
Translanguaging as a Teaching and Learning Choice for all Students: a Retrospective View and a Prospective Change

Nansia Kyriakou¹

Abstract

Translanguaging as a relatively new language pedagogy has managed to challenge the monolingual habitus of educational settings around the world and has widened teaching and learning horizons for all teachers and students. Translanguage has gained extensive academic recognition, since it moves away from standardized teaching and learning practices, which usually result in unauthentic school experiences. However, translanguaging is still viewed with some reservation by teachers, due to political rather than educational reasons. This is because schools have traditionally been spaces that enforce a unitary language to promote homogenization of linguistically diverse student populations (Busch, 2014). Due to this and other reasons, translanguage as a pedagogical trend has been mainly explored in educational contexts that genuinely challenge monolingual educational norms. It has been discussed that this can be reversed if we acknowledge and potentially exploit the connection between translanguage and critical literacy approach (Tsiplakou, 2016, 2022). In this paper, we discuss whether teachers' efforts to consider and use bilingual students' full linguistic repertoire offer the beginning of the exoneration of translanguaging practices' use with not only bilingual students in preparatory or non-formal educational contexts, but also with bidialectal students in formal mainstream contexts and beyond.

Keywords: Bidialectal students, Mainstream classrooms, Preparatory classrooms, Students with migrant, refugee, or other backgrounds, Translanguage pedagogy

Introduction

Even though global migration flows decreased for a while due to restrictive measures imposed to prevent the spread of Coronavirus (European Council, 2022), they were and remain an indisputable fact arising as a result of war conflicts, climate changes, environmental disasters, etc. These flows are one of the most important factors contributing to the creation of complex, social transformations, which strive for educational solutions and practices that do not have traditional connections (Busch, 2014). These complex social transformations

¹ Nansia Kyriakou, doktorica znanosti i predavačica na Fakultetu odgojnih i obrazovnih znanosti Sveučilištu Frederick, Cipar

have led to translanguaging becoming more than ever a pedagogy that transcends the narrow framework of older, traditional language education.

Our discussion will begin with an initial conceptualization as well as a brief historical overview of the term *translanguage*. Translanguaging refers to the practice of multilingual speakers traversing their entire linguistic repertoire with ease to engage in interactive meaning-making (Wei, 2011; García and Wei, 2014). A particularly detailed history of the term has been published by Lewis, Jones, and Baker (2012), dating back to the 1980s. Translanguage, as they mention, is relatively new, but it is also in development since it includes not only the spontaneous process by which meanings, experiences, and communication are achieved through the use of two or more languages, but also how the use of these languages is viewed as a cognitive process, in which learning takes place (Lewis, Jones and Baker, 2012). Even though the term was first coined by Cen Williams (1994, as cited in Lewis et al., 2012), it became renowned through the work of Baker (i.e. 2001) and García (i.e. 2009), generating a lot of research interest and becoming widely accepted in the field of sociolinguistics (Vogel and García, 2017).

In the international literature, there are several terms associated with translanguaging, such as codemeshing (Canagarajah, 2011), translingual practice (Canagarajah, 2012), polylingual languaging (Jørgensen, 2008), flexible bilingualism (Creese and Blackledge, 2010), synaesthesia, heteroglossia, polyglot synthesis, super-diversity and many more (Tsokalidou and Koutoulis, 2015). Each concept has its characteristics and scopes leading to valuable insights, which significantly contribute to the field (Rosiers, Van Lancker and Delarue, 2018). However, it is considered particularly important to discuss translanguaging relationship with plurilingualism in the context of this paper due to their points of convergence. CoE (2001) defines plurilingualism as the combination of linguistic experiences and sociocultural interactions, meaning that as a person's experiences and interactions increase, so does his or her repertoire of communication skills. At first glance, it becomes obvious that both terms, translanguaging and plurilingualism, recognize the unique integrated linguistic repertoire of semiotic resources that each speaker strategically and creatively combines and puts into place according to the context and the participants of the interaction. However, concerns have been raised as to whether plurilingualism only views the use of various plurilingual resources as a way of learning an additional language, and not as a means to express one's self and as a way to embrace own's identity (García and Otheguy, 2020). This concern results from the realization that, in the case of translanguaging, the competence of bilingual speakers is complete at every stage of the process (García and Otheguy, 2020). From a plurilingual perspective, however, it is precisely by deploying one's emerging competence and plurilingual resources in creative and strategic

ways that one expands his/her repertoire and develops his/her communicative abilities. Moreover, plurilingualism has been criticized for not viewing bilingual speakers' linguistic performances as unitary, leaving the concept of named languages intact (García and Otheguy, 2020), affecting the nature of pedagogy promoted. This is largely a result of how each term perceives code alternation. In translanguaging, code alternation appears to be irrelevant, while in plurilingualism, code alternation such as code-switching and code-mixing appears to be a useful emic category in the analysis of plurilingual practices (Vallejo and Dooly, 2020). In addition, some criticism has been leveled as to the inconsistency found between developing and promoting an individual's unique linguistic repertoire (as these are presented in CEFR's multilingual proficiency profiles in 2018 and 2020) and the CEFR descriptors per se (Vallejo and Dooly, 2020). Eventually, it is also discussed that plurilingualism seems to focus mainly on colonial European languages (indirectly promoting neoliberal agendas as opposed to social justice and language sustainability) (Vallejo and Dooly, 2020).

