

Teaching English through pedagogical translanguaging

Jasone Cenoz¹ | Durk Gorter²

¹University of the Basque Country, UPV/EHU

²Ikerbasque, University of the Basque Country, UPV/EHU

Correspondence

Jasone Cenoz, Department of Research Methods in Education, Faculty of Education, Philosophy and Anthropology, University of the Basque Country, Donostia-San Sebastian, Spain.
Email: jasone.cenoz@ehu.eus

Funding information

MINECO/FEDER, Grant/Award Number: EDU2015-63967-R; Eusko Jaurlaritz, Grant/Award Number: DREAMIT1225-19

Abstract

Teaching English has traditionally been associated with a monolingual bias and the exclusive use of English in the classroom is highly recommended in different countries. Nowadays English is widely used to teach academic content and this strict separation of languages can be problematic because it prevents students from using resources they have previously acquired in other languages (Cenoz & Gorter, 2015; Kubota, 2018). In this article we discuss 'pedagogical translanguaging' understood as intentional instructional strategies that integrate two or more languages and aim at the development of the multilingual repertoire as well as metalinguistic and language awareness. Pedagogical translanguaging considers learners as emergent multilinguals who can use English and other languages depending on the social context. Their linguistic resources are valued and learners are not seen as deficient users of English but as multilingual speakers.

1 | INTRODUCTION

Translanguaging is a concept that has gained currency in the last years. It reflects the shift from monolingual ideologies in the study of multilingual education to multilingual ideologies and dynamic views of multilingualism. This shift is clearly related to recent developments in the social context which is characterized by the increasing diversity and mobility of the population. Translanguaging is not necessarily linked to the English language or features associated with the English language as world Englishes is but there are some points in common. As Kachru and Nelson (2006, p. 89) explain, when referring to world Englishes, 'language acquisition in multiple languages may involve both functional differentiation and overlap, often manifested through code-switching and mixing.' Translanguaging is considered to be different from code-switching and code-mixing because it is not just a shift between languages but 'the speakers' construction and use of original and complex interrelated discursive practices' (García & Li Wei, 2014, p. 22). Even if there

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

© 2020 The Authors. *World Englishes* published by John Wiley & Sons Ltd

are differences in the concepts, the importance of using resources from different languages (or 'named' languages) and contact between languages is highlighted both by studies in world Englishes and translanguaging. In the case of world Englishes, the main focus is English and the multilingual community using this language while translanguaging can involve other languages instead of English. Translanguaging has focused mainly on education. Both translanguaging and world Englishes can be regarded as 'bottom-up' because they highlight the role of the real multilingual speaker and the way s/he communicates rather than considering the speaker as deficient when evaluated against the yardstick of monolingual standards based on specific varieties of English or other languages.

This paper focuses on translanguaging education and explores some synergies between translanguaging and world Englishes in the school context. One of the languages used in the curriculum in most countries in the world today is English and in this paper we will discuss translanguaging in the context of learning English along with other languages. The aim of this paper is to discuss how multilingual approaches and pedagogical translanguaging can be positive for students to develop their language awareness and to value different home and school languages. Pedagogical translanguaging and its effect on the development of metalinguistic awareness and language learning will also be discussed. The organization of the paper is as follows. In the next section we analyze some of the characteristics of English and multilingualism in the 21st century. Then we focus on the paradigm change that is taking place in multilingual studies with the shift from monolingual to multilingual ideologies. The concepts of the multilingual speaker, the whole linguistic repertoire and the social context will be discussed as related to some world Englishes perspectives. The next sections look at translanguaging and pedagogical translanguaging, which is understood as the use of planned instruction strategies from the learners' repertoire to develop language awareness and metalinguistic awareness. The discussion brings together translanguaging perspectives and world Englishes and outlines the need for future collaboration between the two approaches.

2 | ENGLISH AND MULTILINGUALISM IN THE 21ST CENTURY

There have been other languages of wider communication in the past but the spread of English is wider than that of other languages both geographically and socially. English is not only used in different parts of the world including countries in the Outer Circle and the Expanding Circle but it is increasingly used by larger sectors of the population in many parts of the world. There are other languages such as Spanish, French or Portuguese spoken in former colonies but their use is not comparable to English. When looking at education we can see that nowadays English is taught as a subject in schools all around the world and it is increasingly used as a language of instruction at schools and universities not only in the Outer Circle but also in the Expanding Circle. There can be considerable differences in the level of English language proficiency even if English is the first foreign language in most schools. For example, according to the English First English Proficiency Index for 2018, there are important differences among European Union countries. Sweden, the Netherlands and Denmark get scores that indicate high proficiency while proficiency is only moderate for Spain, France and Italy. Gerritsen, Van Meurs, Planken, and Korzilius (2016) discuss the possibility that the Netherlands could be considered as a country in the Outer Circle because of the extended use of English. However, after applying the criteria and features developed by Kachru (1985) to the Dutch situation, they conclude that the Netherlands belongs to the Expanding Circle even if the level of English is high.

