

Cummins, J. (in press). Translanguaging: A critical analysis of theoretical claims. In P. Juvonen & M. Källkvist (Eds.) *Pedagogical Translanguaging: Theoretical, Methodological and Empirical Perspectives*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

## 2 Translanguaging: A Critical Analysis of Theoretical Claims

Jim Cummins

### Introduction

During the past decade, the term *translanguaging* has come to dominate academic discussions regarding pedagogy in bilingual and second language (L2) immersion programs as well as pedagogy for multilingual and immigrant-background students in mainstream programs taught through the dominant societal language (e.g. Leung & Valdés, 2019; Paulsrud *et al.*, 2017). The construct of *translanguaging* was introduced by Williams (1994, 1996, 2000) in the context of Welsh-English bilingual programs that were focused on revitalizing the Welsh language. The term drew attention to the systematic and intentional alternation of input and output languages in bilingual instruction. García (2009) extended the construct of translanguaging to describe the dynamic *heteroglossic* integrated linguistic practices of multilingual individuals and to highlight the legitimacy of bilingual instruction that integrates rather than separates languages. In many subsequent publications, García and colleagues<sup>1</sup> elaborated the theoretical dimensions of translanguaging and also explored with educators how translanguaging pedagogies could be implemented in classroom contexts. The City University of New York (CUNY) New York State Initiative on Emergent Bilinguals (CUNY-NYSIEB) has developed an impressive set of resources and guides to support educators in pursuing translanguaging instructional initiatives (<https://www.cuny-nysieb.org/>).

Although some scholars (e.g. Edwards, 2012; Grin, 2018) dispute the usefulness and legitimacy of the term *translanguaging*, there is widespread support in the academic literature for the propositions that bi/multilingual individuals draw on the totality of their linguistic resources in communicative interactions and that classroom instruction should encourage students to use their full linguistic repertoire in flexible and strategic ways as a tool for cognitive and academic learning. For example, virtually all theorists and researchers currently endorse some form of *dynamic systems theory* that highlights the transformation of the cognitive and linguistic system brought about by the acquisition of multiple languages (e.g. de Bot *et al.*, 2007; Herdina & Jessner, 2002).

However, the theoretical elaborations proposed by García and colleagues include a variety of propositions that are considerably more controversial. For example, Jaspers (2018) pointed to the problematic nature of stretching the construct of translanguaging to encompass a wide range of disparate theoretical claims:

In sum, translanguaging can apply to an innate instinct that includes monolinguals; to the performance of fluid language use that mostly pertains to bilinguals; to a bilingual pedagogy; to a theory or approach of language; and to a process of personal and social transformation. By any standard this is a lot for one term. (Jaspers, 2018: 3)

Ballinger *et al.* (2017) similarly point to the vagueness associated with the multiple uses of the term *translanguaging*, which, they claim, encompasses a theory of cognitive processing, societal use of multiple languages in communicative interactions, classroom language use behaviours among emergent bilingual students, and teaching practices that attempt to harness students' multilingual repertoires to enhance learning. They propose the umbrella term *crosslinguistic pedagogy* as preferable to translanguaging to refer to pedagogical practices that support and encourage learners to draw on their full linguistic repertoire in the classroom.

These concerns about the multiple meanings and applications of the term *translanguaging* raise the issue of what criteria should be applied to evaluate the extent to which any theoretical construct, proposition, or framework is *legitimate*. Translanguaging is clearly non-problematic when viewed as a *descriptive* concept to refer to (a) typical patterns of interpersonal interaction among multilingual individuals where participants draw on their individual and shared linguistic repertoires to communicate without regard to conventional language boundaries, and (b) classroom interactions that draw on students' multilingual repertoires in addition to the official or dominant language of instruction. As I argue in a later section, a convincing case can also be made for the *theoretical* claim that these crosslinguistic interactional and instructional practices are legitimate from both ideological and educational perspectives.

As the construct of translanguaging migrated beyond its original formulation in the Welsh context and the core meanings outlined above, it became clear that two very different theoretical positions on translanguaging could be distinguished. According to García and Lin (2017), these theoretical positions can be characterized as *strong* and *weak* respectively:

On the one hand, there is the strong version of translanguaging, a theory that poses that bilingual people do not speak languages but rather, use their

repertoire of linguistic features selectively. On the other hand, there is a weak version of translanguaging, the one that supports national and state language boundaries and yet calls for softening these boundaries. (García & Lin, 2017: 126)

García and Lin cite the work of Cummins (2007, 2017a) in relation to crosslinguistic interdependence and the importance of teaching for transfer across languages as representative of the so-called weak version of translanguaging. By contrast, they support the so-called strong version of translanguaging as a linguistic theory while at the same time recognizing that bilingual education programs should combine the weak and strong versions of translanguaging theory:

On the one hand, educators must continue to allocate separate spaces for the named languages although softening the boundaries between them. On the other hand, they must provide an instructional space where translanguaging is nurtured and used critically and creatively without speakers having to select and suppress different linguistic features of their own repertoire. (García & Lin, 2017: 127)

Although this attempt at synthesis between so-called strong and weak versions of translanguaging theory may appear reasonable, I argue in this chapter that it is built on an unstable and problematic theoretical foundation. Specifically, I suggest that as the concept of translanguaging evolved over the past decade, it acquired a considerable amount of what I have termed *extraneous conceptual baggage* that risks undermining its overall credibility (Cummins, 2017a, 2017b).

This extraneous conceptual baggage includes the following interrelated propositions that have been loosely woven together into the theoretical framework elaborated by advocates of the ‘strong’ version of translanguaging:

- Languages are ‘invented’ and don’t exist as discrete ‘countable’ entities (Makoni & Pennycook, 2007).
- The multilingual’s linguistic system is internally undifferentiated and unitary reflecting the fact that ‘languages’ have no linguistic or cognitive reality (García, 2009).
- Codeswitching is an illegitimate monoglossic construct because it assumes the existence of two separate linguistic systems (Otheguy *et al.*, 2015).
- Additive bilingualism is an illegitimate monoglossic construct because it similarly assumes the existence of two separate languages that are added together in bilingual individuals (García, 2009).

- For similar reasons, the notion of a *common underlying proficiency* and teaching for crosslinguistic transfer imply a monoglossic conception of bilingualism (García & Li Wei, 2014).
- *Academic language* is an illegitimate construct, as is the distinction between the language typically used in social and academic contexts (Flores & Rosa, 2015).
- Additive approaches to minoritized students' bilingualism are rooted in raciolinguistic ideologies (Flores & Rosa, 2015).
- Teaching biliteracy involves teaching standardized language norms in a prescriptive way that stigmatizes and suppresses students' authentic varieties of L1 and/or L2 (Flores & Rosa, 2015).<sup>2</sup>

In this chapter, I argue that all of these theoretical propositions are problematic. In varying degrees, they are unsupported by empirical research, they are logically inconsistent, and they detract from the important potential contribution of the construct of translanguaging to effective and equitable pedagogy. Rather than adopt the semantically loaded terms *strong* and *weak*, I use the terms *Unitary Translanguaging Theory* (UTT) and *Crosslinguistic Translanguaging Theory* (CTT) to highlight distinguishing features of the alternative theoretical orientations identified by García and Lin. MacSwan (2017) has previously used the term 'unitary model' to refer to the theoretical propositions advanced by García and colleagues. The UTT claims that languages have no linguistic or cognitive reality, and the bilingual's linguistic system is unitary and undifferentiated. By contrast, the CTT claims that bilinguals actually *do* speak languages, involving multiple registers, and effective teaching promotes translanguaging involving conceptual and linguistic transfer across languages.

The different orientations of UTT and CTT to the legitimacy of the construct of *language* should not obscure the fact that both theoretical perspectives view languages as socially constructed, they reject rigid instructional separation of languages, and they deplore the frequent devaluation of the linguistic practices that many minoritized students bring to school. Both orientations to translanguaging theory also endorse dynamic conceptions of multilingual cognitive functioning. And, finally, UTT and CTT both view translanguaging pedagogy as a central component in the struggle for social justice and equity in education.<sup>3</sup>

In the next section, I propose three criteria for judging the credibility of any theoretical claim relating to language education and then I apply these criteria to an analysis of the credibility both of the core construct of translanguaging (endorsed by advocates of both UTT and CTT) and the

additional claims that have been woven into the fabric of the emerging UTT translanguaging theoretical framework.

In the final section, I describe a theoretical framework focused on reversing underachievement among minoritized students that highlights the necessity for educators, both individually and collectively within schools, to implement evidence-based pedagogical approaches that challenge the operation of coercive power structures and ideologies. This framework (derived from Cummins, 1986, 1996/2001, 2000; Cummins & Early, 2011, 2015) incorporates the crosslinguistic version of translanguaging and emphasizes the importance for teachers:

- to engage and valorize students' multilingual repertoires, including their home varieties of L1 and/or L2,
- to promote multilingual literacies involving additive rather than subtractive approaches to language learning,
- to reinforce students' grasp of academic language across the curriculum,
- to maximize students' active engagement with literacy (ideally in both home and school languages), and
- to affirm students' emerging identities as cognitively and academically capable bi/multilinguals.

