King's Research Portal

[Link to publication record in King's Research Portal](#)

Translanguaging and the Transdisciplinary Framework for Language Teaching and Learning in a Multilingual World

PREAMBLE

In 2016, the Modern Language Journal (MLJ) celebrated 100 years of publication. The centennial issue celebrating this important anniversary reminded readers (p. 4) that MLJ is the "oldest generalist journal devoted to language teaching and learning." The articles in the centennial issue included what the editor, Heidi Byrnes, referred to as divergent views designed to frame perennial issues in language teaching and learning in a forward-looking fashion. Central to the volume was the transdisciplinary framework for Second Language Acquisition (SLA) presented by the Douglas Fir Group in the context of world multilingualism. The articles in the issue, moreover, set the stage for the second century of MLJ's role in deepening the profession's understanding of both additional language teaching/learning and for the ways in which it must attend to broad, still-unanswered questions, to disagreements about previously accepted views, and to emerging perspectives about multilingualism and multicompetence in a changing world context.

Currently, there is much talk among scholars and researchers, particularly young scholars about changes in the field of SLA. Monolingualist perspectives have been problematized, and the expansion and increasing epistemological diversity in the field of SLA has led to what some (e.g., May, 2013; Ortega 2013a & b) have referred to as the "multilingual turn" in applied linguistics. According to May (2013) and Ortega (2013a), this turn is a direct consequence of a growing dissatisfaction with and concern about the tendency to view individuals acquiring a second language as aspirant, and for the most part, failed native speakers. Beginning in the early 1990s, numerous scholars (Canagarajah, 1999; Davies, 1991, 2003; Doerr, 2009; Doerr & Lee, 2013; Kramsch, 1997) criticized monolingual assumptions and the narrow views of language experience that these perspectives implied.

Ortega (2013b), however contends that mainstream SLA has not yet fully turned away from the comparative fallacy (Bley-Vroman et al., 1989), that is, from the concern about deviations from the idealized norm of the additional language produced by language learners. She argues, moreover, that, in spite of the extensive work carried out on this topic (Canagaragah, 1999; Cook, 1999; Doerr, 2009; Leung, Harris &Rampton, 1997; Piller, 2002; Rampton, 1990; Toker, 2012), many applied linguists and language educators do not fully understand the ideological or empirical consequences of the native-speaker norms and assumptions they rely upon in their work.

Our goal in writing this article is to build on the theme of the centennial volume by engaging in the examination and study of t*ranslanguaging*, a rapidly expanding conceptual-cum-theoretical, analytical and pedagogical lens that directly draws from contemporary perspectives on bi/multilingualism and that in many ways both informs and challenges existing theoretical positions and pedagogical practices on which much of the work of modern languages scholars and MLJ readers has been based. It is our purpose to provide MLJ readers with an overview of translanguaging that allows them to engage in informed discussions as the profession responds to the changing needs of additional language users across diverse instructional settings in various types of globalized and transnational contexts. We agree with Hawkins and Mori (2018) that the

"trans-" prefix as seen in *transnational, transcultural, translocal, transpatial, transmodal, translanguaging,* and *translingual* forces us to grapple with change, with movement, with fluidity and perhaps with conflict. In most cases, the "trans-" turn challenges established orthodoxies and understandings and creates intense debates and disagreements. As we intend to suggest here, however, the "trans-" turn also has the potential of providing us with new directions and new answers to important questions that have engaged both scholars and practitioners in the field of SLA. For reasons of scope and scale, the arguments and observations made in this article are primarily informed by the authors' academic sensibilities and professional experiences associated with the UK and the USA, although we believe that the issues we address here resonate with additional language educators in many other world locations.

This article is organized as follows: we first begin with important preliminary considerations and background issues that we feel must be understood by the reader as an essential context for the discussion of original, current, and evolving perspectives on translanguaging. These include (a) a brief discussion of the different contextual climates in which additional language instruction takes place for majority and minoritized students in today's globalized world; (b) a listing and comparison of the most common additional-language teaching settings, (c) a description of the social and political environment in which conceptualizations of translanguaging were first proposed in the late 90's and mid 2000's and (d) a very brief overview of the rapidly changing theoretical scholarship from which the translanguaging theorists continue to draw. Next we present a brief sketch of the monolingual paradigm that has predominated the professional discourses of additional/second/foreign language teaching in the 20th century, against which the current developments should be seen. Then we move to an account of some of the approaches and programs that have sought to make productive use of students' own languages in the learning of the target language, even when monolingual language teaching was regarded as the orthodoxy.   Our intention here is to provide a context and a bridge to the next part in which we discuss translanguaging in some detail in terms of its many-sided conceptualizations and their associated pedagogic orientations. Finally we highlight some areas where further conceptual clarification and empirical investigation are needed.

PRELIMINARY CONSIDERATIONS: LANGUAGE/S OF SCHOOLING FOR MAJORITY AND MINORITIZED STUDENTS

In predominantly English-speaking societies such as Australia, Britain, (predominantly English-speaking parts of) Canada, New Zealand and the United States, there is a fundamental difference between the study of foreign/world languages as school subjects by students who are majority speakers of a societal language and the acquisition/development of the established societal languages for everyday use by new immigrants, refugees, and indigenous minorities. A key distinction between these two additional-language-learning settings involves the social positions that minoritized groups occupy in a society and the fact that the societal language (i.e., the *target* language) is essential to these marginalized persons' social inclusion and survival. In most immigrant 'receiving' countries, for example, language-in-education policies include regulations and legislation designed to manage the acquisition/development of dominant societal languages within the school context by groups of students (immigrants, and refugees) who do not (fully) understand, speak, read, or write the societal language when they arrive in

school. Policies directed at the acquisition/development of dominant societal languages, moreover, are concerned with assessing (the dominant societal) language proficiency as well as determining the extent of students' learning of subject matter content (often exclusively through the dominant language) as well as their educational progress. By comparison, policies governing the study of foreign or world languages are generally not concerned with students' ability to engage in subject-matter learning through the target language. For example, although foreign languages (e.g. French in the U.S.) are taught as distinct subjects in the general secondary school curriculum, students are not required to demonstrate their learning of regular academic content (math, language arts, science) through assessments in the newly acquired language. However, with the advent of Immersion Education (in the late 60's in Canada) and Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) in the teaching of world languages such as English, French, Mandarin and Spanish, this 'language-only' characteristic is being eroded, since in Immersion and CLIL programs the learning and development of the target language is designed to co-occur with content learning (e.g. learning Science). Ordinarily, Immersion and CLIL students are speakers of the dominant societal language who have often engaged in the study of the target language over several years before engaging in both content and language instruction. However, immersion programs have also been used for the revitalization of minority languages (e.g. indigenous languages in Canada, Hawaii and New Zealand; Basque in Spain).

MLJ READERS AND ADDITIONAL LANGUAGE TEACHING CONTEXTS

What the above contextual examples illustrate is that the goals of additional-language teaching programs vary depending on the educational and socio-political environmentinvolved and, in many parts of the world, on the position of the students in the inter-ethnic relationships within the wider society[1]. Unfortunately, it is often the case that language-teaching professionals, including both researchers and practitioners, tend to assume that the conditions that govern language instruction are broadly similar across settings and contexts; alternatively it is often assumed that additional language teaching and learning is an autonomous activity in that it is non-susceptible to the influences of the sociocultural and political environment in which it is situated. Some language education professionals may read narrowly and focus on their particular languages, groups of learners, school/ university levels and areas of expertise. As a consequence, when new conceptualizations and practices emerge in the literature, the tendency is to examine them primarily from the perspectives with which they are familiar. In writing this article, we make the assumption that readers of this and other similar journals are most familiar with their own particular language instructional contexts (MLJ, for instance, is a journal that for over a century has focused on the foreign/world language teaching profession in the United States and on the teaching of foreign or non-English languages to *monolingual speakers of English)*. However, because beginning in the early eighties, MLJ expanded its coverage, we also assume that they have become increasingly aware of varied additional language teaching contexts including those described and compared in Table 1. We present further illustrative contexts and examples, based largely on the programming and curricular provisions in countries in the Global North, in order to situate our discussion on the origins of expanding and developing perspectives on translanguaging with which we are concerned.

---

[1] See Leung (2016, 2018) for an elaboration in relation to English as an Additional Language provisions in the UK and USA.

Table 1: Additional Language Teaching Contexts

Instructed Additional-Language Focus	Program Types	Examples
Language Instruction Directed at Mainstream Students - Type 1 Goals -to fulfill academic requirements (e.g., college entrance) - to develop oral and written proficiencies to support literary study, international travel, etc.		
Foreign/World Language Teaching & Learning in the US	FL programs originally designed for monolingual speakers of the societal language In some educational jurisdictions heritage language programs for home background users of commonly taught school languages	French, Spanish, Chinese in US high schools and universities Spanish for Latinos in US , Korean for home-background Korean speakers in high schools and universities
Language Instruction Directed at Mainstream Students -Type 2 Goals -to fulfill academic requirements - to develop oral and written proficiencies to carry out academic study in /through English		
English Medium Schooling English Language Teaching (ELT)/English as a Foreign Language (EFL)	Schooling through English as primary medium of instruction English as a foreign language programs for international monolingual speakers of a non-English language Immersion and CLIL (content and Language Integration Learning) program	English-medium schools in India English teaching in Japan English teaching to children in China. Continued development of English through study of academic subjects in English, e.g. English immersion in Japan, English CLIL in Europe, Chile, etc
Language Instruction Directed at Minority Learners Goals - to provide educational support services as required by state educational policies -to develop oral and written proficiencies to carry out academic study in /through English -to prepare students for required state English language proficiency assessments		
English Language Development (ELD)	Direct, form-focused instruction in "leveled" English as an additional/second language courses for newcomers in US Schools	Segregated 4-hour ELD classes for elementary school children in Arizona, and specialist EALD (English as an Additional Language and Dialect) teaching for 6 months for students from linguistically diverse communities in Australia

