria enable the analyst to gauge how local language events emerge from, respond to, and cycle back into broader discourses about language and language learning.

**Table 9 - Text values for critical discourse analysis (Fairclough, 2001, p. 93)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Values of Text</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Experiential value</td>
<td>Evidence of representations of the way in which the text producer’s experience of the natural or social world</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relational value</td>
<td>Cue to the social relationships enacted by the text in the discourse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expressive value</td>
<td>Indicator of producer’s evaluation of the reality a text relates to.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

With these frameworks in place, reasonable guidelines serve to structure ethnographic observation of speech acts in classrooms, as well as discourse analysis of observed interactions and texts. Indeed, considerable ethnographic work has been conducted on speech and language use in classrooms, particularly relating to the language
practices of linguistic minority students. Broadly speaking, this work investigates three particular elements of classroom language use. The first regards language varieties present in classrooms and its deployment in academic tasks, particularly with regard to non-standard varieties or non-dominant languages. With regard to Spanish in American classrooms, work such as that of Benjamin (1996), Gutiérrez, Baquedano-López, and Tejeda (1999), Martin-Beltrán (2009; 2010), Potowski (2004; 2007), and Valdés (2001) follows Latino students in American classrooms noting the role that Spanish and Spanish-influenced English beneficially play in schoolwork as well as the challenges of school environments that privilege English. A second important strand in school ethnography of speech is how language is used in social relations and identity formation among peers or interlocutors. Alim (2004; 2009), Gutiérrez, Baquedano-López, Álvarez, and Chiu (1999), Benjamin (1997), Bucholtz (2011), Martin-Beltrán (2010), Mendoza-Denton (2008), and Reyes (2007), among others, follow students in schools and their school communities capturing how languages and language styles are dynamically used to forge alliances, exclude others, highlight racial or ethnic affiliation, and contest or align with school authorities. Finally, a third strand of classroom speaking ethnography captures discontinuities in students’ language use and the codes expected by teachers in the classroom. Famously, Bernstein (1964; 1972) distinguished between elaborated and restricted codes, with the former being supposedly less rooted in visible contextual supports and typical among upper class students while the latter relied on more tangible contextual clues to meaning and marked the speech of working class students, in turn explaining some of their difficulties in classrooms. These concepts certainly resemble subsequent work by Cummins regarding the BICS/CALP distinction, the problems of
which have already been discussed. Heath (1983) captured differences in childrearing practices with regard to socializing children into language and literacy practices in two racially and socioeconomically distinct communities, with the practices of the middle class white families more closely resembling those of schools. Fordham (1999), meanwhile, observed language use among African-American adolescents in school and found that some adapted their speech to normatively expected forms as a way of “leasing” the standard while others rejected it outright, to their detriment. This third branch of research in the ethnography of speech sought to find sources of underachievement and pathways for remedy. Sadly, much of the work was taken up as evidence of deficiency in the language or childrearing practices of marginalized communities and simply redirected deficit perspectives from biological racism to cultural deprivation theories. It is with this in mind that critical scholars acknowledge the agency and competence of participants’ language use, as well as the misguided, if well-intentioned, influence of language ideology in curriculum, teaching practice, and social interaction in schools.

Before proceeding I must further distinguish ethnographic observation of students and teachers in class from instances of participant observation as separate methodological approaches within the same line of inquiry. Whereas the former principally involved quiet, removed observation, recording, and note-taking, the latter considers many occasions on which I willingly assisted teachers with instruction, joined students during lunchtime play, served as a substitute teacher when participant teachers were called to meetings with parents or administrators, assisted with testing students, and interpreted for teachers and parents during conferences. This distinction that Forsey (2010) notes
between ethnography and participant observation is all too often disregarded plays an important role in how participants relate to the researcher and the nature of data that is collected. While my presence in the school was frequent (between 15 and 20 hours per week) and my role in the classrooms far from that of an uninvolved observer as a whole, I ensured extensive moments of silent observation, looking and listening, to seek patterns in interactions that did not involve me. Further, I did not participate in many of the school-wide activities nor interact with staff and students outside of the school. By not attending staff happy hours and other such informal gatherings or some of the school community events such as late-night movie screenings and pep rallies, I clearly position myself on the periphery of participation in this community of practice (Lave and Wenger, 1991).

I must further recognize my own positioning and negotiated identities as a researcher in the field. Giampapa (2011) discusses the importance of considering dynamic power relationships between researcher and participants, as well as how elements of these identities are contested or upheld in interactions. Reflecting on her work with a Canadian advocacy group for Italian-Canadian LGBT individuals, Giampapa recounts how her gender, heterosexuality, phenotypical features, and Italian proficiency all played a role in her bids for authenticity as a coethnic or otherwise legitimate participant in the group's activities. Indeed, in my presence at the school site, I found myself alternately identified by participants as a teacher, student-teacher, teaching assistant, volunteer, native Spanish speaker, native English speaker, school district employee, and/or Stanford student.
Each of these identities carried with it variable relationships of power with regard to students and staff, and each elicited very different interactions. For instance, students initially made notable efforts to speak Spanish in my presence believing me to be monolingual, and certain staff members began by speaking very candidly with me on the assumption that I was one of several Stanford student-teachers at the site, but later became more guarded after being presented with consent forms and understanding my role as a researcher. Even once my identity as a bilingual researcher seemed securely established, students and staff alike offered contestation to certain facets of these categorizations, such as challenging my bilingualism when I failed to translate a word on command or questioning the legitimacy of my Latino identity when I drew upon regional varieties of Spanish different from those of the predominantly Mexican students. Conversely, my affiliation with Stanford and past relationship as an instructor to some of the teachers at this school site during their teacher preparation studies endowed me with undue authority in other interactions, wherein staff members notably deferred to my own language choices. Nevertheless, by observing, recording, and capturing field-note descriptions of extensive interactions, I was able to distinguish patterns of accommodation from less constrained language use, and it goes without saying that these shifts in language or style, insofar as they formed patterns in their own right, also elucidated attitudes toward particular languages or varieties in given contexts, as will be described in later chapters.
Selecting and Entering the Field Site

My connection to Rivera Elementary School began when a former student in my teacher preparation course secured employment in its DI program. Enthusiastic to investigate and improve upon what we both viewed as problematic notions of language separation and instruction, we approached the school’s principal for permission to conduct the research. Preferring that I work with more experienced teachers, she promptly referred me to the 5th grade team, Maestro Quintara and Ms. Jennifer. I had earlier familiarity with Maestro Quintara who had observed my classroom as a teacher-candidate when I taught 3rd grade nearby before enrolling in graduate school. The two 5th grade DI teachers readily consented to participate, and thus work began.

Starting with staff professional development days and classroom set-up days during the summer of 2011, I spent three to five days a week at Rivera, usually in four hour blocks, through to the 5th grade promotion ceremony on the last day of school. For the most part my time was spent in Maestro Quintara’s classroom, where students would go for the Spanish instruction portion of their day to study science and language arts in Spanish and math in English, although I routinely observed the same students during their English instructional time in Ms. Jennifer’s classroom, as well as in their special classes such as art and physical education, and of course during the recess and lunch periods. Discordance between my own academic calendar and that at Rivera led to occasional variation in the recording schedule (for instance, weeks during which I did not have to teach or attend meetings I was able to observe at Rivera every day for longer periods, and conversely, during vacations or testing blocks at Rivera my windows for observation
were shortened). Moreover, disruptions to the weekly routine at Rivera, such as assemblies, fire drills, testing, parent-teacher conferences, and field trips often forced the teachers to reorganize the activities assigned to any given day. Nevertheless, the prevalent observation and recording schedule is captured in Table 10.

Table 10 - Observation and Recording Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Day</th>
<th>Observation Times</th>
<th>Observed Activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Monday</td>
<td>10:00 AM – 3:00 PM</td>
<td>Spanish language arts&lt;br&gt;English/Spanish language development (ELD/SLD)&lt;br&gt;Mathematics&lt;br&gt;Recess&lt;br&gt;Science&lt;br&gt;Lunch&lt;br&gt;English language arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday</td>
<td>9:00 AM – 12:00 PM</td>
<td>Spanish language arts&lt;br&gt;ELD/SLD&lt;br&gt;Mathematics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>9:00 AM – 12:00 PM</td>
<td>Spanish language arts&lt;br&gt;ELD/SLD&lt;br&gt;Mathematics&lt;br&gt;Recess&lt;br&gt;Science&lt;br&gt;Lunch&lt;br&gt;Music/Art</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday</td>
<td>10:00 AM – 3:00 PM</td>
<td>Spanish language arts&lt;br&gt;ELD/SLD&lt;br&gt;Mathematics&lt;br&gt;Recess&lt;br&gt;Science&lt;br&gt;Lunch&lt;br&gt;Physical Education</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Audio and video recording were gradually introduced, and recording contexts evolved as observations and questions directed. Recording began by placing the microphone at the center of tables during collaborative work, alternating table group on a daily basis in each class period (students were grouped by tested level rather than grade
for math and ELD/SLD) and the video camera in a corner of the classroom. For the first two weeks of observations, I stood near the table where the audio recorder was placed to answer students’ questions and ensure that it was not tampered with. As students became comfortable and familiarized with the recorder after these two initial weeks, I placed it at the center of the table and retreated to the corner of the classroom to observe from a distance and manage the video camera. Video recordings did not begin until this point, as prior to this period, the camera was mounted on a tripod and pointed at the class but not turned on. Students were rather comfortable with being video taped as Maestro Quintara often had them record themselves speaking Spanish as part of language arts and SLD assignments.

After one month in the field, eight focal students for the study were selected based on their levels of verbal participation and the recommendations of Trost (1986) for statistically non-representative sampling. While these students could not be said to statistically represent the population of the classroom, school, or district, they nevertheless provided cases of important independent variables related to language background and bilingual proficiency on scholastic measures. More detailed descriptions of the students are provided in Chapter 3, but Table 11 presents principle demographic characteristics.

Table 11 - Linguistic and Demographic Characteristics of Focal Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Salient Linguistic and Demographic Variables</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elsa</td>
<td>Female, American-born, Spanish-dominant, Advanced on California ELD scale, functionally bilingual household, Proficient on state tests of English Language Arts and Math</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pablo</td>
<td>Male, American-born, Spanish-dominant, reclassified as proficient in English (RFEP), Spanish monolingual household, Proficient in ELA test, Advanced in Math</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melissa</td>
<td>Female, American-born, Spanish-dominant, Intermediate ELL, Below Basic in ELA, Basic in Math</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alex</td>
<td>Male, American-born, English-dominant, RFEP, Basic in ELA and Math</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ramón</td>
<td>Male, Mexican-born, Spanish-dominant, Intermediate ELL, Basic in ELA, Proficient in Math</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max</td>
<td>Male, American-born, English-dominant, third language spoken in the home, Advanced on state test scores</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>Male, American-born, English-dominant, English monolingual household, Advanced on state test scores</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhea</td>
<td>Female, American-born, English-dominant, third language spoken at home, Advanced on state test scores</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Once focal students were chosen, the recorder cycled only among their tables during group work. In addition, a clip-on microphone that attached to the recorder was affixed to the shirt collar of one student per day during the recess and lunch blocks on Mondays and Fridays in order to capture social language use outside the classroom. While observations and field notes tended to follow the microphone, occasional events in the classroom such as arguments or reactions to outside stimuli (insects entering the room, visitors, etc.) received attention at the expense of the focal students.

**Field Notes and Research Memos**

Field notes were taken during each observation session with shifting centers of attention. Initial focus was on teacher instruction, classroom routines, and general student behaviors that supported or countered routines and expected behaviors during class, especially to interactional practices during group work. Once focal students were chosen, attention shifted to these students and their respective table group. Particular topics of interest during observation were the activities in which students were engaged, the teacher practices accompanying said activities or topics of instruction, the subjects of
conversation that emerged during collaborative work, and the language use patterns
during conversation and collaboration. Questions and topics of attention were generated
iteratively roughly every two weeks based on emerging patterns in field notes. Field
notes were taken initially in close proximity to the recording to assure both student
acclimation to being recorded (and non-interference with the recording device) and
fidelity of the field notes (checked against recordings every day for the first month). As
students grew accustomed to being recorded, field notes were taken from greater distance
to discourage students from interacting with me at the expense of their peers. Beyond
classroom and playground interactions among students, field notes were also taken during
or immediately after teacher lectures, assemblies, observations of student work or testing,
field trips that I attended, interactions between teachers and parents, conversations with
participants, and interviews (both planned and extemporaneous).

Research memos served to synthesize field notes and extract from them salient
patterns or questions. Memos were written every two weeks with various points of
emphasis. As with the field notes, initial memos centered around school structures and
routines as well as general descriptions of the students and their emerging personalities.
Once focal students were selected, research memos, reflecting field notes, revolved
around the particular students’ language use, social behaviors, interlocutors, and activities
(academic and social). Research memos also occasionally focused on particular events
that captured teachers’, students’, and the classroom or school’s attention, such as
anticipation and administration of tests, student government campaigns and elections, and
preparation for field trips or special events.
Semi-Structured Interviews

Informal and unstructured interviewing occurred frequently during ethnographic observation. The former usually took place as students and teachers were engaged in other tasks, such as collaborative work, supervision of students, or play during recess. The latter, distinguished from informal interviews in that they occur in a definite time and space with both participants acutely aware that an interview is taking place rather than a casual conversation (Bernard, 2006), took place mainly with teachers during their prep periods and lunch break. Both provided extensive information about students’ and teachers’ perspectives on particular moments, statements, or events in the classroom. Nevertheless, the elusiveness of language attitude and ideology data called for a more formal interview protocol.

Despite vulnerability to response effects (Bernard, 2006) such as the *deference effect* (whereby respondents tell the interviewer what they believe he/she wants to hear) or the *social desirability effect* (in which respondents answer in ways they believe will make them look good), interviews are a reasonable and direct approach to language attitude data (Agheyisi and Fishman, 1970; Garrett, 2010). In her work on language brokering carried out by immigrant children, Orellana (2009) draws heavily on journal entries and interviews with her participants to obtain insights into their experiences with language and cultural understandings that result. Similarly, Potowski (2007) relies on interviews to elucidate students’ attitudes toward Spanish and English as they relate to their self-perception and to social and economic opportunity. Of course, the nature of
researcher identity and how participants challenged or upheld a researcher’s position within the community had to be taken into consideration. 

Since the goal was to gain understanding of participants’ overall notions, attitudes, and understandings about language, bilingualism, and language variation, I opted for semi-structured interviews to allow for more probing, expansion, and flexibility in participants’ responses. In semi-structured contexts, questions are outlined in an interview guide, rather than a firm interview schedule as in structured interviews (Bernard, 2006). In contrast to the list of prescribed questions, the guide offers directions for subjects to be explored with possible question prompts. For this study, topics of conversation began with discussion of participants’ backgrounds in terms of place of birth, linguistic background, migration (if applicable), prior education and schooling, and the linguistic landscape\textsuperscript{xi} (Landry and Bourhis, 1997) of their current community. Some of this data could be corroborated or enriched with school documents, but particularities of past schools, migration experiences, language learning experiences, and the like required questioning and probing. Secondly, questions targeted specific notions and understandings about the roles of English and Spanish in participants’ lives and in American society in general, as well as their understandings of what it meant to “know” a language and to be bilingual. Topics in this line also included parents’ motivation for enrolling their children in a bilingual program, teachers’ motivation for teaching in one, or students’ opinions of being in one. The final category of interview topics was about language learning within this particular DI program. Students were asked about their perceived proficiency and rationale for their self-assessment, as well as things they found beneficial or lacking in their current language instruction. Similarly, teachers were asked
about measures for students’ language proficiency and curriculum or classroom-level
instruction measures to further students’ language development, while parents were asked
to assess and discuss their perceptions of their child’s language proficiency as well as
their own.

**Matched Guise and Verbal Guise Tests**

Numerous ways exist to investigate language attitudes. As mentioned above, interviews and questionnaires can question the matter directly, with speakers asked their opinions of different languages or varieties and the speakers of these respective codes. Commitment tests have speakers of different languages or varieties ask participants to engage in particular behaviors and compare participants’ willingness to “commit” to the requests of different speakers. Matched guise and verbal guise tests, meanwhile, measure language attitudes by asking listeners to evaluate speakers without actually getting to see the speakers. In a matched guise test, a single bilingual or bidialectal speaker reads a passage, once in each language or variety. In a verbal guise test, on the other hand, investigators rely on different speakers, each a native speaker of the variety in question. In both, participants evaluate the speakers on six point Likert scales based on listening to the recordings, unknowing that they are evaluating the same person. The purpose of a six-point scale is to force participants into making a positive or negative judgment. The disadvantage of the verbal guise technique in contrast with the matched guise is the sacrifice of certain controls – voice, tonality, etc. – that inevitably result from having
different speakers. On the other hand, the method provides for more salient and natural expressions of the variables that distinguish one variety or language from another.

Lambert pioneered the matched guise technique to evaluate attitudes towards French and francophone individuals in Canada in the 1950’s (Garrett, 2010). Lambert, Anisfeld, and Yeni-Komshian (1965; cited in Garrett, 2010) advanced the method and combined it with a verbal guise, having two bilingual speakers in Arabic and Hebrew (one with Hebrew as a first language and the other with Arabic, but both speakers deemed fluent in both languages) read texts in Arabic, Yemenite Hebrew, and Ashkenazic Hebrew. These recordings were then played to Arab and Jewish adolescent school children in Israel for the listeners to evaluate each “speaker” on a number of scales including personality ratings of traits such as friendliness, reliability, and humorousness. Listeners did not know, of course, that the voices belonged to the same person, and rather assumed that they were hearing from different individuals. Agheyisi and Fishman (1970) note the advantages of matched guise tests over other attitude inquiries (such as questionnaires or commitment tests) given the ability to control for all factors besides the language or variety in question (such as voice quality, content of text, and speaker personality). Moreover, Lambert et al. (1965, cited in Garrett, 2010) and Giles (1970, cited in Garrett, 2010) showed that despite correlation between direct and indirect measures of attitudes towards languages (Lambert, et al., 1965) or accents (Giles, 1970), participants expressed stronger attitudes in the indirect measures, possibly because more private emotional and conceptual responses were evoked that participants would not consciously share if they knew they were evaluating languages, varieties, or their speakers.
Nevertheless, matched guise tests are not without fault. They presume to reduce the linguistic repertoire of speech communities (for instance, Arabs in Israel or Latino ELL students in the Bay Area) to a single form, disregarding the dynamic language practices of bilinguals. As a complement to engaged listening in ethnographic observation and interview data, however, the administration of matched guise tests to students in which they evaluated speakers of the aforementioned varieties of both Spanish and English offered data to triangulate with the observed language choices from interactions and the statements about language from interviews. Ultimately, a combination of matched guise and verbal guise techniques was used. Unable to find a single speaker to capture standardized English, Spanish influenced English, standardized Mexican Spanish, and Chicano Spanish, I recruited two assistants. Both were young men in their early 30’s of Mexican descent but with considerable time in the US. One, selected for the English guises, was born and raised in California’s Central Valley. The second assistant, who provided the Spanish guises, was born and primarily educated in Mexico before migrating to a Texas border town in his adolescence and relocating to Southern California as an adult. Both speakers were recorded twice narrating a short passage about children playing baseball. Students were asked to evaluate the speakers on a six point Likert scale on characteristics such as intelligence, reliability, affability, humorousness, physical strength, humility, and work ethic. Opposite characteristics were included in the questionnaire to ensure reliability (for instance, participants were asked to rate each speaker in terms of humility and arrogance, such that presumably a high score in one should correspond with a low score in the other). This would help identify and eliminate participants who did not take the questionnaire seriously (as fifth grade students
are sometimes wont to do). Additionally, students rated speakers’ fluency, grammaticality, and overall proficiency in either Spanish or English. Finally, as participants’ linguistic landscape has been shown to influence language attitudes (Dailey, Giles, and Jansma, 2005), items were added at the end of the questionnaire asking participants to quantify the presence of Spanish and English on signs and in media in their community on a four point range of “None,” “A little,” “A lot,” and “Everything is in Spanish/English.”

Preparing Data for Analysis

Recordings from observations and interviews

A great deal of speech was recorded during data collection. Roughly 20 hours of speech were collected per focal child, as well as over 18 hours with the Spanish teacher and 9 with the English teacher (both in conversation and teaching activities), and over 30 hours of other interactions, including students besides the focal children, school assemblies, and parents. Additionally, each semi-structured interview with the focal children lasted between 30 and 45 minutes, while those with teachers and parents of the focal children lasted around an hour. Using field notes as a guide, recordings with salient instances of language variation, metalinguistic speech, overt statements of language attitudes, or statements connecting language and identity were categorized for these features, along with information from field notes or summaries written after listening to the recordings about time of day, class activity, and interlocutors to provide context.
Towards the end of data collection, recordings categorized for these particular features were set aside for transcription, with care that similar contexts were included in the transcribed audio for each child (for instance, each child had at least one recess block, two math classes, two ELD/SLD, two Spanish language arts, and one English language arts block included in his/her transcribed audio). This assured that, while students deployed and developed elements their linguistic repertoires differently across contexts, comparisons could be made within contexts that likewise informed matters of attitudes or identity in these particular settings.

Selected data obtained from observations and interviews was transcribed and then coded iteratively using Dedoose online software. Initial codes marked uses of standardized Spanish, standardized English, Spanish influenced English (including Chicano English), and English influenced Spanish (distinguished between learner varieties for non-native Spanish speakers and American Spanish varieties for bilingual Latino students). Codes also captured codeswitching between the two languages, codeswitches between standardized and non-standard varieties of either language, and metalinguistic discussion about either or both languages (what Kowal and Swain (1994) and Martin-Beltrán (2009) classify as language-related episodes, or LRE). Additionally, codes were in place to capture overt statements of language attitudes (a binary of positive or negative) or ideology, including statements of language propriety or correctness, personal or ethnic affiliation to language, and disposition towards use of a particular language or variety.

In time, it became evident that these codes were insufficient to capture what students and teachers were doing with language as it related to their sharing and
constructing of knowledge in the classroom or their navigation of social relationships. These functions and domains of language could likewise give insight into attitudes based on frequency of use, the *participants* and *scene* (Gumperz and Hymes, 1972) of the speech act (for instance, whether students were engaged in a jovial and relaxed conversation with friends or a work-related interaction with less amiable peers), and the tone of the speech act (or *key*, to remain with Gumperz and Hymes’ mnemonic, such as whether the speech act was friendly, stern, didactic, or remorseful), and the *genre* (oral presentations, collaborative work, reading aloud, and so on). A final iteration of codes built on Hymes’ idea of *instrumentalities* in speech acts and García’s (2009) suggestion of multimodal communication. Students were using lessons and classroom materials in both Spanish and English simultaneously to generate new ideas and work products likewise in both languages, as well as digital media from music, internet videos, interactive websites, and video recordings of themselves and their peers. Thus, I revisited my coding schema and added codes for such instances of translanguaging and specification of the *ends* of the translanguage practice. A more complete collection of these final codes for speech act ends is shown in Table 12, which draws on functions that Benjamin (1993) identified in her ethnographic study examining the role of Spanish in the daily lives of Mexicano children in a New Mexico elementary school. It is, of course, worth noting that these distinct categories are not mutually exclusive and that acts could occur across functions, and functions could occur simultaneously, such as relational social speech co-occurring with collaborative work speech.
Table 12 - Functions of speech and corresponding speech acts (based on Benjamin, 1993, pp. 98-99)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Functions of Speech</th>
<th>Speech Acts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Classroom/Work-related</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Getting help</td>
<td>Asking for assistance, asking for clarification, asking for information,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>asking for confirmation, requesting action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Conveying information</td>
<td>Explaining, stating facts, clarifying</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Guiding collaboration</td>
<td>Suggesting plan, offering assessment, offering confirmation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social/Relational</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Forging alliances, bonds</td>
<td>Complimenting, joking, requesting attention, consoling, offering help</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Distancing, excluding</td>
<td>Threatening, insulting, arguing, tattling, correcting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Storytelling</td>
<td>Narrating, describing, evaluating actual events</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Narrating, performing, inviting imagination of fictitious events</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Matched/verbal guise responses**

Students’ ratings of the speakers were divided into three categories: competency (encompassing ratings of perceived intelligence, language proficiency, responsibility, and sophistication), sociability (comprised of ratings for humorousness, friendliness, trustworthiness, and humility), as well as physical characteristics (physical strength and attractiveness). These speaker ratings were the dependent variables in the multivariate regression. Independent variables were the speaker’s language and variety, the raters’ language background (set up as a binary between native Spanish speakers and non-native
Spanish speakers, although this somewhat oversimplified matters because not all non-native Spanish speakers spoke English as a first language), and the raters’ linguistic landscape. Although a significant variable in other studies, measures for linguistic landscape were dropped from the models because no significant difference existed across ethnic groups in this cohort. With these categories, paired-sample T-Tests could be used to compare attitudes and ratings of one guise to another. A linear regression, meanwhile, shows the degree to which rater ethnicity corresponds with speaker variety in all categories.
Chapter 3:  
Aquí estamos: Settings and Stories from El Valle

There is neither a first nor a last word and there are no limits to the dialogic context (it extends into the boundless past and boundless future). Even past meanings, that is those born in the dialogue of past centuries, can never be stable (finalized, ended once and for all) - they will always change (be renewed) in the process of subsequent, future development of the dialogue. At any moment in the development of the dialogue there are immense, boundless masses of forgotten contextual meanings, but at certain moments of the dialogue's subsequent development along the way they are recalled and invigorated in renewed form (in a new context). (Bakhtin, 1986, p.170; emphasis in original)

Russian thinker Mikhail Bakhtin aptly bridges the social learning theories advanced by, among others, his contemporary Lev Vygotsky and the post-modernist understanding of discourse as a recursive governing knowledge within which (and with which) individuals act. Like Vygotsky, Bakhtin noted the role of speech, particularly others’ speech, in developing one’s learning, stating “Our speech, that is, all our utterances (including our creative works), is filled with others' words, varying degrees of otherness or varying degrees of ‘our-own-ness’...These words of others carry with them their own expression, their own evaluative tone, which we assimilate, rework, and re-accentuate.” (1986, p.89) Particularly, Bakhtin concerns himself with how members of a given social group come to share a way of viewing the world through the process of ideological becoming (Ball and Freedman, 2004). This process of ideological becoming, Bakhtin argues, hinges on one’s words intermingling with others’, with meanings and concepts being negotiated, and these words and ideas in turn intermingling with their historical contexts and future interpretations:
Language is not a neutral medium that passes freely and easily into the private property of the speaker's intentions; it is populated—overpopulated—with the intentions of others. Expropriating it, forcing it to submit to one's own intentions and accents, is a difficult and complicated process... As a living, socio-ideological concrete thing, as heteroglot opinion, language, for the individual consciousness, lies on the borderline between oneself and the other... (Bakhtin, 1992, p.294)

Indeed, the students, teachers, and parents at Rivera did not cast their speech onto blank canvases, nor did their attitudes and ideologies about language emerge through psycho-emotional parthenogenesis. Their utterances were dialogic, whether with visible interlocutors or historical ones (or future ones). Their words and actions emerged from patterns of thought and behavior reinforced by prevalent discourses of language, bilingualism, schooling and curriculum, and the myriad social categories that modern schooling makes salient (race, class, gender, ability level, linguistic background, and so on). And their utterances, writings, and gestures reflected, contested, or transformed these categories in one way or another. Thus, while interactions, interviews, and matched-guise responses speak to the singular moment in time and space in which they occur, we must also consider the historical contexts of the community, El Valle, and the school, of the individuals who shared their words, thoughts, work, and lives with me in common pursuit of more equitable schools, and of the social and political conditions that have brought us to this point. We must heed current trends in policy, demographics, and economics sweeping through El Valle and Rivera Elementary along with the aspirations
and projections of those involved, for their present-tense actions also speak to the futures they hope to mold and for which they, in turn, are being molded.

**El Valle: Changing Hands and Changing Faces**

Like many other communities in California’s San Francisco Bay Area, El Valle boasts a history of conflict and transformation juxtaposed to sterling post-card-worthy images of palm trees, golden hillsides, and the bay. We could take a cue from Alim (2004), and refer to El Valle as part of the Occupied Territories, although a first glance around here doesn’t evoke much sense of repression. On the contrary, a casual stroll through El Valle brings us to a thriving downtown district with multi-ethnic restaurants, bars, coffee shops, and beer gardens adjacent to a public transit center that services two separate rail lines and a number of buses and corporate shuttles. At first glance, this is the modern America, an embodiment of Otsuji and Pennycook’s (2011) *metrolingualism* as languages and cultures come together into singular codes in diverse workspaces and communities. It’s a place with Thai, Indian, Mexican, German, Nouveaux-Californian, and Continental cuisines abutted one against the other, where young Anglo-American, Asian, Latino, and European workers at various technology companies disembark trains in expensive casual clothing and ride bikes along clearly demarcated lanes to their respective office parks, where green initiatives and community events get promoted in multilingual signage throughout the town’s transit stops and park spaces. That a draft beer costs $7, and a median-priced home nears $800,000, however, make it clear that this progress has not come without cost. As the Sunnyside youth from Alim’s (2004) study
professed in regard to his community’s commercial and demographic transition, “This is corporate America takin over!” (p. 110)

El Valle, like the rest of the San Francisco Bay Area, used to be Ohlone land. The narrative of genocide and deception isn’t as straightforward here as it is in other parts of the country, though, because the 1,100 years of Ohlone settlement weren’t interrupted by the English or their American descendants, but rather by the Spanish. From the 6th to 18th centuries, C.E., the Ohlone lived in distinct language groups spreading from both sides of the San Francisco Bay all the way down the Monterey Bay, surviving mainly through fishing, agriculture, and commerce (Bean, 1994). In the 1770’s, Spanish missionaries entered this area of the territory within the Spanish empire dubbed *Alta California* (part of the viceroyalty of *Nueva España* and comprised by what is now California, Nevada, Arizona, Utah, and parts of Colorado and Wyoming), and set about concentrating the Ohlone onto missions in the name of salvation through forced labor and Christianization. Of course, *Nueva España* became a territory of newly independent Mexico in 1821, and the missions were shut down in the 1830’s. The land, and the Ohlone, changed hands again in 1848, when the Treaty of Guadalupe-Hidalgo ended the Mexican-American War, and in 1850 was admitted to the United States as part of California.

