




2019

***Trans +* Languaging: *Beyond* Dual Language Bilingual Education**

Cristian R. Solorza
Bank Street College of Education

Follow this and additional works at: <https://fordham.bepress.com/jmer>

 Part of the [Bilingual, Multilingual, and Multicultural Education Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Solorza, Cristian R. (2019) "*Trans +* Languaging: *Beyond* Dual Language Bilingual Education," *Journal of Multilingual Education Research*: Vol. 9 , Article 15.

Available at: <https://fordham.bepress.com/jmer/vol9/iss1/15>

This Ofelia García as a Scholar is brought to you for free and open access by DigitalResearch@Fordham. It has been accepted for inclusion in Journal of Multilingual Education Research by an authorized editor of DigitalResearch@Fordham. For more information, please contact considine@fordham.edu, bkilee@fordham.edu.



Trans + Linguaging: Beyond Dual Language Bilingual Education

Cover Page Footnote

Christian R. Solorza, EdM, is the director of the Dual Language Bilingual Education & TESOL programs at Bank Street College of Education. He is currently pursuing his PhD in Urban Education at the CUNY Graduate Center. His research interests are language in education policy, translanguaging, teacher preparation, raciolinguistics, culturally sustaining pedagogy, borderland studies, and holistic language pedagogies for emergent bilinguals. His website is <https://graduate.bankstreet.edu/academics/faculty-profile/cristian-solorza>

Trans + Languaging: *Beyond* Dual Language Bilingual Education

Cristian R. Solorza
Bank Street College of Education

Ofelia García calls for a re-imagining of bilingual education by challenging how teachers conceptualize, facilitate, and listen to language use in classrooms. Educators attempt to legitimize students' authentic, fluid, and dynamic language practices through translanguaging, but *non-standard* named language varieties are still marginalized in classrooms. Using the prefix *trans+*, García pushes us to look *beyond* bilingual education to critically challenge hegemonic language ideologies and to break from the monoglossic status quo within dual language bilingual education. Bilingual educators are tasked with envisioning language pedagogies that keep our emergent bilingual students *whole*, as they learn to leverage and expand their linguistic repertoires.

Keywords: bilingual education, dual language bilingual education, hegemonic language ideologies, linguistic repertoires, monoglossic, named languages, Ofelia García, translanguaging

Our transformative pedagogies must relate both to existing conditions and to something we are trying to bring into being, something that goes beyond a present situation. (Greene, 1995, p. 51)

When movements have been unable to clear the clouds, it has been the poets—no matter the medium—who have succeeded in imagining the color of the sky, in rendering the kinds of dreams and futures social movements are capable of producing. (Kelley, 2002, p. 8)

When Ofelia García introduced *translanguaging* (2009) into the field of bilingual education she disrupted how teachers conceptualized language and effectively challenged how we teach it in dual language bilingual education classrooms. No longer are a student's linguistic practices compartmentalized into two or more discrete named languages. Instead, through translanguaging theory we understand that the many ways a student *languages*, inside and outside of school, are all part of a singular and dynamic linguistic system. To value a student *fully* requires us to frame *all* of her linguistic practices as *resources*. How we structure the use of language while teaching content in classrooms determines a student's language output. Although such a declaration seems obvious, it highlights the power we hold as teachers, the power to deliberately *invite* or *silence* features from our students' linguistic repertoire as they interact with curricular content. To teach students *fully* requires us to value and respect them *fully*. For this,

not only must we push *beyond* how we perceive students as language learners, but we must critically challenge normalized expectations for language use during the teaching of standardized curricula in two languages.

Since its introduction, translanguaging in bilingual education has remained controversial due to the field's political origins and three key ideological differences:

