

10-28-2022

Critical Translingual Perspectives on California Multilingual Education Policy

Eduardo R. Muñoz-Muñoz
San Jose State University, eduardo.munoz-munoz@sjsu.edu

Luis E. Poza
San Jose State University, luis.poza@sjsu.edu

Allison Briceño
San Jose State University, allison.briceno@sjsu.edu

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarworks.sjsu.edu/faculty_rsca

Recommended Citation

Eduardo R. Muñoz-Muñoz, Luis E. Poza, and Allison Briceño. "Critical Translingual Perspectives on California Multilingual Education Policy" *Educational Policy* (2022). <https://doi.org/10.1177/08959048221130342>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by SJSU ScholarWorks. It has been accepted for inclusion in Faculty Research, Scholarly, and Creative Activity by an authorized administrator of SJSU ScholarWorks. For more information, please contact scholarworks@sjsu.edu.

Critical Translingual Perspectives on California Multilingual Education Policy

Eduardo Muñoz-Muñoz, Luis Poza, Allison Briceño

ABSTRACT

Policies restricting bilingual education have yielded to policy frameworks touting its benefits. This shift corresponds with evolving lines of debate, focusing now on *how* bilingual education can best support racialized bilingual learners (Cervantes-Soon, et al., 2017). One element of this new debate is the perspective on language underlying curriculum in bilingual programs, with a focus on translanguaging—normalization of the language practices of bilingual communities and positing that bilinguals draw from a singular linguistic repertoire (García, 2017; García, Johnson, & Seltzer, 2017; Leung & Valdés, 2019). This article examines initiatives undertaken in California between 2010 and 2019 using Critical Policy Analysis (Apple, 2019; Taylor, 1997). The work highlights that while opportunities for translanguaging have arisen, tensions between heteroglossic perspectives and the impulses toward standardization and commodification of language undermine such possibilities, and that notable gaps remain between teacher preparation frameworks and intended pedagogical practice.

Critical Translingual Perspectives on California Multilingual Education Policy

The turn of the 21st Century in the U.S. witnessed waves of state and federal policies constricting bilingual education for students classified as English Learners (EL). In 1998, California voters approved Proposition 227, advanced largely by billionaire Ron Unz, which mandated that EL-classified students receive all instruction in English except when families had completed onerous waiver requirements. Similar initiatives were pushed through in Arizona (Proposition 203) and Massachusetts (Question 2) in 2000 and 2002, respectively, and another Unz-backed measure was narrowly defeated in Colorado in 2003. Besides these outright bans, the widespread mandates for standardized testing carried out mostly in English (and *of* English, for EL-classified students) under No Child Left Behind (2001) further pressured schools to abandon or truncate their bilingual programming. The combined effect of these state and federal policies was to cut the number of emergent bilingual learners receiving home language instruction by more than half (Alamillo et al., 2005; Crawford, 2007; Gándara, et al., 2000; Menken, 2009; Menken & Solorza, 2014).

With ample scholarship demonstrating the harms of these constrictions (Darling-Hammond, 2007; Matas & Rodríguez, 2014; Ulanoff, 2014), policies restricting bilingual education have yielded to proliferating frameworks touting its benefits. Nevertheless, allowances for and promotion of bilingualism and bilingual education have not necessarily been linked to the civil rights concerns that racially and linguistically minoritized populations brought to the fore in their initial advocacy for such programs by failing to address broader issues of racialization and marginalization in political and materialist dimensions (Flores, 2016) or the ideological predominance of English (Rubio, 2020). This policy shift corresponds with evolving lines of

debate moving past *whether* bilingual education is helpful and rather focusing on *how* bilingual education can best support racialized bilingual learners (Cervantes-Soon, et al., 2017).

One element of this new debate is the perspective on language underlying curriculum in bilingual programs (Leung & Valdés, 2019). Notable scholarship now advances translanguaging approaches, which we describe further in our theoretical framework, consisting of the normalization of the language practices of bilingual communities and positing that bilinguals draw from a singular linguistic repertoire rather than distinct cognitive repertoires for each of their languages (García, Johnson, & Seltzer, 2017; García & Li, 2014). In this work, we examine four recent measures advanced in California as part of its reversal of previous suppression of bilingual education. We rely on a Critical Policy Analysis framework (Apple, 2019; Taylor, 1997) and incorporate perspectives in applied linguistics that center the communicative practices of multilinguals (particularly those from minoritized backgrounds) as part of a social justice agenda to overturn colonialist norms of race, nationhood, and language (e.g., García & Li, 2014; May, 2013). Specifically, we ask, *how do California's Proposition 58, EL Roadmap, California 2030, and 2016 Teacher Performance Expectations (TPE) provide affordances for or constraints upon translanguaging approaches in schools?* Given that translanguaging perspectives eschew top-down approaches to language planning and curricularization, we acknowledge the tensions in this inquiry. Thus, as our methods section further details, we focus on affordances for translanguaging approaches such as references to elevation of students' familiar linguistic and cultural assets and connections to language as it is used in students' communities which we conceptualize as preconditions and implicit tenets of a translanguaging lens rather than explicit promotion of translanguaging.

Our goal is to elucidate opportunities for educational equity amid the revival of bilingual education, while noting risks based on current and historical patterns in the education of multilingual learners. Moreover, we approach this work from the position of teacher educators preparing future bilingual teachers who themselves were denied access to bilingual education, and who will be on the front lines of policy interpretation and implementation in their classrooms (Menken & García, 2010). We are therefore particularly mindful of the persistent disconnect between student-aimed policies and teacher preparation and have elected to analyze specific language-in-education policies (Prop 58, EL Roadmap), an overarching policy framework (California 2030), and corresponding teacher preparation standards (California TPE) to examine their individual translanguaging affordances as well as their tensions or complementarity.

This work unfolds in four parts. First, our theoretical framework and literature review interweave translanguaging perspectives with Language Policy and Planning (LPP) to note how educational language policy shapes schooling experiences for linguistically minoritized groups. Next, we situate our inquiry within Critical Policy Analysis to explain how our focal policies correspond to historical and contemporary conditions regarding affordances for translanguaging and equity for multilingual learners. Then, we examine four relevant policies: 1) California's Prop 58, which overturned Prop 227's ban on bilingual education, 2) the English Learner Roadmap (CDE, 2017), which articulates systemic and instructional commitments to support multilingual learners, 3) the Global California 2030 initiative (CDE, 2018) that provides an overarching vision and framework for multilingual education in the state, and 4) Teacher Performance Expectations ([TPEs] CTC, 2016) that guide teacher preparation. Lastly, we discuss how these legislative victories for bilingual learners and bilingual education, taken together, can foster translanguaging practices in classrooms and what risks educators must avoid to do so. We

begin, however, with a succinct overview of bilingual education policy in California during the last quarter century to help contextualize our analysis.

California's Bilingual Education Policy Context

Even prior to its incorporation into the United States in 1850, the territory now known as California has been a linguistically and culturally diverse expanse. As with other states in the union, support for languages other than English has undulated over time. For brevity, we focus here on the most recent restrictions on bilingual education in the state and their reversal, and refer interested readers to more comprehensive examinations of the broader history of bilingual education and bilingual education policy in the United States elsewhere (Del Valle, 2003; García, 2009; Kibbee, 2016; Wiley, 2014).

