



Title	言語教育クラスとCLIL/イマージョンプログラムにおいて多言語を生かす教授的トランスランゲージング
Author(s)	セノス, ヤソネ
Citation	母語・継承語・バイリンガル教育 (MHB) 研究. 2023, 19, p. 1-15
Version Type	VoR
URL	https://hdl.handle.net/11094/97098
rights	
Note	

The University of Osaka Institutional Knowledge Archive : OUKA

<https://ir.library.osaka-u.ac.jp/>

The University of Osaka

《招待論文》

言語教育クラスとCLIL/イマージョンプログラムにおいて

多言語を生かす教授的トランスランゲージング

セノス ヤソネ (バスク大学)

**Pedagogical Translanguaging to Benefit from Multilingualism in Language Classes
and in CLIL/Immersion Programs**

CENOZ, Jasone (University of the Basque Country, UPV/EHU)

要 旨

昨今のマルチリンガリズムの広まりにより、学習者たちは第二言語や追加言語を学ぶ必要を求められている。これらは言語の授業で教えられ、CLIL・イマージョン授業では指導言語として使用される。そこで本稿では第二言語や追加言語で学術的な内容を指導する際の課題について論じる。マルチリンガルの学習者はモノリンガルの学習者よりも幅広い言語レパートリーを持っており、追加言語を学習する際、その予備的知識を活用することができる。多言語話者は、言語を学習する際、あるいは第二言語や追加言語を媒介として学習する際、言語レパートリーからメタ言語的ストラテジーを適用できる可能性がある。しかしながら、多言語話者として具わっているそのような能力全てを発揮しているわけではなく、さらにメタ言語的認識を発達させるために予備的知識を活性化させる必要もある。教授的トランスランゲージングは、指導を通じて学習者自身の言語レパートリーを総動員するため、メタ言語認識を高める際に重要な役割を果たすことができる。このように、学習者は自分自身の多言語性を最大限に活用することができる。

Abstract

Nowadays, multilingualism is spreading and students often need to learn second and additional languages. These languages are taught in language classes and are also used as languages of instruction in CLIL/immersion classes. This article discusses the challenges of teaching academic content in second and additional languages. Multilingual learners have a broader repertoire than monolingual learners and can use their prior knowledge when learning an additional language. Multilingual speakers can potentially apply metalinguistic strategies from their multilingual repertoire when learning languages or through the medium of second and additional languages but students do not use all the opportunities they have as multilingual speakers and prior knowledge often needs to be activated so as to develop metalinguistic awareness. Pedagogical translanguaging can play an important role to enhance metalinguistic awareness because it mobilises the students' own multilingual repertoire through instruction. In this way students can make the most of their own multilingualism.

Keywords: multilingualism, pedagogical translanguaging, metalinguistic awareness, academic language, CLIL, immersion programs

1. Multilingualism and Multilingual Education

Multilingualism refers to the ability to speak and communicate in more than one language, and it is a common phenomenon all over the world. Multilingualism is not new; we have examples of ancient inscriptions in multiple languages. A very well-known example is the Rosetta Stone with an ancient Egyptian decree issued by King Ptolemy V in 196 BC. It is written in three scripts: Egyptian Hieroglyphs, Demotic, and Greek. Another example is the Behistun Inscription created by king Darius the Great in the 5th century BC. This inscription is written in Old Persian, Elamite, and Akkadian. There are many other examples of multilingualism in the past, but as Aronin and Singleton (2008) report, multilingualism has some specific characteristics nowadays (see also Cenoz, 2019). Multilingualism can be regarded as a more global phenomenon nowadays than in the past when it was mainly limited to border areas or trade routes. Multilingualism is also more generalized at the social level and multilingual people can be found in different social classes and professions than in the past. Another important difference is related to technology and communication because multilingualism is nowadays instantaneous and multimodal as opposed to limited oral and written communication in the past.

There are many reasons for the development of multilingualism. The mobility of the population can lead to linguistic diversity because migrants, tourists and/or students can contribute to the spread of different languages. In some cases, multilingualism is fostered when regional minority languages are protected and promoted along with national and international languages. Multilingualism is also associated with the spread of English. English is the main language of international communication and is widely spoken as a second or foreign language in many countries worldwide. English has become a lingua franca in many parts of the world, particularly in business, education, and international relations.

The teaching of English is closely linked to multilingualism. English can be taught as a second or foreign language but it is often not a second language but a third or additional language for many students. Multilingualism in education is not the same as multilingual education. A school located in a diverse urban community with a large number of immigrant students who speak a variety of languages is a school where multilingualism is present but it is not necessarily multilingual if it does not aim at developing multilingualism as an educational goal. This could be the case of many schools in English-speaking countries following an English-only curriculum when all instruction is provided in English. The school may use different strategies to support multilingual students but the educational aim regarding languages is not multilingualism but English-only. Multilingual education can be often found in educational programs and approaches aiming to support the development of multiple languages. In many contexts, one of these languages is English. Multilingual education can take many forms, depending on the context and the goals of the program. In some cases, it may involve teaching academic subjects through a second or foreign language, as in a Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) program or immersion programs. In

other cases, the teaching of languages is limited to the language classes.

