

Translanguaging as EFL Teaching Method

Lela Bolkvadze

Tbilisi State University, Tbilisi, Georgia

Email: bolkvadze.lela@yahoo.com

How to cite this paper: Bolkvadze, L. (2023). Translanguaging as EFL Teaching Method. *Creative Education*, 14, 270-287. <https://doi.org/10.4236/ce.2023.142019>

Received: November 15, 2022

Accepted: February 12, 2023

Published: February 15, 2023

Copyright © 2023 by author(s) and Scientific Research Publishing Inc. This work is licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution International License (CC BY 4.0).

<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>



Open Access

Abstract

There has been a heated debate about which method of the two, monolingual or bilingual, is more effective in ESL classrooms. As societal demands are shifting upon learning foreign languages, new approaches to second language teaching are rejecting the monolingual norm and long-standing views about acquiring L2 are challenged. The article offers an overview of the literature on this issue and this overview serves as the basis for an updated framework that indicates necessary areas of change in conceptualization from monolingual to bilingual norm. It can help bring new light onto effective uses of linguistic resources in foreign language teaching, which may lead to the speeding up of the L2 acquiring process. The article also discusses the difference between code-switching and translanguaging and concludes that the two terms cannot be perceived as one and the same. The article suggests that teachers in English language classrooms should be taught ways to incorporate L1 in teaching L2 and offer intentional translanguaging pedagogies to their learners.

Keywords

Translanguaging, Code-Switching, Code-Mixing, Translation, Bilingual, Monolingual

1. Introduction

Due to the internationalization of the English language, there is an increasing demand for even higher standard English classes worldwide and respectively, there is a growing demand for more effective approaches to teaching. According to [Jeremy Harmer \(2013\)](#), for instance, the users of the English language have long outnumbered native speakers and although estimates vary, the ratio is 1:4 and this gap is widening all the time. In his book “The Practice of English Language Teaching” he says: “In a few days I will be going to a large English teachers’ conference in USA which has the title “Tides and Change”. A couple of weeks after that it’s Poland and a weekend called “New Challenges for Language

Teaching and Learning in the Changing World”; and then there’s a “changes” conference somewhere else, and then it’s off to another country for a conference on... changes and how to deal with them! And as the year goes on and who knows, through into the next year and the years after that, there will continue to be meetings, seminars and articles about how to deal with the pace of newness and innovation in a world where increasingly sophisticated technology is only one manifestation of the way things which just keep on moving and developing” (Harmer, 2013). Effective English language skills have become vital for the workforce that forms the basis of social, educational and economic development (Burns & Richards, 2009). A good command of the English language has the decisive role in improving individuals’ economic status and is the key to success and prosperity.

Have you as an educator ever found yourself thinking: we do have good rapport but are they actually learning? Something is missing... I thought I was a good teacher... If thoughts like that occurred to you, you should know that teaching is hard if you really care.

The situation in which the academic community is now in the field of teaching foreign languages is the most interesting from a historical point of view, as language teaching has been characterized by frequent changes and all the experience that has been accumulated in this direction has acquired the appearance of a kind of chaos. Globalization has become one of the reasons for a new understanding of language teaching where the goal has moved to helping students acquire L2 more rapidly due to increasingly equal importance of main profession and L2 (most often, English). The variety of approaches that have been formed particularly in the last decades is impressive, and it must be said that each of them fulfilled its purpose to some extent, influenced both the learning process itself and each other’s development, and thus offered interesting variations to students and teachers, but the major trends that these methods relied on were of two types: monolingual and bilingual.

Different answers have historically been given to this question: sometimes by admitting the importance of using L1 in the classroom, other times by simply banning it and by denying the fact that learners’ L1 might have a role at all and even by arguing that any role L1 might have is detrimental and must be avoided.

Despite the fact that the monolingual methods of teaching the English language have been questioned over the past two decades (Burns, 2009; Canagarajah, 2005; Holliday, 1994), educational institutions still continue to set policies that impose those methods.

The main aim of this article is to present an updated framework for using Translanguaging as an EFL teaching method and with that in mind, provides different sources of data and reviews them to suggest convincing arguments to formulate translanguaging pedagogies as a highly efficient method.

Theories of Translanguaging see languages not just as a set of rules and structures but as means for constructing meaning between individuals (Garcia & Wei, 2014; Gort, 2015). As reported by Canagarajah (2012a), Translanguaging is the

communicative practices associated with shuttling between languages (L1 and L2) within interaction to negotiate meaning and that an individual's languages are one holistic language system that the individual use to communicate strategically (Martinez, 2013).

2. Monolingual vs. Bilingual Approach

It's hard to decide which is better because there are arguments on both sides. Practical needs and new requirements for learning foreign languages generate the importance of taking the ultimate decision on identifying the best between them. Positions in favor of the bilingual approach are significantly strengthened by the advent of translanguaging, and the previously dominating attitude about the unconditional superiority of the monolingual approach is again diluted. This would not be possible if it were not for the solid interdisciplinary arguments that underpin the bilingual and translanguaging approach. On the other hand, any form of using the native language in the lesson is immediately seen as a threat to the learning process, as a lack of foreign language communication and is equated without judgment with the grammar-translation method, but this is a false effect, because the use of students' L1 can have a form in teaching that will be completely different from the principles of the grammar-translation method, which is almost guaranteed to be fulfilled with translanguaging approach, which can be completely based on the principles of communicative methods and might pave the way to new perspectives.

So this seeming problem can easily be solved by considering the potential of the methodology based on translanguaging, but the general objective is to decide which approach should be preferred in teaching foreign languages in order to maximize communicative potential, monolingual or bilingual. Advantage means both the quality and the time that will be spent on achieving the learning goals.

