Translanguaging: Insights into its Theoretical Underpinnings and Classroom Implications

Yaşar Erdin[1], Beykent University, School of Foreign Languages, yasare@beykent.edu.tr
Pınar Salı[2], Uludağ University, Department of English Language Teaching, pinarsali@uludag.edu.tr

Abstract: Language is an ever-developing and ever-changing phenomenon. Therefore, how it is dealt with in teaching/learning settings also develop and change. Translanguaging is a relatively new example of such efforts, challenging the L2-dominant language classrooms and the idealized status of native speaker teachers. It suggests both L1 and L2 can be used in harmony in class, which would yield positive results in terms of language acquisition. What is more, second language learners do not aim to achieve native-like proficiency any more. They would rather communicate by accessing whatever is available in their communicative repertoire, which also justifies the use of Translanguaging. In the light of the facts mentioned above, this study aims to provide insights into theoretical underpinnings and classroom implications of Translanguaging, which has been receiving increasingly more attention in recent years.

Keywords: *Translanguaging, multilingual, bilingual, second language, first language*

INTRODUCTION

Language is an ever-developing and ever-changing phenomenon, thus ways to teach a language also develop and undergo changes in progress of time. To keep up with these developments and changes, new approaches are offered from time to time. Some of them are Blended Learning, Flipped Classroom, Content and Language Integrated Learning just to name but a few. Translanguaging, which is what this paper focuses on, is a relatively new example of such efforts. Actually, the term itself is not something new. It first appeared in the mid-1990s in Wales. The term takes its root from the Welsh word "trawsieithu" which was coined by Williams (1994). It was first called "translinguifying" in English, and then translated and made popular by Baker (2001) as "translanguaging". According to him, it is "the process of making meaning, shaping experiences, gaining understanding and knowledge through the use of two languages" (Baker, 2011, p. 288). Garcia (2009b), a strong advocate of translanguaging, says "Translanguaging is 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" (p. 140). Another major proponent of translanguaging, Canagarajah (2011a), defined it as "the ability of multilingual speakers to shuttle between languages, treating the diverse languages that form their repertoire as an integrated system" (p. 401).

Until recent times, translanguaging was only benefited in limited contexts, especially in Wales where it had been originated. Although it was put forward twenty five years ago, only recently has it been discussed on a large scale. From this aspect, it is similar to the concept of needs analysis, which was first mentioned as "analysis of needs" in the 1920s by Michael West in India (West, 1994), but it was given close attention only as of the 1970s. What is the reason of such ignorance? The reason

[1] ORCID: 0000-0002-5309-7470
[2] ORCID: 0000-0003-2711-6997

might be that both terms were not coined in the countries in the limelight. Thus, they might have been ignored until when they could not be ignored any longer, as the changes brought by the era we live in make these terms inevitable. In terms of translanguaging, it can be argued that the fact that the borders between countries are getting transparent with each passing day also manifests itself in teaching and learning environments. Learners with different first languages, different cultural backgrounds, different nationalities, and different races come together in a classroom with the same goals. In the past, the classrooms were not as diverse as today, thus it did not constitute a big problem to cater for this diversity among learners. In other words, monolingual, or maybe bilingual, classrooms of the past are now replaced by multilingual classrooms. This increasing diversity and multilinguality have also challenged the idealized status of native speakers, and having native-like proficiency has undergone a radical change. As Flores and Aneja (2017) state, "the goal of language development is no longer for students to attain 'native-like' proficiency, but rather for students to strategically choose features of their communicative repertoire in ways that reflect their bi/multilingual identities and that accommodate their interlocutors" (p. 443). Besides, it is presumed that 80% of the English teachers worldwide are non-native English-speaking teachers, outnumbering their native English-speaking counterparts (Freeman et al., 2015). Therefore, nativeness has lost its position in the field, and it can be argued that English does not belong to any specific country, region or nation anymore. In the light of all these changes, translanguaging constitutes one of the efforts aiming to address the needs brought by the era we live in.

WHAT ARE THE THEORETICAL UNDERPINNINGS OF 'TRANSLANGUAGING'?

