Annual Review of Applied Linguistics, **35** (2015), pp. 20–35.
© Cambridge University Press, 2015
doi: 10.1017/S0267190514000233

Translanguaging and Identity in Educational Settings

Angela Creese
University of Birmingham, UK
a.creese@bham.ac.uk

Adrian Blackledge
University of Birmingham, UK
a.j.blackledge@bham.ac.uk

ABSTRACT

This article reviews recent scholarship in language, identity, and education. It critically reflects on developments in sociolinguistics as researchers have engaged with the dynamics and complexity of communication in superdiverse societies where people from an increased number of territories come into contact with one another, and where people have access to an increased range of online resources for communication. The authors focus in particular on recent scholarship on "translanguaging," examining research that has viewed identities as socially constructed in interaction and considering the relationship between language and identities in contexts where communication is mobile and complex. This article offers a critical summary of the implications of these developments for education in the 21st century. In order to illustrate these theoretical points, the authors present an empirical example of the performance of language and identity in education from their recent research.

I. INTRODUCTION

Scholars in sociolinguistics have recently developed a range of ways of describing and analyzing language use in late modern societies. Rather than assuming that homogeneity and stability represent the norm, we look at how mobility, mixing, political dynamics, and historical embedding are now central concerns in the study of languages, language groups, and communication (Blommaert & Rampton, 2011). As large numbers of people migrate across multiple borders, and as advances in digital technology make available a multitude of linguistic resources, so communication is in flux and in development. Given these conditions, the notion of separate languages as bounded systems of specific linguistic features may be insufficient for analysis of language in use and in action (Jørgensen, Karrebæk, Madsen, & Møller, 2011). The idea of *a language* therefore may be important as a social construct, but it is not suited as an analytical lens through which to view language practices. This article considers the limitations of an approach to understanding linguistic diversity that relies on the naming and separation of languages—that is, an approach that relies on the concept of multilingualism to describe the language competence of speakers in the context of language contact. In this context, we investigate the relationship between language(s) and identity, arguing that in a

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190514000233 Published online by Cambridge University Press

world in which language is mobile and complex, identities may be performed through the deployment of certain linguistic resources in certain ways, but *a language* does not necessarily equal *an identity*. Finally, we consider the implications of these arguments for education: If languages are no longer viewed as separate entities, (how) should educators develop pedagogy that incorporates the complex, mobile language repertoires and identities of their students? To answer these questions, we consider the potential of *translanguaging* as pedagogy and practice.

2. LANGUAGE

Sociolinguistic study of multilingualism has moved away from a view of languages as separate, bounded entities to a view of communication in which language users employ whatever linguistic features are at their disposal to achieve their communicative aims as best they can (Jørgensen et al., 2011). Blommaert and Rampton (2011) argued that languages are ideological constructions historically tied to the emergence of the nation-state in the 19th century. Rather than taking the named language as the unit of analysis, Blommaert and Rampton proposed that "it is far more productive *analytically* to focus on the very variable ways in which linguistic features with identifiable social and cultural associations get clustered together whenever people communicate" (Blommaert & Rampton, 2011, p. 1). Makoni and Pennycook (2007) argued for an understanding of the relationships between what people believe about their language (or other people's languages), the situated forms of talk they deploy, and the material effects—social, economic, environmental—of such views and use (p. 22). Recently, a number of terms have emerged, as scholars have sought to describe and analyze linguistic practices in which meaning is made using signs flexibly. These include, among others, flexible bilingualism (Creese & Blackledge, 2010), codemeshing (Canagarajah, 2011), polylingual languaging (Jørgensen et al., 2011; Madsen, 2011), contemporary urban vernaculars (Rampton, 2011), metrolingualism (Otsuji & Pennycook, 2011), translingual practice (Canagarajah, 2013), and translanguaging (García, 2009; Creese & Blackledge, 2011). The shared perspective represented in the use of these various terms considers that meaning-making is not confined to the use of languages as discrete, enumerable, bounded sets of linguistic resources. Rather, signs are available for meaning-making in communicative repertoires (Rymes, 2010) that extend across languages and varieties that have hitherto been associated with particular national, territorial, and social groups. These terms, different from each other yet in many ways similar, represent a view of language as a social resource without clear boundaries, which places the speaker at the heart of the interaction.

Globalization has compelled scholars to see sociolinguistic phenomena and processes as characterized by mobility. Blommaert (2014) argued that adopting mobility as a central concept in a sociolinguistics of globalization has three major methodological effects: (a) it creates a degree of unpredictability in what we observe; (b) we can only solve this unpredictability by close ethnographic inspection

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190514000233 Published online by Cambridge University Press

of the minutiae of what happens in communication; and (c) it keeps in mind the limitations of current methodological and theoretical vocabulary. Blommaert (2014, p. 7) argued that in "superdiverse" environments (both on- and offline), people appear to take any linguistic and communicative resources available to them and blend them into complex linguistic and semiotic forms. Old and established terms such as "code-switching," and even "multilingualism," exhaust the limits of their descriptive and explanatory adequacy in the face of such highly complex blends. Taking mobility as a principle of sociolinguistic research challenges several major assumptions of mainstream sociolinguistics and invites a more complex, dynamic and multifaceted view of sociolinguistic realities.