For the reasons discussed earlier, in this paper, we use the term *translanguage*, even though points of concern on *translanguage* are also discussed in the literature. Although widely accepted, some researchers do raise strong concerns, even objections (Vogel and García, 2017), to the extent that *translanguage* as a theoretical and pedagogical principle can provide answers to all questions related to educational practice (such as the role and nature of language assessment in *translanguage* pedagogy), making discussions on *translanguage* always interesting and relevant. It has also been expressed that it remains unclear whether *translanguage* presents an overall epistemological paradigm shift, as Vogel and García (2017) argue, or whether it projects the expected extensions of more contemporary sociolinguistic and anthropological approaches, those of code-switching and code-mixing (see Nilep 2021; cited in Tsiplakou, 2022).

In the following chapters, we discuss the theoretical and pedagogical framework of *translanguage*, its evolution, its repercussions, but also its special importance in bidialectal linguistic environments, concluding with recommendations on teaching practices and strategies for trainee and in-service teachers.

1. Theoretical Framework

In this section of the paper, *translanguage* is presented as a term widely used to describe language contact and multilingualism, particularly from a postmodern and poststructuralist perspective. That being said, we discuss how the named 'languages' are used, negotiated, and understood in diverse sociocultural contexts, acknowledging the fluidity and complexity of linguistic

identity and communication, while emphasizing the influence of power dynamics, social constructs, and context in shaping linguistic practices.

In the past, sociolinguists focused on studying linguistic phenomena based on specific linguistic systems. Nowadays, the focus has shifted to examining speakers and the way they act in various contexts (Hadjidaki, 2020). As explained by García (2009), social activities construct languages that do not adhere to a single (named) code, but rather change based on space and time. Garcia (2009) also continues that this fluidity of resources should be extended to classrooms to create a 'multilingual ecology' where students can express themselves and embrace their identities in a safe environment. Therefore, even though translanguageing practices are often conceptualized to include numerous discursive practices such as translation, code-switching, code-mixing, and code-meshing, translanguageing as conceptualized by García and Sylvan (2011) differs from these simple practices (code-switching, translation, etc.) in that it refers to a process by which bilingual students understand and perform bilingually in a variety of classroom settings.

Mazak and Herbas-Donoso (2015) argue that deviations from traditional terms to describe language contact phenomena such as the above (i.e. code-switching, code-mixing etc.) stem from changes in conceptualizing language. Language in translanguage pedagogy is treated as a fluid and flexible entity that is not limited geographically (Busch, 2014; Tsiplakou, 2022). More specifically, Tsiplakou (2016, p. 144) describes translanguage, while presenting its conceptual relation with languaging, as a pedagogical approach that favors "a dynamic way of language not as a static system but as languaging, i.e. as a series of performances located in specific social and cultural micro- and macro-contexts, in which elements from multiple and complex linguistic repertoires are retrieved and utilized, in order to produce different kinds of socio-culturally located meanings, to symbolically perform various acts of identification, to symbolically negotiate values, to articulate alternative 'voices', discourses and ideologies, etc.". This definition broadens our understanding of language contact, from attempts to guide, describe, and outline pedagogical practices, to describe broader, everyday, complex, cognitive processes. This conceptualization of translanguage presents, among other things, the encounter of a bilinguals' everyday life with the school life and school experiences within them (Mazak and Herbas-Donoso, 2015). Because of this authentic educational approach, which especially fosters established connections between lived experiences outside and inside the classroom (Conteh, 2018), bilinguals can more easily develop language and literacy skills (e.g. Wei, 2011; Lewis, Jones and Baker, 2012; Rowe, 2018).

2. Translanguage Pedagogy in Bidialectal, Bilingual and Monolingual Educational Settings

A brief literature review presented in the previous section provides a basic understanding of the theoretical base for exploring translanguage pedagogy in education. In continuation, the focus shifts to the practical implementation of translanguage in bidialectal, bilingual, and monolingual educational settings.

An increasing number of studies have focused on investigating the advantages of translanguage practices in various educational settings, including kindergarten (García *et al.*, 2011; Sanders-Smith and Dávila, 2019; Hofslundsengen *et al.*, 2020), elementary (Childs, 2016), secondary (García, Flores and Woodley, 2013) and tertiary education (Fallas Escobar, 2019; Prada, 2019). As translanguage pedagogy is often resisted by teachers and schools, the majority of these studies took place in settings that challenged monolingual regimes, typically informal educational settings (García and Wei, 2014), such as after-schools (García, Zakharia and Octu-Grillman, 2012), complementary programs (Creese and Blackledge, 2010), preparatory language lessons (Kyriakou, 2023) or generally less-structured learning settings with migrant and minority di/multiglossic languages (Wei, 2014; Abourehab and Azaz, 2023) with sparse exceptions in trilingual countries such as the Netherlands and Luxembourg (Duarte, 2018).

