The effectiveness of translanguaging language practices in bilingual education: a literature review[1]

Nikolitsa Angelopoulou
Department of Education and Social Work, University of Patras
nikolitsa.angelop@gmail.com

Abstract

As modern societies become more diverse and culturally complex, bilingualism, biculturalism and biliteracy are considered to be important assets for the individuals. Bilingual individuals and those who have developed more than one cultural identity are considered able to adapt rapidly and effectively to different cultural contexts. In addition, this ability is thought to be an important and beneficial skill for the individuals, since it is required in the internationalized economy. Although, it seems that the language separation educational practices, which are the dominant concerning the bilingual education, do not tend to develop the three aforementioned characteristics (i.e., bilingualism, biculturalism and biliteracy) and do not contribute to the performance in both of the students' cultural identities in the classroom. The language separation approach claims that the mixing of two languages may be confusing and restrictive for the students' progress, but the effectiveness of this approach has been questioned. The last two decades, the hybrid language practices, such as translanguaging, which have been developed within the new perspective of viewing bilingualism as an interactive and flexible relation between two languages, are considered to be the ideal way to educate bilingual students in 21st century. In the present paper, we will examine (in the form of a literature review) how translanguaging practices contribute to the formation of dynamic bilingual students who use their entire linguistic repertoire in order to meet their communicative needs, perform in both their identities in the classroom, develop positive bilingual identities, experience the school environment in a positive way and can be academically competent by participating in the classroom and in the broader society.

Key words

bilingualism, bilingual education, identity, language practices, translanguaging

---

Introduction

The sharp rise in the internationalization of many aspects of society is a characteristic of the recent decades (Rosiers, Lancker & Delarue, 2018). The social, cultural and linguistic diversity of many Western European societies have been influenced by the changes in employment patterns, travel, communication, the mass media, immigration and in an increasingly global economy (as cited in Rosiers et al., 2018). Globalization, along with migration flows and escalating diversity, have increased the multilingualism among the population and, at the same time, advances in digital technology increase the availability of linguistic resources, so communication is in flux and in development (as cited in Creese & Blackledge, 2015; Rosiers et al., 2018). In United States more and more educators are starting to consider the ability to communicate in languages other than English as an academic advantage which can lead to bilingualism, biculturalism and biliteracy (as cited in Palmer, Martinez, Mateus & Henderson, 2014). Given these conditions, the concept of separate languages as bounded systems of specific linguistic features may be inadequate for analysis of language in use and in action (as cited in Creese & Blackledge, 2015).

Bilingual education programs include students who are part of many dominant and nondominant groups and have various language practices. There are different types of bilingual education such as *dual language, two-way bilingual education, two-way immersion, poly-directional bilingual education, bilingual immersion* (Garcia & Wei, 2015). Bilingual education has traditionally asserted that languages should be separated in the learning and teaching of languages (Creese & Blackledge, 2010). For many years, schools have separated the languages used in learning and assigned separate teachers, lessons, or even days of the week to one language or the other, with the belief that any mixing of two languages might confuse students and, as a result, to hinder their progress (Beres, 2015). These bilingual programs, which had gained recognition in the mid-20th century, regarded bilingual individuals as having two distinct languages, which were considered to be parallel rather than interactive, and aimed at using students' home language as a "transition" until they become proficient enough in the second language (Beres, 2015).

The assumptions behind the language separation policies were described by Cummins (2005, as cited in Creese and Blackledge, 2010) as follows: a) instruction should be carried out solely in the target language without recourse to the students L1 (first language), b) translation between L1 and L2 (second language) has no place in the teaching of language or literacy. Encouragement of translation in L2 teaching is considered as a return to the discredited grammar/translation method… or concurrent translation method, and c) within L2 immersion and bilingual/dual language programs, the two languages should be strictly separated;

they constitute "two solitudes". Many dual-language-bilingual-educational practitioners and researchers consider that language separation is a way to ensure students' adequate exposure to the standard monolingual register of each program language (Garcia-Mateus & Palmer, 2017). Critics have further argued that teachers, who maintain the strict language separation, seem to operate from the *two solitudes assumption,* with the inappropriate purpose of generating students who function in similar way to monolingual speakers of two distinct languages (as cited in Palmer et al., 2014).

