Theorizing Translanguaging and Multilingual Literacies through Human Capital Theory

Patrick H. Smith & Luz A. Murillo

University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign

University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign

Department of Curriculum & Instruction

College of Education

1310 S. Sixth Street

Champaign, IL 61821

 Email Addresses:

Patrick Smith: phsmith@illinois.edu (Corresponding author)

Luz Murillo: lmurillo@illinois.edu

Abstract

In this conceptual article we invite multilingual researchers to consider the concept of translanguaging through the lens of human capital theory. Our thinking about the interconnections among human capital, multilingualism, and translanguaging is motivated by our research in border colonias and other minoritized communities in South Texas, U.S.A., and we begin by describing these globalized Mexican diaspora communities located on the U.S.-Mexico border. We provide a brief overview of translanguaging by connecting this concept to similar terms used in related disciplines of interest to multilingualism research. We discuss how human capital has been used in educational research before outlining six forms of capital that offer potential for understanding how multilingualism can be fostered in and out of schools. We conclude with suggestions for empirical research on multilingual literacies and translanguaging.

Keywords: translanguaging, human capital theory, bilingual education, teacher preparation, U.S.-Mexico border

Introduction: Theorizing Multilingualism from the U.S.-Mexico Borderlands

In this conceptual article we urge researchers interested in multilingual literacies to consider human capital theory as a heuristic for understanding more precisely how multilinguals leverage their knowledge of multiple written codes to accomplish various functions in their daily lives. We are interested in extending notions such as "language as resource" (Ruíz, 1984), "Funds of Knowledge" (González, Moll, & Amanti, 2005; Vélez-Ibáñez & Greenberg, 1992), and "community cultural wealth" (Yosso, 2005), all of which have influenced scholarship and, to a lesser extent, practice in the education of multilingual and culturally/linguistically diverse learners. In the case of multilingual reading and writing, we ask "resource for what purposes?" By pinpointing the specific purposes of literacy in multiple languages for readers/writers situated in particular contexts, we hope to contribute to multilingualism research and to provide educators and policy makers with compelling evidence of the value of multilingual literacies in and out of schools.

Through ethnographic research with bilingual teachers and families in communities along the U.S.-Mexico border, we have learned that residents of these multilingual, economically marginalized communities produce and consume written forms of Spanish, English, and a third, mixed form known locally as "TexMex" (Anzaldúa, 1987/2012). There is disagreement regarding the definition and even the existence of TexMex. Demographically, while data from the most recent US Census indicate that approximately 75% of the members of households in

Texas (U.S.A.) counties along the border claim to speak Spanish, the Census, like the Texas Education Agency (TEA), makes no mention of TexMex. Conversely, many of the teachers we have worked with on the border claim that TexMex was their primary family language during childhood, with standardized Spanish and English used outside family domains, including work and school. Distinguishing between the three languages is further complicated by the recent popularization of the term "Spanglish" on a national level (Stavans, 2003), a problem which some scholars have rejected outright by categorizing TexMex as a vernacular form of Spanish (Lipski, 2008) and which others have resolved by describing Mexican American English and Mexican American Spanish as separate codes (Martínez, 2006). Other studies (Martínez, 2010) suggest that Spanglish is comprised of native-like, fluid codeswitching between Spanish and English.

In this paper we treat TexMex as a mixed form that is unique to the Texas, U.S.A. border with Mexico. *The Code Switcher's Guide to the Rio Grande Valley*, an online word list (Herrera, 2014) describes TexMex:

This language has gone mostly undocumented until recent interest in Hispanic literature began to shed light on its existence and to validate its importance. It is a rapidly evolving language that, until now, has been passed on orally from generation to generation, growing and changing in kitchens and backyards from Brownsville to Laredo. Its existence cannot be denied, yet its name, because of its regional specificity, is difficult to pin down. Some call it Tex-Mex, others call it Spanglish or Valluco. The name Rioese has even been suggested" (Introduction, para 1).

Sayer (2013, p. 74) describes features of TexMex as including intersentential and intrasentential code-switching between English and Spanish, borrowings, calques/cross linguistic influences, archaic forms from colonial-era Spanish, and morphosyntactic influences from regional varieties of Mexican Spanish, urban U.S. Spanish slang (Caló), and African American English Vernacular. Although linguists have pointed out that many of the features of TexMex are also found in contemporary dialects of U.S. Spanish (Lipski, 2008), here we follow local preferences among border speakers in order to discuss translanguaging between and beyond what traditionally have been described as three separate languages, English, Spanish, and TexMex.

Along with many other researchers, we find that teachers and school administrators in this region, with some important exceptions, are at best ambivalent and sometimes hostile to the use of Latino students' home languages for anything more than the most temporary of bridges to English literacy (Guerrero & Guerrero, 2009; Murillo, 2010). A number of school districts in the region have instituted Spanish/English bilingual or "dual language" programs, generally with the promise that doing so will help children pass the state test and thereby privileging Spanish to some degree. However, because the state education authorities do not recognize TexMex (the home language of many children growing up along the U.S.-Mexico border), speakers of TexMex do not have the opportunity to learn through their home language at school. Despite one report of positive teacher attitudes toward TexMex in San Antonio, Texas (Sayer, 2013), in our own research on the border we have found very few examples of classrooms in which TexMex is encouraged, permitted, or even acknowledged. This pattern is grounded in the historical linguicism (Philippson, 1992; Skuttnab-Kangas, 2000) exercised in Texas schools against Spanish and TexMex as languages of instruction for minoritized children (Anzaldúa, 1987/2012;

Murillo & Smith, 2011) and is reinforced by the current predominance of high-stakes testing in standardized English only (Nichols & Berliner, 2007). The net effect of this convergence of history and policy has been to reduce the already minimal time that Spanish-speaking students are legally permitted to learn in and through their home language (Palmer, 2011; Palmer & Lynch, 2008).