Essentially, translanguaging is an interpretation of bilingualism and multilingualism. MacSwan (2017) states it appeared as a new concept within bilingual education. In a similar vein, Duarte (2018) says it was introduced as a tool enabling use of several languages in multilingual classrooms. Vogel and Garcia (2017) also state translanguaging presents a distinct theoretical insight into bi- and multilingualism. The terms 'bilingualism' and 'multilingualism' refer to the use of at least two languages by an individual or by a group of speakers (Richards & Schmidt, 2010). In these approaches, as proposed in Cummins's "two solitudes" assumption (2008), languages are treated separately and learners' first language is regarded of less value. Unlike these approaches, translanguaging promotes the use of different languages, including learners' first language, interchangeably and treats each language used in the classroom equally. It also suggests "selecting and deploying particular features from a unitary linguistic repertoire to make meaning and to negotiate particular communicative contexts" (Vogel & Garcia, 2017, p. 1). Therefore, it can be argued that translanguaging aims to create a single linguistic repertoire making use of both L1 and L2, and other languages if they are present in the classroom. This contradicts the common belief that strongly promotes the use of the target language during classes, and strictly restricts L1 use. Translanguaging embraces the use of the first language among others, and accepts that instead of being in competition, different languages can work well together. With the help of their teachers, learners are able to use different languages in the classroom, which enhances their learning. Thanks to translanguaging, how individuals use all of their language resources to accomplish their goals has become more emphasised compared to how many languages they are able to make use of (Conteh, 2018). In addition, Vogel and Garcia (2017) accentuate three basic assumptions underpinned in translanguaging theory as follows:

> "1. It posits that individuals select and deploy features from a unitary linguistic repertoire to communicate.
> 2. It takes up a perspective on bi- and multilingualism that privileges speakers' own dynamic linguistic and semiotic practices above the named languages of nations and states.
> 3. It still recognizes the material effects of socially constructed named language categories and structuralist language ideologies, especially for minoritized language speakers" (p.4).

These notions aim to oppose the segregationist stance of bilingualism and multilingualism, which maintains that languages develop separately. This idea is supported by the 'Discredited

Hypothesis' which is called 'separate underlying proficiency' (SUP) termed by Cummins (1984). This hypothesis suggests that languages exist in different balloons inside the brain. As one balloon is inflated, the other one proportionally becomes deflated. It assumes that there is no connection and no transfer between first and second languages, and each language functions on its own. The theory suggests that proficiency in a second language is only achieved through instruction in and exposure to that language, and first language should not be used for instruction. Cummins (1984) coined this term not to advocate it, but to reveal a possibility. As a matter of fact, there is not any research in the literature supporting this point of view (Baker & Jones, 1998). Research indicates that there is substantial amount of interaction between first and second languages, and this interaction happens easily (Baker & Jones, 1998). In the same vein, Kecskes and Papp (2003) state that transfer between L1 and L2 routinely occurs. Proponents of translanguaging also posit that multilingual individuals process different languages in their repertoire synchronously (Canagarajah, 2011a). Coined by Cummins (1984), common underlying proficiency (CUP) draws upon this idea. It postulates that when individuals produce output, languages operate separately, but in terms of cognitive functions, they work interdependently, which means knowledge of the first language influences the acquisition of the second language. Translanguaging draws on the latter model, i.e. CUP, because it places first language and second language side-by-side, and offers that resorting to the first language contributes to the development of the second. CUP develops via four language skills, namely listening, speaking, reading, writing, practiced in both first and second languages. This theory also explains why it becomes easier to learn another language after a second language is acquired. Just as the balloon metaphor in SUP, Cummins (1984) used the iceberg metaphor to elaborate CUP. At the surface, an individual seems to perform multiple languages, but at the bottom lies CUP, in other words, the whole linguistic repertoire which makes communication possible through various languages. Cummins (2000, p. 39) also argues that "Conceptual knowledge developed in one language helps to make input in the other language comprehensible". It means when a learner comprehends the meaning of a word in his/her first language, what is needed to be done is just to label it in his/her second language. Regarding second language acquisition, Cummins (1979) also proposed 'Linguistic Interdependence Hypothesis', which is another theoretical basis for translanguaging. According to this hypothesis, it is possible to pass on linguistic and/or metalinguistic activities that have been acquired in a language to another language (Cummins, 1979). In other words, learners are able to transfer competencies between available linguistic systems.

As mentioned before, the term "translanguaging" is not something new. Until its emergence, there had been some similar concepts to address the same needs as translanguaging does. These are code-switching and code-mixing. As stated in Longman Dictionary of Language Teaching and Applied Linguistics, the former means:

> "a change by a speaker (or writer) from one language or language variety to another one. Code switching can take place in a conversation when one speaker uses one language and the other speaker answers in a different language. A person may start speaking one language and then change to another one in the middle of their speech, or sometimes even in the middle of a sentence" (Richards & Schmidt, 2010, p. 89).

