2020-01-01

Discourses of Coloniality in the Understanding and Practices of Translanguaging Pedagogy

Gabriela Dolsa
University of Texas at El Paso

DISCOURSES OF COLONIALITY IN THE UNDERSTANDINGS AND PRACTICES OF TRANSLANGUAGING PEDAGOGY

GABRIELA M. DOLSA

Doctoral Program in Teaching, Learning, and Culture

APPROVED:

Katherine S. Mortimer, Ph.D., Chair

María Teresa de la Piedra, Ph.D.

Alice S. Sagehorn, Ph.D.

Alberto Esquinca, Ph.D.

Stephen L. Crites, Jr., Ph.D.
Dean of the Graduate School

DEDICATION

To my family.

DISCOURSES OF COLONIALITY IN THE UNDERSTANDINGS AND PRACTICES OF TRANSLANGUAGING PEDAGOGY

by

GABRIELA M. DOLSA

DISSERTATION

Presented to the Faculty of the Graduate School of

The University of Texas at El Paso

in Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements

for the Degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Department of Teacher Education

THE UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS AT EL PASO

December 2020

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I have been incredibly fortunate to cross paths with incredible people that have moved, inspired and taken care of me throughout this journey. I would like to first acknowledge the dual language educators in my study that have shared with me not only their time, but their stories and hopes for themselves and their students. Their trust and generosity were not taken for granted. I was always in awe about the complexities of their jobs and compassion when interacting with students and parents. They made me feel proud of our profession and renovated my passion to continue working for a just education for linguistic minority students.

To my friend, mentor, colleague, dissertation chair, and professor, Katherine. It is hard to convey all the ways you have touched my life. I have learned so much from you. You patiently guided me through this process and encouraged me to trust myself and my work. Your humanity has always had the power to replenish my basket, help me cope with difficulties, and feel supported. Your friendship and mentorship have been one of the greatest gifts and I cherish your presence in my life. Infinite gratitude for the countless teachings, discussions, conversations, and moments together.

To all my committee members, for their invaluable support, time and feedback. You challenged me when I was your student and continued to do so through your feedback. I feel extremely thankful for the opportunity to know and learn from you. Special thanks to Dr. de la Piedra for accepting to join my committee later in the process. You always had words of encouragement for me and a smile ready to share. To Dr. Esquinca for teaching me so much about discourse analysis and challenging me with questions that push my thinking.

To Alice, who has “adopted” me as a daughter and has been my inspiration to pursue this degree. Your friendship has been a blessing. You and your family have created home for me away from my own. Thank you for always bringing my ideas and theories to practice.

To my family, for all the support and tolerance for the absences this work meant. Sophia and Liam, you are by far my most rewarding role. I am the luckiest mami in the world. You make me so proud and I am simply honored to have the chance to see you grow and be your support along the way. Les amo infinitamente. I thank my sister Lore too. Tus palabras de apoyo y aliento me han ayudado en los momentos más difíciles. Soy muy afortunada de contar con una hermana y mejor amiga.

To the EL3 Lab community for creating such a welcoming and supporting space. The Lab has had a major role in my engagement and resilience during the program. Thank you to all my Lab friends for your encouragement and wisdom.

I am eternally thankful for all the people, experiences and opportunities that came my way during the TLC doctoral program. This work is the fruit of who I have become, part of my of story, my hopes and challenges are reflected in the research and writing.

ABSTRACT

Dual language (DL) education has been regarded as a means toward equity and social justice for linguistic minorities. Several studies, however, question if DL programs can, in fact, overcome inequities in the education of emergent bilinguals. This ethnographic study followed these inquiries and explored how translanguaging theory and pedagogy could transform DL education to better serve social justice purposes in this US-Mexico border context. For translanguaging to achieve this, it is fundamental to know how DL educators understand and practice translanguaging in their classrooms. This study revealed that teachers' understandings and practices of translanguaging were embedded in ideologies of coloniality that reproduced normative whiteness and perpetuated processes of coloniality within these DL programs. Drawing from coloniality theory (Maldonado-Torres, 2007; Mignolo & Walsh, 2018) and translanguaging theory (García, 2009) this study analyzed DL educators' discourses that reappropriate concepts intended to dismantle limiting views and practices to achieve equity in the education of emergent bilinguals. This study underscores the necessity of creating a culture of inquiry and ideological exploration when forming DL educators so that they may develop a stance focused on the goals of equity and social justice. Translanguaging pedagogy is a decolonizing tool that can create spaces where pre-service and in-service teachers learn to value their own linguistic richness and identities and to value their students' identities and linguistic repertoires, as well.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

Dual language (DL) education is currently the most effective approach to improving the academic achievement of emergent bilinguals—students developing their bilingualism. DL programs have been seen as an educational equalizer and with the potential to attain social justice for linguistic minorities to transform realities. As these programs increase in number, supported by their goals of biliteracy, academic achievement, and multiculturalism, studies also question if DL programs are, in fact, an equalizer and game-changer for emergent bilinguals' integral development (Grinberg & Saavedra, 2000; Flores, 2016; Valdez, 1997). My study followed these authors' inquiries and explored how translanguaging theory and its pedagogy could transform DL education to better serve its social justice purposes. For translanguaging to be transformative, it is relevant to know how DL educators understand and practice translanguaging in their classrooms. My study looked at DL educators' interpretations and practices of translanguaging and revealed that their discourses and teaching practices took on "colonial coloration" (Kumaradivelu, 2006), exposing ideologies about bilingualism, languages, and identities of emergent bilinguals that reproduced normative whiteness (Valdez, Freire & Delava, 2016). Coloniality ideologies were embedded in teachers' discourses and practices reconfiguring DL education goal as one to improve and fix emergent bilinguals perceived linguistic and identity deficiencies.

Translanguaging as a theory and practice illuminates epistemologies long held regarding language practices and the identities of speakers, pointing at the legacy of colonial times in the creation of different levels of categories of languages and speakers. I understand translanguaging as an ideology to decolonize coloniality beliefs and as such a tool for DL education to achieve its social justice goals. For this reason, it was significant for this study to look deeply at the

discourses of DL educators that emerged when talking about the concept of translanguaging and its pedagogy and to understand the processes through which certain discourses were naturalized and used to reframe translanguaging. For example, in my study, discourses of fidelity to language allocation—while ostensibly a means of guaranteeing equity—reproduce processes and ideologies of coloniality, limiting the transformative potential of translanguaging pedagogy, and consequently, of DL educational goals. Developing a knowledge of translanguaging and exploring its ideological underpinnings is necessary to counteract coloniality views. Ms. Ana, a DL educator in one of the schools I researched, gave us a starting point to what was necessary to develop a stance that pursued a just education. Her knowledge of her students' context and own personal experiences impacted the development of her translanguaging stance, transforming her emergent bilinguals' subject positionings and initiating a path of new discourses and possibilities.

My research underscores the idea that DL educators' awareness of their beliefs and their implications continues to be one of the most important tools for transformation to break the long-standing linguistic oppression and marginalization of identities in this US-Mexico border context. This research started with one initial question for the DL educators: What is translanguaging for you? That single question revealed layers of ideologies about who their students were, how they were positioned, and the role of the principle of fidelity to the languages in their instruction. Deficit ideologies expressed in discourses and practices in my research in both schools were not new or surprising. A closer look at them, however, revealed the complexity of the ideologies immersed in these discourses that reappropriate the meanings of translanguaging, fidelity, and agency in the classroom, concepts that seek to alter limiting beliefs and equalize education.

This dissertation offers an analysis of the discursive processes that allowed for the continuation and consolidation of deficit ideologies. It looks at how concepts intended to dismantle deficit views and practices and to improve equal access to high-quality curriculum and instruction for emergent bilinguals were reappropriated to accommodate coloniality views and systems. It attempts to show how a power system based on normative whiteness—originating in colonial times—sustains itself by reinterpreting concepts using the logic of coloniality (Mignolo & Walsh, 2018) within DL programs. Despite the fact that we often see DL education as an equalizer, coloniality continues to reappropriate the very theories and goals that aim to disrupt these beliefs. Specifically, while fidelity to language allocation may have been promoted as the key to social justice, it served coloniality processes in my study.

Translanguaging (García, 2009) and coloniality (Maldonado-Torres, 2007) are the overarching theories used in this work, and they support my analysis of DL educators' ideologies, discourses, and practices. Translanguaging seeks to decolonize mindsets by proposing a new epistemology of languages. It focuses on the speakers and their abilities to create and expand their linguistic repertoire to make meaning of their worlds. Governmentality and positioning theories (Flores, 2013; Davies & Harré, 1990) also aided the analysis of the persistence and repetition of discourses that position emergent bilinguals in deficit terms because of coloniality ideologies, even within the context of DL programs. This study is situated in relationship to research reflecting historical and ongoing linguistic oppression in schools with a large number of emergent bilingual students. It is also connected to literature positing fidelity as key to the success of DL programs and as a means of achieving linguistic equity. The literature reviews also include the research that conceptualizes translanguaging pedagogy using researchers' stances and interpretations of their participants' pedagogical practices. The literature

review reveals there is a need for more research into DL educators' discourses and understandings of the principle of fidelity and translanguaging pedagogy as a way to advance DL education goals towards the decolonization of mindsets and the transformation of subject positions—or a sense of self developed through discursive processes which confer different rights and obligations within the specifics of a contextual conversation (Davies & Harré,1990).

My ethnographic study was conducted at two schools with DL programs on the US-Mexico border, Alas and Chamizal. Both schools were located close to the international bridges that connect El Paso and Ciudad Juárez. I collected data for 16 months through classroom participation, interviews, participation in DL professional development sessions, and collection of different artifacts. There were eight participants in this research, and they were DL teachers in grades kindergarten to third. I also collected data from four DL administrators. Data was analyzed through inductive and deductive methods (LeCompte & Schensul,1999). The analytical process consisted of a first round of coding of all data and as recurring patterns were identified, and second and third rounds of codings were conducted to analyze and construct conceptual themes. Representative discourses and practices were selected to represent the analysis of each theme.

This dissertation comprises three journal articles that, together, construct my argument for designing considerations as we move forward in DL education. Chapter 2 in this work presents an analysis of DL educators' understandings of translanguaging and their practices as a key element for translanguaging to attain its transformative potential. This work shows DL educators' discourses about and understandings of translanguaging and how these understandings also guided their practices. Teachers redefined translanguaging as a scaffolding strategy and code-switching practices that students temporarily use before developing proficiency in both

languages. These understandings revealed DL educators' views of their students' identities and their beliefs that emergent bilinguals had incomplete cultural knowledge and linguistic practices.

Chapter 3 introduces Ms. Ana, a DL educator at Alas, who was an exceptional teacher among the participants: one who displayed a translanguaging stance, or ideologies, discourses, and practices that leveraged her emergent bilinguals' identities and language practices. Her stance pointed to her agency to use discourses that leveraged her students' funds of knowledge, transforming her and her students' subject positions within her classroom. The third article, Chapter 4, examines the DL principle of fidelity and the emphasis placed in this context on faithfulness to language allocation. It shows how discourses of fidelity reproduced beliefs and processes of coloniality to define languages and DL educators.

These three articles work together to build the argument that coloniality processes continue to occur even within DL programs, which, in large part, were designed to provide emergent bilinguals with equal access to educational opportunities. Fidelity defined in relation to language allocation is one way this is happening. Translanguaging theory and pedagogy (García, 2009) were conceived to disrupt these processes by proposing new epistemologies defying coloniality logics and decolonizing DL education. The transformative potential of translanguaging pedagogy, however, was limited when interpreted through the lenses of deficit language and identity ideologies. Ms. Ana showed us how to start to pave the way to realize translanguaging's decolonizing goals. She displayed features of a translanguaging stance, and her new discourses transformed subject positions. I agree with Murillo (2017) that teacher preparation programs must invest in pedagogies that create spaces for the analysis of the educators' own marginalization stories and the effect that deficit ideologies of language and their speakers have had on teachers and on the reproduction of linguistic inequalities. To develop a

translanguaging stance, we first need to see and understand our own beliefs and the mindsets that drive our pedagogical conceptualizations and practices. In that way we can start expanding our repertoire of discourses to transform subject positions that will disrupt the predictability of coloniality processes within DL education.

I believe that DL and translanguaging pedagogy have the potential to transform the education of emergent bilinguals and to bring us close to social justice. This potential does not happen automatically, however, and can be impeded by ideologies that privilege normative whiteness and position emergent bilinguals as defective and in need of fixing. In my research I inquired about DL educators' understandings of translanguaging pedagogy and found that discourses of fidelity, in this context, reproduce coloniality processes and minoritized subject positions. Teachers' development of a translanguaging stance is a way to move forward to attain the ultimate goal of DL and translanguaging: social justice.

References

Flores, N. (2016). A tale of two visions: Hegemonic whiteness and bilingual education. *Educational Policy*, *30*(1), 13-38.

García, O. (2011). *Bilingual education in the 21st century: A global perspective*. John Wiley & Sons.

Grinberg, J., & Saavedra, E. R. (2000). The constitution of bilingual/ESL education as a disciplinary practice: Genealogical explorations. *Review of Educational Research*, *70*(4), 419-441.

Kumaravadivelu, B. (2006). TESOL methods: Changing tracks, challenging trends. *Tesol Quarterly*, *40*(1), 59-81.

Maldonado-Torres, N. (2007). On the Coloniality of Being: Contributions to the Development of a Concept. *Cultural studies*, *21*(2-3), 240-270.

CHAPTER 2: "WHATEVER YOU WANNA CALL IT. IT'S A TOOL YOU HAVE TO TEACH. BUT DO YOU REALLY WANT TO TEACH KIDS TO DO THAT?": TRANSLANGUAGING CONCEPTUALIZATIONS OF DL EDUCATORS

Abstract

This paper examines the understandings that DL educators have of translanguaging pedagogy. Much of the research on translanguaging looks at the language practices of teachers and students during instruction. This ethnographic study provides evidence that DL educators understand translanguaging as pedagogy through monoglossic and standard language and identities' ideologies, limiting translanguaging's transformative potential. It shows how DL educators' views of their students' and their conceptualizations of translanguaging influenced each other to reframe translanguaging as another pedagogical tool for fixing students' deficits. I argue for the need to bring DL educators' voices to the front to analyze the discourses available for interpreting translanguaging and the ideologies they reveal. This is a necessary step to ensure that translanguaging pedagogy is not relegated to another "best practice" for academic purposes.

Introduction

Mr. Ronald, the principal at Chamizal dual language (DL) school[1], reflected on the concept of translanguaging. He believed that translanguaging was the same as code-switching and to use translanguaging as a pedagogy meant teaching students to code-switch. He did not think this was a good idea. Mr. Ronald said,

[1] All names of schools, districts, and people are pseudonyms.

> As a teacher, no, [to code switch] because then you start to have conversations with people in the real world, I mean you are going to get a job in, again maybe I'm old school, doesn't sound right [mixing languages] when we are speaking both as part of a conversation (Interview, 17/12/20).

Mixing languages was not something that should be taught to students. Later, during our interview, Mr. Ronald said it was important that Latinx be role models for each other, especially in a context where the media and the current federal government depicted "Hispanics" in negative ways. The students' proper ways of communicating were one of the ways to be good role models. When I asked him if he saw any potential benefits of translanguaging as he understood the term, he said,

> To assist the student as long as we go back to the target language, otherwise, you know I go back to what I said earlier, we are models for them, in this case, language models for them and so, 'Hello Mr. Cadena, habla en inglés y habla en español' [referring to a hypothetical case in which a student comes and perhaps switches, but then apparently the student goes back to whatever was considered the target language at the moment]. Then he goes back, and it's, consistency is important. I always say consistency, consistency, and continuity tend to apply to many things, but it's a tool, beneficial, but do we want to teach our kids to do that? And then there is a formal setting and an informal setting. You are talking when you are hanging out with your friends, watching a game. If you want to do that, that's fine but an informal setting but a formal setting, you are going in for a job interview, you don't want to do that. (Interview, 17/12/20)

Mr. Ronald's language ideologies conceptualized translanguaging as a pedagogical strategy to be used only to assist students. He elaborated on his thinking to note the link between

language ideologies and the identities of speakers. For him, speakers he identified as Hispanic, Latinos, or Chicanos, who mixed their languages, did not depict a proper identity or the right identity. But translanguaging, as articulated in the research literature, transcends concepts such as two different languages being mixed and identities constructed through nation-state ideologies. These concepts translate into a pedagogy that sees emergent bilinguals as "simultaneously belonging to what is seen externally as two worlds, two cultures, two histories, that are in reality integrated into their body and mind" (García, 2017, p. 261).

As most DL educators in my study, Mr. Roland understood translanguaging as pedagogy through monoglossic and standard ideologies limiting translanguaging's transformative potential. In this paper, I focus on dual language teachers' understandings of translanguaging as pedagogy and their identification of students to analyze how these two types of conceptualizations interact to reframe translanguaging as pedagogy. This is essential because, if DL education has as goals equity and social justice (Palmer, Cervantes-Soon, Dorner, & Heiman, 2019), DL educators' ideologies of languages and identities need to be examined to understand the power of these ideologies to discursively reframe theories and pedagogical practices that have as premises equity and socially just education for emergent bilinguals.

The term translanguaging is increasingly entering DL programs as a powerful concept to leverage students' whole linguistic repertoire to develop their entire linguistic and identity repertoires. In the next section, I briefly present a literature review on translanguaging pedagogy to illustrate the depth of the theory and, as I show in my analysis, how the term is re-appropriated in DL education, leaving out its core premises, which in this study are its goal of disrupting monoglossic ideologies of languages and identities.

TRANSLANGUAGING PEDAGOGY CONCEPTUALIZATIONS

As the literature on translanguaging grows, there seem to be multiple meanings of the term, which raises questions about its meaning and purposes in the education of emergent bilinguals (Ganuza & Hedman, 2017; Jasper, 2018; McSwan, 2017). As a theory, translanguaging presents a new epistemology of languages and the language practices of bilinguals. Translanguaging as a theory proposes that bilinguals have one integrated linguistic repertoire from which bilinguals draw different features to make meaning in various contexts (Garcia & Wei, 2014). Translanguaging as pedagogy is a stance or ideology that leverages bilingual language practices and sees bilingualism as an asset. It is also a pedagogical design that integrates home, community, and school language practices to teach. Translanguaging pedagogy is also characterized by shifts or the moment-to-moment decisions educators make to center and elevate their students' language practices and identities (García, Jhonson, Seltzer, 2017). Translanguaging as a theory and pedagogy disrupts traditional notions of bilingualism by understanding that emergent bilinguals have a unitary linguistic repertoire that is not separated into social named languages but it is used as a whole to make meaning. In the classroom the educator with a translanguaging stance knows she is utilizing and expanding one unitary system and not adding a new one.

Understanding how DL educators interpret translanguaging and how its premises can develop is an important goal of my study. Most research on translanguaging pedagogy has concentrated on educators and students' language practices, and notions of bilinguals as two monolinguals in one are prevalent. In both ethnographic and mixed-methods research, the conceptualization of translanguaging is constructed in contrast to the language separation policy and notions of deficit or improper languages characterized by mixing, borrowing, and switching

practices. It is also conceptualized as a scaffolding technique to advance biliteracy or the weaker language (Ballinger, 2013; Bartlett & García, 2011; Esquinca, Araujo & de la Piedra, 2014; Makalela, 2015; Gort & Pontier, 2013; Martín Beltrán, 2014; Sayer, 2013; Vaish & Subhan, 2015). For example, Vaish and Subhan (2015), in their study in Singapore refer to translanguaging as pedagogy as the opportunity for students and teachers to use other languages besides the target one, English. The teachers, the authors claimed, used several cross-linguistic strategies to teach vocabulary during the reading of a story that otherwise would have been presented as isolated English words. Gort and Pontier (2013) found that a pair of preschool teachers engaged in translation and code-switching strategies, which they conceptualized as translanguaging pedagogy. These strategies aimed to facilitate students' comprehension of material and scaffold communication.

The research about the impact of translanguaging pedagogy on identity development is also increasing. These studies have emphasized the need for translanguaging spaces, where students can use their entire linguistic repertoire and, in doing so, affirming their identities as emergent bilinguals (García-Mateus & Palmer, 2017). Translanguaging practices in the classrooms have also focused on community identities, such as the TexMex identities, Sayer (2013) analyzed in his study. Similarly, López-Gopar (2013) accounted for the work by him and a group of pre-service teachers using translanguaging pedagogy to value Oxacan's linguistic practices and ways of being.

The researchers mostly construct conceptualizations of translanguaging as a pedagogy through the frameworks or lessons/activities they adopted in both research types. But teachers' voices are missing in their studies. Framing teachers' teaching approaches as translanguaging pedagogy has characterized these valuable studies. Still, DL educators' voices that tell about their

understandings, motivations, and purposes when using certain teaching strategies have not always been addressed. This posed the following questions: To what extent can the analysis through a translanguaging and sociocultural framework of teacher and student interactions during instruction label a teacher's approach as translanguaging pedagogy without the educators in the studies explicitly referring to their teaching ideologies and understandings of translanguaging? This study attempted to find those voices as an important step to deepen the impact of translanguaging.

Ideological underpinnings of translanguaging

Mr. Ronald, one of Chamizal's DL administrators, revealed the monoglossic ideology of bilingualism (Del Valle, 2000, as cited in García, 2009), which means to believe there are two separate linguistic repertoires formed by socially constructed named languages. This is a belief that emphasizes the languages as observable systems and not the speakers and their practices. Translanguaging, on the other hand, focuses on the practices of emergent bilinguals that "are readily observable" (García, 2009, p. 44).

In DL education, centering named languages takes concrete forms such as the allocation of languages to maintain them separately to protect the space of each and develop biliteracy. This external viewpoint also involves discourses that value standard forms associated with socially constructed languages. Languages, as perceived through structuralist lenses, are defined by their standard lexical and grammatical features. In this case, each language, English and Spanish, are seen as distinct linguistic systems that are not to be mixed if learners are to develop standard/academic ways of talking and writing. The idiolects (Otheguy, García, & Reid 2015), or unique language practices of students and teachers, are hardly recognized as legitimate means of expression and meaning-making process and are often characterized as incomplete and deficient.

This characterization constructs identities that are also seen as incomplete and in need of fixing through the teaching of proper language practices. It is useful to use the notion of raciolinguistic ideologies (Flores & Rosa, 2015) to explain how emergent bilinguals' identities are depicted. According to the authors, raciolinguistic ideologies turn the attention to the white gaze, which listening and speaking stances are rooted in an "ideological position" (p., 151) occupied by both white and non-white . This ideological position naturalizes white linguistic behavior and mark as deviant minority language practices.

According to Otheguy, García, and Reid (2018), understanding translanguaging means to be aware of the socio-political construct of named languages around which identities are formed. They argue that educators who are aware of how languages were historically invented to serve dominant groups' power are empowered to enact a translanguaging pedagogy. This pedagogy fosters and develops criticality, creativity, and empowered identities. Translanguaging pedagogy requires then a paradigmatic shift in ideologies of language and identities. As stated before, this study analyzes how the ideologies of language and identity of DL educators interplay with each other to conceptualize and understand translanguaging and its pedagogy.

LANGUAGE IDEOLOGIES AND IDENTITIES

According to Kroskrity (2004), language ideologies "are beliefs, or feelings about languages as used in their social worlds" (p. 498). Woolard (1998) argues that these beliefs and feelings are about language and related to the speakers' identities and power relations in a social context. Language ideologies actively construct social identities and their elements through categorization and hierarchization (Irvine & Gal, 2000; Kroskrity, 2004). These connections between language ideologies and identities are relevant in the US-Mexico border, with a long history of linguistic discrimination and pervasive standard language ideologies from both sides.

For example, national identities such as the ones my participants used to identify themselves and students—Mexican, American, Mexican-American—were connected to ideas of how people communicate, behave, learn, know. These categories indexed different types of identities. These categories describe people and their idealized values as educated or uneducated, and as speakers with deficient language practices, because of where they are from. The US-Mexican border is a site where two hegemonic systems (Hidalgo, 1986) come together to reinforce all kinds of ideologies about language practices and identities (Mortimer, Dolsa, Villarreal, 2018). These language ideologies are often tacit and affect attitudes towards language practices and its speakers as well as influenced and shape discourses:

> Dominant ideologies guide conceptions of reality through repetition of preferred, privileged practices treated as natural. This control of meaning relegates other cultural systems to the margins by making their meaning systems seem wrong, deviant, unimportant, primate, or even invisible (Johnson, 2000, p. 62).

The border also becomes a site of union and fluidity reflected in the language practices and identities. Translanguaging theory represents an immense shift in ideologies, as it challenges "natural" conceptions of languages and speakers. In the context of this research at DL schools, learning two or more languages is highly valued and fostered, and this belief challenges monolingual ideologies and reductionist ideas that the language of power, English, is the only one that should be learned. DL education has undoubtedly challenged dominant language ideologies. However, DL structures and pedagogies continue to see languages through ideologies of standardization and language purism. Translanguaging theory and its ideologies of language and identities highlight the discrepancies and the ideological work needed by DL education to serve emergent bilinguals justly, especially those in my context of the study.

Raciolinguistic ideologies in DL education

Rosa and Flores (2015; 2017) situate raciolinguistic ideologies as a product of colonial history, which conceptualizes languages as linguistic systems bounded to specific racial groups:

> Raciolinguistic ideologies produce racialized speaking subjects who are constructed as linguistically deviant even when engaging in linguistic practices positioned as normative or innovative when produced by privileged white subjects." (Flores & Rosa, 2015, p. 150)

An ideology of whiteness as superior is deeply rooted in colonial times and has shaped and determined racialized minorities' lives.

Flores (2016) and Grinberg and Saavedra (2000) argue that during the Civil Rights era, the goals of bilingual education aimed to deconstruct the whiteness hegemony that imposes Eurocentric views of the world on the education of all. But those socio-political objectives drifted into a discipline that emphasizes the teaching of an idealized form of standard languages when language practices are fluid and unbounded in reality. Additive bilingual education models, such as DL programs, advocate for emergent bilinguals to become biliterate through the maintenance of their dominant language and the addition of a new one (Lambert, 1975). DL programs provide access to standard forms of languages privileging hegemonic language practices without challenging raciolinguistic ideologies that characterize emergent bilinguals' language practices as deviant. DL programs implicitly convey that emergent bilinguals' language practices need to be fixed instead of addressing and disrupting structural inequalities based on raciolinguistic ideologies. Several authors (Cervantes-Soon, 2014; Cervantes-Soon et al., 2017; Grinberg & Saavedra, 2010; Flores & García, 2017; Palmer & Henderson, 2016; Valdez, 1997, 2018; Varghese & Park, 2010) have described the inequalities

in DL programs that maintain the coloniality logic of stigmatized linguistic behavior. The perspective of raciolinguistic ideologies helped in my study to analyze how DL educators' perceptions regarding themselves, other educators, and their students were tied to ideas of whiteness and idealized white linguistic behavior and identities.