Blommaert (2014) pointed out that a sociolinguistic system is a complex system characterized by internal and external forces of perpetual change, operating simultaneously and in unpredictable mutual relationships. He therefore proposed that in addition to *mobility* we take *complexity* as a paradigmatic principle of sociolinguistic analysis. Blommaert (2012) argued for a recognition that the contemporary semiotics of culture and identity need to be captured in terms of complexity rather than in terms of *multiplicity* or *plurality*. Indeed, he argued that "a vocabulary including 'multilingual,' 'multi-cultural,' or 'pluri-,' 'inter-,' 'cross-,' and 'trans-' notions all suggest an a priori existence of separable units (language, culture, identity), and they suggest that the *encounter of such separable units produces peculiar new units*: 'multilingual' repertoires, 'mixed' or 'hybrid' identities and so forth" (Blommaert, 2012, p. 2). Blommaert argued that a perspective that focuses on code-switching is emblematic of this view. Bailey (2012) engaged with the limitations of an approach to linguistic analysis that emphasizes code-switching, arguing that a focus on linguistic features that are officially authorized codes or languages, for example, "English" or "Spanish" can contribute to neglect of the diversity of socially indexical resources *within* languages. Bailey pointed out that if the starting-point is social meanings, rather than the code or language in use, it is not crucial to ask whether a speaker is switching languages, alternating between a dialect and a national standard, register shifting, or speaking monolingually in a variety that highlights language contact. Language, whether monolingual or multilingual, carries social meanings through phonological, lexical, grammatical, and discourse level forms: "these forms index various aspects of individuals' and communities' social histories, circumstances, and identities" (Bailey, 2012, p. 506). Canagarajah & Liyanage (2012) have noted that even so-called monolinguals shuttle between codes, registers, and discourses, and can therefore hardly be described as monolingual. Just as the traditional distinction between languages is no longer sustainable, so the distinction between monolingual, bilingual, and multilingual speakers may no longer be sustainable.

Canagarajah (2013) adopted the term "translingual practice" to capture the common underlying processes and orientations of the mobility and complexity of communicative modes. In doing so, he argued that communication transcends individual languages and involves diverse semiotic resources and ecological affordances. He pointed out that languages in contact mutually influence each other, and so labeling them as separate entities is an ideological act. Multilingual speakers

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190514000233 Published online by Cambridge University Press

deploy repertoires rather than languages in communication, and they do not have separate competences for separately labeled languages. Canagarajah elaborated on these points, arguing that language is only one semiotic resource among many, and that all semiotic resources work together to make meaning. Separating out language from other semiotic resources distorts our understanding of communicative practice. Canagarajah pointed out that further research is needed to understand the complexity of communicative strategies that make up translingual practice, to explore the implications for meaning construction, language acquisition, and social relations. He also pointed out that the pedagogical implications of translingual practice warrant further attention.

Related to the notion of translingual practice is *translanguaging*. García and Wei (2014) argued that the term *translanguaging* offers a way of analyzing how the complex practices of speakers live between different societal and semiotic contexts as they interact with a complex array of speakers. A translanguaging approach to bilingualism extends the repertoire of semiotic practices of individuals and transforms them into dynamic mobile resources that can adapt to global and local sociolinguistic situations. At the same time, translanguaging also attends to the social construction of language and bilingualism under which speakers operate. We return to the educational implications of translanguaging as pedagogy and practice in section 4. First, though, we consider language and identity.

3. LANGUAGE AND IDENTITY

Riley (2007) pointed to an increasing weight of interdisciplinary evidence that identity is socially constructed, and that our sense of self can only emerge as the result of communicative interaction with others. Blommaert and Varis (2013, p. 146) developed a four-tiered framework for investigating complex and dynamic identity processes. First, identity discourses and practices can be described as discursive orientations toward sets of features that are viewed as emblematic of particular identities. Second, these features are not randomly distributed in a free-for-all, but are more often presented in specific arrangements and configurations. Third, one has to have enough of the emblematic features in order to be ratified as an authentic member of an identity category. And fourth, these processes involve conflict and contestation, and are highly dynamic: configurations of features and criteria of authentic membership or belonging can be adjusted, reinvented, amended. Emblematic features include the way people speak, the way they text (in SMS messages), the way they update their Facebook profile, the way they dress, the food they eat, the beverage they prefer, the music they listen to, the films they enjoy, the novels they read, and so on. Judgments about whether a person has (or performs) enough of the requisite emblematic templates to be accepted as, or endowed with, membership of a particular identity or group are highly nuanced, and not always negotiable (Pavlenko & Blackledge, 2004). Some may not have access to the necessary resources, while others may be viewed as "fake" members

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190514000233 Published online by Cambridge University Press

of an identity category. Moreover, it is likely that in picking our way through the complex and dynamic processes of identity negotiation, we develop an "identity repertoire" (Blommaert & Varis, 2013, p. 157) that enables us to adapt to the contingencies of social life. In this conception of identity, emblematic features are empirically observable and can be investigated ethnographically. Emblems of identity are not merely psychological, but are corporeal, and are performed as practice. This is true not only of the clothes we wear, the music we listen to, the sport we play, and so on. It is also true of the way in which we deploy linguistic resources. It is to this aspect of identity performance and negotiation that we now turn our attention.

