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Guiding Questions

- What are the characteristics of the translanguaging pedagogy used by Kago that distinguish it from much traditional second language and bilingual pedagogy?
- What understandings about bilingual acquisition do you gather from the perspectives expressed by the bilingual learners in this chapter that may be different from the traditional second language acquisition literature?
- What are the advantages of a translanguaging pedagogy for both bilingual and monolingual learners? What may be the difficulties in enacting it?

Introduction

The multilingual turn experienced in the 21st century has greatly impacted national school systems, many of which have been unwilling to use the language diversity of their students as a resource to learn. But despite the resistance of many, multilingualism has in itself ‘turned’ schools and pedagogical practices, as educational systems try to catch up with their sociolinguistic realities.

The United States has always been a nation of immigrants, but schools have focused on encouraging the language shift to English, which has characterized the US in the past. But the multilingual turn experienced globally in
the 21st century has not escaped the US or its students. Despite its limitations, the US Census reports that 22% of students aged 5–17 years old in US schools speak languages other than English at home (US Census Bureau, 2011). The percentage of bilingual students in schools financed by the government, known in the US as public schools, is even greater. It is also now common in the US for students to be ‘bi-schooled’ (Nagaoka, 1998); that is, many US students go to public American schools, and at the same time attend educational programs in languages other than English and following curricula established by other national systems (see García et al., 2012b). That is, these ‘bi-schooled’ students are not only being educated bilingually, but are also following different national curricula delivered by educators with different nationalities and through pedagogies grounded in different sociocultural frameworks. This is the case of the Japanese American students who are the subject of this chapter. Bilingual Japanese American students have remarkable language and literacy abilities, able to read and write using two different scripts and discourse traditions, and expecting to achieve the same national standards in Japanese as those of their peers in Japan, and in English as those of their American peers in the US. To do that, they attend both English public day schools and Japanese supplementary schools either at weekends or after school. But the separateness of their educational spaces – one solely in English and the other solely in Japanese – means that they are never asked to use their bilingual abilities to make sense of what they are learning. This chapter describes an exception, the construction of an instructional space where these bilingual students’ complex bilingual practices, which we call here their trans-languaging, were used as a resource to develop their academic writing in English. We start by discussing the concept of dynamic bilingualism and translinguaging, before we turn to the translinguaging instructional space in which the study was conducted, and to what we learned about the translang-uaging process from the students.

Dynamic Bilingualism and Translanguaging

Motivated by a desire to better understand what happens when all language practices are used to develop a specific practice that is linked to a specific discourse, one of the authors of this chapter, Naomi Kano, designed an English essay writing class for Japanese students in which the students’ bilingual practices were used dynamically to teach and learn. In the 21st century, an additive view of bilingualism as two linear wholes, which has been called the monolingual view of multilingualism (Grosjean, 1982), no longer holds. Different linguistic features are not bound by geographical terr-itories, national spaces or speech communities, but rather they represent complex local practices of interactions that are dynamically enacted by human beings in communication (Mignolo, 2000; Pennycook, 2010) and that
are linked to broader sociopolitical systems, creating possibilities for both agency and resistance (Irvine & Gal, 2000).

Many have argued that bilingualism can be better seen as dynamic (De Bot et al., 2005; García, 2009; Larsen-Freeman & Cameron, 2008). Herdina and Jessner (2002) have proposed a dynamic model of multilingualism based on dynamic systems theory, which posits that there is an interplay between language systems and that there is no simple addition of these systems. They argue that there are no separate language systems, and bi-/multilingualism produces a change in the systems involved, as well as in the degree of metalinguistic and metacognitive awareness of the speaker (Jessner, 2006).

This dynamic bilingualism goes beyond the descriptive models of additive and subtractive bilingualism of the past or even the plurilingualism espoused by the Council of Europe (CoE, 2001) today as 'the ability to use several languages to varying degrees and for distinct purposes', and instead acknowledges the complexity of the language practices of bilingual and multilingual people. Dynamic bilingualism is enacted through fluid languaging practices that scholars have called by different terms, meaning slightly different things. Jørgensen (2008) refers to the combination of features that are not discrete and complete 'languages' in themselves as polylingualism. Jacquemet (2005) speaks of transidiomatic practices to refer to the communicative practices of transnational groups that interact using different communicative codes, simultaneously present in a range of local and distant communicative channels. Otsuji and Pennycook (2010) refer to fluid practices in urban contexts as metrolinguism, rejecting the fact that there are discrete languages or codes. Canagarajah (2011) uses codemeshing to refer to the shuttle between repertoires in writing for rhetorical effectiveness, and refers to translilingual practices (Canagarajah, 2013).