The latter half of the 19th Century was prodigious for El Valle. The town was first named in the 1850’s and its school district inaugurated in the same decade with the opening of its first public grammar school. Docks, wharves, and piers emerge along its coastline with the bay to ship the area’s hay, grain, and produce. In the 1880’s, rail lines connecting San Francisco and San Jose are completed, with stops in El Valle, and while
the rail lines cut into the ship landing’s business, agricultural commerce booms over land and sea. Throughout this period, extensive immigration from Southern Europe (especially Portugal and Italy) and Japan bolsters the labor force in the area’s agricultural and construction sectors. With burgeoning economic and demographic growth, the next century opens with the formal incorporation of El Valle and the introduction of electric streetlights, telephone service, and a municipal water system.

The San Francisco earthquake of 1906 rocked El Valle, and the seismic jolt augured a century full of change and tumult. The city’s first high school exceeded its capacity and a new one was inaugurated in the 1920’s and extensive federal investment accompanied the allotment of part of El Valle’s land for the US Navy, as well as the construction of a major freeway segment within its boundaries. Federal involvement took a more sinister turn in 1942 when President Franklin Roosevelt signed Executive Order 9066, which rekindled the mission experience by forcing all West Coast Japanese Americans onto internment camps for the duration of World War II.

When the Navy, the freeway, and an executive order didn’t displace people, gentrification did. A boom in semiconductor research spawned multiple laboratories in the 1950’s, which in turn spawned a slew of technology companies a generation later. The tech boom forced out much of El Valle’s established businesses and families. Seed companies and hubs of agricultural commerce shuttered their businesses or moved south towards California’s Central Valley, making way for technology business parks. A reputed independent publishing house that had survived the 1906 earthquake and a fire could not handle the area’s quickly rising costs and left the state.
By the time the 1989 Loma Prieta earthquake shook the Bay Area, few could have recognized the new El Valle from its rural past, and the 21st century only hastened change. According to the US Census (1990, 2010), median annual household income in El Valle has more than doubled between 1990 and 2010 from $42,431 to $91,446. Similarly, while the median value of an owner occupied unit in 2000 was $546,900, it is now a robust $779,500 according to the 2006-2010 American Community Survey.xvi

El Valle’s racial and ethnic composition shifts notably in this story as well. The Ohlone population had been so decimated and transformed by Spanish conquest, missions, Mexican independence, and California statehood that prominent anthropologist Alfred Kroeber pronounced them extinct at the turn of the 20th Century (Leventhal, Field, Alvarez, & Cambra, 1994). While the assertion was inaccurate and contested, it was not until revitalization efforts in the 1980’s that awareness of Ohlone persistence took hold, and to date Native Americans comprise only 0.5% of the city’s population. Repression is recursive, however, and the Spanish and, later, Mexican occupying forces get subsumed in US Census figures (presumably as either Indigenous or White) until 1970, twenty years after the Census Bureau began reporting racial data. On land that once belonged to Mexico, the 1970 census reports only 9.3% of a population of over 50,000 xvii as being of Spanish origin or descent. The figure hits nearly 16% by 1990 and today stands at just under 22%. The Asian and Asian-American population, meanwhile, has truly skyrocketed in proportion. Whereas Asians accounted for less than 5% of the population in 1960, the number jumps to nearly 15% by 1990 and 26% by 2010. In the midst of this upheaval, Rivera elementary has sought to foster an inclusive, equitable, and linguistically diverse educational setting.
Rivera Elementary in Perspective

Since the mid-1990’s, Rivera has operated the only Dual Immersion (DI) bilingual program in the district, with instruction split between Spanish and English across the day.\textsuperscript{xviii} Certainly this bilingual pathway makes sense in a community where nearly 22% of the population is Latino. It makes even more sense when one considers that 72% of Rivera’s student body is Latino, compared to less than a quarter in the case of other elementary schools (both private and public) in the district. Rivera also has proportionally over four times as many students who qualify for free or reduced lunch as its neighboring public elementary school (63% compared to 15%\textsuperscript{xix}), so a school program that promotes bilingualism, multicultural understanding, and mindfulness of social justice, as DI purports to do, seems only logical.

But Rivera’s DI program has been far from universally loved. Like other bilingual programs operating at the time of California voters’ approval of Proposition 227 in 1998, it has been the subject of ample debate as to whether instruction in the first language really can support English language acquisition and development for the many Spanish-speaking students in the school and community. In the early 2000’s, the school was subject to an audit that charged it with not maintaining sufficiently high expectations of students, particularly in the case of its linguistic minority population. Criticism rained on the school in all respects – that English learners weren’t learning English, that students with special needs were not being well-served, that curriculum was incoherent and highly variable across teachers, that the DI program taught Spanish to English speakers at the
expense of its Latino students - as it drastically underperformed in comparison to the other public elementary school in the district on standardized tests. The school even found itself forced to scale back its DI program to only half the school in order to ensure an equal split in the classroom between native Spanish speakers and native English speakers.

Today, community news reports herald Rivera as a “hidden gem” within the school district. It still lags slightly behind its peer school in test scores, but not by much. The state of California gives the school an A grade for its overall Annual Performance Index (API) score exceeding 800 points (out of a possible 1,000). And the DI program attracts students from all over the county. To be sure, not all questions have been answered. While API scores for White students near the maximum, those for Latinos, ELLs, students in special education, and socioeconomically disadvantaged students hover below the school’s state-issued benchmark of 800. Nevertheless, the school has made tremendous strides in the last decade and the hard work, openness, and dedication of administrators, teachers, parents, and students that I observed during fieldwork attest to the positive community established.

Before entering into more detail about the specific students and teachers with whom I had the most interaction, I wish to discuss the notion of humanizing research, which Paris (2011) introduces in his description of research conducted in South Vista, a community marginalized politically and economically from its surroundings through decades of racist and classist policies. In studying the language practices of youth at South Vista High, Paris notes an obligation of the researcher to capture the experiences and statements of participants in ways that are authentic to their own contexts and
intentions, devoid of exploitative or paternalistic lenses.

Humanizing research is a methodological stance which requires that our inquiries involve dialogic consciousness-raising and the building of relationships of dignity and care for both researchers and participants. Although such a stance is important in all research, it is particularly important when researchers are working with communities that are oppressed and marginalized by systems of inequality based on race, ethnicity, class, gender, and other social and cultural categories. This ethical need for a humanizing stance emerges as both researchers and participants seek to push against inequities not only through the findings of research, but through the research act itself. (p. 9)

Over the course of this work, I will describe instances in which teachers’, students’, or parents’ words and actions reify or amplify certain unfavorable ideologies about language varieties and their speakers. There were conflicts among children, instances of inequity in teaching practice and curriculum design, disagreements between adults, and plenty else of what we are told is “wrong” or “broken” about schools and the people in them in discourses about accountability and achievement this day in age. The goal of this work is neither to illuminate these moments as problematic in isolation nor to diminish the progress that Rivera has achieved and for which it continues to strive. Rather, the findings speak to the pervasiveness of the ideologies, the inescapability of resource inequality wrought by unjust policies, and intractability of structures and discourses that teachers and students, particularly those in bilingual programs and even more so those of historically marginalized social groups, must fight on a day-to-day and interaction-to-interaction basis. Thus, the episodes I will describe of conflict or of derailed lessons and
learning tasks are not condemnations of particular teachers or students. They are portrayals of how individuals nurtured and raised among discourses of linguistic hierarchy, language standardization, national identity, and socioeconomic inequality make sense of and either challenge or perpetuate these discourses that are equally culpable in our teacher preparation programs, school boards, courts, and legislatures.

The People at Rivera

In my year at Rivera, I had the good fortune of getting to know a great many unforgettable and inspiring children and adults. After all, no school embraces a program as polemical as DI and makes the gains that Rivera has made without tireless work and limitless passion from students, teachers, administrators, and support staff. At different moments throughout the year, nearly all of them shared with me some remarkable story or offered some valuable insight. Some of these will make their way into the work, but for the most part I focus on a dozen key individuals: two teachers and ten students. Earlier I outlined my criteria for selecting these individuals as focal participants, and herein I hope to provide some fundamental background that can provide greater context for the data in the following chapters.

The Teachers

The study primarily focuses on the classrooms of the 5th grade DI teachers, especially the Spanish instructional sessions. A superficial description of the teachers in
these classrooms would offer a rendering of paradigmatic DI instructors: bilingual language repertoires, Masters degrees, nearly a decade teaching for each of them, and a firm commitment to DI, bilingualism, and multiculturalism. Greater depth, however, serves to show the true richness, and challenges, that operate within this paradigm.

Maestro Quintara

To a great extent, Maestro Quintara could have offered a strong case study of the dynamics under investigation if considered longitudinally. He was born and raised in a heavily Latino community within a diverse, urban setting. He grew up functionally bilingual in English and Spanish, but throughout his upbringing and schooling was told to keep the two languages separate and criticized by relatives and teachers for allowing one to influence the other, whether using anglicized forms in Spanish or hispanicized forms in English. Nevertheless, early inklings of a distinct Chicano identity that need not adhere to nativist norms one way or the other emerged for Maestro, and he set out to earn an undergraduate degree in Chicano Studies at one of the nation’s most selective private universities. He completed his degree despite a gap of nearly a decade in which he worked and began a family, and then went on to earn his MA and teaching credential at the same university, where he was exposed to critical theories of language, identity, and bilingualism.

Emerging from his own translanguaging in his upbringing and his teacher training, Maestro sought DI teaching placements upon his graduation and has been at Rivera ever since. He earned his tenure soon after joining the faculty (three years, as is
customary in the district per union agreement) and has taught 4th and 5th grade, as well as combination classes of both age groups, in that time. Marked by experiences helping out at a constructivist pre-school program, Maestro is dedicated to student-centered instruction and creative, inquiry learning. While his particular understandings of languages and bilingualism are described in Chapter 4, suffice it for now to say that he is heavily conflicted between the way social and dynamic ways he believes language is used and learned in contrast to how it is assessed (and in turn, how administrators urge him to teach), and even more so about the implications that has for students with respect to their academic and social trajectories.

Ms. Jennifer

In the adjacent classroom is Maestra Roberts, who most at the school call Ms. Jennifer. Although she and Maestro Quintara are close in age, she has considerably more teaching experience given Maestro’s prolonged route to his BA. Like her colleague, Ms. Jennifer sought DI teaching placements as a result of lifelong experiences with matters of language, identity, and power, and a deep-seated belief in the benefits of multilingualism. In conversation, Ms. Jennifer laughingly shares anecdotes of learning phrases in Japanese or Hebrew to communicate with classmates when she was an elementary school student herself; she teaches her current students signs in American Sign Language (ASL), including the Pledge of Allegiance, which they sign every morning when it is said aloud over the school’s PA system. She speaks German fluently as a result of family connections, and learned Spanish mostly through study-abroad experiences and repeated
travel to Spain. In fact, she chose to attend college in the Northeast, far from her family in California, based on the particular college’s reputation for sound language teaching and extensive immersive, travel-based language programs. Likewise, she is aware of and fascinated by the dynamic nature of language, for example, stating in an e-mail expansion upon interview questions asked earlier in the day,

I just enjoy seeing how words work, how one language draws from another, and what you learn about a culture from its language (the fact that with three genders at its disposal, male, female, and neuter, German uses the neuter for "girl" is just so interesting to know...and that it's a contentious issue that is being objected to and protested, so cool!). I like seeing how language changes or has changed. (E-mail correspondence, 7/6/2012)

It is this same mindfulness of words, meaning, and shift that underlies a great deal of her humor with students, making jokes about English semantics and turning students’ talk on its head.

Ms. Jennifer came to Rivera after a teaching internship in the South Bronx and nearly a decade in a nearby urban school district where, despite the absence of a formal bilingual program, she implemented numerous first language learning opportunities for her ELL students. Despite being more experienced, she is not tenured at Rivera since she is relatively new to the district. Under the new program structure that the school implemented in the year of my data collection (only for the 5th grade), she is teaching English Language Arts and Social Studies (in English) to both groups of students in the 5th grade DI cohort, while Maestro Quintara teaches in Spanish almost all day (Spanish Language Arts and Science). Given the pressure for students to excel on tests
administered in English and to have ELL students reclassified as proficient, Ms. Jennifer, a single mother of twins mindful of the security that tenure would bring, finds her own philosophies of constructivism and social language learning hamstrung by imperatives from administrators for explicit language teaching.

The Students

As mentioned above, the 5th grade cohort in Rivera’s DI program was a spirited intermingling of nationalities, races, classes, and backgrounds. Students had active familial connections to Serbia, Brazil, Japan, Mexico, Guatemala, El Salvador, and of course various states in the US. Most had been in the program since Kindergarten, and a majority had intentions of continuing their bilingual schooling in middle school (parents had effectively lobbied for a middle school in the district to offer Social Studies in Spanish). As will be further discussed in Chapter 4, all of them expressed strong commitment to bilingualism and appreciation for their experiences in DI, but notable divisions existed in the class as well.

By admission of both teachers even without prompting by my interviews or observations, students who readily collaborated in the classroom rarely interacted meaningfully on the playground or outside of school. Expressing frustration at both students’ self-segregation and the school’s policy of grouping students homogenously for language development and math instruction periods, Maestro Quintara said, “We don’t have to track kids; they know how to do it themselves.” (Interview, 9/21/2011)

Similarly, Ms. Jennifer lamented the schisms along linguistic and socioeconomic lines
commenting, “Very few kids cross over to play with each other, although they've all been together since kinder. Kids are not stupid. They can see that some kids have greater advantages than others, and those two groups tend to be separated by home language.” (E-mail correspondence, 7/6/2012) This statement is true in one sense; the kids have indeed gone to school together for quite a few years at this point (the latest entrant to the DI program entered in 3rd grade as an exception to custom, whereas the rest of the cohort has been together since at least first grade). In another sense, however, this statement demonstrates some naïveté on Ms. Jennifer’s part with regard to students’ lives outside of school. Maestro Quintara is more aware of the extent of these divisions, commenting in conversation that students in-school play groups during recess mirror their social circles outside of school, and notes that most of the Latino students live very close to one another in the numerous condominiums and apartment buildings near the school (Field Note, 9/14/2011). Implicit in the statement is acknowledgement of the socioeconomic forces that have resegregated American communities, and some frustration at the inability of Rivera’s DI program to overcome these entrenched social divisions. I argue that deeply entwined in these divisions, at least insofar as they manifest themselves at Rivera, are the language practices of particular students that index a host of characteristics associated with racial, ethnic, or class affiliation. Eight students corresponding to a variety of demographic and linguistic categories serve as focal students in this investigation, and offer insights into the extent of permeation of different language ideologies across group boundaries as well as distinctions within and across said categories.
Elsa

Elsa is the younger of two sisters. She was born and raised in El Valle, although both her parents are from Mexico. Her older sister also went through Rivera’s DI program and in fact drops by from time to time on her way home from a nearby middle school to say hello to the teachers and check up on her little sister’s progress. Elsa reports speaking mostly Spanish to her parents even though her father speaks confidently in English, but mostly English with her sister at home. Her scholastic aptitude is beyond questions, as her test scores qualify her for the Gifted and Talented Education (GATE) program, and she is on the brink of being reclassified as proficient in English. Nevertheless, both Maestro Quintara and Ms. Jennifer worry that in her pursuit of popularity among peers she has adopted a rebellious attitude and a resistance or shame regarding her academic achievement. When asked about the matter, she replies, “I just wanna be with my friends,” and “I’m not a nerd like them [the other GATE students].” (Interview, 10/18/2011) For Maestro Quintara, this is a red flag about associations between Mexican ethnicity and academic achievement (or lack thereof), and raises questions about the effectiveness of DI as a disruptor of cultural stereotypes.

Indeed, Elsa does not at all look or act the “nerd” part. As transcripts in later chapters demonstrate, Elsa avoids the linguistic styling that Bucholtz (1999) ascribes to students engaging in a “nerd” community of practice, such as superstandard and hypercorrect phonological and syntactical forms, lexical items associated with formal registers, and discursive practices oriented to language form, such as puns and parody (p. 212). Rather, Elsa dyes purple and pink streaks into her hair, wears glamorous, sparkle-clad hoodies, and talks about pop and hip-hop music with her friends in Chicano English.
and English-influenced vernacular Spanish. None of her customary friends on the playground or in the classroom participate in GATE programs, and, for 5th grade, she has been leveled into an intermediate math group. She is witty and assertive when it comes to dealing with a classmate’s pestering, but reserved and self-conscious about answering questions aloud in class or contributing to class discussions.

**Pablo**

Pablo, like Elsa, was born in the US to Mexican parents, and reports speaking different languages along generational lines (Spanish to parents and older relatives, English to cousins and friends outside the home). He likewise achieves solidly on high-stakes tests, rating as “Proficient” in English Language Arts and “Advanced” in math. In fact, Pablo had already been reclassified as proficient in English by 4th grade. Unlike Elsa, Pablo embraces his school success but pairs it with a dominating personality across the board that also distances him from the “nerd” label. He is an adept soccer player and remarkable athlete in general, quick to shine in any playground sport. Likewise, he frequently disrupts class with jokes and complaints for the teacher or off-task conversations with his neighbors. Despite this disruptiveness, he ultimately completes his work on time (and well), and offers considerable help to one of his closest friends in the group, Ramón, who is also his cousin.

**Ramón**

Ramón is a kind and generally affable child. He was among the most forthcoming with questions and jokes as I became a member of the classroom community, he circulates easily among his classmates, and, despite goofing around from time to time with Pablo, works rather hard in class. This affability and effort, however,
belies a great deal of struggle. Ramón is a year older than most of his peers, but often
whines to Pablo and his teachers in ways that seem rather immature for a fifth grade
student. He moved to the United States as an infant and attended school through second
grade in the Midwest. His family came to El Valle when he was in third grade to live
with closer to his uncle and cousins, including Pablo. Typically, Rivera does not allow
students into its DI program beyond the first grade, but an exception was made in
Ramón’s case because he was enrolled in a transitional bilingual program before coming
to California. He is classified as “Intermediate” in terms of his English Language
Development and scored “Basic” on the English Language Arts in 4th grade on
California’s state test, but “Proficient” in mathematics. This all suggests that Ramón is
faring relatively well compared to many other immigrant students, but observing him on
a day-to-day basis one can appreciate the effort that goes into most learning tasks,
including often an outright dependency on Pablo to walk him through assignments step-
by-step or copying from Pablo’s work. Further, while he is not shy about approaching
other students in the class, he lacks any fixed social circle beyond Pablo and never moved
beyond the margins of most unstructured social interactions, as transcripts and analysis in
later chapters will show.

**Melissa**

Melissa also struggles with a great deal of academic tasks, including standardized
tests. She is classified as “Intermediate” in terms of her English language development,
scored “Below Basic” in ELA and “Basic” in math. Like Ramón, (and every other fifth
grade student not yet reclassified as English proficient or at least rated as Advanced in
ELD), she misses part of her language arts instruction time every morning for
“Language” class to boost her test scores and English proficiency, and she also depends heavily on classmates, including Elsa, to help her with schoolwork. Despite all this, Melissa is remarkably confident in social interactions and a vocal leader among her circle of friends, which includes Elsa and most of the other Latina girls in the fifth grade DI cohort. She frequently gives orders to other girls in the clique such as what games to play or what music to listen to, and she is not shy about complaining to her teachers, asking for help, or rebuking classmates who tease, bother, or interrupt her. Interestingly, much of this is done in English (to be sure, Chicano English or other Spanish-influenced vernacular English), despite the fact that her peers all understand Spanish perfectly well and that her test scores would suggest these pragmatic feats to be a stretch of her abilities.

**Alex**

Alex offers quite the puzzle to teachers and administrators. On the one hand, he has already been reclassified as proficient in English, a tremendous relief for school staff, for whom reclassification of ELLs is a prime objective. On the other hand, he scores only “Basic” in ELA and Math on the state tests, and underachieves on his classroom assignments. He is lovably disorganized, with papers, pencils, books, and candies always disappearing and reappearing in his desk, backpack, and pockets. He spends much of his class time talking to classmates (often bothering them), and waits until deadlines loom imminently before completing his work, including missing recess to get things done. This isn’t as big a sacrifice as it would be for some of the other students in the class, however, because Alex usually spends recess ambling around the playground area on his own or with one or two other students (usually in lower grade levels). He is, in fact, more likely to spend his recess trying to strike up conversation with a teacher conducting
yard duty (playground supervision) than he is playing football or soccer with other boys or tetherball with the girls (this is pretty much how most recesses break down at Rivera).

Max

Max, born and raised in El Valle, is the son of Swiss immigrants keenly aware of language variation and language ideologies given their respective experiences in Switzerland and since arriving in California. Max’s mother is heavily involved in the school’s Dual Immersion Parent Association and is often present at school helping with events or attending meetings. With the exception of Max’s younger sister in kindergarten (also at Rivera), the members of the family tend to speak Swiss-German to one another, and Max in fact began his time at Rivera classified as an English Language Learner (he was reclassified by first grade). He scores as “Advanced” in both English Language Arts and Math on state tests, and, illegible handwriting aside, excels in the classroom as well. He reads voraciously, keeping stacks of books on his desk at all times for when he inevitably finishes his work early (or gets bored by it) and at one point in the year even takes up the habit of reading while the teacher gives instructions, a practice Maestro Quintara puts a stop to rather quickly, though not without some ambivalence because he too expresses frustration at all the direct instruction demanded by the school administrators.

Whereas a Spanish-English dual immersion program seems fairly logical for most of the students in the class, Max’s parents’ decision to enroll him at Rivera rather than one of the other (higher-rated) schools in the area seems rather interesting. His mother claims a deep commitment to diversity: linguistic, cultural, and socioeconomic in her children’s upbringing, attributing her current professional success to her own exposure to
various nationalities and languages in her youth (Interview, March, 26, 2012). In this vein, DI at Rivera is only a step in a broader language learning agenda for Max. He hopes to learn French in middle school while furthering his Spanish through travel and social interactions. While very popular among peers across linguistic groups, Max certainly displays numerous characteristics of “nerd” speech, and often engages debates about the scientific validity or mechanisms of different elements in stories that his teachers share with the class.

**Thomas**

While Max occasionally acts like a nerd, Thomas wholeheartedly embraces the persona. Granted, he plays rugby in a neighborhood youth league, but this seems to emerge as much out of opposition to American Football (the preferred sport of the European-American boys in the class) as it does any actual enjoyment of the sport (Interview, January 13, 2012). His father is a chemical engineer and the love of science has been clearly inherited. Thomas spends most of his free time sketching prototypes of hypothetical robots and machines. He also thoroughly enjoys car magazines for their concept car sections (where innovative designs and features are showcased in models that are not intended for market) and engaging others in debates (a trap into which Max often falls). Unsurprisingly, Thomas scores “Advanced” on both the English Language Arts and Math tests (although he does not have the highest score in the class, a fact that would surely irritate him to no end were he ever to find it out), and takes great pride in turning in high quality work. Like Alex, Thomas is somewhat solitary in his social relations, either drifting on the periphery of other groups or reading on his own during free time.
Rhea

Rhea, “Advanced” in both ELA and Math, is another student in the class with exposure to languages other than English and Spanish in her day-to-day life. Her mother is Iranian, with her own stories of immigration and bilingual education from a transnational childhood spent between Tehran, Washington DC, and California. Rhea’s mother tries, with little success, to get Rhea interested in learning Farsi, but contents herself with Rhea’s oral receptive skills for the time being and her occasional use of Farsi to keep secrets from her younger sister (Interview, March 2, 2012). She is more concerned that Rhea should develop bilingualism at any level (hence the Spanish DI) and openness to different languages, language varieties, and cultures. She uses her stories of struggle fitting in with American colleagues in her childhood in Washington DC or her difficulties back in Tehran when the Revolution closed British schools and she was mocked for her “accented” Farsi by Iranian peers at her new school to engrain in Rhea value of linguistic flexibility.

Aside from refusing to speak Farsi, Rhea takes these admonitions to heart. She is one of the few students who needs little prodding from Maestro to speak in Spanish during Spanish instructional time, and presses her peers to follow suit. She is also the only non-Latina girl on the playground that I ever saw play tetherball with Elsa, Melissa, and their friends. Indeed, she seems remarkably affable and fearless, authoring and reciting a bilingual poem with a classmate for their end-of-year promotion ceremony, writing and directing small plays to perform for the class, and seeking out opportunities to language broker for her family.
The Rest

As mentioned in the preceding chapter, the selection of these eight students should not imply that others were less engaged in important languaging, learning, and representational practices. These students offered a cross-section of measured achievement categorization, linguistic background, and demographic classification that made them somewhat representative of the group in general. Left out in this contingent of focal students are others whose statements, actions, and attitudes embody and simultaneously help shape the discourses at Rivera about language, proficiency, intelligence, identity, and so forth, and thus still receive mention in the subsequent chapters of this work.
Chapter 4
Ideology in Practice: Monolingual and Monoglossic Pressures in the Curriculum

This chapter presents the first set of findings from the study. Despite ample rhetorical support for bilingualism and multiculturalism throughout the school, the constraining ideological forces discussed in this work’s introduction permeated teaching practices and the ways that students, staff, and parents talked about language and language learning. Principally, I refer to the ideological forces of monolingual and monoglossic biases, which will be explored in greater depth shortly. Simply put, this chapter can be considered the statement of problems in the talk and teaching of language at Rivera, whereas the subsequent chapters can be considered solutions as their findings point to the ways that teachers and teacher educators can overcome these ideological pressures.

Rivera Elementary rightfully prides itself on its DI program and the subsequent multicultural orientations that it establishes among students and parents. To be sure, notions of additive bilingualism permeate elements of discourse throughout school events, such as Parent Teacher Association bulletins, the school website, cultural celebrations, and school assemblies. Such positive framings of the Spanish language, of bilingualism in general, and of Latino culture seemingly match the ideals of paradigmatic DI programs in such a way that members of historically marginalized ethnic or linguistic groups have a greater sense of attachment as well as legitimate access to exchanging cultural capital with dominant groups (Acosta, 2007). There is a clear nurturing of identity investments in bilingualism and biculturalism, which Norton (2000) and Fernández (2002) note as crucial elements in successful second language acquisition.
pedagogies and schooling of linguistic minority students in general. Despite these overt promising signs, however, this chapter presents the findings highlighting the persistence of monolingual and monoglossic ideologies. The structure and pressure brought on by standardized tests, and the subsequent decision at Rivera to implement the Language! curriculum as an intervention to raise test scores and reclassification rates speak to the monolingual pressures, while analysis of interviews and interactions among focal students, parents, and teachers, the results of the matched guise tests administered to students, and an analysis of the components of the Language! curriculum’s research basis demonstrate underlying monolingual and monoglossic biases, which García and Leiva (2013) note are prevalent obstacles that US Latinos face in their educational trajectories.

**Monolingual and Monoglossic Ideologies Revisited**

Monoglossic and monolingual biases overlap, but are not equivalent. Both relate to the ascription of different status and prestige to the language practices of particular speech communities. Monolingual biases in the US refer to the ideological positioning of English over other languages, particularly Spanish for this analysis. Evidence of this ideological undercurrent abounds in policies that restrict or limit bilingual education nationally and in California (Santa Ana, 2002), as well as in the rhetoric surrounding immigration and language policy (Benjamin, 2009; Santa Ana, 2002; Schildkraut, 2005). It is what Ofelia García characterizes as the “‘Anglophone’ ideology that demands English monolingualism for US citizens.” (García, in press, p. 2) These monolingual ideologies are reflected in legislation making English the sole official language in numerous states (including California after the passage of Proposition 63 in 1986) and in
what Deborah Schildkraut (2005) labels “ethnoculturalist” conceptualizations of American identity, whereby individuals link American identity to an imagined tradition of Whiteness and Protestantism and, by extension, the English language. They are well captured and described in Sheila Shannon’s work on the hegemony of English (1995), which notes how the cumulative elevation of English over other languages in the history of the United States (over indigenous languages and other European languages at founding of the nation, for instance) has resulted in a common sense (Gramsci, 1971), that is, an unquestioned and popularly accepted cultural notion of what is normal, around English monolingualism as a norm. In the lives of students at Rivera, these monolingual ideologies underlie the pressures they face towards subtractive language education, towards the acquisition and development of English at the expense of Spanish rather than in conjunction to it.

Monoglossic views, meanwhile, according to García (2009; in press) still relate to hierarchy in language use, but refer to the prizing of standardized or high-prestige forms within languages, including rigidly enforced separation of languages, for instance the allocation of distinct times to Spanish and English instruction in DI programs or the derogatory characterization of US Latinos’ languaging practices as Spanglish (Otheguy & Stern, 2010). The monoglossic ideology conforms to understandings of language as fixed and finite sums of component parts – sounds, words, syntactical rules, and so on – that must be deployed in very particular ways to be “proper,” or “correct.” It is these very monoglossic ideologies and their treatment of language as sums of component parts that educational fallacies such as the “native speaker norm” (Cook, 1997; 1999) are perpetuated. Such constructs presume that a complete, native-like endpoint of second
language acquisition is possible, usually through explicit instruction of language elements and forms. These conceptualizations not only reinforce ideas of language as birthright and links to nationalist discourses from monolingual ideologies, also feed into the problematic dichotomies that schools such as Rivera face when forced to classify students as native speakers of one language or another without regard for their translingual practices and upbringing.

García and Leiva (2013) characterize these ideological elements with regard to the role of Spanish in the lives of US Latinos as “hispanophone ideologies,” noting that they are the pressures that limit Latinos’ repertoires by deriding any English-influenced varieties. Of course, these monoglossic ideologies do not only apply in Spanish, and are equally apparent in the stratification of English varieties, including the Spanish-influenced forms frequently observed at Rivera.

Monolingual Pressure and the Primacy of English: Let’s Talk Testing

Loud and clear: Overt expressions of monolingual bias

The monolingual bias in the US that ascribes higher status to standardized English as a symbol of citizenship, patriotism, and competence relative to other languages manifests itself resoundingly in school curricula through the preoccupation with measuring and augmenting English proficiency for students deemed lacking. To be sure, the urge to recognize the linguistic needs of students learning English in schools and attend to these needs is an altruistic and beneficial one, but glancing at the pathways that
English Learners traverse in schools like Rivera, and the general findings that the English Learner classification itself may be a stigmatizing and limiting force (Callahan, 2005) demonstrates the disconnect between these good intentions and the policies resulting from them.

