
Translanguaging in Bilingual Education

Ofelia García and Angel M.Y. Lin

Contents

Introduction	2
Early Developments	2
Major Developments	4
More Developments and Work in Progress	7
Problems and Difficulties	10
The Future	11
Related Articles in the Encyclopedia of Language and Education	12
References	12

Abstract

Since Cen Williams first used the Welsh term *trawsieithu* in 1994 to refer to a pedagogical practice where students in bilingual Welsh/English classrooms are asked to alternate languages for the purposes of receptive or productive use, the term *translanguaging* has been increasingly used in the scholarly literature to refer to both the complex and fluid language practices of bilinguals, as well as the pedagogical approaches that leverage those practices. This chapter reviews the growing scholarly literature that takes up the term translanguaging and discusses the ways in which the term is contested. We focus here on the potential and the challenges that a translanguaging theory provides for bilingual education. After a review of the scholarship, we discuss two of the problems that the scholarship on translanguaging and bilingual education makes evident – (1) that there are two competing theories of translanguaging, one which upholds national languages

O. García (✉)

Graduate Center, City University of New York, New York, NY, USA
e-mail: OGarcia@gc.cuny.edu

A.M.Y. Lin

Faculty of Education, The University of Hong Kong, Pokfulam Road, Hong Kong
e-mail: yeonmia@gmail.com; angellin@hku.hk

and calls for a softening of those boundaries in bilingual education and a second “strong” version which posits a single linguistic repertoire for bilingual speakers and thus an essential feature of bilingual education, and (2) the fear that translanguaging in bilingual education would threaten the minority language. In this light, we consider how translanguaging theory impacts issues of language allocation and pedagogy in bilingual education.

Keywords

Assessment • Bilingual education • Code-switching • Pedagogy • Translanguaging

Introduction

Since Cen Williams first used the Welsh term *trawsieithu* in 1994 to refer to a pedagogical practice where students in bilingual Welsh/English classrooms are asked to alternate languages for the purposes of receptive or productive use, the term *translanguaging* has been increasingly used in the scholarly literature to refer to both the complex and fluid language practices of bilinguals, as well as the pedagogical approaches that leverage those practices. This chapter reviews the growing scholarly literature that takes up the term translanguaging and discusses the ways in which the term is contested. We focus here on the potential and the challenges that a translanguaging theory provides for bilingual education. After a review of the scholarship, we discuss two of the problems that the scholarship on translanguaging and bilingual education makes evident – (1) that there are two competing theories of translanguaging, one which upholds national languages and calls for a softening of those boundaries in bilingual education and a second “strong” version which posits a single linguistic repertoire for bilingual speakers and thus an essential feature of bilingual education, and (2) the fear that translanguaging in bilingual education would threaten the minority language. In this light, we consider how translanguaging theory impacts issues of language allocation and pedagogy in bilingual education.

Early Developments

Although different epistemologically, translanguaging is linked to the study of code switching in education in that it also disrupts the traditional isolation of languages in language teaching and learning. Throughout the world, code switching, understood as the going back and forth from one language to another, has been used by teachers to scaffold the teaching of additional languages. Although this practice has not been generally legitimized in language-teaching scholarship, teachers engage in code switching on a day-to-day basis. It is, however, when this linguistic behavior is used to teach language-minoritized students that this practice becomes extremely contested. The fear, of course, is that the state or national language would be

“contaminated” by the other language. And yet, scholars have documented how teachers regularly code switch to make meaning comprehensible to students when they are taught through a colonial or dominant language (see, e.g., Lin and Martin 2005). Arthur and Martin (2006) speak of the “pedagogic validity of code switching” in situations in which students do not understand the lessons.

Despite the documentation of code switching as a prevalent pragmatic practice, code switching is “rarely institutionally endorsed or pedagogically underpinned” (Creese and Blackledge 2010, p. 105). In the late 1980s, Rodolfo Jacobson developed what he called the “concurrent approach,” although it was never fully legitimized (Jacobson 1990). Jacobson’s approach relied on having teachers code switch strategically, although only inter-sententially. Whether code switching is done pragmatically by the teacher or as in the Jacobson approach with pedagogical intent, code switching in the education literature, valuable as it may be, focuses not in sustaining bilingualism per se, but in teaching in, or simply teaching, an additional language. In this respect, the concept of translanguaging makes a very different contribution and it is, as we will discuss, an epistemologically different concept because it questions the proposition that what bilinguals are doing is going from one language to another.

