



Association of Mexican American Educators Journal

A peer-reviewed, open access journal

Volume 12 Issue 2

2018

AMAE Invited Special Issue

Linguistic Hegemony and Counterhegemonic Discourse in the Borderlands

Guest Editor

Brendan H. O'Connor
Arizona State University

Editors

Patricia Sánchez
The University of Texas at San Antonio

Antonio J. Camacho
AMAE, Inc.

Associate Editors

Julie L. Figueroa
Sacramento State

Lucila D. Ek
The University of Texas at San Antonio

**The Hegemony of Language Separation:
Discontents en Programas de Lenguaje Dual en Paraguay and El Paso**

Katherine S. Mortimer

University of Texas at El Paso

Abstract

While language hegemonies often take the form of one language imposed upon speakers of another, this article focuses on the hegemony of language boundaries themselves imposed upon everyday language practices, and in particular, upon those of teachers and students in bilingual classrooms. This examination of two different borderland contexts—El Paso, Texas on the U.S.-Mexico border and a central Paraguayan community on an urban-rural Spanish-Guarani speaking border—illustrates how similar dominant ideologies and discourses worked in both places to make it seem as if what participants saw as “language separation” was pedagogically and socially superior to what they saw as people’s everyday “mixed” language use. While teachers’ languaging in practice refused these boundaries, it remained unaffirmed by any explicitly positive discourse. With others, I argue that discourses that explicitly affirm and valorize translanguaging practices must become more available to teachers as ways to name, understand, and evaluate their own (and students’) language use. And specifically, here I highlight the embracing of translanguaging in formal, public events beyond the classroom as key to this process, illustrating this proposal with two such moments in the El Paso and Paraguayan borderland contexts.

DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.24974/amae.12.2.397>

Introduction

Históricamente el Paraguay ha sido un país guaranihablante-guaranihablante. De hecho, la proclama de la independencia nacional en 1811 se hizo en guaraní como para identificar de que era una nación con una lengua distinta de las demás, entonces la proclama de la independencia nacional se hizo en guaraní ((dando golpecitos en la mesa con su dedo, con el ritmo de las últimas palabras)). [Y después en el 1812] las cartillas de enseñanza que se emitió desde Asunción allí decía que la lengua que va a ser utilizada en las escuelas iba a ser el? castellano. El castellano. Y decía eso que la enseñanza se dará en lengua castellana.

Historically Paraguay has been a Guarani-speaking ((with emphasis)) country. In fact, the proclamation of national Independence in 1811 was made in Guarani so as to identify that [Paraguay] was a nation with a language distinct from the others, and so the proclamation of national Independence was made in Guarani ((hitting the table with her finger with the rhythm of the final words)). [And afterward in 1812] the instructional primers that were produced from Asunción there it said that the language that was going to be used in the schools was going to be? Spanish. Spanish. And it said that instruction would be given in the Spanish language. (Official with the Paraguayan Ministerio de Educación y Cultura, Interview, 7/23/2008)

As I interviewed her about Spanish-Guarani bilingual education, an official with the Paraguayan Ministry of Education and Culture tried to help me understand the hegemony of Spanish in this Latin American nation. She wanted me to understand how Spanish had been imposed on the country, which, in her telling, was so identified with the indigenous language, Guarani,¹ that the declaration of independence from Spain had been issued in Guarani. She also wanted me to understand how the imposition of Spanish had happened, in part, through schools. This kind of language hegemony (Vélez-Ibáñez, 2017) is an imposition of one language over

¹ Pronounced with stress on the final syllable, often written in Spanish as guaraní. Following Guarani orthography, I do not use the accent mark on this and other Guarani words in this article (e.g., Jopara) when I am writing in my voice. In direct quotes, originally in Spanish (as in the opening) I do follow Spanish orthography, as was common in the research context in Paraguay.

another, and it is recognizable across the world. In Paraguay, the colonial language, Spanish, was officially imposed in classrooms on a Guarani-dominant population. In what is today the region along the U.S.-Mexico border, Spanish was imposed upon communities of Tigua/Tiwa and Rarámuri speakers, and later, English was imposed upon communities of Spanish speakers. Yet, as Vélez-Ibáñez (2017) highlights, these hegemonies have always met resistance.

Sometimes resistance has taken the form of counternarratives like Paraguay not being a Spanish-speaking country, but a Guarani-speaking one. But resistance also takes the form of everyday language use that refuses language distinctions themselves. In Paraguay, this is often identified as a mix of Spanish and Guarani—or Jopara—and in the El Paso, Texas region along the Mexico-U.S. border, it is often identified as a mix of Spanish and English. In many academic conversations, language use that refuses language distinctions is identified as part of translanguaging (Canagarajah, 2011; García, 2009a). In this article, I focus on the hegemony not of one language imposed upon another, but of language boundaries themselves imposed upon everyday languaging practices, and in particular upon the language practices of teachers and students in bilingual classrooms. I describe how this happened in these two different borderland contexts—El Paso, Texas, and central Paraguay—to illustrate how similarly dominant ideologies and discourses worked in both places to make it seem as if what participants saw as “language separation”² was pedagogically and socially superior to what they saw as people’s everyday “mixed” language use. I contrast these ways of seeing and talking about language use in both places with examples of teachers’ everyday languaging practices that nevertheless refused named-language boundaries but often remained unaffirmed by any explicitly positive discourse. This is to say, that even though teachers, who all identified as speakers of the minoritized language, translanguaged in instructional practice, and even though they articulated pedagogical reasons for drawing fluidly on their whole linguistic repertoires, teachers in neither place had readily available ways to talk about their language use in a positive light. Their practices inherently pushed back at

² Throughout the article I use double quotation marks for two purposes, both of them to distinguish my voice from others’ voices: (1) when attributed to a particular speaker they indicate a direct quote, or someone else’s exact words; and (2) when, as here, used around a single word or short phrase without attribution to a particular speaker they convey that, in general, participants usually meant something by that term that I, as researcher/analyst do not. In this case here, I use quotation marks to indicate that the terms “language separation” and “mixed” were ways that participants and the general public often describe language use but that I, as an analyst striving to take a translanguaging perspective, am trying to avoid. At other times, I mark this difference in voice with a description like “what participants called/recognized as/identified as language separation.”

dominant discourses, but their talk about or evaluations of their own language use pushed back much less. I agree with others (Flores & Rosa, 2015) that targeting dominant ideologies and discourses for change more than teachers' and students' translanguaging practices is the most promising way forward. Specifically, I argue here that discourses that explicitly affirm and valorize translanguaging practices must become more available to teachers as ways to name, understand, and evaluate their own language use. I highlight the embracing of translanguaging in formal, public events beyond the classroom as key to this process, illustrating my proposal with two such moments in the El Paso and central Paraguay borderland contexts.

Language Separation as the Imposition of Named Language Boundaries

Scholars in several fields of language-related research describe language boundaries as socially constructed—that is, not naturally or inherently existing, but existing only socially. That is, as Otheguy, García and Reid (2015) say it, “named languages” do not exist in any linguistic sense, as linguistic things, because their boundaries—where they begin and end—cannot be drawn by any linguistic criteria. Named languages do exist socially, however, as things we refer to, things we recognize as different from or similar to other things, labels we use to identify ourselves, and they do have real consequences (e.g., on an elementary school registration form or home language survey: “Is there a language other than English spoken at home?” where testing and labeling follow). And still, we make these boundaries socially, in talk and social practice. The idea that named languages do not inherently exist can understandably be a tough sell in school, where many of our daily operations as teachers require it (e.g., decisions about whether a child should take the state standardized test in English or Spanish); where, as students, we learn a sense of doing our work in something called English or something called Spanish; and where we learn that our passing grades, our diplomas, our certifications, our job security depend in part on our knowing what is “proper” or “correct” English or Spanish and what is not. But it is precisely because this idea so deeply challenges the status quo or what is taken for common sense, the idea that named languages do not exist is potentially a very powerful one for thinking about how we serve bilingual children.

