

Translanguaging Pedagogy: A Tool for Social Justice and Equity in the Language Classroom

Monishita Hajra Pande | The English and Foreign Languages University

<https://doi.org/10.71106/AIUT8526>

Abstract | Translanguaging is a powerful tool to address questions of social justice and equity in the language classroom. While teaching dominant languages (in this case English) that automatically operate as hegemonic forces, invisible but powerful language hierarchies get formed that often engulf language practices and identities of learners, especially in a classroom that promotes monolingual norms and expectations. This paper discusses pedagogical translanguaging as a transformative practice that has the power to engage in critical literacy in ESL/EFL contexts. It reports experiences and insights from a writing course offered to adults of foreign nationals learning English as a Foreign Language at EFL University Hyderabad, India. It discusses tasks and reflections from classroom interactions and argues for adopting a process approach to teaching writing that incorporates pedagogical translanguaging to maximise learner engagement by systematically creating opportunities for them to use their full linguistic repertoire and actively bring in their cultural resources to negotiate meaning in the classroom. Data from focused group discussions, reflective journals, and unstructured interviews throw light on the learning process and provide useful insights into translanguaging as a pedagogical tool, thereby creating counter narratives which question and contest power and linguistic hierarchies in the classroom.

Keywords | Pedagogical Translanguaging, Multilingual Pedagogy, Bi/Multilingualism, Codemeshing, Writing Skills, Language Education, Language Equity, ESL, Metalinguistic, Social Justice

Introduction

Language classrooms are rich in linguistic and cultural resources which often remain underexplored due to unscientific ways of approaching language teaching and learning. Monolingual biases and hegemonic practices create opaque boundaries between languages and identities, thereby infusing a feeling of lack or deficiency in the learners who are placed in teaching and learning environments that have a subtractive effect on their bi/multilingual competencies. Even traditional bilingual classrooms typically maintain strict separation between languages, treating bilingualism as double monolingualism where each language operates as an independent system. In contrast, translanguaging acknowledges and leverages the fluid, interconnected nature of bi/multilingual language practices. It creates opportunities for learners to utilise their entire linguistic repertoire and question monolingual norms. As a result, ideas and expressions from multiple language sources become legitimate learning resources and create counter literary practices. Ofelia García states that translanguaging goes beyond code switching and encompasses a view of “‘hybrid language use’, that is, a ‘systematic, strategic, affiliative, and sense-making process’ [...] which is important for all bilinguals in multilingual contexts” (140).

Questions of social justice in language education cannot be addressed without discussing the linguistic codes that are used in the classroom for knowledge creation and meaning making. Classrooms being a space for co-creation of knowledge through dominant languages need to recognise and legitimise translanguaging practices. Without promoting translanguaging in the classroom, the power structures cannot be questioned or disrupted through multiple frames of thinking and being. Traditional classrooms impose monolingual norms even when the teachers or learners share languages other than English. Such practices reinforce linguistic hierarchies and define what is knowledge and non-knowledge in the classroom, further marginalising cultural and linguistic identities of learners. In the classroom, cultural hegemony can be understood “within the framework of *hegemony* developed by Antonio Gramsci (1971), which explains how people acquiesce to invisible cultural power” (García 141, italics in original). This is highly relevant in case of a dominant language classroom where the target language, English, is a language of power, privilege, and prestige. Hegemonic practices are “routine actions and unexamined beliefs that are consonant with the cultural system of meaning and ontology within which it makes sense to take certain actions, entirely without malevolent intent, that nonetheless systematically limit the life chances of members of stigmatized groups” (Erickson 45). As English language teachers, it is essential to approach teaching and learning from a place of critical examination of the power structures and linguistic hierarchies than viewing the classroom as a space to simply reinforce such structures. The types of texts selected in the classroom, the nature and

language of classroom interaction and discourse, turn taking¹ and negotiation of meaning, assessment practices—all these are influenced by the dominant understanding of bi/multilingualism and the way it is reflected in the curriculum and classroom practices. A translanguaging pedagogy will look at all the above aspects of teaching and learning from a critical perspective instead of viewing language as a closed system where only form and accuracy define competence.

