


Translanguaging pedagogy: An integrative review study questioning its potential benefits and main concerns

Pınar Koçer¹

¹Tekirdağ Namık Kemal University, Türkiye / Contact: pcankaya@nku.edu.tr 

Abstract

In the era of globalization, when cultural diversity and multilingualism cross borders, specific changes have been observed in human relations and educational implementations. Such changes in multicultural and multilingual contexts have made it necessary to create novel pedagogies for language teaching by tailoring traditional teaching and learning approaches. Therefore, adapting language teaching methods and techniques to multilingual and multicultural classrooms through translanguaging is one of the hottest issues in the current literature. Remarkably, the primary purpose of this present study is to portray a theoretical understanding of translanguaging and further discuss the pedagogical aspect of it in the Turkish context through an integrative review methodology. To this end, five research studies conducted in the Turkish context were selected based on certain criteria and analyzed through document analysis to reach a comprehensive picture of translanguaging practices in EFL classroom settings. By doing so, it attempted to argue its potential benefits and possible challenges to guide stakeholders about how and/or when to benefit from translanguaging pedagogy so that it becomes more precise and beneficial for classroom use.

Keywords

Translanguaging, pedagogical benefits, challenges, EFL context

Submission date

11.08.2023

Acceptance date

23.11.2023

© 2023 The Literacy Trek & the Authors – Published by The Literacy Trek
<https://doi.org/10.47216/literacytrek.1341219>

Introduction

Originally coined as “trawsieithu” by Cen Williams and his colleague (Lewis et al., 2012, p. 3) for a bilingual context in Wales, translanguaging serves as a pedagogical tool for integrating all languages in learners’ repertoire for meaning-making and a better understanding (García & Wei, 2014). Similarly, Garcia (2009) supported translanguaging as a novel pedagogy in which the languages in the learner’s repertoire are benefited to their maximum. Cognitive, pedagogical, and cultural concerns have a certain impact on the definition of translanguaging. For example, Baker (2011) proposed a definition of a cognitive domain as follows: “making meaning, shaping experiences,

gaining understanding and knowledge through the use of two or (more) languages” (p. 288). Nonetheless, Garcia and Kano (2014) emphasized the pedagogic and ideological aspects of translanguaging by defining it as “a process by which students and teachers engage in complex discursive practices that include all the language practices of all students in a class to develop new language practices and sustain old ones, communicate and appropriate knowledge, and give voice to new sociopolitical realities by interrogating linguistic inequality” (p. 225).

As the definitions above suggest, translanguaging, as a pedagogy, is generally considered suitable for bilingual and multilingual contexts (Cenoz, 2009), resulting in increased research studies within these settings (García & Wei, 2014). However, EFL contexts have recently been paid attention to translanguaging practices (Yuzlu & Dikilitas, 2022). That might stem from the monolingual bias in EFL settings because traditionally, within EFL contexts, the monolingual policy has been advocated as native-like proficiency has been targeted. In a similar vein, communicative language teaching putting the greatest focus on the use of target language has reinforced the monolingual strategy leaving either no or not enough room for L1 use in classroom settings (Celce-Murcia, 2001; Wang, 2019), resulting in monolingual bias. Thus, the idea of effectively using the learners’ entire language repertoire has challenged the traditional teaching approach, which emphasizes only target language use in EFL classrooms. Given that the Turkish context is considered an EFL setting, capturing a comprehensive picture of translanguaging implementations through a critical lens is necessary. This need is the main impetus behind the current study, which aims to uncover potential benefits and main concerns of translanguaging practices in the Turkish context. That might contribute to our knowledge of the critical role of translanguaging pedagogy in EFL classrooms by revealing both benefits and challenges during the implementation processes.

Literature Review

Theoretical background: The key considerations of translanguaging

Bilingualism practices have been considered beneficial for learners’ cognitive, linguistic, academic, and cross-cultural development (Moore & Nikula, 2016).

Receiving a considerable amount of attention, bilingual approaches in education, translanguaging as one of them, are on the rise as a result of “education, immigration, extended family, temporary residence” (Bialystok, 2001, p.183), which leads to multilingual and multicultural environments. Translanguaging is a pedagogical strategy for integrating all languages in learners' repertoire for greater comprehension and meaning-making (García & Wei, 2014). Garcia (2009) differentiates between translanguaging and code-switching by emphasizing that translanguaging ‘goes beyond what has been termed code-switching... although it includes it, as well as other kinds of bilingual language use and bilingual contact’ (p. 45). A deliberate use of learners’ languages interchangeably, translanguaging, provides a preliminary ground for learner engagement and active participation in meaning-making (Lewis et al., 2012).

