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The language practices of bilinguals are multiple and dynamic, complex and interrelated, and constantly adapting and adjusting in response to the affordances that emerge in everyday communicative situations (García, 2013; Larsen-Freeman & Cameron, 2008). Bilinguals pragmatically draw on their entire linguistic repertoires to maximize understanding and performance across a variety of contexts, to shape experiences, and to make sense of the world. These practices deviate from those typically espoused by dual language programs, wherein language use policies strictly separate the two target languages by time, subject matter, or teacher. Such artificial linguistic boundaries in bilingual education programs are meant to protect the minoritized language by giving it its own space and function within the context of schooling; however, attempts to separate languages in bilingual classrooms seem to run counter to the sociolinguistic reality of bilinguals whose daily lives and experiences necessitate movement among languages and language varieties.

In recent years, there has been a growing interest among policy makers, practitioners, and researchers in early bilingual development and the unique role of the educational setting’s language policy in this development. In this article, we describe the languaging practices of preschool bilingual co-teachers in a Spanish/English dual language program in an established multilingual community in the southeastern United States. Drawing on a language ecology perspective (Leather & Van Dam, 2003), this ethnographic study examines the affordances of dynamic multilingual learning contexts in expanding emergent bilingual children’s linguistic repertoires and supporting their participation in formalized, school-based language performances that socialize them into the discourses of schooling. We use the term emergent bilinguals to describe young children (ages 3 to 5 years) who are in the dynamic process of developing bilingual and biliterate competencies with the support of their families, schools, and communities (García, Kleifgen, & Falchi, 2008; Gort, 2006; Reyes, 2006). Our analysis focuses on the ways in which teachers’ languaging practices support emergent bilingual children’s participation in such formalized language performances and enable the co-construction of discursive spaces that allow teachers and children to engage with academic language and content from their position as bilinguals.

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

We situate our study within two major theoretical frameworks: (a) a translanguaging pedagogy framework, and (b) an ecology of language framework. We describe each of these in relation to the purpose of our study in the following section.

Languages as bound systems and fixed codes make little sense in multilingual classrooms, and especially in dual language classrooms where children with different linguistic profiles interact with each other and their teachers. In contrast, translanguaging—the ways in which bilinguals move fluidly among multiple languages and dialects in their everyday interactions (García, 2009; García & Leiva, 2014)—builds on the concept of language as it focuses on the discourse practices of multilingual speakers from the point of view of what speakers do and perform with them. Translanguaging encompasses a range of communicative and cultural practices through which bilinguals perform identities, which are shaped and constrained by social norms, expectations, and language ideologies (Sayer, 2013).

García (2009) theorizes translanguaging as an act of bilingual performance and a bilingual pedagogy for teaching and learning that is centered not on the constructed notion of standardized languages, as has often been the case, but on the practices of bilinguals that are readily
observable. These practices are not marked or unusual but rather are the normal mode of communication that, with some exceptions in some monolingual enclaves, characterizes multilingual communities throughout the world. A common, natural, and distinctive feature of bilingual behavior, translanguaging is characterized by bilingual language performances that integrate diverse language and literacy practices in different social and semiotic contexts to maximize communicative potential and indicate social standing, class identity, prestige, and access to different forms of human capital (Bourdieu, 1991; Li, 1998; Poplack, 1980; Zentella, 1997).

In bilingual schools and classrooms, translanguaging is better understood as the dynamic discursive exchanges in which teachers and students engage as they draw on and choose from multiple languages and language varieties. Through translanguaging, students figure out word meanings and academic concepts; display comprehension and developing expertise; develop and maintain dual language competence and, by extension, their bicultural identity; build sophisticated understandings of text and language; as well as participate in identity performances with their classmates that socialize them into the classroom as competent group members (Martínez, 2013; Sayer, 2013; Worthy, Durán, Hikida, Pruitt, & Peterson, 2013). As a pedagogic resource, bilingual teachers draw on translanguaging to expand language boundaries; to create multiple opportunities for language learning; to represent authentic situations that reflect the multilingual communities within and outside the classroom; to transmit information; to model and scaffold comprehension, vocabulary, and metalinguistic strategies; and to perform identities using the linguistic signs at a learner’s disposal (García, 2013; Nichols & Colón, 2000; Worthy et al., 2013). Translanguaging pedagogies have been shown to support various linguistic, educational, affective, and sociocultural functions, including conveying meaning, orienting students to learning strategies, explaining grammatical structures and linguistic features, making relevant connections between the academic content and students’ experiences, revealing emergent understandings and elucidating inaccuracies, alerting students to important new vocabulary, and organizing/managing class activities (Creese & Blackledge, 2010; García, 2013; Gort & Pontier, 2013; Palmer, Martínez, Mateus, & Henderson, 2014). These and related translanguaging practices allow teachers to model authentic bilingual behaviors and to create spaces where multiple languages are treated as resources for learning, thus promoting bilingualism and a bilingual language repertoire as normal, natural, and valuable.

