Blackwell Handbooks in Linguistics

This outstanding multi-volume series covers all the major subdisciplines within linguistics today and, when complete, will offer a comprehensive survey of linguistics as a whole.

Recent Titles Include:

Full series title list available at
www.blackwellreference.com

The Handbook of Bilingual and Multilingual Education

Edited by

Wayne E. Wright, Sovicheth Boun, and Ofelia García

WILEY Blackwell

Dedications

To my dear wife Phal Mao, and our beloved children Jeffrey Sovan,
Michael Sopat, and Catherine Sophaline Wright
(Wayne E. Wright)

To my mother Sivantha By and my father Saing Hak Chea
(Sovicheth Boun)

Para Ricardo, Eric, Raquel y Emma, y por un futuro de nietos bilingües
(Ofelia García)

Valdés, G. (1997). Dual language immersion programs: A cautionary note concerning the education of language-minority students. *Harvard Educational Review, 67*, 391–429.

Vázquez, V., & Rubio, F. (2010). Teachers' concerns and uncertainties about the introduction of CLIL programmes. *Porta Linguarum, 14*, 45–58.

Wode, H. (1999). Immersion teaching: European perspectives. In F. Federica Ricci Garotti (Ed.), *L'immersione linguistica: Una nuova prospettiva* (pp. 78–94). Milano: FrancoAngeli.

13 Translanguaging, Bilingualism, and Bilingual Education

OFELIA GARCÍA AND LI WEI

Bilingual education distinguishes itself from other forms of language education in that content and language learning are integrated; that is, two languages are used as a medium of instruction. In 1974 Wallace Lambert proposed what became the two classic models of viewing bilingualism in schools during the twentieth century—*subtractive bilingualism and additive bilingualism*. Subtractive bilingualism is what happens when schools take away the home language of the child who speaks a minoritized language and substitute it with a majority language. Additive bilingualism, on the other hand, builds on the child's home language as the additional language is learned. However, these models of bilingualism have proven to be insufficient in the twenty-first century, with interactions increasingly occurring in contact spaces such as schools between speakers of different origins, experiences, characteristics, and histories. Bilingual education cannot be simply subtractive or additive, for there are no homogenous groups using the same language practices.

García (2009a) has proposed another two types of bilingualism for schools—recursive bilingualism and dynamic bilingualism. *Recursive bilingualism* refers to the complex and dynamic nature of the bilingualism of ethnolinguistic groups who have undergone substantial language shift as they attempt language revitalization. For these groups, *immersion revitalization bilingual education* programs are organized to move their very different language practices (some speakers having experienced more loss than others) into a bilingual future. *Developmental bilingual education* programs also embody this recursive bilingualism because the ethnolinguistic group is not monolingual to start with, but rather has diverse language practices and multiple identities. These programs are usually found in language-minoritized communities that have undergone some degree of language loss, but have not suffered the language shift of those who need immersion revitalization bilingual education programs.

Dynamic bilingualism refers to the multiple language interactions and other linguistic interrelationships that take place on different scales and spaces among

multilingual speakers. Today most bilingual education programs include children who have various language practices and who are from many dominant and non-dominant groups. Bilingual education types known as *dual-language, two-way bilingual education, two-way immersion, poly-directional bilingual education, bilingual immersion*, deliberately include students with diverse language practices. Beyond these programs, some countries aspire to have their entire population fluent in at least three languages. In these places *multiple multilingual education* uses three or more languages as media of instruction and in literacy instruction. As in other programs, the students are not assumed to be homogeneous.

In this chapter, we discuss how a *translanguaging* lens has the potential to transform structures and practices of bilingual education.[1] The emphasis on the "trans" aspects of language *and* education enables us to transgress the categorical distinctions of the past. In particular, a "trans" approach to bilingual education liberates our traditional understandings and points to three innovative aspects in considering language on the one hand, and education on the other:

1. Referring to a *trans-system and trans-space*; that is, to fluid practices that go *between* and *beyond* language and educational systems, structures, and practices to engage diverse students' multiple meaning-making systems and subjectivities.
2. Referring to its *transformative nature*; that is, as new configurations of language and education are generated, old understandings and structures are released, thus transforming not only subjectivities and identities, but also cognitive and social structures. In so doing, orders of discourses shift and the voices of Others come to the forefront.
3. Referring to the *transdisciplinary* consequences of the languaging and education analysis, providing a tool for understanding, not only language on the one hand, and education on the other, but also human sociality, human cognition and learning, social relations, and social structures.

Translanguaging in education

The term translanguaging was coined in Welsh by Cen Williams to refer to a practice of deliberately changing the language of input and the language of output. Williams (2002) further clarifies that translanguaging in education refers to using one language to reinforce the other in order to increase understanding and in order to augment the *pupil's activity in both languages* (p. 40, as cited in Lewis, Jones & Baker, 2012b, our emphasis). "Translanguaging," as used by Williams, refers to a pedagogic theory that involves students' learning two languages through a process of deep cognitive bilingual engagement (Lewis, Jones, and Baker (2012a, 2012b), following Williams, point out that the cognitive processing involved in translanguaging is more relevant for *retaining and developing bilingualism*, rather than just for emergent bilinguals at the initial stages of the bilingual continuum. As Colin Baker (2011) explains: "To read and discuss a topic in one language, and then to write about it in another language, means that the subject matter has to be

processed and 'digested'" (p. 289). Translanguaging not only promotes a deeper understanding of content, but also develops the weaker language in relationship with the one that is more dominant. In addition, translanguaging promotes the integration of those who are emergent bilinguals with those who have fuller use of bilingualism in a classroom (Lewis, Jones & Baker, 2012b). In parts of the world where bilingualism is valued, translanguaging for the purposes of sustaining bilingual practices is moving to the educational mainstream.