Considering translanguaging pedagogy, the idea of effectively using the learner’s entire language repertoire has challenged the traditional teaching approach which emphasizes only target language use in EFL classrooms. However, there are both advocates of translanguaging pedagogy and opponents who primarily focus on its disadvantages. On the one hand, translanguaging as a pedagogy is considered more practical as “both languages are used in a dynamic and functionally integrated manner to organize and mediate mental processes in understanding, speaking, literacy, and, not least, learning” (Lewis et al., 2012, p. 1). Therefore, translanguaging creates an environment for the learner where s/he can freely use her / his languages while keeping identical, cultural and linguistic varieties. On the other hand, translanguaging pedagogy has been criticized for its negative effect on target language use as a result of overuse of L1, negative transfer, and cross-linguistic interference (Kucukali & Koçbaş, 2021; Liu & Fang, 2020; Yuvayapan, 2019).

Previous research

Various research has been carried out at the national and international levels to explore and grasp a deeper understanding of translanguaging practices in language classrooms. As a result, previous research revealed the key role of the entire language repertoire of the learner in their language learning process. The findings uncovered the following benefits of translanguaging: Learner engagement, active participation in meaning-making (Lewis et al., 2012), greater comprehension (García & Wei, 2014), facilitating mental processes in speaking and literacy (Lewis et al., 2012). For example, as portrayed

in the findings of Baker's study (2011), translanguaging provides remarkable benefits such as "promoting a deeper and fuller understanding of content, helping students to develop skills in their weaker language, facilitating home-school cooperation, developing learners second language ability concurrently with content learning" (p. 281-282). Moreover, as an inclusive approach (Garcia & Wei, 2014), translanguaging pedagogy is believed to create an engaging and motivating environment for learners (Percy, 2016) as they feel free to use their weaker or stronger languages simultaneously for differing purposes. Accordingly, considered as the deliberate use of the languages of learners interchangeably, translanguaging enhances learner engagement and active participation in meaning-making (Lewis, Jones, & Baker, 2012).

On the contrary, serious concerns have been aroused in several research studies focusing on the negative impact of translanguaging on the target language use, overuse of L1, negative transfer, and cross-linguistic interference (Kucukali & Koçbaşı, 2021; Liu & Fang, 2020; Yuvayapan, 2019). Previous research provided valuable information for these negative concerns of translanguaging as the use of L1 interferes with cross-linguistic communication, thus becoming a habit over time (Kucukali & Koçbaşı, 2021; Yuvayapan, 2019). More importantly, excessive use of L1 might reduce learner autonomy and proficiency in the target language (Kucukali & Koçbaşı, 2021; Yuvayapan, 2019). Moreover, it might be another problem not to be able to maintain the balance between the target language and L1 in addition to ignoring the target language use (Kucukali & Koçbaşı, 2021).

Although there is sufficient literature on translanguaging in general, there are fewer studies on the impact of translanguaging within the Turkish context, taking both positive and negative concerns into account, reflecting a research gap in the literature. Consequently, this current research, designed as an integrative review study, attempts to reveal potential benefits and main concerns of translanguaging practices in the Turkish context, presenting research-driven data to obtain a thorough picture of the issue. This study is a comprehensive review of the translanguaging pedagogy that critically evaluates the potential benefits and the main concerns by seeking answers to the following research questions:

RQ1: What might be the potential benefits of translanguaging pedagogy?

RQ2: What might be the main concerns of translanguaging pedagogy?

Methodology

Research Design

Discussing the use, benefits, and main concerns of translanguaging pedagogy within an EFL setting through the perceptions of teachers and students, this study was designed as an integrative research review to investigate the translanguaging pedagogy with its benefits and potential problems by examining five selected studies. Both research and review studies are performed to explore things which are put forward by Newman and Gough (2020) in their own words as follows:

“Reviews to find out what is already known from pre-existing research about a phenomena, subject or topic; new primary research to provide answers to questions about which existing research does not provide clear and/or complete answers” (p.3).

As they suggest, a “protocol” as a written plan of the systematic review involving a research question and the method to examine the question is helpful guidance. That further helps the reviewer decide about the selection criteria for the studies to include, the procedure for assessing the quality of the selected studies, and the way of relating the main results to the research questions formulated.

Therefore, the following steps were undertaken as a protocol for this integrative review study:

“(1) develop research question, (2) design conceptual framework, (3) construct selection criteria, (4) develop search strategy, (5) select studies using selection criteria, (6) coding studies, (7) assess the quality of studies, (8) synthesis results of individual studies to answer the review research question, and (9) report findings” (Newman & Gough, 2020, p. 6).

The selected studies are listed below with their titles and researchers.