1. Bilingual education is a highly-contested political space won through community activism and continuously defended thereafter. In 1972, ASPIRA of New York fought for the educational rights of Puerto Rican students to use Spanish to learn in New York City public schools (Reyes, 2006). The ASPIRA Consent Decree provided all *limited English proficient* students with the right to a bilingual education. The *Lau v Nichols* United States Supreme Court decision (Lau v Nichols, 414 U.S. 563, 1974) further defended the *limited English proficient* speaker's right to a *meaningful* education by engaging with their linguistic resources more fully. It effectively established bilingual education at a national level, including English as a Second Language (ESL). Many bilingual educators believe translanguaging practices unsettle these hard-fought spaces by contaminating the language other than English (LOTE) space with English.
2. Bilingual educators argue that a strict language allocation policy is vital for language learning. It is believed that students immersed in a designated named language space will be more motivated to produce the target language. Translanguaging pedagogy therefore undermines the strict language allocation by allowing students to use languages other than the target language. Thus, many bilingual educators believe translanguaging pedagogy threatens dual language bilingual education altogether.
3. Translanguaging is often (erroneously) viewed interchangeably with code-switching. Code-switching by students and teachers alike has historically been linked to linguistic deficiency. When a speaker switches from one language to another in mid-sentence he is perceived to be a weak bilingual speaker with a limited vocabulary. Moreover, code-switching is so undesirable in some school settings that teachers found using languages interchangeably in a lesson often receive negative written evaluations. It is taken as a sign of poor instruction, a lack of language planning and as presenting deficient language models to students. Unlike code-switching, the act of translanguaging between named languages is not a sign of deficiency but an indication of how the speaker is deliberately deploying her linguistic repertoire to engage with an audience. Still, many school administrators prohibit the use of translanguaging pedagogies in school buildings for fear of a linguistic free-for-all.

Translanguaging is controversial for important reasons; bilingual educators are protecting the political legacy of bilingual education, the establishment of two separate language spaces, as well as the language pedagogies believed to improve language learners' educational experiences in U.S. public schools. However, we must engage critically with translanguaging theory and *not* challenge it blindly for the sake of maintaining the bilingual education status quo. As bilingual educators, we must continue to fight for the educational rights of our students by constantly questioning

our pedagogies and the ideologies that create them. Translanguaging theory pushes us to think *beyond* bilingual education to construct public school spaces that keep our emergent bilingual students *whole*: (1) by helping students leverage and expand their linguistic repertoires within standardized linguistic and content-learning spaces; (2) by shifting the perception of a *marginalized* linguistic variety from *non-standard* to *academic resource*; and (3) by actively establishing translanguaging spaces where students can use their entire linguistic repertoires as academic resources to construct new knowledge.

Educators who genuinely embrace translanguaging theory struggle to create legitimate and discrete translanguaging spaces within bilingual education settings. The pressure to have students perform well on state exams cause teachers to primarily *leverage* students' linguistic repertoires to strengthen standardized linguistic practices. This focus on *standard language* use to engage with content restricts and silences the use of students' other linguistic features deemed *non-standard* or *non-academic*. However well-intentioned, these daily moments *dismember*, or pull, students violently away from their local linguistic and cultural resources (Mayorga, 2018). How do we teach *beyond* such assimilationist approaches that exclude authentic language practices? What does it mean to develop language pedagogies that keep our emergent bilingual students *whole* as they learn to leverage and expand their linguistic repertoires in academic settings? As dual language bilingual teachers we must be vigilant of pedagogies and ideologies that require students to surrender valuable linguistic and cultural resources upon entering dual language bilingual classrooms. Translanguaging theory pushes us to create pedagogies that genuinely honor *non-standard* linguistic features as academic resources and that leverage these as authentic ways to engage with curricular content.

The "trans+" prefix in translanguaging pushes us to imagine what lies *beyond* languaging in bilingual education (García, 2016, personal communication) by problematizing normative narratives of language use during content instruction. In this paper, I build on García's *trans (beyond) + languaging* notion as part of a social justice and liberate project to transform dual language bilingual education by looking *beyond* strict language allocations and standardized language ideologies. Translanguaging pedagogy, translanguaging documentation, critical reflection of students' authentic languaging, and active listening as translanguaging teachers, are offered as humanizing pedagogies for dual language bilingual education classrooms.

Trans +: *Beyond Standard Language Ideologies*

Standard language ideology is a social bias and preference toward the idealized linguistic performance of the White, upper middle class (Lippi-Green, 2012). In other words, the language practices of language-majoritized White populations are deemed more conceptually rich while language-minoritized People of Color need to be taught the *correct* form in order to be college and career ready (Flores, 2016). Schools actively use assimilationist pedagogies to leverage students' *less desirable* home-based linguistic practices in order to develop the *preferred* standard language forms. Even when students learn the standard language varieties well, they are still often seen as outsiders due to racial and/or discourse markers (Flores & Rosa, 2015). Minoritized students feel

disenfranchised and disconnected from what is constructed as the only legitimate discourse, resulting in internalized feelings of deficiency regarding their own oral and written production in schools.

How will young people see themselves as fully authorized speakers and writers when their voices are constructed as inappropriate? How do we expect them to take ownership of their academic and linguistic resources to engage democratically as citizens? This is true violence; whereby a standard language ideology interpellates and constitutes the subject in such a way that they become recognizable *only* in contrast to the parts that are deemed “more correct” (Butler, 1997; Derrida, 1997; García, 2013). This lack of recognition renders students invisible, silenced, and socially (and politically) dead (Dumas, 2016).