In its Welsh origins, translanguaging, or *trawsieithu* as it was originally coined in Welsh (Williams 1994), referred to a pedagogical practice in bilingual education that deliberately changed the language of input and the language of output. Up to the time that Welsh scholars raised a voice of concern and questioned the long-held belief in language separation for language development, language scholars, with some exceptions, continued to view bilingualism, and bilingual education, as simply the addition of two separate languages. Armed, however, with a strong bilingual identity, the Welsh scholars understood that bilingualism was precisely an important instrument in the learning and development of their integrated bilingualism, as well as in the cognitive involvement that was required to be educated bilingually. Lewis et al. (2012b) clarify that translanguaging refers to using one language to reinforce the other in order to increase understanding and augment the pupil’s activity in both languages.

Colin Baker, one of the most influential scholars in the field of bilingual education, observed how the practice of what he first translated from the Welsh *trawsieithu* as *translanguaging* helped students make meaning and gain understandings and knowledge. He explained: “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”” (2011, p. 289). Baker (2001) pointed out four potential educational advantages to translanguaging:

1. It may promote a deeper and fuller understanding of the subject matter.
2. It may help the development of the weaker language.
3. It may facilitate home-school links and cooperation.
4. It may help the integration of fluent speakers with early learners.

A 5-year research project in Wales has determined that translanguaging was used as the only or dominant approach in approximately one-third of the 100 lessons

observed (Lewis et al. 2013). Lewis et al. (2013) found pedagogically effective examples of translanguaging in Welsh classrooms, although it was predominantly found in the latter years of primary education, and in the arts and humanities. The same Welsh researchers have concluded that in translanguaging, “*both languages are used in a dynamic and functionally integrated manner to organise and mediate mental processes in understanding, speaking, literacy, and, not least, learning*” (2012a, p. 1, our italics).

Translanguaging should also be seen differently from code switching. Code switching, even to those scholars who see it as linguistic mastery (see, for example, Auer 2005; Gumperz 1982; Myers-Scotton 2005), is based on the monoglossic view that bilinguals have two separate linguistic systems. Translanguaging, however, posits the linguistic behavior of bilinguals as being always heteroglossic (see Bakhtin 1981; Bailey 2007), always dynamic, responding not to two monolingualisms in one but to one integrated linguistic system. It is precisely because translanguaging takes up this heteroglossic and dynamic perspective centered on the linguistic use of bilingual speakers themselves, rather than starting from the perspective of named languages (usually national or state languages), that it is a much more useful theory for bilingual education than code switching. It is precisely because of its potential in building on the dynamic bilingualism of learners (García 2009) that translanguaging has been taken up by many bilingual educators and scholars in the twenty-first century.

Major Developments

Throughout history, bilingual programs had usually encouraged additive bilingualism for language majorities where an additional second language was simply separately added to a first. However, for language-minoritized people, schools had tended to pursue subtractive bilingualism, taking away the child’s home language. But as a result of the ethnic revival and the demands of minority groups for their civil rights in the second half of the twentieth century, bilingual education became a way of developing the bilingualism of language-minoritized people, especially of those groups that had experienced language shift and language loss as a result of monolingual schooling. In opening up the door of developmental bilingual education for all, a different type of bilingualism came into view, one that not always respected the sociopolitical boundaries that had been established among languages. It is this type of bilingualism that García (2009) has labeled dynamic bilingualism and that is enacted in what we call translanguaging.

At the end of the first decade of the twenty-first century then, three publications extended the concept of translanguaging beyond the Welsh context and in so doing transformed it. One was *Bilingual Education in the 21st Century: A Global Perspective* (2009) by Ofelia García. The other two were by Blackledge and Creese – one an article in *The Modern Language Journal* (Creese and Blackledge 2010) and the other a book titled *Multilingualism: A Critical Perspective* (Blackledge and Creese 2010). Other works on translanguaging soon followed. Canagarajah

(2011a, b), Li Wei (2011), and Hornberger and Link (2012) were among the first to join the dialogue and deepen the work. And Lewis et al. (2012a, b) responded with more translanguaging understandings from the Welsh perspective, also updating and extending Williams' original definition.

