



A publication of the
New York State Association
for Bilingual Education

Journal of Multilingual Education Research

Volume 9 *The Power of Voice: Contributions of
Ofelia García to Language Education*

Article 13

2019

The Emergence of Translanguaging Pedagogy: A Dialogue between Theory and Practice

Jim Cummins

University of Toronto and Åbo Akademi University, Finland

Follow this and additional works at: <https://fordham.bepress.com/jmer>

 Part of the [Bilingual, Multilingual, and Multicultural Education Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Cummins, Jim (2019) "The Emergence of Translanguaging Pedagogy: A Dialogue between Theory and Practice," *Journal of Multilingual Education Research*: Vol. 9 , Article 13.

Available at: <https://fordham.bepress.com/jmer/vol9/iss1/13>

This Ofelia García as a Scholar is brought to you for free and open access by DigitalResearch@Fordham. It has been accepted for inclusion in Journal of Multilingual Education Research by an authorized editor of DigitalResearch@Fordham. For more information, please contact considine@fordham.edu, bkilee@fordham.edu.



The Emergence of Translanguaging Pedagogy: A Dialogue between Theory and Practice

Cover Page Footnote

Jim Cummins, PhD, is a Professor Emeritus at the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education of the University of Toronto and an adjunct professor at Åbo Akademi University in Finland. His research focuses on literacy development in educational contexts characterized by linguistic diversity. In numerous articles and books, he has explored the nature of language proficiency and its relationship to literacy development with particular emphasis on the intersections of societal power relations, teacher-student identity negotiation, and literacy attainment.

Erratum

Updated Dual Language Showcase link is <http://schools.peelschools.org/1363/DualLanguage/Documents/index.htm>

The Emergence of Translanguaging Pedagogy: A Dialogue between Theory and Practice

Jim Cummins

University of Toronto and Åbo Akademi University, Finland

My goal in this paper is to contribute to the process of bringing practice and theory into active dialogue. Initially, I review some early instructional examples of crosslinguistic pedagogy involving emergent bilingual students. I then focus on more recent examples from the Canadian context that illustrate the emerging role of classroom teachers as knowledge-generators. Through their practice, these educators have challenged the assumption that schools serving multilingual students have no option but to be English-only zones. Finally, I explore some of the ways in which these instructional innovations illuminate theoretical understandings of translanguaging and crosslinguistic pedagogy more generally.

Keywords: cross-linguistic pedagogy, emergent bilingual students, home language, instructional innovations, instructional strategies, multilingual students, Ofelia García, practice and theory active dialogue, translanguaging pedagogy

Several years ago, at a national conference for Canadian French immersion teachers, I sat in the audience listening to a presentation by my colleague Sharon Lapkin on pedagogical strategies in immersion programs. Sharon focused on research carried out by Merrill Swain and herself, and several other researchers (reviewed in Swain & Lapkin, 2013), suggesting that ‘principled use of L1’ was a legitimate instructional strategy in French immersion. While emphasizing that teachers should give priority to the use of the target language (L2, French), Swain and Lapkin advocated purposeful use of students’ home language (L1, English) “to illustrate cross-linguistic comparisons or to provide the meaning of abstract vocabulary items” (p. 123). They also suggested that students should be permitted “to use their L1 during collaborative dialogue or private speech in order to mediate their understanding and generation of complex ideas (languaging) as they prepare to produce an end product (oral or written) in the target language” (pp. 122-123).

The reactions of French immersion teachers who listened to Sharon Lapkin articulate these ideas in October 2013 ranged from surprise to confusion. Sharon provided several opportunities during her presentation for participants to discuss the ideas in small groups. I sat at a table with about 10 teachers, most of whom expressed strong skepticism about permitting students to use English for classroom tasks, let alone encouraging teachers to use English to point to linguistic comparisons or explain

complex aspects of French grammar or vocabulary. These teachers, as well as generations of French immersion teachers before them, had been socialized into believing that it was *never* pedagogically acceptable for French immersion teachers to use English and that students should be strongly encouraged to use only French in the classroom. In their eyes, even so-called ‘principled’ use of English by teachers or students would open the door to serious dilution of the French ambiance they strove so assiduously to maintain in their classrooms. Their pedagogical convictions were identical to those articulated by Wallace Lambert, in many ways the principal pedagogical architect of French immersion programs (e.g., Lambert & Tucker, 1972):

No bilingual skills are required of the teacher, who plays the role of a monolingual in the target language ... and who never switches languages, reviews materials in the other language, or otherwise uses the child’s native language in teacher-pupil interactions. In immersion programs, therefore, bilingualism is developed through two separate monolingual instructional routes. (Lambert, 1984, p. 13)

This monolingual instructional orientation, which reflects what I have termed the ‘two solitudes’ assumption in relation to bilingualism and the instruction of bilingual/multilingual students (Cummins, 2007), remains dominant in most bilingual education and L2 immersion programs, as well as programs designed to maintain or reinforce national minority languages (e.g., French in English-speaking regions of Canada, Swedish in Finland).

However, there are exceptions. For example, I had the opportunity in November 2017 to observe classroom instruction across several grade levels in the Finnish/English bilingual program in Suvilahti School in Vaasa, Finland (labeled as Content and Language Integrated Learning [CLIL])ⁱ. In the grade 6 class that I observed, students were reading biographical information about the life of Charles Dickens, in preparation for going to a play the following week (in English) based on Dickens’ novel *Oliver Twist*. The biographical texts were challenging, as illustrated by words such as *insurmountable*, *incarceration*, *prolific*, *denomination*, *premonition*, etc. After reading the texts, students were asked to write answers to 10 questions such as *What is Charles Dickens famous for? What is Mesmerism?* and to provide meanings (in English) for 17 difficult words in the text. In contrast to typical instructional practice in Swedish-language programs in the same city or in French immersion programs, the teacher encouraged students to discuss their responses to the questions with partners in either Finnish (L1) or English. In other words, ‘principled use of L1’ and ‘translanguaging’ were encouraged.

