PEDAGOGICAL TRANSLATION AS A CULTURALLY SUSTAINING PEDAGOGY IN BILINGUAL LANGUAGE ENVIRONMENTS

By Sarah Albrecht, Colleen Hill, and Kelly Jay Smith

Sarah Albrecht is an Assistant Professor of Bilingual Education at the University of Houston–Downtown. Her research interests include biliteracy, pedagogical translation in bilingual environments, and bilingual teacher preparation. She earned her Master of Arts in Spanish from New Mexico State University and her Master of Education and PhD in Language, Reading and Culture from the University of Arizona. She can be reached at albrechts@uhd.edu.

Colleen Hill is an Assistant Professor at New Mexico State University–Alamogordo. Her research interests include the intersectionality of race and whiteness studies in elementary teacher preparation. She earned a Master of Arts in Education from New Mexico State University and a PhD in Language, Reading, and Culture from the University of Arizona. She can be reached at chill1@nmsu.edu.

Kelly Jay Smith is a doctoral candidate at the University of Arizona in the Department of Teaching, Learning, and Sociocultural Studies. His research interests include the integration of environmental education and culturally sustaining pedagogy across curricula. He earned his Master of Arts in Teaching and Learning, with an emphasis in elementary reading, from Nova Southeastern University. He can be reached at kjsmith22@arizona.edu.

Abstract

Continually shifting language policies have made it difficult to implement literacy practices that benefit multilingual and multicultural learners in the classroom (García, A., 2020; Schmid, 2021; Sikes & Villanueva, 2021). In order to address this, teacher preparation programs and in-service teachers need to consider practices they can implement in order to sustain students' languages and cultures to mitigate the loss of culture. As K-12 classrooms become more culturally and linguistically diverse, the need for culturally sustaining pedagogies (CSP) in K-12 classrooms is vital. Through a systematic literature review on pedagogical translation in multilingual educational environments, the authors advocate for translation as a CSP, highlighting translation as "a dialogue between languages and cultures" (Thiong'o, 2023, p. 61). They call on teacher preparation programs and in-service teachers to identify spaces where they can learn best practices to ensure student success. Implications for research include further exploration of translation as a CSP, specifically focusing on teacher versus student needs. Implications for practice are focused primarily on teacher training and the need to move towards praxis (connecting research and practice) in English Language Arts and Reading (ELAR) classrooms.

Keywords: pedagogical translation, culturally sustaining pedagogy, translanguaging, emergent bilinguals, biliteracy

In the past 10 years, language policies have continued to shift (García, A., 2020; Schmid, 2021; Sikes & Villanueva, 2021), making it difficult to implement classroom literacy practices that benefit multilingual and multicultural learners. In the United States, 22% of children speak a heritage language (Carreira, 2016), and in Texas, more than 20% of students are emergent bilingual (EB) (National Center for Education Statistics [NCES], 2023b). To add to this complexity, some states have attempted to enact English-only policies, though there has been a recent general trend towards bilingual education (Schmid, 2021). It is therefore essential to consider practices teacher preparation programs and in-service teachers can engage in to sustain students' languages and cultures, mitigating the potential loss of both (Welch, 2015).

As K-12 classrooms become more culturally and linguistically diverse, the need for culturally sustaining pedagogies (CSP) in K-12 classrooms is vital. In this paper, the authors argue for implementation of translation as a culturally sustaining biliteracy practice. Pedagogical translation is a strategically planned teaching method with objectives to aid student learning. Prior research has shown the benefits of using well-planned pedagogical translation, including mediation for metalinguistic awareness, cultural learning, and collaboration. However, teachers may resist using bilingual teaching strategies such as translation for multiple reasons (Cook,

2010), which may be nuanced. It should be noted that teacher demographics may contribute to such resistance. Nationally, during the 2020-2021 school year, 80% of teachers identified as White and female (NCES, 2023a). Within Texas in the past eight years, more than half of teachers in Texas identified as White, with three-fourths of the Texas teacher workforce identifying as female (Texas Education Agency [TEA], 2023).

Larger cities such as Houston and Dallas boast a more diverse teacher workforce. For example, in Houston alone, more than 34% of teachers identify as African American, while 31% of teachers identify as Hispanic and 26.5% of teachers identify as White (*The Texas Tribune*, 2023). While more diverse, it is important to acknowledge that teachers of color can adopt dominant societal discourses, which may influence their pedagogy. It is important to consider the current demographics of and languages spoken by the teacher workforce as these may play a role in whether translation is used as a culturally sustaining practice within K-12 classrooms.

Additional reasons why teachers may be hesitant to use translation within their classrooms include:

- state or institutional English-only language policies (Linares, 2022; Pacheco et al., 2015)

- ongoing approaches to multilingualism through a monolingual lens in which students' languages are viewed as two monolingual entities, thus precluding bilingual language practices such as translanguaging, or the fluid movement between languages as one repertoire (Cook, 2001; Cook, 2010; Lin, 2015).

Resistance may also stem from confusion between pedagogical translation and simultaneous translation, which tends to be discouraged in bilingual environments (Pacheco et al., 2015; Welch, 2015), and ongoing mistaken alignment of pedagogical translation with the discredited grammar translation method as discussed below (Lin, 2015). However, according to Linares (2022), "The mere inclusion of translation as a pedagogy transforms the classroom into a less monolingual instructional space in which contact between languages becomes the agenda rather than the diversion" (p. 65).

