Explain your understanding of one of the three pairs of key concepts in English Language Teaching (see below). Define the two concepts, making reference to relevant literature, explain why they are important, and identify principal scholars for each. Explain how these concepts are connected to one another and to other aspects of TESOL.

Code-Switching and Translanguaging: An Exploration of Two Era-Defining Concepts in Globalised Intercultural Language Teaching

Based on the misguided belief that linguistic compartmentalisation assists foreign language learning, the general consensus in English Language Teaching (hereafter ELT) has, for a long time, discouraged plurilingual pedagogical strategies (López and González-Davies, 2016, p. 68). It was thought that permitting the simultaneous presence of the students' first language (L1) and second language (L2) would result in a lack of interest or need to use their L2, a reduction in exposure to the L2, and interference between the L1 and L2, otherwise known as negative transfer (ibid.). However, current research has suggested that the concepts of *code-switching* and *translanguaging* have the capacity to support multilingual speakers in processing meaning and experiences, as well as gaining a deeper understanding and knowledge of the languages in use and the content being taught (Lewis et al, 2012). In particular, García, and Wei (2014) extend the advantages of translanguaging to circumventing language separation, and exploring sociolinguistic issues around power, prestige, and identity, which – in standardised monolingual classrooms – can detrimentally affect the performance of minoritised language speakers. This paper aligns with recent literature in challenging the assumptions around plurilingual teaching strategies. It posits that there is massive potential for transcultural methods in language education, iterating the need for researchers and teachers to shift from a separate (monoglossic) view of pedagogical languaging practices towards a holistic (heteroglossic) view.

Concepts

Code-Switching

First proposed in a seminal paper by John Gumperz at the RELC Conference in Singapore, 1977, code-switching is defined as a multilingual alternation of languages (typically a speaker's L1 and L2) or varieties of a language within a specific communicative episode (Gumperz, 1977; Cook, 2001). Used intrasententially or intersententially, these distinguishable codes are often based on social or geographic differences, with so-called 'low varieties' used in everyday situations (such as at home, or with friends), and so-called 'high varieties' used in more prestigious situations (such as at work, or by official institutions such as government, media, or education). Several theoretical models have been constructed to explain code-switching. One is John Gumperz' (1977) Interactional Code-Switching, which offered foundational analysis into conversational multilingual practice, largely in Europe and North America. Aspects of social identity were first raised through Peter Auer's (1988) theory of Code-Switching as Practice, which situated code-switching as a phenomenon of language contact. Auer (2005) later added to his initial theory with a warning against the essentialist paralleling of hybrid language use with hybrid language identity, comparing it to the equation of language and nation which underpins many traditional European language ideologies. Contrastingly, Myers-Scotton's (1993) Markedness Model offered a more deterministic insight into how social forces affect the performance of code-switching. Myers-Scotton (1993) explored the concepts of *unmarked language choices* (the language or code expected in a particular context) and *marked language choices* (the language or code not expected in that context), and their functional purposes, such as the expression of autonomy, authority, or individuality.

As both a concept and a technique, code-switching has not been welcomed in traditional L2 classrooms because of the tendency to mandate the use of the so-called target language (Reyes, 2004). The most likely explanation for this tendency is a widespread belief that switching to an alternate language (especially an L1) reflects incomplete knowledge of the language in which the utterance was initiated (ibid.). Many researchers now admit that code-switching commonly occurs in multilingual contexts, not simply due to a lack of knowledge in the L2, but for alternative communicative functions. An intangible, but invaluable, benefit to allowing speakers to code-switch is that multilinguals are able to manipulate their linguistic codes to form multicultural identities (Cook, 2001). A more quantifiable benefit is that learners are able to perform demanding tasks at a higher cognitive level (Reyes, 2004), and convey the meaning of their intended idea with greater accuracy

(Moore, 2002). In this light, code-switching can be viewed as not only a highly skilled activity in multi-competence, but a flexible interactional resource.