The 1990's in California witnessed rising nativist sentiment, and bilingual education became entwined with anti-immigrant rhetoric and campaigns. Proposition 227 was passed by voters in 1998, merely four years after the state's voters favored a ballot initiative excluding undocumented immigrants from public benefits including education (that initiative, Prop 187 of 1994, was struck down as unconstitutional and never took effect). Dubbed "English Language Education for Immigrant Children," the law proposed under Prop 227 ignored that many EL-classified students were in fact US-born and that over two-thirds of them were in English-only programs already (Matas & Rodríguez, 2014), nevertheless charging that California schools were, "wasting financial resources on costly experimental language programs whose failure over the past two decades is demonstrated by the current high drop-out rates and low English literacy levels of many immigrant children," (CA Secretary of State, nd). The law severely curtailed bilingual education by requiring that all EL-classified students be placed in sheltered English immersion programs for a transitional one year period before entering mainstream English-only

instruction. Bilingual education was prohibited unless a critical mass of parents at any given school submitted annual signed waivers. Scholarship examining the effects of Prop 227 identified a substantial decrease in the proportion of the state's EL-classified students receiving bilingual instruction as mostly only the schools with strong, entrenched bilingual programs adopting the waiver process (Gándara, et al., 2000; García & Curry-Rodríguez, 2000), no gains in student achievement (Matas & Rodríguez, 2014), and lesser preparation of teachers to serve bilingual learners in the state (Ulanoff, 2014).

This state-level restriction was aggravated by federal mandates for standardized testing under the No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB) of 2001. New school accountability measures relied on high-stakes standardized tests to assess student progress generally as well as the specific growth of EL-classified students towards attaining English proficiency. Given that this standardized testing was in English, the law resulted in further reductions in bilingual programming (Crawford, 2007; Menken, 2009; Menken & Solorza, 2014), with scholarship noting constriction on the curricular experiences of bilingual students (Darling-Hammond, 2007; Menken, 2009). Although reauthorization of the No Child Left Behind Act in 2015 as the Every Student Succeeds Act addressed some of the most egregious issues with NCLB such as requiring uniform policies within states for identifying English Learners and reclassifying them as English proficient, it left in place the mechanism of high stakes testing.

As the above cited works attest, mounting evidence pointed to the drawbacks of these policies on students' educational experiences and attainment. Coupled with a growing interest nationwide in bilingualism and bilingual education even among English-dominant, affluent families (Delavan, et al., 2021; Flores, 2016), the stage was set for California to repeal its ban on bilingual education. In 2016, voters approved Proposition 58, also known as the California

Education for a Global Economy Initiative (CA Ed.G.E), which overturned Prop 227. As we discuss further in our analysis, early scholarship on Prop 58 has not identified effects in terms of the number of bilingual programs or student outcomes, but has noted that the framing of bilingual education has evolved from one of civil rights and cultural responsiveness to a more generalist and utilitarian focus on the economic, national security, and diplomacy benefits of multilingualism (Katznelson & Bernstein, 2017; Kelly, 2018).

Theoretical Framework

Our twofold theoretical framework encompasses how California's policy changes enable (or suppress) translingual pedagogies. We draw from LPP scholarship, which explores how state action shapes which linguistic practices are used and valued in a society. We also draw from the burgeoning literature on translanguaging to identify specific theoretical and practical dimensions that bear on the possible outcomes of policy implementation in California.

Translanguaging and Translingual Pedagogies

Translanguaging as a theory of language offers that a bi/multilingual language user's communicative features and practices correspond to a singular repertoire from which they draw strategically for meaning-making rather than distinct linguistic systems (García, 2009; 2017). In other words, translanguaging normalizes the practices of bi/multilinguals, such as mixing features from across political languages ("Spanish," "English," "French," etc.) and across registers, rather than the monolingual paradigms and adherence to standardized forms of language that predominate in educational language policy. Applied linguists advancing translanguaging frameworks thus argue that current frameworks imposing expectations for "native-like" performance of standardized form of language through mechanisms such as testing

and scripted curriculum, including requirements for strict language separation in bilingual programs, reify social hierarchies rooted in colonialism and nation-state governmentality (Flores, 2013). Instead, advocates of translanguaging approaches propose educational language policies that place the rights and dignity of language users at the forefront and language itself as a subsequent consideration (Poza, 2021). They seek policies that make space for community-engaged pedagogy that affirms students' and their families' communicative practices and expressly challenges the power relations embedded in linguistic interaction (García, 2017; Poza, García, & Jiménez-Castellanos, 2021).

The translingual project is conceived in this paper as a triadic framework: translanguaging as a humanizing activity (i.e., centered on speakers/students, see García-Mateus & Palmer, 2017; Li, 2018), translanguaging as fluidity (i.e., integrative meaning-making practices, see Hua, Li, & Lyons, 2017; Pennycook, 2017), and translanguaging as liberatory (i.e., counter-hegemonic, anti-oppressive work, see García & Leiva, 2014; Prada & Nikula, 2018). The underlying assumption is that these constitutive tenets are mutually dependent, complementary, in the conception and enactment of a translingual/heteroglossic policy. Therefore, distance from these principles in the policy streams analyzed can be construed as indicative of the degree of receptiveness of the translingual project.

Language Policy and Planning (LPP)

LPP considers the ideological and functional aspects by which specific languaging features and practices (and, concurrently, the people who use them) are elevated or oppressed within a society (Tollefson, 1991). Beyond legislation, governments also rely on policy mechanisms such as standardized testing to engineer particular linguistic outcomes (Shohamy, 2006). Although language planning is by definition never neutral, it is not inherently negative

and can, in fact, serve to revitalize and affirm minority languages within a society (Hornberger, 1998). In the US, however, scholars have noted both the direct policy efforts to suppress languages other than English (Crawford, 2000; del Valle, 2003; Faltis, 1997; Gándara et al. 2010; Wiley, 2014; Wiley & García, 2016; Wiley & Lukes, 1996) as well as how standardized testing in English undermines bilingual education (Menken, 2009; Menken & Solorza, 2014; Poza & Shannon, 2020).

Nonetheless, scholars of LPP observe that top-down language policy efforts do not always achieve their stated goals. Layers of interpretation and implementation leave room for deviation or outright defiance given the interstitial spaces between legislative and regulatory enactment and practical execution (Ricento & Hornberger, 1996). Classrooms especially create spaces for agency and local language policy negotiation as students, teachers, and families engage their diverse communicative practices, sometimes even creating the social conditions for bottom-up policy influence (García & Wiley, 2016; Hornberger & Johnson, 2007; García & Menken, 2010; Ricento & Hornberger, 1996). While this work centers analysis of the top-down policy efforts in California to foment multilingualism, we consider in our conclusion how translingual practices may indeed correspond more aptly to this local and bottom-up dimension.

Translanguaging and Educational Policy

As described above, translanguaging scholarship builds on sociolinguistic and anthropological research positioning language as a social practice governed by local norms of interaction. Translanguaging critiques structural approaches to language as remnants of colonialism that reinforce the marginalization of linguistically and racially minoritized groups (García, 2009; García & Li, 2014; Mignolo, 1996) and specifically counters the kinds of social control efforts constituted by many language planning regimes that promote monolingualism or

adherence to standardized forms of language. In this manner, translanguaging positions itself as “part of a moral and political act that links the production of alternative meanings to transformative social action” (García & Li, 2014, p. 37).

Applied to LPP, translanguaging perspectives reject monolingual impulses of US policy, calling instead for school organization and curriculum that affirms and sustains community linguistic practices within multilingual ecologies (Hornberger, 2003; Kramsch & Whiteside, 2008). Prior work applying translingual lenses to educational policy has considered the Common Core State Standards (CCSS) (Flores & Schissel, 2014; Rymes, et al., 2016) as well as relevant guidance documents (Poza, 2016) to critique monolingual orientations and highlight opportunities for translingual practice within them. Unlike the CCSS, however, California’s recent policy changes are specifically aimed at supporting multilingual development, and the expectation might be that translanguaging would enjoy more official support. This is precisely the issue we examine.