As a result, schools in this multilingual sociolinguistic region foster, at best, a kind of reductionist approach to biliteracy. We argue that it is reductionist because biliteracy instruction mainly focuses on teaching students a set of isolated skills in English and Spanish (Murillo, 2010), making it unlikely that students will achieve strong literacies in either language. Thus, in a state in which bilingual education is not restricted or banned by voter referendum or through legislation, teachers along the border refer to their Tex-Mex- and Spanish-speaking students as "kinder transition students" and "first grade transition students," to denote the practice of moving these children into English-only classrooms as quickly as possible. In many cases, an outcome is one of reducing local multilingualism.

Like many multilingual and minoritized spaces, South Texas is a place where theories—usually of the deficit variety—are applied, not generated. However, it is in this sociolinguistic environment of linguistic repression and enforced monolingualism and monoliteracy through schooling that we also find examples of human capital that, we argue, are made possible by multilingual literacies. In our work preparing bilingual teachers, language arts educators, and others who teach subject matter courses that are typically designated in bilingual schools as taking place in either "English" or "Spanish" (but very seldom in both), we have learned that,

despite widespread community multilingualism, boundaries between languages and prescriptions for their legitimate use remain strong. By focusing teachers' attention on recognizing examples and the consequences of linguicism in their own educational trajectories and those of their parents and other family members, and by introducing decolonizing pedagogies that include the use of case studies with multilingual readers, *testimonios* (oral histories), documentation of students' family and community literacy practices, and bilingual children's literature written by local authors (Murillo, 2012), we find leverage for the slow process of changing teachers' negative ideologies against the language practices of multilinguals in South Texas. We turn to the topic of translanguaging, another potential tool in this effort.

Translanguaging

Translanguaging (García & Leiva, 2014; introduced by Williams, 1996) is one of the most innovative notions to emerge in the field of multilingualism and education. As the theme of the present special issue suggests, the concept of translanguaging is attracting a great deal of attention among educators who understand the place of multilingualism and multi-dialectalism in the lives of their students and who are seeking ways to tap into learners' linguistic resources as tools for teaching and learning emergent bilinguals (García, 2009; Martínez, 2010; Sayer, 2013). From the perspective of multilingual research, translanguaging is also compelling because it illuminates what bilingual and multilingual speakers actually do with language within and across specific instances of local social interaction.

To some degree, translanguaging research is concerned with language-in-use phenomena traditionally studied through the lenses of "code-switching," an earlier, well known term, and more recently "code-meshing" (Canagarajah, 2013; Guerra, 2012; Young, 2013). Both of these terms refer to the alternation of repertoires pertaining to a single language system. In this article, we consider three languages—English, Spanish, and TexMex—the first two of which are accepted, usually uncritically, by educators and policy makers and certainly in everyday discourse as distinct "languages." In some sense, these terminological distinctions are discipline specific within the language sciences. For example, code-switching (CS) is a term favored by linguists and used by them to focus primarily on the code (languages) being alternated, generally in speech rather than writing. Thus, the binary of "inter-sentential" and "intra-sentential" switches, which allows syntacticians and sociolinguists to distinguish between points of alternation between sentences (inter-sentential CS) and within the bounds of the syntactic unit known to linguists and to grammar teachers (albeit somewhat differently) as "the sentence" (intra-sentential CS; Poplack, 1980, 1981).

Code-meshing (CM) is a term that has been favored recently by composition scholars (Guerra, 2012; Young, 2013) to focus on the use of alternate rhetorical patterns, styles, and messages in the context of writing by young adults, as a form of resistance (Canagarajah, 2011). The emphasis on written texts and youth identities that is the focus of CM scholarship lends itself to the production and interpretation of multimodal texts which can include oral language (for example, through the inclusion of music and video) but which also feature print literacies and digital images with their attendant characteristics of color, font, positioning, etc. (Honeyford, 2014). For a full discussion of the disciplinary nuances that underlie each of these terms, see

García and Wei (2014) and papers in Canagarajah (2013). Here, we summarize the salient points for purposes of our discussion: (1) coming mainly from linguistics, CS research has focused on oral language, with an emphasis at the sentence and word level as much or more as on extended discourse; (2) CM research, coming from composition studies and rhetoric, has focused on written language and longer texts produced and consumed by college students and academics; (3) for different reasons, both CS and CM research has focused mainly on the language use of adults and not on the classroom language of children and youth. (However, for notable exceptions see Toribio, 2001 for research on how children develop competence as code-switchers; Genishi, 1981, Gort, 2012, Reyes 2004, and Zentella, 1981 for research on children's language use in school; and Faltis, 1989 and Jacobson, 1982 for a bilingual methodology using non-concurrent bilingual teaching).

In contrast to research on multilingualism and language alternation from CS and CM perspectives, translanguaging research spans both oral and written language, addressing them from sociolinguistic and psycholinguistic/cognitive approaches to language. Translanguaging has also been used to describe the language use of bilingual children, youth, and teachers in educational settings (Creese & Blackledge, 2010; García, 2009; Gort & Pontier, 2013; Sayer, 2013). Canagarajah (2013) has observed that translanguaging affords a focus on practices rather than on the code or language as product. Sayer (2013, p. 69) notes that translanguaging "captures the sense in which language is a verb rather than a noun, as a social act people do rather than a linguistic object that is possessed." These qualities make translanguaging an attractive concept for multilingual scholars and educators who wish to research and teach with the full range of learners' linguistic repertoires.