Gal (2006) pointed out that in Europe a new elite of multilingual speakers (e.g., of French, German, and English) sustains a breadth of linguistic repertoires that transcends national boundaries. For such groups ethnolinguistic identity may be only an occasional issue. For multilingual speakers of languages with lower status, however, language issues may still be salient as people attempt to negotiate identities, often from relatively powerless positions. Language ideologies are neither simple nor monolithic, however. Notwithstanding the argument that minority language speakers are subject to the symbolic violence of the dominant language ideology, some speakers who (or whose families) may traditionally have been associated with minority "ethnic" languages are using language and languages in new ways (Rampton 1995, 1999). While some speakers are either unable to negotiate their identities from inextricably powerless positions, and others in powerful positions have no need to do so, some speakers in modern nation-states are using their linguistic skills to negotiate new subject positions (Blackledge & Pavlenko, 2001; Pavlenko & Blackledge, 2004). In what Gal (2006, p. 27) described as "self-conscious, anti-standardizing moves," such negotiations may include linguistic practices which reframe previous standard varieties, incorporating, inter alia, urban popular cultural forms, minority linguistic forms, hybridities, and inventions. Here language practices associated with immigrant groups no longer represent backward-looking traditions, but may be linked to global youth culture and urban sophistication. Languages and language practices are not necessarily equated to national identity (but may be so), and are not necessarily dominated by the standardized variety. Despite powerful ideologies of homogeneity, populations in many countries—especially countries with a history of recent immigration—continue to be heterogeneous in their practices. May (2005, p. 337) proposed that linguistic identities need not be oppositional, and asks "what exactly is wrong with linguistic complementarity?" May calls for further ethnographic studies which articulate and exemplify broad linguistic principles of language ideological research in complex multilingual contexts. Duchêne and Heller (2007, p. 11) argued that rather than accepting ideological positions in which there is competition over languages, "perhaps we should be asking instead who benefits and who loses from understanding languages the way we do, what is at stake for whom, and how and why language serves as a terrain for competition."

We agree with Makoni and Pennycook (2007) that the notion of languages as separate, discrete entities, and "countable institutions" (p. 2) is a social construct.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190514000233 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Makoni and Pennycook argued for a critical historical account that demonstrates that, through the process of classification and naming, languages were "invented" (p. 1). They added that, in direct relation with the invention of languages, "an ideology of languages as separate and enumerable categories was also created" (p. 2). Makoni and Pennycook pointed in particular to the naming of languages such as "Bengali" and "Assamese" as the construction of "new objects" (p. 10). Thus languages cannot be viewed as discrete, bounded, impermeable, autonomous systems. Makoni and Pennycook proposed that "local knowledge" is crucial to our understanding of language: "we are arguing for an understanding of the relationships between what people believe about their language (or other people's languages), the situated forms of talk they deploy, and the material effects—social, economic, environmental—of such views and use" (Makoni & Pennycook, 2007, p. 22). This interrelationship between what people believe about language and languages, and the way they access and make use of linguistic resources, provides a focus to our discussion in this article. If languages and identities are socially constructed, we nevertheless need to account for the fact that at least some language users, at least some of the time, hold passionate beliefs about the importance and significance of a particular language to their sense of "identity" (Blackledge & Creese, 2010). As we have seen, it is now well established in contemporary sociolinguistics that one language does not straightforwardly index one subject position, and that speakers use linguistic resources in complex ways to perform a range of subject positions, sometimes simultaneously. However, while accepting this, May (2005, p. 330) argued that "historically associated languages continue often to hold considerable purchase for members of particular cultural or ethnic groups in their identity claims."

Jørgensen (2010) pointed to the fluidity of late modern society, in which identities are not necessarily imposed from above, but may be negotiable within certain social settings. Jørgensen proposes that language users create, construct, and negotiate identities on the basis of a range of resources which can be associated with meaning. To the extent that such resources are part of language, identities are constructed and negotiated in linguistic discourse. Identities are performed, constructed, enacted, produced, but only in interaction with others. That is, "identities arise in interaction among people" (Jørgensen 2010, p. 4). As such, identities are to a large extent subject to negotiation. García (2010) referred to the role of language diversity in the negotiation and construction of identity, and suggests that language choice involves negotiation in every interaction, as particular linguistic resources may provide or prevent access to powerful social networks. That is, multilingual speakers "decide who they want to be and choose their language practices accordingly" (García 2010, p. 524). However, not all linguistic resources are equally available to all speakers at all times (Creese et al., 2006). Certain subject positions may either be non-negotiable, or only partly negotiable, in particular places and at particular times, as social contexts prevent individuals from accessing resources (Pavlenko & Blackledge, 2004). For these reasons, analysis of language practices should attend to spatio-temporal dimensions, and to relations of inequality and power.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190514000233 Published online by Cambridge University Press

