Abstract: In this article, I share two critical incidents from the vocabulary lessons in an instructional cycle on immigration with third-grade bilingual students. In sharing these critical incidents, I seek to raise awareness of how colonial legacies of cultural and linguistic domination permeate translanguaging pedagogy. I use critical reflection, classroom discourse analysis, and positioning theory to unpack the assumptions that guided my approach to translanguaging pedagogy in these lessons. In addition, I investigate the relationship between vocabulary learning and identity development by examining how the students and myself, as their teacher, positioned ourselves and the other participants in relation to the target words and how the interactions during these lessons expanded or constrained opportunities for identity development. The findings of this study show that the language fluidity in these lessons gave students the confidence to share experiences, raise questions, and contribute their perspectives. However, the vocabulary instruction activities overlooked the complexity of the concepts taught and missed significant opportunities for enhancing students’ identity development. Moreover, these missed opportunities were related to my own colonial understandings of identity. These results suggest implications for teacher professional development and vocabulary instruction from a translanguaging perspective.
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But a question… How is a person who carries two countries called?” Johanna, a third-grade Spanish-English bilingual student, asked me this question during a vocabulary lesson in which we reviewed the target word “citizen.” This question suggests Johanna’s search for a concept that captures her sense of belonging to the United States, where she was born and raised, and El Salvador, where her family came from. While access to her Spanish linguistic resources created opportunities for Johanna to raise this question, I narrowly focused the concept of citizen on the nation-state, thus limiting possibilities for my transnational students to find themselves represented in this concept. The interactions around this question and others prompted me to critically examine the underlying assumptions in my approach to translanguaging pedagogy and consider the relationship between vocabulary learning and identity development.

Translanguaging denotes bilingual people’s fluid language use without adhering to named languages (Otheguy et al., 2019) and is also a theory of language and a pedagogical approach. Following García, I use “bilingual” as an overarching concept encompassing the experience of living with two or more named languages (García, 2009). Translanguaging theory invites educators to critically consider the role that ideologies about language play in shaping learning opportunities for bilingual students (García & Kleifgen, 2020). Since language has been used as a tool for establishing hierarchies and boundaries (Flores & García, 2014; Wei & García, 2022), these ideologies also encompass colonial views about nationality, citizenship, and immigration, among others. Translanguage pedagogy includes diverse instructional practices that center bilingual students’ cultural and linguistic resources and broaden what counts as knowledge in the classroom.

The enactment of translanguaging pedagogy requires an ideological shift from monoglossic to heteroglossic ideologies. Monoglossic ideologies center dominant monolingual voices historically constructed as the standard. Heteroglossic ideologies embrace systemically marginalized voices and bring forth diversity, fluidity, and innovation (Bakhtin, 1981). This ideological shift entails replacing static and dominant views of language, knowledge, and identity with a more dynamic understanding in which the categories traditionally used to classify transnational students and their realities are reconceptualized. Johanna’s question in the opening paragraph highlights that to accomplish this shift, it is necessary to unpack colonial legacies that link language to the nation-state and transnational students to nationally bounded identity categories (Ndhlovu, 2017). This ideological shift requires practitioners to engage in critical reflection to gain awareness of how their instructional decisions may be shaped by colonial ways of thinking, such as the establishment of binaries, boundaries, and hierarchies.

My first aim in this article is to illustrate the importance of ideological clarity (Alfaro, 2019) to build awareness of how colonial legacies of cultural and linguistic domination shape classroom interactions and instructional decisions. In addition, as suggested in the opening paragraph, the vocabulary lessons on which this study is based were not only a context for learning new words but for raising identity questions. In this sense, my second goal is to examine the relationship between vocabulary learning and identity development.

To accomplish these aims, I present two critical incidents from my vocabulary lessons in an instructional cycle on immigration. These lessons were part of a pilot study exploring the role of translanguaging pedagogy in literacy learning in
which I worked with a small group of students with different bilingual trajectories (Ossa Parra & Proctor, 2021). Critical incidents are classroom events or interactions that are unexpected, perplexing, or confusing, thus creating opportunities for educators to get in touch with how their assumptions guide their instructional decisions (Brookfield, 2017). For example, I was perplexed by the limited way I defined “citizen” for this group of transnational students and by the interactions my students and I had around this concept, among others. I approached these interactions as a critical incident that confronted me with my own colonial understandings of citizenship as a concept that demarcates territories and restricts people's sense of belonging. This critical incident prompted me to work on my ideological clarity and critically examine my approach to vocabulary instruction while enacting translanguaging pedagogy.

While the critical incidents presented here are unique to my experience enacting and researching translanguaging pedagogy, they bring forth human experiences that may resonate with the tensions other educators and researchers have encountered when working with bilingual transnational students. With this work, I seek to contribute to current discussions on the relevance of addressing the critical dimensions of translanguaging pedagogy (Allard, 2017; Charalambous et al., 2016; Hamman, 2018) and examine vocabulary learning from a translanguaging perspective.

The next section presents translanguaging as a theory informing a dynamic and heteroglossic understanding of bilingual people's language practices and realities. This is followed by a presentation of relevant research on translanguaging pedagogy and its role in bilingual students' identity development and language learning. After this, I describe the context and approach to vocabulary instruction in the present study, present the critical incidents, share the insights gained from these incidents, and propose implications for teacher preparation and vocabulary instruction.

**Translanguaging Theory**

Drawing from sociocultural and critical perspectives, translanguaging theory conceptualizes language as a practice through which we perform identities, indicate belonging to different communities, and negotiate power relationships (García & Kleifgen, 2020; Wei, 2018). From a translanguaging perspective, named languages (e.g., English, Spanish) and registers (e.g., academic/everyday language) are viewed as social and political categories used to classify and organize territories and people (Flores & Garcia, 2014). These classifications have served as barriers preventing bilingual students from fully showing who they are and what they can do in academic contexts (García et al., 2021). Furthermore, the binaries between home/additional languages or every day/academic registers are externally imposed and do not reflect bilingual people’s language practices and transnational experiences and affiliations (Otheguy et al., 2019).

