Two Language Books: The Power and Possibilities of Leveraging Multilingual Texts for Critical Translanguaging Pedagogy

Kelly Hill
University of Alabama at Birmingham

Jennifer M. Ponder
University of Alabama at Birmingham

Jennifer Summerlin
University of Alabama at Birmingham

Paulette Evans
University of Alabama at Birmingham

The number of Emergent Bilinguals (EBs) in U.S. schools increases each year, yet mainstream teachers remain predominantly white and monolingual and receive little training for teaching this population. Additionally, many states mandate harmful "English-only" policies that perpetuate the systemic institutional oppression of minorities. In contrast, translanguaging theory promotes linguistic inclusivity and calls for repositioning EBs as competent multilinugal users. Translanguaging pedagogy can promote more socially-just educational environments and opportunities for EBs. Drawing from critical theory and critical pedagogy, this multiple-case study aimed to understand early childhood teachers' experiences and perceptions of implementing translanguaging pedagogy in writing.

INTRODUCTION

Classrooms throughout the U.S. have more multilingual children than ever before. Almost four million students in grades pre-k-12 are English Learners (ELs), representing about 8% of the student population (National Center for Education Statistics, 2020). The highest percentages of ELs are in pre-k-2nd grade. The younger children are when they enter English dominant schools, the more likely they are to lose their native language causing long-term negative effects on the development of language, literacy, identity, and social and familial relationships (Wong-Filmore, 1991). Because the majority of ELs are in the early childhood grades, a critical period for possible native language loss, supporting multilingualism is crucial.

Historically, children who speak languages other than English have been defined by their perceived language deficit. Labels such as Non-English Proficient (NEP), Limited English Proficient (LEP), and English Language Learners (ELL), among others, position children as inferior language users who need to learn English (Souto-Manning, 2016). Rather than framing ELs from an asset-perspective where bi/multilingualism is recognized and celebrated, most are framed as "struggling" (Martinez, 2018). The

asset-based term Emergent Bilingual (EB) Learners describes students who speak multiple languages and frames bilingualism as a strength (García, 2009).

Though the population of EBs continues to rise, the educator population remains predominantly monolingual and white. Many mainstream classroom teachers, largely due to a lack of coursework and professional development, are not sure how to support their English Learners (Coady, Harper, & de Jong, 2016). However, it is critical that all teachers, not just ESL teachers, support native language development along with English learning, especially in the early childhood setting. Educators can provide this multilingual support by implementing translanguaging pedagogy. Translanguaging pedagogy can be successfully implemented by monolingual teachers in "English-only" settings (Menken & Sánchez, 2019). The purpose of this research was to understand pre-k-2nd grade teachers' experiences and perceptions as they applied translanguaging pedagogy for writing instruction through the use of multilingual mentor texts which included both English and Spanish.

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK AND GUIDING RESEARCH

Several key theories and prior research informed this study. We applied a Critical Theory (CT) lens because schools as institutions historically oppress bilinguals through "English-only" policies. The teachers in this study were implementing linguistically inclusive practices for EBs, drawing from translanguaging theory (Otheguy, Garcia, & Reid, 2015). The instructional implementation leveraged both critical and translanguaging pedagogies. The researchers and teachers drew from prior research on effective writing instruction and aligned those practices with the implementation of translanguaging pedagogy.

Critical Theory

Critical theory (CT) is a lens by which the world can be analyzed and critiqued (Antonio, 1981; Gottesman, 2016). Born from the views of Marx, CT originated from his rebuke of capitalistic classism in the Stalinist Soviet state with an objective of emancipation (Gottesman, 2016). Marxist thought held that "emancipation originates as a battle against domination in the natural sphere, but is later extended to society in reaction to human exploitation" (Antonio, 1981, p. 334). The assertion that institutions are oppressive was clear in Marxist critiques. For this multiple case study, we prioritized oppressed groups within educational institutions, specifically EBs, and focused on the ways in which in-service teachers utilized critical frameworks in writing workshop.

Critical Pedagogy

Critical pedagogy steers critical theoretical scholarship toward education, revealing the integral role education plays in bolstering systems of oppression. The following segment looks more closely at this turn, the possibilities it opened for research focused on the re-education of children (and educators), and initial teacher preparation, by recognizing and dismantling oppressive school practices.

