

Translanguaging Pedagogy for Emergent Bilingual Immigrant Youths in the United States: Is It Transformative?

Eun Young Yeom

Despite the increasing number of immigrant youths with diverse linguistic backgrounds in U.S. classrooms, monolingual policy that valorizes white middle-class Standard English dominates the school curriculum. By conducting a literature review using heteroglossia and translanguaging as conceptual frameworks, this paper explores how immigrant youths engage with translanguaging practices and how their language practices are discriminated in U.S. schools and society. Also, this paper examines how translanguaging pedagogy for immigrant youths can bring changes to the monolingual curriculum by validating and affirming their languages and cultural identities, and to which extent these changes can be transformative in U.S. school contexts.

U.S. school classrooms are becoming linguistically and culturally diverse with the increasing flow of immigrant youths (U.S. Department of Education, n.d.; Warren & Ward, 2019). Immigrant youths often speak their heritage languages and English simultaneously. They intermix named languages and various semiotic repertoires, cultures, and identities to make sense of the world, which is called translanguaging (Blackledge & Creese, 2010; Canagarajah, 2009; García & Li, 2014). That is, immigrant youths are in constant dialogues with their linguistic and cultural repertoires. Bakhtin (1981) also gives us insight into the interconnected nature of diverse meaning-making repertoires, or so-called heteroglossia, although he did not explain how people make meanings using different named languages in detail. That is, meaning-making repertoires do not “exclude

each other, but rather intersect with each other in many different ways” (Bakhtin, 1981, p. 291), just like immigrant youths’ translanguaging.

Immigrant youths can be emergent bilinguals at an incipient stage of learning English as a second language with fledgling bilingual repertoires. They could be bilinguals at an advanced stage, moving dexterously between heritage languages and English. Or they could be the U.S.-born children of immigrant parents, and are learning their parents’ heritage languages in the United States. Whichever stage they are at and whichever language they are learning, immigrant youths can integrate their diverse linguistic and cultural repertoires to make meanings instead of arbitrarily turning on and off separate languages.

However, U.S. school classrooms are often “normed to white, middle-class, native English-speaking, college-bound, and non-working students with increasing standardization forced by high-stakes testing” (Bajaj & Bartlett, 2017, p. 26), thereby dismissing immigrant youths’ heteroglossic translanguaging practices (García, 2009). Challenging the English-only language policy, translanguaging has entered the field of education to mobilize the full range of linguistic, cultural, and semiotic repertoires as enriching resources (García, 2009). That is, translanguaging pedagogy,

Eun Young Yeom is a Ph.D. candidate in the Department of Language and Literacy Education at the University of Georgia. Her research is focused on transnational emergent bilinguals’ translanguaging and their meaning-making processes.

which actively embraces heteroglossic translanguaging practices, has the potential to be transformative by disturbing the centralizing forces of the U.S. educational English-only policy.

Although attempts to separate languages run counter to most immigrant youths' linguistic realities, "keeping it linguistically real is often a threat to those who would prefer to keep it linguistically pure" (Pennycook, 2007, pp. 136–137). Hence, tensions could arise between the centralizing forces of monolingualism and the disruptive power of translanguaging. In this regard, by conducting a literature review, this paper will explore how immigrant youths' translanguaging practices and translanguaging pedagogy are realized in the United States, particularly amidst the push and pull between the disturbing forces of translanguaging and the assimilating forces of monolingualism. Also, by examining how decentralizing translanguaging pedagogy can be based on the literature review, this inquiry will assess to what extent translanguaging pedagogy can be transformative in U.S. school contexts.

The current literature review, therefore, will be guided by the following questions:

1. In what ways are immigrant youths' translanguaging practices and translanguaging pedagogy shaped between the disturbing forces of translanguaging and the centralizing forces of monolingualism?
2. Based on the findings from Question 1, to what extent can translanguaging pedagogy be transformative in U.S. monolingual school contexts?

Working Definitions

Immigrant youths

For the current inquiry, youths indicate the period between Pre-K and K–12 students, although the age range for the youth might vary. They came to live in the United States from non-English-speaking countries by themselves or with their parents, and are learning English as a second language. Or they were born in the United States as the children of immigrant parents and are learning their parents' heritage languages in the United States.

Translanguaging/ Translanguaging practices/

Translanguaging pedagogy

Translanguaging and translanguaging practices

for the purposes of this paper mean intermixing English, immigrant youths' heritage languages, and various semiotic modes. Translanguaging pedagogy indicates classroom practices or lesson plans that incorporate translanguaging practices into teaching and learning.

Conceptual Framework:

Heteroglossia and Translanguaging

Bakhtin (1981) mentions that:

At any given moment of its historical existence, language is heteroglot from top to bottom: it represents the co-existence of socio-ideological contradictions between the present and the past, between different epochs of the past, between different socio-ideological groups in the present, between tendencies, schools, circles, and so forth, all given a bodily form. (p. 291)

For Bakhtin (1981, 1984), endorsing linguistic purism and monolingualism does not make sense, because individuals creatively intermix or remix diverse forms of languages to make meanings. He sees language uses as inherently heteroglossic and contextualized, which cannot be homogenized through decontextualized monolingual uses.

