



Association of Mexican American Educators Journal

A peer-reviewed, open access journal

Volume 15 Issue 3

2021

AMAΕ Special Issue

Centering Translanguaging in Critical Teacher Education:
*Cultivando Nuevos Conocimientos de Translenguaje en la
Educación de Futuros Docentes*

Guest Editors

Pablo C. Ramirez

California State University, Dominguez Hills

Armando Garza Ayala

University of New Mexico

Editors

Patricia Sánchez

The University of Texas at San Antonio

Antonio J. Camacho

AMAΕ, Inc.

Associate Editors

Julie L. Figueroa

Sacramento State

Lucila D. Ek

The University of Texas at San Antonio

Managing Editor

Christian Fallas-Escobar

The University of Texas at San Antonio

<http://amaejournal.utsa.edu>

ISSN: 2377-9187

Where the Translanguaging Rubber Hits the Road: Ideological Frictions, Mixtificaciones y Potentialities in Bilingual Teacher Preparation Programs

Eduardo Muñoz-Muñoz

San José State University

Abstract

Translanguaging has become a particularly relevant (and controversial) concept for the field of bilingual education, with concrete implications for teacher preparation programs serving teacher candidates (TCs) who may identify as heritage speakers of Spanish. However, the regard and understanding of translanguaging, its pedagogical potential, and the positionality to implement it are not evenly distributed among stakeholders involved in the teacher preparation process. This article explores the relationship among California public teacher preparation programs, their bilingual teacher candidates, and the districts that host their field placements that ultimately hire them. Building on the metaphorical concepts of ideological and implementational spaces (Flores & Schissel, 2014), the space between and encompassing the overlap between credentialing programs and school districts is characterized as a friction space beset by tensions between monoglossic and heteroglossic stances and the pragmatism of “entering the workforce.” The dynamics of this space are illustrated in five retratos constructed on qualitative data obtained through semistructured interviews. Based on the author's localized experiences, the article concludes by proposing approaches to navigate the friction space, reinforce the bilingual candidates' counterideological stances, and advance a much-needed productive dialogue in the teacher preparation ecology.

Keywords: translanguaging, heteroglossia, language ideologies, teacher preparation, linguistic ecology

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.24974/amae.15.3.445>

Introduction: Contextual and Ideological Stage

A day in February of 2020, the design team of Dual Language Immersion (DLI) program in Santa Marta,¹ California, met to discuss, among other agenda items, what the program's vision and stance were going to be with regards to "translanguaging." Many of them veterans of other DLI schools, the teachers had attended workshops by the California Association of Bilingual Education (CABE) on the launching of successful programs. They were eager to discuss this much talked about concept. This was undoubtedly el tema del día. Unable to attend, one teacher felt compelled to state her position in an email, which was read aloud to all:

Let me share with you my reflection about language separation versus translanguaging. When you have language separation, you have higher scores across the board. I have worked in schools where there was much more flexibility, so I speak from experience. Often the language was determined by the comfort of the teacher, and students prefer English when they were given a choice. The decision should be made by those who are going to be doing the work and not by beautiful ideas on paper from "others." We need to focus on what really works.

With this ideological stage set, the program designers embarked on a spirited discussion to find common ground. To be sure, this debate at the heart of a new DLI program belongs to California's present sociopolitical context, partly due to pivotal changes in educational legislation in the last five years (e.g., Proposition 58, The English Learner Roadmap). Under the banner of globalization and instrumental multilingualism and this policy landscape, the doors are now open for the development of programs like Santa Marta's. The California 2030 policy (CDE, 2018) described an upward trend in DLI programs from 229 in 2011 to 407 in 2017, projecting 800 by 2020 and 1600 by 2030. The data available at the California Department of Education website confirms that the state is well underway to attain the first of the benchmarks set by this policy, in light of the most current census of DLI schools in California.²

This multilingual growth in California is both exciting and challenging. On the upward side, after years of accumulated evidence, the build-up of multilingual momentum fosters that school districts move away from restrictive monoglossic approaches prescribing English for all.

¹ Pseudonym

². For a list of schools offering multilingual programs as of June 2019 <https://www.cde.ca.gov/sp/el/er/multilingualedu.asp>

For some, the practical challenge is finding bi-multiliterate and ideological conscientious teachers to serve in the new programs (e.g., Alfaro, 2019). Other scholars (e.g., Flores, 2019; Hamman, 2017) are concerned with a different paradigmatic issue where fault lines run deep: the nature of multilingualism, translanguaging, and heteroglossic stances. These scholars challenge ontologies and pose transformative questions: Why do democratic schools embody and sanction language practices that do not represent the people they serve, to the exclusion of vernacular practices? Is it possible not only to advance the vessel of multilingual education but to reframe its content and the way language itself is conceived? Pushing for this epistemological questions, Wei (2018) states that “the-more-the-better approaches to multilingualism seem increasingly over-simplistic and inadequate for the complex realities of the 21st century” (p.14). In other words, one may go *additive bilingual*, pero igual uno se queda monoglósico.

As evidenced by the debate and email in Santa Marta’s school, the echo of these questions above is reaching the field of practitioners. Translanguaging se está poniendo de moda: the programs for the annual California Association of Bilingual Education (CABE) conference, attended by hundreds of educators across the state, register the term “translanguaging” twice in 2016, once in 2017, four times in 2018, and twenty-seven times in 2019.³ Necessarily, the translanguaging debate has repercussions for teacher preparation. Examining the demographics of California K-12 students, one may hypothesize that there is a big pool of [bi]multilingual students who could become much-needed, outstanding dual language teachers (Briceño et al., 2018). However, their educational experience has been often characterized by the Post-proposition 227⁴ institutional deprivation of opportunities to widen their communicative repertoire, resulting in the shunning of their full communicative repertoires. Often, bilingual teachers embody a contemporary embodiment of Anzaldúa’s (1987) translingual in-betweenness:

Deslenguadas. Somos las del español deficiente. We are your linguistic nightmare, your linguistic aberration, your linguistic mestizaje, the subject of your burla. Because we speak with tongues of fire, we are culturally crucified. Racially, culturally and linguistically somos huérfanos —we speak an orphan tongue.
(p. 80)

³ These figures reflect the programs available before the limitations imposed on the CABE Annual Conference by COVID19.