One can talk about English and multilingualism, because English tends to be one of the languages in the multilingual speaker's repertoire and one of the languages used in society. It is difficult to generalize about the effect of English on multilingualism because it depends on the specific context. The strength of English in education can go against multilingualism in some contexts. The prestige of English can result in a declining interest in learning other languages associated with the idea that being proficient in English is enough for global communication. The extensive use of English in higher education in some European countries such as the Nordic countries or the Netherlands has been associated with the problem of domain loss with the worry that the national language will no longer be used in some

scientific and technical domains (Airey, Lauridsen, & Räsänen, 2017). On the other hand, bilingual programs in some European regions such as Catalonia, the Basque Country or Friesland have become more multilingual because English has been added to the curriculum from an early age (Gorter, Zenotz, Etxague, & Cenoz, 2014). In these contexts, bilingualism in the national and regional languages has developed into multilingualism because English has been added to the curriculum.

An important point to consider is that in many parts of the world, users of English are often multilingual because they speak other languages as well. Even countries that can be considered as part of the Inner Circle are becoming increasingly multilingual (Mauranen, 2018). Bolton (2018) explains that in the case of Europe, multilingualism has increased as a result of the mobility of Europeans and immigration. In fact, nowadays diversity is a characteristic of society in Europe and other parts of the world and a large number of different languages are used in many contexts that were traditionally monolingual or bilingual. Nowadays, it is very common for schoolchildren to have a great variety of home languages and many of these languages are not part of the curriculum.

Seidhofer (2011) and Jenkins (2015) point out that speakers of English are multilingual speakers for whom English is one of the languages in their linguistic repertoire but not necessarily their first language (Sridhar & Sridhar, 2018). In the European educational context, English is often a third or additional language for speakers of regional minority languages or immigrant students. In this type of context, where students have rich multilingual trajectories, it is difficult to consider them as deficient and to ask them to learn English in isolation with the aim of becoming similar to monolingual native speakers of the Inner Circle. The social and economic characteristics of the first two decades of the 21st century in different parts of the world have developed into a more intense and dynamic relationship between English and multilingualism. There are also new views on multilingualism as we will see in the next section.

3 | MOVING AWAY FROM MONOLINGUAL IDEOLOGIES

New trends in the study of multilingualism are linked to the new situation of multilingualism that has developed in the last decades. These trends are a reaction against the traditional views of teaching languages based on the isolation of the target language and the reference to the ideal monolingual speaker (Cenoz & Gorter, 2013; Cummins, 2017). In the case of English, which is the most widely taught second or foreign language, the tradition has been to have the Inner Circle as reference for learners of the Outer and Expanding Circles. Moreover, the idea has traditionally been to consider that English should be completely isolated from the other languages spoken by learners so as to avoid their negative influence. In this section we will compare these views by looking at the differences between traditional perspectives and new approaches regarding speakers, repertoires and the social contexts.

3.1 | The monolingual vs. multilingual speaker

Traditionally, the ideal native speaker has been taken as the reference when learning and using English and other languages. The idea is that learners can make progress and advance so as to get closer to the native speaker but most of them never achieve the same level of 'nativeness' as their models. Learners are expected to make progress along what turns out to be an endless path. This situation is sometimes referred to as the 'incomplete acquisition' of the target language (Montrul & Silva-Corvalán, 2019) even though this concept has been severely criticized (Otheguy, 2016). In many contexts, even speakers of English with a high level of competence and teachers of English who do not have English as a first language suffer from anxiety and low self-esteem because they are not non-native speakers (Llurda, 2014; Santos, Cenoz, & Gorter, 2015). The ideal native speaker is closer to the varieties of English spoken by educated speakers in the Inner Circle. This is problematic because even speakers of English as a first language in the Outer Circle sometimes feel that they are not good speakers of English (Higgins, 2003).

There are critical voices against this idea of multilinguals being deficient speakers of other languages. For example Jenkins, Cogo, and Dewey (2011, p. 284) in the context of English as a Lingua Franca consider that multilinguals in this

situation cannot be considered 'failed native speakers' because they often are 'highly skilled communicators who make use of their multilingual resources.' Cook (2010) also considers that this idea of total command of the target language associated with native speakers is not only unreachable for other speakers but also unfair. In the context of second language acquisition, Ortega (2014, p. 36) criticizes this view of the native speaker because it implies that 'monolingualism is taken as the implicit norm, the reality of bi/multilingualism is made invisible, and linguistic ownership by birth and monolingual upbringing is elevated to an inalienable right and advantage.' A crucial idea when discussing this issue is that multilingual speakers are different from monolingual speakers. Already many years ago, Cook (1992) explained that multilinguals have a qualitatively different type of competence, a complex type of competence that he calls 'multicompetence.' We argue that multilingual speakers are indeed different from monolingual speakers and that their competence cannot be measured against the yardstick of an ideal monolingual native speaker. The differences between monolingual and multilingual speakers can be identified at least at three levels: multilingual trajectories, multilingual discourses and multilingual competence.

Multilingual speakers have different trajectories as compared to monolingual speakers. In a globalized world, characterized by mobility of the population and the spread of English, multilingual speakers have experienced different linguistic situations in their lives as compared to monolingual speakers. Their linguistic trajectories are richer and more dynamic. These trajectories influence the way multilinguals learn and use additional languages because they are shaped by experiences in their lives (Douglas Fir Group, 2016, p. 26). Emotions are also part of multilingual trajectories. Some of the languages a multilingual speaker uses may be more salient than others in their identity or there may be some feelings such as anxiety related to learning some languages. An important reason why multilingual speakers are different from monolingual speakers is that they cannot become monolingual because for them learning an additional language means adjusting and developing their own repertoire so as to accommodate for that language (Canagarajah, 2018).