The benefits of translanguage can be attributed to the fact that it considers mother tongues as tools that contribute to the overall development of literacy and language skills (Baker, 2011; Tsiplakou, 2016), referring – partly – to previous language teaching approaches such as Cummins' language interdependence hypothesis (Cummins, 2003), but also of Hornberger's continua of biliteracy (Hornberger and Link, 2012; Tsokalidou and Koutoulis, 2015; Tsiplakou, 2022), where bilinguals' pre-existing language knowledge – rather than being regarded as a problem – is viewed as a resource to be exploited (Tsiplakou, 2022). More specifically, translanguage pedagogy has been recognized as a means of promoting mutual appreciation and respect for all languages and cultures (García *et al.*, 2011), valuing bi/multilingual identity performance, enhancing students' motivation and confidence (Creese and Blackledge, 2010), and enhancing fundamental literacy skills and knowledge (Hornberger and Link, 2012; Abourehab and Azaz, 2023). It can also facilitate co-teaching between proficient and beginner students in the mainstream classroom (Baker, 2011), since it is a flexible mechanism that facilitates understanding among diverse language groups and contributes to inclusiveness (García, 2009). Not only that, but since bilinguals are considered carriers of alternative linguistic and semiotic capitals, linguistic varieties are also considered as indicators of social and cultural structures, trends, discourses, and ideologies (García and Wei, 2014; Tsiplakou, 2022). This perspective considers how different linguistic choices determine social meanings, cultural identities,

communities, practices, and more (García and Wei, 2014; Tsiplakou, 2022). Thus, translanguage can contribute to strengthening relationships and cooperation between school, home, and the wider community.

Translanguage pedagogy is also particularly important for communities characterized with diglossia (Ferguson, 1959) or as otherwise referred to, bi-dialectism (Yiakoumetti, 2006), which mainly refers to speech communities where two or more linguistic varieties of the same named 'language' are used by speakers under different circumstances (Ferguson, 1959). Research has demonstrated that unofficial varieties are used in school contexts despite being less accepted in official contexts (Ioannidou, 2009). Nevertheless, the large accumulation of children with migrant, refugee or other backgrounds in various countries around the world in recent years (*Word Migration Report 2022*, 2021) has caused a small but hopeful change in teachers' attitudes toward the use of unofficial linguistic varieties in public schools (Kyriakou, 2020; Kyriakou, 2023). This is observed because teachers recognize unofficial varieties as their only channel of communication with migrant or refugee students, who often learn and use the unofficial linguistic variety much more quickly and efficiently than the official one (which they only encounter in classrooms). So, despite earlier negative attitudes or reactions from educational and official bodies regarding the authorized and conscious use of unofficial linguistic varieties in schools (e.g., Ioannidou, 2012), multiculturalism and multilingualism may be able to resolve this previous, problematic educational habitus.

Despite the previous recognition of translanguage's educational (and not only) value, its application at a global level has generally been hindered by non-educational factors. One of these factors, perhaps the most important of all, is that 'language' is a sociopolitical construct that has little to do with one's languaging (De Los Reyes, 2019; García, 2019; Wei and Lin, 2019). This is mainly manifested in official spaces such as courts, mass media, and schools. Specifically in the educational field, it is widely known that schools were and still are considered important institutions for implementing language policies that often aim to impose a single language (usually the state language) and to homogenize linguistically diverse populations (Busch, 2014). To achieve this, schools ostensibly present and implement an explicitly monolingual educational practice and develop a highly formalized, linguistic regime that prioritizes 'official languages', rather than children's complex linguistic and semiotic repertoire (Gogolin, 2013). It is therefore not at all surprising that many teachers tend to have a monolingual orientation and are described as less enthusiastic about or outright opposed to the pedagogy of translanguage (Probyn, 2009, 2015; Heugh, 2015; Childs, 2016).

Another factor that seems to significantly contribute to teachers' rejection of translanguaging is their attitudes toward the simultaneous use of multiple

linguistic varieties. Creese and Blackledge (2010) reported in their research that the simultaneous use of linguistic varieties was often demonstrated by children from low socio-economic backgrounds, creating negative conjunctions. It has been established that mixing linguistic varieties is considered a shameful, wrongful, or incriminating practice (Creese & Blackledge, 2010) and that it reinforces an incomplete form of written or spoken language expression (Mitsiaki *et al.*, 2020), which seems to limit and impede bilinguals from using their full linguistic repertoire, while also preventing the recognition of this approach's pedagogical value. Thus, we end up with educational environments which usually recognize, encourage, or use one linguistic variety (at least at the official level). However, these schools are unlikely to reflect the linguistic practices of their bilingual children (Mazak and Herbas-Donoso, 2015), leaving the strong possibility of offering non-authentic educational experiences to their students.

This section presented several arguments in favor of translanguage, however, this information should not be considered without discussing one more point. The implementation of translanguage pedagogy in bilingual and bi-dialectal classrooms must be organized in such a manner that promotes the multilingual and sociolinguistic awareness of all students to overcome visible and significant challenges that may arise in the teaching of bilingual children in a bilingual society. Mitsiaki *et al.* (2020) advise teachers to seek to ensure the most appropriate use of children's speech by the conventions of each communicative occasion, instead of focusing on endless debates as to which is the most appropriate linguistic variety to teach within school environments.