During the course of the 20th century, pedagogical translation as a language-learning tool was largely eschewed due to the fall from favor of the grammar translation method at the end of the 19th century (Cook, 2010). The grammar translation method involved the use of translation to teach discrete grammar points; generally involved literal translation of texts; and was often used to teach Greek or Latin, or, in other words, languages that students would read but not speak. Grammar translation was replaced by various iterations of the direct method (Cook, 2010) with a common underlying characteristic of refusal to allow students' home language use in language teaching. With the combination of the association of classroom translation with grammar translation and the dominance of the direct method, pedagogical translation was not considered to be viable practice during the 20th century.

More recently, though, different translation approaches have emerged, including traditional pedagogical translation, plurilingual translation, and translation from a translanguaging stance (García et al., 2020). Traditional and plurilingual approaches view translation as intercultural or designed to foster intercultural communication "'appropriate' for the other group" (p. 86). See Table 1 for a summary of translation approaches.

Approach	Focus
Traditional pedagogical translation	Utility of translation in language learning
Plurilingual pedagogical translation	Multicultural and multilingual competence
Translanguaging approach to pedagogical translation	Draws on students' full linguistic and cultural resources for language learning; decolonial stance
Note. All approaches and interpretations draw on García et al., 2020	

Table 1. *Pedagogical Approaches to Translation*

A translanguaging approach, however, permits students to draw fluidly on their linguistic resources, including through activities, such as pedagogical translation, which require use of both first and second languages (García & Leiva, 2014). Additionally, through a translanguaging approach, translation is intracultural, drawing on and sustaining students' home cultures while emphasizing a decolonial stance (David et al., 2019; García et al., 2020; Thiong'o, 2023). Translanguaging is also an established approach for the development of student literacy (Jiménez et al., 2015; Keyes et al., 2014; Puzio et al., 2013). Examples of translation activities through a translanguaging approach might include writing bilingual stories to share with classmates and family (Rowe, 2019) or collaboratively translating class *daily news* (Manyak, 2004, 2008), a school newsletter (Cano & Ruiz, 2020), or a short, dense, culturally rich text like a proverb or poem (Escamilla et al., 2014).

Research over the past two decades has shown the benefits of pedagogical translation as a teaching method in language-learning environments, including bilingual, monolingual with EBs, and English as a Second Language (ESL) (Escamilla et al., 2009; Jiménez et al., 2015; Welch, 2015). These benefits include literacy, linguistic, cultural, and heritage language learning (Colina & Lafford, 2017; Escamilla et al., 2009; González-Davies, 2017; Mellinger & Gasca-Jiménez, 2019; Phipps & González, 2004; Velásquez, 2020). Despite the establishment of these benefits in the literature, implementation of pedagogical translation in the classroom has been inconsistent (McLaughlin, 2022).

Pedagogical translation as a CSP should be implemented across the varying language-learning environments found in Texas schools. These include ESL and bilingual programs. The goal of ESL programs is English-language literacy, with instruction primarily in English. In contrast, for bilingual programs, the goal is biliteracy in English and one other language. Instruction begins in the students' home language and moves gradually to the second language (L2) (Sikes & Villanueva, 2021).

Over 10% of Texas students are in one of these programs, while only 2.3% of teachers hold a bilingual or ESL certification (Sikes & Villanueva, 2021). Of these students, 52% are in ESL programs, and 45% are in bilingual programs, with 18% in early exit programs. This generally means that home language support is withdrawn in third grade. Additionally, schools may be listed as providing ESL or bilingual programs, but if certified ESL or bilingual teachers are unavailable, waivers may be in place permitting regular instruction despite the school's classification (Sikes & Villanueva, 2021), thus contributing to nuanced pedagogical practices that limit the sustainment of language and culture. Because of these inequities, it is critical to embed the CSP of translation to sustain EB home languages and cultures regardless of the language environment in which students are placed.

The authors advocate for translation as a CSP, highlighting translation as "a dialogue between languages and cultures" (Thiong'o, 2023, p. 61) and call on teacher preparation programs and in-service teachers, who the authors identify as the main

readers of this work, to identify spaces where they can learn how to effectively incorporate translation as a culturally sustaining practice to ensure student success.

The target group of students in this paper is EBs, who are defined as students who are acquiring bilingualism; this term does not present them from a deficit lens compared to English-speaking students (García, 2009). Bilingual learning environments may be monolingual with EBs, bilingual or dual language, ESL, or foreign language in which bilingual or heritage speakers of the language are present.

To be clear, primarily monolingual environments in which EBs are present can also benefit from translation (Manyak, 2004). Additionally, while not needing translation to sustain language per se, monolingual students are learning about different cultures, thus decentering a dominant narrative (Sandoval et al., 2016), which often controls public school classrooms in the form of pedagogical and curricular choices, such as approaches to teaching language (Matias & Mackey, 2016; Picower, 2009). Implications for research include further exploration of pedagogical translation as a CSP, specifically focusing on teacher versus student needs. Implications for practice are focused primarily on teacher training and the need to move towards praxis (connecting research and practice) in English Language Arts and Reading (ELAR) classrooms. Ultimately, teachers need to feel empowered to use translation in their classrooms to support the growth of their students, as prior research has indicated that translation as a pedagogical strategy can create an environment where culture is sustained and shared (Pacheco et al., 2015).