The idea of language boundaries being socially constructed has been developed in a number of academic fields: among them, linguistic anthropology and sociolinguistics, applied linguistics, language education, and bilingual education. Seminal linguistic anthropological and

sociolinguistic work described the ways that language ideologies (Kroskrity, 2000; Schieffelin, Woolard, & Kroskrity, 1998)—or beliefs about the connection between language and the social world—have functioned historically to distinguish some language forms from others and, in the process, have functioned to distinguish some people from others and rationalize differences in the allocation of rights and resources (Gal & Irvine, 1995; Gal & Woolard, 1995; Irvine & Gal, 2000). Makoni and Pennycook (2005) locate the invention of languages as part of colonialism, as a tool used by colonizers to distinguish between themselves and the colonized and among various colonized groups, and they outline the material effects or inequalities those inventions have produced. Silverstein (1996) describes this phenomenon in the U.S. as a “culture of monoglot Standard [English],” an “aggressively hegemonic” (p. 286) ideology that U.S. society uses to create a sense of homogenous culture through a homogenous language. What we think of as U.S. standard English is not just a construction in opposition to other “non-standard” varieties of U.S. English, but also in opposition to bilingualism (Milroy & Milroy, 1999).

Studying the conflicts between majority languages and minoritized, often indigenous, languages, scholars of language contact and language revitalization recognize an imposition of language boundaries in the form of purism, or efforts to rid a minoritized language of “contamination” by a more dominant language (Joseph, 1987). Purism is a sociopolitical movement and language ideology aiming to restrict the sources of new features in a language to what are considered “native” elements, and it often arises in response to cultural pressures for modernization (see for example, Hill & Hill, 1980). Purism can be part of a response to periods of rapid change in social and political structures (Annamalai, 1989; Jernudd, 1989), and it can be a discourse that, like other language ideologies, circumscribes not just a language but an identity, authorizing and authenticating one and delegitimizing others (see also Bucholtz & Hall, 2005). That is, as Shapiro (1989) writes, “...purification movements imply at some level that impure language elements belong to impure persons. This impurity ascription makes it then possible to put people who cannot claim affiliation with the privileged language in a lesser moral space” (p. 23). Often purism surfaces in the context of the introduction of an indigenous language into schools, where it will be used for functions and topics for which it has not traditionally been used. Such was the case in the introduction of Guarani into Paraguayan schools where it had been proscribed before 1994 and where questions of which variety of Guarani to use in teaching generated intense debate (Mortimer, 2006). Among the controversial questions, for example,

was whether a word like *democracia*,³ commonly used in everyday Guarani but often identified as Spanish, could be used in Guarani in school or whether a word would need to be found that used only morphemes identified as Guarani.

More recently scholars of language education, applied linguistics, and bilingual education have brought attention to the imposition of language boundaries within schooling with critical examinations of how bilingualism and bilingual students' language resources are (inadequately) conceptualized and addressed in education (e.g., Canagarajah, 2013; Creese & Blackledge, 2010; Cummins, 2008; Flores, 2013; García, 2009b; Hornberger & Link, 2012; Jaspers & Madsen, 2016; Lewis, Jones, & Baker, 2012; Palmer, Martínez, Mateus, & Henderson, 2014; Sayer, 2013; P. H. Smith & Murillo, 2015; Zentella, 1997). Initially, a primary focus of language educational work was on how students' bilingualism is ignored or denigrated and on the importance of opening space for and valorization of minoritized languages in school—for example, for Spanish in English-dominated U.S. schools and for indigenous languages in Spanish-dominated Latin American schools—through bilingual, as opposed to monolingual, education programs (e.g., Baker, 2001; Cummins, 1986; Freeman, 1998; Hornberger, 1988). In the process, the idea of “language separation” was produced (Dolsa, Villarreal, & Mortimer, 2017) and promoted as an important way to protect space for a minoritized language. The idea that using a minoritized language in separation from a dominant language is still compelling as a means to build additive bilingualism, as in long-term enrichment dual language programs (Howard, 2007 citing Dulay & Burt, 1978; Legarreta, 1977; Swain, 1983), and as a means to prevent language loss among younger generations (for example, Wyman, 2009).

Yet while the need for bilingual education remains acute, as does the need to protect space for minoritized languages, critical work reveals the inadequacy of fit between language separation and what bilingual people really do with languages. García (2009b; Otheguy et al., 2015) and colleagues, Creese and Blackledge (2010), Hornberger and Link (2012), and others advocate for a translanguaging or translingual (Canagarajah, 2013) perspective that takes bilingual people's (students', teachers', families') fluid and dynamic language practices as the starting point for instruction—that is, actively using teachers' and students' whole linguistic repertoires in

³ In striving to take a translanguaging perspective as much in the writing of this article as in the analysis, I choose to use features of all languages in the same typeface (i.e., not marking some with italics), as in a single linguistic repertoire.

instruction—rather than those of an imaginary, idealized monolingual. While translanguaging-in-teaching includes practices seen as language mixing or codeswitching, it is not only these practices, and should be understood as the languaging that happens when bilingual people feel free to use their whole linguistic repertoires in making sense in interaction (Otheguy et al., 2015).

With translanguaging as an alternative frame through which to see bilingual language use, the hegemony of language separation in schools, and its associated costs and inequities, becomes clearer (Flores, 2013; Martínez, 2013; Martínez, Hikida, & Durán, 2015; Palmer et al., 2014). A growing body of work articulates specifically how teachers can actively, reflectively, and strategically employ translanguaging in instruction for pedagogical purposes. García, Johnson, and Seltzer (2016, p. xi), for example, describe some of the many ways that teachers and students can do this to, for example, support comprehension and to make space for students' ways of knowing. O'Connor and Crawford (2015) show how teachers and students can use translanguaging—specifically hybrid language use—for language play that contributes to stronger teacher-student relationships and for generating opportunities to talk about bilingual identities.

This important work (see also Celic & Seltzer, 2011) makes explicit how teachers can change their language practices or how they can change what they permit or encourage students to do, in order to better support students' learning of both language and content. A complementary approach proposes a shift—or addition—to where we seek change. Rather than primarily targeting minoritized speakers' language practices for change, we should target for change the ideologies of people that hear them (Flores & Rosa, 2015). Flores and Rosa propose this shift as a way of more effectively challenging inequalities among language speakers—that by focusing entirely on changing how Latinx children (and teachers) speak, for example, we may do little to challenge their marginalization, whereas focusing on changing how people hear and evaluate them will do more to produce change. Drawing on Inoue's (2006) work, they talk about hearers as the white listening subject as a way of focusing on the perspective and ideologies of a generic hearer more than a specific person. This white listening subject perspective emerges from the dominant position of white people in general and entails dominant ideologies that make it seem as if whiteness, and in particular white people's language practices and ways of life, are the norm, and somehow more valid than those of people of color.

The white listening subject as a concept is a way of talking about this hegemonic perspective while not assuming that it is taken up only by people who identify as white. That is,

people who identify as white may hear, understand, and evaluate others through this perspective, but people who identify as people of color might also do so, as well as people in their roles as teachers, curriculum writers, test-question writers, and institutions like schools and boards of education. The white listening subject is one way of thinking about the set of ideologies that help to construct language boundaries: as people and institutions hear, understand, and evaluate minoritized language speakers from this dominant subject position, those speakers' practices are judged as Other, perhaps as not English or not proper Spanish. Flores and Rosa's (2015) development of the white listening subject as a target for change is contextualized within U.S. schools, where whiteness and race are primary ways of understanding social difference (Ladson-Billings & Tate, 1995), while in Paraguay, Mexico, and elsewhere in Latin America class and urban-rural distinctions, as well as race, play a similar role. In this article, I refer to the white/dominant listening subject in order to accommodate this variation while taking up Flores and Rosa's call for making dominant hearers—more than minoritized speakers—responsible for change.

Study Methods and Contexts

Data for this analysis come from two ethnographic studies. The first study was conducted in Paraguay with 11 months of fieldwork in two Spanish-Guarani bilingual schools (Mortimer, 2012), where participants included sixth-grade students, their parents, teachers, administrators, Ministry of Education personnel, and language activists. The second study was conducted in the Texas-Mexico border area with 28 months of fieldwork over three academic years in four Spanish-English dual language programs: 2 elementary level and 2 high-school level.⁴ Participants in the U.S. study included elementary and high school teachers and administrators, high school students, and district personnel. In both studies, data were collected through participant observation, interviews, the collection of policy and curricular artifacts, and video recorded classroom interaction. This article draws primarily on interview, observational, and video recorded data from teachers regarding their languaging practices and ideologies about those practices. Analysis in both studies is ethnographic (Emerson, Fretz, & Shaw, 2011; Kaplan-Weinger & Ullman, 2015; LeCompte & Schensul, 1999; Maxwell, 1996) and discourse analytic (Wortham & Reyes, 2015; Gee, 1999; Gee, 2011).