García's use of the Welsh-inspired term translanguaging (2009a) goes beyond the use of two separate autonomous languages in education:

> Translanguaging, or engaging in bilingual or multilingual discourse practices, is an approach to bilingualism that is centered not on languages as has been often the case, but on *the practices of bilinguals* that are readily observable. These worldwide translanguaging practices are seen here not as marked or unusual, but rather taken for what they are, namely, the normal mode of communication that, with some exceptions in some monolingual enclaves, characterizes communities throughout the world. (p. 44, our emphasis)

She continues, "translanguagings are *multiple discursive practices* in which bilinguals engage in order to *make sense of their bilingual worlds*" (2009a, p. 45, emphasis in original). Translanguaging, García says (2011a), goes beyond code-switching and translation in education because it "refers to the *process* by which bilingual students perform bilingually in the myriad multimodal ways of classrooms—reading, writing, taking notes, discussing, signing etc." (p. 147, emphasis added). Translanguaging is not only a way to "scaffold instruction, to make sense of learning and language; rather, translanguaging is part of the metadiscursive regime that students in the twenty-first century must perform" (García, 2011a, p. 147). Describing the work of the International Network of Public High Schools in the United States, García and Sylvan (2011) refer to the fact that students use "diverse language practices for purposes of learning, and teachers use inclusive language practices for purposes of teaching" (p. 397). In the context of U.S. bilingual classrooms for immigrant students who are developing English, García and Kleifgen (2010) describe how educators encourage emergent bilinguals to translanguage in order to think, reflect, and extend their inner speech. García (2009b) describes the role of translanguaging in the process of developing students' bilingualism in the following way:

> Emergent bilinguals do not acquire a separate additional language, but develop and integrate new language practices into a complex dynamic bilingual repertoire in which translanguaging is both the supportive context and the communicative web itself. (n.p.)

In education, García and Kano (2014) say, translanguaging is "a process by which students and teachers engage in complex discursive 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 appropriate knowledge, and give voice to new sociopolitical realities by interrogating linguistic inequality."

Hornberger and Link (2012) explicitly connect translanguaging to Hornberger's continua of biliteracy, enabling the potential "to explicitly valorize all points along the continua, of biliterate context, media, content, and development" (p. 268). Drawing on ethnographic research in complementary schools in the United Kingdom, Creese and Blackledge (2010; also Blackledge & Creese, 2010) describe how the students' flexible bilingualism, their translanguaging, is used by teachers to convey ideas and to promote "cross-linguistic transfer." That is, as a flexible bilingual pedagogy (Blackledge & Creese, 2010), translanguaging offers learners the possibility of accessing academic content with the semiotic resources they bring, while acquiring new ones.

The notion of translanguaging highlights two concepts that are fundamental to education, but hitherto under-explored dimensions of multilingualism, namely creativity and criticality. Li Wei (2011a, p. 1223) defines *creativity* as "the ability to choose between following and flouting the rules and norms of behaviour, including the use of language." Creativity is about pushing and breaking the boundaries between the old and the new, the conventional and the original, and the acceptable and the challenging. *Criticality* refers to the ability to use available evidence appropriately, systematically, and insightfully to inform considered views of cultural, social, and linguistic phenomena, to question and problematize received wisdom, and to express views adequately through reasoned responses to situations. These two concepts are intrinsically linked: one cannot push or break boundaries without being critical; and, the best expression of one's criticality is one's creativity. Translanguaging, as a socioeducational process, enables students to construct and constantly modify their sociocultural identities and values, as they respond to their historical and present conditions critically and creatively. It enables students to contest the "one language only" or "one language at a time" ideologies of monolingual and traditional bilingual classrooms.

Translanguaging in education also pays attention to the ways in which students combine different modes and media across social contexts and negotiate social identities. Kenner (2004) reports on how bilingual/biliterate young children in the UK learn different writing systems (Chinese, Arabic, and Spanish) at home, in complementary schools, and in the mainstream primary school. Her work illustrates how a focus on different modes, including the children's sets of linguistic resources, can foreground the different culture-specific ways multilingual children mesh the visual and actional modes (i.e., make use of shape, size and location of symbols on the page, directionality, type of stroke) in the process of learning how to write in two languages. Moreover, such a focus shows the different ways multilingual children combine and juxtapose scripts as well as explore connections and differences between their available writing systems in their text making. By translanguaging, that is, drawing on more than one set of linguistic and other modal resources to construct bilingual texts in settings where multilingual communication was encouraged, Kenner (2004, p. 118) argued, children could "express their sense of living in multiple social and cultural worlds."

Translanguaging in schools not only creates the possibility that bilingual students could use their full linguistic and semiotic repertoire to make meaning, but

also that teachers would "take it up" as a legitimate pedagogical practice. Rather than just being a scaffolding practice to access content or language, translanguaging is transformative for the child, for the teacher, and for education itself, and particularly for bilingual education.

Although translanguaging is simultaneously transformative, In the next section we consider how translanguaging transforms bilingual education structures and practices, before we review its effects on learners, enabling them to engage with cognitively difficult material and to construct multiple and valid subjectivities. We then look at how translanguaging is transformative for the teacher, able to use translanguaging strategically to cognitively engage every child in the class, to make herself understood, and to truly assess what students know. We start, however, by exploring the meaning of adopting a translanguaging space when working within bilingual education structures.

Translanguaging and bilingual education structures

As national education systems have adopted more responsibility for educating all children, and not just those of dominant majorities, translanguaging has been increasingly used to transgress monolingual education structures. And as bilingual education has increasingly incorporated children with different languaging practices, translanguaging has disrupted school structures. Translanguaging in classrooms is precisely a way of working in the gap between, on the one hand, the global designs of nation-states and their monoglossic education systems, and on the other, the local histories of peoples who language differently.