Perhaps the term that has had the most traction in the literature to refer to these flexible language practices is that of translanguaging. The term translanguaging comes from the Welsh (trawsieithu) coined by Cen Williams (1994). In its original use, it referred to a pedagogical practice where students are asked to alternate languages for the purposes of receptive or productive use; for example, students might be asked to read in English and write in Welsh and vice versa (Baker, 2011). Since then, the term has been extended by many scholars (Blackledge & Creese, 2010; Canagarajah, 2011; Creese & Blackledge, 2010; García, 2009, 2011, 2013; García & Sylvan, 2011; Hornberger & Link, 2012; Lewis et al., 2012a, 2012b) to refer to both the complex discursive practices of bilinguals, as well as to pedagogical approaches that use those complex practices.

We use translanguaging in this chapter to refer not to the use of two separate languages or even the shift of one language or code to the other. Rather, translanguaging is rooted on the principle that bilingual speakers select language features from a repertoire and 'soft assemble' their language practices in ways that fit their communicative situations (García, 2009,
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2013). That is, bilinguals call upon different social features in a seamless and complex network of multiple semiotic signs, as they adapt their languaging to suit the immediate task. Translanguaging, as a soft-assembled mechanism, emerges with enaction, with each action being locally situated and unique to satisfy contextual constraints, and creating an interdependence among all components of the system (Kloss & Van Orden, 2009; Turvey & Carello, 1981). Translanguaging can be defined as a process by which students and teachers engage in complex discursive practices that include all the language practices of students in order to develop new language practices and sustain old ones, communicate appropriate knowledge, and give voice to new sociopolitical realities by interrogating linguistic inequality. We argue that in today's globalized world what is needed is the ability to engage in fluid language practices and to soft assemble features that can 'travel' across geographic spaces to enable us to participate fully as global citizens.

Language education programs, and even bilingual education programs, often insist that the two languages be kept separate (García, 2009). The philosophy has been that the students' home language practices can never be used, and that the teacher should exclusively use the additional language. Even in bilingual education programs, the two languages are most often strictly allocated according to different teachers, different subjects, different time of day or different places. This is what Cummins (2007) refers to as 'the two solitudes'. Very early on, Cummins (1981) posited the interdependence hypothesis. Cummins explains that the surface features of the different languages may be distinct, but there is a 'common underlying proficiency' that enables bilinguals to transfer cognitive and/or academic abilities from one language to the other. Cummins now explains that educators have not used his interdependence and common underlying proficiency to develop programmatic structures and pedagogies that would truly support this interdependence.

In the US, the only educational programs that give students the possibility of developing bilingualism are 'dual language' bilingual education programs that are based on the principle that the languages should be kept separate. The common assumption that only the 'target' language is to be used in language education programs has become increasingly questioned (Cummins, 2007; Fitts, 2006; García, 2009, 2013; García et al., 2012a). Fu (2003) writes about the ways in which she uses what she calls a 'bilingual process approach' to develop Chinese students' writing abilities in English:

I believe thinking (reasoning and imagination) and the ability to organize ideas are equally, or even more, important than language skills in learning to write. If we let our students express themselves and present their ideas in their primary language, we give them opportunities to continue the development of their thinking. With this development uninterrupted, they are able to write well in a second language once they develop proficiency in it. (Fu, 2003: 74)
Translanguaging as a pedagogic practice is increasingly being used to sustain the dynamic languaging of students and to enable them to learn (Creese & Blackledge, 2010; for a pedagogical guide on translanguaging, see Celic & Seltzer, 2012).

Although most language education programs are set up to separate language practices into two neat systems, in practice students and teachers language flexibly in classrooms (see chapter by Conteh, Copland & Creese, this volume). If used strategically, the flexible use of different language practices, translanguaging, has an important purpose in language education. This was precisely the goal of the special private class designed for a group of Japanese American students and taught by Naomi Kano, which we discuss in the next section.