When one visits a New York City elementary school classroom (and probably most classrooms across the nation) one can expect to find predictable components and organization: clustered tables, bulletin boards filled with student work, word walls, mathematical strategies, charts delineating reading and writing processes, libraries of books, a meeting area, and evidence of science and social studies inquiry. Sadly, without their physical presence, it would be hard to get a real sense of the children learning in these rooms. Although you may be able to see a child’s mathematical thinking or read a non-fiction article about dogs, you would find few products depicting students’ authentic use of language and lived experiences. Given the social and economic geography of NYC, school walkthroughs should instead demonstrate enormously rich differences as you travel from one part of the city to another. How does such widespread erasure or sterilization of human experience develop?

In 2010, the National Governors Association and the Council of Chief State School Officers released the Common Core State Standards (CCSS). The standards focus on what they call “the essentials for college and career readiness in a twenty-first-century, globally competitive society” (p. 3). While the authors briefly highlight the importance of developing literacy skills to better understand divergent cultures it leaves much of the creation of such tasks up to the discretion of teachers and curriculum developers. However, many educators and parents have focused on the essentials as a way of raising the bar for *all* students. In the name of equity, states across the country carried out federal accountability measures through high-stakes state exams. In elementary public schools, both the English language arts (ELA) and mathematics state exams were used to measure the progress of disaggregated groups of students, as well as to rate the effectiveness of schools and teachers. The pressure to satisfy imposed performance standards resulted in increased test-preparation and a narrowing of curricula to these two main subjects, including students’ language production to elicit test- and content-aligned vocabulary and phrases.

Public school districts responded to the pressure by purchasing standards-aligned curricula and in some cases, supporting teachers in modifying and developing their curricula further. Understandably, from a school district point of view, the implementation of the standards-based curricula along with the delivery of instruction needed to be carried out consistently across classrooms. School administrators regulated the instructional and linguistic practices through walkthroughs, evaluations,

observations, and constructive feedback. Teachers were urged to follow scripted lessons and standards-aligned curricula with *fidelity* while also required to differentiate for students using rubrics and checklists. Teacher evaluations followed suit, evolving from a complete reliance on student performance on state exams to the present inclusion of more school-based measures such as reading levels, mathematical portfolios, and formal/informal lesson observations using performance assessments such as Danielson's Framework for Teaching (New York City, Department of Education, 2013).

Ironically but not surprisingly, the pressure to create and teach rigorous, high-quality, research-based, college and career-worthy instruction in the name of equity did little to highlight and validate the lives, interests, and diverse languages of local students. Students' experiences outside of school, their divergent cultures, and their many ways of languaging continue to play a non-significant role in school curricula. In a shift to improve the academic lives of *all* students, public school educators developed a highly specialized lens for crafting and evaluating standards-based instruction, but lost some of their sensibilities for seeing the students that sit in classrooms more fully. The students who should be at the center of instruction have essentially been filtered out of the content we teach. Even before the CCSS, language in education was (and continues to be) an essential part of every country's process of nation formation. Throughout history, the dissemination of dictionaries and grammars formalized the illusion of language as an unchanging entity with clear boundaries (Lin, 2013). The reality is that dictionaries have been updated continuously as language norms changed to reflect the cultural practices of the powerful (Vološinov, 1929). The standardization of language has always privileged the language practices of those in power while pushing the less valued linguistic varieties to the margins.

Flores & Rosa (2015) suggest that educators must move *beyond* appropriateness-based approaches and challenge the listening subject to confront their biases regarding the use of language in classrooms. They argue,

Simply adding "codes of power" or other "appropriate" forms of language to the linguistic repertoires of language-minoritized students will not lead to social transformation...Attempting to teach language-minoritized students to engage in the idealized linguistic practices of the white speaking subject does nothing to challenge the underlying racism and monoglossic language ideologies of the white listening subject. Additive approaches to language education inadvertently legitimate and strengthen, rather than challenge, the marginalization of language-minoritized students (p. 167).

They encourage educators to look at their own biases and critically question why the linguistic performances of Students of Color have been determined to be *inappropriate* for academic purposes. If educators continue to view differences as deficits, Students of Color will continue to suffer *physical and psychic assaults* in schools (Dumas, 2016). Our ways of knowing language and teaching language learners uphold a commitment to an epistemology that reproduces social hierarchies and oppressive educational practices (Mignolo, 2015).