Despite the rise in migration and mobility and the resulting growth of multilingualism in the global north (as described in the beginning of this review), languages are kept separate while a learner's home languages are ignored; the "two solitudes" assumption still prevails (Conteh, 2018). However, in the past years, scholars have challenged the effectiveness of the strict separation of languages in classrooms and the double-monolingual treatment of bilingualism (Velasco & Garcia, 2014; Beres, 2015). Some scholars have criticized strict language separation as artificial, arguing that it does not allow for the natural development of bilingualism (as cited in Palmer et al., 2014). Moreover, some studies have shown that moving between languages has traditionally disapproved in educational settings, with students and teachers who do it often feeling guilty about practicing it (as cited in Creese & Blackledge, 2010). Johnson (2013) intended to understand the intricate ways in which bilingual/multilingual adolescent students of an international school in Sweden (though the languages of instruction were Swedish and English, there was not a clear language policy on dual language education) use their language and literacy repertoires in their everyday lives. The study showed that there is a clear inconsistency between the school's official international focus and the efforts that are made in the school to draw on the students' transnational experiences. She states that the dichotomy between the monolingual/double monolingual norm of the school and the everyday practice of bilingualism among the students bring about significant pedagogical disadvantages for, and unfair treatment of, bilingual/multilingual students. There is a risk that bilingual and multilingual students are not supported in their language learning and learning of other subjects when teaching does not build on the students' experiences and practices but rather on an "ideal" monolingual/double monolingual norm.

Many scholars in applied linguistics and related fields are increasingly moving toward the notion of language as a set of practices and as a form of action that arise within particular social and cultural contexts, challenging the notion of language as a preexisting entity and a bounded system of communication (as cited in Palmers et al., 2014). The reframing of language as a practice affords the exploration of the cognitive and academic benefits of the students' everyday language practices such

as *translating or interpreting, crossing, language sharing* and *hybrid language practices,* such as codeswitching or translanguaging (as cited in Palmers et al., 2014). Many concepts arose around the beginning of the 21st century to describe the diverse linguistic repertoires of multilinguals and to describe and analyze the linguistic practices in which meaning is made using signs flexibly (as cited in Creese & Blackledge, 2015; Rosiers et al., 2018). Garcia and Kleifgem (2010, as cited in Palmers et al., 2014) suggested the concept of *dynamic bilingualism,* in which bilingualism is considered as a repertoire of related language practices or ways of using language in specific social and cultural contexts. Some other concepts arose with the aforementioned purpose as *flexible bilingualism, polylingualism, metrolingualism, codemeshing, polylingual languaging, contemporary urban vernaculars, translingual practices,* and *translanguaging,* but the last one seems to have outperformed the other terms in terms of research uptake (as cited in Creese & Blackledge, 2015; Rosiers et al., 2018).

Translanguaging is a practice that is becoming more broadly recognized across educational contexts (Hornberger & Link, 2012). It seems to include all the discursive practices students and teachers engage in for the purpose of communicating in (and making sense of) multilingual classrooms (as cited in Palmers et al., 2014). The origins of translanguaging lie in the Welsh term "trawsieithu" which was introduced in the 1980s by the Welsh educationalist Cen Williams (as cited in Conteh, 2018; Rosiers et al., 2018). The term referred to a teaching method in Welsh secondary schools, which involves the systematic use of two languages for learning and teaching inside the same lesson and an alternation of these languages in a way that the kids receive information in one language, incorporate the new knowledge, process it and then make sense of it in the other language, (e.g., by producing a piece of work) (as cited in Beres, 2015; Conteh, 2018). Baker (2011, p. 288, as cited in Creese & Blackledge, 2015) defined translanguaging as the process of "making meaning, shaping experiences, gaining understanding and knowledge through the use of two languages". He argues that it has a potential to allow a deeper understanding of the subject taught, it encourages school-home interaction and enhances the overall students' learning (Beres, 2015).

Garcia was the one who extended the definition of translanguaging from its original conception as a pedagogical practice of using two languages in input and output for content instruction to a description of the language practices of bilinguals, more precisely how they move in spontaneous and pragmatic ways between their various languages (Rosiers et al., 2018). Garcia and Wei (2015) in their work explain further the notion of translanguaging by citing some parts of previous work of Garcia (2009, 2011), such as "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" (p. 44), "translanguagings are *multiple discursive practices* in which bilinguals engage in order to *make sense of their bilingual words*" (p. 112) and "translanguaging 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. 65). They also mention that the notion of translanguaging highlights the concepts of *creativity* and *criticality*, which are fundamental to education and are further explained by Li Wei (2011). Translanguaging, as a sociocultural process, gives the opportunity to students to create and continually modify their sociocultural identities and values, as they react to their historical and present conditions creatively and critically (Garcia & Wei, 2015).