Rather than having separate named languages and registers, translanguaging theory conceptualizes bilingual people as having a complex linguistic repertoire they adapt to different communicative contexts and purposes (Otheguy et al., 2019). While bilinguals are deeply aware of the language categories through which they navigate their daily lives, they do not experience their languages as separate entities (García et al., 2021). Instead, they fluidly use the linguistic resources associated with named languages, which gives rise to new languaging realities that are different from the language practices and experiences of the immigrant-receiving country and those of the country of origin (García & Leiva, 2014).
The fluid language use that characterizes language practices in immigrant communities defines new identities situated in permeable transnational boundaries in which linguistic, cultural, economic, and political realities from home and receiving countries are brought together in translanguaging spaces (Creese & Blackledge, 2010; García & Leiva, 2014; Wei, 2011). A translanguaging space is “a space that is created by and for translanguaging practices, and a space where language users break down the ideologically laden dichotomies . . . to integrate social spaces (and thus linguistic codes) that have been formerly separated through different practices in different spaces” (Li, 2018, p. 23). The strict boundaries established by categories such as named languages, nationality, and citizenship, historically used to demarcate differences between groups, become permeable, giving way to complex ways of being and languaging.

These fluid language practices and identities have not been recognized in school contexts. Historically, the education of bilingual students in the U.S. has been informed by monoglossic ideologies that center the English academic register and whitestream values, culture, and experiences (Flores & Garcia, 2014; García & Leiva, 2014). Translanguaging theory problematizes this monoglossic approach since it has perpetuated unequal power structures that maintain racial and linguistic hierarchies at schools (Baker-Bell, 2020; Flores & García, 2014; García & Kleifgen, 2020). Instead, it proposes an heteroglossic perspective that recognizes and integrates bilingual students’ voices and ways of language (García & Kleifgen, 2020; Noguerón-Liu, 2020; Seltzer, 2019). In this sense, translanguaging theory informs a transformative approach to bilingual students’ education that blurs the boundaries between school and community by integrating students’ languages, knowledge, and experiences into the classroom.

**Translanguaging Pedagogy**

Translanguaging pedagogy proposes flexible classroom language practices in which bilingual students can access all their linguistic resources to express themselves and share their knowledge and experiences. In this pedagogical approach, bilingual students’ identities are positioned as a crucial aspect of their learning in general and their language and literacy learning in particular (Espinoza & Ascenzi-Moreno, 2021; García & Kleifgen, 2020). When students have access to their entire linguistic repertoires, they can adopt identity positionings as knowledgeable and valuable contributors to the learning community. In this sense, translanguaging pedagogies create a classroom context where bilingual students find their identities affirmed (García-Mateus & Palmer, 2017), thus creating a feeling of “confianza” to show themselves and share their ideas (García & Kleifgen, 2020).

Extensive research on translanguaging pedagogy illustrates how opening up spaces for students to use their entire linguistic repertoires creates possibilities for identity development. For example, in these spaces, multilingual students develop their sense of competence and expertise (García-Mateus & Palmer, 2017; Palmer et al., 2014), learn to take pride in their linguistic and ethnic backgrounds. (Garcia & Leiva, 2014; Sayer, 2013), and further develop their bilingualism by creatively using their linguistic
repertoires to express themselves (Garcia & Wei, 2014; Gort & Sembiante, 2015).

In addition to promoting identity development by opening up opportunities for self-expression and affirmation, translanguaging pedagogy emphasizes the connection between identity and language and literacy learning. Rather than the linear acquisition of discrete skills (e.g., phonemic awareness, fluency, vocabulary, text comprehension), translanguaging pedagogy approaches language and literacy learning as participation in meaningful practices connected to students’ home and community life (Espinoza & Ascenzi-Moreno, 2021; García, 2020; García & Kleifgen, 2020). In this sense, the identities as language users and literate beings that students bring from their homes and communities are embraced and become a valuable source of knowledge in the classroom. Research on language and literacy learning from a translanguaging perspective illustrates how this pedagogical approach enhances the notion of valid language and literacy practices in the classroom. For example, language and literacy practices integrating translanguaging pedagogy invite students to build awareness of the role language plays in their lives (Seltzer, 2019). Other studies show how teachers invite students to draw on the translanguaging practices present in their communities (e.g., language brokering, fluid language use) to enhance their engagement with texts (Daniel, 2018; David et al., 2019). Translanguaging pedagogy also expands classroom language and literacy practices by engaging students with bilingual and multimodal texts connected to students’ realities to deepen their understanding of who they are and explore possibilities for their future (Garcia & Leiva, 2014; Martínez-Álvarez & Ghiso, 2017; Stewart & Hansen-Thomas, 2016).

Although translanguaging pedagogy approaches language as a lived experience rather than as an object that can be taught in discrete units, research on this pedagogical approach has shown that by providing access to students' entire linguistic repertoires, new opportunities for focusing on language as an object are opened (Cenoz & Gorter, 2022; Ossa Parra & Proctor, 2021). For example, in terms of vocabulary, when students have access to all of their language resources, they will more readily identify cognates (Hopewell, 2011; Palmer et al., 2014) and connect words in the new language with the concepts they already know in their additional language(s) (Esquinca et al., 2014; Gort & Sembiante, 2015; Daniel & Pacheco, 2016). The present study goes beyond the role of translanguaging pedagogy in fostering cognate awareness by exploring the relationship between vocabulary learning and identity development. However, creating a translanguaging space that supports students’ identity development requires addressing the ideological tensions in enacting translanguaging pedagogy. These tensions and the concept of ideological clarity are presented in the next section.

I ideological Tensions in Enacting Translanguaging Pedagogy

While the research on translanguaging pedagogy has predominantly documented its affordances, there is also growing awareness of the need to critically consider how interactions in translanguaging classrooms may reify the language and cultural hierarchies it seeks to transcend. Translanguaging pedagogy is located in historical and socio-political contexts with “legacies of colonization, imperialism, and assimilation” (Cervantes-Soon et al., 2017, p. 415), which inform ideologies about how reality, people, and the spaces we inhabit are demarcated, labeled, and organized in clear-cut and hierarchical categories (Smith, 2012).