In contrast to the theoretical claims advanced by advocates of the unitary version of translanguaging, this framework affirms the legitimacy of teachers (a) adopting additive approaches to minoritized students' bilingualism and biliteracy, (b) actively and explicitly teaching students how language and languages work in academic contexts, and (c) teaching for transfer of concepts, skills, and learning strategies across languages.

#### **Criteria for Evaluating Theoretical Claims and Constructs<sup>4</sup>**

The literature on scientific inquiry emphasizes the importance of ensuring that claims and supporting arguments are consistent with the entirety of the relevant empirical evidence and are internally coherent and non-contradictory. Britt *et al.* (2014), for example, point out that in evaluating any scientific claim or argument, it is necessary to assess whether the evidence is sufficient to support the claim. This involves 'weighing the extent to which the totality of the support can overcome counterevidence or competing claims [...] and considering the degree to which counter arguments and opposing evidence is rebutted, explained, or dismissed' (Britt *et al.*, 2014: 116). Britt and colleagues point out that although completely unqualified assertions often tend to be more persuasive to readers, '[q]ualifiers of scope (e.g. generally, always) and certainty (e.g. probably, suggests) are especially significant in academic and scientific writing' (Britt *et al.*, 2014: 116).

This analytic process is often neglected in popular discussions of scientific concepts (e.g. climate change). von der Mühlen *et al.* (2016), for example, compared the performance of college students and scientists in accurately judging the plausibility of arguments and recognizing common argumentation fallacies. They reported that the superior performance of scientists was mediated by their strategy of evaluating in an analytic manner the internal consistency and empirical foundation of the arguments. By contrast, students often relied on intuitive assertion-based judgements based on the extent to which the claim, and supporting evidence or argumentation, was consistent with their prior attitudes, beliefs, and knowledge. In the sections that follow, I will return to this distinction between assertion-based claims that are frequently *evidence-free* and more rigorous analysis-based claims that seriously address the relevant empirical evidence.

In evaluating the legitimacy of theoretical constructs and claims that have been advanced in relation to the construct of translanguaging, I propose three criteria:

- (1) *Empirical adequacy*—to what extent is the claim consistent with all the relevant empirical evidence?
- (2) *Logical coherence*—to what extent is the claim internally consistent and non-contradictory?
- (3) *Consequential validity*—to what extent is the claim useful in promoting effective pedagogy and policies?

These criteria operationally define what is meant by *legitimate* in the current context. The first two criteria reflect the generally accepted analytic processes common to all scientific inquiry. The third criterion was initially articulated in the area of educational testing by Messick (1994) who argued that discussions of the validity of any assessment procedure or test should take into account the consequences, intended or unintended, of applying or implementing this procedure. In a similar way, I argue that theoretical claims and constructs in the area of language education (and education more generally), should be assessed in relation to their implications for both classroom instruction and educational language policies. In other words, such claims should be subjected to a classroom ‘reality check’ to assess the credibility or usefulness of their instructional implications. These three criteria elaborate earlier discussion of these issues (Cummins, 2000, 2009). In the next section, I use the three criteria to evaluate various theoretical claims in the scholarly literature in relation to translanguaging. In the interests of brevity, I combine several of the claims advanced by advocates of the Unitary Translanguaging Theory.

## Evaluating Translanguaging Theoretical Claims

Are interpersonal and pedagogical translanguaging legitimate constructs?

Although codeswitching/translanguaging and use of nonstandard varieties of English and/or L1 are still stigmatized in many schools and university contexts, as well as in the job market (Flores & Rosa, 2015; Lippi-Green, 1997/2012), I know of no researcher in recent years who has disputed the legitimacy of these interpersonal language practices. Ever since Labov (1969, 1972) established ‘the logic of nonstandard English’, there has been consensus among researchers and applied linguists that schools should build on the linguistic resources that students bring to school as part of a process of affirming the ‘funds of knowledge’ that exist in minoritized communities (Moll *et al.*, 1992). In short, there is no academic debate about the legitimacy of interpersonal translanguaging.

With respect to pedagogical translanguaging, the incorporation of students’ home languages into instruction and encouraging teachers to promote their continued development is consistent with a broad range of research data showing positive relationships between L1 and L2 literacy-related abilities (for reviews see Cummins, 1996/2001 and National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine, 2017). There are also numerous documented examples of educators mobilizing minoritized students’ multilingual resources long before the construct of translanguaging had entered North American educational discourse (Auerbach, 1993, 2016; Chow & Cummins, 2003; Cummins *et al.*, 2005; DeFazio, 1997; Lucas & Katz, 1994). Many of the insights about multilingual instructional strategies we have gained over the past 30 years have been generated by educators who have often worked in collaboration with university researchers to document their initiatives. Documentation of these early instructional initiatives, together with more recent examples (e.g. Carbonara & Scibetta, 2020; Cummins & Persad, 2014; García & Kleyn, 2016; Little & Kirwin, 2019; Prasad, 2016), has demonstrated that multilingual instructional strategies (i.e. pedagogical translanguaging) can scaffold higher levels of academic performance, build critical language awareness, engage students actively with literacy in both their home and school languages, and affirm students’ identities.

Carbonara and Scibetta’s collaborative research project in Italy involving analysis of classroom interaction in 5 primary and 3 middle schools and multiple interviews with almost 20 teachers and 122 students is perhaps the most comprehensive investigation of translanguaging to date. The authors highlight a variety of positive outcomes on students’ metalinguistic awareness, academic engagement, and attitudes towards multilingualism in general and their home languages/dialects. Similar outcomes were documented by Sierens and Van

Avermaet (2014) in a 4-year experiment in Flanders. Students developed more positive attitudes towards multiculturalism and their own home languages. However, no impact was noted on students' overall academic performance in Dutch. Jaspers (2018) cautions that these results suggest that researchers should be cautious about making strong causal claims for the transformative power of translanguaging by itself.

In summary, the legitimacy of pedagogical translanguaging is supported by extensive research evidence demonstrating that mobilizing students' multilingual and multimodal repertoires can scaffold students' L2 learning and their understanding of L2 academic content (e.g. Cummins & Early, 2011). These multilingual instructional strategies also serve to connect curriculum to students' lives, affirm their identities, and reinforce their knowledge of how language works as an oral and written communicative system. With respect to consequential validity, the recent theoretical focus on translanguaging, together with earlier multilingual instructional initiatives, has resulted in a significant increase in educators' interest in exploring ways in which minoritized students' home languages can be incorporated productively into instruction.

### ***Do languages exist?***

A major influence on the elaboration of the construct of translanguaging by García and colleagues was the claim by Makoni and Pennycook (2007) that languages do not exist as real entities in the world but rather are inventions of social, cultural, and political movements. They argue that the idea of a *language* is a European invention and a product of colonialism. Advocates of UTT use the term *named languages* to reinforce Makoni and Pennycook's point that languages are socially invented categories. However, García also acknowledged that these 'categories are not imaginary, in the sense that they refer to entities that exist in the societies that have coined the terms and have had real and material effects' (García & Li Wei, 2014: 7). Despite the acknowledgement of so-called named languages as social realities, languages are still presented as somewhat oppressive forces that potentially victimize the fluid linguistic practices of minoritized students. This is evident in the definition of translanguaging as 'the deployment of a speaker's full linguistic repertoire without regard for watchful adherence to the socially and politically defined boundaries of named languages' (Otheguy *et al.*, 2015: 281). The phrase 'watchful adherence' suggests that minoritized students' language use is subject to surveillance and devaluation by institutions (e.g. schools) dedicated to enforcing standardized language norms (e.g. through high-stakes testing regimes).

UTT advocates extend the claim that named languages have no objective linguistic or cognitive reality by arguing that the linguistic system of



bi/multilinguals is unitary, dynamic, and undifferentiated. This *heteroglossic* reality of multilinguals' cognitive system is contrasted with *monoglossic* ideologies that construct named languages as real entities and consequently conceive of multilingualism as the existence of separate monolingualisms within the individual.

Thus, rather than referring to languages as though they actually exist as countable entities or legitimate constructs, advocates of the Unitary Translanguaging Theory use the verb forms *linguaging* and *translanguaging* in order to position language as a social practice in which learners engage rather than a set of structures and functions that they learn. In other words, they adopt a mutually exclusive (either-or) position with respect to language (noun form) and linguaging (verb form). A heteroglossic theoretical orientation, according to this perspective, requires adoption of the verb form (*trans/linguaging*) as legitimate and the noun form (*language*) as monoglossic and hence illegitimate. It is not possible to view both verb forms and noun forms as legitimate constructs.

The empirical evidence related to the claim that the bilingual's linguistic system is unitary and undifferentiated will be considered in the next section. Here my concern is with the broader claim that the construct of *a language* is illegitimate. This claim has been disputed on multiple grounds. For example, Grin (2018: 256) pointed to the consensus that bilingualism is not simply the addition of two monolingualisms: 'Nobody denies that languages are the product of human agency and develop historically, and nobody claims that they are watertight compartments'. However, the "claim seems to be that *since* the users of human language operating in multilingual settings draw on an internal linguistic repertoire, a sort of continuum in which 'named languages' blend into each other, *then* it follows that these 'named languages' are irrelevant constructs" (Grin, 2018: 255, emphasis original). Grin argued that this is a logically flawed inference. The hybridity of linguistic practices and the complexity of linguistic repertoires 'do not carry the consequence that languages do not exist or that named languages are irrelevant' (Grin, 2018: 257).