Theoretical Framework

This paper presents a systematic review of the literature on the use of pedagogical translation from a translanguaging approach in K-12 learning environments. The framework for this review draws on CSP as a way to "perpetuate and foster—to sustain—linguistic, literate, and cultural pluralism as part of the democratic project of school and as a needed response to demographic and social change" (Paris & Alim 2014, p. 88). CSP builds on the asset pedagogies of the 1990s, including "funds of knowledge" (Moll & González, 1994), third space (Gutiérrez et al. 1999), and culturally relevant teaching (Ladson-Billings, 1995).

These frameworks were essential in moving away from the deficit-focused pedagogies that preceded them; however, classroom pedagogies need to go beyond supporting cultural competence to *sustaining* cultures. CSP builds on these asset frameworks by not viewing language, literacies, and cultures as a way to move towards accessing Dominant American English (DAE) and the dominant culture, but instead realizing that home languages and cultures are needed for a pluralistic society to flourish. The authors use the terms DAE and dominant culture within this work to highlight systemic practices within society, specifically connected to language use in classrooms that may impede the use of pedagogical translation. CSP rejects a monolingual/monocultural outcome as a goal for education.

CSP also builds on asset-based pedagogies by viewing culture as always evolving. Traditional culture is not seen as unmalleable—especially regarding youth culture. Paris and Alim (2014) stated that past pedagogies "too often draw over deterministic links between race and language, literacy and cultural practices" (p. 90). Paris (2012) coined the terms "heritage practices" and "community practices" to work with the changing nature of culture. Heritage practices represented intergenerational skills and knowledge much like those found in the funds of knowledge framework whereas community practices represented the ever-changing cultural practices found

in areas such as music. CSP acknowledges integration of cultures may occur and views this as another way culture is evolving. The integration is valued and not simply dismissed because it is not part of the heritage practices.

Finally, a focus on social justice is needed, coupled with a critical eye on the complexity involved with the practices and aims of CSP being both emancipatory and problematic at times. Part of this focus on social justice is raising questions about language and power. By viewing language learners as products of power hierarchies, CSP can help empower learners and teachers to face deficit ideologies head-on. Paris and Alim (2014) also stated CSP must "engage critically with young people about the impact of their words and the full range of their funds of knowledge and create third spaces that take on both the liberative and the restrictive" (p. 95). This means if translanguaging and pedagogical translation are viewed as literacy practices that are embedded within CSP, the following three aspects must be present:

- a move towards pluralistic outcomes

- a view of culture as ever evolving with a move away from the academic/home binary

- a focus on social justice, including reflective practices about the pedagogies being used

Therefore, in this review, the authors sought to answer the following research question: In what ways is translation being used as a culturally sustaining pedagogy in linguistically diverse K-12 classrooms?

Methodology

Part of a larger review including empirical studies on traditional, plurilingual, and translanguaging approaches, this review includes only studies incorporating a translanguaging stance to examine how the use of pedagogical translation can challenge dominant power structures visible through educational language practices and serve as a CSP. Articles for this review were selected based on Torgerson's (2003) systematic literature review protocol. Studies must have been empirical and published in peer-reviewed journals and conducted within K-12 classrooms with a specific focus on pedagogical translation with a translanguaging approach between the years 2000-2022. The year 2000 was chosen as the start date due to a shift in second language acquisition research around this time to include how first language use affects second language acquisition. Hence, more studies on pedagogical translation started to appear (González-Davies, 2017). Only translation activities utilizing written, oral, or hybrid texts (Colina & Lafford, 2017) were considered. Table 2 lists the search terms used for this review.

Anchor term	Additional term
Translation	Bilingual education
	Second language education
	Second language learning
	Second language teaching
	Heritage language learning
	Biliteracy
	Literacy
	Multiliteracies

Note. Translation was combined with each of the terms in the right column.

Note. The search term pedagogical translation was discarded as search results overlapped results with the term translation.

Table 2. *Search Terms*

A total of 24 searches in English was done in the databases EBSCO host and JSTOR, with subsequent mining for articles in two journals, *Language Arts* (based on high frequency of articles meeting the criteria) and *Translation and Translanguaging in Multilingual Contexts,* and in one handbook, *The Routledge Handbook of Translation in Education* (Laviosa & González-Davies, 2019), due to thematic relevance. These sources were selected based on the number of pedagogical translation articles selected, which were already published in the journals, and the high amount of relevant content in the handbook. A preliminary screening of titles and abstracts yielded 91 articles. Post-secondary articles were removed, leaving 40 K-12 articles. These full papers were then screened for the previously mentioned criteria, with remaining article reference lists mined for a total of 10 K-12 studies with a translanguaging approach. See the Appendix for the list of selected articles.

Data Analysis

Given the objective of analyzing existing literature on translation, within a translanguaging perspective, for elements of CSP, the authors coded the articles using deductive thematic analysis (Pearse, 2019). Initially, the authors developed a list of start codes and each author coded Axelrod and Cole (2018) to validate the codes (Pearse, 2019). For the first round of coding, two authors coded each of the remaining articles with parent codes being supported by evidence from the articles (Saldaña, 2021).