Recent research on translanguaging pedagogy highlights the need to examine the role that dominant ideologies, broader contexts, and historical processes play in translanguaging classrooms (Allard,
For example, Hamman (2018) calls attention to how translanguaging in two-way immersion programs may be monopolized by the students who are dominant in the societal language (e.g., English in the U.S.) and underscores the need to recognize linguistic hierarchies in the classroom. It is also necessary to acknowledge the role of broader socio-political contexts in how students strategically use their language resources to position themselves, as evidenced in Charalambous and colleagues’ (2016) study in which Turkish-speaking students’ in a Greek-medium classroom in Cyprus resisted their teachers’ invitation to use Turkish because of the historical conflicts between Cyprus and Turkey that have positioned Turkish people as the enemy.

The studies mentioned above focus on how dominant ideologies and historical processes shape students’ positionings in a translanguaging space. However, another aspect that needs to be considered to guide students in adopting more fluid and complex identity positionings is the educator’s awareness of how their own identity positionings and colonial understandings shape their instructional decisions and their relationships with their students, and the content taught (e.g., target vocabulary). These positionalities encompass gender, ethnicity, nationality, languages, and immigration status, among others (Rodriguez-Mojica et al., 2019).

Alfaro (2019) conceptualizes teachers’ awareness of their positionalities as ideological clarity, defined as a framework of thought that requires teachers’ individual beliefs and values to be repeatedly juxtaposed with the systems of belief of the dominant society. . . [it] allows teachers to . . . recognize if and when their beliefs and practice uncritically mirror and perpetuate dominant hegemonic classroom environments. (p. 195)

To build ideological clarity for enacting translanguaging pedagogy, we need to be aware of the dominance of monoglossic ideologies in our instructional contexts and how we have been taught to understand and organize reality by establishing categories, binaries, and hierarchies.

To unpack these ideologies, I draw on the concept of homogenizing discourses (Ndlovu, 2017). Homogenizing discourses are essentialist views of language and identity in which communities are conceived as immutable and bounded to a particular social group and territory. Homogenizing discourses control physical and symbolic spaces by ascribing identities based on language, nationality, and citizenship. Moreover, these discourses reflect the “culture of labeling” (Rodriguez-Mojica et al., 2019, p. 67) deeply ingrained in western epistemologies focused on classification and the establishment of boundaries and hierarchies (Smith, 2012).

The Present Study

Ideological clarity is achieved by engaging in critical self-reflection to uncover how we may unknowingly perpetuate monoglossic ideologies in our interactions with our students. In this study, I examine the assumptions that guided my approach to translanguaging pedagogy while teaching vocabulary in the context of the immigration lesson cycle described below. I addressed these assumptions by analyzing the identity positionings arising during the interactions around the concepts of immigration and citizenship. The following research questions guided this work: How did participants position themselves and the other participants in relation to the vocabulary words discussed in this translanguaging space? How did the interactions during these
translanguaged vocabulary lessons expand or constrain identity development opportunities?

**The Approach to Vocabulary Learning in this Study**

This study is derived from a larger pilot study in which I examined the role of translanguaging pedagogy in literacy learning. Drawing from a researcher-designed English literacy curriculum combining language instruction (e.g., vocabulary, morphology, syntax) with guided reading, discussion, and writing activities to raise awareness of academic language and promote reading comprehension (Proctor et al., 2020), I designed two lesson-cycles incorporating translanguaging pedagogy. These lesson cycles consisted of a series of lessons in which students read bilingual texts, fluidly used their linguistic repertoires, and participated in bilingual (e.g., side-by-side) text-based vocabulary, morphology, and syntax instruction (see Ossa Parra & Proctor, 2021).

The present study focuses on the vocabulary lessons during the immigration lesson cycle in which we read the bilingual poetry book *My Name Is Jorge* (Medina, 1991) as a starting point to talk about the experiences immigrant children face when starting a new life in the United States. This lesson cycle consisted of 10 lessons averaging 30 minutes each (see Appendix A for a summary of each lesson's content and main activities). These lessons took place weekly in the spring of 2016 and were held during the RISE block. RISE was a 30-minute block where students received small group instruction in the areas where they needed support.

Appendix B presents the target words for the immigration lesson cycle and the reasoning behind selecting these words. The first lesson in the immigration lesson cycle introduced the immigration theme and associated vocabulary words. The rest of the lessons focused on one or two poems, which were starting points for discussing issues related to immigration and identity and analyzing target vocabulary, morphology, and syntax. In terms of vocabulary, before reading the poems, I introduced target words using slides that presented the definition(s), part of speech, related words, images, and sentences. These vocabulary lessons occurred

1. This name and the students’ names were changed to ensure anonymity.
during 6 of the ten immigration-cycle lessons and, on average, took 9 minutes of a lesson.

Vocabulary instruction encompassed activities such as cognate identification, the discussion of polysemy in English, and its contrast with Spanish (for example, there are three words in Spanish for the different meanings of the word “turn”/turno, volcar, convertir). Additionally, I encouraged students to share their thoughts and experiences related to the target words by asking them questions and opening the floor for their comments. The students leveraged their language resources to actively participate in these lessons by sharing experiences and stories related to the target words, commenting on visuals, contributing definitions and examples, asking questions, and identifying differences between written and oral Spanish regional dialects.

Context and Participants

I taught these lessons in a public K-8 school in an ethnically diverse neighborhood that immigrants have historically populated. At the time of the study, its largest immigrant group was from Central and South American countries. The school served a predominantly Hispanic student body (77.3%), and about half of the students (47.3%) were classified as English learners by the district in which the school was located.

At the time of the study, the state-mandated program for emergent bilingual students was placement in sheltered English immersion (SEI) classrooms where instruction was mandated to be predominantly delivered in English. The use of students' additional languages was limited to translating key words and instructions. The SEI third-grade teacher selected five Spanish – English bilingual students with varied language and literacy proficiencies in English and Spanish to participate in these lesson cycles, where they would have more opportunities to use all of their linguistic resources to engage in literacy. See Table 1 for an overview of the students’ backgrounds.