A Transcultural/Translanguaging Class

The purpose of the class taught by Kano was to prepare Japanese students, ranging from 12 to 16 years of age, for the Scholastic Achievement Test (SAT) that American universities use for admissions. The course, taught privately to 10 students in one of the students’ homes, targeted as product the kind of English academic essay that the US values, such as clear organization, critical thinking, unity and coherence, point of view supported by appropriate evidence and examples, and skilful use of language and grammar. To develop the Japanese students’ essay writing abilities, Kano focused on two issues: (1) the organization of the text; and (2) the quality of the ideas that were formulated in writing.

For the most part, the organization of written texts in Japanese schools and American schools differs. English texts follow what Kano (2012) calls ‘a bento-box’ deductive organization; that is, the discrete paragraphing of English essays is like having compartments in a bento box, a Japanese compartmentalized lunch box to-go, in which one can immediately tell what the main dish is. It also allows one to get what one wants at a glance. In contrast, Japanese texts generally follow an inductive organization (Hinds, 1990; Kaplan, 1966). The tendency of Japanese writers is to write inductively, which results in an argument that has not been fully developed, and an expectation on the reader to infer the point being made. Writing deductively has to be taught explicitly to meet the expectation of American readers. For Japanese students, it is often not the language itself (vocabulary, grammar, etc.) that prevents them from getting high scores in the SAT essays, but the ways in which they organize their ideas. Additionally, Japanese students are often hampered by their inability to express ideas on themes with which they are not familiar. This was the focus of the other strand of Kano’s teaching activities.

The teacher, Kano, conducted a thematic analysis of all SAT prompts since 2005 and divided the topics into those which were more foreign to
Japanese culture, such as those having to do with independence, democracy and individuality, and those that were very much part of Japanese culture, such as harmony and cooperation. Japanese students’ scores are often low because of the quality of ideas having to do with themes with which they are not familiar.

What makes it challenging for Japanese student writers to produce English texts, besides the linguistic differences, is the different emphasis in text organization and the expectation of familiarity with ideas that are culturally laden. But to explicitly develop text organization and quality of ideas requires that the teacher acknowledges what students already know and know how to do – their own ideas and the ways they organize ideas in Japanese written texts. That is, teaching has to be responsive to students who know other ways of languaging, other discourses, and other ways of writing, the result of their being bi-schooled. What bilingual students already know in other languages and have learned in other schools is hardly ever recognized in American public schools.

In thinking about how to develop the abilities of Japanese students to expand and organize their ideas, Kano developed a curriculum that used translanguaging pedagogically (see Kano, 2012). This translanguaging pedagogy rested on the ability of the students to use their entire linguistic repertoire (even though an English essay was expected as a product), while giving students agency to use their language practices flexibly in order to construct their own meaning and develop strong English essays. The 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.

The English essay writing curriculum was carried out over a period of six months in 21 weekly lessons of 90 minutes each. Throughout the six-month period, students were given reading material in both English and Japanese to use in constructing their English essays.

The bilingual students

The 10 Japanese students in the class consisted of seven girls and three boys of middle-school and high-school age whose parents wanted them to do well in English essay writing for the SAT. However, the parents also wanted...
a Japanese teacher, able to understand the gaps in language and discourse norms between the two social contexts, and able to be especially sensitive to cultural and social differences. Intuitively, these parents understood that their children had a resource that had heretofore not been tapped— their dynamic bilingual practices. They also assumed that only a teacher able to understand the two trans-discursive cultural styles would be able to negotiate the differences. All the students spoke Japanese at home, although, as we said before, they attended American public schools during the day and Japanese schools at weekends. Not all students were at the same points of the bilingual continuum (García, 2009; Grosjean, 2010); that is, some students spoke, read or wrote with different degrees of proficiency in one language or the other. Five students were emergent bilinguals (García & Kleifgen, 2010); that is, they were developing academic English, and were receiving English as a second language instruction in their public schools. The other five students were experienced bilinguals, able to use English and Japanese well to read and write academic texts. Table 11.1 displays the characteristics of the 10 students in the study.

What is striking about these students is that these are transnational Japanese American youth. Only one of the 10 was born in the US and has lived in the US since then. Of the five emergent bilinguals, three were born in Japan and came to the US at the age of 12. But the other two had moved frequently. One was born in Japan, went to Singapore at the age of two, to Hong Kong at the age of six, to Japan at the age of nine, and came to New York at the age of 14. The other emergent bilingual was born in the Netherlands; at six she moved to the UK, three years later she went back to Japan, and at 12 she came to the US. Among those who are experienced bilinguals, there were five students who had received additional instruction in a country other than the US or Japan. Table 11.1 displays the characteristics of the 10 students in the study.