Context of the Study

EFL University, Hyderabad, offers one-month English proficiency courses for foreign nationals (non-native speakers of English from countries in the Global South) as part of ITEC (Indian Technical and Economic Cooperation) programmes funded by the Ministry of External Affairs, Government of India. Each batch of participants consists of 50 foreign nationals. On the first day of the programme, a proficiency test is administered to identify learner needs and proficiency levels in English. A detailed participant profiling is also done to understand their cultural and linguistic backgrounds and motivations to learn English in India. Based on the performance on the written and spoken tests, the participants are divided into two groups—basic and advanced. The 100-hour proficiency course consists of seven modules planned around the four language skills (Listening, Speaking, Reading, Writing (LSRW) and language elements), Grammar, Vocabulary, and Pronunciation. This paper focuses on the writing module offered to the basic group over a period of four weeks with 16 hours of instruction.

Data reported from the basic group consisted of 23 participants from various countries of South America, Africa, Southeast Asia, and Central Asia. Focused group discussions, unstructured interviews, and reflective journals were the main sources of data. All the participants were working professionals in various ministries in their respective countries. The age ranged from 25 to 45 years. Translanguaging tools were systematically employed to develop their writing skills in English.

Pedagogical Translanguaging

Our understanding of translanguaging in the classroom is still evolving and hence there is a lack of a composite theory or taxonomies that list translanguaging strategies. Therefore, it is important to critically evaluate classroom practices and adopt a bottom-up approach to understand this phenomenon operating in multilingual contexts. Originally the term was coined in Welsh to address teaching in bilingual settings where language mode for input and output was switched deliberately (Lewis et al. 643) but now researchers see it evolving as a distinct pedagogic theory and practice. In United States, the term focuses more on its social justice dimension in the context of empowering minority learners (García and Lin 11). In the Indian context, Lina Mukhopadhyay in her paper “Translanguaging in Primary Level ESL Classroom in India: An Exploratory Study” has reported the use of translanguaging in the context of primary government

¹“Turn taking is the systematic process by which people coordinate their talk in a verbal interaction such as conversation. It is the set of practices and techniques whereby conversants determine when to speak (once they want to) and when to listen in the interchange of talk, and what happens subsequently in various circumstances. In conversation, there is a situation when a speaker takes the chance to speak that is turn” (365). See, Syafar, Dian Noviani, et al. “Turn Taking Strategies in Classroom Interaction.” *TELL-US Journal*, vol. 9, no. 2, 2023, pp. 364–375, <https://doi.org/10.22202/tus.2023.v9i2.6882>.

schools among low Socioeconomic Status groups. The paper discusses teacher's systematic use of Hindi and Telugu to advance academic proficiency in English by giving inputs through a planned teacher training programme (1).

Translanguaging is defined as “the process of making meaning, shaping experiences, understandings and knowledge through the use of two languages” (Baker and Wright 280). Jasone Cenoz and Durk Gorter in their article “Pedagogical Translanguaging: An Introduction” state that translanguaging is often used as an umbrella term to refer to a wide range of practices and theoretical propositions where more than one language is involved (2). It is an approach to language pedagogy and fluid language practices used by bi/multilingual people. García defines translanguaging as “the act performed by bilinguals of accessing different linguistic features or various modes of what are described as autonomous languages, in order to maximize communicative potential” (140). In his book *A Language Gained: A Study of Language Immersion at 11-16 Years of Age*, Cen Williams offers insights into the cognitive aspect of translanguaging when he states that in translanguaging, input processing may happen in one language, and the output can happen in another. The output can be modified, supplemented, and augmented (37). Referring to the multimodal aspect of translanguaging, Li Wei calls it an instinct and a natural drive that highlights “the multisensory and multimodal process of language learning and language use” (24). Suresh Canagarajah in his book *Translingual Practice: Global Englishes and Cosmopolitan Relations* uses the term translingual practices and suggests that translanguaging is part of this broader term (12).