⁴ For more information on Proposition 227 see: <https://www.cde.ca.gov/sp/el/er/prop227intro.asp>

Bilingual teacher preparation programs face the challenge of traversing and “resolving” the paradigmatic frictions between hegemonic monoglossic stances and translingual/heteroglossic “transgression.” The time is now for bilingual teacher preparation programs to learn from and to empower the next generation of translingual “deslenguados” to construct liberatory spaces and dialogues about what it means to be “asset-oriented” (see Ruiz, 1984) and embrace their students' rich linguistic repertoires. In this article, I first review the conceptualizations of heteroglossia, translanguaging, and their applications, which paves the way for the presentation, analysis, and discussion of five educator testimonial retratos. From their district positionalities and leverage, these five educators occupy a professional “friction space,” a metaphor suggested to describe an arena of conflicting ideologies and praxis with regards to the nature of language and its use. At the center of this space, we find emerging bilingual teachers who, as translanguagers themselves, need to reconcile their agency with prescriptive and proscriptive messages about translanguaging coming from different professional and pedagogical sources, from university instructors to mentors to school leaders. This article concludes with pedagogical, programmatic, and institutional recommendations to promote critical dialogue and translingual visibility in the field and among partners in teacher preparation.

Conceptual Framework: Translanguaging, Ideologies, and Spaces

Before conceptualizing translanguaging, the dichotomy of heteroglossia and dialogism vs. monoglossia and monologism needs to be examined (Karatzogianni & Robinson, 2010); which provides a broader conceptual background to comprehend the ideological tensions entailed by translanguaging. In heteroglossic spaces, registers, idiolects, and languages coexist and feed each other with the understanding that the main features of languaging are functionality and communication (Bakhtin, 1981; Kiramba, 2019). These spaces promote dialogues that create communicative actions among participants (teachers and students in our educational contexts) based on the principle of compromise and the willingness to solve any linguistic conflict. In doing so, linguistic repertoires are used to their full extent, with no constraints on how and what ideas are being expressed to convey and build knowledge.

Monoglossic spaces perpetuate the power of dominant languages silencing the hybrid voices that other participants may bring to the conversation (García & Torres-Guevara, 2009; Liberali & Megale, 2016; Reath Warren, 2018). Monologues and standardized registers control

discourse through strategic communications claiming utilitarianism as the pinnacle for and of languaging (Choi, 2003; García, 2014; Muda, et al., 2018). Moreover, in such discursive contexts, languages are ordered to create a hierarchy that limits participation in the co-construction of situational, negotiated knowledge. Accordingly, when the argument of language separation in DLI program arises, on one level the focus is on the ideological pragmatism of school organization, and on another, it concerns deeper (mis) appropriations of language ontologies (Palmer, et al., 2014; Sánchez, et al., 2017). In this controversy, two conceptions of language ecology clash: a superficial (mis)understanding of language ecology and its array of “biological” metaphors (Pennycook, 2004) leading to language segregationism, and Mühlhäusler’s (2000) holistic conception of languages as “an integral part of larger communication process [where] uniformity has numerous hidden long-term costs” (p. 358).

Translanguaging as a heteroglossic concept is posited as a transformative and emancipatory practice that empowers the user to draw upon every corner of their linguistic repertoire (Blackledge & Creese, 2014; García & Leiva, 2014). García (2014) underlines the liberatory nature of translanguaging and how this develops “new language practices and sustain old ones, communicate and appropriate knowledge, and give voice to new sociopolitical realities by interrogating linguistic inequality” (p. 3). This questioning of linguistic inequality is the engine that dismantles the oppression suffered by educators and students whose linguistic repertoires have been questioned for their lack of *standardized* language characteristics (Larsen-Freeman, 2019). Over the years, monoglossic practices have pushed linguistic purity agendas arguing that languages have a univocal way to be used (La Scotte & Tarone, 2019). Furthermore, linguists like Busch (2012) question this unitarian view of languaging citing Bakhtin when she states that “language is not something given (*dan*) but it is an element posited (*zadan*) and every moment of its life” (p. 270). Understanding this duality between a language that is given and, in many cases, imposed on someone versus languaging as a tool grown by each person as a multifaceted instrument for argumentation and development is crucial for translanguaging educators who facilitate learning about and through language (Solsona-Puig et al., 2018).

In their learning and life experiences in general translanguagers create a multilingual and multidimensional linguistic identity. Translanguaging practices validate and affirm the translanguagers’ linguistic capitals, thus fostering the healing from assimilation processes and

equipping them to counterbalance monolingual and monoglossic ideology (Ortega, 2019). With these tools in hand, translanguaging educators position themselves to create a stance from where they see all the linguistic features students bring to the classroom as assets (García & Kleyn, 2018).

The design of heteroglossic practices calls for a shift in how teaching and learning are constructed. Responding to the bilingual education field's call, practitioner-oriented publications such as *The Translanguaging Classroom* (García, et al., 2107) or *Biliteracy from the Start: Biliteracy Squared in Action* (Escamilla et al., 2014) are drawing bridges in the theory-to-practice chasm and contributing in different degrees to generate heteroglossic discussions and “sensemaking” (Weick et al., 2016). Behind their multilingual advocacy, the reader finds a marked emphasis on the agency of the educators de primera línea en las trincheras (Menken & García, 2010), who are well-positioned to explore the flexibility and heteroglossic affordances in their curricular mandates and contextual demands (e.g., Martínez & Mejía, 2020). Akin to notions of thirdspace (Gutiérrez, et al., 2009) and anchored in poststructural language planning and policy approaches, Ricento and Hornberger (1996) presented the concept of implementational and ideological spaces to describe the transformative potential of language policy vacuums when seized by critical agentic educators. These concepts are acquiring relevance and traction in recent scholarship that focuses on ethnographic accounts of bilingual educators transformative classroom practices (Babino & Stewart, 2018; Good et al., 2017) and, similarly, in articles that reflect an interest in teacher preparation transformation by laying out programmatic changes to embrace heteroglossic stances (Collins, et al., 2019; Musanti & Rodríguez, 2017).

