

The Implementation of Translanguaging in Ontario Canada Early Childhood Education Curriculum

Chuan Liu, Western University, Canada

Abstract: Albeit the linguistically diverse settings in Ontario Canada, language policies in schools with English and/or French as the only instructional language(s) departmentalize language repertoires of bi/multilingual students. In response to the surging demand for bi/multilingual students, translanguaging advocates to appreciate students' funds of knowledge and their full language repertoires. This paper explores the role of translanguaging in early childhood education curriculum in Ontario from a socio-constructive and critical theoretical perspective and highlights the need to ensure equitable learning environments for bi/multilingual students, which is neglected in teacher's implemented curriculum. This paper argues that translanguaging scaffolds learning by allowing students to draw on their full linguistic resources, promote cultural responsiveness, and acknowledge the unequal power dynamics between multilingual and dominant language communities. This paper also emphasizes the transformative potential of translanguaging as a political tool that empowers multilingual students to challenge social injustice and transform their future possibilities. This paper suggests that future research should be conducted in early childhood classrooms in Ontario to facilitate students' meaning-making and emancipation of individual voices, and that there is a need for teacher education and professional development to integrate translanguaging in instructional design.

Keywords: Translanguaging, Curriculum, Multilingualism, Early Childhood Education

Introduction

The number of bi/multilingual children (i.e., children who speak more than one language) has increased rapidly in Western societies due to globalization and immigration (Langeloo et al., 2019). In Canada, for instance, one-in-four of the population is bi/multilingual (Statistics Canada, 2022), and in Ontario, approximately 28.3% of the population speaks a language other than English or French (Statistics Canada, 2021). Albeit the linguistically diverse settings in Ontario, the early childhood education (ECE) system (i.e., birth to age 12) continues to operate within a monolingual ideology (Lory, 2020), departmentalizing language repertoires of bi/multilingual students (García, 2009).

The ECE classrooms in bi/multilingual societies present a range of difficulties, such as pedagogical challenges in addressing the need for multiple languages (Kirsch & Mortini, 2021), parenting difficulties in supporting children's literacy development (Krijnen et al., 2020), and challenges in children's language acquisition (Nesteruk, 2010). Some early childhood educators hold negative beliefs about integrating other languages, and even restrict students' language uses (Peyer et al., 2022). Cummins (2005) criticized the ignorance of students' home linguistic resources in Canadian curriculums and language policies. Specifically, the prohibition of using home languages leads to students' self-doubt about their identities (Krumm, 2016), and marginalizes language-minoritized students by overlooking the cultural and linguistic resources and abilities the students have (Otheguy et al., 2015; Sembiente, 2016). Although Ontario was one of the first provinces to implement language equity education to protect and promote individuals' and groups' linguistic rights (Shewchuk & Cooper, 2018), the monolingual language environment contributes to Ontario students' linguistic insecurity, such as inadequate exposure to their home languages and a greater comfort level when using the dominant language (Lasagabaster, 2018). Therefore, it is critical to address bi/multilingual students' varied and unique learning needs (Aguasvivas & Carreiras, 2022).

In response to the surging number of bi/multilingual students in Ontario (Chavez, 2019), translanguaging is advocated to appreciate students' social and cultural capital as well as their full language repertoires (Duarte, 2018). According to García (2009), translanguaging is an approach that enhances students' learning by integrating and making meaning with students' whole linguistic, cultural, and social repertoires. Translanguaging enhances students' comprehension and overall performance by creating spaces for bi/multilingual students to access their full linguistic resources (Martin-Beltrán, 2014; Yilmaz, 2021), thereby offering voices to language-marginalized students (García & Wei, 2014). However, translanguaging in Ontario multilingual ECE contexts is an area that has received scarce attention in research (Galante, 2020).

As a heritage language teacher (i.e., teaching Mandarin as a second language) and an emergent scholar in curriculum studies, I believe that it is timely and relevant to begin the critical conversation regarding the integration of multiple languages in Ontario ECE curriculums. The concept of curriculum is complex,

encompassing various levels and approaches (Morris & Adamson, 2010). For the purpose of this paper, curriculum refers to the implemented curriculum, namely what happens in the teaching and learning process in the ECE classrooms (Morris & Adamson, 2010). In other words, curriculum actualized by teachers demonstrates how teachers interpret curriculum policies and actualize learning goals (Craig & Ross, 2008; Morris & Adamson, 2010). Therefore, the purpose of this paper is to connect teachers' implemented curriculum regarding translanguaging with relevant curriculum and learning theories.

This paper will start with demonstrating the theoretical foundations, socio-constructive theory and critical theory relevant to translanguaging as a socially constructed and transformative pedagogy. Then, this paper will review the literature about translanguaging and how it could be incorporated into the curriculum. Finally, this paper discusses the need of implementing translanguaging in Ontario classrooms and offers both theoretical and practical implications.

Theoretical Framework

This study applies socio-constructive and critical theory lenses to investigate the implementation of translanguaging in Ontario ECE classrooms. Studies about translanguaging in ECE center on bi/multilingual identities and students' full linguistic repertoires mediated by the social context. Drawing insights from critical theory, translanguaging is not only a pedagogy, but a means of emancipating bi/multilingual children from the oppression of the students' rights to voice their thoughts due to the ignorant of their full linguistic repertoires in ECE classrooms.