Table 1

Basic information about the selected studies

Study no	The researcher (s)	Title of the study
Study 1	Muhammet Yasar Yuzlu & Kenan Dikilitas	Translanguaging in the development of EFL learners' foreign language skills in Turkish context
Study 2	Vildan İnci Kavak & Yasemin Kırkgöz	Exploring university students' note taking in the literature courses: a translanguaging perspective
Study 3	Emel Küçükali & Dilara Koçbaşı	Benefits and issues of translanguaging pedagogies on language learning: Students' perspective
Study 4	Gülbin Dağhan - Aslan, & Gülşay Kıray	The Reflection of the First Foreign Language (English) by Utilizing Translanguaging Strategies in the Teaching of Second Foreign Language (German)
Study 5	Fatma Yuvayapan	Translanguaging in EFL classrooms: Teachers' perceptions and practices

By sketching the recent body of research studies, the rationale for choosing the abovementioned studies as the basis of the current paper can be explained with the agreement between the purpose of the current paper and the purpose of the selected studies. That's to say, the main purpose of this paper is to reach a clear understanding of translanguaging pedagogy with its possible benefits and potential challenges and issues through the perspectives of students and teachers. The selected studies also investigated the benefits and concerns of translanguaging as pedagogy in various contexts by obtaining teachers and students' opinions, thus serving as the core data for the current study. The following parts will be devoted to the selection criteria and the detailed analysis of the selected studies, including their methodological and contextual characteristics based on the protocol put forward by Newman and Gough (2020).

Criteria for the selection of the studies

It aims to explore the possible benefits, potential challenges, and issues of translanguaging pedagogy through the selected studies. To this end, in order to select the research studies, first, the inclusion and exclusion criteria were determined as follows:

1. The keywords are identified as “translanguaging, pedagogy, benefits, challenges, EFL, and Turkey.”

2. The databases searched for the study include SSCI, Scopus, ESCI, TR Dizin, MLA, and Sobiad.
3. The studies published between 2019 and 2022 are included in the study.
4. Only translanguaging studies are included.
5. Research articles are selected. However, book chapters, review essays, master and doctorate dissertations are excluded.
6. Studies conducted in the Turkish context are included in the present study.

As seen in the list of the selected studies, the inclusionary focus was merely on the research on translanguaging pedagogy and practices within the Turkish context. The studies were recent and had been published in the following journals: Innovation in Language Learning and Teaching, Turkish Online Journal of English Language Teaching, Çukurova Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi, Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies.

A detailed analysis of the selected studies

The main frameworks of the selected studies are explained here in Table 2. It aims to portray their purpose and research questions. By doing so, the selected research studies are discussed to reach an overall understanding.

Table 2

The main information of the selected studies

Study	Topic area / the purpose	Research questions
Yuzlu & Dikilitas, 2022	The potential impact of translanguaging pedagogy on EFL learners' four language skills	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Does the translanguaging experience have any statistically significant effect upon the students exposed to grammar translation, in terms of their receptive and productive foreign language skills? 2. Does the translanguaging experience have any statistically significant effect upon the students exposed to communicative language teaching in terms of their receptive and productive foreign language skills? 3. What are the impacts of translanguaging pedagogy on learners' perceptions of language learning?

İnci-Kavak & Kırkgöz, 2022	The relationship between translanguaging and note-taking	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. What strategies do ELL students use in their notes? 2. To what extent do ELL students use translanguaging (TL) in their notes? 3. What are the functions of TL in student notes? 4. What are lecturers' attitudes towards students' use of TL in their notes?
Küçükali & Koçbaş, 2021	The benefits and issues of translanguaging pedagogies (TP) in language education	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. What are students' perceptions of TP practiced in their classrooms? 2. What are students' perceptions of using TP depending on the proficiency level of the target language? 3. What are students' perceptions of using TP to teach specific language skills and areas?
Dağhan-Aslan & Kıray, 2020	Translanguaging strategies and questioning the effectiveness of these strategies	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Does the teacher implement TL strategies? If so, what kind of TL strategies does she implement in her SFL classroom? 2. How does the teacher allocate these strategies in German (SFL) classes? Deliberately or not? 3. For what purposes do the learners respond to these strategies?
Yuvayapan, 2019	English language teachers' perceptions of translanguaging	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. What are the perceptions and practices of English language teachers towards translanguaging? 2. For what purposes do EFL teachers use Turkish in their classrooms?