Critical theorist Paulo Freire noted the responsibility of educational systems in establishing an equitable social order. Oppressive structures, in this case, acted to oppress and stratify individuals based on language in favor of dominant language, in this context English. In *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*, Freire (1970) asserted that oppressed people enter "conscientizaçao," or critical consciousness, when they "unveil the world of oppression and through praxis commit themselves to its transformation" (p. 54). He followed with the second step in his pedagogical thinking, after the reality of oppression has been transformed, and "this pedagogy ceases to belong to the oppressed and becomes a pedagogy of all people in the process of permanent liberation" (p. 54). Educators in this study foregrounded the importance of empowerment through the use of translanguaging in writing workshops. Freire (1970) called for teacher-student "co-intentional education," where knowledge and thus reality are co-constructed so that they together become "re-creators." This model redirected the oppressed from "pseudo-participation" to "committed involvement" (p. 69). This redefined relationship between teachers and students served to emancipate students from potentially strict and oppressive monolingual settings. Thus, Freirean approaches to

translanguaging can "develop the tools to engage with the relationship between language and power so as to transform their future possibilities" (Garcia & Wei, 2014, p. 74).

Henry Giroux (1981; 1988) brought critical pedagogy to a contemporary audience and contextualized many of Freire's ideas for the United States audience. Giroux (1981) argued, in a more radical stance, that educational stakeholders must analyze:

> the way in which domination is concealed at the institutional level. It suggests looking at the way a dominant ideology is inscribed in (1) the form and content of classroom material; (2) the organization of the school; (3) the daily classroom social relationships; (4) the principles that structure the selection and organization of the curriculum; (5) the attitudes of the school staff, and (6) the discourse and practices of even those who appear to have penetrated its logic. (p. 22)

Critical pedagogical theories provided an anti-normative viewpoint that allows us to critically analyze and expose oppressive substructures within schools. The aim is to dismantle institutions that work to reproduce domination through language policies and restrictions of home language use in schools (Janks, 2000).

The application of critical pedagogy also presented an opportunity for researchers and practitioners to investigate the complex ways multilingual students acquire knowledge in educational spaces and use language as a tool to understand and act against oppressive structures. A critical framework prioritized the transformative potential of translanguaging through creativity and criticality (Garcia and Wei, 2014). The authors referred to creativity as:

> The ability to choose between following and flouting the rules and norms of behavior, including the use of language. It is about pushing and breaking the boundaries between old and the new, the conventional and the acceptable and the challenging. (p. 67)

They continued that criticality is:

> The ability to use available evidence appropriately, systematically and insightfully to inform considered views of cultural, social, political, and linguistic phenomena, to question and problematize received wisdom, and to express views adequately through reasoned responses to situations. (p. 67)

Creativity and criticality informed this multiple case study. These concepts were extended upon through the employment of critical pedagogies in pre-k-2nd grade setting. The application of a critical framework in translanguaging empowers educators to adopt classroom practices that build capacity within students to uncover and act against oppressive substructures present in educational institutions, as well as larger societal institutions.

Translanguaging Theory

In most U.S. classrooms, English is the language of instruction and the language in which children are expected to speak, read, and write. Traditionally, the inclusion of the native language for speaking and writing is viewed as "code-switching", switching back and forth between languages viewed as separate. Code-switching is considered a disruption of monolingual English use and is commonly stigmatized (Garcia, Johnson, & Seltzer, 2017). In contrast, translanguaging encourages speakers to use their full linguistic repertoires to construct and convey meaning. Otheguy, Garcia, and Reid (2015) define translanguaging as "the deployment of a speaker's full linguistic repertoire without regard for watchful adherence to the socially and politically defined boundaries of named languages" (p. 281). Prior research indicated that students experience greater school success when teachers foster multilingual literacies (Goldenberg, 2008; Nieto, 2010).

Recently, links between translanguaging and social justice were posed promoting fair and equitable education for bilingual students by removing language prejudice in the classroom (Garcia, Johnson, and Seltzer, 2017). In order for multilingual students to be able to fully participate in the classroom, they must be able to access and use multiple languages in all domains (listening, speaking, reading, and writing). Garcia, Johnson, and Seltzer (2017) claimed, "When translanguaging is not allowed in schools, bilingual students are placed at a disadvantage because they are assessed on only a portion of their linguistic repertoires and are taught in ways that do not fully leverage their language resources" (p. 11). They further explained that when schools do not include "linguistic practices other than those that are regarded as 'legitimate school English,' schools are ignoring the potential to build on a child's entire language repertoire and rendering other ways of speaking invisible" (p. 23). This is critical for literacy learning as students need to be able to read, discuss, and write about their reading leveraging their multilingualism. In order to provide socially-just school experiences, in line with the tenets of critical pedagogy, teachers should carefully plan and implement translanguaging pedagogy.