The second major theoretical perspective that guides our understanding of teachers’ translanguaging practices in support of emergent bilinguals’ participation in language and literacy activities is an ecology of language framework (Barton, 2007; Leather & Van Dam, 2003). This perspective sheds light on the ecological environment of the dual language classroom and the complex interrelationships among the different factors within this environment that influence dual language teachers’ languaging practices (e.g., language/s used, by whom, for what purposes; children’s experiences with school-based activities, bilingualism, academic language). Through a language ecology perspective, interactions in the dual language classroom leverage emergent bilinguals’ linguistic repertoires toward the development of academic language and literacy practices, while promoting children’s identities as imaginative and productive bilingual meaning makers—that is, children who are learning multiple languages and using multiple languages to learn (Wells, 1986). Such ecological models acknowledge that bilinguals’ languaging practices are dynamic, malleable, and influenced by naturalistic opportunities in the environment that tap into their potential to develop and use multiple languages, language varieties, and literacies.
METHOD

In this article, we investigate the complex language ecology of one multi-age, dual language preschool classroom, with a focus on the nature of teachers’ translanguaging practices and the ways in which they navigated the hybrid language and literacy learning space of show-and-tell in support of children’s engagement with and participation in the activity.

The Ethnographic Context

The analysis presented here emerged from a two-year, ethnographic study investigating the language and literacy practices of emergent bilingual preschoolers and their teachers in a Spanish/English dual language program located in the socioeconomically, linguistically, and culturally diverse community of South Florida. Miami-Dade County, the broader context in which the study was situated, has been called “the gateway to Latin America” because it marks an important destination for exiles, refugees, and immigrants from South America (McGuirk, 2004). Of the approximately 2.5 million residents in the county, 51% are foreign born, 93% of which come from Latin America. While the county is an example of a Hispanized metropolitan area (McGuirk, 2004), with 65% of its population identifying as Latina or Latino, it is unique from other diaspora Latino communities across the United States in that 34% of the Latino population are Cuban and 25% are from countries other than Mexico or Puerto Rico.

The history of continuous immigration from Spanish-speaking Latin America to the area within the last 40 years has solidified Spanish as a prominent language in both private and public sectors throughout the county (McGuirk, 2004). According to 2012 U.S. Census Bureau data, 72% of the Miami-Dade population who is five years or older speaks a language other than English at home; 64% of which speaks Spanish. Given the large concentration of Spanish-speaking Latino residents in Miami-Dade County, the area has become known as “a de facto bilingual city” (McGuirk, 2004), especially since many recently-immigrated and established residents rely on Spanish as a means of communication. Bilingual and biliterate practices are prevalent throughout the community; for example, signs and announcements are typically printed in both Spanish and English (and also, but to a smaller degree, in Portuguese and Haitian-Creole) at supermarkets, local libraries, banks, retail stores, coffee shops, local businesses, etc. Thus, residents of Miami-Dade County are exposed to multilingual print and discourse across various contexts on a regular basis.

The Preschool Setting

The study took place at Sunnyvale Early Childhood Education Center (all names are pseudonyms), a National Association for the Education of Young Children (NAEYC) accredited early education center and member of the Educare Learning Network. A primary goal of Sunnyvale is to engage children with two languages—Spanish and English—in authentic and varied ways. The school, which had been operating for five years at the time that we began collecting data for the larger study, provides a year-long program serving approximately 130 children from around the county, ages 6 weeks to 5 years old, who represent a variety of cultural,
home language, and socioeconomic backgrounds. To support a socioeconomically diverse student population, the school offers 25% of their enrollment slots to children from families who pay tuition based on an annual income scale, while 25% of families pay full tuition and 50% are provided county, state, and federally supported subsidies, such as Voluntary Pre-Kindergarten (VPK), Head Start, and Early Head Start programs. The average preschool class size during the 2012–2013 academic year was 16 children.

In each of the four preschool classrooms, two teachers work collaboratively throughout the day. Teacher pairs follow a one teacher/one language instructional language policy in which each teacher is encouraged to model monolingual use of her designated language—either Spanish or English—throughout the day with children and with each other and is discouraged from moving between, or “mixing,” languages. Teachers take turns leading whole-group lessons on a weekly basis using their designated language in an effort to more equitably privilege each language as a resource for teaching and learning. The sociolinguistic reality of children’s language use is very different, however, as their language choices and languaging practices are not regulated by the school’s language policy. In practice, because teacher pairs work alongside each other and children are free to draw on multiple linguistic resources to interact and participate in classroom activities, these classrooms represent dynamic, hybridized bilingual instructional spaces wherein teacher pairs and children use varieties of Spanish and English fluidly, concurrently, and flexibly throughout the day.

The school’s language distribution policy was designed as an informal extension and modification of widely implemented language separation policies originally developed for older learners in elementary dual language immersion programs throughout the United States. These policies typically compartmentalize the use of the program’s two official instructional languages by allocating their use to either different times of the day, days of the week, or physical spaces (i.e., separate classrooms), with the goal of providing sustained periods of monolingual instruction in each language (Howard, Sugarman, Christian, Lindholm-Leary, & Rogers, 2007). This goal is based on the ideological assumption that monolingual language use by teachers and students fosters students’ development of parallel proficiency in two languages, what García (2009) and others refer to as double monolingualism. Sunnyvale’s model of language distribution reflects administrators’ and teachers’ concerns about the developmental appropriateness of such rigid language separation practices for young, emergent bilinguals (G. Montes, personal communication, September 22, 2012).