A second important difference is linked to multilingual discourses. Multilingual speakers navigate between languages and do not use each of their languages for the same purposes in all communicative situations, in the same domains, or with the same people. Multilingual speakers not only use different languages depending on the context but can also use resources from different languages. Mauranen (2018, p. 113) refers to a 'composite language resource' as a unique combination of resources for every multilingual speaker. Creese and Blackledge (2010) report how multilingual discourse practices are different from monolingual speakers' practices because of the resources they use. New trends in the study of multilingualism argue for softer boundaries between languages that are no longer considered fixed (Blommaert, 2010; Cenoz & Gorter, 2013). An important development is the study of translanguaging and its applications in multilingual education as we will see in the following sections.

Another important difference when we compare monolinguals and multilinguals is related to the level of competence to be achieved. Grosjean (2010, p. 20) explained how a bilingual person's communicative competence cannot be compared to that of a monolingual speaker because bilingual speakers have a unique linguistic profile. He considered that 'equal and perfect knowledge' of two languages is a myth. The monolingual perspective of setting the competence of the ideal native speaker as a goal to be achieved is even more bizarre when multilingual speakers use three, four or five languages. However, it is not only that the goal is unreachable and that it may not be fair but also that the type of competence multilingual speakers have is qualitatively different from monolingual competence (Cook, 1992).

Sridhar and Sridhar (2018, p. 130) consider that there has been 'a remarkable turnaround in SLA and English language teaching' because it is recognized that proficient non-native speakers can be efficient users of English. It is true that a new paradigm in the study of multilingualism is emerging but as Sridhar and Sridhar (2018, p. 130) also point out 'the native speaker hegemony continues to exert a siren call.' In fact, it is not easy to apply the ideas about the multilingual speaker to language teaching and language testing. Nowadays it is more common to find different varieties of English in listening comprehension and reading comprehension activities in textbooks and even in tests of English as a second or foreign language. However, in many contexts there is still a preference for native speaker teachers and the communicative abilities of multilingual teachers who do not have English as a first language are not fully appreciated (Llurda, 2014). In the European context, the Council of Europe also questions the role of the native speaker as the only legitimate model but the Common European Framework of Reference (Council of Europe, 2001) is usually applied with

native speaker standards from the Inner Circle as a reference. As Kubota (2018) points out powerful ideologies of the Inner Circle are deeply rooted and large-scale language testing reinforces these ideologies.

3.2 | English only vs. multilingual repertoires

Traditionally the goal of language teaching has been to develop communicative competence in the target language. There are different dimensions of communicative competence including linguistic, sociolinguistic, pragmatic, strategic and discourse competence (Canale & Swain, 1980; Celce-Murcia, Dörnyei, & Thurrell, 1995). Nowadays the term 'repertoire,' 'plurilingual competence' and 'multilingual repertoire' have also been proposed. These concepts do not only refer to the target language but also to what the learner already knows and the dynamic nature of their multilingual trajectories. Hall (2019, p. 86) uses the term repertoire 'to refer to the totality of an individual's language knowledge' because it gives flexibility and does not imply the binary idea of being competent or not. The Council of Europe uses the term competence and considers that plurilingual competence 'involves the ability to call flexibly upon an inter-related, uneven, plurilinguistic repertoire' (Council of Europe, 2018, p. 18).

Cenoz and Gorter (2014) consider that the multilingual speaker's whole linguistic repertoire has to be taken into account when learning and using languages (Gorter, 2015). Multilingual speakers can be more effective learners and users of a target language if they are allowed to use resources from their whole linguistic repertoire. Multilinguals have a rich repertoire that includes not only linguistic elements but also their whole trajectories as language learners and language users. When learning a new language multilinguals tend naturally to link prior knowledge to new knowledge (Cenoz & Gorter, 2011) but in many cases the monolingual focus on the target language can prevent students from using their own resources. For example, Kubota (2018) explains how in Japan and other countries in the Expanding Circle there is a monolingual teaching approach because teachers are expected to use exclusively English in the classroom. Similar trends towards monolingualism have been observed in other contexts (Byrd Clark, 2012).

The multilingual repertoire can be a rich resource for multilinguals because they can compare elements of their different languages at different levels (phonetic, lexical, morphosyntactic, pragmatic, discursive) and use their resources cross-linguistically. Activating the whole linguistic repertoire can be related to the development of metalinguistic awareness as it will be seen later. The multilingual repertoire is also a resource to face different situations in communicative interaction and to use learning and communicative strategies that are part of the multilingual speaker's trajectory. Multilingual speakers can communicate by using a single language in some situations or using elements of different languages in others but their trajectories and their whole multilingual repertoire is always part of their multilingual competence.