Before making a distinction between teacher vs student-led translanguaging, it might be helpful to define the term pedagogical translanguaging. Traditionally, languages have been taught by strictly separating target language (operating from native speaker norms) and students' first language; thereby, mixing of languages is prevented. However, research in multilingualism has questioned the scientific basis of such strict language separation especially in multilingual settings where fluidity between languages exist and thrive naturally in the language use of multilinguals. Moreover, they cannot be compared to monolinguals, and their language competencies will differ from their monolingual counterparts. This is not to say that they are deficient or inferior language users. Pedagogical translanguaging is based on the tenets of multilingualism. Cenoz and Gorter in their book, *Pedagogical Translanguaging*, state that the three dimensions of multilingualism that feed into pedagogical translanguaging are multilingual speaker, the multilingual repertoire, and the social context (14).

Pedagogical translanguaging has been defined by Jasone Cenoz 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' resources from the whole linguistic repertoire” (194). She has also distinguished pedagogical translanguaging from spontaneous translanguaging, which occurs in natural settings and is a reality of every bi/multilingual. Another important distinction in this area is natural versus official translanguaging. Natural translanguaging on the other hand, is teacher-led and consists of planned actions which form a part of the lesson execution. When a teacher expects students to write using their full linguistic repertoire, it is an example of official translanguaging. This is also known as teacher-directed translanguaging, which involves structured and systematically planned activities with an aim to create

meaningful and collaborative dialogue in the classroom. “[T]eacher plans the strategic use of two languages, thinks consciously about the allocation of two languages in the classroom, reflects and reviews what is happening, and attempts to cognitively stimulate students by a ‘language provocative’ and ‘language diversified’ lesson.” (Baker and Wright 283). Thus, it is “*a process of knowledge construction that goes beyond language(s)*” (Wei 15, italics in original).

Research in this area has thrown light on how translanguaging by teachers is used as a scaffold to allow students to access complex texts and create new knowledge and practices instead of limiting their learning due to emerging proficiency in the dominant language. “Translanguaging as pedagogy refers to building on bilingual students’ language practices flexibly in order to develop new understandings and new language practices, including those deemed ‘academic standard’ practices” (García and Wei 92). The transformative potential of translanguaging has also been highlighted. It is “capable of calling forth bilingual subjectivities and sustaining bilingual performances that go beyond one or the other binary logic of two autonomous languages” (92–93). Thus, leveraging students’ developing linguistic repertoires forms the cornerstone of pedagogical translanguaging. It is important to note that teachers need not know all the languages in the classroom to set up planned tasks for translanguaging. Instead, the teacher needs to give up her authority in the classroom as the ‘knower’ and take up a more facilitative role thereby setting up tasks for collaborative learning to maximise interaction. García and Wei further suggest that “the teacher sets up the affordances for students to engage in discursive and semiotic practices that respond to their cognitive and social intentions” (93).

When translanguaging is used to teach content in the classroom, translation tasks are used carefully to differentiate language structures and reflect on new morphosyntactic rules. It can be used to develop new background knowledge to support learning and promote critical thinking through multilingual groups, collaborative dialogues, reading multilingual texts, using multilingual audio-visual resources, and project and research-based learning that demand synthesising knowledge from multilingual resources. Translanguaging can also boost crosslinguistic transfer of skills and raise metalinguistic awareness. It can also encourage cross linguistic flexibility which can manifest in the form of translanguaging in speaking and writing, alternating languages and media.

This paper discusses teacher-led or pedagogical translanguaging in the writing classroom and advocates it as part of transformative pedagogy having the power to address issues of social justice in language education.