When the topic areas are concerned, it is easily seen that researchers mostly focused on the impact of translanguaging pedagogy on language learning in general, four language skills, or note-taking in particular cases. To start, addressing the translanguaging pedagogy in terms of its impact on learners, Yuzlu and Dikilitas (2022) posed three main research questions to determine the contribution of translanguaging pedagogy on the four language skills of EFL learners. They also investigated students' perceptions about the benefits of translanguaging pedagogy. Employing a qualitative study, Kucukali and Koçbaş (2021) questioned the benefits and concerns of translanguaging through the university students' eyes. From a different point of view, Dağhan-Aslan and Kıray (2020) investigated translanguaging strategies and their effectiveness in their study. Pointing to a gap in translanguaging studies in the Turkish context, İnci-Kavak and Kırkgöz (2022) attempted to explore the way students take notes for their future selves regarding thought, creativity, and language use and to question translanguaging benefits for writing skill, particularly for note taking. Finally, Yuvayapan (2019) aimed to understand translanguaging practices in real classroom

settings in order to question the discrepancies between teacher perceptions and practices.

The data collection procedure and data analysis

Table 3 below demonstrates the methodological design of the studies, including data collection and analysis procedures. Thus, it explains the data collection procedure and analysis in detail.

Table 3

Research design of the selected studies

Study	Method	Data collection instruments	Data analysis
Yuzlu & Dikilitas, 2022	An embedded quasi-experimental design	Skills test (reading–writing–listening–speaking) &Attributional interview questions	Statistical analyses (paired samples t-test, one-way analysis of covariance) grounded theory
İnci-Kavak & Kırkgöz, 2022	Mixed methods research design	Students’ notes, Student and lecturer interviews &Observations	Content analysis
Küçükali & Koçbaş, 2021	Qualitative study	Focus group interviews & Graphic elicitation tasks	Descriptive statistics (Frequency), and content and visual analysis by using CLAN (Computerized Language Analysis) Program
Dağhan-Aslan & Kıray, 2020	Ethnographic method	Observation &Semi-structured interviews	Deductive analysis for observation data inductive analysis for interview data
Yuvayapan, 2019	Mixed methods research design	A questionnaire,Classroom observations,Semi-structured interviews	Descriptive statistics structural-coding analysis

Most of the researchers (three-fifths) collected qualitative and quantitative data together through mixed methods research designs, while two used only qualitative data collection tools. As can be observed in Table 3, the most frequently used data collection tool was the interview (n=5, 100%), which suggests that the researchers attempted to reach a comprehensive picture of the issue through an in-depth understanding.

Employing a quasi-experimental mixed methods research design, Yuzlu and Dikilitas (2022) used skill tests and attributional interview questions as data collection tools. As a result, qualitative data consisted of 15 themes, while quantitative data included statistical results of paired sample tests and ANCOVA. In her mixed methods research study, Yuvayapan (2019) also collected both qualitative and quantitative data through a questionnaire, observation, and semi-structured interviews. In order to analyze the collected data, she computed descriptive statistics for the quantitative data and structural-coding analysis for the qualitative data. Conducting a qualitative study, Kucukali and Koçbaşı (2021) collected the data through focus group interviews and graphic elicitation tasks. Computing content and visual analysis in addition to descriptive statistics, the researchers revealed the affective, cognitive, and social benefits of translanguaging for students' engagement. In another study, Dağhan-Aslan and Kiray (2020) investigated translanguaging strategies and their effectiveness through a qualitative research design, collecting the data through interviews and classroom observations. Employing a deductive analysis for observation data and inductive analysis for interview data, the researchers presented the results through certain themes and categories. İnci-Kavak and Kırkgöz (2022) gathered necessary data employing non-participant observation technique to investigate students' note-taking practices and lecture and student interviews to explore their perceptions of translanguaging. The researchers used content analysis. Considering the settings and the key informants of the selected studies, Table 4 is prepared.

Table 4

Contextual characteristics of the selected studies

Study	Setting	Participants
Yuzlu & Dikilitas, 2022	A high-school in the north of Turkey	60 pre-intermediate and 60 upper-intermediate students
İnci-Kavak & Kırkgöz, 2022	An English Language and Literature (ELL) programme of a public university in Turkey	6 lecturers
		15 students were interviewed
		155 students were observed
		55 students' notes were examined
Küçükali & Koçbaşı, 2021	A Turkish state university	Learners of English (N=27) and Russian (N=10) as a FL (Foreign Language) and learners of Turkish (N=13) as a SL (Second Language)

Dağhan-Aslan & Kıray, 2020 A 10th grade German class in a high school A German language teacher
29 students

Yuvayapan, 2019 All grades of state and private schools in many cities of Turkey 50 EFL teachers
Five classroom observations
Semi-structured interviews with 10 EFL teachers