There are two types of systems for acquiring foreign languages, inner layer which is subconscious and is called language acquisition and outer layer that implies language learning, of which subconscious acquisition appears to be much more important for flawless linguistic performance.

Empirical studies of L2 mistakes made by students proved that the mistakes are not necessarily traceable to the structure of L1, but are common to students of different linguistic backgrounds (Richards, 1971). Also it is widely known that teachers do the code-switching with various reasons, be it students' lack of terminology to promote a more thorough understanding of content, as a medium of instruction, just to make a joke to avoid boredom or improve rapport or save time and etc. but informally, all these moments fall under the umbrella of exceptions and never intentionally guide students to use their L1 so that alternating fluently between L1 and L2 becomes a norm and lexical agility increased. Using L1 is considered detrimental despite all those moments that occur at specific points and teachers say no to incorporating L1 purposefully into language classrooms because of its close association with grammar-translation method. A shift

in mentality is something that is needed to see purposeful use of both languages is worth of discussing, that purposeful use of both languages may create meaningful experiences that promote better acquisition of L2, that shuttling between languages to co-construct meaning may mean more L2 in students' minds, not less.

3. L1—Mental Bridge

What draws attention is the fact that the influence of mother tongue is traceable in every method based on monolingual approach, as a person constantly uses L1 when thinking, thinks through language, translates the message at least subconsciously into L1 and only afterwards the task is accepted, the reaction shown. And the question is: since the translation already takes part in the process of perception, as it naturally occurred, is it not advisable to give the learner access to L1 in order to reduce the time of perception to establish a connection between two languages and later when automatization is generated remove the scaffolding of L1 and give way to fluent use of L2?

Observations show that methods are often chosen by a large number of teachers without judgement based on its popularity. Not everyone experiences a sudden change of perspective but teachers do have opportunity to discover many significant details, what actually works and how it works that can contribute to the final solution of the task, leave an indelible mark on the question of obvious importance.

We construct our views by interpreting the real world on the basis of our experiences with it. In fact, the word “old” derives from an Indo-European root that means “to nourish”. It is almost unanimously recognized that human beings' perceptions are not an accurate reflection of reality, but are to some extent determined by their internal stimuli and these differences are inextricably linked to past experiences. So, the information received by a person undergoes modification and only afterwards is stored in memory. It is similar to reality but not in an exact way because people process information based on their past. “Memory is the means by which we draw on our past experiences in order to use this information in the present” (Sternberg, 1999).

Jim Scrivener points out that “new learning is constructed over the foundations of our own earlier learning. We make use of whatever knowledge and experience, we already have in order to help us learn and understand new things” (Scrivener, 2002: p. 21). And what is “past” for a language learner? Is it not L1?

The issue of knowledge acquisition has been studied by researchers of different fields with various interpretations but what they do have in common is a clearly expressed idea that all manner of new knowledge is based on the old. Psychologist Ausubel (1968, VI) states: “If I had to reduce all of educational psychology to just one principle, I would say this: the most important single factor influencing learning is what the learner already knows: ascertain this and teach him accordingly” and fundamental questions are raised when the old is

not taken into account when it comes to acquisition of foreign languages. Is it possible to build something new and of quality if the foundations are completely destroyed?

If we look at speaking activities in foreign language classrooms, we often find them largely flawed and prone to ineffectiveness, encountering a number of recurring problems, without the active involvement of the teacher. The reason seems to be unclear at first glance but maybe the limitation of thought formation is at work here, which is triggered by the limitation of L1. Maybe that is the genuine reason that hinders the achievement of desired learning outcomes. “If students’ prior knowledge is encoded in their L1, then their L1 is inevitably implicated in the learning of L2” (Cummins, 2008: p. 67).

Regarding prior knowledge, cognitive and psycholinguistic approaches have brought a new understanding of language acquisition, according to which the importance of using learners’ L1 as prior knowledge that may support or scaffold the learning process is highlighted, which tend to change the views on the issue (Bransford, Brown, & Cocking, 2000; Brooks-Lewis, 2009; Cummins, 2007, 2008; Hall & Cook, 2012).

4. Translanguaging—Unleashing Possibilities

Any manifestation of the use of the native language in ESL classrooms is immediately seen as a lack of L2 by many educators, but in practice it doesn’t work like that. If we look at speaking activities that involves free expression of thoughts in pairs or in groups, we see that they are largely flawed and cannot develop without the active involvement of the teacher. The reason is unclear at first glance, as the relevant lexical material was well processed at a pre-teach stage, the knowledge was even tested by various activities, but the process of free thought formation still faces an obstacle. This is probably because before free communication free thinking is hindered by the banning of the mother tongue in the classroom. For example, according to different data if a person knows about three hundred words, he is able to operate freely in the target language, though not everyone is able to do this. One of the reasons seems to be the lack of information about their personal linguistic repertoire, which every person has and even in group work leaves each learner as an individual. Otherwise, they will not benefit from the learning process. And if learners’ L1 becomes a part of the lesson in a well-planned, reasonable way, then the personal linguistic repertoire is easily recognisable and learners’ start to see the classroom as a special place tailored to their needs which support their motivation.

Phillipson (1992) singled out 5 factors that are completely prevalent in foreign language teaching around the world, and especially discourage teachers from thinking about reintroducing a bilingual approach to classrooms:

- 1) The English language is best studied with a monolingual approach.
- 2) The best teacher is the one for whom this foreign language or target language is his mother tongue.

- 3) The earlier you learn a foreign language, the better the result.
- 4) The more foreign language material, the better the results.
- 5) The quality of teaching a foreign language will be reduced if the native language is used in the teaching, even for better clarification of instructions.