López and González-Davies (2016, p. 67) advocate two plurilingual learning strategies that favour communicative development: Pedagogically Based Code-Switching (PBCS), and Translation for Other Learning Contexts (TOLC). Both strategies are based on humanistic, socio-constructivist educational stances, which are predominantly student-centred, rather than the traditional transmissionist, teacher-centred stance (ibid.). While this paper focuses on the intentional but natural use of PBCS in foreign language learning (and its overlap with the phenomenon of translanguaging), López and González-Davies' proposed TOLC activities are relevant in their encouragement of intercultural competence in translation studies, although, given that the languages involved 'function separately in their respective contexts', their overall cross-code integration is limited (ibid., p. 70). As a pedagogical framework, PBCS is compelling in its fostering of *metalinguistic awareness*. When applied as a code-switching pattern curated by a foreign language teacher – such as González-Davies and Scott-Tennent's (2005) observational study of student behaviour in translation activities – PBCS sensitises students towards language similarities, differences, and connections (López and González-Davies, 2016).

While these studies have offered invaluable insights into the everyday and pedagogical uses of code-switching, there remains a strong impetus on linguistic separation, which stems from a lingering structure of monoglossia. Intending to supplement code-switching with greater socioideological awareness, translanguaging has the potential to simultaneously improve foreign language learning and mitigate social prejudices and inequalities in ELT.

Translanguaging

Translanguaging, or 'Trawsieithu' as it was originally coined in Welsh bilingual education in the 1980s (Lewis et al, 2012, p. 642), was constructed as a cross-curricular strategy to purposefully use two languages for teaching and learning inside the same lesson (Conteh, 2018a, p. 445). By describing both multilingual oral interaction and multilingualism in written texts, translanguaging aligns with the perspective that language is ongoing rather than definitive – hence the term 'languaging' (ibid., pp. 445–446). It is worth distinguishing between *pedagogical translanguaging*, which refers to intentional strategies implemented by

the teacher based on the entirety of their students' linguistic repertoire, and *spontaneous translanguaging*, which involves fluid discursive practices that naturally occur inside and outside the classroom (Cenoz, 2017, p. 194). These categorisations have also been labelled as classroom and universal translanguaging (Lewis et al, 2012).

While code-switching originated in social settings and shifted to classrooms, translanguaging research emerged from (Welsh) classroom research, and has now expanded to include communication outside the classroom (Lewis et al, 2012). Given that the concepts of *code-mixing* and *code-switching* already provided a framework to dissect multilingual language interactions, some researchers questioned the need for the separate notion of translanguaging (Conteh, 2018a, p. 446). However, that stance has been downplayed by Creese and Blackledge (2015), who claim that it draws false distinctions between so-called monolingual, bilingual, and multilingual individuals. They suggest that everyone is multilingual to a varying degree, because everyone possesses a range of ways of using language, even individuals who can only speak and write in one particular language (ibid.).

The recent reappraisal of attitudes towards concurrent multilingualism – and, in a broader sense, the re-evaluation of most curricula and syllabi under initiatives such as 'Decolonising the Curriculum' – has shaped a pedagogical environment which encourages language use reflective of transnational, intercultural identity, and contradictory of linguistic monopolisation or suppression (Lin and Martin, 2005). Specific to ELT, this can be seen in the reappraisal of 'own-language use' in classrooms, which is crucial for the acceptance of a process like translanguaging (Hall and Cook, 2012). The greatest challenge to this acceptance is ELT's 'entrenched monolingualism' (ibid., p. 297); despite massive increases in mobility, migration, and multilingualism in the global north, language classrooms are still constructed on Cummins's 'two solitudes' (2008), which disregards home languages, separates languages, and remains fixated on national and standard languages across policies, curricula, and assessments (Conteh, 2018a).