These examples illustrate the range of instructional practice and theoretical beliefs in relation to the use of L1 and L2 in bilingual and/or L2 immersion programs aimed at developing L2 skills among speakers of the dominant societal language. In monolingual (L2) programs for emergent bilingual students from immigrant backgrounds, a similar range of beliefs and instructional practices is evident. For example, Orhan Agirdag’s (2010) research in Belgium documented the fact that educators continue to prohibit students from using their L1 within the school, thereby communicating to students the inferior status of their home languages and devaluing

the identities of speakers of these languages. Pulinx, Van Avermaet, & Agirdag (2006) documented the fact that 77 percent of Flemish teachers were of the opinion that immigrant-background students should not be allowed to speak a foreign language at school and almost a third believed that students should be punished for speaking their L1 in school.

As Pulinx et al. (2016) point out, these teachers are well-intentioned. They believe that emergent bilingual students require maximum exposure to and encouragement to use the school language. In light of this assumption, it is not surprising that they view students' use of L1 in the school as counter-productive.

There is an enormous amount of research, theory and instructional practice that refutes both the 'two solitudes' and 'maximum exposure' assumptions (see, for example, Cummins [2000] and García [2009]). As the articles in this special issue illustrate, translanguaging pedagogy, broadly understood as the instructional mobilization of students' full linguistic repertoire and the promotion of productive contact across languages, is now widely endorsed (with some qualifications) among the research community and is being actively explored by educators and students in classroom contexts (e.g., Celic & Seltzer, 2011; García & Kleyn, 2016).

Even in the context of Canadian French immersion programs, researchers and educators have cautiously begun to explore the possibilities and boundaries of 'principled use of L1' (e.g., Ballinger, 2013; Ballinger, Lyster, Sterzuk, & Genesee, 2017). Ballinger and colleagues, for example, discuss "how crosslinguistic pedagogy can be adapted for immersion contexts in ways that achieve its stated goals while maintaining a separate space for more complex and sustained use of the minority language" (2017, p. 50). These researchers opt for the term *crosslinguistic pedagogy* because of what they view as a certain vagueness in the term *translanguaging* as a result of the multiple ways in which the term has been used. In the present paper, I use these terms interchangeably, together with terms such as *multilingual or bilingual teaching strategies* and *teaching through a multilingual lens* (Cummins & Persad, 2014). The term *interlingual teaching* has also been proposed (Gallagher, 2008). I view the multiplicity of terminology as a positive feature of this emerging instructional landscape because of the nuance and texture that multiple terms provide.

The emergence of translanguaging pedagogy over the past decade has been fueled by active dialogue between practice and theory. Ofelia García's (2009) book *Bilingual Education in the 21st Century* served as the catalyst for this ongoing practice/theory dialogue. García's theoretical elaboration of both translanguaging interactional practices and translanguaging pedagogy stimulated a process of systematically documenting existing translanguaging instructional practices (e.g., Celic & Seltzer, 2011) and also encouraging educators to explore the pedagogical possibilities opened up by this theoretical construct (e.g., García & Kleyn, 2016). These emerging instructional practices, in turn, informed and expanded the theoretical scope of the construct.

García's (2009) elaboration and expansion of the construct of translanguaging from its original Welsh instructional roots (Lewis, Jones, & Baker, 2012) reinforced the legitimacy and necessity of bilingual education for minoritized students but also

represented a radical critique of prevalent instructional and theoretical assumptions in both bilingual education and monolingual English instructional programs. She argued cogently and persuasively that bilingual education is the *only option* to teach all children in the 21st century in equitable ways. She claimed on the basis of the research evidence that bilingual education “is good for the rich and the poor, for the powerful and the lowly, for Indigenous peoples and immigrants, for speakers of official and/or national languages, and for those who speak regional languages ... [and] is important for hearing children, as well as Deaf children” (p. 11). She pointed to the linguistic complexity of our global community, increasingly in contact across linguistic and cultural boundaries both directly and through electronic communication, as a major reason why “monolingual schooling seems utterly inappropriate” (p. 16).

However, García (2009) also critiqued the pedagogical assumptions underlying many bilingual programs, on the grounds that they were based on monoglossic rather than heteroglossic assumptions. These bilingual programs adhere to an implicit ‘two solitudes’ pedagogical orientation that assumes the two languages should be kept rigidly separate for instructional purposes. In opposition to these pedagogical assumptions, García argued that there is only one linguistic repertoire and bilingual students should be seen as positioned at different points of a bilingual or multilingual continuum and free to draw on the totality of their linguistic resources in carrying out academic tasks, whether they are in bilingual or English-medium programs. Thus, the construct of translanguaging, as elaborated by García, disrupts the normalized instructional assumptions of both bilingual and monolingual programs and promotes social justice by affirming the legitimacy of the language practices of students and their communities. García expressed this point as follows:

Translanguaging recognizes and values the language diversity and multilingualism of the community, while enabling students to practice their home languages and literacies. Actually translanguaging, more than any other practice or pedagogy, sustains home language practices. Notice that we’re here speaking of sustainability of language practices, and not of simple language maintenance. (Bartlett & García, 2011, p. 4).

My goal in this paper is to contribute to this process of bringing practice and theory into active dialogue. Initially, I review some early instructional examples of crosslinguistic pedagogy involving emergent bilingual students. I then focus on more recent examples from the Canadian context that illustrate the emerging role of classroom teachers as knowledge-generators. Through their practice, these educators have challenged the assumption that schools serving multilingual students have no option but to be English-only zones. Finally, I explore some of the ways in which these instructional innovations illuminate theoretical understandings of translanguaging and crosslinguistic pedagogy more generally.

