



Translingualism and its Transformative Potential: A Qualitative Meta-Synthesis*

Jung Sook Kim (Cheongju University)



This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons License, which permits unrestricted non-commercial use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

Received: August 5, 2023
Revised: October 7, 2023
Accepted: October 15, 2023

Jung Sook Kim
Assistant Professor, Dept. of
English Language and Literature
Cheongju University
Email: jskim8015@cju.ac.kr

* This work was supported by the Ministry of Education of the Republic of Korea/ the National Research Foundation of Korea (NRF-2021S1A5A8073225)

ABSTRACT

Kim, Jung Sook. 2023. Translingualism and its transformative potential: A qualitative meta-synthesis. *Korean Journal of English Language and Linguistics* 23, 818-838.

Translingualism has gained recognition as people begin to appreciate the value of multilingualism and linguistic diversity. It celebrates multilingual individuals' diverse linguistic and semiotic repertoires while challenging monolingualism and standard language ideology. Numerous studies are being conducted on translingualism. However, their significance could be limited without proper integration. This article conducts a qualitative meta-synthesis review of the literature on translingualism to integrate key theoretical orientations and concerns emerging from translingual practices across diverse contexts. The goal is to offer novel interpretations that can deepen our understanding of translingualism and its transformative potential. The findings suggest that translingualism as an ideological stance can serve as both a critical intellectual movement and linguistic activism to raise awareness of restrictive language ideologies. Translingualism also brings about an epistemological shift in language studies towards a more holistic understanding of the linguistic repertoire, expanding to trans-semiotics. Translingualism provides substantive pedagogical potential for creating a more inclusive climate in education and broader society. However, practical issues need to be addressed to implement translingual pedagogy successfully. These include designing effective teaching methods and strategies, developing appropriate assessment techniques, preparing teachers adequately, and overcoming stakeholders' reluctance to accept translingual practices as valid norms.

KEYWORDS

translingualism, translanguaging, trans-literacies, trans-semiotic repertoire, language ideology

1. Introduction

In recent years, there has been a growing appreciation for the significance of multilingualism and linguistic diversity. This recognition is significant as a variety of linguistic resources are often overlooked despite their usage by a large number of multiple language users in their everyday interactions. As society becomes more diverse with people from various cultural and linguistic backgrounds, traditional linguistic and cultural boundaries are becoming blurred and porous, making it possible for diverse semiotic resources to contact, negotiate, and generate novel meanings. Such dynamic translingual practices are observed as ordinary and becoming more commonplace in the real world of heterogeneous speech communities. This epistemological shift of linguistic diversity has given rise to a phenomenon known as translingualism.

Translingualism recognizes and values the diverse linguistic and semiotic repertoires of multilingual individuals. It has arisen in opposition to the narrow perspective of language based on monolingualism and standard language ideologies. In contrast to traditional views prioritizing linguistic purity and standardization, translingualism embraces different languages, varieties, and registers as valuable semiotic resources available to language users. Translingualism seeks to overcome the traditional divisions between named languages (Pennycook 2020). It highlights the fluidity and adaptability of language and encourages individuals to utilize their linguistic repertoires in various contexts. At the same time, this translingual idea emphasizes the dynamic aspect of semiosis and challenges the dominant position of language in creating meaning (Gevers 2018), reminding us that language is only one of many mediums that can be used to convey meaning. This concept promotes the idea of using a full range of linguistic and semiotic repertoire rather than limiting oneself to a single language variety. As such, translingualism promotes the use of multiple languages and communication methods, focusing on the ways in which a variety of linguistic and semiotic resources are perceived, utilized, and applied for various meaning-making purposes. This approach has been championed by many critical scholars (e.g., Blommaert 2010, Canagarajah 2013, García and Li Wei 2014). Employing various linguistic resources is seen as a means of resisting the limitations of monolingual and standard language ideologies, which in turn allows for envoicing alternatives and thus pluralizing discourses (Canagarajah 2013). This transformative idea of translingualism has gained significant importance in applied linguistics and has even brought about changes in pedagogical practices. In the realm of education, translanguaging is recognized as a more inclusive approach to bi-/multilingual education that addresses language disparities (García and Li Wei 2014). Through this intellectual movement, the line between standard and non-standard language has been blurred, allowing for a multitude of voices and perspectives to be heard.

Scholars and researchers have been inspired by the liberating and empowering concept of translingualism in pursuit of a more inclusive view of language and language use. A substantial body of studies has been conducted on translingualism around the world, exploring different theoretical and empirical dimensions in various contexts. Various lines of inquiry on translingualism have proliferated, addressing the concerns and issues regarding the use of translingual approaches, especially in language education. These concerns include how to put translingual teaching methods into practice; how to use them with different groups of people; how to train instructors to use them; and whether students will benefit from this approach. These questions are often addressed in qualitative research studies. These studies have explored the potential benefits of translingual approaches, which locate translingual, trans-semiotic, trans-cultural, and multimodal practices at the center of the process of meaning-making. Researchers and practitioners from different cultural backgrounds have discussed and shared their perspectives on the development of multilingualism and translingualism (Kim 2017, 2022, Lee and Canagarajah,

2018, Vallejo and Dooly 2020). One significant agreement among these discussions is that restrictive monolingual and raciolinguistic ideologies entail persisting socio-educational inequalities (Gevers 2018). This recognition leads to a call for more inclusive discourse and pedagogies.

Many different areas of study related to translingualism are currently being explored and expected to continue developing. However, without connecting these studies together, their usefulness and impact may be limited to only a few policies and practices (Scruggs, Mastropieri and McDuffie 2007). Several scholarly attempts have been made to systematically review the literature on translingualism. After reviewing the translingualism literature of the past decade, Gevers (2018) notes that most of the literature remains theoretical or speculative and lacks empirical research support. In a systematic literature review, Prilutskaya (2021) focuses on empirical studies of English language teaching informed by the translanguaging framework. The review synthesizes knowledge and insights into pedagogical translanguaging for linguistically inclusive education. Similarly, Ooi and Aziz's (2021) systematic literature review of empirical journal articles explores the extent of current research on translanguaging as ESL pedagogy. Overall, these reviews have called for more empirical research studies on a pedagogy inspired by translingualism. It is commonly recommended to engage teacher-practitioners in classroom-based studies to determine the effectiveness of this pedagogical approach.

However, the previous literature reviews mostly employ a typical quantitative method of a systemic literature review, aiming to collect, aggregate, and condense quantitative data to a common and standardized numerical value (Zimmer 2006). Such a quantitative review method has limitations in synthesizing and integrating the significance and insight emerging from the contextually embedded qualitative studies. A more thorough qualitative synthesis is necessary to fully understand the affordances, constraints, and challenges of this trans-turn in both theory and practice. Evidence from research done in specific contexts can help validate translingual perspectives and support the need for more inclusive approaches to language and language use.

This article, therefore, reviews and synthesizes the literature on translingualism and translanguaging to integrate key theoretical orientations and concerns that emerge from translingual practices across diverse contexts. It employs a meta-synthesis method to review a selected pool of qualitative studies on translingualism. A qualitative meta-synthesis review can be a viable method to incorporate and deepen our understanding of a collective body of qualitative research. In contrast to a typical systematic literature review, meta-synthesis aims to provide new interpretations of the findings by striving for a more profound comprehension of the field's subject matter (Walsh and Downe 2005). It is a deliberate and systematic process that involves analyzing and interpreting findings across research studies. The purpose of this current review is not merely to examine or summarize existing literature but to critically synthesize and offer novel interpretations for deepening our understanding of translingualism. By doing so, this article contributes to advancing the transformative potential of the translingual paradigm. The research question that guided this study is as follows: What are the affordances and constraints of translingualism?