Socio-Constructive Perspective on Curriculum

The socio-constructive theory is rooted in the work of Vygotsky (1986). Ertmer and Newby (1993) examine the topics of teaching, learning, and curriculum through a socio-constructive lens. They argue that learning is a subjective process that takes place when individuals construct meaning from their experiences. To foster meaningful learning, teachers must incorporate authentic tasks within a social context. Learners are considered active participants who internalize their experiences, leading to self-regulation and autonomy. Meanwhile, socio-constructivism emphasizes the teacher's role as a coach and facilitator who utilizes real-life examples, encourages student reflection, and assesses problem-solving abilities.

Vygotsky argues that learning should be student-centered and extends constructivism by considering social factors (Kay & Kibble, 2016). In alignment with the socio-constructive perspective, learning is not only the process of individual knowledge construction, but is also mediated through interactions with social environments, such as technological tools, cultural artifacts, and languages (Lave & Wenger, 1991; Lemke, 2001). Apart from authentic learning experiences purported by socio-constructivism (Ertmer & Newby, 1993), learning occurs when learners fill the gap between their previous level and the level of the task requires, namely the Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD) (Kay & Kibble, 2016). In other words, ZPD cannot be achieved by learners themselves but through scaffolding, the support from other people and/or external resources (i.e., most knowledgeable others) to connect students' actual level and the expected learning goal (Kay & Kibble, 2016). Accordingly, teachers acknowledge the importance of social and cultural factors in learning, and appropriate instructions and resources to scaffold students' learning processes based on students' ZPD.

Albeit that the socio-constructive perspective recognizes the crucial role of students and social factors in curriculum development, the socio-constructive theory overlooks the underlying value and power dynamics that contribute to the development of the hidden curriculum (Morris & Adamson, 2010). In bi/multilingual classrooms, monolingual language policies often view bi/multilingual children as inferior (Martínez et al., 2015), leading to the marginalization and exclusion of bi/multilingual students from classroom practices (MacSwan, 2017). Therefore, this paper draws from critical theory to make the inherent biases and power imbalances explicit and proposes a transformative approach through translanguaging to acknowledge students' funds of knowledge and empower them to voice their thoughts in ECE teachers' implemented curriculum.

Critical Perspective on Curriculum

Critical theory is a theoretical lens that critiques and challenges the underlying values and interests that are often taken for granted in normalized practices (Eisner, 2002). It originated from Marxist views of human emancipation from exploitation (Antonio, 1981). In an educational context, Freire (1970) revealed the oppressive and dehumanizing system in education and advocated for the revitalization of critical curiosity. Paulo Freire (1970) distinguished between the banking model and the problem-posing model of education, emphasizing the importance of education in emancipating individuals. The banking model views education as a process of depositing knowledge into students' minds as if they were empty bank accounts (Freire, 1970). Teachers employ a banking model to maintain power by narrating and lecturing to students, while ignoring the learning preferences and needs of the students (Freire, 1970). In contrast, the problem-posing approach emphasizes the learner's role as an active participant in the learning process, engaging in questioning and critically analyzing the world (Freire, 1970).

To practice critical theory, Giroux (1988) purported an investigation of dominant ideologies in schools, curricula, and daily practices. Apple (2004) emphasized that education is not neutral but rather reflects social and cultural values that reproduce dominant social, economic, and political relations. Therefore, it is essential to critically examine educational practices and curriculum to uncover hidden messages and ideologies that shape them. In line with the critical approach to curriculum, the teacher's role is to develop students' complex views of examining the world and revealing the unheard voices of less privileged communities (Eisner, 2002). Curriculum development should balance the voices of different stakeholders, such as teachers, parents, and students (Schwab, 1973).

Yosso (2002) extended critical theory by taking race into consideration and rejecting cultural literacy to address the dominant value of the white middle class in the prescribed curriculum. A critical race curriculum is important because the current North American curriculum privileges the white and disregards the voices of other races, such as indigenous people, immigrants, and other racial minorities. Such a curriculum can perpetuate the dominant white culture and reinforce racial hierarchies, which marginalize the languages, experiences, and knowledge of racial minorities. Conversely, a critical race curriculum acknowledges and values the diverse languages, perspectives, and experiences of all racial groups, challenges the dominant narrative by centering the experiences of racial minorities, and explores the social and historical context of racial inequity. By implementing a critical race curriculum, educators can provide a more inclusive and empowering education for students from varied linguistic and cultural communities, leading to critical thinking skills, a deeper understanding of how race operates in society, and greater social justice and equity both inside and outside of the classroom.

In summary, this section provided a theoretical framework for investigating the implementation of translanguaging in ECE curriculum in Ontario. The socio-constructive perspective highlights the importance of considering social and cultural factors in curriculum implementation, while the critical perspective emphasizes the need to challenge the underlying values and interests of existing educational practices. Building on these theories, the next section will review literature that examines the implementation of translanguaging in Ontario ECE curriculum.

Literature Review

To address the question of how translanguaging can be implemented in Ontario ECE classrooms, I will first review the literature about translanguaging as a socio-constructive and transformative pedagogy. Then, I will review the literature about the relationship between translanguaging and the ECE curriculum. Finally, I will review the literature about translanguaging in Ontario to demonstrate a gap in the literature.

Translanguaging

Williams (2002) first used translanguaging as a systematic pedagogical practice that employs two languages to strengthen students' dual language competencies. Translanguaging came from the concept of languaging, a term that refers to using language to make sense of the world (Yilmaz, 2021). In contrast to the focus of

translanguaging on pedagogy, Cenoz and Gorter (2017) conceptualize translanguaging as a universal practice of multilingual students, which is not limited to classrooms. Accordingly, translanguaging is viewed as “the reality of bi/multilingual usage in naturally occurring contexts where boundaries between languages are fluid and constantly shifting” (Cenoz & Gorter, 2017, p. 904).