The Emergence of Translanguaging in Instructional Practice

Three examples from the United States illustrate the emergence of translanguaging approaches to teaching learners of English in the 1990s. These examples focus on classroom contexts involving diverse groups of learners and make no assumption that teachers understand or speak any of the languages represented in

the classroom. Auerbach's influential 1993 paper, focused primarily on adult learners of English, highlighted the fact that English-only instructional approaches had no basis in empirical reality and were essentially ideological biases masquerading as established research. Lucas and Katz (1994) documented the many ways in which teachers of emergent bilingual students in exemplary schools enabled students to draw on their multilingual resources to complete classroom tasks and to engage academically. Their purpose was to 'reframe the debate' from the entrenched oppositions of *bilingual education versus English-only* to the broader issues of how and why teachers should engage students' multilingual repertoires as a normal component of classroom instruction. Finally, DeFazio's (1997) documentation of crosslingual instructional practice at the International High School at LaGuardia Community College in New York City illustrated both the feasibility and academic affordances of transforming classroom spaces from English-only to multilingual instructional zones. Each of these contributions is briefly described in the following sections.

Auerbach: "[T]he issue isn't whether to leverage students' primary linguistic resources, but how" (2016, p. 937). This quote comes from Auerbach's reflection on her original article that appeared in *TESOL Quarterly* in 1993. She summarized the main points in that article as follows:

My goal in "Reexamining" was to problematize the then widely accepted axiom that English is the only acceptable medium of communication in ESL classes. I argued that this taken-for-granted insistence on using only English was rooted in regimes of ideology rather than in evidence-based findings regarding its effectiveness for English acquisition. ... My argument was not that teachers should indiscriminately enable use of learners' first language, but that they should be selective, mindful, and respectful in their approach to this issue. (pp. 936-937)

In her original article, Auerbach reviewed evidence showing that "L1 and/or bilingual options are not only effective but necessary for adult ESL students with limited L1 literacy or schooling and that the use of students' linguistic resources can be beneficial at all levels of ESL." (1993, p. 9).

Lucas & Katz: "[T]he use of the native language is so compelling that it emerges even when policies and programs mitigate against it" (1994, p. 558). Lucas and Katz (1994) describe nine exemplary K-12 programs in which English was the primary language of instruction but in which students' L1 was used in multiple ways for instructionally productive purposes. The following examples illustrate the range of bilingual instructional activities that were observed:

- At one site the teacher devised a group writing assignment in which students used their L1. At another site, students read or told stories to each other using their L1 and then translated them into English to share with other students.
- Students from the same language backgrounds were paired together so that students who were more fluent in English could help those less fluent.

- Students were encouraged to use bilingual dictionaries as a resource to understand difficult text.
- Students were encouraged to discuss school work and get help at home in their native languages from family members.
- Books in students' L1s were provided and students were encouraged to read them.
- Awards were given for excellence in languages that are not commonly studied (e.g. a senior award in Khmer language ability).

The authors cite Auerbach's (1993) arguments for mobilizing students' L1 resources in concluding that "monolingual English speakers or teachers who do not speak the languages of all of their students can incorporate students' native languages into instruction in many ways to serve a variety of educationally desirable functions" (p. 558).

DeFazio: "Students use both English and their native language for all phases of learning and assessment" (1997, p. 103). The International High School (IHS) in La Guardia Community College, New York City, was founded in 1985 and offers learners of English a four-year comprehensive program where they can satisfy state mandated subject matter requirements while they are learning English (DeFazio, 1997; DevTech Systems, 1996). The school web site outlines the current philosophy and program at IHS as follows:

IHS offers a rigorous college preparatory program for limited English proficient students in a multicultural educational environment. IHS gives priority to students of limited English proficiency who have been in the United States fewer than four years at the time of application. ... students maintain and further develop their native language skills by engaging in peer-mediated instructional activities using materials and textbooks in English as well as their native languages. (<http://www.ihsnyc.org/>)

Since its inception, the IHS has pursued numerous instructional innovations including portfolio rather than standardized test assessment, interdisciplinary curriculum, career education across the curriculum, collaborative peer-supported learning, close contacts and collaboration with the wider community, and a focus on language awareness and engaging students' multilingual repertoires across curricular tasks and projects (DeFazio, 1997). Students' first languages are integrated into all phases of learning and assessment. For example, in developing their portfolios in the various interdisciplinary programs, students write in both their first language and English, according to their choice. Other students or members of the wider community assist in translating material that has been written in a language the teachers do not know. Among the other instructional initiatives noted by De Fazio are the following:

- Students write an autobiography or a biography of another student using their choice of English, L1 or both languages.
- Students work in groups to carry out comparisons of English and their L1s including topics such as the sounds in different languages (using the

International Phonetic Alphabet) and crosslinguistic differences in syntax and other aspects of the languages.

- Students write multilingual children's books on some aspect of language or linguistics (e.g., 'How the Chinese Got Language' or 'The Monster that Ate Polish Words').
- Students interview community members about social dimensions of language such as dialect, language prejudice, bilingual education, etc.

The academic outcomes of the instructional program at IHS are impressive. According to DeFazio (1997), entering students score in the lowest quartile on tests of English proficiency, yet more than 90 percent of them graduate within four years and move on to post-secondary education. DevTech Systems (1996) reported that the drop-out rate among limited English proficient students at IHS was only 3.9 percent compared to almost 30 percent in New York City as a whole.