At the time of writing, Conteh's (2018b) argument that research has largely focused on understanding translingual interactional processes rather than hypothesising pedagogical applications was valid, but there has since been a flurry of academic activity addressing this gap (Wei, 2018; Wang, 2019; Cenoz and Gorter, 2021). Similarly focused literature did also exist prior to Conteh's publication (Canagarajah, 2011; García and Wei, 2014), from which useful translanguaging concepts can be extracted, such as García's (2009) notion of additive

(rather than subtractive) bilingualism, whereby an L2 supplements an L1, rather than distracts from or replaces it, and Grosjean's (2010) holistic (rather than fractional) conceptualisation of bilingual cognitive functioning. This is supported by the overlap between translanguaging and cross-linguistic transfer (Benson, 2002), particularly the concepts of *common underlying proficiency* and *linguistic interdependence* (Cummins, 2008). Non-compartmentalisation is also advocated by Lewis et al (2012), who offer a useful summary of neurolinguistic research into translanguaging, which has found that multiple languages remain cerebrally active even when a multilingual speaks in just one language (Hoshino and Thierry, 2011).

Although Creese and Blackledge (2015) occasionally formulate vague arguments regarding the deployment of translingual resources and the contesting of social inequality, they, along with García (2009), have been pivotal in extending the term of translanguaging beyond education. Creese and Blackledge (2015) argue that translanguaging challenges the *deficit ideologies* surrounding multilingualism in education, as well as traditional labels such as (so-called) standard languages and target languages, which have implied hierarchies and prestige. As an ideological stance, translanguaging questions the boundaries between named languages, preferring to view them as different cultural conventions, which multilinguals are socialised into moving between and across in their everyday communication (Grosjean, 2010).

Returning to its Welsh origins, translanguaging can be contextualised as a reaction against the historic separation and associated prestige of the English and Welsh languages. Their representation engendered conflict and repression, often framed as a linguistic battleground of English language dominance and Welsh language endangerment (Lewis et al, 2012, p. 642). As both an interactional phenomenon and a pedagogical technique, translanguaging has been catalytic in the successful revitalisation of Welsh in the late twentieth century, and has illustrated the opportunity for the co-existence of two or more languages in a multilingual school system (ibid.). In the case of Welsh, rebuttals to this success have tended to argue that bilingual schools restrict students to learning solely English and Welsh, rather than branching out into other European (or international) languages (Jaspers, 2018). However, this does not necessarily dilute the potential of translingual classrooms approaches, as it points to flaws in the flexibility and content of the curriculum rather than in translanguaging itself.

While this paper acknowledges the significance of code-switching and translanguaging as interactional phenomena existing outside of education systems, it predominantly aligns itself with the stance that both can be employed as pedagogical techniques to improve foreign language learning. As an ideological system, translanguaging in particular can bolster multicultural understanding and linguistic equality, as well as contradicting monoglossic ideals of linguistic purity. The following sections explore the links between code-switching and translanguaging, their points of differentiation, pedagogical applications, and wider socioideological connections.

Discussion

Links and Differences

Recent discussions offer conflicting views on the relationship between code-switching and translanguaging. On the one hand, some claim that the two cannot be conflated, as translanguaging's conceptualisation of the bilingual mind differs from code-switching's (Goodman and Tastanbek, 2021). On the other hand, some perceive translanguaging as a range of practices under which code-switching is subsumed (García, 2009; Lewis et al, 2012), or that translanguaging casts doubt on the idea of a 'code', but is not intended to replace code-switching (Wei, 2018, p. 27).

It is unsurprising, therefore, that students and scholars, particularly those new to the code-switching/translanguaging debate, have difficulty in differentiating the two. Goodman and Tastanbek (2021, pp. 29–30) underline a potential risk in this confusion – if the nuances of translanguaging are misunderstood, it runs the risk of becoming a polysemic buzzword used in research and teaching, limiting its applications to a continuation of code-switching. Ideologically, translanguaging research has oftentimes functioned as 'a means to document and disrupt monolingual ideologies' (ibid., p. 30). A lack of awareness surrounding both concepts may discourage teachers from allowing translanguaging pedagogical practices in classrooms which would otherwise support students' multilingual, transnational identities (Creese and Blackledge, 2015).