As educators, we must look *beyond* standard language ideologies and critically question normalized instructional practices that *other* our minoritized speakers. Standards-based lenses to content and language sterilize and erase the incredible cultural and linguistic diversity of our students. When we listen for the exclusive use of standard and academic content language throughout daily instruction we fail to recognize our students' rich linguistic repertoires. We end up *listening for the language we want students to learn*—grade-level standardized language and content-specific vocabulary—without recognizing and respecting the full linguistic and experiential resources our students have to offer.

Trans +: *Beyond* Strict Language Allocation Policies

Most schools do not resist conventional barriers—*they create them*—by reproducing social hierarchies and structures through strict monoglossic language policies. Dual language bilingual education (DLBE) programs are no exception to this as they engage in enforcing standard language policies in *two* separate language spaces (García, 2009). As students transition from one linguistic classroom space to another, they are expected to transition from being a standard monolingual speaker in one language to a standard monolingual speaker in the other language (Grosjean, 1982). Furthermore, within each space, students are encouraged to shift from employing informal linguistic varieties to *more appropriate* standard language varieties. These expectations reflect an expanded standard language ideology that reproduces two sets of imagined and idealized language practices, each with its own arrangement of social hierarchies.

A translanguaging approach breaks away from this rigid view of language towards a more dynamic and fluid understanding. Instead of conceptualizing a language as a distinct closed linguistic system, or *box* with clear borders, translanguaging theory sees language as a dynamic set of linguistic features that are ever-changing as we engage flexibly with diverse speakers. This more *open* conceptualization of language includes the many varieties of a language often excluded in classrooms such as those referred to as dialects, informal, colloquial, non-standard, and non-academic and/or social language. The distinction between these varieties and named languages are socially constructed along socioeconomic, racial, ethnic, religious, political, national, and other lines. Therefore, these distinctions do not actually exist structurally in the brain (Otheguy, García, & Reid, 2015) but live in the social imagination and are reified materially in multiple ways. In other words, all language speakers, monolingual and multilingual, are thought to have *one* linguistic system that holds a repertoire of linguistic features employed in their social worlds. Bilingual students are thought to hold linguistic features associated with their two distinct named languages, including the linguistic features linked to standard and non-standard varieties within each of the named languages.

The structural design of dual language bilingual education (DLBE) programs are informed by standard language ideologies that envision languages as closed linguistic systems. This is reflected structurally by the two *separate and discrete* language spaces that exist in dual language bilingual education programs, where models distribute language by percentage, temporally, or by subject. For example, some DLBE programs

alternate language by day while others maintain one language in the morning and the other in the afternoon for a period of one to three weeks.

When translanguaging is introduced into dual language bilingual education classrooms, two conflicting theories of language play out in practice, explaining some of the difficulty DLBE educators experience when creating translanguaging instructional spaces. The DLBE theory of language takes standardized language practices as its focus and treats English and the LOTE as the main subjects while translanguaging theory shifts the focus onto the learner and their dynamic use of language in academic spaces. These theories of language *have two distinct loci that create contradictions* within DLBE instructional practices.

DLBE strict language allocation policies deny students access to their full linguistic repertoires. When we ask students to shut off their English part of the brain and turn on their LOTE part of the brain, what are we asking for exactly? Within a DLBE theory of language, we ask students to focus on developing a specific language variety as the primary locus of instruction and to dismember their unitary linguistic system to align to that focus. In other words, we focus on *teaching an idealized language while disregarding students' authentic linguistic practices*. In contrast, a translanguaging theory of language makes the student the locus of instruction, not the idealized language.

As students transition from one language space to another, we cannot ask them to simply collect the non-target language and non-standard linguistic features and store them in the recesses of their brain. We have all witnessed this impossibility time and time again when our students continue to use their diverse linguistic repertoires regardless of the language of instruction. Furthermore, by asking students to shut off, or temporarily dispose of a set of linguistic resources, we are denigrating their linguistic experiences as not fit for academic classroom discourse. These practices reinforce a damaging social hierarchy in classrooms that elevate speakers who use more standard language varieties to construct new knowledge while depreciating students who use non-standard varieties to communicate their ideas. Unfortunately, the only spaces that students can use their full linguistic repertoire freely is outside the classroom—during lunch, on the playground, or outside of school. Their full linguistic repertoire is not seen as a resource in academic settings, but as a *social* resource to be employed only outside of classrooms.