Yuvayapan (2019) observed five English classes to understand translanguaging practices in real classroom settings. Moreover, 50 EFL teachers from different state and private schools participated in her study, while 10 of them were interviewed to question the discrepancies between their perceptions and practices. Yuzlu and Dikilitas (2022) carried out their study in a high school to investigate the contribution of translanguaging pedagogy to four language skills of EFL learners and the perceptions of students about the benefits of translanguaging pedagogy. Implementing the study for ten weeks with 60 pre-intermediate and 60 upper-intermediate students, they sought to answer whether translanguaging instruction has a statistically significant effect on receptive and productive language skills of students exposed to grammar-translation or communicative approach. Kucukali and Koçbaşı (2021) questioned the benefits and concerns of translanguaging through the university students' eyes (N=50). The researchers collected the data from the learners of English (N=27), learners of Russian (N=10) as a foreign language, and learners of Turkish (N=13) as a second language. They used four cross-linguistic translanguaging activities as follows: "translation, comparison of multiple languages, alternating between multiple languages, and comparison of multiple cultures" (Kucukali & Koçbaşı, 2021, p. 57) in order to discuss students' engagement, which is discussed by three aspects as emotional, social and cognitive through students' eyes. Dağhan-Aslan and Kıray (2020) investigated translanguaging strategies and their effectiveness in their study with a 10th-grade German class with 29 German language students and a language teacher. İnci-Kavak and Kırkgöz (2022) carried out their study at the English language and literature department at a state university in Türkiye to investigate students' note-taking practices in addition to lecture and student interviews to explore their perceptions of

translanguaging. Moreover, 15 students' lecture notes were used for examining their note-taking habits.

Results

The first question of the study is formulated to find out the main benefits of translanguaging practices based on the selected studies. The following table demonstrates the main benefits under three categories. These categories are named as cognitive, emotional-affective, and social-interactional by the researcher herself.

Table 5

The main benefits of translanguaging

Category of benefits	Benefits	Research studies
Cognitive	Facilitating language learning	Kucukali, E., & Koçbaşı, D. 2021 Yuzlu & Dikilitas, 2022
	Developing cognitive skills and strategies	Kucukali, E., & Koçbaşı, D. 2021
	Improving meta-linguistic awareness and knowledge	Kucukali, E., & Koçbaşı, D. 2021 Yuzlu & Dikilitas, 2022
	Deeper understanding of the content/comprehension	Kucukali, E., & Koçbaşı, D. 2021 Yuzlu & Dikilitas, 2022
	Increasing students' autonomy	Yuzlu & Dikilitas, 2022
	Scaffolding and remembering the key vocabulary	İnci-Kavak & Kırkgöz, 2020
Emotional-Affective	Cross-linguistic awareness and flexibility	Kucukali, E., & Koçbaşı, D. 2021
	Adaptation to a foreign language	Kucukali, E., & Koçbaşı, D. 2021
	Increasing support and motivation	Yuzlu & Dikilitas, 2022
	Coping with anxiety	Yuzlu & Dikilitas, 2022
	A comfortable engaging environment	Dağhan-Aslan & Kıray, 2020 Yuzlu & Dikilitas, 2022
	Enhancing their interest and volunteering	Yuvayapan, 2019 Yuzlu & Dikilitas, 2022
Social-interactional	Experiencing enjoyment of learning	Yuzlu & Dikilitas, 2022
	Plurilingual and intercultural competence	Yuzlu & Dikilitas, 2022
	Enhancing students' participation	Dağhan-Aslan & Kıray, 2020
	Building rapport between teacher-student	Yuzlu & Dikilitas, 2022 Yuvayapan, 2019

A better interaction and communication	Dağhan-Aslan & Kıray, 2020 Yuvayapan, 2019 Yuzlu & Dikilitas, 2022
Practical and time-saving	Yuvayapan, 2019

As Table 5 demonstrates, the benefits are grouped as cognitive benefits, emotional-affective benefits and social-interactive benefits. Initially, Yuzlu and Dikilitas's study (2022) demonstrated that translanguaging instruction had an efficient role in students' receptive or productive English language skills based on a paired-sample test and one-way analysis of ANCOVA. The quantitative data results showed that translanguaging instruction in the pre-intermediate experimental group improved learners' receptive and productive foreign language with a .53 effect size. When the upper intermediate experimental group's scores were considered, it was observed that learners' post-test scores increased after translanguaging instruction with the mean value of $M=87.60$; ($SD = 5.31$). Compared to the traditional grammar-translation instruction, translanguaging pedagogy helped learners improve their receptive and productive skills, as demonstrated by ANCOVA statistics.