If used in schools, translanguaging creates the possibility that bilingual students could use their full linguistic and semiotic repertoire to make meaning, it can be considered as a legitimate pedagogical practice to access content or language, and, most of all, it is transformative for the child, for the teacher, and for bilingual education itself (Garcia & Wei, 2015). Hornberger and Link (2012) propose the continua of biliteracy as a lens for recognizing and building on translanguaging in today's bilingual and multilingual classrooms. Biliteracy is where bilingualism and literacy meet. The sets of lenses, which the continua offer, can support educators to organize their pedagogy in today's linguistically diverse classrooms. The continua of biliteracy brings forward the dimensions of context, content, media and development, that research indicates should be taken into consideration in constructing a learning environment that recognizes and builds on the language and literacy repertoires individuals bring to school. It is clear from the research that individual's biliteracy (a) evolves along the continua in direct response to contextual demands placed on them and that (b) develops better when the individuals have recourse to all their existing skills. The writers argue that translanguaging practices in the classroom are capable of valorizing all points along the continua of biliterate context, media, context, and development and they allow teachers and students to access academic content through the communicative repertoire they bring into classroom and to acquire new ones.

However, it should be mentioned that Garcia and Wei (2015) agree that bilingual education must build spaces where certain language practices or others are sometimes expected (as the dominant government schools and their assessment mechanisms require), even though this is opposite to the notion of translanguaging, because these spaces are necessary for the protection and the sustainability of the minoritized language practices that are often stigmatized in the schools. But it will be within these spaces where the schools must construct translanguaging spaces where children will express their creativity, their criticality,

will bring their practices together to extend their bilingual repertoire so they can cognitively involve deeper in the class, will attain a metalinguistic awareness, will co-create their language knowledge, will recognize each other as language resources and will act on their knowing, doing and languaging (Garcia & Wei, 2015).

The purpose of this literature review is to indicate which practices can function as translanguaging pedagogies and which can be the benefits of their implementation for the bilingual and multilingual students and their teachers. This will be accomplished through the review of some studies, which were implemented in different years, countries and educational contexts, and aim to point out the potentials of the implementation of these practices and the necessity of their incorporation in educators' pedagogical practices and, ideally, in the educational policies for bilingual education.

Literature review

Creese and Blackledge (2010) aim to discover how the multilingual orientation of complementary schools' frames bilingual pedagogy as an ideology and in which way students and teachers practice it locally and interactionally. In this article they look at examples of flexible bilingualism from two case studies, which are part of their larger project in complementary schools in United Kingdom and consider some of the bilingual strategies used in the complementary school classrooms of the Gujarati school in Leicester and the Chinese school in Manchester.

The analysis of the research data indicated the following specific knowledge and skills shown by classroom participants in practicing flexible bilingualism and flexible pedagogy:

a) Use of bilingual label quests, repetition, and translation across languages; the translation seemed to serve as a pedagogical strategy for vocabulary teaching.
b) Ability to engage audiences through heteroglossia and translanguaging: translanguaging was used from teachers in a pedagogic context to create meaning, transfer information and engage with their audience using the linguistic signs they had at their disposal.
c) Bilingual participants were using their bilingualism for identity performance and for establishing identity positions.
d) Recognition that languages do not fit into a clear bounded entity and that all languages are necessary for the transmission and negotiation of meanings. Recognition that the languages and literacies are skillfully and simultaneously being used by classroom participants for different functional purposes, as narration, explanation and keeping the pedagogical task moving: both languages were used by the classroom

participants to establish and clarify the pedagogical task and for conveying the full narrative of the stories; "it is the combination of both languages that keeps the task moving forward" (p. 110).

e) Usage of translanguaging for providing greater access to the curriculum, annotating texts and for lesson achievement.