When people make meanings, they are in dialogues with their past and present, feelings, identities, and perspectives, which are mixed and remixed with the various and ever-changing forms of consciousness of the society (Bakhtin, 1981, 1984). That is, meaning-making processes, which are usually realized via language practices, integrate various ways of thinking and histories on a personal and a societal level. In this regard, heteroglossia could be summarized as "the simultaneous use of different kinds of forms or signs, and the tensions and conflicts among those signs, on the socio-historical associations they carry with them" (Bailey, 2012, p. 504).

However, to understand heteroglossia, we should note that diversifying forces operate in tandem with the unifying or centripetal forces of societal norms in individuals' meaning-making processes. Individuals' utterances can stay in a unitary form because human beings tend to assimilate "our consciousness to the ideological world" (Bakhtin, 1981, p. 341). That

is, meanings enunciated through languages are diverse and individualized, while they conform to socially agreed norms and values at the same time (Bakhtin, 1986). Bakhtin (1981) defines this personal and social nature of language practices as dialogized heteroglossia, which is not entirely variable and unique due to the unifying power of societal norms.

Bakhtin (1981, 1984, 1986) does not specifically explain the diversity across different named languages when illustrating heteroglossia, such as how bilinguals communicate. Hence, we need an additional theory, such as translanguaging, which can explicitly illustrate how bilinguals make meanings using two different languages as interconnected units. When the term translanguaging was conceived, it described the pedagogical practices in Wales that aimed to revitalize the diminishing heritage language Welsh while placing equal weight on English uses; hence, teachers teach in Welsh while students respond in English (Baker, 2011). The concept is now expanded to theory and pedagogy.

Translanguaging as a theory places weight on the natural and daily communication practices of bilinguals (García, 2009). Translanguaging theory explains bilinguals' dynamic language practices, which simultaneously incorporate and even transcend the boundaries between named languages and different modes (García & Li, 2014; Li, 2018; Pennycook, 2017). As a pedagogy, such as in U.S. English-only school contexts, it strategically integrates students' heritage languages into classroom practices (García, 2014). Translanguaging pedagogy actively integrates multilingual and multimodal resources into lesson plans, selects culturally relevant texts, and situates teachers as co-learners (García & Kleyn, 2016).

Contrary to the static nature inherent in the term target language acquisition, trans+linguaging contains the dynamic nature of language practices that people are actually doing. Linguaging illustrates "an assemblage of diverse material, biological, semiotic, and cognitive properties and capacities which linguaging agents orchestrate in real-time and across a diversity of timescales" (Thibault, 2017, p. 82). And with the use of prefix trans-, translanguaging can denote the following aspects of the language practices of bilinguals. First, bilinguals are not confined to one single linguistic

entity, even if they are engaged in monolingual communications, and second, human beings can incorporate diverse semiotic resources to make meanings and think beyond the boundaries of defined languages (Li, 2018).

Bakhtin's notion of heteroglossia provides us with the insight into creative language uses and diverse voices helps us understand bilinguals' mixing and remixing different named languages. When immigrant youths engage in translanguaging, their diverse histories, ideologies, cultures, and subjectivities embedded in languages dynamically and continuously merge and remerge (Bakhtin, 1981, 1984). They also fluidly cross the boundaries between named languages (Makalela, 2015, 2019). That is, heteroglossia explains how diverse meaning-making resources are remixed dynamically, and translanguaging illustrates mobile and transgressive language uses between different named languages (Low & Sarkar, 2014).

It must be noted here that "linguistic signs are part of a wider repertoire of modal resources that sign makers have at their disposal and that carry particular socio-historical and political associations" (Li, 2018, p. 22). That is, heteroglossic translanguaging practices operate simultaneously on both individual and societal levels via diverse named languages and semiotic modes, which carry multifaceted and multilayered histories, ideologies, and individual identities. In this sense, heteroglossia provides us with "a lens through which to view the social, political, and historical implications of language in practice" (Blackledge & Creese, 2014, p. 1).

Translanguaging provides us with a lens of linguistic diversity between different named languages or interlingual diversity that inheres within dynamic and ever-changing social and cultural diversity. Social and cultural diversity in current society has even become superdiverse, expedited by the Internet and increased transnational migrations (Blommaert, 2013). Through monolingual viewpoints, we cannot explain immigrant youths' language practices because these language practices embody their superdiverse social, cultural, political, and historical affiliations across national borders.

If heteroglossic translanguaging practices are

integrated into language teaching, it can challenge monolingual institutional norms and affirm students' cultural identities by acknowledging interlingual diversity (Creese & Blackledge, 2010). However, considering that heteroglossia is also influenced by centralizing forces, we should acknowledge that translanguaging practices are simultaneously influenced by the forces of standardization and monolingualism of U.S. school curriculum.

Methodology

Given that all the retrieved research is based on qualitative designs, the current review employed an integrative literature synthesis. This methodology requires reviewing, synthesizing, and critiquing research on a specific topic to provide new understandings or perspectives (Whittemore & Knafl, 2005). In this way, integrative literature review can go beyond mere summary of findings, challenge and extend current understandings through extensive analysis of patterns across studies, and generate new insights regarding a particular phenomenon (Torraco, 2005).