⁴ I am grateful to Gabriela Dolsa and Emiliano Villarreal for their invaluable contributions to data collection and analysis in the El Paso project (see Mortimer, Dolsa, & Villarreal, Under review).

As an ethnographer, my primary research instrument is myself. In both contexts, I identify and am identified in multiple ways, and I am not always sure how much overlap there is between how I saw myself and how participants saw me. In general, in both places I identify as an invested newcomer: a newcomer as someone lacking historical knowledge and experience compared to others in this context, while I also invested in relationships and interaction with the aim that they be long-term, of some mutual benefit, and multiplex, intertwining my personal (mother, neighbor, friend) and professional (researcher, language student, teacher educator, workshop leader) roles. In both places, I identify and was identified as a woman and a mother of bilingual children, like many of the adult participants (teachers, administrators, parents). In Paraguay, I was “Americana” (usually read as inherently white and financially privileged), a profesora, an English speaker, a non-native speaker of Castellano Paraguayo, and a learner of Guarani. In El Paso schools, I am Anglo and white, a U.S. citizen, a university professor, a speaker of what I identify as white, middle-class, Midwestern U.S. English and U.S. classroom Spanishes.

Many of these are positions of power and outsidership. I strive in my research to help dismantle the ideological regimes that privilege my own language forms and stigmatize others, to help make more powerful the forms of languaging that are not my own, while also implicating myself and my own power in the processes and hegemonies I am trying to undermine. In this analysis where I report, in part, on things that Guarani speakers say about other Guarani speakers and things that Latinx (as well as white/Anglo) teachers say about other Latinxs, I do not see myself as an innocent observer. Rather, I see myself as someone whose very languaging—when I speak a dominant form of U.S. English or separate my languages in teaching or interaction—contributes to and benefits from the hegemonies I critique. Because of this, I strive to tread carefully in my discussions of Othering within communities where I am an outsider: while Othering of some Guarani speakers by other Guarani speakers may look disconnected from my own hegemonic English, my position is that it is not. On the contrary, it is very much tied to the colonial and racial hegemonies that privilege me, and I strive to keep those connections present in my analysis. For example, my use of the white/dominant listening subject (Flores & Rosa, 2015) is an effort to keep visible that problematic ideologies are located in systems of whiteness and colonialism, in the institutions that enforce and propagate those ideologies rather than in individual people as if they existed outside these social contexts. This is not to say that individual participants, who in the case of these studies identified as speakers of minoritized languages, do

not have choices to take up particular ideologies or not, but that I, as a white researcher, want to and must foreground for critique the role of whiteness and systemic racism in the circulation of these ideologies.

In Paraguay, the borderland is linguistic rather than geopolitical. Despite widespread and well-documented Guarani-Spanish bilingualism (Fishman, 1967; Rubin, 1968) and ongoing evidence that Guarani speaking (77% of the population) has been more common than Spanish speaking (Paraguay DGEEC, 2012), Guarani was officially prohibited in schools until 1992. In that year and with a major educational reform in 1994, official policy called for universal bilingual education in which Spanish and Guarani would be both instructed languages and languages of instruction using a model similar to 90/10 dual language programs in the U.S.⁵ In both school sites in the study, the focal sixth grade classrooms were to include, according to teachers' understandings of official policy, half the instructional time in Spanish and half in Guarani, using separately what were seen as academic varieties of both languages. However, participants generally identified the variety of Guarani they spoke most often as Jopara (a Guarani word for mixed), which is perceived as mixed Spanish/Guarani and has been well-documented as a feature of the Paraguayan sociolinguistic context (Boidin, 2000; Domínguez, 1982; Krivoshein de Canese & Corvalán, 1987; Lustig, 1996; Meliá, 1974). Because Guarani dominance was far more common in rural areas and Guarani-Spanish bilingualism more common in urban areas (Gynan, 2001), one school site in the study was urban and the other was rural. This article uses primarily data from the rural school where teachers all came from the school community or nearby and identified as bilingual or Guarani-dominant. Students were nearly all Guarani dominant. The data were collected in 2008, 14 years into the educational reform.

In the El Paso, Texas region, the borderland is both linguistic and geopolitical. Spanish-English bilingualism is widespread (72% of households speaking a language other than English, the vast majority of those speaking Spanish; U.S. Census 2015). And similarly, most schooling historically occurred in English only. However, dual language (DL) programs have been available in elementary schools since the mid-1990s and in high schools since the early 2000s. Students in the elementary classrooms in this study were part of two-way 50/50 DL programs, and they comprised both Spanish-dominant English learners (ELs) and English-dominant Spanish learners.

⁵ A student's dominant language is used 90% of instructional time in the earliest years, decreasing by about 10% each year until an even 50/50 split between the two languages in about fifth grade and maintained thereafter.

Students in the high school classrooms were part of what was simply called a dual language program, comprising most courses in English with 1-2 courses offered in Spanish each year. Most having been long-time participants in dual language, nearly all were now proficient in both English and Spanish: some had always been classified as English proficient, some were formerly classified as EL and now exited, and only 2-3 students in the classes observed were still officially classified as EL. At both levels, most students and teachers were Latinx. Following commonly accepted guidelines for dual language education in the U.S. (Howard, Sugarman, Christian, Lindholm-Leary, & Rogers, 2007), it is generally understood in these programs that Spanish and English are to be used separately in instruction. While the Paraguayan and U.S.-Mexico borderland contexts are geographically distant, and in many ways culturally distant, comparison of what teachers do with language and how they evaluate their languaging in school reveals powerful similarities in how the hegemony of language separation takes shape.

Ideologies of Language Separation

In both contexts two related sets of ideologies value what people see as language separation over translanguaging. One set links what people see as language mixing to uneducatedness, to images of uneducated people. The other set links language separation, use of “pure”, “unmixed” varieties, to authenticity. Here I will describe the forms these sets of ideologies take in each context and then how the sets are interrelated. In the first set, what people see as “mixed language” gets connected with models of uneducated identity that in both contexts have names. In El Paso (and elsewhere on the Mexico-U.S. border) language use perceived as mixed Spanish-English (including anglicized Spanish, Spanglish, Chicano English) sometimes gets linked with a kind of person labeled (a) “pocha/o” (Hidalgo, 1986; Richardson, 1999). A pejorative term, it is part of broader powerful ideologies of standard Spanish that are well-documented (e.g., Galindo, 1996; Hidalgo, 1986; Richardson, 1999; R. C. Smith, 2003; Stolk, 2004; Valenzuela Arce, 2004; Wilson, 1946) and help to make various Spanishes (and their speakers) seem like different separate entities and stigmatizing those that are seen as mixed or Americanized: for example, to separate central Mexican Spanishes from stigmatized U.S.-Mexico border Spanishes, to separate Mexican border residents from stigmatized Mexican American border residents, and to separate people seen as educated, middle class from

stigmatized Others seen as uneducated, lower class. With one exception,⁶ I did not witness anyone use the derogatory term itself in school; rather, the linkage between mixing and uneducatedness was made implicitly as in the following quote:

Yo soy la maestra de español y estamos permitiendo que los niños continúen con ese vocabulario [anglicanizado]. No voy a decirles que los han estado educando mal los papás, pero yo soy el ejemplo que ellas me están viendo y que quieren ser el modelo a seguir. Yo creo que yo tengo la responsabilidad moral para decirles a los niños “no se dice carpeta, se dice alfombra, no se dice mapeador, se dice trapeador.” “No, pero es que eso es de la región, es como habla El Paso, o este lugar, o lo que viene siendo la frontera” [hablando como alguien del distrito] pero es que en realidad “estás guachando” no es, no, no es, no está en diccionario de la Real Academia Española y yo creo que si vamos a hablar bien, pues hay que enseñar bien.

