

# TRANSlanguaging: a decolonial perspective for language teaching / *TRANSlinguagem: uma perspectiva decolonial para o ensino de línguas*

*Themis Rondão Barbosa da Costa Silva* \*

Graduated in Literature, enabling Portuguese and English at the State University of Mato Grosso do Sul (2011) and a Masters in Literature at the State University of Mato Grosso do Sul (2015). She is currently an EBTT professor at the Federal Institute of Education, Science and Technology of Mato Grosso do Sul (IFMS), Campus Campo Grande, PhD student in Applied Linguistics (Unicamp). She works mainly on the following topics: translanguaging, decolonial language education, language teacher training.

 <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2296-9387>

**Received** in: 22 apr. 2023. **Approved** in: 23 apr. 2023.

## How to cite this article:

SILVA, Themis Rondão Barbosa da Costa. TRANSlanguaging: a decolonial perspective for language teaching. *Revista Letras Raras*, Campina Grande, v. 12, n. 1, p. 8-22, apr. 2023.

## ABSTRACT

The translanguing orientation represents an important paradigm shift for language studies and language education nowadays. In this field, stands out the collapse of monolithic, monolingual and structuralist ideas regarding the world, the subject and the language-culture. In this sense, this paper aimed to present the fundamental principles of translanguaging, the meaning-making according to the translanguaging perspective and the implications of translanguaging experiences in teaching and learning languages through a decolonial perspective. Finally, I present some considerations about how translanguaging practices point to the development of a linguistic reality that, in addition to the flexibility of linguistic and semiotic resources to give senses and meanings to the world, questions power relations and the subalternization of knowledge, thus promoting social justice through language education.

**KEYWORDS:** Applied linguistics; Language education; Translanguaging; Social justice; Decoloniality.

## RESUMO

A orientação *translíngrua* mostra-se uma mudança paradigmática importante para os estudos da linguagem e educação em linguagem na atualidade. Nesse campo, destaca-se o rompimento com ideias monolíticas, monolíngues e estruturalistas perante o mundo, o sujeito e a linguagem-cultura. Nesse sentido, este artigo teve como objetivo apresentar os princípios fundantes da *translinguagem*, a criação de sentidos na perspectiva *translíngrua* e as implicações das vivências *translínguas* nos processos de ensino e aprendizagem de línguas em perspectiva decolonial. Por fim, teço algumas considerações sobre como as práticas *translínguas* apontam para o desenvolvimento de uma realidade linguística que, além da flexibilidade dos recursos linguísticos e semióticos para dar sentidos e significados ao mundo, questiona relações de poder e subalternização de saberes, promovendo, assim, a justiça social por meio da educação linguística.

**PALAVRAS-CHAVE:** Linguística aplicada; Educação linguística; *Translinguagem*; Justiça social; Decolonialidade.

\*

 [themis.barbosa@ifms.edu.br](mailto:themis.barbosa@ifms.edu.br)

 [10.5281/zenodo.7909699](https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.7909699)

## 1 Introduction

The translingual orientation proposes a relevant paradigm shift for language studies and linguistic education today. This approach opposes the structuralist view of language, conceived as a closed structure, self-defined and independent of spatio-temporal context. In addition, when considering historical, political, geographic and social issues in general, it is guided by a project of more mobile, holistic, situated and broad practices (CANAGARAJAH, 2017). In this movement of breaking with monolithic, monolingual and structuralist ideas towards the world, the subject and the language-culture, the translingual orientation also questions epistemologies of transmissive, disciplinary and excluding principles (ROCHA; MACIEL, 2015).

Research in the field of translanguaging studies has grown considerably despite the disagreements regarding the concept and applicability in educational settings not officially characterized as bilingual or multilingual. In Brazil, specifically, as a result of the recent increase in migratory flows and the interest in more open, dynamic and fluid perspectives for language teaching, translingual studies have expanded, albeit in a very incipient way (MACIEL; ROCHA, 2020). The characteristics of Brazil, a diverse and heterogeneous country (linguistics, identity and culturally), demand an education of a political and transforming nature. In this sense, Rocha and Maciel (2019, p. 121) propose a “transgressive approach, which enables ruptures with predominantly structuralist views of language”, as advocated by translanguaging scholars.