LINGUISTIC OPPRESSION ON THE US-MEXICO BORDER AND INEQUALITIES IN DL PROGRAMS

Due to a long history of subordination and linguistic oppression in the Southwest region, DL teachers in El Paso are more likely to have experienced psychological, physical, and contemporary symbolic violence (Achugar & Pessoa, 2009; Achugar & Oteíza, 2009; Bourdieu, 1979; Guerrero & Guerrero, 2017) that has affected their language and pedagogical ideologies and practices. In several research accounts (Luna, 2013) educators who grew up in the US-Mexican border narrate marginalization experiences because of their language practices not only in the US but also in Mexico. Their language practices are measured against standard forms of English and Spanish, and whatever deviation is linked to definitions of deficient and partial identities and positionings. This double oppression is a consequence of ideologies that render English with a higher status than Spanish and standard forms of each language with a higher value than other varieties in this region (Achugar & Pessoa, 2009; Achugar & Oteíza, 2009; Ek, Sánchez, Quijada Cerecer, 2013; Guerrero & Guerrero, 2017; Zentella, 2009). It is relevant to know the history of linguistic oppression in the region, as DL teachers in my context were likely to be stigmatized because of their language practices on both sides of the border, where "pure forms" of English and Spanish are linked to concepts such as nationalism, patriotism, education, authenticity and identities (Mortimer, 2018; Villarreal, Dolsa & Mortimer, 2019).

While DL was originally thought of as an equalizing program for language minority students, there continue to be studies demonstrating that DL programs may not benefit students

equally when the social context of linguistic minorities is not addressed (de Jong & Howard, 2009). Fitts (2006) has pointed out the relevance of the social justice purpose that DL education has started to emphasize. However, Fitts says, those same social justice discourses can obscure certain realities of language minority students' context. For example, in the context of my study, the specific characteristics of what it takes to travel from Juárez to El Paso daily or weekly, safety concerns, and diversity of language practices and their purposes are rarely discussed or taken into account when analyzing what it would take to achieve a socially just education for emergent bilinguals. I argue that it is important to understand how teachers understand translanguaging and its transformative premises so that it does not become a term that reinforces the same limiting ideologies of languages and identities, thus losing its potential to contribute to social justice.

FOCUSING ON TEACHERS' CONCEPTUALIZATIONS OF TRANSLANGUAGING PEDAGOGY

In 2014-2015, I assisted in a research project on exemplary DL programs in two public elementary schools. One of the findings in this research project consisted of using two languages (Spanish and English) by the teacher participants when instructing students. Our research team analyzed these instances through the theory of translanguaging. When the research was finalized, we shared our findings with the teachers, and later we proposed collaborating for a conference presentation. In our brief meetings with the teachers, they decided they wanted to focus on translanguaging teaching practices.

Of great interest for me were the different understandings the teachers seemed to have about the concept of translanguaging and how they labeled their teaching practices. Their conceptualizations of translanguaging were different from the ideological and practical ideas translanguaging theory advocates for. For them, translanguaging meant mainly pedagogical

scaffolding using students' dominant language to clarify and elaborate on academic concepts. I then designed the present study to pursue a deeper understanding of how teachers construct their meanings of translanguaging and what kind of pedagogies and discourses mediate their conceptualizations.

A salient early pattern of my ethnographic study has been the different discourses —ways of using languages, feelings, beliefs, values, actions for identity purposes (Gee, 1999)– teachers use to identify their students. I analyze these discourses about their conceptualizations of translanguaging as pedagogy, as an attempt to elucidate what is needed to achieve what is at the core of translanguaging pedagogy: the awareness and transformation of social inequalities. In the next sections of this paper, I describe the research methods of this study.

METHODS

This sixteen-month-long ethnography study was guided by the overarching research question: What conceptualizations do DL educators have of translanguaging pedagogy? Data for this research was collected from two schools, Alas and Chamizal, located in two different school districts in El Paso, Texas, on the US-Mexico border. Over 161 hours of observations in K-3 classrooms, professional learning communities, and professional development sessions (PDs) were conducted. Multiple field notes were recorded, and one extended, open-ended interview was conducted with each of the twelve DL educators, teachers, and administrators. Artifacts, such as historical documents of the beginning of Alas, reading scores, writing samples, and handouts from PDs were collected. Also, documents describing schools' demographics and academic performance were obtained through the Texas Education Agency (TEA).

Data analysis was ongoing during my data collection process, as reflected in my field notes and memos throughout my study. I open- coded the data and applied inductive and

deductive methods (LeCompte & Schensul, 1999). Discourses about the identities of students and their language practices emerged from a pre-established code: translanguaging conceptualization. DL educators' responses were also coded for students' identities and DL educators' identities. Using NVivo software, I grouped together codings on translanguaging and identities of DL and students to visualize the patterns in the connections of conceptualizations of translanguaging and identities. Through memo writings, I established links between the educators' translanguaging interpretation and their connections with identity and language ideologies.

Discourse analysis (Gee, 1999) helped me understand the underpinnings of how DL educators talked about their own and their students' language practices and identities. Gee (1999) defines discourse analysis as the study of what we do with language. He says that discourses always involve more than just language: "They involve coordinating languages with ways of acting, interacting, valuing, believing, feeling, and other non-linguistic symbols" (Gee, 1999, p. 24). Discourses are social practices that represent identities and ideologies through language. Discourse analysis aided my comprehension of how conceptualizations of translanguaging and emergent bilinguals are constructed through pervasive discourses available to DL educators. Interrogating those discourses instead of accepting them as natural opens up the possibility of constructing and exploring new discourses and, therefore, different impacts.

RESEARCHER POSITIONALITY

I am from Paraguay, a country where most of the population speaks the Indigenous language, Guarani, and Spanish. Like people from El Paso, Paraguayans also "mix" the two languages, translanguage, in daily conversation, and separate the two languages according to the social contexts. In Paraguay, Spanish is the predominant language of business and government.

At the same time, the use of Guarani is associated with lower social classes, and the mixture of the two is used in conversation in different contexts. To some extent, I understand some of the ideologies about languages and education that circulate in this context because of my experience with my own and my social context language practices when growing up in Paraguay.

I am a former bilingual teacher who has had experience teaching English language learners in different contexts: English as a second language, English only, and Spanish immersion classrooms. Every context influenced and shaped the way I conceptualize teaching practices and particular theories of teaching. During my observations and interviews, I mostly used Spanish but was attentive to participants' preferences and styles to establish better rapport and access covert ideologies.

CONTEXT OF STUDY

El Paso is located in the farthest southwest corner of the state of Texas. It is one of the largest bilingual/binational metropolitan areas globally, situated at the center of the almost 2000 miles long US-Mexican border. Border Studies theorists such as Anzaldúa (1987, 1999) and Rosaldo (1989) have defined the US-Mexican border as hybrid and third spaces and a site of border crossings where people live in (Nepantla -in between) or as some of the dual language educators in my study will identify themselves and their students, "ni de aquí, ni de allá" (not from here nor there). Vila (2000) argues, however, that every pair of cities along the US Mexican border is "the locus of very different processes of internal and international migration, ethnic composition, and political identities on both sides of the border" (p. 7). Ciudad Juárez and El Paso are called sister cities. Although they are perceived to relate peacefully, their relationship is also full of contradictions and inequities, products of their intertwined histories and particular social processes. El Paso's and Ciudad Juárez's interdependence and intrinsic fluid exchange of

languages and cultures are evident in translanguaging practices. The community and DL educators referred to El Pasoans as speakers of Spanish and English with code-mixing styles. I describe this context's language practices as translanguaging or linguistic practices that evidence the rich linguistic repertoires this border community displays.

El Paso is home to more than ten school districts. Alas belonged to the El Paso del Norte District and Chamizal to The Valley School District. El Paso del Norte launched DL education as the default program for all emergent bilingual students in 2014, replacing transitional bilingual program models. Alas was the first school to serve Mexican students on the south side of the Segundo Barrio. In its beginnings, it also functioned as an evening school. In my study, references to Alas school and its community, Segundo Barrio, as impoverished and as contexts that presented challenges to work and learn, were often made. In first grade, one of the Spanish DL educators said that students at Alas did not have the motivation to learn like the students who were in other DL programs just five miles north of them. Another kindergarten teacher said that students in the Segundo Barrio do not interact with other children that look different from them, and therefore their experiences and language are very limited. The third-grade teacher, who was on the hiring board for a new fourth grade DL educator said she did not care about how many degrees the teacher to be hired had; she wanted to know if she understood the context of the Segundo Barrio and the needs the students have there. There were other deficit-based assumptions regarding parents' involvement in their children's education based on attributed social class indicators. For example, one of the kindergarten teachers said this:

> Los niños que llegan a ésta escuela prácticamente, pues, no tienen una base mínima para empezar, entonces, son estudiantes que, que sí se enfrentan a retos de la enseñanza más difícil, porque no hay un apoyo en casa, o sea, este, vienen mal vestidos, la mayoría, este,

mal alimentados, no tienen una estructura familiar, entonces, todos esos factores vienen a afectar en su enseñanza, entonces, sí es un poco más difícil.

The children who come to this school practically do not have a minimum foundation to start; therefore, they face more difficult challenges because there is no support at home. I mean, they come badly dressed, most of them are not well-fed and don't have a family structure. These factors affect the teaching, and yes, it's a little more difficult. (Ms. Nadia's interview, 12/04/2017)

Segundo Barrio and Alas continue today to be regarded as needy, and their students are described as lacking the necessary skills to be successful students. Before implementing their current DL programs, both schools offered transitional bilingual education for emergent bilinguals. Alas' DL program was in its third year of implementation when I began my study. It was a two-teacher model, in which one teacher teaches in Spanish and another in English from K-5th grade following a 50/50 model, which established equal minutes of instruction in all core subjects in Spanish and English. There were about 38 students in the DL program in each kindergarten, first and third classrooms during the 2017-2018 school year. Students were divided into groups A and B and assigned a homeroom teacher with whom students started the day before transitioning to the other classroom and then came back to their homerooms to finish the day.

With a longer history in DL education, the beginnings of Chamizal go back to 1995, when The Valley district used the federal grant "Mariposa" to start a new bilingual education program: a bilingual program that was not considered remedial for emergent bilinguals, but that was going to educate Latinx students through English and Spanish as well as another language of their choice. Chamizal is a K-8 two-way DL program and magnet school, which had a reputation

for high academic achievement, and bilingualism/biliteracy levels were well known in the community. Students received instruction in English and Spanish, and upon entering the school, they could choose a third language to study (Japanese, Russian, German, and Mandarin). Because of this third language option, Chamizal was described as having an 80/10/10 model. Eighty percent of the instruction was in Spanish and ten percent in English in Kindergarten. While the English and Spanish instruction increased and decreased to reach a 50/50 by grade five, ten percent of the language chosen remained until eight grade for a final allocation of 45/45/10. Despite rocky beginnings and challenges with the school staff and parents, who were skeptical of this new model, Chamizal grew into a school included in the bilingual scholarly work for its innovation and research, portraying it as a successful DL school.

The different dynamics and processes of these border contexts continuously reconstruct and shape these two DL programs' ideologies and their manifestations in discourses, language, and teaching practices. Below, Table 1 shows 2016-2017 information from the Texas Education Agency (TEA) about Alas Elementary and Chamizal student' demographics. Table 2 shows the DL educators' demographics. The term Hispanic is used in the students' demographics' table as it is the term TEA uses. I use the term Latinx throughout this paper.

Table 1: Alas and Chamizal students' demographics

School	Total Enrollment	Total Emergent Bilingual Students	Total Economically Disadvantaged Students	Total at Risk Students	Total Students Receiving Special Education Services	Hispanic students
Alas	505	86%	98%	90%	17%	98%
Chamizal	762	88%	67%	58%	8%	98%

Table 2: DL educators/administrators

School	DL educator	Years of experience	Ethnicity
Alas	Ms. Ana	10+	Latinx
Alas	Ms. Zulem	10+	Latinx
Alas	Ms. Marta	20+	Latinx
Chamizal	Mr. Roland	25+	Latinx

"NI DE AQUÍ NI DE ALLÁ": IDEOLOGIES OF PARTIAL LANGUAGE AND IDENTITY

During my conversations with some teachers at Alas, they told me they were attending a PD on DL education with a renowned DL expert in the coming weeks. When I went to visit Ms. Zulem's classroom, I wondered if she was participating in this PD as well. When I asked her, she said those DL professional developments do not help with anything. As a former DL educator, I thought I understood what she meant. Professional developments often present information that does not apply to the particular sociocultural characteristics of school contexts. I had just participated in one DL training for administrators the week before this conversation. I wanted to share with Ms. Zulem my excitement about this, thinking that the information I was about to share with her would address her belief about PD being useless. I told her I was happily surprised that this PD focused on not only the academic but culturally relevant information, such as the

deficit views through which emergent bilingual students are viewed most of the time. Ms. Zulem listened to me while she was arranging some print on her whiteboard. She then stopped her task to tell me, "No sirven para nada [referring to the PDs] Todo el mundo [DL teachers] hace lo que quiere" [They are useless. Everyone does whatever they want to do] (Field note, 10/05/2017).

She then continued to tell me she thought students at Alas needed to know more about this culture. Kids at Alas, she said, did not interact with kids that look different from them. She also told me she did not say they shouldn't be talking about their culture, but that they should be learning that language goes with a culture and it's not only just to learn the language, "No hacen raíz. No son de aquí ni de allá", she said. "They don't make roots. They're not from here nor there" (Field note, 10/05/2017). She added that this happened at Alas because they only came to El Paso to go to school. El Paso just meant going to school for them. She thought people who were from El Paso grew different roots. But for the children at Alas, they just came to school. Ms. Zulem added that the students' manners and everything else indicated they were not from El Paso. She said students told her they were Mexicans, but they told me that in English (Field notes, 10/05/2017).

Ms. Zulem seemed to identify her students in partial terms, not fully from one place or the other. A high percentage of Alas' students were "transfronterizos" (de la Piedra & Arau jo, 2012). They lived in Ciudad Juárez during the week or weekends and crossed the border to come to school. According to her, this was why students at Alas did not have clear "Mexican and American" cultural characteristics, which was evident through students' language practices and mannerisms. Ms. Zulem's assimilative discourse positioned her students as outsiders. They were not from El Paso, but they were not completely from Mexico, either. Ms. Zulem's discourses positioned students with conflicting or ambiguous identities. The ideologies she expressed were

problematic: that people from different nations should speak and act according to cultural characteristics emblematic of their national origins. When Ms. Zulem shared with me how she viewed students at Alas after I expressed my excitement about a PD session addressing deficit ideologies educators hold of emergent bilinguals, she confirmed for me that she saw students in similar deficit-based ways. Not being from here or there disrupted Ms. Zulem's naturalized beliefs about an ideal alignment of nationality, culture, language, and identity. Instead of questioning ideologies when presented with students' ways of beings and actual lives, she uncritically applied and used these ideologies as lenses through which to see and mark Alas's students' identities as deficient and incomplete. These assimilative ideologies ignore the complexities of students' social lives and leave little option for developing identities. Furthermore, these limits are far from the fluidity of identity processes. As Irvine and Gal (2000) state, a process of erasure occurs, denying identities that do not fit with fixed cultural beliefs about identities.

Ms. Zulem's students' language practices also did not conform to her views of standard language practices. Ms. Zulem was quick to give feedback on students' language practices. This feedback often emphasized the use of standard words. For example, in one opportunity, Ms. Zulem was explaining a writing activity to the students sitting on the carpet in front of her. They were supposed to create a toy they would later write about in their journals. She asked students,

> ¿De qué va a crear su juguete? One of the boys in the classroom said he wanted to create a "chango" type of toy. Ms. Zulem, a native of Guatemala and a resident of El Paso of more than twenty years, asked him: ¿Qué es un chango? (A word typically used for monkey in the El Paso region). ¡Un mono! screamed a few students at the same time. Ms. Zulem told the boy: Utilice la palabra correcta, porque chango, así chango suena como

cualquier cosa [Use the right word because chango sounds like whatever]. (Field notes, 05/22/2017)

As for many other DL educators in my study, teaching standard language practices was considered primary for emergent bilinguals, so that they would overcome their deficits as perceived by teachers. Ms. Zulem conveyed standard language ideologies and views of her students as incomplete, without a clear identity and in misalignment to their countries' ways of speaking and cultural characteristics. The above example suggest that the ideologies Ms. Zulem expressed influenced her notion of what constitutes translanguaging.

Translanguaging as a temporary cognitive resource

Ms. Zulem described translanguaging as a process of connection between the two languages to make sense of academic concepts:

> Para mí no es bilingüe [el estudiante] únicamente porque es capaz de responderme en el segundo idioma que le estoy enseñando sino que me puede entender, puede ver algo escrito y no necesariamente responderme en el idioma. Translanguaging es el lenguaje como tal pero no es el idioma, si me explico? La habilidad que tenés de entender el lenguaje y nada tiene que ver con el idioma. Así veo yo el translanguaging con los chiquitos. Ellos saben el concepto pero no necesariamente la palabra. Los estudiantes saben pero sin embargo no saben reconstrui rlo y ponerlo en el nuevo idioma.
> For me, the students are not bilingual just because she can answer to me in the second language I'm teaching to her, but it is if she can understand me, see something written, and not necessarily that she can answer in that language. Translanguaging is the language as such but is not the code. Am I explaining myself? It is the ability you have to understand the language that has nothing to do with the code. That's the way I see

translanguaging with the little ones. They know the concept, but not necessarily the word. The students know, but they cannon reconstruct it and put it in the new code. (Field note, 09/20/2017)

Ms. Zulem later elaborated on this,

> A lo que yo me refiero con el lenguaje, más bien lo que yo entiendo como tal, es la capacidad que se tiene para comunicar. Comunicarse por medio de señas, sonidos, dibujos y/o acciones físicas que indican comprensión. Mientras que el idioma lo entiendo como lengua, es decir el uso sistemático de códigos establecidos como palabras que se utiliza para comunicarse en comunidad. Para mí es importante que sepan expresarse con acciones, dibujos, o señas lo que entienden acerca de los conceptos dados en el segundo idioma o en su defecto, utilicen su idioma dominante... pero mostrando comprensión.
>
> What I refer to with the language, or what I understand about language is that it is the capacity that one has to communicate. To communicate through signs, sounds, drawings, and physical actions that indicate comprehension. Meanwhile, the code is the language as the use of systematically established codes like words used to communicate within the community. For me, they must know how to express to me with actions, drawing, or sign the understanding they have of the given concepts in the second idiom, or if they can't, they use their dominant idiom but showing comprehension. (Field note, 09/20/2017)

Ms. Zulem conceptualized translanguaging as an internal cognitive process of emergent bilinguals to make meaning. She acknowledged the range of modalities her students have to comprehend and communicate. She differentiated between language and idioma or code. For her, the language was all the semiotic resources employed to communicate the internal processing of

understanding. Idioma or code is the specific named language used. Translanguaging consisted of, according to Ms. Zulem, the use of different modalities to communicate when students cannot do it with the idioma or the named language. Even though Ms. Zulem seemed to differentiate between socially constructed named languages (idioma/code) from the actual resourceful use of different semiotic elements (language), she perceived translanguaging as a temporary useful process used when students do not yet know the named language. Otheguy, García, and Reid (2018) argued that educators who conceive bilingualism as the mastering of named languages position their students in a constant "not-there yet" (p. 24) as their bilingualism depends on the proficient performance of named languages.

Ms. Zulem's conceptualization of translanguaging resonated with her view of students being ni de aquí, ni de allá, as not having clear or complete identities. The translanguaging abilities of her emergent bilinguals occurred because their development of English and Spanish were incomplete. Standard language ideologies also signaled a view of languages. She mentioned codes and systems to be learned, which differs from the focus of translanguaging on the speakers and what they do with their linguistic features. Standard language ideologies hold space only for practices considered educated. Deviations such as colloquial practices and the fluidity of languages in the El Paso region are highly criticized and stigmatized on both sides of the US-Mexico border.

In the next section, Ms. Ana from Alas communicated empowering views of her students. Her conceptualizations of hers and her students' identities, similarly to Ms. Zulem, aligned to nation-state ideologies.

AFFIRMING IDENTITIES AND LANGUAGE PRACTICES

Ms. Ana was initially the first grade English teacher before being switched to third grade as the Spanish teacher in the program at Alas. When talking about how she viewed her students, she shared with me,

> Ok, voy a sonar algo tal vez ridícula porque yo me identifico como m exicana, sin embargo, ah, siento que me falta mucho pa ser Mexicana, o sea, mis raíces, yo soy Mexicana, soy hija de padres Mexicanos, crecí en Juárez, claro, a los diez años me vine para acá y eso cambió un poquito, me cambió mi identidad porque siento que no seguí creciendo en mis raíces, como que dejé mis raíces de lado y pos tuve que asimilar la nueva cultura. Pero aún me siento Mexicana aunque no sepa todo lo que debo de saber de mi cultura, aún me siento Mexicana y aunque mi idioma, mi lenguaje, mi, mis conocimientos no son lo que deberían de ser a mi nivel académico, yo soy Mexicana. Tal vez me podrían decir soy poc ha, pero para mí yo soy Mexicana.
>
> Ok, I may sound a little ridiculous, but I identify myself as Mexican. However, I feel I still need a lot more to be Mexican. I mean, my roots, I am Mexican, I'm a daughter of Mexican parents, I grew up in Juárez. Of course, when I was ten years old, I came here, and that changed a little bit. It changed my identity because I feel I did not continue growing up within my roots. I put my roots to the side, and I had to assimilate the new culture, but I still feel Mexican. Even though I don't know everything I need to know about my culture, I still feel Mexican, and although my language, my knowledge is not what they should be at the academic level, I am Mexican. Perhaps they can call me pocha, but for me, I'm Mexican. (Interview, 01/18/2018)

Ms. Ana discussed her identity in a way in that like she needed to explain why she felt Mexican or Mexican American, as she stated close to the end of her excerpt. It was evident that Ms. Ana was aware of prevalent assimilative ideologies at Alas, which one could say are present in other contexts. She was also aware of cultural labels or stereotypes that were often applied to Mexican Americans such as pocha, a term associated with language and cultural practices that have been influenced by English language and American culture (Arce, 2004). This term is pejorative, and it is used on both sides of the border to characterize language mixing as speaking neither English nor Spanish well (Villarreal, Dolsa, and Mortimer, 2017).

Although I did not hear anyone else using the term pocha, discourses of not knowing Spanish and English well, and therefore, not having a clear national identity were constant in my research contexts. The way Ms. Ana felt about her identity influenced the way she viewed her students. During the interview, she told me about wanting to sing with her students a song called "Las Mañanitas" during the Mother's Day event, which is a traditional Mexican birthday song,

> Sabes que el año pasado, yo estaba sorprendidísima porque para el día de las madres, pues los niños tenían que hacer una presentación, entonces nos quedaba un espacio muy grande que no podíamos cubrir y dijimos vamos a cantar las mañanitas, todos los niños saben las mañanitas ¡híjole! [la mayoría de los niños no sabían la canción], en el momento en que teníamos que practicar dos niños se sabían las mañanitas en español y venían de Juárez! Me dió tristeza la verdad, me dió tristeza.
>
> Do you know that last year, I was so surprised because the kids had to do a presentation for Mother's day, and we had left a big chunk of time we had to cover, and we said, 'let's sing las mañanitas.' All kids know las mañanitas. ¡Hijole! [most of the students did not know the song] When we had to practice, only two kids knew las mañanitas in Spanish y

they came from Juárez! It gave me sadness to tell you the truth. It made me sad. (Interview, 02/15/2018)

Ms. Ana affirmed the value of her and her students' and families' cultural background by including a song she thought was familiar to them. This was relevant and encouraging in a context where leveraging of cultural and linguistic practices did not happen often. It also revealed ideologies of identities as fixed and rooted in what one was supposed to know if belonging to one culture. It tells about the struggle that binary conceptions in terms of where she and her students were from affect discourses and the ways she saw herself and her students as not "representatives" of their culture or having lost "traditional" elements of their "Mexican culture."

Ms. Ana's instruction also reflected her beliefs about what it meant to be Mexican. During her instruction, she often was purposeful about establishing connections between Juárez and El Paso's ways of life. For example, in her first grade English reading lessons about traditions, she stated that the piñatas used in celebrations or festivities such as birthday parties were not an American tradition. She told her students if they needed to buy one, they needed to go to a Mexican store in El Paso or Juárez, but they could not find one in Wal-Mart,

> ¿Do you find piñatas in Wal -Mart? Few kids say no, but they seemed confused, looking at each other and puzzled by the question. After a few kids said no, she said that is why they go to an old Mexican store because it is a Mexican tradition, not American. Ms. Ana also pronounced the word piñata purposely with an English accent, exaggerating the voiceless alveolar stop sound of the letter t. She asked her students: Is that the way we pronounce it?" while she smiled. Students said no in unison. Ms. Ana then pronounced the word with a Spanish pronunciation. (Field note, 08/12/16)

I was also confused about her question, as I have seen piñatas at W al-Mart in El Paso. Most of Ms. Ana's students lived a bridge away but in another country. Ms. Ana seemed to want her students to know this element of their culture and separate it from "American culture," also adding linguistic features to mark the separation between cultures. There was a clear intersection between her life experiences, her identity, and her instruction. Her first-graders lived in constant movement in terms of places and contexts for their education and social lives that shaped each other to develop identities that did not always seem to represent emblematic cultural knowledge and language practices.

In another instance in the same first-grade classroom, she elicited answers from students regarding the differences between the trash systems of El Paso and Juárez. In some impoverished neighborhoods of Ciudad Juárez, neighbors wait outside for the trash collector trucks to pick up trash. Most of the time, this is to keep street dogs from getting into the trash before it is collected by these trucks. The students did not offer any answers. As mentioned before, most students at Alas came from different parts of Ciudad Juárez to school. They may not have been familiar with the trash collection system in El Paso or even in some neighborhoods of Juárez. Ms. Ana then explained how El Paso did not have to wait outside for the trash truck collector as neighborhoods in El Paso knew the days and times the trash collectors were coming. Ms. Ana assumed a background knowledge her students seemed not to have. Similarly to the scenario about the piñatas, Ms. Ana imagined her students' identity based on her own expectations of their cultural knowledge and customs rather than the students' funds of knowledge. Cultural beliefs about how students should identify and conduct themselves because of their backgrounds were in the context of my study. In my personal and research assistant interactions and as an immigrant, I often heard comments that positioned others through discourses that made sense for those

positioning others' life trajectories and own conceptualizations and experiences. Assuming concepts of heritage, family roots, language practices, and values are the same within people who share the same ethnic background or category is a way to reify notions of identities and named languages, developing expectations of how and what students should perform.