4. TRANSLANGUAGING AS PEDAGOGY AND PRACTICE

In this section we discuss language, identity, and education through the lens of translanguaging. García (2014) defined *translanguaging* both as an act of bilingual performance and as a bilingual pedagogy for teaching and learning. Coined initially in the 1980s (Williams, 1994, 1996) and subsequently developed in response to changing linguistic phenomena in schools and communities (Baker, 2001, 2006), the term has recently gained currency in discussions of multilingualism, especially in educational contexts (Baker, 2011; Blackledge & Creese 2010, Creese & Blackledge 2011; García, 2009, Li Wei, 2011). For García (2014), translanguaging refers to the flexible use of linguistic resources by bilinguals as they make sense of their worlds. She proposed that translanguaging as pedagogy has the potential to liberate the voices of language-minoritized students. A translanguaging approach to teaching and learning is not about code-switching, but rather about an arrangement that normalizes bilingualism without diglossic functional separation. Baker (2011, p. 288) defined translanguaging as the process of "making meaning, shaping experiences, gaining understanding and knowledge through the use of two languages." In the classroom, translanguaging approaches draw on all the linguistic resources of the child to maximize understanding and achievement. Thus, both or all languages are used in a dynamic and functionally integrated manner to organize and mediate understanding, speaking, literacy, and learning (Lewis, Jones, & Baker, 2012). García argued that bilingual families and communities translanguage in order to construct meaning. She further proposed that what makes translanguaging different from other fluid languaging practices is that it is transformative, with the potential to remove the hierarchy of languaging practices that deem some more valuable than others. Translanguaging, she argued, is about a new languaging reality, a new way of being, acting and languaging in a different social, cultural, and political context, allowing fluid discourses to flow, and giving voice to new social realities (García & Leiva 2014). Wei (2011, p. 1223) made a similar argument, that the act of translanguaging "is transformative in nature; it creates a social space for the multilingual language user by bringing together different dimensions of their personal history, experience and environment." Hornberger and Link (2012) further conceptualized translanguaging in educational contexts, proposing that educators recognize, value, and build on the multiple, mobile communicative repertoires of students and their families. Translanguaging leads us away from a focus on languages as distinct codes to a focus on the agency of individuals engaged in using, creating, and interpreting signs for communication. Lewis et al. (2012, p. 665) argued that the distinction between code-switching and translanguaging is ideological, in that code-switching has associations with language separation, while translanguaging approves the flexibility of learning through two or more languages: "Particularly in the bilingual classroom, translanguaging as a concept tries to move acceptable practice away from language separation, and thus has ideological—even political—associations."

Hélot (2014) explored the learning potential of translanguaging, as she described the deployment of texts by translingual authors to make trainee teachers

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190514000233 Published online by Cambridge University Press

aware of new ways of understanding bilinguals' experiences and engagement with the world. Aware of the constraints inherent in restrictive language policy, Hélot argued for translanguaging as a means to counteract linguistic insecurity in the classroom, to ensure teachers understand that balanced bilingualism is a myth, and that translanguaging is a linguistic resource available to bilinguals to communicate in a creative and meaningful way. Noguerón-Liu and Warriner (2014) suggested that the notion of translanguaging expands existing theories of multilingualism by focusing on the social practices of individuals. They adopted this term to move away from a focus on abstract, idealized notions of "a language" as a set of skills and to emphasize the fact that multilingual users deploy a variety of resources while engaging in everyday practice. They explicitly linked translanguaging and identity practices, saying: "For Latino communities in the USA, translanguaging practices have been an integral part of identity and belonging" (Noguerón-Liu & Warriner, 2014, p. 183). Low and Sarkar (2014) argued that the politics of language is part of everyday interaction in downtown Montreal and is evidenced in the boundary-crossing implied by translanguaging.

García and Wei (2014, p. 20) proposed that the concept of translanguaging is based on radically different notions of language and bilingualism than those espoused in the 20th century, "an epistemological change that is the product of acting and languaging in our highly technological globalized world." For García and Wei,

> translanguaging does not refer to two separate languages nor to a synthesis of different language practices or to a hybrid mixture. Rather translanguaging refers to new language practices that make visible the complexity of language exchanges among people with different histories, and releases histories and understandings that had been buried within fixed language identities constrained by nation-states. (García & Wei, 2014, p. 21)

That is, translanguaging is the enactment of language practices that use different features that had previously been independently constrained by different histories, but that now are experienced against each other in speakers' interactions as one new whole. Translanguaging goes beyond code-switching, but incorporates it. García (2010) pointed out that multilinguals translanguage to include and facilitate communication with others, but also to construct deeper understandings. Translanguaging includes but extends what others have called language use and language contact among multilinguals. García (2010) argued that rather than focusing on the language itself, translanguaging makes it apparent that there are no clear-cut boundaries between the languages of bilinguals. Furthermore, translanguaging emerges from social practices between two or more languages that are neither static nor linked to one national or ethnic identity. For García (2014, p. 204), "translanguaging refers to social practices and actions that enact a political process of social subjectivity transformations."

García and Wei (2014) argue that translanguaging differs from code-switching in that it refers not simply to a shift or a shuttle between two languages, but to the speakers' construction and use of original and complex interrelated discursive

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190514000233 Published online by Cambridge University Press

practices that cannot be easily assigned to one or another traditional definition of a language, but that make up the speakers' complete language repertoire. Translanguaging starts from the speaker, rather than the code or language, and focuses on empirically observable practices. Translanguaging practices are not viewed as marked or unusual, but are rather taken to be the normal mode of communication that characterizes communities throughout the world. A translanguaging lens proposes that, rather than making decisions about which language to use in a particular social setting, people have a linguistic repertoire from which they select resources to communicate. García and Wei (2014) claimed that translanguaging is transformative in its creative and critical potential. In its transdisciplinarity, translanguaging enables speakers to go beyond traditional academic disciplines and conventional structures, in order to gain new understandings of human relations and generate more just social structures, capable of liberating the voices of the oppressed.