In this article we will look at multilingual education by examining the challenges of using a second or additional language as the language of instruction for teaching academic subjects and the way pedagogical translanguaging can contribute to the development of the multilingual students' linguistic resources.

2. The Use of a Second or Additional Language as the Language of Instruction

Second and additional languages are often used as languages of instruction in educational contexts. Cenoz and Ruiz de Zarobe (2015) identify at least four situations in which students in different parts of the world learn through the medium of a second or additional language. These can be:

- i. Speakers of local languages that are not used at school. An example of this situation can be the case for many speakers of indigenous languages in Latin America when students have only Spanish as the language of instruction;
- ii. Speakers of languages that are not taught at school in the host country. An example could be immigrant students speaking languages such as Punjabi or Turkish in European countries which in most cases are not used at school;
- iii. Speakers of majority languages that are used at school but who are taught some subjects through the medium of a local minority language so as to improve their language skills. This is the case of students with Spanish as a first language who learn through the medium of Basque in the Basque Country;
- iv. Speakers of majority or minority languages that are used at school and learn subjects through the medium of English as an additional language. This situation is very common in many parts of the world.

Programs teaching academic subjects, such as science, history, or mathematics, through a language that is not the first language provide the opportunity to learn both content and language at the same time. The target language is used to convey and explain academic content, rather than just being used just in the language classes.

Immersion programs started in Canada in the 1960's and their main characteristic is that they teach academic subjects in French to students who have English as their first language. Genesee (2013, p.24) explains that "in French immersion programs in Canada at least 50% of academic instruction is delivered through French during some part of elementary and/or secondary school." Genesee (2013) adds that the goals include advanced levels of proficiency in the second language (French) and age/grade appropriate levels of proficiency in the first language (English) and in non-language subjects. Another goal is to develop positive attitudes towards French Canadian culture. There are different types of immersion programs depending on the age of onset of the program and the intensity. Immersion programs have spread in different contexts and involve different languages including some minority languages such as Basque, Catalan or Welsh in Europe or Quechua in Latin America.

Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) programs are also often mentioned in the last years, mainly in the context of English language teaching. CLIL has been defined as 'dual-focused educational approach in which an additional language is used for the learning and teaching of both content and language' (Coyle et al., 2010, p.1). The characteristic of CLIL programs is that academic content is taught in the

second or additional language, which in most cases is English. There are different CLIL programs depending on their intensity that can range from content units in language classes to several academic subjects such as science or social studies in the target language. CLIL programs can also start at different school levels.

Cenoz et al. (2014) explain how immersion and CLIL programs have a different origin but share the same characteristics and face similar challenges. Cenoz (2015) compares an immersion program in Basque as a second language and a CLIL program with English as a third language in the Basque Country and concludes that there are no essential differences between the two programs. Cenoz and Gorter (2022) explain how the level of English achieved by the students is usually higher in CLIL programs than in regular programs but that some research studies indicate that students may have some difficulties processing content in a second or foreign language (Fernández-Sanjurjo et al., 2019; Hughes & Madrid, 2020; Lin, 2016; Mahan, 2020). These difficulties can be associated with the level of proficiency in the second or additional language and specifically with the specific uses of academic language. In the following paragraphs, an example that links language proficiency to scores in content subjects will be shown and then some specific characteristics of the language used in academic texts will be discussed.

The relationship between proficiency and achievement in content subjects can be seen in an evaluation carried out in the Basque Country. Participants were 9,019 students who took standardized tests in the second year of secondary education. All the students had Spanish as a first language and Basque as the main language of instruction for content subjects such as mathematics or science. They were in a program that can be considered immersion or CLIL in Basque. All students took tests in several school subjects including mathematics, science and Basque. The Basque tests of oral comprehension and reading comprehension identified students as belonging to one of three profiles: lower level of Basque, intermediate level of Basque and higher level of Basque. The mathematics and science tests had four sections each. The sections in mathematics were “change, amount, space and shape, and problem resolution.” The sections in science were “scientific knowledge, scientific research, natural facts and decision making.” Table 1 shows the scores obtained by students in mathematics and science according to their level of Basque proficiency.

Table 1. Scores in mathematics and science

	Lower level in Basque	Intermediate level in Basque	Higher level in Basque
Mathematics	215.33	255.74	291.78
Science	209.98	249.99	282.25

As it can be seen students who had a higher level in Basque obtained higher scores both in mathematics and science, followed by students with an intermediate level in Basque and the group of students with the lowest level in Basque obtained the lowest scores in mathematics and science. This pattern was found not only in the general results shown in Table 1 but also in all the sections both in mathematics and science. When focusing on the students with a lower level of Basque, it was observed that they had similar difficulties in all the sections in mathematics and science except in the section “space and shape” in mathematics. Students with low proficiency in Basque obtained higher scores in this section (233.24) than in

the rest of the sections but this section did not seem to be easier than the rest of the sections for students who were more proficient in Basque. The analysis of the specific items of this section showed that there were more graphics and less text than the tasks in the rest of the sections. This result indicates that students with low proficiency in Basque in immersion/CLIL programs have more difficulties when there is more text in the mathematics tasks and that there is a relationship between proficiency in the language of instruction and achievement in content. These results can be confirmed when we look at the correlations between the sections in mathematics and science with the level of Basque in oral comprehension and reading comprehension as can be seen in Table 2.