Researcher Positionality

I adopted the role of teacher-researcher, which also makes me a participant in this study. I shared the experience of recent immigration with some of my students. In addition, we had similar cultural and linguistic backgrounds enabling us to share experiences. My process of finding my place in a new context and redefining my linguistic, cultural, and ethnic identity shaped my interaction with my students in multiple and sometimes contradictory ways. In general, these experiences enabled the establishment of a close working relationship with them. However, I use two critical incidents in this paper that prompted me to address my deeply ingrained beliefs regarding language, culture, and identity.

Methodology and Analytic Process

I adopted critical reflection (Brookfield, 2017) as the methodology for building ideological clarity and understanding how the vocabulary lessons during these lesson cycles both created and constrained opportunities for identity development. Critical reflection stimulates teachers to situate classroom interactions in a broader socio-political context and become aware of the role that dominant ideologies and relationships of power play in their classrooms. Critical reflection is stimulated by critical incidents, defined as interactions or events that are unexpected, surprising, or cause discomfort. Critical incidents enable educators to better understand the assumptions, power relations, and identities enacted in classroom interactions (Brookfield, 2017).

In this paper, I focus on two critical incidents I encountered during the data analysis for the larger study. The first focused on the interactions when I introduced the word “immigration/immigrant,” and
Table 2

Transcription Conventions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Text in grey</td>
<td>Original Spanish utterance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Line in cursive below Spanish utterances”</td>
<td>Translation to English of a Spanish utterance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>Overlapping talk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0.0)</td>
<td>Length of silence in tenths of a second</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(.)</td>
<td>Micropause less than 2/10 of a second</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.</td>
<td>Falling intonation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>?</td>
<td>Full rising intonation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Word</td>
<td>Marked stress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>↑</td>
<td>Marked rising shift in intonation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>((Word))</td>
<td>Transcriber’s comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...</td>
<td>Lines were taken out of the original conversation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

the second on the interactions around the term “citizen.” I define these interactions as critical incidents because they exposed how my approach to vocabulary instruction was reifying the labels and boundaries I sought to transcend with translanguaging pedagogies. In this sense, these interactions prompted me to consider how I was perpetuating dominant ideologies despite my desire to connect with my students’ experiences and create possibilities for exploring other ways of being and knowing.

To analyze the critical incidents, I transcribed the discourse in the lessons verbatim and then enhanced the transcriptions of relevant interactional sequences using transcription conventions that captured nonverbal aspects of the interactions (Jefferson, 2004; see table 2). Then, I conducted a fine-grained analysis of the participants’ discourse using classroom discourse analysis (Mehan & Cazden, 2015; Rhymes, 2016) and positioning theory (Bucholtz & Hall, 2005; Harré & Lagemhove, 1991). Classroom discourse analysis enabled me to identify how power circulated in these lessons by characterizing who asked the questions, whose knowledge was privileged, and how turn-taking was organized in these interactions (Mehan & Cazden, 2015; Rhymes, 2016). This analysis gave me a deeper understanding of the assumptions guiding my vocabulary instruction and my students’ engagement in these lessons. I used positioning theory to characterize how identities were enacted in these vocabulary lessons. Positioning is a two-way process by which identities are performed and emerge during interaction (Bucholtz & Hall, 2005; Harré & Lagemhove, 1991). I analyzed how participants negotiated different positionings for themselves and their interlocutors in relation to the vocabulary words discussed in the critical incidents. This analysis also
stimulated me to reflect on how my identity positionings shaped how I guided my students during these lessons. In addition, I used translinguaging theory and the concept of homogenizing discourses (Ndhlovu, 2017) discussed in the introduction to inform the analysis of the assumptions underlying these identity positionings.

**Negotiating Word Meanings and Identities**

This section presents two critical incidents that occurred when we discussed the target words “immigration” and “citizen.” The first critical incident raises awareness of the assumptions shaping how immigrant identities were defined and approached in these translanguaged lessons. The second one sheds light on how the definition of citizenship as connected to the nation-state limited opportunities for considering more hybrid transnational affiliations. The following two sections present the interactional sequences encompassing these critical incidents and their discourse analysis. The discourse analysis addresses how I approached vocabulary instruction, the underlying assumptions and identity positionings that surfaced in these interactions, and how the interactions in these lessons shaped opportunities for identity development.

**Immigrant Identities**

The first critical incident occurred during the second lesson in which I introduced relevant vocabulary (e.g., immigration, culture, bilingualism) for engaging with *My Name Is Jorge* (Medina, 1999) before introducing the book. This critical incident is presented in two excerpts to provide a detailed analysis. Excerpt 1A below shows the interactions after I defined “immigrant” and asked students whether they knew any immigrants.

Excerpt 1A: Do you know anyone who has immigrated?

1. Teacher: Okay. Right. Immigration. And a person, the person who is moving from one country to another country is an immigrant. Right? (.)
2. James: Immigrant
3. Teacher: Right (.) the immigrant (.) Do you know anyone who has immigrated (.) from one country to another country? (0.3)
4. Teacher: No? Do you know someone, James?
(0.2)
5. Teacher: Did any of you immigrate from one country to another country?
6. Johanna: [No]
7. Roberto: [No]
8. Teacher: No? Were you born here in the United States?
9. Johanna: I was
10. Teacher: . . . (to Roberto) And were you born here?
11. Roberto: From Colombia
12. Teacher: Okay so Roberto immigrated to the United States (.) And James?
13. James: Salvador
14. Teacher: Okay so you immigrated to the United States (.) You are immigrants (.) Right? Okay I immigrated from Colombia to the United States too (.) ((To Johanna)) Did your family immigrate from (.) El Salvador to the United States? ((nods))
15. Johanna: 
16. Roberto: My mom did.
17. Teacher: Okay so we know many immigrants Immigration is common in the United States, right? La inmigración es muy común.