Search and Screening Strategy

I searched Google Scholar, UGA Libraries, and the ERIC database using the key terms *translanguaging*, *immigrant*, *youths*, and *the U.S.* The most relevant articles and dissertations published between 2010 and 2021 were retrieved to reflect the most recent trends of the research through the combination of Google Scholar and UGA Libraries. I subsequently searched ERIC to check other relevant articles that were not found using Google Scholar and UGA Libraries. The research was confined to the U.S. context because immigrants' experiences and their language practices may be different in other countries depending on respective countries' unique political circumstances and histories. The initial search through Google Scholar and UGA Libraries generated a total of 4220 peer-reviewed articles, doctoral dissertations, master's theses, and book chapters. Due to the expansive amount of research retrieved through the search, I sampled the first 100 peer-reviewed articles and doctoral dissertations, thus excluding book chapters and master's theses.

While reading titles and abstracts, I included studies concerning immigrant youths' translanguaging practices in and out of school from grades Pre-K to K-12. During the search process, I noticed that most of the research was conducted with Latinx immigrant youths in dual language programs. To balance the research contexts included in the review, I intentionally included the studies conducted with non-Latinx populations in English to Speakers of Other Languages (ESOL) or English as a second language (ESL) classes, English Language Arts classes, community centers, afterschool programs, and families. Through these processes, 32 peer-reviewed articles and 2 dissertations relevant to the aim of the current literature review were selected.

Assessing the quality of each study is important to eliminate any studies with undesirable validity levels. However, a standard quality assessment was not included for this literature review, because the central aim of this review is to understand how translanguaging practices and pedagogy go against and how they are situated within the larger centralizing forces of monolingual hegemony of the United States. My reasoning was that peer-reviewed articles and faculty-approved dissertations have already made a positive contribution to the field regardless of their quality. Hence, I focused more on assessing how the selected articles fit within a broader framework of heteroglossic translanguaging practices, which operates within and pushes back against monolingualism or English-only policies.

Coding and Analysis

I conducted full reads of each article and dissertation to be certain that each study about immigrant youths in the United States was presented therein, and I synthesized the findings of each study in a Word document. To prepare for analysis, an Excel spreadsheet was used to sort out information that was extracted from each article and dissertation, such as population of interest, methodology, key findings, and authors' assertions. Following the primary coding and pattern coding (Miles et al., 2019) for thematic analysis (Braun & Clarke, 2006), codes were developed in a code book of an Excel spreadsheet based on the findings and authors' assertions. Examples from the articles

and my analytic notes were included next to each code. To identify codes regarding pushing and pulling forces inherent in translanguaging, I constantly read original articles and my synthesis of each article. I also referred to the notion of heteroglossia and the theory of translanguaging when identifying codes.

The developed codes based on this process include but are not limited to code-switching, changing registers, jokes, academic language practices, linguicism (linguistic racism), monolingualism, marginalization, equity through language, opening opportunities, academic success, community efforts, teacher efforts, family efforts, and multimodality as a resource. Pattern coding followed, through which larger themes were created. Three major themes emerged: 1) heteroglossic language practices, 2) linguistic and racial inequities, and 3) disrupting monolingual supremacy and embracing diversity. Using the results from the literature review, the transformative nature of translanguaging pedagogy was assessed.

Findings

Based on the literature review, the first three subsections will delineate how immigrant youths' translanguaging practices and translanguaging pedagogy are shaped, as well as various efforts to incorporate translanguaging pedagogy. The last subsection examines how transformative such efforts can be in the U.S. school system.

Heteroglossic Language Practices

Monolingual practices at schools and prioritizing Standard English in U.S. society do not align with the linguistic realities of immigrant youths, who constantly mix languages for academic purposes and in their daily lives (Hornberger & Link, 2012; Link, 2011). Even in dual language programs based on language separation policy, moving between and mixing Spanish and English is integral to the communication between teachers and students, and among peers (Gort & Sembiante, 2015). That is, immigrant youths' translanguaging practices cannot be homogenized in a monolingual frame.

Immigrant youths' translanguaging practices are nuanced and complex by strategically incorporating

translation, code-switching, and paraphrasing (Choi, 2019), flexibly switching registers (Ryu, 2019), integrating various multimodal means (Kim, 2018; Kwon, 2019), and engaging in language brokering (Alvarez, 2014). Bilingual repertoires can serve as assets for immigrant youths to express their whole selves (Ascenzi-Moreno & Espinosa, 2018) and strategically leverage their heritage languages to understand contents in English (Daniel & Pacheo, 2016; Esquinca et al., 2014; Lee, 2020). In other words, immigrant youths can make the best out of translanguaging to benefit their academic learning (Davila, 2020; Song & Cho, 2018). It is not random or compartmentalized but systematic and fluid, as seen in Korean immigrant youths' language uses (e.g., Lee, 2020; Song, 2016).

Linguistic and Racial Inequities

Despite the present-day trends of translanguaging and English becoming a translocal language due to increased transnational mobilities (Pennycook, 2007), white middle-class standard monolingualism is still the norm in most U.S. school curricula (Smith, 2010). The curriculum places white middle-class Standard English or Anglonormativity (McKinney, 2007, 2017) on top of immigrant youths' heritage languages. In other words, English-only policy based on homogeneous national identity (Bajaj & Bartlett, 2017) and school administrators' monolingual policy along with standardized testing (Deroo & Ponzio, 2019) serve as a centralizing force in the U.S. school curriculum.