Translanguaging and Writing Skills Development

Translanguaging in the classroom leads to authentic language use and supports student writing. Authentic language use refers to using language for the purpose of accomplishing self-defined tasks instead of imitating structured language input for targeted L2 learning. Translanguaging also encourages the use of authentic materials (materials not created for language teaching, and which generate language use that mimics real life communication) such as cultural artifacts, songs, films, social media posts, etc., that are created not just in the target language but in languages of the learners thereby encouraging discussions and reflections across language boundaries. The

presence of multiple languages in the classroom is no longer considered a hurdle or hinderance in learning. Translanguaging in pre-, during, and post stages of the writing process can contribute to student writing in ways that help them to use their complete linguistic repertoire strategically making choices to suit their purpose for writing. Translanguaging is not just a scaffold in the classroom to help students with low proficiency in the target language; instead, it can enable student-writers to fully express themselves creatively, empowering them to develop their own voice in writing. In the pre-writing stage, translanguaging helps in brainstorming, thinking, generating ideas, assessing rhetorical situation, negotiating genre conventions, and critically reflecting on their journeys as writers. Thus, translanguaging is not just a scaffold but an essential part of being a bilingual writer.

Samway defines good writing as “clear and evocative writing that captures [her] attention, whether [her] intellect and/or [her] emotions” (22). A writing class that focuses too much on form, grammar, punctuation, and accuracy tasks based on word lists and sentence construction fails to view writing as a complex, collaborative process that also involves “the development of voice, and writing with power” (Elbow, qtd. in Espinosa et al. 7). The process approach to writing acknowledges the discursive nature of writing and all the efforts and steps that precede the final product. A collaborative and dialogic view of writing within the process approach opens possibilities to incorporate translanguaging strategies to assist student-writers to bring their complete linguistic repertoire into the writing process. Other modalities are intrinsically linked to the process of writing such as reading, speaking, visualising, listening, and performing. Flecher and Heard argue that writing classes need to integrate reading materials and provide opportunities to students to engage in peer interaction which help them to create, reflect, critique, and negotiate meaning (qtd. in Espinosa et al. 7). These pedagogic interventions ensure activation of schema, support idea generation and development, help student-writers to structure their writing, and engage in meaning making process.

For bilingual students, meaning making becomes a holistic process when they participate in interactions that allow them to utilise their entire linguistic repertoire, in other words, *translanguage*. By creating spaces for translanguaging in the classroom, authentic writing and learning can be encouraged. Translanguaging in the spoken discourse is often more acceptable than in writing. However, mixing of linguistic codes in writing is a possibility; or, in other words, in writing, one can *translanguage*. Translanguaging is possible through speaking, reading, writing, and thinking even if the final aim is to compose a monolingual text.

Another strong voice in research literature is that of Canagarajah who has engaged with language choices of multilingual writers who are allowed to access their entire linguistic repertoire. Canagarajah in “Understanding Critical Writing” writes, “We should respect and value the linguistic and cultural peculiarities our students may display, rather than suppressing them. We should strive to understand their values and interests and discover ways of engaging those in the writing process” (14). Therefore, Canagarajah argues that instead of limiting our multilingual students to engage only in one language throughout the writing process, it is possible to create space for multilingual engagement in the classroom. For instance, in the planning stage, a reading material in the student’s first language can be used and note taking can happen bilingually, or students may discuss

their ideas with their peers in a common language which feeds into their writing in the target language. Multilingual writers challenge monolingual literacy practices through such acts of translanguaging, leading to better rhetorical awareness.

Canagarajah in “Codemeshing in Academic Writing” reported narrative writing of a bilingual graduate student and found that utilizing her entire linguistic repertoire such as using Arabic words in her English writing, including emoticons and Islamic art allowed her to communicate with her intended audience in a complex manner (403). It was a transformational experience for the student as she was able to critically and creatively compose her text. Moreover, the author highlights the need for educators to carefully study the writing practices of multilingual students so that they can be made into pedagogic strategies (415). Canagarajah also discusses the term codemeshing that refers to fusing a variety of language practices and codes across dialectal choices including diverse symbol systems (403). Translanguaging is thus multimodal, transdisciplinary, and “it emerges from the contextual affordances in the complex interactions of multilinguals” (García and Wei 40).