Few years later, Creese and Blackledge (2015) presented another example from their empirical research in the complementary schools. Having reviewed the scholarship on language, identity and education argue on the following points: a) languages can no longer be considered to be separate entities with defined boundaries, but rather linguistic resources are deployed as people draw on communicative repertoires, b) identities are combined and performed as sets of emblematic, multisemiotic features, including linguistic resources and identity positions may or may not be negotiable in specific social settings, and c) translanguaging offers a pedagogy in a range of educational settings to provide transformative spaces for the performance and embodiment of identities that support the critical and creative learning. In order to illustrate these points, they presented an example from their empirical research in a Panjabi complementary school in Birmingham. In that educational setting teachers and students used translanguaging practices, participated in discourse that had the potential to deepen understandings and sociopolitical engagement, develop critical thinking and enhance their metalinguistic awareness and cross-linguistic flexibility. Also, it seemed that translanguaging in the classroom can engage learners through identity investment and that complex identities are performed through the deployment of certain linguistic resources in certain ways; the students used in their discussion in the classroom a part of a repertoire which indicated a common identity position for their group.

The development of the bilingual identities of the bilingual students and the increase of their metalinguistic awareness is two issues which concerned the scholars. Palmer et al. (2014) intended to propose few potential tools that emerge from a dynamic conception of bilingualism and involve the language practices that children bring into the classroom. Based on the more current understanding of the notion of language as a set of practices, as a form of action which emerges within particular cultural and social contexts, and on the notion of *dynamic bilingualism*, in which bilingualism is better understood as a repertoire of related languages of ways of using language within particular sociocultural contexts rather than a double monolingualism, they decide to use the term *translanguaging* for their article. In addition, they draw on the notions of *positioning* and *investment* of identity theory in order to understand the linguistic and instructional choices of two dual language teachers and to provide the teachers with some potential translanguaging instructional strategies.

Combining the ethnographic methods with discourse analysis, they examined the data from two classrooms of an elementary school in Texas, which implemented a two-way dual language program, where the teachers seemed to have successful bilingual communities with high academic expectations for their students. The teachers' behaviors which were identified as potential translanguaging pedagogies were: modeling dynamic bilingualism, positioning students as bilingually competent, celebrating moments of metalinguistic commentary. Modeling hybrid language practices as translation, codeswitching and using vernacular forms of the language served the purpose of ensuring student understanding of important directions, of ensuring student comprehension and of confirming or reflecting student language practices.

Both of the teachers positioned students as bilingually competent from the first day of school and the pre-kindergarten teacher positioned her students as developing bilinguals by pairing students for their bilingual pair work approximately three months after the beginning of the school year, since she needed time to get to know her students. Another strategy they regularly used in their classrooms was to position their students as language brokers and translators for their classmates, regardless their actual bilingual competencies, in order to encourage them to invest in their bilingual identities. Moreover, one more translanguaging pedagogy the teachers used was the celebration of moments of metalinguistic commentary. They valued the metalinguistic knowledge of the students and they celebrated with the enthusiasm the moments when students noticed similarities and differences between their two languages.

Garcia-Mateus and Palmer (2017), being opposed to the language separation and in line with the immense potential of the translanguaging pedagogies for generative and transformative learning, intended to explore the way in which the use of translanguaging in instruction influences students' critical metalinguistic awareness as well as their positive identity development. The analysis focused on two of the many observations, which were made during the six weeks read-aloud lessons in the language arts and social studies instructional block of a first-grade classroom in an elementary school in southwestern United States, which was implementing the two-way dual language bilingual model. The class teacher despite the regulation of the model, which was expecting from her to teach in either Spanish or English, she used her translanguaging strategies, as code-switching and translating, to communicate with her students when something was ambiguous.

The discussion of the conversations that surrounded two bilingual poems revealed that (a) the fact that the teacher of the classroom welcomed the bilingual phonemic awareness, which one of the students illustrated, is a translanguaging pedagogy, that might had the potential to increase his critical

metalinguistic awareness, and (b) the use of translanguaging practices could support the construction of empowering bilingual identities in a long-term period for both students and deal with language-related social justice problems within the context of critical multilingual stories and real classroom situations.