Table 2. Correlations between mathematics and Basque proficiency

	Oral comprehension in Basque	Reading comprehension in Basque
Mathematics		
Change	429**	507**
Amount	413**	486**
Space and shape	292**	343**
Problem resolution	441**	518**
Science		
Scientific knowledge	404**	479**
Scientific research	373**	427**
Natural facts	492**	557**
Decision making	478**	532**

** Significant correlations at the 0.01 level

The correlation analyses show that all the correlations are statistically significant indicating that students with a higher the level of proficiency in Basque obtain higher scores in all the sections in the mathematics and in the science tests and students with the lowest scores in Basque obtain the lowest scores in the mathematics and science tests. It is interesting to see that the lowest relationship is in the case of “space and shape” in mathematics. The correlation is significant but not as high as the other correlations indicating that the relationship between proficiency in Basque and the section of the mathematics test with more figures and graphics and less text is not as high as all the other sections that have more language. Taken together, these results clearly indicate that students with a low level of proficiency in the language of instruction in CLIL/immersion class face language problems in content subjects, particularly in the tasks that are linguistically more demanding.

Proficiency in the language of instruction can influence the success of immersion/CLIL programs but it is also important that teachers are aware of the specific characteristics of the language used to teach academic content. When English (or another language) is taught as a second language, the focus is on everyday communication but the academic uses of the language in content areas are different from everyday use. Tragant et al. (2016) compared textbooks of the third year of primary used in a school in Spain so as to explore the differences between vocabulary in a CLIL science textbook and an English as a Foreign

language (EFL) textbook. They reported that the CLIL science textbook had more items per unit and also more abstract concepts and classifying concepts than the ELF textbook. The CLIL textbook was linguistically more challenging than the EFL book.

Another study comparing CLIL and ELF textbooks was carried out by Martinez et al. (2021) in primary and secondary school (11-13 years old). They compared social science/history textbooks used in CLIL classes to English language textbooks. They reported that CLIL texts have longer sentences and more diverse vocabulary, among other characteristics. They found that the main difficulty is in vocabulary because “words are less common, they have a broader meaning, and they are more sophisticated” (Martinez et al., 2021, p.22). These characteristics can explain the difficulties that some students face when learning subject content in a second or additional language. They can also explain that some students have comprehension problems both in oral and written language.

Second and additional language classes generally aim at teaching communicative competence in the target language. Cummins (2021) discusses the distinction between Basic Interpersonal Communicative Skills (BICS) and Cognitive Academic Language Proficiency (CALP).

Cummins (2021, p.47) explains the specific differences between the two concepts in contexts where English is spoken by the majority of the population such as most of Canada and the US. In these contexts, English is the language of instruction and some students who have a different home language face difficulties. This is a different situation from that of learning through the medium of English in contexts where English is a foreign language. The difference between BICS and CALP is also relevant in school contexts in countries like Japan, China, Spain or France where English is taught as a foreign language and in the case of CLIL programs some subjects are also taught through the medium of English. In Table 3 we present the distinctions between BICS and CALP for contexts where English is a foreign language. The content of this table is adapted from Cummins (2021, p.47).

Table 3. Differences between BICS and CALP

BICS	CALP
Mainly in English language classes	Mainly in CLIL/Immersion classes
Aim: Develop the ability to interact in familiar face-to-face or on-line situations	Aim: Develop the ability to use oral and written language in school subjects
Involves utterances that are informationally transparent as a result of the immediate context	Involves informationally dense text and oral language
Relatively common grammatical constructions.	Complex grammatical constructions, which are seldom used in face-to-face conversation
High frequency Anglo-Saxon origin vocabulary	Low-frequency vocabulary that derives from Latin and Greek sources
Meaning is supported by facial expressions, gestures, eye contact, intonation, and the immediate context	Discourse conventions that link concepts and ideas in precise ways are necessary to understand informationally dense texts

Based on Cummins 2021, p.47

Students in Japan with Japanese as a home language do not need to develop BICS in Japanese at school because they develop BICS when they communicate in Japanese in everyday life. They need to develop CALP at school both in their Japanese language classes and in all the other classes taught through the medium of Japanese. In the case of a foreign language like English, students need to develop BICS because in many cases they do not use much English outside school. English language classes in Japan, or in many other countries where English is learned as a foreign language, focus on achieving communicative competence so that students can interact with other speakers in English. When English is taught just as a school subject, students will also develop CALP when they are at higher levels and work with texts that are more dense and include less frequent vocabulary and more complex grammatical structures. In fact, BICS/CALP can be regarded as a continuum rather than a dichotomy because there is some academic uses of the language in language classes and some basic communication in CLIL/immersion classes. However, the need to develop CALP is a priority in the case of CLIL/immersion programs because subject matter texts are academic texts characterized by the features of CALP. CLIL/immersion programs have the advantage of providing the opportunity to learn language and content at the same time but they may be challenging when students have a very low level of proficiency and teachers are not aware of the language difficulties in the subject content classes.