Hitherto, we argued that educators can utilize translanguage pedagogy to create inclusive learning environments that value and empower students' linguistic and semiotic repertoire, facilitating meaningful engagement and effective language acquisition across various named 'dialects' and 'languages', bridging theory with practice. However, it is considered important to also explore the affordances provided by translanguage in monolingual classrooms or, better yet, with monolingual students. Despite the rarity of monolingual classrooms, it is not surprising for monolingual students to coexist inside multilingual classrooms with their named 'bilingual' peers.

As with previous theoretical and pedagogical approaches in the Second Language Learning field (take the Communicative approach example and its profound influence on first language instruction), translanguage is believed should be used in both monolingual and multilingual classrooms (García and Wei, 2014). The specific interest arises from the realization that translanguage is not just for named 'bilingual' or 'multilingual' students (Vallejo and Dooly, 2020), since both multilingual and monolingual speakers have an idiolect, considered to be the cornerstone of translanguage (Otheguy, García and Reid, 2015) establishing it as a particular conception of the mental grammars and

linguistic practices of bilinguals. Translanguaging is different from code switching. Under translanguaging, the mental grammars of bilinguals are structured but unitary collections of features, and the practices of bilinguals are acts of feature selection, not of grammar switch. A proper understanding of translanguaging requires a return to the well known but often forgotten idea that named languages are social, not linguistic, objects. Whereas the idiolect of a particular individual is a linguistic object defined in terms of lexical and structural features, the named language of a nation or social group is not; its boundaries and membership cannot be established on the basis of lexical and structural features. The two named languages of the bilingual exist only in the outsider's view. From the insider's perspective of the speaker, there is only his or her full idiolect or repertoire, which belongs only to the speaker, not to any named language. Translanguaging is 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. International literature has also discussed the use of synonyms for idiolect such as the use of the term 'repertoire', which signifies a set of linguistic resources and multimodal forms of expressions (Gumperz, 1972, 1982 as cited in Rosiers, Van Lancker and Delarue, 2018). Thus, translanguage pedagogy paves the way for how a person's idiolect or unique and complex repertoire is utilized and exploited by all students. Currently, very few studies have examined the potential of translanguage pedagogy in monolingual classrooms and/or with monolingual students (Rosiers, Van Lancker and Delarue, 2018). Rosiers, Van Lancker and Delarue (2018) have indicated the rather different nature of translanguage practices utilized in multilingual and monolingual classrooms, however, all these practices seem to serve a socio-emotional purpose remaining an integral part of the classroom activity (Rosiers, Van Lancker and Delarue, 2018). There is a further need to fully explore the opportunities provided by translanguage in monolingual classrooms that remain to be investigated in the future.

Translanguage acknowledges the fluidity and complexity of language use and encourages educators to embrace linguistic and semiotic variation as a valuable resource for promoting equitable educational outcomes. Despite the multiple educational contexts briefly discussed above, one point remains relevant to all: conscious metalinguistic and metacognitive analysis and negotiation of translanguage have the potential to contribute to the meaningful critical treatment of language (Tsiplakou, 2016), which can eventually facilitate cognitive development.

3. Utilization of Translanguage Methods in Educational Settings

Up to this point in the discussion we have established that in multilingual, bidialectal or monolingual environments moving between multiple linguistic and semiotic means is a natural linguistic practice. Discussion has also been developed related to the (meta)linguistic and (meta)cognitive skills that can be developed through translanguage in bilingual, monolingual, and/or bidialectal environments. However, there are concerns as to whether there are appropriate educational tools to effectively use this knowledge in schools. This concern arises because the construction of knowledge offered through translanguage depends entirely on the socio-cultural and historical environment of the application of each practice and also on the local ecologies of schools and classrooms (Creese and Blackledge, 2010). Therefore, the following practices are presented, while recognizing the necessity of a holistic supportive approach, which will not perpetuate an overlaid emphasis on official languages, but will inform parents, children, and the wider educational community about the advantages of these teaching applications. In addition to these, for a successful implementation of translanguage teaching practices, we should aim – among other things – at the complex historical, social, cultural, value, and ideological investment of the entire linguistic and semiotic repertoire of these individuals, but also at the systematization and recollection of different ways of meaning-making depending on the contexts and wider communities in which these are utilized (Tsiplakou, 2022). Presented below are the practices and functions as captured by two selected studies, one survey and one ethnographic study, that focused on the implementation of translanguage pedagogy in the classroom.

The first research was carried out by Duarte (2018), who through her ethnographic study examined two forms of translanguage: a) ‘pedagogical translanguageing’ (Cenoz, 2017), via co-teaching examples, and b) ‘spontaneous translanguageing’ (Cenoz, 2017), studying fluid speech practices that took place in the classroom, as well as cases where the participating teachers encouraged children to use translanguage in their communication to understand the new content. Through the study of these two forms of translanguage, Duarte (2018) recognized that ‘spontaneous’ or otherwise ‘natural’ translanguage mainly aims to enhance understanding both linguistically and cognitively, while the ‘official’ form of translanguage, otherwise ‘pedagogical’ translanguage, aims more at the implementation of didactic applications for the use of multiple languages in the classroom. Specifically, she records three different functions of these forms of translanguage, as they were identified through the data she collected in the mainstream classroom.