2. Conceptualization of Translingualism: What is Translingualism?

Translingualism has been envisaged as an ideological orientation toward multilingual or plurilingual practices. Translingual approaches have emerged as a reaction against the existing restrictive view of language undergirded by monolingualism and standard language ideologies. The translingual vision concerns how diverse linguistic and semiotic repertoires can be embraced as legitimate resources for empowering multilinguals. Translingualism mirrors the changing understanding of language mixing and varieties, which has long been seen as negative or

problematic from the view of linguistic purism and standardization. From a translingual point of view, language is positioned as merely one medium among a vast array of the semiotic repertoire and deemed mobile and fluid, which can be appropriated in different contexts for different meaning-making (Blommaert 2010, Canagarajah 2013). Translingualism acknowledges different languages, varieties, and registers as valuable semiotic resources available to language users. The deployment of various varieties and registers, which are often relegated to forms of deviation from the standard, has disrupted the restrictive norms in the traditional academic realm. The divide between standard and non-standard varieties of language has been challenged and blurred by the intellectual movement inspired by translingualism.

Translingualism has drawn attention to the ways in which linguistic diversity is perceived and utilized in different contexts for different purposes. Translingualism is a sociolinguistic orientation that foregrounds the fluidity of language boundaries (Martinez 2021). Challenging dominant monolingualism, Canagarajah (2013) conceptualizes the notion of translingual practice and emphasizes the significance of communicative strategies redefined and reconfigured across time and space. Furthermore, pushing the trans-turn momentum beyond translingualism, Pennycook (2020) underscores the importance of translingual approaches to the social semiotic trajectories and advocates the conception of trans-semiotic repertoire. This changing view of language contrasts with the conventional understanding of language as a static and bounded entity (Brooks 2021). Translingualism is a construct that reemphasizes the fluid nature of language (Gevers 2018) and, at the same time, decenter the dominance of language in the semiotic system of meaning-making. The notion of translingualism and translanguaging practices problematize the restrictive point of view on language and espouse the entire linguistic and semiotic repertoire.

The rise of translingualism plays an important role in shifting the paradigm in applied linguistics and bringing about changes in pedagogy in general. The concept of translanguaging has been put forth as a more inclusive approach to bi-/multilingual education to tackle persisting issues surrounding language differences (Li Wei and García 2022). Translanguaging as a pedagogical concept originated from the pedagogic practice of alternating between Welsh and English (Williams 1994). The prefix ‘trans captures the flexible and seamless movement across various languages and linguistic varieties, while the verb ‘linguaging’ reflects the view of language as an ongoing, dynamic process of meaning-making through human interactions by the individual agency (Lewis, Jones and Baker 2012).

Meanwhile, there needs to be more clarity among scholars and practitioners regarding the definition of translingualism and translanguaging. Some literature has aimed to clarify these concepts, as they have been frequently misunderstood. Translanguaging, in particular, has often been mistaken for code-switching or other language-mixing practices due to its hybrid nature. However, Otheguy, García, and Reid (2015) clarify that translanguaging is different from code-switching between named languages, asserting that translanguaging is the deployment of a speaker’s full linguistic repertoire without regard for watchful adherence to the socially and politically defined language boundaries. Similarly, the concept of a translingual approach is often mistaken for simply acknowledging or using a first language in multilingual contexts. However, Li Wei and García (2022) challenge this limited understanding, referring to it as ‘additive bilingualism,’ and instead propose translanguaging as a decolonizing project. They argue that the ‘trans-’ in translanguaging connotes the transcendence of named language, which means that multilingual students’ semiotic repertoires should not be viewed as separate entities. They highlight the importance of appreciating translanguaging as a full repertoire of multilingual students and its potential to decolonize education by challenging standardized language ideologies. Even in a recent article, some discuss translingualism as creating a creole language by multilingual individuals in order to shape their experiences and construct their identities. However, Coronel-Molina and Samuelson (2017) point out that current translingual

practices differ from the traditional notion of creolization that occurs in language contact, as the language ideology of purism and standardization has already stigmatized creolization. Instead, the author proposes that translingualism can promote a new form of cosmopolitanism, which should be encouraged, since translingual practices may index speakers' transnational trajectories promoted by the discourse of cosmopolitanism and globalization.

Translingualism is the belief in using multiple languages or forms of communication. It recognizes the value of different linguistic and semiotic resources and encourages their use to empower multilingual individuals. This approach disrupts restrictive norms in academia and challenges the divide between standard and non-standard varieties of language, creating a pluralistic discourse. Traditional views of language as a static and pure entity are challenged by translingualism, which views language as a fluid and flexible tool that can be adapted to different contexts for different meanings. Translingualism seeks to transcend traditional language divisions and encourages the use of multiple linguistic resources as a strategy of resistance to monolingual and standard language ideologies.

3. Methodology

This study conducted a qualitative meta-synthesis review to analyze and interpret existing research on translingualism, with the aim of gaining a new understanding of the concept. There is a good reason for employing meta-syntheses for the current literature review on translingualism. The meta-synthesis process enables researchers to produce interpretive results by integrating and comparing findings across a body of qualitative research on a given topic (Sandelowski and Barroso 2007). It takes a critical perspective and conducts in-depth analysis to offer a new interpretation of the data (Erwin, Brotherson and Summers 2011). When conducting a qualitative meta-synthesis, this article considers two important factors: the criteria used to evaluate the quality of each research study and how to synthesize while ensuring the integrity of individual studies. Since qualitative research is often specific to a particular context, time, and group of participants (Major and Savin-Baden 2010, Thomas and Harden 2008), this synthesis does not intend to generalize or decontextualize the research studies reviewed. The context of a qualitative study can offer valuable information, which is why this synthesis includes as much contextual information as possible about the setting and participants.

3.1 Data Collection Procedure

A search on translingualism was performed using relevant keywords and available databases. The search targeted online citations from 2011 to 2022 to grasp the evolving trends in the research on translingualism over the last decade. The search was mainly conducted through databases such as ERIC, Wiley Online Library, and Google Scholar, along with tracking relevant references. The search terms included 'translingualism', 'translanguaging,' 'translingual practice,' 'trans-semiotic/semiotizing,' 'linguistic/semiotic/communicative repertoire,' 'trans-/multi-modality,' and so on. The selected databases were purposively chosen to retrieve articles published in the field of applied linguistics and language studies, further expanding through citation tracking and reference list searches - the search aimed to achieve conceptual saturation (Thomas and Harden 2008). The process of searching for relevant articles involved a careful evaluation to determine which ones to include and exclude. The inclusion criteria were whether the article focused on translingualism/translingual practices, whether it explored the experiences of multilingual language users, L2 learners, teachers, and practitioners in specific

multilingual contexts, and whether it used a qualitative methodology clearly described in its method. While these criteria were set up to ensure the method's rigor, they were also flexible enough to be revisited and reflected upon as the researcher learned more about the characteristics of translingual practices across different contexts. The articles selected for this synthesis were published in English and were qualitative studies focused on translingualism and translingual practices. These articles were compared based on different parameters such as research purposes, research questions, methods, data analysis, and research findings. The articles were screened based on their titles, abstracts, and keywords, and 77 full-text articles were selected for inclusion. An initial review of the literature was conducted, excluding 20 articles, such as policy reports. Eventually, 57 qualitative research studies were included in the final analysis.

3.2 Data Analysis

The data analysis has been conducted through a cyclical process involving description, analysis, interpretation, and synthesis. A series of categorizations were used in the format of open, axial, and superordinate coding to develop common or novel thematic categories for further synthesis and discussion. The coding process was iterative, with several rounds of recursive readings of the original articles, coding notes, and thematic categorization with a matrix. The codes were created inductively to capture the significance and implications of each study. The recursive readings were intended to ensure the consistency of coding and interpretation. The selected studies were carefully examined during this stage to identify key concepts, themes, and findings. This process was repeated until conceptual saturation was considered reached (Thomas and Harden 2008), and new themes were adequately described within the initial categories. Initially, open coding was used to identify initial categories across 57 studies according to the research keywords, followed by axial coding analysis to identify common themes between the initial categories. Axial coding was used to organize the initial codes into pertaining areas to construct descriptive themes. These descriptive themes were constructed inductively from the initial analysis of the studies reviewed. Constant comparison and analysis of subsequent articles were conducted through recursive readings and interpretation to ensure that all important concepts and findings were explored. This process resulted in the development of several analytical themes: transnationalism as an ideology/ translingual activism; translingual pedagogy and practices (e.g., in writing/composition, literacy, EMI), including various participants (e.g., ESL/ EFL students, pre/in-service teachers); trans-semiotic repertoires; and some reservations about translingualism. In subsequence, the process of superordinate coding was used for synthetic interpretation and discussion. Following the major principles of meta-synthesis suggested by many theorists (Sandelowski and Barroso 2007, Walsh and Downe 2005), throughout the analysis, the current review made an effort to preserve the integrity and context of the original research while also interpreting the findings to gain a deeper understanding.