Methodological Approach: Capturing the Tension

The findings and arguments presented in this article are anchored in fifteen qualitative semi-structured interviews (Rubin & Rubin, 2011) of teacher candidates and other stakeholders involved with translingual and teacher preparation across California.⁵ The purposive sample of participants were selected through initial personal contacts and a snowballing technique (Merriam & Tisdell, 2015) to represent multiple professional categories in the teacher preparation ecology. The recordings were thematically analyzed using qualitative software with known deductive translanguaging concepts and with an eye to emerging/inductive categories

⁵ The interview protocol is shown in appendix A.

(Saldaña, 2012). As an empirical result, I present five microethnographic retratos; a narrative intended to construct a snapshot of biographical, ideological, and pedagogical intersections (Fitch & Sanders, 2004). These five multilayered, situated perspectives sketch with sufficient detail the complexity of the ideological frictions occurring across the context addressed by this article and, at times, within participants themselves.

Positionality and pedagogical stance have a bearing on the analysis and transferability of these results. The author is a speaker of the Andalusian Spanish variety and English, as named languages. Formerly a bilingual teacher and administrator, he currently coordinates the Critical Bilingual Authorization Program Bilingüismo y Justicia at San José State University, a Hispanic-serving institution. Approximately 90 per cent of its credentialed bilingual teachers identify as Latinx. This program endorses translingual practices as part of its culturally sustaining theory of action (Paris & Alim, 2017). As such, the author navigates the ideological and implementational space of the often monoglossic state-sanctioned credential requirements and *proficiency* assessments and strives to create sustaining experiences that empower linguistic dynamism and counterhegemonic stances.

Friction Space: Laying Out the Ideological Field for the Retratos

This article builds on the concepts of ideological and implementational spaces (Flores & Schissel, 2014; Johnson, 2010) and capitalizes on the explanatory potential of these spatial metaphors to suggest the notion of "friction space" in bilingual teacher preparation. Such space can be understood as a co-constructed point of transition between ideological arenas where actors (e.g., teacher candidates, hiring managers) and institutions (e.g., Institutions of Higher Education, school districts) work to make sense of competing paradigms (e.g., monoglossic and heteroglossic epistemologies), deploy their ideologies, and exert the leverage afforded by their positionality. Such friction space's boundaries are necessarily diffused, stretching from the increasing involvement of candidates in field placements to their securing of teaching positions. During this time of theory-to-practice transitions, bilingual teacher candidates may be subject to conflicting messages about a myriad of concepts (e.g., the nature of language, social justice orientations, the (un)orthodoxy of practices, etc.) which are to be made sense of in conjunction with their lived experiences. Far from claiming full representativeness, the five retratos that follow do illustrate some pivotal issues and inner tensions occurring in this space "where the

translanguaging rubber hits the road,” that is, when their individual linguistic ideologies, biographies, knowledge acquired in the credential program, and practices are confronted vis-à-vis with established models of organization (i.e., ideological embodiments) in teacher preparation programs and school districts.

Primer Retrato: Julia Riego,⁶ “pero como que mi mente los quiere separar”

Julia, a determined and award-winning bilingual candidate about to receive her credential and graduate from a California State University (CSU), came to the United States when she was in fourth grade. She feels a strong connection with Latino culture and her family, which fuels her strong specific communicative performance in Spanish and also propels her bilingual teaching vocation. She first heard about translanguaging in her teacher preparation program but she is long-acquainted with Spanglish, as she put it, “Yo lo usaba cuando estaba aprendiendo ambos idiomas... no ambos, el inglés.” Julia separates languages in a diglossic internal tensión when she says, “el Spanglish se me hace más informal, es tener una conversación con una amistad y translenguaje, a mí se me hace como algo que se puede usar en un entorno educativo, el salón de clase, en un lugar profesional [...] el Spanglish trato de no usarlo porque quiero usar el español más limpio que pueda.” However, she quickly qualifies this preference for the sociolinguistic context of her translanguaging and adds, “pero también yo puedo decir que uso translenguaje si yo estoy estudiando en casa o estoy teniendo discusiones con alguna de mis compañeras [in the credential program]... pero como que mi mente los quiere separar.” When asked about this boundary tension she affirms that “intento separarlas porque mis papás siempre me han dicho “no mezcles los idiomas, mantén tu español, español y tu inglés, inglés” y es algo que me encuentro diciéndole a mi hermano menor, porque él tiene más dificultad con el español.” As teacher candidate doing her student teaching, Julia recalls being told to keep a familiar “white lie” when she says “yo ahorita en el primer grado que estoy, es imposible hablar inglés... Tenemos que hacerle creer que no hablamos inglés.” However, she believes that translanguaging has a pedagogical purpose and that “los estudiantes lo deben de usar para llenar los espacios y que los dos idiomas suban.” Translanguaging practices are a way of being and flowing. For her students, translanguaging “es algo natural, crecen y escuchan los dos idiomas y así se les va creando esa identidad de translenguaje y ser bilingües.” However, she resents that

⁶ The participants’ names in the retratos are pseudonyms.

in her current student teaching placement “el programa es muy estricto, como que se le penaliza al estudiante si está hablando inglés en un momento que se habla español, hasta que le quitan puntos.” She tried to balance the punitive consequences of this practices, and resolve this pedagogical tension by stating that “puede ser algo extremo, pero al mismo tiempo entiendo su propósito.” At the end of the interview, this personal, pedagogical and conceptual uneasiness reaches a climax, and asks me “¿Usted cree que puede llegar un programa en el que se pueda usar el translenguaje?”