As we have already seen, the development of multilingualism in school contexts is not only related to the spread of English but also to the mobility of the population and the use of minority languages as school subjects and languages of instruction. Many students have to develop BICS and CALP not only in two languages but in more languages. As an example, in table 4 we can see the need to develop BICS and CALP at school for students in three different situations in a Basque school where Basque, Spanish and English are compulsory and French is an optional subject in secondary school. The three students have Basque as the main language of instruction and some subjects are taught through the medium of English in a CLIL/immersion program. Basque is a minority language but developing CALP in Basque is important because most students in the Basque Autonomous Community learn through the medium of Basque in primary and secondary school and some also in higher education.

Table 4. BICS and CALP in school languages in the Basque Country

	Basque		Spanish		English		French	
	BICS	CALP	BICS	CALP	BICS	CALP	BICS	CALP
Mikel <i>Basque L1</i>		X		X	X	X	X	
Nahiara <i>Spanish L1</i>	X	X		X	X	X	X	
Fatima <i>Berber L1</i>	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	

Mikel has Basque as the home language and goes to a Basque-medium school. He does not need to develop BICS in Basque his first language or in Spanish because it is the majority language in society and he often uses Spanish outside school. He has to develop BICS in English and also in French if he has French

as an optional language. He needs to develop CALP in Basque, Spanish and English but not so much in French because the level of his 4th language is still quite low and the aim is basic communication. Nahiara has Spanish as the home language and she needs to develop BICS and CALP in a similar way to Mikel for different languages but she also needs to develop BICS in Basque because she does not get enough exposure to the minority language outside school. Fatima is from Morocco and her home language is Berber. She needs to develop BICS in Basque and Spanish because she arrived to the Basque Country recently. She also needs to develop CALP in Basque and Spanish and BICS and CALP in English like Nahiara. Fatima manages better than Mikel and Nahiara in French because she already studied French in Morocco. She also learned Arabic at school in Morocco but she does not use it now.

This example shows that students need to develop both everyday language or BICS and academic language (CALP) so as to communicate in a variety of contexts and situations. BICS and CALP have different characteristics but they are not necessarily mutually exclusive. Students need to use features from both depending on the context. In the following sections the importance of developing metalinguistic awareness and the need to develop pedagogical translanguaging so as to benefit from multilingualism will be discussed.

3. Developing Metalinguistic Awareness

Metalinguistic awareness is the ability to reflect on language itself, including its structure, function, and use. Jessner (2006, p.42) defines metalinguistic awareness as: “the ability to focus attention on language as an object in itself or to think abstractly about language, and consequently, to play with or manipulate language.”

Metalinguistic awareness has been associated with the advantages of bilinguals on the acquisition of additional languages (Lasagabaster, 2000; Cenoz, 2013, 2020; Sanz, 2020). Bilingual and multilingual speakers have the possibility of reflecting on more than one language cross-linguistically. By doing this they can compare different structures, functions and uses of the languages they know. Cross-linguistic awareness is part of metalinguistic awareness and Angelovska and Hahn (2014, p.187) define it as “a mental ability which develops through focusing attention on and reflecting upon language(s) in use and through establishing similarities and differences among the languages in one’s multilingual mind.” Multilingual speakers can potentially have enhanced metalinguistic awareness because they may have developed their metalinguistic awareness through the process of becoming multilingual when learning languages. The product of that learning process results in a broader multilingual repertoire with more linguistic elements that include phonemes, vocabulary, grammar, discourse and pragmatics. Monolingual speakers have these elements in only one language and they can only link new information in the target language to their first language. Multilingual speakers have more elements at their disposal and they can use when learning additional languages. Multilingual speakers have the potential to benefit from their multilingual resources and enhanced metalinguistic awareness but it often needs to be developed through explicit instruction (Cenoz & Gorter, 2021).

Metalinguistic awareness can be measured in different ways. The wug test is a classic task developed by Berko (1958) shows a drawing of a creature that looks like a strange bird and calls it an invented word “wug”. The children are shown a picture of a “wug” and a picture of two and are asked: ‘*This is a wug / wug. Now there is another one. There are two of them. There are two ____*’

If children say “wugs” they can show that they have developed some metalinguistic awareness because they know the basic rule for the plural. Other items, also with invented words, are about past tense, third person singular, derivatives or comparatives.