From the beginning there have been differences in the way in which scholars have taken up translanguaging, and as the dialogue continues, the concept itself has undergone some changes. In 2009, and speaking specifically about bilingual education, García posited translanguaging as “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” (p. 44). These practices, in which bilinguals “intermingle linguistic features that have hereto been administratively or linguistically assigned to a particular language or language variety” (p. 51), are “the normal mode of communication that, with some exceptions in some monolingual enclaves, characterizes communities throughout the world” (p. 44). Translanguaging, García (2009) continues, are “*multiple discursive practices* in which bilinguals engage in order to *make sense of their bilingual worlds*” (p. 45, emphasis in original). In education, García says, translanguaging goes beyond code switching and translation because it refers to the *process* by which bilingual students perform bilingually in the myriad multimodal ways of classrooms. García's 2009 text begins to extend the Welsh translanguaging concept as it questions, based on Makoni and Pennycook's influential 2007 book, the concept of language that had been the foundation of all bilingual education enterprise. In Part III of the 2009 book, García also begins to shape a translanguaging pedagogy for bilingual classrooms.

Like Blackledge and Creese (2010) speak about flexible bilingualism “without clear boundaries, which places the speaker at the heart of the interaction” (p. 109). Drawing on their ethnographic research in ethnic community complementary schools in the UK, Creese and Blackledge (2010) describe how the students' flexible bilingualism, their translanguaging, is used by teachers to convey ideas and to promote “cross-linguistic transfer.” In examining the translanguaging pedagogies used in complementary schools, Creese and Blackledge (2010) state:

Both languages are needed simultaneously to convey the information, . . . each language is used to convey a different informational message, but it is in the bilingualism of the text that the full message is conveyed. (p. 108)

And in analyzing the pair work students do, they comment: “It is the combination of both languages that keeps the task moving forward” (p. 110). In the complementary school classrooms they were studying, Creese and Blackledge (2010) witnessed the use of bilingual label quests, repetition and translation across languages, and the use of simultaneous literacies to engage students, establish students' identity positions, keep the pedagogic task moving, and negotiate meanings. For Creese and Blackledge, the translanguaging pedagogical approach of these complementary schools is used both for identity performance and for language learning and teaching. Language is just a social resource without clear boundaries of nation, territory, and social group.

Involved in the research on complimentary schools in the UK led by Blackledge and Creese, Li Wei (2011) developed the concept of a *translanguaging space* where the interaction of multilingual individuals “breaks down the artificial dichotomies between the macro and the micro, the societal and the individual, and the social and the psycho in studies of bilingualism and multilingualism” (p. 1234). A translanguaging space allows multilingual individuals to integrate social spaces that have been formerly practiced separately in different places. For Li Wei (2011), translanguaging is going both *between* different linguistic structures and systems and modalities and going *beyond* them. He says:

The act of translanguaging then is transformative in nature; it creates a social space for the multilingual user by bringing together different dimensions of their personal history, experience and environment, their attitude, belief and ideology, their cognitive and physical capacity into one coordinated and meaningful performance. (p. 1223)

Translanguaging, according to Li Wei, embraces both *creativity*, that is, following or flouting norms of language use, and *criticality*, that is, using evidence to question, problematize, or express views (Li Wei 2011).

In his work on writing, Canagarajah had used the term “codemeshing” to refer to a “communicative device used for specific rhetorical and ideological purposes in which a multilingual speaker intentionally integrates local and academic discourse as a form of resistance, reappropriation and/or transformation of the academic discourse” (Michael-Luna and Canagarajah 2007, p. 56). For Canagarajah, codemeshing differs from code switching in that it refers to one single integrated system in which there is a mixing of communicative modes and diverse symbol systems other than language per se. Michael-Luna and Canagarajah (2007) identified codemeshing strategies, which include selecting multilingual and multimodal texts and modeling oral and written codemeshing so as to encourage student agency in language choice.