The current analysis focused on one classroom where show-and-tell was a regularly scheduled activity. Show-and-tell, a typical North American preschool activity, represents a formalized language performance wherein children are supported in building oral language and literacy skills (Hadley, 1998) as they describe and demonstrate personally relevant items to peers and teachers. Teachers guide children’s elaborations through scaffolded questioning and invite peers to engage with the presenter through their own questions and commentary. Children are positioned as knowledgeable participants who are supported by teachers and peers in communicating object-relevant information that is organized around culturally based discourse styles from the children’s homes, community, and school experiences (Rogoff, 1990).

1 A substantial proportion of Miami-Dade County residents live in poverty, with 30% of households making a total annual income of $25,000 or below, and 19% falling below the poverty line (U.S. Census Bureau, 2012).
During weekly show-and-tell time, children sat in a circle in an open area of the classroom and took turns orally “presenting” an item they had brought from home to the rest of the group. Teachers and peers participated through their questioning and engagement with the presenter and the item being showcased. Given this organizational structure, show-and-tell provided ample opportunity for student–teacher interaction. The length of show-and-tell sessions varied depending on teachers’ schedules and the number of objects being presented, but generally lasted between 20 and 30 minutes. Our focus in this analysis is on a video-recorded corpus of seven show-and-tell sessions, collected in Ms. Katia’s multi-age, dual language preschool classroom during the fall of 2012.

Participants

Teacher participants included three Latina females. The focal and lead teacher, Ms. Katia, is a native Spanish speaker from Honduras who is bilingual in Spanish and English. Ms. Katia was 27 years old at the beginning of data collection and had been living in the United States for 15 years. She had completed two associate degrees in the United States, one of which was in early childhood education, and had previously served as an assistant teacher for one year at Sunnyvale. The two assistant teachers who collaborated with Ms. Katia, Ms. Alba (age 53) and Ms. Laura (age 42), are also native Spanish speakers and bilingual in Spanish and English. Their countries of origin are Puerto Rico and Colombia respectively, and their teaching experience ranged from 10 to 12 years. Each had completed four-year degrees in their home countries and earned certification to teach early childhood in the United States. The teachers’ length of time spent in the U.S. ranged from six to 21 years.

Ms. Katia’s language designation shifted on a weekly basis; that is, she served as either the Spanish- or English-language model on alternating weeks. Ms. Alba and Ms. Laura supported Ms. Katia as co-teachers also on alternating weeks, serving as either the English- or Spanish-language model respectively. Thus, the two focal teacher pairings consisted of Ms. Katia (as Spanish model)/Ms. Alba (as English model) and Ms. Katia (as English model)/Ms. Laura (as Spanish model). While the teachers’ length of employment at the school ranged from three months to three years, this was the first time they collaborated in these pairings.

Ages of child participants (n = 17) ranged from 2;11 to 4;10 at the beginning of Fall 2012. Children reflected the community’s diversity in terms of cultural, ethnic, linguistic, and socioeconomic background. Home languages included Spanish (n = 7), English (n = 6), and Spanish/English (n = 4). All but one child identified as Latino. Table 1 presents information about the children’s ages, home language/s, and ethnicity.

Data Collection, Preparation, and Analysis

We used digital video recordings and ethnographic fieldnotes to document teachers’ and children’s naturally occurring participation in show-and-tell activities. Because the designated language of the lead teacher alternated on a weekly basis, we were able to collect data of the focal teacher (Ms. Katia) modeling both target instructional languages, English and Spanish,
across the data set. In total, we documented seven show-and-tell sessions over the course of the fall of 2012.\footnote{There were several weeks over the fall semester during which Show-and-Tell activity did not occur due to field trips, whole-school special activities, or other interruptions to the regular schedule.}

Data were coded using StudioCode video analysis software and analyzed using the constant-comparative method (Glaser & Strauss, 1967). A microethnographic approach to discourse analysis (Bloome, Carter, Christian, Otto, & Shuart-Faris, 2004) allowed for a reflexive and recursive analytical process for exploring teachers’ translanguaging practices within a bilingual instructional context. We followed an inductive process, combing through video and fieldnotes to identify themes and patterns and to select discourse segments relevant to our research focus. Our unit of analysis was the content of teachers’ and children’s topically based talk (e.g., management of behavior, management of activity, prompt for label of object, prompt for function of object, prompt to engage with object). After coding for content of talk, we then identified and coded for the nature (i.e., form and purpose) of teachers’ translanguaging practices. These included, for example, teacher translation/recast of student talk, teacher translation of other teacher’s prompt/question, teacher code-switch [bilingual speech], and teacher nontarget language use [monolingual speech]. We also coded for speaker (e.g., focal teacher or co/partner teacher). Table 2 highlights sample codes for the content of talk and nature of translanguaging observed. We then turned to smaller segments of talk for close analysis; these segments informed our insights into the larger patterns of translanguaging practices across teacher pairings and guided further examination of the ethnographic data. Member checks with a Spanish-English bilingual research assistant were conducted during and after the coding procedures in order to improve the accuracy and validity of the codes.
## TABLE 2
**Coding Scheme**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample coding categories</th>
<th>Sample codes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Content of teacher talk</td>
<td>Behavior management, Activity management, Prompt for physical description of object, Prompt for information re: origin of object, Prompt for affective connections, Reason for creating/producing, Prompt for reason for bringing/choosing object to share, Prompt for function of object, Prompt to engage with object, Prompt for label of object</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content of student talk</td>
<td>Behavior management, Activity management, Prompt for physical description of object, Prompt for information re: origin of object, Prompt for affective connections, Reason for creating/producing, Prompt for reason for bringing/choosing object to share, Prompt for function of object, Prompt to engage with object, Prompt for label of object</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature of lead teacher’s translanguage</td>
<td>Teacher translation/recast of student talk, Teacher translation of (other teacher) prompt/question, Teacher request/prompt for translation/restatement in target language, Teacher code-switch, Nondesignated language (monolingual speech)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature of co-teacher’s translanguage</td>
<td>Teacher translation/recast of student talk, Teacher translation of (other teacher) prompt/question, Teacher request/prompt for translation/restatement in target language, Teacher code-switch, Nondesignated language (monolingual speech)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature of presenter’s translanguage</td>
<td>Monolingual Spanish, Monolingual English, Student code-switch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature of peer’s translanguage</td>
<td>Monolingual Spanish, Monolingual English, Student code-switch</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## FINDINGS