Instead of translanguaging as a spontaneous phenomenon shared by bi/multilingual children (Cenoz & Gorter, 2017), García (2009) highlights the disempowered status quo of bi/multilinguals in classrooms and argues that translanguaging is a transformative approach that addresses equity and diversity issues. García and Wei (2014) argue that translanguaging is a fluid and dynamic process of multilingual individuals making meaning with social, cultural, linguistic and multimodal resources, thereby achieving social justice.

Translanguaging, in line with socio-constructive theory, enhances multilingual students’ general learning achievement through scaffolding content learning (Yilmaz, 2021). In practice, the utilization of different languages in their classrooms (Williams, 1996) is validated and justified to scaffold multilingual students (Martin-Beltrán, 2014). Teachers take advantage of multilingual students’ social, cultural, and linguistic resources to promote students’ overall performance (García, 2014). For instance, Bauer et al. (2017) investigated how teachers can improve the writing skills of emergent bilingual students through translanguaging. The authors conducted a study in a bilingual kindergarten classroom where teachers used a collaborative writing approach that encouraged students to use their full linguistic repertoires and partnered them with students of different language backgrounds. The approach resulted in improved writing skills in both languages and an increased ability to use translanguaging strategies. Teachers can create an inclusive learning environment by valuing and utilizing the social, cultural, and linguistic resources of multilingual students.

Translanguaging is a powerful approach that not only scaffolds bilinguals’ content and language learning but also gives them a voice in schools where monolingual language policies and ideologies dominate (Flores & García, 2017). By incorporating the complex unitary linguistic repertoire and identities of language-minoritized students, translanguaging can create an equitable learning environment that challenges power dynamics in the classroom from a critical perspective (Yilmaz, 2021). According to Otheguy et al. (2015), translanguaging involves using one’s entire linguistic repertoire without regard for socially and politically defined language labels or boundaries. Translanguaging values and appreciates the entire repertoire of bi/multilingual students as a tool, thereby challenging strong norms that articulate the sharpness of linguistic boundaries (Otheguy et al., 2015). It is important for teachers and educators to discern the transformative entity of translanguaging to implement it appropriately to create an equitable learning environment that challenges coercive power relations in the classroom, particularly for language-minoritized students (Yilmaz, 2021).

Despite the aforementioned benefits, research has shown that translanguaging is hindered by two factors: (1) language policies, and (2) teachers’ and learners’ beliefs (Prilutskaya, 2021). Elementary Schools’ monolingual policies disrupt the actualization of translanguaging, whereby teachers may be punished for using another language (Prilutskaya, 2021). Such monolingual policies are rooted in white supremacy and refuse the rich resources brought by multilingual students (Flores & García, 2017). Meanwhile, teachers’ and students’ negative beliefs about using their home languages also impede the implementation of translanguaging (Prilutskaya, 2021). Teachers view multilingual students as inferior and slow learners who use their home language as lazy behavior (Martínez et al., 2015). Although some monolingual teachers are willing to integrate students’ home languages, those teachers may lack self-efficacy beliefs or confidence in facilitating students through translanguaging (Bernstein et al., 2021; Smith et al., 2022). Some multilingual students in the context of English as a dominant language may feel ashamed of their identity as multilingual individuals and refuse to use their home languages (Wei, 2020).

Translanguaging challenges traditional monolingual approaches to language education and highlights the importance of valuing students’ linguistic and cultural capital, which has significant implications for the implemented curriculum. The following section will explore how translanguaging can be incorporated into the ECE curriculum to create more equitable and inclusive learning environments for bi/multilingual students.

Translanguaging and The ECE Curriculum

According to Tyler's (2013) model, teachers' implemented curriculum in ECE classrooms encompasses the purpose of the curriculum, scope of content, teaching and learning processes, and assessment and evaluation. Teacher's implemented curriculum demonstrates teachers' interpretation of and reaction to education policy based on teachers' personal experiences, beliefs and knowledge (Deng, 2010). To counter the hegemonic force of linguistic purism embodied by the monolingual policies (Hill, 1985), teachers may incorporate translanguaging to recognize the fluidity of children's language shift in everyday classrooms (García, 2009). For example, DeNicolò's (2019) qualitative case study aimed to investigate how translanguaging contributed to school belonging for emergent multilingual students in contrast to the hegemony of monolingual policy. The study included two emergent multilingual students from a US elementary school, and data were collected through classroom observations, interviews, and artifacts. The research shows that translanguaging plays a vital role in promoting school belonging for emergent multilingual students by allowing them to express their identities, participate fully in the classroom, and develop relationships with peers and teachers. This study underscores the need to recognize and value the diverse language and cultural backgrounds of emergent bi/multilinguals to promote inclusive and counter-hegemonic teacher implemented curriculum.

To provide more access to the curriculum content, translanguaging disrupts the traditional view of language separation and recognizes the coexistence of students' full linguistic repertoire. For example, López-Velásquez and García's (2017) study aimed to investigate the bilingual reading practices and performance of two Hispanic first-grade students. The study utilized a qualitative case study approach, with data collected through classroom observations, interviews with the students, and analysis of their reading samples. The study found that the students' reading performance was influenced by their exposure to literacy materials in both languages. The study underscores the importance of the role of language exposure and use in their multilingual reading development. The findings of this study have implications for teachers and educators to provide diverse and meaningful literacy materials in both languages and support the transfer of skills and knowledge between languages.