Translanguaging Pedagogy

Translanguaging pedagogy includes three strands: stance, design, and shifts (Garcia, Johnson, & Seltzer, 2017). First, teachers take a stance that multilingual literacies are valued and encourage children to use their language with fluidity. Though a translanguaging stance may be employed as a temporary support until EBs become proficient in English, the researchers and participants held a transformational translanguaging stance (Garcia, Johnson, & Seltzer, 2017). The transformational stance seeks to remove language hierarchies altogether, allowing EBs to use their full linguistic repertories and select language(s) that will position them as successful speakers, readers, and writers as well as competent content consumers. Teachers must also design instruction and educational opportunities for children to use all of their languages. For this study, teachers purposefully designed mini-lessons that included multilingual mentor texts that modeled translanguaging to support and encourage students to use their full language repertoire in the classroom. Finally, shifts refer to the minute-to-minute decisions that teachers make within the classroom that encourage children to use their full linguistic abilities. For teachers who hold a translanguaging stance, this happens naturally as they engage in individual writing conferences with children and seek opportunities to foster multiple language use. In this study, teachers guided children to purposefully include multiple languages within their writing, thus honoring and valuing their multilingualism.

Writing Instruction

The study was guided by recent research that documented the benefits of translanguaging in writing instruction (Axelrod & Cole, 2018; Pacheco & Miller, 2016; Rowe, 2018; Zapata & Tropp-Laman, 2016). Emergent bilinguals are continually negotiating and mediating meaning for language use which is critical in the writing process (Zapata & Tropp-Laman, 2016). With this in mind, EBs, and all children, need time for writing daily. This time should include focused instruction and extended periods of individual writing time. The writing instruction should enhance their understanding of the writing process and support development of language(s) as they grapple with expressing meaning through writing. In addition to time and focused instruction, writing for authentic purposes is another critical component for supporting writers. Just like listening, speaking, and reading, the end goal of writing is to share or receive a message. If the writing is not authentic, we risk developing writers who are mechanical at best, but lack the deeper structures for mediating messages. To end systems of oppression that work to frame EBs as poor writers, educators must support translanguaging and help students develop strategic abilities to share stories and information in thoughtful, effective, and powerful ways. This type of instruction cannot wait until later in students' education, but rather, must be the foundation of initial writing instruction.

Writing workshop is an instructional approach that values the constructive and contextual nature of the writing process (Wood-Ray, 2001). The writing workshop structure begins with a brief but focused mini-lesson, followed by time for students to write while the teacher confers with individual or small groups of writers, and ends with a whole class debriefing or share session. Rather than providing prescriptive prompts

to "jump start" young writers, teachers invest in mini-lessons honoring the real and raw processes and products that mirror the work of prolific authors (Wood-Ray & Cleaveland, 2004). Teachers who use a writing workshop approach often develop units of study focused on particular writing craft techniques modeled through quality children's literature. Unlike writing prompts that depend on the teacher as decision-maker, students are viewed as writers who make choices from the beginning of a piece through to publication (Kissel, 2017). This abandons teacher-directed writing practices and emphasizes student-generated writing and ultimately empowers children as writers. Empowerment is a core component of critical theory and pedagogy as well as translanguaging theory and pedagogy. The writing workshop promotes empowerment, thus creates a powerful path to the revaluing of previously underserved groups, in this study, EB learners.

Mentor Texts

During writing workshop mini-lessons, teachers *show* children how telling stories, presenting information, choosing words, and using structures and formats that are commonly expected in published writing. This is done by highlighting the work of real authors. Their books are used as mentors for writing - thus, the term mentor texts. Dorfman and Cappelli (2007) defined mentor texts as "pieces of literature that we can return to again and again as we help young writers learn how to do what they may not yet be able to do on their own" (p. 2-3). When students listen to and read mentor texts then talk about the author's craft, they are given authentic models to try out in their own writing. Consistent with critical frameworks, these writing tasks were liberatory and served to give voice to multilingual students.

Tropp-Laman (2013) encouraged the use of mentor texts with multilingual writers so EBs can see writing possibilities and return to them as models for their own writing. To encourage children to engage in translanguaging, they need models such as multilingual picture books (Pacheco & Miller, 2016; Zapata & Tropp-Laman, 2016). These books contribute to a classroom culture where multiple languages are used and recognized as integral to learning. There are children's books in which the author(s) utilize multiple languages, representing examples of how languages are and can be used together. We refer to these as *translanguaging texts*, those that use multiple languages concurrently, as many bilinguals do. While translanguaging texts are mostly in English, which could be perceived as language bias, English-dominant teachers are less intimidated by reading these books aloud. This increases the likelihood of multilingual texts being used during what is typically "English-only" instruction. Using translanguaging texts helps create safe environments that contribute to inclusive multilingual classrooms (Claudine, 2017).