On the other hand, code mixing was described as "using two languages such that a third, new code emerges, in which elements from the two languages are incorporated into a structurally definable pattern" (Maschler, 1998, p. 125). These terms are mostly used interchangeably, but there are some differences. People use code switching deliberately to communicate and make themselves clear, not because of lack of knowledge. However, on the other hand, code mixing happens when people are not able to convey what they mean, and change code. Some scholars argue whether there is a need for translanguaging in the presence of the above-mentioned concepts which already discuss the use of more than one language interchangeably. Nevertheless, translanguaging differs from them. Code switching occurs when more than one language are used intrasententially or intersententially (Cook, 2001). This approach did not use to be embraced in mainstream language classrooms in which the language that learners were aiming to acquire was deemed the primary source of interaction. It has

been admitted that teachers are benefiting from code switching in language classrooms for various functions, and it is not something to be abstained from. A relatively new term, translanguaging bears similarities with code switching in that both involve people who are able to use more than one language and to communicate through languages at their disposal. Distinctively, translanguaging emerged as a pedagogy in Welsh bilingual classrooms and involved the deliberate switching of the linguistic mode of input and output (Williams, 2002, as cited in Park, 2013). Unlike code switching, translanguaging puts the first and second languages side-by-side systematically and consists of such processes as "meaning making, shaping experiences, gaining understanding and knowledge through the use of two languages" (Baker, 2011, p. 288).

Translanguaging also claims that named languages are social constructions imposed upon individuals. According to Otheguy et al. (2015), it also makes a distinction between how society reacts when somebody can use two named languages (the external perspective), and how a person views features of language (the internal perspective). They also assert that notions such as "first language", "second language", "native speaker", and named languages such as "English", "French" are what people use to describe their linguistic skills, but these are social constructs, not linguistically true. Translanguaging posits that instead of such named, discrete languages, we all have one linguistic system. Some scholars oppose this idea and argue that there is no need for the concept of translanguaging, suggesting that the abandonment of named languages will also bring about the abandonment of the concepts 'bilingualism' and 'multilingualism' and in that case the term "languaging" would suffice (Makoni & Pennycook, 2007). The term "languaging" was coined by Swain (2006) and defined as "a process of making meaning and shaping knowledge and experience through language" (p.98). In this definition, "making meaning" involves the communication process in which meaning is exchanged between the two parties of a speech (Matthiessen, 2006). As stressed by Swain (2006), learning is achieved partly thanks to languaging, which enables learners to function based on their linguistic knowledge, to comprehend what they have not fully understood before and therefore to shape their knowledge. In light of these, according to her, through languaging, learners are able to recognize things, which they have not before, regarding their L2. They then make an effort to set these things right through their L2 to steer their mindset. In fact, the two terms, namely languaging and translanguaging, complement each other. Languaging promotes the establishment of linguistic knowledge and translanguaging broadens this knowledge as the brain becomes competent in L2. Therefore, Garcia and Wei (2014) believe that the prefix (trans-) should be kept. Languaging and translanguaging are natural and inevitable processes, they will manifest themselves even if they are restricted or forbidden because after we are born, we cannot avoid acquiring at least one language, in other words the languaging process cannot be avoided, or no matter how hard the mainstream approaches try to limit the use of first languages, translanguaging will happen one way or another. Even if only target language is used in the classroom, the learner will mix his / her first and second languages outside the classroom. In this respect, rather than letting the learner do this disorderly, practicing this systematically through translanguaging in the classroom benefits the learner more.

WHAT DOES CURRENT RESEARCH TELL US ABOUT TRANSLANGUAGING?

There are numerous studies being conducted in the field regarding translanguaging to justify its use in the classroom, because it challenges the practices of conventional language classrooms. Benefited in these classrooms, "many previous constructs arise from pitting one language against another, treating multilinguals as non-native and, therefore, lacking ownership in some languages" (Canagarajah, 2011b, p. 2). Translanguaging challenges this stance, and current research is yielding useful results to help us gain useful insights into it. For example, Rasman (2018), in his study of an EFL class in Indonesia, found that as opposed to the traditional belief, the use of the first language in the classroom does not hinder the acquisition of the second language. In fact, as he concluded, through scaffolding and peer interaction, translanguaging helps learners' linguistic repertoire improve, and the idea of having a nativelike proficiency is deeply rooted in the students' beliefs and this idea should be eliminated with the help of the teacher so that they will be more open to translanguaging. Wang's study (2016) yielded similar results. She administered a questionnaire to Chinese students at a beginner level English class to reveal their attitudes towards multiple language use. The results

demonstrated that both students and teachers believe translanguaging exhibits practical scaffolding techniques, and enhances classroom communication and teacher-student relationship. She also suggests a variety of ways through which translanguaging can be developed, and according to which, teachers should: a) renew knowledge on language learning, b) facilitate structured translanguaging strategies, c) develop a transformative teacher-student role.