Makoni and Pennycook have also pointed to the consequences of the claim that 'discrete languages don't exist' (2007: 2) They acknowledge that, according to this analysis, constructs such as language rights, mother tongues, multilingualism and code-switching are also illegitimate. Grin (2018: 260) highlighted the implications of this claim:

Very practically, language is a key category in much of human rights law; denying the existence of languages blocks the access of minoritized groups to it. But more fundamentally, if languages in general do not *really* exist, if they are misleading constructs, this is true of small languages as well.

Why, then, fight for them? It would be absurd. [...] This is why the advocates of the notion of ‘languaging’, particularly when they go one step further and deny the existence of languages, are not just making scientifically spurious claims. They are also, willingly or not, the objective allies of linguistic imperialism and linguistic injustice. (Grin, 2018: 260, emphasis original)

Obviously, advocates of the Unitary Translanguaging Theory (UTT) are committed to social and linguistic justice and would dispute this conclusion. However, by adopting counter-intuitive positions such as ‘bilingual people do not speak languages’ (García & Lin, 2017: 126), they have locked themselves into a problematic and unproductive theoretical space. There is clearly something seriously amiss when UTT scholars who advocate for critical multilingual language awareness and for translanguaging as an educationally transformative force are being called to task by credible researchers for promoting theoretical positions that are ‘inconsistent with a civil rights orientation on language education policy’ (MacSwan, 2020: 1) and as ‘the objective allies of linguistic imperialism and linguistic injustice’ (Grin, 2018: 260).

Logical inconsistencies are also apparent in the ways UTT scholars contrast their position with so-called weak versions of translanguaging theory. For example, what exactly is meant by García and Lin’s (2017: 126) characterization of the ‘weak’ version of translanguaging as ‘one that supports national and state language boundaries, and yet calls for softening these boundaries’? In supporting national and state language boundaries, are we referring to political beliefs, educational policies, cognitive/linguistic processing or all of the above? How does ‘supporting national and state language boundaries’ differ from García and colleagues’ acknowledgement that (a) languages have social reality, (b) ‘[m]inoritized languages must be protected and developed if that is the wish of people’ (García & Lin, 2017: 127) and, (c) ‘bilingual education must develop bilingual students’ ability to use language according to the rules and regulations that have been socially constructed for that particular named language’? (García & Lin, 2017: 126).

The logically problematic nature of the claim that discrete languages don’t exist is illustrated in the fact that in multiple publications UTT advocates refer to discrete languages as though they actually *do* exist. For example, García and Kleifgen (2019: 9–10) in discussing a research study by Espinosa and Herrera (2016) talk about how the researchers told students to use their entire linguistic repertoire to state the main idea from their reading. Students drew from all their language resources: ‘Some used English, others Spanish, and yet others used both Spanish and English’. There is a clear logical incongruity in using labels

such as *Spanish* and *English* as though they actually referred to real conceptual entities while at the same time claiming that these conceptual entities don't exist. How does the claim that 'bilingual people do not speak languages' (García & Lin, 2017: 126) fit with the acknowledgement that some bilingual students 'used English, others Spanish, and yet others used both Spanish and English'?

The most unfortunate aspect of these logical contradictions is that the confusion they are likely to evoke among educators and policymakers is *completely unnecessary*. There is nothing to be gained theoretically or pedagogically from the assertion that 'bilingual people do not speak languages'. There is no difference in the instructional practices that are implied by so-called strong and weak versions of translanguaging (e.g. Cummins, 2007).

In my reading, the basic (and legitimate) point that UTT advocates wish to convey is that the fluid language practices and varieties of all students (bilingual and monolingual) should be affirmed and built upon by schools in all program types. Students' language repertoires should be actively acknowledged as crucial cognitive tools and intrinsic components of their evolving identities. It is also valid to point out that some so-called bilingual programs have failed to connect instruction to students' lives and affirm their linguistic talents and identities – in other words, they have failed to challenge coercive relations of power (Cummins, 1986, 2001). However, affirmation of this perspective is nothing new – similar points have been repeatedly articulated for at least 40 years within the pejoratively labelled *weak* version of translanguaging (e.g. Cummins, 1981a, 1986, 2001).

There is no dispute about the fact that languages are socially constructed with porous boundaries, but languages are also experientially and socially *real* for students, teachers, policymakers, curriculum designers, politicians, and most researchers. There is also no conceptual difficulty in reconciling the construct of translanguaging, understood as the integrated process through which multilingual individuals use and learn languages, with the experiential and social reality of different languages, understood as historical, cultural, and ideological constructs that have material consequences and determine social action (e.g. language planning, bilingual programs, etc.; cf. Cummins, 2017a). Expressed differently, there is no compelling reason to adopt a binary *either-or* dichotomy between the verb form *trans/languaging* and the noun form *language* rather than a *both-and* position that acknowledges both the legitimacy of the construct of *translanguaging* and the experiential and social legitimacy of languages. Skutnabb-Kangas (2015) has made a similar point, arguing that individuals and groups have the right to claim a language as their own and there is no contradiction between treating languages as both processes and, at the same time, as concrete entities.

This analysis also challenges the convention of using the term *named languages* to signify that socially constructed languages do not have linguistic reality. Use of this term is no more useful or meaningful than the term *named colours*. For example, it would rightly be considered ridiculous for someone to say: ‘I plan to paint my house the named colour blue’. Languages and colours are both social constructions that have permeable boundaries, but which also have undeniable social and experiential reality (Cummins, 2017a).

In short, the claim that discrete languages don’t exist represents a conceptually fragile and profoundly counter-intuitive foundation upon which to build an instructional rationale for translanguaging pedagogy.

***To what extent is it legitimate to characterize codeswitching, additive bilingualism, the common underlying proficiency, and teaching for crosslinguistic transfer as ‘monoglossic’?***

Advocates of Unitary Translanguaging Theory (UTT) establish a clear binary dichotomy between heteroglossic and monoglossic conceptions of bilingualism. They claim that in contrast to translanguaging and its rootedness in a dynamic, heteroglossic, unitary, and undifferentiated conceptual/linguistic system, the constructs of codeswitching, additive bilingualism, the common underlying proficiency, and teaching for crosslinguistic transfer reflect a monoglossic orientation that delineates a dual competence model involving separate L1/L2 features that map onto the characteristics of named languages (e.g. García, 2009; García & Li Wei, 2014). I argue in this section that these claims are without empirical foundation, are logically inconsistent, and highly problematic in terms of consequential validity.

With respect to codeswitching, MacSwan (2017: 179) pointed out that the characterization of codeswitching research as monoglossic in orientation is ‘merely asserted and not tied to an actual analysis of theoretical proposals in the literature, nor are any actual relevant citations provided’. His detailed analysis of research in the areas of codeswitching and bilingual language development supports what he calls an integrated multilingual model that posits both shared and discrete grammatical and lexical resources rather than the unitary undifferentiated model advocated by UTT scholars. This integrated model of multilingual competence is consistent with the common underlying proficiency construct proposed by Cummins (1981b).

Grin (2018: 256) has likewise disputed the empirical basis for a unitary undifferentiated model noting that neurolinguistic research shows that ‘the very fact of using different languages mobilises different areas of the brain and reflects the need, for bilingual language users switching between languages, to *inhibit* one language in order to speak the other’ (emphasis original). In short, serious questions can be raised about the empirical adequacy of the unitary

undifferentiated model of bilingual language processing advanced by UTT advocates.

Similar considerations apply to the assertion that additive bilingualism (Lambert, 1974), the common underlying proficiency (Cummins, 1981a, 1981b), and teaching for crosslinguistic transfer reflect monoglossic ideologies. García (2009), for example, argued that the notion of additive bilingualism represents a theoretical framework in which bilingualism is positioned as two separate, isolated languages rather than as an integrated linguistic system. She goes on to argue that this functional compartmentalization of the bilingual's two languages, implied by additive bilingualism, gets translated into separate instructional spaces within bilingual programs. It is important to note that these claims are merely asserted with no supportive evidence or logical argumentation.

García and Li Wei (2014: 69) also questioned the notion of a common underlying proficiency, because, in their estimation, it still constructs students' L1 and L2 as separate: 'Instead, translanguaging validates the fact that bilingual students' language practices are not separated into ... home language and school language, instead transcending both'. They also argue that we can now 'shed the concept of transfer ... [in favor of] a conceptualization of integration of language practices in the person of the learner' (García & Li Wei, 2014: 80).