Whereas pedagogical code-switching studies have generally observed intersentential and intrasentential language alternation, translanguaging encompasses switches in language use between entire modes of learning and teaching (Wei, 2018). An example of this could be

permitting students to present information orally in one language, before producing related written material in another language. By broadening the scope of language alternation further than the sentential level, translanguaging could allow for a more holistic understanding of the pedagogical value of alternation (Goodman and Tastanbek, 2021). As this understanding has become more deeply embedded in educational and academic circles, the link between code-switching and diglossia is slowly being reconstrued as a heteroglossic perspective on multilingual language use, which epitomises the conceptual shift from code-switching to translanguaging (ibid.).

A common misconception surrounding the distinction between code-switching and translanguaging is that the former can only occur as a naturalistic interactional phenomenon, whereas the latter is invariably a systematic pedagogical method (ibid.). In many instances, this classification is accurate, but it is also an unnuanced and limiting interpretation of both concepts. As defined by García (2009), translanguaging is indeed intended as a methodical harnessing of two languages to elevate one's linguistic skills, but its use can also be serendipitous. Lewis et al's (2012) research showed that, while translanguaging typically represented the intentional and planned use of two languages, learners and speakers also spontaneously use translingual sentence construction to enhance their understanding and boost progress. Consequently, the most commonly cited overlapping feature between code-switching and translanguaging is their functional categorisation as either *spontaneous* or *pedagogical*. Spontaneous code-switching/translanguaging intends to facilitate effective communication between interlocutors; the main goal of pedagogical code-switching/translanguaging is to enhance communicative proficiency in a foreign language within a classroom environment (Macaro, 2014; Cenoz, 2017).

Another link between the two concepts is the ideological reasoning for which they are employed. Teachers' language choices in the classroom are representative of linguistic ideologies, which can be observed as acts of resistance against a monoglossic perspective of language use (Goodman and Tastanbek, 2021). These observations highlight that, despite code-switching and translanguaging belonging to separate academic fields (the former to sociolinguistics, and the latter to bilingual education), there is indisputable common ground between them. In this light, translanguaging can be seen as related to (if undeniably distinct from) code-switching, both in the classroom and, to a lesser extent, beyond it (Lewis et al, 2012). However, without a greater recognition of each concept's finer distinctions and

applications, this illustrated overlap might add to the aforementioned ambiguity around code-switching and translanguaging.

Applications and Shortcomings

To date, literature on code-switching and translanguaging investigates language alternation both in and outside of classrooms, the significance of teacher and student beliefs regarding the extent to which languaging practices are accepted and used, and the influence of these practices in reifying the power of languages and their speakers (Goodman and Tastanbek, 2021). Although there are many links in usage and ideology between code-switching and translanguaging, the most prominent difference is the historically monoglossic conceptualisation of languages in code-switching research, although there are notable exceptions to this generalisation (Reyes, 2004; López and González-Davies, 2016). From a translanguaging perspective which highlights the holistic, heteroglossic, and hybrid nature of language use, this conceptualisation is untenable (Goodman and Tastanbek, 2021), justifying the call for a shift away from code-switching towards translanguaging, and providing a sense of meaning and identity, counteracting marginalisation, and transcending restrictive language boundaries (García, 2009; Canagarajah, 2011; García and Wei, 2014). Arguably, this shift should be interspersed with the areas of overlap between code-switching and translanguaging that do not depend on the problematic conceptualisation of monoglossic multilingualism. Refer to Goodman and Tastanbek's Figure 1 (2021, p. 40) for a visual framework of how non-problematic elements from past code-switching research can be used to inform the present and future application of translanguaging.