There is research, on the other hand, yielding contradicting results. A study by Escobar and Dillard-Paltrineri (2015), for instance, presented interesting findings. They collected data from students majoring in English Language Teaching through semi-structured interviews. The participants' responses revealed three overlapping views, which are: a) L1 use in the classroom is ineffective, b) Acceptability of L1 use is conditional, c) Translanguaging is natural for multilinguals. The participants thus reported little support for translanguaging, stating that it blocks L2 acquisition in that it inhibits the cognitive processes, promotes laziness, and includes translation between L1 and L2. They even associated it with grammar-translation method, which would be a backward pedagogical move. Some other criticisms have recently been leveled at translanguaging, also. One of these criticisms comes from May (2018). He states that translanguaging places insufficient emphasis on "the ongoing impact of structural constraints such as unequal 'capital', access to education, mobility, family background, personal dispositions, language ideologies, political oppression, etc." (p. 65). Jaspers (2018) also criticizes translanguaging by arguing that "[it] trades on causality effects that cannot be taken for granted and in doing so, translanguaging scholars have more in common with the monolingual authorities they criticize than it may seem" (p. 5). Although translanguaging has been embraced as an alternative approach in a rapidly globalizing world, there is also the debate as to whether it involuntarily promotes "the neoliberal subject" which handles multilingualism as a favor to globalization and as a tool that provides personpower to markets (Vogel & Garcia, 2017). In this regard, it is criticized as being an extension of colonialism (Flores, 2013), and in a study conducted in colonial Lesotho and Sri Lanka, Brutt-Griffler (2002) argues that the British benefited education in first language in their colonies in order to provide labor force to factories and agriculture. The South African Constitution has 12 official languages, and it gives the citizens the right to use and receive education in any of these languages. It seems to support bilingual education practices, but it also supports the polarization of people who have their own languages (Flores and Bale, 2016). According to Garcia (2009a), there are no strict boundaries between such minority languages, but most bilingual education programs embitter their marginalization. As an alternative-and as response-to monoglossic language perspectives, she thus advocates drawing on heteroglossic language ideologies which would allow linguistically diverse learners to use language in more fluid and flexible ways. Notwithstanding all such critiques of translanguaging, Garcia and Wei (2014) put emphasis on its potential and state that translanguaging is able "to transform not only semiotic systems and speaker subjectivities, but also socio-political structures" (p. 43).

While there is research for or against translanguaging practices in the current literature, Canagarajah (2011b) points out "some limitations" of them, which are:
　　a. Researchers pay their attention to producing difference, not to discussing it.
　　b. There is no data regarding the participants' stance towards translanguaging practices. We only know how the researcher interprets and responds to them.
　　c. Translanguaging studies are carried out in a product-oriented manner. Processes are ignored.
　　d. Translanguaging is restricted to multilingual individuals in current research. Native English Speakers are excluded.
　　e. Available studies in the literature mostly focus on face-to-face oral interactions. It is still not clear whether or how translanguaging functions in other types of communication. In a similar vein, there is not adequate research on translanguaging in writing.

The above-mentioned limitations in current research should be eliminated to dispel concerns and to enable translanguaging to be more widely accepted, which requires more time and attention.

HOW CAN 'TRANSLANGUAGING' BE IMPLEMENTED IN THE L2 CLASSROOM?

How specific discursive practices in the L2 classroom-such as translanguaging-could be implemented depend on the larger social contexts of the classroom (Lin, 1999). Therefore, the implementation process should be context-specific and teachers should analyze their classrooms well. Along the same line, this paper tries to present some classroom procedures that might work well in a classroom context where students with diverse background or different L1s are present.

The aim of every language classroom is to make learners proficient in the target language. To achieve this aim, translanguaging provides learners with an area of practice where they can use the target language and first language freely. Through this practice and translanguaging then, learners are able to develop their proficiency. This idea also goes well together with the concept of scaffolding. It can well be argued that the relationship between translanguaging and scaffolding is a two-way street; the former is a useful tool for the latter, or vice versa. Bruner (1983, p. 60) defines scaffolding as "a process of 'setting up' the situation to make the child's entry easy and successful and then gradually pulling back and handling the role to the child as he becomes skilled enough to manage it". This process goes more smoothly thanks to translanguaging. Regarding the relationship between the two, as Jones and Lewis (2014, p. 160) state:

> "Translanguaging may be less obvious as a strategy when the language level of the pupil may be insufficient to assimilate content and engage in the process of learning. In such circumstances, pupils need language support if they are to participate in translanguaging tasks in the classroom. The teacher needs to support the pupils by scaffolding the translanguaging activity".