Segundo Retrato: Dra. Luisa Fernández, Spanning Boundaries

“Es cuando los estudiantes usan su primer idioma ya sea español, tagalo, o cualquier idioma que tienen en el hogar para aprender la materia lo que se está enseñando en el salón, comunicar con sus compañeros... y después se les pide que presenten el contenido en el idioma que se está hablando en el salón,” states Dr. Fernández when asked about translanguaging. A veteran educator, founder of a DLI school, and dearly appreciated field supervisor in a credentialing program, Dr. Fernández believes that translanguaging pedagogies should apply to all teachers, not only bilingual. At her school as in others that she has visited, the rule of language separation is observed. In her practice, she “opens up” during English Language Development (ELD) and “en ese momento cuando los chicos no están entendiendo algo yo les hablo en español y buscamos junto lo que queremos decir en inglés.” If in breach of the separation rule, she adopts an assets-based stance and asserts that “no hay consecuencias, para nada. Su poder es ser bilingüe, que es un superpoder y no hay ninguna penalidad por usar el otro idioma.”

With the demographic change in her student population, from mostly immigrant origin to US-born emergent bilinguals, she has seen how “para ellos no es inglés o español si no es lenguaje y no se distingue entre uno, no se separa del otro, o que es como un círculo y los dos funcionan y con los dos me comunico [...] sí entienden que están hablando en un idioma diferente pero yo veo que su forma de pensar y de comunicarse es como que aprendieron una sola lengua que tiene dos, por explicarlo así.” This description coheres and illustrates a practitioner’s view of the construct of a unified repertorio lingüístico. However, from an organizational and culture of schooling perspective, she is concerned that “a los distritos les va a tomar mucho más tiempo empezar a adaptarse.” In hiring practices, for example, districts

keep asking for “native speakers of the target language” to become teachers. Hinting at a generational clash in the understanding of translanguaging, she believes that “los maestros más jóvenes, las generaciones sí que lo captan porque vienen un poco de esa vivencia.” As a caring bilingual field supervisor, she regrets that these same teachers face challenges in the questioning of their “language proficiency,” to the detriment of their gift to connect and sustain the language practices of emergent bilinguals.

Tercer Retrato: Dra. Felicia Martín, a Driven and Critical DLI Administrator

Dra. Martín is a committed DLI instructional leader, engaging with DLI organizations, and seeking advice from renowned expert-consultants. Active in the hiring of newly-credentialed bilingual teachers and the design of professional development for them, she states that “los maestros nuevos necesitan algo diferente, ellos van a necesitar saber desde el principio cuál es la teoría de inmersión doble. Aprendieron la teoría en la escuela, y ahora les falta la práctica.” She is concerned that new teachers would just be too liberal or go unplanned about translanguaging (“uno no nace maestro, pues lo mismo con esto”). In her opinion, translanguaging “es una estrategia instruccional que no se debe usar por debajo de cuarto grado y tiene que ser muy intencional.” Her main worry is the English “invasión” that would follow if the lines are crossed. Allowing fluidity between languages would erode “un tiempo sagrado” and send the students a “subtle status message” that would result in Spanish attrition. Dra. Martín elaborates her concern of unproductive languaging by adding, “si ellos [the teachers] tienen que usar ambos idiomas lo entendemos, los apoyamos, los escuchamos y les decimos cómo se puede decir de una forma académica, pero si lo están haciendo sin un propósito no vamos a tener ni bilingües, no vamos a tener a uno ni de allá ni de para acá.” Thus, she prescribes and restricts the use of languaging since in her view proper translanguaging happens “mejor con niños mayores o adultos que ya están desarrollados bilingües, en ambos idiomas.” In her school, educators are deeply involved in the development of bilingual curriculum, which she decries is scarce or unsatisfactory in the publishing market. In this context, they are starting to implement a restricted translanguaging block for 10 minutes in math, which they have defined as a bridge between the two languages for the transfer of language and concepts. This conception of translanguaging emphasizes the structural contrastive analysis of languages, rendering it closer to the concept of side-by-side “transferability” of language formal characteristics.

In Dra. Martín's eyes, the disparate understanding of the concept of translanguageing is problematic and causing divisiveness in the field. She has vivid memories of a recent "La Cosecha" conference and a heated panel between supporters and detractors of translanguing flexibility. She recounts, "fui a oír a Ofelia García hablar, muy teórico, es mucho de lo que hace el cerebro... muy interesante, pero siempre hubo esa cuestión de cómo se vería en la clase. Si de veras estamos hablando de la división de los idiomas de cuál de los idiomas vas a tomar [instructional time] para hacer el translanguageing ¿a cuál de los dos idiomas vas a quitarle, a cuál?" She made sense of this clash through a certain "generational lens," and says that "lo vi como la generación de antes con la generación más joven, unos 'pero ustedes no le dan chanza, que no saben que hay estudios,' y los otros '¿cuáles estudios? No hemos visto estudios con niños que ha mostrado que esto es efectivo.'" Dra Martín's vignette and her interpretation of an academic paradigmatic clash in understanding the ontology of languageing exemplifies how this ideological friction occurs at multiple scales. Ultimately, these conceptual tensions *trickle down* to classroom practice dilemmas.

Cuarto Retrato: Marta Angelelli, Solo Translanguageing Practice

As a 16-year veteran and founding teacher in her DLI program, Marta has supported the professional development of many novice and veteran teachers in her local district. In an ironic twist, she complains that she has never "gotten any professional development for dual language education. Never." She is currently a doctoral student, which she credits for her awareness and interest in translanguageing. She is passionate about translanguageing in her practice but hesitates about implementation as she says that "I really know translanguageing in theory, but I haven't really seen it done in dual language classrooms... nobody in my school does it." However, she was profoundly inspired by the concept "it is like a third space in the classroom where the language is a crossover." Her reference to third space echoes the Gutiérrez and colleagues' (2009) concept of a symbolic negotiated spatial and pedagogical dimension where learning, identity, and emancipation come together.