Translanguaging Pedagogy for Writing: Need of Our Times

The digital age calls for a new paradigm of teaching writing, a perspective that views fluidity between languages and multilingualism as the norm. Translanguaging pedagogy challenges monolingual views of using only the target language in the classroom and rejects the idea that multiple languages in the classroom is a problem that needs to be tackled. Instead, the language and cultural resources of the learners are organically and systematically integrated in the pedagogical process. This view also questions one standard for writing dictated by native speaker norms. The multilingual writer is constantly negotiating the linguistic codes and contributing to the language use. Language cannot exist in isolation; it is constantly evolving as the users shape it through their experiences and ways of being. Drawing from the ideas of Bakhtin and Holquist, writing pedagogy in the 21st century makes space for multiplicity of voices and perspectives (qtd. in Espinosa et al. 9).

Multilingual literacy practices and multimodality are interconnected. Through the integration of technology, the writing classroom also becomes a space for multimodal explorations. Students are free to compose texts through digital media accessing content in different languages. Writing is no longer restricted to words on paper, but integrating sounds, images, videos, data visualisations can make it multimodal. Writing prompts can be designed keeping in mind the new ways of written expression through social media and online networking. The writers of 21st century need to create multimodal texts such as podcasts, videos, photo essays, memes, webpages, social media campaigns, and other forms of digital texts. Our writing classrooms need to reflect this shift in the real world. Genres that draw from the digital space need to find an organic space in the writing curriculum. For instance, in the writing module under discussion, travel blog and social media posts were included that naturally lends itself to multilingual and multimodal explorations.

Translanguaging Strategies Used in the Course

The one-month proficiency course offered to foreign nationals at EFL University consists of a writing module of 16 hours and provides a space for pedagogic innovations. The

participants in the basic group who are identified as having A1 level of proficiency (as per CEFR scale)² or beginner users of English took part in this study. The number of participants were 23 and they were all multilinguals. The writing tasks were based on integration of skills approach including all the language skills—listening, speaking, reading, and writing. In the pre-task, participants listened to audio and video materials and took notes in their mother tongue, followed by peer interactions in a common language or mixed language groups, followed by generating an idea bank for writing to begin. Mind mapping and brainstorming were done bilingually in groups as the teacher did not know the languages of the students. However, it is important to highlight that it is not necessary for the teachers to know all the languages in the classroom to use translanguaging pedagogy. Multimodal inputs in the form of videos, audios, images, and digital content diversified the writing process. Moreover, participants were encouraged to use bilingual online resources to generate ideas. The final writing task was to create a social media post on their travel to India. This task allowed them to finetune their content to an intended audience that knew their languages and therefore created a genuine need to *translanguage*. Use of images, emoticons, and codemeshing in their languages led to authentic expression of their travel experience.

The following translanguaging tools were incorporated in the writing module:

- Double entry journals

This is a “writing to learn” strategy as outlined in the New York City Writing Project (Domini, qtd. in Espinosa 24). This tool allows students to use their entire linguistic repertoire. The paper is divided into two columns. The first column has a quotation from the aural or written text. Then the students are asked to respond to this quotation by writing their views on the right side of the paper. The teacher can give some prompts to help students reflect on the quotation in meaningful ways. Students are encouraged to use their entire linguistic repertoire. They are free to write in their mother tongue or even mix English and other languages.