- The first has been recorded as the ‘symbolic’ function, which acknowledges and gives value to the minority named ‘languages’, without demanding the

teacher to speak these languages. This function can be achieved via questions related to students' mother tongue, such as "How do we say X in Arabic?".

- The second is the 'scaffolding' function, which takes the form of daily but systematic efforts to bridge the named 'languages' during daily teaching. This practice ultimately gives value to all the class's languages while not requiring the teachers' knowledge of minority languages, but it does assume that the students are the foremost authorities on their mother tongues. A practice that serves this function could be a weekly 'calendar' routine in the mainstream class, where days of the week, months, and seasons are used in all the languages of the class. Of course, the function in issue is not entirely captured by the proposed routine. Other daily routines that might be introduced include vocal praise for accomplishments (such as 'well done', 'good job', etc.) and greetings in the many languages spoken by the students in the class (good morning, happy birthday, good afternoon, have a great weekend, etc.).

- Finally, the third one, is the 'epistemological' function, which is activated by a bilingual teacher and/or through co-teaching, that makes full use of the minority named 'languages' as educational resources to improve both linguistic and cognitive comprehension. Such strategies could include asking for clarification in several languages, giving explanations or more information in various languages.

Around that time, Rowe (2018), being a teacher of a multilingual, second-grade elementary school, presented six practices, that fall fully or partially into the above-mentioned functions, thus providing a variety of examples of how to create translanguage spaces within the school context.

- The first practice refers to explicitly valuing students' languages and cultures. Ideas that fall under this practice are classroom discussions around languages, e.g. "Is the word XX similar in language Z and language P?" and around children's cultures, e.g. "Let's read the biography of this artist from country X", but also through reading various bilingual or multilingual texts. In monolingual classrooms, such a practice could enable the use of educational material or examples from those children's idiolect, personal experiences, and backgrounds (i.e. using memes or emojis in specific writing styles, etc.).

- The second practice refers to modeling translanguage, where teachers use multiple linguistic and semiotic means orally or in writing, via texts they have created together with their students. The researcher herself (Rowe, 2018) states that even in cases where teachers do not know their students' mother tongues, they can either repeat some words they learned from their students or publicly recognize the value of students' translanguage either orally or in writing. The teachers can display the work of their bilingual or bidialectal students by posting their bilingual or bidialectal work on the classroom board or by asking bilingual or bidialectal students to repeat a bilingual or a bidialectal response and highlight how the child managed to communicate using two linguistic varieties.

Similarly, monolingual and multilingual students may also be using various forms of linguistic and semiotic means to socialize and even create and sustain their own digital identity (Çöteli, 2019). Teachers can then display examples of students' use of their unique idiolect to display multimodal or otherwise unique ways of writing and speaking (i.e. via using neologisms). Teachers can also invite family members or members of the wider community at school to write or chat with children, discussing how they use their different linguistic and semiotic means in their daily lives, at work, online, etc. Schools and teachers can organize days when these people can come to the classroom and participate in guided reading activities, and more. Finally, bilingual aids, translators and mediators, employed by various schools, can serve as a resource for teachers who wish to model translanguaging.

- The third practice involves providing authentic opportunities for multilingual communication on issues related to children's lives and interests. An example of this type could be a creation of linguistic portraits (Tsokalidou, 2017) or a presentation of a scene from everyday life of a multilingual family (modified idea from Marrero-Colón, 2022).

- The fourth practice refers to two-way translation. Several classroom activities can support children's use of two-way translation as a comprehension strategy (Jiménez et al., 2015; Pacheco & Miller, 2016 as cited in Rowe, 2018). Although translation and translanguaging are not the same thing (García, 2009), translation creates a space in which students can use their translanguaging abilities in a highly visible and useful way. Such practices can be particularly useful in cases where children and teachers negotiate demanding written or oral texts and teachers translate keywords in children's native language or when bilingual children take personal notes in their mother tongue (Kyriakou, 2023).

- The fifth practice is the composition of multimodal, dual-language, or multilanguage texts utilizing children's entire linguistic and semiotic repertoire. Children who have no prior experience and knowledge of writing in their mother tongue can be supported by teachers by writing phonologically, using letters from the alphabet of their second language (Rowe, 2018). Likewise, children who may not have previous experience with how their unofficial linguistic variety (dialect) is written (like is the case with Greek Cypriot Dialect and Greek Cypriot students), can be provided with examples from known literature or even allowed to write that dialect as they feel fit. Moreover, all students, regardless of the number of the named 'languages' they may speak, could be allowed to use linguistic or semiotic means used in their daily lives, such as hyperlinks, hashtags, and addresses to a global audience in their speaking and writing learning experiences.

- The sixth and final practice refers to connecting children with bilingual or multilingual audiences to whom they can present their work (Cummins, 2011;

Durán, 2016; Louie & Davis-Welton, 2016; Rowe & Miller, 2016 as cited in Rowe, 2018). As we mentioned before, members of the children's family or community could be the bilingual or multilingual audience, to whom the children will address. An example of this practice can be the production of bilingual invitations addressed to children's parents, posting bilingual signs in school areas, and posting multilingual instructions and documents on the school's website.