However, the opposite is shown by the empirical material which is obtained from daily practice and contributes to the perception of using L1 as an effective way of acquiring L2 to be, not based on just logical but dry theoretical reasoning.

Cook (2001: p. 405) says that the teachers who, out of necessity, use their mother tongue in teaching L2 consider it a disadvantage and this indicates how deeply ingrained the idea is that monolingual education is the only correct approach and any manifestation of the use of translation is understood as a return to the past and the grammar-translation method. Although the use of translation for educational purposes has always been active throughout the centuries, and therefore, this experience cannot be ignored, the negative attitude towards it took root in such a way that it gave rise to a kind of radical thinking. Communicative method, task-based teaching, lexical approach and other traditional methods are completely based on monolingual teaching approach on the pretext that, especially in heterogeneous linguistic environment, the only opportunity of foreign language use is in the classroom. It seems logical, but only at first glance, as psycholinguistic factors need to be taken into account.

Resistance to the inclusion of mother tongue in teaching L2 is generated by three reasons:

- 1) A well-established trend of using a monolingual approach (and because of this, careful revision is no longer considered necessary).
- 2) Because of the associations with the grammar-translation method (and this method is associated with all types of activities where the native language is involved).
- 3) Teachers are often reluctant to express their views honestly and openly for various reasons, including fear of losing their reputation, fear of making an unfavorable impression on an employer, and more. In short, it can be described as a lack of professional courage.

What seems reasonable to be done, learners should be given the right to use languages more freely in classroom work, which would make them feel free to interact with languages and would not impose artificial boundaries.

Translanguaging has become a popular concept in applied linguistics and it was first introduced in Welsh, to refer to a pedagogy that implied the use of L1 to promote the acquisition of L2 (Williams, 1994). Considering what is already discussed, it seems particularly interesting to explore the potential advantages of translanguaging for pedagogic practice. These advantages were first introduced by Williams (1994) based on his theory of translanguaging and later discovered and analyzed in depth by other researchers such as Baker (2001), Garcia (2009a) etc. Cen Williams argued that translanguaging has four main advantages: It promotes a more thorough understanding of the subject, helps the development of competence in the weaker language that is the target language, it establishes

home-school connections and this way generates new experience and it makes the communication possible between proficient speakers and early learners (Baker, 2001; Garcia, 2009a; Lewis et al., 2012a). Baker (2001) also explored potential advantages of translanguaging and argued that L1 can be associated with Vygotsky's idea of "zone of proximal development" where it is meant that learning development is based on pre-existing knowledge. Echoing this Baker (2001) argued that the processing for meaning when learners want to write an essay can be successful if the content is fully understood. This can be achieved if learners read or discuss a topic in L1 and then do the writing part in L2 or the other way round as it will ensure that the topic has been practiced and internalized. The use of both linguistic varieties in the classroom can be beneficial but if it is used in a structural and developmental way (Baker, 2001).

Building from Garcia (2009a) and Canagarajah (2012a), translanguaging should be understood as the communicative practices related to shuttling between languages to negotiate meaning. But how these resources are used for interaction relies on different factors, such as linguistic proficiencies of speakers, the aim and the context of interaction. Translanguaging pedagogy helps them use the full range of linguistic resources that makes the learning process dynamic and meaningful. Translanguaging pedagogy aims at encouraging learners to realise their full mental potential and promotes a more thorough understanding of content. It enables them to use the whole knowledge, express their whole selves and delve into their experiences more deeply.

Garcia (2009b) moved beyond Williams' ideas on translanguaging and argued that even if a structured framework is designed by teachers, learners still use their L1 flexibly and often secretly with their peers. Translanguaging can be an especially successful method if teachers and learners collaborate, when learning is learner-centered and uses their prior experiences, if teaching incorporates multilingual methods (Garcia, 2009b).

It seems to be enticing as teachers and researchers are trying to find new ways to enrich teaching methods, to explore new approaches in which students' heritage languages can support students' academic, linguistic and social development (Cummins, 2005) despite "bracketing off" English in instruction (Garcia, 2009b), translanguaging pedagogies give chance to students to draw on all manner of linguistic resources to make meaning (Garcia & Kleifgen, 2010). Translanguaging pedagogies convert learners' bilingualism and multilingualism as resources for learning rather than see it as detrimental. "Translanguaging is an approach to the use of language, bilingualism and the education of bilinguals that considers the language practices of bilinguals not as two autonomous systems as has been traditionally the case, but as one linguistic repertoire with features that have been socially constructed as belonging to two separate languages" (Garcia, 2009a: p. 2).

Lucas and Katz's (1994) found that learners' L1 can play an important role in ESL classrooms, be it facilitating group work or more thorough understanding of content. Garcia and Kleifgen go further (Garcia & Kleifgen, 2010), arguing

that using learners' L1 in the classroom is vital, as translanguaging is the way they make sense of their bilingual worlds.

According to Garcia (2009a) and Canagarajah (2012a), translanguaging is the communicative practices associated with shuttling between languages to negotiate meaning. Theories of translanguaging suggest that learners' multiple languages are part of one holistic language system that is used strategically in various contexts (Garcia, 2009b; Martinez, 2013). Echoing Cook's (2002) notion that the L1 is always present in the L2 mind, resources are obtained from this holistic system (Garcia & Kleifgen, 2010).

Martin-Beltran (2014) revealed the possibility for language development in L1 and L2 when pairs of English-dominant and Spanish-dominant learners took part in peer teaching. She discovered learners' co-constructed linguistic competence through discussions in two languages and that learners acquired their knowledge by acting as "language ambassadors" to teach one another about grammar and lexis (Moll, Neff, & Gonzalez, 1992). Martin-Beltran (2014) concludes that together with improving metalinguistic awareness, the class got better at problem solving and language learning, alongside new opportunities appeared to include language minority students in classroom discourses (p.40).