The Canadian examples of multilingual pedagogy outlined in the following section and in Appendix 1 developed largely independently of initiatives elsewhere. Although these projects emerged in the context of university-school collaborations, educators rather than researchers typically took the lead in pursuing these initiatives. Researchers supported and documented the process and outcomes of these initiatives, but the knowledge-generation is rooted in teachers' instructional practice rather than in research or theory.

Canadian Initiatives: Teaching through a Multilingual Lens

A significant number of multilingual teaching initiatives focused on emergent bilingual students who are learning the dominant societal language have been implemented across Canada during the past 20 years. A detailed listing of these initiatives is provided in Appendix 1. In the following sections, I describe three of these initiatives: *Linguistically Appropriate Practice* (Chumak-Horbatsch, 2012), the *Dual Language Showcase* (Chow & Cummins, 2003), and the *Multiliteracies Project* (Cummins & Early, 2011).

Linguistically Appropriate Practice

Roma Chumak-Horbatsch (2012) of Ryerson University in Toronto has identified and implemented a range of multilingual instructional practices at the preschool (and primary grades) level. Drawing on the dynamic bilingualism framework proposed by García (2009), Chumak-Horbatsch describes *Linguistically Appropriate Practice* (LAP) as follows:

LAP is a new classroom practice that extends current inclusive practices and reflects the principles of dynamic bilingualism. ... LAP views immigrant children as emergent bilinguals, acknowledges their unique language and literacy needs, focuses on the social and communicative aspects of language, encourages translanguaging, promotes bilingualism, and builds partnerships with families. (p. 57)

Examples of each of the following five themes, used to organize LAP activities, are provided below.

- Charting home languages;
- Using home languages in the classroom;
- Linking the home and classroom;
- Bringing the outside world into the classroom;
- Sharing books and newspapers with the children.

Create home language graphs. First, working with the children, make a colour-coded home language chart, listing on a large sheet of construction paper the different languages spoken by children in the classroom. The languages should be listed in alphabetical order. Update the chart as new children arrive in the classroom throughout the year. Children could also add their drawings of the flags of their families' countries of origin, corresponding to the languages they speak, using the information contained in the world flag database (www.flags.net/mainindex.htm). Finally, the teacher could work with the children to create visual representations using bar graphs, pie charts, etc. of the number of children in the classroom who speak each language.

What do you see? Using picture books with brightly coloured illustrations (e.g., of food, body parts, furniture, etc.), the teacher, parent, or child points to each object and asks the children "What do you see?" This can be done not only as a way of building vocabulary in the classroom language but also to promote transfer of knowledge across languages. After asking "What do you see?" in the classroom language, the teacher can ask children to name the object in their home languages. The teacher and the other children try to repeat and learn the names of objects in different languages. Parents can also take part in this game in the classroom and the teacher can encourage them to play the game at home with their children in their home languages.

Parents and grandparents in the classroom. Parents and/or grandparents together with the teacher can read aloud dual language books together, with the parent/grandparent reading a page in his/her home language followed by the teacher reading the same page in the classroom language. Another activity involves the children with the help of parents and grandparents creating a chart that lists the ages of the children and their grandparents. Other information can also be added to the list, such as the languages spoken by children, parents, and grandparents.

Bringing the outside world into the classroom. Children can be encouraged to notice signs in multiple languages in their neighbourhoods and in the neighbourhood of the preschool centre. While they are out walking with their child, parents (or grandparents) could take digital photographs of home language signs in their neighbourhoods and either bring the digital copies or electronically send these signs to the preschool teacher for discussion in the classroom. The child (with the help of the parent) could explain to the teacher and other children what the sign says. The teacher could then compile a collage of the signs in multiple languages that defines the children's landscape.

Sharing books and newspapers with children. Among the activities suggested in *Linguistically Appropriate Practice* for socializing children into the world of books and literacy are the following:

- *Talk to children about books and newspapers.* Describe features of books such as author(s), illustrator(s), publisher, front and back cover, table of contents, text, font, and page numbers. Similarly, describe newspaper components such as name, size, black and coloured print, advertisements, etc.
- *Story time.* As the teacher reads books to the children, s/he can invite children to provide home language translations for words or phrases. In a classroom context where children's languages are actively welcomed, children will respond enthusiastically to this invitation to showcase their expertise and linguistic knowledge. Family members can also be invited to participate in story time and to use similar cross-lingual strategies in reading books in L1 at home to their children (e.g., asking for the meaning of words or phrases in the school language).
- *Visiting the public library.* These visits alert children and their parents/grandparents to the presence of public libraries and the fact that many libraries have books and other materials in a variety of languages. The teacher can encourage children and other family members to join the public library and borrow books in the languages of both the home and classroom.
- *Create multilingual newspapers and dual language or multilingual books.* Children and their parents can be encouraged to create individual or group dual language books such as those created in the Early Authors Project (Bernhard et al., 2006, 2008). These dual language books can be modelled after similar books read to the children in the classroom. Similarly, children and their parents can participate in creating a multilingual newspaper modelled after the newspapers that teachers have read to children in class.

The Dual Language Showcase

The *Dual Language Showcase* emerged from a collaborative project (Schechter & Cummins, 2003) initiated in 1998 in which university researchers (Schechter & Cummins) worked collaboratively with educators in two highly diverse elementary schools (Thornwood & Floradale) in the Peel Board of Education near Toronto to explore effective pedagogical practices in multilingual and multicultural contexts. The Dual Language Showcase project was initiated by Thornwood grade 1 teacher Patricia Chow as a way of engaging students actively in literacy activities that involved their home languages as well as English. An additional impact of the project was the active involvement of parents in helping their children craft stories in the L1 and, in some cases, to translate between L1 and English.

Over the course of 15 years, Thornwood students in grades K through 5 have created dual language texts in multiple languages that are posted on the school's website (<http://schools.peelschools.org/1363/DualLanguage/Documents/index.htm>) (Figure 1). In some cases, newcomer students or those who had developed L1 literacy skills wrote initially in the home language but more frequently students drafted their stories in English and then worked with parents (and sometimes teachers who spoke their L1) to create their L1 version.