3.3 | Decontextualized classrooms vs. the social context

Traditionally, monolingual views focusing on the teaching of English with the reference of the ideal native speaker of the Inner Circle do not develop strong links with the social context where English is taught. These monolingual views are based on the idea that languages are fixed codes that can be taught in the same way in different parts of the world. According to these views, an English language classroom could be practically the same in different parts of the world because it would have the same goal regarding English language competence and the same teaching materials and even the teacher would have the same profile as a monolingual native speaker. However, English is not used in the same way in different parts of the world. As it has already been said, users of English are often multilingual and use English along with other languages in their daily life. Some English language learners plan to live permanently in English speaking countries of the Inner Circle such as the US or the UK but many others may use English mainly in interaction with speakers from the Outer and Expanding Circles. Multilingual speakers may use English only for certain functions in their professional life while they use other languages most of the day. Multilingual speakers may also use English with other multilingual speakers with similar repertoires and they may have opportunities to use shared resources

TABLE 1 Differences between traditional approaches and multilingual approaches

Focus on monolingualism	Focus on multilingualism
Monolingual speaker	Multilingual speaker
English only	English and the whole linguistic repertoire
Decontextualized classrooms	The social context

manifesting creativity and language playfulness to a larger extent. In this way they are also different when compared to monolingual speakers in the Inner Circle.

Multilingual speakers use the resources in their multilingual repertoire in different ways depending on the social context. Multilinguals have their own communities of practice in which they share different ways of communication. For example, studies on chatting in the social media have shown that multilingual speakers share some characteristics even when they communicate in different languages (Cenoz & Bereziartua, 2016). The social context is relevant for the type of communication such as the use of abbreviations or emoticons but also for language awareness. Multilingual speakers are aware of the differences in the status and use of the languages in their repertoire which often includes English, the most important language of international communication. English is a very prestigious language but there may be other languages that are more important in local contexts and multilingual speakers can develop their language awareness and even be critical about the role of the different languages in their community. A multilingual focus when teaching English implies that other languages in the multilingual repertoire, other languages in society and language practices are taken into account without establishing hard boundaries between languages. In sum the three dimensions that have been identified as distinguishing traditional approaches from multilingual approaches can be seen in table 1. These three dimensions, which are related to each other have been labeled by Cenoz and Gorter (2014) as 'Focus on multilingualism' when conducting research and teaching languages. This model implies that multilinguals are different from monolinguals and are not expected to have the same level of proficiency in the languages in their multilingual repertoire. It also implies that the reference of the monolingual native speaker is no longer valid for our multilingual and dynamic society. Focus on multilingualism goes against traditional perspectives that emphasize language separation and aims at softening the boundaries between languages so that language users make the most of their own multilingualism.

4 | THE CONCEPT OF TRANSLANGUAGING

Translanguaging is a concept that is often used in association with new trends in the study of multilingualism. Because it is widely used in different contexts where the realities of multilingualism take various shapes, translanguaging is nowadays an umbrella term that embraces a wide variety of theoretical and practical proposals. These proposals break the traditional ideologies of language separation. However, this extended use of translanguaging can be ambiguous because it is 'a multifaceted and multilayer polysemic term' (Leung & Valdes, 2019, p. 359). In this section we will discuss the characteristics of translanguaging and look at its different development. As is well known, the origin of translanguaging can be found in Welsh bilingual education where it has been used since the 1980s (Lewis, Jones, & Baker, 2012). It is a pedagogical practice designed by the teacher 'who uses the stronger language to develop the weaker one, and in this way, it implies a deep understanding of meaning and can result in increased proficiency in the two languages.' The main idea is to alternate the use of Welsh and English for input and output in the same lesson so that languages reinforce each other and the ability in both languages increases. The pedagogical practice of translanguaging works both ways, from Welsh to English as well as from English into Welsh. For example, students can read a text in Welsh and discuss it or summarize it in English or the other way around. It is important to consider that translanguaging in its original meaning is used in a context where both the majority language (English) and the minority

language (Welsh) are used as languages of instruction and where the aim is to develop proficiency in both languages. The idea is that translanguaging requires a deeper understanding than the separate use of the two languages. It is important to highlight that there is a systematic alternation of the two languages that has been designed as a teaching strategy because this is not going always the case when translanguaging is used in other contexts.

Translanguaging is a widely used concept that has extended beyond the designed teaching strategy used in Welsh classes. García (2009, p. 45) defines translanguaging as 'multiple discursive practices in which bilinguals engage in order to make sense of their bilingual worlds.' This definition refers to natural practices that have not been designed as a teaching strategy and that could take place inside or outside the classroom. Canagarajah (2011, p. 401) defines translanguaging as 'the ability of multilingual speakers to shuttle between languages, treating the diverse languages that form their repertoire as an integrated system.' In this case we can also see that translanguaging is not limited to the classroom. Translanguaging in this way is seen as dynamic and built on a single repertoire because the multilingual speaker uses elements from multiple languages. Translanguaging is associated with new trends that soften the boundaries between languages but some authors also question the concept of languages as separate entities and the idea of deconstructing named languages has been proposed (Makoni & Pennycook, 2007; Otheguy, García, & Reid, 2015). Leung and Valdes (2019, p. 359) distinguish two analytical perspectives. The first considers that 'languages are distinct and separate semiotic entities' and the second that 'languages are configurations of temporal lexical and syntactic features expressing human meaning.' They consider that the first view, which is the mainstream perspective, implies that there are different languages even if they can be related to each other. The second view implies that there are 'lexical, syntactic, phonological, and orthographic features in use in specific places and times.' These features do not have to be permanent in a named language. The first view would be associated with the original concept of translanguaging developed in Wales because Welsh and English are considered separate languages even if there is alternation of both languages for pedagogical purposes. The second view can be associated with the concept of translanguaging proposed by Otheguy et al. (2015, p. 283) as 'the deployment of a speaker's full linguistic repertoire without regard for watchful adherence to the socially and politically defined boundaries of named (and usually national and state) languages.'