In this section, we illustrate how the three dual language preschool teachers navigated the tensions between the program’s language distribution policy and its practical realization by co-constructing and enacting flexible bilingual pedagogic practices in support of emergent bilingual children’s participation in language and literary activities and performance of academic discourse. Despite the intended compartmentalization of languages set forth by the dual language program’s “one teacher/one language” policy, teachers (and in particular, the
lead teacher, Ms. Katia) crossed these boundaries in strategic and flexible ways in the heteroglossic “third space” (Gutiérrez, Baquedano-López, & Tejeda, 2000) of the focal bilingual classroom. Teachers’ dynamic linguistic performances evidenced translanguaging, variations of which appeared to be influenced by teacher partnerships, the function or purpose of the interaction, and teachers’ perceptions of children’s language preferences and unique developmental needs. Teachers’ translanguaging practices of code-switching, translation, bilingual recasting, and language brokering drew on children’s linguistic and cultural funds of knowledge, scaffolded children’s formalized language performances and experimentation with academic discourse and new language forms, and integrated the languages and language varieties of the community, while recognizing, validating, and expressing the teachers’ and children’s shared bilingual identities. Although not the main focus of our analysis, children also engaged in complex and flexible languaging practices with their teachers and each other. Throughout the findings section, researcher notes appear in [brackets] and translation of Spanish language speech appears in <tags>. Intrasentential code-switches and code-switches from teachers’ designated language appear in italics for emphasis.

Enacting Translanguaging Through Coordinated, Parallel Monolingual Discursive Practices: Bilingual Recasting, Language Brokering, and Concurrent Translation

In partnership, Ms. Katia’s (Spanish language model) and Ms. Alba’s (English language model) translanguaging practices included collaborative bilingual recasting, language brokering, and concurrent translation of each other’s activity-related directions and commentary. These practices fulfilled at least two discursive functions: to manage the activity and to involve and give voice to the children. Modeling her respective designated language, each teacher adhered to the program’s parallel monolingual language policy. However, the resulting coordinated discursive patterns were characteristic of a collaborative bilingual pedagogy whereby one teacher articulated something related to the structure or organization of activity, for example, and the partner teacher recast, repeated, or revoiced the information in the other language. The following representative excerpts illustrate typical bilingual coordinated practices enacted by Ms. Katia and Ms. Alba that served to manage the show-and-tell activity and create a space for children’s participation:

Excerpt 1

Alba: Ready, set, go!

Excerpt 2

Katia: [to whole group] ¿Alguien tiene una pregunta para Keira? <Does anyone have a question for Keira?>
Alba: Let’s move to your questions.

Excerpt 3

Alba: We have one more person, Ms. Katia.
Katia: [to whole group] Y la última es Helen. <And the last one is Helen.>
Alba: The closing is going to be by Helen.
Katia: [to Helen] Párate ahí y dinos qué hiciste. <Stand over there and tell us what you did.>
Helen: [speaking softly] My name is Helen and I [unintelligible]
Katia: No te escucho, Helen. <I cannot hear you, Helen.>
Alba: Open your lips so we can hear your best voice. What do you want to introduce?

Ms. Katia’s translanguaging practices while co-teaching with Ms. Alba also included recasting, sometimes bilingually, of children’s performances in show-and-tell activity. These dynamic languaging practices often involved more than just repetition or translation of children’s contributions, as Ms. Katia offered additional information (e.g., contextualization, connections to school- or home-based experiences), prompted further elaborations from children, scaffolded children’s descriptions, or expanded children’s elaborations in ways that more closely resembled the language brokering practices of emergent bilinguals documented by Orellana and colleagues (e.g., Dorner, Orellana, & Jiménez, 2008; Dorner, Orellana, & Li-Grining, 2007; Orellana, 2001; Orellana & Reynolds, 2008; Orellana, Reynolds, Dorner, & Meza, 2003; Reynolds & Orellana, 2009).