As students transition between two language spaces, DLBE teachers interconnect idealized language using *standardized content-specific vocabulary* presented by state-required curricula. Bilingual educators make explicit connections between two standardized varieties by paralleling vocabulary through bridging (Beeman & Urow, 2013), using cognates, and by deliberately sequencing content learned across two linguistic spaces. This focus on developing content through standardized language practices prevent students from using their *non-standard* language features as academic resources. Again, *the standardized language practices become the instructional focus rather than honoring how students employ their authentic language practices to negotiate meaning*. This point is illustrated in the following two scenarios carried out in a DLBE two-world model where students have just transitioned

into the Spanish classroom after studying non-fiction writing in the English classroom for a week. Scenario #1 presents content instruction focused on standardized language practices, while scenario #2 employs translanguaging pedagogies to honor students' full linguistic repertoires as resources for learning new content.

Scenario 1: Content Instruction focused on Standardized Language Practices

The Spanish teacher bridges the English non-fiction writing instruction by presenting students with a teacher-created bilingual dictionary. The teacher asks students to use the dictionary to label the components of a displayed non-fiction piece in Spanish. The teacher presents the sentence stem: "Yo veo que esta pieza contiene un/una ____." (I see that this piece contains a ____.) Students say: "Yo veo que esta pieza contiene un título y un sub-título" (I see that this piece contains a title and a sub-title." Another student says: "Yo veo que esta pieza contiene una introducción y una conclusión." (I see that this piece has an introduction and conclusion).

Scenario 2: Content Instruction Honoring Students' Language Repertoires

The Spanish teacher posts a *translanguaging space* sign and encourages students to use both English and Spanish language features during the discussion. The Spanish teacher displays a chart created in the English classroom labeling the parts of a non-fiction writing piece in English. He projects a Spanish non-fiction piece on the SmartBoard. Pointing to the English chart he says: "Veo que han aprendido mucho con el maestro de inglés. ¿Me pueden explicar qué aprendieron usando todos sus recursos lingüísticos?" (I see you have learned a lot with the English teacher. Can you tell me what you learned using all your linguistic resources?) As he listens, he charts the vocabulary and phrases used by students to describe their learning. Students use language features associated with both English and Spanish. He does not correct their language practices. Students' statements include:

- a. "Este chart dice las partes de un article." (This chart says the parts of an article.)
- b. "Los artículos de non-fiction have titles and sub-titles." (Non-fiction articles have titles and subtitles.)
- c. "También tienen una introducción y conclusión." (They also have an introduction and conclusion.)
- d. Tambien tienen...how do you say these words in Spanish? (pointing to a caption under a picture)? (They also have...how do you say these words in Spanish?)
- e. A friend yells out: ¡Una caption! (A caption!) [Although "una caption" is not the Spanish word for caption the student made an attempt to translate the word "caption." This attempt is validated because the student was able to recognize the non-fiction feature.]

In both scenarios, students are sharing what they learned in the English classroom but they depict different approaches in how teachers engage with students' language practices. In the first scenario, the teacher uses a bilingual dictionary as a support for students who do not yet know the equivalent Spanish vocabulary for the writing terms. This is a great strategy but it does not engage with the students' full linguistic

repertoire. Instead, the teacher is exclusively focused on the state-mandated content and narrows students' production to the corresponding standardized content-specific vocabulary. The second scenario presents the English non-fiction chart as a reference, but the teacher creates a translanguaging space to engage with the academic concepts using students' entire linguistic repertoires.

Language pedagogies centered upon students' linguistic repertoires is a social justice issue; students deserve linguistic agency to express their ideas flexibly. DLBE language learners deserve access to their dynamic linguistic repertoires to negotiate meaning across multiple experiences because *complex ideas take time to develop*. As students travel from one language space to another, their responses cannot always be narrowed down to sentence starters, content-specific vocabulary, and cognates. DLBE students deserve the right to be able to express authentic ideas employing as many of their linguistic features necessary. Educators must challenge themselves to accept and validate ideas expressed using language practices marginalized in academic settings. We must be critical of standard language ideologies that allow *non-standard* linguistic contributions to be admonished, belittled, deemed inappropriate, non-academic, and deficient.

Employing translanguaging pedagogy in DLBE calls for a student-centered approach to teaching language that keeps students *whole* as they expand their linguistic repertoire. We must de-center standard language ideologies in order to privilege students' full lived experiences and their many ways of languaging inside and outside of school. Students' languaging outside of school cannot simply be labeled *social language* while idealized in-school language is termed *academic language*. Additionally, local experiences need to be respected and regarded as academic content, not simply as "*culturally-relevant*" experiences that create scaffolds for *legitimate* academic bodies of knowledge. Actively privileging standardized language practices over students' other *non-standard* linguistic resources in classrooms is an act of violence. This well-intentioned practice dismembers students from their local linguistic and cultural resources (Mayorga, 2018) and renders valuable linguistic resources deficient.