Therefore, to promote translanguaging, scaffolding activities or techniques can be used in the classroom providing an environment where learners feel free to use their language repertoires. Along the same line, Daniel et al. (2019) provided some examples of scaffolding for translanguaging. In the study, the second-and third-grade elementary school teachers designed for their English language learners (ELLs) a scaffolding activity in which they first created an environment for their students where they could talk about their private lives and exchange their translanguaging experiences. Then, they were asked to think and talk about their experiences of benefiting from translating, which revealed that they thought translanguaging is useful for communication and academic achievement. In this way, the teachers aimed to make their students realize how useful translation is and to scaffold a collective consciousness that they translanguage in every part of their lives. In another lesson, the teachers scaffolded such translation strategies as borrowing, negating antonyms, using cognates and circumlocution. The students translated sentences from a book benefiting from these strategies, which would enable them to shuttle between languages more freely. In another lesson, the teachers implemented a transliteration activity. One of the teachers asked the students to say, "I speak Spanish" and "I speak Arabic" in their corresponding languages. Although she knew how to write them correctly, she did so with few spelling mistakes. Next, she asked them to correct the mistakes and to extend the sentence (for example, "I speak Spanish with my mother at church"). In his study, Canagarajah (2011a) argues that conversational questions and peer comments are useful in scaffolding students to translanguage and that teachers' own use of L1 and L2 interchangeably in the class is another way of scaffolding. In a similar vein, Jones and Lewis (2014) provided an example activity in their work (pp. 161-163), in which students were asked to complete a translanguaging task in a Religious Education class. First, they read a text in English and wrote five facts regarding the content in Welsh. The teacher helped them read and understand the English text, and then supported them while writing in Welsh. Another way to implement translanguaging in the L2 classrooms is labelling the objects in the classroom in both first and second languages. Therefore, learners become familiar with the written forms of the words that they usually use during their time at school. Besides, they are able to establish links between the first and second languages. Translanguaging can also be implemented through making a lot of bilingual books or sources available to the learners. Thanks to such books or sources, the learners are able to see and compare their first and second languages, and make a connection between them. To the same end, online sources can also be made use of. Learners

can watch videos in their second language with subtitles in their first language, or videos in their first language with subtitles in their second language. Thus, they have a chance to be exposed to authentic use and different dialects of the target language and observe how the meaning is conveyed into their first language, or observe how their first language seems in their second language. Such activities can also be a way out for teachers following an intense lesson, and the learners can have fun and learn at the same time.

Group work has always been effective in language classrooms, and translanguaging could well benefit from it, too. It is likely for teachers to have students with different first languages and different cultural backgrounds in a classroom. Therefore, when the teacher groups his/her students, it is better to group those with the same first language together, which allows them to comprehend the task better, and to produce a better result. This also creates chances for introvert students to mingle with their friends, and to take part in the lesson. Besides, students learn from each other, so such activities also promote peer learning. In these collaborative groups, students discuss the task in their first language and deliver it in their second language, which would be a good example of translanguaging.

It should not be forgotten that a good teacher is also a good learner. To create a space for translanguaging, teachers should try to learn at least the basics of their students' language and culture. After creating this space, they should also make sure that the students use it. Besides, they should try to keep up with the advances that the era we live in has brought, and to be acquainted with the problems that their student might be experiencing. Thus, both parties have more things in common to discuss, which also increases the motivation of the learners and which creates a better interactive teaching / learning environment.

On a similar note, Kim and Song (2019) point out the significance of establishing a translanguaging space on a larger scale. Therefore, they aimed to expand the scope of translanguaging through social collaboration. To this end, they pioneered a practice called *community translanguaging* in which families with various backgrounds came together to create a family storybook. The aim was to establish a collective communicative repertoire including multiple languages and modes. The project yielded beneficial results for each party involving in it, namely educators, students, and families. The researchers imply that implementing such activities would eliminate such differences as age, ethnicity, race, culture and language, and thus create a better space to translanguage.

As a concrete example of translanguaging, Mwinda and Van der Walt (2015) benefited from translation, which is a useful method when the mutual use of L1 and L2 is aimed, and preview-view-review (PVR) strategy (Garcia, 2009a). The latter holds that the lesson is introduced in L1, taught in English (L2) and finished in L1 again, which would enable learners to reveal what they have learnt. They had their students translate texts from Rumanyo (a minority language spoken in Namibia and some other countries) to English and then vice versa. They also made use of pictures to enrich their vocabulary. Thanks to these methods, the researchers were able to analyse the students' needs and problems and to develop their L2 vocabulary.