	Elsewhere in the English-speaking education systems, 'mainstreaming' of EAL learners means students from diverse language backgrounds, irrespective of their English language proficiencies, are expected to follow the regular age-related English-medium curriculum, mostly without additional specialist English tuition or support; teachers of all subjects are required to make learning of English and subject content accessible for minoritized students in their everyday classroom teaching activities, often with little or no specialist training; this approach can be characterized as a kind of ELD by osmosis, or 'sink or swim'	Mainstreaming in England and Ireland (European Commission, 2013; Leung, 2018)
Bilingual Education	Content instruction through two languages (students' primary language and the societal language) with the ideal goal of acquiring both content knowledge and acquisition of the societal language. Attention and focus on maintenance/development of primary language, however, varies in different program models	In the USA: Transitional/maintenance bilingual education programs Maintenance bilingual education programs, e.g. Spanish-English Two-way Immersion programs; Hawaiian Immersion programs
Language Instruction Directed at Minority Learners Goals - to revitalize minority languages -to develop oral and written proficiencies to support language maintenance -to provide strong cultural connections		
Community Language Teaching	Language and literacy instruction for children in non-societal/immigrant languages sponsored by communities and other organizations	In the UK and USA: Saturday Chinese language programs

Although all of these settings are technically instructed-additional-language teaching-learning environments, the differences between them are significant as are perspectives on the goals of the language learning enterprise and the use of the non-target language in instruction. Because discussions of translanguaging draw from and are applied to these various contexts (often with the assumption that readers are familiar with the particular instructional setting described) the possibilities for misinterpretation are many. In this paper, then, we explicitly point out the specific contexts within which translanguaging has been and continues to be discussed and presented. *We urge readers to take note of these different instructional arrangements and their different pedagogical purposes and to consider them carefully in reading our discussion of the practice, stance and theory of translanguaging itself.*

Terminologically in this article we use the terms 'additional language' and 'additional language education/instruction' to refer to the learning and teaching of a language other than one's own home or community language/s to signal, *inter alia*, a perspectival difference from that associated with terms such as 'foreign language' and 'second language'. That said, we will use 'second language' or 'foreign language' where appropriate for reasons of historical and referential accuracy. We would like to emphasize that the distinction traditionally made in MLJ between the teaching of 'foreign' languages and the teaching of 'second' languages, has not

taken into account sufficiently either the contextual or the political realities that directly influence the mechanisms that inform language instruction today. As we will point out in this article, in the case of a discussion of translanguaging, instructional contexts are especially important. In the research literature the study of various aspects of additional language teaching and learning is housed under the label of Second Language Acquisition (SLA); this term has totemic value at the present time. For that reason, we will use the term 'SLA' in this discussion whenever we refer to the relevant literature for reasons of referential precision and historical fidelity.

BACKDROP – 100 YEARS OF MONOLINGUAL FOREIGN/SECOND LANGUAGE TEACHING

In the past 100 years or so the central doctrine of the late 19th century Reform Movement in additional language education with its advocacy for monolingual teaching, i.e. teaching the focal language through that language exclusively, has held sway in the foreign/second language education thinking (see Cook, 2010: Chapter 1; Cummins, 2007; Hall and Cook, 2012). The key purpose of the reform was to move away from the putatively popular approach generally referred to as grammar translation (a cover term for a range of practices, see McLelland, 2018) which directly implicated the use of students' first or own language. Perhaps it is no accident that additional language teaching programs in school and university education tend to identify and name themselves with the language/s they offer. It is not at all unusual to find a language department, either in a school or a university, offering courses with names such as Chinese, French, German, Japanese, Russian, and Spanish. Where a language has undergone profound (noticed and documented) changes over time, adjectives such as 'modern' (e.g. Modern Chinese) or 'ancient' (e.g. Ancient Greek) may be added. This generic naming practice is so well-established that we barely give it a second thought. (Note other disciplines often go beyond the generic to reflect hybridization or compound subjects with program names such as 'electronic engineering' or even 'American Literature'). There must be a whole host of reasons for the persistence of this practice. Transparency of subject matter is possibly one of the reasons, and adhering to academic tradition may be another. The point of drawing attention to this naming practice is that it resonates with the idea that languages are distinctive and separate entities, and that it gives the impression that learning an additional language means focussing on that language alone. Programs with labels that bring students' own languages into the frame explicitly such as 'French for X–speaking students' are not at all common.

Referred to as both dogma and a professional neurosis by Butzkamm & Caldwell (2009), the monolingual approach rests on a number of assumptions that G. Cook (2010) has characterized as empirically untested including views that (1) using the additional language exclusively is more natural and similar to own language acquisition, (2) that students need large amounts of input (Krashen, 1981) in order to acquire an additional language, (3) that students profit most from interaction with a monolingual, native-speaking teacher, and (4) the classroom can be structured to resemble the target-language country. According to Macaro (2005), the dogmatic or "virtual" position in the ongoing debate insists on the exclusive use of the target language for both teacher instruction and student production.

In their review of first language use in second and foreign language learning, Turnbull and Dailey-O'Cain (2009) agree that the virtual position on the exclusive use of the target

language in foreign/second language classrooms has become hegemonic. They point out, moreover, that "there is a blind acceptance of the notion that exclusive target-language use is the *best* practice" in all types of language teaching and learning. Butzkamm & Caldwell (2009) further characterize the rejection of *mother tongue* (MT) use in language instruction as directly related to educational language policies that recommend a minimal use of students' first language. They emphasize that the "doggedness of dogma" (p.21) that requires exclusive monolingual teaching approaches prevails in spite of extensive research that supports the superiority of bilingual techniques. As others have also done, Butzkamm & Caldwell (2009) further suggest that teachers' own monolingualism, particularly in the case of the English Language Teaching (ELT), may be a strong factor in rejecting the use of students' own languages. Similarly, Kerr (2014) documents what he terms *a long stream of dissent* against the widespread use of mother tongue teaching in language classes. Citing G Cook's (2010) book on translation in language teaching as a catalyst, he relates that subsequent interviews by the British Council of well-known ELT trainers and researchers revealed a strong support for the use of L1 by the teacher but also including the use of bilingual dictionaries, translations of long texts, and new technologies. In immersion programs, Swain & Lapkin (2013), based on a Vygotskian SCT perspective, suggest that the use of the L1 by students is inevitable. As for teachers, they argue that the use of the L1 should be purposeful, consistent and infrequent.

The use of students' home or community language in additional language learning-teaching (re)gained a good deal of scholarly attention in the past 20 years. The renewal of interest in bringing students' own language/s into the classroom is in a sense a kick against the Reform Movement, but the grip of monolingual teaching has not loosened, particularly in terms of language teaching materials and programs. More recently the discussions on the pedagogic value of bringing students' community language into the classroom has gravitated around the rallying call for translanguaging. This has been the case both for instruction focused exclusively on language itself (e.g., ELT in EFL settings, community language teaching to "heritage" students) as well as for instruction focused on the development of an additional language through instruction in subject-matter content (e.g., bilingual education, mainstreamed English as an additional language for minoritized students)[2].

Before we enter into a detailed appreciation of the multi-faceted meaning of translanguaging in relation to language in education and language in society, perhaps it would be historically important to acknowledge that the pedagogic value of making use of students' community languages in the classroom has in fact been part of the debates in language education all along in the so-called 'monolingual century' in language teaching. It would be fair to say though that some of the work in this area did not achieve high visibility. We will briefly mention three bodies of work here to illustrate the ways in which students' community languages have been seen as an integral part of the learning-teaching process. In many ways the issues we are addressing in this article are a particular manifestation of the wider discussion on medium of

---

[2] Heritage students are taught in two different contexts in the US. If they are "commonly-taught" world languages (Spanish, French, Mandarin), they are taught in separate sections as part of regular FL programs in schools and universities. They are also taught in "community" settings by particular language groups (e.g. Chinese Saturday programs). In England there are no publicly funded heritage/community language teaching programs in school; Saturday community language schools are supported by local communities.

instruction in formal education, and as such these issues are relevant to educational programs that are implicitly or explicitly monolingually oriented as well as to programs that are officially designated as bilingual.

The bilingual method

This Bilingual Method has its origin in the training of British military interpreters in the aftermath of the Second World War. Dodson (1968) provides an account of the development work undertaken by him and his colleagues at Cardiff University in Wales. At the end of the second world war in 1945 a large number of interpreters were needed by the armed forces. It was found that the recruits, foreign language graduates and British people who had learned a foreign language in the country concerned before the war, could not be deployed immediately because some of them had inadequate proficiency in the foreign language involved, or others who were fluent in the foreign language lacked the ability to move from one language to the other rapidly and accurately. The latter group were put through 'interpretation exercises' to help them develop the knowledge and skills of rapidly switching between two languages. 'In these exercises the oral stimulus is given in one language and the pupil's response must be made in the other. It is in fact a replica of the kind of work expected from a fully-trained interpreter in the field' (Dodson, op.cit., p.3). Dodson observed that although at the time this method departed from the then 'almost self-evident teaching and learning principles based on the direct method' (loc.cit.), it was justified on the grounds that: (a) as the recruits had already learned another language, the use of a stimulus in one of the languages could not interfere with what had been learned, (b) there was no other known method to help recruits move between the languages rapidly, and (c) the Bilingual Method worked better than anything else that had been tried. These 'interpretation exercises' were later used with the recruits whose foreign language proficiency needed bolstering and also with recruits who had no knowledge of the target language. It was reported that the learning rate for the different groups 'increased sharply, despite contrary predictions based on direct-method principles' (op.cit., p.4). Dodson went on to argue that additional language learning is not the same as mother tongue learning, and that the use of mother tongue can help with understanding of subject matter in the additional language and awareness of aspects of the linguistic differences between the languages involved. (See Dodson, op.cit., pp.9-11 for a description of a teaching framework for secondary school and adult additional language based on his arguments).