Translanguaging shows how colonial and modernist ideologies created and maintained cultural and racial linguistic hierarchies in society. In this way, it challenges the dominant theories of bilingualism and multilingualism and bilingual development in order to destabilize hierarchies that delegitimize linguistic practices of minority groups (VOGEL; GARCIA, 2017). Teaching from a translingual perspective allows students to express themselves in their own language during their learning process, thus promoting social justice, as this practice enables students, who are at a disadvantage with their peers due to language differences, express yourself (GARCIA, 2009).

Translanguaging also considers that, instead of having two or more autonomous language systems as traditionally conceived, language users select and use characteristics of a single linguistic repertoire to construct meanings and to negotiate in specific communicative contexts. That is, translanguaging goes beyond the concept of using languages autonomously and independently in separate situations. In other words, the focus shifts from languages to observable linguistic practices



(GARCIA, 2009). These social practices of speakers in communication situations involve various linguistic and semiotic resources that allow them to maximize their communicative potential.

In addition to this introductory part, in which the founding principles of translanguaging are briefly presented, I bring, in the next section of this article, a discussion on the construction of meanings in the translanguaging perspective. Next, I point out the interfaces of translanguaging with questions of language education and social justice. As a conclusion, based on the theoretical exploration carried out, I present some considerations about possible implications of translanguaging experiences in language teaching and learning processes.

## 2 Translanguaging, a matter of linguistic education and social justice

Translanguaging originated in the 1980s in the context of bilingual education in Wales. The Welsh term coined by Cen Williams is *Trawsieithu*, later translated into English as translanguaging (CONTEH, 2018). Initially, it consisted of a transdisciplinary proposal “of the planned and systematic use of two languages to teach and learn in the same class” (LEWIS *et al.* 2012, p. 3). The focus of the first studies on translanguaging was the pedagogical potential as a strategy to support multilingual speakers and question the concepts of language and bilingualism that marginalized certain speech communities.

The term translanguaging appears frequently in research that addresses the language education of minority students, thus being intertwined with issues of social justice (POZA, 2017). According to Todd (2003), any model of education that values issues of social justice will prioritize the ethical discourse of “rethinking relationships with other people”. In the author's view, “living well together” is the result of joint work between ethics and education. Todd (2003) defends an education for social justice, which, according to her, involves pedagogies that seek to mitigate the social harm caused by unfair practices and structures. The author further argues that

Social justice education has been and continues to be marked by a moral concern with those who have been “Othered” and marginalized through discriminatory relations that are seen as violent, both in symbolic and material terms. Often defined through social categories of identity, difference, and community this figure of the “Other” occupies a special, and central, place in both theoretical and practical approaches to such pedagogical initiatives (TODD, 2003, p.1).

The “Other”, in terms of education for social justice, is seen as a consequence of social, political and economic disaffiliation (TODD, 2003, p.1). According to Rocha and Maciel (2013), diversity in general is recognized in the field of language education as a founding quality of human relationships. This recognition legitimizes the “ways of being, saying, doing and producing knowledge that today are

hegemonically characterized as minor” (ROCHA; MACIEL, p. 16). The condition of lack of prestige of this knowledge, according to the authors, makes it devoid of its value. In this direction, Rocha and Maciel (2013) suggest the search for paradigms that make it possible to “see the world through more plural lenses, which accept complexity and contradiction, discontinuity and incompleteness as also valid ways of relating to the world and producing knowledge” (ROCHA; MACIEL, 2013, p. 19). As an alternative, the authors suggest language education oriented towards citizen action and democratic awareness.

This education proposal converges with the transforming nature of the act of translanguaging. According to Wei (2011, p. 1223), translanguaging “creates a social space for the language user by bringing together different dimensions of their personal history, experience, and environment; their attitude, belief, and ideology; their cognitive and physical capacity, into one coordinated and meaningful performance”. In addition, according to Garcia, Flores and Woodley (2012, p. 52), “translingual pedagogy then refers to the construction of flexible language practices by bilingual students with the aim of developing new knowledge and new language practices”. In this way, it corroborates with social justice, because, as the authors state, this practice will help minority language students to build their bilingual repertoire based on their skills.