Table 11.1 Students in the study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Emergent bilinguals</th>
<th>Experienced bilinguals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Emi F 13 Netherlands —&gt; UK (6) —&gt; Japan (9) —&gt; US (12)</td>
<td>Chihiro F 12 Japan —&gt; US (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haruka F 15 Japan —&gt; Singapore (2) —&gt; Hong Kong (6) —&gt; Japan (9) —&gt; US (14)</td>
<td>Daiki M 13 US —&gt; Japan (1) —&gt; US (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masato M 14 Japan —&gt; US (12)</td>
<td>Kei F 12 Japan —&gt; Canada (2) —&gt; US (7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nozomi F 16 Japan —&gt; US (12)</td>
<td>Risa F 12 US</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satomi F 13 Japan —&gt; US (12)</td>
<td>Yuji M 14 Canada —&gt; US (4)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: Numbers in parentheses refer to the ages of the students when they arrived in that country. The first country that appears is the country of birth.
bilinguals, two were born in the US, one was born in Canada and two were born in Japan but had moved to the US and Canada at the age of two. Of the two born in the US, one had moved to Japan when he was one, and returned at the age of five. Clearly these students have led transnational as well as transcultural lives, picking up different linguistic and cultural practices from all the social contexts and schooling systems they have experienced. And yet, both their American and their Japanese schooling only take into consideration a small part of their linguistic, cultural and schooling practices.

Research Methodology and General Findings

The purpose of this study was to better understand the students' perceptions of translanguaging as pedagogy and as a learning strategy. To do so, a stimulated recall technique was used in which portions of translanguaging-enriched instruction were videotaped and then played back to individual students involved in the task. These interviews took place twice during the six-month period and were conducted in Japanese.

Introspective studies of multilingualism have been used in the past to disclose the experiences of participants in solving tasks (Faerch & Kasper, 1986). These studies usually consist of self-reports of what the participants are doing, of self-observations in which participants are asked to inspect their language behavior, and of self-revelation in which participants disclose their thought process (Cohen, 1996). This study asked the participants to reveal what they were thinking as they inspected their language behavior and to report what they were doing during the translanguaging-enriched task that was videotaped. Despite the fact that some participants were able to say much more than others, the stimulated recall technique enabled the students to focus especially on their thought process as they were engaged in the translanguaging task.

The analyses of the interviews confirmed the fact that translanguaging played an important role in how the students processed their English essay writing. As we will see, translanguaging as a pedagogy made students more aware of their language use; that is, their metalinguistic awareness became more developed. Learners were making choices according to social and motivational factors, as Clyne (2003) has shown. In addition, their anxiety about writing English essays was lowered. However, it also became clear that translanguaging was used differently by the experienced bilinguals and the emergent bilinguals. Whereas the experienced bilinguals used translanguaging seamlessly for their own enhancement, the emergent bilinguals used translanguaging as support, and sometimes to expand their understandings. As we will see, emergent bilinguals had a dependent translanguaging pattern, whereas experienced bilinguals had an independent translanguaging pattern. In all cases, however, both languages seemed to be continuously activated, but to different degrees (Green, 1986; Thierry & Wu, 2007). That is, although the goal of the
The lesson was to produce an English language text, the students could not achieve this without working with, and through, Japanese. As we will see, the translanguaging pedagogy, focusing on the dynamic nature of the interaction between the components of the bilingual system, led to the emergence and development of metalinguistic and metacognitive awareness (Herdina & Jessner, 2002), abilities which can facilitate self-regulation in learning.

Translanguaging in Action

The interviews revealed that all students, regardless of where they were positioned in the bilingual continuum, translanguaged frequently in order to make sense of the lesson being taught, as well as in the process of writing their English essays. All students used the readings provided in both Japanese and English, although they used them selectively and differently. They demonstrated much linguistic awareness of their own 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. Nevertheless, whereas the emergent bilinguals often translanguaged because they were dependent on their expertise with other language practices in order to complete the task, the experienced bilinguals translanguaged only to enhance the task, demonstrating their greater autonomy and ability to self-regulate. We first look at what the emergent bilinguals said about their reading of bilingual texts in order to build their background knowledge and develop the quality of their ideas, and then discuss how the experienced bilinguals handled the same exposure to bilingual texts.