For students classified as English Learners at any point in California’s academic pipeline, the pathway is complicated not just by the demands of learning to function in a language and master discipline-specific content in that language, but also by a barrage of testing that begins before one’s first day of school. Figure 2 below shows the labyrinthine course that English learners take in terms of assessments and evaluation criteria en route to reclassification as proficient. The first “test” is the administration of a home language survey. This evaluation asks parents or guardians which language their child spoke first, which language the child speaks most frequently at home, which language the parents or guardians speak most frequently to the child, and which language is used most often by adults at home. If the answer to any of these questions is a language other than English, the child is assessed using the California English Language Development Test (CELDT), which tests listening, speaking, reading, and writing proficiency in English. Students scoring a 4 or 5 (Early Advanced or Advanced, respectively) with no sub-score in any of the four language competencies below a 3 (Early Intermediate) are immediately reclassified as Initial Fluent English Proficient (IFEP). Students who do not meet this threshold are classified as ELL and leveled according to their score.

Students identified and categorized as ELLs then receive specialized services to support their English language development. The primary programmatic option is
Sheltered English Immersion (SEI) instruction, which conducts content instruction mostly in English but with strategies to make the material more accessible to English learners. The vast majority of students classified as ELLs enter this pathway. Students may also receive ESL pull-out services or be in separate ESL classes. Finally, students can, with a parent waiver, be placed in bilingual programs in which they receive native language instruction. As they receive these services, students are assessed annually using the CELDT, the CST (California Standards Test), and their course grades. While specific benchmarks vary by district, students at the secondary level generally must score a 4 or 5 on the CELDT with no sub-score below a 3 in the domains of reading, writing, listening, or speaking, score Basic, Proficient, or Advanced on the CST English Language Arts test, receive a grade no lower than a C in their English language arts coursework (including higher levels of ESL/ELD in districts that offer separate classes for ELL students, and obtain parent consent for their reclassification.

If students meet the reclassification criteria, they shed the ELL label in favor of RFEP. At this point they are placed in mainstream English classrooms, but must still be monitored for two years. If students fail to reclassify, they remain categorized as ELL and continue to receive whatever services or instructional programs their respective districts allocate. Students persisting in this category for longer than six years, scoring at the same CELDT level in two consecutive years, and scoring Below Basic or lower on the CST English Language Arts test receive the newly created policy classification of Long Term English Learners (LTEL).
The problems with the tests themselves and with the conceptualizations of language and language proficiency entailed by these measurements is a matter of monoglossic biases, but the existence and omnipresence of this many layers speaks to the preoccupation with English that bilingual programs such as Rivera’s cannot escape. Consequently, even though the program espouses ideals of bilingualism and equal status across languages, extensive implicit messages are sent to teachers and students alike that English matters and Spanish does not. In a conversation following the administration of the CST to students over the course of eight days in April, Maestro Quintara commented on a discussion he had had with the principal regarding his lack of accountability. While his untenured counterpart, Ms. Jennifer, worried extensively about students’ scores and their reflection on her teaching, Maestro felt generally removed from the testing process. In field notes taken immediately following the conversation, I observed “Maestro says he feels ‘no accountability’ in the school’s academic measurements. The only measure of
Spanish ability that he reports is the DRA,\textsuperscript{xxv} which he only shares with administrators and parents once a year. He notes that test scores, on the other hand, come up before school starts and are part of conversations throughout the year in PD [Professional Development] sessions and collaborative planning.” (Field note, 5/1/2012) Responding to Maestro’s observation, I took up the topic with Ms. Jennifer. She echoed the notion that the pressures of accountability held for English, while being minimal and informal for Spanish instruction.

There is constant pressure to teach more in English, to raise English scores. That pressure is non-existent when it comes to teaching in Spanish or Spanish scores. They [parents and administrators] complain that our kids’ Spanish isn’t good enough, that they don’t use reflexive verbs right or make gender mistakes with the articles, but the push is all on getting the native Spanish speakers fluent in English. (Interview, June 7, 2012)

Of course, there is also the explicit message communicated by the Language! block of instruction. Concerned that certain students classified as English learners would not reclassify before finishing 5th grade, Rivera’s administration adopted the Language! curriculum, a “comprehensive literacy curriculum” that targets students scoring in the bottom 40% of standardized tests. Students deemed in need of remedial instruction in English are pulled from their classrooms, often during Spanish instructional time for students in Rivera’s DI program, and given direct instruction in phonics and phonemic awareness, word recognition and spelling, vocabulary and morphology, grammar and usage, listening and reading comprehension, and speaking and writing (what Language! refers to as “all of the necessary strands of literacy.”) (Voyager Learning, 2013). A
number of students in the 5th grade DI program attended this Language intervention, including Melissa and Ramón, both of whom consistently expressed displeasure and frustration when asked about the special class.

In a particularly telling moment, Melissa one day refused to leave her science work during the Spanish block (an independent research project on an element from the periodic table) despite Maestro Quintara’s insistence that she had to report to Language. In a field note capturing the incident, I recorded, “Melissa refuses to go to Language. She whines that she doesn’t want to go as the kids from the other class wait at the door. She looks at Maestro and asks, ‘Do I have to go? Estoy trabajando en mi elemento!’ Maestro says, ‘Si, m’ija, ya hablamos d’esto.’ Melissa insists, ‘But it’s so booo-ring. No aprendemos na-da! Puro spelling and grammar!’” (Field note, 1/5/12) Melissa obviously relented, but her argument and displeasure clearly communicate the learning priorities for ELL students as they are perceived at Rivera. As opposed to the content knowledge that Melissa deems valuable, she is instead being pulled away from science, and Spanish instruction (although she uses English prominently throughout the class, including for the website serving as her primary information source in this specific research project), in favor of English language-as-subject instruction. The message, for Melissa and students throughout the school as these routine classroom extractions occur, is that “spelling and grammar” in English matter more than just about anything else (keeping in mind that other students are being pulled from social studies, art, or music, which, although taught in English, do not segment and isolate linguistic elements the way this targeted intervention does). This message becomes even more problematic when one considers
the content and structure of the *Language!* block, which I describe in greater detail in later discussions of monoglossic pressures.

**Soft bias: Covert pressures towards English monolingualism**

While relentless testing and the physical removal of children from classrooms provide very tangible, concrete instances of monolingual pressure, ideological elements operate discursively to uphold and reinforce these pressures. Language shift, the gradual adoption of the majority language on the part of minority-language speakers, provides the clearest example of these ideological elements. Just as other researchers working in DI classrooms have observed (Potowski, 2007; Tarone and Swain, 1995), students at Rivera likewise relied heavily upon English even during blocks of instruction designated for Spanish to communicate with peers or with the teacher. In fact, the use of English was so pervasive in Maestro Quintara’s classroom that throughout the year he resorted to different incentive systems to reward Spanish speaking and discourage English. At first, he offered points to the different classes as he hears them using Spanish in their discussions as a whole group or in small groups, with the class boasting the most points at the end of the week earning 10 minutes of extra recess on Friday. When this fell short of expectations, he resorted to a carrot-and-stick model, offering individual students tickets to reward their effort to use Spanish exclusively during his class. Students who amassed enough of these tickets could return them to Maestro in exchange for a small smoothie from Jamba Juice or a pack of Hi-Chew candy. In turn, repeated warnings about using English during class time could be punished with students being forced to
leave their groups and copy Spanish verb conjugations. Obviously, these particular measures also speak to the monoglossic ideologies about language purity through separation that will be addressed shortly, but for the time being let us note that they arise from the inevitable language shift brought on by life in a diglossic society.

Language loss, moreover, directly speaks to one of the principal research questions of this work by providing snapshots into the language practices of bilingual students in DI programs. Let it be clear that I almost never heard a student officially classified as a Native English Speaker at Rivera use the target language of Spanish outside of classroom interactions specifically designated for Spanish use. Interviews with students and their parents suggest this is not a fully representative sample, as they claimed to use Spanish in restaurants or while traveling, but from what I observed Spanish was very domain-specific for these students, compounded by the highly visible breaks along ethnic lines in terms of peer friendship circles, such that Latino students almost exclusively socialized only with other Latinos, and so on. On the other hand, students acquiring English at Rivera used their target language prevalently, including spaces designated for Spanish use. Of course, the simple increase in English use among bilingual students for whom English is a target language is not inherently evidence of language loss, as it could simply point to the enhancement of that facet of students’ linguistic repertoires without necessarily implying a loss of Spanish. Nevertheless, as students’ and teachers’ statements in interviews about language use and language choices indicate, the pattern was indeed toward the hegemony of English.
Language loss in the students’ own words

Generally speaking, students looked favorably upon bilingualism and their own abilities to communicate across groups of people in linguistically diverse communities. That is to say, no one dismissed Spanish or bilingualism as useless or worthless in interviews. Nevertheless, important distinctions emerged in interviews in terms of the particular values and uses attached to the respective languages, with Spanish reserved for the home or travel while English was positioned as commercially useful, particularly for college and a professional career. This status differential was emphasized by the prevalence of English in school despite the supposed balance in the curriculum, by the lack of bilingual programs beyond elementary school (a fact of which students and parents at Rivera were very aware), and to the general omnipresence of English around the world as a language of commerce and politics in such a way that it threatens linguistic diversity (Pennycook, 2007; Phillipson & Skutnabb-Kangas, 1996).

Alex (A) speaks to this disproportionate presence of English when asked about his language use among peers at Rivera.

Luis (LP): ¿Cómo decides tú cuando usas el español o el inglés?
A: Con mis amigos, mucho del tiempo hablo... hablo el esp... el inglés. Por... que, así nos acostumbramos. Creciendo nos vamos acostumbrando hablar el inglés, pero rarely, si no sé cómo decir, hablamos español.
LP: Okay. ¿Por qué crees que se hayan acostumbrado a hablar el inglés?
A: Porque ese es mi primer... mi segundo lenguaje, pero lo hablo más y... muchas de mis clases son en inglés y me voy acostumbrando al inglés. Se me hace más fácil hablar en inglés. (Interview, 3/27/2012)

Similarly, when asked to reflect on his language use at home, Alex specifically attributes his shifting language practices to schooling.
LP: Bueno. Y...dime...¿Qué idiomas hablas en casa?
A: Yo hablo español, mucho. Pero como he estado yendo a la escuela y todo eso, no hablamos tanto, la verdad.
LP: Okay...
A: Estamos...
Más y más inglés todo el tiempo.
Más. Pero... pero estamos, eh... sí, hablamos más español que inglés.
LP: Ah okay.
En la casa. (Interview, 3/27/2012)

The same pattern holds for the other focal students in the study classified as ELL or RFEP, albeit for different reasons. Melissa (M) notes her prevalent use of English with friends outside of school as a result of her friends’ enrollment in SEI programs and subsequent halting development of Spanish, as well as the prevalence of (and their preference for) English-language entertainment media.

LP: Bien. ¿Y se hablan mayormente en español o en inglés?
M: Emm...En inglés.
En los dos. Okay. Pero más en inglés.
Pero cuando no sabemos decir a una cosa, la decimos en español.
LP: Ahm, okay. ¿Qué tal la música que escuchas, la televisión que ves, en qué idiomas son esos, mayormente?
M: En inglés.
LP: ¿Sí? ¿Por ejemplo, que música escuchas?
M: Wiz Khalifa.
LP: ¿Oh, sí? ¿Te gusta el rap y el hip hop?
M: Aha.
LP: Okay. ¿Y qué programas de televisión?
M: Disney Channel.
LP: Oh, okay.
M: Y Disney Xd.
LP: ¿Y cuál?
M: Y, Disney Xd.
LP: Bueno. Entonces usas mucho el inglés fuera de la escuela.
Okay. Y...¿Te parece importante aprender inglés?
M: Sí.
LP: Okay. Por qué?
M: Porque inglés...Hmm...
Se...eh...se habla...es el segundo idioma en todo el mundo. (Interview, 3/28/2012)
Elsa (E) reiterated this role of prevalent English-language entertainment media and monolingual schooling models in her own growing comfort with and preference for English. Following an exchange in which she interviewed me about my hobbies and interests that was carried out in English (despite the teacher’s instructions that it should be done in Spanish), I asked her about her choice of code.

LP: Okay. Ahora tú sabes que yo hablo español y entiendo español, y tú hablas español, y sin embargo me hiciste esas preguntas en inglés. ¿Porque crees que…? ¿Qué cosas te ayudan a decidir si vas a usar el español o el inglés?
E: You are just saying, because either one he’ll understand. Como va a entender, ya a entender cuál idioma porque habla inglés y español.

LP: Okay. Así que porque… ¿pero por qué decidiste en el inglés?
E: Me gusta el inglés.

LP: Okay. ¿Por qué crees que te gusta?
E: Hmm… Es un lenguaje como… como… es hmmm… es… es como… es como simple para mi hablar el inglés, porque yo… ahmm… Yo aprendí el inglés en preschool, porque esta, aquí hay un preschool. Y en el afterschool también. Todo en inglés.

LP: Que bien. ¿Y la música que escuchas, televisión y eso, es más en inglés, o español?
E: Inglés y español.

LP: Los dos.
E: Como unos shows son español y otros son inglés, pero más veo inglés, y escucho más música en inglés.

LP: Okay. ¿Cómo quién?
E: Lil Wayne, Wiz Khalifa y Rihanna. (Interview, 5/1/2012)

Thus, both girls note curricular and extracurricular forces pushing them towards English monolingualism. While Elsa points to English monolingual programs in which she herself participated in pre-school and in the daily after school program at the local public library, Melissa notes that most of her friends outside of school are not in bilingual programs and she accommodates to their speech. Asked about the importance of learning English, meanwhile, Melissa interestingly notes the role of English as lingua-franca.
above more local concerns such as middle school, college, or typical American workplaces where English is the prevalent code. This latter, more frequent, response is exemplified in Ramón’s interview response.

LP: ¿Crees que es importante aprender inglés?
R: Sí.
LP: ¿Por qué?
R: Como si quieres agarrar trabajo… Mmm, para que tengas una vida mejor. O si tu familia no entiende lo que dicen en inglés, lo puedes traducir en español. (Interview, 2/17/2012)

Pablo (P) echoed this utilitarian view of English to justify its centrality in the curriculum when I asked him his feelings about being reclassified as Proficient (following a conversation he had with Elsa about her prospects for reclassification that year).

Notably, not only does he mention the commercial value of English, but he also raises the usefulness of language brokering abilities for relatives or others who need help understanding English as a benefit of bilingualism.

LP: ¿Qué te parece estar reclasificado?
P: Me parece mejor porque me puede ayudar más cuando crezca para, para agarrar como… diferentes trabajos.
LP: Bueno. Y…sigues…Todavía estás en el programa bilingüe. ¿Para qué cosas piensas que vas a usar tu español, ya de adulto? ¿Por qué quieres ser bilingüe?
P: Como, si voy a diferentes países.
LP: Hmm.
P: O conozco diferentes personas que no…no hablan otros idiomas. (Interview, 3/8/2012)

In short, Rivera’s messages in praise of bilingualism and linguistic equality are undermined both overtly and implicitly. Overt impositions such as accountability policies and the subsequent impacts these have on curriculum through testing, teaching materials, and teaching practices establish an imbalance in the attention given to English
and Spanish even within the program. This imbalance is aggravated by exposure to academic circles outside Rivera, such as friendship groups enrolled in SEI programs, after-school programs taught entirely in English, or knowledge of an impending transition to predominantly English instruction in middle school. On the implicit level, focal students describe discursive elements that pressure them to draw upon English at the expense of Spanish for commercial opportunity in the future. The message students receive is that English is commercially viable on a global scale while Spanish is useful for language brokering among friends, relatives, or strangers who do not know English.

Certainly no teacher or parent at Rivera could be asked to overlook this obvious diglossia in American society and not preach the importance of English in American society to students. To the contrary, data suggests that language shift is accelerating compared to previous generations of immigrants to the US and that learning English is a high priority (Crawford, 1998; 2008). Rather, what these findings call for is an ecological perspective on English in multilingual settings (Phillipson and Skutnabb-Kangas, 1996), whereby English can emerge without obviating multilingualism and foreign language learning and without usurping the linguistic human rights (Skutnabb-Kangas, 2000; 2006) of minority-language speech communities. In such an environment with a human rights perspective, priority is placed on equality in communication, multilingualism, maintenance of languages and cultures, and promotion of foreign language education (Phillipson & Skutnabb-Kangas, 1996, p. 436). That is, while the importance of English would be acknowledged, it would be done so critically and in a manner that does not negate the value and importance of Spanish or other languages in students’ homes and communities, or in the countries from which they and/or their families have immigrated. Instead, what
has taken hold is a Diffusion of English paradigm rooted in capitalism and discourses of modernization, science, and technology, that presses “ideological globalization,” “Americanization and homogenization of world culture,” and “linguistic, cultural, and media imperialism.” (Phillipson & Skutnabb-Kangas, 1996, p. 436) To be sure, overcoming these monolingual pressures poses a daunting task for teachers invested in bilingualism and linguistic equality, but they are not the only challenge to be overcome. In addition to these monolingual pressures, folks at Rivera must also contend with monoglossic pressures, and in fact, some measures taken in the hopes of elevating the status of Spanish actually aggravate the latter by demanding languages be understood as separate, bound, and standardized entities.

**Constraining Language and Bilingualism: Monoglossic Pressures**

Beyond the challenges posed by English-only ideologies in curriculum and social discourse, students at Rivera must also contend with monoglossic pressures (García, 2009). These forces prize clear separations between English and Spanish in school curriculum and in students’ language practices, as well as adherence to standardized varieties of both. Maestro Quintara’s policing against English in his classroom is a clear example of policies that emerge from such ideologies. Of course, Maestro was trained to recognize the benefits of letting students use code switching in expression and himself often relied on English to clarify points during Spanish class (or vice versa in the math class he taught in English), so clearly these policies emerge from broader pressures than just individual preference. Indeed, observation makes it rather clear that both Maestro Quintara and Ms. Jessica adhered to the monolingual pressures largely out of curricular
and administrative obligations rather than any sense of commitment. Monoglossic pressures, on the other hand, thrived in these classrooms as both teachers insisted on “correct” forms and tying these to language separation (albeit the latter somewhat inconsistently).

**Monoglossic pressures in the curriculum: Language!**

Although it only applied to a fraction of the students in this program, the clearest manifestation of monoglossic pressures is the *Language!* block of instruction. To highlight the prevalent ideologies about language and language learning that this remedial instruction and its very implementation entail, a critical discourse analysis is in order with respect to the *Language!* materials. The following is an analysis of materials from the Voyager Learning website, specifically materials regarding the *Language!* curriculum (Voyager Learning markets a number of curricula for language and literacy remediation, and most of the materials on the website refer to some of these other programs). The corpus, described in Table 13, includes the three publications reporting on the effectiveness of *Language!* in different school districts and with different student populations, an independent evaluation of the program by the Florida Center for Reading Research, the technical guide to the program’s “Vital Indicators of Progress” (VIP), and the curriculum research basis from the program website.

**Table 13 - Description of *Language!* Curriculum research materials**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Middle School Pilot Evaluation with Students</td>
<td>Evaluation of 8-month implementation of curriculum with 775 students in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eligible for Special Education: Hawthorne</td>
<td>grades 6-8. Sample includes 59% ELL and 25% SPED. Measures growth with</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School District, California</td>
<td>California State ELA Test</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Close reading of all these documents reveals a number of prevalent themes that resonate with aforementioned societal discourses about language and education. One that emerges immediately is the fixation on quantifiable data that captures student learning and the need for “scientifically based research” with regard to instruction and curriculum called for by the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001. In a 2002 seminar directed by Susan Neuman, the Assistant Secretary for Elementary and Secondary Education at the time, in which experts in education and science explained the meaning of “scientifically based research.” In this seminar, the deputy of the Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI), Valerie Reyna, explains scientifically-based research in the
context of education as an attempt to replicate medical clinical trials, and contrasts it to making decisions based on tradition and anecdotal evidence (Reyna, 2002). Of course, what this approach excludes is the scientific validity of qualitative data gained from considering students as individuals with different starting points, learning contexts, and patterns of development, rather than as homogenous and predictable inputs in the schooling assembly line. Such discourse that limits what constitutes valid evaluation and knowledge about effective teaching practices predictably leads to curriculum and teaching practices that offer a series of distinct drills with quantifiable outputs such as decoding word lists, naming letters, and fluency measurements. In turn, segmenting language learning and assessment in this form reinforces ideologies of language as bound, static, finite sets of elements and skills that need simply to be combined and rearranged for proficiency.

Two other recurrent themes found throughout these documents are references to the discrete skills and elements that supposedly comprise language and the conflation of literacy skills and language proficiency. Given that in the high-stakes testing environments of contemporary classrooms academic achievement and language proficiency are closely intertwined (evidenced by the role of standardized tests in the reclassification protocols illustrated in Figure 2), this conflation is unsurprising. It points to ideologies of language as static and finite elements that can be accumulated and developed through explicit instruction, repetition, and manipulation, without regard to the social contexts of learning and interaction that actually underlie language development. Resulting from these ideologies are a series of teaching practices that take letters, words,
and texts out of authentic contexts and ask students to make meaning from them in their own right, rather than in relation to genuine functions or interactions.

Finally, the documents that offer logic or a research background for the intervention all point to language learning as a predictable, sequential process. This notion is undermined by aforementioned new research in SLA that explores variation across learners and contexts and in turn posits language learning as an indeterminately ongoing process highly susceptible to learning contexts and conditions and marked by high levels of variability within and across individuals (Larsen-Freeman, 1997; 2011; de Bot, et al., 2007). This is demonstrated by the leveling of lessons and strands in Language! into a hierarchy of skills beginning with phonics and ascending to reading comprehension, and by the prescriptions for determining “mastery” through summative evaluations at the end of particular lessons and the progression of skills taught and assessed in isolation without recurrence.

These prevalent ideologies come together to advance a particular perspective of language and language learning. In this perspective, which I label monoglossic, language is a static entity comprised by distinct elements that can be mastered sequentially through explicit instruction towards an ultimate acquisition of proficiency aligned with a fallacious “monolingual native speaker” norm. These elements of language, moreover, can supposedly be acquired and mastered devoid of interactional context or conceptual meaning, as with the case of developing vocabulary through the word lists and proficiency in written communication through spelling exercises. Table 14 captures particular instances of these ideologies operationalized in the texts within and about the Language! curriculum by highlighting cases in which language is conceptualized as the
sequential acquisition of language pieces and where explicit instruction of said pieces is recommended. In addition, the table shows how academic skills, particularly around literacy, are conflated with language proficiency and language learning such that addressing student needs in these areas is often diluted by emphasis on linguistic proficiency.

**Table 14 - Ideologies of language and language learning in Language! curriculum research base**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document</th>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Underlying ideology about language and SLA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Middle School Pilot Evaluation with Students Eligible for Special Education: Hawthorne School District, California (SWES, 2013)</td>
<td>“All students in grades 6–8 who performed below the 60th percentile on a test of reading comprehension and fluency were placed in classrooms using LANGUAGE! as a core replacement.” (p. 2)</td>
<td>• Literacy of academic tasks is a necessary component of language proficiency • Explicit instruction of language-as-subject is the optimal intervention for language development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“Findings from the retrospective evaluation of LANGUAGE! in Hawthorne School District suggest that LANGUAGE! positively impacted low-performing students’ reading gains.” (p. 2)</td>
<td>• Reading comprised of distinct elements (fluency and comprehension). • Performance of academic tasks equivalent to language development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“Matched pre- and post-LANGUAGE! implementation data from the California Standards Test for English-Language Arts (CST-ELA) and/or the Test of Silent Word Reading Fluency (TOSWRF) were available and analyzed.” (p. 2)</td>
<td>• Academic tasks and reading fluency comprise language proficiency • Language proficiency can be measured through observations of individuals on individual tasks rather than in social settings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Elementary and Middle School Retrospective Evaluation with State</td>
<td>“Matched pre- and post-LANGUAGE! implementation data from the North Carolina End-of-Grade (NC EOG) Reading</td>
<td>• Academic tasks and reading fluency comprise language proficiency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Data: Caldwell County Schools, North Carolina (SWES, 2013)</strong></td>
<td>Comprehension Tests, the Test of Silent Word Reading Fluency (TOSWRF), and the Degrees of Reading Power® (DRP) test were analyzed for 346 students in grades 3 through 7” (p. 2)</td>
<td>• Language proficiency can be measured through observations of individuals on individual tasks rather than in social settings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Language! (Florida Center for Reading Research, 2002)</strong></td>
<td>“LANGUAGE! is designed specifically for students who benefit from explicit instruction in a structured language curriculum, whether they are in the general or special education program. The classroom teacher delivers sequenced, systematic, cumulative and explicit instruction.” (p. 1)</td>
<td>• Language is learned through explicit instruction of language-as-subject.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“The program is highly individualized, with students placed at an instructional level on the basis of an entry assessment, and continuing on that level until mastery of concepts and skills is attained. Flexible, small instructional groups are formed within the whole class according to mastery performance.” (p. 2)</td>
<td>• Academic tasks (individualized tests of fluency and reading comprehension) comprise language proficiency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“During teacher directed small group instruction other students may be assigned: 1) practice to build fluency in sorting, categorizing, grammar, and writing, 2) independent reading at their independent reading level, and 3) journal writing.” (p. 2)</td>
<td>• Language proficiency is acquired through individualized tasks without interaction addressing distinct academic tasks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“The LANGUAGE! program comes with its own book of phonemic awareness activities, which include rhyming, production, isolation, segmentation, blending, deletion, substitution, and reversal of phonemes. Phonics is directly taught by linking the correct letter symbol to the phonemes. Vocabulary development is taught through a study of structures”</td>
<td>• Language and literacy development follow a hierarchical, predictable skill development sequence • Literacy hinges first on phonemic awareness, phonics, and vocabulary before comprehension</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
including comparative forms, tenses, and affixes, and Greek, Latin, and Anglo-Saxon roots. In addition, oral/listening vocabulary instruction supplements the concepts of each J & J Language Reader story.” (p.2)

**“LANGUAGE! was introduced in 1994-95 as a comprehensive reading/language arts curriculum for nonreaders, second language learners, students with special education needs, and below average readers.” (p. 2)**

| **Language! “Research and Background” white paper (Voyager Sopris Learning, 2013)** | **“Models of proficient reading and an understanding of the many cognitive systems that support it do not tell us how people learn to read. Researchers have, however, investigated how the nature of skilled reading changes over time. At the end point, the proficient reader has learned to recognize words and interpret text rapidly, accurately, and often effortlessly. All processors are functioning and support reading. However, the role that each processor plays in reading development and the functional relationships among the processing systems change as reading skill develops. Good readers’ brain activation patterns change with experience in reading.” (Moats and Tollman, 2009, cited p. 58)** | **• Interventions of academic need conflated with language development**  
**• Being a “second language learner” is a deficit to be remedied rather than an asset to be cultivated**  
**• Literacy development is part of language proficiency and is an individual, cognitive process measurable through neurological observation**  
**• Academic tasks define language proficiency**  
**• Language is acquired** |
| --- | --- | --- |

**An intervention study showed that the vocabulary knowledge and reading**
comprehension gap between English language learners and native English speakers can be significantly reduced through enriched vocabulary instruction” (Dutro and Moran, 2003, cited p. 65)

“One way to think of vocabulary is as comprising “general-utility” and “content-specific” words. Continuing our architectural metaphor, we refer to these, respectively, as “brick” and “mortar” words. “Brick” words are the vocabulary specific to the content and concepts being taught in a given lesson [...] “Mortar” words and phrases are the general-utility vocabulary required for constructing sentences—the words that determine the relation between and among words.” (Dutro and Moran, 2003, cited p. 65)

“The basic subject/verb/predicate adjective structure of this comparison sentence can be adapted by varying the verbs (e.g., have, are, can, do, use) or conjunctions (however, whereas). The ability to manipulate these basic sentence structures using a variety of content is necessary for demonstrating conceptual understanding in a lesson calling for comparison.” (Dutro and Moran, 2003, cited p. 66)

“Basic language skills are the best predictors of good or poor reading at all ages (Catts, Fey, Zhang, & Tomblin, 1999; Shankweiler et al., 1999). These basic language skills include (1)

- Language comprised of finite and static set of elements
- Language is acquired through language-as-subject instruction
- Literacy and language proficiency intertwined

- Language proficiency is the ability to manipulate and arrange language component pieces in prescribed, predictable ways
- Language proficiency includes literacy
- Literacy is a set of skills and elements that can be taught, assessed, and mastered in isolation
the ability to identify and manipulate the component speech sounds in spoken words, and (2) the speed and accuracy with which a student can read words in lists and in passages.” (p. 3)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LANGUAGE! Addresses the Needs of English Language Learners by:</th>
<th>Language comprised of finite and static set of elements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Providing activities designed for additional practice producing difficult phonemes</td>
<td>• Language proficiency is the ability to manipulate and arrange language component pieces in prescribed, predictable ways</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Providing additional practice in suffix and contraction discrimination, as well as other difficult word forms</td>
<td>• Language-as-subject instruction is the best way to achieve language proficiency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Providing explicit instruction in the production and discrimination of words in connected speech and the means by which English speakers use intonation</td>
<td>• There is a unitary language of “American culture” and mastery of this standardized form constitutes language proficiency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Including explicit instruction of idioms and common expressions</td>
<td>• The influence of the L1 is only as interference and obstacle because of its different intonations, phonemes, and linguistic forms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Teaching collocational use and semantic differentials in semantically related words</td>
<td>• Emphasizing grammatical functions such as article use, negation in English, and additional practice with English verb tense formation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Emphasizing grammatical functions such as article use, negation in English, and additional practice with English verb tense formation</td>
<td>• Providing explicit instruction in the linguistic forms that constitute politeness in American culture” (p. 10)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These problematic framings of language and language learning inextricably and unquestioningly tie language proficiency to the performance of academic tasks modeled after those on standardized tests. They present language as the sum of a series of
component elements that can be mastered through explicit and systematic instruction. The documents refer to language learning (and literacy development) as the acquisition of systematic and sequential mastery of these listed elements and sub-skills, without recognizing that these particular skills or elements (such as “brick words”) are deeply rooted in the practices of certain people and groups. In this vein, they offer that students learning English is school require the same remediation as students with special needs or otherwise “at risk” and below grade level, with no recognition of the role of the L1 in acquiring a second language and no recognition of the need of emergent bilinguals to acquire language and content knowledge simultaneously. Finally, much of this research base ignores or glosses over other problematic facts. Only the report from the Florida Center for Reading and Research points to the methodological shortcomings of the intervention studies, which do not include control groups and cannot account for other factors that may have produced greater growth among Language! students. Most egregiously, the pilot study of middle school children notes that nearly 19% of the ELL students in the sample were simultaneously receiving or qualified to receive special education services, a proportion that speaks to the conflation of language development and mastery of academic tasks as well as the bias that marginalizes students of color into special education at disproportionately high rates (Artiles & Trent, 1994).