The enhancement of the language and literacy learning of the students through translanguaging was the topic which mainly concerned the research of Martin-Beltran (2014). The purpose of her study was the investigation of the way that linguistically diverse adolescents mediated language-learning opportunities, as they engaged in collaborative literacy activities across English and Spanish in the Language Ambassadors (LA) program[2]. Specifically, she examined (a) how students try to solve linguistic problems and co-construct knowledge about literacy and language in their moment-to-moment interactions related with writing and (b) how this context afforded opportunities to mobilize students' diverse linguistic funds of knowledge as tools for learning. The study was carried out in a culturally and linguistically diverse high school in Washington D.C. greater metropolitan area. The article presented 5 transcripts of the student utterances, since these were representative of the ranges of the observed *language related episodes* (LRE) across the 39 transcripts of the study. The findings revealed that:

a) Students' translanguaging practices opened navigational spaces to examine multiple aspects and improve conceptual and linguistic understanding: students drew upon translanguaging as a tool to consider, compare and defend their word choices,

b) Translanguaging practices opened transformative spaces and broadened zones for learning: students were learning in new ways, that they had negotiated with their peers through translanguaging.

c) Translanguaging practices differ across different speakers in different contexts.

d) Students used translanguaging practices and their collective linguistic tool kit to meet halfway between languages when they had doubts about how to express their meaning fully in one language alone.

e) Students' linguistic funds of knowledge were mobilized, and linguistic repertoires were extended when the students were recognized from their peers as multilingual users with whom they could practice their linguistic dexterity and when they involved in translanguaging practices with them.

The writer highlights that engaging in translanguaging might holds the transformative power to alter teachers' and students' prevailing monolingual

---

[2] The LA program brought together emergent bilinguals to participate in multilingual literacy activities, which involved mutual teaching/learning opportunities among peers.

ideologies toward more pluralist understandings of the broad linguistic repertoire students bring to literacy and beyond. Also, she argues that the recognition and the harnessing of these practices as tools for learning have the potential to develop more pluralist and plurilingual school literacies.

One year later, Gort and Sembiante (2015) drawing on the translanguaging pedagogy framework and on an ecology of language framework investigated the ways in which teachers' languaging practices encourage emergent bilingual children's participation in formalized, school-based language performances and facilitate the co-construction of discursive spaces that permit children and teachers to engage with academic language and content from their position as bilinguals.

The discourse analysis of the data revealed that translanguaging pedagogies as bilingual recasting, language brokering, and concurrent translation fulfilled two functions: the management of the activity and the involvement and giving a voice to the children. More explicitly, bilingual recasting, which involved more than repetition or translation of students' ideas but also offered further information as contextualization and connection to school- or home-based experiences, motivated children to elaborate their thoughts and scaffolded their descriptions. In addition, the use of the practices of questioning and language brokering, such as bilingual recasting, revoicing and translation, confirmed, broadened and validated one student's language performance and experimentation with academic discourse. Furthermore, drawing on both languages in flexible and fluid ways helped one teacher to manage the activity, to increase children's participation and engagement, to plan with her partner teacher, to make general observations, to redirect children's behavior and to interact with them. The teachers' bilingual performance and acceptance of both languages in the activity, supported the creation of the classroom as a dynamic multilingual environment, where students were reinforced to use their entire linguistic repertoire and to perform academic discourses through their developing bilingual identities, indicating translanguaging as proper resource for teaching, learning and interacting; "a pedagogic, meaning-making and communicative resource that recognized, validated and expressed students' and teachers' shared bilingual identities" (Gort & Sembiante, 2015, p. 21).

The relationship between the translanguaging practices and the writing process of the bilinguals was the topic which concerned Velasco and Garcia (2014) in their study. The literature review showed that translanguaging may be a helpful and legitimate part of the complex process of writing for bilinguals and it entails purposeful action to solve writing problems at the word, sentence, and whole-text level. The five samples, which come from the K-4th-grade classrooms of teachers in Spanish-English and Korean-English dual-language bilingual education in New York City, show how translanguaging contributed in all aspects of the

writing process for different students, in different grades and with different languages interplaying. More specifically, translanguaging was used by bilingual writers in all stages of writing process (i.e., planning, drafting, production) and for different reasons. In planning they used multimodalities (e.g., drawing, videos, etc.), they drew from their multilingual repertoire and they used glosses, which provided them with certainty about the meaning of a word. The writers argue that only when the writers are encouraged to engage with their linguistic repertoire the planning will serve its purpose. In drafting one student used his multilingual repertoire to convey and access his personal meaning of the story and another one used translanguaging for word retrieval and transformation. Translanguaging was used in the final product sometimes for rhetorical engagement and for increasing the effectiveness of the written text.