Example from my class:

In the first week, my students listened to a TedTalk on the power of writing, and based on the listening they were asked to respond to a quote from the talk. The quote given to them was “Writing is a superpower. It is a weapon to change the world.” Participants were then asked to get into groups with similar mother tongues and brainstorm in their language groups followed by a double entry journal which led to generation of ideas around this quote. These discussions also brought forth alternate perspectives to literacy practices when speakers of African languages highlighted how many of their languages do not have a written script. Participants also reflected on the politics of writing histories of nations that have been colonised. Therefore, writing is also a matter of privilege and power as many languages in the world do not have a written script. Challenging mainstream written discourse became another point for discussion. Such critical conversations were possible only because the writing classroom became a

²For more information on the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (CEFR) scale, see, www.coe.int/en/web/common-european-framework-reference-languages/level-descriptions.

site for reflections on our multilingual identities and experiences. These discussions were used as the basis for writing an argumentative paragraph.

- Writing from a different perspective

This tool allows students to look at a text from diverse perspectives and engage in critical thinking. It also helps them evaluate purpose, context, and audience while writing. Students can be put in home language groups to be able to use their mother tongue for discussion.

Example from my class:

In the second week of the programme, we discussed informal emails. After reading an email set in a particular context, the participants imagined writing about the same topic but to different people. This led to discussions on how the same topic can be presented in different ways with the change of audience in a writing situation. When we write an email to a relative vs a friend vs a family member, we look at the topic from a different perspective to suit the purpose and needs of the audience. This led to discussions on word choice, register, tone, and inclusion and exclusion of details. Participants varied their content based on this rhetorical awareness and engaged in natural language use drawing from their experiences without focusing on structured language input. They were also encouraged to revise their drafts through self and peer evaluation rubrics. Some students, especially with Spanish as their first language (L1), also *codemeshed* words from their L1 and reflected on those words to find the equivalents in English in their second draft. Since Spanish and English share several cognates (related words such as *clase/class*, *opción/option*, *universidad/university*, *mercado/market*, *examen/exam*).

- Writing as Readers—Using Mentor Texts

Exposing students to relevant texts that can inspire them as writers is important. Writers are keen readers taking cues from texts they read and adopting some of the moves in their own writing. Mentor texts are authentic materials that students can analyse, critique, and reflect on to make their own choices while writing. For instance, a social media post can be brought into the classroom as a mentor text. It is an authentic material because it was not composed keeping in mind any instructional setting. It is important to note that mentor texts can also be critiqued. While they may reflect effective language use, they can also be analysed to generate relevant discussions around rhetorical elements. Drawing the attention of the learners to genre conventions through mentor texts can be a powerful pedagogic strategy. The role of a teacher is significant in drawing attention to strategies used by the author in crafting a text, in noticing new forms, and helping learners incorporate or experiment in their own writing (Griffith, qtd. in Espinosa 56). Choosing mentor texts is also a complex process. The mentor texts must reflect the linguistic and cultural diversity of the learner group. Socially situated texts have a greater impact on learning than texts that alienate learners. Teachers can create a pool of mentor texts with the help of learners to reflect their locally situated literacy practices.

Example from my class:

In the third week of the course, we worked on writing a travel blog. Students watched a video on Indonesian adventure in Bahasa and read travel blog entries of

travellers across the globe. These texts incorporated cultural information, images, words from other languages, and provided examples of mentor texts for the participants to compose their own. These authentic texts were in English and in the languages of the participants which gave them space to reflect on the features of the genre across linguistic codes. This facilitated cross-linguistic transfer of writing strategies. In common language groups, they brainstormed and arrived at the textual features and genre conventions. They also commented on the writing styles. This empowered them to reflect on writing as a process irrespective of their linguistic backgrounds. The participants reported a higher degree of understanding of the genre through this task. In the focused group discussions, they particularly liked watching videos in other languages and claimed that it brought them closer to their classmates, and their languages and cultures. Incorporating videos in other languages allowed participants with diverse language backgrounds to contribute to the class discussion, drawing from their own cultural resources and legitimising the knowledge systems available in their languages as useful and enriching, shaping the classroom discourse.