METHOD

For this qualitative study, we employed a multiple case study design (Yin, 2002). There has been little research on teachers' experiences and perceptions of implementing translanguaging in writing workshop with young EBs, so qualitative design was a useful approach to inquiry (Willis, 2007). Yin (2002) defined case as "a contemporary phenomenon within its real-life context, especially when the boundaries between a phenomenon and context are not clear and the researcher has little control over the phenomenon and context" (p. 13). We defined the case for this study as the early childhood in-service teachers' practices and perspectives of implementing translanguaging pedagogy in writing workshop using multilingual mentor texts to promote translanguaging among pre-k-2nd EB students. Yin's (2002) definition of case fits within our study as the multiple teacher participants planned and implemented translanguaging pedagogy, but it was not clear how students would respond. The purpose of this study was to understand in-service teachers' experiences and perceptions of implementing translanguaging pedagogy in pre-k-2nd grade writing workshop leveraging translanguaging mentor texts.

Participants

We employed purposeful sampling to select study participants (Hatch, 2002). The teachers in the study were all general education teachers with certification in early childhood and elementary education (pre-k-6th grade) who were seeking certification and a master's degree in Teaching English as a Second Language

(TESOL). The participants' teaching experience ranged from one to seven years. Of the four teachers who participated in the study, two were pre-k teachers, one was a kindergarten teacher, and one was a second-grade teacher. Two of the teachers were monolingual English speakers, one was emergent bilingual (English-Spanish), and one was proficient bilingual (English-Spanish). Three were white and one identified as white-Hispanic. The participants taught at three different school settings representing both urban and suburban areas.

Context

The study was conducted at a large urban University in the southeast, in a state that mandates "English-Only" instruction in pre-k-12 schools. As part of the participants' graduate coursework, they were introduced to translanguaging theory and participated in professional development (PD) on translanguaging pedagogy. The participants also explored action research methodology and were guided by their course instructor (one of the researchers) on the construction of their research question(s) and methodology. This five-month PD and coursework included a bi-weekly book study with one of the researchers, multilingual mentor text selection, writing lesson plans that leveraged translanguaging pedagogy, lesson implementation, and reflective journaling. Each participant planned and conducted an individual action research project. Teachers reviewed, analyzed and selected translanguaging mentor texts to use for writing workshop mini-lessons. The selected texts guided their writing workshop lessons, which was the main focus of their own action research projects. Each participant sought to understand different impacts of the use of mentor text including: students' spontaneous use of translanguaging during writing, the impact of same language partners writing together, and the influence of writing genre on the use of translanguaging. The researchers analyzed the teachers experiences during implementation and their perceptions of translanguaging pedagogy as a result of their action research projects.

Procedures

Multiple forms of data were collected during the study by the teacher participants and researchers. For their action research projects, participants collected artifacts including lesson plans, modeled writing samples from mini-lessons, student writing samples, photographs, and videos. The teacher participants also kept a reflective journal documenting their instructional implementation which were shared with the researchers. The journals included reflections, questions, and notices about the three strands of translanguaging pedagogy and how EBs, and all children, were responding to the instruction.

To collect data about the teachers experiences and perceptions of implementing translanguaging pedagogy in writing workshop through the use of translanguaging texts as mentors, the researchers collected three different types of data. After the completion of their action research projects, teacher participants completed a survey about their use of translanguaging pedagogy and participated in a small group semi-structured interview during the last class. They also uploaded their reflection journal and implementation artifacts to an online learning system. The researchers analyzed surveys and interview transcription using open coding to identify themes. In an effort to triangulate the data, the teachers' reflective journals were also analyzed to confirm emergent themes and identify any new themes. Further, the teachers' reported findings of the EB students' responses to instruction were identified through coding and confirmed through student work samples and lesson plans. Two of the researchers for this study initially co-constructed the themes and created data tables with emerged themes and supporting participant quotes. A third researcher then independently authenticated the identified themes.

To further strengthen the internal validity of the study, we implemented member checking (Guba, 1981). This served as cross-checking for credibility of the researchers' interpretation of the participants' perceptions (Teddlie & Tashakkori, 2009). The themes and quotes were shared with the participants via email and the feedback received unanimously supported the presented findings. The participants have co-presented these findings at professional conferences and fully support the collective experiences and perceptions reported in the study.

RESULTS

Through careful data analysis, three themes were identified: connecting and designing instruction; transformation; and, resistance. Sub-themes also emerged from the larger themes. Thick descriptions were used to establish the significance of participants' voices, feelings, actions, and meanings related to their experiences and perceptions (Denzin, 1989).

Connecting and Designing Instruction

Within connecting and designing instruction, the following sub-themes emerged: context and content extension; honoring language(s); and, inclusion of all language domains. Translanguaging pedagogy transcended writing workshop, which was initially introduced for research purposes. Teachers noted that translanguaging texts influenced read alouds, word walls, anchor charts, classroom resources, shared writing, daily news, and individual conferences with children. One teacher shared:

> My entire class fell so in love with our 'two language' books that this became our reading structure for the remainder of the year. By students being able to see their language in the read alouds we were using, it gave strength to the use of their home language.