The students have set in motion their self-regulatory mechanisms and have selected different ways to solve the problems that all writers face when they write a text. Translanguaging is not only a scaffolding strategy but it can self-regulate and advance students' learning and allow the emergent bilinguals to solve challenges in language comprehension and production, when they create their own text and convey their unique voice.

While almost every translanguaging study emphasizes on bilinguals, Rosiers et al., (2018) expanded the research by aiming to analyze the translanguaging practices of both multilinguals and monolinguals and how these practices unfold in interaction from an interlinguistic and an intralinguistic perspective. The two schools they focus on their research are both regulated by the Dutch-speaking Community of Belgium; therefore, the language of instruction is Dutch. In the first case study, they focus on the interlinguistic variation in a classroom with 13 students of a primary school in Brussels, where the language of instruction is Dutch, but the locally dominant language is French (also French in combination with other languages, as Spanish or Arabic, was used), so the classroom can be characterized as "multilingual". In the second case study, they focus on the intralinguistic variation in a secondary school in Flanders with 41 adolescent students, where the locally dominant variety is *tussentaal*, a "kind of language use that is neither identifiable as standard nor as a dialect use but shares a large amount of features with both" (p. 17), so the classroom can be characterized as "monolingual". The translanguaging practices were used in different situational contexts: in the margins of the school activities, during a transition phase between an informal and a more formal school activity, and during a formal school activity.

The "anti-norm" form of the translanguaging practices which have been observed in the school in Brussels was (a) the inclusion of some words of other "named" languages into the default system by the students and the teacher, and (b) the moves between larger parts of different named languages by the students, mainly when the

teacher was not present. The use of translanguaging practices in the school in Flanders indicated the return to the "norm": using *tussentaal* was so frequent that the students and teachers were "translanguaging" into Dutch. The students and the teachers were either increasing substantially the use of standard features in their speech or were using only one standard feature in their whole non-standard speech.

The analysis of the data indicated that in both classrooms the translanguaging practices served a socio-emotional purpose: the students expressed their realization of the hierarchical distance between themselves and the teacher, they used the practices to express and, also, mediate between two identities (the one of the friend and the other one of the model student), their multilingual identities and their socio-emotional development were promoted, and also the teachers could use these practices to build relationships with their students and, if so, make them feel socio-emotionally supported. Although, the translanguaging practices served apparent pedagogical goals only in the classroom with the interlinguistic variation: quick translations from the teacher or fellow pupils ensured possible pedagogical progress. In the other classroom, translanguaging only marked the transition from practicalities to actual teaching and did not serve any pedagogical goal in the same extent as in the school in Brussels, since its lack did not prevent the comprehension.

Conclusion

The review of many studies indicated that the practicing of flexible bilingualism and the implementation of translanguaging practices can have many benefits for the classroom participants. The research participants came from various educational environments, such as complementary schools, kindergartens, elementary schools, and high schools. The purposes that the implementation of translanguaging practices serve will be presented as subjected to two broader categories: the pedagogical goals and the socio-emotional goals. This categorization is keeping in line with the one, which was proposed by Rosiers et al., (2018) in their research.

Before the presentation of the categorization, a summary of the translanguaging practices will be a given, which were identified through the review. These are: code-switching, repetition and translation across languages, use of bilingual label quests, bilingual recasting, questioning, language brokering, use of vernacular forms of language, inclusion of some words of other "named" languages into the default system, substantial increase in the use of non-standard features, moving between larger part of different named languages by the students, drawing from the linguistic repertoire and use of glosses in the writing process, recognizing students as multilingual language users, positioning students as bilingually competent, welcoming of bilingual phonemic awareness and celebrating moment

of metalinguistic commentary, recognizing the fact that all languages are necessary for the transmission and negotiations of meaning, endorsing simultaneous literacies and languages to keep the pedagogic task moving, and recognizing that teachers and students skillfully use their languages for different functional goals, such as narration and explanation.

Translanguaging served as a pedagogical strategy in many ways. Firstly, it was practiced from teachers to create meaning, to transfer information and to engage with their audience. Also, through the modeling of hybrid language practices teachers ensured students' understanding of important directions and their comprehension and they were helped to confirm and reflect on students' languages practices. They lead their classes in deeper understanding and involvement in the discussion; the practice of translanguaging gave voice to the children. It helped teachers to manage the classroom activities, to motivate students to elaborate their thoughts and develop their descriptions, to make general observations and redirect children's behavior. The translations served as a pedagogical strategy for vocabulary teaching and ensured possible pedagogical progress.