As a result of this synthesis, six categories of themes emerged: 'translingual activism/ideological transgression,' 'translingual pedagogy,' 'translingual/trans-literacies,' 'translingual competence,' 'trans-semiotic repertoire,' and 'some reservations/practical constraints,' all of which are situated within the overarching concept of translingualism. The findings were summarized and synthesized based on the themes and proceeded to further discussion. The implications of the findings were considered for future research and the policy and practices of translingualism. In the following section, these findings will be discussed in greater detail.

4. Findings

4.1 Translingual Activism: Ideological Transgression

There is a strand of research on translingualism that aims to decolonize language by promoting a holistic view of language and semiotic repertoire. This approach challenges monolingual ideologies and the compartmentalization of language into a hierarchical order of named languages (Li Wei and García 2022, Pennycook 2020). The translingual ideology movement is characterized by a transgressive approach observed at various social levels and contexts. For example, Canagarajah and Dovchin (2019) analyze translingualism as a form of resistance in everyday politics. Through studying the social media translingual practices of young people in Mongolia and Japan, they explore the transgressive implications of their language choices. With a strong focus on the political implications, the researchers seek to expand the translingual tradition by highlighting the ordinariness of these practices in everyday life. Kiramba (2016) studied writing practices in a multilingual, rural, fourth-grade classroom in Kenya and found that the translanguaging process in writing was tense due to issues such as language separation and correctness. The author argues that translanguaging can disrupt unequal voices and language hierarchies by challenging standard ideologies in academic writing. Canagarajah's (2021) recent work further theorizes the challenges of decolonizing discourses surrounding translingualism. He traces the roots of translingualism in the Global South and critiques the problematic ways in which translingualism is appropriated in academic, economic, and political contexts in the Global North. Canagarajah advocates for entextualizing translingualism to preserve its decolonizing potential that will facilitate more pluriversal epistemology and practices. Dovchin and Dryden (2021) analyze the discriminatory experiences of skilled transnational migrants in Australia's labor market. They introduce the notion of translingual discrimination, which refers to the unfair treatment of transnational migrants based on their English proficiency and transnational identities.

Discussions of the novelty of translingualism or the ordinariness of its associated practices are also under the theme of translingual ideology and activism. In effect, translingual practices are not a new phenomenon but have long been present as everyday practices in multicultural and multilingual environments (Canagarajah 2021, Martinez 2021). Martinez (2021) argues for recovering translingualism in the precolonial Philippines, which became subject to the linguistic imperialism of English. Martinez's (2021) analysis reveals that the hierarchical language ideology devalued translingual practices in the precolonial Philippines, primarily through translation tasks by Spanish missionaries at the time. Sun and Huang (2018) also describe the lived experience of multilingual individuals in Taiwan's daily life. In such an environment where linguistic and cultural diversity is an everyday encounter, the authors argue, translingualism is a series of actions or steps of empowerment that enables one to form positive heterogeneous relationships with different peoples from various cultural backgrounds.

Translingualism as an ideological stance also manifests in various artistic and literary works. Some research studies showcase how multilingual subjects mobilize translingual creativity for identity politics to counter the dominant ideology (Milu 2018, Zucca 2022). For instance, Milu (2018) demonstrates how Kenyan hip-hop artists engaged in linguistic activism through their translingual practices to resist the dominant deficit model of racial and ethnic categorization and to challenge the status quo. Meanwhile, Tannenbaum (2014) examines translingual Arab writers in Israel, focusing on interfaces of linguistic, sociological, psychological, and political aspects and patterns of language usage in their writings. Popescu-Sandu (2018) considers translingual practices in Romanian-American poetry written by immigrant Romanian writers in the US, drawing on Bakhtin's (1981) notion of dialogism. Williams (2020) traces the global development of translingual literature, debunking the pervasive myth of the

monolingual paradigm and persistent Eurocentrism in translingual literature. This essay highlights how translingual writers employ translingualism as a vital tool for hybrid identity expression and a creative revolt working against the standards of monolingual cultural purity. With the lived experiences of those who grapple with questions of cultural and linguistic identity construction, these researchers strongly posit that translingualism is more inclusive and gives more powerful voices to translingual persons, often marginalized in the regime of monolingualism.

Indeed, translingualism is an ideology that aims to empower individuals and challenge dominant monolingualism and standard language ideology. It promotes social equality and justice by embracing different forms of semiotic repertoires. The movement is situated within the concept of transgression or linguistic activism, seeking to transcend rigid boundaries between named languages and decenter the centrality of language as the privileged medium of meaning-making. Translingualism is a liberating and empowering stance that advocates for individual agency and a more inclusive society. This movement has been hailed as an emancipatory ideology.

4.2 Translingual Pedagogy: Toward More Inclusive Pedagogies

Translingual pedagogy is another core theme of translingualism that emerged from the literature review. In the established pedagogical theory and practice, the strict separation of languages, which is undergirded by monolingual and standard language ideologies, has long been problematic. This separation limits the use of diverse linguistic resources (Cenoz and Gorter 2020, Kubota 2016). Many scholars and educators have pursued more inclusive pedagogies that recognize the potential of linguistic diversity (Hornberger 2005, Li Wei and García 2022). The inclusive nature of translingualism has inspired an increasing number of scholars and practitioners across the globe to embrace and apply translingual pedagogy to various educational contexts. Through a translingualism lens, Li Wei and García (2022) illustrate how dominant raciolinguistic ideologies have led to two multilingual students in London and New York City being seen as deficient due to their own languages. Their empirical research findings offer valuable insights into the challenges multilingual learners face in educational settings: Schools often severely restrict translanguaging, even when it is particularly relevant to the linguistic and intellectual growth of bi/multilingual students. Wang (2018) proposes translingual/transdisciplinary rhetoric as a means of cultivating intentional strategy that integrates languages and promotes the development of a multilingual repertoire, metalinguistic skills, and language awareness. A central concern is whether and how multilingual and/or linguistically minoritized students can benefit from translingual pedagogy. Some scholars have suggested various experimental methods for integrating translingualism into pedagogy, such as peer collaboration in writing/composition classes between students from different linguistic backgrounds (Canagarajah 2013, Horner, NeCamp and Donahue 2011). Others have promoted the use of digital technology to enhance both translingual competence and digital literacy, creating a new genre of literacies (Medina 2022, Spilioti 2019). Several authors have shown how translanguaging can be used in English as a Medium of Instruction (EMI) classrooms to promote both content understanding and language learning. (e.g., Kim 2022, Romanowski 2020, Tomakazu 2021).

Meanwhile, in the earlier stages of the development of translingual pedagogy, critics note that much of the existing literature on translingual pedagogy is mostly theoretical and speculative (Gevers 2018, p.76). While research studies have shown the benefits of translingualism in pedagogy, few provide concrete examples of translingual teaching methods, such as lesson plans, activities, and assessment methods (Canagarajah 2011). Canagarajah suggests that the lack of teachable translanguaging strategies is one of the issues that needs to be addressed in the classroom. However, translingualism in pedagogy still faces significant practical challenges, such

as assessment and adherence to official norms (Gilyard 2016). In a review of 42 empirical studies on translingual approaches to writing in English as an additional language (EAL), Sun and Lan (2020) find that such approaches have been practiced in diverse contexts, with various writer groups, and for different research goals. The authors report that these approaches encourage agency and the use of diverse linguistic resources while also sparking ideological debates about teaching EAL writing. However, the findings also suggest that it is essential to be cautious when adopting a translingual approach to pedagogical practices, as balancing linguistic norms and respecting linguistic differences are crucial.