Particularly in the case of translanguaging practices of Black immigrant youths, their statuses as immigrants along with being racial and linguistic minorities create intersectionality to further marginalize these youths (Smith, 2010). Similarly, because of raciolinguistic ideologies or linguicism, people are socioeconomically stereotyped as underprivileged if they have Latinx racial and Spanish linguistic backgrounds (Flores & Rosa, 2015). Even if they are in Spanish-English dual language programs, Latinx immigrant children position themselves by favoring English over Spanish because they are aware of English dominance in the formal curriculum and in U.S. society (Hamman, 2018).

Also, immigrant children can develop negative attitudes toward translanguaging due to their constant disempowering experiences with the mixed use of languages at school (Bussert-Ween et al., 2018) or explicit English-only school policies (Sayer, 2013). For example, Korean immigrant adolescents tend to avoid using the Korean heritage language for their academic success and social mobility (Han, 2017), which is often enabled by higher English proficiency. In this sense, it could be argued that immigrant youths' unique communication, meaning-making processes, and bicultural identities are invalidated and silenced, thus being considered deviant at schools and in society. Altering what has been accepted as a norm could take an enormous amount of effort, and it could start from resisting the inequities that many of us have been socialized into. The next section will delineate the efforts of affirming, validating, and normalizing translanguaging practices at schools.

Disrupting Monolingual Supremacy and Embracing Diversity

Intentional integration of translanguaging classroom practices can push back against white English-only supremacy residing in school curriculum (Smith, 2010).

repertoires can be validated and leveraged (Sayer, 2013). Such efforts can decolonize the dominant intellectual knowledge (García & Leiva, 2014) that is often shaped by constant Standard English uses. Decolonizing through decentering the dominant white English-only supremacy and including culturally relevant lesson plans can be beneficial, particularly for Latinx immigrant youths, who are often socialized into the colonial ethnic history of their home countries (Ríos & Seltzer, 2017).

Actively integrating various named languages and semiotic modes can maximize the beneficial potential of translanguaging pedagogy. Multimodal activities such as making podcasts can let immigrant youths be more creative in their language uses and express their whole selves as immigrants living in the United States (de los Ríos, 2020). What is more, classroom discussions regarding culturally relevant topics such as immigration issues based on translanguaging practices can be empowering and culturally sustaining for immigrant youths, as translanguaging is part of their daily language practices and immigration issues are socio-politically relevant to their personal lives (Herrera, 2017).

In this regard, Bajaj and Bartlett (2017) suggest a

The tensions between the diversifying forces of translanguaging and the centralizing norms of white, English-only supremacy create a vortex; the energy of this vortex is constantly generated and maintained by these two opposite forces.

Translanguaging classroom practices are inherently transformative and political (García & Li, 2014) by keeping the language practices real and resisting the dominant norms (Langman, 2014) and by decentering what has been centered in the curriculum (Bajaj & Bartlett, 2017). The tensions between the diversifying forces of translanguaging and the centralizing norms of white English-only supremacy create a vortex; the energy of this vortex is constantly generated and maintained by these two opposite forces.

If culturally relevant lesson plans and critical thinking activities are paired up with translanguaging, translanguaging pedagogy can reap more benefits because immigrant youths' cultural and linguistic

critical transnational curriculum, which engages transnational or immigrant youths to ponder political and environmental issues directly affecting their communities. Culturally relevant lesson plans and the transformative nature embedded in translanguaging can disrupt raciolinguistic ideologies, which immigrant youths might have been socialized into. Transformative translanguaging pedagogy is an effort to normalize bilingualism and diversity, which are often considered deviant in U.S. formal curriculum and society.

Disruptive power can also be generated by embracing differences. For example, embracing immigrant youths' linguistic and cultural identities can make the classroom environment more inclusive.

Teachers' efforts to create more linguistically inclusive circumstances help immigrant youths feel safe, because the inclusive environment allows the students to fully draw on their funds of knowledge shaped both in English and in their heritage languages (DeNicolò, 2019). The safety that immigrant youths feel through translanguaging in classrooms can "support the development of cross-linguistic awareness" (García-Mateus & Palmer, 2017, p. 253). More importantly, this safe environment and cross-linguistic awareness can make a positive contribution to empowering bilingual identities in the long run (García-Mateus & Palmer, 2017).

The inclusive environment generated by translanguaging pedagogy "provide practitioners, teachers, and researchers with a fuller understanding of the resources students bring to school and help us identify ways in which to draw on these resources for successful educational experiences" (Hornberger & Link, 2012, p. 264). In other words, immigrant youths' successful educational experiences can take place based on the understanding of their cultural identities and transnational affiliations with their home countries along with translanguaging practices (Stewart & Hansen-Thomas, 2016).