After the first round, the authors iteratively reviewed each other's coding to norm coding references and adjust the code book as needed. The second and third rounds of coding were then completed to identify and collapse themes (Pearse, 2019). Finally, a frequency distribution was constructed to triangulate established categories (Creswell, 2007; Maxwell, 2013) and confirm the appearance of meaningful themes across the data (Privitera, 2019), with the top three categories being selected. Other categories important to the field emerged, such as writing proficiency and audience awareness. However, these were not addressed in this work due to the lower frequency distribution. See Table 3 for frequency distribution results.

Main category	Sub-categories	Frequency count
Mediation for reading comprehension	Literal vs. figurative language	n = 52
	Vocabulary	
	Metalinguistic awareness	
	Linguistic problem solving	
Validation of cultural identities	Culturally rich environment	n = 31
	Home practices	
Collaboration	Bidirectional flow of expertise	n = 19
	Intracultural and intercultural learning	
	Socially just practices	

Table 3. *Frequency Distribution Results*

Results

Pedagogical Translation Mediates for Reading Comprehension in Bilingual Learning Environments

Through the mediation of translation as a bilingual reading strategy, students had "conceptually rich and linguistically sophisticated discussions," which contributed to reading comprehension (Puzio

et al., 2013, p. 345). For example, in these studies, instead of using monolingual strategies, such as character or thematic description, students evaluated their translations. Through discussion of handling of figurative language or how their language choices demonstrated inferences that supported narrative elements such as theme and character, they arrived at similar outcomes (Cano & Ruiz, 2020; David et al., 2019; Jiménez et al., 2015; Keyes et al., 2014; Pacheco et al., 2015; Puzio et al., 2013). See Table 4 for a synthesis of reading comprehension outcomes across articles.

Code	Evidence	Article
Translation as bilingual strategy	Nuanced audience awareness in writing	Axelrod & Cole (2018)
		Welch (2015)
	Awareness of figurative language, theme, and character in reading; Example: translation of La Muerte (personified) vs. la muerte (noun) (Pacheco et al., 2015)	Cano & Ruiz (2020)
		Jiménez et al. (2015)
		Keyes et al. (2014)
		Pacheco et al. (2015)
		Puzio et al. (2013)
	"Conceptually rich and linguistically sophisticated discussions" (Puzio et al., 2013, p. 345)	Puzio et al. (2013)
	Inference to support narrative elements	Cano & Ruiz (2020)
		David et al. (2019)
		Jiménez et al. (2015)
		Keyes et al. (2014)
		Pacheco et al. (2015)
		Puzio et al. (2013)
Vocabulary learning	Problem-solving for hard words or phrases	David et al. (2019)
	Understanding texts through vocabulary learned through translation	Jiménez et al. (2015)
	Nuanced understanding of vocabulary such as *snapped, western, wacky*	Manyak (2004)
		Puzio et al. (2013)
	Medical vocabulary learning for language brokering; English and Spanish science terms with cross-linguistic connections	Welch (2015)
Metalinguistic awareness	Generation of rules and hypotheses about language	Axelrod & Cole (2018)
		Jiménez et al. (2015)
	Cross-linguistic connections, including in written conventions	Axelrod & Cole (2018)
		Jiménez et al. (2015)
		Manyak (2008)
		Pacheco et al. (2015)
		Welch (2015)
	Linguistic learning, including phonemic, syntactic, and semantic awareness	Jiménez et al. (2015)
		Manyak (2008)
	Need for teacher recognition of student metalinguistic statements	David et al. (2019)

Table 4. *Theme 1: Mediation of Translation for Reading Comprehension*

Pedagogical Translation Validates Cultural Identity

The literature in this review shows that use of pedagogical translation from a translanguaging perspective can also validate student identity by creating culturally rich environments (Manyak, 2008) and by drawing on student home practices and socio-cultural resources (Puzio et al., 2013). See Table 5 for a summary of the data on validation of cultural identity.

Code	Evidence	Article
Creation of culturally rich environments	Multilingual language development	Axelrod & Cole (2018)
	Encouragement of bilingual "identities of competence"	Cano & Ruiz (2020, p. 167)
	Selection of culturally relevant texts facilitates student meaning-making	David et al. (2019)
	Leveraging student languages leads to culturally relevant curricula	Keyes et al. (2014)
	Students positioned as linguistic and cultural knowers	Pacheco et al. (2015)
	Analysis of translation differences validated cultural identity	Puzio et al. (2013)
	Bilingual identity understood and supported	Welch (2015)
Leveraging home practices	"The nature of this program allowed the children's voices, situated within their contexts and communities of language practice, to be heard in their writing"	Axelrod & Cole (2018, p. 149)
	Home-school connection through in-class translation of students' "daily news"	Manyak (2008)
	Home language brokering practices recognized as an asset in the classroom	Welch (2015)
Drawing upon sociocultural resources	Translation used as a strategy for reading comprehension which stemmed from student sociolinguistic assets	Cano & Ruiz (2020)
	Linguistic problem solving connected to attention to students' linguistic and affective needs	David et al. (2019)
	Monolingual teachers should encourage bilingual students' language use and see it as an asset	Manyak (2004)
	Students and teachers as scaffolders for language learning	Pacheco et al. (2015)
	Translation expertise in and out of the classroom recognized as a literacy asset	Puzio et al. (2013)
	Student sociocultural expertise made visible through translation activity	Puzio et al. (2013)