The Dual Language Showcase exerted a very significant impact on both Ministry of Education and school district policy-makers and educators in demonstrating that

teachers *could* expand the instructional space beyond simply an English-only zone to include students' and parents' multilingual and multimodal repertoires even when they themselves did not speak the multiple languages represented in their classrooms. It opened up pedagogical possibilities for many of the subsequent multilingual pedagogy projects that are listed in Appendix 1. As noted by Cummins and Early (2011) in their book on *Identity Texts* "Many of the case studies in the book owe their inspiration to the Dual Language Showcase" (p. v). Students in these projects (and their parents) took enormous pride in their creative dual language writing and illustrations, which were frequently shared on school or university websites or in the school library as hard-copy books displayed on the same shelves as the 'real' authors whose books they were reading in their classrooms.



Figure 1. The Dual Language Showcase created by Thornwood Public School teacher Patricia Chow (@Chow/Thornwood 2001). Used with permission.

<http://schools.peelschools.org/1363/DualLanguage/Documents/index.htm>

The Multiliteracies Project

This cross-Canada project (2002-2007) involved educators and university researchers working together to explore pedagogies that prepare students for the literacy challenges of a globalized, networked, culturally, and linguistically diverse world (<http://www.multiliteracies.ca>). A number of the case studies focused on translanguaging pedagogies, although that term had not yet emerged into common usage as a descriptor of multilingual educational practices. Several of these case studies have been described elsewhere (e.g., Cummins, 2007; Cummins et al., 2005; Cummins & Early, 2011; Giampapa, 2010; see also <http://www.multiliteracies.ca>) and I will therefore not attempt to summarize these descriptions here. Instead, I will convey the perceptions of students and teachers who were involved in these projects by means of a series of quotations focused on how teacher-student identities are negotiated between teachers and students in the context of translanguaging pedagogies, specifically the writing of dual language books. Teacher and student perceptions regarding other themes (*teaching for transfer, inclusion, and assessment*) can be found in Leoni et al. (2011).

Teacher Lisa Leoni

The way I see it everything has to relate to the identity of the students; children have to see themselves in every aspect of their work at school. My overarching goal as a teacher is to uncover all that is unknown to me about my students—linguistically and culturally, and especially to understand the community they are part of (their parents, their friends, their faith) and the list goes on. So, when a student enters my class, I want to discover all that I can about that student as a learner and as a person.

What I love about using identity texts as a teaching strategy is that it validates students' cultural and linguistic identities. They also help connect what students are learning in the class to their prior lived experiences and when these connections happen, learning becomes real for them because they are using their language and culture for purposes that have relevance for them. Most importantly, they end up owning the work that they produce.

Grade 7 student Kanta Khalid

How it helped me was when I came here in Grade 4 the teachers didn't know what I was capable of. I was given a pack of crayons and a coloring book and told to get on coloring with it. And after I felt so bad about that--I'm capable of doing much more than just that. I have my own inner skills to show the world than just coloring and I felt that those skills of mine are important also. So when we started writing the book [*The New Country*], I could actually show the world that I am something instead of just coloring. And that's how it helped me and it made me so proud of myself that I am actually capable of doing something, and here today [at the Ontario TESL conference] I *am* actually doing something. I'm not just a coloring person—I can show you that I *am* something.

Grade 7 student Sulmana Hanif

When my grandma came here last Sunday, and I told her about the book, first of all she couldn't believe it and then I said, "Wait grandma, I'll show you proof." And I showed her [the book]. She was so surprised and so happy that her granddaughter is so popular, that her books are all around Canada and after she saw the whole thing she was like "Wow, you're great," and she started kissing me.

Grade 7 student Madiha Bajwa

I am proud of *The New Country* because it is our story. Nobody else has written that story. And when we showed it to Ms. Leoni she said it was really good. She said, "It's about your home country, and family, and Canada, it's all attached, that's so good." I like that because it means she cares about our family and our country, not just Canada. Because she cares about us that makes us want to do more work. My parents were really happy to see that I was writing in both Urdu and English; my mother was happy because she knows that not everyone has that chance.

Grade 6 student Tomer Shahar

With *Tom Goes to Kentucky* it was easier to begin it in Hebrew and then translate it to English and the other thing that made it easier was that I chose the topic. Because I love horses, when I'm writing about horses it makes me want to continue to do it and do it faster.

I think using your first language is so helpful because when you don't understand something after you've just come here it is like beginning as a baby.

It makes it more faster to be able to use both languages instead of just breaking your head to think of the word in English when you already know the word in the other language so it makes it faster and easier to understand.

The first time I couldn't understand what she [Ms. Leoni] was saying except the word Hebrew, but I think it's very smart that she said for us to do it in our language because we can't just sit on our hands doing nothing.

Practice and Theory in Dialogue

The examples of translanguaging practice outlined in this paper and in the appendix contribute to the elaboration of translanguaging theory in several ways. First, the forms of crosslingual practice initiated by educators in the IHS in New York City and across Canada in the 1990s and 2000s predated the recent theoretical elaboration of the translanguaging construct. Teachers in these multilingual contexts were aware of research highlighting the relevance of L1 for the development of academic proficiency in the school language but were not in a position to pursue formal bilingual education programs due to the multiplicity of languages in their classrooms and, in many cases, a political and legislative context unsympathetic to bilingual approaches. However, through their innovative practice, these teachers generated knowledge about the possibilities and constraints of crosslinguistic instruction. *In short, the examples*

described in this paper highlight the role (and the power) of educators as knowledge-generators.