Translanguaging and Human Capital

To theorize translanguaging and multilingual literacies, we approach language and literacy from a human capital perspective. We reject key assumptions of monetarist interpretations of human capital, including claims for the existence of "good family backgrounds" (Becker, 1993, p. 17; Checchi, 2006, p. 94) and the implicit corollary that some types of family backgrounds are inherently bad. We also disregard the assumption that cultural and linguistic homogeneity in communities are highly desirable economic conditions. Following Weinreich (1953, vii), who observed more than sixty years ago that "a linguistic community is never homogenous and hardly ever self contained," we doubt that such homogeneity truly exists, except in gross, relative terms. Although some of the more culturally and linguistically homogenous communities may indeed be wealthier in terms of economic capital than some communities that are more diverse, we see no evidence for causal effects. Thus, we understand human capital not as the reduction of complex human activities, such as education and literacy, to simplistic variables in financial equations, but in a broad sense compatible with an understanding of multilingual literacies and cultural diversity as complex, nuanced phenomena that are simultaneously globally and locally situated.

Bourdieu's ideas provide a starting point for thinking about how translanguaging and capital are related. Bourdieu was especially interested in the place of language in social relations, as evident in his claims that "… the whole social structure is present in each [linguistic] interaction …" and that utterances are "signs of wealth" (1991, pp. 66–67). For Bourdieu and other human capital theorists, the value associated with forms of capital is dependent on the practicality of their

conversion into other forms, including monetary wealth. This line of thought has been extended by Luke (2008) through a focus on the material consequences of literacy, specifically the use of pedagogy to "enable the equitable conversion of *embodied capital* (e.g., skill, disposition) into *material capital* (e.g., cognitive artifacts) for translation into *institutional capital* (e.g., credentials, diplomas, degrees)" (p. 349, emphasis in the original).

In multilingual schools and communities, such exchanges are complex because aspects of material culture are represented by and represent multiple languages (Aronin & Ó Laoire, 2011). As Wei and Hua (2013, 42-43) remind us, "bilingualism and multilingualism can mean different things in different generations and individuals in the same diasporic community." Similarly, Luke (2008, 350) observed that forms of capital possess no "intrinsic salience and purchase unless there are enabling conditions and other available forms of capital . . . in those adjacent and overlapping social fields where students/literates live and practice." Thus, schools, homes, workplaces, and community can be regarded as "adjacent and overlapping social fields" where key actors (learners, teachers, administrators, and parents) may hold and express shared and divergent views regarding the place of multilingual literacies and translanguaging in education.

In the following section, we describe six forms of capital: affective, cognitive, social, intercultural, academic, and economic, using examples from research in border communities in South Texas to illustrate how they are connected to multilingual literacies and translanguaging. We are not the first, of course, to propose linkages between specific forms of capital and language use among speakers, readers, and writers of minoritized languages and language varieties. For example, recent work has extended the concept of funds of knowledge by relating

it to social capital and cultural capital and by proposing a framework for how household knowledge is (mis)recognized, transmitted, converted, and activated or mobilized by educators on behalf of under-represented students (Rios-Aguilar, Kiyama, Gravitt, & Moll, 2011). Our debt to Luke (2004, 2008) and Yosso (2005) will be particularly evident to those familiar with the work of these groundbreaking authors. With both, we share an appreciation for linguistic diversity and its potential as a resource for transformational learning and teaching among minoritized groups. From Luke, we draw on the idea of multilingual literacies and their material consequences in specific settings that are simultaneously local and global. Similarly, Yosso's (2005) notion of community cultural wealth informs our understanding of multilingual literacies and capital. In her description of the wealth held in U.S. Latina/o households and communities, Yosso (2005) includes forms of capital (including linguistic capital, social capital, and cultural capital) that we also address in this article. An additional form, Yosso's "familial capital," we render here as "affective capital," in recognition of the fact that families are not the sole source of affect. What distinguishes our theorizing from that of Yosso (2005) is our emphasis on the central role of languages and literacies in multilingual communities, not as a separate form of capital, as in Yosso's model, but as a generator of capital (Smith & Murillo, 2013) and meditational tool in the development of forms of capital and the exchange and conversion among them. Furthermore, neither Luke nor Yosso is concerned specifically with U.S.-Mexico border communities or with the multilingual literacies of the Spanish/English/TexMex readers and writers in South Texas that motivate our research.

Affective capital stands for a person's emotional resources and feelings about oneself and others. Language and emotion is a relatively new area of inquiry in

bilingualism/multilingualism studies, and even less so in terms of written language. Pavlenko (2012) has raised the question of how bilingualism and emotion are related, suggesting that linguistic features expressing emotion are most deeply embedded in the home or "first" language(s), but also that some people report being better able to express some aspects of emotion in a second or additional language. Furthermore, recent studies have addressed connections between bilingualism/multilingualism and areas of emotion or affect such as humor, anger, guilt, and love (Pavlenko, 2006).

Multilingual literacies convey affective capital because the foundational relationships developed in families and friendships are embodied and carried out in particular languages and language repertoires, and the use of language, in oral or written form, can signal intimacy, solidarity, and in-group status. For example, one pre-service bilingual teacher from South Texas described an infant in a case study family like this: *This baby is very embracilado by his mamá*. In this sentence we see an example of translanguaging that involves a single expression of disaggregated features that have been societally constructed as belonging to English, Spanish (mamá), and Tex Mex (embracilado) [cuddled, literally, embraced] embodied in this future teacher's communicative repertoire.