Stating that English used in academia today is mostly derived from Latin and Greek, and there are lots of cognates between English and other Romance languages, Cummins (2005) argues that encouraging learners to benefit from these cognates is useful for L2 acquisition. Looking for similar meanings in their L1 repertoire while reading a text in L2 is helpful in transferring L1 knowledge to L2. He also suggested making use of *sister class projects* in which students from different countries use their L1 and L2 to produce art and literary works and/or to discuss social issues in an electronic environment and that such activities possess the potential of having learners engaged in language learning and/or maintenance.

Combining technology, gamification and translanguaging, Deutsche Welle, German international public broadcaster, initiated an interactive language teaching program called *Harry-gefangen in der Zeit* (Deutsche Welle, n.d.) for those who would like to learn German. Harry, an English native speaker, is a fictional character trapped in a time loop in Germany, where he goes as a

tourist with his girlfriend. His days in Germany keep repeating themselves and nobody believes him. Therefore, in order to explain himself better and get out of this time loop, Harry has to learn German, and the player helps him to do so while learning German.

It would also be useful to include some ideas for translanguaging practices in parallel with the context of the journal. In their study, Mary and Young (2017) present the experiences of a preschool teacher teaching French to Turkish learners among those of some other nationalities. The teacher made use of culture-specific elements/words to establish rapport with the students and to increase their motivation. In the mentioned study, the teacher used the word *lahmacun* (a pizza-like Turkish dish) to do so. The teacher also hung some pieces of paper stating such things as "Do you need to use the toilet?" in the students' home languages on the wall in order to address their immediate needs. The teacher also sang a nursery rhyme in French and then translated it into Turkish. On another occasion, the teacher repeated what Turkish students said in their L1 by reformulating some of the statements such as "And you, mouse?/Ve sen?/And you?". Therefore, the teacher enabled the students to shuttle between their languages and to use their linguistic repertoires without restrictions. In another example, two Turkish students read a story in French then commented on and retold it in Turkish. During this process, the teacher did not interrupt them, so these two students enjoyed the story in their L1. However, French was not completely absent in the process. Afterwards, the teacher checked a word/picture book with these students and they benefited from their knowledge of both Turkish and French (Mary & Young, 2017).

Winning the 2018 ELTons Digital Innovation award, *Fun with Ruby Rei* (Cambridge University Press & Wubbi, n.d.), an adventure game for English learners, can also be a good example for translanguaging activities. The game is only available in Turkey, Mexico and Spain, thus, Turkish and Spanish learners of English can benefit from it. In the game, the main character is called Ruby Rei. She is trapped on a planet while travelling, loses her friend/robot and tries to find it. The player helps her throughout her adventure while learning English. During the game, the player can click on the sentences that Ruby Rei utters and see the Turkish or Spanish translation. Thus, he/she can establish links between English and his/her L1.

Since the immigrant population in Turkey is increasing each day, the use of above-mentioned activities could be incorporated into classrooms of any kind to create more space for translanguaging-related pedagogies in the context of the present study.

CONCLUSION

In consideration of all insights presented in this paper, the researchers take a positive stance towards the use of translanguaging. The use of L1 during class time should not be something to be abstained from, because it might contribute to student learning and classroom interaction. According to what Salı (2014) indicated in her study, L1 could serve such key functions in L2 classrooms as academic, managerial and social/cultural. To illustrate, L1 in language classrooms could be used to facilitate learner comprehension, to deal with disruptive behavior and to establish rapport in the classroom. As long as L1 is used purposefully, these affordances should not be ignored. Besides, when everyone shares the same L1 in an L2 classroom, it might be inevitable to use it. Even if the teacher does not speak L1 in the classroom, students speak it one way or another. Therefore, it would be beneficial to do so in a systematic way, as is also proposed by translanguaging. In addition, as Salı (2014) states, language teachers do not appear to have a clear understanding about how and/or when to benefit from L1. Translanguaging can thus present teachers a framework by which they can use L1 and L2 in a planned way.