Table 5. *Theme 2: Mediation of Pedagogical Translation for Validation of Cultural Identity*

Collaboration Through Pedagogical Translation

Finally, the data also revealed that collaboration during pedagogical translation can encourage a bidirectional flow of expertise between students and teachers, encourage intracultural and intercultural learning, and empower students. The term *collaborative translation* may refer to simply collaborating while translating, as in Axelrod and Cole (2018), or it may refer to a defined collaborative strategy which "involves students reading an academic text, translating key passages, and evaluating these translations" (Keyes et al., 2014, p. 17). Intracultural learning is defined as learning about one's own culture, while intercultural learning is learning about other cultures (McNeill, 2017). See Table 6 for a synthesis of the data on collaborative translation.

Code	Evidence	Article
Bidirectional flow of expertise	Shifting role of the instructor and students between expert and learner	Pacheco et al. (2015)
	"The translation activity engaged students in a wide range of verbal debate, challenge, and questioning, which are consistent with a distributed expertise ethos" (Puzio, 2013, p. 333)	Puzio et al. (2013)
Intracultural learning and intercultural learning	"Children's composition of texts includes translanguaging and interliteracy and is grounded in the contexts in which they live" (Axelrod & Cole, 2018, p. 148)	Axelrod & Cole (2018)
	Collaborative composing embedded in community	Axelrod & Cole (2018)
	"Their language usage displays a highly-developed fluency in words that can convey shades of meaning to audiences across socioeconomic, cultural and linguistic boundaries" (Axelrod & Cole, 2018, p. 147)	Axelrod & Cole (2018)
	"In addition to positioning bilingualism as a valued skill, the acts of translation by Ms. Page and her students also fostered collaboration across languages and cultures" (Manyak, 2004, p. 16)	Manyak (2004)
Student empowerment	"Collaboration added value because —along with engaging students in argument—it regularly produced translations that made more sense and better reflected the narrative's language, characters, and themes" (Puzio et al., 2013, p. 342)	Puzio et al. (2013)

Table 6. *Theme 3: Collaborative Translation*

Discussion

The purpose of this systematic literature review was to answer this research question: In what ways is translation being used as a culturally sustaining pedagogy in linguistically diverse K-12 classrooms?

Pedagogical Translation Mediates for Reading Comprehension in Bilingual Learning Environments

The results confirmed that pedagogical translation mediated for reading comprehension in bilingual learning environments. However, it is important to reiterate that pedagogical translation as a strategy can also function as a CSP when applied from a translanguaging perspective in which students' home languages and cultures are drawn on as resources (García et al., 2020). For example, in Cano and Ruiz (2020), students were able to leverage their linguistic repertoire to negotiate and make meaning from text through activities such as translating a school newsletter to their home language. Students drew on their bicultural and bilingual knowledge, demonstrating sophisticated attention to audience and subsequent language choice and the utility of pedagogical translation as a CSP in literacy instruction.

In contrast, in Kultti and Pramling's (2018) study of the translation of a Finnish children's song in a Finnish-English preschool, multilingual students also leveraged their linguistic resources to make meaning from an oral text. However, because some students came to class with home languages other than Finnish, which were not recognized or utilized in the translation activity,

translation functioned as a strategy for developing literacy skills but not as a CSP. While translation is an effective bilingual reading comprehension strategy, as a CSP, students' home languages and cultures must be drawn on as well.

Pedagogical Translation Validates Cultural Identity

Pedagogical translation also functioned as a CSP as students' identities were validated through the development of culturally sustaining curricula which include strategies such as translation (Keyes et al., 2014) or when students are positioned as authoritative linguistic or cultural knowers during translation activities (Jiménez et al., 2015; Pacheco et al., 2015; Puzio et al., 2013; Welch, 2015). For example, Puzio et al. (2013) found that student cultural and linguistic understanding became visible as students negotiated, thought, and translated in Spanish, signifying the value of bilingual strategies in the classroom. In contrast, "English-only models of instruction are likely to exclude a vast array of linguistic, cognitive, and social resources brought by linguistically and culturally diverse students" (Puzio et al., 2013, p. 345), and students who lose their home language tend to lose their cultural identity (Welch, 2015).

Collaborative Translation

In the literature reviewed, translation used collaboratively contributed to its function as a CSP. Collaboration included the bidirectional flow of student-student and teacher-student expertise (Keyes et al., 2014; Manderino & Castek, 2016; Pacheco et al., 2015) and intracultural and intercultural learning (Axelrod & Cole, 2018; Cano & Ruiz, 2020; David et al., 2019). In Pacheco et al. (2015), students and teachers were positioned as experts and learners at various stages of the instructional process, which validated students as possessing valuable linguistic and cultural skills that were not ordinarily recognized in their educational environment. Students were also able to draw on their linguistic and cultural knowledge to negotiate textual meaning (Puzio et al., 2013; Welch, 2015) and to recognize and validate cultural differences evident through their Spanish language variation (Pacheco et al., 2015).