As García and Otheguy (2020, p. 25) explain 'translanguaging sees multilinguals as possessing a unitary linguistic system that they build through social interactions of different types, and that is not compartmentalized into boundaries corresponding to those of the named languages.' An implication of this position, which is clearly different from the original concept of translanguaging developed in Wales, is that translanguaging can be applicable to bilinguals and monolinguals (Otheguy et al., 2015). García and Otheguy (2020, p. 26) even go further because translanguaging includes non-linguistic multimodal resources such as 'gestures, gazes, posture, visual cues, and even human-technology interactions.' Leung and Valdés (2019, p. 365) consider that this concept of translanguaging has some difficulties when addressing 'the pedagogic issues connected to the development of language-specific proficiency and use for learning purposes.' García and Otheguy (2020) are aware of the fact that students need to have access to named languages but they consider it is completely necessary that their own translanguaging practices have to be accepted in school settings.

Boundaries between languages have traditionally been hard in education and have not reflected the discursive practices of multilinguals, who often use a wide range of elements from their multilingual repertoire. In some situations it may be difficult to distinguish different languages because multilinguals use elements from their whole linguistic repertoire but in other situations and depending on the social context, multilinguals can use only one language. For example, in the context of the Basque Country, where Basque and Spanish are used, some data from informal chatting in the social media by young adolescents show that it can be difficult to say if a given conversation is in Basque or in Spanish (Cenoz & Gorter, 2014). However, these same young multilinguals are able to have a conversation or write a text that is clearly in Basque or in Spanish. As Cummins (2017) says, languages are social constructions and their boundaries are arbitrary but it is important to consider that speakers treat them as separate and are able to identify them. People can refer most conversations as being in one or another language even if the boundaries can be harder or softer depending on the social context.

It has been claimed that translanguaging can be beneficial for minoritized communities and their languages because it can empower speakers of minoritized languages (Otheguy et al., 2015; Li Wei, 2018). This can be the case in some social contexts because translanguaging can be a liberation from strict purist ideologies and it can be closer to the way people communicate in real life. However, there can be situations in which translanguaging can be felt as a threat for the use of minority languages. Arocena, Cenoz, and Gorter (2015) reported that Basque teachers are worried about translanguaging because it can weaken the Basque language in the Basque Autonomous Community in Spain. Translanguaging in this context, where everybody is proficient in Spanish and only one third of the population is proficient in Basque, can be seen as a threat for Basque. It is not a threat for Spanish because it is the powerful language and the influence goes from the majority to the minority language. In fact, in this asymmetrical relation, students can use Spanish with very limited traces of Basque but because of the strength of Spanish in the social context, when they speak Basque they tend to use many elements from Spanish. If these practices are encouraged the minority language could disappear in the near future. This concern has also been addressed in the Welsh context (Lewis et al., 2012). It is not a question of establishing hard boundaries between languages and monolingual ideologies and we argue that boundaries between languages should be softer than what they have traditionally been. At the same time, in contexts in which minority languages are used, it is necessary to develop strategies to protect and promote the use of the minority language in functional breathing spaces for using the minority language (Cenoz & Gorter, 2017).

5 | PEDAGOGICAL TRANSLANGUAGING AND METALINGUISTIC AWARENESS

In the previous section we have seen that there are different perspectives when discussing the concept of translanguaging. Even if there are different approaches that are often related to the social contexts and the complexities of multilingualism, translanguaging implies that languages should not be taught as separate entities but in interrelationship with the learner's existing language features and practices (Cenoz & Gorter, 2011, 2015; May, 2014; Moore & Gajo, 2009). Schneider (2016) says that translanguaging so far has mainly been discussed in theoretical and ideological terms. In this section we are going to focus on pedagogical translanguaging which can be understood as 'planned by the teacher inside the classroom and can refer to the use of different languages for input and output or to other planned strategies based on the use of students' (Cenoz, 2017, p. 194).

The understanding of translanguaging as a pedagogical strategy is related to the original concept used in Welsh bilingual education but it has some differences because it goes beyond the use of a specific strategy in bilingual classes. Pedagogical translanguaging implies a focus on multilingualism based on the concept of the multilingual speaker, the whole linguistic repertoire and the social context as it has been seen in previous sections. Pedagogical translanguaging implies that languages are separate entities but that their boundaries are soft. Therefore, it implies a transformation in comparison to traditional ideologies of language separation. Another difference is that pedagogical translanguaging goes beyond the Welsh model of alternating the two languages. Alternation of two languages can be one of the strategies but there can be many others and translanguaging can take place using elements from several languages. Pedagogical translanguaging is also different from what we label as spontaneous translanguaging because it is planned for teaching languages or content. Spontaneous discursive practices can be used pedagogically to develop students' awareness about the way languages are used in natural communication.