In short, UTT advocates conflate notions of additive bilingualism, the common underlying proficiency, and teaching for crosslinguistic transfer with monoglossic, dual competence, or separate underlying proficiency notions of bilingualism despite the fact that the former constructs have been invoked for more than 40 years to argue *against* separate underlying proficiency (Cummins, 1981a, 1981b) or *two solitudes* (Cummins, 2007) conceptions of bilingualism. No explanation has been provided as to why additive bilingualism (and its opposite *subtractive bilingualism*) is interpreted exclusively as referencing patterns of *linguistic* processing rather than as part of the *social* landscape experienced by students and teachers at school. As Cummins (2017b) pointed out, additive bilingualism emerged largely as a sociopolitical construct to challenge the suppression of minoritized students' home languages in schools. *It implies nothing with respect to how bilinguals process languages*. The conflation of additive bilingualism with monoglossic ideologies derives from the oversimplified dichotomy of heteroglossic/monoglossic and is simply asserted with no empirical evidence or analytic discussion.

The dismissal by García and Li Wei (2014) of the *common underlying proficiency* and *teaching for crosslinguistic transfer* took no account of relevant research consistent with these theoretical constructs. The Report of the National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine (NASEM, 2017) summarized more than 40 years of research relevant to these theoretical claims.

The following conclusion of this report affirmed the empirical foundation of the common underlying proficiency construct: ‘The two languages of bilinguals share a cognitive/conceptual foundation that can facilitate the acquisition and use of more than one language for communication, thinking, and problem solving’ (NASEM, 2017: 243). The legitimacy of teaching for crosslinguistic transfer was similarly reinforced in the same report: ‘the experimental studies reviewed [...] suggest that instructional routines that draw on students’ home language, knowledge, and cultural assets support literacy development in English’ (NASEM, 2017: 297).

The categorization of additive bilingualism as monoglossic also ignores the fact that numerous researchers who explicitly endorse dynamic conceptions of bilingual/multilingual cognitive processing also endorse the construct of additive bilingualism, understood as an instructional orientation to build on minoritized students’ multilingual repertoires. The originator of the notion of translanguaging, Cen Williams (2000), clearly had no problem in invoking additive bilingualism as a legitimate construct:

It could be argued that the constant switching from one language to the other, and the fact that sections of the notes were read in English and then explained in Welsh, provided students with opportunities to develop their individual bilingual capabilities; that it was a means of translanguaging and another form of creating an opportunity for additive bilingualism. (Williams, 2000: 139)

Lewis, Jones and Baker (2012b: 668) also viewed additive bilingualism as fully compatible with the notion of translanguaging, which, they suggest, shifts perceptions of minority group bi/multilingualism from separate and diglossic to integrated and heteroglossic and ‘from ideology that accented the subtractive and negative nature of bilingualism to one that expresses the advantages of additive bilingualism where languages in the brain, classroom, and street act simultaneously and not sequentially, with efficient integration and not separation’.

In summary, there is no basis for UTT advocates to conflate additive bilingualism with monoglossic ideologies. They have cited no research or documentary evidence to support any connection between the construct of additive bilingualism and patterns of bilingual language processing *for the simple reason that there is none*. Rather than ignoring the documentary evidence, it would have been more accurate to acknowledge that educators and researchers who promoted additive bilingualism were challenging the socially imposed hierarchy of languages and language varieties and the coercive power relations

that continue to suppress student and community languages in schools (see Cummins, 1986, 2001, for elaboration of this perspective).

With respect to consequential validity, the stigmatization of additive bilingualism as monoglossic and implicated in ‘watchful adherence’ to standardized language norms raises the question of how this perspective should be communicated to educators who, for many years, have promoted additive bilingualism as a challenge to subtractive ideologies in schools. What are the implications for teachers who are mandated by curriculum policies to help students develop proficiency in the standard academic language, including strong reading and writing skills, in both L1 and L2? García (2009: 36) has addressed this issue, but in a way that does little to clear up the confusion:

Because literacy relies on the standard, the standard language itself is taught explicitly in school, and it *certainly needs to be taught*. [...] We are not questioning the teaching of a standard language in school; without its acquisition, language minority children will continue **to fail and will not have equal** access to resources and opportunities. But we have to recognize that an *exclusive* focus on the standard variety keeps out other languaging practices that are children’s authentic linguistic identity expression. (García, 2009: 36, emphasis original)

Who has argued that the promotion of additive bilingualism involves an *exclusive* focus on the standard language? What García probably intends to communicate here is that the teaching of biliteracy together with L1 and L2 standard language skills should also include affirmation of minoritized students’ authentic languaging practices. I completely agree with this sentiment. However, this is not what has been argued in multiple publications by UTT advocates. Additive bilingualism (i.e. biliteracy) is dismissed unequivocally, with no qualifications or exceptions, as monoglossic, and hence stigmatizing of students’ integrated heteroglossic language varieties and practices. This may be perceived as a ‘strong’ and perhaps even superficially persuasive version of translanguaging theory (Britt *et al.*, 2014), but it falls far short of the criteria of empirical adequacy, logical coherence, and consequential validity.

To what extent do discourses of appropriateness rooted in raciolinguistic ideologies lie at the core of additive approaches to language education? <sup>5</sup>

This question reflects the claims advanced by Nelson Flores (e.g. Flores, 2019; Flores & Rosa, 2015) and other researchers who have contributed to the emerging ‘strong’ version of translanguaging theory (e.g. Martin *et al.*, 2019). These researchers argue that ‘additive approaches to bilingual education continue to interpret the linguistic practices of bilinguals through a monolingual

framework that marginalizes the fluid linguistic practices of these communities' (Flores & Rosa, 2015: 153). They claim that "notions such as 'standard language' or 'academic language' and the discourse of appropriateness in which they both are embedded must be conceptualized as racialized ideological perceptions rather than objective linguistic categories" (Flores & Rosa, 2015: 152). According to this interpretation, the teaching of academic language in additive bilingual programs involves the imposition of standardized language norms that are permeated by raciolinguistic discourses of appropriateness focused on molding minoritized students 'into white speaking subjects who have mastered the empirical linguistic practices deemed appropriate for a school context' (Flores & Rosa, 2015: 157).

As noted previously, the use of the term *additive bilingualism* by researchers or educators does not in any way imply endorsement of a two solitudes conceptualization of bilingual proficiency and bilingual instruction. Furthermore, as Cummins (2017b: 405) pointed out, far from marginalizing bilingual students, 'additive approaches to language education have explicitly challenged historical and current patterns of societal power relations that devalue, disparage, and exclude from schooling the language and cultural accomplishments and practices of minoritized communities'.

The problematic nature of the theoretical claims advanced by Flores and Rosa (2015) can be analyzed with reference to the criteria of empirical adequacy, logical coherence, and consequential validity. First, however, it is important to acknowledge the validity and importance of some aspects of their analysis. For example, it is clear that raciolinguistic ideologies *do* exist and that they exert pernicious effects on minoritized students' academic engagement and achievement (e.g. Labov, 1972; Lippi-Green, 1997/2012). It has also been long recognized that ideologies of linguistic purism communicated by teachers to students can undermine bilingual students' confidence and competence in both their home and school languages. Cummins (1981a: 32), for example, noted that '[d]espite the fact that Labov's analysis is universally accepted by linguists and sociolinguists, it is still disturbingly common to find administrators and teachers of language minority students in bilingual education programs disparaging the nonstandard version of the primary language (L1) which children bring to school and attempting to teach the standard version through explicit formal instruction'. At this point, despite ongoing discriminatory instructional policies and practices within schools, there is no dispute among educational researchers and applied linguists that 'educators must recognize, validate, and build on the diverse and rich repertoire of language practices that multilingual learners bring with them to school' (Martin *et al.*, 2019: 26). Inspirational educators have been showing



for many years how this can be implemented in linguistically diverse classrooms (e.g. Chow & Cummins, 2003; DeFazio, 1997).

Thus, Flores and Rosa's (2015) analysis is a useful reminder of the ongoing reality of both raciolinguistic ideologies and discourses of appropriateness. However, their claim that raciolinguistic ideologies and discourses of appropriateness are *intrinsically and inevitably* implicated in the teaching of academic language and additive approaches to bilingualism and biliteracy is unsupported.

No empirical evidence is cited by Flores and Rosa (2015) to support their conflation of academic language with standardized language and the embeddedness of both of these constructs, together with additive bilingualism, in raciolinguistic discourses of appropriateness. Their views on the teaching of standard language also appear to be at variance with García's (2009: 36) position that the standard language certainly needs to be taught.

Flores and Rosa (2015) do not acknowledge the considerable evidence that *academic language* is a legitimate theoretical construct that can be empirically distinguished from the language typically used in everyday social interactions (for reviews see Cummins, 2000; 2007b; Heppt *et al.*, 2016; Uccelli *et al.*, 2015). As one example of the research supporting the conceptual reality of academic language, Massaro (2015) reported that the vocabulary in 112 picture books he analyzed contained nearly twice the number of sophisticated or rare words than that found in adult speech directed to children or in speech between adults. Any attempt to dismiss the legitimacy of the construct of academic language that fails to even consider the empirical evidence is unconvincing.

With respect to logical coherence, Cummins (2017b) has pointed to numerous contradictions and inconsistencies in the theoretical claims advanced by Flores and Rosa (2015). One inconsistency involves their claim that 'discourses of appropriateness [...] permeate additive approaches to language education' (Flores & Rosa, 2015: 166) and their simultaneous claim that they are 'not suggesting that advocates of additive approaches to language education should abandon all of their efforts to legitimize the linguistic practices of their language-minoritized students' (p. 167).