In Manyak (2004), students' translations of the class *daily news* and other texts "often developed into collaborative production in which the children's voices overlapped and intertwined" (p. 14). Students valued and learned about each other's cultures through the process, and bilingual students were positioned as language brokers who could instigate "intercultural transactions" (p. 17) in a class—and school—that had previously been culturally divided. In contrast to the tendency in education towards linking race, language, literacy, and cultural practices, these experiences exemplify student empowerment and a move towards pluralistic outcomes (Paris & Alim, 2014).

This discussion on collaboration also illustrates the interconnectedness of the three themes and how they can be expected to function together in practice. Therefore, the authors strongly advocate for inclusion of CSP such as pedagogical translation in the ELAR curriculum, regardless of whether the language of instruction is English and/or if the instructor speaks only English.

Implications

It is important to consider the relevance of this work to Texas ELAR instruction. Scholars, teacher preparation programs, and in-service teachers can go beyond monolingual strategies, which continue to honor dominant norms, to spaces in which a rich environment is created and cultural practices are sustained. Normalizing translation will not only encourage bilingual, biliterate language development, but also challenge dominant norms surrounding language use (Axelrod & Cole, 2018; Welch, 2015), thus pushing back against the White listener.

Teacher Training

Manyak (2004, 2008) stressed the importance of creating a culturally rich classroom community. A component of this was the use of collaboration as a tool to aid in language development and sustainment. In his work, which discussed collaborative translation, Manyak argued for the use of explicit instruction that was rich in students' cultures. Thus, school districts should provide intentional training in CSP.

The low number of bilingual teachers has resulted in more waivers being issued, with the number of waivers issued doubling in the last five years, and with only 2.3% of teachers in Texas holding a bilingual certification (Sikes & Villanueva, 2021), training should be multi-tiered and continuous to ensure student success. Additionally, it is imperative that pre-service teachers receive adequate training prior to entering the field professionally. Since critical pedagogies are often seen as additive approaches and misused (Ladson-Billings, 2014), this training should include a deep theoretical understanding of CSP combined with opportunities for practice. It is important to note that both school districts and teacher preparation programs should remain cognizant of monolingual practices and pedagogical styles that might possibly continue the cycle of harm multilingual students face.

Teachers' vs. Students' Needs

Scholars still do not fully understand how the direct use of translation as a CSP influences language outcomes in K-12 classrooms. One under-researched area of importance is the decision-making processes teachers engage in when choosing to use translation in their classrooms. Scholars should consider whether teachers are more likely to use translation to meet their needs or the needs of students, specifically when a high percentage of teachers do not have formal classroom training due to national teacher shortage (Pelika, 2022). Considering state and nationally mandated policies such as teacher evaluations and testing, where does translation fit into the needs of teachers versus those of students?

Pedagogical Implications

The themes which emerged show not only the efficacy of pedagogical translation as a bilingual method for teaching literacy, linguistic, cultural, and heritage language, but also its value as a CSP. Therefore, we recommend that pedagogical translation be incorporated into ELAR instruction in elementary, starting as early as third grade, and secondary education (Escamilla et al. 2014). We also recommend that stakeholders such as teachers, site teams, district specialists and teacher preparation programs first review the research-based potential of pedagogical translation and then implement PD opportunities and curricular modifications in K-12 and teacher preparation programs.

Conclusion

This work started with our concern that common monolingual practices were not adequately addressing the needs of diverse students, such as sustaining student cultures, specifically their home languages. Through a limited, yet extensive literature review, we found that translation was being used in classrooms to increase or promote different aspects of language and literacy development, such as increasing metalinguistic awareness, honoring home practices, and encouraging collaboration in classrooms.

While important to bilingual and biliterate language development, the authors advocated for the explicit use of translation as a CSP not only in classrooms that contain a high percentage of EB students, but also in classrooms that are primarily monolingual. As we consider the future of the field and potentially highly divisive language

policies that continue to shift, it is essential that scholars explore the benefits of translation as it relates to CSP. Classrooms continue to become more diverse (NCES, 2023c), and teacher preparation programs should prepare teachers to validate and honor linguistic diversity by dismantling what has become normalized discourse surrounding language use and learning outcomes. Ultimately, teacher preparation programs and educators should advocate for the development and sustainment of bilingual and biliterate students.

References

Axelrod, Y., & Cole, M. W. (2018). 'The pumpkins are coming … vienen las calabazas … that sounds funny': Translanguaging practices of young emergent bilinguals. *Journal of Early Childhood Literacy*, *18*(1), 129-153. doi:10.1177/14687984187549

Cano, J., & Ruiz, N. T. (2020). "Wait! I don't get it! Can we translate?": Explicit collaborative translation to support emergent bilinguals' reading comprehension in the intermediate grades. *Bilingual Research Journal*, *43*(2), 157-177. doi: 10.1080/15235882.2020.1738286

Carreira, M. (2016). A general framework and supporting strategies for teaching mixed classes. *Advances in Spanish as a Heritage Language*, *49*, 159-176.

Colina, S., & Lafford, B. A. (2017). Translation in Spanish language teaching: The integration of a "fifth skill" in the second language curriculum. *Journal of Spanish Language Teaching*, *4*(2), 110-123. doi: 10.1080/23247797.2017.1407127

Cook, G. (2010). *Translation in language teaching*. Oxford University Press.