In the process of teaching and learning, teachers not only scaffold and appropriate multilingual students' content and language learning but also offer students a space to express their ideas in monolingual-dominated contexts in a translanguaging space (Flores & García, 2017). Multilingual students can flexibly deploy their full linguistic repertoires to make meaning in social contexts and demonstrate their multilingual identities (García & Wei, 2014). For example, Johnson et al. (2019) explored how a Spanish teacher connected students' home languages and historical backgrounds with reading through translanguaging in literacy classes. Another research was done by Escamilla et al. (2019), who conducted a longitudinal quasi-experimental design to examine students' writing performance through translanguaging. Both studies demonstrate that translanguaging scaffolds multilingual students' literacy development through culturally responsive, linguistically relevant practices, and enhances the efficiency, equity, and diversity of instructional design.

Concerning assessment, teachers incorporate translanguaging as a formative assessment to differentiate tasks based on students' language needs and authenticate students' learning through culturally relevant tasks (García et al., 2012; Kelly, 2009; Yilmaz, 2021). As such, Wei (2011) argues that the authenticity of assessment brought by translanguaging establish equity for language-minoritized students, in that it integrates diverse linguistic and cultural resources, appropriate assessment tools, and allows critical discussions that go beyond student's rote memorization of knowledge. In addition, translanguaging allows students to develop their metalinguistic awareness (i.e., the ability to think and reflect on the language and its use) (García & Kleifgen, 2010), thereby facilitating a more comprehensive understanding of students' linguistic repertoire as opposed to traditional monolingual tests (García et al., 2012). For example, Bauer et al. (2020) focus on the assessment of literacy in a bilingual kindergarten classroom. Students deployed multimodality and home languages to support their meaning-making in narrating stories and retelling a wordless book. Students also demonstrated linguistic knowledge transferred from their home language to the target language in the formative assessment.

Overall, translanguaging can play a vital role in promoting inclusive and counter-hegemonic education in the ECE curriculum. By recognizing and valuing the diverse language and cultural backgrounds of

emergent multilinguals, teachers can promote school belonging and facilitate access to the curriculum content. Through culturally responsive, linguistically relevant practices, teachers can scaffold multilingual students' literacy development and enhance the efficiency, equity, and diversity of their teaching practice. Finally, by incorporating translanguaging as a formative assessment, teachers can differentiate tasks based on students' language needs and authenticate students' assessment through culturally relevant tasks, allowing language-minoritized students to display higher-order thinking skills and develop their metalinguistic awareness.

Translanguaging in Ontario ECE Curriculum

Translanguaging is specified in Ontario's ECE curriculum from the Ministry of Education (MoE). The kindergarten program (MoE, 2016) indicates that "it is essential that the children's home language is valued and encouraged" (p. 118). It also advocates that teachers perform translanguaging by translating their talk and engaging students to write in their home language (MoE, 2016). Similar to French as a second language curriculum (MoE, 2013), strategies of translanguaging are specified, such as using students' home language to "talk, read, and write at home" (p. 11). In the English as a second language curriculum document (MoE, 2007), however, the only description pertaining to translanguaging is "strategic use of students' first languages" (p. 23) without specific guidance and activity recommendation. In contrast, the mathematics, science, and social studies curriculums (MoE, 2018, 2020, 2022) acknowledge language learners' home language as their linguistic resources and legitimate access to their home languages in classrooms.

Notwithstanding the recognition of students' home languages in the curriculum, there is a scarcity of research on translanguaging regarding multilingual ECE contexts in Ontario (Galante, 2020). One example I found was the research by Stille et al. (2016), who collaborated with Ontario teachers across curricula to explore why and how translanguaging is implemented. The findings showed that teachers shifted their perspective of integrating home language in their classrooms and co-created activities to accommodate multilingual students' needs. Stille et al. (2016) identify a gap in the macro policy level in Ontario to maintain the sustainability of translanguaging and a need to develop students' self-esteem in using their home languages. Another example was that Brubacher (2022) recognizes a conflict in Canada's policies as claiming to be multicultural in a bilingual country. These conflicts result in learners feeling humiliated by using their home language, as discussed by Stille et al. (2016). To alleviate this problem, Brubacher (2022) viewed students as co-researchers and regained their confidence in writing through translanguaging and eliminated doubts about using home languages as a lazy behavior.

Discussion

This paper incorporates socio-constructive theory and critical theory to examine how translanguaging in the implemented curriculum can engage multilingual students in socially and culturally responsive practices and empower multilingual students to embrace their identities, interests, and rights in Ontario ECE classrooms.

Translanguaging, in line with socio-constructive theory, can scaffold students' learning by engaging their entire linguistic repertoires (Kay & Kibble, 2016). That said, both teachers and students play a crucial role in the fluidity of utilizing any language purposefully and strategically (Priestley et al., 2012). Teachers can create culturally responsive environments by incorporating students' home languages and cultures (Ladson-Billings, 2014), while students can develop literacy skills and thinking abilities through the mediation of linguistic and human resources in the classroom (Kay & Kibble, 2016). For instance, students from diverse language backgrounds can act as experts to support each other's bilingual development. Moreover, the integration of translanguaging in the ECE curriculum can support multilingual students' comprehension and promote their development of their ZPD (Kay & Kibble, 2016). As such, by legitimizing access to students' complete linguistic resources, translanguaging can bridge the gap between students' current level and desired level of understanding. However, monolingual teachers' negative beliefs about translanguaging in practice due to their limited understanding of alternative languages remain a challenge (Prilutskaya, 2021).