Dr.-to-be Angelelli once wrote an article about translanguageing which was trying to "simply echo Ofelia Garcia's ideas" and approach them to practitioners. She recounts that it "received a great deal of backlash." Further, the rawness and emotion in the feedback was still present in her memory when she said, "I was one of those who used to have this antiquated

way of thinking that you can never mix both languages, and when I wrote this article, I had people saying that I didn't know what I was talking about, that you should never mix the languages." This conflicting mixing of languages echoes the long-standing language separation controversy (Palmer et al., 2014; Poza, 2017) and the role that languaging fluidity may play in schools. In her opinion, this reaction reflects how theoretical concepts at the university level are not trickling down to classroom teachers or administrators, as she put it, "I hardly ever hear people talking about it. People just have a vague idea, they have a lot of misconceptions about what it even means."

Quinto Retrato: Luis Alberto Márquez, En Carne Propia

As he works to add his bilingual authorization,⁷ Luis Alberto is already in his first year as a secondary bilingual teacher of record in a dual immersion program. The first time he heard about translanguaging was in his credentialing program, and "inmediatamente pensé mi propia experiencia como estudiante. Durante la preparatoria yo estaba tomando clases de AP inglés y de AP español, y lo que conocía de español e inglés lo usaba en las dos clases." In our conversation Luis Alberto equates Spanglish and translanguaging, and feels he only got a "full grasp" of it when working in a summer language academy for newcomers. Thus, in his experience translanguaging implies that "un estudiante o una persona puede usar todas las herramientas que tiene en término de sus lenguas, de sus idiomas y utilizar todo ese conocimiento, todas esas habilidades para poder entender un concepto que se presente en el salón, o en sus vidas." He illustrates this with his own life experiences, as he says, "me pasa mucho cuando estoy intentando buscar una palabra en inglés y en español y no la encuentro y entonces intento buscar algo en medio para poder explicarlo." That space in between is also for him a bridge between communities and he explains that "si a veces quiero comunicar algo a una persona que vive tanto en la comunidad latinoamericana como la comunidad americana, puedo usar el spanglish para identificarme con esas dos comunidades y en esas dos experiencias." For Luis Alberto identification with collectives and experiences is also performed through translanguaging practices.

⁷ Teacher candidates in California obtain a teaching credential and, upon completion of additional state requirements, they may add a supplemental language-specific bilingual authorization which allows them to teach subject matter in the authorization language.

In his classroom, Luis Alberto uses translanguaging frequently with multiple benefits and explains that “me ayuda bastante para poder transmitir el entendimiento del contenido, también me ayuda un poco más a construir comunidad dentro del salón, entre los que acaban de llegar y los que nacieron aquí.” He feels that this flexibility supports his own developing language specific performance in Spanish. Anticipating potential critics and hinting at the need to address a knowledge chasm, he thinks that “mucha oposición vendrá de la falta del conocimiento del translanguaging.” Opposition may happen in the classroom and he adds that “A veces los estudiantes quieren separar las lenguas ellos mismos, y no sé si viene del estudiante o de reflejar su experiencia en el salón con otros maestros.” Luis Alberto occasionally worries about his professional identity as perceived by parents, who might think “que estoy usando Spanglish porque mi conocimiento del español es mucho menor de lo que esperaban.” However, by virtue of the networking that supports marginalized professional identities and practices, he counts on a mentor teacher who is familiar with the concept and, while together they humbly feel that they “do not know everything about it”, he feels that they are both advancing in their understanding of this transformative pedagogy.

Discussion: Sensemaking in the Translingual Friction Space

The participants’ experiences and testimonies in this article provided evidence that ideological stances are far from homogeneous and conditioned by a recursive process of sensemaking between accumulated experiences and professional scenarios new to the participants’ trajectories. In the friction space between monoglossic and heteroglossic ideas and practices, some bilingual candidates find a dissonance between their linguistic heritage, beliefs, and practices and the normative structure of the schools. Conversely, school leaders gatekeep the pedagogical trends implemented in their schools, wary of buzzwords and “flavor of the year” approaches to school transformation. Other educators construct their professional identity across different institutions, often espousing conflicting educational paradigms. The friction space is therefore co-constructed and navigated by actors who in different capacities and with varying degrees of centrality search, among other things, for a sense of ideological coherence (i.e., sensemaking and harmonizing their beliefs and their practice with their contextual settings). Concerning translanguaging, the ideological friction is multilayered and

encompasses challenges (conceptual, identity, curricular, implementational, and ecological) that overlap and interact.

First, there is a foundational *conceptual challenge* with translanguaging and its perception. As an attractive, fast-evolving field of inquiry, the literature has already interrogated the effects of "discourse drift" (see Wei, 2018), or a potential "watering down" of its ontological force (see Poza, 2017). In the retratos, the participants articulate their definitions and also express a substantial degree of uncertainty (occasionally angst) about "what translanguaging really is." On occasion, their sensemaking leads them to mapping translanguaging over existing practices such as "transferability time," commonly understood as an instructional segment focusing on contrastive analysis where differences/commonalities between L1 and L2 are explicitly instructed. Thus, while on the surface, transferability may seem harmonized into the existing instructional structure of a DLI class schedule with bound language allocations, the critical paradigmatic tension between monoglossic versus heteroglossic, circumscribed language versus language repertoire flow remains unaddressed and unchanged (i.e., the "two monolinguals in one" (Grosjean, 1982) archetype is untouched).

Second, this friction space is also a trying time for the teacher candidates' sense of self. Such *identity challenge* is exemplified in Julia's tension for and against the hybridization of named languages. On the one hand, her respect for Spanish is instilled by her family and a concern for language attrition. On the other, she commonly flows between languages and sees the potential of translanguaging as a pedagogy. In Luis Alberto's case, translanguaging may trigger concerns about the "appropriateness" of his linguistic "proficiency." Such everyday experiences among bilingual candidates, fearing the loss of heritage and identity, or the questioning of one's abilities, are forces working to maintain the monoglossic status quo.