For monolingual education, adopting a translanguaging lens means that there can be no way of educating children inclusively without recognizing their diverse language and meaning-making practices as a resource to learn and to show what they know, as well as to extend these. This is so for language minorities, and most especially for language majorities who need a translanguaging space that would enable them to build dynamic plurilingual practices for the twenty-first century. Gutiérrez, Baquedano-López and Alvarez (2001) have convincingly demonstrated the diversity of, and interplay between, linguistic codes and literacy practices in the familiar and ever present multilingual classrooms of the twenty-first century.

For bilingual education, adopting a translanguaging lens means that we would build flexibility within strict language education policies to enable children to make meaning by engaging their entire linguistic repertoire and expanding it. Many bilingual education types, and most especially immersion and two-way dual language bilingual programs, pride themselves in controlling carefully the language use within the different spaces they construct. The argument is made that children need to be given opportunities to practice languages as if they belonged to different nation-states of different speech communities. In so doing the two languages remain in what Cummins (2008) calls "bilingual solitudes." But in the twenty-first century language has been deterritorialized as diasporic communities interact with other communities of practice in what Mary Louise Pratt

has called 'contact zones' (1991). In this more dynamic world of interaction it is practice in translanguaging that students need.

Furthermore, in the twenty-first century, the exigencies of learning and of using language have become more complex. For example, bilingual education and "second language education" programs in the 20th century emphasized communicative skills. Today, however, the emphasis is on the development of critical thinking skills and deep comprehension. Schools cannot afford to focus on just developing linguistic communicative skills to later teach students to use these skills to learn and think. They also cannot afford to use solely languaging associated with one socially constructed autonomous language before introducing other language practices. If languaging and knowing are constitutive, then schools must pay attention from the beginning to getting students to use their emergent language practices to think critically. But this, of course, cannot happen without translanguaging, for students cannot engage in meaningful discussion, comprehension, or design of texts with only a set of emergent language practices. Instead, all the child's language and semiotic practices must be put in the service of making meaning and engaging intellectually. Even if schools only value certain standard language practices, those cannot emerge except in interrelationship with others, with whom children have practice making meaning at home, in the community, and within themselves.

We agree that bilingual education programs must build spaces where certain language practices or others are sometimes expected. On the one hand, this is what dominant government schools and their assessment mechanisms continue to require, and thus, it is important to give students an opportunity to engage in these practices that in themselves violate translanguaging. On the other hand, these spaces are sometimes needed to protect and sustain minoritized language practices that are often stigmatized in schools. García (2009a, p: 301) argues:

> While it is important to put the minority language alongside the majority language, thus ensuring for it a place in powerful domains, it is important to preserve a space, although not a rigid or static place, in which the minority language does not compete with the majority language.

But within those separate spaces, schools must also construct *tranlanguaging spaces*, spaces where, as Li Wei (2011a) has proposed, children are given agency to act linguistically by being both creative and critical. In this translanguaging space, children's language practices are brought together in ways that not only develop an extended bilingual repertoire capable of deeply involving them cognitively, but also a more sophisticated metalinguistic awareness. That is, in these translanguaging spaces linguistically diverse students are able to co-construct their language expertise, recognize each other as resources, and act on their knowing, doing, and languaging. Gutiérrez, Baquedano-López and Tejeda (1999) refer to these translanguaging spaces as *third spaces* in which students' language and cultural practices transform the official practices in school. Whereas some traditional bilingual education program types control language practices rigidly, there is a new type of educational program emerging that

structures itself within this translanguaging space. The secondary programs for immigrant newcomers to the United States that García and Sylvan (2010) have described fall within this space. In these programs, students are given the agency to negotiate their linguistic and meaning-making repertoires. That is, the locus of control of the language rests with the students, as they move to expand their home language practices to include those in English for academic use. In so doing they rely especially on peers and resources such as iPads, and certainly not solely on the teacher who rarely shares the language practices of the students. The teacher then becomes the facilitator, generating opportunities for language use, and seeing herself not as the linguistic authority, but as another language learner. A limitation of such programs is that translanguaging is valued because of its potential to educate the children in English, more than for its capacity to sustain the students' own languaging. García and Kleifgen (2010) have called programs that give students agency to negotiate their language practices while developing bilingualism and biliteracy *dynamic bi/plurilingual education*. These educational spaces of negotiation and contact exist rarely in established school systems.

A translanguaging space changes the nature of learning, as well as of teaching. We consider below how students use translanguaging to learn, even when a translanguaging space has not been officially available. That is, we look at how learners open up their own translanguaging spaces.

Translanguaging to learn: students

Developing new language practices, and especially academic ones, is not easy for learners. Learning new ways of languaging is more difficult than just learning new subject content in school because, as A. L. Becker (1995, p. 227) has said, it also involves learning "a new way of being in the world." If language constitutes us, then adding to a linguistic and semiotic repertoire means that we acquire not only new ways of speaking and acting, of languaging, but also of being, of knowing, and of doing. For new languaging to be learned then, much more is needed than just picking it up as in the "acquisition" promoted by communicative language teaching, or learned as a system of structures as in grammar-translation methods. New language practices can only emerge in interrelationship with old ones, without competing or threatening an already established sense of being that languaging constitutes. Norton (2000) has called this *investment* in learning a language. To invest in learning new language practices some things are needed. On the one hand, learners need a secure sense of self that allows them to appropriate new language practices as they engage in a continuous becoming. On the other, learners must be able to cognitively engage with the learning and to act on the learning. That is, it is not enough simply to listen and take in forms or to output new forms. It is important to engage with the material and interact cognitively and socially in ways that produce and extend the students' languaging and meaning making. Translanguaging is important to mediate students' identities, but also cognitive complex activities.