Trans +: Listening Beyond What We Want Students to Say

When we use instructional pedagogies rooted in standardized language ideologies we become the *White listening subject* (Flores & Rosa, 2015). When dual language bilingual Teachers of Color utilize culturally-sustaining pedagogies solely to *leverage* a student's linguistic repertoire to strengthen school-based academic language, they too embody the *White listening subject*. Our strong focus on standardized content-specific language prevents us from engaging with the authentic linguistic practices of Students of Color. As the *White listening subject*, we listen for the language we want students to learn—we actively regulate and monitor their linguistic output for specific language that aligns to lesson goals, such as content-specific vocabulary, academic phrases, genre-specific sentence structures, and proper syntax. Teachers of Color embody the *White listening subject* when they filter out and correct language deemed non-academic and push informal language varieties outside of the perimeters of the lesson. Among all the diverse and authentic linguistic practices being used daily in our classrooms, DLBE educators' ears have developed a highly specialized filter through which they sort classroom language, effectively silencing and erasing the many ways of

languaging that are distinct from the standardized content language. Paris & Alim (2014) ask: “What would liberating ourselves from this [White] gaze and the educational expectations it forwards mean for our abilities to envision new forms of teaching and learning?” (p. 86).

Listening *beyond* standard language and content-specific language requires a significant and deliberate shift in both intention and practice—one in which we stop listening for the language we want students to learn and instead learn to *hear what students actually say*. Translanguaging theory pushes educators to engage with students’ authentic ways of languaging—to respectfully listen to what actually is being said by students without judgement. However, when teachers are conditioned to not (necessarily) listen to their authentic language production it is difficult to hear, acknowledge, and appreciate translanguaging practices as resources.

Translanguaging documentation can be used as a pedagogical tool to appreciate and assess students’ authentic languaging practices in dual language bilingual education classrooms (for specific details and examples see Sánchez, García, & Solorza, 2017 and Solorza, Aponte, Leverenz, Becker, & Frias, 2019). When students communicate with diverse audiences they are deliberately employing their linguistic repertoires in specialized ways. For instance, when a student talks to a teacher who defines herself as a White, upper middle-class Colombian, the student may feel the need to use linguistic features associated with standard varieties of Spanish. When talking to his bilingual best friend during a math center, the student may use language features associated with informal and formal varieties of both English and Spanish. If DLBE educators document these specific authentic interactions throughout the day they would develop an emerging profile of each student’s linguistic repertoire, as well as gain a sense of how, when, and why the student translanguages.

As educators gain a deeper awareness of their students’ translanguaging, they must be careful not to resort to assimilationist approaches when teaching language and content. As stated before, many teachers in DLBE classrooms use translanguaging as a way to leverage their students’ minoritized language features with more standard language features. This is a *dismembering* practice that de-centers the value of students’ linguistic resources in order to teach them academic language. As educators, we must look *beyond* these approaches by critically analyzing why we have difficulty accepting a student’s authentic use of language. Why do we want students to replace their language features with more standard language features? What biases are we carrying as a listener? What local bodies of knowledge do we reject and why? Why do we privilege some language content as academic and some as social? What social hierarchies and oppressive ideologies have we internalized that allow us to devalue a student’s linguistic and cultural production?

Translanguaging documentation, and ongoing critical reflection of how we perceive students’ translanguaging as listeners, become important daily practices for valuing our students more *fully*. Combined with culturally sustaining practice (Paris & Alim, 2014), an ongoing appreciation of students’ authentic funds of knowledge (Moll, Amanti, Neff, & Gonzalez, 1992) and community cultural wealth (Yosso, 2005), bilingual educators can engage in *re-membering* students to their local linguistic and cultural

resources (Mayorga, 2018). These practices *educate the educator* by establishing respectful humanizing practices that allow them to learn from and with their students. Armed with a greater understanding of students' local bodies of knowledge and authentic language practices, educators are better able to modify curriculum and advocate for changes that include their students more fully. Together, teachers and students can build and co-create instructional practices that heal and counteract harmful dismembering and oppressive pedagogies (Greene, 1995).

Conclusion

García (2009; 2013) calls for a re-imagining of bilingual education by challenging how teachers conceptualize, facilitate, and listen to language use in classrooms. Using the prefix *trans+*, García pushes bilingual educators to look *beyond* bilingual education to critically challenge hegemonic language ideologies and to break from the monoglossic status quo within dual language bilingual education. This paper envisions *trans+* languaging as a transformational pedagogy for dual language bilingual education, one that pushes *beyond* normalized ways of teaching to genuinely validate students' entire linguistic repertoires.