Secondly, translanguaging was also practiced by the students for different reasons and had pedagogical results. They used it to meet halfway between languages, when they had doubts about how to express their meaning fully in one language alone. Also, they drew upon it as a tool to consider, compare and defend their word choices and, as a result, their conceptual and linguistic understanding was improved. When they were recognized from their peers as multilingual users, their linguistic funds of knowledge were mobilized, and their linguistic repertoire were extended. By using translanguaging practices students' learning was advanced: they were learning in new ways through their contact with their peers and, also, translanguaging functioned as a self-regulation mechanism for their learning. It contributed in all aspects of the writing process (planning, drafting, production) and solved challenges in language comprehension and production. Moreover, the teachers' welcoming of the students' expression of the bilingual phonemic awareness could serve as a translanguaging practice with the potential to increase their critical metalinguistic awareness.

The implementation of these practices in the classroom also served socio-emotional purposes. In some cases, the teachers used translanguaging to interact with their students, to build relationships with them and make them feel socio-emotionally supported. In addition, the use of translanguaging practices and the position of the students as language brokers and translators can support the construction of empowering bilingual identities and can encourage the students to invest in their bilingual identities. Moreover, bilingual students were using bilingualism to perform an identity and to establish a certain identity position, to mediate between two identities, to express their multilingual identities and to

express their realization of the hierarchical distance between themselves and the teacher.

This literature review does not cover all the studies, which have been conducted about the effectiveness of translanguaging practices in bilingual and multilingual classrooms. There are many more to be reviewed and certainly there are many which contradict the conclusions of this literature review. Also, it should be mentioned that five studies were conducted in educational institutions of United States, two of them in United Kingdom and one of them in Belgium. There is a need to be reviewed more studies from many different countries and educational systems in the world. However, we consider that the conclusions of this review are in line with the literature on translanguaging and depict the potentials of the implementation of these practices in linguistically and culturally diverse classrooms.

References

Beres, A.M. (2015). An overview of translanguaging. 20 years of 'giving voice to those who do not speak'. *Translation and Translanguaging in Multilingual Contexts, 1*(1), 103-118.

Conteh, J. (2018). Translanguaging. *ELT Journal, 72*(4), 445-447.

Creese, A., & Blackledge, A. (2010). Translanguaging in the bilingual classroom: a pedagogy for learning and teaching? *The Modern Language Journal, 94*(1), 103-115.

Creese, A., & Blackledge, A. (2015). Translanguaging and Identity in Educational Settings. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics, 35*, 20-35.

Garcia, O., & Wei, L. (2015). Translanguaging, Bilingualism, and Bilingual Education. In W.E. Wright, S. Boun & O. Garcia (Eds.), *The Handbook of Bilingual and Multilingual Education* (pp. 223-240). United Kingdom: Wiley Blackwell.

Garcia-Mateus, S., & Palmer, D. (2017). Translanguaging pedagogies for positive identities in two-way dual language bilingual education. *Journal of Language, Identity & Education, 16*(4), 245-255.

Gort, M., & Sembiante, S.F. (2015). Navigating hybridized language learning spaces through translanguaging pedagogy: dual language preschool teacher's languaging practices in support of emergent bilingual children's performance of academic discourse. *International Multilingual Research Journal, 9*(1), 7-25.

Hornberger, N.H., & Link, H. (2012). Translanguaging in today's classrooms: A biliteracy lens. *Theory into Practice, 51*(4), 239-247.

Johnson, C. (2013). Translanguaging and multilingual literacies: diary-based case studies of adolescents in an international school. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language, 2013*(224), 85-117.

Martin-Beltran, M. (2014). "What do you want to say?" How adolescents use translanguaging to expand learning opportunities. *International Multilingual Research Journal, 8*(3), 208-230.

Palmer, D.K., Martinez, 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.

Rosiers, K., Lancker, I.V., & Delarue, S. (2018). Beyond the traditional scope of translanguaging. Comparing translanguaging practices in Belgian multilingual and monolingual classroom contexts. *Language & Communication, 61*, 15-28.

Velasco, P., & Garcia, O. (2014). Translanguaging and the writing of bilingual learners. *Bilingual Research Journal, 37*(1), 6-23.