Apart from the above translanguaging tools, participants also engaged in self evaluation and peer feedback to improve their drafts. Participants' lexical and syntactic choices were accepted even if they reflected deviation from standard language use. This is an important aspect of translanguaging pedagogy.

Student Reflections and Insights

At each stage of the writing process, students engaged in reflective conversation and discussions to understand the effect of translanguaging on their writing. These discussions helped them develop metalinguistic and metacognitive awareness about language use.³ From the group discussions and reflective entries of the students, the following themes emerged that were significant to understanding the use of translanguaging in the classroom.

Pre-writing tasks	During writing tasks	Post-writing tasks
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Translanguaging helped in idea generation, brainstorming, mind mapping · Written and aural texts in mother tongue as input material facilitated schema activation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Use of online bilingual resources helped in word choices · Writing double entry journals enhanced written expression 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Peer feedback (focussed on content) through evaluation rubrics was found to be useful and facilitated peer learning · Comparing drafts led to improvement in subsequent drafts

³Metalinguistic awareness refers to students' ability to reflect on language and having the meta language to talk about language whereas metacognitive awareness refers to the conscious understanding of one's own thought processes allowing learners to be aware of their strengths in the learning process and achieve better task outcomes.

Consequent Developments and Outcomes		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Reduced learner anxiety · Gained confidence to express ideas freely · Activated previous experiences and knowledge about the topic · Mixed language groups helped in negotiation of meaning · Same language pairs/groups facilitated interaction and ideation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Generating topic sentences in mother tongue helped in organisation and planning · Use of cohesive devices/frequency markers through comparison in mother tongue helped in developing better flow · <i>Codemeshing</i> expanded word use and helped in expressing ideas; also facilitated in bringing in experiences across cultures 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Self-evaluation through rubrics helped in self correction and noticing language forms, punctuation errors and lexical gaps · Self-reflection on the writing process allowed participants to understand their fears and blocks around writing · Self-reflection questioned the dominant beliefs of the participants about their native languages as well as English

The above table shows that in the pre-writing stage, translanguaging helped learners in idea generation, mind mapping, address anxiety, free writing, and activating prior knowledge on the topic and genre. The strategies used during writing helped them integrate L1 and L2 language use, raised awareness of language choices, and metalinguistic knowledge through comparison and codemeshing. Post-writing strategies facilitated peer feedback, self-reflection and noticing, as well as questioning dominant beliefs about writing.

In the writing test administered at the end of the course, participants were found to be more aware of their rhetorical situation. Crafting of topic sentences, use of connectors, lexical choices and overall text organisation improved in the final test.

Ideas for Integrating Translanguaging in Teaching Writing

Based on the discussion in this paper, here are some ideas to promote translanguaging in the writing classrooms.

- Plan tasks strategically to ensure that learners use their entire linguistic repertoire to achieve task outcomes.
- Pay attention to the pre-writing stage and encourage students to use multilingual and multimodal resources to brainstorm and plan. Pre-writing can happen in L1 or through codemeshing. One language can be selected later for subsequent drafts.
- Explore language groupings that allow negotiation of meaning and lead to collaborative learning based on genuine information gap that is culturally diverse. Also encourage peer feedback through guided rubrics.
- Create real time writing tasks where learners can experiment with translanguaging in writing for bilingual and monolingual audiences. Integrating digital media can create opportunities for multimodal practices.

Conclusions

This paper argues that translanguaging is a powerful pedagogic tool to ensure inclusivity and strive for social justice in the language classroom, which becomes a site for reflexivity and critical engagement. Specifically in a writing classroom—where writing is viewed as a collaborative and dialogic process—encouraging learners to put in collective efforts in active co-creation of knowledge emerging from their lived experiences and reflecting on their diverse cultural and linguistic backgrounds is a transformative experience. Language classrooms often end up reinforcing the hegemonic practices and dominant beliefs about language hierarchies without critically engaging with the sociocultural context in which the target language (in this case English) is being learnt. A monolingual, target language focussed classroom fails to adopt a contextually reflexive and relevant pedagogy. Both teachers and learners pay a huge price when placed in such teaching and learning environments. They are stripped of their linguistic resources the moment they walk into the language classroom which instils in them a feeling of lack or deficit. This has a negative impact on learning since their cognitive, metacognitive, linguistic, and cultural resources are not integrated in the language classroom. Thus, by embracing translanguaging pedagogy, teachers and learners challenge hegemonic language practices, disrupt established power hierarchies, and validate the complex multilingualism that exists across the world.