Children develop affective capital through linguistic interactions with parents, family members, and other intimates (Kao & Rutherford, 2007). Language connects family members across generations, but children's loss of the home language(s) can muffle or silence communication between immigrant youth and their grandparents (Wong Fillmore, 1991), and between children and their parents (N., 2014). Many teachers we work with recall prohibitions on speaking and

12

writing in Spanish and TexMex at school, including "Spanish detention" and other punishments, as incidents of emotional violence that still invoke deep feelings of shame (Anzaldúa, 1987/2012; MacGregor-Mendoza, 2000; Rippberger & Staudt, 2003). In a California-based study about Spanish speaking children "passing" as (silent) English monolinguals, Monzó and Rueda (2009) ask "How then can Latino students preserve a sense of dignity as Spanish speakers in an English-speaking world? That is, how can they present themselves as competent, intelligent, resourceful, and valuable when so many interactions they engage in with the outside world render them incapable, limited, underprepared victims of cultural deprivation?" (p. 22). In South Texas classrooms, many students learn to hide two languages, Spanish and TexMex, in order to appear successful (Anzaldúa, 1987/2012; Guerra, 2007; Richardson, 1999). For some, acts of linguistic humiliation have served as motivation to succeed despite the odds. Reyes' (2011) collection of language and literacy autobiographies by biliteracy scholars features numerous references to specific forms of literacy in Spanish and their associations with emotions such as pride, love, and determination.

Households along the border can be considered sites for affective capital through translanguaging in written and multimodal texts because children, youth, and adults are interpreting and authoring informal and digitally mediated texts in English, Spanish (Díaz & Bussert-Webb, 2013; Díaz, 2010), and TexMex (Smith & Murillo, 2012). Among these are texts that serve official functions, such as job applications, driver licenses, and school communications. These are typically written in English, and, when a written response is required, English is usually the expected language. In our fieldwork, we have observed families pooling their collective linguistic resources to make sense of and respond to information in oral

and written texts across languages, a process Orellana (2009) describes as language brokering, and which carries emotional weight for participants across generations (Martínez, McClure, & Eddy, 2009). Mijut (2014) uses the term "affinity work" to describe the "in-the-moment" emotional support that language brokers provide Romanian immigrants who are navigating the literacy requirements of the official immigration bureaucracy in the U.S. Many families in the border regions may include one or more persons without the documents needed to live legally in the U.S. Because the threat of deportation remains strong in the region, this aspect of multilingual literacy practice has clear implications for emotional capital.

Cognitive capital encompasses the intellectual resources of individuals and groups. From the perspective of multilingual literacy, we consider two elements. First, an ability to comprehend oral and written information in multiple languages offers greater opportunities for learning, and this is surely an important aspect of cognitive development in emergent bilingual/multilingual children. Psycholinguists who study emergent biliteracy are intrigued by apparent advantages for early bilinguals on measures of verbal reasoning, including the ability to recognize words as arbitrary labels for objects and concepts (Bialystok, 2006; García & Wei, 2014). At the other end of the lifespan, bilingualism and particularly, biliteracy, are associated with memory retention and delayed onset of dementia (Craik, Bialystok, & Freedman, 2010).

Second, cognitive capital is often measured in the form of scores on intelligence and achievement tests that are seldom given in a language other than standardized English. Tests that assess knowledge exclusively through English may fail to capture what multilingual students know, and may lead educators to underestimate the cognitive capital that learners have already

developed, as well as their potential for future development. Furthermore, when school districts and state and national governments convert such test scores and passing rates into data for ranking themselves and their "competitors," they create a form of collective academic capital that can be used to reward and punish schools, teachers, and learners.

Social Capital means the networks of relations that individuals draw upon to pursue their goals (Lin, 1999). Of the six forms of capital considered here, social capital is easily the form most frequently addressed in education research. Along with Bourdieu, sociologists Robert Putnam, and James Coleman are among those well known for work in this area. Putnam's (2000) notion of "bonding capital" among in-group members and "bridging capital" with members of other groups is frequently cited in educational research, but widely critiqued for ignoring race, as well as structural and cultural differences among communities (Fine, 2010; Yosso, 2005). Coleman (1988) has claimed that reciprocity and mutual obligation are necessary conditions for accessing social capital, but likewise with little attention to research suggesting that the enactment of these constructs varies substantially depending on local context.

Thus, these predominant views of social capital were not generated to explain and may not hold for the transnational communities in the U.S-Mexico borderlands, in which religion, class, and immigration status are more salient markers of distinction than ethnicity or language background (Smith & Valenzuela, 2012). Similarly, current theories of social capital do not appear to explain the emergence of the new social networks afforded by online practices of immigrant youth who are heavily engaged in digital literacies (Lam & Warriner, 2012), or for access to the technologies these practices require. Other critiques of social capital highlight problems in

15

definition and measurement, and raise doubts about its validity as a construct (Fine, 2010; Smith & Kulynych, 2002), particularly in inherently multidisciplinary fields such as education. Less contested examples of social capital related to the education of emergent bilinguals include parents' level of formal schooling (for example, first generation high-school and college graduates); friendships or relationships with highly educated mentors (Portés, 2009); and participation in civic or community-oriented activities (Nuñez-Mchiri, 2009; Stanton-Salazar, 1997). Multilingual literacies and translanguaging are especially important in developing and maintaining social capital related to religious and spiritual practices. For example, it is a common practice in local church services to read the Bible and other religious texts in one language and discuss them in another. In one small town we found a handmade sign advertising Catholic Mass services offered in Spanish, English, and TexMex on different days of the week. When we shared this text with pre-service teachers, one asked, "if TexMex and Spanish are okay with God, why can't we use them at school?"

Cultural capital refers to the "store of experience and life knowledge individuals acquire throughout life, influenced by family background and sociocultural experiences" (Marsh, 2006, p. 164). Cultural capital is analogous to "funds of knowledge," or the types of local knowledge developed and practiced in language minority households, and which skillful teachers can reposition as resources for curriculum and instruction (González et al., 2005; Rios-Aguilar et al., 2011). The local social capital of border communities is shaped by immigration; the availability of human labor, products, and services originating in Mexico and other nations; and the instantaneous transmission of popular culture through digital media originating from both sides of the border. In keeping with the transfronterizo (transborder) dimensions of cultural capital, we

prefer the term **intercultural capital**, which Nuñez-Mchiri (2009, p. 27) defines as the affiliations that "enable students to recognize their own identity in relation to others, perceive cultural similarities and differences, treat one another with respect, build constructive cross-cultural relationships, and challenge stereotypes or exclusion." Examples of intercultural capital as related to multilingual literacies include the knowledge parents and students develop in operating a home or family business, particularly if children observe or engage with adults and older siblings in reading and writing for purposes related to their daily routines, including work, leisure, and religious observance. Other intriguing examples are students' awareness of and appreciation for the diverse forms of languaging used in radio, television, print and electronic journalism and entertainment programs, and how media experts effectively shift voices for different cross-border audiences (Martínez, 2010).