Other well known tests of metalinguistic awareness are grammaticality judgment tests. These tests usually include a number of sentences and students have to determine which sentences are grammatically correct or not. The sentences may be grammatically correct but they may not make sense in meaning. These are some examples:

1. *The students was tired by the end of the day
2. *Mary is too busy to talk to you*
3. *Cherries growed on trees
4. *Lemons grow on cars*

Examples 1 and 3 are grammatically incorrect and examples 2 and 4 are grammatically correct even though in example 4 does not make sense.

There are other tests of metalinguistic awareness. Elder and Manwaring (2004) asked participants to match grammatical categories to parts of speech and Falk et al. (2015) asked participants about their explicit knowledge of grammar rules to measure metalinguistic awareness with questions on Swedish grammar such as “Explain where the adjective is placed in relation to its noun.” and “How is past participle created for verbs belonging to group 1?” (p. 232). Metalinguistic awareness tests can also be focused on comprehension of sentences that share some characteristics and word segmentation (Pinto & El Euch, 2015). Another technique to measure metalinguistic awareness is to use think-aloud protocols that can be applied by recording students’ comments while they are conducting a task or retrospectively when they are reflecting about the tasks they have just completed while students are conducting.

Metalinguistic awareness can be understood in different ways. Some instruments measure metalinguistic knowledge, that is the knowledge of the phonetic, lexical, syntactic or pragmatic rules see for example Falk et al. (2015) while others look at an implicit knowledge as in the case of the “wug” test (Berko, 1958). The instruments used to measure metalinguistic awareness can focus on some linguistic levels such as morphology or syntax rather than others such as discourse and pragmatics. In general, research studies associate bilingualism and metalingualism with a higher level of metalinguistic awareness (Lasagabaster, 2001; Sanz, 2020; Hirosh & Degani, 2018; Woll, 2018; Hofer & Jessner, 2019) and metalinguistic awareness is considered to have an important positive influence on the acquisition of additional languages (Hufeisen & Jessner, 2018).

It is not necessary to be multilingual to develop metalinguistic awareness. Monolingual individuals can

also analyze and understand how their language works and they can reflect on their language. Metalinguistic awareness can be developed in a single language that can be the first language. For example, students speaking English as a home language who have English as the language of instruction for all the subjects develop metalinguistic awareness in their English language classes at school when they reflect about how the language work. They also develop academic uses of the language by reading textbooks and listening to explanations in the different school subjects. When students are exposed to two or more languages they have the opportunity to use their own multilingual resources to develop metalinguistic awareness and their academic skills in the different languages. Multilingual students have more resources at their disposal when they learn other languages or subjects in second or additional languages but these resources need to be activated. In the next section we can see how pedagogical translanguaging can be useful to enhance that process.

4. Pedagogical Translanguaging

The term translanguaging was first used in the Welsh language as “trawsieithu” by Cen Williams (1994) in the context of Welsh-English bilingual education in the United Kingdom. Williams identified some successful bilingual pedagogical practices at schools that were based on switching the two languages, Welsh and English, in the input and output in the same class. This was a planned strategy that aims to develop a high level of proficiency in both languages. In the context of Wales, there is a majority language, English and a minority language, Welsh, and the aim is that students with English, Welsh or other languages as home language develop proficiency in both Welsh and English. Translanguaging practices also aim at developing academic skills across the curriculum in immersion/CLIL programs.

The original meaning of translanguaging has had an important development in the United States and in many parts of the world and nowadays translanguaging can be used in different ways (Yukawa & Kano, 2021). As Williams (2002, p.42) explains the priority in the United States is often “to acquire the second language, English, in order to displace the vernacular language” and this is quite different from contexts such as Wales or the Basque Country where the minority language is promoted not only for speakers who use Welsh or Basque at home but also for students of the majority languages.

In the context of the US translanguaging is often used to refer to the discursive practices of bilingual speakers which are not necessarily linked to the school context. García (2009, p.36) advocates for the acceptance of bilingual communicative practices in education so as to enhance opportunities for language-minority children to be successful at school. The legitimization of these existing practices in school contexts is seen as a way to empower minority students (García & Lin, 2017).

Cenoz and Gorter (2020, 2021) distinguish between spontaneous and pedagogical translanguaging. Pedagogical translanguaging, also called intentional, designed or classroom translanguaging, refers to instructional strategies that integrate two or more languages. It is a pedagogical theory and a pedagogical practice. Spontaneous translanguaging that has also been called street translanguaging refers to the reality of bilingual usage in naturally occurring contexts. In these contexts boundaries between languages are fluid and

constantly shifting.

Pedagogical translanguaging is closely related to the original concept of translanguaging as coined by Williams (1994) but it is broader because it can be used not only with two but also with three or more languages. It is also broader because it can be implemented not only in bilingual programs including a minority language but in other immersion/CLIL programs and even in language classes. The most common practice in the context of translanguaging in Wales is the alternation of the two languages, Welsh and English in the input and output. This is also one of the practices in pedagogical translanguaging but other possibilities are also included provided that students' resources from their multilingual repertoire are activated. Some of the activities proposed as pedagogical translanguaging are closely related to the development of metalinguistic awareness.