Translanguaging is also a transformative approach in line with critical theory. The mono-lingual policies in schools reflect the white supremacy of language usage and espouse standard English while diminishing

the vernaculars of different races and linguistic resources of multilingual learners (Yosso, 2002). As such, the predominant language policies and content fail to acknowledge multilingual students' capability based on their cultural and linguistic resources. As opposed to monolingual policies and racialized curriculum (Morris & Adamson, 2010; Yosso, 2002), translanguaging frees multilingual children by offering them "tools to engage with the relationship between language and power so as to transform their future possibilities" (García & Wei, 2014, p. 74). Translanguaging as a political tool empowers multilingual students to fight against social injustice, makes the fixity of language identities embedded in national ideologies visible, and transforms learners with the ability to reveal the complexities of communicative and historical discourses (García & Wei, 2014).

Translanguaging in Ontario ECE curriculum recognizes the unequal power in the hidden curriculum between multilingual students and students from the dominant language communities (Anyon, 1980; Morris & Adamson, 2010). While research on translanguaging has mainly focused on the voices of students and teachers against hegemonic monolingual policies at the institutional level (e.g., Frieson & Scalise, 2021; Martínez et al., 2015; Rowe, 2022), studies pertaining to Ontario ECE curriculum have not considered the perspectives of parents regarding the implementation of translanguaging.

In summary, translanguaging, in conjunction with socio-constructive and critical theory, can be a powerful approach in Ontario ECE curriculum. Research in translanguaging has demonstrated that translanguaging centers on bi/multilingual identities and encourages the use of students' full linguistic repertoires by drawing on their funds of knowledge. By empowering multilingual students to engage with their identities and social practices in ECE classrooms, translanguaging supports an equitable and inclusive learning environment. Teachers who incorporate translanguaging in their practice are able to scaffold students' learning by connecting with their linguistic repertoires, while also promoting cultural responsiveness and acknowledging the unequal power dynamic between multilingual and dominant language communities.

Conclusion and Implications

This paper explores translanguaging in teachers' implemented curriculum in Ontario, drawing on socio-constructive and critical theory. The paper argues that translanguaging should be a social and critical component in Ontario ECE classrooms to facilitate students with meaning-making and emancipation of individual voices. The ECE curriculum policy in Ontario acts as a guide for teachers to advocate translanguaging in their classrooms. However, the ECE curriculum does not adequately address the concerns and negative beliefs of monolingual teachers regarding the use of translanguaging in teaching, often due to a lack of understanding of alternative languages (Prilutskaya, 2021).

Resonating with Stille et al. (2016) and Brubacher (2022), this paper urges the incorporation of translanguaging in teachers' professional development to promote an asset-based belief toward translanguaging from the instructional level and the teacher education level. Pedagogically, teachers can differentiate the languages and forms of assessment to promote multilingual students' learning (Kelly, 2009; Tomlinson et al., 2003). Teachers can create culturally responsive spaces by drawing on students' home cultures and languages, while students can act as experts to support each other's bilingual development in the classroom. Concerning teacher education, teachers should be introduced to the concept of translanguaging and given opportunities to explore its theoretical foundations and practical implications through coursework, workshops, and experiential learning (García & Wei, 2014). Moreover, teacher education programs should critically examine the underlying ideology of monolingualism and its impact on multilingual students (MacSwan, 2017). Lastly, teacher education programs can collaborate with multilingual communities to develop a deeper understanding of the cultural and linguistic practices of their students (Reyes et al., 2016).

Given the limited research contextualized in Ontario, future research should be conducted to explore teachers' beliefs and implemented curriculum about translanguaging in Ontario ECE classrooms. Researchers may also investigate how multilingual students in Ontario use translanguaging in their daily practices at home and in the classroom through qualitative methods, such as interviews, observation, and collecting artifacts, thereby demonstrating and acknowledging the nature of students' linguistic practices.

These endeavors can inform curriculum development, policymaking, and teaching practice regarding translanguaging.