Although Ms. Ana identified herself and her students through the ideologies that prescribed what identities from different countries sound like and know about, her leveraging of her students' bilingualism and language features were evident through her instruction. When Ms. Ana was teaching English reading in her first-grade classroom, she was working with one of her students on one particular English sound.

> She told her student to place his hand on his throat. While doing this, she told me that this particular student "has a very strong Spanish." Because of it, he is having a hard time hearing the English sound they were working on (Field note, 03/29/2017).

Hearing her saying this was refreshing and stood in direct opposition to how other DL educators in my study conceptualized their students as knowing neither Spanish nor English well because of identities that are neither from Juárez nor El Paso.

Ms. Ana's discourses and practices positioned students as capable and as having resources that will help them develop both languages. However, this student's strong Spanish could also be seen as his Spanish proficiency getting in the way of his English learning. But I observed several opportunities in which Ms. Ana used her students' bilingualism to advance their language development, which leads me to the interpretation that here she was appreciating his strong Spanish and affirming their language background and repertoire. In another opportunity, in third grade, the year Ms. Ana was assigned to instruct in Spanish, she was giving a reading test to one of her students. After reading a Spanish passage, the girl needed to retell the story for

comprehension and vocabulary development purposes. Ms. Ana asked her to tell her about the character of the story. The student started describing the character in Spanish but pointed to the character's picture in the book to signal the character was in a wheelchair. But she seemed not to know the word for a wheelchair. Ms. Ana then seemed to know the girl knew the word but did not want to say it in English, perhaps because they were reading in Spanish.

> Ms. Ana asked her in Spanish, what is that picture in English, and the girl answered right away, "wheelchair!" Then Ms. Ana asks her, ¿Qué es chair in Spanish?
>
> Silla [Chair] the girl, says
>
> Ms. Ana asks again: "¿Qué es wheel?"
>
> "Llanta" [tire] says the girl.
>
> Ms. Ana says then, "O rueda [another word for tire], ¿verdad?"
>
> "¡Silla de ruedas!" [wheelchair] says the girl with a smile. (Field note, 09/19/2017)

Ms. Ana tapped into her student's linguistic repertoire and elicited the linguistic features necessary for the girl to expand her repertoire in Spanish. Ms. Ana's views of her students and the resources they bring informed her understanding of translanguaging.

Translanguaging as code-switching and as a strategy for scaffolding

I asked Ms. Ana what translanguaging was for her. She said: "Para mí translanguaging es usar ambos idiomas para apoyar uno al otro" [For me, translanguaging is to use both languages to support one antoher] (Interview, 09/02/2018). Ms. Ana used the term translanguaging and code-switching as synonyms. On several occasions, she told me she code switches with her students all the time, especially when she was the English first-grade teacher. She said this practice was beneficial, and she could see the benefits in her students' English and Spanish reading scores. This conceptualization of translanguaging was not unique to Ms. Ana. In my

research, many DL educators understood translanguaging as code-switching, but not everyone agreed on these practices being valuable when sustained or taught explicitly. These oppositions came from ideologies of identities linked to standard language ideologies. For example, Ms. Marta, a native from Mexico City and a longtime resident of El Paso, was a DL administrator from the central office at El Paso del Norte School District. When I asked her about her understanding of translanguaging, she said,

> A pesar de que ellos [comunidad de El Paso] usan mucho esto del translenguaje , porque la cosa es que te comuniques como le hagas, yo sigo teniendo estas raíces de que hay lugares en que pues sí hay uno y luego hay otros en que está bien ¿no?, en los comerciales, en los anuncios, en los letreros, pues, bueno, estás en una ciudad en lo que va y viene la gente, les da la idea de eso, está bien, pero valorar que lo hagas así siempre no me, todavía me causa... [gestos de malestar].
>
> Despite the fact they [El Paso community] used a lot of this, of the translanguaging, because the thing is that you communicate however you do. I keep my roots though about the belief that there are places where yes, there is one [language] and other places where it is ok [translanguaging], right? In the stores, in commercial ads, on signs. Well, you're in a city where people come and go, which gives them the idea of that [translenguar]. But to value that you do that always, it still causes me… [showing gesture of discomfort]. (Interview, 09/13/2017)

She added that translanguaging is useful in the classroom for students to express whatever they want, but not for teachers:

> Y todavía soy de la filosofia que ella [maestras] se mantenga en el... modelando el idioma que está, no te digo que es que nunca cruce, o sea, no te digo que nunca use el otro

idioma, sí, a veces es necesario y a veces quieres que los niños te entiendan bien, entonces, lo vas a decir de la manera que te entiendan ¿verdad?, depende, o sea, tienes que ser estratégico, este, quizá Kathy Escamilla y Manuel [DL académico] digan no, háblelos así ya no háblenle así como ellos hablan en el barrio, pero yo todavía no caigo bien ahí totalmente de eso.

I still have the philosophy that they [teachers] keep on… they model the language in which she is. I'm not saying that she never crosses or uses the other language. Yes, sometimes it is necessary, and you sometimes want that the kids understand you well, then you're going to say it in the way they are going to understand you, right? It depends, I mean, you need to be strategic. Perhaps Kathy Escamilla and Manuel [DL scholar] say no and speak to them as they speak in their neighborhoods, but I do not completely agree with that. (Interview, 09/13/2017)

During our interview, Ms. Marta conveyed to me that she was proud of the educational opportunities she had throughout her life. She attended a bilingual school in Mexico City, where she said she learned to value English and Spanish equally because of the program model similar to a 50/50 model. She said they did not mix languages when she was in school because they respected and valued them. She told me several times she was now used to the language practices of El Paso but still felt uneasy with mixing English and Spanish and did not think one should speak that way in all contexts. Ms. Marta added she was aware that Kathy Escamilla, a bilingual scholar, said that teachers should speak to students the way they do it in the "barrio," but that she still had the philosophy teachers need to model standard language practices. In a PD session lead by Ms. Marta and other DL educators for DL teachers from Alas, one of them cautioned teachers not to engage in "back and forth." She said: "Going back and forth, you are

used to speaking in both languages. We have not to do that. That is very important. We can't do that. And here people are used to doing that" (Field notes, 10/19/2017).

DL programs at Alas and Chamizal were rooted in standard language ideologies, which idealize and elevate monolingualism in a standardized national language. According to the DL lead trainer, the "going back and forth" of El Paso did not adhere to the cultural construct of standard language practices, which included not using both languages concurrently. Standard language practices are ideologies that connect to identities that are considered educated. For Ms. Marta, translanguaging was for the students and learning,

> El traslenguaje para los niños, para que los niños le den sentido a lo que están aprendiendo académicamente también puede ser maravilloso, pero yo creo que de enseñarles, de hacer una presentación en el idioma que se debe hacer, porque cuando vayan a la entrevista de trabajo es en el idioma en el que se va a hacer, te dice mucho de tu educación como hablas ¿no?, no queremos juzgar a nadie, pero, como te ves, como te desenvuelves, como te expresas, no te… Todavía rige en todo el mundo [lenguaje standard académico].
>
> Translanguaging is for the children, so that the children can make sense of what they're learning academically, and it's wonderful. Still, I believe in teaching them how to do a presentation in the language that it has to be done, because when they go to a job interview, it is in the language that it's going to be. It says a lot about your education, how you speak, no? We don't want to judge anyone, but how you look, act, and express...It still rules in the world...[standard and academic language practices] (Interview, 09/13/2017).

For Ms. Marta, switching between Spanish and English was equivalent to translanguaging, was not considered standard, and was marked as uneducated, and therefore not a language behavior to be modeled by DL educators. Ms. Marta articulated how language practices of students are linked to educated identities, and language practices had consequences for situations such as job interviews. The concept of translanguaging pedagogy here is reduced to a scaffolding strategy students and teachers engage for academic comprehension purposes. Translanguaging pedagogy was not connected to its purposes of creativity and criticality to make teachers and students inquire about the different ways of using languages and its meanings and consequences.

In this study, DL educators felt the responsibility of "improving" students' past and current language practices to prepare them for their future listeners in the form of jobs, colleges, or institutionalized interactions. Ms. Marta was aware of deficit discourses and was a strong advocate of students' translanguaging. Still, she was hesitant to embrace teachers' translanguaging, because, as she said, "how you look, how you express" or raciolinguistic attitudes 'still rules the world." Ms. Marta and other DL educators, set as goals to change emergent bilinguals' language practices to fix their identities, rather than changing the beliefs of the white listening subject (Flores & Rosa, 2015).

IDEOLOGIES THAT EXPAND OR CONSTRAIN THE POTENTIAL OF TRANSLANGUAGING PEDAGOGY

The research question for this study was about the conceptualizations and practices of translanguaging that DL educators hold. I did not expect the question to raise matters of the identities of students and DL educators. I then decided to explore how understandings of translanguaging and discourses of identities were related to each other. The DL educators in my study thought translanguaging was a beneficial practice to aid students' academic understandings

and to help develop both languages. They acknowledged that students' linguistic repertoire could be used for academic and language development. All of them engaged in some type of translanguaging instruction consisting of code-switching to enhance academic comprehension.

However, teachers' identifications of students as "ni de aquí, ni de allá" because of national and standard language ideologies gave insights into how translanguaging theory and pedagogy theory can be reframed through pervasive ideologies and limit its potential. If DL educators perceived their students' identities as to be in limbo or incomplete because they do not adhere to certain cultural beliefs, traditions, and language practices, then translanguaging becomes a pedagogy of scaffolding for emergent bilinguals. It does not disrupt any established notion of what languages are and how identities are formed through language ideologies. These notions are at the heart of educational injustices. Translanguaging pedagogy has the potential to transform educators' views and therefore, transform their students' identities legitimizing their language practices and equalizing classroom discourse and practices. Translanguaging is an ideology of language that focuses on the speakers rather than in languages, codes, or idiomas and embraces language practices and identities' fluidity. If translanguaging is understood as code-switching, then the main core of one of its premises is lost.

No matter how positively code-switching is conceived, both in the sociolinguistic and the language education literature, it still endorses what García (2009), following Del Valle (2000), called a monoglossic ideology of bilingualism, one that takes an external viewpoint of language and that only considers two named languages that are said to constitute two linguistic systems (García & Kleyn, 2016, p. 12). To conceive emergent bilinguals as two monolinguals that have not developed either of their languages with proficiency reifies ideologies that identify students as "not there yet" and, as we see in this study, as not representing their assumed cultures with

competence. Without calling attention to the ways educators identify their students, the meaning and potential of translanguaging pedagogy seem lost.

There is a need for educators to become aware of identity processes and how positioning informs their pedagogies (Palmer & Martínez, 2013). The professional development that has been offered to my teacher participants was strong in teaching and planning strategies for a fifty-fifty model in which academic content cannot be repeated but introduced and expanded in two different languages. Although language separation was underscored throughout these professional development sessions, biliteracy and connections between the two languages were also addressed. For the most part, however, there were no opportunities to reflect on their students' identifications and the ideologies underpinning those identities and the consequences they may have. For this to happen, I argue, teachers must also have the space to reflect on their own identities to understand their students' identities. This is an experiential exercise, which I think is needed to start making sense of the teachers' fundamental role in their students' construction of their own identities. Translanguaging is a pedagogy of inquiry. As Norton (2013) claimed, all students need pedagogies that foster critical analysis of the ways linguistic and cultural practices naturalize some identities and marginalize others. Translanguaging pedagogy may otherwise not reach its transformative effects and may risk becoming another "best practice" that does not address what it is at the core of the theory, which is the empowerment of identities and the formation of new subject positions (see Chapter 3 through the development of criticality and creativity for social justice goals.

I believe the answer to Mr. Ronald's question, "do we really want to teach it ?" [translanguaging] is yes. Current and future DL educators need to engage in new frameworks that offer different conceptualizations of cultural identities. The field of DL education should

also interrogate who is considered “expert” in the field and adopt a more fluid view of what expertise means, its purposes and stances. Understanding translanguaging theory, as Robinson (2019) states, "can be a starting place to change thinking and activities" (p. 63) to create "new classroom realities" for Chamizal and Alas emergent bilinguals.

References

Achugar, M., & Oteíza, T. (2009). “In whatever language people feel comfortable”: Conflicting language ideologies in the US southwest border. *Text & Talk, 29*(4), 371-391.

Achugar, M., & Pessoa, S. (2009). Power and place: Language attitudes towards Spanish in a bilingual academic community in southwest Texas. *Spanish in Context, 6*(2), 199-223.

Alemn, E., & Luna, R. (2013). Stolen education. *Directed by Rudy Luna*.

Schensul, S. L., Schensul, J. J., & LeCompte, M. D. (1999). *Essential ethnographic methods: Observations, interviews, and questionnaires* (Vol. 2). Rowman Altamira.

Anzaldúa, G. (1987). *Borderlands: the new mestiza*. San Francisco: Spinsters Aunt Lute Books.

Anzaldúa, G. (1999). Borderlands/la frontera. San Francisco: Aunt Lute Books

Arce, J. (2004). Fronteras y representaciones sociales: La figura del pocho como estereotipo del chicano. *Aztlan: A Journal of Chicano Studies*, *29*(1), 125-133.

Ballinger, S. (2013). Towards a cross-linguistic pedagogy. biliteracy and reciprocal learning strategies in French immersion. *Journal of Immersion and Content-Based Language Education, 1*(1), 131-148.

Bartlett, L., & García, O. (2011). *Additive schooling in subtractive times* Dominican immigrant youth in the heights. Nashville, TN: Vanderbilt University Press.

Bourdieu, P. (1979). Symbolic power. *Critique of Anthropology, 4*(13-14), 77-85.

Cervantes-Soon, C. G. (2014). A critical look at dual language immersion in the new latin@ diaspora. *Bilingual Research Journal, 37*(1), 64-82.

Cervantes-Soon, C. G., Dorner, L., Palmer, D., Heiman, D., Schwerdtfeger, R., & Choi, J. (2017). Combating inequalities in two-way language immersion programs: Toward critical consciousness in bilingual education spaces. *Review of Research in Education, 41*(1), 403-427.

Johnson, F. L. (2000). *Speaking culturally: Language diversity in the United States*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Jong, E. D., & Howard, E. (2009). Integration in two-way immersion education: Equalising linguistic benefits for all students. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, *12*(1), 81-99.

de la Piedra, María Teresa, & Araujo, B. (2012). Transfronterizo literacies and content in a dual language classroom. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism, 15*(6), 705-721.

Ek, L. D., Sánchez, P., & Quijada Cerecer, P. D. (2013). Linguistic violence, insecurity, and work: Language ideologies of Latina/o bilingual teacher candidates in texas. *International Multilingual Research Journal, 7*(3), 197-219.

Esquinca, A., Araujo, B., & de, l. P. (2014). Meaning making and translanguaging in a two-way dual-language program on the U.S.-mexico border. *Bilingual Research Journal, 37*(2), 164-181. doi:10.1080/15235882.2014.934970

Fitts, S. (2006). Reconstructing the status quo: Linguistic interaction in a dual-language school. *Bilingual Research Journal*, *30*(2), 337-365.

Flores, N. (2016). A tale of two visions: Hegemonic whiteness and bilingual education. *Educational Policy, 30*(1), 13-38.

Flores, N., & García, O. (2017). A critical review of bilingual education in the united states: From basements and pride to boutiques and profit. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics, 37*, 14-29.

Flores, N., & Rosa, J. (2015). Undoing appropriateness: Raciolinguistic ideologies and language diversity in education. *Harvard Educational Review, 85*(2), 149-171.

Ganuza, N., & Hedman, C. (2017). Ideology vs. practice: Is there a space for pedagogical translanguaging in mother tongue instruction?

García, O. (2009). *Bilingual education in the 21st century: A global perspective* John Wiley & Sons.

García, O. (2017). Translanguaging in schools: Subiendo y bajando, bajando y subiendo as afterword. *Journal of Language, Identity & Education, 16*(4), 256-263.

García, O., Johnson, S. I., & Seltzer, K. (2017). *The translanguaging classroom: Leveraging student bilingualism for learning* Caslon Philadelphia, PA.

García, O., & Kleyn, T. (Eds.). (2016). Translanguaging with multilingual students: Learning from classroom moments. Routledge.

García-Mateus, S., & Palmer, D. (2017). Translanguaging pedagogies for positive identities in two-way dual language bilingual education. *Journal of Language, Identity & Education, 16*(4), 245-255.

Gee, J. (1999). P.(1999) An Introduction to Discourse Analysis: Theory and Method.

Gort, M., & Pontier, R. W. (2013). Exploring bilingual pedagogies in dual language preschool classrooms. *Language and Education, 27*(3), 223-245.

Grinberg, J., & Saavedra, E. R. (2000). The constitution of bilingual/ESL education as a disciplinary practice: Genealogical explorations. *Review of Educational Research, 70*(4), 419-441.

Guerrero, M. D., & Guerrero, M. C. (2017). Competing discourses of academic spanish in the Texas-Mexico borderlands. *Bilingual Research Journal, 40*(1), 5-19.

Hidalgo, M. (1986). Language contact, language loyalty, and language prejudice on the mexican border. *Language in Society, 15*(2), 193-220.

Jaspers, J. (2018). The transformative limits of translanguaging. *Language & Communication, 58*, 1-10.

Kroskrity, P. V. (2004). Language ideologies. *A Companion to Linguistic Anthropology, 496*, 517.

MacSwan, J. (2017). A multilingual perspective on translanguaging. *American Educational Research Journal, 54*(1), 167-201.

Makalela, L. (2015). Translanguaging as a vehicle for epistemic access: Cases for reading comprehension and multilingual interactions. *Per Linguam, 31*(1), 15-29.

Martin-Beltrán, M. (2014). "What do you want to say?" how adolescents use translanguaging to expand learning opportunities. *International Multilingual Research Journal, 8*(3), 208-230.

Mortimer, K. S. (2018). The hegemony of language separation: Discontents en programas de lenguaje dual en Paraguay and El Paso. *Association of Mexican American Educators Journal, 12*(2), 121-152.

Mortimer, K.S., Dolsa, G., & Villarreal, E. (2018). "Back and Forth": *The making and erasing of languaging and identity boundaries in dual language programs on the US-Mexico border* Manuscript submitted for publication

Norton, B. (2013). Identity and language learning: Extending the conversation. Multilingual matters.

Otheguy, R., García, O., & Reid, W. (2015). Clarifying translanguaging and deconstructing named languages: A perspective from linguistics. *Applied Linguistics Review, 6*(3), 281-307.

Otheguy, R., García, O., & Reid, W. (2019). A translanguaging view of the linguistic system of bilinguals. *Applied Linguistics Review, 10*(4), 625-651.

Palmer, D. K., Cervantes-Soon, C., Dorner, L., & Heiman, D. (2019). Bilingualism, biliteracy, biculturalism, and critical consciousness for all: Proposing a fourth fundamental goal for two-way dual language education. *Theory into Practice, 58*(2), 121-133.

Palmer, D. K., & Henderson, K. I. (2016). Dual language bilingual education placement practices: Educator discourses about emergent bilingual students in two program types. *International Multilingual Research Journal, 10*(1), 17-30.

Palmer, D., & Martínez, R. A. (2013). Teacher agency in bilingual spaces: A fresh look at preparing teachers to educate Latina/o bilingual children. *Review of research in Education*, *37*(1), 269-297.

Rosa, J., & Flores, N. (2017). Unsettling race and language: Toward a raciolinguistic perspective. *Language in Society, 46*(5), 621-647.

Robinson, E. (2019). To language differently: Drawing on feminist poststructuralism and translanguaging to prepare language teachers. *Translation and Translanguaging in Multilingual Contexts*, *5*(1), 49-66.

Rosaldo, R. (1989). Border crossings. *Culture and truth: The remaking of social analysis*, 196-207.

Sayer, P. (2013). Translanguaging, TexMex, and bilingual pedagogy: Emergent bilinguals learning through the vernacular. *TESOL Quarterly, 47*(1), 63-88.

Vaish, Vinity & Subhan, Aidil. (2015). Translanguaging in a reading class. *International Journal of Multilingualism, 12*(3), 338-357.

Valdés, G. (1997). Dual-language immersion programs: A cautionary note concerning the education of language-minority students. *Harvard Educational Review, 67*(3), 391-430.

Valdés, G. (2018). Analyzing the curricularization of language in two-way immersion education: Restating two cautionary notes. *Bilingual Research Journal, 41*(4), 388-412.

Varghese, M. M., & Park, C. (2010). Going global: Can dual-language programs save bilingual education? *Journal of Latinos and Education, 9*(1), 72-80.

Vila, P. (2000). *Crossing borders, reinforcing borders: Social categories, metaphors, and narrative identities on the US-Mexico frontier*. University of Texas Press.

Woolard, K. A. (1998). Introduction: Language ideology as a field of inquiry. *Language Ideologies: Practice and Theory, 3*(11)

Zentella, A. C. (2009). Transfronterizo talk: Conflicting constructions of bilingualism on the US-Mexico border.

CHAPTER 3: "NI DE AQUÍ, NI DE ALLÁ": A TRANSLANGUAGING STANCE TO CREATE NEW SUBJECT POSITIONS

Abstract

In this article, I describe how a translanguaging stance has the potential to transform subject positions of emergent bilinguals in DL classrooms. Drawing from translanguaging theory (García, 2009) and positionality theory (Davies & Harré, 1990), this ethnographic study shows how a DL educator's translanguaging stance positioned her students as legitimate speakers and co-constructors of knowledge by embracing their language practices and cultural background. I argue that it is essential for educators to have opportunities to engage in conversations about how discourses construct the positionings of emergent bilinguals and the implications of these discourses and positionings for limiting or expanding empowered identities.

Introduction

This article describes how a dual language (DL) teacher enacted a translanguaging stance by positioning herself and her students as valid and active constructors of their learning. This educator acted agentively by resisting others' positioning of her and using discourses that positively affirmed her students' identity. In a context on the US-Mexico border where deficit discourses about bilingual students and educators were prevalent and their language practices and cultural background were equated to disadvantaged identities, Ms. Ana chose discourses and practices that elevated and empowered herself and her students. According to García, Ibarra and Seltzer (2017), developing a translanguaging stance is "an act of social justice" (p. 51) because it breaks with the predominant views of emergent bilinguals as having deficient language practices and knowledge. A translanguaging stance does not frame students' linguistic repertoire as

incomplete, and therefore, just useful for academic scaffolding. It sees it as part of how emergent bilinguals see and make meaning of their worlds. A translanguaging stance can create new subject positions—the location subjects occupy that allow for rights, constraints and possibilities within particular discourses (Davies & Harré, 1990)— by identifying emergent bilinguals as resourceful, creative, and possessors of relevant experiences and language practices. García and Kleyn (2016) claim that a translanguaging stance is a transformative stance (p. 21). Ms. Ana's translanguaging stance transformed her emergent bilinguals' subject positions in a context where students were identified as having linguistic and knowledge shortfalls.

This study shows how discursive practices positioned emergent bilinguals as incomplete and in need of fixing, revealing ideologies of standard language practices and the stereotypes or categories of identities they created. Ms. Ana, however, chose different discourses to view and refer to her students. Her classroom at Alas school was a space where her emergent bilinguals' language practices and knowledge were legitimized by the connections Ms. Ana established with academic content and her caring interactions with her students. Power dynamics were transformed in her classroom because she saw students as valid constructors of knowledge using all their cultural and linguistic repertoire.

I analyze Ms. Ana's discourses and practices through the frameworks of translanguaging (García, 2009) and positioning theory (Davies & Harré, 1990). This analysis emphasizes the importance of the research on translanguaging, positioning, and agency in DL educators. It is essential to look at the relationship between these concepts to understand teachers' beliefs and discourses about themselves and their students. I argue that this is crucial to understanding and advocating for DL educators' spaces, where they can engage in developing more socially just stances to transform their own and students' subject positions and, consequently, to transform

unequal power relations. This study is relevant to understanding the linguistic oppression this border community has faced for a long time and its reproduction within DL programs as reflected in inequalities and deficit positionings.

Linguistic oppression and ongoing inequalities in DL programs

In several research accounts, educators who grew up in the US-Mexican border narrate marginalization experiences because of their language practices in the US and Mexico (Cervantes-Soon, 2018; Ek, Sánchez, Quijada Cerecer, 2013; Guerrero & Guerrero, 2017). Their language practices were measured against standard English, and Spanish forms, and whatever deviation is linked to definitions of deficient and partial identities and positionings. This double oppression is a consequence of ideologies that render English with a higher status than Spanish and value a standard form of Spanish over linguistic practices in the US-Mexican border, which are characterized by mixing of English and Spanish (Achugar & Pessoa, 2009; Achugar & Oteíza, 2009; Ek, Sánchez, Quijada Cerecer, 2013; Guerrero & Guerrero, 2017; Zentella, 2009, Villarreal, Dolsa & Mortimer, 2017). DL educators in El Paso are more likely to have experienced psychological, physical, and contemporary symbolic violence (Bourdieu, 1979). For many, these experiences have impacted their language and teaching practices. Furthermore, their identities may have been stigmatized because of their language practices on both sides of the border, where "pure forms" of English and Spanish are often linked to concepts such as nationalism, patriotism, education, authenticity, and identities (Mortimer, 2018).

While originally DL was thought of as an equalizing program for language minority students, studies continue to demonstrate that DL programs may not benefit students equally when the social context of linguistic minorities is not addressed (de Jong & Howard, 2009). Fitts (2006) has pointed out the relevance of the social justice goals of DL education now starting to

be reemphasized. However, Fitts says, those same social justice discourses can obscure the certain realities of language minority students' context. The DL program at Alas, where Ms. Ana taught, was intended to recognize both English and Spanish equally. Still, the school's historical context and the regions' complex ideologies continued to be a source of positionings that reinforced categories and marginalization practices. For example, discourses identified Alas' students as lacking appropriate resources to succeed in academic endeavors. Ms. Ana took up a translanguaging stance, and although influenced by those deficit discourses, she chose discourses that transformed her students' positioning from lacking learners in need of fixing to active and legitimate co-constructors of knowledge. In this way, power dynamics were also transformed.

TRANSLANGUAGING AS AN IDEOLOGICAL STANCE

Translanguaging, along with other terms—flexible bilingualism (Creese & Blackledge, 2010, 2015), code meshing (Canagarajah, 2011), polylingual languaging (Jørgensen, Karrebæk, Madsen & Møller, 2011), metrolingualism (Otsuji & Pennycook, 2011), translingual practice (Canagarajah, 2013), contemporary urban vernacular (Rampton, 2011)—looks at language as fluid practices immersed in historical-sociocultural contexts. Translanguaging pays close attention to the power relationships created, maintained, transformed, and contested in the specific contexts of communities. Translanguaging proposes that bilinguals have one, unique, and integrated linguistic repertoire from which bilinguals draw different features to make meaning in different contexts (Garcia & Wei, 2013). Translanguaging as pedagogy is a stance or ideology that leverages bilingual language practices and sees bilingualism as an asset. Its pedagogy integrates home, community, and school language and knowledge.