Methods

Critical Policy Analysis

Critical Policy Analysis (CPA) empirically investigates how global political and economic forces interact with domestic policy to shape educational practice (Rata, 2014; Taylor, 1997). Notably, the method elucidates tensions between global capitalist patterns of exploitation, austerity, and privatization alongside aspirations for education as an engine of social mobility and positive social change (Apple, 2019; Rata, 2014). Pioneers in CPA (e.g., Apple, 1982; Ball, 1991) criticized assumptions that policy and policy research were objective, rational processes conducted with complete information. Instead, they highlighted the role of power and ideology

in policymaking and called attention to the disparate impacts of certain policies on minoritized groups (Diem, Young, & Sampson, 2019).

Examining our selected California policies through a CPA lens required iterative coding and analysis. Based on major distinctions raised in prior research between allowing or restricting bilingual education and our research questions, we began with structural codes (Saldaña, 2009) capturing specific text segments within the policy documents that encouraged or constrained bilingual approaches, particularly translanguaging, as well as conspicuous “silences” that reified an unjust status quo (Foucault, 1990). We followed with elaborative coding (Saldaña, 2009) for construct refinement by applying themes identified in existing research that examines policy through a translingual focus (e.g., Poza, 2016) and possible interpretations in light of concurrent and historical discourses in official guidance documents, policy white papers, practitioner conference programs, and district action plans (the “policy stream”). This latter stage foregrounded the importance of intertextuality, referring to the need to analyze individual discursive acts (such as policy documents) not in isolation but with consideration of their histories and the broader discursive environments in which the texts were produced and are consumed (Fairclough, 1989). Developed by Kristeva (1986) and rooted in Bakhtin’s dialogism, intertextuality as an analytical concept elucidates how texts partake in co-constructed discourse lineages by in the process of cross-referencing themselves and each other (Johnstone, 2017; Tannen et al., 2015). Thus, our elaborative codes focused on whether references to bilingualism were monoglossic (rooted in notions of standardized language and separate linguistic repertoires for bilinguals) or heteroglossic (attuned to translingual perspectives of language and language development) (García, 2009), and whether bilingualism and bilingual education were positioned

merely as human capital enhancement or pursuant to an anti-racist civil rights agenda (Flores, 2016). Our codes are summarized in Table 1 below.

Table 1 - Codes and Examples

Structured Codes	
Code	Example
Encouraging bilingual approaches	“Bilingualism provides benefits from the capacity to communicate in more than one language and may enhance cognitive skills, as well as improve academic outcomes.” (EL Roadmap, p. 3)
Allowing bilingual approaches	“All parents will have a choice and voice to demand the best education programs for their children, including access to language programs” (SB 1174, p. 5)
Constraining bilingual approaches	“...literacy in the English language is among the most important of these [skills]” (SB 1174, p. 5)
Conspicuous silence	“California’s K-12 education system has made great strides in teaching world languages to students, providing more opportunities for fluency and the benefits fluency brings.” (Global California, p. 4) - Silent regarding status distinction between learning a “world language” (though Spanish pre-dates English in CA) and learning English; silent regarding criteria for fluency that may devalue community language practices deemed non-standard.
Elaborated Codes	
Code	Example
Heteroglossic affordances	“Many English learners represent the newest members of our society (including recently arrived immigrants and children of immigrants) who bring a rich diversity of cultural backgrounds and come from families with rich social and linguistic experiences. They also bring skills in their primary languages that contribute enormously to the state’s economic and social strengths as a talented multilingual and multicultural population.” (EL Roadmap, p. 1)
Monoglossic orientations	“California has the unique opportunity to provide all parents with the choice to have their children educated to high standards in English and one or more additional languages...”(SB 1174, p. 4)

Civil rights orientation to bilingualism	“Providing more equitable funding and local control, allowing communities to determine how to best meet the educational needs of the students they serve.” (Global California 2030, p. 5)
Human capital orientation	“California employers across all sectors, public and private, are actively recruiting multilingual employees...” (SB 1174, p. 4)

Policy Selection and Review

We selected our four focal policies on the basis of their direct relation to pedagogical practice and its ideological context. Taken as an analytic whole, the stream of these policies and their tributaries of guidance, regulation, and scholarship chart a specific vision for educating linguistically minoritized youth. By overturning Prop 227, Prop 58 marked a crucial turning point in the state’s educational vision. The EL Roadmap, by its specific mention of asset-orientations to the linguistic resources that students classified as EL bring to their learning and its ambitious scope of cohesive, meaningful learning experiences, adds potential for translingual perspectives that affirm community multilingualism. Similarly, California 2030, a comprehensive vision for increasing multilingual instruction in the state, invokes asset-orientations regarding emergent bilinguals. Lastly, the revised TPE’s could connect the lofty goals of the first three policies to specific knowledge and skills that teacher candidates must be able to implement. That is, policies that favor bilingual approaches are meaningless if teachers are not expected to learn linguistically responsive and culturally sustaining pedagogies (CSP) to enact them.

Our analysis excludes California’s Seal of Biliteracy, recognition of the state’s high school graduates deemed proficient in English and one other language, even though this too is an important element in reviving bilingual education in the state. We exclude it in consideration of space limitations, recognition that excellent scholarship has already examined the policy’s

benefits vis-a-vis raising the status of bilingual education and drawbacks in terms of undermining the civil rights concerns of racialized bilinguals in favor of human capital development arguments that perpetuate hierarchies among language varieties and the racialization of certain bilingual communities (Subtirelu et al., 2019; Valdés, 2020).

Translanguaging in Selected California Policies

Proposition 58

Proposition 58, introduced as EdGE (Education for the Global Economy) and renamed LEARN (Language education, Acquisition, and Readiness Now), overturned the English-only mandates of Proposition 227. With a 73.5% passage support, it facilitated bilingual education by lifting stringent requirements with regards to parent requests. Proposition 58 incarnated Senate Bill 1174 (Lara, 2014) and seemed to crystallize a policy trend heralded by the groundbreaking 2011 Seal of Biliteracy (Brownley, 2011). While celebrated, however, the b-word was not coming back *por la puerta grande* (not through "the main gates") but notably silenced in the proposition and replaced by "multilingualism", as the apparently resounding passage of the proposition masked conflicting attitudes towards cultural diversity among the California electorate. Katznelson and Bernstein (2017) highlight that 1 million Trump voters also supported proposition 58, complicating any inference of mandate emerging from the ballot box.

The superficial reading of alleged changes in linguistic sensitivities in California combined with causal arguments based on demographic shifts are also to be dimmed in light of the critical analysis of the text itself. Based on survey studies preceding the November 2016 election, Citrin, Levy, and Wong (2017) argue that the title and framing of the initiative (starting with the words "English proficiency") may have triggered approval among conservative voters

who otherwise, when informed about the repeal of proposition 227, would have voted against it. Aware of the prospects of certain opposition and armed with the handbook of the political realist, it seems plausible that the developers of the proposition embraced a pragmatist approach capitalizing on language-as-a-resource policy orientation (Ruiz, 1984).