New concurrent approach

The conceptualization and development of this approach emerged from the reported teacher practice of switching from one language to another when working with Latino immigrant-origin students enrolled in bilingual education programs in the 1970s in the United States the two objectives of which was to successfully teach academic content and to promote the acquisition of English. The switching forth and back between the school language and the students' community language was sometimes known as the 'concurrent approach'. Jacobson (1981) observed that there was little systematic study of this approach at the time, and that there were some reservations as to its pedagogic value – e.g. random switching between languages might serve to confuse students; where the teacher switching was tantamount to translation, students might simply wait for their preferred or stronger language to turn up (thus obviating the need to attend to the other language). Drawing on his work with the United Independent School District in Laredo, Texas, Jacobson proposed that switching between English and Spanish (the

local community language) should be purposeful; he developed a system of cues to trigger teacher-led motivated switching in what he termed New Concurrent Approach. The switching cues were designed to serve pedagogic objectives such as conceptual reinforcement, reviewing content and lexical enrichment. The student was expected to follow the teacher-initiated switch. Teachers were expected to be aware of the reasons for their switching. It should be noted that the New Concurrent Approach was intended to promote bilingual development through content teaching and learning, not for language teaching and learning (which should take place in language classes). The following example shows an instance of the new Concurrent Approach in action:

1	T:	*¿Quién descubrió América?*
		Who discovered America?
2	S1:	*Christopher Columbus.*
3	T:	*That is correct. Cristobal Colón descubrió América.*
		Christopher Columbus discovered America.
4	S2:	*Y vino en un barco grande.*
		And he came in a big boat.
5	T:	*Si, vino en el Santamaria.*
		Yes, he came in the Santamaria.

(Original conversation in italics, Spanish utterances followed by English translation: Jacobson, 1981, p.19)

In Line 2 S1 responds to the teacher's question (in Spanish) in English. The teacher follows through first with an affirmation in English and then reinforces it in Spanish (Line 3). In Line 4 S2 joins the conversation by offering additional information in Spanish. The teacher enriches the contribution by naming the ship 'Santamaria' in Line 5. (For a fuller exposition of the New Concurrent Approach, also see Jacobson, 1990; Faltis, 1989, 1990).

We also note that the pedagogic value of using students' first language was also recognized in the French immersion education programs in Canada, which were initially designed for majority Anglophone students in the 1960s. While the language of the curriculum and teaching was French, the students' first language, English, was not cast aside in the classroom – teachers were advised to accept students' responses in English in early grades (Johnson and Swain, 1997).

Common Underlying (Bilingual) Proficiency and Interdependence Hypothesis

Beyond the active use of students' first and second/additional languages in the teaching-learning interface in the classroom, the nature of bilingualism and bilingual development was also explicitly addressed with reference to schooling success since the 1960s in North America. The role played by students' first language in the acquisition of their additional/second language was given consideration in classroom practice and in research. Cummins, a leading investigator of the inter-dependent relationship between use of students' first/community language (L1), academic success and additional language development, was writing a defense of the use of students' L1 in the schooling of linguistic minority children He was focused on subject matter development and sought to persuade policy makers that more English did not result in more learning. So it was as much an argument about the medium of instruction as additional language development. His theoretical argument then was: because of the common underlying proficiency, any subject matter teaching done in L1 will result in development of academic

proficiencies in the additional language. In relation to the language development of linguistic minority students Cummins (1981, p.3) asks more specifically: "What are the cross-lingual dimensions of language proficiency, i.e. how does the development of proficiency in L1 relate to the development of L2 proficiency?". After reviewing the then available research into bilingual education programs in the United States, Cummins concluded that linguistic minority students in bilingual school programs that provided some curriculum instructions in their first language tended to perform better than those in solely English-medium programs in English acquisition and in other curriculum subjects, and some achieved above national /state averages. This understanding formed the basis of his arguments for a Common Underlying Proficiency. The central idea here is that although bilingual individuals' languages are often seen in terms of separate proficiencies, e.g. mother tongue or native speaker knowledge and skills in Japanese, in English as an additional language, both languages in fact share a common underlying proficiency which can facilitate the development of a bilingual person's language repertoire as a whole. This dynamic interaction is expressed in his Interdependence Hypothesis (op.cit., p.29):

> "To the extent that instruction in Lx is effective in promoting proficiency in Lx, transfer of this proficiency to Ly will occur provided there is adequate exposure to Ly (either in school or environment) and adequate motivation to learn Ly."

Some 20 years later Cummins (2000:38) reaffirms the validity of this view thus: "In virtually every bilingual program that has ever been evaluated, whether intended for linguistic majority or minority students, spending instructional time teaching through the minority language entails no academic costs for students' academic development in the majority language …". These arguments are echoed in the recommendations made by the National Academies of Sciences (2017) for the promotion of educational success for English learners in the United States.

In this brief snapshot of some relevant work our purpose is to show that the use of students' community languages in additional language teaching and in schooling more generally has been a part of educational thinking and research for quite some time. We do not suggest that by virtue of the fact that we make use of students' community languages we have found a pedagogic panacea. Far from it, the use of students' community languages in the classroom can open up different and new issues. For instance, many of the long-standing challenges related to quality of language learning or education success associated with immersion/bilingual programs are still in need of answers (see Tedick, Christian and Fortune, 2011; Chapter 1 for a discussion).

INSTRUCTIONAL CIRCUMSTANCES LEADING TO THE CURRENT DEVELOPMENT AND EXTENSION OF TRANSLANGUAGING THEORY AND PRACTICE

The term 'trawsieithu' ('translanguaging' in Welsh) was first translated by Baker (2001) who attributed it to Cen Williams, a Welsh educator who in the 1980's developed the pedagogical practice of using two languages for teaching and learning in Welsh classrooms in a context of Welsh language endangerment and English language oppression. Lewis et al. (2012, p. 642), in describing the educational context in which the practice was first implemented use terms such as "language struggle," "fighting for survival," and "language battleground" to underscore the unique needs of Welsh children in the 1989's, an era of Welsh revitalization and a moment in which "the idea of Welsh and English as holistic, additive, and advantageous was beginning, allowing the idea of translanguaging to emerge." According to Lewis et al., in the

Welsh context, translanguaging was seen as "a natural way of simultaneously developing and extending a child's bilingualism within a curriculum context while also deepening understanding of the subject area" (p. 645). While this conceptualization shares broadly similar pedagogic goals with other efforts to make use of students' own language/s such as the New Concurrent Method (Jacobson 1981), it is important to recognize that there are some significant political and social factors in the Welsh context; the struggle for Welsh language revival[3] and the policy support for societal and individual multilingualism within the Welsh nation (Tavakoli and Jones, 2018) constitute a significant backdrop to be taken into account.

The further expansion and development of both the theory and practice of translanguaging, by a number of scholars (e.g., Anderson and Lightfoot, 2018; Creese and Blackledge, 2010; Garcia, 2009; Garcia & Kleyn, 2016; Garcia & Li, 2014; Garcia & Lin, 2016; Garcia & Sanchez, 2015) signal its increasing analytic and pedagogic penetration in different world locations. Within this body of international literature, a good deal of the work that was produced by US-based scholars was initially centered on the education of Latinx students in the United States in the environment of Spanish-English bilingual education programs. *This is a key detail because, as emphasized above, additional language teaching settings differ in important ways. In order to fully understand the nuances of current and evolving translanguaging discussions, the reader will profit from having some familiarity with the political and ideological context that originally informed translanguaging theory and practice and that continues to influence critical scholars' perspectives on the education of Latinx students in the United States.* An understanding of this historical context will facilitate context sensitive analysis of future developments.

The use of Spanish and English in the education of Latinx children in the US setting has a long and conflicted history.[4] Known as bilingual education, this approach to initial schooling for non-English-background children has been seen primarily as a compensatory arrangement and one of many "services" required by law that can be provided for the category of students labeled "Limited English Proficient" and later "English Language learners." Increasingly implemented using various different program models across the country after the passage of the Bilingual Education Act of 1968, it was described as a key tool in addressing the perceived educational failure of language minority students among which Latinx students were the most numerous. Prohibited twenty years later in several states (e.g., California,) and only recently legally permitted once again, bilingual education programs were still implemented in other states in which Latinx children were most numerous (e.g., New York, Texas, Florida). Programs labeled "bilingual education" followed a number of different program designs some of which had as their purpose moving children as quickly as possible to monolingual English instruction. Various program types reflected what have been termed monoglossic ideologies of language and narrow views of bi/multilingualism itself. As Rosa (2016) has recently argued, Latinx youngsters in the US, because they are racialized by the majority English-speaking dominant community in the country, have been seen as *languageless* (i.e., competent in neither English nor Spanish) and for

---

[3] Welsh census data showed that in 1981 there were 503,549 Welsh speakers - 17.9% of the total population of 2813000 (Williams, 2000).

[4] For further discussions on the history and practice of bilingual education in the US see Brisk, 2006; Garcia (2009); Ovando, 2003.

that reason failing in school. Latinx youngsters, then, like many groups of students in other parts of the world, are also engaged in a *language struggle* between a dominant language and minoritized language; in this case of Spanish, a world language that is minoritized in American educational institutions.

The group of researchers listed above who first expanded and developed William's notion of translanguaging, then, were scholars committed to social justice in a particular context in which students included (1) mainly low-income, newly arrived immigrant-background students referred to as *emergent bilinguals* and (2) Spanish-English *bilingual language learners.*[5] This is important, because as Jaspers (20174) maintains, citing Cameron (1995, p.127), new concepts run the risk of "discursive drift." In the case of translanguaging the dangers of misinterpretation, include impreciseness, application to very different additional-language contexts, and lack of attention to the still-evolving insights that the conceptualization offers about the nature of multicompetence as it is manifested in the communicative practices and educational contexts in different instructed settings and contexts (see Table 1 above).

THE THEORETICAL CONTEXT: THE EVOLVING SCHOLARSHIP ON BI/MULTILINGUALISM IN THE SLA FIELD

Until recently, the field of SLA and the practice of additional-language teaching was not informed by the scholarship on bilingualism or multilingualism. Rather than conceptualizing the end-state of world language acquisition by adolescents or adults as late bilingualism (with all of the complexity that the term implies), the goal of language study was seen as the acquisition of the linguistic characteristics of the educated native speaker of the additional language being studied (Cook, 2007; Leung, Harris & Rampton, 1997). This native speaker, moreover, was constructed as a monolingual, educated native user of the prestige variety of the language (Kramsch, 1997). When bilinguals entered the discussion, they were viewed from a narrow perspective that has dominated the second and foreign language teaching field and that constructed "ideal" or "full" bilinguals as two monolinguals in one (Grosjean, 1989) who are capable of keeping their two internalized language systems (or their two sets of social practices or linguistic resources) completely apart. Such views reflect the view established by early researchers on bilingualism (e.g. Weinreich, 1974) that true or competent bilinguals do not alternate between their two languages. As it has been widely acknowledged, until quite recently, monoglossic and monological thinking dominated the field of applied linguistics and the professional discourses on the practice of language teaching. Dominated by both established theoretical linguistic perspectives as well as by a written language bias (Linell, 2004), languages were seen as singular, enclosed systems. As a result, language students' involuntary, momentary transfers from their own community or national language were frowned upon, corrected, and labeled linguistic interference. The use of borrowings and other elements belonging to another language system were labeled language mixtures, and language learners were urged to keep their new language "pure."[6] They were expected to refrain from "mixing" languages and from

---

[5] A recent National Academy of Sciences (2017) report uses the term *dual language learners* to refer to bilingual students who are exposed to two languages in the home.