Translanguaging theory proposes a necessary paradigm change to beliefs about languages, language practices, and the speakers' identities. When educators can deconstruct

pervasive deficit views of their students regarding language practices such as code-switching or the use of non-standard ways by analyzing the ideologies and the sources, the shift to a translanguaging stance is possible. García, Johnson, and Seltzer (2017) define translanguaging stance as,

> The teachers' beliefs that a bilingual student has one holistic language repertoire that he or she draws on at school. They act on the belief that who their students are, what they know, and where they come from matters and that they have the potential to do great things with their lives. (p. 50)

The concept of translanguaging presents new discourses for educators and students that "enable them to construct and modify their socio-cultural identities, as they respond to historical and present conditions" (García & Wei, 2014, p. 67). A translanguaging stance in the classroom transforms subject positions from mere passive recipients of information and subjectivities constructed through deficit language ideologies and identities to subject positions who are active participants in constructing knowledge. As García and Kleyn state, students' positions are transformed,

> from students inferior to English monolinguals to students with extensive language practices that are outside of mandated standards and standardized exams. This transformative stance seeks to disrupt hierarchical structures of power and differs significantly from a scaffolding stance that solely includes translanguaging as a way to transition students to English (García & Kleyn, 2019, p., 73).

DL educators with a translanguaging stance make space for translanguaging practices in their classrooms amidst deficit discourses and language policies of separation of English and Spanish during instruction. They see students' funds of knowledge and use them to deepen academic

understanding and create connections during instruction. They provide access to relevant and meaningful literature that reflect their students' backgrounds. Teachers with a translanguaging stance feel comfortable with not knowing everything and learning with their students (García, Ibarra & Seltzer, 2017). Some literature on DL educators' translanguaging stance indicates the need for reflecting spaces for educators to understand and develop an ideological stance towards translanguaging.

TRANSLANGUAGING SPACES TO DEVELOP TRANSLANGUAGING STANCES

Wei (2011) claims that a translanguaging space, "creates a social space for multilingual users by bringing together different dimensions of their personal history, experience and environment, their attitude, belief and ideology, their cognitive and physical capacity into one, and meaningful performance" (p. 2). In a case study at a university on the US-Mexico border, Musanti and Cavazos (2018) described their trajectory with the development of their translanguaging stance and how this impacts the design of their undergraduate writing course for pre-service teachers. The authors explored the different spaces in which pre-service teachers could enact translanguaging when writing academically. They found the pre-service teachers used their entire linguistic repertoire, moving from English to Spanish in creative ways. They transformed the academic writing space traditionally conceptualized as using one language only in standard ways. The authors claim that because of their development of a translanguaging stance, they could open up a space for pre-service teachers in which they were able to show their understandings of concepts and apply different meta and crosslinguistic skills.

In a similar setting with university students, Deroo and Ponzio (2019) described how graduate students engaged in a translanguaging course taught by one of the authors. They found the educators expressed different constraints that prevent them from taking up a translanguaging

stance at the micro, meso, and macro levels. At the micro-level, participants view translanguaging stances as advocating for inclusivity, but in practice, they thought they would feel not in control of the learning of their students, not knowing if their students understood academic material. At the meso level, participants cited administrative demands and administrators' monolingual ideologies. At the macro level, the students referred to the accountability system and their demands on their teaching instruction. However, the participants were able, after this space during their translanguaging course, to find some agency in their classrooms to resist ideologies of monolingualism and deficit views of their students.

Arguing for the need for a "critical translanguaging space," Hamman (2017) described how students in an elementary DL program displayed unequal participation in translanguaging spaces created by the teacher. Using as theoretical lenses translanguaging and positioning, Hamman argues that translanguaging spaces that allow for flexible language practices can boost or hinder students' positionings as competent students. Translanguaging was used in these classrooms as scaffolding, authentic and valid classroom practice, and a right to speak. However, the author noted, this right to speak was displayed more often by the dominant English students. A critical translanguaging space needs to take into account, the author claims, the contextual factor and the already unequal power relations in which emergent bilinguals are immersed. In this way, this critical translanguaging space allows for flexible language practices but prioritizing the linguistic minority students' practices and needs. In the next section, I describe positioning theory and its connection with the translanguaging stance.

POSITIONING AND TRANSLANGUAGING STANCE

According to Davies and Harré (1990), positioning is a process that emerges in conversations through which subject positions are located and constructed. Davies and Harré (1990) write,

> A subject position incorporates both a conceptual repertoire and a location for persons within the structure of rights for those that use that repertoire. Once having taken up a particular position as one's own, a person inevitably sees the world from the vantage point of that position and in terms of the particular images, metaphors, storylines, and concepts which are made relevant within the particular discursive practice in which they are positioned (p. 46).

Social interactions construct, through discursive practices, an array of subject positions and through discourses speakers resist and reposition themselves into different subject positions. This process depends on the availability of discourses to do so. According to Van Langenhove and Harré (1994), people position themselves through discourses using images, metaphors, categories, stereotypes, and storylines that make their beliefs and behavior coherent and intelligible within a specific conversation and location. Positioning can be based on "moral order" and ascribe rights and duties accepted or contested by the positioned subjects. Positioning can also be constructed through character attributes. For example, "powerful or powerless, confident or apologetic, dominant or submissive, definite or tentative, and so on. A 'position' can be specified by reference to how a speaker's contributions are hearable with respect to these polarities of characters, and sometimes even of a role" (p. 363).

One way of positioning, as mentioned by the authors is through the use of stereotypes, which according to Van Langenhove and Harré (1994), are, "rhetorical devices that people use to

position themselves and others" (p. 371). They point out that positioning theory focuses on the "positioning aspect" (p. 364) of stereotypes and not so much on how they are constructed. For example, a salient social category throughout my research was that of Mexican, American, Mexican-American (as used by the participants). These social categories formed through language and identity ideologies came along with discourses of what people are like, know, behave, and speak. The narrative about these different categories indexed different types of identities and storylines, such as educated, uneducated, and speakers with deficient language practices because of where they were from. For example, Ms. Zulem, a kindergarten teacher at Alas, thought her students, who mostly came from Ciudad Juárez, did not fully belong to an American or Mexican category because they did not behave or speak as Americans and Mexicans: "No hacen raíz. "No son de aquí ni de allá," she said. [They don't make roots. They're not from here nor there].

The US-Mexican border is a site where two hegemonic systems (Hidalgo, 1986) overlap by its locations proximity and fluid ways of life to reinforce all kinds of separations, nations, nationalities, languages (Villarreal, Dolsa, Mortimer, 2019). These social categories of nationalities involve ideologies of language and identity about how nationals of these countries speak and behave. DL educators and students were positioned as less educated and had incomplete knowledge of their conceived two different cultures. These positioning processes took place in the context of historical oppression on the basis of linguistic practices and background. DL students' and educators' knowledge and languages were not considered valid, positioning them as powerless to make their own meanings and be co-constructors of knowledge. The reproduction of deficit discursive practices continued to create passive subject positions whose language practices and cultural knowledge needed to be fixed to align with the categories'

identities. While my analysis focuses on Ms. Ana's translanguaging stance, she also engaged in more traditional positionings familiar at Alas, such as what it meant to be Mexican and American. From a positioning theory perspective, it is common to hold contradictory discourses to resist and reproduce them simultaneously. Choice and agency become relevant through a positioning lens.

Davies and Harré (1990) argue there are different subject positions created and taken up at different times and discourses. Ms. Ana positioned herself as an advocate of her students' rights and assumed the responsibilities to empower them. She also engaged in different discourse about her students that identified them as resourceful and constructors of knowledge, and in this way, Ms. Ana created new subject positions. Her discourses and practices reflected a translanguaging stance, which García and Kleyn (2016) said transform subject positions by enabling students to perform with what they bring, with their own practices and experiences. Using positioning theory, I analyzed Ms. Ana's discourses and practices and how she created new subject positions for herself and her students.

CONTEXT OF THE STUDY

Alas school is located south of downtown in one of the oldest neighborhoods of El Paso, called Segundo Barrio. Since its beginning, Segundo Barrio has been a site of struggles to improve housing conditions and resist the urbanization plans of the city of El Paso (Cornejo, 2011; Staudt & Coronado, 2002). Alas was the first school to serve Mexican students on the south side. Located close to one of the international bridges that unites El Paso and Ciudad Juárez, most of Alas' students cross daily and weekly for school. Discourses about Alas and Segundo Barrio as being disadvantaged and consequently challenging environments to work and

learn were made often during my research. For example, one of the kindergarten teachers, Ms. Nadia, said this:

> Los niños que llegan a ésta escuela prácticamente, pues, no tienen una base mínima para empezar, entonces, son estudiantes que sí se enfrentan a retos de la enseñanza más difícil, porque no hay un apoyo en casa, o sea, este, vienen mal vestidos, la mayoría, este, mal alimentados, no tienen una estructura familiar, entonces, todos esos factores vienen a afectar en su, en su enseñanza, entonces, sí es un poco más difícil.
>
> The children that come to this school do not practically have the minimum foundation to start. Then, they face challenges in their education because there is no support at home. I mean, they come bad dressed. The majority come not well fed. They don't have a family structure. Therefore, all of these factors affect their education, so it is more complicated. (Interview, 12/04/2017)

Alas is part of the large school district El Paso del Norte. It serves more than 57,000 students through 10 high schools, 15 middle schools, and 58 elementary schools. More than 80 percent of the students in this district are Hispanic. Not far from Alas school, but in a higher-income part of town, the district's first two-way dual language program was started in the late 1990s. According to DeMatthews, Izquierdo, and Knight (2017), parents in this area supported and pushed for the program implementation and expansion of it to middle school and high school to enrich the education of their native English-speaking children. The rest of the El Paso del Norte school district had a transitional bilingual program in which emergent bilinguals were transitioned to all English instruction as soon as second grade. Efforts to expand DL programs to more schools began in 2008, and in 2013 DL became the default program for all emergent bilinguals in the district.

Alas' DL program was in its third year of implementation when I began my study. It was a two-teacher model, in which one teacher teaches in Spanish and another in English. There were about 38 students in the DL program in each kindergarten, first and third classrooms during the 2017-2018 school year. Students were divided into groups A and B and assigned a homeroom teacher with whom students started the day before transitioning to the other classroom and then returning to their homerooms to finish the day. The teachers in my research at Alas and another administrator from the district all expressed doubts about "the right ways" of implementation and teaching and some skepticism about DL program benefits for their school. In this climate, I entered the kindergarten, first grade, and third-grade classrooms at Alas and got to know the DL educators and their students.

Alas, which in 2006 combined with another school in the district and moved into their new building, had amply supplied classrooms equipped with computers and smartboards. All classrooms had plenty of colored posters and bulletin boards with students' works, word walls, calendars, behavior charts, and plenty of written and verbal reminders to remain on the language of instruction and to speak in full sentences, except for Ms. Ana's classroom. She did not use a behavior management chart, and all language practices seemed to be a regular part of their instructional days. Ms. Ana stood out from my other participants. Her deep roots in the community of Segundo Barrio were exhibited through her advocacy for the students and her abundant warmth towards them. She deeply cared for her students. This was evident in how she listened to them attentively, and her interactions with them transpired care and respect. Throughout my field notes, I made repeated notes about how Ms. Ana listened to students attentively, remembering their told stories, asking follow-up questions, being intentional about understanding students' feelings, and using their stories and backgrounds to make instructional

analogies. The following excerpt is just one of the instances in which Ms. Ana showed genuine interest to understand and address the needs of one of her first-grade students. Darío was having a particularly hard day in Ms. Ana's first-grade classroom. He was constantly moving, jumping around, and causing many distractions among his peers and other students' reporting about his behavior. Ms. Ana asked him several times to sit.

> Ms. Ana: "You're very silly today, and that's very distractive to your peers."
>
> It was just not Darío, but in general, the class was very active, and others were called on by Ms. Ana. Ms. Ana seems frustrated and asks Darío to sit at a separate desk, but Darío complains. Ms. Ana tells him he cannot stay still, so he needed to sit there not to distract classmates. Darío starts crying and does not go. Ms. Ana repeats to Darío he needed to sit there while she answers questions about the current activity. Darío keeps crying. After the rest of the students seemed to have achieved some independence in their work, Ms. Ana approached Darío and kneels to say to him softly:
>
> Ms. Ana: "Did I give you enough chances, Darío?" Darío keeps crying loudly.
>
> Ms. Ana: "Estás perdiendo el tiempo así que ponte a trabajar y se acabó el problema "You are wasting your time. Get to work and problem is over. Darío is still up crying.
>
> Ms. Ana: "Ok, Darío dime cuál es el problema, ¿por qué estás llorando?
>
> Darío is speaking in English very quietly, and I only hear Ms. Ana, who switches to English to talk to him. (Field note, 05/05/2017)

Ms. Ana's attentiveness and warmth with Darío differed from other student-teacher interactions I observed at the school. Ms. Ana wanted to know what Darío's source of discomfort was and was willing to take the time and approach needed to help him. The interactions between her and her students were refreshing. They presented a particular classroom atmosphere filled

with a sense of warmth and enjoyment, where students were put first and their needs of the moment taken into consideration. While other teachers in my study applied quick classroom management actions such as using disciplinary charts and other teachers' or principal's intervention, Ms. Ana cared for the reasons behind students' actions. Furthermore, it was common to hear teachers in my study talk about certain students in ways that depicted them as problematic and engaging in discourses about their families as a cause of misbehavior. Ms. Ana's compassionate view of her students was different. In her classroom, I spent the most time during my research because of her different stance and practices.

Methods

The larger sixteen-month long ethnographic study, of which this analysis is one part, took place at two public schools, Alas and Chamizal, with DL programs located in two different school districts in El Paso, Texas. The study was guided by the overarching research question: What are the conceptualizations DL educators have of translanguaging pedagogy? This single question led to a myriad of discourses about identities, language practices, and positionings. While I observed and interviewed eleven educators, K-3 grade teachers, administrators, and a literacy coach, in this article, I analyze the discourses, beliefs, and practices of one Alas DL educator, Ms. Ana.

Data includes over fifty hours of observation in her classroom, grade-level professional learning communities (PLCs), and professional development sessions. It also comprises a 56-minute interview and the collection of artifacts such as reading assessment scores and samples of her students' work. Data were analyzed through deductive and inductive methods (LeCompte & Schensul, 1999). Deductive codes emerged naturally from my research interest, such as translanguaging practices and conceptualization, teachers' and students' identities, language

practices. Inductive codes were derived from an analysis of all my participants' field notes, interviews, and artifacts. After initial open coding, clear discursive patterns and practices emerged regarding students' and teachers' identities and pedagogical practices and a connection among these patterns and their translanguaging understandings.

One of my participants, Ms. Ana, appeared to break out of discourse patterns in the data about her students and teaching practices. In the second round of coding, I focused on Ms. Ana's discourses and practices in which agency was displayed in a context with widespread and normalized deficit ideologies of language and identities. Her discourses, interaction with students, and teaching practices validated her students' funds of knowledge (Moll, Amanti, Neff, Gonzalez, 1992) to learn and express themselves, transforming subject positions. I theorized Ms. Ana's beliefs and practices as a translanguaging stance (García, Ibarra Johnson, & Seltzer, 2017).

RESEARCHER POSITIONALITY

I am from Paraguay, a country where most of the population speaks the native language, Guarani, and Spanish. Like people from El Paso, Paraguayans also "mix" the two languages, translanguage, in daily conversation, but also have a separation between the two languages. In Paraguay, Spanish is the predominant language of education, business, and government, while the use of Guarani is associated with rural areas and lower social classes, even though the mixture of the two is used in conversations in a variety of different contexts. I understand some of the ideologies about languages and education circulating in this context because of my experience with my own and my social context language practices when growing up in Paraguay. Growing up, I often heard discourses that linked language practices to what were seen as uneducated or "campesino" (farmer) ways of talking in derogatory ways, much like the discourses I hear about the language practices of inhabitants of the US-Mexico border. I am a

former bilingual teacher who has had experience in teaching English language learners in different contexts: English as a second language, English only, and Spanish Immersion classrooms. Every context influenced and shaped the way I conceptualize teaching practices and particular theories of teaching. Having had the opportunity to teach students with different social and ethnic backgrounds, I questioned pedagogies that kept a strict separation of languages that control and monitored students' language practices.

"I THOUGHT I WOULD HAVE TO SETTLE": MS. ANA'S DEVELOPMENT OF A TRANSLANGUAGING STANCE THROUGH DIFFERENT POSITIONING

Throughout Ms. Ana's educational experiences, she said she had educators who believed in her and her potential and encouraged her to pursue her dream of becoming a teacher. It was not easy for her. From a young age, she faced some personal hardships that made her professional journey challenging. The teachers she found in her life had made a difference for her and she stated that she aspired to be like those teachers who helped her. In her essay she was going to present as part of her candidacy for teacher of the year, she talked about the impact other educators had on her life,

> Throughout the years, I have met many teachers who inspired me and whose qualities I've tried to mirror to provide my students with the educational opportunities every child deserves. During my senior year in high school when most students were submitting college applications, I was still undecided where I wanted to attend college, I knew what I wanted to do but I didn't know how I would pay for it. I thought I would have to settle for community college because my parents couldn't afford to pay for my education, and to make matters worse I found out I was pregnant at the age of 16. Although most teachers advised me to enroll in the CCTE parent center and find a trade instead of

> enrolling in a four-year college or University. My school counselor believed and encouraged me to follow my dreams, he pushed me to apply for different scholarships and universities, to my surprise I was admitted to Baylor which was my first choice and was offered a scholarship. Unfortunately, I was not able to attend because I could not support and care for my daughter on my own. (01/30/2018)

This is the kind of influence that Ms. Ana saw herself as having on students, believing in their potential despite the hardships they faced. Ms. Ana seemed to apply her beliefs shaped by her own experiences as a student in her classroom. In her own life, the educators created a new subject position for Ms. Ana that made her see herself as a positive and powerful influencer. Ms. Ana positioned herself as an agent of change (Valenzuela, 2016). In a teaching philosophy statement she shared with me for feedback purposes, she stated she became a teacher to make a difference in children's lives,

> Although I came into the education field to serve and make a difference in a child's life, I must admit the rewards have been just as edifying on a more personal level. I have gained intellectual wealth, as I expand my knowledge and discover new things as I teach. I have also learned valuable life lessons from each and every one of my students and get to laugh and make memories with them every day. (Field note, 01/30/2018)

In another conversation, she expressed that she was discontent with Alas experiencing several changes simultaneously (e.g., the introduction of dual language instruction, new assessments, and new ways to test students) and what she felt was a lack of support from administration. She told me she was thinking of leaving Alas: "Quiero ir donde me necesitan" [I want to go where I am needed] and indicated she wanted to keep working in her community, Segundo Barrio (12/04/2017). Ms. Ana believed the similarities of her background and

experiences with her students were an advantage to be a better advocate for them. She is highly knowledgeable and connected to her context, as she experienced it first hand when she moved to Segundo Barrio from Juárez at the age of 10. Just as an educator positioned her as capable and with potential, she positioned her students in the same way.

TRANSLANGUAGING STANCE AND THE POSSIBILITY OF NEW SUBJECT POSITIONS

Within the paradoxes of ideologies and positioning dynamics in this research context, Ms. Ana's translanguaging stance revealed ideologies that characterized a translanguaging approach to bilingualism and the importance of teaching embracing students' identities. Her storylines positioned herself as someone resilient and capable, and they were connected with her discourses and instruction positioning her students. As mentioned earlier, Ms. Ana said that during her years as a secondary student, she had an educator in her life who positioned her as someone with full potential and who encouraged her to pursue further education. She considered this fundamental, as her background and difficult life circumstances at that moment seemed to indicate that she was not going to be able to go to college. But an educator positioned her as a capable, college-bound individual. This and other personal successes were connected to her beliefs about her students' potential and possibilities who had similar struggles to her growing up. She knew it took a different positioning for students to be motivated and to achieve their personal goals. Ms. Ana developed a translanguaging stance defined by García and Kleyn (2019) as a philosophical approach that sees bilingualism as a resource, embraces all language practices, and transforms subject positionalities through empowerment and advocacy. García and Kleyn (2016) note that a translanguaging stance looks like going against pervasive beliefs and discourses, and that is what Ms. Ana did at Alas.

As stated before, positionalities are produced and reproduced through discursive practices during social interaction. In Ms. Ana's classroom, social interactions happened through students' and Ms. Ana's language practices characterized by colloquial terms and switching between different codes and registers. Her pedagogical strategies included students' knowledge, languaging, and backgrounds in the lessons. They included resisting the DL principle of language separation in favor of students' perceived needs of more in-depth understanding, language development, and emotional necessities. Ms. Ana positioned herself as a learner and let her students know when she needed help to find answers. By doing these things, Ms. Ana transformed her students' positionings and her own by defying dominant representations and stereotypes reproduced at Alas. Her students were positioned as legitimate speakers and valid participants in the everyday construction of knowledge. In the following segment, I further describe how Ms. Ana's positioning strategies exhibited a translanguaging stance's characteristics.

"Me gusta mucho valorar lo que los niños traen"

A translanguaging stance sees and values one linguistic repertoire and considers its features as legitimate resources for learning and identity expression. This is what Ms. Ana displayed in the classroom. Ideologies of language purism and standard language practices are pervasive on both sides of the US-Mexican border. Beliefs about correct ways to speak and write take concrete forms in schools, and it was even more complicated in DL programs in this border context. Different Spanishes, including mixing it with English, and the uses of non-standard words and phrases positioned subjects in a continuing cycle of linguistic marginalization.

Throughout my research, feedback about students' language practices was constant during instruction. In Ms. Ana's classroom, colloquial terms were accepted as part of classroom

interactions. For example, a student said the word ‘chafa’, which is a term common in Mexico to indicate something is of low quality:

> Ms. Ana was walking around the classroom during her instructions. She stopped at the desk of a student and started laughing. I did not hear the interaction between them, so I asked her what happened and she amusingly told me: Lisandro me está diciendo que mis marcadores en la clase son ¡chafas! [Lisando is telling the markers in my classroom are cheap!]. Then, Ms. Ana tells Lisandro with a loud laugh, "¡Tráeme nuevos por favor! [Bring me new ones, please!]. (Field note, 10/03/2017)

In other classrooms, during my research time at Alas, I observed how colloquial words and informal interactions with teachers were corrected and reproved by dual language educators. Ms. Zulem, for example, told her students that they should not use the word ‘chango’ and instead should use the ‘correct word’, mono (Field note, 05/22/2017). In contrast, Ms. Ana promoted and validated her students' interactions and language practices through adopting an open and humorous attitude, positioning students as full, valid, and creative participants of their class.

Ms. Ana also valued and accepted students' life experiences displayed in the classroom. In one of my observations during Ms. Ana's third-grade transitions from English to Spanish, the students busily entered her classroom. Two girls came quickly to talk to Ms. Ana to tell her that they had overheard two boys inviting each other to drink some beers after school,

> Ms. Ana looked at me after what the girls told her and said: Si quieres aprender de la vida, aquí es el lugar. Esa es su vida, es lo que viven [If you want to learn about life, this is the place. This is their lives, what they live]. Ms. Ana then moved on to get her students started on their literacy block. (Field note, 20/10/2017)

Ms. Ana's reaction to this story was not one of admonishment, surprise, or humor, but one of understanding and compassion towards her students' experiences. Alas, for her, was the place to learn about life, about stories of hardships and successes. It is the same context that saw Ms. Ana's difficulties and accomplishments. Through her own experiences, she knew that her students lived in and through multiple adversities and that "esa es su vida" and those experiences were valued by her. Ms. Ana positioned her students as capable of growth and achievements despite and beyond the circumstances they faced. They were not victims or defective but subjects full of resources that continuously learn to cope with complex situations.

I found Ms. Ana's approach to what students said empowering. It did not involve sharp criticism that could have diminished her interaction with students and reinforced deficiencies around their language practices and context. Ms. Ana often used and valued students' background and cultural knowledge to make meaning during instruction:

> During shared reading time, Ms. Ana wanted students to make connections between the reading and their lives to expand the meanings of the word tostada. In one part of the story she was sharing, the characters had orange juice and toasts for breakfast. Ms. Ana asked the students if they thought it was healthy to have tortillas, beans, and cheese for breakfast. Altogether, students responded that it wasn't, and some of them added that they could have them during lunch. Ms. Ana agreed and told her students that the tostadas in the story are not the same as the tostadas or tortillas they have at lunch, but a bread that was toasted and not a tortilla. (Field note, 08/22/2017)

Connections between students' lives and the story's events were common during Ms. Ana's instruction and interactions with students. She positioned students as holders of valuable knowledge, as she used their backgrounds to develop more profound meaning.

Translanguaging stance reflected in her pedagogy

Another common discourse throughout my research was one about staying in the language of instruction. Language separation is a DL principle that is emphasized as a way to give equal value to each language and develop each target language fully (Thomas & Collier, 2012). Ms. Ana had shared with me during one of our conversations that she was well aware that the DL model required fidelity to the language of instruction (see Chapter 4). Still, in her opinion, fidelity to the language of instruction could not be applied to Alas' context. This was so because Alas' student population was dominant in Spanish, and comprehension during English instruction was not optimized if she did not code-switch. In one of my visits to her classroom, Ms. Ana proudly showed me her first-grade students' reading scores in English and her students' success in reading. The scores were based on the Developmental Reading Assessment/Evaluación del Desarrollo de la Lectura assessments. They indicate the reading level students should reach at the beginning, middle, and end of the year. Ms. Ana's students' reading levels showed noticeable progress. She compared her scores to her Spanish teaching partner telling me that even though Ms. Ana was supposed to use only English, she used Spanish often for comprehension and engagement.

She also used her students' knowledge of English to explain concepts. On one occasion, Ms. Ana used English examples to explain a third-grade lesson in Spanish on comparative adjectives:

> Students are reading about adjetivos from the textbook. Ms. Ana walks around the classroom, holding the textbook and explaining about adjetivos, while students follow her and her reading with her textbooks in Spanish at their desks. Ms. Ana calls on some students to read a paragraph, and she gives some explanation s after each reading. Ms.