I am the Spanish teacher and we're allowing the children to continue with that [anglicized, or mixed with English] vocabulary. I'm not going to tell them their parents have been educating them poorly, but I'm the example they are seeing and the model they want to follow. I believe I have the moral responsibility to tell the children, “You don't say carpeta [to mean carpet], you say alfombra, you don't say mapeador [to mean mop], you say trapeador.” “No, but that comes from the region, it is the way people speak in El Paso, or this place, or the border,” [speaking like someone from the district] but in reality, “Are you guachando?” ... it's not in the dictionary of the Royal Spanish Academy, and I think that if we are going to speak well, well then, we have to teach well. (Ms. Karen, Interview, 5/13/2014)⁷

⁶ A discussion in a high school Chicano studies class about discrimination between Mexicans and Chicanos and in which identity terms themselves were discussed (field notes, 6/23/2015).

⁷ A note on translation: I translate into English longer quotes from participants' interviews while I choose to leave untranslated some shorter phrases in Spanish. These choices are an effort to draw broadly on my linguistic repertoire, and perhaps those of readers, while also striving to make participants' words comprehensible to the maximum number of readers.

Ms. Karen identified a number of what she and the interviewer, who both grew up in the Juárez-El Paso area, called “anglicismos” and she links them to the possibility of being badly educated. She frames her role in correcting them as *la maestra de español* as a *responsabilidad moral*, not simply a technical responsibility but one of moral value, of *hablando y enseñando bien*, which she describes as speaking without anglicismos. While critiquing anglicized forms that her students use, and thus valorizing hegemonic forms over what students do, Ms. Karen also identified with her students and saw herself as an English learner like them. She may have seen her moral responsibility, in part, as preparing her students to evade the criticism of those who would judge them negatively for “mixing.” Deeply committed to protecting space for Spanish and Spanish-speaking children in school, Ms. Karen and many other dual language teachers resist the hegemony of English, while also supporting the hegemony of language separation. As detailed more below, hegemony and counterhegemony can happen at the same time, sometimes in the same actions.

In Paraguay, what is perceived as mixed Guarani-Spanish language use gets linked to a kind of person called (a) “*guaranga/o*,” a pejorative term to describe someone as Guarani speaking as well as ignorant and rude (Pane, 2005) and often from a rural area. In general, people linked the term with Guarani speaking and not explicitly with mixed language use, but since the introduction of Guarani into schools debate in mass media and public discourse had produced a widely recognized distinction between “*guaraní-guaraní/guaraní académico*” and “*jopará*” (Mortimer, 2006) and, although not universally appreciated, Academic Guarani was distinctly linked with educatedness and cultural forms like poetry and traditional song. Many felt that Jopara was not appropriate for school:

Para mí que no. En un principio [el Ministerio] pedían que se acepte como el niño habla pero para mí que deberíamos tratar de sacar ese jopará. E inculcándoles hablar correctamente el idioma guaraní y correctamente el idioma castellano... que distinguen bien lo que es castellano y lo que es guaraní.

For me, no. In the beginning [the Ministry] asked that how the child speaks be accepted but for me, we should try to get rid of that Jopara. And instill in them how to speak the Guarani language correctly and the Spanish language correctly...

that they distinguish well what is Spanish and what is Guarani. (Profesora Carla, Interview, 5/7/2008)

Profesora Carla's description of her position on Jopara is uncannily resonant with Ms. Karen's description of her position on Fronterizo Spanish. Both responded to attempts from above (the district in Ms. Karen's case and the Ministry of Education in Profesora Carla's case) to encourage a more dynamic perspective on students' bilingualism with a recommitment to language separation as good education. Both are teachers who displayed deep caring for their students and devotion to the minoritized language. The "unmixed" Spanish Ms. Karen taught and the "unmixed" Guarani Profesora Carla taught are both valued assets in their contexts; their practices guarded space and power for Spanish and Guarani against what might be seen as inevitable encroachment from English and Spanish, respectively. This is to say that their language separation was bivalent—implicating both counterhegemony and hegemony at the same time. At the same time that dual language educators actively fight against monolingual education, advance a bilingual, biliterate model of educated personhood in the students they are teaching, and demand more space in the world for their students and themselves—all important counterhegemonic activities—they may reproduce another hegemony: that of language separation.

In addition to ideologies that link language mixing with uneducatedness, a second and related set of ideologies links language separation with authenticity. In the case of Paraguay this is evident in a comment from an academic, writer, and member of the National Commission on Bilingualism (the body originally responsible for forming national language policy) in which he juxtaposed Jopara and "authentic Guarani":

El paraguayo cree que sabe guaraní y no sabe. Si no estudió, no sabe guaraní...
¿Qué clase de palabras en guaraní traen los niños de la calle o de la casa? Traen el
jopará, no trae un guaraní auténtico.

The Paraguayan thinks that he knows Guarani, and he doesn't. If he hasn't studied [it in school], he doesn't know... What kind of words in Guarani do the children bring from the street or from home? They bring Jopara, they don't bring an authentic Guarani. (Interview, 7/28/2004)

Language use recognized as authentic, unmixed Guarani (often called Guarani-Guarani) was important for displays of Paraguayan national identity: for example, at school assemblies for national holidays. Equating Guarani-Guarani with being Paraguayan, one student's mother commented, "Yo opino que está bien [que los funcionarios públicos puedan hablar] en guaraní porque acá todos somos paraguayos y está bien que hable en guaraní-guaraní [I think that it's good (that public employees can speak) in Guarani because here we are all Paraguayans and it's right that one speaks in Guarani-Guarani]" (Interview, 9/3/2008). In El Paso, a sense that mixed language undermines the strength of one's Spanish, which teachers understood as important for good academic achievement, is evident in a comment like the following:

She says that some children "don't have a language." Parents speak Spanish at home but they've gone to all English daycare and so they're losing their Spanish already. That's hard. They need a foundation in their first language. You're not going to have a strong house if you don't pour the cement first, she says. (Field notes, 2/24/2014)

This teacher's argument was not that Spanish is problematic—as is sometimes part of public discourse—but that "strong" Spanish was critical, and mixing was a threat to that goal. In El Paso a teacher's argument for dual language education, linked perhaps to notions in teacher education like "semilingualism" (MacSwan, 2000), is also linkable to the circulating idea of a person whose Spanish is not only seen as inauthentic but also their Mexicanness (e.g., Stolk, 2004). In both places, language separation is implicated within the valorization of the minoritized identities: to widen space for Guarani-speaking in Paraguay and for Spanish-speaking in the U.S. the other language must be kept out.

Translanguaging Practices and Evaluations

Despite the strength of ideologies privileging language separation, teachers translanguaged anyway. In El Paso, elementary DL teachers frequently encouraged students to translate for each other, issued swift management instructions in the "non-target" language, called children by terms of endearment in the other language, and in other ways drew on their full linguistic repertoires

over long stretches of discourse but also across words and within sentences. For example, one teacher responded to a student's question asking if they could go to sleep in the literacy corner during reading time with, "¡Qué go to sleep, ni qué go to sleep! Get busy!" (Field notes, 4/16/2014) (also see Mortimer et al., Under review). When asked, she said she often found language use like this more effective than if she were to say it all in what she saw as Spanish or English. We observed in interactions like this that she created humor and authority while effectively re-directing students' behavior.

Some high school DL teachers translanguaged throughout instruction of their content-area subjects. The following excerpt from a ninth-grade biology class shows some of the ways that the teacher, Ms. Robles (MR) and a student (S), translanguaged:

Excerpt 1: El páncreas

1	MR	Ok (.) vamos a continuar (.)	Ok (.) we're going to continue (.)
2		ok cuando, pongan atención,	ok when, pay attention,
3		ok, cuando el intestino delgado	ok, when the small intestine
4		está absorbiendo los nutrientes	is absorbing the nutrients
5		as the villi are absorbing the nutrients	
6		aquí es cuando viene el páncreas	here is when the pancreas comes
7		this is the pancreas (2.0) ok	
8		y el páncreas (6.0) qué va a hacer	and the pancreas (6.0) what will it do?
9	S	ah, producir insulina	ah, produce insulin
10	MR	producir insulina para qué	produce insulin for what
11	S	para reducir los niveles de azúcar	to reduce the levels of sugar
12	MR	para para reducir los niveles de azúcar	to to reduce the levels of sugar
13		remember it is the hormone that	
14		tells. the red blood cells. pick up the	
15		glucose. take it to the body cells. so	
16		they can use it for energy.	
17		ok, hablamos de la diabetes cuando	ok, we talk about diabetes when
18		una persona tiene diabetes es porque	someone has diabetes it's because
19		el páncreas no está produciendo	the pancreas isn't producing

20	insulina o no está produciendo	insulin or isn't producing
21	lo suficiente	enough
22	so instead of their body cells using	
23	up the glucose	
24	en vez de que está usando esa glucosa	instead of using that glucose
25	they're just keeping it and storing it	
26	and storing it and storing it, k, and so	
27	the pancreas releases the insulin to	
28	tell your body cells use the glucose	
29	for energy.	
30	Entonces,	And so,
31	it releases (5.0) ((writing)) hormone	
32	you have to know that it's a hormone	
33	(2.0) insulin (.)	
34	insulina (4.0)	insulin
35	it tells the body (7.0) to use (2.0)	
36	glucose (4.0) to make ATP (12.0)	
37	ok, and because it's a gland	
38	es una glándula	it is a gland
39	the pancreas is also a gland we're	
40	going to color it yellow.	