With the Language! curriculum as its central intervention for struggling students, Rivera’s monolingual and monoglossic biases resonate. Language is conflated with mastery of academic tasks and performance on standardized tests, and drill-like training in these test-related behaviors and skills is equated with teaching language. The following is a transcript from an interview with Ms. Christine, a veteran teacher whose
ability to raise students’ test scores earned her tremendous respect among the faculty and the responsibility of having some of the most “at risk” students in her homeroom and of teaching the Language! intervention.

**LP:** What is it like ….so you’re teaching in an SEI class that’s full bilingual kids at different levels of bilingualism at a school with a bilingual program… How does that play out in their language use?

Ms. Christine (MC): They do switch back and forth a lot. I remind them “English please.” “Practicing your English” because they are technically supposed to be speaking English in class but they do switch a lot, I find. It’s funny especially in the ELD because a lot of the DI kids come into my room for giving me a hand, I get more Spanish during the ELD than I do any other time in the day, I have to keep on them. I really, I’m fairly insistent, because it is ELD. That’s what we’re supposed to be doing is practicing English, I’m fairly insistent then…

[…]

**LP:** So then, with respect to ELD and testing, and Language! and things like that you imagine that English is like the base standard language that they shift to, so how does that get taught in a monolingual frame with kids who draw on multiple languages?

Ms. Christine (MC): Right, you know, sometimes we use like refreshers for the vocabulary, we have a vocabulary program through (xxx) and they have on cards, on the vocabulary cards forming the Spanish call native there is one so we’ll use that then, sometimes I’ll introduce a word and I’ll hear some students, I’ll hear a buzz over there in Spanish and I know they’re talking about the word and explaining to each other “oh I know what this word is” and I just, I mean I guess in a sense I ignore it but I just allow that because you’re understanding what a word is because somebody else is giving you some context in Spanish then I’m all for that. Now I want you to know what it is in English and I’m going use it in some English sentences and you’re gonna say the English sentences and we are going talk about what part of the speech it is and all of that but, and then I have a lot a Spanish in the room recently because I just got a newcomer and so the girls in particular are being, trying to kind of to bring her up to speed a little bit and because I don’t speak Spanish I mean I have a very little Spanish I rely a lot on them.

**LP:** Ok, and then again with the test so what I imagine is that these kids are at varying levels of bilingualism, it sounds like a lot of them are getting schooling in English for a long time, and you know, they speak a lot of English out in the playground, things like that but that’s not always the English that they are tested on …. 

MC: Correct, I think they have an extra burden when it comes to the test because I teach all of these vocabulary words but if it doesn’t happen to be the word that’s tested or if
the choices that they have, so let’s say it’s a word that I taught, but the four choices down there contain three words that they don’t know, now they are very limited, you know I can teach them strategies to figure it out. *Language!* does a lot with roots and they are actually very good on all the Latin roots, I mean those they are able to memorize really quickly because they have that background, Greek roots are a little bit harder for them but they do definitely have an extra burden when it comes to the test. I would say though that listening to them at like Back to School either in an open house or in conferences their academic vocabulary is all in English. They would be speaking with their parents explaining something in class and they have to put it in the English academic words because they don’t it in Spanish. There was one girl who was doing a power point presentation, they’ve made one, and she was showing it to her, and she had to turn to her uncle and said “How do I say this in Spanish? Because she knew it in English, it was about persuasive speaking but she didn’t know the words in Spanish and he was able to tell her then what the words were; but their much stronger academic language is definitely English. I think is a disadvantage for them as well and they go home and the try to talk about the things that they learned in school, let’s say we’re talking about water cycle or something and they learn the word precipitation and it might be the same word in Spanish but it might not, but they don’t know that word in Spanish. (Interview, June 8, 2012)

Ms. Christine, a respected teacher with a decade of experience in the classroom (although not all of it at Rivera), displays her own understandings and challenges with these monolingual and monoglossic pressures. She recognizes that the shift to English is not without its drawbacks, naming specifically students’ decreased ability to communicate with family and connect their schooling lives with their home. In this interview and plenty of other interactions she expressed contentment with the fact that students did not have to “disavow” their home language at Rivera, and that even in the SEI classes there was an appreciation of Spanish. Nevertheless, her statements betray understandings of language and second language acquisition that reflect those in the *Language!* curriculum and broader societal ideologies. She critiques the presence of Spanish in her classroom, noting that at best it serves as a crutch to understanding of English vocabulary words, but that this support is insufficient in the context of using words in sentences and such. She emphasizes pedagogical strategies such as vocabulary
cards, labeling parts of speech, and repeating teacher-given sentences that suggest language is learned individually by mastering subsets of skills and component parts that add up to a true, pure, standard form. Unfortunately, these monoglossic views were prevalent throughout the classrooms I observed at Rivera, internalized by students, teachers, and parents alike, and applying both to English and Spanish.

**Monoglossic Pressures: Talking like “educated people”…and More Testing**

Though the Language! curriculum offers one of the more robust bodies of monoglossic and monolingual ideology, the day-to-day of classroom life had no shortage of such issues. As mentioned, Maestro Quintara relied both on rewards and punishment systems to promote maintenance of homogeneously Spanish code in accordance with the “Hispanophone ideology” that García and Leiva (2013) and Otheguy and Stern (2010) distinguish. While he allowed students to code switch in their speech and in their writing as a preliminary step in communication, the expectation was that final products would be in a single language, Spanish, and that this form would be in an “academic” register, as would comments in whole class discussions, for the most part. Students speaking exclusively in Spanish received tickets that could be redeemed for treats when enough were accumulated, and likewise when the whole class used Spanish in its small-group work, the class could earn points towards extra recess. Conversely, students who predominantly used English in class despite warnings and encouragement otherwise were forced to copy verb conjugations in Spanish. Though he expressed displeasure with
having to resort to such measures, Maestro Quintara explained that he felt pressure from parents and administrators to ensure students’ language did not fully shift to English.

The students and parents echoed these notions of language purity. Thomas’s mother, Andrea, who self-identified as an English-dominant bilingual, offered extensive thoughts to that effect in our interview when we discussed the family’s language practices at home.

**LP:** And… um… so does your husband, does he speak Spanish as well?

**A:** He speaks fluent Spanish. But he is not home as much.

**LP:** Ok

**A:** So… and he spends his whole day speaking English so he doesn’t habitually speak Spanish unless he’s reminded. Like… he and Thomas… you know, speak Spanish! Oh ok, then they’ll speak Spanish. Although we speak a lot of Spanglish.

**LP:** Like, so like you mentioned the Spanglish and the code switching, so these kind of less formal varieties of Spanish or English, like do those… do you draw on those at home a lot?

**A:** I mean we speak Spanglish all the time, I don’t know what that… I mean I want to cultivate their academic proper Spanish. Like their understanding of stuff, but I also want them to be cool with other cultures and just swing that way you know like not a big deal.

**LP:** Yeah, right.

**A:** And they actually think it’s so cool that they can speak Spanish like, phee, I’ll tell their little cousins and stuff, ‘well, hehehe, I speak two languages.’ So they think it’s cool to speak more than one language. Didn’t you think it was cool to speak more than one…?

**LP:** I thought it was really cool.

**A:** That’s right see, it’s the same you know. They think it’s cool.

[Thomas’s little sister is running around the staff lounge, demanding attention]

**LP:** Alright, I will let you attend to them.
A: Alright.

LP: Thank you so much.

A: Did that help you? Is that what you needed?

LP: Hey so much… immensely. Yeah, yeah… I’m just you know, trying to get a big picture behind them. So I’m hearing them talk every day in class and stuff. When they learn and what.

A: Yeah does Thomas ever speak up for Spanish?

LP: He does.

A: During Spanish language development

LP: During Spanish language development, and in his Spanish class, but then you know depending on who he’s talking to or what they are talking about.

A: Yeah exactly. It’s a real…

LP: It’s a… yeah, so…

A: Cause you should respond to a person in the language they speak to you in, just polite.

LP: Yeah… seems to be. But…

A: So he’s totally capable.

LP: Yeah absolutely.

A: Absolutely capable

[Discussion continues about Thomas using Spanish in Church and understanding other members of the congregation]

LP: Ok.

A: So he has a little bit of a better ear…Hearing a lot more… aha

LP: … and then…

A: Well and I can understand people that speak clearly. Educated people, I find easy to understand… well Spaniards I understand pretty well. When we went to Spain, they speak a little more clear, educated tend to speak more proper Spanish…
LP: Sure.

A: … they are easier for me to understand. I have a really hard time with the kinda mumbly, street sort of thing.

LP: Yeah. A little faster…

A: Yeah, if I can’t hear the word, I can’t process the word like putting the ns in words

LP: Yeah.

A: Too fast for my brain. Almost.. like there’s been a few people that I was like… are they from Colombia? Yeah they are, ‘cause I can’t understand them either cause they are so fast and one of them told me: “Yeah in Colombia we speak a little faster”.

LP: Right, yeah.

A: And the other thing is what I can’t. I’ve always been getting better, but it’s like… it’s such a difference in…

LP: Yeah no it’s tough, it’s tough. (Interview, March 6, 2012)

The interview with Andrea offers a generally representative glimpse into the monoglossic attitudes that many parents and students had towards bilinguals’ translanguaging practices, as well as how easily researchers can fall into such discourses. On the one hand, she expresses a desire for her children to be comfortable across a variety of cultures and recognizes the linguistic variation even among certain Spanish speaking communities when she downplays critiques of code switching with “but I also want them to be cool with other cultures and just swing that way.” On the other hand, she precedes this qualification by stating that she wants to support their learning of “academic proper Spanish.” She offers that the family uses “a lot of Spanglish” and I, in turn, accept this term without contestation, perhaps even aggravating matters by framing it as “less formal varieties” in my subsequent turn. Though well aware of the indexical power of the term Spanglish, I recognize its ubiquity in societal descriptions of speech
practices of Spanish-English bilinguals and let Andrea’s description of the family’s language practices continue. Nevertheless, my uptake of the term signals our shared understanding of the term *Spanglish* not only as codeswitching in speech, but also as a speech practice best suited for use in the home, indicating complicity in prevalent discourses at Rivera and societally that denigrate translingual codes. The connotations of such statements are that translanguaging codes cannot serve academic purposes and that they are, by extension, improper. The conflation of propriety and academics overlooks both the myriad contexts outside of schools in which language is actually required and the power relations that have shaped what constitutes the academic curriculum – for language and otherwise.

Andrea reinforces these problematic assumptions in describing the Spanish varieties that she can understand. She distinguishes at once regional variation between Spain and Colombia, the former being easily intelligible and the latter more difficult to her, and associates this with interlocutors’ levels of education. In stating, “I can understand people that speak clearly. Educated people, I find easy to understand… well Spaniards I understand pretty well. When we went to Spain, they speak a little more clear, educated tend to speak more proper Spanish,” in contrast to, “I have a really hard time with the kinda mumbly, street sort of thing,” which she likens to the speech of Colombians, she conveys a host of biases associated with colonialist and classist ideologies. The implication that there is a single variety of Spanish spoken in Spain or Colombia is clearly untrue, and the suggestion that one is inherently more proper and educated than the other is laughable. Both societies have their range in educational attainment, regional variants, class differences, and so forth. Equating quicker speech,
English lexical or syntactical influence, and aspirated final syllable /s/ or /n/ with “that kinda mumbly, street sort of thing” indicates precisely the bind in which many bilingual US Latinos find themselves when language proficiency is tied up in academic tasks and mythologies of standardized forms.

Unsurprisingly, Thomas himself had internalized some of this disdain for particular speech variables and translanguaging in speech. In one interview, the topic surfaced about the differences between Maestro Quintara’s Spanish, influenced by largely Mexican and Mexican-American speech communities, and Ms. Jennifer’s, marked by her time studying abroad in Spain. This elicited discussion of other forms of variation within language.

LP: Ahm. And it is also funny when you kind of speak to a lot of native Spanish speakers or people who live in different countries, they’ll talk about some people’s Spanish being really good. They’ll be like, “Oh, these people speak really good Spanish, or Spaniards, people in Spain speak really good Spanish. Do you have a sense of kind of who speaks good? And it doesn’t have to be by country.

T: Well, not really. I mean as long as they can communicate, if they are not going like “Mi zaapataowww”. If someone speaks fluently, and I mean if you think Spaniards like Ms. [xxx], like Ms. Jessica, ahm.. speak really good Spanish, ahm… I really don’t know well, but it’s actually a little harder for me to understand, ‘cause I’m kind of used to the more of the Mexican version…

LP: Right. The Latin American Spanish is where you are more of… Yeah, absolutely. That’s really good. So, like the accent to you is kind of like a big deal, yeah?

T: Yeah. I mean if… I mean if the words are all choppy and stuff then I think “he needs to work on his Spanish,” but if it’s in the dual immersion and stuff, I really don’t care as long as I can communicate with them.

LP: What about with native Spanish speakers? Sometimes the native Spanish speakers who are enrolled in dual immersion or who have lived in English speaking countries, for example for a long time they start to mix in Spanish and English, and things like that. What do you think about language in that sense?
T: Well, if you are gonna combine two languages, I wouldn’t be speaking to total strangers like that, but if say you are a really good friend or maybe relatives who kinda speak like that. Like, well… I don’t know. I think if you are gonna speak interchanging English and Spanish, it should mostly be with family members, not your teacher.

LP: Yeah, it makes sense. (Interview, January 13, 2012)

First and foremost, this exchange problematically reiterates my own reliance on ideological constructions of the native speaker as an ultimate judge or measure of language proficiency. While the term here is deployed to elicit Thomas’s perceptions of attitudinal judgments about Spanish variation among L1 Spanish speakers, it reinforces socially constructed linkages between birthright, nation-state, and language, as well as upholding an inaccurate monolingual-based benchmark for bilinguals’ language abilities. My use of the term reflects the frequently used categories at Rivera (and other DI environments) that dichotomize students as native Spanish and native English speakers, as demonstrated by Thomas’s familiarity and instant understanding of the term, but misses an opportunity to undermine this oppressive construction.

Thomas’s statements, to his credit and that of his teachers, reflect a priority on understanding and communicative competence over form. Nevertheless, he shares his mother’s (and indeed, most of society’s) disdain for code switching in speech. He clearly demarcates such practices as suitable only for social, casual, and non-academic spaces (even though his own teachers sometimes engaged in and encouraged these practices for the sake of effective communication). Thomas provided some additional nuance to his mother’s perspective of variation when we discussed the case of English.

LP: What do you think about English varieties?

T: English varieties? Well, I think it’s kind of fun listening to the people who have that kind of an Alabama accent.
LP: Uh-huh.

T: They all yell like that, and it’s kind of fun, but I mean as long as I can understand it I really don’t care. Unless the… like the New York accent, rapping in some really annoying song like…

LP: Okay. Do you think it’s kind of a time and place thing or just as long as you can understand it, it doesn’t matter?

T: Just as long I can understand it and it’s not like… and it’s not like… making them sound real, well not very sophisticated I am fine with it.

LP: Okay.

T: I mean I don’t care as long as I can understand it.

LP: What do you mean by really sophisticated? Just wondering.

T: Well… like say they are… You know that kind of a rapper New York attitude?

LP: Sure.

T: I think when people do it, it’s like swearing. I mean if you swear a lot then really… Why?

LP: Hmm.

T: I mean it makes you think they… you are kinda of immature it’s sort of like that, but maybe a little more or less so.

LP: Okay. Anything… that’s more matter of accent or the particular words that people might use?

T: I think…

LP: Like in rap if we say things like “aight,” or “k’namean.”

T: Or “more awesomer.”

LP: Oh okay, I see.

T: Like that. Hmmm.

LP: So, it’s the words and the accents together.
T: Yeah, but if they are using like “plethora” and a bunch of really sophisticated words, then hmm… then they are going (xxx) in New York accent. I mean it’s pretty much, but if they are speaking crisp British and there are words like “I am more awesomer than you”, I think… you know.  (Interview, January 13, 2012)

Once again, Thomas stresses the importance of understanding in communication as a key criterion for language proficiency. Moreover, unlike his mother, he distinguishes between phonological variables and grammatical ones, offering that the latter are more important in determining one’s level of formality or proficiency. Thus, even the stereotypical association between British accents (themselves a highly varied and stratified bunch) and propriety is broken for Thomas if the speaker errs in doubly qualifying something as “more awesomer.”

Thomas, habitually, was more direct than most peers, although his views were certainly not unique. Max, responding to the same prompt about what constitutes “good” speech, offered the following in an interview.

LP: Okay. Y entonces cuando la gente aprende un idioma, se habla mucho de "hablar bien," o de "usar bien el idioma" ¿A qué crees que se refiere, eh... que se refiera la gente cuando dice "él habla bien el inglés" o "él habla bien el español"? ¿Qué es "hablar bien"?

M: Hablar bien es, eh... diría... es gramática, bueno, no la gramática, pero... como, como "la padre", en vez de... no decir "la padre", es "el padre," y decir cosas así, correctamente... y... hablar... eh... flu... no sé cómo se dice...

LP: No sé que...

M: Con... con...

LP: Con fluidez.

M: Fluidez, fluidez.

LP: Así que no, no estás... eh... ¿Qué tal las formas más sociales del idioma? Así que, por ejemplo "ser bilingüe es padre" Right, like in very simple terms, eh... y, o sea en español o en inglés. ¿Qué crees que eso también... es incluido en poder hablar... conocer bien un idioma, o...?
M: Puede porque hay, como en (xxx) unos... amigos de mi... los, los amigos de mi padre tienen hijas, entonces, ellos vienen de Colombia, entonces llegan y dicen "chévere", "que chévere", entonces, eh... yo diría que puede ser, porque hay como trash talk, como... estás jugando basketball...

LP: Sí.

M: En la calle, dices, pero no usas palabras por ejemplo como ain’t en inglés, o... así en español. Mas no es tan... correcto.

LP: Okay. Así que ese lenguaje informal, viene siendo... no, no es correcto en cuanto al idioma...

M: Pero...

LP: Pero sí se puede usar en ciertos contextos.

M: Sí, sí. Es como...

LP: Sí. Hmm.

M: Sí.

LP: Y, o sea si no es correcto, ¿Por qué crees que la gente lo usa?

M: Porque creen que es lo correcto, y no saben... como... como unas personas en mi clase, no son... no practican el español.

LP: Hmm.

M: O no hablan el español, entonces dicen cosas... que no son correctas... en el lenguaje, entonces pueden... o sea... decir como "I didn’t do nothing".

LP: Hmm.

Interestingly, Max’s take on what constitutes “good” English or Spanish overlaps a great deal with that of the Language! curriculum even though he is not one of the students pulled out for remedial instruction. He specifically mentions grammar and fluency as characteristics of proper language. Moreover, his examples of improper language show an interesting distinction. Whereas his example in Spanish is rooted in a
learner-variety grammatical error of mismatching the gender of a noun and its adjective (“la padre”), his examples in English offer elements of non-standardized varieties (“ain’t” and the double negative “didn’t do nothing,”), both of which manifest in African American Vernacular English, Appalachian English, and other lower status English varieties. That he further uses basketball trash talk as an example of improper language overlaps with Thomas’s caricature of the language in rap music as “immature” and pointless swearing as the singling out of speech practices commonly associated with African Americans (although to claim that either child was specifically making racially-based linguistic evaluations would certainly require more probing). Finally, perhaps in line with Max’s highlighting of a learner variety error as evidence of improper Spanish, his explanation that people sometimes speak in ways that aren’t “good” derives from some combination of ignorance (“porque creen que es lo correcto y no saben”) and lack of practice (“no practican el español”) echoes language ideologies that reinforce standard varieties and that promote language teaching through drills and repetition.

Those developing their Spanish at Rivera were not the only ones showing such monoglossic views of the language. Alex’s mother, Victoria, described the Spanish spoken in her neighborhood in unflattering terms, referring to its perceived lack of propriety and her reasons for wanting her son to be schooled in Spanish as well as making periodic visits to Mexico.

LP: ¿Entonces en casa cómo dividen los idiomas?

V: Pues hablamos un poco de inglés un poco de español. Empezamos a hablar a veces en español y terminamos en inglés y así. Usamos a los dos como el Spanglish.

LP: ¿Nota usted una distinción, entre, o sea, algunos temas que típicamente son en español o…?
V: A veces es más fácil hablar en inglés, en la casa porque... Bueno, para ellos se le hace mucho más fácil hablar el inglés que el español. Hay unas palabras que es, muy complicadas de decirlas creo, de captarlas en español para ellos.

LP: Okay. ¿Y entonces la decisión de poner a Alex en un programa bilingüe viene entonces de...?

V: De los dos, porque queríamos que Alex aprendiera a leer y escribir en español, porque hablarlo, muchas personas lo pueden hablar, pero no lo pueden leer o escribir. Entonces...

LP: ¿Así que la lectoescritura entonces-

V: -Sí.

LP: -era la razón.

V: Aha. Y también porque allá en México nadie habla español. ¡Va! Nadie habla inglés. Todos hablan en español. Entonces...

LP: ¿Y qué tan a menudo Alex viaja a México?

V: En el momento, cada año vamos.

LP: ¿Ah, durante los veranos?

V: Ah, si el verano pasado estuvimos. Un mes y medio... casi dos meses. Sí, casi dos meses.

[Discussion follows about where in Mexico they have family and who Alex speaks to when he travels there before returning to the subject of language at school].

LP: ¿Y cómo se siente usted entonces en cuanto el... en cómo él ha desarrollado su lectura y su escritura en español?

V: A mí me gusta mucho que él sepa leer y escribirlo, y... Aunque a veces no le gusta hacerlo, pero... pero me encanta que él habla los dos idiomas.

LP: Y eso viene haciendo una gran parte del estudio, verdad. Porque estamos en un país bastante monolingüe, que premia el inglés, y es algo que se ve mucho en los estudiantes que... ah... Aunque saben el español no les gusta usarlo. Como, cuando él se queja de tener que hacer trabajos en español o qué cosas dice.

V: Hmm. No, realmente no se queja, sino le encanta hacer las tareas, le gusta eso, pero a veces se le hace mucho más fácil al hablar el inglés.
LP: Usar el inglés. Okay.

V: Porque eso es lo que nuevamente… televisión inglés, cuando está hablando con alguien habla en inglés. Igualmente, hablamos en casa inglés. Entonces se le… ¿Qué sería la palabra? Se le dificulta un poquito a veces, no lo pone mucho en práctica.

LP: ¿Qué importancia cree…? ¿Siente usted en cuanto que Alex mantenga ambos, o desarrolle ambos, o…?

V: Pues a mí me gustaría que hable… pues que desarrolle a los dos.

LP: Sí.

V: Siempre trato de enseñarle palabras nuevas que tienen doble significado, que como muchas personas… cómo lo hablan por aquí. Ohm… Como por ejemplo, en el parque, pues su… el español allá es mucho más… Ohm. ¿Cómo sería la palabra? No pobre sino que…. No es muy…

LP: O sea no es el académico.

V: ¡Académico! (Interview, March 26, 2012).

In these descriptions of Alex’s language use, Victoria not only paints a rather grim picture of language loss among her children, but also a clear delineation between the Spanish spoken in their community in the US and that spoken by family in Mexico. She labors to characterize the language practices of their neighborhood, offering as example the playground and specifically rejecting “poor” (“pobre”) as an adjective, but enthusiastically agrees at my offering that it is “not academic.” She also hints at ideologies of language as a sum of fixed component parts, noting that her efforts in teaching the language at home emphasize vocabulary (“Siempre trato de enseñarle palabras nuevas que tienen doble significado, que como muchas personas… cómo lo hablan por aquí.”) rather than authentic communication, which is allocated to the domain of visiting family in Mexico.
These overt rejections of code switching and of English-influenced forms of Spanish offer tangible explanation on the part of students and parents as to the manifestation of these monoglossic pressures in day-to-day life. Teacher correction and instruction practices likewise play a role in furthering these ideologies. Maestro Quintara, although committed to collaborative learning and constructivist principles, bristled when Latino students deployed the expanded semantics of agarrar characteristic of Chicano Spanish. Rather than simply meaning “to grab,” the word was used by students (and among many Latinos in the broader speech community of El Valle) to also mean “get,” “receive,” “catch,” or “take.” As example, Maestro’s (M) interjection during an exchange between Ramón (R) and another classmate (not a focal student, labeled in the transcript as J) as they discussed their scores on an assignment from the Language! class, demonstrates his frustrations. It is also worth noting that this exchange happened during a transition as students entered Maestro’s class from previous rooms, so conversations at this point had not been steered towards any academic purpose nor any expectations set for rules of interaction other than the mandated language separation presumed to take place between Maestro’s and Ms. Jennifer’s classrooms.

1 J: Ramón, what´d you get?
2 R: Ma::n
gagarré un two (1)
Puros spelling mistakes
3 M: ¿Cómo agarraste un dos?
4 ¿Sacaste la mano y lo agarraste así? (Extends arm and makes snatching motion with hand)
5 R: Noo-
6 J: -(laughing)
7 M: A ver, ¿así? (peers above as if tracking a mosquito in flight before clapping his two hands together above his head)
8 ¿Cómo se agarra un dos?
9 J: (laughing)
This interaction is important in a number of ways. On the one hand, it exemplifies Maestro’s playful tone with the students and his insistence on keeping learning lighthearted and fun. On the other, it demonstrates an adherence to standardized varieties even in informal and unstructured conversations among students during transitions. Ironically, Maestro’s rejection of the expanded semantics of agarrar in this instance belies his own socialization into lower prestige varieties of Spanish (Maestro proudly touted his upbringing in a Chicano community in East Los Angeles), evidenced by his addition of final /s/ to second person singular verbs in lines 15 and 18, when he slows his speech to emphasize alternatives for agarrar. These features appear in numerous popular varieties of Spanish, including the Chicano Spanish variety with which Maestro often identified.

In more formally structured contexts, harmful ideologies around conceptualizations of language and language learning could also be seen. During both the ELD and SLD (Spanish Language Development) blocks, instruction was highly regimented and focused on approaches to language as a sum of component parts. In both English and Spanish, extensive instructional time was used in teaching parts of speech, including the distribution of word lists that students could use in their writing. For example, in one SLD project for which students had to draw a map and write a
corresponding narrative of a protagonist traversing the depicted landscape, students were given lists of adjectives, verbs, and adverbs to make their stories more interesting. Similarly, as essays comparing two texts were an integral part of 5th grade assessment (both on the CST and in the reclassification of students classified as ELLs), teachers resorted to offering model essays that students could copy, substituting their own selected text titles and supporting details for those used in the teacher model (for instance, Maestro wrote an essay comparing a Sherlock Holmes story and TV show episode as a guideline for students to compare the book and graphic novel of *El mago de Oz*).

Students in both SLD and ELD completed numerous worksheets filling in blanks with correct verb conjugations, pronouns, and spellings, all designed to mirror tasks they would be asked to complete on standardized tests. These overt monoglossic practices had clear consequences on how students viewed language varieties, and the matched guise tests brought these to the surface.

“*It’s a Mexican cowboy!*” Language Attitudes in the Matched Guise Tests

The final important component in understanding the monolingual and monoglossic ideologies at work at Rivera are the matched guise tests administered to students in Spanish and English. In both cases, students heard the same speaker narrate a short sequence about children playing baseball. The ratings themselves show significant attitudinal differences towards the speakers, but some of the ancillary conversation also proved instructive.
In the first administration, a narration in standardized English was paired against a non-native Spanish influenced English narration. The former was chosen because of its high status in language hierarchies. As Carmen Fought (2006) notes,

Middle class Latinos in the communities that have been studied often use a variety that contains few or no vernacular grammatical structures. Also, there is pressure to use a standard variety in the school setting, and at least some children will use a different variety there than they do at home.” (p. 74)

The latter variety was chosen on the basis of combining findings from past attitudinal research. Carranza (1982) notes in his comprehensive review of the literature on attitudinal research on Hispanic language varieties that earlier attitudinal studies of Latino speech patterns isolated phonological elements. Thus, the second narration featured two main phonological variants commonly associated with non-native Spanish influenced English, the tense realization of /I/ (such as “heet” instead of “hit”), and the occasional substitution of stops for interdental fricatives (/t/ and /d/ for fricatives /θ/ and /δ/, such as “trow” in place of “throw”). Morphosyntactically, the low prestige guise adopted features of Latino English varieties, particularly Chicano English (Fought, 2006), as the extended semantics of “barely” was used once in the latter narrative (“He barely got to bat” to refer to the player who previously batted). The reasoning behind combining features of two distinct varieties into one guise was to encapsulate features found among students in the class without having to resort to yet another guise (one featuring immigrant speech characteristics and another isolating US Latino speech features, although this is certainly fertile ground for future attitudinal work). Moreover, the literature on attitudinal studies and language variation in US Latino speech
communities indicates the co-occurrence of these features on the community and individual level (Fought, 2006). Pooled variables were assembled from the mean for all traits evaluating the speaker’s language proficiency (fluency, grammar, vocabulary, overall English) and positive traits (intelligence, humility, responsibility, friendliness). Table 15 shows the T scores for the corresponding difference in mean ratings in both cases.

Table 15 - T-scores for mean differences in ratings of English matched guises (** = statistically significant with 99% confidence)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Matched Guise Pair</th>
<th>Mean and SD Language Proficiency Rating</th>
<th>T-Score</th>
<th>Mean Positive Personality Rating</th>
<th>T-Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Standardized English and Spanish-</td>
<td>m=4.217 sd=1.084 m=3.261 sd=0.964</td>
<td>t(45)=-5.927** p&lt;0.01</td>
<td>m=3.696 sd=0.881 m=2.783 sd=0.846</td>
<td>t(45)=-5.707** p&lt;0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>influenced English</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The resulting T-scores, significant at the 99% level, suggest a significantly lower rating on both language proficiency and positive personality traits for the speaker of Spanish-influenced English. The linear regression testing the relationship between ethnicity and ratings returns a statistically insignificant value, most likely due to the small sample size in each category (Latino and non-Latino). These findings mirror the reports given by students and parents in interviews or evident in transcripts of classroom interaction. Similar results are evident for Spanish variation.