Translanguaging is also important for students to embrace *positioning*, which according to Davies & Harré (1990, p. 48) is "the discursive process whereby selves are located in conversations as observably and subjectively coherent participants in jointly produced story lines." It is through meaningful participation in the act of learning enabled by translanguaging that bilingual students can create for themselves academic identities and, thus invest in learning. Translanguaging enables even emergent bilinguals to model forms of knowing and talking and to serve as "language brokers" to other learners (Lee, Hill-Bonnet, & Raley, 2011).

Translanguaging not only allows for shuttling between acts of language that are socially and educationally constructed as being separate, but integrates bilingual acts in ways that reflect the unified constitution of the learner. That is, translanguaging allows us to go from the concept of *transfer* that Cummins so long ago introduced to the field of bilingual education to a conceptualization of *integration of language practices in the person of the learner*. Translanguaging goes beyond having to acquire and learn new language structures, rather it develops the integration of new language practices into one linguistic repertoire that is available for the speaker to be, know, and do, and that is, in turn, produced in the complex interactions of bilingual speakers. Rather than learning a new separate "second language," learners are engaged in appropriating new languaging that makes up their own unique repertoire of meaning-making resources. The language practices then don't belong to the school or to the home; the languaging is that of the learner, his or her own being, knowing, and doing.

If languaging is being, doing, and knowing, then it stands to reason that learners cannot appropriate language practices without also knowing. Development of new language practices are acts of knowing and doing. For those who are still developing new language practices, that is, for emergent bilingual students, knowledge cannot be accessed except through language practices with which they are already familiar, and language practices cannot be developed except through their existing knowledge. Thus, translanguaging enables emergent bilinguals to enter into a text that is encoded through language practices with which they are not quite familiar. At the same time, translanguaging enables students to truly show what they know. Furthermore, the more students know about a text, the more they can "language" and make meaning.

Translanguaging refers to the flexibility of bilingual learners to take control of their own learning, to self-regulate when and how to language, depending on the context in which they are performing language. Williams (2012) refers to this in the classroom as *natural translanguaging*. Lewis, Jones and Baker (2012a) call it *pupil-directed translanguaging*. This means, for example, that when bilinguals have to find new information by reading or speaking to others, they can language and use meaning-making resources that are not found in the classroom and with which teachers may not be familiar. Translanguaging strategies promote a high sense of self-efficacy, as students self-regulate their learning. Embedded in this practice is the belief that learning is not a product, but a process, mediated by peers and teachers.

According to sociocultural theory (Vygotsky, 1978), knowledge is acquired interpersonally; that is, in relationships with others and the world, before it becomes

internalized. And thus, translanguaging is important for metatalk (talk about talk), metacognition (talk about the task), and whispered private speech (Kibler, 2010), all essential for learning. During cooperative tasks, translanguaging has been found to be helpful to move the task along, as well as to attend to vocabulary and grammar (Swain & Lapkin, 2000).

Bilingual students at different points of the bilingual continuum seem to use translanguaging differently to learn. In a study by García and Kano (2014) that used translanguaging as pedagogy (more on this below), emergent bilinguals were shown to have a tendency to translanguage because they were dependent on their expertise with other language practices in order to complete the task; the more experienced bilinguals translanguaged to enhance the task, demonstrating their greater autonomy and ability to self-regulate. In all cases, however, both languages seem to be continuously activated, but to different degrees. The Japanese students interviewed in the García and Kano study revealed that all students, regardless of where they were positioned in the bilingual continuum, translanguaged frequently in order to make meaning. They demonstrated much linguistic awareness of their own linguistic needs and were cognizant of their strengths and weaknesses. Beyond that, the students demonstrated much autonomy and control in languaging appropriately for the task in which they were involved.

Many scholars have convincingly shown how students themselves use translanguaging in order to learn. In a study of a two-way dual language bilingual kindergarten (5 year olds), García (2011b) considers how translanguaging is used by children who enter school speaking what the school considers only English or only Spanish. These young kindergarteners use translanguaging for six metafunctions, as they develop their bilingualism:

1. To mediate understandings among each other
2. To co-construct meaning of what the other is saying
3. To construct meaning within oneself
4. To include others
5. To exclude others, and,
6. To demonstrate knowledge.

What is interesting about the translanguaging of these very young learners is that they were not shy about using their entire language repertoire to make meaning, successfully communicating across "languages" and "modes" by combining all the multimodal semiotic signs at their disposal. Translanguaging always included linguistic signs from their growing repertoire, accompanied by gestures, pointing, physical imitations, noises, drawings, and onomatopoeic words.

One of the most influential aspects of schooling is the development of literacy. Written-linguistic modes of meaning are also intricately bound up with other visual, audio and spatial semiotic systems (Kress, 2003), but also with languaging practices that vary depending on situations, sociocultural contexts and complex social interactions (Street, 1995). García, Bartlett, and Kleifgen (2007) speak about *pluriliteracy practices* to emphasize that literacy practices are interrelated and flexible, and have

equal value; that is, translanguaging is important for literacy development because students develop the agency to use their entire semiotic systems.

We now have much research evidence that students' translanguaging builds deeper thinking, provides students with more rigorous content, affirms multiple identities, and at the same time develops language and literacy practices that are adequate for specific academic tasks (Blackledge & Creese, 2010; Creese & Blackledge, 2010; García, 2009a, 2014 a,b; García, Flores, & Woodley, 2012; García & Li Wei, 2014; Hornberger & Link, 2012; Lewis, Jones & Baker 2012a, 2012b; Li Wei 2011a, 2011b; Li Wei & Wu, 2009; Palmer & Martínez, 2013; Sayer, 2013). Whereas translanguaging for learners is a way to become more knowledgeable as language practices are expanded, for teachers, as we will see, it is a strategy to educate children holistically, but also to teach all the students in the classroom. And yet, as we will also see, a translanguaging pedagogy that works within an educational space that encompasses a multiplicity of signs and issues without privileging one over the other is difficult to construct. We focus next on translanguaging as a tool for teachers, a less understood and less developed area.