Consequently, translanguaging maintains that learners benefit from a single semiotic repertoire that integrates different linguistic features of lexis, morphology, and grammar, body language, and social practices rather than alternating between two interdependent language systems (Vogel & Garcia, 2017). It posits rather a radical idea, which promotes the use of L1 as much as L2 in the classroom, thus contradicting the traditional practices. Therefore, this might make it difficult to embrace in a short

time. As mentioned before, although translanguaging is not a new term, it has recently been addressed as pedagogy. Therefore, more research needs to be conducted, and criticisms against it should be argued out so that translanguaging can gain a more solid place in the field.

REFERENCES

Baker, C. (2011) *Foundations of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism* (5th ed.), Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Baker, C., & Jones, S. P. (Eds.). (1998). *Encyclopedia of bilingualism and bilingual education*. Multilingual Matters.

Bruner, J. (1983) *Child's Talk*. New York: Norton.

Brutt-Griffler, J. (2002). Class, ethnicity, and language rights: An analysis of British colonial policy in Lesotho and Sri Lanka and some implications for language policy. *Journal of Language, Identity, and Education, 1*, 207–234.

Cambridge University Press & Wubbi (n.d.) *Fun with Ruby Rei*. https://fun.rubyrei.com/

Canagarajah, S. (2011a). Codemeshing in Academic Writing: Identifying Teachable Strategies of Translanguaging. *The Modern Language Journal*, *95*(3), 401–417. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.2011.01207.x

Canagarajah, S. (2011b). Translanguaging in the classroom : Emerging issues for research and pedagogy. *Applied Linguistics Review*, 1–28.

Conteh, J. (2018). Translanguaging. *ELT Journal, 72*(4), 445-447.

Cook, V.J. (2001). Using the first language in the classroom. *Canadian Modern Language Review, 57*, 402-423.

Crystal, D. (2012). *English as a global language*. Cambridge, United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press.

Cummins, J. (1979). Linguistic interdependence and the educational development of bilingual children. *Review of Educational Research, 49*(2), 222–251.

Cummins, J. (1984). *Bilingualism and special education: Issues in assessment and pedagogy* (Vol. 6). Taylor & Francis Group.

Cummins, J. (2000). *Language, power, and pedagogy: Bilingual children in the crossfire* (Vol. 23). Multilingual Matters.

Cummins, J. (2005). A proposal for action: Strategies for recognizing heritage language competence as a learning resource within the mainstream classroom. *Modern Language Journal*, 585-592.

Cummins, J. (2008). Teaching for transfer: Challenging the two solitudes assumption in bilingual education. *Encyclopedia of language and education*, 1528-1538.

Daniel, S. M., Jiménez, R. T., Pray, L., & Pacheco, M. B. (2019). Scaffolding to make translanguaging a classroom norm. *TESOL Journal*, *10*(1), e00361.

De Meulder, M., Kusters, A., Moriarty, E., & Murray, J. J. (2019). Describe, don't prescribe. The practice and politics of translanguaging in the context of deaf signers. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 1–15. https://doi.org/10.1080/01434632.2019.1592181

Deutsche Welle (n.d.) *Harry gefangen in der Zeit.* http://harry.dw.com/landing/en/

Duarte, J. (2018). Translanguaging in the context of mainstream multilingual education. *International Journal of Multilingualism*, 1-16.

Escobar, C. F., & Dillard-Paltrineri, E. (2015). Professors' and Students' Conflicting Beliefs about Translanguaging in the EFL Classroom: Dismantling the Monolingual Bias. *Revista de Lenguas Modernas*, *23*, 301–328.

Flores, N. (2013). The unexamined relationship between neoliberalism and plurilingualism: A cautionary tale. *TESOL Quarterly, 47*(3), 500–520.

Flores, N., & Aneja, G. (2017). "Why Needs Hiding?" Translingual (Re) Orientations in TESOL Teacher Education. *Research in the Teaching of English, 51*(4), 441–463.

Flores, N., & Bale, J. (2016). Sociopolitical issues in bilingual education. *Bilingual and multilingual education*, 1-13.

Freeman, D., Katz, A., Garcia Gomez, P., & Burns, A. (2015). English-for-teaching: Rethinking teacher proficiency in the classroom. *ELT journal, 69*(2), 129-139.

García, O. (2009a). *Bilingual education in the 21st century: A global perspective*. Malden: Wiley-Blackwell.

García, O. (2009b). Education, multilingualism and translanguaging in the 21st century. *Social justice through multilingual education*, 140-158.