Emergent bilinguals translanguaging for support

Satomi, Masato and Nozomi were all born in Japan and came to the US at the age of 12. Thus, they have been in the US for one to four years and are at the beginning points of the bilingual continuum. All three benefited greatly from the bilingual reading texts that the teacher prepared, but they each used them differently.

Satomi shows her ability to zoom in on the language that she needs for a particular task. She is shown a video clip in which she is engaged in reading the bilingual texts. When asked in what language she was reading, she answers:

"In English, I was reading corresponding passages in the Japanese language whenever I didn't understand it in English.

This says much about Satomi's self-regulating process of learning. She knows she is going to write in English, and thus prefers to read in English.
However, whenever she does not fully understand the English language, she goes back to the Japanese. In a way, Satomi is doing what all good readers do—they use all their semiotic resources to negotiate meaning with the text. This is a strategy used by many of the students, and certainly by another two emergent bilingual students, Masato and Nozomi.

When shown the video clip of his reading and asked what language he first read in, Masato says:

日本語で必要な部分を見て、そこを英語で見て、アウトラインを書きました。

[The Japanese one. Then, I picked relevant parts and switched to the English text for writing the outline.]

Masato's strategy is different from the one used by Satomi in that the order of the language in which he enters the reading texts is different. Satomi first reads the English text, knowing that she would have to write in English, and only relies on Japanese when she does not understand. Masato goes straight for full comprehension of the reading and thus reads the Japanese text first, going back to the English text only when he has to write. Satomi and Masato's different approaches to the process of translanguaging reveal something about their different learning styles. Satomi is interested in doing well in English, and uses Japanese as a resource when she does not understand English. Masato, on the other hand, really wants to understand and gain deep content knowledge. Although some might understand his reading of Japanese first as 'taking the easy way out', in reality he reads in Japanese first because it gives him the most depth in comprehension. That is, the Japanese text is used as a resource to understand deeply. Masato understands that writing is about rendering in written words a thought, an idea, a feeling, and that the more one understands, the easier it is to develop it in writing.

There is much more going on in Masato's language use than just an alternate use of his different language resources. Masato also reveals how he uses his linguistic resources purposefully and simultaneously. He describes what he was doing in the video clip as he was getting ready to write:

アウトラインに書く文章は頭の中で英語にして考えて、日本語で読んだのの要点とかを考えるときは、日本語になっていると思います。

[I was thinking in English about what I was going to write in English; for summing up the main points of the text I read in Japanese, I was thinking in Japanese.]

Masato has at his disposal a range of language resources, which are not in any way the same. Just as Japanese and English have different scripts, in a class to develop English academic writing the languages have different purposes. Masato thinks in English if he is planning to write in English, but he
uses Japanese to better comprehend the text that will be the springboard for his writing in English. In other words, through the translanguaging pedagogy used in this class, Masato is made aware of the advantages of using his bilingualism dynamically to learn and to show what he knows. He self-regulates the construction of his knowledge and uses Japanese for knowledge input, and English for language input.

Another of the emergent bilinguals was Nozomi, a 16-year-old who has been in the US for four years. Nozomi was also asked to comment on a video-clip where she is shown working with the bilingual texts. Her strategy was different again from that of Satomi and Masato, for she read in both Japanese and English. She explains:

日本語のほうを最初に読んで、それで使いたい所を見て英語のその部分だけ読んでみます。... 日本語でそのまま読むと変になっちゃうんで、英語のを見て見本にして書いてほうがまだわかりやすいかな、って。

[I read the Japanese text first, and then I decided the area that is relevant to my essay, and read the equivalent part in English. ... If I translate directly from the Japanese I've written, the product [in English] may seem odd. Referring to the English text makes my English essay easier to understand for the readers.]

Nozomi's strategy is similar to Masato in that she reads the Japanese text first, but then quickly identifies the equivalent part in English, which she then uses to write her English essay. Whereas Masato is interested in the deep meaning that the Japanese text provides, Nozomi is looking for ways to use Japanese to complete the academic task, which is the English essay.