Forms of **academic capital** include grades, test scores, graduation rates, letters of recommendation, scholarships, degrees earned, publications, etc., with distinct implications for individuals and groups (Monkman, Ronald, & Théramène, 2005). In the U.S., researchers are just beginning to describe the relationship between bilingualism and academic capital (see Santibañez & Zárate's 2014 study of how Spanish/English bilingualism contributes to four-year college enrollment). Along the border, it is not unusual to see large billboards along highways proclaiming a local school district or school for achieving "Commended" or "Exemplary" status, as determined by the state education agency. Evaluations of academic capital are, in many cases, judgments of a person's ability to read and write well in academic settings.

We have already mentioned the practice of conducting literacy assessments with multilingual learners primarily or only through English, a reflection of the close association of academic capital with monolingualism we have observed in schools along the Texas border. In the case of teacher education programs, decisions to "allow" students to write course papers, theses, and dissertations in English or Spanish (but almost never both or in TexMex), and whether university instructors with non-prestigious, "foreign" accents should be permitted to teach courses in reading are further examples of how potential connections between multilingual literacies and the development of academic capital are disrupted. Below is a segment from an interview we conducted with a para-professional who was studying to become a bilingual teacher that illustrates these tensions:

Luz: Now, how do you feel about using Spanish here at the university, do you like using Spanish here at the university?

Student :   In my classes..?

Luz: In either classes or outside.

Student: Ok, in classes I use English. It's just something *que me me… yo no*

sé de dónde lo traigo pero in your class, in my other classes where I can speak Spanish, I would start in English, *es que siento que si lo hago en español como que 'toy mal, no debo de estar hablándoles en español debo de estar hablándoles en inglés*, so I do it in English *pero saliendo del* classroom, "'*tamos en el lab y estamos todas ayudándonos*," "*oyes ¿cómo le hicites, le*

18

entendites, que hizo?" *"A ver explícamelos…"* We all code switch, my classmates and myself, but I don't know why in the classroom I feel like I have to do it in English.

[Ok, in classes I use English. It's just something that …I don't know where I get it from but in your class, in my other classes where I can speak Spanish, I would start in English, it's that I feel that if I do it in Spanish, like it's bad. Like I shouldn't be speaking to you in Spanish, I should be speaking with you in English, so I do it in English. But leaving the classroom, we're in the lab and we're all helping each other "Hey, how'd you do that? Did you get it? What'd you do?" and "C'mon, tell us how." We all code switch, my classmates and myself, but I don't know why in the classroom I feel like I have to do it in English.]

We find in this response an example of how a multilingual person participates in "passing" (Monzó & Rueda, 2009), or presenting herself as monolingual to her professors in the classroom and multilingual to her friends in the laboratory, a less regulated linguistic academic environment. Given this student's impressive translanguaging abilities, we are curious about which aspects of her multilingual repertoire may be evident (or silenced) in her current work as a para-professional and her future work as a bilingual teacher.

Economic capital refers to the material and financial resources that actors hold or can easily access. Wealth is regarded as "the most liquid capital" (O'Brien & Ó Fathaigh, 2004, p. 8), and thus a key to acquiring or developing other forms of capital. With respect to multilingual literacies, this includes the demand for bilingual teachers and the practice of paying higher salaries, stipends, and signing bonuses to attract certified bilingual teachers in regions with large numbers of emergent bilingual learners. Outside the field of education, most jobs on the border

require an ability to communicate across languages, including nurses and other health care workers; social workers; store clerks and restaurant workers; telemarketers; paralegals; and police officers and US Border Patrol and Customs and Immigration agents. In addition to wages and salaries, other examples of economic capital include income from family-owned businesses and exchanges of services, goods, and labor in the informal economy. This last category is attested and plainly visible in South Texas communities, where pulgas and tianguis (flea markets) abound and are packed with residents buying and selling year round. During the harvest seasons, residents sell citrus, onions, melons, and other locally grown crops from the back of pickup trucks, and makeshift, temporary farm stands are found on just about every road during the harvest seasons. These informal sources of income are fundamental to the economic survival of many border families (Campbell & Heyman, 2007; Richardson & Pisani, 2012), and writing in two or three languages is present in many of the handmade texts generated to advertise these goods and services (Trueba, 2004).

Directions for Researching Human Capital and Translanguaging

We close with some ideas for empirical research on the topic of translanguaging and human capital in multilingual communities and schools. One area for further study is how different forms of human capital are recognized or valued by actors across multilingual contexts or in the different domains or social fields found in specific communities. For example, how do students, parents, teachers view the use of translanguaging in school settings, but also at work, at home, in

church, etc.? What implicit or explicit conventions of language use shape or influence how multilingual literacies are performed in and across these sites? (Rios-Aguilar et al., 2011). We have suggested that acceptance of TexMex and translanguaging in public religious settings raises the possibility that they could be viewed as legitimate language practices in schools. Conversely, studies have shown how the ideologies encoded in official language-in-education policies against the use of Spanish in school settings can "leak" into bilingual domains (Baquedano-López, 2004), and we would like to know whether strong support for translanguaging in classrooms, of the sort advocated for by García and Wei (2014) and Sayer (2013), might raise meta-linguistic awareness among students and teachers that could potentially influence language practices in out-of-school domains.