The first claim entails a blanket condemnation, without qualification or nuance, of all forms of additive approaches to language education on the grounds that these pedagogical directions are permeated by raciolinguistic discourses of appropriateness. The second claim suggests that under certain unspecified circumstances, additive approaches *can* be mobilized to legitimize the linguistic practices of minoritized students. However, this second claim, which contradicts the initial claim, cries out for clarification and elaboration. Does this second claim mean that teachers should abandon only *some* of their efforts to promote

additive bilingualism? If so, which instructional components are problematic, and which are acceptable? Is it acceptable for teachers to promote reading, writing, and other academic skills together with additive forms of bilingualism so long as they also ‘shift the focus to scrutiny of the white listening subject’ (Flores & Rosa, 2015: 167)? If this is in fact the position that Flores and Rosa are advocating, it is unclear why they argue against additive approaches to bilingualism – their argument is against *uncritical* instructional approaches generally that fail to challenge coercive relations of power.

The argument that additive approaches to bilingualism are permeated by discourses of appropriateness and raciolinguistic ideologies invokes the following flawed logic:

Because

*some* educators who adopt additive approaches to minoritized students’ bilingualism in both bilingual and English-medium programs disparage, implicitly or explicitly, students’ fluid non-standard language varieties and practices by failing to affirm and build on these language varieties and practices as they teach standard academic language skills,

therefore

*all* educators who adopt additive approaches to bilingualism involving the teaching of academic skills in two languages are complicit in the marginalization of students’ fluid language varieties and practices.

In addition to failing to meet criteria of empirical adequacy and logical coherence, Flores and Rosa’s (2015) analysis falls short with respect to the criterion of consequential validity. As one example, they critique Olsen’s (2010: 33) argument that instruction for long-term English learners should promote their home language literacy skills and focus ‘on powerful oral language, explicit literacy development, instruction in the academic uses of English, high quality writing, extensive reading of relevant texts, and emphasis on academic language and complex vocabulary’. They characterize Olsen’s pedagogical recommendations as ‘squarely focused on molding [long-term English learners] into white speaking subjects who have mastered the empirical linguistic practices deemed appropriate for a school context’ (Flores & Rosa, 2015: 157). They suggest that an alternative pedagogical focus on critical language awareness combined with a heteroglossic rather than a monoglossic perspective has the potential to open up space for unmasking the racism inherent in additive approaches to language education.

A pedagogical focus on critical language awareness that valorizes the home language practices of minoritized students is endorsed by virtually all UTT and CTT advocates who have engaged with the construct of translanguaging (see, for example, Cummins, 2001; García & Kleifgen, 2019; Hélot *et al.*, 2018). But how is this focus in any way inconsistent with Olsen's recommendations that instruction should support students' home language literacies and expand their abilities to use oral and written language in powerful ways? Are Flores and Rosa (2015) suggesting that teachers should *not* encourage the development of powerful oral language, high quality writing, and extensive reading of relevant texts? If it is problematic for teachers to focus on powerful oral language, what should they focus on instead? If extensive reading of relevant texts is a problematic instructional goal, how should teachers expand their students' literacy skills? Are teachers who provide conceptual and linguistic feedback on minoritized students' academic writing complicit with discourses of appropriateness?

In short, Flores and Rosa's critique of additive approaches to biliteracy and of teachers' attempts to expand minoritized students' access to academic language registers has no empirical basis, is logically flawed, and devoid of clear pedagogical directions for teachers. Blanket generalizations simply asserted without qualifications risk undermining the overall credibility of a critical translanguaging approach to teaching minoritized students.

Flores (2019) has recently revisited the construct of additive bilingualism in a way that appears to contradict his earlier analysis. Specifically, despite his earlier claim that discourses of appropriateness permeate additive approaches to language education, he suggests that additive bilingualism is not necessarily infused with raciolinguistic ideologies. The limitation to additive bilingualism resides in the fact that it attributes the educational underachievement of Latinx students to linguistic difficulties rather than to racism:

In short, from a raciolinguistic perspective, the limitation to additive bilingualism is not that it is 'infused with raciolinguistic ideologies' (Cummins, 2017b, p. 415) but rather that it offers a purely linguistic analysis of a phenomenon that is highly racialized. Despite nods to structural inequality, at the core of additive bilingualism is a similar theory of change as the one that lies at the core of subtractive bilingualism – that the root of the problems confronted by Latina/o students is linguistic in nature. (Flores, 2019: 56)

To what extent is this claim valid? Obviously, the abstract concept of additive bilingualism is not making any theoretical claims and so the question becomes: To what extent do proponents of additive bilingualism offer a purely linguistic

analysis of underachievement among Latinx students rather than identifying the racialized power structures that undermine students' academic engagement and achievement? As one of many proponents for developing minoritized students' biliteracy abilities, I will answer this question with reference to my own academic work.

### **Evidence-Based Frameworks for Promoting Academic Achievement among Minoritized Students**

In multiple publications in the late 1970s and early 1980s, Cummins (1979, 1981a, 1981b, 1986) highlighted the fact that linguistic variables could not, by themselves, explain the underachievement of minoritized students. He argued that the root causes of underachievement lie in sociopolitical and sociocultural realities associated with societal power relations. Cummins (1981a: 39), for example, argued that '[t]here is no evidence for the belief that a switch between the language of the home and that of the school, i.e. "linguistic mismatch", is in itself, a cause of school failure'. Cummins (1986: 20) suggested that the linguistic mismatch hypothesis was 'patently inadequate' and that '[m]inority students are disabled or disempowered by schools in very much the same way that their communities are disempowered by interactions with societal institutions' (p. 23). An additive orientation towards minoritized students' language and culture was proposed as an essential ingredient to challenge disempowering educational structures. In short, Flores' (2019) claim that proponents of promoting additive bilingualism attribute Latinx students' academic problems exclusively or primarily to linguistic factors is without foundation (see Cummins, 1996/2001, for detailed discussion of this issue).

The frameworks outlined in Figures 2.1 and 2.2 sketch perspectives on the underachievement of minoritized students that, I would argue, are evidence-based, logically coherent, and useful in stimulating exploration of classroom and school-based instructional initiatives. The initial framework (Figure 2.1) proposes that relations of power in the wider society, ranging from coercive to collaborative in varying degrees, influence both the ways in which educators define their roles and the types of structures that are established in the educational system. Coercive relations of power refer to the exercise of power by a dominant individual, group, or country to the detriment of a subordinated individual, group or country. The assumption is that there is a fixed quantity of power that operates according to a zero-sum or subtractive logic; in other words, the more power one group has the less is left for other groups.

Collaborative relations of power, by contrast, reflect the sense of the term *power* that refers to *being enabled*, or *empowered* to achieve more. Within collaborative relations of power, power is not a fixed quantity but is generated

through interaction with others. The more empowered one individual or group becomes, the more is generated for others to share. The process is additive rather than subtractive. Within this context, empowerment can be defined as *the collaborative creation of power*. Schooling amplifies rather than silences minoritized students' power of *self-expression* regardless of their current level of proficiency in the dominant school language.

## SOCIETAL POWER RELATIONS

influence  
the ways in which educators define their roles (teacher identity)  
and  
the structures of schooling (curriculum, funding, assessment, etc.)  
which, in turn, influence

the ways in which educators interact  
with linguistically and culturally diverse students.

These interactions form  
an

### INTERPERSONAL SPACE

within which  
*learning happens*  
and  
*identities are negotiated.*

These **IDENTITY NEGOTIATIONS**

either

Reinforce coercive relations of power

or

Promote collaborative relations of power

**Figure 2.1** Societal power relations, identity negotiation, and academic achievement.

*Note.* Adapted from *Negotiating identities: Education for empowerment in a diverse society* by J. Cummins 2001, p. 20. Copyright 2001 by J. Cummins. Reprinted with permission.

Educator role definitions refer to the mindset of expectations, assumptions and goals that educators bring to the task of educating linguistically and culturally diverse students. Educational structures refer to the organization of schooling in a broad sense that includes policies, programs, curriculum, and assessment. While these structures will generally reflect the values and priorities of dominant groups in society, they are not by any means fixed or static and can be contested by individuals and groups.

Educational structures, together with educator role definitions, determine the patterns of interactions between educators, students, and communities. These interactions form an interpersonal space within which the acquisition of knowledge and formation of identity is negotiated. Power is created and shared within this interpersonal space where minds and identities meet. As such, these teacher-student interactions constitute the most immediate determinant of student academic success or failure. Teacher agency is intrinsic to this framework in the sense that the interactions between educators, students and communities are never neutral; in varying degrees, they either reinforce coercive relations of power or promote collaborative relations of power.

The central tenet of this framework is that effective education for students from minoritized communities *requires* educators to challenge coercive relations of power as they are manifested in the structures and processes of schooling. This obviously includes a challenge to all forms of raciolinguistic ideologies whether manifested through discourses of appropriateness or some other channel. However, the framework also includes a broader range of discriminatory structures and ideologies than is captured by the construct of raciolinguistic ideologies. For example, deaf students have suffered major discrimination for generations as a result of educational policies that prohibit instructional use of natural sign languages (e.g. Snoddon & Weber, in press). Similarly, the well-documented and long-term underachievement of white working-class students in the United Kingdom (House of Commons Working Committee, 2014) is not readily captured within discourses of *racial* discrimination.