REFERENCES

- Aguasvivas, J. A., & Carreiras, M. (2022). Bilingualism, foreign language learning, and cognition: Insights for education. In M. V. Alves, R. Ekuni, M. J. Hermida, & J. Valle-Lisboa (Eds.), *Cognitive sciences and education in non-WEIRD populations* (pp. 153–168). Springer.
https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-06908-6_10
- Antonio, R. J. (1981). Immanent critique as the core of critical theory: Its origins and developments in Hegel, Marx and contemporary thought. *The British Journal of Sociology*, 32(3), 330–345.
<https://doi.org/10.2307/589281>
- Anyon, J. (1980). Social class and the hidden curriculum of work. *The Journal of Education*, 162(1), 67–92. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/42741976>
- Apple, M. (2004). Ideology and cultural and economic reproduction. In M. Apple (Ed.), *Ideology and curriculum* (3rd ed., pp. 25–40). New Books.
- Bauer, E. B., Colomer, S. E., & Wiemelt, J. (2020). Bilingualism of African American and Latinx kindergarten students in a dual-language program: Understanding students' translanguaging practices across informal assessments. *Urban Education*, 55(3), 331–361. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0042085918789743>
- Bauer, E. B., Presiado, V., & Colomer, S. (2017). Writing through partnership: Fostering translanguaging in children who are emergent bilinguals. *Journal of Literacy Research*, 49(1), 10–37.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/1086296X16683417>
- Bernstein, K. A., Kilinc, S., Troxel Deeg, M., Marley, S. C., Farrand, K. M., & Kelley, M. F. (2021). Language ideologies of Arizona preschool teachers implementing dual language teaching for the first time: Pro-multilingual beliefs, practical concerns. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 24(4), 457–480. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050.2018.1476456>
- Brubacher, K. (2022). Print literacy humiliation: Translanguaging and emotions with newcomer children. *Language and Literacy*, 24(2), 133–152. <https://doi.org/10.20360/langandlit29529>
- Cenoz, J., & Gorter, D. (2017). Minority languages and sustainable translanguaging: Threat or opportunity? *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 38(10), 901–912.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/01434632.2017.1284855>
- Chavez, B. (2019). *Immigration and language in Canada, 2011 and 2016*. Statistics Canada.
<https://www150.statcan.gc.ca/n1/en/pub/89-657-x/89-657-x2019001-eng.pdf?st=XRy55XBC>
- Craig, C. J., & Ross, V. (2008). Cultivating the image of teachers as curriculum makers. In F. M. Connelly, M. F. He, & J. Phillion (Eds.), *The Sage handbook of curriculum and instruction* (pp. 282–305). SAGE. <https://doi.org/10.4135/9781412976572.n14>
- Cummins, J. (2005). A proposal for action: Strategies for recognizing heritage language competence as a learning resource within the mainstream classroom. *The Modern Language Journal*, 89(4), 585–592. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3588628>
- DeNicolò, C. P. (2019). The role of translanguaging in establishing school belonging for emergent multilinguals. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, 23(9), 967–984. <https://doi-org.proxy1.lib.uwo.ca/10.1080/13603116.2019.1602364>
- Deng, Z. (2010). Curriculum planning and systems change. *International Encyclopedia of Education*, 1, 384–389. <https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-08-044894-7.00062-2>
- Duarte, J. (2018). Translanguaging in the context of mainstream multilingual education. *International Journal of Multilingualism*, 17(2), 232–247. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14790718.2018.1512607>
- Eisner, E. W. (Ed.). (2002). Curriculum ideologies (Chapter 3). *The educational imagination: On the design and evaluation of school programs* (3rd ed., pp. 47–86). Merrill Prentice Hall.
- Escamilla, K., Fine, C., & Hopewell, S. (2019). Enhancing writing outcomes in Spanish/English biliteracy programs. *Bilingual Review/Revista Bilingüe*, 34(1), 77–96.
<https://www.bilingualreviewjournal.org/index.php/br/article/view/303>

- Ertmer, P. A., & Newby, T. J. (1993). Behaviorism, cognitivism, constructivism: Comparing critical features from an instructional design perspective. *Performance Improvement Quarterly*, 6(4), 50–72. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1937-8327.1993.tb00605.x>
- Flores, N., & García, O. (2017). A critical review of bilingual education in the United States: From basements and pride to boutiques and profit. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 37, 14–29. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190517000162>
- Freire, P. (1970). *Pedagogy of the oppressed* (M. Bergman Ramos, trans.). Herder and Herder.
- Frieson, B. L., & Scalise, M. (2021). Linguistic artistry and flexibility in dual-language bilingual classrooms: Young Black children's language and literacy practices. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 44(2), 213–230. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15235882.2021.1942323>
- Galante, A. (2020). Pedagogical translanguaging in a multilingual English program in Canada: Student and teacher perspectives of challenges. *System*, 92, 102–274. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2020.102274>
- García, O. (2009). Education, multilingualism and translanguaging in the 21st century. In T. Skutnabb-Kangas, R. Phillipson, A. K. Mohanty, & M. Panda (Eds.), *Social justice through multilingual education* (pp. 140–158). Multilingual Matters. <https://doi-org.proxy1.lib.uwo.ca/10.21832/9781847691910-011>
- García, O., Flores, N., & Woodley, H. (2012). Transgressing monolingualism and bilingual dualities: Translanguaging pedagogies. In A. Yiakoumetti (Ed.), *Harnessing linguistic variation to improve education* (pp. 45–75). Peter Lang. <https://doi-org.proxy1.lib.uwo.ca/10.1080/14790718.2019.1640705>
- García, O., & Kleifgen, J. A. (2010). *Educating emergent bilinguals: Policies, programs, and practices for English language learners*. Teachers College Press.
- García, O., & Wei, L. (2014). Language, bilingualism and education. In *Translanguaging: Language, bilingualism and education* (pp. 46–62). Palgrave Pivot. https://doi-org.proxy1.lib.uwo.ca/10.1057/9781137385765_4
- Giroux, H. A. (1988). *Teachers as intellectuals: Toward a critical pedagogy of learning*. Greenwood Publishing Group.
- Hill, J. H. (1985). The grammar of consciousness and the consciousness of grammar. *American Ethnologist*, 12(4), 725–737. <https://doi.org/10.1525/ae.1985.12.4.02a00030>
- Johnson, S. I., García, O., & Seltzer, K. (2019). Bilingualism and translanguaging in dual-language bilingual education. In D. DeMatthews, & E. Izquierdo (Eds.), *Dual language education: Teaching and leading in two languages* (pp. 119–132). Springer. https://doi-org.proxy1.lib.uwo.ca/10.1007/978-3-030-10831-1_8
- Kay, D., & Kibble, J. (2016). Learning theories 101: Application to everyday teaching and scholarship. *Advances in Physiology Education*, 40, 17–25. <https://doi.org/10.1152/advan.00132.2015>
- Kelly, A. V. (Ed.). (2009). Assessment, evaluation, appraisal and accountability (Chapter 6). *The curriculum: Theory and practice* (6th ed., pp. 147–186). Sage.
- Kirsch, C., & Mortini, S. (2021). Engaging in and creatively reproducing translanguaging practices with peers: A longitudinal study with three-year-olds in Luxembourg. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 1–17. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050.2021.1999387>
- Krijnen, E., van Steensel, R., Meeuwisse, M., Jongerling, J., & Severiens, S. (2020). Exploring a refined model of home literacy activities and associations with children's emergent literacy skills. *Reading and Writing*, 33(1), 207–238. <https://doi-org.proxy1.lib.uwo.ca/10.1007/s11145-019-09957-4>
- Krumm, H.-J. (2016). Multilingualism as capital: An insight and its consequences for an educationally just education system. In I. Dirim, & A. Wegner (Eds.), *Bildungsgerechtigkeit: Erkundungen einer didaktischen Perspektive* (pp. 59–68). Verlag Barbara Budrich.
- Ladson-Billings, G. (2014). Culturally relevant pedagogy 2.0: Aka the remix. *Harvard Educational Review*, 84(1), 74–84. <https://doi.org/10.17763/haer.84.1.p2rj131485484751>