Pedagogical translanguaging aims at linguistic and academic development. The aim is to increase proficiency in the languages included in the curriculum and these could be a national language, a minority language, English or other languages. Pedagogical translanguaging also aims at academic development in content subjects, particularly when they are taught through the medium of a second or additional language in immersion and CLIL programs. It is aimed at multilingual students who can be at different stages of language proficiency in different languages and can also be regarded as emergent multilingual students. An important characteristic of pedagogical translanguaging is that it is planned and designed as a pedagogical resource to improve the learning of language(s) and content subjects. The focus in this article is on pedagogical translanguaging but spontaneous translanguaging can also take place in the classroom and is common among multilingual students. Unlike spontaneous translanguaging, pedagogical translanguaging is an integral part of the class planning and it takes place as part of the instructional activities that are designed for learning language(s) and content.

Cenoz and Gorter (2021) explain that pedagogical translanguaging embraces different practices. The practices can be considered stronger or weaker depending on the degree of pedagogical intervention. The practices are the following:

Enhancing metalinguistic awareness. This is the strongest practice because it involves activities that use two or more languages in the same class and students need to reflect on the different languages. When activating prior knowledge of the languages in the multilingual repertoire students can make connections between the languages and reflect about their similarities and differences. By developing their metalinguistic awareness, students can make progress in language classes and also enhance their comprehension and production skills in content classes.

Leonet et al. (2020) report a study on derivatives and compounds in Basque, Spanish and English and showed that pedagogical translanguaging can have a positive influence on metalinguistic awareness in the case of morphology. Morphological awareness can be useful also for languages that do not share much vocabulary when activities compare derivation or composition in different languages. When the target languages do not share much vocabulary or grammar, pedagogical translanguaging activities can be linked to pragmatics and discourse. Pedagogical translanguaging activities can include writing the same type of text (descriptive, argumentative) in different languages or reflecting on requests or apologies expressed in

different languages. Enhancing metalinguistic awareness practices usually take place in language classes by using two or more languages in the same class. If the school has a CLIL/immersion program, the language classes can give support to the content classes by working across languages in the development of academic uses of the language.

Use of whole linguistic repertoire: This practice is very closely linked to the origin of translanguaging in Welsh-English education. Two or more languages are used in the same class for input and output or to find information in different languages. An example of alternation of input and output could be when students watch a video or read a text about the muscles or different functions in the human body in one language and then they answer some questions or write a summary in another language. Another example of using the whole linguistic repertoire is reported by Cenoz and Santos (2020). In this example a group of students in secondary school look for the same news item in online newspapers in Basque, Spanish, English and French. They analyze the content and structure of the news items in all these languages and then they make summaries and write letters in the different languages. These two examples of the use of the whole linguistic repertoire could take place both in language and in content classes. This practice is considered a strong practice of pedagogical translanguaging because the different languages are used in the same class and also because there is some focus on reflecting on language.

Integrated language curriculum. This practice can be regarded as a weaker form of pedagogical translanguaging because the main language in each of the language classes is only one and not two or more. The link between the language classes is based on the coordination of the syllabuses of the different languages so that the languages reinforce each other. An example of integrated language curriculum is reported by Lyster et al. (2013). The aim of this intervention, that took place in a Canadian primary school, is to develop morphological awareness in French and English, the two languages in the curriculum. The focus was on derivation and decomposition both in the French and English language classes but there were different teachers for the two languages and only the target language was used in each of the classes. The activities were in one language only but they were coordinated so that students could develop metalinguistic awareness across the two languages. This practice of integrated language curriculum does not use two or more languages in the same class but from the point of view of the students there is translanguaging because the multilingual repertoire is used as a resource even if it is consecutively in one class after another and not in the same class.

Translanguaging shifts. This is a term used by García et al. (2017) to refer to unplanned decisions that respond to communicative needs in the classroom. Cenoz and Gorter (2021) consider translanguaging shifts as a weaker form of translanguaging because these shifts start as spontaneous and they are not planned. They can happen when students use a word in a language that is not the target language or ask for a translation and the teacher uses the opportunity to link spontaneous to pedagogical translanguaging and provides an explanation or asks questions so as to develop metalinguistic awareness across languages.

In this section we have seen that pedagogical translanguaging can contribute to the development of metalinguistic awareness and academic uses of the language that are crucial in immersion/CLIL programs. Pedagogical translanguaging practices can be implemented in many different ways and at different levels.

They can be used to improve pronunciation, vocabulary, grammar, pragmatics and discourse and are specially suited to develop reading and writing skills in academic contexts.