Second, the instructional initiatives serve to clarify the role of researchers in contributing to knowledge generation in collaboration with educators. In most of the examples profiled in the appendix, researchers observed teachers' instructional initiatives, documented them, analyzed the principles or claims underlying the observed practice, and synthesized these principles across diverse contexts in order to assess the extent to which they could account for the observed data. At that point, the theoretical intuitions, hypotheses, and potential insights that derived from this process were brought into direct dialogue with instructional practice, resulting in practice and theory serving as reciprocal catalysts for each other.

Third, the instructional initiatives automatically embody a critical element in so far as they explicitly challenge the exclusion of minoritized students' L1 from the school. Auerbach (1993, 2016) pointed to the fact that language learning and teaching are located in broader relations of power: "it is particularly important that languages which are devalued in the broader social context be valued and respected in the ESL classroom" (2016, p. 936). Thus, in societal contexts characterized by subtractive orientations to students' bilingualism, an additive orientation to students' languages challenges coercive relations of power (Bartlett & García, 2011; Cummins, 1986).

Fourth, although translanguaging pedagogies automatically imply some degree of critical orientation, this orientation may be somewhat superficial. García (2017), for example, has called for more explicit attention to the development of *critical multilingual language awareness* that would include awareness of histories of colonial and imperialistic oppression as well as awareness that language is socially created, and thus socially changeable. In the Canadian context, Marshall and Toohey (2010) documented an intergenerational literacy project that involved Grades 4 and 5 students from Punjabi, Hindi, and Malay linguistic home backgrounds interviewing and audio recording their grandparents telling stories about some aspect of their childhoods. While acknowledging the success of the project in enabling students to produce dual language books "in a resolutely monolingual school" (p. 238), they note that the project was seen by teachers, parents, and students as 'not really school' and the pedagogical potential of the stories to promote critical literacy was not actively pursued in the classroom:

Bringing this critical consciousness into dialogue with others who might feel or think differently is what education is supposed to be about. It is important to try to create some kinds of critical pedagogies around these funds of knowledge projects. Otherwise, we run the risk of keeping the institutional violence of schooling in place through literacy and language practices that pay only lip service to the lives and experiences of children and their families (p. 238).

The examples of translanguaging pedagogy from the 1990s and 2000s described in this paper should not obscure the fact that these initiatives, albeit inspirational in many cases, represented only a tiny fraction of instructional practice, which remained predominantly rooted in monoglossic assumptions. The immense contribution made by Ofelia García's theorization of translanguaging has been to inject the construct into

mainstream discussions of effective pedagogy for minoritized students in educational contexts around the world. Not only has there been an explosion of academic books and articles focused on translanguaging since *Bilingual Education in the 21st Century* was published, the term has also entered the discourse of teacher education programs and professional development not only in North America but also globally. The expanded heteroglossic instructional practice that is being stimulated by García's theorization of translanguaging will undoubtedly generate new insights that, in turn, will act as a catalyst for further refinement of theory in the education of multilingual students.

References

- Agirdag, O. (2010). Exploring bilingualism in a monolingual school system: Insights from Turkish and native students from Belgian schools. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 31(3), 307–321. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01425691003700540>
- Armand, F., & Dagenais, D. (2012). S'ouvrir à la langue de l'autre et à la diversité linguistique [Becoming aware of others' languages and of linguistic diversity]. *Education Canada*, 52(1). Retrieved from <http://www.cea-ace.ca/education-canada/article/s'ouvrir-à-la-langue-del'autre-et-à-la-diversité-linguistique>
- Armand, F., Sirois, F., & Ababou, F. (2008). Entrée dans l'écrit en contexte plurilingue et défavorisé: Développer les capacités métaphonologiques et sensibiliser à la diversité linguistique. *Canadian Modern Language Review*, 65(1), 61-87.
- Auerbach, E. (1993). Reexamining English only in the ESL classroom. *TESOL Quarterly*, 27, 9–32.
- Auerbach, E. (2016). Reflections on “Reexamining English only in the ESL classroom.” *TESOL Quarterly*, 50(4), 936-939.
- Ballinger, S. (2013). Towards a cross-linguistic pedagogy: Biliteracy and reciprocal learning strategies in French immersion. *Journal of Immersion and Content-Based Language Education*, 1(1), 131–148. <https://doi.org/10.1075/jicb.1.1.06bal>
- Ballinger, S., Lyster, R., Sterzuk, A., & Genesee, F. (2017). Context-appropriate crosslinguistic pedagogy: Considering the role of language status in immersion education. *Journal of Immersion and Content-Based Language Education*, 5(1) 30–57. <https://doi.org/10.1075/jicb.5.1.02bal>
- Bartlett, L., & García, O. (2011). *Additive schooling in subtractive times: Bilingual education and Dominican immigrant youth in the Heights*. Nashville, TN: Vanderbilt University Press.
- Celic, C., & Seltzer, K. (2011). *Translanguaging: A CUNY-NYSIEB guide for educators*. New York, NY: CUNY-NYSIEB.
- Chow, P., & Cummins, J. (2003). Valuing multilingual and multicultural approaches to learning. In S. R. Schecter & J. Cummins (Eds.), *Multilingual education in practice: Using diversity as a resource* (pp. 32–61). Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Chumak-Horbatsch, R. (2012). *Linguistically appropriate practice: A guide for working with young immigrant children*. Toronto, Canada: University of Toronto Press.
- Cummins, J. (1986). Empowering minority students A framework for intervention. *Harvard Educational Review*, 56, 18-36.