Turning more explicitly to education, García (2010) argued that translanguaging goes beyond code-switching and translation in education because it refers to the process in which students perform bilingually in the myriad multimodal ways of classrooms—reading, writing, taking notes, discussing, signing, and so on. That is, in line with the conception of identity performance outlined by Blommaert and Varis (2013), translanguaging is multisemiotic. In education, García and Kano proposed that translanguaging is

> a process by which students and teachers engage in complex discursive practices that include ALL the language practices of ALL students in a class in order to develop new language practices and sustain old ones, communicate and appropriate knowledge, and give voice to new sociopolitical realities by interrogating linguistic inequality (García & Kano, 2014, p. xx).

This is clearly a definition of linguistic practice which goes some way beyond the question of which language is, or should be, in use in a particular pedagogical event. Rather, it refers not only to practice but to ideology, to beliefs about the value of students and teachers deploying the full range of their linguistic repertoires in educational settings.

Furthermore, García and Wei (2014) argued that creativity and criticality are key features of the transformative potential of translanguaging. *Creativity* is the ability to choose between obeying and breaking the rules and norms of behavior, including the use of language. It is about challenging boundaries and making something new. *Criticality* refers to the ability to use available evidence to inform considered views of cultural, social, political, and linguistic phenomena, to question and problematize received wisdom, and to express views adequately through reasoned responses to situations. These two concepts are intrinsically linked: boundaries cannot be challenged without a critical orientation; and creativity is often an expression of criticality. García and Wei (2014) pointed out that translanguaging, as a socioeducational process, enables students to construct and constantly modify their sociocultural identities and values, as they respond to their historical and present conditions critically and creatively. Translanguaging in education also pays attention to the ways in which students combine different modes and media across social

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190514000233 Published online by Cambridge University Press

contexts and negotiate social identities. García and Wei (2014) noted that translanguaging as pedagogy contributes to identity investment and positionality to engage learners. Creese and Blackledge (2010) similarly found that student translanguaging established identity positions that were both oppositional to, and encompassing of, institutional values. In a translanguaging pedagogy language practices belong neither to the school nor to the home. Instead, languaging is situated within the practice of the learner, as it emerges through social interaction (García & Wei, 2014, p. 80). García & Wei concluded that the practice of translanguaging is not only based on a trans-semiotic system, it also produces "trans-spaces." (2011) argued that the notion of *translanguaging space* embraces the concepts of creativity and criticality, which are fundamental but underexplored dimensions of multilingual practices. García and Wei (2014, p. 80) pointed out that in producing a trans-subject, translanguaging is capable of transforming subjectivities and identities. Palmer, Mateus, Martinez, and Henderson (2014) presented classroom examples that demonstrate that modeling and engaging in dynamic bilingualism, celebrating hybridity and moments of metalinguistic commentary, and positioning children as competent bilinguals can be potentially powerful translanguaging pedagogies. They argued that translanguaging pedagogies open up spaces for students to engage in sensitive and important topics and take risks to express themselves in developing languages (e.g., attempting to translate).

García and Wei (2014, p. 121) set out teachers' goals of translanguaging pedagogy as follows:

> To differentiate among students' levels and adapt instruction to different types of students in multilingual classrooms.
>
> To build background knowledge so that students can make meaning of the content being taught and of the ways of languaging in the lesson.
>
> To deepen understandings and sociopolitical engagement, develop and extend new knowledge, and develop critical thinking and critical consciousness.
>
> For cross-linguistic metalinguistic awareness so as to strengthen the students' ability to meet the communicative exigencies of the socioeducational situation.
>
> For cross-linguistic flexibility so as to use language practices competently.
>
> For identity investment and positionality; that is, to engage learners.
>
> To interrogate linguistic inequality and disrupt linguistic hierarchies and social structures.

In what follows we will consider these goals in relation to a transcript of a typical lesson in a Panjabi complementary school in the United Kingdom.

What we have argued so far is that, first, languages can no longer be held to be separate entities with fixed boundaries, but rather linguistic resources are deployed as people draw on communicative repertoires. Second, we have argued that identities are incorporated and performed as sets of emblematic, multisemiotic features, including linguistic resources, and that identity positions may or may not

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190514000233 Published online by Cambridge University Press

be negotiable in particular social settings. Third, we agree with García and Wei (2014) that translanguaging offers a pedagogy in a range of educational settings to offer transformative spaces for the performance and embodiment of identities that contribute to critical and creative learning. In the next section we present a brief example of translanguaging in the complementary school classroom.

5. TRANSLANGUAGING IN THE PANJABI CLASSROOM

In order to illustrate the theoretical points made so far we will very briefly present a single example from our recent empirical research in a Panjabi complementary (also known as *community language* or *heritage language*) school in Birmingham, UK. The main purpose of the school is to teach Panjabi to young people of "Panjabi heritage". The school operates across two sites in Birmingham, on Saturdays only, throughout the school year. Complementary schooling is additional to regular (full-time) schooling and is largely funded by local communities.

In the following examples, the teacher, Kirpal, wears a digital audiorecorder with a tie-clip microphone. Two students, Sandip and Kiruth, also wear digital audiorecorders with tie-clip microphones. Kirpal is 23 years old; Sandip (male) and Kiruth (female) are both 17 years old. Pavan is a teaching assistant and is 19 years old. The other students range in age from 8 to 16 years old.

The task for the class is to write sentences about what they did on their holidays.