In this excerpt, I adopted a teacher-led approach to vocabulary instruction in which I provided word
definitions (turn 1) and prompted students to establish connections with target words. I predominantly used English in this excerpt, only providing the Spanish label for immigrant (turn 1) and translating a key conclusion in turn 17. The words immigrant/inmigrante/immigrate/immigrated/inmigración are underlined, showing the emphasis I gave to these words. This emphasis is also illustrated in the marked rising intonation after I say these words (e.g., turns 14 and 17).

“Do you know anyone who has immigrated . . .?” (turn 3) was a known-answer question since we had shared our countries of origin in the introductory session just before this one. I had anticipated that the students would answer the question affirmatively and share their experiences, and I was surprised at their reluctance to participate. Their unwillingness is suggested in their silence after I posed the question in turn 3 and repeated it in turn 4 and their brief answers to my probing questions (turns 5 – 11). This excerpt shows that, despite my purpose of providing bilingual instruction, I privileged English in this sequence. In addition, it reveals a fast-paced, teacher-centered approach to vocabulary learning in which I assumed the connections my students would make between the concepts of immigration/immigrant and their lives.

This excerpt also shows my assumptions about immigration. As illustrated in turns 12 to 17, I led students to identify themselves and their families as immigrants based on the assumption that immigration was a shared and unproblematic experience. I positioned myself as an immigrant in turn 14, and then, in turn 17, I normalized our immigrant identities by establishing that immigration was very common in the United States. During the lesson, it did not occur to me that this could be a sensitive issue for my students and that their silence probably was not a signal of a lack of understanding of the concept’s meaning but rather a deliberate decision not to disclose this information or to identify with this label.

The interaction in Excerpt 1A continued with the side conversation between James and Johanna presented in excerpt 1B below. With this side conversation, James changed the language of interaction to Spanish and opened a space for Johanna to differentiate herself from the identity positioning as an immigrant and for him to share his experiences.

### Excerpt 1B: ¡Qué Suerte!

18. James: ((whispering to Johanna))
   Usted no es inmigrante?

   “You are not an immigrant?”


   “Fortunately.”

20. Teacher: Te parece una suerte no ser inmigrante?

   “Do you think you are fortunate not to be an immigrant?”


22. Teacher: Mejor ser (.)

   ”Better be”

23. James: Pero, pero por veces† Pero cuando alguien (.) a mi me han dicho que (.) que::: lo malo es que todo lo que yo hago (.) lo que yo hago acá† lo voy a tener en un papel y cuando vaya (.) cuando vaya allá† al juez (.) se lo tengo que dar y me va a decir si me quedo o me voy

   “But, but sometimes. But when someone, I have been told that, that, the bad thing is that everything that I do, everything that I do here, I will have it on a paper and when I go there, to the judge, I have to turn in that paper
Excerpt 1B shows a shift from a teacher-centered to a student-centered interaction where James and Johanna provided insights into the meaning that immigration had in their lives. How they positioned themselves in relation to the immigrant label suggests their awareness of their socio-political context and its impact on how they define themselves. For example, Johanna’s sense of being fortunate about not being an immigrant resonates with the idea of the “U.S. citizenship privilege” of not feeling the anxiety and fear of deportation (Rodríguez-Mojica et al., 2019, p. 63). In contrast, James’ lived experience of being under surveillance (e.g., everything that he does will be written down) and on probation (e.g., a judge will decide whether he can stay in the U.S.) suggests the impact that “anti-immigrant and dehumanizing policies” (Rodríguez-Mojica et al., 2019, p. 71) have on immigrant children.

My prompts for engaging students with the concept of immigration in excerpt 1A closed opportunities for them to explore the meaning of immigration in their lives. These prompts reflected homogenizing discourses about immigrants (Ndhlovu, 2017) that disregarded my students’ unique experiences and immigration trajectories. In contrast, excerpt 1B illustrates how this concept came to life when I released control and allowed an organic interaction in which students shared their ideas on their own terms and using their entire linguistic repertoire. In this organic interaction, Johanna and James were agentive in repositioning themselves in relation to the “immigrant” identity I gave them in excerpt 1A. Johanna rejected this identity, and James used his Spanish language resources to share the uncertainties American immigration policies create for immigrant people.

This critical incident highlights the complex identity negotiation processes during this vocabulary lesson. In excerpt 1A, I approached immigration/immigrant as a neutral concept that we would easily affiliate with due to our backgrounds. However, my students brought a more complex understanding of this concept as they shared their experiences in excerpt 1B. The identity positionings that emerged in relation to this concept highlight the problematic nature of assuming language as neutral since it is always tied to the experiences that shape our understandings and ways of using language. In this sense, these vocabulary lessons were not only about defining the key concepts but also about sharing where we stood in relation to these concepts.

(Trans)national Affiliations

The second critical incident encompasses two excerpts illustrating the underlying assumptions and identity positionings that emerged when we discussed the target word “citizen.” In lesson 4, I introduced this word before reading the poem “Yankee” (Medina, 1999). This poem exposes the conflict that Jorge, the character, faced when singing American songs that did not represent him. As a result, Jorge decided to remain silent while his friends, who were American citizens, sang. I had planned to introduce two definitions for this concept – the first one tied to the nation-state, and then expand this definition to global citizenship. Unfortunately, I did not consider the concept of transnationalism in my lesson plan. During the lesson, we focused on the notion of citizenship as connected to the nation-state, and little time was dedicated to global citizenship. The interactional sequences presented in this section illustrate how this approach to citizenship constrained opportunities for the students to reflect on their transnational affiliations. Excerpt 2A below shows the interactions after I introduced this concept.

Excerpt 2A: En parte del Salvador

1. Teacher: Okay so the citizen is a person who belongs to a country and has the rights,
protection and duties of that country. What country are you a citizen of? Johanna?