It has been argued that translanguage challenges the monolingual status quo of (mainly European) mainstream education (Duarte, 2018), thus deep and substantial teachers' training is necessary, which will lead to a targeted and systematic implementation, rather than to a superficial, folkloristic didactic that is fragmentary integrated or implemented due to fashion. However, we may question it and ask ourselves whether it is worth it. It is strongly believed that translanguage practices and functions can cultivate people both as students and as speakers so that they can reverse the dominant discourse that often treats their experiences and cultures as inferior and give voice to groups that are usually silenced or ignored (Hadjidaki, 2020).

10. Conclusion

Translanguage as a language teaching approach has multiple theoretical implications [see the utilization of translanguage in Art (Tsokalidou, 2017) etc.], while the intense academic engagement with it foretells that we have not yet seen all its manifestations and potentials in various learning and socializing environments.

Based on what is already known, it is recognized that translanguage can contribute to removing the stereotypical perception of language use as a simple movement between L1 and L2. Translanguage is the starting point, if not the driving force, to turn our research and pedagogical interest to how different theoretical and methodological approaches complement each other and expand our understanding of pedagogical and other social issues via language.

The discussion carried out in this chapter aims, among other things, to change educational policies and public opinion, but most importantly teachers' attitudes toward translanguage. Translanguage can help in the development of students' entire linguistic and semiotic repertoire (Marrero-Colón, 2022). Translanguage forces us to see what is in front of us, since as a pedagogy it is based on reality, but also a necessity of modern multicultural classrooms (Maligkoudi, Panteliou and Papanikolaou, 2021). As educators but also as members of multilingual and multicultural societies, we could either keep the named 'languages', 'dialects' and cultures hidden, uncherished and non-exploited – or

we could allow space for our children's and our fellow human beings' entire linguistic and semiotic repertoire to be voiced.

Based on what has been mentioned, there is a relative sense of optimism that a new era has begun, where teachers who work and live in bilingual, multilingual, and multicultural communities are not only able to destigmatize the use of translanguage, as has been suggested in the past (Tsokalidou and Koutoulis, 2015), but also to specifically contribute to the 'legitimization' of unofficial linguistic varieties' usage and idiolects within school premises. Now is the time for systematic and substantial efforts to inform, strengthen and support the educational community, which will not be limited to using multiple linguistic varieties in a fragmented and arbitrary manner within the classroom, or using sterilized linguistic and semiotic means, but will progress toward an unrestrained process of strengthening metalinguistic awareness among students of today and tomorrow.

11. Literature

- Abourehab, Y. and Azaz, M. (2023) 'Pedagogical translanguageing in community/heritage Arabic language learning', *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 44(5), pp. 398–411. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1080/01434632.2020.1826496>.
- Baker, C. (2001) *Foundations of bilingual education and bilingualism*. 3rd ed. Clevedon [England] ; Buffalo [N.Y.]: Multilingual Matters (Bilingual education and bilingualism, 27).
- Busch, B. (2014) 'Building on Heteroglossia and Heterogeneity: The Experience of a Multilingual Classroom', in A. Blackledge and A. Creese (eds) *Heteroglossia as Practice and Pedagogy*. Dordrecht: Springer Netherlands (Educational Linguistics), pp. 21–40. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-007-7856-6_2.
- Canagarajah, S. (2011) 'Codemeshing in Academic Writing: Identifying Teachable Strategies of Translanguageing', *The Modern Language Journal*, 95(3), pp. 401–417. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.2011.01207.x>.
- Canagarajah, S. (2012) *Translingual Practice: Global Englishes and Cosmopolitan Relations*. 0 edn. Routledge. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203073889>.
- Cenoz, J. (2017) 'Translanguageing in School Contexts: International Perspectives', *Journal of Language, Identity & Education*, 16(4), pp. 193–198. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1080/15348458.2017.1327816>.
- Childs, M. (2016) 'Reflecting on translanguageing in multilingual classrooms: Harnessing the power of poetry and photography', *Educational Research for Social Change*, 5(1), pp. 22–40. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.17159/2221-4070/2016/v5i1a2>.
- CoE (2001) *Common European Framework of References for Language: Learning, Teaching, Assessment*. Strasburg: Modern Lanfguages Division.
- Conteh, J. (2018) 'Translanguageing', *ELT Journal*, 72(4), pp. 445–447. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccy034>.