(Videorecorded classroom interaction, 12/7/2016)

As Ms. Robles was talking, she used an overhead projector to project on the classroom screen a diagram of the digestive system, which students also had in their notebooks. She pointed to, wrote on, and colored in the diagram as she spoke. In lines 3-4, she began describing the digestive process using Spanish features, and in line 5, she specified that it was, in particular, the villi within the small intestine that did the absorption work. When asked about this move, Ms. Robles indicated that she may not have known the term for villi in Spanish, but she wanted to ensure that students understood the process in general and knew the specific term villi in English. Biology is a “tested subject” in Texas with students required to pass the end of course (EOC)

exam in order to graduate, and Ms. Robles indicated that many of her languaging decisions, including this one, related to her goal of preparing students to pass the EOC. As in line 32 and again in lines 37-38, she often wanted to call students' attention to English terms they would need to recognize on the exam, as well as related meanings in Spanish. In terms of García, Johnson, and Seltzer's (2016) purposes, Ms. Robles was both providing support for her students to engage with and comprehend the target biology content and providing space for her students to further develop their bilingualism. Similarly, in lines 17-21, she gave a real-life context with which students could understand the function of the pancreas using features that were most likely the most familiar to students for that topic. We noted that students would be likely to have experience with diabetes in their families, and that through this example, their experience would connect with the target content. When asked she indicated that she had also been trying to help them notice the phonology of the word diabetes in "standard" Spanish, where the last vowel sound is an /e/ and not an /i/ as it is pronounced in English and often pronounced by her students and the local community.

In Paraguay, some teachers (like Profesora Carla quoted above) kept languages separate in instruction, but many teachers, especially those who taught Guarani-dominant children, used Jopara frequently for instruction. The following excerpt shows Profesora Elena's translanguaging during a *trabajo y tecnología* lesson focusing on the major agricultural products of Paraguay. Students in her class were largely dominant in Jopara. She read aloud from a textbook in Spanish while students followed along in shared copies on their desks, and as Profesora Elena read she added commentary of her own to the textbook material. She read a sentence stating that mandioca (cassava), beans, sugar cane, and corn are products grown throughout the country. She then paused and added that these are all products that can be grown in the backyard and thus do not need to be purchased from a store.

Excerpt 2: Ñande hardínpeko [In our garden]

1	Eso quiere decir que nuestro	That means that our
2	pueblo no tiene la necesidad	community has no need
3	de comprar ya que pueden ser	of buying since they can be
4	cultivados en cualquier parte	grown in any place

5	no necesitan de lugar exclusivo	no need for a dedicated place
6	...para plantar, solamente que	...for planting, just that
7	nosotros los paraguayos	we Paraguayans we are
8	estamos acostumbrados a	accustomed to
9	comprar ndajerekói varâko	buying sometimes we don't have
10	pe hepyrâ ha jaja	the money to buy it and
11	jadeve pe almacénpe	we go and owe money to the
12	mandi'óre. Siendo que	store for mandioca [root]. When
13	podemos cultivar [estas cosas]	we can cultivate [these things]
14	nosotros en cualquier parte de	ourselves in any part of
15	nuestra casa. Aunque sea	our house. Even though it's in
16	ñande hardínpeko ñañotyva'erâ	our garden that we have to plant
17	peteî kumandá, pero no,	one bean, but no,
18	nosotros no queremos hacer	we don't want to do
19	eso.	that.

(Video recorded classroom interaction, 7/25/2008)

Profesora Elena used longer stretches of what was recognized as Spanish (e.g., lines 1-8) and of Guarani (e.g., lines 9-12) as well as words composed of morphemes from both languages (e.g., e.g., line 11: *almacénpe* [to the store] derived from the Spanish *almacén* [neighborhood store] and the Guarani postposition *-pe* [to]) that might be recognized as Spanish or Guarani or Jopara differently by different people. Like the elementary teachers in El Paso, Profesora Elena evaluated her translanguaging as important for pedagogical goals—primarily for students' content learning and comprehension—although they saw it as undesirable and often a personal fault. Profesora Elena said, "I use both, always both...because if I teach them all in Spanish few are those who understand...very few, including me, I get tripped up with Spanish because I use more Guarani, or that is, Guarani Jopara, it's not the pure Guarani either...I see that they understand better...but it comes to hinder them at some point, Jopara" (Interview, 10/22/2008). An elementary administrator and former classroom teacher in El Paso said, "I really think that we have to be, try to stick to the language of instruction...but I'm so bad, I'm the worst...I do codeswitching constantly...but then, codeswitching is like an art" (Interview, 6/11/2014). This is

to say that their pedagogical experience told them translanguaging was good practice, and thus, they resisted the hegemony of language separation by using both languages together. Yet they often evaluated their own language use negatively, seeing their own language practices through the eyes of the white/dominant listening subject and reinscribing the hegemony they undermined in practice.

Teachers in both El Paso and central Paraguay knew implicitly that students' and their own translanguaging practices were important resources for classroom communication and learning overall, even though discourses that explicitly valorized them were not readily available in either place. And they must be. The fast growth of translanguaging scholarship increasingly makes some of these discourses available in the U.S.: for example, practical texts that specifically outline translanguaging pedagogies for teachers (Celic & Seltzer, 2011; Garcia et al., 2016; O'Connor & Crawford, 2015), discussions of translanguaging in language education materials (Baker, 2011; García, 2009a; Wright, 2015), and alternative possibilities for talking about language knowledge/use like the term *lingual* rather than *bilingual* (Flores, 2013). In Paraguay, in 2008 at the time of the study, some discourse affirming the importance of Jopara for instruction had been available to a limited extent through policy documents (Paraguay MEC, 2000, 2004, 2006) and previous public debate (Mortimer, 2006) about what I would now call translanguaging vs. language separation, but in 2008 these affirmative discourses were seldom heard and teacher participants did not use them to talk about their translanguaging practices. If we are to support minoritized speakers' resistance to the hegemony of language separation, and I take the position that we should, teachers and students must have available to them ways of talking about what they are doing that specifically affirm their use of their broad linguistic repertoires.

Translanguaging in Public, Formal School Space: Toward Broader Ideological Change

How then do we make more available to teachers, as well as others, ideologies and discourses that can be used to explicitly valorize what they and students are doing? A reasonable locus for change is the broadly available set of ideologies that we use to hear, understand, and evaluate teachers' and students' practices and the discourses through which those ideologies are made perceivable—that is, change to the ideologies and discourses of the white/dominant listening subject. I argue that moments in both contexts when translanguaging erupted beyond

the classroom boundaries and claimed space at formal, public events suggest a pathway toward this broader ideological and discursive change.

One of these events was at a high school ceremony in El Paso where all graduating seniors in the district who had completed all the requirements of the dual language program were honored and were awarded a special DL program cord to wear with their graduation regalia. While it was not their actual graduation ceremony, all the usual signs of a formal graduation ceremony were present: an auditorium stage with floral decorations and a podium; an audience full of family members; students in graduation regalia; a formal presentation of honor cords where graduates were called one by one to cross the stage, shake their teachers' and administrators' hands, receive their cord, and pose for a photo. A number of student honorees had been chosen by their class peers to represent their respective high school DL programs by giving a short valedictorian-style speech. In the speeches students reflected on their experiences in the DL program and the value of their biliteracy and their Latinx identities and thanked teachers, parents, and friends. Across two of these ceremonies that we observed over the course of the study, many of these student speakers translanguaged in their speeches in ways that could have seemed transgressive in the formal context of the event, but we observed no evidence that it was perceived as such. Some moments like introductions were translated, delivered sequentially and somewhat separately, repeating similar content across the two versions, as if to address distinct Spanish-speaking and English-speaking audiences. But students' translanguaging was more diverse, drawing more broadly on their linguistic repertoires to compose a message complete only in its translanguaging. Despite the dominant discourse that forms of translanguaging like "Spanglish" or popular Spanish of the U.S. are almost invariably perceived as informal (Otheguy & Stern, 2010), students' translanguaging co-existed with the distinct formality of these events. Very much because it was a formal event, their languaging was a powerful assertion of their control over their linguistic repertoires and over the way the event would get produced.