Cook, V. (2001). Using the first language in the classroom. *Canadian Modern Language Review*, *57*(3), 402-423. doi: 10.3138/cmlr.57.3.402

Creswell, J. (2007). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches*. Sage Publications.

David, S. S., Pacheco, M. B., & Jiménez, R. T. (2019). Designing translingual pedagogies: Exploring pedagogical translation through a classroom teaching experiment. *Cognition and Instruction*, *37*(2), 252-275. doi: 10.1080/07370008.2019.1580283

Escamilla, K., Geisler, D., Hopewell, S., Sparrow, W., & Butilofsky, S. (2009). Using writing to make cross-language connections from Spanish to English. In C. Rodríguez-Eagle (Ed.), *Achieving literacy success with English language learners: Insights, assessment, instruction* (pp. 141-156). Reading Recovery Council of North America.

Escamilla, K., Hopewell, S., Butvilofsky, S., Sparrow, W., Soltero-González, L., Ruiz-Figueroa, O., & Escamilla, M. (2014). *Biliteracy from the start: Literacy squared in action*. Caslon Publishing.

García, A. (2020). A new era for bilingual education in California. *Phi Delta Kappan*, *101*(5), 30-35. doi: 10.1177/0031721720903825

García, O. (2009). Emergent bilinguals and TESOL: What's in a name? *TESOL Quarterly*, *43*(2), 322-326. doi: 10.1002/j.1545-7249.2009.tb00172.x

García, O., Aponte, G. Y., & Le, K. (2020). Translations and translanguaging. In S. Laviosa and M. González-Davies (Eds.), *The Routledge handbook of translation and education*, 34.

García, O., & Leiva, C. (2014). Theorizing and enacting translanguaging for social justice. In A. Creese & A. Blackledge (Eds.), *Heteroglossia as practice and pedagogy* (pp. 199-216). Springer.

González-Davies, M. (2017). The use of translation in an integrated plurilingual approach to language learning: Teacher strategies and best practices. *Journal of Spanish Language Teaching, 4*(2), 124-135. doi: 10.1080/23247797.2017.1407168

Gutiérrez, K. D., Baquedano-López, P., & Tejeda, C. (1999). Rethinking Diversity: Hybridity and Hybrid Language Practices in the Third Space. *Mind, Culture, and Activity*, *6*(4), 286-303.

Jiménez, R., David, S., Risko, V., Pacheco, M., Pray, L., & Gonzáles, M. (2015). Using translation to drive conceptual development for students becoming literate in English as an additional language. *Research in the Teaching of English*, *49*(3), 248-271.

Keyes, C. S., Puzio, K., & Jiménez, R. T. (2014). Collaborative translations: Designing bilingual instructional tools. *Journal of Education*, *194*(2), 17-24. doi: 10.1177/002205741419400203

Kultti, A., & Pramling, N. (2018). "Behind the words": Negotiating literal/figurative sense when translating the lyrics to a children's song in bilingual preschool. *Scandinavian Journal of Educational Research*, *62*(2), 200-212. doi: 10.1080/00313831.2016.1212261

Ladson-Billings, G. (1995). Toward a theory of culturally relevant pedagogy. *American Educational Research Journal*, *32*(3), 465-491. doi: 10.3102/00028312032003465

Ladson-Billings, G. (2014). Culturally relevant pedagogy 2.0: Aka the remix. *Harvard Educational Review*, *84*(1), 74-84. doi: 10.17763/haer.84.1.p2rj131485484751

Laviosa, S., & González-Davies, M. (Eds.). (2019). *The Routledge handbook of translation and education*. Routledge.

Lin, A. M. Y. (2015). Conceptualising the potential role of L1 in CLIL. *Language, Culture and Curriculum, 28*(1), 74-89. doi: 10.1080/07908318.2014.1000926

Linares, E. (2022). The challenges and promise of classroom translation for multilingual minority students in monolingual settings. *L2 Journal*, *14*(2), 51-74.

Manderino, M., & Castek, J. (2016). Digital Literacies for Disciplinary Learning: A Call to Action. Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy: A Journal from the International Reading Association, *60*(1), 79–81. doi: 10.1002/jaal.565

Manyak, P. C. (2004). "What did she say?": Translation in a primary-grade English immersion class. *Multicultural Perspectives*, *6*(1), 12-18. doi: 10.1207/S15327892mcp0601_3

Manyak, P. C. (2008). What's your news? Portraits of a rich language and literacy activity for English language learners. *The Reading Teacher*, *61*(6), 450-458. doi: 10.1598/RT.61.6.2

Matias, C. E., & Mackey, J. (2016). Breakin' down whiteness in antiracist teaching: Introducing critical whiteness pedagogy. *The Urban Review*, *48*, 32-50. doi: 10.1007/s11256-015-0344-7

Maxwell, J. A. (2013). *Qualitative research design: An interactive approach*. Sage.

McLaughlin, M. (2022). The future of translation in higher education: Introduction to the special issue. *L2 Journal*, *14*(2), 3-11.

McNeil, L. (2017). Languaging about intercultural communication: The occurrence and conceptual focus of intracultural peer collaborative dialogues. *Language Awareness*, *26*(3), 151-169. doi: 10.1080/09658416.2017.1377723

Mellinger, C. D., & Gasca-Jiménez, L. (2019). Challenges and opportunities for heritage language learners in interpreting courses in the US context. *Revista Signos: Estudios de Lingüística*, *52*(101), 949-974.