- Cummins, J. (2000). *Language, power, and pedagogy: Bilingual children in the crossfire*. Clevedon, England: Multilingual Matters.
- Cummins, J. (2007). Rethinking monolingual instructional strategies in multilingual classrooms. *The Canadian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 10(2), 221–240.
- Cummins, J., Bismilla, V., Chow, P., Cohen, S., Giampapa, F., Leoni, L., Sandhu, P., & Sastri, P. (2005). Affirming identity in multilingual classrooms. *Educational Leadership*, 63(1), 38-43.
- Cummins, J., & Early, M. (Eds.). (2011). *Identity texts: The collaborative creation of power in multilingual schools*. Stoke-on-Trent, England: Trentham Books.
- Cummins, J., & Persad, R. (2014). Teaching through a multilingual lens: The evolution of EAL policy and practice in Canada. *Education Matters*, 2(1). Available at: <http://em.synergiesprairies.ca/index.php/em/issue/view/7>
- Dagenais, D., Toohey, K., Bennett Fox, A., & Singh, A. (2017). Multilingual and multimodal composition at school: ScribJab in action. *Language and Education*, 31(3), 263-282.
- DeFazio, A. J. (1997). Language awareness at The International High School. In L. Van Lier & D. Corson (Eds.), *Knowledge about language. Encyclopedia of language and education* (pp. 99-107). Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Kluwer Academic Publishers, Inc.
- DevTech Systems Inc. (1996). *A descriptive study of the ESEA Title VII educational services provided for secondary school limited English proficient students: Final report*. Washington, DC: National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education.
- Gallagher, E. (2008). *Equal rights to the curriculum: Many languages, one message*. Clevedon, England: Multilingual Matters.
- García, O. (2009). *Bilingual education in the 21st century. A global perspective*. Malden, MA: Wiley.
- García, O. (2017). Problematizing linguistic integration of migrants: The role of translanguaging and language teachers. In J. C. Beacco, H.-J. Krumm, D. Little, & P. Thagott (Eds.) *The Linguistic integration of adult migrants/L'intégration linguistique des migrants adultes. Some lessons from research/ Les enseignements de la recherche* (pp. 11-26). Berlin, Germany: De Gruyter Mouton.
- García, O., & Kleyn, T. (Eds.). (2016). *Translanguaging with multilingual students*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Giampapa, F. (2010). Multiliteracies, pedagogy and identities: teacher and student voices from a Toronto Elementary School. *Canadian Journal of Education*, 33(2), 407-431.
- Lambert, W. E. (1984). An overview of issues in immersion education. In California State Department of Education (Ed.), *Studies on immersion education: A collection for United States educators* (pp. 8-30). Sacramento: California State Department of Education.
- Lambert, W. E., & Tucker, G. R. (1972). *Bilingual education of children: The St. Lambert experiment*. Rowley, MA: Newbury House.
- Leoni, L., Cohen, S., Cummins, J., Bismilla, V., Bajwa, M., Hanif, S., Khalid, K., & Shahar, T. (2011). 'I'm not just a coloring person': Teacher and student perspectives on identity text construction. In J. Cummins & M. Early (Eds.), *Identity texts: The collaborative creation of power in multilingual schools*. Stoke-on-Trent, England: Trentham Books.

- Lewis, G., Jones, B., & Baker, C. (2012). Translanguaging: Origins and development from school to street and beyond. *Educational Research and Evaluation: An International Journal on Theory and Practice*, 18(7), 37-41.
- Lotherington, H. (2011). *Pedagogy of multiliteracies: Rewriting Goldilocks*. New York: Routledge.
- Lotherington, H., & Paige, C. (Eds.) (2017). *Teaching young learners in a superdiverse world: Multimodal approaches and perspectives*. New York: Routledge.
- Lucas, T., & Katz, A. (1994). Reframing the debate: The roles of native languages in English-only programs for language minority students. *TESOL Quarterly*, 28, 537-562.
- Lyster, R., Collins, I., & Ballinger, S. (2009). Linking languages through a bilingual read-aloud project. *Language Awareness*, 18, 366-383.
- Marshall, E., & Toohey, K. (2010). Representing family: Community funds of knowledge, bilingualism, and multimodality. *Harvard Educational Review*, 80(2), 221-241.
- Naqvi, R., Thorne, K., Pfitscher, C., Nordstokke, D., & McKeough A. (2012). Reading dual language books: Improving early literacy skills in linguistically diverse classrooms, *Journal of Early Childhood Research*. Published online 12 October 2012, <https://doi.org/10.1177/1476718X124449453>
- New London Group (1996). A pedagogy of multiliteracies: Designing social futures. *Harvard Educational Review*, 66, 60-92.
- Ntelioglou, B. Y., Fannin, J., Montanera, M., & Cummins, J. (2014). A multilingual and multimodal approach to literacy teaching and learning in urban education: a collaborative inquiry project in an inner city elementary school. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 5, 1-10. Article 533. Available at: www.frontiersin.org. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2014.00533>
- Prasad, G. (2016). Beyond the mirror towards a plurilingual prism: Exploring the creation of plurilingual “identity texts” in English and French classrooms in Toronto and Montpellier. *Intercultural Education*, 26(6), 497-514. Special Issue ed. A. Gagné & C. Schmidt. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14675986.2015.1109775>
- Pulinx, R., Van Avermaet, P., & Agirdag, O. (2016). Silencing linguistic diversity: The extent, the determinants, and consequences of the monolingual beliefs of Flemish teachers. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050.2015.1102860>
- Stille, S., & Prasad, G. (2015). “Imaginations”: Reflections on plurilingual students’ creative multimodal works. *TESOL Quarterly*, 49(3), 608-621.
- Roessingh, H. (2011). Family Treasures: A dual language book project for negotiating language, literacy culture and identity. *Canadian Modern Language Review*, 67(1), 123-148.
- Schechter, S., & Cummins, J. (2003). *Multilingual education in practice: Using diversity as a resource*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Swain, M., & Lapkin, S. (2013). A Vygotskian sociocultural perspective on immersion education: The L1/L2 debate. *Journal of Immersion and Content-Based Education*, 1(1), 101-129.
- Van Viegen Stille, S., Bethke, R. Bradley-Brown, J., Giberson, J., & Hall, G. (2016). Broadening educational practice to include translanguaging: An outcome of educator inquiry into multilingual students’ learning needs. *The Canadian Modern Language Review*, 72(4), 480-503.