Related to this is the idea of exchange or conversion among various forms of capital. Do processes of capital exchange work in similar ways in multilingual contexts away from South Texas? For many residents, communities along the U.S.-Mexico border are what Vélez-Ibáñez (2004) describes as "regions of refuge," sites of economic stress, poor living conditions, and concerns about legal status, all factors associated with low levels of social network formation (Cattell, 2001). At the same time, border communities are also considered safe spaces by Mexican-origin (im)migrants who share common multilingual and cultural backgrounds, high rates of home ownership, and a high percentage of children living in two-parent households (Campbell & Heyman, 2007; Smith & Valenzuela, 2012). Because human capital theory, and particularly social capital, have been criticized for paying insufficient attention to context (Smith & Kulynych, 2002), ethnographic research that considers power relations (Rios-Aguilar, 2011;

Yosso, 2005) is needed to discover what multilingual literacies "do" for residents of other, non-border communities.

Research on translanguaging can also identify differences that may exist between the uses and perceptions of multilingual literacies as opposed to biliteracy, or literacy in two languages. In the U.S. generally and in the Southwest borderlands in particular, language is typically presented as, at best, a binary: English and/or Spanish, although multi-dialectalism and multilingualism are, in fact, the norm for many persons and communities. In this vein, we encourage researchers to bear in mind a question raised recently by Labov (2012) on whether language diversity should be considered a property of the individual or the collective. Some of the forms of capital we have proposed here may be easier to conceptualize, operationalize, and describe in terms of individual language use (e.g., cognitive and affective capital), whereas others (social capital and intercultural capital) may lend themselves more readily to the language and literacy practices of groups. Each of these approaches to the study of languages and literacies—individual and collective—carries attendant traditions of disciplinary assumptions, methods, and analyses. Since language is inherently and simultaneously biological, cognitive, social, cultural, and political (Hall, Smith, & Wicaksono, 2011), we propose that developing the full potential of translanguaging as a theory of language in use will require multilingual researchers to read, and ideally collaborate, across the language sciences.

Finally, we are hopeful that the international origins of the concept of translanguaging, building on theory and practice in multilingual regions including Argentina, Chile, Java, and Wales (García & Wei, 2014), will continue to enrich this promising area of research. In this way, the

further study of translanguaging and other translingual practices (Canagarajah, 2013) can tell us much more about what multilingual readers and writers do with literacy and what their uses of literacy do for them.

References

Anzaldúa, G. (1987/2012). *Borderlands/La Frontera: The new mestiza*. San Francisco: Aunt Lute Books.

Aronin, L., & Ó Laoire, M. (2011). The material culture of multilingualism. In D. Gorter, H.F. Marten, & L. Van Mensel (Eds.). *Minority languages in the linguistic landscape*. (pp. 299-318). London: Palgrave.

Baquedano-López, P. (2004). Traversing the center: The politics of language use in a Catholic religious education program for immigrant Mexican children. *Anthropology & Education Quarterly, 35*(2), 212-232.

Becker, G. S. (1993). *Human capital: A theoretical and empirical analysis with special reference to education*. (3rd ed.). Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Bialystok, E. (2006). The impact of bilingualism on language and literacy development. In T. K. Bhatia and W. C. Ritchie (Eds.). *The handbook of bilingualism* (pp. 577-601). Oxford: Blackwell.

Blommaert, J. (2013). *Ethnography, superdiversity and linguistic landscapes: Chronicles of complexity*. Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Bourdieu, P. (1986). The forms of capital. In J. Richardson (Ed.). *Handbook of theory and research for the sociology of education*. (pp. 241-258). New York: Greenwood.

Bourdieu, P. (1991). *Language and symbolic power*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Bussert-Webb. K., & Díaz, M. E. (2012). New literacy opportunities and practices of Latino/a children of poverty in and out of school. *Language and Literacy, 14*(1), 1-25.

Campbell, H., & Heyman, J. (2007). Slantwise: Beyond domination and resistance on the border. *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography, 36*(1), 3-30.

Canagarajah, A. S. (2011). Codemeshing in academic writing: Identifying teachable strategies of translanguaging. *The Modern Language Journal*, 95, 401-417.

Canagarajah, A. S. (Ed.). (2013). *Literacy as translingual practice: Between communities and schools*. Routledge: New York.

Cattell, V. (2001). Poor people, poor places, and poor health: The mediating role of social networks and social capital. *Social Science and Medicine, 52*, 1501-1516.

Checchi, D. (2006). *The economics of education: Human capital, family background and inequality*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Coleman, J. S. (1988). Social capital in the creation of human capital. *The American Journal of Sociology, 94*, 9-120.

Craik, F. I., Bialystok E., & Freedman M. (2010). Delaying the onset of Alzheimer disease: Bilingualism as a form of cognitive reserve. *Neurology*, *75*(19), 1726-1729.

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

Díaz, M. E., & Bussert-Webb, K. (2013). Reading and language beliefs and practices of Latino/a children in a border colonia. *Journal of Latinos and Education, 12*(1), 59-73.

Faltis, C. (1989). Code-switching and bilingual schooling: An examination of Jacobson's new concurrent approach. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development, 10*(2), 117-127.

Fine, B. (2010). *Theories of social capital: Researchers behaving badly*. London: Pluto Press.

García, O. (2009). *Bilingual education in the 21ˢᵗ century: A global perspective*. Malden, MA. Wiley-Blackwell.

García, O., & Leiva, C. (2014). Theorizing and enacting translanguaging for social justice. In A. Blackledge & A. Creese (Eds.). Heteroglossia as practice and pedagogy. *Educational Linguistics, 20*, 199-216.

García, O., & Wei, L. (2014). *Translanguaging: Language, bilingualism, and education*. New York: Palgrave MacMillan.