- Langeloo, A., Mascareño Lara, M., Deunk, M. I., Klitzing, N. F., & Strijbos, J. W. (2019). A systematic review of teacher–child interactions with multilingual young children. *Review of Educational Research, 89*(4), 536–568. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0034654319855619>
- Lasagabaster, D. (2018). Language awareness in minority language contexts. In P. Garrett & J. M. Cots (Eds.), *The Routledge handbook of language awareness* (pp. 402–417). Routledge.
- Lave, J., & Wenger, E. (1991). *Situated learning: Legitimate peripheral participation*. Cambridge University Press.
- Lemke, J. L. (2001). Articulating communities: Sociocultural perspectives on science education. *Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 38*(3), 296–316. [https://doi-org.proxy1.lib.uwo.ca/10.1002/1098-2736\(200103\)38:3<296::AID-TEA1007>3.0.CO;2-R](https://doi-org.proxy1.lib.uwo.ca/10.1002/1098-2736(200103)38:3<296::AID-TEA1007>3.0.CO;2-R)
- López-Velásquez, A. M., & García, G. E. (2017). The bilingual reading practices and performance of two Hispanic first graders. *Bilingual Research Journal, 40*(3), 246–261. <https://doi-org.proxy1.lib.uwo.ca/10.1080/15235882.2017.1351008>
- Lory, M. P. (2020). Shifting from a monolingual to a plurilingual pedagogical practice. In T. G. K. Bryce, N. L. Leavitt, & B. Lee (Eds.), *Enhancing intercultural communication in organizations* (pp. 93–101). Routledge
- MacSwan, J. (2017). A multilingual perspective on translanguaging. *American Educational Research Journal, 54*(1), 167–201. <https://doi-org.proxy1.lib.uwo.ca/10.3102/0002831216683935>
- Martin-Beltrán, M. (2014). “What do you want to say?” How adolescents use translanguaging to expand learning opportunities. *International Multilingual Research Journal, 8*(3), 208–230. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19313152.2014.914372>
- Martínez, R. A., Hikida, M., & Durán, L. (2015). Unpacking ideologies of linguistic purism: How dual language teachers make sense of everyday translanguaging. *International Multilingual Research Journal, 9*(1), 26–42. <https://doi-org.proxy1.lib.uwo.ca/10.1080/19313152.2014.977712>
- Ministry of Education. (2007). *English language learners ESL and ELD programs and services*. <https://www-edu-gov-on-ca.proxy1.lib.uwo.ca/eng/document/esleldprograms/esleldprograms.pdf>
- Ministry of Education. (2013). *The Ontario curriculum: French as a second language*. <https://www.edu.gov.on.ca/eng/curriculum/elementary/fsl18-2013curr.pdf#page=55>
- Ministry of Education. (2016). *The kindergarten program*. https://files.ontario.ca/books/edu_the_kindergarten_program_english_aoda_web_oct7.pdf
- Ministry of Education. (2018). *The Ontario curriculum grades 1-8: Social studies, history and geography*. <https://www.edu.gov.on.ca/eng/curriculum/elementary/social-studies-history-geography-2018.pdf#page=67>
- Ministry of Education. (2020). *The Ontario curriculum grades 1-8: Mathematics*. <https://assets-us-01.kc-usercontent.com/fbd574c4-da36-0066-a0c5-849ffb2de96e/3ed76499-9df4-4524-8cc2-3c0010a51811/The%20Ontario%20Curriculum%20Grades%201%E2%80%938%20-%20Mathematics%2C%202020%20%28January%202021%29.pdf>
- Ministry of Education. (2022). *The Ontario curriculum grades 1-8: Science and technology*. <https://assets-us-01.kc-usercontent.com/fbd574c4-da36-0066-a0c5-849ffb2de96e/a6136d61-3120-43f0-94a3-5859e0319382/The%20Ontario%20Curriculum%20Grades%201%E2%80%938%20-%20Science%20and%20Technology%202022.pdf>
- Morris, P., & Adamson, B. (Eds.). (2010). Studying the curriculum (Chapter 1). In *Curriculum, schooling and society in Hong Kong* (pp. 1–16). Hong Kong University Press.
- Nesteruk, O. (2010). Heritage language maintenance and loss among the children of Eastern European immigrants in the USA. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development, 31*(3), 271–286. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01434630903582722>
- Otheguy, R., García, O., & Reid, W. (2015). Clarifying translanguaging and deconstructing named languages: A perspective from linguistics. *Applied Linguistics Review, 6*(3), 281–307. <https://doi-org.proxy1.lib.uwo.ca/10.1515/applirev-2015-0014>