In the following representative example, Ms. Katia and Ms. Alba collaboratively scaffolded Valentina’s presentation, during which she shared a picture of her sister, Camila. Through discursive practices such as questioning and language brokering (i.e., bilingual recasting, revoicing, translation), Ms. Katia and Ms. Alba affirmed, expanded, and validated Valentina’s language performance and experimentation with academic discourse. While the teachers each modeled monolingual use of their designated language, Valentina comfortably and flexibly moved between Spanish and English, aligning her language choices to those of her teachers and peers:

Valentina: And my mommy was thinking, and then she have one idea and then she gave me her llaves and then she gave me a picture of my sister. <... keys...>
Alba: Mmmhmmm.
Katia: [to whole group] Bien. Valentina tenía un problema y lo resolvió porque ella no ... se le olvidó traer su foto. <Okay. Valentina had a problem and she solved it because she did not ... she had forgotten to bring her picture.>
Valentina: Mi mamá me lo solvió. Mi mamá me lo solvió. <My mom solved it for me.>
Katia: [to whole group] Su mamá le resolvió el problema. Ella se le había olvidado traer la foto y su mamá pensó y le dijo, “te voy a llevar la foto del llavero,” ¿verdad? <Her mom solved the problem for her. She had forgotten to bring the picture and her mom thought and told her, “I will bring you the picture from the keychain.” Is that right?>
Valentina: del llavero <from the keychain>
Katia: Mmm. Entonces ¿qué está haciendo Camila en esa foto? <Mmm. Then, what is Camila doing in that picture?>
Valentina: Le están tomando una foto. <They are taking a picture of her.>
Katia: Sí, pero, ¿dónde está Camila? <Yes, but where is Camila?>
Valentina: Yo no sé ... yo no estaba. <I don’t know ... I was not there.>
Katia: O, ¿tú no estabas allí? ¿No? Okay. <Oh, you were not there? ...>
Helen: I think she’s in Disney World.
Valentina: Solo mi mama ... solo mi mamá estaba. <Only my mom ... only my mom was there.>
Alba: Oh, your mommy took the picture of Camila?
Valentina: I don’t know who take the picture . . . because I’m not there.
Alba: Oh.
Katia: O, tú no estabas ahí cuándo tomaron la foto. <Oh, you were not there when they took the picture.>

The conversation in this excerpt illustrates the dynamic nature of show-and-tell presentations in this dual language classroom in which students and teachers collaboratively, flexibly, and purposefully moved among English and Spanish in the co-construction of shared meaning. Valentina seamlessly integrates monolingual and bilingual speech to provide details about the origin and nature of her object (e.g., explaining how her mother thought of, and subsequently provided, an alternative picture for Valentina to use in her presentation after realizing that she had left the original picture at home that morning; answering questions about where the picture had been taken and what her sister was doing at the time). The resulting narrative reflects Valentina’s developing expertise in storytelling and recounting and draws on her personal experiences and linguistic and cultural funds of knowledge (Moll, Amanti, Neff, & González, 1992).

Valentina’s intrasentential code-switch (“And my mommy was thinking, and then she have one idea and then she gave me her llaves and then she gave me a picture of my sister.”) may have been an instance of “crutching,” or using a word from one language to cover a vocabulary gap in the other. Or, it may simply reflect her quicker lexical access to the Spanish word than its English equivalent, keys. In any case, the code-switch was accepted by her teachers, as evidenced by both Ms. Alba’s affirmation (“Mmmhmmm”) and Ms. Katia’s Spanish language summary of Valentina’s narrative thus far (“Bien. Valentina tenía un problema y lo resolvió porque ella no . . . se le olvidó traer su foto.”). Valentina’s correction of Ms. Katia’s summary serves to clarify that it was, in fact, her mother who came up with a solution (“Mi mamá me lo solvió.”). Her statement includes an invented—or heteroglossic (Creese & Blackledge, 2010)—term (“solvió”) that approximates the standardized Spanish language verb used by Ms. Katia (“resolvió”) and suggests Valentina’s skillful movement among her linguistic repertoire as she draws flexibly and fluidly on features that have been socially assigned as English or Spanish.3 Ms. Katia’s subsequent revision (“Su mamá le resolvió el problema. Ella se le había olvidado traer la foto y su mamá pensó y le dijo, ‘te voy a llevar la foto del llavero,’ ¿verdad?”), positions Valentina as a knowledgeable and competent storyteller and Ms. Katia as a responsive teacher who recognizes and validates Valentina’s expertise, while modeling standardized usage of Spanish without either stating or implying that Valentina’s usage is inaccurate or unacceptable. With the teachers’ scaffolding, peers such as Helen interpret and build upon Valentina’s narrative (“I think she’s in Disney World.”) and engage in rich, contextualized, co-constructed storytelling. Ms. Katia and Ms. Alba—who, although performing monolingually in their language production in this interaction, perform linguistically in their active engagement with and acceptance of both languages in the activity—contribute to a construction of the classroom as a dynamic multilingual environment, marking translanguaging as a legitimate resource for teaching, learning, and interacting.