Another teacher noted, "My modeled writing was bilingual but [before this research] I was not reflecting bilingualism in my anchor charts, questions, and conversations with all my students." All participants noted ways in which translanguaging went beyond writing workshop. Embracing multilingualism in all contexts of the classroom became a part of their classroom community and learning environment.

All teachers noticed a shift toward an honoring of language(s). One participant reflected, "A teacher's translanguaging stance is a belief that a child's home language is an asset and should be honored in the classroom throughout the school day." This belief also supported the initial subtheme because translanguaging was no longer limited to writing workshop. In response to a change in teaching practice, another teacher shared:

> The main change I would note is the imperative need for children to be invited to use their home language in all four language domains. However, until I began to introduce translanguaging mentor texts and invite students to write in their home language, I didn't truly understand the meaning of translanguaging.

To further the idea of honoring language, and the importance of doing so, one teacher reflected on how language is a part of learners' funds of knowledge, "I did not realize the importance of using the entire language repertoire of students in the classroom. I now believe that students should be able to draw from their entire funds of knowledge in order to develop their literacy." This valuing of language began to shift across all four classroom communities, embracing more linguistically inclusive learning environments.

Finally, the theme of including all four language domains in instruction emerged. Though teacher participants implemented the mentor texts during writing workshop mini-lessons, they noticed multiple language use in reading and conversations as well. Some began to leverage translanguaging texts for read alouds and noticed more written and spoken use of languages. One identified her own learning, "I better understand how to incorporate a translanguaging stance across the four language domains to support a culture of a multilingual classroom." Another reflected on the progression of her lesson planning and noted that over time, she had begun to purposefully plan for including listening, speaking, reading and writing in order to "represent bilingualism in all four language domains throughout the writing workshop". Though the initial focus for implementing translanguaging pedagogy was in writing, all participants shifted their instruction to include translanguaging across language domains and throughout the school day.

Transformation

The second theme of transformation included changes in the physical environment, the classroom community, home-school partnerships, and overall teaching philosophy. All teachers noticed an organic transformation in the physical classroom environment after implementing translanguaging pedagogy. They noted the books, labels, charts, and environmental print in the classroom began to represent the multiple languages spoken in the classroom. They provided more multilingual resources including books, word walls, translation apps, and bilingual dictionaries. One participant shared: "I [began to] see translanguaging design as intentional incorporation of all represented languages in my classroom. From the physical environment (books, labels, charts, etc.) to the design of lessons." Participants' design practices began to include overall classroom design for translanguaging rather than just lesson design alone. For many, this was the first-time multilingualism was "seen and not 'just' heard" within their classrooms.

A positive change in classroom community was also noted. Overall, teachers noticed more inclusive attitudes among students and a valuing of children who had been traditionally silenced. One teacher noted, "My EB students were seen as 'rock stars'...they were the leaders of the classroom instruction in the 'two language' book lessons." Another stated, "I have noticed an energy that was once not there...I know this is not necessarily about the monolingual students but many of them also were energized about writing in both languages." One teacher found that her monolingual students began to show more interest in learning Spanish from the EBs in their classroom. Two of her monolingual students asked, "How do you speak Spanish?" These students went on to explain that they wanted to learn Spanish so they could communicate with a newcomer in the classroom who only used and understood Spanish. They valued her inclusion and wanted to acquire the language they believed necessary to welcome her voice into the classroom community. Only one participant noted initial confusion among her students when she began implementing translanguaging pedagogy, but reported that over time, they came to enjoy the multilingual mentor texts.

Multiple participants noticed a change in home-school connections and were more purposeful with these partnerships for translanguaging design. One participant shared, "Design links home language, home, and school. That is so important because if there is not a bridge between home and school the students' language, literacy, and socio-emotional development can suffer." Another teacher began to routinely invite families in to read the "two-language" books to the children. One participant shared, "I had parents thank me and actually embrace me physically for sending home texts their students had written in their home language." A positive shift toward family engagement resulted when teachers began embracing multilingual practices through translanguaging pedagogy.

Participants also noticed a transformation in their philosophical beliefs. Some connected to constructivist and whole language philosophies. One teacher stated, "Translanguaging pedagogy has changed my educational philosophy. I understand much more about the literacy development of children." While another shared, "Learning about translanguaging changed my whole teaching philosophy." This evolution marked more thoughtful and planned inclusivity of language and an intentional removal of institutional structures and barriers that served only to oppress minority language users. The transformations identified in the classroom community, learning environment, family engagement and teachers' philosophy all served as change agents for empowering EB learners and removing linguistic and educational barriers.