Schooling should inspire learners to become whole, not dismember and displace them. Standard language ideologies and standards-based curricula essentialize the language practices of minoritized students and bar them from using their own cultural and linguistic resources. This paper suggests using translanguaging documentation as a tool to value students more fully. The objective documentation of students' authentic use of language provides space from which to frame such productions as resources. As curriculum developers, DLBE educators must find genuine ways to reposition students' home/community experiences as official knowledge and as active ingredients for content instruction, not simply as scaffolds. Translanguaging pedagogies as described in scenario #2 offer ways to meet this goal by legitimately privileging students' full linguistic repertoires during standards-based content instruction. We must forge spaces where students' bodies of knowledge and diverse ways of languaging develop alongside what is perceived as academic content in schools.

The teacher as listener can invite or silence a student's authentic use of language. If bilingual educators want to genuinely honor and respect students *fully*, they must engage in hearing what students actually say instead of listening for the language they want students to learn. Daily critical reflection is needed to increase educators' awareness of how they hear students in classrooms and as a way to gauge their personal biases toward language use.

Trans+ languaging pushes us to dream and imagine possibilities *beyond* bilingual education so we may further serve the authentic linguistic and lived realities of our students. Maxine Greene (1995) notes,

To tap into imagination is to become able to break with what is supposedly fixed and finished, objectively and independently real. It is to see beyond what the imaginer has called normal or 'common-sensible' and to carve out new orders in experience. Doing so, a person may become freed to glimpse what might be, to form notions of what should be and what is not yet. And

the same person may, at the same time, remain in touch with what presumably *is* (author's emphasis) (p. 19).

García's work with translanguaging echoes Maxime Green's words by calling us to break with what is supposedly fixed and finished in the field of bilingual education. Bilingual educators are tasked with envisioning language pedagogies that keep our emergent bilingual students *whole* as they learn to leverage and expand their linguistic repertoires.

Finally, to appropriately honor Ofelia García's transformative work in this special issue, I must conclude by sharing a personal academic experience that underlies the ideas presented in this article. A decade ago, I met her during my second year of doctoral studies at a time when I felt completely estranged from the bodies of knowledge I called my own. Although I had entered academia with lots to say and a soulful connection to the written word, I became voiceless, and my attempt to write often resulted in words paralyzed by the fear of sounding stupid. When learning is limited to writing, discussing, and reading academic papers that use linguistic forms of privileged expression, academia becomes violent and leaves us *dismembered* from local forms of power, knowledge, and place (Mayorga, 2018). When I *dropped out* of academia I looked for a possible learning disability as the explanation for my failure. This is the story of many dismembered students – where we internalize notions of deficiency because we do not see ourselves represented in academic texts nor in the legitimate language practices used to sustain ideas in graduate classrooms. When we do deviate from academia's norms and try to *re-member* ourselves to our local histories, place, and to each other (Mayorga, 2018; Vizenor, 2008) we are often corrected and directed to seek remediation, intervention, and/or leave the institution of school altogether.

The effects of academic violence are traumatic and long lasting. I still struggle to piece together an *academic* voice in academia that feels legitimate while remaining rooted in my local experiences and language. With García's encouragement, care, and advocacy I was able to return to my doctoral program. Her validation of my diverse ways of languaging revitalized me and helped me develop an appreciation of my own intellectual and linguistic resources. Although academia has not changed much since I left, I have drawn much from translanguaging pedagogies to sustain my sense of wholeness by centering my efforts on nourishing my voice as a learner and actively imagining openings for my ways of knowing and languaging (Greene, 1995; Bakhtin, 1982).

I sincerely thank, Ofelia García, for being a constant source of inspiration and for helping me dream beyond academic norms to recognize my own wholeness. In this—my first solo writing piece—I imagine, disrupt, and reclaim in her honor.

References

- Bakhtin, M. (1982). *The dialogic imagination*. Austin, TX: University of Texas Press.
- Beeman, K., & Urow, C. (2013). *Teaching for biliteracy*. Philadelphia, PA: Caslon.