Translanguaging also presents a *curricular challenge*. Destabilizing (or attempting to) monoglossic pillars such as academic language, standard language, or language separation-purism is an affront that triggers heated ideological reactions among stakeholders in the friction space. Heteroglossic stances pose a threat to deeply institutionalized and history-laden educational practices. Valdés (2018, 2020) concept of "curricularization" is particularly useful to understand the complexity of this attachment to monoglossic epistemologies. This apt concept describes how theoretical and ideological mechanisms (e.g., language acquisition theories, raciolinguistic ideologies), policies and sociopolitical forces (e.g., societal preferences, macropolitical

processes), and programmatic arrangements (e.g., program structures, the testing regime) co-work to institutionalize language conceptualizations and their curricular enactments.

When new bilingual teachers enter this friction space embracing what García and colleagues (2107) have described as translanguaging corriente, they are swimming against the curricularizing flow of an inherited monoglossic current. As principal, Dra. Martín argues, translanguaging is perceived as trying to undo the legacy of thirty years of bilingual education “results,” with its acumen of sedimented pedagogical and organizational practices. In fact, the entrenched struggle over translanguaging she depicts is also about legitimacy and authoritative voices prescribing and proscribing what should happen in multilingual classrooms. This legitimacy tug of war pits theory (i.e., university scholarship) against practice (i.e., the realities of the field), experienced versus novice teachers, old generation versus young generation, English time versus Spanish time, order versus chaos “para no acabar ni siendo de aquí ni de allá.” Thus, promoting the legitimacy of translanguaging requires adopting a multiprong counterstrategy addressing all these same curricularizing and dichotomizing forces in order to overcome the current state of monoglossic oppression.

Curriculum is tied intimately to the *implementational challenge* in translanguaging. As I learned from veteran teachers such as Dra. Fernández and Marta, the historical lack of multilingual resources and the apparent absence of articulated models of implementation undermine the transmission of translingual pedagogies. The empirical and action-oriented scholarship about translingual practice seems not to be reaching the field in ways that “the dots can be connected.” While teachers like Luis Alberto count on mentors who share similar ideological stances, the efforts of translingual mentors may fall into deaf ears if they are not scaled up and institutionalized into communities of practice.

Overarching all these issues, there is an *ecological challenge* in which the ideologies, interests, and practices of bilingual teacher preparation stakeholders are often at odds with one another. Against the backdrop of a severe bilingual teacher shortage, heritage bilingual teachers are often in a prime position to sustain linguistically minoritized populations. Still, they are likely to be the target of censorship or scrutiny with regards to their abilities if they translanguage in their own linguistic performances. Further complicating this friction space, teaching preparation programs are expected to engage with the school districts’ needs, often presented in monoglossic terms as in “we want bilingual teachers with native levels of academic language.”

Such demand presents a dissonant ideological scenario to navigate for teacher educators with heteroglossic stances. Having likely endured sociolinguistic pressures themselves (e.g., Escamilla, 2018; Rodríguez-Mojica et al., 2019), bilingual teacher educators may feel the need to give in to linguistic caveats and diglossic warnings about the differences between the sociolinguistic context “in here” and “out there,” discriminating between translanguaging in the potentially safe(r) heteroglossic space of the university-driven teacher preparation program, and the performances in high stakes settings (e.g., language proficiency tests, job interviews, etc.). To confront this navigational dilemma, the next section will discuss some strategies to expand the horizon for translanguaging in this friction space and beyond.

Conclusion and Implications: Towards Translingual Legitimacy in and through Teacher Education

It is appropriate to conclude that, in advancing translanguaging, the preparation of new bilingual teachers with a sophisticated critical metalinguistic awareness (Fairclough, 2014) is of paramount importance. For many of them, it is not solely a professional issue, but a matter of personal, cultural, and linguistic sustenance. Accordingly, it is incumbent on teacher preparation programs committed to empower their candidates’ linguistic repertoires to curate the candidate’s sustaining experiences, to scrutinize their explicit and implicit language policies, and to open a critical dialogue with the institutions partnering with them in their teacher preparation.

At the *bilingual candidate experience level*, interview participants stressed the importance of connecting with their linguistic biography to ground the concept of linguistic dynamism and hybridity thoroughly. Thus, program content acquires special significance when imbued with the linguistic trajectories of individuals and local communities. Further, the raciolinguistic framework provides a useful analytical lens to deconstruct instances in which their linguistic performances may be devalued, and construct a stance of hope and courage. Translanguaging gains more legitimacy, visibility, and grounding when bilingual candidates work on assignments and projects that exhibit their multilingual potential, and showcase them publicly.

When starting their student teaching experience and entering the friction space, bilingual teacher candidates benefit from engaging in the shared critical analysis of these grounded experiences (e.g., analyzing local language policies and hierarchies in their schools),

since their temporary positionality as student teachers may allow them to remain more detached from the organizational regime of the placement schools. Besides clinical experience, candidates are also empowered when they participate in preservice experiential activities that allow them to engage in translingual pedagogy firsthand with less institutionalized monoglossic constraints (e.g., Luis Alberto's summer academy for newcomers).

At a *programmatic level*, bilingual authorization programs (and the teacher preparation programs where they may be nested) may benefit from analyzing critically the ontological and epistemological assumptions embedded in explicit or implicit language policies (e.g., syllabi, classroom protocols). Further, they may interrogate how safe (i.e., language policing-free) the program spaces are for diverse linguistic repertoires. Importantly, besides these formal structures, teacher preparation programs should ask themselves how they are being perceived by the community of multilingual speakers and adopt a listener's perspective (Flores & Rosa, 2015; Inoue, 2004).