García, O., & Wei, L. (2014). Language, bilingualism and education. In *Translanguaging: Language, bilingualism and education* (pp. 46-62). London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Jaspers, J. (2018). The transformative limits of translanguaging. *Language & Communication*, 58, 1–10. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.langcom.2017.12.001

Jones, B., & Lewis, W. G. (2014). Language Arrangements within Bilingual Education. In E. M. Thomas & I. Mennen (Eds.), *Advances in the Study of Bilingualism* (pp. 141–170). Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

Kecskes, I., & Papp, T. (2003). How to Demonstrate the Conceptual Effect of L2 on L1? Methods and Techniques. In V. Cook (Ed.), *Effects of the Second Language on the First* (pp. 247–265). https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263104343056

Kim, S., & Song, K. H. (2019). Designing a Community Translanguaging Space Within a Family Literacy Project. *The Reading Teacher*, *73*(3), 267-279.

Lewis, G., Jones, B., & Baker, C. (2012). Translanguaging: Developing its conceptualisation and conceptualisation. *Educational Research and Evaluation, 18*, 655-670.

Lin, A. M. Y. (1999). Doing-English-lessons in the reproduction or transformation of social worlds? *TESOL Quarterly, 33*(3), 393-412.

MacSwan, J. (2017). A multilingual perspective on translanguaging. *American Educational Research Journal*, *54*(1), 167-201.

Makoni, S., & Pennycook, A. (2007). *Disinventing and reconstituting languages*. Clevedon, U.K.: Multilingual Matters.

Mary, L., & Young, A. S. (2017). From Silencing to Translanguaging: Turning the Tide to Support Emergent Bilinguals in Transition from Home to Pre-school. In B. Paulsrud, J. Rosén, B. Straszer & Å. Wedin (Eds.), *New Perspectives on Translanguaging and Education* (pp. 108-128). Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

Maschler, Y. (1998). On the transition from code-switching to a mixed code. In *Code-switching in conversation: Language, interaction and identity* (pp. 125-149). Routledge.

Matthiessen, C. M. I. M. (2006). Educating for advanced foreign language capacities: Exploring the meaning-making resources of languages systemic-functionally. *Advanced language learning: The contribution of Halliday and Vygotsky*, 31-57.

May, S. (2018). Commentary - Unanswered Questions: Addressing the Inequalities of Majoritarian Language Policies. In Lisa Lim, Christopher Stroud & Lionel Wee (eds.), *The Multilingual Citizen*, 65–72. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

Mwinda, N., & Van der Walt, C. (2015). From 'English-only' to translanguaging strategies: Exploring possibilities. *Per Linguam: a Journal of Language Learning= Per Linguam: Tydskrif vir Taalaanleer*, *31*(3), 100-118.

Otheguy, R., García, O., & Reid, W. (2015). Clarifying translanguaging and deconstructing named languages: A perspective from linguistics. *Applied Linguistics Review*, *6*(3), 281–307. https://doi.org/10.1515/applirev-2015-0014

Park, M. S. (2013). Code-switching and Translanguaging: Potential Functions in Multilingual Classrooms. *TESOL & Applied Linguistics*, *13*(2), 50–52. https://doi.org/10.1080/09500782.2013.788022

Rasman. (2018). To Translanguage or Not To Translanguage? The Multilingual Practice in an Indonesian Efl Classroom. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, *7*(3), 687–694. https://doi.org/10.17509/ijal.v7i3.9819

Richards, J. C., & Schmidt, R. (2010). *Longman Dictionary of Language Teaching & Applied Linguistics* (4th ed.). Great Britain: Pearson Education Limited.

Salı, P. (2014). An analysis of the teachers' use of L1 in Turkish EFL classrooms. *System, 42*, 308-318.

Swain, M. (2006). Languaging, agency and collaboration in advanced second language learning. In H. Byrnes (Ed.), *Advanced language learning: The contributions of Halliday and Vygotsky* (pp. 95–108). London, England: Continuum.

Vogel, S., & Garcia, O. (2017). Translanguaging. In G. Noblit & L. Moll (Eds.), *Oxford Research Encyclopedia of Education*. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315752617-9

Wang, D. (2016). Translanguaging in Chinese foreign language classrooms: students and teachers' attitudes and practices. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 138–149. https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050.2016.1231773

West, R. (1994). Needs analysis in language teaching. *Language Teaching, 27*(1), 1–19. http://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444800007527

Williams, C. (1994) *Arfarniad o Ddulliau Dysgu ac Addysgu yng Nghyddestun Addysg Uwchradd Ddwyieithog*, [An evaluation of teaching and learning methods in the context of bilingual secondary education]. Unpublished Doctoral Thesis (University of Wales, Bangor).

Williams, C. (2002). Extending bilingualism in the education system. *Education and lifelong learning committee ELL-06-02*. Retrieved from http://www.assemblywales.org/3c91c7af00023d820000595000000000.pdf