Jimenez and colleagues' (2015) work with middle school learners explores how translation can foster their reading skills and more precisely, their overall language competence and translating strategies. The researchers found that by translating English texts into Spanish, students collaboratively constructed meanings at the word, sentence and text levels while acquiring deeper understandings about the forms and functions of language.

Cummins (1991) argues that if learners' L1 is developed, a foundation is laid not only for L1 literacy but also for L2 acquisition. And according to Genesee, teachers have the opportunity to begin students' process of bilingual competence (Genesee, 2002) and this competence or skill, to strategically use resources in multiple languages for communicative purposes, grows if learners are provided with opportunities to develop this competence (Reyes, 2012).

L1 and L2 continuity also effects biliteracy development. Development in L1 is closely related to the progress in L2 (Hornberger, 1989). Studies tried to investigate "to what extent knowledge of one language transfers to the other (and aids learning) and to what extent knowledge of the one interferes with the other (and impedes learning)" (Hornberger, 1989: p. 282). Findings suggest that interference from the native language to the target language results in learning by applying knowledge of L1 to L2, L2 learning can significantly be enhanced if L1 is continuously developing good learning foundations (Hornberger, 1989). It should be mentioned that "interference" is implied as a positive transfer of linguistic competence and not negative.

Also Hornberger and Link (2012) argued that using literacy practices in L1 can help the acquisition of literacy in L2 together with L1 and according to Garcia (2009b), pedagogy that uses funds of knowledge from L1, community, parents' experiences can turn out to be highly effective to learners with different

backgrounds. [Martin-Jones & Jones \(2000\)](#) argued that speaking around a text and specifically using all available linguistic resources to speak around monolingual texts can benefit learning. [Martin-Jones & Jones \(2000\)](#) also introduced the term multilingual literacies to refer to the communicative repertoires used for different purposes where speakers use linguistic codes of different languages ([Garcia, 2009b](#)).

[Garcia et al. \(2012: p. 52\)](#) emphasized that translanguaging refers not just to shuttling between languages as code-switching but to “the use of complex discursive practices that cannot be easily assigned to one or another code”. Learners combine their bilingual practices to acquire knowledge and this way enhances their learning by drawing on all of their available linguistic repertoire ([Garcia et al., 2012](#)). [Baker \(2011: p. 288\)](#) added to this definition by describing translanguaging as being “the process of meaning-making, shaping experiences, gaining understanding and knowledge through the use of two languages”.

Bilinguals translanguage within their bilingual communities to construct meaning and not leave the members out in discussions ([Garcia, 2009b](#)). That means this practice makes the communication easier and acts as a mediator for the acquisition of meaning and understanding their bilingual worlds. Translanguaging in the classroom gives learners opportunity to draw on all of their linguistic resources to maximize their potential and achieve educational progress ([Lewis et al., 2012a](#)). No one will use the framework in exactly the same way, but it will direct the focus to more beneficial ways of acquiring L2. Cross linguistic transfer enables both languages to be used in a dynamic linguistic continuum improving the functionality of mental processing in meaning-making, communication process, reading and writing and as a result, learning ([Lewis et al., 2012b](#)). It should be noted that languaging is a holistic process through which knowledge, meaning and communication is created and experience is constructed through language ([Lewis et al., 2012a](#)).

Building from [Cenoz and Gorter \(2020, 2022\)](#), although translanguaging as a pedagogical tool originated from Wales, it is still one of its variants and there can be many more, taking into account that from translanguaging perspective the boundaries between languages are soft and it incorporates the entire linguistic repertoire in the teaching process. In sum, “Pedagogical translanguaging refers to the use of different planned strategies based on activating students’ resources from their whole linguistic repertoire” ([Cenoz & Gorter, 2022](#)).

But how to activate those resources? That is the question that requires set borders for translanguaging as an EFL method.

Firstly, it is really important to determine the exact place of L1 in L2 classroom as using L1 carries an ambivalent meaning in such a context. Uncontrolled use of L1 can harm learners’ interests and make their efforts unsuccessful. In terms of this, three areas can be identified for inclusion of L1 in L2 teaching:

- 1) Where learners are given opportunity to reveal their full linguistic repertoire (eliciting stage, discussions etc.).

2) Where there is comparison of language forms to determine the correlation between them.

3) Where it is absolutely necessary to clarify the meaning.

Unsystematic use of L1 in L2 teaching is harmful and not desirable.

When reviewing literature (including methodology, applied linguistics, psycholinguistics and psychology) and empirical data related to this issue, it lays the foundation for new assumptions to position communicative method, audio-lingual method, lexical approach, project-based learning and dogme as the base for an updated framework of translanguaging as a pedagogical tool.

All of the methods mentioned above contributed to success but in some degree and that was the reason for the constant search for new ones, although flawless details must be preserved.

Translanguaging pedagogy focuses on fostering critical thinking, promotes the growth of relevant skills through using both languages in a way which exposes learners to revealing their full linguistic repertoire and not being constricted by hazy and imperfect knowledge of L2.

The development of critical thinking is one of the fundamental goals of education in the modern world and using translanguaging as an EFL method ensures accomplishment of such goals, arouses a sense of fulfilment which is directly related to self-evaluation. It also allows teachers to show differentiated approaches to individuals which is much needed especially in the groups where language proficiency is sharply unequal.

To sum up, purposeful use of L1 can contribute to L2 and maximize understanding, also improve the linguistic competence in both languages.