In the Spanish matched guise, the same narrative was offered two more times. The first was in Standardized Central American Spanish, the latter with variables characteristic of Spanish in the norma popular register. Phonologically, the ending of “para” was aspirated (“pa”) repeatedly in the narrative while, in lexical terms, “nadien”
was used once in place of “nadie” and “asina” used multiple times instead of the standardized “así” in descriptions of the baseball game. A humorous interlude interrupted this administration of the matched guise when Thomas blurted, “It’s a Mexican cowboy!” as the second narration took place. Maestro had repeatedly corrected students for their use of “nadien” (although he used it from time to time in conversation), and Thomas was thus primed to associate such cues with informal, perhaps rural, and uneducated speech. Table 16 shows the T-scores between the mean ratings of each speaker’s overall language proficiency and positive characteristics.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Matched Guise Pair</th>
<th>Mean Language Proficiency Rating</th>
<th>T-Score</th>
<th>Mean Positive Personality Rating</th>
<th>T-Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Norma culta Spanish and norma popular/rural</td>
<td>m=4.826 sd=0.839 m=4.087 sd=0.639</td>
<td>t(45)= -3.453*** p&lt;0.01</td>
<td>m=3.862 sd=0.826 m=3.174 sd=0.899</td>
<td>t(45)= -4.026** p&lt;0.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Once again, the overall ratings across speakers were statistically significant while the linear regression testing the relationship between ethnicity and speaker rating was not. Nevertheless, this speaks, perhaps, to the broad acceptance of language ideologies among students, such that regardless of their ethnicity and prevalent language socialization circles students still adhered to the same notions of what constituted proper language and what personal characteristics are indexed by speaking in standardized varieties.
Conclusion

In short, Rivera’s rhetoric praising bilingualism and multiculturalism belies the persistence of widespread ideologies prizing English monolingualism and monoglossic perspectives towards both Spanish and English. Patterns of language practices shifting to greater proportions of English expression among Latino students, removal of students classified as English learners from mainstream instruction for English language-as-subject remediation, and the pressures of accountability in high-stakes testing all demonstrate the pressure towards English operating at Rivera. Simultaneously, the nature of the Language! curriculum that emphasizes phonics, vocabulary, and grammar through drills and explicit instruction, the emphasis on vocabulary, sentence frames, and model essays in language instruction, the school-wide insistence on language separation, and the patterns of language correction in class speak to the monoglossic approaches to both Spanish and English.

Students, parents, and teachers alike expressed negative opinions of translanguaging practices such as code switching and use of non-standard varieties in communication. Whether in interviews, teacher correction practices, curriculum choices, or speaker ratings in matched guise tests, preferences for standardized varieties of both Spanish and English were clear. While most also expressed awareness of language variation on regional levels, few recognized the consequences for those speaking non-standardized varieties within any given territory. The insidiousness of this lack of attention to language ideology at work is that the negatively described and rated languaging practices in fact mirrored those of most of the Latino students in the class.
Chapter 5: 
Translanguaging and Learning at Rivera

Introduction: The Third Spaces within Rivera

The myriad pressures reinforcing monoglossic and monolingual ideologies at Rivera might suggest a grim picture for teaching and learning practices, particularly those around language pedagogies. Nevertheless, as the snapshot from the introduction suggests, Maestro Quintara and Ms. Jennifer both preside over highly interactive classrooms, and their vigilance for language “purity” is frequently in tension with their rooted beliefs in the value of student interactions, cooperation, and inquiry as valuable learning resources. With this latter philosophy in mind, both teachers frequently structured classroom assignments to include collaboration among students of diverse linguistic backgrounds and let students engage with a series of communicative modalities in any single assignment, including videos, music, and a host of online resources from the Internet, books in both Spanish and English, and some degree of choice in the final work product.

This chapter concerns itself with the second important set of findings from the study, the manner in which students deployed their broad array of linguistic resources to support their learning and meaning-making activities in the classroom and the manner in which teachers enabled and even facilitated this resourcefulness. In so doing, this chapter considers two important theoretical constructs. The first is cultural theorist Homi Bhabha’s (1994) concept of the Third Space. Bhabha poses the Third Space in terms of colonial and post-colonial terms, referencing the potential for hybrid identities of those in
post-colonial states situating them as simultaneously oppressed by the legacies of colonial reign yet empowered to overturn racial and economic hierarchies, stating,

It is significant that the productive capacities of this Third Space have a colonial or postcolonial provenance. For a willingness to descend into the alien territory – where I have led you – may reveal that the theoretical recognition of the split-space of enunciation may open the way to conceptualizing an international culture, based not on the exoticism of multiculturalism or the diversity of cultures, but on the inscription and articulation of culture’s hybridity. To that end we should remember that it is the ‘inter’- the cutting edge of translation and negotiation, the inbetween space – that carries the burden of the meaning of culture. It makes it possible to begin envisaging national, anti-nationalist histories of ‘the people.’ And by exploring this Third Space, we may elude the politics of polarity and emerge as the others of ourselves.” (Bhabha 1994, p. 39)

This concept of the Third Space thus signals a site of resistance and upheaval to longstanding ideologies as those on the margins refute their position. Inherent to this uprising is a renegotiation of identity that occurs in the Third Space in which Bhabha notes the trappings of cultural scripts can be claimed and subverted.

“It is that Third Space, though unrepresentable in itself, which constitutes the discursive conditions of enunciations that ensure that the meaning of symbols of culture have no primordial unity or fixity; that even the same signs can be appropriated, translated, rehistoricized and read anew.” (Bhabha, 1994, p. 37)

Of course, these negotiations of identity and cultural practice are not without conflict. Chicana feminist Gloria Anzaldúa (1987) notes the inevitable clash when cultural
positions in any *frontera* identity are reconciled, “Like others having or living in more than one culture, we get multiple, often opposing messages. The coming together of two self-consistent but habitually incomparable frames of reference causes *un choque*, a cultural collision. (p. 78) Bhabha similarly evokes this notion of borderlines to represent the conflict when members of historically oppressed groups enter spaces of contestation to affirm the rights of modernity and self-determination of post-colonialism, “The non-synchronous temporality of global and national cultures opens up a cultural space - a third space - where the negotiation of incommensurable differences creates a tension peculiar to borderline existence.” (Bhabha, 1994; p. 218) Thus, the Third Space describes liminal and physical spaces in which individuals, through interaction, renegotiate identities and power relations otherwise ossified in society.

This concept of the Third Space has been incorporated into educational research repeatedly, in considerations of literacy practices and multiliteracies (New London Group, 1996; Skerett, 2010) and themes of culturally relevant pedagogy that seek to reconcile differences between students’ lives at home and at school. Recurrent in all these appropriations and connections are the notions of dynamism and hybridity, as well as the notion of the Third Space as a transformative zone in which societal scripts and hierarchies can be challenged and overturned. In this respect, I draw heavily upon the work of Kris Gutiérrez and her various colleagues, who have repeatedly conceptualized the Third Space in this transformative sense, positioning it as a zone of development in which students belonging to historically marginalized groups subvert hierarchies of status, ability, and power in the classroom to craft hybrid identities and advance their

Gutiérrez, Rymes & Larson (1995) introduce the concept of the Third Space within classrooms to describe how prevalent discourses in society, which they call *transcendent scripts*, shape teachers’ customary relations to students (*teacher scripts*), upheld by students themselves, which suppress dialogue and critical positioning. Students’ resistance to teacher direction or habitual modes of instruction (*student counterscripts*), in turn, challenges these teacher scripts, albeit in a way that conforms to the transcendent scripts by likewise avoiding dialogue and intersubjectivity. In certain moments, however, the authors note that students pose critical questions that diverge from student disruptiveness but likewise draw the teacher away from habitual practice to create dialogic interactions in which the teacher recognizes students’ curiosity and experiences. These moments represent heteroglossic spaces in the classroom in which multiple voices contribute to the meaning-making endeavor, as the authors represent with Figure 3 below.

*Figure 3 - Third Space as Place for Contesting Societal Scripts in the Classroom (Gutierrez, Rymes & Larson, 1995, p. 453)*

As the figure indicates, dialogue in the Third Space does not always counter
transcendent scripts with regard to power relations (hence the short arrow), but it can at
times do just that (represented by the long arrow). To describe these instances in which
classroom heteroglossia disrupts transcendent scripts, Gutiérrez, Baquedano-López &
Turner (1997) note,

The third space in learning environments refers to a place where two scripts or
two normative patterns of interaction intersect, creating the potential for authentic
interaction and learning to occur. This is a new sociocultural terrain in which a
space for shifts in what counts as knowledge and knowledge representation is
created (p. 372)

The findings presented in this chapter echo this tone. In this chapter, I argue that as
teachers fostered environments rich in creativity and interaction, student interactions
challenged transcendent scripts about power relations in the classroom and linguistic
hierarchies in ways that fostered and advanced learning.

This brings us to the second important theoretical construct discussed in this
chapter: translanguaging as a practice and as a stance. In terms of practice, this reflects
what JØrgensen (2008) characterizes simply as languaging, which the author uses in
targeted fashion to describe the linguistic work of Turkish-Danish teens, stating, “We use
the term languaging for this behavior: language users employ whatever linguistic features
are at their disposal with the intention of achieving their communicative aims.” (p. 169).
García’s concept of translanguaging elaborates on this concept of languaging, adding to
it the interpretive and synthesizing capacities upon which language users depend. To
emphasize this meaning-making facet, I reiterate García’s definition of translanguaging
presented in the introduction, in which García introduces translanguaging as “multiple
discursive practices in which bilinguals engage in order to make sense of their bilingual worlds. Translanguaging therefore goes beyond what has been termed code-switching.” (2009, p. 45, emphasis in origingal)

Translanguaging as a stance, meanwhile, refers to the acknowledgement of the theoretical underpinnings of said language practices. Walter Mignolo (1996) deploys the term languaging over a decade before JØrgensen, likewise recognizing the hybridity of language features that speakers deploy in language contact settings, but with additional consideration of identity and power dimensions inherent in language practices. Mignolo (1996) analyzes literary work by authors in post-colonial states who draw upon creole and colonized varieties deliberately to assert empowered, hybrid identities that challenge imperialist relations of power and constructions of knowledge and language purity,

It is languaging, rather than language, that Arguedas and Cliff allow us to emphasize, moving away from the idea that language is a fact (e.g.: a system of syntactic, semantic, and phonetic rules) toward the idea that speaking and writing are moves that orient and manipulate social domains of interaction. (1996, p. 188)

García herself cites Mignolo in the explanation of translanguaging as a stance and conceptualization of language, adding to his original context the interactional component of language use in classrooms and speech communities. Asserting this empowering function of hybrid language practices, García (in press) writes,

I argue that for US Latinos, translanguaging offers the alternative of performing a dynamic bilingualism that releases them from the constraints of both an “Anglophone” ideology that demands English monolingualism for US citizens, and a “Hispanophone” ideology that blames US Latinos for speaking “Spanglish.”
In short, *translanguaging* refers both to the language practices of multilingual and multidialectal individuals who draw upon the breadth of their linguistic repertoires for meaning making and communicative function as well as to the conceptualization of language from this repertoire perspective which emphasizes the dynamic and contextually responsive nature of languaging patterns.

Returning to Rivera, this chapter will show how despite the pressures of monolingual and monoglossic ideologies, both teachers fostered plenty of open collaboration among students and, by extension, allowed for a *third space* in which activities are reorganized and extended resulting in new learning opportunities. While often stressing a monolingual final product that conformed to the norms of standardization that state tests and curricula demanded, both Maestro Quintara and Ms. Jennifer allowed students to draw on their ample linguistic repertoires during the group work that preceded final drafts of persuasive essays, oral presentations, written fictional narratives, book reports, and math worksheets, among other assignments. In these third spaces created by minimally regulated conversation, students used translanguaging strategies frequently and effectively to impart, clarify, and construct knowledge with others. Once more, the particular functions for which translanguaging was deployed are coded in line with the work of Rebecca Benjamin (1993) repeated from chapter 2 in Table 17 below, which reflects the classroom and work-related functions that Benjamin uses in her analysis. The following transcripts exemplify several of these scenarios.
**Table 17 - Functions of Language (Benjamin, 1993, p. 98-99)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Functions of Speech</th>
<th>Speech Acts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Classroom/Work-related</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Getting help</td>
<td>Asking for assistance, asking for clarification, asking for information, asking for confirmation, requesting action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Conveying information</td>
<td>Explaining, stating facts, clarifying</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Guiding collaboration</td>
<td>Suggesting plan, offering assessment, offering confirmation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Conveying Information**

**Elsa and Narissa explore fractions**

A frequent reason for students to translanguage was for the conveyance of information to others. Often in these cases students used linguistic knowledge from one code to communicate disciplinary knowledge in another. In this particular transcript, focal student Elsa (E) collaborates with another student, Narissa (N), who comes to Maestro Quintara’s class for math instruction, which is leveled at Rivera by scores on the previous year’s CST. The two use their lexical knowledge of Spanish in conjunction with a disciplinary schema for mathematics, which is taught in English as they play a game intended to help solidify their understanding of the vocabulary and concept of fractions in which the girls take turns rolling two dice. The first die indicates the numerator of a fraction, and the second die the denominator. Each girl writes down her fraction and accompanies the numeric form with a representative illustration, such as a circle divided into equally sized wedges with the number of wedges represented in numerator shaded.
N: Okay
Put the denominator
And the numerator – 
E: Okay =
N: =Wait
You don’t know how to play
E: Oh yeah
(xxx)
N: No::
El numerador es el de arriba!
E: Okay [corrects worksheet, gives dice to N]
Go.
N: Six

In this interaction, Narissa (classified as an intermediate ELL) is helping Elsa (and advanced ELL) correctly arrange her written fraction. After rolling the dice, Elsa attempts to write down her result but, following the order in which Narissa initially told her to write the fraction in lines 2 and 3 of the transcript, inverts the numerator and the denominator. Narissa corrects her by drawing on their Spanish lexical repertoire to communicate the position of the numerator with respect to the denominator (“on top”), but maintaining the English item “numerator” since it is the way the concept has been taught and the way it will be assessed. Elsa’s confusion is resolved, whether it was a confusion about the definitions of numerator and denominator or of the rules of the game, and she is able to complete her worksheet in English not despite but rather because of Narissa’s instructions in Spanish, which both clarify the terms and emphasize the game sequence.
Max, Jenny, and Kellen debate the fantasy genre

In a second example of students conveying information to one another, Maestro Quintara (Q) drops in on a small group as it discusses its reading of El mago de Oz, a Spanish translation of Frank L. Baum’s The Wonderful Wizard of Oz (1900/1985), and a graphic novel in Spanish based on the same work. The group is comprised by focal student Max (M) and his classmates Kellen (K) and Jenny (J) (both Max and Kellen are considered “native English speakers by the school even though Max’s parents speak Swiss-German to him at home, while Jenny is a reclassified proficient English learner), and is brainstorming ways in which the stories resemble one another as well as how they differ, an assignment geared towards meeting an element of the new Common Core State Standards with regard to literature. In addition, the whole class has been instructed to particularly focus on the indicators of the fantasy genre within the text, for which the students have been provided the mnemonic, las tres Ms, (the three “m”s), - magic, monsters, and medievalism. In this exchange, the students attempt to reconcile seeming anachronisms in the story – the presence of castles in the kingdom of Oz contemporaneous to modern towns in the parallel story of Dorothy’s life in Kansas. Maestro guides their learning with questions rather than directives, allowing students to draw from their experiences and prior knowledge, and further lets them elaborate these ideas using the breadth of their linguistic resources. He begins by letting Kellen describe a visit to a castle in Ireland that he took with his family to try resolve whether or not castles and towns can coexist.

1 Q: Y Kellen
2 Tú, cuando estabas visitando este castillo
¿Cómo te pareció?
Te pareció que había gente viviendo adentro del castillo?
K: No=
Q: =¿O fuera del castillo?
K: Fuera del castillo=
Q: =Fuera del castillo
K: En el centro había mucho espacio(.)
Como un: courtyard
Y entonces no:
no tenía espacio cio para los hogares
Q: O
A:m:::
¿Quién sigue después de Kellen?
Max?
M: (xx)
Q: Max(1)
Okay(.)
Jenny
J: Entonces el castillo
Es como un:
neighborhood(.)
Una vecindad
Q: Puede ser(.)
como una vecindad=
J: =Como una vecindad(.)
m:hm:
Una vecindad

Thus far, Maestro has fostered the third space in two ways. First, he draws upon earlier social conversations with Kellen and invites his expertise into the discussion about castles and medieval social organization. Such invitations clearly subvert the transcendent and teacher scripts that Gutiérrez, Rymes & Larson (1995) critique, in which the teacher’s particular cultural practices and notions of what constitutes knowledge are normalized and valued above students’ knowledge and experience.
Secondly, while Maestro initially imposes the turn-taking structures of a whole class discussion in lines 17-22 by calling on individual students who seem to have something on their minds, he lets the discussion flow into a more conversational tone, evidenced in lines 26-30 as Maestro and Jenny go back and forth offering the terms vecindad and neighborhood to reframe Kellen’s suggestion that outside the castle there was a courtyard area in which a town could possibly be established. In this exchange, moreover, Maestro does not correct students’ translanguaging as they share their experiences and ideas bilingually, whether because of lexical need or simple preference. This openness in the exchange, meanwhile, not only allows students to convey their own ideas, but also to engage with others’, as evidenced in lines 24-26 when Jenny suggests a neighborhood could indeed exist near the castle as opposed to Kellen’s contention that one could not.

Moving on to the next portion of the interaction, Max now articulates the thought he has been formulating as Kellen, Jenny, and Maestro discussed the layout of the medieval castle Kellen described. Once more, Maestro is inviting students’ prior knowledge and allowing conversation to flow without his direction of turns. In this exchange, Max offers his hypothesis as to how the settings of Kansas and Oz can coexist without it necessarily indicating a magical shift across dimensions.

32 Q: Puede ser(.)
33 M: [Um:
34   La(.)
35   La:
36 ¿La historia fue escrita en qué año?
37 Q: Um::
38 Fue escrita
39 En mil novecientos veinte(,) o treinta
40 M: So, sÍ(,)
41 Puede [ser que
42 Q: [Antes=
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M: =fue(.)
Fue hacido como futuro
Para ese periodo de tiempo
Q: Puede ser(.)
M: Um:
Asi que(.)
Yo pienso
que: es
Time period de
match Kansas and Oz(.)
Pienso que:
es del time period
that they were exploring the Arctic(.)
Porque:
ya tenían(.) carros(.)
and big cities
Y también there are
Still some
(x) castles(.)
and kings
and whatnot=
Q: =Mhm::
M: =More than now
There still are some(.)
Um::
Y::
Could also match Oz(.)
´cause they(..)
Yeah(.)
Oz would be(.)
That time period
Except they have=
J: =They just have cities
M: Yeah=
J: =There´s a train [pointing to illustration in graphic novel]
Q: Y dentro de la ciudad
Se pueden ver las casas, los hogares donde
donde viven las personas(.)
los habitantes de:
de la Ciudad de las Esmeraldas
y hasta parece que tenemos un tren dentro del palacio.

Um:

Y así es cómo yo me imagino los castillos durante el tiempo. 

M: Yo creo que yo creo que Frank L. Baum, Él tiene un montón de ideas de tiempos de:

So like um de medievalismo. Y después de:

Ahí por Mil ochocientos cincuenta=

Q: =(mhm:)

M: Y ahí pues

→ Los combinó

Max offers a possibility informed by his independent reading in lines 51-63. He suggests there could be a “match” between the Land of Oz and Kansas in terms of American cities and towns coexisting with kingdoms elsewhere (probably Europe). Jenny elaborates on Max's suggestion proposing a spatial distinction, whereby in Kansas “they just have cities” (line 75) as opposed to the possible setting of Oz where society is still organized into kingdoms. Nevertheless, Jenny contests this simple explanation by pointing to more evidence of modernity coinciding with medieval vestiges in the form of
an illustration of a train (line 77). She has understood Max’s bilingual proposition and countered with her own observation. Despite the facts that the discussion is about two texts in Spanish, that it is taking place during the Spanish instruction block, and that Jenny has the lexical knowledge in Spanish to comply with this organization if she so chooses, Jenny opts for English in making her point. Quite possibly this is demonstrative of her appropriate reading of her interlocutors and wanting to ensure that her suggestion is taken up by her peers, not just by Maestro. As Maestro attempts to reconcile the possibility of medieval castles and trains, Jenny once more interjects (line 91), and ultimately Max concedes that Frank L. Baum most likely combined medieval elements with those of the late 19th Century in weaving a fantasy tale (lines 108, 109).

Once again, the interaction embodies a third space where the teacher’s authority in structuring discussion or even offering ideas can be contested and in which translanguaging thrives, evidenced by the way in which students break the official rule of language separation and debate Maestro’s vision of medieval castles (line 91). Curriculum mandates of Spanish monolingualism are eschewed for dynamic bilingualism that possibly facilitate the expression and assimilation of ideas, and a key understanding in terms of the story corresponding to the fantasy genre is negotiated by the group.

**Elsa and Melissa prepare a science report**

A final representative instance of translanguaging enabling the conveyance of information can be seen as Elsa and Melissa complete a worksheet that will serve as their outline for an informational text and presentation. The two have been assigned to gather information about an element of their choosing from the periodic table. Information for
the project can be sought in the students’ science textbooks, in a series of other books that Maestro has brought into the class, or on the Internet as pairs of students take turns at the classroom’s three computers. Melissa and Elsa are just beginning their 15-minute turn at one of the computers and make extensive use of their dynamic bilingualism to guide their inquiry based on a worksheet that is in Spanish, websites in English, and their own exchanges. During this particular work, Elsa is in control of the keyboard and mouse as Melissa sits beside her giving directions and reading from the worksheet the girls are completing.

1 M: Well(.)
2 Tenemos que ir [a Google
3 E: [Es como un gas
4 So(.)=
5 M: =Tenemos que ir a Google(.)
6 File(.) [Directing Elsa to move the mouse by pointing at the monitor]
7 E: Ya voy a ir(.)
8 Va↑mos
9 M: Now we’re gonna go(.)
10 Vamos a File(.) [Directing mouse as both look at computer monitor]
11 Y luego vamos a ir(.)
12 New Window:()
13 Luego(.)
14 E: Voy a i:r(.)
15 Google(.)
16 Voy a poner(.)
17 Elemento neon(.) [typing into search bar]
18 Ne:on:
19 ‘kay↑?
20 E:l:e:m:e:n::to::
21 M: And then you’re gonna(.)
22 Vas a poner:=
23 E: =Images?
24 M: No(.)
25 Um:(.)
26 E: (xxx)
This first portion of the collaboration perfectly exemplifies García’s characterization of translinguaging as a meaning-making endeavor in bilingual worlds. Elsa and Melissa, tasked with an assignment in Spanish, readily manipulate commands in English on the computer (presented in lines 6-18 as the girls open a web browser and type and begin to explore Internet search results in English as well. Of course, this task is not accomplished without a good deal of information being conveyed. In lines 2 and 6, we observe Melissa (an intermediate ELL scoring below basic on her ELA CST) directing Elsa as to the computer commands needed to open a new web browser. Elsa partly heeds Melissa’s direction but also makes clear in lines 14-20 as she enters the search terms that she too knows her way with computers. Then, in lines 34-38, both girls interpret the results generated by the Google search, deciding on one particularly promising link (line 38). All of this is accomplished in translinguaging exchanges – information coming and going between the two students and the computer, blurring language boundaries every step of the way. In the latter portion of the transcript, we observe Elsa and Melissa further delving into and expanding their linguistic repertoires as they shift back and forth.
between the Spanish worksheet and the English website, incorporating newly learned content area vocabulary into their discussion.

39 E: Okay(.) so neon
40 Okay su:
41 M: Atomic number(.)
42 Tienes que poner su atomic number
43 E: No(.) okay(.)
44 M: Atomic number(.) [Reading from computer monitor]
45 Symbol(.)
46 Número atómico(.)
47 E: Número atómico↑::(.)
48 Diez(.)
49 Um(:.)
50 M: Símbolo(.) [Reading from worksheet]
51 E: Okay(.)
52 Atomic weight?(.) [Elsa points to atomic weight on monitor]
53 Okay(.)
54 M: Um(:.)
55 Okay(.)
56 Elemental (xx)
57 E: ¿Tienes que poner su volumen?
58 No, su(.)
59 Well(.) colorless(.) [Reading from screen]
60 Okay(.) so it’s colorless
61 It’s(.)
62 [Odorless(.)
63 M: [Estado de materia(.)
64 Punto de ebullición (Reading from worksheet)
65 E: Aquí dice
66 Colorless (.) odorless (.) and tasteless gas [Reading from screen]
67 M: Vamos a poner (xxx)
68 E: Why don’t we just put odorless?
69 M: Okay
70 Um(:.)

As Melissa reads from the items to be filled out on the worksheet, Elsa scrolls through the webpage looking for the key words Melissa offers. In lines 41-46, Melissa
conveys that the worksheet calls for the número atómico, and subsequently directs Elsa to find the atomic number as it is presented on the webpage the girls are consulting. She reframes the request into Spanish in line 46 and Elsa acknowledges the query and responds in turn (line 48). As Melissa continues offering items for Elsa to find on the webpage (lines 50, 56, 63, 64), Elsa in turn demonstrates her ability to extract information herself and offers it to Melissa (lines 52, 57, 65, 68). As the girls navigate their way through the worksheet and the website, they display and build upon their proficiency in using technology to acquire information and vocabulary specific to their current unit in the science curriculum. They do this without minding monolingual pressures – whether those of a website entirely in English or a class supposedly entirely in Spanish. And contrary to the dogmatic thinking that would prohibit such linguistic shifts, these translanguage conveyances of information back and forth in no way hinder (and may even enable) Elsa and Melissa to complete their outline, which will later allow them to compose a brief informational text and make an oral presentation to their peers.

**Getting Help**

**Max has questions for Arielle**

Another common manifestation of translanguageing in the classroom occurred when students drew upon multiple codes to solicit knowledge or clarification. In this particular interaction, Max has questions about another student’s fictional narrative. After reading El mago de Oz and completing the aforementioned assignment exploring genre, the students have been asked to compose their own fantastic narratives. Just like
Baum’s work and the graphic novel that the class used as a support, the narrative is to be accompanied by a map that illustrates where the protagonist begins the story and where different plot events take place, and students are to present their narratives and maps to the class in Spanish. Arielle, another student classified as a native English speaker by the school (although whose family includes Puerto Rican grandparents on one side with whom she reports speaking in Spanish), is presenting her story, which builds on the Disney film “Spirit: Stallion of the Cimarron” (2002) about a wild horse that escapes efforts by members of US Cavalry to capture and domesticate it. This in itself marks translanguaging as Arielle uses media in English to inform the creative work she is crafting in Spanish, but central to this particular element of analysis is the fact that Max, not initially grasping that Arielle’s story is a sequel to the film, asks for clarification drawing on both Spanish and English within his repertoire, and in turn receiving elucidation from Arielle and Maestro Quintara in dynamic bilingual exchanges.

1 M: No entendí cuando.
2 En el.
3 El esquema.
4 No entendí.
5 Bueno era bueno.
6 Pero no entendí qué um:
7 Qué.
8 ¿Qué es la historia?
9 ➔ He escaped from the soldiers.
10 Pero no entendí qué está haciendo ahora.
11 Q: ¿Quizás aún no sabemos todavía.
12 A: That’s my prologue.
13 Q: Muy, muy buena [pregunta.
14 M: [Oh, pensé que el esquema=
15 Q: =Eso es todavía[ el inicio –
16 A: [It’s the same thing
17 ➔ Q: Es el inicio.
18 O sea it’s the first part.
19 (xxx)
Max demonstrates his translanguaging abilities here to solicit clarification. In lines 1-8, he offers praise for the narrative (line 5) but tempers his praise with a question about the plot arc (line 8). Both of these things are achieved in Spanish. He demonstrates what he has managed to understand in line 9, stating in English a summary of what Arielle has thus far presented, which is merely a synopsis of the original Disney film that serves as the prologue to her own story but that Max has mistaken for the entirety of the tale. Perhaps acknowledging that the source material for this prologue is a film the students most likely encountered in English, he utters this summary in English before rephrasing his question in line 10 in Spanish. Both Maestro Quintara and Arielle respond that what has been shared so far is merely the beginning, Arielle doing so in English (line 12) at the same time that Maestro Quintara does so in Spanish (line 11). After Maestro Quintara doubly clarifies that the prologue is simply the beginning of the story in lines 17 and 18, himself blurring language boundaries to ensure Max’s comprehension, Max affirms his newfound understanding (line 21) and encapsulating the source of his initial doubt (lines 23 and 24) with intra-sentential codeswitches. Thus, Max builds upon prior knowledge of a story in English and his classmate’s retelling in Spanish to ask for information about how her story departs from the original. When Arielle and Maestro Quintara respond in both English and Spanish simultaneously, he assimilates the information and, in both languages, expresses his new understanding.
Melissa, Susana, and Cristina study the periodic table

Preceding the work on individual elements of the periodic table, the class learned about the table itself – how it is arranged, what the respective symbols and numbers and their positions mean, and the properties of particular groups in the table. In this particular activity, students are listing and describing the transition and post-transition metals, focusing on some that are commonly found in industrial and commercial uses such as iron, tin, aluminum, copper, gold, silver, lead, and so on. In this first lesson of the series, students are listing the metals and objects made from them, along with illustrations. Afterward, they will discuss the commonalities among all the objects listed to compile a list of the properties of metals. The following transcript captures the interaction between focal student Melissa and her classmates Susana and Cristina, both US-born Latinas classified as ELLs who have been enrolled at Rivera since the 1st grade.

1  S:  Melissa
2  M:  hu::h?
3  S:  Meli↑ssa
4  C:  Me(.)(i(.))ssa
5  S:  Necesito ayuda
6  C:  Me(.)(i(.))ssa
7  S:  Necesito ayuda también
8  S:  Ella(.) ella
9  C:  Um:
10  S:  Algo que sea de metal(2)
11  M:  ¿Necesitas ayuda?
12  S:  [Sí
13  C:  [Sí
14  S:  Cristina necesita (.)
15  M:  ¿Cómo puedes hacer algo de metal?
16  C:  Uh(.)(u:h
17  S:  Necesitamos otra cosa de metal
18  M:  Um:(.)muchas veces(.)
19  S:  Um:
20  M:  Hay(1)  (dangles keys)
¿Como éste verdad?

¿Puedo trazar tu llave?

M: M:hm:: [Hands keys to Cristina, Cristina traces a key]

C: That’s my ugly key

S: Me gusta tu llave

C: Gracias Melissa [Hands keys back to Melissa]

M: De nada

C: Now what can (xx)

S: Um:

C: (xxx)

S: (xxx)

¿Ques otra cosa de metal?

M: ¿No sabes ques otra cosa de metal?

C: No

M: ¿Sabes ques metal?

C: ¿Qué?