> Ana then asks students for some examples of comparative adjectives, but students seem hesitant to offer one. She does: Los niños son tan fuertes como las niñas [The boys are as strong as the girls]. This example causes students to chat and giggle. Ms. Ana goes on to talk about adjetivos superlativos asking: ¿Qué es un adjetivo? ¿Cómo se transfiere, cómo cambiaban los adjetivos en inglés y en español? [What is an adjective? How do you transfer, how do you change the adjectives in English and Spanish?]. En los adjetivos comparativos estábamos comparando dos sustantivos y los superlativos pueden comparar ¿cuántas cosas? [With the comparative adjectives we were comparing two nouns and the superlative can compare, how many?]. Some students said at the same time: ¡Tres o más! Ms. Ana continues: en inglés usamos, les voy a dar el ejemplo de small. She is writing the examples, small, smaller, smallest on the whiteboard. [In English we use, I'll give you the example of the word small]. Students seem engaged and respond to examples in English provided by Ms. Ana. (Field note, 09/19/2017)

After the lesson and when students were transitioning to their classroom where they would receive English instruction, I asked Ms. Ana about using English content and language to explain Spanish comparative adjectives. She said she did it partly because her third-grade students were her former pupils when she was the English first-grade teacher. She thought her students would have remembered this lesson and were going to establish a connection more easily. García and Wei (2013) state that a translanguaging stance is transformative and reflected in the educators' pedagogy. Ms. Ana did more than code-switching or using English instead of the language of instruction in writing. She transformed the subject positions of her students. Alas students were positioned as Spanish dominant or as "Spanish kids," and the institutional label of LEP (limited English proficiency) was used to refer to emergent bilinguals. Ms. Ana's

positioning of her students as also English language speakers and knowers of the language by using their knowledge in English to understand Spanish concepts was an affirmation of their identities and the recognition of their emergent bilingualism. Ms. Ana's translanguaging stance was also noticeable during this lesson as she expanded students' linguistics repertoire with new linguistic features. Students were now incorporating adjectives in Spanish, which made sense for them because in their single repertoire they had this information. A translanguaging stance sees students' language practices and knowledges as emerging from one linguistic repertoire and not as two different linguistic systems competing with each other.

Through Ms. Ana's intentional drawing on her students' background knowledge and her stance of "valorar lo que los niños traen", she positioned them as active participants in their learning. When Ms. Ana arrived in El Paso as a child, she had enrolled in an elementary school in Segundo Barrio. She understood her students' language practices. She knew that even if she characterized her students in terms of language practices as being dominant in Spanish, their linguistic repertoire worked together as a single system that was in constant expansion. In another moment, while Ms. Ana facilitated a writing task, her positioning of students as fully resourceful was clear to me:

> During reading time, students were completing Johnny Can Spell tasks. One of them is writing sentences with certain words. A couple of students ask Ms. Ana about the meaning of old. Before Ms. Ana, as I often observed she did, waited a little to see if the response to the questions came from students. A girl yells with enthusiasm: ¡mayores! [a word in Spanish to refer to adults] Ms. Ana says to her: I like that word a lot! That's great, but you need an adjective for the word shoes in your sentence. Can we say, mis zapatos son mayores? [my shoes are adults?]. (Field note, 05/11/2017)

This excerpt was an instance that showed Ms. Ana using students' resources and positioning them as capable of making meaning using their linguistic repertoire at the same time she was expanding them. The students' bilingualism was seen, used, valued, and transformed during this instructional interaction.

Another way Ms. Ana positioned herself and her students as constructors of knowledge through her pedagogy was by allowing her students' language practices and using them for connection with the students and academic instruction working together as a community of learners. During a math lesson on multiplication, Ms. Ana was in constant conversation with students while sitting at their desks with their math notebooks. Mrs. Ana moved around, asking questions, assessing understanding, commenting on students' work, and exchanging smiles and jokes. The math lesson on that day was about multiplication and using representation models to explain the concept. The students started the multiplication lesson in their English math time and during Spanish math, Ms. Ana was supposed to cover matrix multiplication. Ms. Ana wondered about the word matrix in Spanish throughout the lesson, which she said was matrices. However, she felt this was not right. She asked me and then consulted Google under the watch of her students, and she concluded that even though she felt uncomfortable with that word she needed to use it. More importantly, she said, if that is the word used in the STAAR test (the Texas state standardized test), then she needed to adopt it. Ms. Ana felt comfortable in showing her students that she was not "an expert" or did not know it all in Spanish just because she was the teacher. She positioned herself as a learner and exemplified resourcefulness and collaborative learning. Ms. Ana's classroom felt empowering because she valued students' language practices and lived experiences as evidenced by the excerpts. She gave students a voice by embracing their language practices as part of the learning environment. This transformed the power dynamics in

a context where students and educators were frequently positioned as deficient Spanish and English speakers because of mixing the languages and their social contexts.

A roadblock in expanding a translanguaging stance: Internalization of deficit language practices and identity ideologies

García and Kleyn (2016) claim that it is challenging for educators to develop a translanguaging stance within contexts where monoglossic and standard language ideologies pervade. Even though DL programs counteract monolingualism ideologies as the norm by positioning students as emergent bilinguals, other contradictory positionings are inherent in discursive dynamics (Davies & Harré, 1991). Ms. Ana navigated these types of contradictions by, on one hand, positioning herself through deficit discourses that seemed to be internalized and helped to accommodate or make sense of her context. On the other hand she resisted these discourses by expressing pride and affirming her assumed positioning and identity.

Ms. Ana, as mentioned before, came from Juárez at the age of ten and had a humble upbringing in Segundo Barrio said,

> Voy a sonar algo tal vez ridícula porque yo me identifico como Mexicana, sin embargo, ah, siento que me falta mucho pa ser Mexicana, o sea, mis raíces, yo soy Mexicana, soy hija de padres Mexicanos, crecí en Juárez, claro, a los diez años me vine para acá y me cambió mi identidad porque siento dejé mis raíces de lado y pos tuve que asimilar la nueva cultura. Y aunque mi idioma, mi lenguaje, mi, mis conocimientos no son lo que deberían de ser a nivel educacional, yo soy mexicana. Tal vez me podrían decir soy pocha, pero para mí yo soy Mexicana o soy México-Americana porque me crié aquí, porque he vivido veintitantos años aquí en los Estados Unidos, pero mis raíces, yo soy Mexicana.

> I will sound perhaps ridiculous because I identified as Mexican. However, I feel I lack a lot to be Mexican, I mean, my roots, I am Mexican, I am a daughter of Mexican parents, grew up in Juárez. Yes, at the age of ten, I came here, and that changed me a little bit. It changed my identity because I feel I did not continue to grow in my roots. Since I left my roots, I had to assimilate to the new culture, but I still think Mexican. And although my language, my knowledge is not at the academic level that they should be, I'm Mexican. Maybe they would say I'm pocha, but for me, I am Mexican or Mexican-American because I was raised here, because I have lived in the US for more than twenty years, but my roots I'm Mexican. (Interview, 02/09/2018)

Before saying how she identified, Mrs. Ana's fear of being seen as ridiculous was evidence of internalization and awareness of positionings that occurred because of demographics and linguistic practices. She anticipated others positioning her as not "truly Mexican," or as she said, pocha—a derogatory term that labels a person whose linguistic practices include what is seen as a mix of English and Spanish, which is common on the US-Mexico border. It also refers to a Mexican person who is perceived as Americanized or not truly or fully Mexican (Hidalgo, 1986; Mortimer, 2018). This positioning of herself is a product of the prevalent discourses in El Paso that emerged from ideologies about how people from a demographic must behave as a representative of that culture. Ideologies of standard languages and identities are conflated with conceptualizations of "true bilinguals," which are those who are seen to be proficient in both languages. Therefore, they do not "need" to mix (Mortimer, Dolsa, Villarreal, 2017).

Another example of this type of positioning based on linguistic, demographic, and cultural practices came from Ms. Zulem, quoted earlier that emergent bilinguals are "ni de aquí, ni de allá" [neither from here nor from there]:

> Ms. Zulem said that some students might speak English at Alas, but they did not belong to a specific single culture. She also added that language was the most critical element of a culture and that students have difficulties learning English "porque están con un pie acá y allá" [because they are with a foot her and the other over there]. (Field note, 10/05/2017)

Ms. Zulem considered this a problem. Students at Alas' identities did not align to ideologies of nation-state language practices and cultural ideals. The positionings of oneself and others occurs through categories and storylines. It is a reciprocal process in which "every position exists only as the reciprocal of some other position" (Van Langenhove & Harré, 1994, p. 362). When one positions others, one is automatically positioning herself. The authors called this first-order positionings, which they argued are mostly unintentional.

Ms. Ana was aware of others positioning her as "ni de aquí ni de allá" and pocha. She rejected this positioning and stated her identity as Mexican. Harré and Van Langenhove (1991) argue that when subjects reject certain positionings, the choice becomes available and, therefore, the agency to choose a different positioning. Even though Ms. Ana had lived in the US for more than twenty years, she felt Mexican. She also said she was Mexican American but was empowered by her agency of positioning herself as she wanted to regardless of others' ideologies. Ms. Ana valued her Mexican roots. Her underscoring of being Mexican in her discourse can also be understood as a way to adequate to pervasive discourses in Juárez that positioned those who moved from Ciudad Juárez to El Paso as likely to forget and break loyalty to the Mexican nation and culture (Vila, 2000). Ms. Ana thought that it was important for DL students to maintain their Mexican roots as well. The vast majority of students and educators at Alas still maintained ties in Mexico. Some of the educators had moved from Mexico to El Paso.

Others had family there and crossed the border often for visits and errands. Most of the students, as mentioned before, crossed the border on a daily or weekly basis. Ms. Ana lamented that the administration did not emphasize students' and educators' Mexican connections through school-wide celebrations.

"I DO MANY THINGS I'M NOT SUPPOSED TO DO."

Ms. Ana's translanguaging stance afforded her the "possibility of acting agentively in situations in which there were contradictory requirements" (Davies & Harré, 1990, p. 59). Early during my research, when Ms. Ana was the first grade English teacher and the winter holidays were approaching, I asked her if the school was planning on doing the traditional Posadas:

> She said the school would not have a Posadas celebration, but she would do it in her classroom. She said she thought it was essential to keep that tradition alive, even though, in her observation, many of her students who commute daily from Juárez do not know what Posadas are. She also added, "I do many things I'm not supposed to do." (Field note, 16/12/08).

Ms. Ana underscored her students' importance to feel affirmed, validated, and legitimized about their Mexican culture by maintaining cultural traditions. She expressed some frustration with the administration for not supporting and promoting Mexican festivities. Although, as she had stated before, she was surprised that some of her students were not familiar with the Posadas—the celebration of Posadas seemed to be less common in Juárez and El Paso now than they were during Ms. Ana's childhood—she considered it important for them and their context to celebrate Mexican traditions. This extract from an early field note acquired increased meaning throughout my participation in Ms. Ana's classroom. She made decisions aligned to her beliefs about who her students were and what was best for them, even when those decisions contrasted

with the school norms and administrative directives. Her positioning of students resisted assimilative discourses common at Alas that sought to erase cultural identities that did not fit into the idealized American one. By choosing to disregard the school's intentional dismissal of Mexican cultural celebrations, Ms. Ana validated her students' and families' backgrounds.

Ms. Ana resisted what seemed to be a persistent denial of hers and her students' background through affirmative discourses positioning their culture as legitimate. During our interview, Ms. Ana said:

> Como estuvimos hablando de tradiciones yo les estaba platicando de cuando vamos al panteón y llevamos flores y luego ellos [estudiantes] estaban sorprendidos y ellos decían '¿y usted hace eso miss?, pero si usted no vive en Juárez, y yo les dije, es que no tienes que vivir en Juárez, es algo que yo traigo en mí, yo voy a llevar mi cultura a donde yo vaya, porque es parte de mí, es mi identidad y me dicen '¿yo lo puedo hacer?', bueno, si tú sientes a hacerlo, lo puedes hacer aquí o en China porque es parte de ti.
>
> Since we were talking about traditions, I was telling them of when we go to the cemetery and take flowers y then [students] were surprised and told me, 'Do you do that Miss? But if you live in Juárez' I told them, you don't have to live in Juárez. It's something I bring it with me and I will take my culture wherever I go. Because it's part of my identity and they told me [students] 'Can I do it'? and I tell them, well, if you feel like doing it, you can do it here or in China, because it's inside you. (Interview, 09/02/2018)

According to Ms. Ana, one of her students asked her if they could follow a Mexican tradition, even though they were in El Paso. This question revealed how Ms. Ana and the student who asked the question assimilated an internalized nationalist discourse and the erasure of parts of their identities. This leads to different positioning and, consequently, unequal participation

dynamics where power resides in those who adapt and to and fit these discourses. Ms. Ana's answer not only affirmed students' identities but positioned them as subjects whose funds of knowledge were not contingent on permission from anyone but rather were an intrinsic part of their identities, free to be expressed and used anywhere. This is a transformative translanguaging stance that positions students as legitimate identities with valid language practices and cultural knowledge. A translanguaging stance not only transforms subjectivities in the classrooms but, as García and Kleyn (2016) state, "It restores the power of language to the communities" (p. 21) and therefore, I argue, legitimizes the community funds of knowledge.

As September 16th was approaching, the day of Mexican independence, I asked Ms. Ana if they would celebrate it. She looked at me with an irritated facial expression, indicating that the answer to my question was an obvious one: the school was not going to. She then remembered an occasion last year when she had asked the administration if teachers could wear their traditional Mexican dresses to celebrate cinco de mayo, and she received a rhetorical question as a response: "¿Si Uds. se sentien Mexicanas?" [If you all feel Mexican?] (Field note, 09/14, 2017). Ms. Ana felt that this response from the administration implied that the teachers should not feel Mexican and that the administration did not share or understand their students' identities. She decided she was not going to pursue the idea of having any commemoration celebration.

Ms. Ana's teaching practices were evidence and her beliefs about the importance of resisting other positionings and ideologies of assimilation. It revealed her positioning of students as well. During her literacy time, she read a story about the holidays:

> In the story, piñatas are mentioned, and Ms. Ana decided to ask her students, "Do you find piñatas at Wal- Mart?" Few kids say no, but they don't sound so sure [I was not either. I know she wants to arrive to the point that piñatas are Mexican tradition, but kids

do see piñatas at Wal-Mart and Albertsons] After some of the kids said no, Ms. Ana says, that's why they go to an old Mexican store because is a Mexican tradition, not American. She continues, would they find it in a Chinese Market? (Field note, 12/08/2016).

Ms. Ana emphasized her Mexican connections and the ones she positioned her students as having. Ms. Ana's question about the piñatas was notable to me. It was common to find piñatas at stores in El Paso, such as Walmart and Albertsons (a supermarket). It was common to go to birthday parties and participate in the game of breaking the piñatas. Even so, she was establishing a clear separation between cultures, and it can be understood as resisting assimilative discourses positioning herself and her students as pochos and not truly Mexicans. But she was also underscoring categories and stereotypes that are problematic and perpetuate deficit discourses such as the ones she is resisting. Van Langenhove and Harré (1994) state that categories are used in order to position oneself and others and that they are not easy to change "if new representations are not taken up in discourse" (p. 37). Even though Ms. Ana was resisting the typical positionings of students and educators. New discourses about the fluidity and ongoing changing characteristics of identities are needed to deepen and extend Ms. Ana's translanguaging stance.

In another informal conversation with her, she told me that she felt sad that students did not know certain songs and traditions such as Las Mañanitas—a traditional birthday song—and Posadas—a Christmas tradition. She acknowledged too that she did not teach her children about certain Mexican traditions, and this was a source of guilt for her for not having been able to pass some of her own traditions on to them. She expressed some sadness about her son identifying as an American and not Mexican and considered herself as somehow responsible for this. Ms. Ana

sharing this aspect of her life reinforced her positioning as resistance to assimilation forces, but it also signaled her acquiescence to structuralist national identities or categories.

When Ms. Ana moved to teach third grade in Spanish, she often told me that she felt her Spanish was not good enough: "A veces siento que ya no soy de aquí ni de allá con mi español." [Sometimes I feel I am not from here nor there] (Field note, 05/11/2017). She also added that her children were surprised to hear that she was going to teach Spanish in the DL program because they thought she would teach the students "todo mal" [all wrong]. This self-positioning (and reported positioning by her children) was a product of the history of marginalization of Spanish in El Paso, and the lack of opportunities for bilingual teachers to develop academic Spanish. The deficit discourses about the Spanish language and identities have been well documented (Guerra, 1997; Guerrero and Guerrero, 2017; Zentella, 2012). Ms. Ana would often engage in discourses about her Spanish language abilities every time she could not remember a word in Spanish, and she only knew that word in English. Navigating assimilative discourses and resisting them at the same time is not uncommon but becoming aware of positioning dynamics and its paradoxes could mean the ability to start moving towards a stance of criticality and consciousness of positioning material consequences.

In another visit with Ms. Ana, I expected to find students engaged in literacy centers according to the first-grade schedule. Ms. Ana explained that instead of doing centers, she needed to test students' reading again as requested by the administration, even though they had been tested back in the month of February, just two months ago. Ms. Ana did not elaborate on the reasons given by the administration as to why students needed to be retested but went on to talk about her disagreement with the principal regarding students' eligibility for Saturday School, which is a program intended to give additional support for students, who are not progressing as

expected. In first grade, Mrs. Ana explained that students needed to reach a reading level score of 16 by the end of first grade, and this level was measured by the Developmental Reading Assessment tool. The students who reached levels between 12 and 15 before the end of the year were recommended to go to Saturday School. However, Ms. Ana expressed to the principal her dissent with this, arguing that she had about four students below those reading levels. These students, Ms. Ana continued, were the ones who needed Saturday School the most. She added that the reading data was useful to figure out what reading intervention students needed. Still, only the students who were close to achieving the reading goal received the intensive intervention through Saturday School. Ms. Ana expressed her frustration to the principal, saying that it was not fair for the school and district to leave behind the students needing reading skills' improvement (Field note, 04/10/2017). Ms. Ana felt this injustice profoundly and resonated with her own experience with academic struggles.

Ms. Ana's translanguaging stance positioned her as someone with a voice and with her own beliefs that were often in opposition to what the district, school, and even her teacher colleagues thought and demanded. She may not have succeeded in changing others' ideas and actions, but her agency in speaking up and standing for what she believed students should have received and experienced created a classroom environment that felt to me to empower her students. She indeed did and said things she was not supposed to in a context that positioned her and students in limiting and powerless ways. Her translanguaging stance defied these limiting and deficit ideologies and positioned herself as a participant and advocate of her students' education.

DISCUSSION AND IMPLICATIONS

García, Johnson, and Seltzer (2017) claim that educators who have a translanguaging stance "know who their students are, what they know and where they come from, and that they have the potential to do great things" (p, 50). Taking a trangualaging stance is an act of social justice (García, Johnson, and Seltzer, 2017) providing Ms. Ana with the agency to go against discourses of deficiencies about emergent bilinguals, students, and educators. Ms. Ana's translanguaging stance was evidenced by the way she positioned students through discourses and pedagogical practices. The transformative effect of a translanguaging stance is revealed in the creation of new subject positionings, who become empowered by positioning their language practices and experiences as valid. A powerful call that García et al. mentioned,

> If you want students to emerge from schooling after twelve years as intelligent, imaginative, and linguistically talented, then treat them as intelligent, imaginative, and linguistically talented from the first day they arrive at school (Cummins, 2010 p., ix, as cited in García et al., 2017).

This may be a simple and well-known idea in educational contexts. Yet, it has an enormous significance for emergent bilinguals who belong to minority groups, positioned through deficit stereotyping. Habitual discourses create different subject positions, and as Van Langenhove and Harré (1994) assert, changing any type of stereotyping means changing discursive conventions. A translanguaging stance transform discourses that reflect deficit ideologies into discourses that convey new conceptualizations of language, bilingualism, and identities. Therefore, the possibilities of subject positions in which students are intelligent, talented linguistic people, and subject positions whose lives are centered and not depicted as

defective and lacking. In these discourses, educators such as Ms. Ana can exercise agency to resist and build different positionings for herself and others.

First of all, Ms. Ana rejected assimilative discourses that sought to impose on her a cultural identity. Language is not an indicator of a single subject position or nationality and the accompanying socially constructed emblematic cultural features. People use different linguistic resources to carry out different subject positions (Creese and Blackledge, 2015). The discourse of not being de aquí o de allá emerged from nationalist ideologies and the unawareness of the nature of identity as multiple and fluid. Ms. Ana experienced other identities and not only the one positioning her as American or ni de aquí ni de allá. She felt that part of her identity was dismissed, rejected, and positioned as undesirable. She actively dismissed single and inadequate positionings. In this way, instead of being an object of a position, she became a subject with voice, telling others who she was instead of accommodating and accepting others' positionings. Her stance also gave voice to her students by affirming their identities through embracing and including their language practices and life experiences. Her students were not passive subjects or empty vessels (Freire, 1970) that needed to be filled and rescued from their deficits: they were constructors of their learning. Her translanguaging stance took up the students' whole linguistic repertoire as full of resources to make sense of academic concepts and resist and defy standardized language ideologies that created categories of speakers discriminating emergent bilinguals whose language practices do not conform to standard language ideologies. Wei (2011) argues that translanguaging is transformative as it brings forward the different educators' personal histories, contexts, and experiences.

A translanguaging stance requires "critical consciousness" (Palmer, Cervantes-Soon, Dorner, Heiman, 2019) or the ability to reflect on the power inequalities that influence the lives

of minority emergent bilinguals. Ms. Ana was reflective of the life factors and educational policies surrounding her students. Her critical consciousness provided her with the possibility of acting agentically and changing discourses to position her students as valid and legitimate. Taking up a translanguaging stance within a context of deeply rooted ideologies about bilingualism, national identities, and languages is no easy task. Many educators believed students would not be able to learn either language if a "mixing" was allowed. Others thought that their learning English would be jeopardized, which would not let them advance and compete academically and professionally with more privileged students. Many educators in the area had internalized these ideologies and conceptualizations and understood their students' lives through the filter of their own experiences of marginalization.

Ms. Ana's translanguaging stance could be strengthened by working on "ideological clarity" (Bartolomé & Balderrama, 2001) that confronts and examines internalization processes and the paradoxes we all hold in education. Martínez, Hikida and Durán (2015) call for conversations with educators about their own implicit language ideologies. I agree with these authors. DL educators can be presented with translanguaging stance discourses and the effects on positioning. Still, until they analyze the impact of prevalent ideologies and discourses on their own educational and professional trajectory, translanguaging remains conceptualized as scaffolding or transitionary strategy. Teacher preparation programs for pre- and in-service teachers need to make this work central by opening up spaces to discuss translanguaging and unpack beliefs about speakers and the positionings assigned to them and that they give to others. And as they are doing the work of examining themselves, as teachers' identities are embraced, teachers will have more opportunities to develop a translanguaging stance that values students' multiple identities and language practices. As Robinson (2019) states, it is crucial that teachers

delve into the ideologies that translanguaging disrupts so that they understand the power of named languages and how they can teach languages as a tool for justice. DL educators can then collaboratively create a translanguaging stance discourse bank where they can draw discourses that position students in ways that resist and reformulate pervasive ideologies and stereotypes to create new classroom and community realities. A translanguaging stance not only transforms emergent bilinguals' subject positions, but it also changes DL educators' positions from passive executors of curriculum to critical and creative educators.

References

Bartolomé, L. I., & Balderrama, M. V. (2001). The need for educators with political and ideological clarity: Providing our children with "the best." *The Best for our Children: Critical Perspectives on Literacy for Latino Students,* , 48-64.

Bourdieu, P. (1979). Symbolic power. *Critique of Anthropology, 4*(13-14), 77-85.

Canagarajah, S. (2011). Translanguaging in the classroom: Emerging issues for research and pedagogy. *Applied linguistics review*, *2*, 1-28.

Cervantes-Soon, C. G. (2018). Using a Xicana feminist framework in Bilingual teacher preparation: Toward an anticolonial path. *The Urban Review*, *50*(5), 857-888.

Creese, A., & Blackledge, A. (2010). Translanguaging in the bilingual classroom: A pedagogy for learning and teaching? *The Modern Language Journal, 94*(1), 103-115.

Creese, A., & Blackledge, A. (2015). Translanguaging and identity in educational settings. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics, 35*, 20-35.

Cornejo, A. (2011, May 27). Segundo Barrio: A living history lesson. Borderzine. Reporting Across Fronteras. Retrieved from https://borderzine.com/2011/05/segundo-barrio-a-living-history-lesson/

Davies, B., & Harré, R. (1990). Positioning: The discursive production of selves. *Journal for the Theory of Social Behaviour, 20*(1), 43-63.

De Matthews, D., Izquierdo, E., & Knight, D. S. (2017). Righting past wrongs: A superintendent's social justice leadership for dual language education along the US-mexico border. *Education Policy Analysis Archives/Archivos Analiticos De Politicas Educativas,* (25), 1-32.

Deroo, M. R., & Ponzio, C. (2019). Confronting ideologies: A discourse analysis of in-service teachers' translanguaging stance through an ecological lens. *Bilingual Research Journal, 42*(2), 214-231.

Ek, L. D., Sánchez, P., & Quijada Cerecer, P. D. (2013). Linguistic violence, insecurity, and work: Language ideologies of Latina/o bilingual teacher candidates in Texas. *International Multilingual Research Journal*, 7(3), 197-219.

Fitts, S. (2006). Reconstructing the status quo: Linguistic interaction in a dual-language school. *Bilingual Research Journal, 30*(2), 337-365.

Freire, P. (1996). Pedagogy of the oppressed (revised). *New York: Continuum*.

García, O. (2009). *Bilingual education in the 21st century: A global perspective* John Wiley & Sons.

García, O., & Kleyn, T. (2016). *Translanguaging with multilingual students: Learning from classroom moments* Routledge.

García, O., & Wei, L. (2013). *Translanguaging: Language, bilingualism and education* Palgrave Macmillan.

Guerrero, M. D., & Guerrero, M. C. (2017). Competing discourses of academic Spanish in the Texas-Mexico borderlands. *Bilingual Research Journal*, *40*(1), 5-19.

Hamman, L. (2018). Translanguaging and positioning in two-way dual language classrooms: A case for criticality. *Language and Education, 32*(1), 21-42.

Henderson, K. I., & Palmer, D. K. (2015). Teacher and student language practices and ideologies in a third-grade two-way dual language program implementation. *International Multilingual Research Journal, 9*(2), 75-92.

Hidalgo, M. (1986). Language contact, language loyalty, and language prejudice on the mexican border. *Language in Society, 15*(2), 193-220.

Jong, E. d., & Howard, E. (2009). Integration in two-way immersion education: Equalising linguistic benefits for all students. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism, 12*(1), 81-99.

Jørgensen, J. N., Karrebæk, M., Madsen, L. M., & Møller, J. S. (2011). *Polylanguaging in Superdiversity.Diversities, 13 (2), 23-37,*

Langenhove, L. v., & Harré, R. (1994). Cultural stereotypes and positioning theory. *Journal for the Theory of Social Behaviour, 24*(4), 359-372.

LeCompte, M. D., & Schensul, J. J. (1999). *Designing and conducting ethnographic research* Rowman Altamira.

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*(1), 26-42.