---

3For a fuller discussion of the invention of languages, see Makoni and Pennycook (2007).
Enacting Translanguaging Through a Flexible Bilingual Pedagogy: Code Alignment in Response to Perceived Language Preference and Choice

Ms. Katia’s languaging practices in partnership with Ms. Laura (Spanish language model) reveal a different pattern. In this pairing, Ms. Katia (English language model) aligned her language choices when addressing specific individuals with her perception of their preferred or stronger language. In keeping with this pattern, Ms. Katia always interacted with Ms. Laura in Spanish. To address the class as a whole, however, she generally used English. Thus, Ms. Katia’s official language designation in this partnership did not exclusively define her languaging practices; instead, she adopted a flexible bilingual pedagogy that was responsive to her interlocutor’s language preference and/or strengths.

A variety of dynamic languaging practices are evidenced in the following representative excerpt, presented in two segments, in which we see Ms. Katia drawing on English and Spanish in flexible and fluid ways to manage the show-and-tell activity, to invite children’s participation and engagement, to elicit more detailed descriptions from children, to plan with her partner teacher, and to redirect children’s behavior. For this particular show-and-tell session, children did not bring special objects from home but instead described to their teachers and peers illustrations they had produced in class. In the first segment, Iliana—a flexible emergent bilingual who uses both languages comfortably and confidently—shares her picture, which she had begun at school and finished at home:

Iliana: My name is Iliana. This is my picture I draw in my home after I get to school.
Katia: What did you draw?
Iliana: I draw...I draw...these things that is on my paper.
Laura: ¿Y qué cosas están en tu papel? ¿Nos puedes contar? <And what things are on your paper? Can you tell us?>
Iliana: Flowers.
Isabella: I see butterflies.
Iliana: Flowers, butterflies, and one rainbow with stamps on them.
Laura: Wow, un arco iris. <...a rainbow.>
Isabella: I see two rainbows.
Valentina: I see one little and one big.
Iliana: No, this one...this one I make my mom because I didn’t do it...I didn’t do it right. This one [pointing to her picture].
Laura: Aaah, ok.
Katia: [to whole group] Do we have any questions for Iliana? Please raise your hand.
Laura: [to whole group] ¿Qué quieren preguntar? <What would you like to ask?>
[Several children raise their hands.]
Iliana: Madeline.
Katia: Madeline, ¿cuál es tu pregunta, mi amor? <...what is your question, my love?>
Madeline: What are top verde? <...green?>
Iliana: Because...This? [seeking clarification from Madeline by pointing to figure toward top edge of her drawing]
Madeline: Yeah.
Iliana: Because that’s one picture of a flower.
Isabella: ‘Cause one made it my mom and one made it me that . . . I didn’t did it right so I put one stamp inside it. [About 5 seconds pass, no other child raises her hand]
Katia: Perfect. Thank you, Iliana.
Laura: Gracias. <Thank you.>

Although Iliana is a flexible emergent bilingual who typically adapts her language choices in response to those of her interaction partners, she performs this entire show-and-tell presentation in English. Ms. Katia adopts Iliana’s language choice by asking her in English to provide details about her drawing (“What did you draw?”). As an additional scaffold, Ms. Laura recasts Ms. Katia’s prompt in Spanish, making it more explicit (“¿Y qué cosas estás en tu papel?”) and expanding it to include an invitation to “tell more” (“¿Nos puedes contar?”). Iliana takes up this invitation, offering a relevant response (“Flowers.”), to which peers add details. Isabella’s observation (“I see butterflies.”) prompts further elaborated descriptive language from Iliana (“Flowers, butterflies, and one rainbow with stamps on them.”) and elicits several more comments from peers (e.g., “I see two rainbows,” “I see one little and one big”). Ms. Katia uses English to pose questions to the group as a whole, but switches to Spanish when addressing Spanish-dominant emergent bilingual children like Madeline (“Madeline, ¿cuál es tu pregunta, mi amor?”), who subsequently poses a question for Iliana using both languages (“What are top verde?”). Such dynamic bilingual exchanges scaffolded children’s collaborative meaning negotiation, experimentation with developing language structures, and performance of academic discourse, as illustrated by Iliana’s ensuing clarifications and explanations (“...this one I make my mom because I didn’t do it...I didn’t do it right...” “Because that’s one picture of a flower” and “‘Cause one made it my mom and one made it me that...I didn’t did it right so I put one stamp inside it.”). Ms. Katia switches back to English to provide closure to the presentation and to thank Iliana for her contribution (“Perfect. Thank you, Iliana.”). Throughout the segment, Ms. Laura uses Spanish (her designated language) to invite and affirm children’s comments (“Wow, un arco iris,” “Aaah, ok.”), and to revoice bilingually Ms. Katia’s questions and remarks for the whole group (“¿Qué quieren preguntar?,” “Gracias.”).