Appendix

A Sampling of Crosslinguistic/Translanguaging Instructional Initiatives Implemented in Canadian Schools 2000 - 2017

- The *ÉLODiL* project (Éveil au Langage et Ouverture à la Diversité Linguistique—Awakening to Language and Opening up to Linguistic Diversity) (<http://www.elodil.com/>) has developed a variety of classroom activities to promote students' awareness of language and appreciation of linguistic diversity. This project has been undertaken both in Montreal (Dr. Françoise Armand, Université de Montréal) and Vancouver (Dr. Diane Dagenais, Simon Fraser University) (Armand & Dagenais, 2012; Armand, Sirois, & Ababou, 2008).
- The *Dual Language Showcase* (<http://schools.peelschools.org/1363/DualLanguage/Documents/index.htm>) was created by educators at Thornwood Public School in the Peel District School Board to demonstrate the feasibility of enabling elementary grades students who were learning English as an additional language to write stories in both English and their home languages (Chow & Cummins, 2003; Schecter & Cummins, 2003).
- The *Multiliteracies* project involved a series of collaborations between educators and university researchers Dr. Margaret Early at the University of British Columbia in Vancouver and Dr. Jim Cummins at the University of Toronto (<http://www.multiliteracies.ca>). Drawing on the construct of *multiliteracies* (New London Group, 1996), the projects focused on broadening conceptions of literacy within schools both with respect to modality and language.
- The *Multiliteracies Pedagogy* project initiated in 2003 by Dr. Heather Lotherington of York University in Toronto involved a range of collaborations between educators in Joyce Public School and researchers at York University to explore how the concept of plurilingualism could be translated into pedagogical design. The professional learning community at Joyce Public School worked with students on a variety of multilingual and multimodal projects including rewriting traditional stories from a critical perspective using their multilingual linguistic repertoires (Lotherington, 2011; Lotherington & Paige, 2017).
- *Linguistically Appropriate Practice (LAP)* is an approach to working with immigrant-background children in preschool and primary grades. Pioneered by Dr. Roma Chumak-Horbatsch (2012) at Ryerson University in Toronto, LAP consists of both an educational philosophy and a set of concrete instructional activities that build on children's home language and literacy experiences in order to encourage them to use their home languages in the classroom, take pride in their bilingualism, and continue to develop their home language as they are acquiring fluency and literacy in the dominant language of instruction.
- *The Dual Language Reading Project* was initiated by Dr. Rahat Naqvi of the University of Calgary and colleagues in the Calgary Board of Education. It documented the impact of teachers and community members reading dual language books to students both in linguistically diverse schools and in the

Calgary Board of Education's Spanish-English bilingual program (see <http://www.rahatnaqvi.ca> and Naqvi et al., 2012).

- The *Family Treasures and Grandma's Soup* dual language book project was initiated by Dr. Hetty Roessingh at the University of Calgary in collaboration the Almadina Language Charter Academy. Its goal was to enable Kindergarten and grade 1 students to create dual language books to enhance their early literacy progress (see <http://www.duallanguageproject.com/> and Roessingh, 2011).
- At Simon Fraser University, Dr. Diane Dagenais and Dr. Kelleen Toohey have collaborated for many years with educators in the implementation of projects focused on developing students' awareness of language and promoting their multilingual and multiliteracy skills (see, for example, Marshall & Toohey, 2012). This work has resulted in the website *ScribJab* (<http://www.scribjab.com>), which is described on the website as follows: "ScribJab is a web site and iPad application for children (age 10 – 13) to read and create digital stories (text, illustrations, and audio recordings) in multiple languages (English, French, and other non-official languages). *ScribJab* creates a space for children to communicate about their stories, and come to an enhanced appreciation of their own multilingual resources." (Dagenais et al., 2017) provide a detailed account of the origins and impact of *ScribJab*.
- The *Storybooks Canada* project (<http://www.storybookscanada.ca/about.html>) is described as follows on its website: Storybooks Canada is a website for teachers, parents, and community members that aims to promote bilingualism and multilingualism in Canada. It makes 40 stories [derived from Africa] available in the major immigrant and refugee languages of Canada, in addition to the official languages of English and French. A story that is read in English or French at school can be read in the mother tongue by parents and children at home. In this way, Storybooks Canada helps children to maintain the mother tongue in both oral and print form, while learning one of Canada's official languages. Similarly, the audio versions of the stories can help beginning readers and language learners make the important connection between speech and text. Students can also compose stories using the images on the *Storybooks Canada* site.
- *Other translanguaging projects* implemented by Canadian educators and researchers include Cummins and Persad (2014), Lyster, Collins, and Ballinger (2009), Marshall and Toohey (2012), Ntelioglou, Fannin, Montanera, and Cummins, 2014; Prasad (2016), Stille and Prasad (2015), and Van Viegen Stille et al. (2016).

End Notes

¹ A description of the 'English Line' [CLIL] program can be found at https://eduvaasa.sharepoint.com/p:/r/sites/kasvatus/_layouts/15/Doc.aspx?sourcedoc=%7B667bbb3a-d50f-4592-8f75-08b43f6c3d1e%7D&action=edit. I am grateful to Dr. Mikaela Björklund, of Åbo Akademi University, Vaasa, for arranging the visit to Suvilahti School and also to the teachers who welcomed me into their classrooms.