M: Este:: [points to pencil lead]

C: ¡Ah!↑

¡Lá↑piz!

S: ¿Lápiz?

C: La punta!

S: No:::

M: La punta es de [metal

S: [No(.) no:

C: What about:

El::

¿Éste del folder? [points to metal rings in binder]

No:

S: ¿Cómo lo puedes dibujar?

M: Éste [pointing to TV in classroom]

No(.)

la televisión no es de metal(.)

Verdá↑

C: M:m:: [nodding “no”]

A veces el arte-

Los a::

Los are:tes:(.)
A great deal of help and information is being requested and exchanged in this interaction. Susana and Cristina, sitting on one side of the table, ask Melissa, seated across from them, for help coming up with common items made of metal. After Melissa offers her keys as an example, Cristina draws from her hybrid language inventory in line 25 by using trazar as a cognate for trace. This is an example of the dynamic nature of language as a word that purists would recognize as meaning to simply draw or sketch as per dictionary definitions has evolved to include this meaning, a common phenomenon especially in bilingual communities whereby an original lexical item experiences semantic extension. Moreover, Cristina uses English, a frequent code for social interaction, to make her aside about her disappointment in the result of her attempts to trace one of Melissa’s keys on her paper (line 27).

Translanguaging continues to play a helpful role as the girls expand their list. In lines 50 and 62, Cristina and Susana respectively offer suggestions without regard for language boundaries and drawing on the resources of both languages, particularly evident in Susana’s statement in which she uses the English ring immediately after Cristina has offered anillos. In this exchange, unencumbered by the boundaries of a curriculum that would rigidly divide Spanish and English, the girls succeed in thinking of numerous items made of metal, a first step in their understanding of the properties of metals in their study of the periodic table of elements. Translanguaging, even in simple tasks like asking
for keys or naming common objects, thus serves a valuable role in the learning processes of these emergent bilingual children.

**Guiding Collaboration**

**Rhea and Ana outline a narrative**

Translanguaging greatly aids the students at Rivera not only in their communication of known information or their requests from others, but also in the generation of new ideas. As students in Maestro Quintara’s class collaborate, they emerge with deeper understandings of content matter and language. In this particular instance, focal student Rhea (R) is working with her friend and classmate, Ana (A) to compose a narrative in the fantasy genre. This is the next phase of the assignment in which we earlier observed Max questioning Arielle’s story outline. At this stage, students are taking their general outlines and the maps for the story and converting them to prose. Rhea and Ana have outlined a story in which the hero begins in a poor community and must travel through mountain ranges and forests to reach the wealthy city in which the villain resides (not unlike Dorothy being transported from rural Kansas and venturing to the opulent Emerald City in *El mago de Oz*, the foundational story for the unit). As the students craft their narratives, they must mold the stories into an outline they have been given that asks them to describe each setting in which a major plot event occurs, the characters involved, and the particular event that makes it important to the narrative arc. The settings and events are to be presented chronologically, and, in an effort to draw attention to descriptive language, Maestro Quintara has given out two
sheets of paper with word lists - one for describing geographical terrain and the other
with adjectives that can be used to establish tone in the story by speaking to characters’
emotional state. As Rhea and Ana plan their narrative, they must reach agreement on the
particular words they plan to use from the lists, and in this regard, access to their full
linguistic repertoires proves invaluable to the discussion.

1   A:   Okay
2   [Haznos sentir como si estuvieras allí]   [Reading directions]
3   R:   So la ciudad de los héroes debe como(.)
4   A:   oler como:
5   Like colors
6   R:   como (xx) y flores
7   Sí, el casa del
8   A:   [La↑]
9   R:   El casa de los héroes debe ser
10  A:   [LA!]
11  R:   No(.) El casa del pobre y el héroe (. ) sí
12  →   Pero la casa del malvado sueños
13  Debe tener el olor
14  Como um:
15  A:   Como que vas a morir
16  R:   Sí, es algo
17  Cuando(.)
18  Cuando tú entres al
19  parte de los malvados
20  Tú (.)
21  Tú cuerpo
22  In(.) in(.) instan↑temente se va como
23  A mío no me gu↑sta( )quí↑   [Shuddering and imitating fearfulness]
24  No tienes que ver a las cosas
25  Sólo no lo gustas cuando vas allá
26  A:   Puedes morir
27  R:   Sí(.) tú dijistes
28  Puedes morir con el(.) um(.) olor
29  A:   Um::   [Writing on outline sheet]
30  R:   Huele como::
31  R:   Quizás como(.)
32  Este(.)
¿Piensas que está un nombre bueno el bosque de los muertos?

A: Sí me gusta(,) sí

R: Bueno(,)

Gracias

A: La otra palabra(,)

La otra pregunta y:

Es::

Usa palabras de esta(,)

Del estado de ánimo

R: Um(,) en la casa del héroe

En la casa(,)

Animados(,)

Felices

Felices

R: Y coloreado=

A: =Relajados

R: Relajados y coloreados

Porque no sólo el alrededor

A: Los malv(,) Los malvados están grises y feos

R: Sí(,) si(,) como Kansas en el Mago de Oz

Pero(,) um

Aquí tenemos que(,)

Como las personas también(,)

Como dijiste-

Relajados

Calmados

Todo así pero(,)

Felices

Pero también tienen que ser colo-

Coloreados

de felicidad

Porque el lugar del pobre es coloreado

Tú piensas como si estás (,)

Todos los pobres están muy tristes

Pero aquí son como familia y amigos buenos

A: Sí

As Ana and Rhea progress from an illustrated and labeled map to a story outline, their translanguaging abilities serve them well. First and foremost, they are clearly able
to synthesize linguistic and conceptual inputs from the texts in Spanish of *El mago de Oz* that they have read independently and in class as well as the movie in English that they watched as a class after completing the first writing assignment comparing the novel and the graphic novel. The influence of this latter source is evident when Ana suggests in line 5 that the initial setting, from which the story’s hero originates, is colorful. The movie begins with black and white cinematography portraying Dorothy’s life in rural Kansas, and it is only when the tornado whisks her away to the Land of Oz that the film goes into color format. While in Ana and Rhea’s narrative this color pattern is chronologically inverted (the protagonist’s origins being jovial and in color while the villain’s realm is gray and dreary), the parallel is clear, especially when Rhea expresses it directly in line 52. We can also note that in the third space that this collaborative work has established there are no penalties and recrimination for what would be considered errors in standardized speech practices, as opposed to the transcendent scripts. As Rhea twice mismatches the gender correspondence between the noun *casa* and the definite article *la* (replacing it with the masculine *el*) in lines 7 and 9, Ana interjects with corrections in lines 8 and 10, but lets slide Rhea’s repetition of the pairing in line 11. Rhea nevertheless adjusts her own speech in line 12. Interactions such as this allow students to experiment with language and gradually broaden their linguistic repertoires to meet growing communicative needs (in this case, literary craft), hinting at the possible benefits of translanguaging. The second portion of the interaction reiterates this point, as the girls begin to execute their plan, writing their story outline onto the provided organizer.

69  A:  La casa de (1)  [Writing on worksheet for outline]
70  El (.)
Héroe
R: En la casa del héroe
en la lugar.
Como porque es más como un lugar
No un casa
En el lugar del héroe
Todos están feliz
A: ¿Cómo es habitat en español?
R: Es hábitat
El hábitat del héroe
A: El
Hábitat
[Writing on worksheet]
Del
R: Héroe
A: Héroe
Te sientes
R: Te sientes relajado
Calmado
Y coloreado
Con flores
A: De la-
R: -con colores vibrantes
A: Relajado
R: Calmado
A: Calmado
R: y um:
A: Lleno de color
R: Y lleno de colores vibrantes

In this second portion, we once more see Rhea correcting her own errors of noun-article gender correspondence, this time without Ana’s reminder (lines 73-76, although un casa goes unnoticed). In this same instance, (lines 73-76), Rhea engages in metalinguistic discussion about appropriate labels for the settings being described, noting the inadequacy of casa to capture the breadth of the space they seek to describe and instead recommending lugar. In addition, we see the girls drawing upon and elaborating ideas from past learning. Ana offers the word habitat, and confidently requests Rhea’s
help in translating it for writing (lines 78-80). Clearly, allowing students to draw freely from their linguistic repertoires allows more concerted attention on the academic demands of classroom tasks as well as more elaborate expression (for instance, habitat instead of lugar).

**Elsa and Betsy plan persuasive essays**

As with the previous transcript, this representative interaction demonstrates students’ translanguaging dexterity to plan and execute a piece of writing while jointly pulling from prior knowledge in both Spanish and English to assist them in grasping a new concept. This specific instance once again features Elsa (E), although this time with another classmate, Betsy (B). While both are classified as ELLs, this interaction takes place mostly in English, and indeed the girls are composing a persuasive essay in Ms. Jennifer’s English language arts class in preparation for when they will have to write a persuasive essay in English independently in the assessment to determine whether or not they can be reclassified as proficient. The girls have also written persuasive essays in their Spanish class earlier in the year building from a highly structured model. In this exchange, Betsy is finishing the first draft of her essay while Elsa struggles with hers, and to help her Betsy will retrieve an earlier essay she wrote in Spanish, which she in turn will then revise as helping Elsa gives her an idea. The class has been given a formulaic outline of what a persuasive essay looks like, beginning with the introductory paragraph which they have been told should include a hook, itself consisting of either an onomatopoeic reference or an engaging question, three reasons for the position they are advocating, and a thesis statement that begins with, *For these reasons* before restating the
claim of which they hope to persuade the reader. Having such rigid structure in the task exemplifies the problematic conceptualizations of pathways to language proficiency by focusing on rules and forms, but is secondary for the moment to the linguistic dexterity that Elsa and Betsy demonstrate as they jointly improve their essays.

1   B: I’m done with my whole essa::y::
2     (xxx)
3   E: Nobody asked you::
4   B: How do we re-
5     How do we restate
6   E: The thesis?
7   B: Which one?
8   E: Are you using my paper?
9   B: A ver
10  (xxx)
11  E: Okay then(.) help me then
12  Esto(.)
13  E: Trying to restate the thesis
14  B: A ver
15  E: **Cómo** For these [three reasons
16  B: [So which one are you in?
17     The first one?
18  Oh my:
19  E: You wanna restate your:
20  B: No(.) so this point
21  E: You have to do your reasons
22  B: Restating your thesis
23  E: For these reasons
24  B: You wanna see how we did it in our introduction?
25     (B goes to Maestro to get her other essay)
26  B: It doesn’t says the last one “For these reasons
27  We should…”
28  E: Este no [dice
29     [Tengo tres razones de=
30  B: =Uh huh
31  (xxx) For these [reasons
32  E: [So I would write
33  M::
34  B: Have you ever imagined eating candy in class?
35  E: Huh?
In lines 4-6, Elsa articulates the question that begins the collaborative construction of knowledge by asking Betsy how she should restate the thesis, or more specifically, asking what it means to restate a thesis. She verbalizes the inquiry and also looks at Betsy’s paper before reiterating the question in line 16. This reiteration, by beginning in Spanish, emphasizes that her struggle is as much with the lexical demands of the task as with the procedure itself, as she expresses doubt of the fact that a thesis should begin with “For these three reasons.” To help Elsa, Becky retrieves her persuasive essay written for Spanish class from her portfolio and shows Elsa the introductory paragraph, pointing out the difference in the Spanish essay to Elsa’s current work, which lacks the concluding sentence to the opening paragraph (lines 26-31). As Elsa grasps the transferability of the form of thesis they have been instructed to use from one language to another (line 32), Betsy notices Elsa’s first sentence, which opens her persuasive essay on why children should be allowed to eat candy in class with a question for the reader (lines 34, 36). Realizing that Betsy is now revising her own work for a previously submitted essay in Spanish on why children should be allowed to chew gum in school, Elsa offers her work in English as a model (lines 39-40). Finally, Becky decides to abandon the onomatopoeic
opening of her prior piece, using Spanish to critique her hook that uses English sound words (“chomp” in line 47) and instead begin her essay with a query.

While it could certainly be said that elements of this interaction also correspond to the clarifying function of translanguaging since the girls use dynamic bilingual practices to solicit information, it goes on to more demonstrably capture how the two of them jointly incorporate resources in Spanish and English to create and improve upon works in both languages. As a result of their spoken conversation and sharing of written work, both students improve upon their original writing. Collaboratively, the two have constructed knowledge about optimal opening paragraphs in persuasive essays despite working within a highly structured framework. Indeed, this is one of the benefits that García (in press) notes about translanguaging as a pedagogical strategy, proclaiming its integral importance to classrooms given “its potential for liberating the voices of language minoritized students.”

Conclusion

These transcripts give a glimpse into how students use translanguaging practices to develop the academic skills we demand from them. Just as importantly, they highlight the importance of teaching practices that allowed for these third spaces and translingual interaction. In these spaces, conventional scripts about how teachers and students relate to one another, to curriculum, and to classroom tasks are subverted in favor of more democratic and asset-oriented perspectives. Students are given opportunities to bring their experiences, interests, and prior knowledge into conversations about literature, science, and math. The ability to take linguistic risks without fear of humiliation or
marginalization, the freedom to approach assignments with focus on the conceptual underpinnings rather than minding norms of monoglossic ideologies – I observed repeatedly in classrooms at Rivera how these freedoms afforded to students resulted in confident, collaborative, and learning-focused interactions.

But language is not only a resource for classroom learning. Just as students blurred language boundaries in their exploration of literary genre and the physical properties of matter, they relied on translanguaging dexterity for a number of relational and identity functions. Students at Rivera consistently drew upon hybrid language practices to merge social alliances and present particular identities, chief among them the same hybrid identities that Anzaldúa (1987), Bhabha (1994), and Mignolo (1996) extol.
Chapter 6:  
*Los dos son mi idioma: Translanguaging and Identity Work*

**Introduction**

The benefits of translanguaging as a learning support were clear as students continually advanced their conceptual and linguistic knowledge in class by relying on their varied repertoires. Nevertheless, dwelling exclusively on this framing still risks relegating translanguaging abilities to scaffolds that can be gradually removed as students are socialized into the particular repertoires of practice that any given teacher or school labels “academic language.” An important aspect to keep in mind about translanguaging as both an act and a stance is that this dynamic lingualism (Flores, 2013) is more than a selectively drawn upon register, but rather an integral reflection of students’ social learning experiences. As such, translanguaging abilities very much constitute part of students’ perceived identities and play an important role in their social relationships, whether navigating classroom interactions or out on the playground. Perhaps Jenny (J), a student in the class who often interacted with some of the study’s focal students and from whom we have heard in the previous chapter, best captured the idea of language hybridity being indivisible from hybrid identities in an interview I conducted with her and her classmate Ignacio (I):

**LP:** ¿Qué te parece el programa bilingüe, aquí en Rivera?

**J:** Yo pienso que está divertido, porque puedes aprender más de un lenguaje.

**I:** También

**LP:** Sí, okay. ¿Les gusta el hecho de que están también manteniendo su español?

**J:** Sí.
I: Sí

LP: ¿Por qué creen que es importante mantener el español, o por qué les gusta mantener el español?

J: Para que no se te olvide de donde viniste.

LP: Mmm.

J: Como tu idioma.

LP: Así que sientes que el español es tu idioma, y el inglés es otro idioma. Okay.

J: Yo siento que los dos son mi idioma, porque no soy... como en todos los lugares que voy soy diferente. En la casa soy la única que ha nacido aquí. Y en la escuela soy la única que tiene, que es mmm, casi dos tercios de El Salvador.

In her rationale for valuing her bilingualism, Jenny makes two keen observations. First and foremost, she unites her bilingual repertoire as a singular, as *mi idioma*, rather than as two separate codes of Spanish and English. Secondly, she directly connects her linguistic repertoire with her unique, hybrid identity. She is simultaneously American, Mexican, and Salvadorian, a unique combination in her class and her home, and the only one among her cousins enrolled in a bilingual program. Spanish and English, in academic and social registers, are simultaneous, overlapping, and inextricable elements of her identity.

This chapter calls attention to the role that translanguaging plays in the enactment of hybrid identities like Jenny’s. That is, it explores how students use their dynamic bilingualism to position themselves relative to peers and adults. Importantly, it also explores how students position themselves relative to transcendent scripts about race, migration, class, nationality, and ability (academic and linguistic) that drape themselves over any interaction at a school like Rivera in which these categories are clearly and
repeatedly made salient through tests, classroom placements, curriculum, cafeteria lines, and friend groups. The restrictive effects of these transcendent scripts have been discussed in academic contexts in Chapter 4 and will be expanded upon more generally in the closing of this work, but for present purposes this chapter highlights the effectiveness and value of hybridity in terms of identity and languaging in creating a third space and in contesting hegemonic norms.

In this regard, the importance of these Third Spaces cannot be overstated. School and district categories most often referred to students in dichotomous terms – Native English Speaker or Native Spanish Speaker, ELL or RFEP, Socioeconomically Disadvantaged or not, “High achieving” or “Struggling.” At best, students could be classified within a series of discrete categories – Below basic, basic, proficient, and advanced; Latino, White, Black, Asian; Beginner, Early Intermediate, Intermediate, Advanced - for example. People at Rivera, including the students, often took up these labels themselves in conversations about relative ability, expectations, or lesson and curriculum planning, but just as importantly students and teachers overtly and implicitly challenged these imposed categories, particularly with reference to connections between language background, ethnicity, and ability. In this respect, students challenged monolithic assumptions of culture and notions that any single classification could suitably predict or explain their behaviors.

This agentive use of language in identity and relational work evokes critiques of monolithic definitions of culture and essentialist approaches to educating diverse students. It reminds us that students exist not only as members of cultural groups or leveled achievement clusters, but also as individuals with varied social histories and
strategies for knowledge construction, only some of which can be attributed to membership in any given category. Gutiérrez, Baquedano-López & Tejeda (1999) offer a framework for this role that diversity plays in fomenting productive learning environments.

Diversity here not only includes racial, ethnic, socioeconomic, and linguistic diversity, but also diversity in the mediational tools, roles, and the activity systems themselves. Hybridity and diversity, then, are not problematic but rather are viewed as important cultural resources in children's development (Cole, 1998). Hybridity and diversity serve as the building blocks of Third Spaces. (p. 287)

Moreover, the work of Gutiérrez & Rogoff (2003) reminds us that membership in any given category is itself dynamic to the extent that culture can be considered participation in sets of social practices, rather than the possession (or lack) of particular traits.

People’s varied participation in the practices of dynamic cultural communities can be distinguished from membership in ethnic groups, which often is treated in an all-or-none, static fashion (Rogoff, 2003). Individuals participate in varying and overlapping ways that change over their lifetimes and over historical change in a community’s organization and relationships with other communities. (p. 21)

With these ideas in mind, this chapter presents findings with respect to two particular
roles that translanguaging plays in students’ relational and identity work. With
transcripts from student interactions, I revisit a portion of Benjamin’s (1993) framework
of speech functions, captured in Table 18, and show how translanguaging effectively
allows students to navigate social spaces.

Table 18 - Functions of speech and corresponding speech acts (Benjamin, 1993, p. 98-99)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social/Relational</th>
<th>Corresponding speech acts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Forging alliances, bonds</td>
<td>Complimenting, joking, requesting attention, consoing, offering help</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Distancing, excluding</td>
<td>Threatening, insulting, arguing, tattling, correcting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Storytelling</td>
<td>• Narrating, describing, evaluating actual events</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Narrating, performing, inviting imagination of fictitious events</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition, this chapter considers how students’ speech acts and their conceptualizations
of their linguistic abilities serve not only their overt function as listed above, but also as
contestation or reification of societal stereotypes. In her book *Language, Identity, and
Stereotype Among Southeast Asian American Youth: The Other Asian*, Angela Reyes
(2006) distinguishes three prevalent stereotypes in societal transcendent scripts about
Asian Americans: “forever foreigner,” “honorary White,” and “problem minority.” She
comments that “Although the forever foreigner, honorary White, and problem minority
stereotypes circulate to varying degrees at the societal level, the ways at which they are
invoked as local models in the performance and interpretation of identities can be
examined at the interactional level.” (p. 16) Reyes proceeds to show how the words and
speech styles of Cambodian youth in an after-school program, as well as those of the
adults they encounter through the program, serve to uphold or contest these stereotypes and to fortify or challenge panethnic Asian identities.

Similar work can be done for the Latino focal students in this study if one considers the particular stereotypes about Latinos in US society. Jane Hill (1998) notes that whereas Latinos must be mindful of their speech in the “outer sphere” (Urciuoli, 1996) where they interact with out-group members, Whites can engage in speech patterns divergent from the standardized norms without being marked as deviant and often as a sign of joviality. Hill thus analyzes the role of “Mock Spanish” in this White public space as indirectly indexing negative stereotypes about Latinos in US society, “Yet in order to make sense of ‘Mock Spanish,’ interlocutors require access to very negative racializing stereotypes about Latinos and Chicanos as stupid, politically corrupt, sexually loose, dirty, lazy, and disorderly.” (Hill, 1998, p. 683)

Hill’s statement about societal stereotypes of Latinos reflects an ample body of scholarship into popular depictions of Latinos in media. Charles Ramírez Berg (1990), in an analysis of portrayals of Latino/a characters in films offers a typology that echoes these stereotypes noted by Hill, albeit with greater specificity. With the categories of “el bandido,” “half-breed harlot,” “male buffoon,” “female clown,” “Latin lover,” and “dark lady,” Berg paints a picture of broad portrayals of Latinos/as in film as hypersexual, uneducated, treacherous, and prone to emotional and/or violent outbursts. Taylor and Bang (1997) analyze portrayals of Latinos in magazine advertisements, noting first and foremost that they were largely absent, which is problematic in that it conveys to majority groups that Latinos are a negligible minority, while communicating to Latinos that they are unwanted in mainstream cultural media. In the portrayals they do uncover, however,
the authors note generally that “commonly held stereotypes of Latino Americans portray them as being uneducated blue-collar workers who are not well-assimilated.” (p. 289) Méndez-Méndez and Alverio (2003), meanwhile, note in their report for the National Association of Hispanic Journalists that in television news coverage on major networks, “Latinos continued to be portrayed as a dysfunctional underclass that exists on the fringes of mainstream US society.” (p. 3) This stereotype was reinforced by the topics networks chose to report about, as the authors note that 66% of stories about Latinos dealt with crime, terrorism, and illegal immigration, and particularly that “The number of Latino-related crime stories in 2002 was grossly excessive when compared to statistics on crimes involving Latinos,” and that “Illegal immigrants are often depicted as a security threat to the country.”(p. 3) These characterizations of stereotypes mirror the work of James Crawford (1992), who in his defense of bilingual education undermines portrayals of Latinos as unwilling and unable to assimilate to the linguistic and cultural practices of the U.S. Finally, Otto Santa Ana (2002) analyzes the presence of cognitive metaphor in California news reports about Propositions 187 (1994), 209 (1996), and 227 (1998), which curtailed resources and opportunities for undocumented immigrants, ended affirmative action in California public universities, and banned bilingual education, respectively. Santa Ana notes two overarching metaphors – nation as body and nation as house – that govern discourse around these policies. Within these metaphors, Latinos are framed as a burden or illness (consistent with the “nation as body” metaphor), as an irresistible invading force, and as dangerous waters (such as a flood or tidal wave). These metaphors, in turn, are consistent with the prevalent societal stereotypes noted by
the aforementioned authors that regard Latinos as a risk to the American education system, its political unity, and its social mores.

In short, as mentioned in Chapter 4, the monolingual and monoglossic pressures students face at Rivera reflect ideologies and stereotypes about immigrants, speakers of languages other than English, and speakers of low-prestige varieties in any language. Through translanguaging practices, students not only acquire necessary academic skills, as shown in Chapter 5, but also perform identities that contest, or at times uphold, these stereotypes. The acquisition and development of academic skills certainly challenges the stereotypes regarding ability, intellect, and work ethic, and the interview responses presented in this chapter will reinforce these findings as well as speak to Latino students’ willingness and ability to incorporate to the American milieu. The transcripts that follow describe how, in the performance of social/relational speech acts, students carry out this important identity work. As an analytical note, some of the descriptions of the interactions will refer to code switches to draw attention to the dynamic use of language in particular turns or exchanges. This is not intended to undermine the broader translanguaging of the interactions and relationships in a bigger picture, but rather to show how what would conventionally be labeled code switching is just part of the translingual repertoire, along with the understanding of multilingual and multimodal inputs and other communicative forms such as symbols, signals, sounds, and gestures.
Contrary to the aforementioned negative stereotypes about Latinos, and immigrants in particular, interviews with the Latino students at Rivera showed them to be quite hard-working, interested in learning English, invested in mainstream American culture, and considerate of others. One particular question that elicited a great deal of these findings was when students were asked to give their opinion about being enrolled in a bilingual program and of being educated with a bilingual curriculum. Overwhelmingly, students had favorable views of bilingual education, bilingualism in general, and of Spanish-English bilingualism in particular. Generally speaking, these responses could be categorized as altruistic orientations, which emphasized the role of bilingualism in helping others, and utilitarian orientations, which noted the academic and economic advantages to being bilingual.

Altruistic orientations

A great deal of students mentioned altruistic reasons for valuing their bilingualism. To those who expressed positive opinions of being in a bilingual program (all students), I asked why they valued being bilingual or why it was good to know Spanish and English. Quite a few students mentioned that it provided them the ability to help others, often relatives, who could not understand one language or another. A sample of representative responses is shown in Table 19.
Table 19 - Sample responses showing altruistic orientations towards bilingualism

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>¿Por qué crees que es bueno ser bilingüe?</td>
<td>Adriana</td>
<td><em>Puedo hablar con personas que no hablan inglés y necesitan un traductor.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>¿Por qué crees que es bueno saber español e inglés?</td>
<td>Alex</td>
<td><em>Puedo usarlo para traducir y ayudar.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ramón</td>
<td><em>Porque mi familia no habla inglés.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tanya</td>
<td><em>Because lots of people speak Spanish and not English, so I can help them.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Elsa</td>
<td><em>Porque así puedes hablar con todos el mismo idioma que tienen.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yessica</td>
<td><em>Porque puedes hablar otro idioma y porque si otra persona necesita ayuda tú les puedes ayudar.</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Utilitarian orientations**

In contrast, other students offered much more economic perspectives when appraising the value of their bilingual development. For those answering in this camp, bilingualism figured as a key ingredient in succeeding in school and gaining admission to college (an advantage teachers frequently preached at Rivera) or as a competitive advantage in landing a profitable job in the modern globalized economy (likewise touted by teachers and adults who supported Rivera’s DI program). Some representative responses with this utilitarian perspective are offered in Table 20.
Table 20 - Sample responses showing utilitarian perspectives of bilingualism

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>¿Por qué crees que es bueno ser bilingüe?</td>
<td>Narissa</td>
<td><em>Porque a lo mejor tienes un trabajo y si no sabes que dicen no vas a tener trabajo.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>¿Por qué crees que es bueno saber español e inglés?</td>
<td>Pablo</td>
<td><em>Para agarrar un trabajo bueno.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ignacio</td>
<td><em>Para ayudarme entrar a un colegio bueno.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alicia</td>
<td><em>Es importante porque te pueden dar un trabajo.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Roberto</td>
<td><em>Piens que si sabes los dos, si sabes inglés y español, tienes una ventaja sobre otras personas que sólo saben uno.</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While these utilitarian perspectives on bilingualism directly contradict stereotypes about Latinos as lazy and lacking ambition, they warrant some discussion. As Flores (2013b) notes, while multilingualism may be increasingly valuable in a globalized, neoliberal economic landscape, the multilingualism conceptualized in these discussions most frequently requires English as part of the repertoire and, perhaps more importantly, leaves unquestioned the imposition of hegemonic standardized or prestige varieties of language that overlook the dynamic and locally-situated nature of language and language learning. But for this caveat, these interview responses clearly demonstrate how students view language, bilingual repertoires in particular, as valuable assets in contributing to society from altruistic and economic perspectives. Analyzing student interactions, meanwhile, show how students’ repertoires further help them perform important communicative functions on social and relational levels.
Translanguaging and Communicative Function

Forging alliances and bonds

One of the truly remarkable, and lamentable, aspects of life at Rivera was the segregation that occurred beyond classroom walls. In the cafeteria and eating areas, as well as on the playground, ethnic, gender, and class boundaries highly structured play—in terms of social grouping, games played, and location within the playground. While Latina girls could reliably be found at the tetherball posts, Latino boys consistently played soccer on one of the asphalt basketball courts. White (and Asian) boys, meanwhile, predictably played basketball on the other asphalt courts or touch football on grassy areas if the weather allowed. White girls, finally, played on the swing set or wandered to Maestro and Ms. Jennifer’s classroom for conversations. Teachers noted and lamented these divisions, but acknowledged that they emerged from circumstances far broader than the school’s scope of influence. Children played with friends who lived near them, and since most of the White and Asian students came from other parts of the district specifically to attend the DI strand, they had little interaction with the Latino students once the final bell rang. Of course, these patterns had exceptions, and it was an established goal among staff to make these more commonplace. When group divisions were crossed during structured play, translanguaging played an integral role in the permeability of these boundaries.

The first transcript offers an example of just such an instance. In this interaction, focal student Rhea joins focal students Melissa and Elsa in tetherball. Rhea, to her credit, was among the students who most frequently engaged in outgroup interactions. Her
mother was born in Iran but moved to the US as a child and fully urged Rhea to embrace opportunities for multicultural understanding. As a result, she not only enrolled Rhea in the DI program, but also had her join the school’s balet folklórico outfit (an extracurricular group in which students learned traditional Mexican dances). Through the latter, Rhea established relationships with Latina students that few of the other White\textsuperscript{xxxv} students had. Indeed, this was an important reason for her selection as a focal student.