- Çöteli, S. (2019) 'The Impact of New Media on The Forms of Culture: Digital Identity and Digital Culture', *Online Journal of Communication and Media Technologies*, 9(2). Available at: <https://doi.org/10.29333/ojcm/5765>.
- Creese, A. and Blackledge, A. (2010) 'Translanguaging in the Bilingual Classroom: A Pedagogy for Learning and Teaching?', *The Modern Language Journal*, 94(1), pp. 103–115. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.2009.00986.x>.
- De Los Reyes, R.A. (2019) 'Translanguaging in multilingual third grade ESL classrooms in Mindanao, Philippines', *International Journal of Multilingualism*, 16(3), pp. 302–316. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1080/14790718.2018.1472268>.
- Duarte, J. (2018) 'Translanguaging in the context of mainstream multilingual education', *International Journal of Multilingualism*, 17(2), pp. 232–247. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1080/14790718.2018.1512607>.
- Fallas Escobar, C. (2019) 'Translanguaging by Design in EFL Classrooms', *Classroom Discourse*, 10(3–4), pp. 290–305. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1080/19463014.2019.1628789>.
- Ferguson, C. (1959) 'Diglossia', *Word*, 15, pp. 325–340.
- García, O. (2009) *Bilingual education in the 21st century: a global perspective*. Malden, MA ; Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell Pub.
- García, O. et al. (2011) 'Bilingual youth: Spanish in English speaking societies John Benjamins.', in K. Potowski and J. Rothman (eds) *Translanguaging of Latino kindergarteners*, pp. 33–55.
- García, O. (2019) 'Translanguaging: a coda to the code?', *Classroom Discourse*, 10(3–4), pp. 369–373. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1080/19463014.2019.1638277>.
- García, O., Flores, N. and Woodley, H.H. (2013) 'Harnessing linguistic variation to improve education', in A. Yiakoumetti (ed.) *Transgressing monolingualism and bilingual dualities: Translanguaging pedagogies.*, pp. 45–75.
- García, O. and Otheguy, R. (2020) 'Plurilingualism and translanguaging: commonalities and divergences', *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 23(1), pp. 17–35. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050.2019.1598932>.
- García, O. and Sylvan, C.E. (2011) 'Pedagogies and Practices in Multilingual Classrooms: Singularities in Pluralities', *The Modern Language Journal*, 95(3), pp. 385–400. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.2011.01208.x>.
- García, O. and Wei, L. (2014) *Translanguaging: language, bilingualism and education*. Basingstoke, Hampshire New York: Palgrave Macmillan (Palgrave Pivot). Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1057/9781137385765>.
- García, O., Zakharia, Z. and Octu-Grillman, B. (2012) 'Introduction', in *Bilingual community education and multilingualism: Beyond heritage languages in a global city. Multilingual Matters.*, pp. 3–42.
- Gogolin, I. (2013) 'The "monolingual habitus" as the common feature in teaching in the language of the majority in different countries', *Per Linguam*, 13(2). Available at: <https://doi.org/10.5785/13-2-187>.
- Heugh, K. (2015) 'Epistemologies in multilingual education: translanguaging and genre – companions in conversation with policy and practice', *Language and Education*, 29(3), pp. 280–285. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1080/09500782.2014.994529>.
- Hofslundsen, H. et al. (2020) 'The literacy environment of preschool classrooms in three Nordic countries: challenges in a multilingual and digital society', *Early Child*

- Development and Care*, 190(3), pp. 414–427. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1080/03004430.2018.1477773>.
- Hornberger, N.H. and Link, H. (2012) ‘Translanguaging and transnational literacies in multilingual classrooms: a biliteracy lens’, *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 15(3), pp. 261–278. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050.2012.658016>.
- Ioannidou, E. (2009) ‘Using the “improper” language in the classroom: the conflict between language use and legitimate varieties in education. Evidence from a Greek Cypriot classroom’, *Language and Education*, 23(3), pp. 263–278. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1080/09500780802691744>.
- Jørgensen, J.N. (2008) ‘Polylingual Linguaging Around and Among Children and Adolescents’, *International Journal of Multilingualism*, 5(3), pp. 161–176. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1080/14790710802387562>.
- Kyriakou, N. (2023) ‘Greek-Cypriot Teachers’ Use of Translanguaging Spaces in Elementary Preparatory Classrooms in a Post-lockdown Era’, *Electronic Journal of Foreign Language Teaching*, 20(2), pp. 137–154. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.56040/nskk2022>.
- Lewis, G., Jones, B. and Baker, C. (2012) ‘Translanguaging: origins and development from school to street and beyond’, *Educational Research and Evaluation*, 18(7), pp. 641–654. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1080/13803611.2012.718488>.
- Marrero-Colón, M. (2022) *Translanguaging: Theory, concept, practice, stance, or all of the above?* Available at: https://www.cal.org/wp-content/uploads/2022/05/TranslanguagingTheoryConceptPracticeStance%E2%80%A6orAllOfTheAbove_CALCommentary.pdf (Accessed: 25 March 2023).
- Mazak, C.M. and Herbas-Donoso, C. (2015) ‘Translanguaging practices at a bilingual university: a case study of a science classroom’, *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 18(6), pp. 698–714. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050.2014.939138>.
- Otheguy, R., García, O. and Reid, W. (2015) ‘Clarifying translanguaging and deconstructing named languages: A perspective from linguistics’, *Applied Linguistics Review*, 6(3), pp. 281–307. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1515/applirev-2015-0014>.
- Prada, J. (2019) ‘Exploring the role of translanguaging in linguistic ideological and attitudinal reconfigurations in the Spanish classroom for heritage speakers’, *Classroom Discourse*, 10(3–4), pp. 306–322. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1080/19463014.2019.1628793>.
- Probyn, M. (2009) ‘“Smuggling the vernacular into the classroom”: conflicts and tensions in classroom codeswitching in township/rural schools in South Africa’, *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 12(2), pp. 123–136. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050802153137>.
- Probyn, M. (2015) ‘Pedagogical translanguaging: bridging discourses in South African science classrooms’, *Language and Education*, 29(3), pp. 218–234. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1080/09500782.2014.994525>.
- Rosiers, K., Van Lancker, I. and Delarue, S. (2018) ‘Beyond the traditional scope of translanguaging’, *Language & Communication*, 61, pp. 15–28. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.langcom.2017.11.003>.
- Rowe, L.W. (2018) ‘Say It in Your Language: Supporting Translanguaging in Multilingual Classes’, *The Reading Teacher*, 72(1), pp. 31–38. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1002/trtr.1673>.