5. Code-Switching, Code-Mixing vs. Translanguaging

Some researchers relate translanguaging, code-switching and code-mixing to one another and even argue that they are one and the same. [Lin \(1997: p. 273\)](#) referred to code-switching as “the alternating use of more than one linguistic code in the classroom by any of the classroom participants”. Some researchers distinguish code-switching from code-mixing by asserting that code-switching is characterized as an ability to use the language based on its recognizable linguistic characteristics while code-mixing refers to mixing linguistic codes because the speaker is not aware of the difference between them ([Garcia, 2009b](#)).

Even though code-switching is considered by some as a mark of insufficient knowledge of both languages, it has been discovered that code-switching is an advanced linguistic skill and characterizes also proficient bilinguals ([Garcia, 2009b](#)).

[Martin-Jones & Heller \(1996\)](#) state that code-switching is a way of scaffolding the construction of knowledge by using the full linguistic repertoire of both languages when learning. [Lin and Arthur \(2005\)](#) and [Arthur and Martin \(2006\)](#) emphasize the pedagogic potentials of code-switching maximizing the inclusion, participation and deepening understandings of students in the learning

processes, but teachers often do not understand the pedagogic value of code-switching because of the constraints from educational institutions that create distance between students' linguistic resources in L1 and the educational settings (Martin-Jones & Heller, 1996).

Li Wei (1997) argued that there is an urgent need for expanding knowledge regarding code-switching in contexts such as the classroom. Arthur's and Martin's research (Arthur & Martin, 2006) showed that code-switching deepened students' understanding and offered greater opportunities of participation in classroom activities to especially passive students and helped them achieve the learning goals.

Recent discussions show conflicting views on especially these two terms: code-switching and translanguaging, which describe the practice of using more than one language in bilingual or multilingual contexts. Some researchers argue that translanguaging is based on a different conceptualization of the bilingual mind from code-switching and respectively, the two terms cannot be conflicted (Otheguy, Garcia, & Reid, 2015, 2019). Lewis et al. (2012a; 2012b) pointed out that translanguaging in the classroom is historically related to code-switching and arguments also abound that translanguaging is a series of practices that include code-switching (Garcia, 2009a; Lewis, Jones, & Baker, 2012a, Mazak, 2017; Sayer, 2013) or some of the researchers say that translanguaging challenges the notion of "code" and is not intended to replace the term code-switching (Wei, 2018). Some of them focus on the theoretical differences (Heugh, 2015) or overlap (Baker & Wright, 2017) of these two terms. The main risk in this maze is that if translanguaging is poorly understood, it seems likely it will become a buzzword that confines translanguaging to mere code-switching.

Whereas code-switching started in social settings and later moved to educational settings, translanguaging emerged from classroom research and only afterwards was used for communication outside the classroom (Lewis et al., 2012a). Whereas code-switching looks at language alternation between separate words or phrases, Williams meant translanguaging to practice switches in language use between whole modes of teaching, e.g. giving information in one language and letting learners produce related information in another language (Garcia, 2009a; Lewis et al., 2012b). By enlarging the scope of language alternation beyond the sentence, the alternation between languages and its pedagogical value started to be accepted more holistically (Hornberger & Link, 2012).

Baker (2001) stated that translanguaging is not the same as code-switching since it is a pedagogical practice that helps the natural existence of bilingualism develop without "functional separation". Lewis et al. (2012a) also advocated that code-switching considers linguistic transfer as language separation while translanguaging supports the idea that linguistic resources are flexible and brought together as one like a unified whole and if translanguaging is used as a resource in pedagogy, it then serves as a scaffold (Carstens, 2016; Garcia & Wei, 2015; Gort & Sembiente, 2015).

This modernized view of language use and language learning is the main

component of the conceptual shift from code-switching to translanguaging. Garcia (2009a) pointed out the following: Languages are not compartmentalized in a diglossic situation, but rather they overlap, intersect and interconnect, giving students the chance to “move fluently between their languages in their search for knowledge” (Joseph & Ramani, 2012: p. 30).

Jarvis & Pavlenko (2008) note that intentional transfer can take place not only as “a communicative strategy”, but as well “a learning strategy” by which the learner uses his or her knowledge of one language as a resource for formulating hypotheses about the forms, structures, functions, meanings, rules and patterns of another” (p. 9). Intentional transfer has mostly been discussed as a teaching strategy in the literature (Williams & Hammarberg, 1998, Jessner, 2006).

6. Pedagogical Value of Translation

As for the major component or basis for translanguaging and code-switching, which is translation, for a very long time it was one of the most central tools for teaching foreign languages and has always given rise to a significant number of heated debates within the framework of L2 teaching. It was the dominant practice and the most common technique in the grammar-translation method and ever since the adoption of the communicative approach to language teaching, translation lost its importance almost at once. It was mainly due to fallacious perceptions and interpretations of the new theories, but the situation seems to start being reversed lately.

Despite the fact, that translation is often neglected by English language teachers just because of its close connection with the grammar-translation method, some of the researchers (Whyatt, 2009; Weydt, 2009; O’Muireartaigh, 2009) argue that it is promising to incorporate translation tasks into L2 teaching and that it improves L2 learner proficiency.

Cook (2010), among others, argues that translating should be a major aim and means of language learning. In relation to teaching grammar, Gonzalez (2001) says that translation can help clarify certain complex grammatical points, where it can be especially useful if the targeted structures in L1 and L2 are completely different. Swan (2007: p. 295) stated that the “existence of cross-language equivalents can further substantially reduce teaching need in some areas” and that tasks like translation that help multi-lingual competence develop are useful for language learners. Hedge (2003) also echoed this by saying that when teaching grammar, translation can “clearly be a helpful strategy” (p. 147).