5. Final remarks

Pedagogical translanguaging aims at developing linguistic proficiency and metalinguistic awareness by using students' own multilingual repertoire. By activating students' prior knowledge it can provide support for students who are learning languages in their language classes by activating the resources they already have at their disposal. Pedagogical translanguaging can also help students to develop a deeper understanding of the subject content when they face comprehension difficulties in their immersion/CLIL classes. Pedagogical translanguaging can be an effective approach for supporting the academic and linguistic development of multilingual learners and can be implemented in different levels of education. Pedagogical translanguaging is closely linked to the original concept of translanguaging proposed by Williams (1994) but includes more languages and more practices to enhance metalinguistic awareness.

Pedagogical translanguaging can be regarded as a multilingual pedagogy and as such it replaces hard boundaries by soft boundaries between languages. Soft boundaries allow for using two or more languages in the same class so that multilingual students benefit from prior knowledge. The implementation of pedagogical translanguaging needs to be adapted to the educational context. It needs to take into account the aims of the school regarding languages and teaching through different languages and the linguistic background of the students. Pedagogical translanguaging needs to be introduced gradually and its intensity depends on the specific educational context. As Cenoz and Gorter (2022, p.18) argue, "Pedagogical translanguaging needs to be tailor-made for specific contexts and has to be adapted to existing school pedagogies."

Funding

This work was supported by the Agencia Estatal de Investigación, Spain [Grant Number PID2019-105818GB-100]

References

- Angelovska, T., & Hahn, A. (2014). Raising language awareness for learning and teaching L3 grammar. In A. Benati, C. Laval, & M.J. Arche (Eds.), *The grammar dimension in instructed second language learning* (pp. 185-206. Bloomsbury Academic.
- Aronin, L., & Singleton, D. (2008). Multilingualism as a new linguistic dispensation. *International Journal of Multilingualism*, 5 (1), 1-16. <https://doi.org/10.2167/ijm072.0>
- Berko, J. (1958). The child's learning of English morphology. *Word* 14 (2-3), 150-177.
- Cenoz, J. (2013). The influence of bilingualism on third language acquisition: Focus on multilingualism. *Language Teaching*, 46 (1), 71-86. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444811000218>
- Cenoz, J. (2015). Content-Based instruction and Content and Language Integrated Learning: The same or different? *Language, Culture and Curriculum*, 28 (1), 8-24. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07908318.2014.1000922>
- Cenoz, J. (2019). Translanguaging pedagogies and English as a lingua franca. *Language Teaching*, 52 (1), 71-85. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444817000246>
- Cenoz, J. (2020). Third Language Acquisition. In C.A. Chapelle (Ed.) *The concise encyclopedia of applied linguistics*