Linguistically inclusive classroom environments help immigrant youths open their whole selves, and such environments eventually enhance their academic achievement, such as academic writing (Ascenzi-Moreno & Espinosa, 2018; Bauer et al., 2017). Successful educational experiences can promote increased graduation rates, as evidenced by the English-learning immigrant students enrolled in International High School in New York City (García & Sylvan, 2011). In this high school, being immigrants, linguistic minorities, and low socioeconomic status do not get in the way for the enrolled students to achieve successful academic performance. This is mainly because of the core principle of "singularities in pluralities" (p. 386), which respects immigrant youths' distinct cultural and linguistic backgrounds.

Academic enhancement based on translanguaging is possible mainly because immigrant youths' heritage languages act as a scaffold to make meanings of contents written in English. Considering

that language is a mediational tool for thinking (Vygotsky, 1986), it could be assumed that a second language (either English or heritage language) is interwoven "with the existing fabric of verbal thought" (John-Steiner, 1985, p. 365). García and Li (2014) also argue that bilinguals "are engaged in appropriating new language that makes up their own unique repertoire of meaning-making resources" (p. 80). For example, immigrant youths can model translanguaging for one another and scaffold other peers' translanguaging such as through translation of English words into their heritage languages, and heightened linguistic awareness mediates their understanding of academic contents written in English (e.g., Lee, 2020; Ryu, 2019; Sayer, 2013; Song & Cho, 2018).

Transformative Pedagogy: Transformation Within Centralizing Forces

The aforementioned efforts are aimed at resisting the norms and transforming the status quo. The transformative power inherent in translanguaging pedagogy can challenge the norm of Anglonormativity embedded in the scripted curriculum, which only valorizes white middle-class English and devalues multilingualism (McKinney, 2007). Translanguaging pedagogy also allows immigrant youths to perform their bilingual identities, and it can flatten the linguistic hierarchy, thereby alleviating social injustice embodied through linguistic inequities (García & Leiva, 2014). By resisting what has been constructed as a norm, translanguaging pedagogy tries to normalize what used to be deemed deviant and deficient in the U.S. school curriculum.

It must be noted, however, that translanguaging pedagogy may not be transformative as much as it is expected to be. Translanguaging pedagogy may not even disturb the societal norm but creates lethargic forces if it is misinterpreted. For example, learning English plays a crucial role in their academic and future professional success in the United States. However, English-learning emergent bilingual students might misinterpret a translanguaging space as a safe space where they can speak only in their heritage languages, instead of learning English through the use of their heritage languages in ESL classrooms (Lang, 2019).

At this point, we should consider what academic success and successful educational experiences mean and how much translanguaging pedagogy can disturb Anglonormativity. The reviewed studies often argue that translanguaging can leverage immigrant youths' heritage language repertoires to maximize their cognitive and metacognitive capacities during content learning, particularly in the research regarding Korean immigrant youths (e.g., Lee, 2020; Ryu, 2019; Song & Cho, 2018). It is important to note that these content learning experiences signify white middle-class college-bound monolingual U.S. school curricula. Hence, academic success and successful educational experiences based on translanguaging might mean showing legitimate academic performances by using Standard English in the formal U.S. curriculum.

The successful academic experiences in dual language programs (e.g., Alvarez, 2014; Daniel & Pacheco, 2016; Esquinca et al., 2014) also seem to imply the same message. Despite the name "dual," dual language programs sometimes act as a bridge for immigrant youths to become more proficient in English and promote their excellence in English-dominant school curriculum. By being transformative and inclusive, translanguaging pedagogy ironically socializes immigrant youths into the formalized discourses of schooling (Gort & Sembiente, 2015). Moreover, immigrant youths' translanguaging practices cannot even be acknowledged as legitimate outside of their dual language classrooms (Link, 2011). That is, the transformative potential of dual language programs does not seem to extend beyond the boundaries of the classroom.

When it comes to ESOL or ESL programs, highlighting academic success through English improvement is more evident. For example, Ascenzi-Moreno and Espinosa (2018) illustrate how the participating ESOL teachers incorporated Spanish and culturally relevant topics to improve English learning in Latinx emergent bilinguals' English writing proficiency. At a micro level, the teachers incorporated translanguaging into teaching English writing. However, it did not change the bigger social centralizing forces of teaching English as a new language. The program aimed to enhance the participating immigrant youths'

English proficiency, an integral part of academic success in the U.S. curriculum and society.

Similarly, regarding the program for English-learning immigrant youths' science learning through science teachers' and ESOL teachers' collaboration, Langman (2014) argues that the teachers' classroom language practices were somehow confined within the state language policy which promotes higher English proficiency. By allowing students' translanguaging,

where the students of these teachers are left in a context of a language whose authenticity does not appear to extend far beyond the confines of the individual classroom in which they find themselves—although, ironically it does align with District interpretations of State Policy (Langman, 2014, p. 196)

In this regard, García and Lin (2016) support bilinguals' improvement in academic language as follows: "bilingual education must develop bilingual students' ability to use language according to the rules and regulations that have been socially constructed for that particular language" (p. 127). García and Li (2014) also mention that "students need practice and engagement in translanguaging, as much as they need practice of standard features used for academic purposes" (pp. 71–72). Translanguaging pedagogy endorses linguistic diversity; however, it also operates within the forces of standardization and unification.