There are several issues which remain unresolved within the current body of translanguaging literature. One is the practicality of finding multilingual teachers who can (and are willing to) translanguage in their classrooms. As with any pedagogical shift, intensive teacher training will be required, necessitating a redirection of resources and funds (Jaspers, 2018). Another issue lies in non-linguistic communication. According to Meulder et al (2018, p. 893), translanguaging 'challenges the six decade long project of sign language linguistics and by extension Deaf Studies to legitimize the status of sign languages and, correspondingly, the right of deaf people to acquire and use a sign language in educational and community settings'. In its pursuit of balancing unequal sociolinguistic structures, translanguaging must avoid replacing one pedagogically oppressed group with another.

The most glaring shortcoming in the current body of pedagogical code-switching and translanguaging literature is transitional. Currently, it is unclear as to whether the benefits of these pedagogical approaches would also be applicable for monolingual speakers. Rosiers et al (2018) found that pedagogical translanguaging goals only occur in the multilingual classroom, implying that students would require at least a baseline proficiency in both languages to avoid errors in comprehension that would impede learning in such an environment. One of the most cited benefits of translanguaging is that it can be a norm-breaking trigger for the integration of multicultural, multilingual practices and ideologies (Canagarajah, 2011; García and Wei, 2014) – but how to manage this integration so as to avoid ostracising monolingual learners (which in turn could deter them from learning a foreign language and benefitting from translanguaging in future) remains unaddressed. Logically, the pro-translanguaging counter argument is that ostracising monolinguals only occurs within government-curated education systems that propagate monoglossic standards (Lin and Martin, 2005). However, Jaspers (2018) raises a valid point in that translanguaging scholars, advocates, and practitioners can at times share convictions with the authorities they criticise, and that they must prevent translanguaging from becoming a dominant rather than liberating force.

In sum, despite differences in academic classifications and empirical goals, code-switching and translanguaging scholars have frequently converged at several key issues. The two most prominent of these issues are that viewpoints on linguistic competence need reappraising, and that the mainstream pedagogical approaches cannot sufficiently encompass the dynamicity and complexity of multilingual speech (Creese and Blackledge, 2015). Intercultural, multilingual communities worldwide are characterised by fluid and intricate networks of interaction, which theories based on monolingual norms fail to reflect (Goodman and Tastanbek, 2021). The fact that code-switching and translanguaging researchers have both arrived at similar conclusions regarding these maladaptive theories indicates their perpetuity, and the urgent necessity to shift attitudes, models, and theories towards a multicultural, heteroglossic interpretation of foreign language learning. This shift must be characterised by an awareness of its impact on non-linguistic communication (such as sign language), and on monolingual speakers and teachers. It is important that sociolinguistic researchers and educational practitioners reconcile around the pursuit of this reinterpretative shift, rather than making futile efforts to establish oppositional or polarising schools of thought between code-switching and translanguaging.

Bibliography

Auer, P. (1988) *Code-switching in Conversation: Language, Interaction and Identity (ed.)*. London: Routledge.

Auer, P. (2005) 'A Postscript: Code-Switching and Social Identity', *Journal of Pragmatics*, 37(3), pp. 403–410.

Benson, C. (2002) 'Transfer/Cross-linguistic influence', *ELT Journal*, 56(1), pp. 68–70.

Canagarajah, S. (2011) 'Translanguaging in the classroom: Emerging issues for research and pedagogy', *Applied Linguistics Review*, 2(1), pp. 1–28.

Cenoz, J. (2017) 'Translanguaging in school contexts: International Perspectives', *Journal of Language, Identity & Education*, 16(4), pp. 193–198.

Cenoz, J. & Gorter, D. (2021) *Pedagogical Translanguaging*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Conteh, J. (2018a) 'Translanguaging', *ELT Journal*, 72(4), pp. 445–447.