With an emphasis on commodified language in a globalized era, the extant literature has consistently highlighted the neoliberal ideological substratum in the policy. In their analysis of neoliberal governmentality, Martín Rojo and Del Percio (2019) focus on the linguistic implications derived from the current regimes of power and control that characterize late-capitalism, and how they influence the ontology and epistemology of speakers and language. Petrovic, for instance, notes that “The resource orientation appeals to neoliberal economic forces to promote cultural pluralism and prop up language diversity... to undermine the civil rights gains of the 1960s and 1970s” (2005, p. 400) in reference to the alignment of bilingual education advocacy with commodifying capitalist discourses that may allow languages other than English but do not inherently resist privatization and defunding of public programs like education. Similarly, Flores (2019) states, “at the core of the neoliberal governmentality are heteroglossic language ideologies that develop conceptualizations of language that take bi/multilingualism as the norm” (p. 57). Thus, our concern in critically analyzing the policy focused on identifying such “heteroglossic seeds,” ascertaining the degree to which Prop 58 may be fertile for translingual approaches or, rather, partake in the neoliberal governmentality logic that alternatives are not possible. Beyond the resounding silences around equity for linguistically minoritized populations and the recognition of the long road of bilingual and civil rights struggles in the state, the linguistic notions and the linguistic imagery embedded in proposition

58 are anchored in distinct but interrelated pillars of monoglossic ideology, namely English centrality, native-speaker ideology, and language objectification.

The bill emphasizes nation-state discourses and reasserts English primacy. The preamble defines an ideological package inherited from proposition 227 reinforcing monoglossic English-as-the-norm, “Whereas the English language is the national public language of the United States of America and the state of California” (Section 2[a]), with old meritocratic ideological lore, “Whereas all parents are eager to have their children master the English language and obtain a high-quality education, thereby preparing them to fully participate in the American dream of economic and social advancement” (Section 2 [b]). Echoing Duchêne and Heller's "pride" and "profit" (2012), it is worth noting how the nationalistic strain of the policy is undergirded by the electoral siren's song of California's linguistic and economic exceptionalism.

By partitioning the body of students binarily as either “English learners” or “native speakers of English” (305. (a)(1), and 306 (a) and (b)p. 95), Prop 58 reinforces the schema of the mythical native speaker (Bonfiglio, 2013), proficient by virtue of being born into the named language. Moreover, monoglossic ideological strands coordinate by reserving “nativeness” for English speakers, further reinforcing English centrality. In a noteworthy metalinguistic turn in the legislative text, “native speakers” are defined in the bill as those who “learned and used English in their homes from early childhood with English as their primary means of concept formation and communication” (pp. 6-7). From this metalanguage, the connection between the construct of a named language and the assumed determinism over early cognitive processes stands out. Such a conceptual turn in a legislative text may strike the reader as rhetorical and reinforces the ideological current of biologization that undergirds the native-speaker concept (Bonfiglio, 2013).

The text's emphasis on economic advancement and California's global role depends on the exploitation of commodified linguistic resources (Heller, 2010) and instrumental multilingualism (Bernstein, et al., 2015). The proposition's metaphorical language reveals an inconspicuous objectification of language intermingled with its stated purposes: "California has a natural reserve of the world's largest languages, including English, Mandarin, and Spanish, which are critical to the state's economic trade and diplomatic efforts." (2.f., p.94). As it will be later discussed, such reification contributes to monoglossic language ontologies by increasing the discreteness of named languages and the perceived boundaries among them.

Certainly, the decisive breakthrough in proposition 58 is the overturn of the suffocating pre-existing framework. The question has already been raised by researchers and theorists (see Flubacher & Del Percio, 2017; Rojo & Del Percio, 2019) that have decried the neoliberal emphasis on linguistic resource extraction: At what cost and for whom? Can the downplay of critical racial and linguistic concerns serve a higher policy purpose? This cannot fully be adjudicated on the basis of proposition 58 alone, but in scrutinizing the discursive stream that emanated from prop 58. In other words, historical distance will tell if the policy has served as a muted contestation of proposition 227, or a strategic long-range move to lift the restrictions on the growth of a bilingual critical mass. Thus, the next sections attempt to delineate critically the policy trajectory specifically with regards to the translingual project that concerns us.

EL Roadmap

The stated goal of California's English Learner Roadmap (the "Roadmap") is to provide direction to Local Education Agencies (LEAs) in "welcoming, understanding, and educating the diverse population of students who are English learners" (EL Roadmap, 2017, p. 1). It consists of four principles: (1) Assets-oriented and needs-responsive schools; (2) intellectual quality of

instruction and meaningful access; (3) system conditions that support effectiveness; and (4) alignment and articulation within and across systems. Within each principle, various "elements" further clarify the intent.

Like Proposition 58, the EL Roadmap holds a strongly neoliberal perspective, albeit softened by language of inclusion. For example, the policy's introduction addresses ELs' contribution "to the state's economic and social strengths." The mission statement claims, "California schools prepare graduates with the linguistic, academic, and social skills and competencies they require for college, career, and civic participation in a global, diverse, and multilingual world, thus ensuring a thriving future for California." The purpose of education, according to the Roadmap, is for the economic success of the state and students' college and career readiness. In fact, the policy's eight uses of variants of the term "college and career readiness" suggest the purpose of educating ELs is statewide financial gains rather than the benefits ELs might receive from education. While education can provide the potential benefit of upward mobility for linguistically minoritized students (Callahan & Gándara, 2014), EL students' right to an appropriate education (*Ella T. v. State of California* settlement, 2020; *Lau v. Nichols*, 1974) is understated in the policy.

The EL Roadmap's mission statement explains that schools should "affirm, welcome and respond to a diverse range of EL strengths, needs and identities." While the terms "diverse" and "diversity" together are used 12 times in the policy, when "diverse" is defined in the policy, it is only as EL classification constructs (e.g., "newcomers, long-term English learners, students with interrupted formal education," among others). However, the Roadmap's acknowledgement of the significant diversity within the EL population and the resulting variety of educational practices

that might therefore be required is a strength compared to prior policies that take a monolithic view of ELs. Principle 1 Element B states:

Recognizing that there is no universal EL profile and no one-size-fits-all approach that works for all English learners, programs, curriculum, and instruction must be responsive to different EL student characteristics and experiences. EL students entering school at the beginning levels of English proficiency have different needs and capacities than do students entering at intermediate or advanced levels. Similarly, students entering in kindergarten have different needs than students entering in later grades. The needs of long term English learners are vastly different from recently arrived students (who in turn vary in their prior formal education). Districts vary considerably in the distribution of these EL profiles, so no single program or instructional approach works for all EL students.

This statement leaves instruction open to a variety of approaches, including Translanguaging, for educators who are seeking to implement it. In contrast, the Roadmap positions language as a set of skills ("they also bring skills in their primary language"); its perspective on language learning is that of building linguistic skills to participate in the global economy. Those skills are intended to prepare students for "college and career readiness," or to operate in settings that are traditionally white and where standardized English is privileged. The skills-based approach to language contrasts with practices that view *language as practice* (Palmer & Martinez, 2013), such as translanguaging.

However, savvy educational leaders could interpret the Roadmap to defend translanguaging pedagogies (Briceño & Bergey, 2022). The Roadmap does not address specific theoretical perspectives or pedagogical practices. Instead, it requires "differentiated and

responsive” approaches to ELs’ diverse linguistic strengths and needs, thus opening the door (albeit the back door) for translanguaging. The most significant opportunity for translanguaging appears in Principle Two, which states that schools should "provide access for comprehension and participation through native language instruction and scaffolding." This statement allows a wide array of instructional practices that foster comprehension and communication-based language development. However, as in Prop 58, the term “native language” evidences a theoretical misalignment with translanguaging’s single linguistic reservoir (García & Li, 2014) and underlying heteroglossic foundation.