All of these draw on the views that translation should not be kept out of the foreign language teaching process and that its intentional use can facilitate learning. It is not hard to notice that translation processes are naturally at work in the language learners’ mind when operating in L2, be it in the form of sub-conscious translation or on purpose. Such processes can be positively exploited as a pedagogical tool (Kallkvist, 2004, 2008; Laufer & Girsai, 2008) and shed light on dark areas to help learners promote their linguistic competence more easily.

Some of the researchers (Cook, 2010; Witte, Harden, & Harden, 2009; Wid-

dowson, 2003) clearly point out that translation has recently been unfairly rejected in second language teaching and overtly advocate the use of translation for educational purposes. It is not clear why translation is not considered an effective means of achieving communicative goals implied by the communicative approach and why translation is considered against the communicative principles. Echoing this, Vermes (2010: p. 91) points out that “translation is not only structure manipulation; it is primarily a form of communication”. And as such, it necessarily involves interaction and cooperation between people, which makes it a potentially very useful device in foreign language teaching. It is a useful tool to enhance linguistic and communicative competence, which helps learners use the foreign language efficiently and as Cook (2010: p. 100) suggests, enables learners “to move backward forth between L1 and L2”, about which Admiral (1994) argues that L1 and L2 translation is a more efficient practice than L2 and L1 inverse translation.

It should be noted, that translation as an effective and timely tool in L2 classroom is not an easy task at all, as Newmark (1988) argues, it tends to take students to “ten different directions” (pp. 4-5) and to get rid of the grammar-translation method, we should construct a clear theoretical framework for it based on current teaching methodology.

Having taken all the above into account, rather than viewing translation as detrimental for the communicative purposes and considering it conflicting with the fundamental principles of the communicative approach, its incorporation in L2 teaching can be accepted as rewarding and beneficial, enhancing rather than hindering the development of communicative competence.

The above perspective can pave the way to new vision and new framework for creating a breeding ground to develop L2 proficiency more efficiently and the new understanding of translation as a communicative and functional process in teaching L2 can launch a new era in EFL methodology.

These above examples illustrate how negotiating resources is closely linked to learner goals. To conclude, it must be noted that, despite the fact that the learners’ L1 is still not widely considered helpful when teaching or learning, it is advisable to study this question from various perspectives and discover what actually works and how it works to generate a clear framework. Echoing this, the article advocates the idea that L1 does have a positive role in ESL classrooms and that translanguaging as an EFL method has the potential to become the most perfect method of modern times because along with narrow professional goals, it enhances the personal development of learners.

Conflicts of Interest

The author declares no conflicts of interest regarding the publication of this paper.

References

- Arthur, J., & Martin, P. (2006). Accomplishing Lessons in Past Colonial Classrooms; Comparative Perspectives from Botswana and Brunei Darussalam. *Comparative Edu-*

- cation, 42, 177-202. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03050060600628009>
- Ausubel, D. (1968). *Educational Psychology: A Cognitive View*. Rinehart & Winston.
- Baker, C. (2001). *An Introductory Reader to the Writings of Jim Cummins*. Multilingual Matters.
- Baker, C. (2011). *Foundations of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*. Multilingual Matters.
- Baker, C., & Wright, W. E. (2017). *Foundations of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism* (6th ed.). Multilingual Matters. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-02258-1_2
- Bransford, J., Brown, A., & Cocking, R. (2000). *How People Learn: Brain, Mind, Experience and School*. National Academy Press.
- Brooks-Lewis, K. (2009). Adult Learners Perceptions of the Incorporation of Their L1 in Foreign Language Teaching and Learning. *Applied Linguistics*, 30, 216-235. <https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/amn051>
- Burns, A. (2009). Action Research in Second Language Teacher Education. In A. Burns, & J. C. Richards (Eds.), *The Cambridge Guide to Second Language Teacher Education* (pp. 289-297). Cambridge University Press.
- Burns, A., & Richards, J. (Eds.) (2009). *The Cambridge Guide to Second Language Teacher Education*. Cambridge University Press.
- Canagarajah, S. (2005). *Reclaiming the Local in Language Policy and Practice*. Lawrence Erlbaum. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781410611840>
- Canagarajah, S. (2012a). Translanguaging in the Classroom: Emerging Issues for Research and Pedagogy. *Applied Linguistics Review*, 2, 1-28. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110239331.1>
- Canagarajah, S. (2012b). *Translingual Practice: Global Englishes and Cosmopolitan Relations*. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203073889>
- Carstens, A. (2016). Translanguaging as a Vehicle for L2 Acquisition and L1 Development: Students' Perceptions. *Language Matters*, 47, 203-222. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10228195.2016.1153135>
- Cenoz, J., & Gorter, D. (2020). Teaching English through Pedagogical Translanguaging. *World Englishes and Translanguaging*, 39, 300-311. <https://doi.org/10.1111/weng.12462>
- Cenoz, J., & Gorter, D. (2022). Pedagogical Translanguaging and Its Application to Language Classes. *The RELC Journal*, 53, 342-354. <https://doi.org/10.1177/00336882221082751>
- Cook, G. (2010). *Translanguaging in Language Teaching: An Argument for Reassessment*. Oxford University Press.
- Cook, V. (2001). *Second Language Learning and Language Teaching* (3rd ed.). Oxford University Press.
- Cook, V. (2002). *Portraits of the L2 User*. Multilingual Matters. <https://doi.org/10.21832/9781853595851>
- Cummins, J. (1991). Interdependence of First- and Second-Language Proficiency in Bilingual Children. In E. Bialystok (Ed.), *Language Processing in Bilingual Children* (pp. 70-89). Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511620652.006>
- Cummins, J. (2005). A Proposal for Actions: Strategies for Recognizing Heritage Language Competence as a Learning Resource within the Mainstream Classroom, *Modern Language Journal*, 89, 585-592.
- Cummins, J. (2007). Rethinking Monolingual Strategies in Multilingual Classrooms. *Ca-*