On this particular day, Rhea opted not to join her friends during a working lunch in Maestro Quintara’s room and instead go play tetherball with Melissa, Elsa, and several other Latina girls. Also joining the game of tetherball for this interaction is a 4\textsuperscript{th} grade student, and the transcript begins as this 4\textsuperscript{th} grader starts her first match against Alicia (A), another student in the 5\textsuperscript{th} grade DI cohort, and some of the other girls urge Alicia to let the newcomer win. Also present during this interaction are Yessica (Y) and Narissa (N), other Latinas in the DI 5\textsuperscript{th} grade.

\begin{verbatim}
M: Just let her::
Jus[] let[]er
Y: That’s too: ea↑:sy.
R: Go ea::↑sy on her Ali↑cia
A: She’s pretty good for (xx)
R: She’s cu:::te
Y: I kno↑w

R: Aw::

(1)
R: Aw::

(3)

It’s like (xxx)-

-Ow↑

Ah↑

(1)

Someone hit my-
I keep getting hi↑t with the ba:↑ll

(Girls laughing)

[Rhea and the other girls turn their attention back to the game]

Hit it hard!
\end{verbatim}
As this portion of the transcript shows, much of the interaction occurs in English. This is not, as one might assume, an accommodation made for Rhea’s sake on the part of the other girls. Rather, this was a frequently observed pattern in the interactions among those playing tetherball during recess. Surprisingly, it is Rhea who begins the translanguaging in this social space by shouting her support for Alicia as she gets close to defeating the 4th grader against whom she is playing. The words of encouragement may signal accommodation on Rhea’s part, although, again, English was a prevalent code in the social interactions at Rivera and there is no indication in the interaction that Spanish was a suitable accommodation. More likely, Rhea’s translanguaging recognizes the playground and tetherball in particular as a dynamically bilingual space, and she offers a cheer that is understood and taken up by her playmates. Thus, Rhea’s presence and participation, while a rare blurring of de facto boundaries on the playground, offers an exception that proves the rule – that dynamic bilingualism reflects the multilingual realities in which students at Rivera are growing up and making sense of the world, and serves as a shared code with which to forge friendships.

The pattern continues later in the interaction as the girls strike up conversation while they wait their turns to play tetherball. In this portion of the transcript, Rhea and her classmates translanguage in exchanges of information and compliments in ways that advance their alliances.
56  E:  [To Rhea] You’re so tall
57  R:  No I’m not
58  Y:  Yes you are
59  R:  No (.) I’m not
60  →  N:  My prima’s taller than you
61  R:  You have really long hair [Rhea runs a hand through Narissa’s hair]
62  Y:  [To the group] I wanna play Alicia
63  [To Alicia] I wanna play you
64  →  R:  Pues then Alicia has to beat Elsa and me
65  And Alicia will definitely beat me

In this portion, Elsa attempts to disrupt the interaction between Yessica and Rhea. This is not necessarily indicative of any animosity between Elsa and Rhea. While the two rarely socialized in class, more often than not they were friendly with one another, and as two of the higher-achieving students in the class, their academic collaborations were frequently very smooth and fruitful. Rather, as mentioned in Chapter 3, Elsa is experimenting with a rebellious attitude that includes occasionally teasing other students. In any case, Yessica and Rhea are jovially complaining about their physical education class (PE) displaying their dynamic bilingualism (lines 53-55) to align in their dislike for the class (while one might assume that part of Rhea’s alignment would require Spanish, Auer (2005) notes that in American immigrant situations such as Rivera’s in which almost everyone is bilingual, “the majority language is neutral with respect to ethnic belonging,” and “is neutralized by virtue of being used ‘by everybody.’” (p. 405)) Suddenly, Elsa attempts to draw attention to Rhea’s height (line 56), which distinguishes her from most of her classmates. Rhea, aware of this difference and its possible stigma, becomes defensive before Narissa interjects in line 60 and makes Rhea’s height seem less exceptional. Narissa’s translanguaged interjection at once defuses the escalating tension between Elsa and Rhea while also contesting any racialization of height as a physical
attribute (whether the latter is done intentionally or not, I cannot say). Rhea, recognizing the favor, compliments Narissa with words and a gesture, indicating her understanding of and gratitude for Narissa’s bilingual, pacifying interjection. Further, she translanguages a conciliatory comment towards Elsa as well in lines 64 and 65, when she excludes Elsa from her self-deprecating reassurance\textsuperscript{xxxvi} to Yessica that before she can play against Alicia in tetherball, Alicia must beat both Rhea and Elsa first. Rhea’s self-deprecation, uttered to Yessica but clearly with Elsa as an additional intended audience, and Narissa’s earlier de-escalation of the argument between Rhea and Elsa both demonstrate the effectiveness of translanguaging in forging alliances and bonds. Importantly, these bonds and the shared linguistic practices of the group likewise counter popular discourses about Latinos being unwilling or unable to assimilate to an American milieu. This interaction shows, on the contrary, that the girls very readily engage in common American playground activities such as tetherball and speaking English, and that they actively seek to foster and repair bonds with their White American classmate rather than enforce or accept segregation.

Another instructive example of translanguaging to build social bonds once more involves Rhea, Melissa, and Alicia. On this occasion, the three are at a table in the lunch area adjacent to the playground. Alicia and Melissa eat the school lunch since both qualify for subsidized food, while Rhea brings her lunch from home. In this interaction, Melissa and Alicia ask and joke about Rhea’s lunch. Rather than becoming defensive, Rhea joins the joking in its dynamic bilingual code, furthering her relationship with her classmates.

1 M: Is that seaweed?
2 R: No:
M: Le mme see
What is it?
R: It’s –
M: -Guacamole?
R: It’s tofu with curry(.)
Spinach
And bean(.) rice things
M: Oh
Cool
Does it have carrots?
R: Hm::?
M: Does it have carrots?
R: Um: (.) I don’t know
R: I wonder where Jenna and Ada are
I thought they were(.)
Are they in the working lunch?
M: Is that rice?
R: Not really
M: The brown things
R: Not really
It’s like beans (.)
Little bean sprout
Rice things (.)
I don’t know what↑ they are
But they’re good.
M: What if they were cockroaches?
→ Cucara↑chas [Wiggles fingers to mimic insect legs]
R: Then I wouldn’t eat it
M: Yeah
But they’re not
Th[ey’re not
R: [I know
Yeah
My mom doesn’t make me cockroaches for dinner
M: Are those crunchy?
R: Um::-
→ A: -Hay una soda machine over there
R: A what?
A: A vending machine
R: At the school?
[You’re lying
E: [You’re lying
A: [Giggles] That would be cool
→ R: Juicy(.) crunchy(.) slimy cucaracha
M: Ew:
A: Imagine you were eating cucara::chas [Wiggling fingers in Melissa’s direction]

Juicy and slimy=

Ew↑:::

Ew this cockroach is ho↑rrible

In lines 28 and 29, Melissa begins the joking by suggesting that the bean sprouts in Rhea’s lunch are cockroaches. Rhea and Melissa clearly both understand the term “cockroach” so a translation is superfluous, yet in this case, effective. Melissa’s repetition of the concept, as well as her tone as she prolongs the word and gestures when saying it in Spanish, convey both her disgust for cockroaches and her comic intent that attempts to amuse Rhea and the group. When Rhea initially rejects the joke, Melissa promptly aligns (lines 30-35), but continues to ask about Rhea’s lunch. Perhaps wanting attention, Alicia interrupts with her own bilingual fabrication in line 39, pointing to a fictional soda machine to try get the other girls to look and be disappointed by their gullibility. Rhea and Elsa, savvy veterans of this gullibility prank, refuse to look and call out Alicia’s efforts in unison. Rhea, however, then takes up Melissa’s earlier joke once more in line 46, perhaps recognizing the currency of joking in this interaction, once more translinguaging to deliver the punch line. Not to be left out, Alicia joins the joke in line 48, turning the tables on Melissa and disgusting her by repeating her hand gestures to mimic a crawling cockroach. Ultimately, the girls share a laugh and enjoy a pleasant lunch with help from their translinguaging abilities to advance their comedic efforts. Moreover, while it is likely not an underlying motivation for the translinguaging, this exchange does connect with transcendent scripts about immigrants and their unwillingness or inability to assimilate. In this case, it is Rhea who is mocked for her food and not any of her Latina classmates. On the other hand, her food is mocked
because its Asian roots and ingredients differ from the school lunch of chicken nuggets that the other girls are eating, in turn perpetuating elements of the “forever foreigner” stereotype that Reyes (2006) addresses.

**Distancing and excluding**

Commensurate with the ability of translanguaging to forge alliances, it could equally serve a distancing and exclusionary function. In the interviews, quite a few students mentioned one advantage of bilingualism being their possession of a secret language that they could use to conceal communication from parents, younger siblings, or strangers. Such acts of exclusion were impossible at Rivera given the generally shared linguistic codes (although students certainly had other ways of excluding one another, such as forming informal clubs and cliques, restricting participation in particular games or sports, and particular body-positioning or resource-dominating moves during group work). Nevertheless, this shared code could be used quite effectively to distance and convey dislike among peers.

In this first transcript, focal student Alex and classmate Jacqueline are engaged in independent work at their table during English class with Ms. Jennifer. While the work is independent, students are allowed to converse as they work, without that conversation being particularly policed by Ms. Jennifer who is working with small groups at a table in a corner of the room to review their progress on their reading assignments for literature circles. The independent work with which the students are engaged is the creation of a poetry journal. Students are to copy poems of their choosing from Ms. Jennifer’s extensive (and bilingual) collection, compile them, and then bind them into a journal for
which they can decorate the cover. Alex and Jacqueline are both, as this interaction unfolds, starting with their covers by cutting and gluing different pieces of construction paper. Jacqueline is humming at first, and eventually begins softly singing the lyrics to “Defying Gravity,” a song from the musical *Wicked*, which clearly displeases Alex.

```
1  J:    [singing]
2  A:  Why are you singing?
3  J:  Defying gravity: [Still singing]
4  A:  Why are you singing?
5  What are you singing
6  J:  This is a free country
7       I can do what I want
8  →  A:  It’s not a free country(.)
9  You still have to follow the >law<
10  J:  Yeah
11  A:  But there’s no law against singing
12  J:  No
13  A:  But it’s annoying(.)
14  J:  Still
15  A:  Well
16  J:  Then you can leave the table
17       [If you like]
18  →  A:  [I can go ra: ra: >rara<ra: [To the tune of Lady Gaga’s “Bad Romance”]
19  J:  Well now <you’re> singing
20  And annoying u’s
21  A:  [Yeah
22  J:  [It’s not like we can’t sing
23  A:  Okay
24  J:  Let’s both not [sing
25  A:  [Perfect
26  J:  (1)
27  It IS a free country
28  A:  >No it’s not<
29  J:  Yes(.) it is:
30  A:  It was a free country
31  J:  it’s SUPPOSED to be a free country
32  A:  Just let me do:
33  J:  What I WANT to DO
34  A:  Do whatever you wanna do
```
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Alex and Jacqueline continued arguing until Ms. Jennifer asked them to sit at separate tables a few seconds later, reinforcing through physical distance the rift that their interpersonal exchange had already well established. Clearly, translanguaging is not an essential piece of the distancing functions in these speech acts, but it does support the goal quite well. Alex counters Jacqueline’s singing with his own in line 18, singing the introduction to Lady Gaga’s “Bad Romance.” Certainly, just as other students identified English-speaking American artists such as Lil Wayne and Wiz Khalifa as their favorite artists, Alex’s choice speaks to a degree of assimilation to American popular culture that counters stereotypes about voluntary cultural and linguistic isolation.

Of greater importance, however, is Alex’s translanguaging in line 36. At this point in the interaction, the two have possibly reached a truce, however unstable, with Alex having told Jacqueling she should just do as she pleases (line 36). A brief pause follows before Alex reopens the discussion of singing by narrating his actions in song. Drawing on the Spanish cortar rather than the English cut lets him more closely approximate the actual song while ostensibly staying on task. Taking the bait, Jacqueline
rekindles the debate on whether or not the United States is a free country, a point that Alex finally concedes in line 49 before asking once more that nobody sing.

Whether or not Alex’s claim that the United States is not a free country is a denouncement of unjust laws (particularly in lines 8 and 9)\textsuperscript{xl} and evidence of the transgressive and transformative potential of translanguaging is beyond this analysis. Nevertheless, his manipulation of his linguistic repertoire and concepts creates an argument on two fronts – the veracity of the United States being a free country and the legitimacy of Jacqueline’s right to sing – and by conceding on the former, Alex falsely seems open to compromise as long as Jacqueline will concede on the latter, which is actually at the heart of their disagreement.

Not all distancing interactions were so tense and emotional. Pablo and Ramón were cousins and dear, close friends, but as family is wont to do they occasionally disagreed and got on each other’s nerves. A particularly touchy subject for them was their soccer allegiances. Pablo supports América, a team based in Mexico City and boasting a long history of championships and marquee players. Ramón, on the other hand, supports Chivas, a squad from Guadalajara that is similarly storied in terms of stars and titles but perhaps best known for its owner’s insistence on only employing Mexican-born players on its roster. In this interaction, the two boys chat as they work on a writing assignment in Maestro Quintara’s class, and Ramón, although fully aware of every last score and standing in the Liga Mexicana, feigns ignorance to get Pablo to concede América’s current struggles. To be sure, this interaction includes some level of community building through conflict, as the two boys, despite their rooting interests, are
united by their fandom of Mexican soccer, but the rivalry between América and Chivas is real and intense for these two nonetheless.

1 R: Pablo
2 América’s in the (.) like
3 the last place
4 P: Átlan is in last place
5 R: → Pero América está casi abajo
6 P: They’re like
7 They’re like-
8 R: → -Tienen bien poquitos puntos
9 P: Chivas is in eigh-
10 eighth=
11 R: =Fou↑rth!
12 P: Fourth?
13 R: Fourth(.)
14 → Están en fourth
15 P: Who’s the first?
16 R: Pumas
17 Porque le ganó al <Amé↑rica>
18 P: I thought it was (.)
19 Jaguares
20 (1)
21 R: Pablo (.)
22 You think
23 You think América’s gonna win
24 right?
25 P: Versus who?
26 R: uh?
27 P: → En el gran clásico?Xli
28 R: I go for Chivas
29 P: Es el último deste mes
30 R: → Chivas is in 4th place because they lost two partidos
31 P: Eh?
32 no
33 they tied one (.)
34 Dude (.)
35 and last year
36 they lost versus <San Luis>

Translanguaging helps Ramón stoke the embers of their rivalry and take advantage of América’s slow start to the season to taunt Pablo. In lines 5 and 8, Ramón
counters Pablo’s and his own English in opening the conversation with Spanish enunciations about América’s mediocrity. While these could be evocations of the Mexican patriotism aligned with Chivas’ ethnocentric roster construction, they are certainly evidence of Ramón’s ability to process statements in English and counter in Spanish while fulfilling a single function – alienating Pablo for his particular soccer team allegiance.

Not to be outdone, Pablo seeks to undermine Chivas’ early-season success by first misrepresenting their current standings and then by calling into question Ramón’s knowledge of the league (in lines 33-36, when Pablo notes Ramón has misstated Chivas’ record to date and then reminds him of an embarrassing loss the previous season). Additionally, he switches intersententially himself in line 27 to engage Ramón’s challenge for the upcoming gran clásico, in which América and Chivas play against each other. Ramón, however, deflects the criticism, again drawing on translanguaging to convey his point. In lines 14 and 30, Ramón corrects Pablo’s underestimation of Chivas’ current ranking. Throughout this interaction, the two boys demonstrate a comfortably dynamic bilingualism that lets them distance themselves from one another into separate camps of soccer affinity.

**Storytelling**

Translanguaging also aided storytelling for students at Rivera. Whether crafting narratives for class assignments, recounting experiences from their personal lives, or telling jokes and stories, students drew upon the full breadth of their linguistic
repertoires. The following interaction provides an example of imaginary narration, as focal student Alex tells classmate Narissa a joke.

A: Okay

Okay

It’s about a little butt who was walking through the forest

N: A little what?

A: [laughs]

A little butt

[Both laughing]

A: Okay

[Both still laughing]

N: ¡Que asco!

[Both still laughing]

A: Y sigue

And it ke-

And it was walking through the forest

And Jesus appeared and said-

Jesus appears to the little butt and says

Why are you sa↑d little butt?

And he’s like

“cause I don’t wa↑nna be a butt”

And then Jesus turns him into a little bird

N: A wha:t?

A: Un pájaro

A little bird

N: Oh:[

A: [And then he flies accidentally into another little bird’s Um

tree

And the bird says

What are you doing on my tree?

And he’s like

I’m a new bird here

and I don’t know what to do

And(. ) and(.) and(.) and th-

and th[h]en

[giggling]

And then the bird asked him

Why don’t you whistle?

And then the little butt that was a –

that turned into a bird goes

[Imitating flatulence noises]=

N: =[laughing]

A: You get it?
Appropriateness (or lack thereof) notwithstanding, Alex’s storytelling benefits from his dynamic languaging, which helps to clarify and deliver the joke. He processes Narissa’s interjection in line 8 and switches himself to keep the narrative going in line 9 before switching back to English for the bulk of the telling. When Narissa again interrupts in line 18, Alex again resorts to Spanish to respond. Narissa knows full well what bird means and what a bird is, but Alex’s utterance in Spanish of pájaro helps distinguish it from the phonologically similar “butt” that has protagonized the joke thus far. And of course, the punch line of the joke can be said to correspond to either or both codes, as the onomatopoeic reference to flatulence serves useful functions in the communicative repertoires of young children in any culture and speech community.

In an example of storytelling related to real events, we see translanguaging help focal student Melissa and classmate Susana make arrangements for an informal celebration after Rivera’s charity Walk-a-thon. In this brief exchange, Susana gives Melissa some details about the upcoming celebration and quickly recounts an earlier failed attempt at organizing something similar in prior years.

1   S:   Huh?
2   M:   I thought you were (xx)
3   S:   You guys play with her?
4   M:   She’s invited too
5   M:   What?
6   S:   I don’t understand
7   S:   Bring something
8   M:   Last year
9   M:   people didn’t bring anything
10  M:   We brought like
11  M:   two napkins
12  M:   and we had to
13  M:   um
14  M:   share them
15  M:   No
16  M:   She?
Susana’s storytelling begins in line 8 when she begins to recount an earlier botched attempt at a celebration in which participants did not bring enough supplies. In line 17, Susana switches codes just as the narrative switches focus. Rather than emphasize a collective failing in supplying the party, lines 17-24 accuse one person in particular of bringing a backpack of supplies that was insufficient. Susana adds intrasentential codeswitching in line 26 to provide a setting to her story in response to Melissa’s inquiry *When?* To make the nature of inquiry clear, Melissa rephrases the question in line 29 drawing on her own dynamic bilingualism to clarify that she is not as interested in the time of the past event as she is in that for the upcoming celebration. Thus, we see translanguaging dually facilitate the telling of a story and the acquisition of information. It is further worth noting that in the planning of this celebration, while occurring in the divided space of the playground, the girls intended to include all the girls
in their cohort, once more contesting notions of Latinos’ unwillingness to integrate and supporting the multiculturalist claims of DI program advocates.

Another useful example of translanguaging in storytelling once more involves Jenny, the student mentioned in the introduction to this chapter. Alongside focal student Ramón as the pair worked in the computer lab on a PowerPoint presentation for one of their book reports for Maestro Quintara’s class, Jenny and I engaged in a conversation about her relationship with Maestro Quintara. The two had a very comfortable rapport, frequently joking and teasing one another and Jenny always demonstrating excitement when it was time to switch from Ms. Jennifer’s class to Maestro’s (although she related well to Ms. Jennifer too, and was successful in both classes). In this brief exchange, Jenny relates the origins of her relationship with Maestro, throwing in some humor to boot.

1  LP:    So I noticed that you guys
2       li:ke
3  banter back and forth
4  with Maestro
5   J:    Huh?
6  LP:    You like(.)
7       make jo:kes
8  and tease each other-
9   J:    =Yeah
10  LP:   Is it cool for him to do that with everyone
11      or is it
12  he <knows> you guys
13  or:-
14  J:    I’ve known him since first [grade
15  LP:    [Oh
16  And Ra[món too
17  R:      [Yeah
18  LP:    ¿También?
19  J:    We’ve known him since first grade
20  R:    ['Cause he was
21  J:    [He was like you right now
Jenny tells the vast majority of the story in English. Her conversation with Ramón, which I interrupted to ask her my question that initiated the storytelling, was likewise mostly in English, although coming on the heels of her asking Maestro a question in Spanish and Maestro offering a witty, unhelpful retort before saying he could come by and work with the pair shortly (it was this retort that prompted my question). Of note, however, is Jenny’s move in line 26, in which she characterizes the early stages of their relationship when Maestro was a student-teacher in her first grade class years ago. Nothing in the prior turns seems to elicit Spanish, and Jenny’s English proficiency is certainly advanced enough to communicate the fact that Maestro used to not speak to them or joke with them at all in English. What the episode makes clear, therefore, is that for Jenny and other children growing up in multilingual communities, the multiple codes within their linguistic repertoires do not exist in isolated, compartmentalized subsets, but rather as a contextually-responsive whole that can be strategically divided as speakers choose.
Conclusion

In short, translanguaging served a number of functions in students’ social and identity work at Rivera. As opposed to prevalent stereotypes about Latinos that circulate in US society, students’ dynamic bilingualism was not evidence of a reluctance to assimilate and participate in life outside ethnic enclaves nor did it signal any lack of work ethic, intellect, or scruples. On the contrary, as interviews demonstrate, students largely viewed their bilingualism as tremendously valuable in helping others with more limited linguistic repertoires, in landing jobs that would allow them to thrive in and contribute to American society, and for traveling and fulfilling deep curiosities about global cultures and languages. Likewise, their effective deployment of the elements in their dynamic bilingual repertoires shows that transluangaging is not a weakness to be stigmatized or barrier to expression. Rather, it is an effective resource in communication, forging alliances, excluding and distancing others, and narrating real or fictitious events.
Chapter 7
Conclusion: Moving Forward with Translanguaging Pedagogies

My time at Rivera ended on the day of the 5th grade graduation ceremony. The event itself was bittersweet. Students cheerfully walked across the stage in the school auditorium and rejoiced with one another and their families after the ceremony, but as they emptied their desks and said good byes, quite a few tears were shed as students recognized that many of them would be going separate ways – to different middle schools, different cities, and even different countries for some. Maestro Quintara and Ms. Jennifer experienced their own emotional roller coasters as well, expressing a great deal of pride and happiness for the students’ success, especially those who had successfully reclassified as English proficient or made dramatic academic growth, alongside some lament at knowing this would be the last time they would see quite a few of the students and some trepidation knowing that middle school is a frequent stumbling block for Latino students, especially those classified as ELL.

Awash in the emotions, congratulations, and farewells going on all around me, the moment offered opportune material to reflect upon all that I had observed and learned throughout the year. Over the course of my time at Rivera, I obviously came to respect and appreciate the students, teachers, parents, and staff that dedicatedly labored not only for individual students to succeed within the DI program, but also for the value and quality of the DI program itself to be recognized and supported more broadly. Speaking in greater detail, I particularly learned to appreciate the strategic and effective use that students and teachers at Rivera made of their dynamic bilingual repertoires. In this concluding chapter, I hope to recap the important findings of this work, rearticulating the
ideological pressures that students and teachers encountered in trying to nurture linguistic equity, as well as the important academic and social functions that translanguaging served for students in their day-to-day lives at Rivera. In addition, however, I hope to recognize some of the important shortcomings of this work and of some of the theoretical arguments it posits, particularly noting the limitations and challenges to cultural and linguistic hybridity as transformative forces. Finally, I synthesize work in various arenas of educational research to offer some guiding principles for teaching and teacher training in the spirit of *culturally sustaining pedagogies* (Paris, 2012) for students growing up in communities where translanguaging is the norm and who must struggle against the same language ideologies and social stereotypes that students at Rivera confronted.

**Major Findings Revisited: Oppressive Ideologies and Translanguaging Opportunity**

Of the many things one first notices upon spending any extended time in Rivera, one of the more notable is tremendous pressure that teachers and students are under to achieve high scores on academic tests of English Language Arts and to progress on tests of English Language Development, ideally to the point of reclassification. Interviews with teachers made this pressure immensely clear as both Maestro Quintara and Ms. Jennifer recognized the disproportionate attention that scores and instruction in English received in terms of administrative evaluation, professional development, and notions of teacher accountability compared to anything going on during the time allotted for Spanish instruction and assessment. Interviews with students likewise revealed their internalization of English proficiency as a priority as many in the class noted its disproportionate presence in the curriculum (especially for those taking additional
remedial English Language Development instruction through the Language! intervention) and its significant economic and social value in American society. Besides presenting the interviews with students and teachers, Chapter 4 additionally considered students’ shifting language practices as a product of habituation to English monolingualism and considered the embedded normative positions that the Language! curriculum offered by posing English proficiency as integral to emergent bilinguals’ American cultural assimilation and of languages other than English as nothing more than an obstacle to English language acquisition. This preferential positioning of English existed despite ample rhetorical support for rigorous bilingualism and biliteracy and equality between English and Spanish at Rivera. These calls for language equality presented problems in their own right.

Calls for language equality in Rivera’s bilingual program challenged the monolingual ideologies emerging from discourses about race, nationality, and immigration that prize English over other languages. Nevertheless, the manner in which English and Spanish were divided and conceptualized in accordance to the norms of standardized or prestige varieties marginalized the locally situated languaging practices and communication patterns valuable in the particular speech community of El Valle, and indeed, in many predominantly Latino speech communities in the US. Through a series of data sources, Chapter 4 demonstrated entrenched monoglossic ideologies - conceptualizations of language as bounded and finite pieces arranged in accordance to universal and static rules – at work in the way teachers, students, and parents at Rivera understood language and language learning. Interviews revealed that, by and large, people at Rivera did place language varieties in hierarchy and that “proper” varieties
avoided the codeswitching and borrowing frequently seen in conditions of language contact. Additionally, a great deal of emphasis for students and parents in terms of defining language proficiency revolved around notions of language as a set of component parts, as interviews showed that extensive vocabulary and attention to standardized grammatical conventions were key determinants in people’s evaluations of others’ language abilities. Additionally, Chapter 4 showed how the Language! curriculum advanced these monoglossic ideologies by segmenting language instruction into the sequential and isolated teaching of language pieces – phonics, spelling patterns, word forms, grammatical rules, and so on – in such a way that ignored what the field has gained from sociocultural theories of learning and social-oriented theories of second language acquisition, not to mention post-structuralist approaches to language in general.

Finally, although perhaps most convincingly, the robustly significant t-scores for attitudinal ratings that students gave to speakers in the matched guise demonstrate strong negative associations of both personality and language proficiency for speakers of non-prestige varieties of both English and Spanish. This remarkably large effect size confirms what one observes in interviews and language teaching curricula and shows how the attitudinal and ideological pressures of monoglossic views apply to the whole cohort, rather than just the focal students. In short, the quantitative data gathered through the matched guise tests triangulates with the qualitative data to paint a holistic picture of entrenched language ideologies at Rivera.

And yet, in the face of these oppressive monolingual and monoglossic ideologies, teachers and students in Rivera’s 5th grade DI classrooms fostered productive third spaces, where transcendent scripts about language hierarchies and power relations could
be challenged and overturned – flipped, as it were. In Chapter 5, social interactions among students during collaborative classroom tasks were considered to show how translanguaging, or hybrid language practices, could effectively lead to the acquisition and refinement of academic knowledge. Whether manipulating concepts and vocabulary for math, science, or language arts, students at Rivera deployed the resources of their full linguistic repertoires in offering explanations and conveying information, asking questions or seeking clarification, and guiding collaboration with peers. In so doing, not only rebuked stereotypes about Latinos as lazy, unintelligent, and academically uninterested, but also showed that reliance on translanguaging strategies could in fact yield understanding and proficiency with academic tasks. Such a finding undermines common current practices, which isolate students classified as ELL and insist upon building English proficiency through monoglossic instructional sequences before giving students access to academic content.

Similarly, students’ translanguaging abilities and understandings also played an important role in their identity and relational work. Findings from interviews with students discussed in Chapter 6 showed that, while perhaps simultaneously adhering to monoglossic ideologies of language separation, students recognized unequivocal value in their bilingual repertoires. Mirroring the encouraging words of teachers and DI program supporters at Rivera, some noted the economic utility and competitive advantage that a broader linguistic repertoire offered in terms of college admissions and career prospects in a globalized economy. Others, meanwhile, noted the tremendous altruistic value that their linguistic repertoires offered as they could position themselves as translators and language brokers for relatives and strangers alike whose monolingual repertoires were
inadequate for the communicative demands of a community like El Valle. Besides the findings from interview responses, Chapter 6 also provides representative examples of interactions in which students use translanguaging to meet a series of interactional goals, namely forming alliances and bonds, excluding or distancing others, and narrating both fictional stories and real experiences. Once more, the efficacy of translanguaging in fulfilling these communicative functions demonstrates that, far from a broken and reprehensible practice, it is an effective and useful strategy for communication.

**Limitations of the Study and the Theoretical Positions**

While the study offers useful descriptions of the ideological hurdles that emergent bilinguals and advocates of linguistic equanimity (Alim, 2004) must overcome and valuable insights into the inevitability and efficacy of translanguaging for emergent bilinguals, it is not without its limitations. Generalizing findings, in this case the particular teaching practices that created productive third spaces and supported student translanguaging to other contexts without regard to the specificities of those contexts is always a shortcoming of qualitative work with small samples. Indeed, it is quite possible that even at other grade levels within Rivera the ideological and sociolinguistic landscapes of the classroom would be different in important ways (for example, the presence of more African American or Asian and Asian American students, less alignment between ethnicity and socioeconomic status, or a different allocation of time and language from among the several available for DI programs) that would alter the
observed power relations around race, ethnicity, class, gender, nationality – etc. - and language in these particular classrooms.

In addition, the work focuses exclusively on oral exchanges at a time when the implementation of the Common Core State Standards draw ever-increasing attention to literacy. A logical and feasible future direction for this work is to consider the literacy practices of the teachers and students at Rivera – instructional techniques and curriculum that teachers used in teaching reading and writing skills in both Spanish and English, students’ processes and products in reading and writing assignments across the curriculum – in order to gain a more complete picture of the ideologies of language and language learning at play as well as the extent and possibilities of translanguaging in learning and communication.

Another limitation is that while the study captures instances of students translanguaging across varieties within languages, little systematic attention is given to this phenomenon or the patterns that elicit it. For that matter, no concrete patterns for translanguaging across languages either in general or among particular speakers are presented in the work either, complicating the ability to distinguish between translanguaging and language shift.

Finally, while the work promotes a post-structuralist approach to language and advocates for translanguaging as a stance in addition to its practice, the text does little to avoid conventional labels of languages and language users. Though surely it would be too onerous (and unintelligible to most) to consistently make references such as “pertaining to the structuralist conceptualization of English” in place of “English” and “lingual with repertoire elements corresponding to codes of distinct linguistic orgins”
instead of “bilingual,” the inability to escape these terms risks perpetuating the notion that languages are separable, unchanging, and abiding by constant rules.