Finally, at the *institutional level*, it behooves the committed scholars and translanguaging activists to open up spaces for productive and forward-looking discussions in the friction space. In addition to the hopes that the lived experiences of new bilingual teachers may slowly but steadily decenter the monoglossic inclinations of the educational institutions, it is crucial to look for points of contact between teacher preparation programs and the school districts where student teaching happens, such as partnerships, shared personnel, or professional development, which may serve as boundary spanning and potential conduits for ideological transformation. Assuming an ethical commitment, translanguaging scholars in direct contact with districts may utilize their positionality to pave the way for new heteroglossic teachers and contribute wedge open the spaces of possibility for a new multilingual education inside out.

Aprecio y reconocimiento

El autor quiere reconocer la energía vital y feedback recibidos del Dr. Ferran/Fernando Rodríguez-Valls, compañero translenguador. Graciès.

References

- Alfaro, C. (2019). Preparing critically conscious dual-language teachers: Recognizing and interrupting dominant ideologies. *Theory into Practice*, 58(2), 194–203.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/00405841.2019.1569400>
- Anzaldúa, G. (1987). *Borderlands/la frontera*. Aunt Lute Press.
- Babino, A., & Stewart, M. A. (2018). Remodeling dual language programs: Teachers enact agency as critically conscious language policy makers. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 41(3), 272–297.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/15235882.2018.1489313>
- Bakhtin, M. M. (1981). *The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays* (Vol. 55). University of Texas Press.
<https://doi.org/10.2307/40136453>
- Blackledge, A., & Creese, A. (2014). *Heteroglossia as practice and pedagogy* (1st ed.). Springer Netherlands. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-007-7856-6>
- Briceño, A., Rodríguez-Mojica, C., & Muñoz-Muñoz, E. (2018). From English learner to Spanish learner: Raciolinguistic beliefs that influence heritage Spanish speaking teacher candidates. *Language and Education*, 32(3), 1–15.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/09500782.2018.1429464>
- Busch, B. (2012). The linguistic repertoire revisited. *Applied Linguistics*, 33(5), 503–523.
<https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/ams056>
- CDE. (2018). *Global California 2030: Speak, Learn, Lead*. Sacramento.
- Choi, P. K. (2003). “The best students will learn English”: Ultra-utilitarianism and linguistic imperialism in education in post-1997 Hong Kong. *Journal of Education Policy*, 18(6), 673–694. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0268093032000145917>
- Collins, B. A., Sánchez, M., & España, C. (2019). Sustaining and developing teachers’ dynamic bilingualism in a re-designed bilingual teacher preparation program. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 1–17. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050.2019.1610354>
- Escamilla, K. (2018). Growing up with the Bilingual Education Act: One educator’s journey. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 41(4), 369–387.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/15235882.2018.1529641>
- Escamilla, K., Hopewell, S., Butvilofsky, S., Sparrow, W., Soltero-González, L., Ruiz-Figueroa, O. A., & Escamilla, M. (2014). *Biliteracy from the start: Literacy squared in action*. Caslon Publishing.
- Fairclough, N. (2014). *Critical Language Awareness. Sociolinguistics and language education*. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315845661>
- Fitch, K. L., & Sanders, R. E. (Eds.). (2004). *Handbook of Language and Social Interaction*. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781410611574>
- Flores, N. (2019). Producing national and neoliberal subjects. In L. Martin Riojo & A. Del Percio (Eds.), *Language and Neoliberal Governmentality* (pp. 49–68). Routledge.
<https://doi.org/10.4324/9780429286711-3>
- 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>
- Flores, N., & Schissel, J. L. (2014). Dynamic bilingualism as the norm: Envisioning heteroglossic approach to standards-based reform. *TESOL Quarterly*, 48(3), 454–479.
<https://doi.org/10.1002/tesq.182>
- Garcia, N. (2015). Tensions between cultural and utilitarian dimensions of language: A

- comparative analysis of 'multilingual' education policies in France and Germany. *Current Issues in Language Planning*, 16, 43–59. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14664208.2014.947015>
- García, O. (2014). TESOL Translanguaged in NYS: Alternative perspectives. *Journal.Nystesol.Org*, 1(1), 2–10. <https://doi.org/10.1002/tesj.2014.5.issue-4>
- García, O., & Kleyn, T. (2018). *Translanguaging with multilingual students: Learning from classroom moments*. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19313152.2017.1306673>
- García, O., & Leiva, C. (2014). Theorizing and enacting translanguaging for social justice. In A. Blackledge & A. Creese (Eds.), *Heteroglossia as practice and pedagogy* (pp. 199–216). Springer Netherlands. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-007-7856-6_11
- García, O., & Torres-Guevara, R. (2009). Monoglossic ideologies and language policies in the education of U.S. Latinas/os. In R. T. Galvan, S. Villenas, C. Martinez, M. Machado-Casas, Jr. E. Murillo, & J. S. Muñoz (Eds.) *Handbook of latin@s and education: Theory, research, and practice* (pp. 182–193). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780429292026-11>
- Good, A. G., Fox Barocas, S., Chávez-Moreno, L. C., Feldman, R., & Canela, C. (2017). A seat at the table: How the work of teaching impacts teachers as policy agents. *Peabody Journal of Education*, 92(4), 505–520. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0161956X.2017.1349490>
- Grosjean. (1982). *Life with two languages: An introduction to bilingualism*. Harvard University Press.
- Gutiérrez, K. D., Baquedano-López, P., & Tejeda, C. (2009). Rethinking diversity: Hybridity and hybrid language practices in the third space. *Mind, Culture, and Activity*, 6(4), 286–303. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10749039909524733>
- Hamman, L. (2017). Translanguaging and positioning in two-way dual language classrooms: A case for criticality. *Language and Education*, 32(1), 21–42. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09500782.2017.1384006>
- Inoue, M. (2004). What does language remember?: Indexical inversion and the naturalized history of Japanese women. *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology*, 14(1), 39–56. <https://doi.org/10.1525/jlin.2004.14.1.39>
- Johnson, D. C. (2010). Implementational and ideological spaces in bilingual education language policy. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 13(1), 61–79. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050902780706>
- Karatzogianni, A., & Robinson, A. (2010). *Power, conflict and resistance: Social movements, networks and hierarchies*. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203869383>
- Kiramba, L. K. (2019). Heteroglossic practices in a multilingual science classroom. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 22(4), 445–458. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050.2016.1267695>
- Larsen-Freeman, D. (2019). On language learner agency: A complex dynamic systems theory perspective. *The Modern Language Journal*, 103, 61–79. <https://doi.org/10.1111/modl.12536>
- La Scotte, D., & Tarone, E. (2019). Heteroglossia and constructed dialogue in SLA. *Modern Language Journal*, 103, 95–112. <https://doi.org/10.1111/modl.12533>
- Liberali, F. C., & Megale, A. (2016). Elite bilingual education in Brazil: An applied linguist's perspective. *Colombian Applied Linguistics Journal*, 18(2), 95. <https://doi.org/10.14483/calj.v18n2.10022>
- Martínez, R. A., & Mejía, A. F. (2020). Looking closely and listening carefully: A sociocultural approach to understanding the complexity of Latina/o/x students' everyday language.