Genishi, C. (1981). Codeswitching in Chicano six-year-olds. In R. P. Durán (Ed.), *Latino language and communicative behavior* (pp. 133–152). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

González, N., Moll, L. C., & Amanti, C. (2005). *Funds of knowledge: Theorizing practices in households, communities, and classrooms*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Gort, M. (2012). Codeswitching patterns in the writing-related talk of young emergent bilinguals. *Journal of Literacy Research, 44* (1), 45-75.

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

Guerra, J. C. (2007). Out of the Valley: Transcultural repositioning as a rhetorical practice in ethnographic research and other aspects of everyday life. In C. Lewis, P. Enciso, and E. B. Moje. (Eds.). *Reframing sociocultural research on literacy: Identity, agency, and power*. (pp. 137-162). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Guerra, J. C. (2012). From code-segregation to code-switching to code-meshing: Finding deliverance from deficit thinking through language awareness and performance. In P. M. Dunston, S. K. Fullerton, C. C. Bates, K. Headley, & P. M. Stecker (Eds.). *61ˢᵗ Yearbook of the Literacy Research Association*. (pp. 29-39). Oak Creek, WI: Literacy Research Association.

Guerra, K. D. (2014). *The code switcher's guide to the Rio Grande Valley*. Retrieved October 30, 2014 from https://apex.utpa.edu/apps/f?p=149:7:5334736030829647.

Guerrero, M. D., & Guerrero, M.C. (2009). El (sub)desarrollo del español académico entre los maestros bilingües: ¿Una cuestión de poder? *Journal of Latinos and Education 8*(1), 55-66.

Hall, C. J., Smith, P. H., & Wicaksono, R. (2011). *Mapping applied linguistics: A guide for students and practitioners*. London: Routledge/Taylor & Francis.

Honeyford, M. A. (2014). From aquí y allá: Symbolic convergence in the multimodal literacy practices of adolescent immigrant students. *Journal of Literacy Research, 46*(2), 192-233.

Jacobson, R. (1982). The role of the vernacular in transitional bilingual education. In B. Hartford, A. Valdman, & C.R. Foster (Eds.). *Issues in international bilingual education: The role of the vernacular*. (pp. 181-197). New York: Plenum Press.

Kao, G., & Rutherford, L. T. (2007). Does social capital still matter? Immigrant minority disadvantages in school-specific social capital and its effects on academic achievement. *Sociological Perspectives, 50*(1), 27-52.

Labov, W. (2012). *Dialect diversity in America: The politics of language change*. Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press.

Lam, W. S. E., & Warriner, D. S. (2012). Transnationalism and literacy: Investigating the mobility of people, languages, texts, and practices in contexts of migration. *Reading Research Quarterly, 47*(2), 191–215.

Lipski, J. (2008). *Varieties of Spanish in the United States*. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.

Luke, A. (2004). On the material consequences of literacy. *Language and Education, 18*(4), 331-335).

Luke, A. (2008). On the situated and ambiguous effects of literacy. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 11(2), 246-249.

MacGregor- Mendoza, P. (2000). Aquí no se habla español: Stories of linguistic repression in Southwest schools. *Bilingual Research Journal, 24*(4), 333-345.

Marsh, J. (2006). Popular culture in the literacy curriculum: A Bourdieuian analysis. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 41(2), 160-174.

Martínez, C. R., McClure, H. H., & Eddy, J. M. (2009). Language brokering contexts and behavioral and emotional adjustment among Latino parents and adolescents. *The Journal of Early Adolescence*, *29*(1), 71-98).

Martínez, G. A. (2006). *Mexican Americans and language: Del dicho al hecho*. Tucson: The University of Arizona Press.

Martínez, R. A. (2010). *Spanglish* as literacy tool: Toward an understanding of the potential role of Spanish-English code-switching in the development of academic literacy. *Research in the Teaching of English*, *45*(2), 124-149.

Mijut, A. L. (2014). Literacy brokers and the emotional work of mediation. *Literacy and Composition Studies*, *2*(1), 57-79.

Monkman, K., Ronald, M, & Théramène, F. D. (2005). Social and urban capital in an urban Latino school. *Urban Education*, *40*(4), 4-32.

Montrul, S. (2013). *El bilingüismo en el mundo hispanohablante*. [Bilingualism in the Spanish-speaking world]. Oxford: John Wiley & Sons.

Monzó, L. M., & Rueda, R. (2009). Passing for English fluent: Latino immigrant children masking language proficiency. *Anthropology & Education Quarterly, 40*(1), 20-40.

Murillo, L. A. (2010). Local literacies as counter-hegemonic practices: Deconstructing anti-Spanish ideologies in the Rio Grande Valle. In R.T. Jiménez, V.J. Risko, D.W. Rowe, & M.K. Hundley (Eds.). 59th *Annual Yearbook of the National Reading Conference* (pp. 276-287). Oak Creek, WI: Literacy Research Association.

Murillo, L. A. (2012). Learning from bilingual family literacies. *Language Arts*, 90(1), 18-29.

Murillo, L. A. & Smith, P. H. (2011). "I will never forget that": Lasting effects of language discrimination on language minority children and families in Colombia and on the U.S.-Mexico border. *Childhood Education*, 87(1), 2-9.

N., José Ángel. (2014). *Illegal: Reflections of an undocumented immigrant*. Chicago: The University of Illinois Press.

Nichols, S. L., & Berliner, D. C. (2007). *Collateral damage: How high-stakes testing corrupts America's schools*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Education Press.

Nuñez-Mchiri, G. G. (2009). The political economy of the *colonias* on the U.S. Mexico border: Human-environmental challenges and community responses in southern New Mexico. *Southern Rural Sociology, 24*(1), 67-91.

O'Brien, S. & M. Ó Fathaigh. (2004). Bringing in Bourdieu's theory of social capital: Renewing learning partnership approaches to social inclusion. *Irish Educational Studies, 24*(19), 65-76.

Orellana, M. F. (2009). *Translating childhood: Immigrant youth, language, and culture*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.