While translanguaging views language as a social practice governed by local norms of interaction, the EL Roadmap privileges “academic” English proficiency, with the term “academic” used 18 times in the policy. Five of the references describe language (e.g., “academic language”), and the others describe a set of skills distinct from language (e.g., “linguistic, academic and social skills” in the mission statement). There is debate about the definition of academic language (Valdés, 2004), and the operationalization of “academic language” usually results in bi/multilingual students being assessed on an arbitrary, undefined standard (Valdés et al., 2011). In this way, schools’ linguistic colonialism ignores the communication practices of bi/multilingual communities (García & Li, 2014), results in students being labeled as “semilingual” instead of multilingual (Edelsky, et al., 1983), and interferes with students' ability to achieve the arbitrary "academic" standards required within a racist educational system (Flores & Rosa, 2015).

While multilingualism is supported in the policy, the vision statement explains that EL students should have “high levels of English proficiency” as compared with more vague “opportunities to develop proficiency in multiple languages,” implying a hierarchy of

importance. Despite these constraints on translingual practices, the Roadmap's acknowledgment of ELs' linguistic diversity, the (limited) space for translingual practices, and the explicit references to ELs' assets are progress in the policy stream toward foundational ecological conditions where heteroglossia and translanguaging could be implemented by agentive educators.

California 2030

While undisputedly modest in its reach and mostly testimonial in nature, focusing on the “California 2030: Speak, Learn, Lead” nonbinding initiative (CDE, 2018) allows for meaningful qualifications in our analysis of the discursive trajectory in the Prop-58 policy stream. The text serves as a corollary in bundling together the policy drive behind prop 58 and the ELL Roadmap. Forward-looking in nature, the document lays out expectations for the growth of multilingualism in the state and implications for teacher preparation, namely the shortage of authorized bilingual teachers and the low number of bilingual teacher preparation programs.

Most importantly, California 2030 adopts an eclectic pluralism and carefully balances the language as a right and language as a resource orientations (Ruiz, 1984). The document opens, “the mission of global California 2030 is to equip students with world language skills to better appreciate and more fully engage with the rich and diverse mixture of cultures, heritages, and languages found in California and the world, while also preparing them to succeed in the global economy” (p.4). As is the case throughout the document, economic arguments are systemically counterbalanced with humanizing arguments foregrounding the speakers and the values of their culture. The fact that both “economy” and “culture” (including their lexical derivatives) appear six times, often in textual proximity of one another, further reinforces this assessment.

California's Teaching Performance Expectations (TPEs)

The California TPEs (2016) outline the knowledge, skills, and abilities that teacher candidates ought to possess upon licensure, and thus determine the content and structure of teacher preparation programs. First developed by the commission on teacher credentialing in 2001, this policy was then revised in 2003 and fully redrafted in 2016 to establish structural parallels with other documents in its policy ecology such as the California Standards for the Teaching Profession (CTC, 2009a) or the Continuum of Teacher Practice (CDE, CTC, & NTC, 2012). Underlying teacher preparation, this policy logically occupies a pivotal position in determining the relationship between aspiring teachers and language, the invocation of linguistic targets, and the potential role that newly minted teachers may occupy as language policy agents. The analysis underlying this paper has accordingly considered how the TPE conceptual framework may cohere with the post-Prop 58 policy stream, and whether it may foster or constrain teachers' engagement with translanguaging.

While the 2016 TPEs were approved in June 2016 and predate proposition 58, the process of drafting and design overlapped with the ramping up of the proposition's campaign. However, while both partake in a policy discourse environment that heightens the role of language in learning, lack of any intertextual connections or references to bilingual education is most notable. Aside from structural modifications, this iteration of the TPEs departs from previous editions in the recurring referencing of language throughout the document, which brings the standards in an intertextual relationship with the English Language Development standards (CDE, 2012) and, by extension, the English Language Arts/English Language Development Framework (CDE, 2014). Throughout the description of expectations and specific credentials, the TPEs identify "academic language" and "standard language" as linguistic targets and English-language learners and Standard English Learners as specific populations in need of

linguistic support (Author 1, 2018). References to standard language and its “users” go from one occurrence in the 2013 edition to 11 in the 2016 policy, whereas references to academic language and ELLs go from 4 and 10 to 27 and 36, respectively. This marked linguistic turn in the TPEs is associated with a monoglossic inclination in the identification of target linguistic varieties and purported speaker subgroups, which the policy does not define or substantiate.

The TPEs remain agnostic with regard to bilingual education, and the minimal references to languages other than English do so in the context of using the primary language as a scaffold for English proficiency. Such silencing promotes the English-dominant status quo. It can be argued that the de facto divorce between generalist and bilingual education after proposition 227 left its mark in the chasm between the TPEs in their recent iteration and the Bilingual Authorization (BILA) Standards (CTC, 2009b), which regulate the credentialing of aspiring bilingual teachers. Existing as a separate document and lacking overt intertextual ties with TPEs, the BILA standards that apply to a limited subset of California teachers have become the de facto repository of concrete bilingual-oriented knowledge, skills, and abilities, even though most bilingual learners will not have access to bilingual instruction.

Discussion

In addressing how amenable the “return” of California bilingual education may be to the translingual project in the preparation of new teachers, the sections that preceded have first laid out the components of this policy ecology and presented a disconnect between the Prop 58 policy stream and the basic reference in teacher preparation policy, the TPEs. This divide is exemplified in practice by current funded policy initiatives that aim at the dissemination of the ELL Roadmap as inservice opportunities (e.g., Educator Workforce Investment Grant, 2020), leaving preservice

programs to their own devices to incorporate these paradigmatic changes. However, the discussion to follow will conceive such a vacuum as both a challenge and an opportunistic space for the implementation of bottom-up, grounded, and transformative language policies.

Proposition 58's foundation in nation-state discourse and nativism and its focus on communication as a capitalist transaction present obvious barriers to hybridizing conceptions of language. Partially modifying the steer of Prop 58, the ELL Roadmap and California 2030 bring English Language Learners to the discourse focus. This "recentering" process is most noticeable in the rhetorical progression of the 2030 policy, which espouses the language as a right argument with a now proportionately attenuated Prop 58 economic impetus. However, the still palpable neoliberal traits and solid monoglossic tenets in the Roadmap and 2030 frameworks raise doubts as to the potential for top-down embrace of translanguaging, particularly with regards to its unbounded fluidity leading to heteroglossic liberation.

In the case of California's Prop 58 policy stream, advocates and scholars face a decades-old conundrum that pits pragmatism and policy realism (McGroarty, 2006) against fidelity to a democratic and social agenda in education (Petrovic, 2005). Recently, García and Sung (2018) reflected on the rise and demise of the Bilingual Education Act of 1968 (PL90-247), in which the justice principles of activists were first withheld and finally diluted in the process, thus thwarting the transformative potential of bilingual education and laying the foundation for the English-centric backlash that ensued. Alarming parallels can be drawn between present dynamics of ethical concessions, the path charted by the expansion of elite bilingualism, and the 40-year-old tensions that García describes, which played to the detriment of linguistically minoritized students.

With regard to the discourse stream centered around the TPEs, our analysis indicates that, while language gains relevance as a learning factor, the conceptual foundations behind this linguistic turn remain unequivocally monoglossic. In fact, the 2016 TPEs echo the linguistic thrust behind other state policy documents, such as the 2014 ELA-ELD framework, that build on the linguistic momentum propelled by the Common Core Standards. The TPEs, therefore, gravitate around traditional language targets such as "standard" and "academic" English, which are heavily inscribed across all sets of content standards and discursively reinforced by the curricularizing influence of scholars, consultants, and advocates (Leung & Valdés, 2019).