- Peyer, E., Barras, M., & Lüthi, G. (2022). Including home languages in the classroom: A videographic study on challenges and possibilities of multilingual pedagogy. *International Journal of Multilingualism*, 19(1), 162–177. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14790718.2020.1736080>
- Priestley, M., Edwards, R., Priestley, A., & Miller, K. (2012). Teacher agency in curriculum making: Agents of change and spaces for manoeuvre. *Curriculum Inquiry*, 42(2), 191–214. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-873X.2012.00588.x>
- Prilutskaya, M. (2021). Examining pedagogical translanguaging: A systematic review of the literature. *Languages*, 6(4), 180. <https://doi.org/10.3390/languages6040180>
- Reyes, I., Da Silva Iddings, A. C., & Feller, N. (2016). Building relationships with diverse students and families: A funds of knowledge perspective. *Journal of Early Childhood Literacy*, 16(1), 8–33. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1468798415584692>
- Rowe, L. W. (2022). Disrupting monolingual ideologies: Constructing biliterate composing practices in a second-grade classroom. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 57(4), 1149–1166. <https://doi-org.proxy1.lib.uwo.ca/10.1002/rrq.465>
- Schwab, J. J. (1973). The practical 3: Translation into curriculum. *The School Review*, 81, 501–522. <https://doi.org/10.1086/443100>
- Semiante, S. (2016). Translanguaging and the multilingual turn: Epistemological reconceptualization in the fields of language and implications for reframing language in curriculum studies. *Curriculum Inquiry*, 46(1), 45–61. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03626784.2015.1133221>
- Shewchuk, S., & Cooper, A. (2018). Exploring equity in Ontario: A provincial scan of equity policies across school boards. *Canadian Journal of Education*, 41(4), 917–953. <https://journals.sfu.ca/cje/index.php/cje-rce/article/view/3248/2659>
- Smith, P., Smit, J., Nigam, A., Finch, B., & Burke, D. (2022). (Critical) multilingual and multicultural awareness in the pedagogical responsiveness of literacy educators. *Berkeley Review of Education*, 11(1), 5–40. <https://doi.org/10.5070/B811145763>
- Statistics Canada. (2022). *While English and French are still the main languages spoken in Canada, the country's linguistic diversity continues to grow*. <https://www150.statcan.gc.ca/n1/daily-quotidien/220817/dq220817a-eng.htm>
- Statistics Canada. (2021). *Census program data viewer*. <https://www12.statcan.gc.ca/census-recensement/2021/dp-pd/dv-vd/cpdv-vdpr/index-eng.cfm?locale=en-CA&statisticsProgramId=3902&activeIndicatorId=21100031&visualizationGeographyLevelId=2&focusGeographyId=2021A000011124>
- Stille, S. V. V., 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. *Canadian Modern Language Review*, 72(4), 480–503. <https://doi.org/10.3138/cmlr.3432>
- Tomlinson, C. A., Brighton, C., Hertberg, H., Callahan, C. M., Moon, T. R., Brimijoin, K., Conover, L. A., & Reynolds, T. (2003). Differentiating instruction in response to student readiness, interest, and learning profile in academically diverse classrooms: A review of literature. *Journal for the Education of the Gifted*, 27(2–3), 119–145. <https://doi.org/10.1177/016235320302700203>
- Tyler, R. W. (2013). Basic principles of curriculum and instruction. In D. J. Flinders, & S. J. Thornton (Eds.), *The curriculum studies reader* (4th ed., pp. 59–68). Routledge.
- Vygotsky, L. (1986). *Thought and language (revised edition)*. The MIT Press.
- Wei, L. (2011). Moment analysis and translanguaging space: Discursive construction of identities by multilingual Chinese youth in Britain. *Multilingual Structures and Agencies*, 43(5), 1222–1235. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2010.07.035>
- Wei, L. (2020). Dimensions of bilingualism. In F. Grosjean & L. Li (Eds.), *The bilingualism reader* (pp. 3–22). Routledge.
- Williams, C. (1996). Secondary education: Teaching in the bilingual situation. In C. Williams, G. Lewis, & C. Baker (Eds.), *The language policy: Taking stock* (pp. 39–78). CAI.

- Williams, C. (2002). *Ennill iaith: Astudiaeth o sefyllfa drochi yn 11–16 oed [A language gained: A study of language immersion at 11-16 years of age]*. School of Education.
http://www.bangor.ac.uk/addysg/publications/Ennill_Iaith.pdf
- Yilmaz, T. (2021). Translanguaging as a pedagogy for equity of language minoritized students. *International Journal of Multilingualism*, 18(3), 435–454.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/14790718.2019.1640705>
- Yosso, T. J. (2002). Toward a critical race curriculum. *Equity & Excellence in Education*, 35(2), 93–107.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/713845283>

ABOUT THE AUTHOR

Chuan Liu is a Ph.D. student at the University of Western Ontario, where he is conducting research in the areas of language and literacy, technology integration, and curriculum studies. With a background as a language teacher, curriculum manager, and school director, Chuan brings valuable practical experience to his academic pursuits. He is passionate about exploring the intersection of language, technology, and curriculum to enhance educational practices and promote social justice in educational settings.