Yet these limitations should not detract from what the work accomplishes. Though its findings may not be generalizable and apparent in all contexts, they offer insights into the processes by which the monolingual and monoglossic ideologies prevalent in the US infiltrate the classrooms and attitudes of well-intentioned teachers and even students and parents marginalized by these very ideologies. Such findings build on existing discussions for how to improve outcomes not only in DI, but also in the educational trajectories for emergent bilinguals in any program of instruction. In addition, the work elucidates some of the processes and strategies whereby teachers can leverage student collaboration and full linguistic repertoires to support learning, even if the list is not comprehensive, and once more start discussion that questions the paradigms of how emergent bilinguals, including those in bilingual programs, are taught. Finally, while this particular work fails to escape the prevalent labels for languages and language users that are bound in nationalistic ideals, it points to the inadequacy of those labels and may catalyze the shift towards more enlightened discussion of the topics and broader understanding of terms like *lingual, languaging, and translanguaging*.

There are also, unfortunately, theoretical limitations to the work. Like much of the work that embraces concepts relating to hybridity of culture and language, this work predominantly views the positive to be gained by contesting traditional categories and their hierarchical arrangement. Writing about emerging discourses in the study of diaspora and diasporic populations, Dirlik (1999) offers scathing critique of the romanticizing and oversimplification of the notion of hybrid identities.
Diaspora discourse has an undeniable appeal in the critical possibilities it offers against assumptions of national cultural homogeneity, which historically have resulted in the denial of full cultural (and political) citizenship to those who resisted assimilation into the dominant conceptualizations of national culture, were refused entry into it, or whose cultural complexity could not be contained easily within a single conception of national culture…

This critical appeal, however, also disguises the possibility that diasporic notions of culture, if employed without due regard to the social and political complexities of so-called diasporic populations, may issue in reifications of their own, opening the way to new form commodification…The danger of reification is implicit in a contemporary culturalism which easily loses sight of the distinction between recognizing autonomy to culture as a realm of analysis versus the rendering of culture into a self-sufficient explanation for all aspects of life, therefore rendering culture once again into an off-ground phenomenon available to exploitation for a multiplicity of purposes. Moreover, since much of the discussion of culture and cultural identity is mediated by the new discipline of "cultural studies," there has been a tendency to carry questions and findings concerning one group of people to all groups similarly placed, in effect erasing considerable differences in the experiences of different populations through the universalization of the language of cultural studies. In either case, the erasure is the erasure of the social relations that configure difference within and between groups and, with them, of historicity. (pp. 96-97)
Indeed, over-reliance on hybridity as a useful and transformative explanation of the work students undertake at Rivera negates the many differences amid their shared experiences. Issues of race, gender, citizenship status, migration history, family structure and personal experience all influence students’ linguistic practices, schooling trajectory, and position in fields of power relations. Reductive hybrid identity categories, while useful to some extent, overlook hierarchies within those categories along other identity classifications, and it is important not to lose sight of this fact. To wit, for all the attention paid to Spanish at Rivera, what of the Japanese, Farsi, Hindi, German, and Torlakian*liii that other students counted within their linguistic repertoires? What of the relations between Mexicans, Guatemalans, and Salvadorians historically maps onto power relations among students in the classroom all hidden under the pan-ethnic label Latino? With such complications in mind, Maynak (2002) writes,

Joseph (1999) cautions that hybridity is always ‘mediated through censoring modes such as religious, political, legal, and psychic regulatory regimes’ (p. 20). This recognition questions the assumption that the elements that commingle to form hybrid practices do so on equal terms and in equal measure and suggests the need for careful consideration of ‘the terms of mixture [and] the conditions of mixing’ (Nederveen Pieterse, 1995, p. 57) in situated instances of hybridity. (p. 424)

Once more, however, these limitations should not be taken to negate the entire endeavor. Generalizations about hybrid identities and hybrid language practices herein can serve as a starting point to advocate for newer, better conceptualizations of language and language learning that do not negate the presence of individual and subgroup
differences, including personal and social histories. On the contrary, translanguaging as a stance and sociocultural approaches to language learning in general would very much maintain and support such critical inquiry into teaching practice to prevent the reification of stereotypes and power relations whether among existing categories or new ones. The battle is not simply one about labels and categories but ultimately about the respect and opportunity that underlie certain categories. Any theoretical and analytical framework that overlooks the socially constructed, negotiated, and dynamic nature of categorization systems misses the point in this pursuit and is doomed to reproduce the inequities it seeks to remedy, if only across new axes of difference.xliv

**Recommendations for Teaching and Teacher Training**

Based on these findings and points for further inquiry and discussion, we are left with a mandate to improve the way we teach emergent bilinguals and the way we prepare teachers who will do so. Education research is awash in principles for improving schools and improving teacher practice, but these principles too often become hollow labels attached to all forms of misappropriations that the original authors never intended (witness the mockery made of Ladson-Billings’ (1995) notion of *culturally relevant pedagogy* when it is purportedly applied in basal readers and other whitewashed curricula (Leonardo, 2009; Paris, 2012)). Thus, the call is for more than principles. While we cannot lose sight that practice without critical stance and awareness of underlying theory is likely to reproduce social inequities, we need to advance a literature with detailed and specific practices that correspond to these principles. Combining these specific practices
with principles and a principled stance for educational equity and linguistic equanimity offers schools and teachers the resources to adapt to the specific contexts of students’ and communities’ needs and the abilities and resources of a school and district. In doing so, this brings us to the correspondence of translanguaging pedagogies to the broader repertoire of culturally sustaining pedagogy, which Paris (2012) notes “requires that our pedagogies be more than responsive of or relevant to the cultural experiences and practices of young people – it requires that they support young people in sustaining the cultural and linguistic competence of their communities while simultaneously offering access to the dominant cultural competence.” (p. 95)

In preparing some guiding principles and accompanying practices for translanguaging pedagogies that align with this mission of acknowledging, nurturing, and leveraging students’ full linguistic repertoires, I briefly summarize some of the existing literature of recommended principles and then synthesize these suggestions towards prospective guidelines for teaching and teacher training.

I begin broadly, looking at the work of Kevin Kumashiro (2000) and its recommendations for anti-oppressive education. Kumashiro considers the literature on societal and educational marginalization of groups across identity categories – race, class, gender, sexuality, language background, and so forth – and concludes that there are four main approaches to addressing this marginalization in the literature. The first, Education for the Other, calls upon teachers and teacher educators to recognize that certain students are marginalized in society and schools, and must therefore turn schools into safe, supportive, therapeutic, and empowering spaces for students from marginalized groups.
That is, they must be provided spaces where their experiences are validated and their needs given attention within the school. The second approach, *Education about the Other*, calls for including units about the experiences of marginalized groups and integrating such information throughout the curriculum with the aim of disrupting current knowledge. Third, Kumashiro describes *Education that is Critical of Privileging and Othering*, closely linked to the ideas of critical pedagogy, calls for critique and transformation of hegemonic structures, as well as recognition and exploration not only of how particular groups are marginalized, as with the first two approaches, but also of how the privilege of the “norm” is socially constructed and maintained. Finally, the work points to post-Structuralist approaches encapsulated in *Education that Changes Students and Society*, which notes that oppression is situated and calls for teachers and their students to labor to disrupt citational practices that reinforce stereotypes and patterns of oppression. Taken together, these approaches call for recognition of students’ and groups’ experiences on interactional levels at the school and in the curriculum, as well as the forces that lead to their marginalization, without essentializing any singly group or individual or any single mechanism of oppression. The recommended amalgam of these approaches raises awareness of oppression and the experiences of oppressed groups, builds capacity to counter mechanisms of oppression, and provides students with space to work through the inevitable crisis brought on by the disruption of conventional knowledge and the daunting nature of the task to fight for equity.

Turning more specifically towards equity and equanimity for emergent bilingual students, I consider the work of Flores (2013), Hawkins (2004), and Manyak (2002). Manyak (2002) reviews the literature on linguistic and cultural hybridity and pairs it with
ethnographic observation that investigates hybrid literacy practices in a particular DI classroom. While cautioning against an overly romanticized perspective of hybridity as a theoretical construct, Manyak proposes three lessons to be taken into future practice. First, Manyak offers that children’s full linguistic repertoires should be leveraged for classroom participation and acquisition of reading and writing (p. 438). Second, “bilingualism should be utilized to promote collaborative negotiation of meaning across languages and thus be positioned as a special emblem of academic competence.” (p. 438) Third, “developmental biliteracy should be the goal of literacy instruction for language minority children.” (p. 439) Hawkins’ (2004) work, meanwhile, offers seven core notions that characterize a classroom organized for sociocultural approaches to second language acquisition. These notions are summarized along with their implications for practice in Table 21.

Table 21 - Core Notions of Sociocultural SLA Classrooms (Hawkins, 2004, pp. 15-21)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Notion</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Implications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Communities of learners/communities of practice</td>
<td>Recognizes that classrooms are composed of learners socialized into linguistic and academic practices by peers and experts</td>
<td>Classrooms must create spaces for interaction and collaboration among peers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zone of Proximal Development/ Apprenticeship</td>
<td>Students rely on prior knowledge and experiences to ground and sense of new learning</td>
<td>Teachers must recognize students’ prior knowledge to appropriately scaffold learning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple Social Languages</td>
<td>Language is not fixed, bound, or static. Rather, it is dynamic and locally situated, responsive to the contexts and communicative needs of language users</td>
<td>Teachers must recognize diverse speech practices and validate them as learning resources while also growing students’ linguistic repertoires to include prestige varieties and the contexts in which these are demanded.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identities/Positioning</td>
<td>The identities that students present are fluid and co-constructed, reflective of social history and</td>
<td>Teachers should be mindful not to essentialize student identities to any single demographic, linguistic, or academic category</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power/Status</td>
<td>Interactions are situated in broad social, institutional, and community contexts with embedded ideologies and attitudes.</td>
<td>Teachers must be mindful that interactions with students and among students do not perpetuate societal power relations that deny certain individuals or groups access to particular identities, opportunities for learning, and a voice within the classroom.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple Literacies</td>
<td>“The ‘new literacy studies’ propose a view of ‘literacies’ as the requisite knowledge and skills to send and interpret messages through multiple media and modes in (rapidly changing) local and global contexts, and to align meanings within situated social practices.” (p. 20)</td>
<td>As with the core notion of multiple social languages, teachers must be mindful to socialize students into practices beyond conventional school definitions of literacy of decoding and producing text. Rather, they must ensure technological skills and the ability to “read school,” by apprenticing them in the social practices that predict school success.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom as ecology</td>
<td>“Social interaction [is] the hub of meaning making and knowledge and skill acquisition. Classrooms are complex ecosystems, where all of the participants, the practices, the beliefs, the forms of language, the forms of literacies, the social, historical and institutional context(s), the identity and positioning work, the politics and power relations, the mediational tools and resources, the activity and task designs, and the influences of the multiple local and global communities within which”</td>
<td>The teacher’s role shifts from simply planning and delivering instruction to managing an ecological system, which requires recognizing the individuals and interactions that participate in the classroom, and addressing the interactions and factors in instruction, curriculum, and school that constrain learners in these interactions.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Finally, Flores (2013) adopts much of this literature on post-structuralist and sociocultural approaches to language and language teaching to offer five principles of *Dynamically Lingual Education* (pp. 283-284):

1. Reject linguistic Othering
2. Reject static and idealized notions of language
3. Provide spaces for students to experiment with their fluid language practices
4. Make language into a contested part of the curriculum
5. Treat language as an indeterminate and “always becoming process” that is shaped and re-shaped through collaboration within dynamic and ever-changing communities of practice.

These principles strongly echo the aforementioned suggestions and ideas offered by Hawkins, Manyak, and Kumashiro. They call simultaneously for recognition of power relations that establish linguistic and social norms that marginalize particular individuals and groups, support classrooms that allow critique and subversion of these hierarchies, validate students’ entire linguistic repertoires and incorporate their diverse elements into instruction and curriculum, and view learning and language acquisition as social processes of apprenticeship and interaction.

Rather than suggest yet another list of principles, I build on Flores’ principles of dynamically lingual education and offer a series of specific practices in Table 22, foster transformative third spaces and promised more equitable learning opportunities and
schooling experiences for emergent bilingual students, particularly those from historically marginalized Latino and working class backgrounds.

Table 22 - Principles and practices of dynamically lingual education (Flores, 2013, pp. 283-284)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principle</th>
<th>Accompanying Practices</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. Reject linguistic Othering                                            | • Avoid deficit-oriented labels such as Limited English Proficient and English Language Learner tied to lower expectations and negative ideologies about ability and motivation.  
• Provide students acquiring the societally dominant language in schools with equal (if not greater) opportunities to interact with the language and academic practices they will need to succeed in school, rather than isolate them in language-as-subject courses and watered-down content programs.  
• Ensure the classroom is a safe space in which students can express themselves without fear of being teased, whether about their language and literacy practices or otherwise, through teaching and practice in social skills such as conflict resolution and emotion management, as well as community building activities. |
| 2. Reject static and idealized notions of language                        | • Recognize, value, and teach the ways that language has been adapted in students’ particular speech communities, as well as students’ own linguistic flexibility. Assignments that let students record and analyze their own or peers’ speech across contexts, analyze and compare words and language forms that convey similar meaning, and compare language and literacy practices from different communities and cultures (ideally of the diverse students in the classroom), along with explicit instruction to the effect that language variation is natural while language hierarchy is political, assures students that they can broaden their repertoire without shame or sacrifice of their existing practices. |
| 3. Provide spaces for students to experiment with their fluid language practices | • Foster extensive collaboration and interaction. Maestro Quintara and Ms. Jennifer let students work in groups on most assignments and, albeit with some exceptions for stigmatized language forms or words or when insistent on the language separation they were supposed |
to enforce, speak to each other in the ways that were most natural and comfortable within the interaction to cement conceptual understanding, guide collaboration, and clarify doubt. Similarly teachers should support such organization in their assignments, overtly encouraging students’ translanguaging to advance learning, and only insisting on single codes or registers when teaching them alongside the contexts and practices that demand them.

• Provide exposure and interaction with diverse communicative modalities. Maestro Quintara and Ms. Jennifer let students express themselves in conventional school ways – written work and oral presentations – they also let students make informative or fictional video shorts, use PowerPoint slideshows as substitutes for book reports, and interact with websites, songs, illustrations, and symbols to make and convey meaning. Such variety in the linguistic demands of tasks not only let students incorporate their own speech practices and recognize their value in learning, but also broaden their repertoire to include practices of peers and the dominant culture. Teachers could further leverage technological tools such as Internet message boards and Skype or Google Chat to create opportunities for interaction between students with different language practices in areas removed from the nearby speech community.

4. Make language into a contested part of the curriculum

• Teachers should recognize and reject prevalent ideologies about language, which in turn means teacher educators must make this part of the teacher preparation curriculum, along with the associations between these ideologies and discourses about immigrants, racial minorities, the poor and working class, and so on.

• Teachers should be receptive to dynamic language practices that fulfill the same communicative functions of the forms more traditionally valued in school. Thus, providing students choice in work products and avoiding normative labels such as “good” or “appropriate” language and the “right way” to say things allows students to themselves critically analyze the contexts and demands of a particular communicative episode with teacher guidance.
- Familiarize students with the history and power relations in the community. Assignments such as community historiographies, interview projects, and interactions with community organizations, businesses, and individuals allow students to understand and reflect upon how norms, linguistic and otherwise, have been put in place in their respective communities and manifest themselves in current schooling policy and practice. This, in turn, provides students with a framework for critique and transformation of oppressive and marginalizing forces in ways that recognize the collective yet diverse experiences within marginalized populations.

5. Treat language as an indeterminate and “always becoming process” that is shaped and re-shaped through collaboration within dynamic and ever-changing communities of practice.

- Evaluate students’ linguistic proficiency across contexts and communicative functions. Teachers should not assume linear, sequential progress in language acquisition and should not evaluate language with such segmented snapshots. Rather, they should observe students’ language use in various interactions and assignments (including some conventional measures, to be sure, such as writing a variety of genres and decoding text with particular goals for comprehension) to get a more complete picture of students’ full repertoires (including practices outside the societally dominant language), and provide opportunities for additional interaction with the practices that need further development.

In conclusion, my observations of both oppressive ideologies and transformative opportunities at Rivera convince me that the current challenges facing Latino emergent bilingual students in American schools are surmountable, but not without considerable challenge. It requires a reorientation of teacher training and teaching practice that recognizes the power relations that establish language norms, the ideologies and discourses about groups outside the dominant culture that reinforce these norms even among those that they oppress, and an openness to reflect upon and criticize long held
notions of what language is and how it is learned. Above all, it requires the courage and determination to persevere amidst tremendous institutional inertia and societal resistance, including overt racism, xenophobia, and class-based bias. Nevertheless, it is a goal worth striving for and, as I learned at Rivera, one that is attainable in a sequence of small, local victories upon which to build.

On my last day at Rivera, at the promotion ceremony, Rhea and Alicia gave a farewell address on behalf of their class that beautifully encapsulated these small victories and their aggregate impact. Reminiscing on their favorite moments in their time at the school, the girls took turns speaking in Spanish before the gathered multilingual crowd. After describing a series of humorous, endearing, and trying events, they closed with a statement of gratitude,

[Rivera] nos inspiró a pensar más libremente y nos dio el apoyo para despegar como un avión algo que sí era bello. Gracias maestros. El desafío contra los límites, el humor, el disfrutar de los compañeros, la alegría compartida y el dar una buena bienvenida son las lecciones más destacables de nuestro tiempo aquí en esta escuela tan linda. Queremos dar las gracias a todos las personas importantes: nuestros maestros, padres y amigos por ayudarnos durante nuestro tiempo en [Rivera]. Gracias. (Rhea and Alicia, speech, June 13, 2012)

No, niñas, gracias a ustedes.
Notes to Chapter 1

i To ensure confidentiality, the names of all locations and participants have been replaced with pseudonyms.

ii The term “native speaker” is problematic for a host of reasons, including its linking of language and national identity or birthright and its implication that language can be developed to resemble that of individuals born and socialized for life into a particular speech community to a “native-like” state of proficiency (Cook, 1997; 1999). Nevertheless, the term is frequently found in second language acquisition research and is deployed for both official and informal purposes at Rivera, thus its inclusion in this work.

iii For this analysis, I use the terms Latino/a and Hispanic interchangeably, the former being a prevalent form of identification in research and among the study’s participants, while the latter remains the category label on official reports such as the U.S. Census.

iv Part of the larger context of this study, it must be noted, is also an assumption that the role of schools is to provide equal opportunities for learning and social mobility regardless of race, class, gender, linguistic background, and so on. As Ramirez (2006) notes, this has not always been an assumption to be taken for granted. With mass schooling linked to the rise of the Nation-State, Ramirez notes, a central mission of schooling was educating a citizenry that identified with and contributed to the national society. Embedded in this mission were goals of acculturation to national language, mythologies, and customs, as well as debates over who deserved to be made a citizen or who was even educable enough to warrant schooling.

v Just as it is problematic for schools to ignore linguistic realities and proclaim English as better than Spanish or particular varieties of either as superior to others, my references to the two languages as though there were clear boundaries between them often overlooks the way bilingual students raised in bilingual communities are socialized into language practices that readily and purposefully combine these two supposedly separate codes. I apologize for the oversimplification but resort to it for ease of intelligibility.

vii The norma culta is itself also recognized to vary, with a formal register and informal register. The former is prevalently used by the educated urban elite in official capacities, while the latter, used by the same speakers, applies to their vernacular speech.

viii Contributors to Hernández-Chávez, Cohen, and Beltramo (1975) present cases of variation in the particular varieties of Mexicans and Mexican-Americans in New
Mexico, Arizona, Texas, and California, and in some cases even address particular cities or towns in these states.

Gumperz also laments the political ideologies that disparage code-switching, noting a sign in French on a Montreal bus that reads “To speak right is to think right,” stating “When political ideology changes, attitudes to code-switching may change also.” (1977, p. 5) Sadly, he did not live to see this day, although the recent burgeoning of translanguaging scholarship portends progress 46 years after he expressed these hopes.

Notes to Chapter 2

All names have been replaced with pseudonyms to ensure confidentiality and anonymity.

The linguistic landscape of a community “refers to the visibility and salience of languages on public and commercial signs within a given territory or region.” (Landry and Bourhis, 1997; p. 23) The authors analyzed questionnaire data for francophone secondary students in various Canadian communities and found that the presence of French in local signs emerged as a notable and separate variable explaining ethnolinguistic vitality (in-group sense of identification with a language and notions of that language’s vitality [Giles and Johnson, 1987]) for that specific speech community.

Other work (Dailey, et al., 2005) used much larger samples of students, drawing participants from multiple schools and thus, communities with different linguistic landscapes. Certainly Spanish was more present in the homes of Latino students in the study, but this does not comprise part of the linguistic landscape as defined in the literature.

Notes to Chapter 3

Including Junípero Serra, who spearheaded the missionization efforts and whose name now “graces” local roads, freeways, schools, and parks in the area. Bakhtin may not have meant it so literally, but given this colonialist nomenclature, think of all the history, tumult, and future bound up in just giving someone directions.

We could find a rich story right here about language variation, standardization efforts, and language ideologies, both in terms of Ohlone inter-group conflict and then the sweeping imperialism of the Spanish, but that’s another project altogether.
Besides, save for a couple weeks in fourth grade social studies when the kids made models of missions and visited one in a nearby city, the Ohlone didn’t really factor into participants’ understanding of their community – and that’s a project unto itself, too.


_xvi_ Adjusting for inflation, this represents an increase of around $20,000 in median annual household income over 20 years rather than an actual doubling and an increase of $100,000 rather than $200,000 in household value, but the extensive population growth and consumption (especially in areas such as housing) in the area certainly play their role in raising the Consumer Price Index which underlies inflation calculations.

_xvii_ It bears noting the population explosion El Valle experienced after World War II. Population grows over 50% between 1940 and 1950, from just fewer than 4,000 to over 6,500, and then balloons to 31,000 by 1960 and again to 51,000 by 1970. Growth tapers from there and currently El Valle claims just over 70,000 residents.

_xviii_ Students begin in kindergarten with 75% of instruction is in Spanish and 25% in English, with proportions shifting to 70/30, 60/40, and finally 50/50 by third grade, with this ratio maintained through fifth grade (this allotment was implemented after ten years of the program, which originally began with a 90/10 split in K, then 80/20 in 1st grade, and so forth. Of course, this breakdown does not account for special courses such as art and music that are taught in English and may fall during students’ allotted Spanish time, nor does it factor in the “Language” instruction block created amid urgency to have ELL students reclassified as proficient before the end of 5th grade.

_xix_ A decade ago the number was just shy of 100%, attenuated only by the influx of more affluent students from other districts within the county to attend the DI program.

_xx_ Discourses, I might add, that many argue are thinly veiled or sometimes even overt championing of privatization, union-busting, and profiteering in education. The most notable critic of these discourses recently is Ravitch (2010; 2013), although she is certainly not alone in research or practice circles.

_xxii_ There are nine across the two classes who self-identify as “Latina,” “Mexican,” or some other Central American nationality as an ethnic identity. A number of other girls in the program entered officially as native Spanish speakers, since the program requires a balance of English and Spanish speakers in its kindergarten cohorts, but their Spanish proficiency is due either to bilingual parents who learned Spanish later in life or having only one Spanish speaking parent. In either case, these students do not self-identify as
Latino/a. A nearly opposite case occurs as well, with some students raised in monolingual Spanish speaking households using Spanish only under pressure from teachers and peers and rejecting elements of Latinidad in their identity.

There are three other students in the class in whose home a language other than these two is spoken, and other students who have at least one parent who speaks a language other than these two, but none of them reported or demonstrated the same comfort in those languages as Max shows with German.

Notes to Chapter 4

Portions of this section, including Figure 2, borrow significantly from Valdés, Brooks & Poza, in progress.

The DRA, or Directed Reading Assessment, is a measure of students’ reading abilities as indicated by a fluency measure from a short running record and a series of comprehension questions teachers ask students about text. The test is administered to students twice a year at Rivera, once in the beginning and once towards the end, but plays no notable role in lesson planning or curriculum design.

Once more, I reiterate the problematic nature of the term “Native Speaker,” especially given that a handful of the students at Rivera classified as Native English Speakers in fact acquired English along with or after another language. Nevertheless, because the term was instrumental for official purposes in the enrollment of students in the DI program (which mandated an even balance of students with Spanish and English as their respective target languages) and in unofficial terms from the perspective of planning instruction, I could not escape reference to the term in conversations with parents, staff, or students themselves.

Notes to Chapter 5

For instance, students sometimes were allowed to present book reports as oral presentations with Powerpoint slideshows, and students could make scripted video presentations or Powerpoints with their informational texts rather than simply submitting essays.

A graphic novel is like a comic, but of book-length. Frequently they are used in classrooms as scaffolds to important works of literature for students who cannot access the original text, and indeed this is the case in this classroom as students are asked to read the graphic novel at home independently and follow along as Maestro
Quintara reads aloud from the novel itself in class.

Again, names have been changed in the text and as they are uttered in transcripts to protect participants’ confidentiality and anonymity. Kellen is a White US-born boy proud of his Irish descent but also of his bilingualism. He diligently works to maintain Spanish as a unitary code as often as possible in Maestro Quintara’s class, frequently reminding peers who start using English in class conversations.

Jenny is a young, US-born Latina with a Mexican mother and Salvadorian father. She has been reclassified as fluent and proficient in English and is one of the more high achieving students in the class. She is also one of the few students who comfortably crosses ethnic boundaries in friend relationships, as will be seen in chapter 6. By year’s end, she is accepted and offered a scholarship to a reputable all-girls middle school in the area.

The edition the students read of *El mago de Oz* includes a map of the Kingdom of Oz which shows where the respective witches have their castles and the path that Dorothy takes in her adventure.

Ana is a simultaneous multilingual, growing up in a household in which Arabic, Spanish, and English were exchanged. She is the daughter of Iraqi and Spanish immigrants but herself born in the United States, yet for the purposes of Rivera’s admissions and classification schemes, she is labeled a native Spanish speaker.

Notes to Chapter 6

While Berg’s (1990) categories paint a broad picture, the individual stereotype descriptions prove interesting as well. The table below offers specific quotes corresponding to his typology.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stereotype</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>El Bandido</td>
<td>“Typically, he is treacherous, shifty, and dishonest. His reactions are emotional, irrational, and usually violent; his intelligence is severely limited…He is dirty and unkempt.” (p. 294)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male buffoon</td>
<td>“What is funny about this character is his simple-mindedness…his failure to master standard English…his childish regression into emotionality.” (p. 295)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Half-breed harlot | “She is lusty and hot-tempered...The Halfbreed Harlot is a slave to her passions; her character is based on the premise that she is a nymphomaniac. In true stereotypical fashion, motivations for her actions are not given – she is a prostitute because she likes the work, not because social or economic forces have shaped her life.” (p. 294)

Female clown | “The Female Clown represents a way of neutralizing the overt sexual threat posed by Halfbreed Harlot...Once again her emotionalism and her inability to control her baser instincts – indeed, she is controlled by them – conform with the common representation of Hollywood’s stereotypical Hispanic woman.” (p. 295)

Latin lover | “The Latin Lover has been a remarkably consistent screen figure, played by a number of Latin actors, from César Romero, Ricardo Montalbán, Gilbert Roland, and Fernando Lamas to Gabriel Byrne’s recent version in Siesta (1987), all maintaining the erotic combination of characteristics instituted by Valentino: “Suavity and sensuality, tenderness and sexual danger.” (p. 296)

Dark lady | “She is mysterious, virginal, inscrutable, aristocratic – and alluring precisely because of these characteristics.” (p. 296)

xxxiv I avoid using the label instrumental bilingualism which in the past has been put in contrast with integrative bilingualism to refer to one’s motivation for acquiring a second language. The former suggests the motivation is based on potential economic or political gains while the latter presumes a desire on the learner’s part to integrate herself into a society that uses the target language (Lambert, 1967). Although this utilitarian category largely presents students citing economic advantages to being bilingual, the reality of their education and surroundings in the United States suggests that the instrumental label would belie their desires to integrate and thrive in American society.

xxxv As mentioned, Rhea is actually half-Iranian. Phenotypically, she looked “White,” that is, like a European-American, given her blond hair and fair skin. Perhaps more importantly, however, to her racial reading as White is that in this DI program in which enrollment is dictated by linguistic background given the insistence on balancing “native Spanish speakers” and “native English speakers,” classification as an English speaker in effect drives one’s racial reading as “not Latina/o,” and thus students like Rhea and a number of her peers of East Asian, South Asian, Middle Eastern, or Eastern European descent were nevertheless grouped with Anglo-American peers in practice. English, it could thus be said, whitens its speakers, as Bucholtz (2001) notes in the racial identity work of “nerd-speech” and its hyperstandardness.
Goffman (1963) notes that self-deprecation is a strategy used by individuals in a performance as a deflection strategy for the embarrassment of not living up to the paradigms of the identity being performed and to maintain good relations with an audience.

This was a frequent comedic tool used by students, whereby they would make outlandish claims or point to fantastic objects and, upon their interlocutor’s realization that the claim was false, triumphantly stating “psych,” “gotcha,” “made ya look,” or some other phrase pointing out the victim’s naïveté.

Literature circles are teaching structures whereby groups of students at similar literacy levels are grouped and given books to read independently. The groups then discuss features of and reactions to portions of the book as they move through it, either with teacher guidance or on their own with guiding worksheets or journal prompts.

Although there are certainly those who would lump this in with Portes & Zhou’s (1993) notion of downward assimilation insofar as they deemed pop and rap music as a negative facet of “American” culture.

And this is a real possibility since the class had discussed and critiqued policies such as Arizona’s SB 1070, which gave local law enforcement officials authority to inquire about and act upon immigration status, leading to popular outcry about racial profiling against Latinos.

El gran clásico is whenever América and Chivas, among the most popular and accomplished franchises with the most loyal fanbases square off against one another.

It may be worth noting that the information in lines 8 and 26 is contradictory. Whereas “last year” would place the girls in 4th grade, Susana’s latter statement places the story when the girls were in 3rd grade. It’s possible that this means something important, but more likely it simply reflects that as students in the DI program progress with relative stability and lower turnover in terms of both classmates and teachers than their SEI peers, the years blur together over time.

Notes to Chapter 7

Torlaki is a Serbian variety prevalent in the country’s southern region. It was spoken by the parent of one student in the classroom, and this student in turn lamented not being able to communicate with a quarter of her extended family.
Consider, for example, the lack of progress for Mexican students who went from being segregated by surname to being racially classified as White and allowed into White-only schools to then being segregated by proxy through language proficiency classifications.
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