Moll, L. C., & González, N. (1994). Lessons from research with language-minority children. *Journal of Reading Behavior*, *26*(4), 439-456.

National Center for Education Statistics. (2023a, May). *Characteristics of public school teachers*. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences. https://nces.ed.gov/programs/coe/indicator/clr/public-school-teachers

National Center for Education Statistics. (2023b, May). *English learners in public schools*. U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences. https://nces.ed.gov/programs/coe/indicator/cgf.

National Center for Education Statistics. (2023c, May). *Racial/ethnic enrollment in public schools*. U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences. https://nces.ed.gov/programs/coe/indicator/cge

Pacheco, M. B., David, S. S., & Jiménez, R. T. (2015). Translating pedagogies: leveraging students' heritage languages in the literacy classroom. *Middle Grades Research Journal*, *10*(1), 49-63.

Paris, D. (2012). Culturally sustaining pedagogy: A needed change in stance, terminology, and practice. *Educational Researcher*, *41*(3), 93-97. doi: 10.3102/0013189X12441244

Paris, D., & Alim, H. S. (2014). What are we seeking to sustain through culturally sustaining pedagogy? A loving critique forward. *Harvard Educational Review*, *84*(1), 85-100. doi: 10.17763/haer.84.1.982l873k2ht16m77

Pearse, N. (2019, June). An illustration of deductive analysis in qualitative research. In *18th European Conference on Research Methodology for Business and Management Studies.* doi: 10.34190/RM.19.006

Pelika, S. (2022, September). Six charts that explain the educator shortage. *National Education Association.* https://www.nea.org/advocating-for-change/new-from-nea/6-charts-explain-educator-shortage

Phipps, A., & Gonzalez, M. (2004). *Modern languages: Learning and teaching in an intercultural field*. Sage.

Picower, B. (2009). The unexamined whiteness of teaching: How white teachers maintain and enact dominant racial ideologies. *Race Ethnicity and Education*, *12*(2), 197-215. doi: 10.1080/13613320902995475

Privitera, G. J. (2019). *Essential statistics for the behavioral sciences*. Sage.

Puzio, K., Keyes, C. S., Cole, M. W., & Jiménez, R. T. (2013). Language differentiation: Collaborative translation to support bilingual reading. *Bilingual Research Journal*, *36*(3), 329-349. doi: 10.1080/15235882.2013.845118

Rowe, L. W. (2019). Emergent bilingual students' translation practices during eBook composing. *Bilingual Research Journal, 42*(3), 324-342. doi: 10.1080/15235882.2019.1632756

Saldaña, J. (2021). *The coding manual for qualitative researchers*. Sage.

Sandoval, D. M., Ratcliff, A. J., Buenavista, T. L., & Marín, J. R. (Eds.). (2016). *"White" washing American education: The new culture wars in ethnic studies*. Praeger.

Schmid, C. (2021). The politics of English only in the United States: Historical, social, and legal aspects. In *Language ideologies* (pp. 62-86). Routledge.

Sikes, C. L., & Villanueva, C. K. (2021). *Creating a more bilingual Texas: A closer look at bilingual education in the lone star state*. Every Texan. https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED614323.pdf

Texas Education Agency. (2023). *Employed teacher demographics 2015-16 through 2022-23*. Texas Education Agency. https://tea.texas.gov/reports-and-data/educator-data/employed-teacher-demographics.pdf

The Texas Tribune. (2023). *Houston ISD*. https://schools.texastribune.org/districts/houston-isd/

Thiong'o, N. W. (2023). *The language of languages: Reflections on translation*. Seagull Books.

Torgerson, C. (2003). *Systematic reviews*. Bloomsbury.

Velásquez, E. (2020). The effect of discipline-related knowledge on heritage language learners› reading comprehension. *Athens Journal of Education*, *7*(1), 31-47.

Welch, I. (2015). Building interactional space in an ESL classroom to foster bilingual identity and linguistic repertoires. *Journal of Language, Identity & Education*, *14*(2), 80-95. doi: 10.1080/15348458.2015.1019784

Appendix

Articles Incorporating Translation Through Translanguaging Stance by Year

Year	Type of classroom	Grade level	Location	Type of translanguaging	Article
2004	Monolingual with EBs	Elementary	United States	Strong, implied	Manyak (2004)
2008	Monolingual with EBs	Elementary	United States	Strong, implied	Manyak (2008)
2013	Monolingual with EBs	Intermediate	United States	Strong, implied	Puzio et al. (2013)
2014	Monolingual with EBs	Intermediate	United States	Strong, implied	Keyes et al. (2014)
2015	Monolingual with EBs	Intermediate	United States	Strong, implied	Jiménez et al. (2015)
2015	Monolingual with EBs	Intermediate	United States	Strong, implied	Pacheco et al. (2015)
2015	ESL	Elementary	United States	Strong, implied	Welch (2015)
2018	Bilingual	Elementary, Before School Program	United States	Strong, implied	Axelrod & Cole (2018)
2019	Monolingual with EBs	Intermediate	United States	Strong, implied	David et al. (2019)
2020	Bilingual	Elementary	United States	Strong, implied	Cano & Ruiz (2020)