Figure 2.2 highlights the fact that more than just a critical translanguaging or critical multilingual awareness (García, 2017) approach is required to transform the educational achievement of minoritized students. The international literature on patterns of academic achievement (e.g. OECD, 2010; Van Avermaet *et al.* 2018) identifies three groups (excluding students with special educational needs) that are commonly seen as potentially educationally disadvantaged: (a) students whose L1 is different from the language of school instruction, (b) students from low-socioeconomic status [SES] backgrounds, and (c) students from communities that have been marginalized or excluded from

educational and social opportunities as a result of discrimination in the wider society. Figure 2.2 specifies some of the societal conduits through which these potential educational disadvantages operate and also specifies evidence-based educational interventions that respond to these potential disadvantages. It should be noted that *disadvantage* is not a fixed or static construct; the linguistic and social realities of the three groups specified above are transformed into actual educational disadvantages only when the school fails to implement instruction that responds effectively to these realities.

A critical translanguaging or multilingual awareness approach would clearly include the instructional strategies of engaging students' multilingual repertoires, connecting to students' lives, decolonizing curriculum and instruction through culturally sustaining pedagogy, valorizing and building on students' varieties of home and school languages, and affirming students' identities. However, other instructional strategies such as scaffolding instruction, reinforcing students' grasp of academic language across the curriculum, and maximizing literacy engagement have been less emphasized by advocates of UTT (e.g. García, 2017; García & Kleifgen, 2019; Martin *et al.*, 2019). For example, an extremely large body of research demonstrates a causal relationship between literacy engagement and literacy achievement for both native-speakers and second-language speakers of the school language (e.g. Guthrie, 2004; Krashen, 2004; Lindsay, 2010), but this research is not highlighted as relevant even in articles focused directly on translanguaging and literacies (e.g. García & Kleifgen, 2019).

Student background	Linguistically Diverse	Low-SES	Marginalized Status
<b>Sources of potential disadvantage</b>	-Failure to understand instruction due to home-school language differences;	-Inadequate healthcare and/or nutrition; -Housing segregation; -Lack of cultural and material resources in the home due to poverty; -Limited access to print in home and school;	-Societal discrimination; -Low teacher expectations; -Stereotype threat; -Stigmatization of L1/L2 language varieties; -Identity devaluation;
<b>Evidence-based instructional response</b>	-Scaffold comprehension and production of language across the curriculum; -Engage students' multilingual repertoires; -Reinforce academic language across the curriculum;	-Maximize print access and literacy engagement; -Reinforce academic language across the curriculum;	-Connect instruction to students' lives; -Decolonize curriculum and instruction through culturally sustaining pedagogy; -Valorize and build on L1/L2 language varieties; -Affirm student identities in association with academic engagement;

**Figure 2.2** Evidence-based instructional responses to sources of potential underachievement.

Similarly, mixed messages are given about the importance of reinforcing academic language across the curriculum. This instructional strategy is seemingly endorsed by statements such as the following: ‘A translanguaging literacies approach also includes strategies such as translation and cross-linguistic study of syntax, vocabulary, word choice, cognates, and discourse structure to advance students’ metalinguistic awareness of their own bilingual practices, thus heightening their engagement with texts’ (García & Kleifgen, 2019: 13). But at the same time, this message is undermined by arguments that dispute the existence and legitimacy of academic language as well as deny the linguistic reality of languages in general. With reference to the quotation above, educators might well ask questions such as the following: If languages have no linguistic reality, what are we translating between? What does *cross-linguistic* mean if languages don’t really exist? If languages are *real* only in a social sense but not a linguistic sense, how should we interpret cognates?



## Conclusion

There is probably minimal difference in practice between the instructional strategies promoted by advocates of Unitary Translanguaging Theory as compared to those promoted by advocates of Crosslinguistic Translanguaging Theory. However, I have argued that the *theoretical framing* of these strategies in the scholarly writing of UTT advocates fails to address relevant empirical evidence, incorporates logically inconsistent propositions, and communicates unclear and at times confusing messages to educators committed to equitable and effective teaching of minoritized students. Specifically, the theoretical framing proposed by UTT advocates is problematic in light of:

- inconsistencies in their depiction of the construct of *language* as (a) illegitimate, (b) socially real, (c) a set of standard conventions that should be taught explicitly in school, and (c) potentially oppressive to minoritized students;
- their identification of additive bilingualism, academic language, and teaching for crosslinguistic transfer as inherently monoglossic and consequently illegitimate;
- their depiction of additive approaches to minoritized students' bilingualism as permeated with discourses of appropriateness and raciolinguistic ideologies;
- their dismissal of the fact that promotion of additive bilingualism and the teaching of academic language registers have been framed within a detailed analysis of how societal power relations are actualized through patterns of teacher-student identity negotiation in schools;
- the multiple inconsistencies, inaccuracies, and contradictions that derive from unqualified assertions and generalizations (e.g. teaching powerful oral language and high quality writing to minoritized students serves only to mold them into white speaking subjects);
- their failure to review and evaluate empirical evidence relevant to their theoretical assertions (e.g. research supporting the legitimacy of the common underlying proficiency construct).

The problematic theoretical framing of UTT has resulted in unproductive debates about whether this perspective is inconsistent with the promotion of civil rights (MacSwan, 2020) and an ally of linguistic imperialism and linguistic injustice (Grin, 2018). These debates are, at the very least, a distraction from the main goal of translanguaging theory, namely the transformation of the educational experiences of minoritized students such that their voices are heard in the classroom and beyond.

In contrast to UTT, CTT advocates argue that the interdependence of academic language skills and the integrated nature of bilingual language

processing do not require us to relinquish the construct of specific languages nor to banish from the lexicon terms such as home language, school language, L1/L2, etc. A CTT approach also affirms the legitimacy of constructs such as additive bilingualism, common underlying proficiency, and teaching for transfer across languages. Additive approaches to bilingualism are conceptualized as committed to challenging coercive relations of power and affirming the fluid linguistic practices of minoritized students. Finally, while cautioning against any form of rigid prescriptivism that devalues minoritized students' linguistic practices and talents, CTT advocates concur with scholars such as Fillmore and Wong Fillmore (2012), García (2009), Olsen (2010) and Delpit (2006) that academic language should be taught explicitly in school in a way that demystifies not only how the language itself works but also how language use intersects with hierarchies of power in all aspects of human society.

This critique of the extraneous theoretical baggage that has accumulated around the construct of translanguaging is not in any way intended to undermine the theoretical and pedagogical value of the core construct. Similarly, the constructs of raciolinguistic ideologies and discourses of appropriateness represent useful tools to conceptualize and guide antiracist teaching (Lee, 1985). My hope is that the credibility and instructional impact of these conceptual tools will benefit from constructive and critical dialogue.

## Notes

(1) For ease of expression, I am using the citation 'García and colleagues' to refer to the following publications cited in this chapter that represent a sample of the extensive scholarly output produced by Ofelia García and colleagues over the past decade: Bartlett & García, 2011; Flores, 2019; Flores & Rosa, 2015; García, 2009; García, 2017; García, 2018; García & Kleifgen, 2019; García & Kleyn, 2016; García & Li Wei, 2014; García & Otheguy, 2014; Martin *et al.*, 2019; Otheguy *et al.*, 2015.

(2) Cummins (in press) also critiqued an additional theoretical claim regarding the Council of Europe's notion of *plurilingualism* which, García (2018: 883) argues, ignores power imbalances between speakers of different languages and 'in today's globalized neoliberal economy, plurilingualism is exalted as a tool for profit making and personal gain'. Cummins pointed out that the conflation of plurilingualism with a neoliberal corporate agenda is simply asserted, without empirical evidence. Furthermore, if knowledge of multiple languages is seen as furthering a neoliberal agenda, the same argument would apply to any educational qualification. Few educators (progressive or non-progressive) would suggest that we should stop educating people because a highly educated workforce promotes corporate profit making.

(3) It is beyond the scope of this chapter to review other theoretical conceptions of multilingualism that have been proposed during the past decade under the influence of García's (2009) elaboration of the construct of translanguaging. These include Creese and Blackledge's (2010) concept of *flexible bilingualism*, Cenoz and Gorter's (2014) *Focus on Multilingualism*, Slembrouck *et al.*'s (2018), *Functional Multilingual Learning*, and the *Holistic Model for Multilingualism in Education* proposed by Duarte and Günther-van der Meij (2018). All of these approaches, together with Hornberger's (2003) *Continua of Biliteracy*, view the boundaries between languages as permeable and share the goal of 'turning multilingualism into a powerful didactic tool' (Slembrouck *et al.* 2018: 18). However, unlike UTT, these theoretical proposals do not propose an *either-or* dichotomy between *language* and *linguaging* or claim that the notion of *a language* is an illegitimate construct. For example, Cenoz and Gorter (2014: 242) suggest that 'languages can be distinct entities because they are treated as such by social actors in the school context'. In this respect, these theoretical formulations can be seen as consistent with CTT.