Palmer, D. & Lynch, A. W. (2008). A bilingual education for a monolingual test? The pressure to prepare for TAKS and its influence on choices for language of instruction in Texas elementary bilingual classrooms. *Language Policy, 7*(3), 217-235.

Palmer, D. (2011). The discourse of transition: Teachers' language ideologies within transitional bilingual education programs. *International Multilingual Research Journal, 5*, 103-122.

Pavlenko, A. (2012) Multilingualism and emotions. In Martin-Jones, M., Blackledge, A., & A. Creese (Eds.). *The Routledge Handbook of Multilingualism*. (pp. 454-469). London: Routledge.

Pavlenko, A. (2005). *Emotions and multilingualism*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Phillipson, R. (1992). *Linguistic imperialism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Poplack, S. (1980). Sometimes I'll start a sentence in Spanish y termino en español: Toward a typology of code-switching. *Linguistics, 18*, 581-618.

Poplack, S. (1981). Syntactic structure and social function of codeswitching. In R.P. Durán. *Latino language and communicative behavior*. (pp. 169-184). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Putnam, R. D. (2000). *Bowling alone: The collapse and revival of American community*. New York: Simon & Schuster.

Reyes, I. (2004). Functions of code switching in schoolchildren's conversations. *Bilingual Research Journal, 28*(1), 77-98.

Reyes, M. L. (Ed.). (2011). *Words were all we had: Becoming biliterate against the odds*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Richardson, C. (1999). *Batos, bolillos, pochos, and pelados: Class and culture on the South Texas border*. Austin: The University of Texas Press.

Richardson, C., & Pisani, M. J. (2012). *The informal and underground economy of the South Texas border*. Austin: The University of Texas Press.

Rippberger, S. J., & Staudt, K. A. (2003). *Pledging allegiance: Learning nationalism at the U.S.-Mexico border*. London: RoutledgeFalmer.

Rios-Aguilar, C., Kiyama, J. M., Gravitt, M., & Moll, L. C. (2011). Funds of knowledge for the poor and forms of capital for the rich? A capital approach to examining funds of knowledge. *Theory and Research in Education, 9*(2), 163-184.

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

Santibañenz, L., & Zárate, M. E. (2014). Bilinguals in the US and college enrollment. In R.M. Callahan & P.C. Gándara (Eds.). *The bilingual advantage: Language, literacy and the US labor market*. (pp. 211-233). Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters.

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

Skutnabb-Kangas, T. (2000). *Linguistic genocide in education-or worldwide diversity and human rights?* Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Smith, S. S., & Kulynych, J. (2002). It may be social, but why is it capital? The social construction of social capital and the politics of language. *Politics & Society, 30*(1), 149-186.

Smith, P. H., & Murillo, L. A. (2012). Researching transfronterizo literacies in Texas border colonias. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism, 15*(6), 635-651.

Smith, P. H., & Murillo, L. A. (2013). Repositioning biliteracy as capital for learning: Lessons from teacher preparation at the U.S.-Mexico Border. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education,26*(3), 301-323.

Smith, P. H., & Valenzuela, A. V. (2012). Literacies on the margins: Border colonias as sites for the study of language and literacy. In P. M. Dunston, S. K. Fullerton, C. C. Bates, K. Headley, &

P. M. Stecker (Eds.). *The 61st Yearbook of the Literacy Research Association*. (pp. 335-346). Oak Creek, WI: Literacy Research Association.

Stanton-Salazar, R. (1997). A social capital framework for understanding the socialization of racial minority children and youth. *Harvard Educational Review*, *67*(1), 1-39.

Stavans, I. (2003). *Spanglish: The making of a new American language*. New York: HarperCollins.

Toribio, A. J. (2001). On the emergence of bilingual code-switching competence. *Bilingualism, Language and Cognition, 4*(3), 203-231.

Trueba, E. T. (2004). *The new Americans: Immigrants and transnationals at work*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.

Valdés, G. (2011). Ethnolinguistic identity: The challenges of maintaining Spanish-English bilingualism in American schools. In K. Potowski & J. Rothman (Eds.). *Bilingual youth: Spanish in English-speaking societies*. (pp. 113-146). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Vélez-Ibáñez, C. G. (2004). Regions of refuge in the United States: Issues, problems, and concerns for the future of Mexican-origin populations in the United States. Human Organization, 63(1), 1-20.

Vélez-Ibáñez, C. G., & Greenberg, J. B. (1992). Formation and transformation of funds of knowledge among U.S.-Mexican households. *Anthropology & Education Quarterly, 23*(4), 313-335.

Wei, L. & Hua, Z. (2013). Diaspora: Multilingual and intercultural communication across time and space. *AILA Review, 26*, 42-56.

Weinreich, U. (1953). *Languages in contact: Findings and problems*. The Hague: Mouton.

Williams, C. (1996). Secondary education: Teaching in the bilingual situation. In C. Williams, G. Lewis, & C. Baker (Eds.). *The language policy Taking stock: Interpreting and appraising Gwynedd's language policy in education*. (pp. 39-78). Llangfni, UK: CAI Language Studies Centre.

Wong Fillmore, L. (1991). When learning a second language means losing the first. *Early Childhood Research Quarterly, 6*, 323-346.

Yosso, T.J. (2005). Whose culture has capital?: A Critical Race Theory discussion of community cultural wealth. *Race, Ethnicity, and Education, 8*(1), 69-91.

Young, V.A. (2013). Keep code-meshing. In A.S. Canagarajah (Ed.). *Literacy as translingual practice: Between communities and schools*. (pp. 139-145). Routledge: New York.

Zentella, A. C. (1981). T´a bien, you could answer me en cualquier idioma: Puerto Rican codeswitching in bilingual classrooms. In R. P. Duran (Ed.), *Latino language and communicative behavior* (pp. 109–131). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.