EXAMPLE I

Shaan: saumvaar mair TV dekhiya *<on Monday I see TV>*

Kirpal: [to Shaan:] dekhiya si *<watched>* you end it with si *<had>* yeah past tense sassay *<s>* sassay nu bihari *<elongated e sound on the s>* did you eat, did you eat on Monday?

Simran: yeah, you had to have roti (*chapatti*)

Kirpal: [laughs:] mair roti daal naal khaadi si *<I ate chapatti with lentils>*

Here the student, Shaan, presents a sentence in the target language, Panjabi. The teacher, Kirpal, makes a teaching point in a form that includes English and Panjabi resources. This not only requires the student to make meaning from both languages in use together but also to recognize this form as an acceptable classroom practice. In what follows, Kirpal more formally models an appropriate sentence, offering the students an example of the past tense. In the next example Kirpal continues to adopt the usual discourse of this classroom:

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190514000233 Published online by Cambridge University Press

EXAMPLE 2

Kirpal: kam karla <*get your work done*> come on, I'm coming round to check your work, Sandip tu ithay kam khraab karditta saariyaa da na kam karda na karan dindaa <*you have messed up things for everyone you don't work and you don't let others work*>

Kiruth: eh kam ka-ran <*he work does*> pretend ki kiti <*done what*> hmm

Here Kirpal translanguages not only to make teaching points but also to maintain standards of classroom engagement, admonishing Sandip. It was noticeable that Kirpal would differentiate between students, adapting the extent and level of Panjabi for classroom management depending on the proficiency of the student. Here Kiruth, also relatively proficient in relation to most of the students, attempts to join in with the translanguaging discourse, defending her friend Sandip while adopting a linguistic form which pleases the teacher.

The prescribed classroom activity prompts a discussion of what Sandip did during the school holidays. The *gurdwara* is the local place of worship for members of the Sikh religion:

EXAMPLE 3

Sandip: [shouts:] I went to the gurdwara three days in a row

Kiruth: did you have an akhand path? <*seventy-two hours of continuous prayer*>

Sandip: and then I got constipation. My days

Kiruth: dude, dude

Sandip: [laughs]

Kiruth: I don't want to know about this

Sandip: the rotiyaan <*chapattis*> are hard as rock I'm not even joking

Kiruth: did you not make them?

Kirpal: listen

Sandip: no, at the gurdwara

Kirpal: don't bad mouth the roti in the gurdwara, those rotiyaan are for people who don't get roti

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190514000233 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Simran: yeah, seva <*selfless service*>

Sandip: no, cos they're usually, they're usually dank, they're usually dank, they're usually dank

Kiruth: I love the gurdwara food to be fair

Kirpal: there you go

Sandip: no, I do like it, it was just that weekend I think it was cos my thyee <*father's older brother's wife*> was cooking

Kiruth: [laughter] don't diss your thyee <*father's older brother's wife*>

The discussion moves forward confidently as translanguaging discourse, again retaining Panjabi for terms associated with Sikhism and kinship. Sandip describes his commitment to the religious practice of undertaking 72 hours of continuous prayer, but he does so through a mini-narrative that partly usurps this serious cultural-religious practice ("I got constipation"). Kirpal acts as a moderator of cultural values here, intervening in the discussion to insist that there should be no criticism of the emblematic *roti*, bread served at the gurdwara to any poor person who may come looking for a meal. He finds support from Simran ("yeah, seva") and Kiruth ("I love the gurdwara food to be fair"), and Sandip concedes with a more emollient "no, I do like it" (although in doing so he runs up against Kiruth's family values). The exchange provides examples of young people being light-hearted but also serious about their cultural heritages. But this is not an example of translanguaging which merely moves between English and Panjabi. Such an analysis would remain in the realms of code-switching. A more nuanced analysis reveals that the young people adopt a translanguaging discourse that is sharply aware of terms emblematic of certain cultural values and traditions (e.g., seva, akhand path, roti), and kinship (thyee). Furthermore, this is not a binary discourse. A more helpful lens than language(s) here is that of register, as the young people adopt a discourse that positions them as urban, sophisticated speakers of a repertoire that includes nonstandard terms commonly understood (by them at least) to index a youthful, "cool" positionality: "my days," "dude," "I'm not even joking," "bad mouth," "dank," "to be fair," "diss." Such discourse is rapidly mobile, and at the time of writing, a year or two after the interaction itself, these same terms are no doubt as uncool as can be. At the time, however, they served as part of a repertoire which indexed a common identity position for this group of young people.

These are typical, everyday, unremarkable examples of teachers and students adopting, imposing, and negotiating identity positions as they translanguage, moving across and between mobile sets of linguistic resources within their communicative repertoires. Despite the complexity in evidence as the young people deploy different languages and registers, this is far from being a free-for-all. Rather, established norms are in play as teachers and students discursively orient toward sets of features which are emblematic of particular identity positions.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190514000233 Published online by Cambridge University Press