- Theory into Practice*, 59(1), 53–63. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00405841.2019.1665414>
- Menken, K., & García, O. (2010). *Negotiating language education policies: Educator as policymakers*. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203855874>
- Merriam, S., & Tisdell, E. (2015). *Qualitative research: A guide to design and implementation* (3rd ed.). John Wiley & Sons.
- Muda, R., Niszczota, P., Bialek, M., & Conway, P. (2018). Reading dilemmas in a foreign language reduces both deontological and utilitarian response tendencies. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning Memory and Cognition*, 44(2), 321–326. <https://doi.org/10.1037/xlm0000447>
- Mühlhäusler, P. (2000). Language Planning and Language Ecology. *Current Issues in Language Planning*, 1(3), 306–367. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14664200008668011>
- Musanti, S. I., & Rodríguez, A. D. (2017). Translanguaging in bilingual teacher preparation: Exploring pre-service bilingual teachers' academic writing. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 40(1), 38–54. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15235882.2016.1276028>
- Ortega, L. (2019). SLA and the study of equitable multilingualism. *Modern Language Journal*, 103, 23–38. <https://doi.org/10.1111/modl.12525>
- 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. *Modern Language Journal*, 98(3), 757–772. <https://doi.org/10.1111/modl.12121>
- Paris, D., & Alim, H. S. (2017). *Culturally sustaining pedagogies: Teaching and learning for social justice in a changing world*. Teachers College Press.
- Pennycook, A. (2004). Language policy and the ecological turn. *Language Policy*, 3, 213–239. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10993-004-3533-x>
- Poza, L. (2017). *Translanguaging: Definitions, implications, and further needs in burgeoning inquiry*. *Berkeley Review of Education*, 6(2), 101–128. <https://doi.org/10.5070/B86110060>
- Reath Warren, A. (2018). Monoglossic echoes in multilingual spaces: language narratives from a Vietnamese community language school in Australia. *Current Issues in Language Planning*, 19(1), 42–61. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14664208.2017.1337831>
- Ricento, T. K., & Hornberger, N. H. (1996). Unpeeling the onion: Language planning and policy and the ELT professional. *TESOL Quarterly*, 30(3), 401. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3587691>
- Rodríguez-Mojica, C., Briceño, A., & Muñoz-Muñoz, E. (2019). Combating linguistic hegemony: Preparing and sustaining bilingual teacher educators in the United States. *Teacher Education Quarterly*, 46(3), 57–78.
- Rubin, H. J., & Rubin, I. S. (2011). *Qualitative interviewing: The art of hearing data*. Sage.
- Saldaña, J. (2012). *The coding manual for qualitative researchers*. Sage.
- Solsona-Puig, J., Capdevila-Gutiérrez, M., & Rodríguez-Valls, F. (2018). La inclusividad lingüística en la educación multilingüe de California: Coexistencia de las variedades y registros de lengua para enriquecer el aula de inmersión dual. *Educación y Educadores*, 21(2), 219–236. <https://doi.org/10.5294/edu.2018.21.2.3>
- Valdés, G. (2018). Analyzing the curricularization of language in two-way immersion education: Restating two cautionary notes. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 41(4), 388–412. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15235882.2018.1539886>
- Valdés, G. (2020). The future of the seal of biliteracy. In A. J. Heineke & K. J. Davin (Eds.), *The seal of biliteracy: Case studies and considerations for policy implementation* (pp. 177–204). Information Age Publishing Inc.
- Wei, L. (2018). Translanguaging as a practical theory of language. *Applied Linguistics*, 39(1), 9–

30. <https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/amx039>
Weick, K. E., Sutcliffe, K. M., Obstfeld, D. (2016). Organizing and the process of sensemaking. *Organization Science*, 16(4), 409–421. <https://doi.org/10.1287/orsc.1050.0133>

Appendix A

Teacher Preparation and Translanguaging – Semi-structured Interview Protocol

- 1 Introduction to the project
- 2 What is your name and position/academic status? If not a teacher candidate: How many years do you have in the profession?
- 3 For non-teacher candidates:
What is your relationship to teacher preparation? What is your relationship to bilingual teacher candidates? What is your relationship to preparing professional development for (new) teachers?
- 4 What is translanguaging for you? When did you first hear it?
- 5 What is Spanglish for you? Why does it happen?
- 6 Have you participated in any professional development/learning experiences about this topic of translanguaging?
- 7 Do you translanguage in your personal life? Do you translanguage in your professional/academic life? How does it influence your professional/academic practice/experience?
- 8 Are there any policies about language separation in your school (s)? Focus on DLI-bilingual schools.
- 9 What have you seen in professionals/teacher candidates/mentors/faculty around you?
- 10 In your school, what reactions have you seen in the community (students, parents) to translanguaging?
- 11 Have you engaged with teacher candidates/classmates in a conversation about translanguaging?
- 12 (If applicable) What strategy or pedagogy or advice would you follow to introduce the concept in your professional community?
- 13 Is there any other aspect you would like to add? Do you have any questions for me?