According to the semi-structured interview results, translanguaging pedagogy yielded constructive, cognitive, interactive, and affective benefits. The majority of the interviewees (four-fifths) held positive tendencies to use translanguaging pedagogy to cope with pedagogical, linguistic, or affective difficulties. Learners exposed to translanguaging pedagogy outperformed the learners in control groups, whether taught through grammar-translation or communicative language teaching. This result shows that flexible and simultaneous use of L1 and L2 enhances interaction and communication by ensuring a better comprehension and meaning-making process both for learners and teachers. Considering the benefits of the constructive domain, it was acknowledged that translanguaging promoted learners' meaning-making and autonomous learning. Cognitively, the authors mentioned four main benefits: "accessing full linguistic repertoire, discovering the language system, bilingual awareness raising, and facilitating learning" (Yuzlu & Dikilitas, 2022, p.190). As highlighted, being aware of their own language repertoire and exploring the differences of these languages enable learners to realize their full potential. Regarding the interactive dimension, the researchers noted three main benefits: developing interactional language use, authentic

language use, and promoting communicative abilities. Employing translanguaging activities, learners had the opportunity to use the language in their daily lives. Regarding affective concerns, the researchers reported the following benefits: feeling secure, developing a sense of comfort, sustaining motivation, volunteering, experiencing the enjoyment of learning, and developing a sense of real language learning.

Grouping the purposes of translanguaging as classroom-oriented and student-oriented, Yuvayapan (2019) listed the main benefits as follows: classroom management, building bonds with students, giving feedback, describing vocabulary items, and praising students. Not only those cognitive gains but also affective and social benefits such as a motivating and engaging environment are also noteworthy to state. In Kucukali and Koçbaşı's study, particularly foreign students and minority students reported the emotional benefits of translanguaging as adaptation and feeling more comfortable (2021). Based on Celic and Seltzer's curriculum (2011), Dağhan - Aslan, and Kıray (2020), investigated 27 translanguaging strategies in their studies and concluded that "the vocabulary-based, syntax-based and multilingual ecology" strategies are the most frequently used ones. Considering interview analysis, it was observed that 'Strategies for TL Classroom' and 'Strategies for Language Development' were the most used by the teachers while 'Strategies for 'Content-Area Development' was rarely benefitted from. In İnci-Kavak and Kırkgöz's study (2020), the participants used translanguaging mainly for scaffolding, remembering the key vocabulary, and restating the information in their note taking. In addition to note-taking techniques such as "color-coding, highlighting, and tabulating", students adopt translanguaging as a facilitative technique. The students' notes that the researchers examined showed that they used L1 and L2 together to reach a better and deep understanding of the content while the key terminology was written in L2 only (e.g. "colonised" and "coloniser").

In this sense, translanguaging by combining L1 and L2 allows them to understand the content knowledge in less time and more effectively because L1 makes more sense as it is a part of their daily life and identity. Having discussed the benefits translanguaging pedagogy provides for classroom use, it is well-known that everything has its drawbacks; thus, the following part explores the potential problems of translanguaging based on the data from the selected studies.

The second question of the study attempts to discuss the potential problems of translanguaging pedagogy. For this purpose, Table 6 is prepared to show the main concerns of translanguaging pedagogy by referring to the related studies. Thus, the information below is based on the research-driven data obtained from the selected studies in this paper.

Table 6

Main concerns of translanguaging pedagogy

Category of concerns	Main concerns	Research studies
L1 Use	Overuse of L1 by students	Kucukali & Koçbaş, 2021
	Negative transfer	Yuvayapan, 2019
	Confusion due to cross-linguistic interference	Yuvayapan, 2019
Target language use	Not developing productive skills in TL	Kucukali, E., & Koçbaş, D. 2021
	Ignoring TL	
	Not understanding the logic of TL structure	
	Losing NLTL balance	
Implementation	A lack of guidance on implementation	Dağhan-Aslan & Kiray, 2020
	Distraction in class	Kucukali & Koçbaş, 2021

The potential problems can be grouped under three categories such as L1 use, target language use, and implementation problems. On the contrary to the supporters of translanguaging, opponents think that L1 use hinders learner autonomy and competence in the target language as it might turn into a habit and overuse of L1 in the long run in addition to the cross-linguistic interference (Kucukali & Koçbaş, 2021; Liu & Fang, 2020; Yuvayapan, 2019). As Yuvayapan (2019) argued, L1 use was not encouraged by most of the participant teachers (72%) during pair-work or group work activities. Even though the majority of the participant teachers (58 %) showed a positive tendency for L1 use in teaching English, the results of the classroom observations and the interviews portrayed a different picture which stemmed from the institutional policies and perspectives of colleagues and parents. This mismatch between teachers' perceptions of translanguaging and their actual classroom practice was explained by the institutional policy for the monolingual approach and the expectations of parents and students by

Yuvayapan (2019). However, Canagarajah (2011) discussed that the monolingual language policies should not limit translanguaging pedagogy as they naturally occur in foreign language classrooms for instructional and pedagogical purposes. Moving the discussion further, both students and teachers agree on the importance of proficiency levels for determining the extent to which translanguaging should be used. That is to say, translanguaging is regarded as useful for beginner-level students with low proficiency, while the amount of translanguaging used is much more limited for higher-level students as they cope with the challenges of the target language by finding ways to produce it. International students and minority students, in particular, reported the emotional benefits of translanguaging, such as adaptation and feeling more comfortable (Kucukali & Koçbaşı, 2021).