- nadian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 10, 221-240.
- Cummins, J. (2008). Teaching for Transfer: Challenging the Two Solitudes Assumption in Bilingual Education. In N. H. Hornberger (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of Language and Education* (pp. 1528-1538). Springer.
- Garcia, O. (2009a). *Bilingual Education in the 21st Century: A Global Perspective*. Wiley/Blackwell.
- Garcia, O. (2009b). Encountering Indigenous Bilingualism. *Journal of Language, Identity and Education*, 8, 376-380. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15348450903305155>
- Garcia, O., & Kleifgen, J. A. (2010). *Educating Emergent Bilinguals: Policies, Programs and Practices for English Language Learners*. Teachers College Press.
- Garcia, O., & Wei, L. (2014). *Translanguaging: Language, Bilingualism and Education*. Palgrave Pivot.
- Garcia, O., & Wei, L. (2015). *Translanguaging: Language, Bilingualism and Education*. Palgrave Macmillan. https://doi.org/10.1057/9781137385765_4
- Garcia, O., Flores, N., & Woodley, H. (2012). Transgressing Monolingualism and Bilingual Dualities: Translanguaging Pedagogies. In A. Yiakoumetti (Ed.), *Harnessing Linguistic Variation to Improve Education* (pp. 45-75). Peter Lang.
- Genesee, F. (2002). *Portrait of the Bilingual Child*. Multilingual Matters. <https://doi.org/10.21832/9781853595851-009>
- Gonzalez, D. M. (2001). Translation in Foreign Language Learning Bridging the Gap. In *The APAC-ELT Convention*.
- Gort, M. (2015). Transforming Literacy Learning and Teaching through Translanguaging and Other Typical Practices Associated with “Doing Being Bilingual”. *International Multilingual Research Journal*, 9, 1-6. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19313152.2014.988030>
- Gort, M., & Sembiente, S. F. (2015). Navigating Hybridized Language Learning Spaces through Translanguaging pedagogy: Dual Language Preschool Teachers’ Language Practices in Support of Emergent Bilingual Children’s Performance of Academic Discourse. *International Multilingual Research Journal*, 9, 7-25. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19313152.2014.981775>
- Hall, G., & Cook, G. (2012). Own-Language Use in Language Teaching and Learning. *Language Teaching*, 45, 271-308. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444812000067>
- Harmer, J. (2013). *The Practice of English Language Teaching*. Pearson Education Limited.
- Hedge, T. (2003). *Teaching and Learning in the Language Classroom*. Oxford University Press.
- Heugh, K. (2015). Epistemologies in Multilingual Education, Translanguaging and Genre. Companions in Conversation with Policy and Practice. *Language and Education*, 29, 280-285. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09500782.2014.994529>
- Holliday, A. (1994). *Appropriate Methodology in Social Context*. Cambridge University Press.
- Hornberger, N. H. (1989). Continua of Biliteracy. *Review of Educational Research*, 59, 271-296. <https://doi.org/10.3102/00346543059003271>
- Hornberger, N. H., & Link, H. (2012). Translanguaging and Transnational Literacies in Multilingual Classrooms: A Biliteracy Lens. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 15, 261-278. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050.2012.658016>
- Jarvis, S., & Paavlenko, A. (2008). *Crosslinguistic Influence in Language and Cognition*. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203935927>

- Jessner, U. (2006). *Linguistic Awareness in Multilinguals: English as a Third Language*. Edinburgh University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9780748626540>
- Jimenez, R. T., David, S., Fagan, K., Risko, V. J., Pacheco, M., Pray, L., & Gonzales, M. (2015). Using Translation to Derive Conceptual Development for Students Becoming Literate in English as an Additional Language. *Research in the Teaching of English, 49*, 248-271.
- Joseph, M., & Ramani, E. (2012). "Glocalization": Going beyond the Dichotomy of Global versus Local through Additive Multilingualism. *International Multilingual Research Journal, 6*, 22-34. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19313152.2012.639246>
- Kallkvist, M. (2004). The Effect of Translation Exercises versus Gap-Exercises on the Learning of Difficult L2 Structures: Preliminary Results of an Empirical Study. In K. Malmkjar (Ed.), *Translation in Undergraduate Degree Programmes* (pp. 173-184). Benjamins. <https://doi.org/10.1075/btl.59.12kal>
- Kallkvist, M. (2008). L1-L2 Translation versus No Translation: A Longitudinal Study of Focus-on-Forms within a Meaning-Focused Curriculum. In L. Ortega, & H. Byrnes (Eds.), *The Longitudinal Study of Advanced L2 Capacities* (pp. 182-202). Routledge.
- Ladmiral, J. (1994). *Traduire: Theoremes de la Traduction*. Gallimard.
- Laufer, B., & Girsai, N. (2008). Form-Focused Instruction in Second Language Vocabulary Learning: A Case for Contrastive Analysis and Translation. *Applied Linguistics, 29*, 694-716. <https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/amn018>
- Lewis, G., Jones, B., & Baker, C. (2012a). Translanguaging: Origins and Development from School to Street and Beyond. *Educational Research and Evaluation, 18*, 641-654. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13803611.2012.718488>
- Lewis, G., Jones, B., & Baker, C. (2012b). Translanguaging: Developing Its Conceptualisation and Contextualisation. *Educational Research and Evaluation, 18*, 655-670. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13803611.2012.718490>
- Lin, A. M. Y. (1997). Translanguaging as Dynamic Activity Flows in CLIL Classrooms. *Journal of Language, Identity & Education, 16*, 228-244. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15348458.2017.1328283>
- Lin, A., & Martin, P. (Eds.) (2005). *Decolonization, Globalization: Language-in-Education Policy and Practice*. Multilingual Matters.
- Lucas, T., & Katz, A. (1994). Reframing the Debate: The Roles of Native Languages in English-Only Programs for Language Minority Students. *TESOL Quarterly, 28*, 537-562. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3587307>
- Martin-Beltran, M. (2014). "What Do You Want to Say?" How Adolescents Use Translanguaging to Expand Learning Opportunities. *International Multilingual Research Journal, 8*, 208-230. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19313152.2014.914372>
- Martinez, R. A. (2013). Reading the World in *Spanglish*: Hybrid Language Practices and Ideological Contestation in a Sixth-Grade English Language Arts Classroom. *Linguistics and Education, 24*, 276-288. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.linged.2013.03.007>
- Martin-Jones, M., & Heller, M. (1996). *Voices of Authority: Education and Linguistic Difference*. Praeger.
- Martin-Jones, M., & Jones, K. (2000). *Multilingual Literacies. Reading and Writing in Different Worlds*. John Benjamins Publishing Company. <https://doi.org/10.1075/swll.10>
- Mazak, C. M. (2017). Introduction: Theorizing Translanguaging Practices in Higher Education. In C. M. Mazak, & K. S. Carroll (Eds.), *Translanguaging in Higher Education: Beyond Monolingual Ideologies* (pp. 1-10). Multilingual Matters.