[6] For additional detail on what Haugen (1972) referred to as the "stigmata of bilingualism," the reader is referred to Lippi-Green (2012).

engaging in practices typical of competent multilinguals that involve the alternation of (what have been considered to be) two separate and distinct systems[7].

As pointed out above, the field of SLA has recently undergone what scholars have referred to as the bi/multilingual turn. While this shift is currently discussed in leading SLA journals and other publications, it is not clear how much the shifting theoretical apparatus has changed instruction in ELT, world language teaching, or led to increasing interest by the SLA and applied linguistics profession about the condition of bilingualism itself, that is, about the acquisition of functional communicative repertoires by language learners outside of classroom contexts and about the characteristics of these individuals' *languaging* practices in everyday interaction (see later discussion on "Languages as bundles of lexical, syntactical, phonological and orthographic features").

As we will discuss below, the notion of translanguaging draws directly from the scholarship on bilingualism both in the US and around the world and yet specifically intends to move beyond this previous scholarship by problematizing static monolingualist, structuralist perspectives on bilingual practices that have failed to accurately describe the complexity of bi/multilinguals and communities. Rather than being uniquely revolutionary or novel in orientation, however, the translanguaging paradigm both encompasses and expands on a set of growing concerns and shifting perspectives present in the study of bilingual and multilingual individuals and societies over many years as well as on more recent critical examinations of language and migration, superdiversity and globalization .[8]

TRANSLANGUAGING: A TRANSMUTABLE CONCEPT

To date, the term *translanguaging*, defined in a number of different ways has been the subject of numerous publications, conference presentations, pedagogical conversations, and theoretical debates (e.g., Canajarajah, 2011; Cenoz, 2017; Cenoz & Gorter, 2017; Creese & Blackledge, 2015; Garcia, 2009, 2011, 2013; Garcia & Li, 2014; Hornberger & Link, 2012; Li, 2018; Li & Ho, 2018; Lin & He, 2017; MacSwan, 2017; Reynolds & Oellana, 2014; Swanwick, 2017; Li, 2011). For a number of scholars who work within the tradition of both critical applied linguistics and the new sociolinguistics of mobility, moreover, (e.g., Blommaert, 2012; Jacquemet, 2005; Otsuji & Pennycook, 2010) conceptualizing language as a series of social practices and actions referred to variously with terms such as *metrolingualism, code-meshing,* and *transidiomatic practices* signals both the shifting of the established conceptual lens and the examination and reconceptualization of perspectives that have informed pedagogical practice. Importantly, this reframing is seen as directly connected to larger issues including sociolinguistic critiques of prior scholarship on bilingualism, to ongoing political struggles, and to the promise of linguistic liberation and educational equity for minoritized populations.

Li (2018a) points out that the term *translanguaging* seems to have captured people's imagination. It is used variously by both researchers and practitioners, and there are currently many different perspectives on the term itself. Definitions of translanguaging as well as

---

[7] It can be argued that this view has been indirectly reinforced by the concept of interlanguage (Selinker, 1972 1992), which is premised on the idea that the learner's own language and the additional language are two separate entities.
[8] In relation to this point, for a helpful overview of the field of bi/multilingualism, the reader is referred to Heller & Pavlenko (2010). For a relevant discussion on language and superdiversity, see Blommaert and Rampton (2011).

pedagogies described as translanguaging frequently illustrate very different understandings of the term. Still evolving and deepening as a stance, a theory <u>and</u> a pedagogy, translanguaging has been described as a "way of thinking about and acting on the language practices of bilingual people" (Garcia, Ibarra Johnson & Seltzer, 2017, p. ix) as well as a good candidate for an applied linguistics theory of language practice (Li, 2018, p.22) that allows us to reconceptualize language

> "as a multilingual, multisemiotic, multisensory, and multimodal resource for sense- and meaning-making, and the multilingual as someone who is aware of the existence of the political entities of named languages and has an ability to make use of the structural features of some of them that they have acquired. It has the capacity to enable us to explore the human mind as a holistic multicompetence (Cook 1992; Cook and Li 2016), and rethink some of the bigger, theoretical issues in linguistics generally."

Seeking to bring clarity to current debates on translanguaging and noting the evolving nature of the concept, Vogel & Garcia (2017, p. 4) have put forward three core premises (quoted below) as fundamental to translanguaging theory:

1. It posits that individuals select and deploy features from a unitary linguistic repertoire [i.e. an individual's own repertoire possibly comprising feature drawn from different named languages] in order to communicate.
2. It takes up a perspective on bi- and multilingualism that privileges speakers' own dynamic linguistic and semiotic practices above the named languages of nations and states.
3. It still recognizes the material effects of socially constructed named language categories and structuralist language ideologies, especially for minoritized language speakers."

Vogel and Garcia (2017, p. 4) further state that " Taken together, these premises seek to challenge previous models of bi- and multilingualism, and in so doing, to elevate the status of individuals and peoples whose language practices have been traditionally minoritized and labeled as being 'nonstandard'."

　　While translanguaging is often considered to be closely related to the concept of *plurilingualism* in the language education field, Garcia and Otheguy (forthcoming) argue that plurlingualism (the development of partial competence in several languages and tolerance toward different languages and varieties) was promoted as a goal with the majority white European citizens in mind. For black and brown refugees, however, there was, in fact, no tolerance for partial competence in the societal language. For students from these minoritized groups, the goal was abandonment of the home language and the development of native-like proficiency in the national language. Garcia and Otheguy specifically contrast translanguaging with plurilingualism stating that translanguaging " did not start from a position of power by those who believed in the value of multilingualism for national integration into a neoliberal economy. It started rather from a minoritized multilingual position that understood the effects that colonialism and nation-building had had on the community's identity, language, and economy, and who advocated for greater national liberation and power" (Garcia & Otheguy, forthcoming). Once again, the concern for and the focus on minoritized populations is emphasized (cf. for different perspectives on the transformative potentials of translanguaging in the political economy, see Block, 2018; Flores, 2013; Jasper, 2018).

A summary of the range of positions on translanguaging with which we are concerned in this article was recently provided by Poza (2017). While his work had as its purpose examining the dilution of the social justice implications of the term, he traced the scholarship from the time the term translanguaging first appeared in the literature in Williams (1994) to the period between 2009 and 2014 when it entered wider circulation. Using both the ERIC Database, Google Scholar, and materials produced by the CUNY-NYSIEB group (Celic and Selzer, 2001), he examined a total of 53 publications of different types including 31 empirical studies, 2 literature reviews, 8 summative textbook/practitioner guides, and 12 theoretical essays that included a variety of different perspectives including: (1) translanguaging seen simply as language alternation (a descriptive term), (2) translanguaging as an overturning of traditional conceptualizations of linguistic norms, and (3) translanguaging as a practice that "upends traditional language ideologies and norms and simultaneously counters established relations of power".

While the discussion of the scholarship and literature on translanguaging that we present here is organized differently, we make reference to Poza's review of the literature here because it offers evidence of the evolving nature of the term, the contested nature of various conceptualizations present in the literature today, and of the challenge of providing a coherent introduction for a broad audience of language educators. As we have signaled, the rapidly expanding corpus of work in translanguaging into conceptually distinguishable categories suggests that we are dealing with a multi-faceted and multi-layer polysemic term. For educational and pedagogic purposes there are at least two analytic perspectives that would help us understand the diverse epistemic and ontological assumptions underlying this term more clearly: (1) languages are distinct and separate semiotic entities, and (2) languages are configurations of temporal lexical and syntactic features expressing human meaning. The first perspective is broadly in line with the well established 'mainstream' view in language education, that English is different from Spanish, and that Spanish is different from Japanese and so on. There are typological similarities in some cases (e.g. between German and Swedish), but any formal similarity represents merely pedagogical convenience in so far as it may reduce the teaching and learning load. Fundamentally, from a language education point of view, languages are unrelated entities. Each has its own grammatical and lexical rules, conventions of use, standards and requirements in terms of proficiency. The second view sees languages as bundles of lexical, syntactic, phonological and orthographic features in use in specific places and times. These features can change and cross from one (named) language to another. There are no intrinsic linguistic reasons to confer any kind of permanence to languages, and there is certainly no educational merit in preserving and promoting language insularity, however defined, in terms of use for communicative purposes. These two perspectives are useful in helping us to disambiguate the diverse meanings embedded in the professional language teaching and assessment literature in respect of translanguaging[9]. In the two sections that follow, we first show some examples of the work associated with the first perspective. After that we will turn to the second view that sees languages as bundles of lexical, syntactic, phonological and orthographic features.

Languages as distinct and separate semiotic entities

---

[9] For a related discussion in language assessment see Jenkins and Leung (2019).

The world-wide English (as a Foreign) Language Teaching (ELT) enterprise, with its ubiquitous and influential commercial textbook industry, has been undoubtedly the professional field that has been most receptive to the monolingual language teaching approach, especially since the onset of the Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) in the late 1970s. As Littlewood (2014) points out, there are different variants of CLT, from a strong version that takes communicative use of the focal language as the basis of language learning to weaker versions that deploy communicative activities (e.g. pair discussion) as part of language learning. The relevant observation here is that CLT teacher training programs, teaching menus and materials (e.g. the international textbooks) rarely mention the value and pedagogic affordance of students' first languages; it is monolingual language teaching *par excellence* in terms of pedagogic principles and professional training. And yet, even in this putative stronghold of monolingual language teaching we find accounts of teachers and students use their shared first language in the classroom. Humphries and Burns (2015), for instance, provide an illuminating account of English Language teachers (first language speakers of Japanese) in a Japanese *kosen* (a specialist college in engineering) using Japanese in their English lessons.