In another culminating event, this time in Paraguay, teachers, students, and mothers produced a formal, public event in which translanguaging was central. At this rural school, most informal, everyday conversation was in what people identified as Jopara, though all the formal, public, whole-school events I had witnessed (preschool graduation, schoolwide mass, most morning assemblies) were almost exclusively in Spanish. Indeed, Spanish was one of the sociolinguistic elements that helped to make these events seem formal. By public I mean school

events to which parents, families, the community were invited. This exceptional event, however, La Mini-Expo de Remedios Yuyos (Pohâ Ñanâ) [The Mini-Expo of Medicinal Herbs] did not follow these patterns. One of a handful of formal, public, school-wide special events that I attended at Escuela San Blás, it occurred on an October afternoon at the end of the school year. In the largest classroom at the school, students assembled on the floor and window sills, teachers and students stood at the front, and several mothers sat in chairs along the back wall. All parents had been invited and the seven who came were honorary guests. At the front of the room three tables were arranged, decorated in white lace tablecloths and covered with carefully-arranged arrays of medicinal plants gathered in bunches and labeled with the plants' names: ñuatî pytâ, amba'y, cedrón kapi'i, yerba de lucero. The spatial organization of the room into a stage-like space and an audience space, the arrays of labeled plants, the tablecloths, and a colorful announcement of the event drawn on the blackboard all resembled other formal events and helped to create the formality of this one.

The Expo was the culmination of a whole-school project in which students had researched different pohâ ñanâ, or medicinal plants, where they grow, and what medicinal uses they serve. These wild-growing herbs were a significant source of income for many community members, who picked them, washed them, bunched them, and took them in baskets to the city center, where people bought them as additives for terere (cold mate tea) or mate (hot mate tea), for poultices, or for many other therapeutic uses. A whole-school project on some topic was required by the Ministry of Education and the teachers at the school had chosen pohâ ñanâ. Profesora Romilda, the pre-k/first grade teacher, opened the Expo presentation and acted as the master of ceremonies throughout. She began the ceremony in Jopara.⁸ Each grade stood in succession before the audience and pairs or individual students presented particular herbs, giving the plants' names, describing where they grow, and explaining their uses—many of the students' languaging was more Jopara and some was more Spanish. Profesora Romilda and the two teachers took turns asking students questions about their plants and providing additional information on them—all three did this in Jopara and Spanish. The school director stood at the rear of the room and interjected occasionally in Jopara or Spanish. I also stood at the back with a video camera.

⁸ Throughout this description I use the terms Jopara and Spanish in the ways participants in this community typically used them, while analytically I am aware that the forms of languaging the terms refer to are all included in translanguaging.

The director had asked me to video record the event and to give them a copy that they might use when presenting their work to the Ministry of Education, making the Ministry a potential audience as well as parents and community members who were physically present. At the end of the event, Profesora Romilda asked the mothers to come forward and provide an oral evaluation of the students' performance—all did so at least in part in Jopara.

In the following excerpt, Ña⁹ María, (ÑM, also Señora María), the mother of two sixth-graders, spoke about feeling pleased that her children learned about pohâ ñanâ because the plants were inexpensive alternatives to going to the doctor. Profesora Romilda (PR) then added that it was important for the students to learn about pohâ ñanâ not just because the plants are cheap, but also because they are a source of economic power and independence. Both spoke in Jopara.

Excerpt 3: No solamente ivaráto haguére [It's not just because they're cheap]

1	ÑM	Soy la mamá de Soledad y	I am the mother of Soledad and
2		Alberto ha aime contentaiterei	Alberto and I am very pleased
3		peina oikuaa la ñande pohâ	they know our remedies
4		porque la ñande pohâkuéra	because our remedies
5		oconveni ñandéve porque	suit us because
6		ivaráto doctor umia ome'ëva	they are cheap those doctors
7		hepy ha'â	are expensive and they
8		oîva ñande alcansepe	[pohâ ñana] are within our reach
9		ñame'êvo chupekuéra la pohâ ()	to give them, pohâ ñana ()
10		ha entero ñandéve avei ()	and to all of us too ()
11	PR	La Señora Maria dijo	Señora Maria said
12		avy'aiterei porque la ñande	I am very pleased because our
13		pohâ barato he'i	remedies are cheap she says
14		otro avei la	another [reason] also is that
15		ndaha'eí la ivaratónte	they're not only cheap
16		sino ñande jareko ko	but we have them in this

⁹ A common respectful title for older women, likely a shortened version of Doña.

17	comunidad ko'ape ity	community here and that's to
18	ja'eporâsero guarâ y	say they are abundant and
19	en esta comunidad inclusive se	in this community too they
20	puede explotar todavía tanto	can be exploited still as much
21	que también sirve de	as they can also be a source of
22	sustento familiar la (.)	family sustenance the (.)
23	sustento para algunas familias	sustenance for some families
24	que es, que no solamente	that is that it's not just
25	ivarato haguére Ña	because they are cheap Mrs.
26	Maria hina es más para los	Maria but more because the
27	y si nosotros sabemos	and if we know how to
28	utilizarlos como debe ser	use them how they should be
29	vamos a salir mucho más allá	[used] we will really get ahead
30	arriba con todo esto	way up there with all this
31	que es pohâ ñanâ y eso para	that is pohâ ñanâ and that for
32	la comunidad y los niños	the community and the children

(Video recorded interaction, 10/16/2008)

What was notable about their language use, and the languaging of others throughout the Expo, was that their use of Jopara occurred together with (a) a formal event, and (b) explicit valorization of community knowledge and livelihoods. The topic of pohâ ñanâ, itself, centered a major community resource and required students to draw not primarily on sources of information—books or materials—produced elsewhere, but rather to draw primarily on their adult relatives' knowledge. They studied both an object in close proximity to them: the plants that grew around the school, around their homes, physically within their daily experience; and they studied the knowledge in close proximity to them: the information and practices in their relatives' experience. They studied what already belonged to them and to the teachers, who also identified as members of the community. Though not explicitly framed as such, the Pohâ Ñanâ Expo was most definitely a funds of knowledge (González, Moll, & Amanti, 2005) project, one designed to draw upon community knowledge and expertise in connection with “academic”

activities like researching, writing, and public speaking. Ña María makes this clear in lines 2-5 where she expresses her pleasure that the students have learned about “our remedies” (line 3). Profesora Romilda affirms that the remedies/knowledge belong to the community when she repeats “our remedies” in lines 12-13 and when she locates them “in this community” (lines 16-17). She expands on the idea that they are valuable, not just because they are a cheap alternative to doctors (outside the community), but also because they are a source of income (lines 21-22) and a way to “get ahead” (line 29). While Ña María identifies the value of pohâ ñanâ in local terms, as having value because people may not be able to afford a doctor, Profesora Romilda identifies the value of pohâ ñanâ more broadly, as having value not just to their rural community but also to the urban customers who buy them and to the rural families who sell them and whose economic situation could improve as a result.

The significance of the event lay not just in Ña María, Profesora Romilda, and the others present speaking in Jopara (which most did frequently) or speaking about pohâ ñanâ being valuable (which may also have happened other times), but in their doing so at the same time that they created a formal, public event—formal with fine tablecloths, elegant displays of the plants, a clear stage and audience, single speakers rather than multiple conversations, writing displayed on the walls; and public with parents and community members invited and the Ministry of Education possibly seeing it later via video recording. Other formal, public events I observed, both at this rural school, at an urban school, and more broadly in daily life, were almost exclusively in Spanish, or in Spanish with what would have been identified as Guarani-Guarani portions, but not in Jopara. In these other events, Spanish was one tool among many that helped to make the events formal, but in the Expo, formality was produced along with Jopara. Like the perceived informality of popular Spanish of the U.S. (Otheguy & Stern, 2010), Jopara is predominantly read as informal, and yet such a reading was complicated by the formality of the Expo. Similarly, in the El Paso high school celebration of dual language graduates, formality was produced by all the usual graduation ceremony features at the same time that the student speakers translanguaged.