- <https://doi.org/10.21832/9781783096657-003>
- Moll, L., Neff, D., & Gonzalez, N. (1992). Funds of Knowledge for Teaching: Using a Qualitative Approach to Connect Homes and Classrooms. *Theory into Practice, 31*, 132-141. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00405849209543534>
- Newmark, P. (1988). *A Textbook of Translation*. Prentice Hall.
- O'Muireartaigh, R. (2009). Terminology as an Aid to Enhancing Reading Skills. In A. Witte, Th. Harden, & A. Ramos de Oliveira Harden (Eds.), *Translation in Second Language Learning and Teaching* (pp. 215-226). Peter Lang.
- Otheguy, R., Garcia, O., & Reid, W. (2015). Clarifying Translanguaging and Deconstruction Named Languages: A Perspective from Linguistics. *Applied Linguistics Review, 6*, 281-307. <https://doi.org/10.1515/applirev-2015-0014>
- Otheguy, R., Garcia, O., & Reid, W. (2019). A Translanguaging View of the Linguistic System of Bilinguals. *Applied Linguistics Review, 19*, 625-652. <https://doi.org/10.1515/applirev-2018-0020>
- Phillipson, R. (1992). *Linguistic Imperialism*. Oxford University Press.
- Reyes, I. (2012). Biliteracy among Children and Youths. *Reading Research Quarterly, 47*, 307-327. <https://doi.org/10.1002/rrq.022>
- Richards, J. (1971). Error Analysis and Second Language Strategies. *English Language Teaching, 25*, 115-135.
- Sayer, P. (2013). Translanguaging, TexMex, and Bilingual Pedagogy: Emergent Bilinguals Learning through the Vernacular. *TESOL Quarterly, 47*, 63-88. <https://doi.org/10.1002/tesq.53>
- Scrivener, J. (2002). *Learning Teaching*. Macmillan Education.
- Sternberg, R. J. (1999). *Introduction to Educational Psychology*. Cambridge University Press.
- Swan, M. (2007). Why Is It All Such a Muddle and What Is the Poor Teacher to Do. In M. Pawlak (Ed.), *Exploring Focus on Form in Language Teaching* (pp. 285-289). Special Issue of Studies of Pedagogy and Fine Art, Faculty of Pedagogy and Fine Arts.
- Vermes, A. (2010). Translation in Foreign Language Teaching: A Brief Overview of Pros and Cons. *Eger Journal of English Studies, 10*, 83-93.
- Wei, L. (1997). Banana Split? Variations in Language Choice and Code-Switching Patterns of Two Groups of British-Born Chinese in Tyneside. *Trends in Linguistic Studies and Monographs, 106*, 153-176.
- Wei, L. (2018). Translanguaging as a Practical Theory of Language. *Applied Linguistics, 39*, 9-30. <https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/amx039>
- Weydt, H. (2009). Reading Books with Translations: Getting over the Reading Barrier. In A. Witte, Th. Harden, & A. Ramos de Oliveira Harden (Eds.), *Translation in Second Language Learning and Teaching* (pp. 291-308). Peter Long.
- Whyatt, B. (2009). Translating as a Way of Improving Language Control in the Mind of an L2 Learner. Assets, Requirements and Challenges of Translation Tasks. In A. Witte, Th. Harden, & A. Ramos de Oliveira Harden (Eds.), *Translation in Second Language Learning and Teaching* (pp. 181-202). Peter Lang.
- Widdowson, H. G. (2003). *Defining Issues in English Language Teaching*. Oxford University Press.
- Williams, C. (1994). *An Evaluation of Teaching and Learning Methods in the Context of Secondary Education*. Doctoral Dissertation, University of Wales.

- Williams, S., & Hammarberg, B. (1998). Language Switches in L3 Production: Implications for a Poliglot Speaking Model. *Applied Linguistics, 19*, 295-333. <https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/19.3.295>
- Witte, A., Harden, Th., & Harden, A. R. (2009). *Translation in Second Language Learning and Teaching*. Peter Lang. <https://doi.org/10.3726/978-3-0353-0252-3>