- Sanders-Smith, S.C. and Dávila, L.T. (2019) 'Progressive practice and translanguaging: Supporting multilingualism in a Hong Kong preschool', *Bilingual Research Journal*, 42(3), pp. 275–290. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1080/15235882.2019.1624281>.
- Vallejo, C. and Dooly, M. (2020) 'Plurilingualism and translanguaging: emergent approaches and shared concerns. Introduction to the special issue', *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 23(1), pp. 1–16. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050.2019.1600469>.
- Vogel, S. and García, O. (2017) 'Translanguaging', in Vogel, S. and García, O., *Oxford Research Encyclopedia of Education*. Oxford University Press. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1093/acrefore/9780190264093.013.181>.
- Wei, L. (2011) 'Moment Analysis and translanguaging space: Discursive construction of identities by multilingual Chinese youth in Britain', *Journal of Pragmatics*, 43(5), pp. 1222–1235. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2010.07.035>.
- Wei, L. (2014) 'Translanguaging knowledge and identity in complementary classrooms for multilingual minority ethnic children', *Classroom Discourse*, 5(2), pp. 158–175. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1080/19463014.2014.893896>.
- Wei, L. and Lin, A.M.Y. (2019) 'Translanguaging classroom discourse: pushing limits, breaking boundaries', *Classroom Discourse*, 10(3–4), pp. 209–215. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1080/19463014.2019.1635032>.
- Word migration report 2022* (2021). International Organization for Migration (IOM).
- Yiakoumetti, A. (2006) 'A Bidialectal Programme for the Learning of Standard Modern Greek in Cyprus', *Applied Linguistics*, 27(2), pp. 295–317. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/aml012>.
- Ευρωπαϊκό Κοινοβούλιο (2022) *Προσφυγική κρίση και ΕΕ: στοιχεία και αριθμοί, Επικαιρότητα: Ευρωπαϊκό Κοινοβούλιο*. Available at: <https://www.europarl.europa.eu/news/el/headlines/society/20170629STO78630/prosfugiki-krisi-kai-ee-stoicheia-kai-arithmoi>.
- Κυριάκου, Ν. (2020) 'Η γλωσσική χρήση από μαθητές ΕΕΓ και εκπαιδευτικούς Α΄ τάξης στα κυπριακά δημοτικά σχολεία', in Ε. Ιωαννίδου, Μ. Κατσογιάννου, and Χ. Χριστοδούλου (eds). *Έρευνες για την Ελληνική Γλώσσα. Λευκωσία*, Γλωσσολογική Εταιρεία Κύπρου.
- Μαλιγκούδη, Χ., Παντελιού, Ν. and Παπανικολάου, Ε. (2021) 'Ο ρόλος της διαγλωσσικότητας στην επικοινωνία μεταξύ ενήλικων σπουδαστών της Ελληνικής ως δεύτερης/ξένης γλώσσας', in *14ο Συνέδριο Ελληνικής Γλωσσολογίας*, Πάτρα.
- Μητσιάκη, Μ. et al. (2020) *Αναλυτικό Πρόγραμμα Σπουδών για την Ελληνική ως Δεύτερη Γλώσσα (Προδημοτική, Δημοτική, Μέση Γενική, Μέση Τεχνική και Επαγγελματική Εκπαίδευση και Κατάρτιση της Κύπρου)*. Λευκωσία: Παιδαγωγικό Ινστιτούτο Κύπρου. Available at: https://www.pi.ac.cy/pi/files/epimorfosi/entaxi/APS_G2_18.1.2022_ISTOSELIDA.pdf (Accessed: 25 March 2023).
- Τσιπλάκου, Σ. (2016) '«Ακίνδυνη» εναλλαγή κωδίκων και διαγλωσσικότητα: It's complicated.', *Επιστήμες της Αγωγής*, Θεματικό Τεύχος, pp. 140–160.
- Τσιπλάκου, Σ. (2022) 'Εναλλαγή γλωσσών', in Δ. Γούτσος and Σ. Μπέλλα (eds) *Κοινωνιογλωσσολογία*. Gutenberg.
- Τσοκαλίδου, Ρ. (2017) *Σì Δα Yes: πέρα απο τη διγλωσσία στη διαγλωσσικότητα: beyond bilingualism to translanguaging*. Athèna: Εκδόσεις Gutenberg.
- Τσοκαλίδου, Ρ. and Κουτούλης, Κ. (2015) 'Η Διαγλωσσικότητα στο Ελληνικό Εκπαιδευτικό Σύστημα: Μια Πρώτη Διερεύνηση', *Επιστήμες Αγωγής*, pp. 161–181.
- Χατζηδάκη, Α. (2020) *Διδάσκοντας δίγλωσσα παιδιά*. Πεδίο.