Moll, L. C., Amanti, C., Neff, D., & Gonzalez, N. (1992). Funds of knowledge for teaching: Using a qualitative approach to connect homes and classrooms. *Theory into Practice, 31*(2), 132-141.

Mortimer, K. S. (2018). The hegemony of language separation: Discontents en programas de lenguaje dual en paraguay and el paso. *Association of Mexican American Educators Journal, 12*(2), 121-152.

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.

Otsuji, E., & Pennycook, A. (2011). Social inclusion and metrolingual practices. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism, 14*(4), 413-426.

Palmer, D. K., Cervantes-Soon, C., Dorner, L., & Heiman, D. (2019). Bilingualism, biliteracy, biculturalism, and critical consciousness for all: Proposing a fourth fundamental goal for two-way dual language education. *Theory into Practice, 58*(2), 121-133.

Rampton, B. (2011). From 'multi-ethnic adolescent heteroglossia'to 'contemporary urban vernaculars'. *Language & Communication, 31*(4), 276-294.

Staudt, K. & Coronado, I. *Fronteras No Mas. Toward Social Justice at the US Mexican Border* Palgrave Macmillan.

Robinson, E. (2019). To language differently: Drawing on feminist poststructuralism and translanguaging to prepare language teachers. *Translation and Translanguaging in Multilingual Contexts, 5*(1), 49-66.

Thomas, W. P., & Collier, V. P. (2012). *Dual language education for a transformed world*. Dual Language Education of New Mexico/Fuente Press.

Valdés, G. (1997). Dual-language immersion programs: A cautionary note concerning the education of language-minority students. *Harvard Educational Review, 67*(3), 391-430.

Valenzuela, A. (2016). *Growing critically conscious teachers: A social justice curriculum for educators of Latino/a youth* Teachers College Press.

Vila, P. (2000). Crossing borders, reinforcing borders: Social categories, metaphors, and narrative identities on the US-Mexico frontier. University of Texas Press.

Wei, L. (2011). Moment analysis and translanguaging space: Discursive construction of identities by multilingual Chinese youth in Britain. *Journal of Pragmatics, 43*(5), 1222-1235.

Zentella, R. (2012, May 1). Transfronterizo talk: Conflicting constructions of bilingualism on the US-Mexico border. YouTube. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=VvrO1jHkcUg&t=37s

CHAPTER 4: DISCOURSES OF FIDELITY IN DUAL LANGUAGE EDUCATION: "YO SÍ CREO QUE ESTO FUNCIONA, PERO TODOS DEBEMOS DE COMULGAR CON EL MISMO PADRE."

Abstract

The principle of fidelity to the program model has been emphasized in DL education as crucial to attaining success in the education of emergent bilinguals. This ethnographic analysis of discourses of fidelity shows that the meanings of fidelity expressed and practiced by DL educators in this US-Mexico border context were shaped by ideologies of coloniality, reproducing processes that privilege normative whiteness within DL education. I conclude that DL educators will benefit from opportunities and spaces where they can problematize these discourses by analyzing the coloniality ideologies embedded in discourses of fidelity to language allocation. I conclude by discussing translanguaging pedagogy as tool for decolonizing epistemologies and practices.

Introduction

In dual language (DL) education, fidelity to the program model is a well-known principle that is strongly linked to the success of DL education and the achievement of its goals. Several DL scholars have claimed that successful DL programs are faithful to the structures and components of the language model (Collier & Thomas, 2004; Gomez, Freeman & Freeman, 2005; Thomas & Collier, 2012; Lindholm-Leary, 2005). Fidelity in DL has different meanings and its interpretations among educators vary. In this study in two schools on the US-Mexico border, fidelity discourses weigh heavily, and their meanings centered on the allocation of

languages in the program and on the language practices of educators and students. In the title quote, Ms. Zulem, the kindergarten teacher at one of the schools, Alas, conveyed the relevance of fidelity to the program model. Her saying, "comulgar con el mismo padre" [to commune with the same father] carried a religious sentiment with which fidelity is taken up in DL. Communion is a Christian sacrament that symbolizes the spiritual union between Christ and the communers. It represents the deep faith and beliefs to the premises of Christianity. Ms. Zulem strongly believed in the benefits of DL for all students and thought everyone at Alas should believe too to follow it faithfully, that is, communing with the 50/50 language allocation throughout the school academic subjects and art blocks. As a former DL educator, I related to the sense of relevance that fidelity to the program model has to achieve the promising goals of DL programs for emergent bilinguals. At the same time, I also connected to fidelity discourses with some tension and continuous questions regarding its meanings and impacts. In this paper, I argue that fidelity discourses have important consequences for language practices and ideologies, educators' senses of agency and control, accountability measures, and identities.

In this 16 month- long ethnographic study conducted at two schools with DL programs, Alas and Chamizal, on the US-Mexico border, I analyzed discourses about fidelity that arose during my research. Using coloniality (Maldonado-Torres, 2007) and governmentality (Flores, 2013) frameworks, this article delves deeper into what meanings of fidelity were emphasized in my context of study and what types of coloniality and governmentality ideologies and processes were reproduced. Both frameworks center the discourses and the mechanisms through which power systems are maintained and reproduced. This study seeks to support new ways of thinking about fidelity that fosters DL educators' critical thinking, reflexivity, and agency to disrupt

coloniality processes in DL education. Problematizing discourses of fidelity in this article attempts to convey the importance of engaging in critical analysis of DL discourses.

FIDELITY IN THE GUIDING PRINCIPLES OF DL EDUCATION

I use the definition of DL education program of the Texas Administrative Code (TAC) in its Chapter 89 on Adaptions for Special Populations, as it was the set of guidelines to which educators in this context referred. The two schools in my research had one-way DL education, which meant that the majority of the students in those programs were emergent bilinguals. TAC uses the term DL immersion/one-way and defines it in this way,

> A bilingual/biliteracy program model in which students identified as English learners is served in English, and another language and are prepared to meet reclassification criteria to be successful in English-only instruction not earlier than six or later than seven years after the student enrolls in school. Instruction provided in a language other than English in this program model is delivered by a teacher appropriately certified in bilingual education. The goal of one-way DL immersion is for program participants to attain full proficiency in another language and English. This model provides ongoing instruction in literacy and academic content in the students' primary language as well as English, with at least half of the instruction delivered in the student's primary language for the duration of the program (TAC §89.120(c)(3).

It has been well documented that DL programs are considered to be the most effective approach to improving emergent bilinguals' academic achievement and positively impacting students' identities (August & Shanahan, 2006; Christian, 2016; Collier & Thomas, 2004; de Jong, 2014; Palmer, 2008; Thomas & Collier, 2012). Numerous studies also argue that implementing the program model faithfully is crucial to see its positive effects (Collier &

Thomas, 2004; Freeman, Freeman & Mercuri, 2005; Lindholm-Leary & Genesee, 2010 Thomas & Collier, 2012; Whitacre, 2015). For example, Collier and Thomas (2004) argue: "How faithful teachers are to the principles can strongly influence the success of the program" (p. 13). In one of their works Thomas and Collier (2012) state, there are some "non-negotiable components" of DL education which include at least fifty percent of instruction that has to be conducted in the partner language and languages need to be separated for instruction. If they are non-negotiable components, they are not to be questioned or interpreted, but they need to be applied faithfully. The *Guiding Principles for Dual Language Education* (Howard, Lindholm-Leary, Rogers, Olague, Medina; Kennedy, Sugarman & Christian, 2018) utilizes the word fidelity to evaluate the alignment between instruction and curriculum and the faithful implementation of DL components. One of those components referred to the language allocation of the program, 50/50 or 90/10, or equal ratio of instruction in English and the partner language and ninety percent of the partner language and ten percent in English starting to Kindergarten until fifth grade, where instruction takes the form of a 50/50 model.

Fidelity in DL education refers to the faithfulness educators have to the program model structures, such as language allocation, to reach the three goals of DL education: academic achievement, biliteracy proficiency, and cultural competence. It is a concept that seems to be taken at face value in schools and professional development. The meaning of fidelity in my study required a mindset, a belief the DL program will achieve its goals only when implemented faithfully. Discourses of fidelity in my study emerged when I asked my participants about their knowledge of translanguaging. Translanguaging meant to them code-switching (see Chapter 2). For most of them, this new concept did not align with the concept of a language allocation that provides equal spaces in terms of minutes of instruction in both English and Spanish.

Participants emphasized fidelity when they referred to language use and language allocation. But the DL program model has other components also considered essential to have a successful DL program as described in the *Guiding Principles for Dual Language Education,* and which could just as well be linked to fidelity.

The *Guiding Principles for Dual Language Education*, which intends to aid the design and implementation of DL programs, is organized into seven strands (program structure, curriculum, instruction, assessment, staff quality, family and community, and support and resources). Every strand holds principles and key points to which DL programs can measure their level of alignment. The first strand, program structure, lists and describes program model components: program duration, language allocation, literacy instruction, and student demographics. For a DL program to significantly impact students' achievement, it needs to extend for at least six years. As mentioned before, language allocation refers to the proportion of instruction conducted in English and the partner language. The research mentioned in the document argues that "students who spend less time in English in DL programs tend to score at similar levels as their peers who receive more English" (p. 15). Literacy instruction is another component of the program structure. In this area, according to the *Guiding Principles*, there is little research comparing successive or sequential literacy instruction differences and similarities in students' biliteracy development. It is generally understood that both ways will successfully develop biliteracy at different rates depending on the percentages of language allocation of program models. Finally, the student demographics component advises that the most desirable ratio is fifty percent English speakers and 50% of the partner language speakers to promote integration and educational and linguistic equity.

Of all these components, the one that seemed most salient in my study was that of language allocation. For example, in a professional development (PD) session on DL essentials for administrators, the presenter described the three "pillars" of DL education, as stated in the *Guiding Principles*. When he talked about the pillar of high academic achievement, he said to his audience:

> Last time I was here, I found out some of you do not have specials (arts, physical education, music and other classes considered not core subject-matters) in Spanish
> He then told administrators he was aware that he was making them uncomfortable because then that means that in some programs, they had more English than Spanish. He added: The research shows that if we do an -ish, we're actually hurting children (Field note, 09/06/2017).

The presenter did not elaborate on this statement. Nobody asked him how exactly the students were hurt when doing as the presenter said, "an -ish", or not following a 50/50 language allocation. There was a silence that seemed to express a getting-caught feeling about language allocation issues. The local university professor who was one of the organizers and supporters of the training seemed to interpret the room's feeling the same way. She addressed the presenter, telling him that Thomas and Collier's initial research did not include the specials being part of the DL curriculum. The presenter acknowledged this and said they are moving in the direction of including specials to ensure that was part of the equal distribution of English and Spanish in the DL model. The exchange between the professor and the presenter underscored the emphasis placed on language allocation in this context, as evidenced by the exchange regarding equal minutes spent immersed in English and Spanish.

The word fidelity appears in the *Guiding Principles* under the Instruction strand.

Instructional methods are derived from research-based principles of dual language education and ensure fidelity to the model (p. 57). Under this principle, the first Key Point says: “The program model and corresponding curriculum are implemented with fidelity” (p. 57). The *Guiding Principles* offers a rubric to measure the level of alignment (minimal, partial, full, and exemplary practice) of instructional practices in a DL program. The exemplary practice is defined as:

> All teachers are held accountable by the program and the district to align instruction with the program model (e.g., providing the appropriate percentage of instruction in each language, sequencing literacy instruction as indicated by the model) and to develop and implement the corresponding curriculum with fidelity. There is a clear plan for or ensuring that teachers who are new to the program understand the program model and its implications for curriculum implementation (Exemplary practice level for KeyPoint A, p. 57).

The only time fidelity is mentioned in the *Guiding Principles* is under this strand. It is measured by vague quantity terminology of few, many, or all teachers' practices aligned to the program model. "Providing the appropriate percentage of instruction in each language," or language allocation, was emphasized, and my participants interpreted language allocation as equal percentages of instruction in both languages. This also included the instruction students received in their other classes, such as library time, physical education, music, and art, as an overall equal distribution of languages. Language allocation within instruction depends heavily on teachers using only the target language at that time. In my study, translanguaging practices were the norm among teachers, students, and the community. Equal allocation of Spanish and English as a means to place equal value on both language and ensure that English does not take minutes away from Spanish is problematic and raises questions. How was language allocation

measured in a context where hybrid language practices occurred not only among teachers but also in students? Wouldn't this mean that being faithful to language allocation, if this could ever be possible, will remove these communities' identities?

There are other principles and key points that focus on instruction alignment to the three goals of DL, such as pedagogical practices, student-centered instruction, and technology integration. In my study, however, the word fidelity about the program model was exclusively used in terms of language allocation and reliance on language separation as ways to develop the three defining goals of DL. There is little said about other principles and keypoints delineated by the *Guiding Principles* and an absence of discourse about the social justice purposes that once marked the beginnings of bilingual education (Flores, 2013).

A great deal of research points at the benefits of DL education and argues that fidelity to the different components of the programs ensures positive effects. While it was originally thought that DL would be an equalizer program for language minority students, there continue to be studies that demonstrate that DL programs may not benefit students equally, when the social context of linguistic minorities is not addressed (de Jong & Howard, 2009). Fitts (2006) has pointed out the importance of the social justice goal of DL education to avoid reproducing the status quo and producing more benefits for already privileged groups and ideologies. Fitts also claims the same social justice discourses may unintendedly obscure realities of language minority students' context by adopting color-blind approaches. Almost ten years before and with the rise of DL programs, Valdés(1997) questioned DL education programs and their role in making a difference for linguistic minority children under certain social conditions. I locate my study along these lines of inquiries and center my participants' socio-historical features to understand fidelity discourses in DL education. In the section that follows, I review the literature

in which fidelity in DL education is analyzed as a required principle to achieve the programs' goals and the barriers that different contexts present to faithfully following program model components.

What fidelity does for DL education

Echevarria, Richards-Tutor, Chinn, and Ratleff (2011) claim little work has been done around the role of fidelity in the educational field and the ways it is measured. Researchers in the field of psychology define fidelity as the "degree to which an intervention or model of instruction is implemented as it was originally designed to be implemented" (MacMillan, Beebe-Frankberger & Bocckian, 2000, p. 426 as cited in Echevarria et al., 2011). This is important, Echevarria et al. argue, because if fidelity is not studied, one cannot know the educational method's real effectiveness or model. The instructional method, the Sheltered Instruction Observation Protocol (SIOP) that Echevarria, Vogt, and Short (2008), developed over several years has been, according to the authors, carefully tested and designed to be followed with fidelity by teachers to ensure its reliability. Having high degrees of fidelity meant the consistency to which teachers included all the SIOP components during their instruction. Echevarria et al. (2011) claim fidelity should be of main focus when implementing any instructional models. In DL education, fidelity is also used in terms of the program being implemented in alignment with all components of DL.

Several authors in the DL field also claim that fidelity is crucial to close achievement gaps and to realize all the benefits of DL education. For example, Collier and Thomas (2004) and Thomas and Collier (2012) argue that fidelity to the three "non-negotiable components of dual language education": “(1) Fifty percent of the instructional time must be taught in the non-

English (partner) language, (2) Separation of the two languages for instruction, and (3) PK/K-12 commitment" (p. 32)—determine students' academic achievement.

Li, Steele, Slater, Bacon, and Miller (2016) in their study of DL program implementation effects in Oregon, took up two aspects of fidelity: adherence (the proportion to which the elements of programs were implemented as prescribed), and quality of delivery (the degree to which executors of the program use strategies and methods as prescribed). More specifically, the authors measured the adherence to the partner language and the quality of the sheltered strategies prescribed by SIOP during instruction. Through observation methods, the authors found that most of the teachers in their study used the partner language "100 percent of the observed class period" (p. 37). The teachers' fidelity to the prescribed instructional method also showed consistent levels in their implementation. According to the authors, fidelity in DL is measured by what they called the quality of delivery of teaching practices and the adherence to the partner language use as prescribed by the school district. They found that the success of the district-wide DL implementation in Oregon was due to these two aspects of fidelity, which were consistent with the DL students' academic achievement. Their findings supported the scholars mentioned above about the correlation between fidelity and DL program success. However, their research raises questions as to how they conceptualize "the partner language" and how they could measure and tell apart from one language from the other. Conceptualizing languages as neutral and countable so that they can be somehow measured is problematic and is one of the ways coloniality operates to define success and accountability.

Other researchers question how fidelity of DL programs is affected by the context, ideologies, state mandates, and structural features of school districts. Palmer, Henderson, Wall, Zúñiga, and Berthelson (2015) argued that the call for fidelity in DL programs, which are most

often implemented in a top-down fashion, ignores the demands that standardized tests perform in these programs and the difficulty to develop and focus on DL goals when faced with these demands. Fránquiz and Ortiz (2018) also analyzed recent studies that point out the challenges many DL program contexts have and that accomplishing DL education goals requires addressing barriers that affect fidelity, such as over-reliance on English assessments and an emphasis on strict language separation. Furthermore, Henderson (2017) has questioned how fidelity is affected by teachers' language ideologies and the contextual factors that create ideological tensions.

Discourses of fidelity at Alas and Chamizal also revealed ideological struggles. Most of the educators in my study believed in adhering to language allocation in the school and classroom and how to use languages in equal percentages. A few others thought the school and the community's contextual features required teaching strategies that were not supported by the concept of fidelity to language allocation. For example, one teacher at Alas said fidelity could not be applied to the context of Alas Elementary because most students spoke Spanish. She added she had been successful in first grade and now in third through her code-switching during instruction (Field note, 03/23/2017).

Discourses of fidelity and the importance that has as the ultimate factor to achieve DL programs' three goals seemed to obscure deeper and complex ideologies of language and identities and deny and reduce teachers' and students' local knowledge and agency to design their local goals. Buxton, Allexsaht-Snider, Kayumova, Aghasaleh, Choi, and Cohen (2015) have proposed a different approach to the fidelity of implementation to understand how science teachers for emergent bilinguals engage in professional learning and enact practices. Through their collaborative work with teachers to enact a science program for emergent bilinguals, the

authors concluded that to empower educators, a change in the paradigm of fidelity and adherence to program models is needed. The authors proposed to engage theoretically and practically with the concepts of engagement in professional learning, such as PDs and the enactment of pedagogical strategies in the classrooms. In this way, we understand how structure and agency influence each other during teacher decision making and its impact on students. This is done through educators engaging in the process of ongoing reflection and documentation. The next section presents the theories I used to analyze the discourses of fidelity.

COLONIALITY AND GOVERNMENTALITY

My analysis is informed by the work of Quijano (2000), Smith (2012), Mignolo and Walsh (2018), and Maldonado-Torres (2007) on coloniality. These authors propose the concept of coloniality as a tool to criticize and transform epistemologies and their ideologies. At the center of the concept of coloniality is power. According to Smith (2012), it is the relationship with power that has produced marginalization, domination, and otherness. Understanding coloniality as a process that continues today and did not end when colonialism was over, helps us to "decolonize our mind to recover ourselves, to claim a space in which to develop a sense of authentic humanity" (Smith, 2012, p. 24). Maldonado-Torres's (2007) definition of coloniality also informs my analysis. He claims coloniality is an everlasting consequence of colonialism— which was a political and economic organization where another nation controlled the autonomy of a group of people or nation— defines coloniality as,

> The long-standing patterns of power that emerged as a result of colonialism but that define culture, labor, intersubjective relations, and knowledge production well beyond the strict limits of colonial administration. It is maintained alive in books, in the criteria of academic performance, in cultural patterns, in common sense, in the self-image of

peoples, in aspiration of self, and so many other aspects of our modern experience (p. 243).

Colonialism's long-term effects are ingrained in the way we perceive the world and others through Eurocentric discourses of modernity. These discourses organize and manage institutions such as the school. There is no other institution that can reflect and reproduce power relationships so effectively as the school. This is evident through a curriculum that prioritizes Western perspectives and histories while erasing the colonized stories. It is also reflected in top-down DL programs' implementation that evidence epistemic hegemony by assuming a superiority of Eurocentric knowledge over local ways of being and learning.

According to Quijano (2000), these long-standing patterns of power and forms of control were and continue to be sustained by ideas of race as biological realities that, in themselves, justify an unequal division of labor and subjugation. During colonialism, the construction of race became, in Quijano's words, a tool of social classification, the rationale to justify profound inequalities established by the Europeans' colonizers. Coloniality emerged from colonialism. Coloniality points out the ongoing ideological, socio-political, and economic forms of domination that developed during colonial times. Colonialism refers to a form of domination of others by a central authority and involves people's subjugation by those in power. It conveys an unequal structure of labor based on others' perceived inferiority based on perceived racial characteristics. I adhere to the preference Mignolo (2007), Quijano (2000) and Mignolo and Walsh (2018), and López-Gopar (2016), among others, have for the term coloniality over the word postcolonialism to emphasize that coloniality has not gone anywhere but stayed to sustain epistemologies and socio-economic and political structures. In the words of Mignolo (2018), "coloniality is not over, it is all over" (p. 119).

I use the concept of coloniality to show how this "complex ideology" (Smith, 2012, p.23) pervades the domain of dual language education in ways; it excludes and delegitimizes language practices, identities, and knowledges. Coloniality helped me understand the ideological underpinnings of discourses of fidelity and how they operate to continue the process of coloniality in DL education. As described above, fidelity in DL refers to the faithfulness educators need to all components of DL programs for it to accomplish its goals. In my study, when my participants talked about fidelity, they referred primarily to one of those components: language allocation or how languages are equally distributed to ensure students are equally exposed to both languages. I show below how coloniality operates through the understandings of fidelity and ideological underpinnings of those interpretations.

Mignolo and Walsh (2018) and Quijano (2010) explained that coloniality with its rhetoric of modernity established a social and cultural classification system that categorizes certain groups into supposedly less evolved human beings who inherently do not possess Europeans' physical and cultural characteristics, which are supposedly more evolved. This classification created hierarchies of groups, and everybody not fitting the colonizers' models were devalued. Mignolo and Walsh (2018) named this hierarchical system the colonial difference in which the racialized person is considered inferior. The complex matrix of power is justified by an assimilated and internalized colonial difference. Veronelli (2015) analyzes the linguistic paradigms developed during the 16th century making the relationship between the colonial difference and the devaluation of language practices. If certain groups of people, the colonized, were considered less than human, then their language practices were regarded as deficient, primitive, and inferior. Pennycook and Makoni (2005) say languages should be understood as an invention part of the colonial project of classification and others' subordination. These authors

theorized that languages were invented as part of the Christian/colonial project. Alongside this project, ideologies that languages are standard and quantifiable objects with static features were also invented (p. 138). Colonizers had "languages" or real languages, and the colonized did not have one.

Discourses about the fidelity principle in my context seemed to reproduce coloniality ideologies of languages and identities in ways that obscure DL programs' social justice purpose. Flores (2013) and Grinberg and Saavedra (2000) argued that Latino activists originally criticized monolingual and standard language ideologies and their activism led to more inclusivity through bilingual education. However, the authors argued, the epistemology was not changed, and the conceptualizations of bilingualism and bilingual subjects continued to reflect coloniality classifications of peoples and their languages. In this article, I argue that the fidelity principle of DL education needs to be reevaluated and reformulated to avoid the reproduction of coloniality epistemologies.

Another useful framework to analyze discourses of fidelity is the concept of governmentality (Flores, 2013; Foucault, 1978). According to Bhabha (1996), discourses are a form of governmentality (Foucault, 1978) that seeks to control and manage behavior to organize particular ways of social and institutional lives. Following Foucault (1978), Flores (2014) explained governmentality as "political rationality that circulates through a multitude of institutions as a part of the production of governable subjects" (p. 2). Language, Flores (2014), and Miller and Rose (1990) add, is the main tool that shapes what, how, and why social issues are discussed and framed. Linguistic elements construct rationalities through which social life is organized, and their subjects governed (Miller and Rose, 1990). Flores (2014) argued that to ensure people regulate or govern themselves appropriately, they had to be "socialized into the

appropriate mindset and process" (p. 4). He adds that sets of theories, knowledge principles, and shared vocabularies are the means to normalize and accept face value concepts and ideologies. In my study, the notion of governmentality provides insights into how participants' discourses reproduced rationalities that functioned as a regime of truth and control of their own and students' linguistic practices. The coloniality framework provides an understanding of ideologies, its sources, and constructions. In contrast, governmentality, which operates within a coloniality framework illuminates the process through which the matrix of power is sustained through common discourses and knowledge that circulates through all parts of any system. Discourses of fidelity operated as a regime of truth that imposes itself in all contexts obscuring and excluding local knowledge and closing spaces for critical discussions of the experiences and expertise of DL teachers, especially those who have long experienced sociolinguistic marginalization.

In the context of my study, nearly 100 percent of the students and educators in the two DL programs were Latinx, and both schools served a high percentage of low-income families. Assimilationist discourses that reflect white mainstream language practices' ideologies on both sides of the US-Mexican border that conceptualize certain language practices as standard and others deficient were still present. The discourses of fidelity to the language allocation of DL programs within a historically disempowered community reproduced coloniality ideologies of languages and identities and continued the internalization process of deficit and subordinated identities. Some researchers (de Jong, 2016; Henderson & Palmer, 2015; Sayer, 2013) have questioned "exemplary" DL programs and non-negotiable principles of equal allotment of languages in communities where hybrid language practices are the norm. These authors questioned the value of artificially separating the languages when students' and teachers' practices differ from the "ideal" DL structure. Discourses of fidelity reinforce coloniality by

upholding white/colonial power and consequently disempowering educators and students through discourse that reflects coloniality ideologies of languages, identities, and knowledges.

METHODS

This analysis is part of a larger sixteen-month-long ethnography that was guided by the following overarching research question: What are the conceptualizations DL educators have of translanguaging pedagogy? Participants were not familiar with the concept or defined translanguaging as code-switching, which quickly led to discussions of language separation and allocation and fidelity to the program model. When interrogating the fidelity principle further, several ideologies of languages and identities arose. In this article, I analyze how coloniality operates through discourses of fidelity and the ideologies that they revealed.

Data for this research were collected from two schools, Alas and Chamizal, which were located in two different school districts in the area of El Paso, Texas, on the US-Mexico border. Over 161 hours of observations were conducted in K-3 classrooms, professional learning communities, and professional development sessions (PDs). Multiple field notes were recorded, and one extended interview was conducted with each of the twelve participating DL educators, teachers, and administrators. Artifacts, such as historical documents of the beginning of Alas, reading scores, writing samples, and handouts from PDs, were collected. Also, documents describing demographics and academic performance of schools were obtained through the Texas Education Agency (TEA).