In response to criticism, various empirical studies from different educational contexts have reported diverse teaching strategies and effects of translingual pedagogies. For example, Mendoza and Parba (2018) explore how English-Filipino translanguaging can facilitate the development of Filipino academic writing skills among heritage learners who have been subject to subtractive bilingualism and challenge the ideology of discrete languages and speech communities. They argued that while translanguaging practices did not necessarily improve students' writing skills in Filipino, they did lead to a deeper and more critical understanding of content. Similarly, Yiğitbilek and Yazici (2018) demonstrate how the notion of corrective feedback can be reevaluated by translingualism in teaching writing. They found that a translingual approach to teaching writing can be a more comprehensive pedagogy to appreciate linguistic diversity and help students find their own voice in academic writing. David, Pacheco, and Jiménez (2019) advocate for "pedagogical translation" as one method employed in translingual pedagogies, which leverages multilingual children's resources for learning, emphasizing the agentive work of teachers and students. The study analyzed how language arts teachers in middle-grade classrooms learned to integrate a small-group collaborative translation activity into their teaching approach. The teachers used a protocol that was designed for all teachers in linguistically diverse classrooms to involve their students in linguistic problem-solving activities through translation. The study found that teachers were able to effectively utilize their students' knowledge of language structure to enhance their learning experience. Seals et al. (2020) describe the creation of translanguaging grammar rules and pedagogical materials in multilingual educational settings in New Zealand. They demonstrate how to embody translingual practices and core cultural values by creating translingual children's books and other teaching materials. Using a microethnographic study, the researchers collected data on translanguaging practices within Māori and Samoan communities. Based on the empirical findings, they created pedagogical materials in the form of children's books. These materials were based on a set of rules observed in discursive practices, which included syntax used by speakers in the communities. The rules served as a model for translanguaging grammar and syntax. Their findings emphasize the importance of translingual pedagogies going beyond the traditional discussion of codeswitching in the classroom. Those empirical studies demonstrated that the situatedness of multi- or plural language speakers could stimulate critical dialogue among different stakeholders in educational settings traditionally regimented by dominant ideologies (Canagarajah 2021). Such critical dialogue may raise awareness of the dominant ideologies about language in education and broader societal domains.

4.3 Translingual/Trans-literacies: Translingual, Transcultural, and Multimodal Writing and EMI

There is a noticeable increase in the focus on translingual approaches in writing and literacy education for students who speak multiple languages. Horner, NeCamp, and Donahue (2011) urge for a new paradigm that embraces a translingual approach to multilingual composition scholarship, recognizing the limitations of a linguistically homogeneous approach. They suggest a shift from an 'English Only' norm in academia to one that acknowledges and values the language diversity of multilingual writers. In a study of young bilingual writers,

Velasco and García (2014) suggest using translanguaging to improve bilinguals' academic writing. They recommend using translanguaging more as a self-regulating mechanism in which bilingual students can engage rather than a writing pedagogy per se. Medina (2022) explains how translingualism contributes to the development of academic literacy at the tertiary level, highlighting the importance of a student's first language (L1) in developing their writer identity. Canagarajah and Matsumoto (2016) present a case study illustrating the translingual literacies of a Japanese student and her instructor in an American university-level writing course. They emphasize the importance of creating a translingual contact zone that can provide an ecological affordance to negotiate voices. Thomas and Ahmad (2018) examine the ideological and practical obstacles to teaching a multilingual or translingual writing course at a 'monolingual' American university. Further, Lee and Canagarajah (2018) demonstrate the potential of a transcultural and translingual approach in academic writing. They analyze a multilingual student's case to show how his transcultural disposition and experience enabled his translingual writing practice.

In EMI classrooms, there is often a disconnect between policy and practice. To address this issue, researchers have studied translanguaging, or the use of multiple languages, to promote both content and language learning. Studies have been conducted in various contexts, including Japanese (Tomakazu 2021) and Polish (Romanowski 2020) EMI classrooms. Muguruza, Cenoz, and Gorter (2020) examine an EMI practice and flexible language policy at a university in the Basque country, Spain, allowing for the use of three different languages. They report that most students responded positively to the policy. Duarte (2020) also examined the implementation of 'official translanguaging' in Luxembourg and the Netherlands, conducting an EMI design-based project to include migrant and minority languages in mainstream education. The findings suggest that official translanguaging can be an effective pedagogical strategy to acknowledge migrant languages, reduce language separation frequently observed in traditional immersion models, and increase content understanding. Tai (2021) conducted a case study on an EMI secondary mathematics lesson in Hong Kong, using Multimodal Conversation Analysis (MCA) and an ethnographic approach to understanding how translanguaging practices can facilitate content and language learning in EMI classrooms. Similarly, Tai and Li Wei (2021) found that 'playful talk' constructed through translanguaging in an EMI math classroom allowed creative acts and experiments with various voices to facilitate meaning-making and knowledge construction. Chang (2019) investigated translingual practices in higher education EMI classrooms, noting that the translingual practices are constrained by monolingual ideologies of English Only "neglecting the role of other languages, semiotic resources, and modalities in the construction and communication of knowledge." These studies emphasize the urgency to address the monolingual language policy prevalent in EMI contexts. As observed by various research studies, the potential benefits of translanguaging are often limited by the hegemony of English and monolingual ideologies. Due to the weight of English, the practice of translingualism is not always straightforward or desirable. Researchers, therefore, argue that more must be done to bridge the discrepancy between the reality of the multilingual and the ideals of translingualism in order to make it a viable pedagogical approach.

The fluidity and dynamic of translingual practices are evidenced in online/ virtual spaces, where multilingual, multicultural, multimodal, and multi-semiotic resources are deployed and stylized among translingual subjects. Fraiberg's (2018) research focuses on the mobility of transnational literacy enacted by transnational student writing, which often mobilizes a variety of human and non-human actors in his/her everyday literacy practices. The notion of 'mobility' offers a new concept of mobile literacies, which implies fluidity that is not confined within a specific norm or convention and thus defies any prescriptive impulse. Fall (2019) utilizes multimodality in translingual literacy practices and presents sensory and multimodal narratives to denounce ideologies that render the identities of translingual individuals invisible. Drawing on a translingual and multimodal perspective of

composition, Pacheco and Smith (2015) explore bilingual adolescents' multimodal code-meshing in the literacy classroom. They highlight how students mesh linguistic and modal resources to engage multiple audiences, convey nuanced meanings, and (re)voice their subjects' experiences. Gonzales (2015) situates rhetorical genre studies in the translingual and multimodal composition, examining connections between students' linguistic repertoires and their approaches to multimodal composition. Using focus group data from two large public state universities, the author reports that L2 students exhibit advanced expertise and rhetorical sensitivity in meaning-making through multimodal composition.

The use of technology and digital media is an integral part of translingual practices, particularly in writing and literacy classrooms (Chen, Zhang and Huan 2022, Spilioti 2019). Spilioti (2019) proposes a translanguaging lens for studying multilingual digital writing. The researcher draws on the notion of trans-scripting as a key to understanding such writing practices as creative and performative, revealing a link between trans-scripting as a creative practice and digital orality. Martín, Hirsu, Gonzales, and Alvarez (2019) offer a pedagogical framework for teaching digital composing through a translingual approach. Their research is based on a collaboration on a series of blog posts called "Beyond A Single Language/Single Modality Approach to Writing," published on the Sweetland Digital Rhetoric Collaborative. The series included contributions from teachers and scholars working with students from diverse linguistic and ethnic backgrounds across the US. They showcased different approaches to writing instruction that incorporate flexible ideas of language and digital composing practices. Likewise, Canagarajah and Dovchin (2019) explore social media translingual practices to consider everyday language choices in different geographical contexts such as Mongolia and Japan. Further, Medina (2022) identifies the role of multimodality and digital translingual practices in writing and proposes that "semiotic competence," the ability to navigate the multilingual and multimodal terrain of the communicative act, should be integrated within translingualism. As well demonstrated by those empirical studies, translingualism serves as a practical pedagogical framework in various on-/offline contexts for diverse purposes.