Conteh, J. (2018b) 'Translanguaging as pedagogy – a critical review', in Creese, A. & Blackledge, A. (eds.) *The Routledge Handbook of Language and Superdiversity.* London: Routledge, pp. 473–487.

Cook, V. J. (2001) 'Using the first language in the classroom', *Canadian Modern Language Review*, 57(3), 402–423.

Creese, A. & Blackledge, A. (2015) 'Translanguaging and identity in educational settings', *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 35(1), pp. 20–35.

Cummins, J. (2008) 'Teaching for transfer: Challenging the two solitudes assumption in bilingual education', *Encyclopaedia of Language and Education*, 5(1), pp. 65–75.

Meulder, M. D., 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*, 40(10), pp. 892–906.

García, O. (2009) 'Education, multilingualism and translanguaging in the 21st century', in Skutnabb-Kangas, T., Phillipson, R., Mohanty, A. K. & Panda, M. (eds.) *Social justice through multilingual education* (pp.140–158). Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

García, O. & Wei, L. (2014) 'The Translanguaging Turn and its Impact', in García, O & Wei, L (eds.) *Translanguaging: Language, Bilingualism and Education*. Palgrave Pivot: London, pp. 19–44.

Goodman, B. & Tastanbek, S. (2021) 'Making the shift from a codeswitching to a translanguaging lens in English language teacher education', *TESOL Quarterly*, 55(1), pp. 29–53.

González Davies, M. & Scott-Tennent, C. (2005) 'A problem-solving and student-centred approach to the translation of cultural references', *Meta: Journal des Traducteurs/Meta: Translators' Journal*, 50(1), pp. 160–179.

Grosjean, F. (2010) *Bilingual: Life and Reality*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Gumperz, J.J. (1977) 'The sociolinguistic significance of conversational code-switching', *RELC Journal*, 8(2), pp. 1–34.

Hall, G. & Cook, G. (2012) 'Own-language use in language teaching and learning', *Language Teaching*, 45(3), pp. 271–308.

Hoshino, N. & Thierry, G. (2011) 'Language selection in bilingual word production: Electrophysiological evidence for cross-language competition', *Brain Research*, 1371(4), pp. 100–109.

Jaspers, J. (2018) 'The transformative limits of translanguaging', *Language & Communication*, 58(1), pp. 1–10.

Lewis, G., Jones, B. & Baker, C. (2012) 'Translanguaging: Origins and development from school to street and beyond', *Educational Research and Evaluation*, 18(7), pp. 641–654.

Lin, A. & Martin, P. W. (2005) *Decolonisation, globalisation: Language-in-education policy and practice.* Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

López, C. C. & González-Davies, M. (2016) 'Switching codes in the plurilingual classroom', *ELT Journal*, 70(1), pp. 67–77.

Macaro, E. (2014) 'Overview: Where should we be going with classroom codeswitching research?', in Barnard, R. & McLellan, J. (eds.) *Codeswitching in university English-medium classes: Asian perspectives* (pp. 10–23). Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

Moore, D. (2002) 'Code-switching and learning in the classroom', *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 5(5), pp. 279–293.

Myers-Scotton, C. (1993) 'Common and uncommon ground: Social and structural factors in codeswitching', *Language in Society,* 22(4), pp. 475–503.

Reyes, I. (2004) 'Functions of code switching in schoolchildren's conversations', *Bilingual Research Journal*, 28(1), pp. 77–98.

Rosiers, K., Van Lancker, I. & Delarue, S. (2018) 'Beyond the traditional scope of translanguaging: Comparing translanguaging practices in Belgian multilingual and monolingual classroom contexts', *Language & Communication*, 61(1), pp. 15–28.

Wang, D. (2019) 'Translanguaging in Chinese foreign language classrooms: Students and teachers' attitudes and practices', *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 22(2), pp. 138–149.

Wei, L. (2018) 'Translanguaging as a practical theory of language', *Applied Linguistics*, 39(1), pp. 9–30.