In both events, in El Paso and in central Paraguay, people’s languaging—because it could potentially be read as transgressive—was a powerful assertion of their full linguistic repertoires in contexts where usually they would be partially suppressed. Moreover, the formality of these events complicated the social meaning of participants’ translanguaging. As a result of linguistic anthropological research, we know that the social meaning of languaging—whether, for example,

it is read as authentic or inauthentic, educated or uneducated—depends in part upon the context in which it occurs, upon the other signs that accompany it. In the case of the events described here, translanguaging was accompanied by multiple signs of formality, and in particular, formal academic “success”: graduation regalia, procession across a stage, elegant visual displays and oral performances of student work, etc. These other signs make it more difficult to read translanguaging as informal, uneducated, or inauthentic because of the otherwise formal, academic context in which they occur. This is not to say that a formal context magically changes the way people read these languaging practice, but rather, that as disruptions like these accumulate there is the potential also for disrupting the longstanding and dominant ideologies that valorize language separation. Because these events were public and accessible to audiences beyond a single teacher and their students, alternative social meanings of translanguaging as formal and academic were performed before a broader group of people: before parents, administrators, community members, district/ministry officials. Both aspects of context—formality and public setting—are important to this potential for change.

These disruptions must also be accompanied by discourse that explicitly valorizes translanguaging, as in the discourses of translanguaging pedagogy. Yet if these affirmative discourses are used only to describe and evaluate classroom interaction and instruction, we miss opportunities for broader ideological change. Confining the valorization of translanguaging to instruction and to the relative informality of the classroom upholds appropriateness based on the white/dominant listening subject’s determination of that as the guide for how bilingual people use their linguistic repertoires. While just one among many possible disruptions, embracing translanguaging in additional formal, public spaces in school interrupts patterns that can be easily interpreted as appropriate or inappropriate and ensures teachers and students are more able to use their full linguistic repertoires for whatever communicative purposes they desire. By embracing I mean that any of us in positions to choose, use, hear, understand, or evaluate language practices in formal, public schooling spaces beyond the classroom should do so affirmatively, and we must also talk about it. The active and intentional circulation of affirmative discourses about translanguaging makes available alternative ways of interpreting language practices, alternative social meanings, and could chip away at the power of ideologies of language separation. If we are to work toward changing the ideologies of the dominant listening subject it will be important to do so in public, in formality, in the formal public display of knowledge and success, at the same

time that we also make far more readily available ways of naming and talking about translanguaging in school that affirm teachers' practices of resistance both within classrooms and beyond classroom walls.

References

- Annamalai, E. (1989). The linguistic and social dimensions of purism. In B. H. Jernudd & M. J. Shapiro (Eds.), *The politics of language purism* (pp. 225-232). New York, NY: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Baker, C. (2001). *Foundations of bilingual education and bilingualism*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Baker, C. (2011). *Foundations of bilingual education and bilingualism* (5th ed). Buffalo, NY: Multilingual Matters.
- Boidin, C. (2000). ¿Jopara? ¿jehe'a? El mestizaje de las palabras, de las plantas, y de los cuerpos en Paraguay. *Acción: Revista Paraguaya de Reflexión y Diálogo*, 206, 28-31.
- Bucholtz, M., & Hall, K. (2005). Identity and interaction: A sociocultural linguistic approach. *Discourse Studies*, 7(4-5), 585-614.
- Canagarajah, S. (2011). Translanguaging in the classroom: Emerging issues for research and pedagogy. *Applied Linguistics Review*, 2, 1-27.
- Canagarajah, S. (2013). *Translingual Practices: Global Englishes and cosmopolitan relations*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Celic, C., & Seltzer, K. (2011). *Translanguaging: A CUNY-NYSIEB guide for educators*. New York, NY: CUNY-NYSIEB.
- Creese, A., & Blackledge, A. (2010). Translanguaging in the bilingual classroom: A pedagogy for learning and teaching? *Modern Language Journal*, 94(1), 103-115.
- Cummins, J. (1986). Empowering minority students: A framework for intervention. *Harvard Educational Review*, 56(1), 18-34.
- Cummins, J. (2008). Teaching for transfer: Challenging the two-solitudes assumption in bilingual education. In J. Cummins & N. H. Hornberger (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of Language and Education* (2e ed., Vol. 5: Bilingual Education, pp. 65-75). New York, NY: Springer Science + Business Media.
- Dolsa, G., Villarreal, E., & Mortimer, K. S. (2017). *A critical genealogy of language separation in dual language education: Has the nuance been left out?*. Paper presented at the American Association for Applied Linguistics, Portland, OR.
- Domínguez, R. (1982). Glosario del jopara. In G. Corvalán & G. De Granda (Eds.), *Sociedad y Lengua: Bilingüismo en el Paraguay* (pp. 613-635). Asunción: Centro Paraguayo de Estudios Sociológicos.
- Dulay, H., & Burt, M. (1978). From research to method in bilingual education. In J. E. Alatis (Ed.), *International Dimensions in Bilingual Education* (pp. 551-575). Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.
- Emerson, R. M., Fretz, R. I., & Shaw, L. L. (2011). *Writing ethnographic field notes* (2 ed.). Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Fishman, J. A. (1967). Bilingualism with and without diglossia: Diglossia with and without bilingualism. *Journal of Social Issues*, 23(2), 29-38.

- Flores, N. (2013). Silencing the subaltern: Nation-state/colonial governmentality and bilingual education in the United States. *Critical Inquiry in Language Studies*, 10(4), 263-287.
- Flores, N., & Rosa, J. (2015). Undoing appropriateness: Raciolinguistic ideologies and language diversity in education. *Harvard Educational Review*, 85(2), 149-171.
- Freeman, R. (1998). *Bilingual education and social change*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Gal, S., & Irvine, J. T. (1995). The boundaries of languages and disciplines: How ideologies construct difference. *Social Research*, 62(4), 967-1001.
- Gal, S., & Woolard, K. A. (1995). Constructing languages and publics: Authority and representation. *Pragmatics*, 5(2), 129-138.
- Galindo, D. L. (1996). Language use and language attitudes: A study of border women. *Bilingual Review/La Revista Bilingüe*, 21(1), 5-17.
- García, O. (2009a). *Bilingual education in the 21st century: A global perspective*. Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.
- García, O. (2009b). Education, multilingualism, and translanguaging in the 21st century. In T. Skutnabb-Kangas, R. Phillipson, A. K. Mohanty, & M. Panda (Eds.), *Social justice through multilingual education* (pp. 140-158). Buffalo, NY: Multilingual Matters.
- García, O., Johnson, S. I., & Seltzer, K. (2016). *The translanguaging classroom: Leveraging student bilingualism for learning*. Philadelphia, PA: Caslon.
- Gee, J. P. (1999). *An Introduction to Discourse Analysis: Theory and Method*. New York: Routledge.
- Gee, J. P. (2011). *How to do discourse analysis: A toolkit*. New York: Routledge.
- González, N., Moll, L. C., & Amanti, C. (2005). *Funds of knowledge: Theorizing practices in households, communities, and classrooms*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Gynan, S. N. (2001). Language planning and policy in Paraguay. *Current Issues in Language Planning*, 2(1), 53-118.
- Hidalgo, M. (1986). Language contact, language loyalty, and language prejudice on the Mexican border. *Language in Society*, 15, 193-220.
- Hill, J. H., & Hill, K. C. (1980). Mixed grammar, purist grammar, and language attitudes in modern Nahuatl. *Language in Society*, 9, 321-348.
- Hornberger, N. H. (1988). *Bilingual education and language maintenance: A southern Peruvian Quechua case*. Providence, RI: Foris Publications.
- Hornberger, N. H., & Link, H. (2012). Translanguaging and transnational literacies in multilingual classrooms: A biliteracy lens. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 15(3), 261-278.
- Howard, E. R., Sugarman, J., Christian, D., Lindholm-Leary, K. J., & Rogers, D. (2007). Guiding principals for dual language education. In E. R. Howard, J. Sugarman, D. Christian, K. J. Lindholm-Leary, & D. Rogers (Eds.), *Guiding principals for dual language education* (2nd ed) (pp. 51-116). Washington, DC: Center for Applied Linguistics.
- Inoue, M. (2006). *Vicarious language: Gender and linguistic modernity in Japan*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