In 2011 Canagarajah takes up the term translanguaging as “the ability of multilingual speakers to shuttle between languages, treating the diverse languages that form their repertoire as an *integrated* system” (p. 401, our italics). And yet, Canagarajah (2011a) points out that we have not developed a taxonomy of translanguaging strategies or theorized those practices. In his 2013 book, he coins the term *translingual practice* as an umbrella for the many terms that are presently being used to reflect the fluidity of language practices today – polylingualism, metrolingualism, codemeshing, and translanguaging – and says:

The term translingual conceives of language relationships in more dynamic terms. The semiotic resources in one’s repertoire or in society interact more closely, become part of an integrated resource, and enhance each other. The languages mesh in transformative ways, generating new meanings and grammars. (p. 8)

Canagarajah prefers the term translingual practices because he maintains that unlike translanguaging, translingual practices focus on the social practices of mixing modes and symbol systems as a creative improvisation to adapt to the needs of the

context and the local situations (Canagarajah 2011b). We, however, insist that translanguaging is not solely a social practice but also a linguistic theory that poses a mental grammar shaped, of course, through social interaction and negotiation (see Otheguy, García and Reid 2015).

Hornberger's *Continua of Bilinguality* (2003) had addressed the complex relationship between the languages of bilinguals. Hornberger (2005) explains:

Bi/multilinguals' learning is maximized when they are allowed and enabled to draw from across all their existing language skills (in two+ languages), rather than being constrained and inhibited from doing so by monolingual instructional assumptions and practices. (p. 607)

Translanguaging, Hornberger and Link (2012) claim, builds on Hornberger's continua of bilinguality. By doing away with the distinctions between the "languages" of bilinguals, translanguaging offers a way for students to draw on the diverse aspects of the Hornberger continua.

Scholars working on translanguaging have increasingly questioned the concept of language. Busch (2013) summarizes this trend, saying: "There is consent among the authors who deal with translanguaging that the focus of interest is shifting from languages to speech and repertoire and that individual languages should not be seen unquestioningly as set categories" (p. 506).

It is this position that was taken up by García and Li Wei in their 2014 book, *Translanguaging: Language, Bilingualism and Education*. That book is divided into two sections. The first section addresses a theory of translanguaging, building on the concept of languaging and of dynamic bilingualism. The second section gives examples of translanguaging in classrooms.

From a linguistic theory perspective, Otheguy, García and Reid (2015) explicitly differentiate translanguaging from code switching, defining translanguaging as "the deployment of a speaker's full linguistic repertoire without regard for watchful adherence to the socially and politically defined boundaries of named (and usually national and state) languages" (p. 3). This has deep social justice implications for the education of bilingual students. Whereas monolingual students are usually allowed the full use of their linguistic repertoire in assessment and in learning, bilinguals are seldom permitted to do so, thus keeping them silent and unengaged in teaching and assessment activities. We will return to what this means for bilingual education in the section on problems and difficulties.

More Developments and Work in Progress

The take-up of the term translanguaging in the literature has been swift (see also, Li Wei and García, [forthcoming](#)). We focus here on how translanguaging has been used specifically in bilingual education. As more scholars take up translanguaging, it sometimes has drifted in meaning. Flores (2014) warns us that translanguaging is not simply a research methodology, or code switching, additive bilingualism, or a plain

response to globalization, as many claim. Translanguaging, Flores tells, is “a political act.” Although many are using the term, not all scholars see it in this vein.

In the USA, translanguaging has been taken up by scholars especially to push back against the “two solitudes,” to quote Jim Cummins (2007), that characterize dual language bilingual programs. In those programs, sometimes called “two-way immersion,” the languages are strictly separated. Many of the dual language bilingual programs are said to be two-way, attempting to include language majority and language minority students in balanced numbers. Although popular in the social imagination and among educators for whom this is the only way in the USA to develop bilingualism, there is controversy about whether these programs do serve language-minoritized children (see Valdés 1997; Palmer et al. 2014). Scholars have begun to use the concept of translanguaging both to describe the actual language practices in those classrooms and to carve a space for different language use in order to meaningfully educate language-minoritized children.