4.4 Translingual Competence: Metalinguistic Awareness of Translinguals

Multilingual students' meta-linguistic awareness is another intriguing theme for scholars and educators. Meta-linguistic awareness refers to the sensitivity to the contexts and situatedness in which speakers are placed. The meta-linguistic knowledge is part of the linguistic repertoire which multilinguals utilize for their meaning-negotiation (Cenoz and Gorter 2020). Through the process of learning two or more languages and negotiating meaning in transnational or translingual spaces, multilinguals might have developed meta-linguistic competence in their lives. The keen meta-linguistic awareness enables multilingual individuals to deploy different resources for different purposes in different contexts. The metalinguistic awareness of students can be used as a practical pedagogical method. Pedagogical translanguaging, as defined by Cenoz and Gorter (2020), is an intentional instructional strategy that integrates two or more languages to develop multilingual repertoires as well as metalinguistic and language awareness. When students provide metacommentary or metalinguistic accounts of language, they engage in the process of meaning-making that challenges monoglossic ideologies and the dominant and restrictive ideology that views them as struggling students. In doing so, students are encouraged to reflect upon and foster their translingual competence by engaging with differences, developing translingual rhetorical dexterity, and raising meta-linguistic awareness.

The development of teachers' translingual competence is also discussed as one of the crucial factors in successfully implementing translingual pedagogy. Translingualism has profound implications for teacher education, with teachers' agency being crucial for creating implementational and ideological spaces for minoritized

students (Hornberger 2005). Martínez, Hikida, and Durán (2015) conducted qualitative research on two Spanish-English dual-language elementary classrooms. They found that teachers' perspectives on translanguaging echoed linguistic purism ideologies, whereas their everyday language and instructional practices reflected translanguaging. This finding highlights the discrepancy between policy and practice and the constraints preventing both teachers and students from using their valuable resources for teaching and learning. From an asset-based perspective, Cinaglia and De Costa (2022) underscore the responsibility of teacher educators in raising awareness among teachers of the dominant ideologies in language education. In this respect, Ki, Lee, and Li (2022) investigate translingual practices in teacher preparation EMI courses in Korea. They reported that EMI and translingual practices had a positive impact on prospective teachers' content and language acquisition, as well as their evolving perceptions of bilingualism and multicultural education. Fall (2019) analyzes contemporary language theories, practices, and pedagogies in the preparation of L2 teachers. This study features personal narratives from language and literacy professionals, including teachers and researchers. These stories not only denounce anti-minoritized groups' rhetoric but also counter prejudiced standpoints about the validity and appropriateness of their literacies. Fall's study sheds light on issues of power and linguistic hierarchies entrenched in language philosophies and pedagogies, along with the illustration of translingual individuals' literacy practices. Informed by a perspective of transliteracies, Pacheco et al. (2019) conducted a case study examining a teacher's strategic participation in translingual practices, which shaped emerging bilingual students' meaningful engagement with texts. The findings highlight the importance of developing teachers' translingual competence and emerging multilingualism.

4.5 Trans-Semiotic Repertoire

Studies exploring trans-semiotic approaches are an expanding line of inquiry building upon the trans-turn. This type of research extends translingualism to trans-semiotic practices that involve multiple semiotic systems (e.g., language, images, symbols, graphs, gestures, etc.). Numerous case studies illustrate how multilingual students incorporate various resources into their writing, as Medina (2022) and Pennycook (2020) show. Ethnographic research, such as Martínez's (2021) work on post-colonial communities, has applied the notion of trans-semiotic repertoire to translingual practices, focusing on cross-semiotic examples of interactions. Blackledge and Creese's (2017) ethnographic research on super-diverse cities in the UK focuses on the body as a dimension of the semiotic repertoire. They argue that when people's biographical and linguistic histories barely overlap, they translanguage by deploying wide-ranging semiotic repertoires, for instance, body gestures. Kellman (2019) provides numerous examples of translingual imagination, demonstrating how the mechanism of intercultural and transnational interaction of linguistic and extralinguistic elements works in each case. Tagg and Lyons (2021) investigate how semiotic repertoire emerges and is shaped in repertoire assemblage processes in interactions between two women of Polish origin in the UK, mediated by mobile messaging apps. Their research illustrates how mobile interlocutors exploit technological affordances and constraints for meaning-making. Chen, Zhang, and Huan (2022) examine the association between translanguaging/trans-semiotizing and learner agency in content and language-integrated learning. They analyze the patterns of trans-semiotizing in social media interaction and the process of trans-semiotizing for learner agency through multimodal conversation analysis. The findings show that trans-semiotizing was a common practice in everyday and crisis contexts, being closely associated with learner agency. The authors assert that trans-semiotizing makes learner agency more visible and achievable, emphasizing the significance of teachers' trans-semiotic competence. These studies highlight the importance of a dynamic conceptualization of the semiotic repertoire, which indicates that translingualism is not limited to language issues and challenges the centrality of language in traditional semiotic systems. The lived experiences of multilinguals

suggest that various semiotic repertoires are significant for human interactions.

4.6 Reservations about Translingualism and Constraints in Practice

Some concerns have been raised about the use of translingual pedagogy (Kato and Kumagai 2020, Kuteeva 2020, Romanowski 2020, Zhou, Li and Gao 2021). Some critics have expressed concerns about the challenges of incorporating translingualism into traditional educational settings despite recognizing its value in education (Gevers 2018). Despite advocates of translingualism expecting students to appreciate their diverse linguistic abilities, some studies have shown that EFL students prefer privileged English over their other language repertoires. For example, Kato and Kumagai's (2020) research on telecollaborative interaction between Japanese EFL students and US undergraduates found that the EFL students preferred to use English rather than embracing linguistic plurality. Similarly, Kuteeva (2020) examined students' conceptualizations of English in an EMI program at a Swedish university and suggested that translingual practices in EMI contexts are not always associated with empowering students but rather function as a mechanism of exclusion and reinforcement of language standards by a group of 'elite' translinguals. Zhou, Li, and Gao's (2021) findings also show ambivalence among EFL students towards pedagogical translanguaging practices in an EMI finance classroom at an international school in Shanghai, China. While participants were generally positive about translanguaging regarding the enhancement of content learning, some expressed reservations about accepting translanguaging as a standard, formal linguistic choice. Zhang-Wu's (2022) study explored multilingual international students' perceptions of translingualism in an online college composition class. It revealed that most multilingual international students had an English-superiority fallacy and believed their home language should be kept out of the classroom. Kaufhold's (2018) longitudinal qualitative research examined students' academic writing practices in a Swedish university. It found that students' linguistic ideologies and experiences can either enable or restrict their capacity to draw on their varied linguistic repertoires.

These findings suggest the need to cultivate a sense of ownership of language diversity and practices while also recognizing and valuing students' entire linguistic repertoires. It is important to exercise caution when using translingual approaches, as their effectiveness may depend on contextual factors and normative demands in different academic settings. Normative demands and conventions in academic settings cannot be ignored, as in doing so, linguistically minoritized students could risk being further marginalized. Therefore, to successfully apply translingualism in educational practices, structural, institutional, and individual issues must be addressed, including teacher training and preparation for translingual approaches, as well as learners' practical needs and desires.

5. Discussion

Translingualism has emerged in pursuit of more inclusive discourses surrounding language differences. It is the consequence of a collective effort questing for more just ways for linguistic ecology. Translingualism is a 'trans turn' in language studies (Hawkins 2018), driven by the awareness of structural and social inequalities entailed by the ideological workings of monolingualism and standardization. It is a critical intellectual movement that challenges standardization and monolingualism. Translingualism challenges the traditional understanding of

language as a separate, static, and thus immutable entity. Translingualism departs from the traditional view of language, which is dominated by monolingualism and standard language ideologies. It aims to decolonize linguistic realities subjected to restrictive language ideologies, which often result in deficit models and discourses of language and identity concerning those from multilingual, multicultural backgrounds. The translingual idea presents innovative ways of looking at an established language classroom as a translingual space or community where multilingual participants can be reimagined as translingual practitioners. This perspective disrupts the mono-/standard language ideology regime and enables the (re)configuration of diverse linguistic resources to create new meanings and identities.