2. Johanna: Here

3. Teacher: You’re a citizen of the United States. (To Roberto) And what country are you a citizen of?

4. Roberto: From Colombia (To Johanna) Joha, Joha, Joha, you’re from El Salvador

5. Johanna: No

6. Roberto: Yeah

7. Joseph: She’s from Guatemala (pointing at Johanna)


9. Joseph: [she’s] from Colombia (pointing at Valentina)

10. Johanna: En parte del Salvador “In part from El Salvador”

11. Valentina: Ella es del Salvador pero ella nació acá. “She is from El Salvador but she was born here.”

12. James: ((To Johanna)) Usted es del Salvador “You are from El Salvador”

As with the concept of immigration, I followed a teacher-led approach where I used English to introduce a definition centered on the nation-state that did not reflect my students’ experiences. A known-answer question followed this definition in turn 3 - “What country are you a citizen of?” which again prompted students to consider their immigrant status. In turn 4, Roberto responded to my question and began a student-led sequence (turns 4 – 12), which he started in English, and the language of interaction gradually shifted to Spanish.

In turn 4, Roberto denied Johanna’s affiliation as an American citizen and established that she was from El Salvador, and in turns 7 and 12, Joseph and James joined Roberto in this claim. While in turn 5, Johanna used English to deny Roberto’s move to position her as from El Salvador, in turns 8 and 10, she used Spanish to concede that she was partly from El Salvador, thus hinting that she recognized the hybridity in her affiliation to different nation-states. In turn 11, Valentina gave prevalence to the role of Johanna’s country of descent in defining her affiliations despite being born in the U.S. Finally, James reinforced the idea that Johanna only belonged to El Salvador in turn 12.

The identity positionings evidenced in this excerpt highlight the limitations of addressing the concept of citizenship as tied to the nation-state, mainly when working with a group of transnational children. The narrow definition of “citizen” presented in turn 1 reified the citizenship regime by focusing on the “membership rules, rights and entitlements, social expectations and responsibilities, and physical borders” (Montoya, 2020, p. 149). By having students establish their country of citizenship, I reified the boundaries that they, or their parents in the case of Johanna and Joseph, had already crossed, thus denying the borderland space (Anzaldúa, 2012) in which we were situated.

Johanna’s response in turns 8 and 10 (En parte. En parte from El Salvador/In part from El Salvador) suggests her search for a more hybrid affiliation. Excerpt 2B, taken from a vocabulary review lesson a few weeks after Excerpt 2A, illustrates Johanna’s search for a label reflecting her identity of being from two places simultaneously. This excerpt is part of an interactional sequence in Spanish in which I had asked students to define “citizen,” and as in the last excerpt, we approached this concept as tied to the nation-state.

Excerpt 2B: ¿Cómo se llama una persona que lleva dos países?


2. Teacher: Dime “Tell me.”
3. Johanna: Cuando si tus papás son de otro país como Joseph es de [Honduras] y de “When, if your parents are from another country like Joseph is from Honduras and from”

4. Roberto: [Inmigrante] “Immigrant”

5. Joseph: [No.] Yo no soy de Honduras “No. I’m not from Honduras”

6. Teacher: Los papás “The parents”

7. Johanna: Los padres (.) y del Salvador (.) Cómo se llama la persona (.) una persona que lleva dos países? “The parents. And from El Salvador. How is the person who carries two countries called?”

8. Teacher: Eso puede (.) eso (.) no se llama de [una forma] “That may be, that is not called in a way.”

9. Roberto: [No es que] nació en dos partes. Es bilingüe “It is not that he was born in two places. It is bilingual.”

10. Teacher: sino que tú dices que tienes doble doble ciudadanía “instead you say that you have double, double citizenship.”

Excerpt 2B shows a student-centered interactional sequence where Johanna used her Spanish to raise a critical question: “¿Cómo se llama la persona, una persona que lleva dos países?/How is the person, a person who carries two countries called?” (turn 7). With this question, she brought her life into this vocabulary lesson by asking for a concept representing her since the definition of citizen presented in these lessons did not reflect Johanna’s experiences. Johanna introduced her question by giving an example of the situation she wanted to label and aligning herself with Joseph. Both shared the experience of being born in the U.S. to immigrant parents. As she aligned herself with Joseph, she distinguished their experiences from the other students who had recently immigrated to the U.S.

In turn 4, Roberto overlapped with her attempting to propose that the label Johanna was looking for was “immigrant,” while Joseph overlapped in turn 5 to reject the affiliation with Honduras. I clarified that Johanna was referring to his parents. In the following turn, Johanna echoed this clarification and proposed her question: ¿Cómo se llama la persona, una persona que lleva dos países?/How is the person, a person who carries two countries called? Johanna’s word choice in this question is noteworthy. She did not ask about a person who is from two countries but about a person who lleva/carries two countries. With this word choice, she changed the source of identity and belonging from an exterior and bounded nation-state to an internal and fluid identity within the person. Johanna’s question resonates with the ambiguity of being situated in an in-between space (Anzaldua, 2012) and highlights her search for a concept to help her define her identity.

Unfortunately, I didn’t have an answer to her question, as can be seen in my response in turn 8 (Eso no se llama de una forma/that is not called in a way). In turn 9, Roberto took the floor after overlapping with me. He started his turn by highlighting the problematic nature of using the country of birth as a location tied to identity since it is impossible to be born in two places (No es que nació en dos partes/It is not that she was born in two places). After this, he established that “bilingual” was the identity category Johanna sought (Es bilingüe/It is bilingual). With this contribution, Roberto proposed bilingualism as an identity category reflecting the experience of being from two places simultaneously.

I ignored Roberto’s contribution. Instead, I established that to refer to the experience of “llevar
“dos países/carrying two countries,” she could say that she had dual citizenship (turn 10). However, dual citizenship does not represent the concept that Johanna sought since it separates her identities and affiliations into two distinct categories. With this response, I reinforced the duality of the borderland conflict described by Anzaldúa (2012), in which identity is built around homogenizing discourses associated with nation-states.