The approach to teaching of English as a foreign language in Japan has been following the well-established *yakudoku* (訳読), based on reading (for meaning) of the grammatically rendered Japanese translation of the original language (Hino, 1988). In effect it is a form of grammar translation orchestrated by the teacher. In this approach the students' first language in very much integrated into the learning process. It is generally acknowledged that the public examination system, teacher education, and public expectations (in relation to foreign language education) are all aligned with this approach. In order to meet the new accreditation requirement by an external qualification authority, the *kosen* in Humphries and Burns's account had to adopt a new English Language program designed to develop communicative competence, and to prepare the students for the internationally marketed TOEIC test (The Test of English for International Communication). As part of the change new textbooks were developed that focussed on meaning rather than grammar, emphasized the spoken language (listening and speaking in English), promoted interaction activities in which students expected to use English. All of this would, in theory, reduce the need to use Japanese in the English classes. However, in their classroom observations Humphries and Burns (2015, p.242) report that: "… participants [teachers] continued to follow the *yakudoku* tradition … Classes were primarily teacher led, highly structured, conducted in Japanese and focused on recurring language structures". Instead of asking students to engage in problem-solving communicative exercises, the teachers provided answers to the students so that they could complete the activities. And instead of inviting the students to listen to spoken passages for comprehension exercises, the teachers used transcripts and translated the texts for them. The teachers also commented that some of the textbook-based activities designed to encourage students to discuss and explore cultural topics in English was too difficult for students to follow; they provided the students with explanations in Japanese.

The relevance of this account of the English Language teachers in this *kosen* is that *yakudoku* seems to assume additional language learning is premised on accessing meaning in another language through students' first language, and that the distinct and separate grammatical systems and lexical resources in the additional language can be learned through exercises that involve conscious use of first language. In the field of English Language Teaching in different parts of the world, the monolingual teaching principle is increasingly questioned (Littlewood,

2014; also see Anderson and Lightfoot, 2018 in relation to professional and policy dispositions in India). Although it would be difficult to be precise about the extent of first language use in foreign language classrooms in different world locations, in a review study Littlewood and Yu (2011) suggest that 60-70% of word use in first language is not unusual.

Perhaps we should also note that the term "translanguaging" does not appear to have a strong presence in the English Language Teaching literature. The reasons for this are probably partly related to its commercial and marketing imperatives, i.e. the promotion and sale of English Language as a 'standard' product should not be distracted by notions of pedagogic deviation and legitimization of dilution and hybridity (not quite English), and partly related to its disconnection from local community language practices – the carrier content and language exercises in the international English language textbooks are generally sanitized to avoid any possible association with socially, politically and culturally sensitive issues anywhere in the world. There is in fact an acronym, PARSNIP, reminding textbook writers to steer away from topics linked to politics, alcohol, religion, sex, narcotics, isms (e.g. socialism) and pork (https://www.theguardian.com/books/2015/jan/14/pigs-textbooks-oup-authors-pork-guidelines). So any allusion to vernacular uses of language linked to particular ethnic communities would seem off beam. Indeed much of the discussion related to the pedagogic use of students' first language is oriented towards greater teaching efficiency and cognitive advantages in aid of the learning of English.

In a discussion focussed on clarifying the meaning of translanguaging in the Welsh educational context where the school system has to meet the needs of different groups of learners of Welsh (minority language) and English (majority language), Lewis, Jones and Baker (2012, p.655) state that

> "… translanguaging tries to draw on all the linguistic resources of the child to maximise understanding and achievement. Thus, both languages [Welsh and English] are used in a dynamic and functionally integrated manner to organise and mediate mental processes in understanding, speaking, literacy, and, not least, learning."

From this statement it is quite clear that Lewis et al. take a cognitive view of language as a mediating facility for mental processes. The phrase 'both languages are used in a dynamic and functionally integrated manner' suggests that Welsh and English are conceptualized as separate and distinct, but they can be used in combination and alternation for particular purposes. This view is expressed more directly in a later passage where it is claimed that

> "… translanguaging in the classroom has special properties. It … seeks to consciously vary the language of input and output but with dual-language processing … A lesson may begin in one language but then utilise another language because deeper learning may occur when both languages are activated." (op.cit., p.667)

This elaboration suggests that the two languages are seen as instruments that can be directed to perform in a certain way to maximise cognitive processing and to facilitate learning. We note in this 2012 article that Lewis et al see translanguaging in terms of both planned and intentional two-language usage, and spontaneous use of two languages (Welsh and English) in classroom

spoken interaction to enhance understanding and communicative effectiveness. They also recognize translation as part of the dual language use in the classroom.

> "While translanguaging is the concurrent use of two languages, translation is more about language separation, scaffolding, and working mainly in the stronger language. In a classroom with bilingual children, translation may be used so that the weaker academic language (e.g., English) used for content transmission is translated into the children's stronger (e.g., home) language to ensure understanding and the learning of a concept." (op.cit., p.659)

Thus it is assumed that within bi-/multilingual individuals their knowledge and skills in their languages are separately constituted and their language repertoires vary in terms of proficiency, but their overall multilingual repertoire can be activated to facilitate learning in a translanguaging classroom. Translating subject content presented in the student's weaker language into their stronger language can assist comprehension. For Lewis et al it is this intra-individual dual-language facilitation that is key to bilingual education.

Languages as bundles of lexical, syntactic, phonological and orthographic features in use in specific places and times

In a critical 'reconsideration' of the fundamental tenets in language education in our time Reagan (2004) argues that by taking a social and historical view we can see that any language is constantly changing as it varies across time in terms of individual speaker predilection, context of use, social class, gender and so on. Thus a language is "ultimately a collection of idiolects which have been determined to belong together for … ultimately non- and extra-linguistic reasons" (Reagan, 2004, p.46).   There is little doubt that diachronic evidence of language change would bear out the central proposition in this position, namely, language changes over time. If we accept that historically language does not stay still, recent developments in digital communication and mass movements of people through migration have undoubted accelerated the pace of change. The permeability of languages with names (Chinese, Japanese, Korean …) is also well recognized. The old adage that languages are dialects that have flags and gunboats clearly recognizes that naming a language is not based on a linguistic fact (also see Cooper, 1989; Hudson, 1996; Romaine, 1994). Makoni and Pennycook (2005) link the idea of naming languages to European colonial imposition of ideas and practices on their subjugated peoples in parts of Africa and Asia.

Given this protean nature of language, the often unquestioned acceptance in language education that languages have stable, even fixed, lexicogrammatical and pragmatic characteristics and properties has served to perpetuate a form of reification. Adopting a broadly similar perspective, Jørgensen and his colleagues (2008, 2011, 2014) take the view that while conventionally we have come to see languages as different entities each with their own linguistic and pragmatic features, in contemporary societies we can see the porous and leaky nature of language. Working in ethnolinguistically diverse urban environments in Denmark, they provide evidence of language use in context that is not restricted to one single 'named' language. The following is an example from Jørgensen et al (2011, p.24) It is a Facebook exchange between three girls; Maimuna, who is "quite a bit of an artist" has promised the other two girls that she would provide them with drawing.

(Language representations in translation: English in italics, standard Danish in recte, youth Danish underlined, other language in bold)

‘Maimuna 13:45:	har købt the equipment, skal bare finde tid til at lave en spektakulær én kun tje dig morok, den skal være speciel med ekstra spice :P, sorry tar mig sammen denne weekend! Insallah
Translation:	have bought *the equipment*, must just find the time to make a spectacular one just **for** you **morok**, it must be special with extra *spice* :P, sorry <u>pull</u> myself together this *weekend*! **insAllah**

Ayhan 15:20:	gracias muchas gracias!! jeg wen-ter shpæændt gardash ;-)) love youuu...
Translation:	**gracias muchas gracias!** I <u>am wait-ing</u> excitedly **gardash** ;-)) *love youuu...*

İlknur 23:37:	Ohhh Maimuna, Du havde også lovet mig en skitse... Og du sagde, at det ville været efter eksamener, men??? Still waiting like Ayhan, and a promise is a promise :d :d:d
Translation:	*Ohhh* (Maimuna), You had also promised me a sketch... and you said, that it would be after exams, but??? *Still waiting like Ayhan, and a promise is a promise* .d :d:d’

In this stretch of Facebook interaction the languages involved are associated with Danish, youth Danish, Arabic, English and Spanish. In addition, Jørgensen et al report that ‘morok’ is a an old Amenian term meaning ‘old man/father’ that has been adopted in Turkish. Maimuna does not speak Turkish but has used this term in this exchange. ‘Gardash’ is an adapted Turkish word ‘Kardeş’ (meaning ‘sibling’) that means ‘friend’ among urban youth in Denmark. Jørgensen and his colleagues argue that it would be difficult to analyse this kind of language use in terms of linguistic origin without running into almost unresolvable ambiguities. For instance, the distinction between youth Danish and other varieties of Danish is not clearcut. It would also be difficult to determine how many languages are involved; is ‘gardash’ Danish or Turkish, or even Copenhagen urbanese of a particular time?

While any attempt to trace the language origins of a text such as the one under discussion here is of linguistic interest, from a perspective of understanding language in social use, and by extension, in language education, it would be more productive to study the linguistic features of any real-life language-based communication without normative judgements. In many ways it almost does not matter whether a Turkish word has been rendered in Danish and it has appeared in a text produced by a young Danish person in 21st century Copenhagen. What matters is that it has featured in the shared linguistic resources of a particular group of people. For Maimuna and her friends the fact that their language repertoire is made up of all sorts of words and semi-inherited meanings from diverse sources probably does not add much to the content of their messaging. What counts is that they share a common linguistic repertoire that comprises features that they all understand and use to express themselves. As Jørgensen and Møller (2014, p.73) observe: "… speakers employ linguistic features associated with different languages as a matter of habit". They call this polylanguaging. We note that polylanguaging does not dispense

with the idea that for language communication to take place, there is a need for a certain amount of shared patterns and resources among interlocutors. Indeed any such shared linguistic patterns and resources are an inherent part of language practice. The basic argument here is that the observed grammar rules and other perceived intrinsic linguistic regularities are mere epiphenomena. Hopper (1998:157-158) puts this view thus: 'There is no natural fixed structure to language. Rather, speakers borrow heavily from their previous experiences of communication in similar circumstances, on similar topics, and with similar interlocuters. Systematicity, in this view, is an illusion produced by the partial settling or sedimentation of frequently used forms into temporary subsystems'[10].