Discussion

Though limited in number, translanguaging studies in the Turkish context (Kucukali & Koçbaşı, 2021) bear the greatest importance as they reveal benefits for classroom use and main pedagogical concerns for future implementations. That is why the present study plays a pivotal role as it comprehensively analyses five research studies in the Turkish context as an EFL setting, which would shed light on where, when, why, and how to benefit from translanguaging. Thus, research-based evidence from the selected studies is discussed, and implications are extracted.

In the first place, acquiring the necessary knowledge and the skills to master the target language through translanguaging might enhance participation fully in classroom interactions, creating a motivating and engaging environment. The main idea of reaching a full understanding of the content lies in the fact that using translanguaging pedagogy serves as a means of scaffolding by using the stronger language instead of the weaker one where and when necessary, thus creating a dynamic and engaging learning environment (Garcia, 2009; Garcia & Wei, 2014). As translanguaging provides emotional, cognitive, social, and interactional benefits for learners by enhancing comprehension, communication, and interaction, it is of utmost importance to enable future teachers with multilingual pedagogies, including translanguaging. Enhancing participation (Nambisan, 2014), teaching vocabulary (McMillan & Rivers, 2011), improving comprehension, and building rapport (Sali, 2014) are among the main

benefits of translanguaging, as noted by Yuvayapan (2019) in her study. More broadly, Creese and Blackledge (2015) summarized the potential benefits as “deepening understandings and sociopolitical engagement, developing critical thinking, and extending metalinguistic awareness and cross-linguistic flexibility” (p. 33). However, both students and teachers in Kucukali and Koçbaşı’s study (2021) agree on the importance of proficiency levels for determining the extent to which translanguaging should be used. That is to say, translanguaging is regarded as useful for beginner levels with low proficiency students while the amount of translanguaging use is much more limited for higher level of students as they cope with the challenges of target language by finding ways to produce it.

Collecting the data through three interview sessions, Dağhan-Aslan and Kıray (2020) attempted to find out teacher awareness of translanguaging, deliberate or unplanned use of translanguaging, and teachers’ intention to use translanguaging in future practices. Based on the interview data, the participant teacher was found using translanguaging unintentionally, as she was unaware of its definition but still willing to use it as a pedagogical tool in her classroom practice. More interestingly, the researchers drew attention to the unplanned use of teachers’ translanguaging, which showed the natural implementations of translanguaging, which is also supported by Canagarajah (2011). However, what is significant to note here is that a systematic use of translanguaging for classroom use is still needed for a more practical and sounder implementation.

In sum, Yuzlu and Dikilitas (2022) proved that translanguaging instruction served as a practical pedagogy with its undoubted strengths and benefits for learners’ receptive and productive foreign language skills in addition to the affective sides of it. Offering implications for different stakeholders such as teacher educators, researchers, policy-makers, and teachers, the researchers supported flexible use of L1 and L2 based on students’ increased scores. Moreover, the integration of translanguaging into “curriculum, materials, and even evaluation criteria” is suggested, making translanguaging more concrete and practical for classroom use.

Conclusion and Future Studies

Translanguaging pedagogy, as the focus of this integrative review study, has been debated with its benefits and drawbacks in the literature (Yuvayapan, 2019; Yuzlu & Dikilitas, 2022). Despite its advantages, there are still certain concerns about its implementation process in classroom settings about L1 use, target language use, and the extent to which and how it is used. Thus, this current review has illuminated its benefits and potential problems based on the previous research-driven data as a comprehensive overview, providing a fertile ground for further exploration. As the reviewed studies indicated, the main benefits can be categorized as cognitive benefits, social-interactional benefits, and emotional-affective benefits while the most frequently encountered problem is noted as the hindrance of L1 use for the target language acquisition. Concerning teachers' instructional challenges, lack of guidance for translanguaging implementation causes problems as the active implementers of this novel pedagogy (teachers) are generally unaware of how to use, where, and when to use translanguaging pedagogy. For this reason, future research might pay attention to the implementation of translanguaging practices to illuminate the effectiveness of translanguaging pedagogy within diverse contexts.

Ethics committee permission information

Ethical approval is not applicable, because this article does not contain any studies with human or animal subjects.

Conflict of Interest

No potential conflicts of interest were disclosed by the author(s) with respect to the research, authorship, or publication of this article.

Funding

No specific grant was given to this research by funding organizations in the public, commercial, or not-for-profit sectors.