Data analysis was ongoing during my process of data collection, as reflected in my field notes and memos throughout my study. I open- coded the data and applied inductive and deductive methods (LeCompte & Schensul, 1999). Fidelity discourses emerged inductively from the pre-established codes of DL conceptualization, translanguaging, and language separation

language practices and became salient. I then engaged in a second round of coding to identify fidelity discourses and meanings. I used discourse analysis (Gee, 1999) to understand the ideological underpinnings of fidelity discourses. Gee (1999) defines discourse analysis as the study of what we do with language. He says that discourses always involve more than just language: "They involve coordinating languages with ways of acting, interacting, valuing, believing, feeling, and other non-linguistic symbols" (Gee, 1999, p. 24). Discourses are social practices that represent identities and ideologies through language. Discourse analysis helped me understand what ideologies discourses of fidelity showed. It also helped me establish links between the macro and micro sociocultural contexts and helped me understand how discourses of fidelity functioned to reproduce inequities.

RESEARCHER POSITIONALITY

I am from Paraguay, a country where most of the population speaks the native language, Guarani, and Spanish. Like people from El Paso, Paraguayans also "mix" the two languages, translanguage, in daily conversation and separate the two languages according to the social contexts. In Paraguay, Spanish is the predominant language of business and government, while the use of Guarani is associated with lower social classes, and the mixture of the two is used in conversation in different contexts. I understand, to some extent, some of the ideologies about languages and education that circulate in this context because of my experience with my own and my community's language practices when growing up in Paraguay. I am also a former bilingual teacher who has had experience in teaching English language learners in different contexts: English as a second language, English only, and Spanish immersion classrooms. Every context influenced and shaped the way I conceptualize teaching practices and particular theories

of teaching. During my observations and interviews in this study, I mostly used Spanish but was attentive to my participants' preferences and styles to establish a better rapport.

Context of the study

El Paso is located in the farthest southwest corner of the state of Texas. It is one of the largest bilingual/binational metropolitan areas situated at the center of the almost 2000 miles long US Mexican border. Border Studies theorists such as Anzaldúa, (1987, 1999) have defined the US-Mexican border as hybrid and third spaces and a site of border crossings where people live in (nepantla -in between) or as some of the dual language educators in my study will identify themselves and their students, "ni de aquí, ni de allá" (not from here nor there). Vila (2000) argues, however, that every pair of cities along the US-Mexican border is "the locus of very different processes of internal and international migration, ethnic composition, and political identities on both sides of the border" (p. 7). Ciudad Juárez and El Paso are called sister cities. Although they are perceived to relate peacefully, their relationship is also full of contradictions and inequities, which are products of their intertwined histories and particular social processes. El Paso's and Ciudad Juárez's interdependence and intrinsic fluid exchange of languages and cultures are evident in translanguaging practices. The community and DL educators referred to El Paso's majority as speakers of Spanish and English code-mixing styles. I described my participant's language practices as translanguaging or linguistic practices that evidence the rich linguistic repertoires this border community displays.

El Paso is home to more than ten school districts. My research study was in two elementary schools, Alas Elementary and Chamizal school, with DL programs located in two different school districts: El Paso del Norte District and The Valley School District, respectively. El Paso del Norte launched DL education as the default program for all emergent bilinguals in

2014, replacing transitional bilingual program models. Alas was the first school to serve Mexican students on the south side, and it also functioned as an evening school founded in 1887 by a Franciscan priest. In my field study, references were often made to Alas school—and the Segundo Barrio where it was located—as impoverished and consequently challenging environments to work and learn. In first grade, one of the Spanish DL educators said students at Alas did not have the motivation to learn like the students in other DL programs just five miles north of them. There were other comments regarding the parents and their involvement in the education of their students. For example, one of the kindergarten teachers said this:

> Los niños que llegan a e sta escuela prácticamente, pues, no tienen una base mínima para empezar, entonces, son estudiantes que, que sí se enfrentan a retos de la enseñanza más difícil, porque no hay un apoyo en casa, o sea, este, vienen mal vestidos, la mayoría, este, mal alimentados, no tienen una estructura familiar, entonces, todos esos factores vienen a afectar en su, en su enseñanza, entonces, sí es un poco más difícil.
>
> The children that come to this school, practically, don't have the minimum foundation to start. Therefore, they're students that face more difficult instructional challenges because there is no support at home, I mean, they come bad dressed, the majority poorly fed and they don't have a family structure. All these factors affect the teaching. Therefore, yes, it is more difficult. (Ms. Nadia's interview, 12/04/2017)

After a century, Segundo Barrio and Alas continue to be seen as needy, and their students were described as lacking the necessary skill to be successful bilingual students. The poverty and inequalities at Alas in Segundo Barrio continued to be referred to as being inherently part of the area, ignoring historical, socio-political, and educational policy factors that have and still shape this community. Before implementing their current DL programs, both schools in the study

offered transitional bilingual education (TBE) for their emergent bilinguals. Alas' DL program was in its third year of implementation when I began my study. It was a two-teacher model, in which one teacher teaches in Spanish and another in English from K-5th grade following a 50/50 model. There were about 38 students in the DL program in each Kindergarten, first and third classrooms during the 2017-2018 school year. Students were divided into groups A and B and assigned a homeroom teacher with whom students started the day before transitioning to the other classroom and then came back to their homerooms to finish the day.

With a long history in DL education, the beginnings of Chamizal go back to 1995, when The Valley district used a federal earned grant named "Mariposa" to start a new bilingual education program: one that was not considered remedial for emergent bilinguals, but that was going to educate Hispanic students through English and Spanish as well as another language of their choice (Texas Monthly, 2009). Chamizal is a K-8 two-way DL program and magnet school whose reputation for high academic achievement and bilingualism/biliteracy levels was well known in the community. Students received instruction in English and Spanish, and upon entering the school, they could choose a third language to study (Japanese, Russian, German, and Mandarin). Because of this third language option, Chamizal was described as having an 80/10/10 model. Eighty percent of the instruction was in Spanish and ten percent in English in Kindergarten. While the English and Spanish instruction increased and decreased to reach a 50/50 by grade five, the ten percent of the language chosen remained until eighth grade for a final allocation of 45/45/10. Despite rocky beginnings and challenges with the school staff and parents, who were skeptical of this new model, Chamizal grew into a school that was included in the bilingual literature for its innovation and research portraying it as a successful DL school. The different dynamics and processes of this border context continuously reconstruct and shape

these two DL programs' ideologies and their manifestations in discourses, language, and teaching practices. Table 1, below, gives a demographic description of both schools.

Table 1: Alas and Chamizal students' demographics

School	Total Enrollment	Total Emergent Bilingual Students	Total Economically Disadvantaged Students	Total at Risk Students	Total Students Receiving Special Education Services	Hispanic Students
Alas	505	86%	98%	90%	17%	98%
Chamizal	762	88%	67%	58%	8%	98%

Table 2: DL educators/administrators

School	DL educator	Years of experience	Ethnicity
Alas	Ms. Ana	10+	Latinx
Alas	Ms. Zulem	10+	Latinx
Alas	Ms. Marta	20+	Latinx
Chamizal	Mr. Roland	25+	Latinx

Changes in the program models and fidelity discourses

Alas, and Chamizal schools follow the 50/50 and 90/10 model, respectively. Discourses of DL fidelity were salient because of the particular changes both schools were experiencing. After operating with a transitional bilingual program for many years, Alas' DL program was entering its fourth year of DL implementation with the openings of four third grade classrooms. Every year there were new grade level demands to understand and align with the DL program model. Consequently, Alas teachers were intensively part of professional learning community discussions and ongoing professional development sessions. The participating teachers and

administrators at Alas felt that not everybody in the school had discarded the "old paradigm" of transitional bilingual, and a new "mindset" and "attitude" were required to ensure faithful implementation of the 50/50 model.

Chamizal's 90/10 model had more than twenty years' existence, and most of the teachers I worked with had started their careers there and had not taught in any other type of bilingual program model. Discourses of fidelity were relevant because the second-grade DL teachers felt that the administration wanted to change the model by increasing English instruction percentage. These DL educators felt the relatively new administration did not understand the model nor the fidelity required for its success. Both schools were transitioning in different directions at the time of my research: one toward DL 50/50 program ideals and the other away from their 90/10 model. Fidelity, in these two contexts, meant remaining faithful to the language of instruction and the appropriate amount of time for each language. The subsequent section examines the ways that coloniality processes were reproduced at Alas and Chamizal

FIDELITY REPRODUCES DOCILE SUBJECTS

Fidelity at Alas was important as their shift from a transitional to a DL model exposed some competing ideologies between transitional bilingual and DL programs, as expressed by the teachers. Ms. Zulem, who was the kindergarten Spanish teacher quoted at the beginning, expressed her strong belief in the program model and how important is everyone else in the school, share hers:

> Yo soy férrea, férrea abogada del programa dual. Entonces, yo sí creo, yo sí creo que esto funciona, pero todos debemos de, de, estar, de comulgar con el mismo padre, viste, y estar en la misma página porque no estamos, no estamos ¡ah! De manera que sí reciban [los estudiantes] cincuenta por ciento, cincuenta de cada cosa, que si la bibliotecaria no

habla español, pues, mándele su curso de español, para que la media hora que los niños van a eso reciban español, y aquí todavía no y se sienten cada vez que uno lo dice".

I am a tough, tough advocate of the DL program. I do believe DL works, but we all need to be, we all need to commune with the same priest, you see, on the same page, because we are not, we are not. So, students need to receive fifty percent of each. If the librarian does not speak Spanish, then she needs to be sent to a course to learn Spanish so that the thirty minutes that the children are with her, they receive Spanish. And here that is not happening, and they do not like it when one tells them that. (Interview 09/20/17)

Ms. Zulem expressed on different occasions that other teachers at Alas do not believe in the DL program, and they seemed to be bothered by her comments about faithful implementation. For example, she said, for DL to be a 50/50 exposure of English and Spanish for the students, specials such as library time should be in Spanish. The librarian at Alas was an English speaker. I have observed her use words in Spanish, mostly translating nouns when reading stories to the students. Ms. Zulem thought the library teacher should have her instructional time all in Spanish if they are to be faithful to the 50/50 language allocation required by their DL program model. According to her, it was important that all teachers at Alas understood and supported the program to be successful. Belief in the DL program model seemed to create two categories of DL educators, those who did not believe and those who believed and were strong advocates for it. Ms. Zulem thought it was important to have precisely a 50/50 exposure in Spanish and English during the day, and that should include all specials so that 50/50 was achieved across the program. If Ms. Zulem's students went to the library for 30 minutes during the time they were in Spanish instruction, then a 50/50 distribution would mean the librarian should be giving her instruction in Spanish as well. It was interesting to me that during

my observations in her Spanish kindergarten classroom, she often switched to English to talk with her English teaching partner and fewer times to speak with a couple of students who were English dominant. How was fidelity measured? Ms. Zulem argued the whole school should follow a 50/50 model, but language practices differed moment by moment producing unbalanced exposure and uses of languages. It is difficult to say how a 50/50 exposure can genuinely happen and how to calculate these percentages throughout the day and weeks, given the fluidity of languages and the dynamics of a single school day with its interruptions and events.

During a DL PD for Alas administrators, the presenter, an out-of-state consultant for the district, reproachingly declared, "Some in this room do not believe in DL yet" (Field note 09/06/17). It was unclear to whom the presenter referred, but Alas' administrator and others whose schools had recently started implementation may have been the intended recipients. The presenter later also said that teachers who did not believe in and support DL could go to the "distrito de al lado" (Field note, 09/06/2017). The tone of these discourses seemed to align to a top-down style of program implementation, one that, in the words of Fitzsimmons-Doolan, Palmer and Henderson (2017), "commercially and publicly available DL Bilingual education that school districts and states can adopt for top-down implementation" (p. 2). According to these authors, top-down implemented DL programs reduce the possibility of creating spaces for analysis, input, and decision-making by the teachers and the community. Certainly, the DL program at Alas reflected a top-down implementation process, which came due to the district-wide DL program implementation. Similarly, to Ms. Zulem's discourse, support, and knowledge of the DL model reduced the possibility of further examination into structural decisions' reasons and purposes. Top-down decisions by subjects with epistemological power (Alcoff, 2007) make it infeasible to hear and explore other local alternatives that seek the elevation of the

community's linguistic and cultural funds through the active participation of communities in the design and formulation of goals of language programs.

Ms. Nadia, the kindergarten Spanish teacher, and Ms. Zulem's teaching partner, said the following,

> Entonces, yo pienso que muchas maestras no lo hemos comprendido, lo que es [el Programa Dual] y por eso quizás muchas [maestras] no están de acuerdo, porque la mayoría de aquí no está de acuerdo y no cree en el programa, entonces, si tú no crees ¿qué estás enseñando?, pero yo sí creo, yo sí creo que funciona y, y sí funciona.
>
> I think that many of us, teachers, have not understood what it is [DL programs], and perhaps that is why many do not agree with it because the majority of teachers here do not agree with and do not believe in the program. Then, if you don't believe in it, what are you teaching? But I do, I do believe it works, and it does work. (Interview, 17/12/04)

Similarly, Ms. Nadia also expressed her concern about other educators not following and not believing in the DL program. She positioned herself first among the teachers who may not understand the DL program structure well, but at the end of her discourse, she separated herself by stating she does believe in the program because it does work. Ms. Ana, who taught first grade first as the English teachers and then third grade as a Spanish teacher, said that it was not that the teachers at Alas did not understand the model but were not open to it. Ms. Ana added that when she started teaching the DL model in first grade in English, she had a hard time planning with her Spanish partner because she did not believe in it: "Todavía no estaba convencida [la maestra en español]. Era bien difícil porque batallé mucho para ponerme de acuerdo con mi compañera para estar en lo mismo" [She was not convinced yet [the teaching partner in Spanish]. It was

difficult because I struggle a lot with my teaching partner to be on the same page] (Field note, 08/28/2017).

I had met Ms. Ana's teaching partner and had a couple of informal conversations with her. She was not one of the research participants, but I knew she had been a teacher at Alas for a long time and, therefore, taught TBE longer than she had been in the DL program. She had told me she thought TBE worked better for the students in that context, given the lack of different educational resources in the students' lives. Although we did not go deeper into this conversation, there seemed to be an assumption that more English would give these students more opportunities and growth for the perceived resources they needed. Discourses such as the ones from Ms. Ana, Ms. Zulem, and Ms. Nadia about the necessary beliefs, communion, convictions and openness to the program model created two categories of educators. There were those who believed in the purposes and goals of DL education, and there were the others who did not and were thus perceived as "outdated" in their disagreements towards the model. The "others" in this case were the teachers who held onto the TBE preference. There was a new educational program in place that required a shift of paradigms. I include myself in the implicit assertion that a DL model is a better alternative than TBE. But I also analyzed this outdated and dichotomy between those who believed and those who did not as a coloniality process of imposing one knowledge over others and coloniality rhetoric of imposing new knowledge to discard backward thinking.

Discourses of DL education became hegemonic and legitimized by the epistemic credibility of the experts. It continues the coloniality logic of imposing one ideal model over others. Most importantly, discourses of believing faithfully in program models do not address crucial questions about the schools' contexts, such as the types of resources needed to have equal

access to high levels of instruction and curriculum, and the ultimate beneficiaries of a particular program model. In coloniality terms, hegemonic discourses and their top-down applications produced subalterns or "docile colonial subjects" (Flores, 2013, p. 268) whose meaningful teaching experiences and knowledges of their contexts are silenced. Ms. Ana, Ms. Nadia, and Ms. Zulem were experienced educators, and they referred to their own experiences with DL education as being successful for their students. However, that success they saw in their students was defined in terms of language acquisition of English and Spanish and their academic scores. For them, fidelity to the program model produced this type of ideal success required to develop acceptable and valued identities: culturally assimilated, balanced bilinguals. With Alas' long history of assimilative discourses and its purpose to "educate" Mexican children, fidelity discourses operated as a form of governmentality through which educators self-regulate and regulate others. Fidelity discourses defined what the problem was at Alas: the educators' mentalities. Certain mentalities became naturalized and gave a self-sense of having more power and authority (Bloomaert, 2006). Grinberg and Saavedra (2000) pointed out this process of governmentality to explain how the field of bilingual education slowly aligned to rationalities of language and identities to conform and be accepted as a discipline.

In an interview with Mr. Roland, one of the administrators at Chamizal, I asked him what he looked for when hiring a DL teacher. He said most of all a willingness from the teacher to learn about the model. He gave the example of a recently hired teacher about whom he said,

> She is a bilingually certified teacher but really had not been indoctrinated in what dual language is, and so I just, I knew that she wasn't going to be at the same level as any of my second-grade teachers are. I have her in another grade, but in comparison to second grade I just needed to hear from her that she was open and willing to learn because if they

are not, it doesn't matter what you do, they are not going to, they are not going to follow the model. She's required support, but she is willing to and open to learn and so that is all that we want to ask. (Interview, 12/20/2017)

Mr. Roland argued that if a teacher does not accept the model as it is, she will not be faithful. This teacher was willing to be indoctrinated so that she could join the second-grade teacher, who was regarded highly by Mr. Roland as long-experienced DL educators. In another part of the interview, Mr. Roland illustrated how knowledgeable his teachers were of the DL model. He said kindergarten, first, second and third-grade teachers came to him to argue that because students changed classrooms during science instruction (in English) to maintain the model of one teacher one language they wasted time during transitions, which reduced the time spent in English during Science. Mr. Roland claimed that the argument was based on the fidelity to equal language allocation. He decided to let the teacher go to other classrooms to teach science instead of students transitioning under the condition that they made sure they will only use English at that time.

This new teacher that Mr. Roland hired did not have this type of knowledge and, therefore, fidelity notions, but she was open to learning about the program, which was relevant for Mr. Roland. Indoctrination meant teaching only in Spanish and English as dictated by the model. The notion about knowing the program meant mainly being faithful to language allocation was conveyed in other conversations at Chamizal. For example, during my conversation with Ms. Laura, one of the second-grade teachers, she said

Cuando inicié yo [trabajo en Chamizal], ya tenían muy fuerte su programa dual y una de las cosas que yo noté al principio y que es lo que peleamos cada vez que entra una

maestra nueva y que, como te mencionaba antes, que me ha tocado estar en entrevistas y que digo pregúntele por favor si habla bien español.

When I began [work at Chamizal], the DL model was already very strong and something I noticed, and it was what we fight with, every time a new teacher came, and I like I mentioned to you before, I got the change to be in interviews, and I said 'ask her if she speaks Spanish well.' (Interview, 03/09/2018)

Knowing the program model for Ms. Laura was making sure that the teacher candidates had strong language skills in Spanish, otherwise mixing will occur. During Chamizal's Wednesday professional learning communities, Ms. Ada, the instructional coach, constantly translanguaged when facilitating the meetings. Ms. Laura, when addressing or responding to her, often paraphrased her using only Spanish words.

Ms. Ada, to whose translanguaging Ms. Laura seemed to object, told me during an informal conversation that she was aware of Ms. Laura's dislike of her using English and Spanish and this is was obvious as she came to her to let her know a substitute they had one day was using English and Spanish during Spanish time. (Field note, 09/27/2017)

Indoctrination also seemed to be a form of control of other educators' language practices in the name of following the model correctly.

Chamizal's DL program is older than the one at Alas, and its reputation is well known. Separation of languages in this context was important. For example, during my interview with Mr. Roland, he made me notice how he asked me in what language I preferred having the interview,

In the very beginning, I asked you what language you wanted to speak. I started to do it in Spanish, and then you said, well, in part that you are consistent as teachers. It's a tool

that we have. We want to push and challenge our students so if they don't know the term en español, or in whatever language and you need to assist them, then you assist them, but then we go back to the target language, otherwise what happens is that people start code-switching and then there is no consistency of language. I go back to what I said earlier. We are models for them [students], in this case, language models for them and so, "Hello Mr. Roland," habla en ingles y hable en español and then he goes back, and it's, consistency is important. I always say consistency, consistency, and continuity tend to apply to many things but it's a tool, beneficial, but do we want to teach our kids to do that? And then there is a formal setting and an informal setting. (Interview, 12/20/2017)

Mr. Roland considered switching between languages in code-mixing forms as a marker of informality, and he saw the school as a formal space where teachers needed to model consistency in the use of languages. Consistency in the use of languages is highly improbable, but fidelity discourses not only function as a control mechanism, but they construct measurable success. Administrators and teachers at Chamizal and Alas adopted a manager and controller role to safeguard program model structures against teachers' and students' inconsistencies, which translated into mixing Spanish and English. Pennycook (1989) argued that when there is a strong adherence to a particular method of language teaching, a kind of knowledge is also dominant and follows a coloniality logic of ignoring local knowledge.

Ms. Nadia thought it was important that administrators believed and supported the DL program as well:

Es que para mí un programa dual va a funcionar siempre y cuando toda la, o sea, empezando desde arriba [administración] estén de acuerdo, lo que es, porque no más dicen que sí, pero [las maestras] cerramos la puerta y tampoco no lo llevamos como

tal. Entonces, si no vemos que ha tenido un éxito, pues, es que radica yo creo que desde arriba, que no nos dicen realmente lo que tenemos que hacer o no lo queremos hacer porque es muy difícil.

In my opinion, a DL program will work as long as everybody, starting from high above [administration], agree with because they just say yes, but then we [teachers] close our doors and don't carry the program as it should be. So, if we don't have any success, I think it's because people from high above don't tell us exactly what we have to do, or we don't want to do it because it's too hard. (Interview, 12/04/2017)

Ms. Nadia's considered it important that campus administrators also agreed on the program model and defined this knowledge to transmit it to the teachers. It should somehow be policed as well as many teachers, as she stated, may not be teaching faithfully to the program model behind their closed classroom doors. Another element revealed in Ms. Nadia's discourse is a seemingly passive role as the recipient of DL knowledge given from the top. As Pennycook (1989) stated, several factors lead to a "de-skilling" of teachers, and one of them is the rise of prescriptive models, methods, and curriculum that undermine teachers' critical and evaluative skills. Believing and knowing the program model was supposed to ensure fidelity to the 50/50 model. Believing was the first step. It meant for educators discarding old knowledge and experiences from TBE to adopt a new model that maintains coloniality concepts of language, knowledge, and the passive subject positions. Flores (2014) argues that to ensure teachers control and govern themselves, they need to be socialized "into the appropriate mindset and practices" produced by those with epistemic legitimacy in the bilingual education field (p.4). The emphasis of knowing, being indoctrinated, and faithfully applying a program model excludes the variability of a context leaving out the knowledge and practices of the non-dominant

communities. It also reproduces relations of domination and submission, in which governed subjects. When the rationality of fidelity is accepted at face value, utilizing language and research that enforces mindsets or ideologies that are not questioned or critically analyzed through different lenses, educators become governed subjects, who enter a dynamic of self-regulation and control of others. This is how the coloniality process persists.

The next finding describes DL educators' discourses of fidelity about keeping the languages separate.

FIDELITY REPRODUCES NOTIONS OF "REAL" LANGUAGES

DL educators in my research supported a language-as-resource orientation (Ruíz,1984) to learn another one and as an asset for the global economy. But not all language practices were considered valuable. Ms. Zulem was quick to correct students when they used a word she considered not standard. For example, on one occasion, one of the students used the word chango, which is a colloquial word for mono [monkey] commonly used in El Paso and in Northern Mexico. She reprimanded the student by telling her to use the “correct work”, mono, on his writing task. Ms. Zulem made a clear point about the word chango not fitting into her Spanish standard lexicon idea. Ms. Zulem also paid attention to the English pronunciation of her students, for example, after hearing a student saying the word orange pronouncing the ending sound with a /ch/ sound, she emphatically told her: "It is not oranch, it's orange!" (Field note, 11/09/2017).

Ms. Zulem was also very critical of the Spanish language practices of the teachers at Alas. She said, "it drove her crazy" how her teacher assistant added the s at the end of Spanish verbs (a common feature of Spanish in the border and in varieties of Spanish elsewhere). In one of my visits to Ms. Celene's, Ms. Zulem's kindergarten teaching partner, the assistant and her

were debating regarding the verb's correct conjugation in a sentence. At the same time, the children were busy copying on their journal the sentence projected on the whiteboard. The assistant was walking around, assessing and helping the students. After a few minutes, he asked Ms. Celene saying,

> Teacher assistant: "¿Ya cambiastes?" [refiriéndose al verbo tener]
>
> Teacher assistant: "Did you change it?" [referring to the change of the verb has to have]
>
> Ms. Celene laughs and repeats the assistant's question emphasizing the s sound at the end of the word cambiastes in a joking manner. (Field note, 04/28/2017)

Ms. Zulem and Ms. Celene would imitate him or comment on the teacher assistant's colloquial uses. Ms. Zulem also said she opted against bilingual education for her own now grown-up children because of the "teachers' Spanish" in some schools. Similarly, Ms. Marta, one of the central office's DL administrators, thought the Spanish of some of the teachers her son had when they just moved to El Paso from Mexico, DF, was not one she would have liked for him. She shared with me the story of when she enrolled her child, more than twenty-five years ago in the "bilingual program" in one of the schools of El Paso del Norte school district, but realized later that it had a transitional model and not a 50/50 language allocation,

> Y voy y me doy cuenta que utilizan el español sólo para regañarlos, darles órdenes, pero nunca para instrucciones académicas y sólo les enseñan en inglés, entonces ¿cómo? ¿no me dijeron que era bilingüe?, no, ya me explicaron que su objetivo era que aprendieran el inglés únicamente, pero usaban el español que sabían para enseñarles inglés, entonces, yo les pregunté ¿y luego qué con el español? E ste, no, no, pues, nada más lo usamos para que aprendan inglés, nada más queremos que hagan la transición al inglés y a mí, pues, eso no me sonó nada bien, mi hijo hablaba italiano, español e inglés y ahora sólo

quieren que sepa en inglés, no tenía sentido, entonces, me, me movieron el tapete y dije no, tengo que empezar a participar aquí en esta escuela porque eso no tiene sentido y empecé como voluntaria, bueno, empecé como voluntaria y todo y saqué a mi hijo de ese programa porque no me gustó, este, que sólo los regañaban, les hablaban muy feo, pero, además con un español, o sea, les decían niños, siéntensen en la carpeta (carpeta means folder in standard Spanish and it also means "carpet" in this border region) lo cual Ms. Marta veia como un calco lingüistico sin sentido), y dígale a su papá que me llame pa' atrás porque se portó muy mal y el nivel de inglés de la maestra tampoco era así como dijeras.