The fluidity and dynamics across different semiotic resources represent a general nature and ordinariness of translingual practices in mundane interactions among multilingual individuals and communities. Before theorizing translingualism as a novel or emergent scholarship, it is essential to rethink the novelty in light of the linguistic ideology of monolingualism and standard language that overshadows translingual/multilingual realities. The belief that languages should be kept separate and that monolingualism is ideal clashes with the way people actually use language in their day-to-day lives. To fully understand translingualism and its practices, we must first challenge the linguistic ideology that standard languages and monolingualism are the norm. As strongly argued by critical translingualism scholars and practitioners (Li Wei and García 2022), translingualism is not simply about mixing different languages or code-switching. A pluralistic perspective that acknowledges the use of L1 or non-standard varieties is necessary but insufficient to fully account for the multilingual realities of translinguals. For translingual individuals, the boundaries between named languages and between language and other semiotic signs are deliberately manipulated and broken, which is a key feature of translingual practice. Again, it is important to note that mixing semiotic resources does not simply mean code-switching, which has been stigmatized by a dominant deficit model. The meaning-making process among heterogeneous semiotic resources should be placed at the center in order to denaturalize the dominance of monolingualism and move towards a holistic understanding of meaning-making and knowledge construction. The hybridity of multiple semiotic systems should be viewed as a heuristic strategy for multilingual individuals to appropriate their full linguistic repertoires for meaning-making. Such fluidity, hybridity, and dynamism of multiple semiotic systems are integral parts of the translingual interactions of human beings.

Differences should not be celebrated simply for the sake of it. It is important to note that any transformative and emancipatory discourse can be appropriated by both marginalized and dominant groups, as revealed by the current review of numerous empirical studies (e.g., Kato and Kumagai 2020, Kuteeva 2020, Romanowski 2020, Zhou, Li and Gao 2021). While translingualism could undoubtedly contribute to enhancing the awareness of linguistic diversity and repertoire and disrupting restrictive norms through linguistic creativity, it could also serve as an inhibiting factor, whether wittingly or not, in the advancement of multiple language users, by reinforcing or perpetuating the marginalization of the multilinguals. As Blommaert (2010) asserts, translingual resources should enable the linguistically minoritized to move out of their marginalized situations if considered as empowering resources. Therefore, approaches to translingualism should be aware of the ambivalence of a subversive discourse against hegemony or domination. It is not to say we should comply with restrictive norms and conventions. Instead, by critically engaging in inclusive discourse, we can better understand the relationship between language and society, as well as the various components of the semiotic repertoire. Through the tension of competing perspectives, translingualism can be refined through further empirical inquiry. It is crucial to seek a symbiotic pursuit that fosters more inclusive and embracing ways of linguistic symbiosis or linguistic ecology.

Translingualism resonates with a growing desire for more inclusive educational practice, which aligns well with the changing social climate toward greater social equality and justice. The term 'translingualism' has gained

attention in applied linguistics over the past two decades. While there is no agreed-upon way to implement translingual pedagogy, a significant amount of empirical research supports that translingualism has pedagogical potential. Many studies have documented the successful implementation of translingualism in various educational settings, including language education, L2 writing and composition (e.g., Thomas and Ahmad 2018, Velasco and García 2014), and trans-literacies (e.g., 2022, Pacheco et al., 2019), as well as in EMI contexts (e.g., Muguruza, Cenoz and Gorter 2020, Tai and Li Wei 2021). Technological advancements have also expanded the pedagogical potential of translingual approaches, including digital writing and composition and trans-semiotic practices through social media (e.g., Canagarajah and Dovchin 2019), and incorporating multimodality into the semiotic repertoires of multilingual speakers (e.g., Tagg and Lyons 2021, Chen, Zhang and Huan 2022). These qualitative studies have proven fruitful in supporting translingualism as a valuable teaching approach.

A translingual vision provides new opportunities for researchers and educators. Researchers and educators can benefit significantly from a translingual approach. However, it is essential to distinguish between pedagogical theories and their practical implementation. From a theoretical dimension, on the one hand, translingualism is indeed a promising concept in educational settings where monolingual and standard language ideologies have dominated. Some proponents of translingual pedagogy prioritize raising critical language awareness by exposing students and teachers to various language varieties rather than emphasizing a specific translingual method or strategy. In order to incorporate translingualism into their teaching practices, teachers and students must develop a critical awareness of language differences. Teachers working with multilingual students should strive to incorporate their students' everyday/ordinary interactional practices outside the classroom. On the other hand, while acknowledging the importance of building critical awareness, practitioners and instructors call for more concrete ways to successfully and effectively implement translingual practices. The practicality of a translingual teaching approach remains uncertain, with several critics (Kubota 2016, Matuda 2014) raising concerns about its implementation. Critics question whether students should be explicitly taught to incorporate different languages and varieties into their academic work, an essential question that remains unanswered. For example, in writing classes, there is a difference between allowing and encouraging or requiring translingual writing (Lee and Canagarajah 2018). Gevers (2018) highlights the limitations of the specific application of a translingual approach and the challenges of addressing the diverse needs of multilingual students through such pedagogies. While translingual practices are common in everyday and quotidian interactions for multilingual individuals, it is a different matter when such practices are incorporated into institutional practices such as classroom instruction. Teachers and students need to know explicitly whether and how they can incorporate linguistic variations, even when dominant discourses and conventions do not recognize their translingual proficiency or competence.

As previously noted, in the initial phases of the development of translingualism, some critics voiced concerns about the unquestioning adoption and implementation of translingual pedagogy in educational settings. (Atkinson et al. 2015, Kubota 2016, Matsuda 2014). Following Gevers' viewpoints (2018), it is recommended to approach the concept of translingualism with caution; teachers should consider when and how it is appropriate, effective, and empowering for students to blend their linguistic resources; both teachers and students need to analyze the social norms, beliefs, and individual experiences that shape the ways of interactions and identity construction. Further, translingual scholars and educators should consider whether multilingual students are willing and able to actively negotiate their translingual identities. However, an increasing number of educators and researchers are showing an interest in implementing translingual pedagogy despite the criticism of the sort above. It is equally important to recognize why translingualism is highly regarded among educators, particularly those working with multilingual students. As substantiated by the numerous research findings reviewed in this paper, a translingual approach is necessary to tackle the limitations and oppression caused by monolingual dominance (Canagarajah

2021, García and Li Wei 2014). It can significantly benefit linguistically marginalized individuals and communities (Dovchin and Dryden 2021, Milu 2018).

A translingual approach requires significant structural changes at the institutional level, which may be challenging in a context where normativity prevails over diverse languages, varieties, and variations. For successfully implementing translingualism in pedagogy, the role of teachers and instructors is crucial. Training and professional development programs should be provided to equip instructors with translingual competence and pedagogies. These programs could help teachers to be more aware of language issues in education and society. Teacher educators and teachers need to have a fluid perspective on language and be equipped with translingual competence. Viewing language as a dynamic process is crucial, as is reflected in the term ‘translanguaging.’ When designing courses that incorporate translingual pedagogy, it is essential to consider the needs and desires of students. Additionally, teachers should take into account social norms and expectations, particularly with regard to the types of literacies that are expected in academic and workplace settings. It is also important to consider the potential benefits and risks associated with translingual practices.

A translingual approach can foster critical awareness and transnational/cosmopolitan sensibilities, but this requires greater awareness from all stakeholders, including students, teachers, administrators, and policymakers. It also involves reforming stereotypes about linguistic diversity, standardization, and monolingualism, challenging the social mechanisms that control access to privileged resources, and creating a social climate that supports translingualism and promotes greater social inclusion. Researchers and scholars must first critically reflect on their own positionality and be mindful of the potential impact of their work on reinforcing dominant discourse. These are all fruitful areas of future research as theories of translingualism continue to be refined and further elaborated.

In future research on translingualism, therefore, it is important to address a broader range of issues and concerns. Further research needs to investigate further how multilingual and minoritized learners can benefit from translingual pedagogies and how pre- and in-service teachers can be trained to be more translingual competent in their pedagogical practices. It may also include developing critical awareness of language issues associated with multifaceted social and cultural factors. Moreover, future research should investigate how translingual pedagogies can help students progress not only in their educational pursuits but also in their entire social lives. The concept of linguistic and semiotic repertoire should also be further discussed in light of the ever-expanding hybridity of different semiotic resources, leading to interdisciplinary scholarship on trans-semiotization.

6. Conclusion

The rise of translingualism has brought about an epistemological shift in studies of language and other associated social relations closely related to identity politics. Translingualism serves as a tool to push a critical intellectual movement and linguistic activism to challenge monolingualism and standard language ideology. It also provides a substantive pedagogical potential for creating a more inclusive climate in education as well as broader society. Translingual practices have proven to enhance linguistic creativity and multilingual students’ engagement in educational processes, such as literacy and writing, mobilizing their full semiotic repertoires for meaning negotiation and identity construction. However, practical issues need to be addressed to implement translingual pedagogy successfully. These include designing effective teaching methods and strategies, developing appropriate assessment techniques, preparing teachers adequately, and overcoming stakeholders’ reluctance to accept translingual practices as valid norms.