Translanguaging pedagogy could be transformative at a micro level in each classroom by embracing linguistic diversity and interrupting monolingualism. However, it might unintentionally place more weight on supporting immigrant youths' socialization into formal schooling rooted in Anglonormativity. This socialization into societal norms can cause immigrant youths to avoid using their heritage languages, as seen in Korean immigrant adolescents' determined use of English for both academic and communication purposes (Han, 2017).

Discussion and Conclusion

In the dynamic vortex created by the disruptive forces of translanguaging and the centralizing forces of the mainstream white English-only superiority, integrating translanguaging pedagogy into classrooms

can challenge the monoglossic linguistic hierarchy. It can also create an inclusive teaching and learning environment for linguistic and racial minorities. Such an inclusive environment empowers their bilingual identities and enhances their academic achievement using their heritage languages as a scaffold.

Translanguaging pedagogy, in this sense, could be transformative. It can “give back the voice that had been taken away by ideologies of monoglot standards” (García & Li, 2014, p. 105).

Even if it creates disturbing forces, translanguaging pedagogy operates within the centralizing forces of white middle-class Standard English. It can disturb the monolingual rhetoric of the curriculum and society. However, this does not dramatically change unequal social structures. Based on the analysis of the current literature review, the transformative possibilities of translanguaging lie in the potential of enhancing immigrant youths’ academic achievement defined by the formal school curriculum and standardized testing. By being more inclusive and supporting diversity, translanguaging pedagogy seems to inadvertently valorize the compulsory command of monolingual Standard English.

However, it is undeniable that the disruptive power lurks within translanguaging practices in daily lives and translanguaging pedagogy in the classroom. It challenges what conforms us to the imagined normativity called Standard English or monolingualism (Menken & Sánchez, 2019). Challenging the intersectionality of white supremacy and monolingualism can be transformative in and of itself. It opens the doors for linguistically and racially marginalized immigrant youths to feel validated. In such an inclusive and empowering environment, immigrant youths can express their thoughts by using their cultural, linguistic, and semiotic assets, which used to be devalued in the normative academic register.

Translanguaging practices in daily lives and integrating translanguaging into classrooms can create disruptive potential, but do not completely dismantle or deconstruct the centralizing forces of Anglonormativity. However, creative energy resides in diversity (Bakhtin, 1981). Without the creative power of heteroglossia, society, the community, and individuals would be

trapped within the dichotomy between socially defined intelligence and deficiency. In the dynamic whirlwind of the interruptive power of translanguaging and the centralizing forces of monolingualism, the arbitrary linguistic hierarchy can be disrupted, although slowly. All in all, translanguaging is not a metaphor but a transformative practice. It can challenge the centralizing rhetoric of white middle-class monolingual supremacy, which silences immigrant youths’ creative and splendid language uses.

References

- Alvarez, S. (2014). Translanguaging traesas: Emergent bilingual youth as language brokers for homework in immigrant families. *Language Arts, 91*(5), 326–339. Retrieved from <https://www.jstor.org/stable/24575544>
- Ascenzi-Moreno, L., & Espinosa, C. M. (2018). Opening up spaces for their whole selves: A case study group’s exploration of translanguaging practices in writing. *NYS TESOL Journal, 5*(1), 10–29.
- Bailey, B. (2007). Heteroglossia and boundaries. In M. Heller (Ed.), *Bilingualism a social approach* (pp. 257–276). Palgrave Macmillan.
- Bajaj, M., & Bartlett, L. (2017). Critical transnational curriculum for immigrant and refugee students. *Curriculum Inquiry, 47*(1), 25–35. doi: 10.1080/03626784.2016.1254499
- Baker, C. (2011). *Foundations of bilingual education and bilingualism* (5th ed). Multilingual Matters.
- Bakhtin, M. (1981). *The dialogic imagination: Four essays*. (M. Holquist, Ed.; C. Emerson & M. Holquist, Trans.). University of Texas Press.
- Bakhtin, M. (1984). *Problems of Dostoevsky’s poetics*. University of Michigan Press.
- Bakhtin, M. (1986). *Speech genres & other late essays* (C. Emerson & M. Holquist, Eds.; V. McGee, Trans.). University of Texas Press.
- Bauer, E. B., Presiado, V., & Colomer, S. (2017). Writing through partnership: Fostering translanguaging in children who are emergent bilinguals. *Journal of Literacy Research, 49*(1), 10–37. doi: 10.1177/1086296X16683417
- Blackledge, A., & Creese, A. (2010). *Multilingualism: A critical perspective*. Continuum.