Resistance

The final theme that emerged was resistance: not only outward resistance from various stakeholders, but also resistance stemming from traditional educational views and practices. Participants noted resistance by various stakeholders, including students, colleagues, and administrators. It was surprising to the participating teachers that some EB learners were resistant to translanguaging at first. One teacher reflected, "My biggest challenge from theory to practice was the resistance of my children to embrace their home language in their writing. More than once I was told, 'I don't want to two language...writing is hard enough in one'!" Another participant was stunned when a student said, "Spanish is for home, and English is for school." In one pre-k class, a participant shared that an EB student still would not use her home language, even after two weeks of modeling translanguaging and using multilingual mentor texts. However,

participants indicated that most students, even those who were resistant at first, eventually embraced the power of their multilingualism.

Participants expressed a belief that their colleagues would likely show resistance to translanguaging pedagogy, revealing a preference toward more traditional (and oppressive) language practices. Two participants voiced concerns about possible judgment from other teachers. One shared, "Some of my colleagues would not be supportive but they are used to me doing things differently than them so it wouldn't be too surprising for them." Another stated, "My colleagues, on the other hand, will be resistant to say the least. I feel like this is due to a lack of education and awareness, coupled with a social, political, and academic prejudice." All felt like outliers in their quest to promote more linguistically inclusive educational environments that empower EB learners.

Several wondered if their administration would be supportive. One participant believed her administration would be "hesitant" but eventually supportive. Another shared that her administrator would be "unaware" of the practices implemented in her classroom. However, this perceived resistance did not keep teachers from implementing and embracing translanguaging pedagogy during writing workshop and beyond. In fact, two participants shared goals to advocate for more linguistically inclusive practices, such as translanguaging pedagogy, toward the removal of the systematic institutional oppression of multilingualism perpetuated by "English-only" policies.

DISCUSSION AND IMPLICATIONS

The findings from this study are significant for the current and future education of emergent bilingual learners and the re-education of teachers. The researchers found that participants' understanding of translanguaging pedagogy, coupled with guided support during implementation, positively transformed all areas of instruction and the classroom environment with shifts toward practices that promoted multilingualism. Through implementing translanguaging pedagogy, participants critically analyzed practices for selecting and organizing curriculum, an overarching tenet of critical pedagogy in education (Giroux, 1981). Therefore, translanguaging pedagogy connected to critical pedagogy should be more intentionally introduced in teacher education programs for pre-service teachers and in professional development (PD) for in-service teachers. This initial preparation and PD for educators is needed in order to achieve a reframing and empowering of oppressed groups and for the removal of unjust school practices that free students from these punitive structures.

The results of this study have important implications for transformational practices and perspectives. As discussed above, initially implementing translanguaging pedagogy in just one content area, led to curricular transformations in all other content areas. Beyond instructional transformations, the classroom community also changed. As Friere (1970) asserted, once the reality of oppression has been reconstructed, the pedagogy no longer belongs to the oppressed, but to all people in the process of liberation. In this study, the teachers and their students, EB and monolingual alike, adopted a translanguaging stance and reconstructed the linguistic learning environment. This change in the classroom community is also consistent with Garcia, Johnson, and Seltzer's (2017) claim that classroom environments are co-constructed by teachers and students to include more linguistic freedom. This study provides a case of support for translanguaging pedagogy as a potentially effective practice to abolish linguistically oppressive structures and remove language bias from schools.

Transformations in the classroom environment also occurred. As Giroux (1981) explained, through critical pedagogy, educators analyze classroom materials. In this study, educators clearly analyzed children's picture books to include models of translanguaging. The inclusion of other materials such as bilingual dictionaries, word walls, and classroom labels also promoted translanguaging. These resources and materials helped empower EBs to revalue and use their own multilingualism.

Finally, as the participants implemented translanguaging pedagogy, their philosophy about teaching, in general, evolved. Historically, many teachers have heteronomously implemented educational mandates without the critical analysis Giroux (1981) promoted. Oftentimes, classroom teachers' pedagogical decision-making is heavily influenced by politicians and other inexperienced, nescient authorities who

legislate oppressive educational policies. The teachers' and students' valuing of translanguaging pushed back against traditional and oppressive linguistic exclusion and removed language hierarchies within the classroom. In this way, both students and teachers were empowered as a result of implementing translanguaging pedagogy. Emancipation, the primary objective of critical theory, was achieved within the participants' classrooms as they were freed from unjust "English-only" educational environments. Another fulcrum of power in this study was the ability of the teachers to carry on with translanguaging practices despite the resistance from administrators, colleagues and students. In fact, they took up an advocacy stance for linguistic inclusion. This advocacy is critical in promoting empowerment of historically oppressed groups.