Translanguaging to teach: teachers and pedagogies

Given that translanguaging was originally coined in Welsh to teach bilingually, Welsh scholars have paid much attention to its development as pedagogy. Williams (2012) distinguishes between *natural translanguaging* and *official translanguaging*. *Natural translanguaging* refers mostly to acts by students to learn, described in the previous section, although it also includes the teachers' use of translanguaging with individuals, pairs and small groups "to ensure full understanding of the subject material" (p. 39). In contrast, *official translanguaging* is mostly conducted by the teacher, although it can also include students, as described by Williams (2012, p. 39) and summarized here:

By the teachers
- Orally when it is needed.
- To explain a term relating to the subject or a general term.
- To explain complex parts of the topic being taught, using clauses, sentences or fuller discussions rather than individual words within sentences.
- In writing, where a short appropriate translation is needed.

By the students
- To explain something in the other language so as to show full understanding of the subject area.
- To explain to parents who do not speak the language.
- In tests' and examinations when students feel they cannot convey the exact information.

Lewis, Jones and Baker (2012b) also differentiate between the pupil-directed translanguaging described in the previous section and teacher-directed translanguaging. *Teacher-directed translanguaging* involves planned and structured activity

by the teacher and is related to translanguaging as a transformative pedagogy. In the diverse classrooms of today, learners have diverse profiles—linguistically, but also socially, educationally, experience-wise, etc. For teachers, then, translanguaging is important not only because it allows them to engage each individual child holistically, but also because it is a way of differentiating instruction to ensure that all students are receiving the appropriate linguistic input, producing the adequate linguistic output, and are cognitively involved.

Teachers use translanguaging strategically as a scaffolding approach to ensure that emergent bilinguals at the beginning points of the bilingual continuum engage with rigorous content, access difficult texts, and produce new language practices and new knowledge. But translanguaging is also a transformative pedagogy capable of sustaining bilingual identities and bilingual performances that go beyond one or the other binary logic. Opposite from what translanguaging requires of the learner who takes control of his or her language practices in order to access texts and knowledge, the teacher who uses translanguaging gives up her authority role in the classroom. Rather than teachers, they become facilitators, able to set up the project-based instruction and collaborative groupings that maximize translanguaging to learn. The teacher sets up the affordances for students to engage in discursive and semiotic practices that respond to their cognitive and social intentions. Translanguaging in teaching is always used in the service of providing rigorous instruction and maximizing interactions that would expand the students' language and meaning-making repertoire, including practices that fall under what some consider standard language for academic purposes.

Adopting translanguaging to teach requires what Busch (2011) calls a "critical gesture" of language practices that aims to develop a high degree of linguistic awareness. Following Busch (2011), one can say that teachers' translanguaging practices not only acknowledge the use of all students' language practices as a resource (what Bakhtin called *raznojazycie*), but in so doing also entail a commitment to multidiscursivity (what Bakhtin called *raznorecie*) that includes students' discourses, concerns, and topics of interest. But, beyond this, a teacher who uses translanguaging as pedagogy participates as learner; that is, she adopts a multivoicedness, a *raznoglosie* in Bakhtin's terms.

Scholarship on bilingual education has focused on language allocation policies, as two or more languages are assigned to one structure or another (either time, content, person, place). These *macro-alternation policies* require attention, but are easily established. Teachers have to be taught to work within these structures efficiently, but the structure itself is easy to grasp. More difficult, however, is how to educate teachers to use translanguaging strategically *moment-by-moment* and as a *critical gesture*. This is the art of translanguaging as pedagogy.

Translanguaging as pedagogy refers to building on bilingual students' language practices flexibly in order to develop new understandings and new language practices, including language practices for academic purposes. Translanguaging pedagogies are important for language-minoritized students, whether they are emergent bilingual or not, because they build on students' linguistic strengths. They also reduce the risk of alienation at school by incorporating languaging and

cultural references familiar to them. Translanguaging as a pedagogical practice is increasingly being used not only to enable language-minoritized students to learn meaningfully, but also to sustain their dynamic languaging (Creese & Blackledge, 2010).

The translanguaging pedagogy used in the experimental curriculum developed by Kano (2010) and referred to above, enabled Japanese students to become more aware of the differences in the construction of Japanese and English written texts, so that they would be able to produce better English essays. Her translanguaging pedagogy followed three steps:

1. Students read bilingual texts on the topic about which they were assigned to write. These bilingual texts were presented side-by-side, or there was an English text coupled with a parallel translation in Japanese, or a set of English and Japanese texts about the same subject, but not parallel translations;
2. Students discussed the bilingual readings mostly in Japanese;
3. Students wrote an essay in English on the topic of the bilingual reading and the discussion in Japanese about the readings.

As reported by García and Kano (2014) a translanguaging pedagogy that took into account the entire linguistic and discursive repertoire of Japanese students produced better written texts in one language, English. And although this was not the purpose of the study, in some cases evidence was provided through the interviews that students' greater awareness of language differences also had repercussions on their understanding and construction of Japanese written texts. The translanguaging pedagogy, enabling students to move back and forth along their entire linguistic repertoire, actually overcame the differences in language, discourse, and idea inventory of Japanese American students writing in English. That is, their English essay repertoire was enriched through the inclusion and attention paid to their Japanese language and cultural practices, including their entire semiotic repertoire.