Nozomi was the least bilingual in the bilingual continua of all the students in the study. She has learned to write English by finding her words in what she reads, and as she says above, refers to the English written text to produce her own English written text. However, Nozomi also reveals in her interview what is not readily seen, which is, as we have explained above, crucial to the delivery of a good English essay – what happens as she constructs her ideas and organizes them. She explains:

だいたい考えておいて、どんなことを書くか決めて、その他と日本語で考えながら、英語にします。

[Before I start writing, I roughly organize my thoughts, and decide on what I'm gonna write, and while thinking in Japanese, I write in English.]

Thinking internally in Japanese, alongside the external English written product, allows Nozomi to write an English essay.

The three emergent bilingual students introduced in this section have the least proficiency in English, and yet they translanguage differently and show a great deal of autonomy and control over the task they are performing.
They are knowledgeable translanguagers, able to translanguage to support their learning and the production of an English essay. The following section portrays how the two other emergent bilinguals who are further along the bilingual continuum use translanguaging.

**Emergent bilinguals translanguaging for expansion**

Emergent bilinguals who are further along the bilingual continuum seldom rely on the Japanese written texts to make meaning of the English texts. But this does not mean that they do not also use translanguaging actively. Emi and Haruka are the two other emergent bilingual students; however, because they have lived in many other international contexts, they arrived with very good receptive ability in English.

Emi is shown the video clip in which she is engaged in pre-writing the English essay. She explains what she's doing:

英語でメモ取ってるときでも、たまにわからなかったりしたときはそれをそのまま書いてしまうので、書いてやっています。

[While taking notes in English, when I come across things I don't get, I quickly jot it down in Japanese instead.]

Emi uses all her linguistic resources to expand her understanding, to speed up her learning, to save cognitive space and time. For example, Emi annotates her own notes in English with Japanese, to ensure that she understands, remembers and appropriates the meanings, and that she speeds up the process of making meaning. Her annotations in Japanese expand her ability to make meaning. This is the same process used in glosses – marginal or interlinear annotations of texts – used since medieval times to enlighten the comprehension of texts written in Classical languages.

Haruka, who had lived in Singapore, Hong Kong and Japan before arriving in the US, is shown a video clip of herself working on an English vocabulary exercise in which she has to come up with synonyms. She is asked what language process she used to accomplish the task. Her answer reveals her use of translanguaging not simply as a support, but as an expander. She says:

そのときは日本語で考えてました。… あの、思い出かなくて、やっぱり日本語でどう出したらかっていうの。それに関しては日本語でした。

[同義語練習問題の例] ‘use up’ っていうことがあって、それ、‘消費’ って思い出したら、‘consume’ が出て来たんで。そういうふうに日本語を使ってました。

[I was thinking in Japanese at the time. … I couldn’t think of synonyms in English because Japanese words kept shooting through my mind one after
another. So, I depended on my Japanese. [For example], we had 'use up' among
the list. When I understood the word in Japanese ('消費'), an English word
'consume' came through my mind. This way, I used the Japanese language for
the task.]

For this emergent bilingual student, translanguaging enables her to complete
the academic task in English, as she uses her entire linguistic repertoire,
which includes lexicon from Japanese, to generate lexicon in English. Emi
and Haruka, the two emergent bilinguals who are further along the bilingual
continuum, are using translanguaging to expand their cognitive and linguis­
tic experiences, and not simply as support. How experienced bilinguals use
translanguaging is the topic of the next section.

Experienced bilinguals translanguage for strategic
expediency and enhancement

Experienced bilinguals use their entire linguistic repertoire in seamless
ways and translanguage for strategic expediency, as well as to enhance their
learning. Yuji, an experienced bilingual student, is asked to explain his pro­
cess of thinking when writing in Japanese or English. He communicates his
facility with matching up his thinking process with his reading and writing
process:

[If I were to write in English, I would most likely think in English. When I am
reading a book in English and having a discussion in Japanese, my brain would
be working in English... [in this class] If I'm not writing in English, I'd most
likely be thinking in Japanese.]