- Blackledge, A., & Creese, A. (2014). Heteroglossia as practice and pedagogy. In A. Blackledge & A. Creese (Eds.), *Heteroglossia as practice and pedagogy* (pp. 1–20). Springer. doi: 10.1007/978-94-007-7856-6_1
- Blommaert, J. (2013). *Ethnography, superdiversity and linguistic landscapes: Chronicles of complexity*. Multilingual Matters.
- Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology, 3*, 77–101. doi:10.1191/1478088706qp063oa
- Bussert-Wenn, K. M., Masson, H. M., & Lewis, K. A. (2018). Latinx children's push and pull of Spanish literacy and translanguaging. *The Qualitative Report, 23*(11), 2648–2669. Retrieved from <https://nsuworks.nova.edu/tqr/vol23/iss11/4>
- Canagarajah, S. (2009). The plurilingual tradition and the English language in South Asia. *ALIA Review, 22*, 5–22. doi: 10.1075/aila.22.02can
- Choi, J. Y. (2019). A child's trilingual language practices in Korean, Farsi, and English: From a sustainable translanguaging perspective. *International Journal of Multilingualism, 16*(4), 534–548. doi: 10.1080/14790718.2019.1593423
- Daniel, S. M., & Pacheo, M. B. (2016). Translanguaging practices and perspectives of multilingual teens. *Journal of Adolescent and Adult Literacy, 59*(6), 653–663. doi:10.1002/jaal.500
- Davila, L. T. (2020). Multilingual interactions and learning in high school ESL classrooms. *Tesol Quarterly, 54*(1), 30–55. doi: 10.1002/tesq.536
- de los Ríos, C. V. (2020). Translingual youth podcasts as acoustic allies: Writing and negotiating identities at the intersection of literacies, language, and racialization. *Journal of Language, Identity, and Education, 1*–15. doi: 10.1080/15348458.2020.1795865
- DeNicolò, C. P. (2019). The role of translanguaging in establishing school belonging for emergent multilinguals. *International Journal of Inclusive Education, 23*(9), 967–984. doi: 10.1080/13603116.2019.1602364
- Deroo, M. R., & Ponzio, C. (2019). Confronting ideologies: A discourse analysis of in-service teachers' translanguaging stance through an ecological lens. *Bilingual Research Journal, 42*(2), 214–231. doi: 10.1080/15235882.2019.1589604
- Esquinca, A., Araujo, B., & de la Piedra, M. T. (2014). Meaning making and translanguaging in a two-way dual-language program on the U.S.-Mexico border. *Bilingual Research Journal, 37*(2), 164–181. doi: 10.1080/15235882.2014.934970
- Flores, N., & Rosa, J. (2015). Undoing appropriateness: Raciolinguistics and language diversity in education. *Harvard Educational Review, 85*(2), 149–171. doi: 10.17763/0017-8055.85.2.149
- García-Mateus, S., & Palmer, D. (2017). Translanguaging pedagogies for positive identities in two-way dual language bilingual education. *Journal of Language, Identity & Education, 16*(4), 245–255. doi: 10.1080/15348458.2017.1329016
- García, O. (2009). Bilingual education in the 21st century: A global perspective. Wiley-Blackwell.
- García, O. (2014). Countering the dual: Transglossia, dynamic bilingualism and translanguaging in education. In R. Rubdy & L. Alsagoff (Eds.), *The global-local interface, language choice and hybridity* (pp. 100–118). Multilingual Matters.
- García, O., & Kleyn, T. (2016). *Translanguaging with multilingual students: Learning from classroom moments*. Routledge.
- García, O., & Leiva, C. (2014). Theorizing and enacting translanguaging for social justice. In A. Blackledge & A. Creese (Eds.), *Heteroglossia as practice and pedagogy* (pp. 199–216). Springer.
- García, O., & Li, W. (2014). *Translanguaging: Language, bilingualism and education*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- García, O., & Lin, A. (2016). Translanguaging and bilingual education. In O. Garcia, A. Lin, & S. May (Eds.), *Bilingual and multilingual education* (pp. 117–130). Springer.
- García, O., & Sylvan, C. E. (2011). Pedagogies and practices in multilingual classrooms: Singularities in pluralities. *The Modern Language Journal, 95*(3), 385–400. doi: 10.1111/j.1540-4781.2011.01208.x
- Gort, M., & Sembiente, S. F. (2015). Navigating hybridized language learning spaces through translanguaging pedagogy: Dual language preschool teachers' languaging practices in support of emergent bilingual children's performance of academic discourse. *International*