García, Flores, and Woodley (2012) have documented how teachers with different language proficiencies working in two secondary New York City schools with a large number of emergent bilinguals use translanguaging as pedagogy. Three metafunctions for translanguaging are identified: (i) the contextualization of key words and concepts, (ii) the development of metalinguistic awareness, and (iii) the creation of affective bonds with students. Paying attention to the teaching of writing in a dual language bilingual first grade classroom, Michael-Luna and Canagarajah (2007) identified translanguaging pedagogical strategies, which they refer to as code-meshing strategies. These strategies included selecting multilingual texts; that is, including texts in different languages and with different semiotic resources, so as to activate prior knowledge. Translanguaging strategies also included modeling oral and written code-meshing so as to encourage student agency in language choice. Finally, translanguaging strategies were also used by the teacher to scaffold the negotiation with the text. Schecter and Cummins (2003) described how some teachers supported their students' creation of identity-texts that were bilingual dual-language books. In so doing, students used their families'

multilingualism as a resource, and were engaged in translanguaging exercises, supported by the teacher. What all these examples show is that despite much monolingual instruction and language separation, teachers use translanguaging to enable students to make meaning and learn, even though they mostly continue to see the school language and the child's language as separate and autonomous practices.

We see translanguaging as used by teachers for seven different purposes:

1. To differentiate among students' levels and adapt instruction to different types of students in multilingual classrooms; for example, those who are bilingual, those who are monolingual, and those who are emergent bilinguals.
2. To build background knowledge so that students can make meaning of the content being taught and of the ways of languaging in the lesson.
3. To deepen understandings and cognitive engagement, develop and extend new knowledge, and develop critical thinking.
4. For cross-linguistic transfer and metalinguistic awareness so as to strengthen the students' ability to translanguage in order to meet the communicative exigencies of the socioeducational situation.
5. For cross-linguistic flexibility so as to translanguage competently.
6. For identity investment and positionality, to engage learners.
7. To interrogate linguistic inequality and disrupt sociopolitical structures so as engage in social justice.

That is, translanguaging as a transformative pedagogy deepens communication and appropriation of knowledge, develops new language practices and sustains knowledge, and gives voices and shapes new sociopolitical realities by interrogating linguistic inequality.

Translanguaging strategies correspond to three categories (for more on translanguaging strategies, see Celic & Seltzer, 2012):

1. Teacher *attentiveness to meaning-making*, by:
   - Translanguaging when appropriate for understanding,
   - Encouraging translanguaging in inner speech.
2. Teacher *use of classroom resources for translanguaging*, which include:
   - The availability and design of multilingual and multimodal texts,
   - The availability and design of technological enhanced media,
   - The availability and design of a multilingual/multimodal classroom landscape that includes, among others, listening and visual texts, technologically enhanced media, multilingual word walls, multilingual sentence starters, cognate walls.
3. Teacher *design of classroom and curriculum structures for translanguaging*, which include:
   - Peer grouping, according to home language, to enable collaborative dialogue and cooperative tasks, using translanguaging,
   - Project and task-based learning, to build on multimedia and kinetics,

- Research tasks, so that students can translanguage, as they find new information,
- Curriculum thematic units, to integrate ways of languaging and knowledge-building,
- Language-inquiry tasks to build translanguaging capacities and extend metalinguistic awareness of lexicon, syntax and morphology.

Beyond the inclusion of different language practices, translanguaging opens up a space of resistance and social justice, since language practices of minoritized youth are usually racialized and stigmatized. Gutiérrez (2008) reports on how instructors in a summer program for youth from migrant farmworker backgrounds privileged "hybrid language practices" to "incite, support, and extend students' repertoires of practice" (p. 160); what she calls their *sociocritical literacy*. Translanguaging as pedagogy requires a sociocritical approach to teaching. This is precisely the position of the high school teacher (C. Leiva) whom García portrays in her study of translanguaging for social justice (2014). In that "English" classroom for Latino immigrants, translanguaging releases students from the constraints of both an Anglophone ideology that demands English monolingualism for U.S. citizens; and a Hispanophone ideology that blames U.S. Latinos for speaking "Spanglish." By exposing alternative histories, representations, and knowledge, translanguaging has the potential to crack the "standard language" bubble in education that continues to ostracize many bilingual students, and most especially immigrant and other minoritized students.

Because this sociocritical positioning is often not allowed in classrooms in state schools, studies of translanguaging as pedagogy are many times situated in informal educational settings, and especially in after-school or supplementary programs. Blackledge and Creese (2010) studied the flexible bilingualism present in eight complementary schools in four UK cities, and for four linguistic communities. The chapters in García, Zakháría, and Otcu (2013) address the translanguaging pedagogies used by bilingual community programs in the city of New York to teach the increasingly diverse students who attend these programs. In an innovative after-school program, Gutiérrez, Bien, Selland, and Pierce (2011) leverage translanguaging as a pedagogical resource (although they refer to it as hybridity), as they challenge the divide between "everyday and school-based literacies" (p. 258). All of these cases give evidence how translanguaging is the norm used to teach and learn in communities.

The potential of a translanguaging pedagogy to develop more sophisticated discourse, deeper comprehension of texts, production of complex texts, evaluation of what students know, and to include the voices of learners who have been minoritized, is increasingly being recognized by educators. However, it is not always officially sanctioned by educational authorities. But even this is beginning to change. One example is the City University of New York–New York State Initiative on Emergent Bilinguals (CUNY-NYSIEB, www.cuny-nysieb.org), where CUNY scholars are working with school leaders and teachers in failing schools with large numbers of emergent bilinguals to incorporate translanguaging pedagogies.