The second segment of the excerpt begins with Katia’s transition to the next presentation. Consistent with the languaging pattern established earlier, Ms. Katia uses English to address the whole group but adapts her language choice when interacting with individual students and Ms. Laura based on their language preferences:

Katia: [to whole group] And let’s move on to... Today we have a lot of drawings. 
Okay, gracias Iliana... Y ahora Valentina. <Okay, thank you, Iliana... And now Valentina.>
Valentina: I’m here. [Valentina waits for signal from teacher/s to begin her presentation.]
Laura: [to child who is fidgeting] Siéntese bien. <Sit correctly.>
Joaquin: [to Ms. Katia, who is sitting next to him] Ms. Katia, the one... what was the painting I made?
Katia: [to Joaquin] I don’t know, sweetie.
Laura: [to whole group] Vamos a escuchar. Tenemos que tomar turnos. <Let’s listen. We have to take turns.>
Isabella: [flips through stack of paintings that are lying on floor between her and Ms. Katia] This one is mine.
Katia: [to Isabella] I know.
Laura: [to whole group] Vamos a escuchar. <Let’s listen.>
Isabella: [to Ms. Katia] And I brought . . . and I brought a chapstick too.
Katia: [to Isabella] Turn around and focus.
Isabella: [to Ms. Katia] And I brought a chapstick too.
Katia: [to Isabella] It’s either the drawing or the chapstick. You cannot talk about both.
Katia: *Okay, Madeline, siéntese bien. <sit correctly.>*
Isabella: [to Ms. Katia] I’m not going to do the drawing, okay?
Laura: [to Ms. Katia] Las dos pueden hacer la presentación, que trabajaron bastante esta mañana. <The two of them can do their presentations as they worked quite a lot this morning.>
Katia: [to Ms. Laura] Sí, pero ella dice que quiere hablar de su chapstick. <Yes, but she says that she wants to talk about her chapstick.>
Laura: [to Ms. Katia] ¿Quién? <Who?>
Katia: [to Ms. Laura] *Isabella* [Spanish pronunciation].
Katia: [to whole group] Y ahora Valentina.

In this segment, Ms. Katia moves among English and Spanish to fulfill various discursive functions. First, she uses English to manage the activity and to make general observations to the group (“And let’s move on to . . . Today we have a lot of drawings.”). Second, Ms. Katia uses English or Spanish to interact with individual children, e.g., to thank Iliana for her presentation (“Okay, gracias Iliana . . .”), to give Valentina the floor for her turn (“Y ahora Valentina.”), to redirect Isabella’s and Madeline’s behavior toward the activity (“Turn around and focus,” “Okay. Madeline, siéntese bien”), and to answer Joaquin’s question (“I don’t know, sweetie”). Third, she uses Spanish to communicate and plan with Ms. Laura (“Sí, pero ella dice que quiere hablar de su chapstick”). Ms. Laura, in contrast, consistently models Spanish in interaction with the whole group, individual children, and Ms. Katia in accordance with her official language designation. In this partnership, a flexible and dynamic bilingual pedagogy, characterized by Ms. Katia’s responsiveness to her students’ and partner teacher’s language preferences and choices, leverages children’s developing expertise with academic discourse and new language forms, formalized language performances, and linguistic and cultural funds of knowledge.

DISCUSSION AND IMPLICATIONS

The study reported in this article sought to understand the nature of dual language preschool teachers’ languaging practices within the context of show-and-tell, a typical interactive and formalized language and literacy performance activity in North American early childhood classrooms. Our analysis of classroom discourse in this activity illustrates dynamic and responsive
languaging practices that reflect a holistic view of bilinguals as individuals with wide repertoires of language practices, and normalize translanguaging—or the use of multiple modes and linguistic features to achieve a communicative goal (García & Kleifgen, 2010)—as a valid form of interaction in school. Ms. Katia, in particular, demonstrated skillful navigation within and across—and disruption of—the normative binary of language separation prevalent in most dual language programs. Throughout the data, examples abounded of the varied ways teachers leveraged translanguaging as a pedagogic, meaning-making, and communicative resource that recognized, validated, and expressed students’ and teachers’ shared bilingual identities.

By enacting a flexible bilingualism and implementing a coordinated bilingual pedagogy, the teachers in this classroom set up a collaborative space for dynamic bilingualism and meaning making in which they modeled and legitimized a wide range of linguistic resources for thinking, communicating, and constructing meaning (Gort, 2012; Martínez, 2010; Orellana & Reynolds, 2008). This was achieved both through coordinated, parallel monolingual discursive practices and through a more flexible, bilingual pedagogy that included code-switching, translation, bilingual recasting/revoicing, and language brokering, and varied depending on the teacher partnership, the discourse function, and teachers’ perceptions of children’s language developmental needs and preferences. These various forms of languaging reflect a more concurrent and integrated use of languages and language varieties and a pragmatic multilingual approach to maximizing understanding and performance across different contexts and purposes that challenge traditional language compartmentalization policies and practices in bilingual education (Baker, 2010; Blackledge & Creese, 2010; Creese & Blackledge, 2010; Durán & Palmer, 2013; Fortune, Tedick, & Walker, 2008; García, 2009; García & Leiva, 2014; Gort, 2012; Gort & Pontier, 2013).

Together, the two focal teacher pairs interpreted and enacted the dual language program’s policy of language distribution in ways that created a space for integrated bilingualism and reflected the multicompetence, reality, and experiences of emergent bilingual children as they construct meaning, shape their experiences, gain knowledge, and make sense of their world through multilingual discursive practices (Baker, 2011; García, 2009, 2011). In so doing, teachers thoughtfully constructed a responsive and integrated multilingual classroom environment in which students were encouraged to use their entire linguistic repertoire to perform academic discourses through their developing bilingual identities.