- Multilingual Research Journal*, 9(1), 7–25. doi: 10.1080/19313152.2014.981775
- Hamman, L. (2018). Translanguaging and positioning in two-way dual language classrooms: A case for criticality. *Language and Education*, 32(1), 21–42. doi: 10.1080/09500782.2017.1384006
- Han, J. H. (2017). *Bilingualism, biliteracy, and academic self-efficacy among adolescent Korean heritage language learners*. [Doctoral dissertation, New York University].
- Herrera, L. Y. (2017). *Translanguaging practices for educational equity: Moments in a bilingual middle school classroom*. [Doctoral dissertation, City University of New York].
- Hornberger, N. H., & Link, H. (2012). Translanguaging and transnational literacies in multilingual classrooms: A biliteracy lens. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 15(3), 261–278. doi: 10.1080/13670050.2012.658016
- John-Steiner, V. (1985). The road to competence in an alien land: A Vygotskian perspective on bilingualism. In J. V. Wertch (Ed.), *Culture communication and cognition: Vygotskian perspectives* (pp. 348–371). Cambridge University Press.
- Kim, S. (2018). “It was kind of a given that we are all multilingual”: Transnational youth identity work in digital translanguaging. *Linguistics and Education*, 43, 39–52. doi: 10.1016/j.linged.2017.10.008 0898-5898
- Kwon, J. (2019). Parent–child translanguaging among transnational immigrant families in museums. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 1–16. doi: 10.1080/13670050.2019.1689918
- Lang, N. W. (2019). Teachers’ translanguaging practices and “safe spaces” for adolescent newcomers: Toward alternative visions. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 42(1), 73–89. doi: 10.1080/15235882.2018.1561550
- Langman, J. (2014). Translanguaging, identity, and learning: Science teachers as engaged language planners. *Language Policy*, 13, 183–200. doi: 10.1007/s10993-013-9312-9
- Lee, C. H. (2020). Korean bilingual students’ strategic employment of translanguaging while writing. *US-China Foreign Language*, 18(4), 119–135. doi: 10.17265/1539-8080/2020.04.003
- Li, W. (2018). Traslanguaging as a practical theory of language. *Applied Linguistics*, 39(1), 9–30. doi:10.1093/applin/amx039
- Link, H. (2011). “Hola” means “hello”: The intersection of language policy and language ideology in the early elementary classrooms of a New Latino Diaspora Community. *Working Paper in Educational Linguistics*, 26(2), 100–120.
- 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). Springer. doi: 10.1007/978-94-007-7856-6_6
- Makalela, L. (2015). Translanguaging as a vehicle for epistemic access: Cases for reading comprehension and multilingual interactions. *Per Linguam*, 31(1), 15–29. doi: 10.5785/31-1-628
- Makalela, L. (2019). Uncovering the universals of ubuntu translanguaging discourses. *Classroom Discourse*, 10(3–4), 237–251. doi: 10.1080/19463014.2019.1631198
- McKinney, C. (2007). ‘If I speak English, does it make me less black anyway?’: ‘Race’ and English in South African desegregated schools. *English Academy Review*, 24(2), 6–24. doi: 10.1080/10131750701452253
- McKinney, C. (2017). *Language and power in postcolonial schooling: Ideologies in practice*. Routledge.
- Menken, K., & Sánchez, M. T. (2019). Translanguaging in English-only schools: From pedagogy to stance in the disruption of monolingual policies and practices. *Tesol Quarterly*, 53(3), 741–767. doi: 10.1002/tesq.513
- Miles, M. B., Huberman, A. M., & Saldaña, J. (2019). *Fundamentals of qualitative data analysis*. SAGE Publications.
- Pennycook, A. (2007). *Global Englishes and transcultural flows*. Routledge.
- Pennycook, A. (2017). Translanguaging and semiotic assemblages. *International Journal of Multilingualism*, 14(3), 269–282. doi: 10.1080/14790718.2017.1315810

- Ríos, C. V., & Seltzer, K. (2017). Translanguaging, coloniality, and English classrooms: An exploration of two bicoastal urban classrooms. *Research in the Teaching of English, 52*(1), 55–76.
- Ryu, M. (2019). Mixing languages for science learning and participation: An examination of Korean-English bilingual learners in an after-school science learning program. *International Journal of Science Education, 41*(1), 1303–1323. doi: 10.1080/09500693.2019.1605229
- Sayer, P. (2013). Translanguaging, TexMex, and bilingual pedagogy: Emergent bilinguals learning through the vernacular. *Tesol Quarterly, 47*(1), 63–88. doi: 10.1002/tesq.53
- Smith, P. (2020). The case for translanguaging in black immigrant literacies. *Literacy Research: Theory, Method, and Practice, 69*, 192–210. doi: 10.1177/2381336920937264
- Song, K. W. (2016). “Ok, I will say in Korean and then in American”: Translanguaging practices in bilingual homes. *Journal of Early Childhood Literacy, 16*(1), 84–106. doi: 10.1177/1468798414566705
- Song, K., & Cho, B. Y. (2018). Exploring bilingual adolescents’ translanguaging strategies during online reading. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism, 24*(4), 577–594. doi: 10.1080/13670050.2018.1497008
- Stewart, M. A., & Hansen-Thomas, H. (2016). Sanctioning a space for translanguaging in the secondary English classroom: A case of a transnational youth. *Research in the Teaching of English, 50*(4), 450–472. Retrieved from <https://www.jstor.org/stable/24889944>
- Thibault, P. J. (2017) The reflexivity of human languaging and Nigel Love’s two orders of language. *Language Sciences, 61*, 74–85. doi: 10.1016/j.langsci.2016.09.014
- Torraco, R. J. (2005). Writing integrative literature reviews: Guidelines and examples. *Human Resource Development Review, 4*(3), 356–267. doi: 10.1177/1534484305278283
- U.S. Department of Education. (n.d.). *Our Nation’s English Learners*. <https://www2.ed.gov/datastory/el-characteristics/index.html#three>
- Vygotsky, L. S. (1986). *Thought and language*. (A. Kozulin, Ed.; A. Kozulin, Trans.). MIT Press.
- Warren, A. N., & Ward, N. A. (2019). Equitable education for English learners through a pedagogy of multiliteracies. *Kappa Delta Pi Record, 55*(2), 89–94. doi: 10.1080/00228958.2019.1580989
- Whittemore, R., & Knafl, K. (2005). The integrative review: Updated methodology. *Journal of Advanced Nursing, 52*, 546–553. doi: 10.1111/j.1365-2648.2005.03621.x