Though the teachers in this study supported translanguaging in their classroom, there was perceived resistance from colleagues and administrators. This resistance is consistent with the work of Bowles and Gintis (1977) who described the intention and effects of cognitively and socially repressive schools in *Schooling in Capitalist America*, where they describe the reproductive nature of educational systems. One participant shared:

> My greatest concern about implementing a translanguaging pedagogy for my EBs in my particular school is the fact that when they leave me, it will… NOT [be] embraced... I will have told them this is right and good and then they will be shamed or made to feel bad about it in first grade.

A valuing of all languages is not yet wide-spread in early childhood classrooms. Language biases are often perpetuated within classroom settings even by caring and effective teachers. The statement above relayed a lack of collegial support for multilingual use, but amazingly did not stop her implementation of translanguaging pedagogy. This is a critical finding because it implies that if teachers are actively involved in designing, developing, implementing, and evaluating practices in meaningful ways, then subsequent results potentially empower them to view all new innovations through the lens of a liberator.

Even the EB students initially resisted translanguaging, indicating an early formation of dominant language bias. For example, the children were unwilling to readily employ their native language even when it was encouraged and prompted. This demonstrates the child's established belief that using any language other than English is wrong even if the monolingual adult/educational caretaker encourages it. One student explicitly stated that Spanish was for home and English was for school. This could be a result of unspoken American school and larger societal norms and "rules" perpetuating these oppressive linguistic beliefs. This indicates that children, as young as four to eight years old, had already begun constructing ideas of multilingualism that supported native language exclusion from the school setting. Even in the early childhood grades, these EBs were eager to abandon their native language(s) and conform to oppressive "English-only" educational norms. They were clearly already constructing identities as learners and writers. This is consistent with Wagner's (2018) findings that children as young as pre-k are actively forming multilingual and reading identities. This provides a case of support for translanguaging pedagogy implementation in the early grades, as young children are already beginning to construct their bilingual and educational identities, which will impact their later identity and how they are situated and seen within the larger society.

LIMITATIONS AND FUTURE RESEARCH

In scholarly research, it is important to identify limitations of the study. One limitation of this research was the narrow data analysis focused exclusively on teachers' reflections of their experiences. Although this approach supported the initial research question, observations by the researchers would provide an added level of evidence for triangulating findings. Another study limitation is the sample size. Although the purposive sampling composition afforded investigation across multiple grade levels, an increased sample size would have allowed researchers to experience data or thematic saturation (Hatch, 2002),

confirming the extraction of all possible themes. Finally, as consistent with qualitative research, the presented findings cannot be generalized to a larger population.

From this study, researchers identified several implications for future research. First, as the current study only focused on teachers' perspectives and experiences, insights from other stakeholders are needed to fully understand the ways in which translanguaging pedagogy are perceived and valued. Future studies should seek to understand the experiences, perceptions and values of Emergent Bilingual students, their families, and school administrators. Future research is also needed to analyze EBs writing development over time, with a close look at the use of their multilingual voices as they compose written pieces. This research focused specifically on translanguaging pedagogy implemented during writing workshop, though findings from this study indicated that translanguaging permeated other aspects of curriculum and instruction. It would be helpful to look closely at translanguaging pedagogy in other content areas such as reading, math, social studies, and science. Finally, as the participants in this study were seeking an advanced degree in TESOL, additional studies on classroom teachers' implementation of translanguaging pedagogy with PD only would be insightful.

CONCLUSION

In this discussion of findings, the researchers consistently noted links between critical pedagogy and translanguaging pedagogy. This study supports a case for the application of *critical translanguaging pedagogy* in pre-k-2nd grade settings. We introduce this term as a structure for not only removing oppressive language practices, but also dismantling larger structures of systemic oppression in education through intentional pedagogical practices. The results show that through this intentional use of both critical and translanguaging frameworks, teachers prioritized and honored students' lived experiences and native language. Teachers and students, both EB and monolingual, operating within historically oppressive monolingual settings, demonstrated a rejection of normative, oppressive classroom practices and embraced a true critical translanguaging stance. More importantly, EB students were provided an opportunity to elevate more authentic representations of themselves through translanguaging in their reading, writing, and speaking. In this study, the use of the two-language books as translanguaging mentor texts elevated the linguistic possibilities for EBs and served as a catalyst for removing oppressive "English-only" practices.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The researchers would like to acknowledge and thank the amazing classroom teachers involved in this study. Thank you for the wonderful work you are doing to eliminate oppressive language policies and institutional practices to empower children and promote the development of strong, positive multilingual identities for young EBs.

REFERENCES

Antonio, R.J. (1981). Immanent critique as the core of critical theory: Its origins and developments in Hegel, Marx and contemporary thought. *British Journal of Sociology*, *32*(3), 330–45.

Axelrod, Y., & Cole, M.W. (2018). 'The pumpkins are coming… vienen las calabazas… that sounds funny': Translanguaging practices of young emergent bilinguals. *Journal of Early Childhood Literacy*, *18*(1), 129–153.