Teachers’ and children’s languaging practices consistently assumed bilingual expertise in their interactions with each other. Teachers did not demand that children perform in one language or the other, but instead accepted and responded to all styles and forms of communication while scaffolding for a range of different proficiency levels (Durán & Palmer, 2013). In different ways, the three teachers supported students’ meaning making and participation in show-and-tell activity and positioned translanguaging as a normalized classroom practice and important resource for participating in school. For example, Ms. Laura and Ms. Alba consistently modeled monolingual speech that carefully built on, and/or scaffolded, Ms. Katia’s assertions and the children’s activity-related talk and behavior. Similarly, whether or not Ms. Katia’s language choices aligned with the language assigned to her in a given teacher partnership, her languaging practices evidenced a strategic pedagogy that built on her partner teachers’ practices and responded to individual children’s needs and preferences. Although it might appear to a casual observer that Ms. Katia jumped from Spanish to English in a haphazard or random way, close analysis of her languaging practices revealed a much more intentional approach to fostering a learning environment that was
purposely structured to leverage children’s and teachers’ bilingual and bicultural resources and to support and sustain their participation and developing expertise in show-and-tell activity.

One way in which Ms. Katia’s language choices were purposeful was by ensuring, through her translanguaging practices, that the use of Spanish was always prevalent and supported during show-and-tell activity. Ms. Katia “protected” the position and value of Spanish in the classroom in several ways across both teacher pairings. For instance, when she assumed the role of the Spanish language model in partnership with Ms. Alba, Ms. Katia modeled monolingual Spanish use, ensuring that students were equitably exposed to Spanish and English through each teacher’s consistent use of her respective designated language in interactions with each other and the children. In contrast, Ms. Katia was more flexible in her language choices when she assumed the role of the English language model in partnership with Ms. Laura. In this pairing, Ms. Katia always used Spanish in interactions with her partner teacher and was similarly responsive to individual children’s language choices and developing proficiencies by using either Spanish or English. Thus, Ms. Katia’s languaging practices not only highlighted the utility of Spanish for performing academic and everyday discourses but also modeled the behavior of fluent bilinguals in ways that were supportive of children’s participation in show-and-tell activity, thereby challenging the hegemony of English in schools and more authentically reflecting bilinguals’ sociolinguistic reality. In these ways, Ms. Katia, Ms. Laura, and Ms. Alba collaborated in specific and intentional ways to co-construct a pluralist discourse of bilingualism that privileged bilingualism and its normative practices (Durán & Palmer, 2013) and protected their classroom space for bilingual/biliterate development and authentic expressions of a bilingual identity.

These findings have important implications for dual language teaching in early education learning contexts. They illustrate how teachers are uniquely situated as powerful agentic social actors within classrooms and schools despite prevalent structural constraints around language choice and use. By embracing and fostering dynamic bilingualism as a resource for teaching and learning, teachers can begin to challenge ideologies and practices that do not build upon their students’ cultural and linguistic resources—or funds of knowledge (Moll et al., 1992)—and related paradigms that are rooted in monolingual norms and that might actually restrict possibilities for children’s multilingual potential. As emergent bilingual student populations continue to grow, and as the number of dual language programs increases, an ecological perspective demands that we interrogate the pedagogic validity of promoting bilingualism through monolingual approaches (Arthur & Martin, 2006; Creese & Blackledge, 2010). Language distribution policies and their implementation in early childhood education, in particular, have not been widely attested. Further investigation of classroom language ecologies might focus on interactional dynamics in preschool bilingual learning contexts and explore the ways in which teachers’ languaging practices capitalize on the intelligence and flexibility displayed by young bilinguals as they engage with school tasks. There is also a need to better understand dual language early childhood teachers’ perceptions of language separation policies and how their own education and professional development experiences have supported them (or not) in working with innovative approaches to language allocation in instruction. Research in these directions will contribute to our understanding of the potential impacts and limitations of translanguaging pedagogies in dynamic bilingual contexts.
CONCLUSION

This research offers insights into the ways in which the educational and language ecology of one dual language preschool classroom facilitated children’s engagement with the kinds of typical translanguaging practices widely documented in multilingual communities. Given the school’s language policy of “one teacher/one language,” and the presence of two teachers who enacted monolingual and bilingual performances of the instructional languages, the focal classroom became a vibrant bilingual space where children and teachers displayed a dynamic bilingualism that allowed them to use their entire linguistic repertoire flexibly, meaningfully, and competently. Through the enactment and (at times) disruption of their officially-designated language roles, teacher pairs modeled the utility of bilingual speech/interaction by performing varied, dynamic bilingual discursive practices and encouraging children to draw from their developing bilingual repertoires to engage in classroom language and literacy activities.

Teachers’ translanguaging performances defined the hybrid learning space and created the conditions for constructing and enacting integrated language identities in this classroom. By focusing on the ways in which teachers and emergent bilingual learners drew on translanguaging practices and pedagogies to expand language and literacy boundaries, to create multiple opportunities for language and literacy learning, and to perform identities using all available linguistic signs and resources, the study illuminates the utility of bilingualism as a communicative and academic resource and provides insight into the complex dynamics involved in “doing being bilingual” (Auer, 1984, p. 7).
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