Palmer, Martínez, and their colleagues (2014) explore the instruction of two experienced bilingual teachers in dual language classrooms and give evidence of the translanguaging practices used by the students, as well as some translanguaging instructional strategies used by the teachers. Gort and Sembiante (2015) explore how translanguaging pedagogies support young emergent bilingual children in a pre-school Spanish-English dual language bilingual program. All of these scholars document how despite the policy of linguistic compartmentalization in the classroom, teachers cross these artificial boundaries to ensure that children are educated bilingually. The issue of the *International Multilingual Research Journal*, edited by Mileidis Gort (2015), gives evidence of the growing appeal of translanguaging for purposes of making the structures and practices in dual language bilingual education classrooms more flexible.

Language practices in transitional bilingual education programs have also been explained using the concept of translanguaging. Sayer (2013), for example, describes how in a second-grade transitional bilingual education classroom in San Antonio, Texas, Latino students and their bilingual teacher use features of what is named Spanish, English, and TexMex to mediate not only academic content but also the standard languages used in the classroom.

A translanguaging theoretical framework has also been increasingly used to study bilingual practices in early childhood bilingual education. In an Arabic-Hebrew bilingual kindergarten in Israel, Schwartz and Asli (2014) describe how both the children and their teachers use translanguaging. Garrity et al. (2015) have shown how infants aged 6–15 months in what is supposedly a dual language bilingual classroom use Spanish, English, and baby sign languages in what they called “simultaneous translanguaging practice.”

In the Basque Country, where trilingual education in Basque, Spanish, and English is becoming commonplace, Cenoz and Gorter are conducting research on how a translanguaging pedagogy can support the students’ trilingualism. In a school with a progressive orientation of the Sistema Amara Berri, students go to three

different classrooms daily where they work through one of three languages. Each classroom is organized into four tasks and four different groups that work collaboratively. Cenoz, Gorter, and their research team have developed translanguaging instructional material to be used with two of the four groups as they work in the different language classrooms. For example, in the Basque material for the Basque classroom, the experimental translanguaging material asks students to compare certain structures, vocabulary, or discourse in Basque to those in Spanish or English. The team is assessing student progress in each language when translanguaging tasks are introduced. Cenoz and Gorter's recent book titled *Multilingual Education: Between Language Learning and Translanguaging* (2015) contains contributions that support a translanguaging approach, arguing for the inclusion of the child's full and unique language repertoire in instruction.

It may be deaf bilingual education where the concept of translanguaging has proven more useful. Swanwick (2015) has been doing work on the bimodal bilingual translanguaging of deaf children and has found it to be a useful means of conceptualizing their language practices and the ways in which they use their language repertoires in the different spaces through which they move.

Although translanguaging is evident in bilingual and multilingual programs described by scholars, it is difficult for teachers, steeped in monoglossic language ideologies, to accept translanguaging. Martínez et al. (2014) explore how teachers in two Spanish-English bilingual elementary classrooms fluidly use their entire language repertoire while expressing ideologies of linguistic purism that emphasize language separation and showing concern about protecting the minoritized language.

It is precisely because even bilingual teachers suffer from monoglossic ideologies on language and bilingual instruction that developing translanguaging pedagogical strategies is so important. The project CUNY-NYSIEB has developed a number of pedagogical resources accessible on the project's website (www.cuny-nysieb.org). García et al. (2016) and García and Kleyn (2017) also offer guidance on curricular design, pedagogy, and assessment using translanguaging.

In assessment, López et al. (forthcoming) are developing a way of assessing bilingual students' knowledge of subject matter content through translanguaging. Using a computer-based platform (CBT), students have the opportunity to see or hear an item in both English and Spanish and to then write or say responses using their full language repertoire. To create the space for translanguaging and encouraging student-to-student interactions, students are asked to select a virtual friend or assistant. The translanguaged multimodal assessment creates a space for translanguaging by stimulating student-to-student interactions and promoting what López and his colleagues call "bilingual autonomy."

Clearly translanguaging has made its mark in the bilingual education scholarship, although its entrance has not been without controversy. In the next section, we discuss some of the problems and difficulties involved with translanguaging and bilingual education.