In summary, the excerpts presented in this section show that, even though the students were invested in the discussion by providing their perspectives and asking relevant questions, my definition of “citizen” limited opportunities for identity development, such as redefining their positionalities as transnational/global citizens. The interactions presented in these excerpts reified the borders that silo immigrants into monolithic groups (Ndhlovu, 2017). The way I approached citizenship in these vocabulary lessons brought forth the problematic nature of these rigid classification systems. These excerpts underscore the relevance of centering alternative definitions of citizenship in the curriculum that open spaces for envisioning new political practices and transformation (Montoya, 2020) and stimulating students to conceptualize their identities in more fluid and performative ways (Rodríguez-Mojica et al., 2019).

Discussion

The critical incidents presented in this paper show the complex identity negotiation processes during these vocabulary lessons. While the focus on two concepts discussed with a small group of students makes for a constrained analysis, the results presented here provide theoretical and instructional insights into the enactment of translanguaging pedagogy and the relationship between identity and vocabulary learning. The two main insights gleaned from this analysis are: (1) The teacher’s awareness of their identity positionings is crucial for accomplishing the transformative potential of translanguaging pedagogy, and (2) Vocabulary learning should be expanded from building academic language to learning new concepts in ways that foster students’ knowledge of the self and the world.

Teacher Identity

The analysis of these critical incidents confronted me with how my positionality regarding my immigration status, citizenship, and nationality shaped my approach to translanguaging pedagogy and vocabulary instruction. My uncertainties regarding my own immigration status and my sense of being in a liminal space where I held fast to my country of origin and nationality shaped my relationships with the content and my students. My understanding of translanguaging was based on the theories I had read, not my experiences. In Colombia, I had been socialized in a monolingual context where my experiences of bilingualism and identity were shaped by monoglossic ideologies that dictated using only one language at a time and establishing clear-cut boundaries between languages, cultures, and nationalities.

Through analyzing these critical incidents, I grappled with my ambivalence and lack of clarity regarding my identity positionings in a new context. I realized I needed to deepen my understanding regarding the new positionalities I was wrestling with (e.g., immigrant or visitor, Latina or Latin American) to better guide my students in this translanguaging space. This experience resonates with Zoch’s (2020) study highlighting how teachers’ self-awareness of their identities is necessary to shape the instructional contexts and learning communities they wish to accomplish (Zoch, 2020). In addition, my experience resonates with other authors’ calls to encourage educators to engage in ongoing critical reflection to build awareness of how their and their students’
identities shape their understanding and engagement with the concepts taught (Alfare, 2019; Rodríguez-Mojica et al., 2019). This awareness is needed to guide students in developing adequate language to understand and talk about the complexity, fluidity, and hybridity of their experiences.

As Ndhlovu (2017) proposes, it is necessary to move out of our comfort zones to build awareness about what it means to “live and do things in the orbit of an unstandardized universe” (p. 154). Moving out of this comfort zone entails the willingness to understand reality from our students’ perspectives. It also entails working on our ideological clarity (Alfare, 2019) to unlearn monolingual and essentialist views of language and culture. This ideological clarity is necessary to ensure the transformative nature of translanguaging spaces.

**Vocabulary Learning to Understand the Self and the World**

Like other studies on the role that translanguaging plays in building students’ identities of competence (García-Mateus & Palmer, 2017; Palmer et al., 2014), this study shows that students felt confident in sharing their questions and experiences. However, the fine-grained discourse analysis of the identity negotiation processes in these critical incidents also revealed the need to critically consider how the content is presented and how students engage with the content to ensure that these lessons afford opportunities for critical and creative engagement (Wei, 2018).

The missed learning opportunities during the vocabulary lessons critically analyzed in this paper provide valuable insights into a translanguaging perspective on vocabulary learning. From this perspective, vocabulary learning is tied to identity development because learning new concepts offers new tools for understanding the self and the world. Current approaches to vocabulary instruction establish word selection criteria that highlight the relevance of target words for understanding the text, content, and how language works (e.g., their morpho-syntactic features) (Carlo et al., 2004; Lesaux & Harris, 2015; Proctor, 2011). However, these guidelines miss the critical role of language and literacy in providing the tools and knowledge for defining our place in the world (Luke, 2012). The critical incidents presented in this article illustrate the missed learning opportunities of approaching vocabulary as a neutral and teacher-centered process where she defines the words and controls the conversations about them.

Target words for vocabulary instruction should be relevant for understanding the text and future content and, most importantly, for helping students understand their world. This does not mean only teaching them about their own experiences, as in this study, but rather ensuring that target concepts inspire students’ curiosity and desire to learn because they can see their relevance for engaging with the world around them. In addition to expanding the criteria of relevance to go beyond academic content, it is crucial to open up conversations where students explore how these concepts help them, or not, to understand themselves and the world. In this sense, vocabulary learning from a translanguaging perspective entails engaging students in open-ended discussions where they use their linguistic and semiotic repertoire to co-construct word meanings and establish connections between texts and their social realities. From a translanguaging perspective, vocabulary learning may encourage students’ deep reflection on how the target concepts represent them and their experiences and provide tools for understanding the world.

**Implications and Directions for Future Studies**
While the data for this study is limited and based on my individual experience enacting translanguaging pedagogy, it may resonate with other educators’ experiences and questions about translanguaging pedagogy. With the critical incidents presented in this paper, I exposed missed learning opportunities that I hope will inform other educators’ and researchers’ work on translanguaging pedagogies. These missed learning opportunities inform implications for teacher preparation in translanguaging pedagogy and vocabulary instruction.

Regarding teacher preparation, the critical incidents presented in this work highlight the relevance of engaging in critical reflection to gain ideological clarity. The analysis of these critical incidents raised my awareness of the gap between my theoretical understanding of translanguaging theory and pedagogy and the deeply ingrained assumptions guiding my instruction. I realized that the ideological shift from monoglossic to heteroglossic ideologies goes far beyond using culturally relevant literature and encouraging students to use their entire linguistic repertoire. While providing access to students’ cultural and linguistic resources is a crucial first step, practitioners must build their ideological clarity (Alfaro, 2019). Building ideological clarity entails becoming aware of how our identity positionings shape our interactions with students, our instructional decisions, and how we relate to the content taught. In addition, this ideological clarity will provide awareness of how dominant ideologies, broader contexts, and historical processes shape interactions and learning in translanguaging classrooms (Allard, 2017; Hamman, 2018).