Although translanguaging as pedagogy is being increasingly used by teachers, whether in sanctioned or unsanctioned situations, it is rare to actually find schooling situations in which students are being taught to translanguage as a legitimate practice. As Canagarajah (2011, p. 8) writes:

> A further set of questions relate to the possibility of teaching translanguaging in classrooms. The pedagogical side is underdeveloped in general. While we have studied the practice of translanguaging in social life—i.e., in urban youth encounters, linguistic landscapes, and the Internet—we haven't figured out how to develop such proficiency among students in classrooms.

If translanguaging is an important ability for students in the twenty-first century; then the question becomes: Where does one learn to translanguage? Is it enough to provide translanguaging spaces in schools and communities where children develop this expertise on their own? Or do schools need to do more than just acknowledge and leverage translanguaging practices to develop "standard" language practices for academic contexts? Can those academic contexts also accommodate translanguaging for its own sake?

Translanguaging contests and transcends all scripts of the larger dominant society. It is unlikely that schools will accommodate translanguaging as more than what it is today, an *adaptive* space. An *established* translanguaging space in schools would require more. It would require that translanguaging practices be accepted, for example, in assessment, since a bilingual student's linguistic repertoire cannot be measured in a single language. And it would demand that we stop penalizing students who translanguage, extending this ability to all. It would authorize the translanguaging norm of bilingual communities as valid and as an equal meaning-making and cognitive mechanism to the "standard academic" norm. It would require, in other words, that we structure learning and teaching taking into account the tension of different meaning-making signs so as to bridge the social spaces that, despite much translanguaging, remain separate today.

Conclusion

This chapter has considered what a translanguaging approach means for bilingual education. Although translanguaging is quite apt to describe the languaging practices of bilinguals from the user perspective, it has not been sufficiently extended in the practice of education. Translanguaging refers to the ways in which bilinguals use their complex semiotic repertoire to act, know, and to be. Yet translanguaging is seldom used in schools as a tool to mediate cognitive complex activities. We need to question why this is so, as we continue to legitimize translanguaging in schools to ensure that students, and especially bilingual students, learn content and ways to language, and find an equitable meaning-making generous and liberating space.

NOTE

1   A fuller treatment of translanguaging and the issues discussed here is available in García and Li Wei (2014).

REFERENCES

Baker, C. (2011). *Foundations of bilingual education and bilingualism* (5th edn.). Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Becker, A. L. (1995). *Beyond translation: Essays toward a modern philosophy.* Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.

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

Busch, B. (2011). Building on heteroglossia and heterogeneity: The experience of a multilingual classroom. Presentation at the 3rd International Conference on Language, Education and Diversity (LED) Colloquium: Language, Education, and Superdiversity. University of Auckland, New Zealand.

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

Celic, C., & Seltzer, K. (2012). *Translanguaging: A CUNY-NYSIEB Guide for Educators.* New York: CUNY-NYSIEB, The Graduate Center, CUNY. http://www.nysieb.ws.gc.cuny.edu/files/2013/03/Translanguaging-Guide-March-2013.pdf (accessed November 17, 2014).

Creese, A., & Blackledge, A. (2010). Translanguaging in the bilingual classroom: A pedagogy for learning and teaching? *Modern Language Journal, 94*, 103–115.

Cummins, J. (2008). Teaching for transfer: Challenging the two solitudes assumptions in bilingual education.

In N. H. Hornberger (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of language and education* (pp. 1528–1538). New York: Springer.

Davies B., & Harré, R. (1990). Positioning: The discursive production of selves. *Journal for the Theory of Social Behaviour, 20*(1), 43–63.

García, O. (2009a). *Bilingual education in the 21st Century: A Global perspective.* Malden, MA: Wiley/Blackwell.

García, O. (2009b). Reimagining bilingualism in education for the 21st century. Presentation at the NALDIC (National Association for Language Development in the Curriculum) 17th Annual Conference "Integrated language, integrated curriculum." http://www.youtube.com/results?search_query=NALDIC&aq=f. (accessed May 20, 2013).

García, O. (2011a). Educating New York's bilingual children: Constructing a future from the past. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism 14*(2), 133–153.

García, O. (2011b) (with Makar, C., Starcevic, M., & Terry, A.). Translanguaging of Latino kindergarteners. In K. Potowski & J. Rothman (Eds.), *Bilingual youth: Spanish in English speaking societies* (pp. 33–55). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

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

García, O., Bartlett, L., & Kleifgen, J. A. (2007). From biliteracy to pluriliteracies. In P. Auer and Li Wei (Eds.). *Handbook of applied linguistics (Vol. 5, Multilingualism,* pp. 207–228). Berlin: Mouton/de Gruyter.

García, O., Flores, N., & Woodley, H. H. (2012). Transgressing monolingualism and bilingual dualities: Translanguaging pedagogies. In A. Yiakoumetti (Ed.), *Harnessing linguistic variation for better education* (pp. 45–76). Bern: Peter Lang.

García, O., & Kano, N. (2014). Translanguaging as process and pedagogy: Developing the English writing of Japanese students in the US. In J. Conteh, & G. Meier (Eds.) *The multilingual turn in languages education: Benefits for individuals and societies* (pp. 258–277). Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters.

García, O., & Kleifgen, J. (2010). *Educating emergent bilinguals. Policies, programs and practices for English language learners.* New York: Teachers College Press.

García, O., & Li Wei. (2014). *Translanguaging: Language, bilingualism and education.* London, UK: Palgrave McMillan.

García, O., & Sylvan, C. (2011). Pedagogies and practices in multilingual classrooms: Singularities in pluralities. *Modern Language Journal 95*(iii), 385–400.

García, O., Zakharia, Z., & Otcu, B. (Eds.). (2013). *Bilingual community education for American children: Beyond heritage languages in a global city.* Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Gutiérrez, K. (2008). Developing a sociocritical literacy in the third space. *Reading Research Quarterly, 43*, 148–164.