From a language education point of view, paying attention to the actual ways in which students use their own language repertoire in context without prejudice would provide some descriptive and analytic purchase on language practice in actual communities. Many would argue that this is, if nothing else, a more efficacious approach to language education as it would help tap into students' background knowledge and current communicative repertoire effectively. There is a substantial body of work in language education that is related to this view. From a perspective broadly similar to Jørgensen et al and with reference largely to Hispanic and other minoritized students in parts of the USA, García and Kleyn (2016) and Otheguy, García and Reid (2015) argue that named languages are labels that exist in society as artefacts, they have 'no linguistic reality' (e.g. there is nothing inherent in words such as 'mesa' and table' that would make them Spanish or English). Furthermore, multilinguals operate only one unified language system within their own repertoire, which can comprise language features from different named languages without distinction. So the term translanguaging refers to "the deployment of a speaker's full linguistic repertoire without regard for watchful adherence to the socially and politically defined boundaries of named (usually national and state) languages" (Otheguy et al, 2015 p.81; also see Vogel and García, 2017). So the terms bilingualism and multilingualism do not imply more than one (named) language system residing within the individual multilingual speaker (Otheguy, García and Reid, 2018); the language repertoire of the individual multilingual comprises the assembled resources from named languages.

At this point one may ask: How would this view of language as *bundles of lexical, syntactic, phonological and orthographic features in use in specific places and times* help improve our approach to and practice in language education? For García and Kano (2014, p.261), in the specific educational contexts in which they work in the United States, translanguaging has the potential of unlocking unacknowledged possibilities; they suggest that translanguaging is 'a process by which students and teachers engage in complex discourse practices that include ALL the language practices of ALL students in a class in order to develop new language practices and sustain old ones, communicate and appreciate knowledge, and give voice to new socio-political realities by interrogating linguistic inequality'. Furthermore, García and Kleyn (2016, p.14) see translanguaging as a form of pedagogic empowerment for students who have historically been characterized as languageless: "This [translanguaging] gives legitimacy to the practices of multilingual speakers and encourage us as educators to leverage their full language repertoire to support their understanding of content, develop their language performances, and buttress their socioemotional development". In a similar vein Li (2011, p.13)

---

[10] From this perspective the use of language involves both thinking and practice; the distinction between cognition and enactment is obviated.

suggests that through translanguaging people enact "… different dimensions of their personal history, experience and environment, their attitude, belief and ideology, their cognitive and physical capacity into one co-ordinated and meaningful performance … making it into a lived experience". So translanguaging is a "transformative, resemiotization process" through which they "consciously construct and constantly modify their sociocultural identities and values …"; beyond this intra-individual process "[t]anslanguaging creates a social space ,,, [and this] has its own transformative power because it is forever evolving and combines and generates new identities, values and practices" (Li, 2018a, pp.14-15).

RAISING ISSUES FOR FURTHER DEBATE AND RESEARCH

The development of the concept of translanguaging has clearly come a long way in a relatively short time. The intensification of the debate in the past ten years or so has challenged and destabilized some of the settled ideas and propositions related to the sanctity of named languages as separate and distinct linguistic systems, the folk value of monolingual language purity, the ontological validity underlying the concept of code-switching, and the very basis of what counts as language competence itself. In the process a number of the widely accepted and promoted propositions in additional language education such as language separation in both teaching and curriculum arrangements have been scrutinized. There is little doubt that the highly energized debate has opened new conceptual vistas and epistemological perspectives that can lead to more diverse pedagogic approaches and educational provisions for students in different contexts. At the same time the emerging ideas and arguments have also generated some complex questions. We will now turn to some of them briefly.

An important strand of the translanguaging conceptualization suggests that multilinguals have a unitary linguistic repertoire, drawing on features of different named languages without differentiation (e.g. Li, 2018a; Otheguy et al, 2015; Vogel and García, 2017). One interpretation of this proposition is that translanguaging speakers have an intra-individual space to use language resources freely and creatively in terms of choosing and combining their language resources. It is unclear how and how far this creative capacity can be harnessed at this time in language teaching and learning. In earlier code-switching research, there was some discussion on possible structural constraints on bilingual combinations, e.g. Poplack's (1980) free morpheme constraint. However, in Cantonese-English an expression such as *un-ding-able* is possible (the transliterated *ding* is inserted as a morpheme, *ding* 頂 means 'to support' or 'to bear/tolerate', so *undingable* means 'unbearable' idiomatically)[11]. It is not clear whether this kind of translingual morphemic combinational pattern would work (and how they work) across all (named) languages. (For a further discussion see MacSwan's (2017) proposition that there is a possible named language-derived grammaticality effect on multilinguals' use of their linguistic resources, and the rebuttal of this by Otherguy et al (2018).) From wider research, the notion of semantic prosody, from corpus-based research in relation to collation (e.g. Sinclair, 1991), also suggests that at the level of actual language use word-level combinations may not be entirely unconstrained, even within a single named language (also see Hoey, 2005 for the idea of language priming). Beyond morphology and syntax, there may well be semantic and pragmatic

---

[11] See '*el horringlish*' in Ortega (2019) and Li's (2018b, blog) graphic that comprises Chinese, English, Japanese and images of water melon.

considerations to be examined. These are significant issues in terms of learning and teaching, and evaluating and assessing actual language use. It may well be that the structural constraints and other language specific influences on language use are the consequences of the affordances and delimitations engendered by the prevailing language separationist environment (including language education and teaching approaches), but we need conceptual clarity and empirical support for these propositions and views. Other conceptual issues are connected to the idea that translanguaging has transformative power because it is constantly evolving, and it "combines and generates new identities, values and practices" (Li, 2018, p.15, see earlier discussion). Is there a limit to such transformation? Does any such transformation require interactional support and validation on the part of one's interlocutors with reference to the idea of achieving understanding in cross-cultural and multilingual encounters (Bremer et al 1996)? Is such transformative effect an inherent potential in translanguaging practices in all communication contexts? Is there a need to take the language practices of the wider community and cultural environment into account (see Anderson and Lightfoot, 2018). In some world locations where the key aim of additional language learning is to revitalize a minority language, e.g. the learning and use of Basque in the Basque country in Spain, is translanguaging using Basque, Spanish and other languages a hindrance or help for the revitalizing of Basque? In this kind of situation the sought after transformation would include an uplift in the learning and use of the language to be vitalized with a view to promoting it as a separate and distinct linguistic system. Language practices in education would need to consider both the imperative of protecting and promoting the specific language in question through monolingual use, and the communicative advantages brought about by using all bilingual resources available through translanguaging (see Cenoz and Gorter, 2017 for a further discussion).

At other levels, additional areas of complexity become visible if we ask different questions, for example: What will translanguaging perspectives contribute to the analysis of the communicative practices of multicompetent individuals? How can we best describe these practices, for example, without labeling resources as belonging to different codes? Indeed, if it is conceptually vacuous to refer to named languages as an autonomous and immanent resource for language practices, as it is argued that there is no linguistic reality to named languages, then the term 'translanguaging' itself is redundant (Swain, personal communication, 11th January 2019). Are practices identified as translanguaging by some researchers and as code-switching by others similar or different? Given an example of verbal interaction between multicompetent speakers what analytical advantages are there to viewing elements of it as translanguaging versus code-switching? And if code-switching and translanguaging tap into different epistemologies (with different analytic purchases), would it make sense to see them as separate conceptual and analytic approaches that can yield different insights (rather than being seen as incommensurate concepts).

In terms of pedagogy, moreover, we can ask: Is translanguaging a beneficial classroom/educational practice in all circumstances? There are probably many different answers, depending on our points of interest and educational context. From a classroom teaching standpoint where the focus is academic subject matter learning, there is *prima facie* case for using all the language resources at the disposal of the students to promote effective understanding and learning. So, in a classroom where the students and the teacher share similar language repertoires, there is every reason to translanguage, to draw from a translanguaging

stance (Garcia et al., 2017) to generate a positive *corriente* (García et al, 2017), to promote communication and learning. But in a linguistic diverse classroom (whether the focus is exclusively the development of an additional language or whether the focus is on subject-matter learning) when students and the teacher have very divergent linguistic repertoires, there may well be a need to critically examine the consequences of translanguaging with only some of the students and not with the others. Furthermore, there may well be a broader question of equality of entitlement and treatment of minoritized students who are not in a position to translanguage (for a treatise on the equality of social entitlement and treatment see Taylor, 1994). From the point of view of the well-observed differences between spoken and written language, it is clear that proficiency in spoken language does not necessarily mean similar proficiency in the written mode (for an overview of the issues, see Lippi-Green, 2012: Chapter 1). Helping students to achieve understanding of content and inter-personal meanings through translanguaging in the classroom does not necessarily lead to the development of an ability to use the societal dominant language for reading and writing, especially when in many societies the dominant language tends to populate the curriculum material; reading materials in particular are likely to be in the dominant language. Thus the question arises that how does a translanguging classroom address the pedagogic issues connected to the development of language-specific proficiency and use for learning purposes, an issue recognized by García et al (2017). This question in turn raises some fundamental issues of teacher education and professional preparation (see Anderson, 2018 for a further discussion), and of system-wide policy affordance and constraints. In England, for instance, virtually all content-related educational reading material, particularly for secondary school students, is in English. From the perspective of a teacher who is interested in putting in place a translanguaging-oriented pedagogy, what translanguaging oriented teaching principles and specially prepared materials could be deployed potentially for students who need to develop their language-specific reading ability, and academic literacy more generally, in English? In curricular contexts where the learning of a named language is part of a broader aim of developing an (inter-)cultural understanding and aesthetic sensibility associated with the focal language, further discussion would be needed to harness translanguging affordances to that end (see Kramsch, 2010; Jasper, 2018).