CONCLUSION

In summary, recent scholarship in sociolinguistics has sought a nuanced framework with which to describe and analyze communication patterns which appear to have become, and continue to become, more dynamic, mobile, and complex. As people from a greater range of territories come into contact, so do their communicative repertoires. Nor are such repertoires fixed, but they change in use. In this article we have focused on translanguaging as a lens through which to view the ways in which people in multilingual settings deploy discursive practices that may not be limited to a traditional definition of a language, but that make up the speakers' complete language repertoire. Sociolinguists currently argue for an approach to the study of multilingual communication that starts not from the code, but from the speaker. In this article we have also examined recent research which links the complexity of language in use and action with the dynamics of identity construction, performance, and negotiation. Recent scholarship has argued that communicative resources constitute identity repertoires which afford adaptation to the contingencies of social life. Beyond this, the article reviewed research which has identified implications of a focus on translanguaging and identities for teaching and learning in educational settings. Finally we presented examples from recent empirical research in an educational setting in the United Kingdom where teachers and students translanguage, engaging in discourse that has the potential to deepen understandings and sociopolitical engagement, develop critical thinking, and extend metalinguistic awareness and cross-linguistic flexibility. We saw that translanguaging in the classroom can engage learners through identity investment, transforming relations of power between teachers and students. Through a focus on translanguaging as pedagogy and practice we are able to examine the relationship between language in use and mobile, complex identities which are performed (at least partly, and perhaps mainly) through the deployment of certain linguistic resources in certain ways. Such a focus further enables us to investigate how pedagogy for multilingual learners can incorporate the complex, mobile language repertoires and identities of their students, and in so doing enhance learning.

ANNOTATED BIBLIOGRAPHY

Blommaert, J. (2014). From mobility to complexity in sociolinguistic theory and method. *Tilburg Papers in Culture Studies,* 103. Tilburg, The Netherlands: Tilburg University.

Jan Blommaert provides a theoretical overview of changing theoretical orientation to language in use and action, proposing that mobility and complexity are key theoretical notions in understanding changing language practices.

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

Suresh Canagarajah synthesizes scholarship on translanguaging conducted in different academic disciplines and social domains, and raises critical questions on theory, research and pedagogy to take the orientation forward.

Creese, A., & Blackledge, A. (2010). Translanguaging in the bilingual classroom: A pedagogy for learning and teaching. *Modern Language Journal, 94*, 103–115.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190514000233 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Angela Creese and Adrian Blackledge present research which analyses translanguaging as pedagogy in complementary schools in the UK. In developing this analysis, the article takes a language ecology perspective and seeks to describe the interdependence of skills and knowledge across languages.

García, O., & Wei, L., (2014). *Translanguaging: Language, bilingualism and education*. Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.

Ofelia García and Li Wei trace the development of the theory of translanguaging and consider its relationship with traditional theories and models of language and bilingualism. Based on practices by students and teachers in a variety of educational contexts, this book describes how translanguaging is used by bilingual learners to learn and by teachers to teach.

REFERENCES

Bailey, B. (2012). Heteroglossia. In M. Martin-Jones, A. Blackledge, & A. Creese (eds.), *The Routledge handbook of multilingualism* (pp. 499–507). London, UK: Routledge.
Baker, C. (2001). *Foundations of bilingual education and bilingualism* (3rd ed.). Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.
Baker, C. (2006). *Foundations of bilingual education and bilingualism* (4th ed.). Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.
Baker, C. (2011). *Foundations of bilingual education and bilingualism* (5th ed.). Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.
Blackledge, A., & Creese, A. (2010). *Multilingualism: A critical perspective*. London, UK: Continuum.
Blackledge, A., & Pavlenko, A. (2001). Negotiation of identities in multilingual contexts. *International Journal of Bilingualism, 5*(3), 243–259.
Blommaert, J. (2012). Complexity, accent and conviviality: Concluding comments. *Tilburg Papers in Culture Studies, 26*. Tilburg, The Netherlands: Tilburg University.
Blommaert, J., & Rampton, B. (2011). Language and superdiversity. *Diversities, 13*(2), 1–22.
Blommaert, J., & Varis, P. (2013). Enough is enough: The heuristics of authenticity in superdiversity. In Duarte, J., & I. Gogolin (eds.), *Linguistic superdiversity in urban areas: Research approaches* (pp. 143–160). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
Blommaert, J. (2014). From mobility to complexity in sociolinguistic theory and method. Tilburg Papers in Culture Studies, 103. Tilburg, The Netherlands: Tilburg University.
Canagarajah, S. (2011). Translanguaging in the classroom: Emerging issues for research and pedagogy. *Applied Linguistics Review, 2*, 1–28.
Canagarajah, S. (2013). *Translingual practice: Global Englishes and cosmopolitan relations*. Abingdon, UK: Routledge.
Canagarajah, S. and Liyanage, I. (2012) Lessons from pre-colonial multilingualism. In Martin-Jones, M., A. Blackledge, and A. Creese (eds.), *The Routledge Handbook of Multilingualism*. (pp. 49–65). London, UK: Routledge.
Creese, A., Bhatt, A., Bhojani, N., & Martin, P. (2006). Multicultural, heritage and learner identities in complementary schools. *Language and Education, 20*, 23–43.
Creese, A., & Blackledge, A. (2010). Translanguaging in the bilingual classroom: A pedagogy for learning and teaching. *Modern Language Journal, 94*, 103–115.
Creese, A., & Blackledge, A. (2011). Separate and flexible bilingualism in complementary schools: multiple language practices in interrelationship *Journal of Pragmatics*, *43*(5), 1196–1208.
Duchêne, A., & M. Heller. (2007). *Discourses of endangerment: Ideology and interest in the defence of languages*. London, UK: Continuum.
Gal, S. (2006). Minorities, migration and multilingualism: Language ideologies in Europe. In P. Stevenson & C. Mar-Molinaro (eds.), *Language ideologies, practices and policies: Language and the future of Europe* (pp. 13–27). London, UK: Palgrave
García, O. (2009). *Bilingual education in the 21st century*. Oxford, UK: Wiley-Blackwell.
García, O. (2010). Languaging and ethnifying. In J. A. Fishman & O. García (eds.), *Handbook of language and ethnic identity. Disciplinary and regional perspectives*, Vol. 1 (pp. 519–534). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
García, O., & Kano, N. (2014). Translanguaging as process and pedagogy: Developing the English writing of Japanese students in the U.S. In J. Conteh & G. Meier (eds.), *The multilingual turn in languages education: Benefits for individuals and societies* (pp. 258–277). Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190514000233 Published online by Cambridge University Press