Works Cited

- Baker, Colin, and Wayne E. Wright. *Foundations of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*. Multilingual Matters, 2017.
- Canagarajah, Suresh. *Critical Academic Writing and Multilingual Students*. U of Michigan P, 2002.
- . "Codemeshing in Academic Writing: Identifying Teachable Strategies of Translanguaging." *The Modern Language Journal*, vol. 95, no. 3, 2011, pp. 401–417.
- . *Translingual Practice: Global Englishes and Cosmopolitan Relations*. Routledge, 2013.
- . "Understanding critical writing." *Language and Linguistics in Context: Readings and Applications for Teachers* edited by Harriet Luria, Deborah M. Seymour and Trudy Smoke, Taylor and Francis, 2012, pp. 307–314.
- Cenoz, Jasone. "Translanguaging in School Contexts: International Perspectives." *Journal of Language, Identity and Education*, vol. 16, no. 4, 2017, pp. 193–198, <https://doi.org/10.1080/15348458.2017.1327816>.
- , and Durk Gorter. "Pedagogical Translanguaging: An Introduction." *System*, vol. 92, 2020, <https://doi.org/10.1080/15348458.2017.1327816>.
- , and Durk Gorter. *Pedagogical Translanguaging*. Cambridge UP, 2021, <https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009029384>.
- Erickson, Federick. "Transformation and School Success: The Politics and Culture of Educational Achievement." *Minority Education: Anthropological Perspectives*, edited by Evelyn Jacob and Cathie Jordan, Ablex, 1996, pp. 27–52.
- Espinosa, Cecilia, et al. *A Translanguaging Pedagogy for Writing: A CUNY-NYSIEB Guide for Educators*. CUNY-NYSIEB, 2016, www.cuny-nysieb.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/05/TLG-Pedagogy-Writing-04-15-16.pdf.
- García, Ofelia. "Education, Multilingualism and Translanguaging in the 21st Century." *Social Justice through Multilingual Education*, edited by Tove-Skutnabb Kangas, Robert Philipson, Ajit K. Mohanty and Minati Panda, Multilingual Matters, 2009, pp. 140–158.
- , and Li Wei. *Translanguaging: Language, Bilingualism and Education*. Palgrave Macmillan, 2014.
- , and Lin, Angel. "Translanguaging and Bilingual Education." *Bilingual Education: Encyclopedia of Language and Education*, edited by Ofelia García, Angel Lin and Stephen May, Springer, 2017, pp. 117–130.
- Lewis, Gwyn, et al. "Translanguaging: Origins and Development from School to Street and Beyond." *Educational Research and Evaluation*, vol. 18, no. 7, 2012, pp. 641–654, <https://doi.org/10.1080/13803611.2012.718488>.
- Mukhopadhyay, Lina. "Translanguaging in Primary Level ESL Classroom in India: An Exploratory Study." *International Journal of English Language Teaching*, vol. 7, 2020, pp. 1–15.

Samway, Katherine. D. *When English Language Learners Write: Connecting Research to Practice, K-8*. Heinemann, 2006.

Wei, Li. “Translanguaging as a Practical Theory of Language.” *Applied Linguistics*, vol. 39, no. 1, 2018, pp. 9–30, <https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/amx039>.

Williams, Cen. *A Language Gained: A Study of Language Immersion at 11-16 Years of Age*, School of Education, U of Wales, 2002.