All of these issues would also benefit from further conceptual elaboration and empirical investigation. There is, of course, a corpus of supportive work that looks at translanguaging in different contexts, e.g. Anderson and Lightfoot, 2018; Blackledge and Creese (2010), Creese and Blackledge (2010), García et al, 2017; García and Kano (2014), Paulsrud et al (2017). At this point though it would be particularly important to explore translanguaging practices in different educational, political and socio-cultural contexts from an emic perspective that gives voice to the participants (their experiential accounts, views and preferences), and to examine the educational and social consequences of such practices that would provide a basis for further pedagogic and ethical considerations.

CONCLUDING REMARKS

As we have pointed out in this article, translanguaging is a multifaceted and a multilayered polysemic term. It has implications for both theory and practice, and while it has indeed captured the attention of both scholars and practitioners around the world, the question for the additional language teaching community is how to utilize the various insights that the use of the term *translanguaging* has provided us to date. We need to understand what it buys us from

a theoretical perspective and what it leaves unanswered. From a pedagogical perspective, we need to develop an ongoing research agenda focusing on translanguaging that can inform instruction for different groups of students. In this article we have repeatedly emphasized the importance of context – interactional, local, societal and/or global. There is an important difference between immigrant origin students (i.e., bilingual minoritized youngsters) who already use resources from two "named" languages when they arrive in school and students (e.g., new international learners of English, monolingual speakers of dominant languages enrolled in two-way immersion programs) who have had access exclusively to resources that are part of a single "national language" before they arrive in school. There is much work to be done in designing and conducting studies that help us understand the ideal role of initial communicative resources as well as the function and the quantity of exposure to additional-language communicative resources in the development of variously identified instructional goals. In moving forward, it will serve us well if researchers and practitioners carefully identify: (1) the specific context of their study and practice, (2) the particular goals of instruction, (3) the language resources that make up the repertoires of both teachers and students at the beginning of the particular instructional event/situation that is described, (4) the designed end goal of the activities and pedagogies in which teachers and students are engaged, including life-long learning frameworks and schemes that take account of developments and attritions. (For a further discussion, see Leung and Scarino, 2016),

These are interesting times. Beginning with the social turn in applied linguistics and moving to today's focus on the bi/multilingual and translingual turns, as a profession, we have made much progress in re-examining our conceptualizations and ideologies of language and our specific practices and pedagogies. The notion of translanguaging is both challenging and exciting: challenging because it forces us to examine our previous perspectives on language itself, and exciting because it suggests new possibilities and outcomes for the teaching and learning of additional languages. We would urge our readers to accept the challenge of improving both our practice and our understanding of the degree to which our conceptualizations of "named languages" and language-teaching have been both narrow and ideological and possibly divorced from the reality of the ways in which the majority of the world's multilingual populations both use and develop various bundles of communicative resources which they then use successfully in their everyday lives.

REFERENCES

Anderson, J. (2018). Reimagining English language learners from a translingual perspective. *ELT Journal, 72*(1), 26-37.

Anderson, J., & Lightfoot, A. (2018). Translingual practices in English classroom in India: Current perceptions and future possiblities. *International Jounral of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*. doi:10.1080/13670050.2018.1548558

Baker, C. (2001). *Foundations of bilingual education and bilingualism (3rd edition)*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Blackledge, A., & Creese, A. (2010). *Multilingualism: A critical perspective*. London: Continuum.

Bley-Vroman, R. (1989). What is the logical problem of foreign language learning? In S. Gass & J. Shacter (Eds.), *Linguistic perspectives on second language acquisition* (pp. 41-68). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Block, D. (2018). The political economy of language education research (or the lack thereof): Nancy Fraser and the case of translanguaging. *Critical Inquiry in Language Studies*, 15(4), 237-257.

Blommaert, J. (2012). Supervernaculars and their dialects. *Dutch Journal of Applied Linguistics, 1*(1), 1-14.

Blommaert, J., & Rampton, B. (2011). Language and Superdiversity. *Diversities, 13*, 3-21. Bremer, K., Roberts, C., Vasseur, M., Simonot, M., & Broeder, P. (Eds.). (1996). *Achieving understanding: discourse in intercultural encounters*. London: Longman.

Brisk, M. E. (1998). *Bilingual Education: from compensatory to quality education*. London: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers.

Butzkamm, W., & Caldwell, J. A. W. (2009). *The bilingual reform: A paradigm shift in foreign language teahcing*. Tübingen: Gunter Narr Verlag.

Cameron, D. (2005). *Verbal hygiene. London*: Routledge.

Canagarajah, S. (1999). *Resisting linguistic imperialism in English teaching*. Oxford UK: Oxford University Press.

Canagarajah, A. S. (2011). Codemeshing in academic writing: Identifying teachable strategies of translanguaging. *Modern Language Journal, 95*(3), 401-417.

Cenoz, J. (2017). Translanguaging in School Contexts: International Perspectives. *Journal of Language, Identity, and Education, 16*(4), 193-198. doi:10.1080/15348458.2017.1327816

Cenoz, J., & Gorter, D. (2017). Minority languages and sustainable translanguaging: threat or opportunity? *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*. doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/01434632.2017.1284855

European Commission. (2013). *Study on educational support for newly arrived migrant children (final report)*. Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union.

Cook, G. (2010). *Translation in language teaching : an argument for reassessment*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Cook, V. (1992). Evidence for multi-competence. *Language Learning, 42*, 557-591. doi:10.1111/j.1467-1770.1992.tb01044.x

Cook, V. (1999). Going beyond the native speaker in language teaching. *TESOL QUARTERLY, 33*(2), 185-209.

Cook, V. (2007). The Goals of ELT. In *International handbook of English language teaching* (pp. 237-248).

Cook, V., & Li, W. (2016). *The Cambridge handbook of linguistic multi-competence*: Cambridge University Press.

Cooper, R. L. (1989). *Language planning and social change*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Creese, A., & Blackledge, A. (2015). Translanguaging and identity in educational settings. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics, 35*, 20-35.

Cummins, J. (1981). The role of primary language development in promoting educational success for language minority students. In California State Department of Education (Ed.), *Schooling and language minority students: a theoretical frameword*. Los Angeles: Evaluation, Dissemination and Assessment Center.

Cummins, J. (2000). *Language, Power and Pedagogy*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters Ltd.

Cummins, J. (2007). Rethinking monolingual instructional strategies in multilingual classrooms. *Canadian Jounral of Applied Linguistics// Revue canadienne de linguistique appliquee, 10*(2), 221-240.

Davies, A. (1991). *The native speaker in applied linguistics*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Davies, A. (2003). *The native speaker: Myth and reality* (Vol. 38): Multilingual Matters Limited.

Dodson, C. J., Price, E., & Williams, I. T. (1968). *Towards bilingualism: Studies in language teaching methods* (Vol. 1): University of Wales Press.

Doerr, N., & Lee, K. (2013). *Constructing the Heritage Language Learner: Knowledge, Power and New Subjectivities* (Vol. 103): Walter de Gruyter.

Doerr, N. M. (2009). *The native speaker concept: Ethnographic investigations of native speaker effects* (Vol. 26): Mouton de Gruyter.

Faltis, C. (1990). New directions in bilingual research design: The study of interactive decision making. In R. Jacobson & C. Faltis (Eds.), *Language distribution issues in bilingual schooling* (pp. 45-57). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Faltis, C. J. (1989). Code-switching and bilingual schooling: An examination of Jacobson's new concurrent approach. *Journal of Multilingual & Multicultural Development, 10*(2), 117-127.

Flores, N. (2013). The unexamined relationship between neoliberalism and plurilingualism: A cautionary tale. *TESOL QUARTERLY, 47*(3), 500-520.

Garcia, O. (2009). *Bilingual education in the 21st century*. Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.

García, O. (2011). Theorizing translanguaging for educators. In C. Celic & K. Seltzer (Eds.), *Translanguaging: A CUNY-NYSIEB guide for educators* (pp. 1-6). New York: The Graduate Center, The City University of New York.

García, O. (2013). From diglossia to transglossia: Bilingual and multilingual classrooms in the 21st century. *Bilingual and multilingual education in the 21st century: Building on experience, 94*.

García, O., & Flores, N. (2012). Multilingual pedagogies. In M. Martin-Jones, A. Blackledge, & A. Creese (Eds.), *The Routledge handbook of multilingualism* (pp. 232-246). Abbingdon: Routledge.

García, O., Johnson, S. I., Seltzer, K., (2017). *The translanguaging classroom: Leveraging student bilingualism for learning*: Caslon Philadelphia, PA.

García, O., & Kano, N. (2014). Translanguaging as process and pedagogy: Developing the English writng of Japanese students in the US. In J. Conteh & G. Meier (Eds.), *The multilingual turn in languages education : opportunities and challenges* (pp. 258-277). Bristol Multilingual Matters.

García, O., & Kleyn, T. (2016). Translanguaging theory in education. In O. García & T. Kleyn (Eds.), *Translanguaging with multilingual students: Learning from classroom moments* (pp. 9-33). New York: Routledge.

García, O., & Li, W. (2014). *Translanguaging: Language, bilingualism and education*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

García, O., & Lin, A. M. Y. (2016). Extending Understandings of Bilingual and Multilingual Education. In O. García, A. Lin, & S. May (Eds.), *Bilingual and Multilingual Education* (3 ed., pp. 1-20).

García, O., & Sánchez, M. (2015). Transforming schools with emergent bilingual students: The CUNY-NYSIEB Project. In I. Drim, I. Gogolin, D. Knorr, M. Kruger-Potratz, D. Lengyel, & H. H. Reich (Eds.), *Impulse für die Migrationsgesellschaft: Bildung, Politik und Religion* (pp. 80-94): Waxmann Verelag.

Hall, G., & Cook, G. (2012). Own-language use in language teaching and learning. *Language Teaching, 45*(3), 271-308.

Haugen, E. (1972). The stigmata of bilingualism. In A. Dil (Ed.), *The ecology of language: Essays by Einar Haugen* (pp. 307-324). Stanford CA: Stanford University Press.