Yuji seems to be saying that his performance of academic language in reading
and writing is matched by his thinking ability in that particular language,
and especially by his self-regulation and awareness of the appropriate
response in that case. However, he also reveals that it is possible for him to
have a discussion in Japanese, while thinking in English in ways that permit
him to expand the meaning of the reading in English. Yuji has only had
experience with a separation approach to biliteracy where students and teach­
ers are expected to match the language in which they are communicating
around writing to the language of the text (García, 2009). But in the trans­
languaging space of this special class, Yuji is beginning to move away from
this separation approach to biliteracy, moving towards what has been termed
pluriliteracies (García et al., 2007), that is, a recognition that written-linguistic
modes of meaning are intricately bound up with all kinds of visual, audio and spatial semiotic systems (Cope & Kalantzis, 2000; Kress, 2003). Pluriliteracies give agency to the person involved in the literacy act to use different literacy practices to capitalize on the meaning of the text that is being received or produced.

What makes the concept of pluriliteracies important is the emphasis on having bilingual students develop the agency to use their entire language repertoire to make meaning, regardless of the language of the text or the language of instruction. The idea is that literacy practices are about making meaning from texts and in texts; thus, the communication that takes place in or around writing has to draw on the entire semiotic and bilingual continua, including the continua between receptive and productive language, oral and written, and home-school language practices (Hornberger, 1989).

Hornberger and Skilton-Sylvester (2003) emphasize that biliteracy is better obtained when learners can draw on all points on the continua of biliteracy, especially those aspects that have less power in the school system, such as oral language and home language practices. A flexible dynamic translanguaging approach towards the development of literacy can indeed situate students in in-between border spaces. In these spaces, as Mignolo (2000) makes clear, alternative representations and buried histories of linguistic subjugation are released; that is, ideologies about language and identity, constrained by nation states, are allowed expression, thus also freeing different ways of speaking and being. Yuji is starting to find that place where he translanguages not for support, not even for expansion, but for enhancement.

Yuji also recounts how he made the best use of his bilingual abilities, using both languages to research because he wanted to get the best information. He recalls how he used different texts in both languages to prepare an essay:

今年の作文なんですけど、携帯電話が良いか悪いか、でリサーチをしたとき、日本語のものも英語のものも両方使いました。… 携帯電話が有益かどうか、日本語でやってみて、で日本語のリサーチを取って、英語でも、って英語のやつも取って、でそれを二つ使いました。… 両方のことばで調べてみて、一番良いのを使おうと思って。

[This year, when I was doing research on the pros and cons about cell phones, I used materials both in Japanese and English. … I searched for the articles in Japanese on whether cell phones were beneficial, and I took some of them. Then I did the same thing in English. I ended up using the materials in both languages. … I searched in both languages in order to get the best ones available.]

Yuji is an active translanguager, using every opportunity he has to develop his bilingual abilities. Yuji was born in Canada, moved to the US at the age
of four, and has never lived in Japan, and yet he speaks Japanese confidently and fluently. Yuji reveals his strategy to develop his Japanese:

英語ではこう言う。でも、日本語ではこう言う。っていうのは時々考えます。授業中とか、たまに先生のいうことは日本語に変えてみたりすることもあります。

[Sometimes, I think of a word in English and another word in Japanese that has the same meaning. ... I sometimes translate what the teacher says in English into Japanese.]

It turns out that Yuji consciously uses translanguaging as a self-regulating strategy to develop his bilingual skills. Not only does he take every chance to use his full linguistic repertoire, but he also spontaneously creates opportunities to augment such chances, and to enhance his linguistic abilities.

Yuji is not the only one who uses translanguaging to bolster and enhance his bilingual abilities. An advantage of a translanguaging pedagogy, even when applied to an English essay class, is that by making use of the full linguistic repertoire available to students, it also allows students to self-regulate their development of either language. Chihiro is another experienced bilingual who uses the English texts to develop her understanding of Japanese. In expressing her support for the translanguaging approach of the classroom, she says:

自分では日本語のほうがボキャブラリーがちょっと少ない気がするんで、あと漢字が不頼意なんで、それで英語で一回読んで、それにそのあとに日本語であてはめれば少しずつことばとかわかるので、結構それは好きです。

[I think my vocabulary range is more limited in Japanese than in English. And I'm not good at Chinese characters. If I read an English text once, then I apply what I understood there to reading the Japanese text. I can understand the Japanese words little by little. So I like it.]

It turns out that, although the translanguaging pedagogy used in this special class was specifically to teach English essay writing, experienced bilinguals also use it actively and fruitfully to sustain and develop their Japanese literacy abilities, a by-product of this teaching.