(4) In the present chapter, *theory* refers to a principle or set of principles proposed to explain or promote understanding of specific phenomena. To be considered valid, a theory must be capable of accounting for *all* the relevant phenomena that have been credibly established. A *theoretical proposition* or *claim* is a statement that purports to be evidence-based and valid. A *theoretical hypothesis* is a more tentative statement or prediction usually put forward so that its validity can be tested through research. A *theoretical construct* is an abstract explanatory variable or conceptual entity that is not directly observable, but which is used to account for observations, behavior, or phenomena. Finally, a *theoretical framework* is a more elaborate grouping of interrelated theoretical propositions and constructs designed to account for phenomena, guide research, and/or legitimize particular instructional approaches.

(5) Many of the problematic claims in relation to additive approaches to bilingualism and raciolinguistic ideologies discussed in this section relate specifically to the prolific publications of Nelson Flores. I focus primarily on the Flores and Rosa (2015) article as representative of this work. I also locate this work within the general theoretical framework elaborated by García and colleagues on the grounds that these authors cite Flores' work extensively and have co-published with him. However, it is not clear that García would endorse all of the theoretical claims made by Flores. For example, Flores and Rosa's claim that additive approaches are embedded in discourses of appropriateness

would also seem to apply to the book written by Bartlett and García (2011) entitled *Additive Schooling in Subtractive Times: Bilingual Education and Dominican Immigrant Youth in the Heights*.

Similarly, García (2019: 36) does not question the teaching of a standard language in school whereas Flores and Rosa (2015: 152) view both standard language and academic language as ‘racialized ideological perceptions’ embedded in discourses of appropriateness. They include no qualifications of scope or certainty (Britt *et al.*, 2014) in relation to this and similar assertions throughout their article. Thus, it is legitimate to interpret their position as claiming that the teaching of standard forms of the school language (and, in bilingual programs, students’ home languages), and the expansion of students’ ability to use language powerfully in academic contexts are inevitably and invariably rooted in raciolinguistic ideologies.

This position is clearly at variance with García’s (2009) perspective. However, at this point, García has not distanced herself from any of the theoretical claims advanced by Flores. Consequently, I feel it is legitimate to include Flores’ work as an integral part of the emerging theoretical framework proposed by García and colleagues.

## References

- Auerbach, E. (1993) Reexamining English only in the ESL classroom. *TESOL Quarterly* 27, 9–32.
- Auerbach, E. (2016) Reflections on “Reexamining English only in the ESL classroom.” *TESOL Quarterly* 50(4), 936–939. doi: 10.1002/tesq.310
- Ballinger, S., Lyster, R., Sterzuk, A. and Genesee, F. (2017) Context-appropriate crosslinguistic pedagogy: Considering the role of language status in immersion education. *Journal of Immersion and Content-Based Language Education* 5 (1) 30–57. doi 10.1075/jicb.5.1.02bal
- Bartlett, L. and García, O. (2011) *Additive Schooling in Subtractive Times: Bilingual Education and Dominican Immigrant Youth in the Heights*. Nashville, TN: Vanderbilt University Press.
- Britt, M.A., Richter, T. and Rouet, J.F. (2014) Scientific literacy: The role of goal-directed reading and evaluation in understanding scientific information. *Educational Psychologist* 49 (2), 104–122. doi: 10.1080/00461520.2014.916217
- Carbonara, V. and Scibetta, A. (2019) *Imparare Attraverso le Lingue: Il Translanguaging come Pratica Didattica*. Rome: Carocci Editore.
- Cenoz, J. & Gorter, D. (2014) Focus on multilingualism as an approach in educational contexts. In A. Creese & A. Blackledge (eds), *Heteroglossia as Practice and Pedagogy* (pp. 239–254). Berlin, Germany: Springer.

- Chow, P. and Cummins, J. (2003) Valuing multilingual and multicultural approaches to learning. In S. R. Schecter and J. Cummins (eds), *Multilingual Education in Practice: Using Diversity as a Resource* (pp. 32–61). Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Council of Europe. (2018) *Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, teaching, assessment. Companion volume with new descriptors*. Strasbourg, France: Council of Europe Publishing. Retrieved from <https://www.coe.int/en/web/common-european-framework-reference-languages/home>
- Creese, A. & Blackledge, A. (2010) Translanguaging in the bilingual classroom: A pedagogy for learning and teaching? *The Modern Language Journal* 94 (1), 103–115.
- Cummins, J. (1979) Linguistic interdependence and the educational development of bilingual children. *Review of Educational Research* 49, 222–251.
- Cummins, J. (1981a) Four misconceptions about language proficiency in bilingual education. *NABE Journal* 5, 31–45.
- Cummins, J. (1981b) The role of primary language development in promoting educational success for language minority students. In California State Department of Education (ed), *Schooling and Language Minority Students: A Theoretical Framework* (pp. 3–49). Los Angeles: Evaluation, Dissemination and Assessment Center, California State University.
- Cummins, J. (1986) Empowering minority students: A framework for intervention. *Harvard Educational Review* 56, 18–36.
- Cummins, J. (1996/2001) *Negotiating Identities: Education for Empowerment in a Diverse Society*. Los Angeles: California Association for Bilingual Education.
- Cummins, J. (2000) *Language, Power and Pedagogy: Bilingual Children in the Crossfire*. Clevedon, England: Multilingual Matters.
- Cummins, J. (2007) Rethinking monolingual instructional strategies in multilingual classrooms. *The Canadian Journal of Applied Linguistics* 10, 221–240.
- Cummins, J. (2009) Transformative multiliteracies pedagogy: School-based strategies for closing the achievement gap. *Multiple Voices for Ethnically Diverse Exceptional Learners* 11, 38–56.
- Cummins, J. (2017a) Teaching for transfer in multilingual educational contexts. In O. García and A. Lin (eds), *Bilingual Education: Encyclopedia of Language and Education, 3<sup>rd</sup> edition* (pp. 103–115). New York: Springer Science + Business Media LLC.

- Cummins, J. (2017b) Teaching minoritized students: Are additive approaches legitimate? *Harvard Education Review* 87 (3), 404–425.
- Cummins, J. (in press) Teachers as knowledge-generators and agents of language policy: research, theory and ideology in plurilingual pedagogies. In Piccardo, E., Germain-Rutherford, A. and Lawrence, G. (eds), *Routledge Handbook of Plurilingual Education*. New York: Routledge.
- Cummins, J., Bismilla, V., Chow, P., Cohen, S., Giampapa, F., Leoni, L., Sandhu, P. and Sastri, P. (2005) Affirming identity in multilingual classrooms. *Educational Leadership* 63 (1), 38–43.
- Cummins, J. and Early, M. (2011) (eds), *Identity Texts: The Collaborative Creation of Power in Multilingual Schools*. Stoke-on-Trent, England: Trentham Books.
- Cummins, J. and Early, M. (2015) *Big Ideas for Expanding Minds: Teaching English Language Learners across the Curriculum*. Toronto: Rubicon Press/Pearson Canada.
- Cummins, J. and Persad, R. (2014) Teaching through a multilingual lens: The evolution of EAL policy and practice in Canada. *Education Matters*, 2(1). Available at:  
<http://em.synergiesprairies.ca/index.php/em/issue/view/7>
- de Bot, K., Verspoor, M. and Lowie, W. (2007) A dynamic systems theory approach to second language acquisition. *Bilingualism, Language and Cognition* 10, 7–21. Retrieved from  
<http://www.rug.nl/staff/c.l.j.de.bot/DeBotetal2007-Bilingualism.pdf>
- DeFazio, A. J. (1997) Language awareness at The International High School. In L. Van Lier and D. Corson (Eds), *Knowledge about Language. Encyclopedia of Language and Education* (pp. 99–107). Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Kluwer Academic Publishers, Inc.
- Delpit, L. (2006) *Other People's Children: Cultural Conflict in the Classroom*. New York: The New Press.
- Duarte, J. and Günther-van der Meij, M. (2018) A holistic model for multilingualism in education. *EuroAmerican Journal of Applied Linguistics and Languages* 5 (2), 24–43. Retrieved from  
<http://dx.doi.org/10.21283/2376905X.9.153>
- Edwards, J. (2012) *Multilingualism: Understanding linguistic diversity*. London: Continuum.
- Espinosa, C. and Herrera, L. (2016) Reclaiming bilingualism: Translanguaging in a science class. In O. García and T. Kleyn (Eds), *Translanguaging with Multilingual Students: Learning from Classroom Moments* (pp. 160–178). New York, NY: Routledge.