Pedagogical translanguaging aims at reinforcing the learning processes by using the whole linguistic repertoire rather than avoiding the knowledge multilinguals have because of their own linguistic and educational background. Pedagogical translanguaging can be used in language and in content classes and it includes pedagogies that go across languages even if the term translanguaging is not used in all the studies. For example, Arteagoitia and Howard (2015) reported that an intervention based on the use of cognates from Spanish, the students' L1, enhanced English academic vocabulary and reading skills in the context of the US. The intervention focused on developing metalinguistic

awareness by highlighting the similarities between English and Spanish words that have the same root. Other strategies used to develop metalinguistic awareness and improve vocabulary in English and French are reported by Lyster, Quiroga, and Ballinger (2013). The languages involved in these studies are Indo-European and their vocabularies are more likely to be related but pedagogical translanguaging can also include non-Indo-European languages such as Basque. Leonet, Cenoz, and Gorter (2017) report a study where compounds in Basque, Spanish and English are compared and the similarities and differences in their structure is compared.

There are many situations in the Outer and Expanding Circles in which English is in contact with languages that are linguistically distant and even have different scripts. Indeed, it may be more difficult to see how softening boundaries between languages by using pedagogical translanguaging can help. It could be that pedagogical translanguaging has some limitations to be applied to vocabulary development in this context but it can be applied to the development of other linguistic elements. One possibility is to develop metalinguistic awareness along with pragmatic and discourse competence. Languages are not fixed codes in a vacuum. Languages are developed and shaped in interaction among speakers in specific contexts. Pragmatic and discourse strategies are closely rooted in different contexts and pedagogical translanguaging can certainly develop metalinguistic awareness in these contexts as well. For example, the organization and content of a letter asking for more public spaces can be similar even if the languages are very different and it can be quite different even if the languages are typologically related. Pedagogical translanguaging has the multilingual speaker and his/her whole multilingual repertoire as its basis. Some strategies can be used across languages while others can be new for the speakers. The idea is to maximize the learner's linguistic resources when learning English, academic content or other languages. Multilingual speakers may not use their own resources to their full extent if these resources are not activated. Pedagogical translanguaging aims at activating these resources and developing metalinguistic awareness so that students can benefit from their own multilingualism.

6 | CONCLUSION

Most speakers of English in the world are multilingual and English is one of the languages in their repertoire. However, traditional ideologies have ignored communicative practices among multilingual speakers of English and have used the reference of ideal native speakers of English from the Inner Circle. This approach does not even include all speakers of the Inner Circle, who are in many cases multilingual. Over the last years there have been substantial changes in society because of the mobility of the population and digitalization and a perspective of English based on monolingual ideologies is untenable. Traditional ideologies are being replaced by multilingual ideologies that adjust better to the characteristics of society in what we could consider an emergent paradigm. This paradigm is developing in different related areas and includes proposals in related fields. In this paper we have focused on multilingual ideologies and translanguaging for pedagogical purposes. As it has already been seen, the study of world Englishes and the study of translanguaging are linked to multilingual ideologies and share some characteristics. Different varieties of English are at the core of world Englishes and English is in most cases one of the languages (or named languages) involved in the study of translanguaging. Moreover, both world Englishes and translanguaging are linked to contexts where several languages are spoken. In spite of sharing these characteristics, there are also some differences. World Englishes focuses on the diversity of English at the linguistic and functional levels and, in spite of its multidisciplinary approach, it can be regarded as rooted in sociolinguistics. Translanguaging has been linked to education but it is also expanding in different ways. Lewis et al. (2012, p. 7) explained that 'the term has been generalised from school to street, from pedagogical practices to everyday cognitive processing, from classroom lessons to all contexts of a bilingual's life.' World Englishes has certainly been applied to education and language teaching as well but we can say that rather than 'from the classroom to the street' it has spread 'from the street to the classroom.'

Going against monolingual ideologies is not always easy. Many teachers consider that the goal of English language teaching is to become a native speaker of the Inner Circle (Arocena et al., 2015; Jenkins et al., 2011). Pedagogical

translanguaging implies softening language boundaries so as to use resources from different languages in language and in content classes. This goes against the traditional ideas of isolation of the target language and even against the organization of many schools in departments for specific languages. Pedagogical translanguaging is also challenging because it implies the involvement of the whole school and effective collaboration between teachers of different languages and between language and content teachers. An additional difficulty is language assessment and there have been very few attempts to develop multilingual assessment procedures (Gorter & Cenoz, 2017). World Englishes has contributed to developing multilingual ideologies and has provided 'empirical data that helped the field of ELT adopt a more complex and nuanced understanding of diverse users of English today' (Matsuda, 2019, p. 149). It can be said that the work on world Englishes in the last decades has been crucial for the development of translanguaging pedagogies. Another challenge pedagogical translanguaging faces is the protection and promotion of minority languages as we have already seen above. An important point that can relate this challenge to world Englishes is the need to develop language awareness in the classroom so that students reflect about contexts of powerful and less powerful languages and also about different varieties of the languages in their social context and in the school curriculum. The study of world Englishes and translanguaging share multilingual ideologies and can enrich each other so as to contribute to the developing of multilingualism in education and elsewhere. The development of synergies between the two areas will certainly strengthen the expansion of multilingual ideologies.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

This work was supported by the MINECO/FEDER [Grant number EDU2015-63967-R] and the Basque Government [Grant number DREAM IT1225-19].