Problems and Difficulties

One of the problems that plagues translanguaging work in education has to do with the tension between two theoretical positions on translanguaging. On the one hand, there is the strong version of translanguaging, a theory that poses that bilingual people do not speak languages but rather, use their repertoire of linguistic features selectively. On the other hand, there is a weak version of translanguaging, the one that supports national and state language boundaries and yet calls for softening these boundaries.

The weak version of translanguaging has been, in some ways, with us for a long time, ever since the pioneer and premier scholar of bilingual education, Jim Cummins, taught us about linguistic interdependence and transfer (see Cummins, ► [Teaching for Transfer in Multilingual School Contexts](#), this volume). Originally, Cummins hypothesis didn't say anything about language separation in instruction; it simply alleged that instructional time spent through one language impacted the development of the other. But with time, Cummins (2007) started rethinking monolingual instructional strategies in bilingual education and challenging what he called "the two solitudes" especially in immersion bilingual education programs. Many scholars today follow Cummins in calling for flexible instructional strategies in bilingual education (see, for example, Lin 2013), but some use the term "translanguaging" to describe both the children's fluid language use and the flexible strategies used in classrooms.

Although we support the strong version of translanguaging as a linguistic theory (see Otheguy, García and Reid 2015), bilingual education responds to the conception of languages as defined by states and nations. After all, languages as names of enumerable things have been socially constructed, maintained, and regulated especially through schools. It is important then to understand that named national and state languages have had real and material consequences and continue to have them. But to advocate for fairer and more just assessments and a more appropriate bilingual education that gives voice to all children, no matter what their language practices, requires that we understand that named languages, imposed and regulated by schools, have nothing to do with individuals and the linguistic repertoire they use. From the bilingual child's perspective, the language they have belongs to them and not to the nation or the state.

True, bilingual education must develop bilingual students' ability to use language according to the rules and regulations that have been socially constructed for that particular named language. For some national groups, and especially groups that have been marginalized and have undergone language loss and shift, bilingual education is a way of revitalizing their language practices. But to get students to use features of the "named languages," to get them to appropriate those features as part of their linguistic repertoire, educators must first concede that the lexical and structural features that make up a bilingual student's repertoire are valid and need to be leveraged and used. This is, of course, where translanguaging pedagogical strategies come in, for besides providing students with opportunities to learn to select the appropriate features of their repertoire to meet the communicative

exigencies of the social situation at hand (and to suppress other features of their repertoire), bilingual education must also provide students with opportunities to fully use their entire language repertoire, without regard to the socially and politically defined boundaries of named languages and the ideologies of language purity that accompany them.

Minoritized languages must be protected and developed if that is the wish of people. But it is important to understand that the linguistic features that make up that minoritized language cannot be totally isolated from others because they are generally part of the linguistic competence of bilinguals. Bilingual education cannot maintain minoritized languages as if they were autonomous museum pieces; instead it can only help *sustain* and develop them in functional interrelationship within the communicative context in which they are used by bilingual speakers.

For bilingual education programs to both offer a fairer and more just education to bilingual children and sustain minority language practices, it is important that they combine the weak and strong versions of translanguaging theory. On the one hand, educators must continue to allocate separate spaces for the named languages although softening the boundaries between them. On the other hand, they must provide an instructional space where translanguaging is nurtured and used critically and creatively without speakers having to select and suppress different linguistic features of their own repertoire. Only by using all the features in their linguistic repertoire will bilingual students become virtuoso language users, rather than just careful and restrained language choosers. Only by assessing bilingual students on the full use of their linguistic repertoire – their ability to express complex thoughts effectively, to explain things, to persuade, to argue, to give directions, to recount events, etc. – and not simply on a set of lexical and structural features, will we understand their capacity for meaning and for achieving.

The Future

As always, translanguaging practices will continue to be present in bilingual classrooms, sometimes surreptitiously and other times out in the open. Translanguaging offers many advantages for a multilingual future, for by taking the perspective of the individual speaker, and not that of the state, bilingual users are freed from the strictures that keep us from understanding each other and from discovering the common features in our language repertoire and those held by others. The linguistic flexibility posed by a translanguaging perspective means that individuals will be able to more openly appropriate linguistic features and make them their own, rather than linking them to a particular language or state.