García, O., & Leiva, C. (2014). Theorizing and enacting translanguaging for social justice. In A. Blackledge & A. Creese (eds.), *Heteroglossia as practice and pedagogy* (pp. 199–218). Dordrecht, The Netherlands: SpringerScience+Business Media.

García, O., & Wei, L., (2014). *Translanguaging: Language, bilingualism and education*. Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.

Hélot, C. (2014). Rethinking bilingual pedagogy in Alsace: Translingual Writers and translanguaging. In A. Blackledge & A. Creese (eds.), *Heteroglossia as practice and pedagogy* (pp. 217–238). Dordrecht, The Netherlands: SpringerScience+Business Media.

Hornberger, N. H., & Link, H. (2012). Translanguaging and transnational literacies in multilingual classrooms: A biliteracy lens. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism, 15*, 261–278.

Jørgensen, J. N. (2010). *Languaging: Nine years of poly-lingual development of young Turkish-Danish grade school students. Copenhagen Studies in Bilingualism.* Copenhagen, Denmark: University of S. Copenhagen Faculty of Humanities.

Jørgensen, J. N., Karrebæk, M. S., Madsen, L. M., & Møller, J. S. (2011). Polylanguaging in superdiversity, *Diversities, 13*(2), 23–38.

Lewis, G., Jones, B., & Baker, C. (2012). Translanguaging: Developing its conceptualisation and contextualisation. *Educational Research and Evaluation, 18*(7), 655–670.

Low, B., & Sarkar, M. (2014). Translanguaging in the multilingual Montreal hip-hop community: Everyday poetics as counter to the myths of the monolingual classroom. In A. Blackledge & A. Creese (eds.), *Heteroglossia as practice and pedagogy* (pp. 99–118). Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Springer Science+Business Media.

Madsen, L.M. (2011) Social status relations and enregisterment in contemporary Copenhagen. *Working Papers in Urban Language and Literacies, 72.* London, UK: King's College Publications.

Makoni, S., & A. Pennycook. (2007). Disinventing and reconstituting languages. In S. Makoni & A. Pennycook (eds.), *Disinventing and reconstituting languages* (pp. 1–41). Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.

May, S. (2005). Language rights: Moving the debate forward. *Journal of Sociolinguistics, 9*(3), 319–347.

Noguerón-Liu, S., & Warriner, D. (2014). Heteroglossic practices in the online publishing process: Complexities in digital and geographical borderlands. In A. Blackledge & A. Creese (eds.), *Heteroglossia as practice and pedagogy* (pp. 181–198). Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Springer Science+Business Media.

Otsuji, E. & Pennycook, A. (2011) Social inclusion and metrolingual practices, *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, *14*(4), 413–426.

Palmer, D., Mateus, S., Martinez, R.A., & Henderson, K. (2014). Reframing the debate on language separation: Toward a vision for translanguaging pedagogies in the dual language classroom. *The Modern Language Journal, 98*(3), 757–772.

Pavlenko, A., & Blackledge, A. (2004). New theoretical approaches to the study of negotiation of identities in multilingual contexts. In A. Pavlenko & A. Blackledge (eds.), *Negotiation of identities in multilingual contexts* (pp. 1–33). Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Rampton, B. (1995). *Crossing: Language and ethnicity among adolescents*. London, UK: Longman.

Rampton, B. (1999). Styling the other: Introduction. *Journal of Sociolinguistics, 3*(4), 421–427.

Rampton, B. (2011). From "multi-ethnic adolescent heteroglossia" to "contemporary urban vernaculars." *Language & Communication, 31*, 276–294.

Riley, P. (2007). *Language, culture and identity: An Ethnolinguistic approach*. London, UK: Continuum.

Rymes, B. R. (2010). Classroom discourse analysis: A focus on communicative repertoires. In N. Hornberger & S. McKay (eds.), *Sociolinguistics and language education*. Avon, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Silverstein, M. (1993). Metapragmatic discourse and metapragmatic function. In J. Lucy (ed.), *Reflexive language* (pp. 35–38). New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

Wei, L., (2011). Moment Analysis and translanguaging space: Discursive construction of identities by multilingual Chinese youth in Britain. *Journal of Pragmatics. 43*, 1222–1235.

Williams, C., (1994). *Arfarniad o Ddulliau Dysgu ac Addysgu yng Nghyd-destun Addysg Uwchradd Ddwyieithog* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Bangor, UK: University of Wales Bangor.

Williams, C., (1996). Secondary education: teaching in the bilingual situation. In C. Williams, G. Lewis, & C. Baker (eds.), *The language policy: Taking stock* (pp. 193–211). Llangefni, UK: CAI.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190514000233 Published online by Cambridge University Press