- Butler, J. (1997). *Excitable speech: A politics of the performative*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Derrida, J. (1997). *Of grammatology*. Baltimore, MD: John Hopkins Press.
- Dumas, M. J. (2016). Against the dark: Antiracism in education policy and discourse. *Theory Into Practice*, 55(1), 11-19. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00405841.2016.1116852>
- Flores, N. (2016). A tale of two visions: Hegemonic whiteness and bilingual education. *Educational Policy*, 30(1), 13-38. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0895904815616482>
- Flores, N., & Rosa, J. (2015). Undoing appropriateness: Raciolinguistic ideologies and language diversity in education. *Harvard Educational Review*, 85(2), 149-171. <https://doi.org/10.17763/0017-8055.85.2.149>
- García, O. (2009). *Bilingual education in the 21st century: A global perspective*. Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.
- García, O. (2013). From diglossia to transglossia: Bilingual and multilingual classrooms in the 21st century. In C. Abello-Contesse, P. Chandler, M. M. López-Jimenez, T. López, & R. C. Beltrán (Eds.), *Bilingualism and multilingualism in school settings* (pp. 155-175). Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters. <https://doi.org/10.21832/9781783090716-012>
- Greene, M. (1995). *Releasing the imagination: Essays on education, the arts, and social change*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Grosjean, F. (1982). *Life with two languages*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Kelley, R. (2002). *Freedom dreams. The black radical imagination*. Boston, MA: Beacon Press.
- Lau v Nichols*, 414 U.S. 563 (1974).
- Lin, A. (2013). Heteroglossia: Toward paradigmatic change in TESOL methodologies: Building plurilingual pedagogies from the ground up. *TESOL Quarterly*, 47(3), 521-545. <https://doi.org/10.1002/tesq.113>
- Lippi-Green, R. (2012). *English with an accent: Language, ideology, and discrimination in the United States* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203348802>
- Mayorga, E. (2018). Education in our Barrios Project. #BarrioEd Project. In J. Ayala, J. Cammarota, M. I. Berta-Ávila, M. Rivera, L. F. Rodriguez, & M. E. Torre (Eds.). *PAR Entremundos: A pedagogy for the Americas*. New York, NY: Peter Lang.
- Mignolo, W. D. (2015). Sylvia Wynter: What does it mean to be human? In K. McKittrick (Ed.), *Sylvia Wynter: On being human as praxis* (pp. 106-123). Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Moll, L., Amanti, C., Neff, D., & Gonzalez, N. (1992). Funds of knowledge for teaching: Using a qualitative approach to connect homes and classrooms. *Theory into Practice*, 31(2), 132-141. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00405849209543534>
- National Governors Association Center for Best Practices & Council of Chief State School Officers. (2010). *Common core state standards for English language arts & literacy in history/social studies, science, and technical subjects*. Authors, Washington, DC. Retrieved from <http://www.corestandards.org/ELA-Literacy>.

- New York City. Department of Education. (2013). *Danielson 2013 rubric: Adapted to New York City Department of Education framework for teaching components*. Retrieved from <http://schools.nyc.gov/NR/rdonlyres/8A4A25F0-BCEE-4484-9311-B5BB7A51D7F1/0/TeacherEffectivenessProgram1314Rubric201308142.pdf>.
- Otheguy, R., García, O., & Reid, W. (2015). Clarifying translanguaging and deconstructing named languages: A perspective from linguistics. *Applied Linguistics Review* 2015, 6(3), 281-307. <https://doi.org/10.1515/applirev-2015-0014>
- Paris, D. & Alim, S. (2014). What are we seeking to sustain through culturally sustaining pedagogy? A loving critique forward. *Harvard Educational Review*, 84, 85-100. <https://doi.org/10.17763/haer.84.1.982l873k2ht16m77>
- Reyes, L.O. (2006). The ASPIRA Consent Decree: A Thirtieth-Anniversary Retrospective of Bilingual Education in New York City. *Harvard Educational Review*, 76, 3, 369-400.
- Sánchez, M. S., García, O. & Solorza, C. (2017). Reframing language allocation policy in dual language bilingual education. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 41,1, 37-51, <https://doi.org/10.1080/15235882.2017.1405098>
- Solorza, C., Aponte, G., Leverenz, T., Becker, T., & Frias, B. (2019). *Translanguaging in dual language bilingual education: A blueprint for planning units of study*. New York, NY: CUNY-NYSIEB.
- Vizenor, G. (Ed.). (2008). *Survivance: Narratives of native presence [Kindle edition]*. Lincoln, NB: University of Nebraska Press.
- Vološinov, V.N. (1929). Marxism and the philosophy of language. In *The Bakhtin reader: Selected writings of Bakhtin, Medvedev and Vološinov*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Yosso, T. J. (2005). Whose cultural has capital? A critical race theory discussion of community cultural wealth. *Race Ethnicity and Education*, 8(1), 69-91. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1361332052000341006>