But translanguaging in education sometimes contradicts the regulatory role of schools. Bilingual educators must decide whether to always accept the regulations imposed upon bilingual students that restrict them as two monolinguals or to find spaces to liberate their tongues and minds. Only then will bilingual education be truly able to assist bilingual students to choose intelligently when to select or

suppress certain features of their repertoire and when to liberate their tongues, their full language repertoire, along with their minds and imagination.

Related Articles in the Encyclopedia of Language and Education

Angel Lin: [Code-Switching in the Classroom: Research Paradigms and Approaches](#).

In Volume: Research Methods in Language and Education

Feliciano Chimbutane: [Multilingual Resources in Classroom Interaction: Portuguese and African Languages in Bilingual Education Programs](#). In Volume: Multilingual Resources in Classroom Interaction

Judith Green: [Classroom Interaction, Situated Learning](#). In Volume: Discourse and Education

Kate Menken: [Language Policy in Classrooms and Schools](#). In Volume: Language Policy and Political Issues in Education

L. Wei and O. Garcia: [From Researching Translanguaging to Translanguaging Research](#). In Volume: Research Methods in Language and Education

D. Gorter, J. Cenoz: [Linguistic Landscape and Multilingualism](#). In Volume: Language Awareness and Multilingualism

Acknowledgment During the writing of this chapter, Ofelia García was in residence at the University of Cologne. She is grateful for the collaboration of her colleagues there.

References

- Arthur, J., & Martin, P. (2006). Accomplishing lessons in postcolonial classrooms: Comparative perspectives from Botswana and Brunei Darussalam. *Comparative Education*, 42, 177–202.
- Auer, P. (2005). A postscript: Code-switching and social identity. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 37(3), 403–410.
- Bailey, B. (2007). Heteroglossia and boundaries. In M. Heller (Ed.), *Bilingualism: A social approach* (pp. 257–276). Basingstoke: Palgrave.
- Baker, C. (2001). *Foundations of bilingual education and bilingualism* (3rd ed.). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Baker, C. (2011). *Foundations of bilingual education and bilingualism* (5th ed.). Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- Bakhtin, M. (1981). *Dialogic imagination: Four essays*. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Blackledge, A., & Creese, A. (2010). *Multilingualism: A critical perspective*. London: Continuum.
- Busch, B. (2013). The linguistic repertoire revisited. *Applied Linguistics* (2012), 33(5), 503–523.
- Canagarajah, S. (2011a). Codemeshing in academic writing: Identifying teachable strategies of translanguaging. *The Modern Language Journal*, 95, 401–417.
- Canagarajah, S. (2011b). Translanguaging in the classroom: Emerging issues for research and pedagogy. In L. Wei (Ed.), *Applied linguistics review* (Vol. 2, pp. 1–27). Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton.
- Cenoz, J., & Gorter, D. (2015). *Multilingual education: Between language learning and translanguaging*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Creese, A., & Blackledge, A. (2010). ‘Translanguaging in the bilingual classroom: A pedagogy for learning and teaching?’ *Modern Language Journal*, 94(i), 103–115.