And I go and realized that they [teachers] only used Spanish to scold them, give commands, but never for academic instruction and then they just teach English. Then, what? I was told this was a bilingual program? No, then they explained to me that the goal of the program was for them to learn only English, but they used the Spanish they [students] knew to teach them English. Then I asked them, and what with the Spanish? Well, nothing, we just used it to learn English, we just want them to do the transition to English, and that did not sound good to me. My son spoke Italian, Spanish, and English, and now they just want him to know English. It didn't make any sense, so then they made me think, and I decided to participate in the school more. And I started as a volunteer, and I took my son out of that program because they only scolded him, they talked to him in an ugly way, and on besides, their Spanish...they said to him sit on the carpeta [folder in Spanish, which Ms. Marta saw as not making sense in Spanish], tell your father to call me pa atrás [call me back in English, which did not make sense to Ms. Marta, but this is a

legitimate and meaningful phrase in borderland Spanish] because you misbehaved. And the level of English of the teachers was not good either. (Interview, 03/19/2017)

Ms. Marta was well aware of the shortcomings and the ideologies of TBE and wanted her children to continue with their Spanish development. She saw languages as resources and multilingualism as an asset. But she also was conveying deficit perspectives about the Spanish in this border context. Colloquial uses as the ones she mentioned were perceived as an ill-formed or uneducated. Ms. Marta expressed to me that she was proud of the educational opportunities she had throughout her life. She attended a bilingual school in Mexico City, where she said she learned to value English and Spanish equally because the program model was similar to a 50/50 model. She said they did not mix languages when she was in school because they respected and valued them. This respect and value for her meant not mixing languages, which is what, in her mind, speakers of "border Spanish" do. The speakers from Central Mexico are often considered to use the standard or educated form of Spanish (Villarreal, Dolsa, Mortimer, 2017). Respect and value to the languages are common discourses in DL contexts and literature (Swain, 1983). Ms. Marta told me several times she was now used to the language practices of El Paso, but still felt uneasy with mixing English and Spanish and did not think one should speak that way in all contexts. Ms. Marta added that she still had the philosophy teachers need to model standard language practices, and that teachers cannot just speak to students like they are in the “barrio.”.

Another time, during a PD session, Ms. Marta cautioned the educators not to go back and forth between languages , even though they are used to doing that (Field notes, 10/19/2017). DL programs at Alas and Chamizal were rooted in monoglossic standard language ideologies, which idealize and elevate monolingualism in a standardized national language. According to the

DL lead presenter, the "going back and forth" of El Paso did not adhere to the cultural construct of standard language practices, which included not using both languages concurrently (Flores & Rosa, 2015). Mortimer, Dolsa, and Villarreal (2017) argue there are different types of linguistic back and forths in this context. One type is the mixing of languages, which indexes an uneducated bilingual identity, the identity that Mrs. Marta was referring to. The other type is the back and forth between languages in the appropriate manner and context, linked to an educated or "true bilingual" identity.

This is an essential goal of DL education. To be faithful to the program model means to alternate languages in the prescribed and standard ways. Standardization of languages is a prime coloniality project that seeks to construct an idealized modern and educated person. Real languages are the languages that were positioned as superior by colonizers. The superiority and notion of languages as separate objects with an intrinsic value were naturalized, and its legacy continues today in DL programs. Any language practice that did not conform were deemed inferior. Real languages are the standard ways of Spanish and English. Fidelity discourses reproduce these same conceptions of languages as measurable and discrete objects. These discourses also naturalize their hegemony over the language practices of the speakers in this context.

DISCUSSION AND IMPLICATIONS

The goal of this article was to problematize the principle of fidelity in DL education. When I asked teachers about translanguaging fidelity discourses arose. Fidelity to the program model seemed to present paradoxes to the teachers when I asked them about what they knew and thought about translanguaging pedagogy. In my research, the DL educators firmly believed in allocating languages in equal percentages to value both and properly developed them. This

allocation should be reflected throughout the school and during instruction. It was important not to mix or engage in code-switching during the times allocated to a specific language. Even though the Alas and Chamizal language practices also reflected the community's fluid languaging, the DL education program model imposed itself in a historically marginalized and disempowered context. Placing my study within the growing scholarly work that questions the tenets and benefits of DLE for minority children, I examined the ongoing coloniality processes that discourses of fidelity enabled. I argued that fidelity discourses disempower DL educators by reproducing docile subjects through governmentality or mechanisms that impart authorities or experts' ways of thinking. These rationalities spread through discursive processes normalize and regiment educators' conduct, attitudes, language practices, ways of beings, and knowledges. This process has costly implications for educators and students as well. When fidelity as a principle is presented as the essential element to achieving academic success for all groups of students, biliteracy development and social competence and it places high stakes accountability on teachers to attain them, fidelity becomes an instrument of control and regimentation. It restricts the spaces where cultures of inquiry are fostered, as it dichotomized educators into believers and non-believers of DL education and defined what success and equality are for a community. Fidelity discourses continue the coloniality process of epistemic superiority and universality of application by discarding the community's perspectives and knowledges and ignoring the complexities and variety of realities.

Fidelity discourses that emphasized equal language allocation and practices reproduce ideologies of what the real languages are: the standard forms valued in school. In coloniality terms, the colonizers' languages were real languages, and other languages were considered inferior. This idea is reproduced in DL education and has a profound impact in a US-Mexico

border community who has been marginalized and punished for generations for speaking Spanish. It reinforces the links between language practices and identities and shapes DL education as a program to fix emergent bilingual students and their teachers' practices.

The concept of fidelity in the educational field also seems to undermine a fundamental educational goal, which is critical thinking, as Freire (1998) put it, the ability to read the world. Fidelity in DL programs should be analyzed by contexts having in mind its goal of social justice. Social equality and justice will not be achieved by prescribing language program models to be followed by subaltern educators (Kumaradivelu, 2016), but by engaging in reflection to interrogate colonial epistemologies that support only one type of knowledge. López-Gopar (2016) talks about decolonizing teaching practices for indigenous languages and claims that the lower status of minoritized languages will not change in society through language policies and planning only, but by promoting the speakers of these languages. If one type of knowledge and standard language continue to be promoted over the local language practices, the deficit discourses about the identities of the speakers will continue to be reproduced within DL programs.

Murillo (2017) argues that to decolonize pedagogies in the US-Mexican border, bilingual teacher preparation programs need to engage in an analysis of their own marginalization stories and the effect that deficit ideologies of language and their speakers have on the reproduction of linguistic inequalities. She asks, "What happens when local ways of using languages are made the focus of bilingual teacher preparations?" Her findings showed that those pre-service teachers paid more attention to the language practices and the knowledge they have developed in their communities. They increased their abilities to include the funds of knowledge of their community when planning lessons. Their self-confidence and resistance to discourses from both

sides of the border affirmed. As a DL educator myself, I agree that language allocation is an instructional structure that can ensure exposure to both languages but requiring fidelity to it does not allow for discourses of flexibility to attend to the biliteracy continuum (Hornberger, 2004) of the students. As García, Menkel, Velasco, and Vogel (2018) claim, a flexible approach to language allocation supports students' zone of proximal development and legitimizes their language practices (p. 51). Translanguaging pedagogy is a tool for decolonizing knowledge and language teaching. It provides discourses to make connections between interrogating colonial power structures and ideologies to the teaching of languages, program models, and methods (Robinson, 2019).

This article focused on the principle of fidelity in DL education, and its analysis is relevant to understanding how coloniality processes are ongoing and present in DL education. Coloniality and governmentality operate together through discourse, such as the one of fidelity in DLE. The realization and questioning of what fidelity discourses emphasize and what other realities obscure is fundamental to understanding the power of discourses and how to use them as tools for social justice and decolonization of deeply internalized views of ourselves and others. This work starts in teaching preparation programs, where inquiry and formulation of new questions needs to be at the center of teachers' formation. As Robinson (2019) states in her work on exploring translanguaging to prepare language teachers, it is imperative to prepare educators who, "challenge foundational epistemologies, challenge foundational ontologies and challenge foundational methodologies and pedagogies" (p. 49).

References

Anzaldúa, G. (1999). *Borderlands/La frontera*. San Francisco: Aunt Lute Books.

Anzaldua, G. B. (1987). La frontera: The new mestiza. *San Francisco: Spinsters/aunt Lute,*

August, D. E., & Shanahan, T. E. (2006). *Developing literacy in second-language learners: Report of the national literacy panel on language-minority children and youth.* Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers.

Bhabha, H. (1996). The other question: Difference, discrimination, and the discourse of colonialism. *Black British Cultural Studies: A Reader,* 87-106.

Blackeslee, N. (2009/May). Common Language. Sueño de un Idioma Común. *Texas Monthly.* Retrieved from https://www.texasmonthly.com/politics/dream-of-a-common-language-sueno-de-un-idioma-comun/

Buxton, C. A., Allexsaht-Snider, M., Kayumova, S., Aghasaleh, R., Choi, Y., & Cohen, A. (2015). Teacher agency and professional learning: Rethinking fidelity of implementation as multiplicities of enactment. *Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 52*(4), 489-502.

Christian, D. (2016). *Dual Language Education: Current Research Perspectives,*

Collier, V. P., & Thomas, W. P. (2004). The astounding effectiveness of dual language education for all. *NABE Journal of Research and Practice, 2*(1), 1-20.

de Jong, E. J. (2016). Two-way immersion for the next generation: Models, policies, and principles. *International Multilingual Research Journal, 10*(1), 6-16.

de Jong, E. J., & Bearse, C. I. (2014). Dual language programs as a strand within a secondary school: Dilemmas of school organization and the TWI mission. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism, 17*(1), 15-31.

Echevarria, J., Richards-Tutor, C., Chinn, V. P., & Ratleff, P. A. (2011). Did they get it? the role of fidelity in teaching English learners. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy, 54*(6), 425-434.

Echevarria, J., Vogt, M., & Short, D. (2008). Making content comprehensible for English learners: The SIOP model.

Fitts, S. (2006). Reconstructing the status quo: Linguistic interaction in a dual-language school. *Bilingual Research Journal, 30*(2), 337-365.

Fitzsimmons-Doolan, S., Palmer, D., & Henderson, K. (2017). Educator language ideologies and a top-down dual language program. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism, 20*(6), 704-721.

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. (2014). Creating republican machines: Language governmentality in the united states. *Linguistics and Education, 25*, 1-11.

Flores, N., & Rosa, J. (2015). Undoing appropriateness: Raciolinguistic ideologies and language diversity in education. *Harvard Educational Review, 85*(2), 149-171.

Fránquiz, M. E., & Ortiz, A. A. (2018). *Coeditors' Introduction: Ensuring the Success of Dual Language Programs through Alignment of Research, Policy, and Practice,*

Freeman, Y. S., Freeman, D. E., & Mercuri, S. (2005). *Dual language essentials for teachers and administrators* Heinemann Portsmouth, NH.

Freire, P., & Freedom, P. O. (1998). Ethics, democracy, and civic courage. *Maryland: Rowman&Littlefiel.*

Foucault, M. (1978). The history of sexuality: volume I-An introduction. Pantheon Books.

García, O., Menken, K., Velasco, P., & Vogel, S. (2018). Dual language bilingual education in New York city: A potential unfulfilled. *Perspectives on Dual Language Programs.Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matter.*

Gee, J. P. (1999). *An introduction to discourse analysis: Theory and method*. London: Routledge.

Gomez, L., Freeman, D., & Freeman, Y. (2005). Dual language education: A promising 50–50 model. *Bilingual Research Journal, 29*(1), 145-164.

Gresham, F. M., MacMillan, D. L., Beebe-Frankenberger, M. E., & Bocian, K. M. (2000). Treatment integrity in learning disabilities intervention research: Do we really know how treatments are implemented? *Learning Disabilities Research & Practice, 15*(4), 198-205.

Grinberg, J., & Saavedra, E. R. (2000). The constitution of bilingual/ESL education as a disciplinary practice: Genealogical explorations. *Review of Educational Research, 70*(4), 419-441.

Henderson, K. I. (2017). Teacher language ideologies mediating classroom-level language policy in the implementation of dual language bilingual education. *Linguistics and Education, 42*, 21-33.

Henderson, K. I., & Palmer, D. K. (2015). Teacher and student language practices and ideologies in a third-grade two-way dual language program implementation. *International Multilingual Research Journal, 9*(2), 75-92.

Hornberger, N. H. (2004). The continua of biliteracy and the bilingual educator: Educational linguistics in practice. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism, 7*(2-3), 155-171.

Jong, E. d., & Howard, E. (2009). Integration in two-way immersion education: Equalising linguistic benefits for all students. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism, 12*(1), 81-99.

Kumaravadivelu, B. (2016). The decolonial option in English teaching: Can the subaltern act? *TESOL Quarterly, 50*(1), 66-85.

LeCompte, M. D., & Schensul, J. J. (1999). *Designing and conducting ethnographic research* Rowman Altamira.

Li, J., Steele, J., Slater, R., Bacon, M., & Miller, T. (2016). Teaching practices and language use in two-way dual language immersion programs in a large public school district. *International Multilingual Research Journal, 10*(1), 31-43.

Lindholm-Leary, K. J. (2005). Review of research and best practices on effective features of dual language education programs. *Center for Applied Linguistics, 35*, 17-23.

Lindholm-Leary, K., & Genesee, F. (2010). Alternative educational programs for English learners. *Improving Education for English Learners: Research-Based Approaches,* , 323-382.

López-Gopar, M. E. (2016). *Decolonizing primary English language teaching* Multilingual Matters.

Makoni, S., & Pennycook, A. (2005). Disinventing and (re) constituting languages. *Critical Inquiry in Language Studies: An International Journal, 2*(3), 137-156.

Maldonado-Torres, N. (2007). On the coloniality of being: Contributions to the development of a concept. *Cultural Studies, 21*(2-3), 240-270.

Mignolo, W. D., & Walsh, C. E. (2018). *On decoloniality: Concepts, analytics, praxis* Duke University Press.

Miller, P., & Rose, N. (1990). Governing economic life. *Economy and Society, 19*(1), 1-31.

Murillo, L. A. (2017). Aquí no hay pobrecitos: Decolonizing bilingual teacher education in the US-Mexico borderlands. *Diaspora, Indigenous, and Minority Education, 11*(4), 163-176.

Palmer, D. K. (2008). Building and destroying students'‘academic identities’: The power of discourse in a two-way immersion classroom. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education, 21*(6), 647-667.

Palmer, D., Henderson, K., Wall, D., Zúñiga, C. E., & Berthelsen, S. (2016). Team teaching among mixed messages: Implementing two-way dual language bilingual education at third grade in Texas. *Language Policy, 15*(4), 393-413.

Palmer, D., Henderson, K., Wall, D., Zúñiga, C. E., & Berthelsen, S. (2016). Team teaching among mixed messages: Implementing two-way dual language bilingual education at third grade in Texas. *Language Policy, 15*(4), 393-413.

Pennycook, A. (1989). The concept of method, interested knowledge, and the politics of language teaching. *TESOL Quarterly, 23*(4), 589-618.

Quijano, A. (2000). Coloniality of power and eurocentrism in Latin America. *International Sociology, 15*(2), 215-232.

Robinson, E. (2019). To language differently: Drawing on feminist poststructuralism and translanguaging to prepare language teachers. *Translation and Translanguaging in Multilingual Contexts, 5*(1), 49-66.

Ruiz, R. (1984). Orientations in language planning. *NABE Journal, 8*(2), 15-34.

Sayer, P. (2013). Translanguaging, TexMex, and bilingual pedagogy: Emergent bilinguals learning through the vernacular. *TESOL Quarterly, 47*(1), 63-88.

Sayer, P. (2013). Translanguaging, TexMex, and bilingual pedagogy: Emergent bilinguals learning through the vernacular. *TESOL Quarterly, 47*(1), 63-88.

Smith, L. T. (2013). *Decolonizing methodologies: Research and indigenous peoples* Zed Books Ltd.

Texas Administrative Code § 89.120 (c) (3). Chapter 89. Adaptations for Special Populations Subchapter BB. Commissioner's Rules Concerning State Plan for Educating English Learners. Retrieved https://tea.texas.gov/sites/default/files/89bb-two_0718.pdf

Thomas, W. P., & Collier, V. P. (2012). *Dual language education for a transformed world* Dual Language Education of New Mexico/Fuente Press.

Valdés, G. (1997). Dual-language immersion programs: A cautionary note concerning the education of language-minority students. *Harvard Educational Review, 67*(3), 391-430.

Veronelli, G. A. (2015). The coloniality of language: Race, expressivity, power, and the darker side of modernity. *Wagadu: A Journal of Transnational Women's & Gender Studies, 13*

Vila, P. (2000). *Crossing borders, reinforcing borders: Social categories, metaphors, and narrative identities on the US-Mexico frontier* University of Texas Press.

Villarreal, E., Dolsa, G., & Mortimer, K., (2019). El arte del code switch: Identidades transfronterizas emergentes en la educación pública bilingüe en el suroeste de Texas. In Barrera, P., Mendoza, G., & Rivera, I. (Eds.), Algunas aportaciones psicológicas y sociológicas a la educación – Vol. lll (pp. 111-135). Alfagrama.

Whitacre, M. (2015). Attitudinal perspectives: A factor to implementation of a dual language program. *International Journal of Instruction, 8*(1), 35-46.

CHAPTER 5: CONCLUSION

This study contributes to the increasing literature that seeks to advance the social justice goals of DL education by looking at discourses and teaching practices of DL educators. It analyzed how translanguaging theory and pedagogy have the potential to transform DL education to attain equity in the education of emergent bilinguals. As evidenced in my study, however, this potential is being limited by discourses that revealed coloniality ideologies. My analysis showed that the discourses available to DL educators to interpret, give meaning, and use translanguaging as part of their pedagogies came together to define and reappropriate translanguaging with meanings different from those in the research literature. This reappropriation contributed to the reproduction of coloniality ideologies through deficit discourses of languages and identities. These coloniality discourses circulate and constrain the potential of translanguaging pedagogy to a pedagogy of academic scaffolding for the purpose of language acquisition. These discourses defeat the purpose of the theory that seeks to normalize bilingual practices and empower identities, especially those of minorities who have been silenced and excluded throughout history.

The success of DL is generally perceived to be heavily dependent on fidelity to the language allocations of program models. I believe this principle has an important pedagogical purpose and supports the expansion of linguistic repertoires at certain times of the instructional day. However, fidelity in the context of my study was enforced from a stance of privileging standard language practices and identities that conformed with idealized normative whiteness. Fidelity discourses followed a coloniality logic that categorized speakers and naturalized deficit ideologies. Discourses of fidelity to language allocation in DL programs on the US-Mexico border deserve close attention and analysis, because this context has been historically

disempowered and linguistically oppressed. Not questioning fidelity and its ideological underpinnings within a contextualized framework continues the internalization of deficits and subordinated identities of teachers and students.

The fidelity principle seems to co-exist in tension with teachers' understandings of translanguaging. In my study, translanguaging was understood as code-switching practice and pedagogy that scaffolds a transitional period where biliteracy proficiency was not achieved yet. These notions were also tied to discourses of teachers' and students' identities, what "real Mexicans and Mexican Americans" sound like and know about according to the DL educators' ideologies. In this context, fidelity discourses reinforced these ideologies, reappropriating translanguaging as a scaffolding technique and a mixing of languages that is either temporary or used in informal contexts. Among these teacher participants, Ms. Ana showed agency in choosing and developing a translanguaging stance within this context where fidelity discourses were strong. Different elements can make up a translanguaging stance. Ms. Ana's stance on how she viewed her students was a crucial one that drove her interactions and instruction. Ms. Ana's perspective was fertile ground to propel examination of other concepts in the translanguaging stance such as the role of students' communities in the construction of knowledge and the intentional design of translanguaging spaces where teacher and students challenge traditional views of language and identities (García, Ibarra & Seltzer, 2017). As these authors claim, "taking up a translanguaging stance is an act of social justice" (p. 51) that will have an impact beyond the classroom.

This research underscores the importance of developing "ideological clarity" (Bartolomé & Balderrama, 2001) and critical consciousness (Palmer, Cervantes-Soon, Dorner, & Heiman, 2019) to generate new discourses and stances. Teaching is complex, and educators' undoubtedly

good intentions are not discussed here. Intentions are not always aligned with the impact educators have on students. It is necessary to have conversations that continuously interrogate what identities and language practices are being privileged when engaging in decision-making in the classrooms, schools, and districts. I suggest that DL educators consider how different discourses such as fidelity in DL settings align with a coloniality mindset, and we, as educators, internalize this mindset throughout our lives? We can then engage in a translanguaging pedagogy with tactics and strategies to pursue our minds' decolonization and liberate identities.

The first article in this study presented the DL teachers' understandings of translanguaging and its pedagogy. Their discourses revealed beliefs about themselves and their students' identities and language practices based on standard language ideologies that indexed identities that were seen as deficient and incomplete. This work showed how DL educators' ideologies merged into discourses that reappropriate meanings of translanguaging as code-switching as a temporary cognitive resource and scaffolding strategy. These meanings did not disrupt deep-seated deficit views of emergent bilinguals and accommodated translanguaging to dominant ideologies. In the second piece, I introduced Ms. Ana, whose translanguaging stance exhibited what may be needed and the different ideological layers to work on to allow for a deeper understanding of the transformational power of translanguaging as pedagogy. Ms. Ana's agency expressed through her discourses about her students and her instructional practices transformed her emergent bilinguals' subject positions. In the last paper, I problematized the principle of fidelity to language allocation. I argued that these discourses of fidelity reproduced coloniality beliefs and processes.

The realization and questioning of what fidelity discourses emphasize and what other realities obscure is fundamental to understanding the power of discourses and how to use them as

tools for social justice and decolonization of deeply internalized views of ourselves and emergent bilinguals. Translanguaging offers new discourses and presents a new epistemology of languages and identities to break with the logic of coloniality. Developing a translanguaging stance is a transformative journey that demands introspective work from DL educators. Ms. Ana shared part of that reflection of her own experiences as a language learner, and her beliefs about her students' richness brought to her classrooms. She questioned the principle of fidelity and defied the ways other DL educators positioned her and her students.

As translanguaging is increasingly part of professional development and teacher preparation topics, this study's findings underscore the relevance of forming pre-service teachers within a culture of inquiry and ideological exploration. Kumaradivelu (2016) argues that teacher education programs need to reform to create spaces where teachers become "producers and not consumers of pedagogical knowledge and materials" (p. 81). One way to do this is through educators' collaborative analysis and application of concepts from the field in professional learning communities and professional development sessions. This collaboration can reframe the meanings of fidelity and adherence to program models to forefront DL educators' agency in their understandings and enactments of pedagogies (Buxton, Allexsaht-Snider, Kayumova, Aghasaleh, Choi, and Cohen, 2015).

The goal of social justice in DL education needs to become central and unpacked to understand how it looks in each program. Instead of a narrow focus on fidelity on language allocation, an emphasis on DL educators' stances will serve emergent bilinguals more justly. The goal of social justice in DL education requires more than good intentions to repair years of marginalization. It demands more than closing academic gaps by attending to emergent bilinguals' perceived linguistic and cultural deficits. Social justice demands active engagement to

challenge power dynamics and hegemonic discourses that keep the power of coloniality in place. Translanguaging is a decolonizing tool, but without awareness of our beliefs and the processes of internalization, translanguaging winds up drowned in discourses that reappropriate its premises. It is not about replacing one epistemology with another, it is about DL education being a space where different languaging and ways of being cohabitate without oppression.

This study brings to the forefront the need to support DL educators in developing a translanguaging stance in order to shift discourses and practices to be more in alignment with DL social justice purposes. We can shift discourses and practices by designing courses that promote preservice teachers' introspection and reflection on their own bilingual trajectories and working with pedagogies of discomfort (Sharma & Lazar, 2014) to analyze biases and deficit views. We can work with in service teachers through mentoring programs that have as their foundation equity for all students. These programs can be designed to promote autonomy and critical thinking through the use of tools that encourage analytical processes of planning for emergent bilinguals.

We can work with DL administrators to help support professional development sessions that make educators aware of the dynamics of power and authority within those spaces so that educators understand how questions are formulated and what new ones can be posed to the topic discussed. As DL scholars we can develop ways of collaboration that center the views and experiences of Latinx educators to research questions relevant to their practices and ideologies. It is necessary to have conversations that continuously interrogate what identities and language practices are being privileged when engaging in decision-making in the classrooms, schools, and districts. How do different discourses in DL settings such as fidelity align with a coloniality mindset, and how do we, as educators, internalize this mindset throughout our lives? We can

then engage in a translanguaging pedagogy with its tactics and strategies to pursue our minds' decolonization to liberate identities.

References

Bartolomé, L. I., & Balderrama, M. V. (2001). The need for educators with political and ideological clarity: Providing our children with "the best.". *The best for our children: Critical perspectives on literacy for Latino students*, 48-64.

Buxton, C. A., Allexsaht-Snider, M., Kayumova, S., Aghasaleh, R., Choi, Y. J., & Cohen, A. (2015). Teacher agency and professional learning: Rethinking fidelity of implementation as multiplicities of enactment. *Journal of Research in Science Teaching*, *52*(4), 489-502.

García, O., Johnson, S. I., & Seltzer, K. (2017). *The translanguaging classroom: Leveraging student bilingualism for learning*. Philadelphia, PA: Caslon.

Kumaravadivelu, B. (2016). The decolonial option in English teaching: Can the subaltern act? *TESOL quarterly*, *50*(1), 66-85.

Palmer, D. K., Cervantes-Soon, C., Dorner, L., & Heiman, D. (2019). Bilingualism, biliteracy, biculturalism, and critical consciousness for all: Proposing a fourth fundamental goal for two-way dual language education. *Theory into Practice*, *58*(2), 121-133.

Sharma, S., & Lazar, A. (2014). Pedagogies of discomfort: Shifting preservice teachers' deficit orientations toward language and literacy resources of emergent bilingual students. In *Research on preparing preservice teachers to work effectively with emergent bilinguals*. Emerald Group Publishing Limited.

VITA

Gabriela María José Dolsa Barreto earned her Bachelor's degree in English Language from Universidad Nacional de Asunción, Paraguay, in 2005. In 2005, she received her Master's in Science with an emphasis in English of Speakers of Other Languages (ESOL) from Pittsburg State University in Kansas. In 2011, she received her Master in Elementary Education from Grand Canyon University in Arizona. She worked as an elementary teacher for five years before joining the doctoral program in Teaching, Learning, and Culture at the University of Texas at El Paso in 2013. While pursuing her degree, Ms. Dolsa worked as a research and teaching assistant at the University. She was awarded the Frank B. Cotton scholarship and the Dodson Research Grant. In 2020, she was rewarded with a scholarship to participate in the course: Strategies for Effective Facilitation at Harvard University. From 2019-2020, Ms. Dolsa worked as an instructional coach in Literacy/Biliteracy in an El Paso ISD elementary school. She currently works for the New Teacher Center and UTEP partnership as a Lead Coach.

Ms. Dolsa has presented at several national academic conferences, including the American Anthropological Association (AAA), The American Educational Research Association (AERA), the National Association for Bilingual Education, La Cosecha Conference, and Ethnography in Education Research Forum at the University of Pennsylvania. She has co-authored publications in the *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism* and in an edited volume entitled, *Algunas Aportaciones Psicológicas y Sociológicas a la Educación,* as well as a book review of *Decolonizing Primary English Language Teaching*.

Contact Information: gabydolsa@gmail.com