REFERENCES

- Airey, J., Lauridsen, K. M., & Räsänen, A. (2017). The expansion of English-medium instruction in the Nordic countries: Can top-down university language policies encourage bottom-up disciplinary literacy goals? *Higher Education*, 73, 561–576.
- Arocena, E., Cenoz, J., & Gorter, D. (2015). Teachers' beliefs in multilingual education in the Basque country and in Friesland. *Journal of Immersion and Content-Based Language Education*, 3, 169–193.
- Arteagoitia, I., & Howard, L. (2015). The role of the native language in the literacy development of Latino students in the U.S. In J. Cenoz & D. Gorter (Eds.), *Multilingual education: Between language learning and translanguaging* (pp. 61–83). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Blommaert, J. (2010). *The sociolinguistics of globalization*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bolton, K. (2018). World Englishes and Second Language Acquisition. *World Englishes*, 37, 5–18.
- Byrd Clark, J. (2012). Heterogeneity and a sociolinguistics of multilingualism: Reconfiguring French language pedagogy. *Language and Linguistics Compass*, 6, 1–19.
- Canagarajah, S. (2011). Codemeshing in academic writing: Identifying teachable strategies of translanguaging. *The Modern Language Journal*, 95, 401–417.
- Canagarajah, S. (2018). Materializing 'competence': Perspectives from international STEM scholars. *The Modern Language Journal*, 102, 1–24.
- Canale, M., & Swain, M. (1980). Theoretical bases of communicative approaches to second language teaching and testing. *Applied Linguistics*, 1, 1–47.
- Celce-Murcia, M., Dörnyei, Z., & Thurrell, S. (1995). A pedagogically motivated model with content specifications. *Issues in Applied Linguistics*, 6, 5–35.
- Cenoz, J. (2017). Translanguaging in school context: International perspectives. *Journal of Language, Identity and Education*, 16, 193–198.
- Cenoz, J., & Bereziartua, G. (2016). Is Instant Messaging the same in every language? A Basque perspective. *Reading and Writing*, 29, 1225–1243.
- Cenoz, J., & Gorter, D. (2011). Focus on multilingualism: A study of trilingual writing. *The Modern Language Journal*, 95, 356–369.
- Cenoz, J., & Gorter, D. (2013). Towards a plurilingual approach in English language teaching: Softening the boundaries between languages. *TESOL Quarterly*, 47, 591–599.
- Cenoz, J., & Gorter, D. (2014). Focus on multilingualism as an approach in educational contexts. In A. Blackledge & A. Creese (Eds.), *Heteroglossia as practice and pedagogy* (pp. 239–254). Dordrecht: Springer.