References

Bialystok, E. (2001). *Bilingualism in development: Language, literacy and cognition*. Cambridge University Press.

- Canagarajah, S. (2011). Translanguaging in the classroom: Emerging issues for research and pedagogy. *Applied Linguistics Review*, 2(2011), 1–28. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110239331.1>
- Celce-Murcia, M. (2001). Language teaching approaches: An overview. *Teaching English as a Second or Foreign Language*, 2(1), 3–10.
- Celic, C., & K. Seltzer. (2001). *Translanguaging: A CUNY-NYSIEB guide for educators*. New York, NY: City University of New York, Graduate Center. Available at <http://www.nysieb.ws.gc.cuny.edu/files/2013/03/Translanguaging-Guide-March-2013.pdf>
- Cenoz, J. (2009). *Towards multilingual education: Basque educational research from an international perspective*. Multilingual Matters.
- Creese, A., & Blackledge, A. (2010). Translanguaging in the bilingual classroom: A pedagogy for learning and teaching? *The Modern Language Journal*, 94(1), 103–115. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.2009.00986.x>
- García, O. (2009). Education, multilingualism and translanguaging in the 21st century. In T. Skutnabb-Kangas, R. Phillipson, A. K. Mohanty, and M. Panda (Eds.), *Social justice through multilingual education*, (pp. 140-158). De Gruyter.
- García, O., & Kano, N. (2014). Translanguaging as process and pedagogy: Developing the English writing of Japanese students in the US. In J. Conteh and G. Meier (Eds.), *The Multilingual Turn in Languages Education: Opportunities and Challenges* (pp. 258, 277). De Gruyter.
- García, O., & Wei, L. (2014). *Translanguaging: Language, bilingualism and education*. Palgrave Macmillan
- Lewis, G., Jones, B., & Baker, C. (2012). Translanguaging: Origins and development from school to street and beyond. *Educational Research and Evaluation*, 18(7), 641–654. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13803611.2012.718488>
- Liu, Y., & Fang, F. (2020). Translanguaging theory and practice: How stakeholders perceive translanguaging as a practical theory of language. *RELC Journal*, 53(2), 391-399. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0033688220939222>
- McMillan, B. A., & Rivers, D. J. (2011). The practice of policy: Teachers' attitudes towards "English only". *System*, 39, 251-263. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2011.04.011>
- Moore, P., & Nikula, T. (2016). Translanguaging in CLIL Classrooms. In T. Nikula, E. Dafouz, P. Moore, and U. Smit (Eds.), *Conceptualising Integration in CLIL and Multilingual Education* (pp. 211–234). Multilingual Matters.
- Nambisan, K. A., (2014). Teachers' attitudes towards and uses of translanguaging in English language classrooms in Iowa (Unpublished Masters Thesis). Iowa State University, Iowa, the USA.
- Newman, M., & Gough, D. (2020). Systematic reviews in educational research: Methodology, perspectives and application. In Zawacki-Richter, O., Kerres, M., Bedenlier, S., Bond, M., Buntins, K. (Eds.), *Systematic Reviews in Educational Research* (pp. 3-22). Springer.

- Peercy, M. M. (2016). New pedagogies in teacher education for teaching linguistically diverse learners. *International Multilingual Research Journal*, 10(3), 165–167. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19313152.2016.1185904>
- Sali, P. (2014). An analysis of the teachers' use of L1 in Turkish EFL classrooms. *System*, 42, 308-318. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2013.12.021>
- Wang, D. (2019). *Multilingualism and translanguaging in Chinese language classrooms*. Springer.

Appendix

Research studies included in the review

- Dağhan - Aslan, G., & Kıray, G. (2020). The Reflection of the first foreign language (English) by utilizing translanguaging strategies in the teaching of second foreign language (German). *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies*, 16(3), 1368-1386.
- İnci Kavak, V., & Kırkgöz, Y. (2022). Exploring university students' note-taking in literature courses: A Translanguaging Perspective. *Çukurova Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 51(2), 1468-1486.
- Kucukali, E., & Koçbaş, D. (2021). Benefits and issues of translanguaging pedagogies on language learning: Students' perspective. *Turkish Online Journal of English Language Teaching (TOJELT)*, 6(3), 55- 85.
- Yuvayapan, F. (2019). Translanguaging in EFL classrooms: Teachers' perceptions and practices. *Dil ve Dilbilimi Çalışmaları Dergisi*, 15(2), 678–694. <https://doi.org/10.17263/jlls.586811>
- Yuzlu, M. Y., & Dikilitas, K. (2022). Translanguaging in the development of EFL learners' foreign language skills in Turkish context. *Innovation in Language Learning and Teaching*, 16(2), 176–190. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17501229.2021.1892698>