- Irvine, J. T., & Gal, S. (2000). Language ideology and linguistic differentiation. In P. V. Kroskrity (Ed.), *Regimes of language: Ideologies, politics, and identities* (pp. 35-83). Santa Fe, MN: School of American Research Press.
- Jaspers, J., & Madsen, L. M. (2016). Sociolinguistics in a languagised world: Introduction. *Applied Linguistics Review*, 7(3), 235-258. doi:10.1515/applirev-2016-0010
- Jernudd, B. H. (1989). The texture of language purism: An introduction. In B. H. Jernudd & M. J. Shapiro (Eds.), *The politics of language purism* (pp. 1-19). New York, NY: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Joseph, J. E. (1987). *Eloquence and power: The rise of language standards and standard languages*. New York, NY: Basil Blackwell.
- Kaplan-Weinger, J., & Ullman, C. (2015). *Methods for the ethnography of communication*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Krivoshin de Canese, N., & Corvalán, G. (1987). *El español del Paraguay en contacto con el guaraní*. Asunción: Centro de Estudios Paraguayos.
- Kroskrity, P. V. (Ed.) (2000). *Regimes of language: Ideologies, politics, and identities*. Santa Fe, NM: School of American Research Press.
- Ladson-Billings, G., & Tate, W. F. (1995). Toward a critical race theory of education. *Teachers College Record*, 97(1), 47-68.
- LeCompte, M. D., & Schensul, J. J. (1999). *Analyzing and interpreting ethnographic data*. Walnut Creek, CA: AltaMira Press.
- Legarreta, D. (1977). Language choice in bilingual classrooms. *TESOL Quarterly*, 11(1), 9-16.
- Lewis, G., Jones, B., & Baker, C. (2012). Translanguaging: developing its conceptualisation and contextualisation. *Educational Research and Evaluation*, 18(7), 655-670. doi:10.1080/13803611.2012.718490
- Lustig, W. (1996). Mba'éichapa oiko la guarani? Guaraní y jopara en el Paraguay. *Papia*, 4(2), 19-43.
- MacSwan, J. (2000). The threshold hypothesis, semilingualism, and other contributions to a deficit view of linguistic minorities. *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences*, 22(1), 3-45.
- Makoni, S., & Pennycook, A. (2005). Disinventing and (re)constituting languages. *Critical Inquiry in Language Studies*, 2(3), 137-156. doi:10.1207/s15427595cils0203_1
- Martínez, R. A. (2013). Reading the world in Spanglish: Hybrid language practices and ideological contestation in a sixth-grade English language arts classroom. *Linguistics and Education*, 24, 276-288.
- Martínez, R. A., Hikida, M., & Durán, L. (2015). Unpacking ideologies of linguistic purism: How dual language teachers make sense of everyday translanguaging. *International Multilingual Research Journal*, 9, 26-42.
- Maxwell, J. A. (1996). *Qualitative research design: An interactive approach*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Meliá, B. (1974). Hacia una "tercera lengua" en el Paraguay. *Estudios Paraguayos*, 2, 31-71.

- Milroy, J., & Milroy, L. (1999). *Authority in language: Investigating standard English* (3rd ed.). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Mortimer, K. S. (2006). Guaraní académico or Jopará? Educator perspectives and ideological debate in Paraguayan bilingual education. *Working Papers in Educational Linguistics*, 21(2), 45-71.
- Mortimer, K. S. (2012). *The Guaraní speaker in Paraguayan bilingual education policy: Language policy as metapragmatic discourse*. Unpublished dissertation. University of Pennsylvania. Philadelphia, PA.
- Mortimer, K. S., Dolsa, G., & Villarreal, E. (Under review). "Back and forth": The bordering and debordering of languaging and identity boundaries in dual language programs on the US-Mexico border.
- O'Connor, B. H., & Crawford, L. J. (2015). An art of being in between: The promise of hybrid language practices. *Advances in Research on Teaching*, 24, 149-173.
- Otheguy, R., García, O., & Reid, W. (2015). Clarifying translanguaging and deconstructing named languages: A perspective from linguistics. *Applied Linguistics Review*, 6(3), 281-307. doi:10.1515/applirev-2015-0014
- Otheguy, R., & Stern, N. (2010). On so-called Spanglish. *International Journal of Bilingualism*, 15(1), 85-100.
- Palmer, D. K., Martínez, R. A., Mateus, S. G., & Henderson, K. (2014). Reframing the debate on language separation: Toward a vision for translanguaging pedagogies in the dual language classroom. *The Modern Language Journal*, 98(3), 757-772.
- Pane, L. (2005). *Los paraguayismos: El español en el habla cotidiana de los paraguayos*. Asunción: Arandura Editorial.
- Paraguay DGEEC. (2012). *Censo 2012*. Asunción, Paraguay: Dirección General de Estadística, Encuestas y Censos.
- Paraguay MEC. (2000). *La educación bilingüe en la reforma educativa Paraguaya*. Retrieved from Asunción, Paraguay:
- Paraguay MEC. (2004). *La educación bilingüe en la reforma educativa*. Retrieved from Asunción, Paraguay:
- Paraguay MEC. (2006). *La educación bilingüe en la reforma educativa*. Retrieved from Asunción, Paraguay:
- Richardson, C. (1999). *Batos, bolillos, pochos, and pelados: Class and culture on the South Texas border*. Austin, TX: University of Texas Press.
- Rubin, J. (1968). *National bilingualism in Paraguay*. The Hague: Mouton.
- Sayer, P. (2013). Translanguaging, TexMex, and bilingual pedagogy: Emergent bilinguals learning through the vernacular. *TESOL Quarterly*, 47(1), 63-88.
- Schieffelin, B., Woolard, K. A., & Kroskrity, P. V. (Eds.). (1998). *Language Ideologies: Practice and Theory*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Shapiro, M. J. (1989). A political approach to language purism. In B. H. Jernudd & M. J. Shapiro (Eds.), *The Politics of Language Purism* (pp. 21-29). New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

- Silverstein, M. (1996). Monoglot "standard" in America: Standardization and metaphors of linguistic hegemony. In D. Brenneis & R. K. S. Macaulay (Eds.), *The Matrix of Language: Contemporary Linguistic Anthropology* (pp. 284-306). Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Smith, P. H., & Murillo, L. A. (2015). Theorizing translanguaging and multilingual literacies through human capital theory. *International Multilingual Research Journal*, 9, 59-73.
- Smith, R. C. (2003). Diasporic memberships in historical perspective: Comparative insights from the Mexican, Italian, and Polish cases. *International Migration Review*, 37(3), 724-759.
- Stolk, H. (2004). "This is not Mexico, this is the border": Discourses on authentic Mexican culture in Tijuana. *Etnofoor*, 17(1/2), 227-242.
- Swain, M. (1983). Bilingualism without tears. In M. A. Clarke & J. Handscombe (Eds.), *On TESOL '82: Pacific perspectives on language learning and teaching* (pp. 35-46). Washington, DC: TESOL.
- Valenzuela Arce, J. M. (2004). Fronteras y representaciones sociales: La figura del pocho como estereotipo del chicano. *Aztlán: A Journal of Chicano Studies*, 29(1), 125-133.
- Vélez-Ibáñez, C. (2017). *Language hegemonies and their discontents: The southwest North American region since 1540*. Tucson, AZ: University of Arizona Press.
- Wilson, W. E. (1946). A note on "pochismo". *The Modern Language Journal*, 30(6), 345-346.
- Wortham, S., & Reyes, A. (2015). *Discourse Analysis beyond the Speech Event*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Wright, W. E. (2015). *Foundations for teaching English language learners: Research, theory, policy, and practice*. Philadelphia: Caslon.
- Wyman, L. T. (2009). Youth, linguistic ecology, and language endangerment: A Yup'ik example. *Journal of Language, Identity & Education*, 8(5), 335-349. doi:10.1080/15348450903305122
- Zentella, A. C. (1997). *Growing up bilingual: Puerto Rican children in New York*. Malden, MA: Blackwell.