Bowles, S., & Gintis, H. (1976). *Schooling in capitalist America: Educational reform and the contradictions of economic life.* New York: Basic Books.

Claudine, K. (2017). Translanguaging practices during storytelling with the app iTEO in preschools. *Translation and Translanguaging in Multilingual Contexts*, *3*(2), 145-166.

Coady, M., Harper, C., & de Jong, E. (2011). From preservice to practice: Mainstream elementary teacher beliefs of preparation and efficacy with English language learners in the State of Florida. *Bilingual Research Journal*, *34*(2), 223-239.

Denzin, N.K. (1989). *Interpretive interactionism.* Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
Dorfman, L., & Capelli, R. (2007). *Mentor texts: Teaching writing through children's literature, K-6.* Stenhouse: Portland, ME.
Freire, P. (1970). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. New York, NY: Herder & Herder.
García, O. (2009). Emergent bilinguals and TESOL. What's in a name? In *TESOL Quarterly*, *43*(2), 322-326, special issue edited by Shelley Taylor.
García, O., & Wei, L. (2014). *Translanguaging: Language, bilingualism and education*. Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.
Garcia, O., Johnson, S.I., & Seltzer, K. (2017). *The translanguaging classroom: Leveraging student's bilingualism for learning.* Philadelphia, PA: Caslon.
Giroux, H. (1981). *Ideology, culture, and the process of schooling*. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.
Giroux, H. (1988). *Teachers as intellectuals*. New York, NY: Bergin & Garvey.
Goldenberg, C. (2008, Summer). Teaching English language learners: What the research does – and does not – say. *American Educator*, pp. 8-44.
Gottesman, I. (2016). *The critical turn in education from Marxist critique to poststructuralist feminism to critical theories of race*. New York, NY: Routledge.
Guba, E.G. (1981). Criteria for assessing the trustworthiness of naturalistic inquiries. *Educational Communications and Technology Journal*, *29*(2), 75–91.
Hatch, J.A. (2002). *Doing qualitative research in education settings*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
Janks, H. (2000). Domination, access, diversity and design: A synthesis for critical literacy education. *Educational Review*, *52*(2), 175-186.
Kissel, B. (2017). *When writer's drive the workshop: Honoring young voices and bold choices.* Portland, MA: Stenhouse Publishers.
Martinez, R.A. (2018). Beyond the English learner label: Recognizing the richness of bi/multilingual students' linguistic repertoires. *The Reading Teacher*, *71*(5), 515-522.
Menken, K., & Sánchez, M.T. (2019). Translanguaging in English-only schools: From pedagogy to stance in the disruption of monolingual policies and practices. *TESOL Quarterly*, *53*(4), 741-767.
Nieto, S. (2010). *Language, culture, and teaching: Critical Perspectives* (2nd ed.). New York: Routledge.
Otheguy, R., Garcia, O., & Reid, W. (2015). Clarifying translanguing and deconstructing named languages: A perspective from linguistics. *Applied Linguistics Review*, *6*(3), 281-307.
Pacheco, M.B., & Miller, M.E. (2016). Making meaning through translanguaging in the literacy classroom. *The Reading Teacher*, *69*(5), 533-537.
Rowe, L.W. (2018). Say it in your language: Supporting translanguaging in multilingual classes. *The Reading Teacher*, *72*(1), 31– 38.
Souto-Manning, M. (2016). Honoring and building on the rich literacy practices of young bilingual and multilingual learners. *The Reading Teacher*, *70*(3), 263–271.
Teddlie, C., & Tashakkori, A. (2009). *Foundations of mixed methods research: Integrating quantitative and qualitative approaches in the social and behavioral sciences.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
Tropp-Laman, T. (2013). *From ideas to words: Writing strategies for English language learners.* Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics. (2020). *English learners in public schools.* Retrieved from: https://nces.ed.gov/programs/coe/indicator_cgf.asp
Wagner, C.J. (2018). Being bilingual, being a reader: Prekindergarten dual language learners' reading identities. *Journal of Early Childhood Literacy*, *18*(1), 5–37.
Willis, J. (2007). *Foundations of qualitative research.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
Wong-Fillmore, L. (1991). When learning a second language means losing the first. *Early Childhood Research Quarterly*, *6*, 323-346.

Wood Ray, K., & Cleaveland, L.B. (2004). *About the authors: Writing workshop with our youngest writers.* Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
Wood-Ray, K. (2001). *The writing workshop: Working through the hard parts (And they're all hard parts)*. Urbana, IL: NCTE.
Yin, R.K. (2002). *Case study research: Design and methods*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.
Zapata, A., & Tropp-Laman, T. (2016). "I write to show how beautiful my languages are": Translingual writing instruction in English-dominant classrooms. *Language Arts*, *93*(5), 366–378.