- (pp. 1089-1093). Wiley.
- Cenoz, J., Genesee, F., & Gorter, D. (2014). Critical analysis of CLIL: Taking stock and looking forward. *Applied Linguistics*, 35 (3), 243-262. <https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/amt011>
- Cenoz, J., & Ruiz de Zarobe, Y. (2015). Introduction: Learning through a second or additional language: Content-Based Instruction and CLIL in the twenty-first century. *Language, Culture and Curriculum*, 28 (1), 1-7. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07908318.2014.1000921>
- Cenoz, J., & Gorter, D. (2020) Pedagogical translanguaging: A introduction. *System*, 92. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2020.102269>
- Cenoz, J., & Gorter, D. (2021). *Pedagogical translanguaging*. Cambridge University Press.
- Cenoz, J., & Santos, A. (2020). Implementing pedagogical translanguaging in trilingual schools. *System*, 92. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2020.102273>
- Cenoz, J., & Gorter, D. (2022). Pedagogical translanguaging in content and language integrated learning. *Journal of Multilingual Theories and Practices*, 3(1), 7-26. <https://doi.org/10.1558/jmtp.21812>
- Coyle, D., Hood, P., & Marsh, D. (2010). *CLIL: Content and Language Integrated Learning*. Cambridge University Press.
- Cummins, J. (2021). *Rethinking the education of multilingual learners: A critical analysis of theoretical concepts*. Multilingual Matters.
- Elder, C., & Manwaring, D. (2004). The relationship between metalinguistic knowledge and learning outcomes among undergraduate students of Chinese. *Language Awareness*, 13(3), 145-162. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09658410408667092>
- Falk, Y., Lindqvist, C., & Bardel, C. (2015). The role of L1 explicit metalinguistic knowledge in L3 oral production at the initial state. *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition*, 18 (2): 227-235. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S1366728913000552>
- Fernández-Sanjurjo, J., Fernández-Costales, A., & Arias Blanco, J.M. (2019). Analysing students' content-learning in science in CLIL vs. non-CLIL programmes: empirical evidence from Spain. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 22(6), 661-674. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050.2017.1294142>
- García, O. (2009). *Bilingual education in the 21st century: A global perspective*. Wiley-Blackwell.
- García, O., Johnson, S.I., & Seltzer, K. (2017). *The translanguaging classroom: Leveraging student bilingualism for learning*. Caslon.
- García, O., & Lin, A. (2017). Translanguaging in bilingual education. In O. García, A. Lin, & S. May (Eds.) *Bilingual and multilingual education (3rd ed.): Encyclopedia of Language and Education*, 5. (pp. 117-130). Springer Cham.
- Genesee, F. (2013). Insights into bilingual education from research on immersion programs in Canada. In C. Abello-Contesse, P.M. Chandler, M.D. López-Jiménez, & R. Chacón-Beltrán (Eds.) *Bilingual and multilingual education in the 21st century : Building on experience: Bilingual Education & Bilingualism*, 94 (pp. 24-41). Multilingual Matters.
- Hirosh, Z., & Degani, T. (2018). Direct and indirect effects of multilingualism on novel language learning: An integrative review. *Psychonomic Bulletin & Review*, 25 (3), 892-916. <https://doi.org/10.3758/s13423-017-1315-7>
- Hofer, B., & Jessner, U. (2019). Multilingualism at the primary level in South Tyrol: How does multilingual education affect young learners' metalinguistic awareness and proficiency in L1, L2 and L3? *The Language Learning Journal*, 47(1), 76-87. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09571736.2016.1195865>
- Hufeisen, B., & Jessner, U. (2018). The psycholinguistics of multiple language learning and teaching. In L. Aronin & D. Singleton (Eds.) *Twelve Lectures of Multilingualism* : MM Textbook, 15 (pp. 65-100). Multilingual Matters.
- Hughes, S.P., & Madrid, D. (2020). The effects of CLIL on content knowledge in monolingual contexts. *The Language Learning Journal*, 48, 48-59. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09571736.2019.1671483>
- Jessner, U. (2006). *Linguistic awareness in multilinguals: English as a third language*. Edinburgh University Press.
- Lasagabaster, D. (2000). Three languages and three linguistic models in the Basque educational system. In J. Cenoz & U. Jessner (Eds.) *English in Europe: The acquisition of a third language* (pp. 179-197). Multilingual Matters.
- Lasagabaster, D. (2001). The effect of knowledge about the L1 on foreign language skills and grammar. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 4 (5), 310-331. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050108667735>
- Leonet, O., Cenoz, J., & Gorter, D. (2020). Developing morphological awareness across languages: translanguaging pedagogies in third language acquisition. *Language Awareness*, 29 (1) 41-59. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09658416.2019.1688338>
- Lin, A.M.Y. (2016). *Language across the curriculum & CLIL in English as an additional language (EAL) contexts: Theory and practice*. Springer.
- Lyster, R., Quiroga, J., & Ballinger, S. (2013). The effects of biliteracy instruction on morphological awareness. *Journal*

- of Immersion and Content-Based Language Education*, 1 (2), 169–197. <https://doi.org/10.1075/jicb.1.2.02lys>
- Mahan, K.R. (2022). The comprehending teacher: scaffolding in content and language integrated learning (CLIL). *The Language Learning Journal*, 50 (1), 74-88. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09571736.2019.1705879>
- Martinez, A. A., Kortazar, K.B., & Gonzalez-Dios, I. (2021). Are CLIL texts too complicated?: A computational analysis of their linguistic characteristics. *Journal of Immersion and Content-Based Language Education*, 9 (1). 4-30. <https://doi.org/10.1075/jicb.19022.agu>
- Pinto, M.A., & El Euch, S. (2015). *La conscience métalinguistique: Théorie, développement et, instruments de mesure*. [Metalinguistic awareness :Theory, development and measurement instruments]. PRESSES DE L'UNIVERSITÉ LAVAL
- Sanz, C. (2020). Multilingualism and metalinguistic awareness. In C.A. Chapelle (Ed.) *The concise encyclopedia of applied linguistics* (pp. 780-789). Wiley-Blackwell.
- Tragant, E., Marsol, A., Serrano, R., & Llanes, A. (2016). Vocabulary learning at primary school: A comparison of EFL and CLIL. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 19 (5), 579-591. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050.2015.1035227>
- Williams, C. (1994). Arfarniad o Ddulliau Dysgu ac Addysgu yng nghyd-destun Addysg Uwchradd Ddwylieithog [An evaluation of learning and teaching methods in the context of bilingual secondary education]. Unpublished doctoral thesis, University of Wales, Bangor.
- Williams C. (2002). *A language gained: A study of language immersion at 11–16 years of age: Education transactions*. School of Education, University of Wales Bangor. https://www.academia.edu/37435946/A_LANGUAGE_GAINED_A_Study_of_Language_Immersion_at_11_16_years_of_age_CEN_WILLIAMS
- Woll, N. (2018). Investigating dimensions of metalinguistic awareness: What think-aloud protocols revealed about the cognitive processes involved in positive transfer from L2 to L3. *Language Awareness* 27 (1-2), 167-185. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09658416.2018.1432057>
- Yukawa, E., & Kano, N. (2021). Revisiting “Translanguaging”: Its Concept, Criticism, and Educational Applications. *Studies in Mother Tongue, Heritage Language, and Bilingual Education*, MHB17.pdf, 52-74.