While the present analysis has described a policy stream evolving towards the humanizing orientation of language as a right, skepticism remains with regard to the policy momentum to grow in the direction of the translingual project. For one, at the general level, education is but an arena among many imbued by the logic of neoliberal governmentality (Martín Rojo & Del Percio, 2019) which, while predicated on arguments of freedom, flexibility, and adaptability in structures and the human capital, still profits from the reified/commodified constructs of the nation-state ideologies. In other words, the neoliberal world order is still predicated in hierarchical othering and monopolistic regimes that justify inequity and minoritization. Second, concerning LPP, modernist top-down conceptions of policy underlying the prop 58 policy stream and the TPE iterations are at odds and struggle with concepts and practices that elude objectification and explicit regulation by a policy, such as the case of translanguaging. To illustrate this dynamic, Flores and Schissel (2014) elaborate on the local appropriation of the CCSS in the New York State Bilingual Common Core Initiative, the resulting heteroglossic affordances seized in two classrooms and the tensions with the monoglossic testing regime. Accordingly, hope for policies that embrace the translingual project

can be found in bottom-up ecological (Mühlhäusler, 2000) and ethnographic approaches (Johnson, 2009) to LPP that put the spotlight on carving out such ideological and implementational spaces and emphasize the policy agency of educators as grounded actors (García and Menken, 2010). Exemplifying this in the CA context, Martínez and Mejía (2020) conveniently interrogate the concept of “academic English” and exhort practitioners to be mindful of their agency and potential by demonstrating how a student in central Los Angeles employs his fluid linguistic repertoire to engage in communicative interactions that fulfill linguistic expectations outlined in the CCSS.

As discussed earlier, the disconnect between the Prop 58 policy stream and the TPEs presents a challenge from a modernist-rationalist policy perspective, since such a stance aspires at controlling the LPP process and achieving calculated linguistic results. Conversely, from an ecological and ethnographic perspective, this disconnect presents transformational educators with an ideological space to be filled up. With the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CTC) launching a committee of bilingual field practitioners and scholars to review the BILA standards (and add a newly developed set of bilingual TPEs to complement in a one-to-one correspondence the general TPEs) in May 2020 and its work through 2022¹, a window of opportunity is opening up before progressive bilingual teachers and California teacher educators. Building on the momentum of the ELL Roadmap, a collaborative of teacher educators and advocates published a white paper (Bilingual Standards Refresh Work Group, 2020) evidencing the field’s desire to account for recent and important developments in bilingual education such as translanguaging. While affecting the monoglossic status from the single angle of bilingual teacher preparation may have limited leverage, it paves the way for a future

¹ Author 1 serves on this committee. The BILA standards were approved in December 2021 but the full policy, comprehending planning questions and implementation regulations, is expected to be approved in 2022.

replenishment of the system with educators that have explicitly learned and tackled the monoglossic-heteroglossic tension. Given that this committee's work is still subject to commission approval and input from the field and that, if approved, it will take one to two years to become a firm mandate, due caution needs to be exercised with its potential outcomes and its role in influencing the trajectory of the Prop 58 policy stream.

Conclusion

This article has discussed the conditions for the development of translingual perspectives and practices in light of recent developments in language policy and teacher preparation policy in California. Proposition 58 and the ensuing stream of policies evolved towards a language-as-a-resource-and-as-a-right integrative approach that ultimately ignored paradigmatic linguistic differences. Concerning teacher preparation, the TPEs have evolved over the years to discursively mirror and cohere with the monolingual perspective of language present in the general education standards. Ultimately, while intertextually disconnected, both the Prop 58 and the TPE policy streams remain discursively anchored in monoglossic conceptions of language, limiting the potential for translanguaging.

Nevertheless, the acknowledgment of the silences and ambiguities within and between our target policy streams allows us to conclude with a call to action for educators and teacher educators as policymakers to occupy such ideological and implementational spaces (Flores & Schissel, 2014). The growing translanguaging scholarship needs to be capitalized on to enrich conversation between research and policymaking, which entails the legitimate recognition of ecological LPP approaches within the general field of education policy. Capitalizing on the unique features of the California bilingual dynamics, this study captures the ideological

morphing of policy discourses over time with critical policy analytical implications that can transfer to other contexts (e.g., the deconstruction of neoliberal framings of bilingualism in other states; global neoliberal discourses of language standardization and regimes of control, see Martín Rojo & Del Percio, 2019) and its ramifications in teacher preparation language policy discourses (i.e., possibilities for agentic reappropriation of language policy).

By shedding light on the historical progression of bilingual policy in California, this article raises the possibility of future heteroglossic policy trajectories that merit additional research: A translingual and CSP-inspired revision of the bilingual authorization standards in California could serve as an influence platform for the next iteration and reframing of the general TPEs. Accordingly, we want to highlight the potential of seemingly peripheral policies to contribute heteroglossic conditions that may influence the redrafting of existing monoglossic policies in the ecology in California and beyond. At a micropolicy level, teacher preparation programs may benefit from including critical policy awareness content in coursework (e.g., sociology of education courses in interaction with English Learner-related courses) and clinical experiences (e.g., analysis of the interaction among state, district, and school language policies), the exploration of educator agency and, importantly, practical advice on successful language activism in diverse micropolitical professional contexts given teachers' ability to serve as local policy agents (Wiley & García, 2016; Hornberger & Johnson, 2007; Menken & García, 2010; Ricento & Hornberger, 1996). Following from the work of Somerville and Faltis (2019), who note bilingual students' translanguaging as a subversive tactic in light of language separation requirements within their dual language programs, we argue that educators can operate within the strategies of new policy to open doors for bilingual instruction and adopt translingual perspectives and student-centered linguistic curriculum as tactics for CSP. As a much-needed

result, new generations of translingual teachers may interrogate the ideological foundations behind the current policy status quo (e.g., standardized testing regimes), how to carve translingual spaces in them, and how to make these practices not only compatible with, but necessary to, their existence and agency in the educational system. In advancing the cause of a heteroglossic learning ecology, the critical scrutiny of teacher education and EL policies by teacher educator activists is a necessary and actionable first step.

References

- Alamillo, L., Palmer, D. K., Viramontes, C., & Garcia, E. (2005). California's English-only policies: An analysis of initial effects. In A. Valenzuela (Ed.), *Leaving children behind: How Texas-style accountability fails Latino youth* (pp. 201–224). SUNY Press.
- Apple, M. W. (1982). *Education and Power*. London: Routledge.
- Apple, M. W. (2019). On doing critical policy analysis. *Educational Policy*, 33(1), 276-287.
- Ball, S. J. (1991). *Politics and policy making in education*. London, England: Routledge.
- Bernstein, K. A., Hellmich, E. A., Katznelson, N., Shin, J., & Vinall, K. (2015). Introduction to Special Issue: Critical Perspectives on Neoliberalism in Second / Foreign Language Education. *L2 Journal*, 7(3), 3–14
- Bilingual Education Act (1968). Publ. No. (90–247), 81 Stat 816.
- Bilingual Standards Refresh Work Group. (2020). Bilingual authorization program standards content analysis white paper. Loyola Marymount University Center for Equity for English Learners & The Sobrato Foundation. Los Angeles, CA. Retrieved from https://soe.lmu.edu/media/lmuschoolofeducation/departments/ceel/contentassets/documents/BilingualAuthorization_ContentStandards_WhitePaper-Final.pdf
- Bonfiglio, T. P. (2013). Inventing the native speaker. *Critical Multilingualism Studies*, 1(2), 29-58.
- Briceño, A. & Bergey, R. (2022). Policy Implementation: Navigating the English Learner Roadmap for Equity. *Journal of Leadership, Equity, and Research*, 8(1), 24-33.
- Brownley. CA Assembly Bill 815 (2011).