All the experienced bilinguals used their language resources fluidly and flexibly in order to participate in class discussion, mostly in Japanese, read the bilingual texts and write in English. Chihiro watched a video clip of herself preparing to participate in class discussion in Japanese, and tried to explain what she was doing:

(英語の) テキストは日本語に訳さないでそのまま読んでました。でも日本語でディスカッションしたので、発言したりする前にはある程度日本語に直してました。
This statement by Chihiro demonstrates her awareness of how she uses her linguistic repertoire flexibly in order to communicate appropriately and expediently. All the experienced bilingual students translanguaged to potentialize effective communication for strategic expediency but also for enhancement. Translanguaging enabled them to enrich their languaging and academic experiences.

The experienced bilinguals also acknowledge their frequent use of translanguaging as a strategic expedient resource to complete the academic task. Risa, born in the US, says, for example:

> If I thought about something in Japanese in the last lesson, I would think about it again in Japanese in this lesson. If I thought about something in English in the last lesson, I would think about it again in English this lesson. I would write my notes down in Japanese if what I was thinking about was in Japanese. If my notes were in Japanese, I would think about what I was reading in Japanese. It's the same case if this happened in English.

And she continues:

> エッセーが英語のときは英語で書いて、エッセーが日本語のときは日本語で書きます...何かを（英語で書いたものに）足したいとき、日本語で説明とか入れたりします。

Experienced bilinguals are able to use their entire linguistic repertoire for their own enrichment. They seem to have an enhanced multilingual monitor that activates different language use when they have to perform certain academic tasks with specific language practices (Jessner, 2006), but privately, it is their translanguaging that enables them to produce the specific language for the academic task. It is also their ability to translanguage and the opportunities to translanguage in this class that develops their dynamic bilingualism as they self-regulate as learners.
In many ways what the interviews with the experienced bilinguals reveal is precisely the common underlying proficiency that Cummins (1981) postulated so long ago. What we see, the surface features, are indeed what may be deemed as two languages socially. But if we capture the thinking and self-talk process that students use to produce academic tasks in one or the other language – in Vygotskyan terms, their private speech (Antón & Di Camilla, 1998) – it is translanguaging practices that are the motor of the process which may result in products in one or the other language.

Conclusions

The students’ reflections on their linguistic behavior demonstrated much metalinguistic and metacognitive awareness – essential abilities to develop as bilinguals and learners because they facilitate self-regulation in learning. The translanguaging pedagogy used in this experimental class enabled Japanese students to become more aware of the differences in the construction of Japanese and English written texts, to develop expertise in using their own translanguaging strategies to construct academic texts in English, and to build their biliteracy practices. It turned out that a translanguaging pedagogy which 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 our study, in some cases evidence was provided through the interviews that students’ greater awareness of language differences also had repercussions for 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 translanguaging practices.

Students at different points of the bilingual continuum, however, used translanguaging to construct written texts in English differently. Some of the emergent bilinguals translanguaged, with autonomy and control, to support their learning. Other emergent bilinguals who were further along the bilingual continuum used translanguaging even more actively to expand their cognitive and linguistic performance. In general, the use of translanguaging by emergent bilinguals falls under what we call a dependent translanguaging pattern where new language practices emerge in interrelationship with old ones. Experienced bilinguals, on the other hand, used their entire linguistic repertoire seamlessly and translanguaged only for strategic expediency, as well as to enhance their learning. We refer to this as an independent translanguaging pattern, pointing to the flexible use of language practices by experienced bilinguals to respond to different languaging situations within an integrated dynamic system of language practices.
In a translanguaging classroom, by rejecting the subjugation of one language to the other and giving agency to bilingual students to self-regulate their language practices in learning, diverse linguistic and cultural repertoires are harnessed to their fullest extent. Through those experiences, bilingual students can construct truly bilingual identities and enrich their languaging and academic experiences.

Although in this chapter the translanguaging pedagogy was used with bilingual students, one can imagine that this pedagogy would also be effective with monolingual students who are learning an additional language. For monolingual students to 'catch up' to the multilingual turn would require that all schools engender opportunities for translanguaging, available through families, students and media in all classrooms. What are needed in the 21st century are more classroom spaces where translanguaging is not seen as an illegitimate practice, or solely understood as scaffold for those learning a new language, but as a resource for all students to learn and be part of the dynamic multilingual turn.
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