A translingual approach is not a one-size-fits-all solution to educational problems. Blindly adopting

translingualism could dull its transformative edge. Education is complex and multifaceted. The potential benefits of translingual pedagogies depend on the situatedness, which takes into consideration various reasons, needs, and purposes of diverse stakeholders in different social and cultural contexts. Some reservations about translingualism still need to be accounted for and solved due to the absence of substantial empirical evidence. It is important for those working on translingualism to keep this in mind as they continue to refine and elaborate on the inquiry. Nonetheless, it is worth noting the potential benefits that translingualism may offer. To fully realize these possibilities, expanding the domain of empirical evidence should continue. Scholars and researchers should provide both specific examples and theoretical concepts to guide further inquiry into translingualism. Exploring the advantages and feasibility of a translingual pedagogy in different contexts and for different purposes can lead to better understanding. Further investigation is necessary to develop specific pedagogical methods and strategies and determine their empirical adequacy.

Language is a social construct intertwined with complex social, ideological, and personal factors. Not only educators but also students should critically engage with the ideological baggage long entrenched in pedagogy. In effect, embracing translingualism can help us raise critical awareness of the subtle ideological workings and challenge dominant ideologies and discourse in a meaningful way. Although such criticism should be taken seriously to challenge racially color-blind multilingualism (Kubota 2016), the substantive affordances offered by translingualism should not be dismissed too readily, as the translingual momentum may push further a critical move to destabilize the status quo of monolingual hegemony.

References

- Atkinson, D., D. Crusan., P. K. Matsuda., C. Ortmeier-Hooper., T. Ruecker., S. Simpson et al. 2015. Clarifying the relationship between L2 writing and translingual writing: An open letter to writing studies editors and organization leaders. *College English* 77(4), 383-386.
- Bakhtin, M. M. 1981. *The dialogic imagination: Four essays by M. M. Bakhtin*. (C. Emerson & M. Holquist, Trans), edited by M. Holquist. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Blackledge, A. and A. Creese. 2017. Translanguaging and the body. *International Journal of Multilingualism* 14(3), 250-268.
- Blommaert, J. 2010. *The Sociolinguistics of Globalization*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Brooks, E. 2021. Translanguaging and the shifting sands of language education. *ELT Journal* 76(1), 129-146.
- Canagarajah, S. 2011. Translanguaging in the classroom: Emerging issues for research and pedagogy. *Applied Linguistics Review* 2, 1-28.
- Canagarajah, S. 2013. *Translingual Practice: Global Englishes and Cosmopolitan Relations*. London: Taylor & Francis.
- Canagarajah, S. 2021. Challenges in decolonizing linguistics: The politics of enregisterment and the divergent uptakes of translingualism. *Educational Linguistics* 1(1), 25-55.
- Canagarajah, S. and S. Dovchin. 2019. The everyday politics of translingualism as a resistant practice. *International Journal of Multilingualism* 16(3), 1-18.
- Canagarajah, S. and Y. Matsumoto. 2016. Negotiating voice in translingual literacies: From literacy regimes to contact zones. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* 38(5), 390-406.
- Cenoz, J. and D. Gorter. 2020. Teaching English through pedagogical translanguaging. *World Englishes* 39(2), 300-311.
- Chang, S-Y. 2019. Beyond the English Box: Constructing and communicating knowledge through translingual practices in the higher education classroom. *English Teaching & Learning* 43, 23-40.

- Chen, Y., P. Zhang and L. Huan. 2022. Translanguaging/trans-semiotizing in teacher-learner interactions on social media: Making learner agency visible and achievable. *System* 104, 102686.
- Cinaglia, C. and P. I. De Costa. 2022. Cultivating critical translingual awareness: Challenges and possibilities for teachers and teacher educators. *RELC Journal* 53(2), 452-459.
- Coronel-Molina, S. M. and B. L. Samuelson. 2017. Language contact and translingual literacies. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* 38(5), 379-389.
- David, S. S., M. B. Pacheco and R. T. Jiménez. 2019. Designing translingual pedagogies: Exploring pedagogical translation through a classroom teaching experiment. *Cognition and Instruction* 37(2), 252-275.
- Dovchin, S. and S. Dryden. 2021. Translingual discrimination: Skilled transnational migrants in the labour market of Australia. *Applied Linguistics* 43(2), 365-388.
- Duarte, J. 2020. Translanguaging in the context of mainstream multilingual education. *International Journal of Multilingualism* 17(2), 232-247.
- Erwin, E. J., M. J. Brotherson and J. A. Summers. 2011. Understanding qualitative metasynthesis: Issues and opportunities in early childhood intervention research. *Journal of Early Intervention* 33(3), 186-200.
- Fall, M. S. B. 2019. A layered account of translingual invisible tongues: Sensory and multimodal narratives from the English 101 to the Ph.D. Classroom. *Teacher Education Quarterly* 46(3), 10-33.
- Fraiberg, S. 2018. From activity to mobility systems: Tracing multilingual literacies on the move. In X. You, ed., *Transnational Writing Education: Theory, History, and Practice*, 156-169. New York, NY: Routledge.
- García, O. and Li Wei. 2014. *Translanguaging: Language, Bilingualism and Education*. New York, NY: Palgrave MacMillan.
- Gevers, J. 2018. Translingualism revisited: Language difference and hybridity in L2 writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing* 40, 73-83.
- Gilyard, K. 2016. The rhetoric of translingualism. *College English* 78(3), 284-289.
- Gonzales, L. 2015. Multimodality, translingualism, and rhetorical genre studies. In S. Park., B. Bailie., R. Garcia., A. Licona., K. Navickas and D. Blakesley, eds., *Best of the Journals in Rhetoric and Composition 2015-2016*, 85-120. SC: Parlor Press.
- Hawkins, M. R. 2018. Transmodalities and transnational encounters: Fostering critical cosmopolitan relations. *Applied Linguistics* 39 (1), 55-77.
- Hornberger, N. H. 2005. Opening and filling up implementational and ideological spaces in heritage language education. *The Modern Language Journal* 89(4), 605-609.
- Horner, B., S. NeCamp and C. Donahue. 2011. Toward a multilingual composition scholarship: From English Only to a translingual norm. *College Composition and Communication* 63(2), 269-300.
- Kato, R. and Y. Kumagai. 2020. Translingual practices in a 'Monolingual' society: Discourses, learners' subjectivities and language choices. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism* 25(2), 1681-1696.
- Kaufhold, K. 2018. Creating translanguaging spaces in students' academic writing practices. *Linguistics and Education* 45, 1-9.
- Kellman, S. G. 2019. Literary translingualism: What and why? *Polylinguality and Transcultural Practices* 16(3), 337-346.
- Ki, H. J., Y-J. Lee. and Y. Li. 2022. Content learning through languaging: Translingual practices in a graduate-level teacher preparation EMI course in South Korea. *International Journal of Learning, Teaching and Educational Research* 21(3), 379-395.
- Kim, J. 2017. Translingual identities of international graduate students and monoglossic language ideologies in a