- California Department of Education. (2012). English language development standards. Common Core State Standards California, California Department of Education, Sacramento, CA. Retrieved from <https://www.cde.ca.gov/sp/el/er/documents/eldstndspublication14.pdf>
- California Department of Education. (2014). ELA/ELD framework. California Department of Education: Sacramento, CA. Retrieved from <https://www.cde.ca.gov/ci/rl/cf/elaeldfrmwrksbeadopted.asp>
- California Department of Education. (2017). English Learner Roadmap. California Department of Education: Sacramento, CA. Retrieved from <https://www.cde.ca.gov/sp/el/rm/index.asp>
- California Department of Education (2018). Global California 2030: Speak, learn, live. California Department of Education, Sacramento, CA. Retrieved from <https://www.cde.ca.gov/eo/in/documents/globalca2030report.pdf>
- California Department of Education (2020). Educator workforce investment grant program. California Department of Education, Sacramento, CA. Retrieved from <https://www.cde.ca.gov/pd/ps/ewig.asp>
- California Department of Education, Commission on Teacher Credentialing & New Teacher Center (2012). Continuum of teaching practice. Sacramento, CA. Retrieved from <https://www.ctc.ca.gov/docs/default-source/educator-prep/ca-ti/final-continuum-of-teaching-practice.pdf>
- California Secretary of State. (nd). English language in public schools. Initiative Statute. <https://vigarchive.sos.ca.gov/1998/primary/propositions/227text.htm>
- Callahan, R. M., & Gándara, P. C. (Eds.). (2014). *The bilingual advantage: Language, literacy and the US labor market*. Tonawanda, NY: Multilingual Matters.

Citrin, J., Levy, M., & Wong, C. J. (2017). Politics and the English language in California:

Bilingual education at the polls. *California Journal of Politics and Policy*, 9(2), 1-14.

Commission on Teacher Credentialing. (2009a). California standards for the teaching profession

(CSTP). Commission on Teacher Credentialing, Sacramento, CA. Retrieved from

<https://www.nctq.org/dmsView/CSTP-2009>

Commission on Teacher Credentialing. (2009b). Bilingual Authorization Program Standards.

Commission on Teacher Credentialing, Sacramento, CA. Retrieved from

<https://www.ctc.ca.gov/docs/default-source/educator-prep/standards/bilingual-authorization-handbook-pdf.pdf>

Commission on Teacher Credentialing. (2016). California teaching performance expectations.

Commission on Teacher Credentialing, Sacramento, CA. Retrieved from

<https://www.ctc.ca.gov/docs/default-source/educator-prep/standards/adopted-tpes-2016.pdf?sfvrsn=0>

Common Core State Standards. (2010/2020). English language arts standards. Common Core

State Standards Initiative. Retrieved from <http://www.corestandards.org/ELA-Literacy/>

Crawford, J. (2000). *At war with diversity: US language policy in an age of anxiety*.

Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Crawford, J. (2007). The decline of bilingual education: How to reverse a troubling trend?.

International Multilingual Research Journal, 1(1), 33-37.

Darling-Hammond, L. (2007). Race, inequality and educational accountability: The irony of 'No

Child Left Behind'. *Race, Ethnicity, and Education*, 10(3), 245-260.

del Valle, S. (2003). *Language rights and the law in the United States: Finding our voices*.

Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

- Delavan, G. M., Freire, J. A., & Menken, K. (2021). Editorial introduction: a historical overview of the expanding critique (s) of the gentrification of dual language bilingual education. *Language Policy*, 20(3), 299-321.
- Diem, S., Young, M. D., & Sampson, C. (2019). Where critical policy meets the politics of education: An introduction. *Educational Policy*, 33(1), 3-15.
- Duchêne, A., & Heller, M. (Eds.) (2012). *Language in late capitalism: Pride and profit*. New York and London: Routledge.
- Edelsky, C., Hudelson, S., Flores, B., Barkin, F., Altwerger, B., & Jilbert, K. (1983). Semilingualism and language deficit. *Applied Linguistics*, 4(1), 1-22.
- Ella T. v. State of California*, Settlement Agreement. (2020). Los Angeles County Superior Court. Retrieved from <https://media2.mofo.com/documents/200220-literacy-ca-ella-t-settlement-agreement.pdf>
- Fairclough, N. (1989). *Language and power*. London and New York: Longman.
- Faltis, C. (1997). Bilingual education in the United States. In J. Cummins & D. Corson (Eds.) *Bilingual Education. Encyclopedia of Language and Education*, vol 5. Dordrecht: Springer.
- 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. (2016). A tale of two visions: Hegemonic whiteness and bilingual education. *Educational Policy*, 30(1), 13-38.
- Flores, N. (2019). Producing national and neoliberal subjects: Bilingual education and governmentality in the United States. In L. Martín Rojo & A. Del Percio (Eds.), *Language and Neoliberal Governmentality*. (49-68). New York: Routledge.

- Flores, N., & Rosa, J. (2015). Undoing appropriateness: Raciolinguistic ideologies and language diversity in education. *Harvard Educational Review*, 85(2), 149-171.
- Flores, N., & Schissel, J. L. (2014). Dynamic bilingualism as the norm: Envisioning a heteroglossic approach to standards-based reform. *TESOL Quarterly*, 48(3), 454-479.
- Flubacher, M. & Del Percio, A. (2017). *Language, education and neoliberalism: Critical studies in sociolinguistics*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters
- Foucault, M. (1990). *The history of sexuality: An introduction*. New York: Vintage.
- Gándara, P., Maxwell-Jolly, J., Garcia, E., Asato, J., Gutierrez, K., Stritikus, T., & Curry, J. (2000). The initial impact of Proposition 227 on the instruction of English learners. University of California Linguistic Minority Research Institute. Education Policy Center, University of California Davis. <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED470809.pdf>
- Gándara P., Losen D., August D., Uriarte M., Gómez M. C., & Hopkins M. (2010). Forbidden language: A brief history of US language policy. In P. Gándara & M. Hopkins (Eds.), *Forbidden language: English learners and restrictive language policies* (pp. 20–33). New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- García-Mateus, S., & Palmer, D. (2017). Translanguaging Pedagogies for Positive Identities in Two-Way Dual Language Bilingual Education. *Taylor & Francis*, 16(4), 245–255.
- García, E. E., & Curry-Rodríguez, J. E. (2000). The education of limited English proficient students in California schools: An assessment of the influence of Proposition 227 in selected districts and schools. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 24(1-2), 15-35.
- García, O. (2009). *Bilingual education in the 21st century: A global perspective*. Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell

- 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*. Philadelphia, PA: Caslon.
- García, O., & Leiva, C. (2014). Theorizing and Enacting Translanguaging for Social Justice. *Educational Linguistics*, (pp. 199-216) Dordrecht: Springer Netherlands.
- García, O., & Li, W. (2014). *Translanguaging: Language, bilingualism and education*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- García, O., & Sung, K. K. (2018). Critically assessing the 1968 Bilingual Education Act at 50 years: Taming tongues and Latinx communities. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 41(4), 318-333.
- Heller, M. (2010). The commodification of language. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 39, 101-114.
- Hornberger, N. H. (1998). Language policy, language education, language rights: Indigenous, immigrant, and international perspectives. *Language in society*, 27(4), 439-458.
- Hornberger, N. H. (2003). Afterword: Ecology and ideology in multilingual classrooms. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 6(3-4), 296-302.
- Hornberger, N. H., & Johnson, D. C. (2007). Slicing the onion ethnographically: Layers and spaces in multilingual language education policy and practice. *Tesol Quarterly*, 41(3), 509-532.
- Hua, Z., Li, W., & Lyons, A. (2017). Polish shop(ping) as translanguaging space. *Social Semiotics* 27(4), 411-433.
- Johnson, D. C. (2009). Ethnography of language policy. *Language Policy*, 8(2), 139-159.
- Johnstone, B. (2017). *Discourse analysis*. John Wiley & Sons