“Target words for vocabulary instruction should be relevant for understanding the text and future content and, most importantly, for helping students understand their world.”

Regarding vocabulary instruction gaining ideological clarity entails reflecting on how target vocabulary is selected, defined, and used since these instructional decisions may help contest or reify dominant ideologies. The critical incidents presented in this paper suggest the relevance of critically examining the dominant goal of vocabulary learning as building academic language and considering how vocabulary learning enables students to gain the conceptual tools to understand themselves and their realities. Linking vocabulary learning to identity entails encouraging students to reflect on how target words allow them to conceptualize their experiences and worlds. It is possible to engage students in this identity work by selecting and approaching target words as generative tools that allow students to examine their realities and identities. In this sense, vocabulary learning is an opportunity to gain new words for “naming and renaming, narrating and understanding learners’ life worlds” (Luke, 2012, p. 5).

To build a more solid empirical foundation for these implications, future research should examine whether and how the analysis of critical incidents supports teachers in building their ideological clarity when enacting translanguaging pedagogy. In addition, a relevant research direction derived from this work is design studies of vocabulary instruction from a translanguaging perspective to gain more profound knowledge of the link between language learning and identity development.

Conclusion

Through critical reflection, I grappled with my own positionalities as a teacher-researcher and increased my awareness of the complexities of identity negotiation and vocabulary learning in a translanguaging space. The enactment of
translanguaging pedagogies requires us to transcend the hierarchies, binaries, and rigid categories that have historically guided how we understand ourselves and the world. As educators, we must be open to building our ideological clarity by recognizing our positionalities and unpacking colonial understandings. This ideological work lays the foundation for guiding our bilingual students in their own identity development. The missed learning opportunities exposed in the critical incidents presented in this article highlight the possibilities of linking vocabulary learning to identity development by selecting generative target words that stimulate students to think about their positionalities and their place in the world and designing instructional activities where students co-construct word meanings and use these meanings to deepen their understanding of these positionalities and how they can act upon their worlds.
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### Appendix A

#### Content of the Lessons

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lesson</th>
<th>Duration in minutes</th>
<th>Content</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Lesson 1 | 26 | • Introduction to the work and conversation norms  
• Completed an identity chart  
• Vocabulary lesson – introduced “bilingual/bilingüe, multilingual/multilingüe” |
| Lesson 2 | 17 | • Vocabulary lesson: immigration/inmigración, immigrant/inmigrante, identity/identidad, culture/cultura, assimilate/asimilar  
* Critical incident 1 |
| Lesson 3 | 30 | • Introduction to *My Name is Jorge* and read the first poem also titled “My Name is Jorge”*  
• Discussed experiences and challenges of moving  
• Vocabulary lesson – overview of lesson cycle’s vocabulary words by identifying cognates. Focused on the different meanings of “turn/voltear, convertir” in the poem. |
| Lesson 4 | 34 | • Reviewed “My Name is Jorge” and read “Why am I Dumb” and “Invisible”  
• Discussed whether Jorge was dumb  
• Vocabulary lesson – Reviewed the different meanings of “turn,” introduced “invisible/invisible” and “disappear/desaparacer” and discussed the relationship between these words. |
| Lesson 5 | 27 | • Students shared their favorite parts of the poems we had read  
• Discussed why the character was struggling with his identity.  
• Vocabulary lesson – introduced the word “citizen/ciudadano”  
• Read “Yankee” and continued the discussion about the character’s experiences in relation to his identity  
* Critical incident 2 – Part 1 |
| Lesson 6 | 35 | • Vocabulary review and practice  
• Read “T-Shirt” and discussed the character’s decision to ask his teacher to call him Jorge instead of George  
• Discussed and wrote about Jorge’s experiences  
* Critical incident 2 – Part 2 |
| Lesson 7 | 25 | • Vocabulary lesson – introduced the word “power/poder”  
• Read “Recitation” and discussed how the character felt reciting his poem. |
• Morphology lesson – introduced the suffixes -ful, -less and its Spanish counterparts

Lesson 8 30
• Morphology review and practice
• Read “Relajando” and students selected their favorite parts of the poem
• Syntax lesson – used the poem to introduce adjective placement in English and Spanish

Lesson 9 40
• Syntax review and practice
• Reviewed poems and discussed whether Jorge should change his identity to fit in his new school.

Lesson 10 30
• Reviewed prior lesson’s discussion
• Reviewed “Recitation” to analyze the author’s use of Spanish in the English version of the poem.
• Wrote an opinion paragraph addressing the question: Should Jorge change his identity to fit in his new school?

*We read the Spanish and English versions of each poem
## Appendix B

### Rationale for Selecting Target Words

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target Words</th>
<th>Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>immigration/inmigración,</td>
<td>• Relevance for understanding the character’s and their own experiences.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>immigrant/inmigrante,</td>
<td>• Cognates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>identity/identidad,</td>
<td>• Potential use in discussions and other academic contexts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>culture/cultura,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>assimilate/asimilar</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>turn/voltear, convertir, turno</td>
<td>• Relevance for understanding the main theme addressed in the book in which the character grapples with the fear of becoming someone else</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Polysemy: Two of its meanings appear in the poem “My Name is Jorge/Me llamo Jorge”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Cross-linguistic relations – While in English turn has different meanings, in Spanish there are three different words for each meaning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>invisible/invisible,</td>
<td>• Turn is only a cognate in one of these cases</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>disappear/desaparecer</td>
<td>• Potential use in discussions and other academic contexts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>citizen/ciudadano</td>
<td>• Relevance for understanding the poem “Yankee”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Potential use in discussions and other academic contexts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>power/poder</td>
<td>• Relevance for understanding the character’s experiences in the poem Recitation/Recitación</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Affordances for introducing the suffixes – ful/oso(a), ado(a) and -less/des</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Potential use in discussions and other academic contexts</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>