Hawkins, M. R., & Mori, J. (2018). Considering 'Trans-'Perspectives in Language Theories and Practices. *Applied Linguistics, 39*(1), 1-8.

Heller, M., & Pavlenko, A. (2010). Bilingualism and multilingualism. *Society and Language Use; Jaspers, J., Östman, J., Verschueren, J., Eds*, 71-83.

Hoey, M. (2005). *Lexical priming: A new theory of words and language*. New York: Routledge.

Hopper, P. (1998). Emergent grammar. In M. Tomassello (Ed.), *The new psychology of language: Cognitive and functional approaches to language structure* (pp. 155-176). Mahwah: Erlbaum.

Hornberger, N. H., & Link, H. (2012). Translanguaging and transnational literacies in multilingual classrooms: A biliteracy lens. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism, 15*, 261-278.

Hudson, R. A. (1996). *Sociolinguisitcs (2nd edition)*. Cambridge: Cambridge University press.

Jacobson, R. (1981). The implementation of a bilingual instructional model: The new concurrent approach. *Ethnoperspectives in bilingual education research, 3*, 14-29.

Jacobson, R. (1990). Allocating two languages as a key feature of a bilingual methodology. In R. Jacobson & C. Faltis (Eds.), *Language distribution issue sin bilingual schooling* (pp. 3-17). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Jaspers, J. (2018). The transformative limits of translanguaging. *Language & Communication, 58*, 1-10.

Jenkins, J., & Leung, C. (2019). From mythical 'standard' to standard reality: The need for alternatives to standardized English language tests. *Language Teaching, 52* (1), 86–110.

Johnson, R. K., & Swain, M. (Eds.). (1997). *Immersion education: international perspectives*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Jörgensen, N., Karrebæk, M. S., Madsen, L. M., & Møller, J. S. (2011). Polylanguaging in superdiversity. *Diversities, 13*(2), 20-37.

Kramsch, C. (1997). The privilege of the nonnative speaker. *PMLA, 112*, 359-369.

Kramsch, C. (2010). The symbolic dimensions of the intercultural (Plenary speech). *Language Teaching, 44*(3), 354–367.

Krashen, S. (1981). *Second language acquisition and second language learning*. Oxford: Pergamon.

Leung, C. (2016). English as an Additional Language - A genealogy of language-in-education policies and reflections on research trajectories. *Language and Education, 30*(2), 158-174. doi:10.1080/09500782.2015.1103260

Leung, C. (2018). English as an additional language: challenges of ethnicity, language and subject identity in the contemporary classroom. In M. Maguire, K. Skilling, M. Glackin, S. Gibbons, & D. Pepper (Eds.), *Becoming a teacher* (pp. 221-236). Maidenhead, Berkshire: Open University Press, McGraw-Hill Education.

Leung, C., Harris, R., & Rampton, B. (1997). The idealised native speaker, reified ethnicities, and classroom realities. *TESOL QUARTERLY, 31*(3), 543-560.

Leung, C., & Scarino, A. (2016). Reconceptualizing the nature of goals and outcomes in language/s education. *The Modern Language Journal, 1000*(S1), 81-95.

Lewis, G., Jones, B., & Baker, C. (2012). Translanguaging: Developing its conceptualisation and contextualisation. *Educational Research and Evaluation, 18*(7), 655-670.

Lewis, G., Jones, B., & Baker, C. (2012). Translanguaging: Origins and development from school to street and beyond. *Educational Research and Evaluation, 18*(7), 641-654.

Li, W. (2011). Moment analysis and translanguaging space: Discursive construction of identities by multilingual Chinese youth in Britain. *Journal of Pragmatics, 43*(5), 1222-1235.

Li, W. (2016). New Chinglish and the post-multilingualism challenge: Translanguaging ELF in China. *Journal of English as a Lingua Franca, 5*(1), 1-25.

Li, W. (2018a). Translanguaging as a practical theory of language. *Applied Linguistics, 39*(1), 9-30.

Li, W. (2018b, blog). Translanguaging and code-switching: what's the difference? Retrieved from https://blog.oup.com/2018/05/translanguaging-code-switching-difference/

Li, W., & Ho, W. Y. (2018). Language Learning Sans Frontiers: A Translanguaging View. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics, 38*, 33-59. doi:10.1017/S0267190518000053

Lin, A. M. Y., & He, P. (2017). Translanguaging as dynamic activity flows in CLIL classrooms. *Journal of Language, Identity & Education, 16*(4), 228-244.

Linell, P. (2004). *The written language bias in linguistics: Its nature, origins and transformations*: Routledge.

Lippi-Green, R. (2012). *English with an accent: Language, ideology, and discrimination in the United States (2nd edition)*. New York: Routledge.

Littlewood, W. (2014). Communication-oriented language teaching: Where are we now? Where do we go from here? *Language Teaching, 47*(3), 349-362.

Littlewood, W. T., & Yu, B. (2011). First language and target language in the foreign language classroom. *Language Teaching, 44*(1), 64-77.

Macaro, E. (2005). Codeswitching in the L2 classroom: A communication and learning strategy. In E. Llurda (Ed.), *Non-native language teachers* (pp. 63-84). New York: Springer.

MacSwan, J. (2017). A multilingual perspective on translanguaging. *American Educational Research Journal, 54*(1), 167-201.

Makoni, S., & Pennycook, A. (2005). Disinventing and (re)constructing languages. *Critical Inquiry in Language Studies, 2*(3), 137-156.

May, S. (Ed.) (2014). *The multilinjgual turn: Implications for SLA, TESOL and bilingual education*. Abingdon, Oxon: Routledge.

McLelland, N. (2018). The history of language learning and teaching in Britain. *The Language Learning Journal, 46*(1), 6-16.

Moller, J. S., Jorgensen, J. N., & Holmen, A. (2014). Polylingual development among Turkish speakers in a Danish primary school - a critical view on the fourth grade slump. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism, 17*, 32-54.

National Academies of Sciences. (2017). *Promoting the educational success of children and youth learning English: Promising futures*. Washington, DC: The National Academies Press.

Ortega, L. (2013a). SLA for the 21st century: Disciplinary progress, transdisciplinary relevance, and the bi/multilingual turn. *Language Learning, 63*(s1), 1-24.

Ortega, L. (2013b). *Ways forwarad for a bi/multilingual turn in SLA*: Routledge.

Ortega, L. (2019). SLA and the study of equitable multilingualism. *The Modern Language Journal, 103*(Supplement). doi:10.1111/modl.12525

Otheguy, R., García, O., & Reid, W. (2015). Clarifying translanguaging and deconstructing named languages: A perspective from linguistics. *Applied Linguistics Review, 6*(3), 281-307.

Otheguy, R., García, O., & Reid, W. (2018). A translanguaging view of the linguistic system of bilinguals. *Applied Linguistics Review, Early View*. doi:https://doi.org/10.1515/applirev-2018-0020

Otsuji, E., & Pennycook, A. (2010). Metrolingualism: fixity, fluidity and language in flux. *Journal of Multilingualism, 7*(3), 240-254.

Ovando, C. J. (2003). Bilingual education in the United States: Historical development and current issues. *Bilingual Research Journal, 27*(1), 1-24.

Paulsrud, B., Rosén, J., Straszer, B., & Weden, A. (Eds.). (2017). *New perspectives on translanguaging and education*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

Piller, I. (2002). *Bilingual Couples Talk. The discursive construction of hybridity*. Philadelphia, PA, USA: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Poplack, S. (1980). Sometimes I'll start a sentence in English y termino en Español": toward a typology of code-switching, . *Linguistics, 18*(7-8), 581–618.

Poza, L. (2017). Translanguaging: Definitions, Implications, and Further Needs in Burgeoning Inquiry. *Berkeley Review of Education, 6*(2).

Rampton, B. (1990). Displacing the 'native speaker': expertise, affiliation, and inheritance. *ELT Journal, 44*(2), 97-101.

Reagan, T. (2004). Objectification, positivism, language studies: A reconsideration. *Critical Inquiry in Language Studies: An International Journal, 1*(1), 41-60.

Reynolds, J. F., & Orellana, M. F. (2014). Translanguaging within Enactments of Quotidian Interpreter-Mediated Interactions. *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology, 24*(3), 315-338.

Romaine, S. (1994). *Language in society: an introduction to sociolinguistics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Rosa, J. D. (2016). Standardization, racialization, languagelessness: Raciolinguistic ideologies across communicative contexts. *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology, 26*(2), 162-183.

Selinker, l. (1972). Interlanguage. *International Review of Applied Linguistics, 10*, 209-231.

Selinker, L. (1992). *Rediscovring interlanguage*. London: Longman.

Sinclair, J. (1991). *Corpus, concordance and collocation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Swain, M., & Lapkin, S. (2013). A Vygotskian perspective on immersion education: The L1/L2 debate. *Journal of Immersion and Content Based Language Education, 1,* 101-129.

Tavakoli, P., & Jones, R. (2018). *An overview of approaches to second language acquisition and instructional practices. : Welsh Government report number 12/2018*. Cardiff: Welsh Government

Taylor, C. (1994). The politics of recognition. In A. Gutmann (Ed.), *Multilculturalism: examining the politics of recognition*. Princeton: N.J.: Princeton University Press.

Tedick, D. J., Christian, D., & Fortune, T. W. (2011). *Immersion education: Practices, policies, possibilities* (Vol. 83): Multilingual Matters.

Toker, E. B. C. (2012). What Makes a Native Speaker? Nativeness, Ownership, and Global Englishes. *The Minnesota Review, 2012*(78), 113-129.

Turnbull, M., & Dailey-O'Cain, J. (2009). *First language use in second and foreign language learning* (Vol. 44): Multilingual Matters.

Vogel, S., & García, O. (2017). Translanguaging. *Oxford Research Encyclopedia of Education*. Retrieved from https://academicworks.cuny.edu/gc_pubs

Weinreich, U. (1974). *Languages in Contact*. The Hague: Mouton.

Williams, C. (1994). *Arfarniad o ddulliau dysgu ac addysgu yng nghyd-destun addysg uwchradd ddwyieithog [An evaluation of teaching and learning methods in the context of bilingual secondary education] (Unpublished PhD thesis)*. University of Wales, Bangor.