- Cummins, J. (2007). Rethinking monolingual instructional strategies in multilingual classrooms. *The Canadian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 10(2), 221–240.
- Flores, N. (2014). Let's not forget that Translanguaging is a political act. <https://educationalinguist.wordpress.com/2014/07/19/lets-not-forget-that-translanguaging-is-a-political-act/>
- García, O. (2009). *Bilingual education in the 21st century: A global perspective*. Malden/Oxford: Wiley/Blackwell.
- García, O., & Li Wei. (2014). *Translanguaging: Language, bilingualism and education*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- García, O., Ibarra-Johnson, S., & Seltzer, K. (2016). *The translanguaging classroom*. Philadelphia: Caslon.
- García, O., & Kleyn, T. (Eds.) (2017). *Translanguaging with multilingual students*. New York and London: Routledge.
- Garrity, S., Aquino-Sterling, C., & Day, A. (2015). Translanguaging in an infant classroom: Using multiple languages to make meaning. *International Multilingual Research Journal*, 9(3), 177–196. doi: 10.1080/19313152.2015.1048542.
- Gort, M. (2015). Transforming literacy learning and teaching through translanguaging and other typical practices associated with “doing being bilingual”. *International Multilingual Research Journal*, 9(1), 1–6. doi:10.1080/19313152.2014.988030.
- Gort, M., & Sembiante, S. F. (2015). Navigating hybridized language learning spaces through translanguaging pedagogy: Dual language preschool teachers’ languaging practices in support of emergent bilingual children’s performance of academic discourse. *International Multilingual Research Journal*, 9(1), 7–25. doi:10.1080/19313152.2014.981775.
- Gumperz, J. J. (1982). *Discourse strategies*. New York: Cambridge University.
- Hornberger, N. H. (2003). Continua of biliteracy. In N. H. Hornberger (Ed.), *Continua of biliteracy: An ecological framework for educational policy, research, and practice in multilingual settings* (pp. 3–34). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Hornberger, N. (2005). Opening and filling up implementational and ideological spaces in heritage language education. *Modern Language Journal*, 89, 605–612.
- Hornberger, N. H., & Link, H. (2012). Translanguaging and transnational literacies in multilingual classrooms: A bilingual lens. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 15(3), 261–278.
- Jacobson, R. (1990). Allocating two languages as a key feature of a bilingual methodology. In R. Jacobson & C. Faltis (Eds.), *Language distribution issues in bilingual schooling* (pp. 3–17). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- 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.
- Lewis, G., Jones, B., & Baker, C. (2013). 100 Bilingual lessons: Distributing two languages in classrooms’. In C. Abello-Contesse, P. Chandler, M. D. López-Jiménez, M. M. Torreblanca-López & R. Chacón-Beltrán (Eds.), *Bilingualism and Multilingualism in School Settings*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- Li Wei. (2011). Moment analysis and translanguaging space: Discursive construction of identities by multilingual Chinese youth in Britain. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 43, 1222–1235.
- Li Wei, & García, O. (forthcoming). From researching translanguaging to translanguaging research. In K. King & Yi-Ju Lai (Eds), *Research Methods. In Encyclopedia of Language and Education*. Springer.
- Lin, A. M. Y. (2013). Towards paradigmatic change in TESOL methodologies: Building plurilingual pedagogies from the ground up. *TESOL Quarterly*, 47(3), 521–545.
- Lin, A. M. Y., & Martin, P. W. (Eds.). (2005). *Decolonisation, globalization. Language-in-education policy and practice*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- López, A., Guzmán-Orth, D., & Turkan, S. (forthcoming). Conceptualizing the use of translanguaging in content assessments for emergent bilingual students. Princeton, NJ: Educational Testing Service.

- Makoni, S., & Pennycook, A. (2007). *Disinventing and reconstituting languages*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Martínez, R., Hikida, M., & Durán, L. (2014). Unpacking ideologies of linguistic purism: How dual language teachers make sense of everyday translanguaging. *International Multilingual Research Journal*, 9(1), 26–42.
- 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.
- Myers-Scotton, C. (2005). *Multiple voices: An introduction to bilingualism*. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.
- Otheguy, R., García, O., & Reid, W. (2015). Clarifying translanguaging and deconstructing named languages: A perspective from linguistics. *Applied Linguistics Review*, 6(3), 281–307.
- Palmer, D. K., Martínez, R. A., Mateus, S. G., & Henderson, K. (2014). Reframing the debate on language separation: Toward a vision for translanguaging pedagogies in the dual language classroom. *The Modern Language Journal*, 98(3), 757–772. doi:10.1111/modl.12121.
- Sayer, P. (2013). Translanguaging, textmex, and bilingual pedagogy: Emergent bilinguals learning through the vernacular. *TESOL Quarterly*, 47(1), 63–88.
- Schwartz, M., & Asli, A. (2014). Bilingual teachers' language strategies: The case of an Arabic-Hebrew Kindergarten in Israel. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 38, 22–32.
- Swanwick, R. (2016). Scaffolding learning through classroom talk: The role of translanguaging. In M. Marschark & P. Spencer (Eds.), *The Oxford handbook of deaf studies: Language and language development*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. Chapter 28.
- Valdés, G. (1997). Dual-language immersion programs: A cautionary note concerning the education of language-minority students. *Harvard Educational Review*, 67, 391–429.
- 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 doctoral thesis, University of Wales, Bangor.