- Fillmore, L.W. & Fillmore, C.J. (2013). What does text complexity mean for English learners and language minority students? Stanford University, Graduate School of Education, Understanding Language Project. Retrieved from [https://ell.stanford.edu/sites/default/files/pdf/academic-papers/06LWF%20CJF%20Text%20Complexity%20FINAL\\_0.pdf](https://ell.stanford.edu/sites/default/files/pdf/academic-papers/06LWF%20CJF%20Text%20Complexity%20FINAL_0.pdf)
- Flores, N.L. (2019) Translanguaging into raciolinguistic ideologies: A personal reflection on the legacy of Ofelia García. *Journal of Multilingual Education Research*, Vol. 9, Article 5. Available at: <https://fordham.bepress.com/jmer/vol9/iss1/5>
- Flores, N. and Rosa, J. (2015) Undoing appropriateness: Raciolinguistic ideologies and language diversity in education. *Harvard Educational Review* 85, 149–171.
- García, O. (2009) *Bilingual Education in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century. A Global Perspective*. Boston: Basil Blackwell.
- García, O. (2017) Critical multilingual language awareness and teacher education. In J. Cenoz, D. Gorter and S. May (eds), *Language Awareness and Multilingualism, Encyclopedia of Language and Education* (pp. 263–280). doi 10.1007/978-3-319-02240-6\_30
- García, O. (2018) The multiplicities of multilingual interaction. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism* (21)7, 881–891 doi:10.1080/13670050.2018.1474851
- García, O. and Kleifgen, J. A. (2019) Translanguaging and literacies. *Reading Research Quarterly*. Published online, 12 November. doi:10.1002/rrq.286
- García, O. and Kleyn, T. (eds) (2016) *Translanguaging with Multilingual Students*. New York and London: Routledge.
- García, O. and Lin, A. M. Y. (2017) Translanguaging in bilingual education. In O. García and A.M.Y. Lin (eds), *Bilingual and Multilingual Education (Encyclopedia of Language and Education, Vol. 5)* (pp. 117–130). Dordrecht: Springer.
- García, O. and Otheguy, R. (2014) Spanish and Hispanic bilingualism. In M. Lacorte (ed.) *The Routledge Handbook of Hispanic Applied Linguistics* (pp. 639–658). New York, NY: Routledge.
- García, O. and Li Wei. (2014) *Translanguaging: Language, Bilingualism and Education*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Grin, F. (2018) On some fashionable terms in multilingualism research: Critical assessment and implications for language policy. In P. A. Kraus and F. Grin (eds), *The Politics of Multilingualism: Europeanisation, Globalization and Linguistic Governance* (pp. 247–273). John Benjamins Publishing Company.

- Guthrie, J. T. (2004) Teaching for literacy engagement. *Journal of Literacy Research* 36, 1–30.
- Hélot, C., Frijns, C., VanGorp, K. and Sierens, S. (eds) (2018) *Language Awareness in Multilingual Classrooms in Europe: From Theory to Practice*. Amsterdam: de Gruyter Mouton Publishers.
- Heppt, B., Sofie Henschel, S. and Haagb, N. (2016) Everyday and academic language comprehension: Investigating their relationships with school success and challenges for language minority learners. *Learning and Individual Differences* 47, 244–251.  
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.lindif.2016.01.004>
- Herdina, P. and Jessner, U. (2002) *A Dynamic Model of Multilingualism: Changing the psycholinguistic perspective*. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Hornberger, N.H. (2003) (ed.) *Continua of Biliteracy: An Ecological Framework for Educational Policy, Research, and Practice in Multilingual Settings*. Bristol, England: Multilingual Matters.
- House of Commons Education Committee (2014) *Underachievement in Education by White Working Class Children. First Report of Session 2014–15*. London: The Stationery Office Limited.
- Jaspers, J. (2018) The transformative limits of translanguaging. *Language and Communication* 58, 1–10.
- Krashen, S. D. (2004) *The Power of Reading: Insights from the Research*. 2nd edition. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Labov, W. (1969) *A study of non-standard English*. Washington, DC: Center for Applied Linguistics. Retrieved from  
<https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED024053.pdf>
- Labov, W. (1972) *Language in the Inner City*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Lambert, W.E. (1974) Culture and language as factors in learning and education. In F. E. Aboud and R. D. Meade (eds) *Cultural Factors in Learning and Education. Proceedings of the Fifth Western Washington Symposium on Learning* (pp. 99–122). Bellingham, WA: Western Washington University.
- Lee, M. (1985) *Letters to Marcia: A Teacher's Guide to Anti-Racist Education*. Toronto: Cross Cultural Communication Centre.
- Leung, C. and 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. doi: 10.1111/modl.12568



- Lindsay, J. (2010) *Children's Access to Print Material and Education-Related Outcomes: Findings from a meta-analytic review*. Naperville, IL: Learning Point Associates.
- Lippi-Green, R. (1997/2012). *English with an Accent: Language, Ideology and Discrimination in the United States*. New York: Routledge.
- Little, D., and Kirwin, D. (2019) *Engaging with Linguistic Diversity*. London: Bloomsbury Academic.
- Lucas, T. and Katz, A. (1994) Reframing the debate: The roles of native languages in English-only programs for language minority students. *TESOL Quarterly* 28, 537–562.
- MacSwan, J. (2017) A multilingual perspective on translanguaging. *American Educational Research Journal* 54 (1), 167–201. DOI: 10.3102/0002831216683935
- MacSwan, J. (2020) Translanguaging, language ontology and civil rights. *World Englishes*. 1–13. Published online 16 March 2020. <https://doi.org/10.1111/weng.12464>
- Makoni, S. and Pennycook, A.D. (2007) Disinventing and reconstituting languages. In S. Makoni and A. Pennycook (eds), *Disinventing and Reconstituting Languages* (pp. 1–41). Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Martin, K.M., Aponte, H J. and García, O. (2019) Countering raciolinguistic ideologies: the role of translanguaging in educating bilingual children. *Cahiers Internationaux de Sociolinguistique* 16 (2), 19–41.
- Massaro, D.W. (2015) Two different communication genres and implications for vocabulary development and learning to read. *Journal of Literacy Research* 47 (4) 505–527. doi: 10.1177/1086296X15627528
- Messick, S. (1994) The interplay of evidence and consequences in the validation of performance assessments. *Educational Researcher* 23, 13–23.
- Moll, L.C., Amanti, C., Neff, D. and Gonzalez, N. (1992) Funds of knowledge for teaching: Using a qualitative approach to connect homes and classrooms. *Theory into Practice* 31 (2), 132–141.
- NASEM (National Academies of Sciences, Engineering and Medicine). (2017) *Promoting the Educational Success of Children and Youth Learning English: Promising Futures*. Washington, DC: The National Academies Press. doi: 10.17226/24677
- OECD. (2010) *PISA 2009 Results: Learning to Learn—Student Engagement, Strategies and Practices (Volume III)*. Paris: OECD. Retrieved from <http://www.oecd.org/dataoecd/11/17/48852630.pdf>

- Otheguy, R., García, O. and Reid, W. (2015) Clarifying translanguaging and deconstructing named languages: A perspective from linguistics. *Applied Linguistics Review* 6 (3), 281–307. doi:10.1515/applirev-2015-0014
- Paulsrud, B., Rosén, J., Straszer, B. and Wedin, Å. (2017) (eds) *New Perspectives on Translanguaging and Education*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- Prasad, G. (2016) Beyond the mirror towards a plurilingual prism: Exploring the creation of plurilingual “identity texts” in English and French classrooms in Toronto and Montpellier. *Intercultural Education* 26 (6), 497–514.
- Sierens, S. and Van Avermaet, P. (2014) Language diversity in education. In D. Little, C. Leung and P. Van Avermaet (Eds), *Managing Diversity in Education* (pp. 204–222). Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- Skutnabb-Kangas, T. (2015) Linguicism. *The Encyclopedia of Applied Linguistics*. Malden, MA: Blackwell. Published Online: 19 June 2015. doi: 10.1002/9781405198431.wbeal1460.
- Slembrouck, S., Van Avermaet, P. and Van Gorp, K. (2018) Strategies of multilingualism in education for minority children. In P. Van Avermaet, S. Slembrouck, K. Van Gorp, S. Sierens and K. Maryns (eds) *The Multilingual Edge of Education* (pp. 9–39). London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Snoddon, K. and Weber, J. (in press) (eds) *Critical Perspectives on Plurilingualism in Deaf Education*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- Uccelli, P., Barr, C. D., Dobbs, C. L., Galloway, E. P., Meneses, A. and Sanchez, E. (2015) Core academic language skills: An expanded operational construct and a novel instrument to chart school-relevant language proficiency in pre-adolescent and adolescent learners. *Applied Psycholinguistics* 36, 1077–1109.  
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/S014271641400006X>
- von der Mühlen, S., Richter, T., Schmid, S., Schmidt, E. M. and Berthold, K. (2016) Judging the plausibility of arguments in scientific texts: a student–scientist comparison. *Thinking and Reasoning* 22 (2), 221–249. doi: 10.1080/13546783.2015.1127289
- Williams, C. (1994) *Arfarniad o ddulliau dysgu ac addysgu yng nghyd-destun addysg uwchradd ddwyieithog* [An evaluation of teaching and learning methods in the context of bilingual secondary education] (Unpublished PhD thesis). University of Wales, Bangor, UK.
- Williams, C. (1996) Secondary education: Teaching in the bilingual situation. In C. Williams, G. Lewis and C. Baker (eds). *The Language Policy: Taking Stock* (pp. 39–78). Llangefni, UK: CAI.

Williams, C. (2000) Welsh-medium and bilingual teaching in the further education sector. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism* 3 (2), 129–148.