- Katznelson, N., & Bernstein, K. A. (2017). Rebranding bilingualism: The shifting discourses of language education policy in California's 2016 election. *Linguistics and Education*, 40, 11-26.
- Kelly, L. B. (2018). Interest convergence and hegemony in dual language: Bilingual education, but for whom and why?. *Language Policy*, 17(1), 1-21.
- Kramersch, C., & Whiteside, A. (2008). Language ecology in multilingual settings. Towards a theory of symbolic competence. *Applied Linguistics*, 29(4), 645-671.
- Kristeva, J. (1986). *The kristeva reader*. Columbia University Press.
- Lara. Senate CA Bill 1174 (2014). <https://elections.cdn.sos.ca.gov/ballot-measures/pdf/sb-1174-chapter-753.pdf>
- Lau v. Nichols*, 414 US 563 (1974).
- Leung, C., & Valdés, G. (2019). Translanguaging and the transdisciplinary framework for language teaching and learning in a multilingual world. *The Modern Language Journal*, 103(2), 348-370.
- Li, W. (2018). Translanguaging as a Practical Theory of Language. *Applied Linguistics*, 39(1), 9–30.
- Martín Rojo, L., & Del Percio, A. (Eds.). (2019). *Language and neoliberal governmentality*. London: Routledge.
- Martínez, R. A., & Mejía, A. F. (2020). Looking closely and listening carefully: A sociocultural approach to understanding the complexity of Latina/o/x students' everyday language. *Theory Into Practice*, 59(1), 53-63.

- Matas, A., & Rodríguez, J. L. (2014). The education of English Learners in California following the passage of proposition 227: A case study of an urban school district. *Penn GSE Perspectives on Urban Education*, 11(2), 44-56.
- May, S. (Ed.). (2013). *The multilingual turn: Implications for SLA, TESOL, and bilingual education*. New York and London: Routledge.
- McGroarty, M. (2006). Neoliberal collusion or strategic simultaneity? On multiple rationales for language-in-education policies. *Language Policy*, 5(1), 3-13.
- Menken, K. (2009). No Child Left Behind and its effects on language policy. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 29, 103-117.
- Menken, K., & García, O. (Eds.). (2010). *Negotiating language policies in schools: Educators as policymakers*. New York: Routledge.
- Menken, K., & Solorza, C. (2014). No child left bilingual: Accountability and the elimination of bilingual education programs in New York City schools. *Educational Policy*, 28(1), 96-125.
- Mignolo, W. D. (1996). Linguistic maps, literary geographies, and cultural landscapes: Languages, languaging, and (trans) nationalism. *Modern Language Quarterly*, 57(2), 181-197.
- Mühlhäusler, P. (2000). Language planning and language ecology. *Current Issues in Language Planning*, 1(3), 306-367.
- Muñoz-Muñoz, Eduardo R. (2018). Destandardizing the standard (s): ideological and implementational spaces in preservice teacher education [Doctoral dissertation, Stanford University] <https://searchworks.stanford.edu/view/12698948>
- Palmer, D. & Martinez, R. (2013). Teacher agency in bilingual spaces: A fresh look at preparing teachers to educate Latina/o bilingual children. *Review of Research in Education*, 13, 269-297.

- Pennycook, A. (2017). Translanguaging and semiotic assemblages. *International Journal of Multilingualism*, 14(3), 269–282.
- Petrovic, J. E. (2005). The conservative restoration and neoliberal defenses of bilingual education. *Language Policy*, 4(4), 395-416.
- Poza, L.E. (2016). Barreras: Language ideologies, academic language, and the marginalization of Latin@ English language learners. *Whittier Law Review*. 37(3). 401-421.
- Poza, L. E. (2021). Adding Flesh to the Bones: Dignity Frames for English Learner Education. *Harvard Educational Review*, 91(4), 482-510.
- Poza, L. E., García, O., & Jiménez-Castellanos, Ó. (2021). After Castañeda: a glotopolítica perspective and educational dignity paradigm to educate racialized bilinguals. *Language Policy*, 1-24.
- Poza, L.E. & Shannon, S.M. (2020). Where language is beside the point: English language testing for Mexicano students in the Southwestern United States. In S.A. Mirhosseini & P.I. De Costa (Eds). *The sociopolitics of English language testing*. (46-67). London, UK: Bloomsbury.
- Prada, J., & Nikula, T. (2018). Introduction to the special issue: On the transgressive nature of translanguaging pedagogies *EuroAmerican Journal of Applied Linguistics and Languages Special Issue*, 5(2), 1–7.
- Rata, E. (2014). The three stages of critical policy methodology: An example from curriculum analysis. *Policy Futures in Education*, 12(3), 347-358.
- Ricento, T. K., & Hornberger, N. H. (1996). Unpeeling the onion: Language planning and policy and the ELT professional. *Tesol Quarterly*, 30(3), 401-427.
- Rubio, J. (2020). Educational Language Policy in Massachusetts: Discourses of the LOOK

Act. *Educational Policy*, DOI: [10.1177/0895904820974406](https://doi.org/10.1177/0895904820974406)

- Ruiz, R. (1984). Orientations in language planning. *NABE Journal*, 8(2), 15-34.
- Rymes, B., Flores, N., & Pomerantz, A. (2016). The Common Core State Standards and English Learners: Finding the silver lining. *Language*, 92(4), e257-e273.
- Saldaña, J. (2009). *An Introduction to codes and coding: The coding manual for qualitative researchers*. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publishing
- Shohamy, E. G. (2006). *Language policy: Hidden agendas and new approaches*. New York and London: Routledge.
- Somerville, J., & Faltis, C. (2019). Dual languaging as strategy and translanguaging as tactic in two-way dual language programs. *Theory Into Practice*, 58(2), 164-175.
- Subtirelu, N. C., Borowczyk, M., Thorson Hernández, R., & Venezia, F. (2019). Recognizing whose bilingualism? A critical policy analysis of the Seal of Biliteracy. *The Modern Language Journal*, 103(2), 371-390.
- Tannen, D., Hamilton, H. E., & Schiffrin, D. (2015). *The handbook of discourse analysis*. John Wiley & Sons.
- Taylor, S. (1997). Critical policy analysis: Exploring contexts, texts and consequences. *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education*. 18:1, 23-35.
- Tollefson, J. W. (1991). *Planning language, planning inequality*. New York: Longman
- Ulanoff, S. H. (2014). California's Implementation of Proposition 227. *The mis-education of English learners: A tale of three states and lessons to be learned*, 79-107.
- Valdés, G. (2004). Between support and marginalization: The development of academic language in linguistic minority children. *Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 7(2&3), 102-132.

- Valdés, G. (2020). The future of the Seal of Biliteracy. In A.J. Heineke & K.J. Davin (Eds.) *The Seal of Biliteracy: Case studies and considerations for policy implementation*. (177-204).
Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing.
- Valdés, G., Capitelli, S., & Álvarez, L. (2011). *Latino children learning English: Steps in the journey*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- Wiley, T. G. (2014). Diversity, super-diversity, and monolingual language ideology in the United States: Tolerance or intolerance?. *Review of Research in Education*, 38(1), 1-32.
- Wiley, T. G., & García, O. (2016). Language policy and planning in language education: Legacies, consequences, and possibilities. *The Modern Language Journal*, 100(S1), 48-63.
- Wiley, T. G., & Lukes, M. (1996). English-only and standard English ideologies in the US. *Tesol Quarterly*, 30(3), 511-535.