- Cenoz, J., & Gorter, D. (2015). Towards a holistic approach in the study of multilingual education. In J. Cenoz & D. Gorter (Eds.), *Multilingual education: Between language learning and translanguaging* (pp. 1–15). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Cenoz, J., & Gorter, D. (2017). Minority languages and sustainable translanguaging: Threat or opportunity? *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 38, 901–912.
- Cook, V. (1992). Evidence for multicompetence. *Language Learning*, 42, 557–591.
- Cook, V. J. (2010). The relationship between first and second language acquisition revisited. In E. Macaro (Ed.), *The Continuum companion to second language acquisition* (pp. 137–157). London: Continuum.
- Council of Europe. (2001). *Common European framework of reference for languages: Learning, teaching, assessment*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. Retrieved from http://www.coe.int/t/dg4/Linguistic/Source/Framework_EN.pdf
- Council of Europe. (2018). *Common European framework of reference for languages: Learning, teaching, assessment: Companion volume with new descriptors-2018/1680787989*. Strasbourg: Council of Europe. Retrieved from <https://rm.coe.int/cefr-companion-volumewith-new-descriptors-2018/1680787989>
- Creese, A., & Blackledge, A. (2010). Translanguaging in the bilingual classroom: A pedagogy for learning and teaching. *The Modern Language Journal*, 94, 103–115.
- Cummins, J. (2017). Teaching for transfer in multilingual school contexts. In O. García, A. Lin, & S. May (Eds.), *Bilingual education: Encyclopedia of language and education* (Vol. 5, pp. 103–115). Berlin: Springer.
- Douglas Fir Group. (2016). A transdisciplinary framework for SLA in a multilingual world. *The Modern Language Journal*, 100, 19–47.
- García, O. (2009). *Bilingual education in the 21st century: A global perspective*. Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell.
- García, O., & Li, W. (2014). *Translanguaging: Language, bilingualism and education*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- García, O., & Otheguy, R. (2020). Plurilingualism and translanguaging: Commonalities and divergences. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 23, 17–35.
- Gerritsen, M., Van Meurs, F., Planken, B., & Korzilius, H. (2016). A reconsideration of the status of English in the Netherlands within the Kachruvian Three Circles model. *World Englishes*, 35, 457–474.
- Gorter, D. (2015). Multilingual interaction and minority languages: Proficiency and language practices in education and society. *Language Teaching*, 48, 82–98.
- Gorter, D., & Cenoz, J. (2017). Language education policy and multilingual assessment. *Language and Education*, 31, 231–248.
- Gorter, D., Zenotz, V., Etxague, X., & Cenoz, J. (2014). Multilingualism and European minority languages: The case of Basque. In D. Gorter, V. Zenotz, & J. Cenoz (Eds.), *Minority languages and multilingual education: Bridging the local and the global* (pp. 278–301). Berlin: Springer.
- Grosjean, F. (2010). *Bilingual: Life and reality*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Hall, J. K. (2019). The contributions of conversation analysis and interactional linguistics to a usage-based understanding of language: Expanding the transdisciplinary framework. *Modern Language Journal*, 103, 80–94.
- Higgins, C. (2003). Ownership' of English in the Outer Circle: An alternative to the NS–NNS dichotomy. *TESOL Quarterly*, 37, 615–644.
- Jenkins, J. (2015). Repositioning English and multilingualism in English as a Lingua Franca. *English in Practice*, 2, 49–85.
- Jenkins, J., Cogo, A., & Dewey, M. (2011). Review of developments in research into English as a lingua franca. *Language Teaching*, 44, 281–315.
- Kachru, B. B. (1985). Standards, codification and sociolinguistic realism: The English language in the Outer Circle. In R. Quirk & H. G. Widdowson (Eds.), *English in the world: Teaching and learning the language and literatures* (pp. 11–30). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kachru, Y., & Nelson, C. L. (2006). *World Englishes in Asian contexts*. Hong Kong: Hong Kong University Press.
- Kubota, R. (2018). Unpacking research and practice in world Englishes and Second Language Acquisition. *World Englishes*, 37, 93–105.
- Leonet, O., Cenoz, J., & Gorter, D. (2017). Challenging minority language isolation: Translanguaging in a trilingual school in the Basque Country. *Journal of Language, Identity and Education*, 16, 216–227.
- Leung, C., & Valdés, G. (2019). Translanguaging and the transdisciplinary framework for language teaching and learning in a multilingual world. *The Modern Language Journal*, 103, 348–370.
- Lewis, G., Jones, B., & Baker, C. (2012). Translanguaging: Origins and development from school to street and beyond. *Educational Research and Evaluation: An International Journal on Theory and Practice*, 18, 641–654.
- Wei, Li (2018). Translanguaging as a practical theory of language. *Applied Linguistics*, 39, 9–30.
- Llurda, E. (2014). Native and non-native teachers of English. *The encyclopedia of applied linguistics*. London: Blackwell.
- Lyster, R., Quiroga, J., & Ballinger, S. (2013). The effects of biliteracy instruction on morphological awareness. *Journal of Immersion and Content-Based Language Education*, 1, 169–197.
- Makoni, S., & Pennycook, A. (2007). Disinventing and reconstituting languages. In S. Makoni & A. Pennycook (Eds.), *Disinventing and reconstituting languages* (pp. 1–41). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Matsuda, A. (2019). World Englishes in English language teaching: Kachru's six fallacies and the TEIL paradigm. *World Englishes*, 38, 144–154.

- Mauranen, A. K. (2018). Second Language Acquisition, world Englishes, and English as a Lingua Franca (ELF). *World Englishes*, 37, 106–119.
- May, S. (Ed.). (2014). *The multilingual turn: Implications for SLA, TESOL, and bilingual education*. New York: Routledge.
- Montrul, S., & Silva-Corvalán, C. (2019). The social context contributes to the incomplete acquisition of aspects of heritage languages. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 41, 269–273.
- Moore, D., & Gajo, L. (2009). Introduction—French voices on plurilingualism and pluriculturalism: Theory, significance, and perspectives. *International Journal of Multilingualism*, 6, 137–153.
- Ortega, L. (2014). Ways forward for a bi/multilingual turn in SLA. In S. May (Ed.), *The multilingual turn: Implications for SLA, TESOL and bilingual education* (pp. 32–52). New York: Routledge.
- Otheguy, R. (2016). The linguistic competence of second-generation bilinguals: A critique of 'incomplete acquisition'. In C. Tortora, M. den Dikken, I. L. Montoya, & T. O'Neill (Eds.), *Romance linguistics* (Vol. 2013, pp. 301–320). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Otheguy, R., García, O., & Reid, W. (2015). Clarifying translanguaging and deconstructing named languages: A perspective from linguistics. *Applied Linguistics Review*, 6, 281–307.
- Santos, A., Cenoz, J., & Gorter, D. (2015). Communicative anxiety in English as a third language. *International Journal of Bilingualism and Bilingual Education*, 20, 823–836.
- Schneider, E. (2016). Hybrid Englishes: An exploratory survey. *World Englishes*, 35, 339–354.
- Seidlhofer, B. (2011). *Understanding English as a lingua franca*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Sridhar, S. N., & Sridhar, K. K. (2018). Coda 2: A bridge half-built: Toward a holistic theory of Second Language Acquisition and world Englishes. *World Englishes*, 37, 127–139.

How to cite this article: Cenoz J, Gorter D. Teaching English through pedagogical translanguaging. *World Englishes*. 2020;39:300–311. <https://doi.org/10.1111/weng.12462>