Gutiérrez, K., Baquedano–López, P., & Alvarez, H. (2001). Literacy as hybridity: Moving beyond bilingualism in urban classrooms. In M. de la. Luz Reyes & J. J. Halcón (Eds.), *The best for our children: Critical perspectives on literacy for Latino students* (pp. 122–141). New York: Teachers College Press.

Gutiérrez, K. D., Baquedano-López, P., & Tejeda, C. (1999). Rethinking diversity: Hybridity and hybrid language practices in the third space. *Mind, Culture, and Activity, 6,* 286–303.

Gutiérrez, K. D., Bien, A. C., Selland, M. K., & Pierce, D. M. (2011). Polylingual and polycultural learning ecologies: Mediating emergent academic literacies for dual language learners. *Journal of Early Childhood Literacy, 11,* 232–261.

Hornberger, N., & H. Link. (2012). Translanguaging and transnational literacies in multilingual classrooms: A bilingual lens. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism, 15*(3), 261–278.

Kano, N. (2012) Translanguaging as a process and a pedagogical tool for Japanese students in an English writing course in New York. Doctoral dissertation, Teachers College, Columbia University.

Kenner, C. (2004) *Becoming biliterate: Young children learning different writing systems.* Stoke on Trent, UK: Trentham.

Kibler, A. (2010). Writing through two languages: First language expertise in a language minority classroom. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 19*, 121–142.

Kress, G. (2003). *Literacy in the new media age.* New York: Routledge.

Lambert, W. E. (1974). Culture and language as factors in learning and education. In F. E. Aboud & R. D. Mead (Eds.), *Cultural factors in learning and education.* Bellingham, WA: Fifth Western Washington Symposium on Learning.

Lee, J. S., Hill-Bonnet, L, & Raley, J. (2011). Examining the effects of language brokering on student identities and learning opportunities in dual immersion classrooms. *Journal of Language, Identity, and Education, 10,* 306–326.

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

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

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

Li Wei (2011b). Multilinguality, multimodality and multicompetence: Code- and mode-switching by minority ethnic children in complementary schools. *Modern Language Journal, 95*(3), 370–384.

Li Wei & Wu, C.-J. (2009). Polite Chinese children revisited: Creativity and the use of codeswitching in the Chinese complementary school classroom. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism, 12*(2), 193–212.

Michael-Luna, S., & Canagarajah, A. S. (2007). Multilingual academic literacies: Pedagogical foundations for code meshing in primary and higher education. *Journal of Applied Linguistics 4*(1), 55–77.

Norton, B. (2000). *Identity and language learning: Gender, ethnicity, and educational change*. Harlow, UK: Longman/Pearson.

Palmer, D., & Martínez, R. A. (2013). Teacher agency in bilingual spaces: A fresh look at preparing teachers to educate Latina/o bilingual children. *Review of Research in Education, 37*, 269–297.

Pratt, M. L. (1991). Arts of the contact zone. *Profession* (MLA), *1991*, 33–40.

Sayer, P. (2013). Translanguaging, TexMex, and bilingual pedagogy: Emergent bilinguals learning through the vernacular. *TESOL Quarterly, 47*(1), 63–88.

Schechter, S. R., & Cummins, J. (Eds.). (2003). *Multilingual education in practice: Using diversity as a resource*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Street, B. (1995). *Social literacies: Critical approaches to literacy in development, ethnography and education*. London, UK: Longman.

Swain, M., & Lapkin, S. (2000). Task-based second language learning: The uses of the first language. *Language Teaching Research, 4*(3), 251–274.

Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Williams, C. (2002). Ennill iaith: Astudiaeth o sefyllfa drochi yn 11–16 oed [A language gained: A study of language immersion at 11–16 years of age]. Bangor, UK: School of Education. http://www.bangor.ac.uk/addysg/publications/Ennill_Iaith.pdf (accessed 30 January, 2014).

Williams, C. (2012). *The national immersion scheme guidance for teachers on subject language threshold: Accelerating the process of reaching the threshold*. Bangor, Wales: The Welsh Language Board (manuscript).

14   Multiliteracies, Pedagogies, and Academic Literacy

MADHAV KAFLE AND SURESH CANAGARAJAH

Historical overview

Multiliteracies in academic communication have been marked by some striking imbalances. Though the notion of multiliteracies has drawn the attention of scholars since the programmatic work of the New London Group in the mid 1990s (see Cope & Kalantzis, 2000), if not earlier through the empirical work of New Literacy Studies in the mid 1980s (see for a review, Baynham & Prinsloo, 2009), it has been slow to transform pedagogies of academic literacy.

The imbalance is manifested in many intriguing ways. Perhaps because academic literacy is considered a high-stakes communicative activity, with a lot of pressure on students to pass composition classes and scholars to publish in journals, teachers have been slow to introduce changes in their approaches. Multiliteracies have been researched with greater relevance to Internet communication (Williams, 2009), children's writing (Gere, 1988), and community practices (Hornberger, 2004). In other words, multiliteracies have made more advances in nonacademic contexts and genres compared to academic essays and literacy.

It is not that professional organizations have not recognized the relevance of multiliteracies for academic literacy. There are many outcomes and position statements that include the need to help students and scholars develop proficiency in negotiating diverse languages, modalities, and genres in their writing (see statements by the Conference on College Composition and Communication (CCCC), the Council of Writing Program Administrators (CWPA), the National Council of Teachers of English (NCTE), Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages (TESOL), etc.). However, these statements have not changed pedagogical practices too much. This imbalance is so striking that some scholars have started calling for more discussion and help on "enacting" multiliteracies in the place of further policy statements (see Tardy, 2011; Creese & Blackledge, 2011a). Indeed policy