- U.S. university ESL classroom. *Korean Journal of Applied Linguistics* 33(3), 3-31.
- Kim, J. 2022. Bifurcated language policy and practices: English Only vs. De facto translingual practices in English-medium instruction classrooms at a Korean university. *Korean Journal of English Language and Linguistics* 22, 619-636.
- Kiramba, L. K. 2016. Translanguaging in the writing of emergent multilinguals. *International Multilingual Research Journal* 11 (2), 115-130.
- Kubota, R. 2016. The multi/plural turn, postcolonial theory, and neoliberal multiculturalism: Complicities and implications for applied linguistics. *Applied Linguistics* 37(4), 474-494.
- Kuteeva, M. 2020. Revisiting the 'E' in EMI: students' perceptions of standard English, lingua franca and translingual practices. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism* 23(3), 287-300.
- Lee, E. and S. Canagarajah. 2018. The connection between transcultural dispositions and translingual practices in academic writing. *Journal of Multicultural Discourses* 14(1), 14-28.
- Lewis, G., B. L. Jones and C. F. Baker. 2012. Translanguaging: Origins and development from school to street and beyond. *Educational Research and Evaluation* 18, 641-654.
- Li Wei and O. García. 2022. Not a first language but one repertoire: Translanguaging as a decolonizing project. *RELC Journal* 53(2), 313-324.
- Major, C. and M. Savin-Baden. 2010. *An Introduction to Qualitative Research Synthesis: Managing the Information Explosion in Social Science Research*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Martín, C. S., L. Hirsu, L. Gonzales and S. P. Alvarez. 2019. Pedagogies of digital composing through a translingual approach. *Computers and Composition* 52, 142-157.
- Martinez, J. C. 2021. Recovering translingualism in precolonial Philippines. *International Journal of Multilingualism* 20(3), 1031-1051.
- Martínez, R. A., M. Hikida and L. Durán. 2015. Unpacking ideologies of linguistic purism: How dual language teachers make sense of everyday Translanguaging. *International Multilingual Research Journal* 9(1), 26-42.
- Matsuda, P. K. 2014. The lure of translingual writing. *PMLA* 129(3), 478-483.
- Medina, A. E. 2022. Translingualism as an insight to develop academic literacy in foreign language in tertiary education: A literature review. *Letras* 93(137), 86-101.
- Mendoza, A. and J. Parba. 2018. Thwarted: Relinquishing educator beliefs to understand translanguaging from learners' point of view. *International Journal of Multilingualism* 16(3), 270-285.
- Milu, E. 2018. Translingualism, Kenyan Hip-Hop and emergent ethnicities: Implications for language theory and pedagogy. *International Multilingual Research Journal* 12(2), 96-108.
- Muguruza, B., J. Cenoz and D. Gorter. 2020. Implementing translanguaging pedagogies in an English medium instruction course. *International Journal of Multilingualism* 20(3), 540-444.
- Ooi, W. Z. and A. A. Aziz. 2021. Translanguaging pedagogy in the ESL classroom: A systematic review. *International Journal of Academic Research in Progressive Education and Development* 10(3), 676-709.
- Otheguy, R., O. García and W. Reid. 2015. Clarifying translanguaging and deconstructing named languages: A perspective from linguistics. *Applied Linguistics Review* 6(3), 281-307.
- Pacheco, M. B. and B. E. Smith. 2015. Across languages, modes, and identities: Bilingual adolescents' multimodal codemeshing in the literacy classroom. *Bilingual Research Journal* 38(3), 292-312.
- Pacheco, M. B., S. M. Daniel., L. C. Pray., and R. T. Jiménez. 2019. Translingual practice, strategic participation, and meaning-making. *Journal of Literacy Research* 51(1), 75-99.
- Pennycook, A. 2020. Translingual entanglement of English. *World Englishes* 39(2), 222-235.

- Popescu-Sandu, O. 2018. Translingualism as dialogism in Romanian-American poetry. *Journal of World Literature* 3, 50-71.
- Prilutskaya, M. 2021. Examining pedagogical translanguaging: A systematic review of the literature. *Languages* 6 (4), 180.
- Romanowski, P. 2020. Perceptions of translanguaging among the students and teachers of EMI classrooms in Poland. *Lenguas Modernas* 55, 151-165.
- Sandelowski, M. and J. Barroso. 2007. *Handbook for synthesizing qualitative research*. New York, NY: Springer.
- Schreiber, B. R. and M. Watson. 2018. Translingualism ≠ code-meshing: A response to Gevers' "Translingualism revisited" (2018). *Journal of Second Language Writing* 42, 94-97.
- Scruggs, T. E., M. A. Mastropieri and K. A. McDuffie. 2007. Co-teaching in inclusive classrooms: A metasynthesis of qualitative research. *Exceptional Children* 73, 392-416.
- Seals, C. A., V. Olsen-Reeder., R. Pine., M. Ash and C. Wallace. 2020. Creating translingual teaching resources based on translanguaging grammar rules and pedagogical practices. *Australian Journal of Applied Linguistics* 3(1), 115-132.
- Spilioti, T. 2019. From transliteration to trans-scripting: Creativity and multilingual writing on the internet. *Discourse, Context & Media* 29, 100294.
- Sun, T-Y. and T-C. Huang. 2018. The reconstruction of positive multicultural environments through translingualism in Taiwan. *Psychology Research* 8(5), 192-203.
- Sun, Y. and G. Lan. 2020. Enactment of a translingual approach to writing. *TESOL Quarterly* 55(2), 398-426.
- Tagg, C. and A. Lyons. 2021. Repertoires on the move: Exploiting technological affordances and contexts in mobile messaging interactions. *International Journal of Multilingualism* 18(2), 244-266.
- Tai, K. W. H. 2021. Translanguaging as inclusive pedagogical practices in English-medium instruction science and mathematics classrooms for linguistically and culturally diverse students. *Research in Science Education* 52, 975-1012.
- Tai, K. W. H. and Li Wei. 2021. Constructing playful talk through translanguaging in English medium instruction mathematics classrooms. *Applied Linguistics* 42(4), 607-640.
- Tannenbaum, M. 2014. "With a tongue forked in two": Translingual Arab writers in Israel. *International Journal of Bilingualism* 18(2), 99-117.
- Thomas, J. and A. Harden. 2008. Methods for the thematic synthesis of qualitative research in systematic reviews. *BMC Medical Research Methodology* 8, 45-55.
- Thomas, W. and W. A. Ahmad. 2018. Obstacles in multilingual/translingual approaches to teaching writing at a "Monolingual" American university. *Proceedings of Innovation in Language Learning 11th Edition 2018*.
- Tomokazu, I. 2021. Translanguaging and English-within-multilingualism in the Japanese EMI context. In W. Tsou and W. Baker, eds., *English-medium instruction translanguaging practices in Asia: Theories, frameworks and implementation in higher education*, 39-57. Cham: Springer Singapore.
- Vallejo, C. and M. Dooly. 2020. Plurilingualism and translanguaging: Emergent approaches and shared concerns. Introduction to the special issue. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism* 23(1), 1-16.
- Velasco, P. and O. García. 2014. Translanguaging and the writing of bilingual learners. *Bilingual Research Journal: The Journal of the National Association for Bilingual Education* 37(1), 6-23.
- Walsh, D. and S. Downe. 2005. Meta-synthesis method for qualitative research: A literature review. *Journal of Advanced Nursing* 50, 204-211.
- Wang, Z. 2018. Rethinking translingual as a transdisciplinary rhetoric: Broadening the dialogic space. *Composition*

- Forum* 40. Association of Teachers of Advanced Composition.
- Williams, C. 1994. *Arfarniad o ddulliau dysgu ac addysgu yng nghydestun addysg uwchradd ddwyieithog [An evaluation of teaching and learning methods in the context of bilingual secondary education]*. Doctoral dissertation, University of Wales, Bangor, UK.
- Williams, H. T. 2020. Translingualism as creative revolt: Rewriting dominant narratives of translingual literature *Forum* 30, 1-12.
- Yigitbilek, D. and İ. G. Yazici. 2018. Translingual Approach to Teaching Writing and Corrective Feedback. *International Journal of Media Culture and Literature Year* 4(1), 67-78.
- Zhang-Wu, Q. 2022. 'Keeping home languages out of the classroom': Multilingual international students' perceptions of translingualism in an online college composition class. *Journal of Multilingual Theories and Practices* 3(1), 146-168.
- Zhou, X., C. Li and X. Gao. 2021. Towards a sustainable classroom ecology: Translanguaging in English as a medium of instruction (EMI) in a finance course at an international school in Shanghai. *Sustainability*. 13(19), 10719.
- Zimmer, L. 2006. Qualitative meta-synthesis: A question of dialoguing with texts. *Journal of Advanced Nursing* 53, 311-318.
- Zucca, C. 2022. The Origins of translingualism: From classical to contemporary literatures in contact. *Journal of Comparative Literature and Aesthetics* 45(2), 48-61.

Examples in: English

Applicable Languages: English

Applicable Level: Tertiary