The theory of translanguaging, according to Vogel and Garcia (2017), shows how colonial and modernist ideologies created and maintained linguistic, cultural, and racial hierarchies in society. In this way, it challenges the dominant theory of bilingualism and multilingualism in order to destabilize these hierarchies that delegitimize linguistic practices of minority groups. According to the authors, translanguaging, as already mentioned, argues that more than having two or more autonomous language systems as traditionally conceived, multilingual bilinguals, as well as all language users, select and use characteristics of a unique linguistic repertoire to construct meanings and to negotiate in specific communicative contexts. Therefore, translanguaging has a theoretical lens that offers a different view from that adopted by bilingualism and multilingualism.

Mignolo 's (2000) discussion of the relationship between coloniality and epistemology and the subalternization of knowledge by a hegemonic (Eurocentrist) knowledge. This author criticizes the coloniality of power and the processes of subordination of knowledge, peoples and cultures and points to the manifestation of new *loci* of enunciation, describing them as border gnosis. The liminal gnosis, in the view of Mignolo (2000), is the “subaltern reason striving to bring to the foreground the strength and creativity of subaltern knowledge during a long process of colonization of the planet” (MIGNOLO, 2000, p. 13). This gnosis is a critical reflection that aims to rescue silenced knowledge; in other words, it aims

at decolonizing and transforming the boundaries established by the coloniality of power in the configuration of the colonial-modern world system. In this sense, Mignolo points out that

By insisting on the links between the locus of theorization (being from, coming from, and being in) and the locus of enunciation, I imply that the loci of enunciation are not given but enacted. I am not assuming that only people from such a place could do X. Let me insist that I am not pouring the argument in deterministic terms but the open field of logical possibilities, historical circumstances, and individual sensibilities. I am suggesting that those for whom colonial legacies are real (that is, those to whom they harm) are more inclined (logically, historically, and emotionally) than others to theorize the past in terms of coloniality. I also suggest that postcolonial theorization relocates the boundaries between knowledge, the known, and the knowing subject (which is why I have emphasized the complicities of postcolonial theories with “minorities”) (MIGNOLO, 2003, p. 165-166).

With regard to epistemological aspects, European knowledge is considered advanced, superior and of undeniable universal value. This view, according to Mignolo (2000), reflects an epistemological colonization based on the Eurocentric ethnocentrism of modernity. Therefore, only the knowledge and theories of the center of the colonial system are validated and valued, with the subalternization of productions from the margins. This reveals, in the author's view, a close relationship between geohistorical locations and epistemological locations, a relationship shaped by the colonial difference.

The understanding of colonial difference and epistemological subalternity is decisive for the *border thinking* or marginal thinking, which, for Mignolo (2000, p. 110) is “another way of thinking, carried out from the margins”. It is about “a way of thinking that is not inspired by its own limitations and is not intended to dominate and humiliate; a way of thinking that is universally marginal, fragmented and open; and, as such, a non-ethnocidal way of thinking” (MIGNOLO, p. 68). According to the author, marginal thinking develops in the fissures of coloniality and can enable the emergence of voices, languages and cultures without others having to be silenced or excluded.

Thus, interfaces between translanguaging and decolonial thinking can be identified. Translingual pedagogy aims at the development of both named languages as the object of bilingual education and considers them in a horizontal perspective in the composition of the learners' repertoire rather than in separate compartments in a hierarchical relationship. In addition, it comprises the social practices of speakers in communication situations, accessing different linguistic and semiotic resources, which allow them to maximize their communicative potential. In this sense, teaching from a translingual perspective, according to Garcia, allows students to learn where they can express themselves in their own language. Thus, the practice promotes social justice for immigrant students who are at a disadvantage with their peers due to language differences (GARCÍA, 2009).

As the education process is profoundly linguistic, language often works as a powerful instrument of exclusion. However, the marginalization of students goes beyond linguistic issues, being strongly intertwined with ethnic issues. Therefore, as a result of violence and social inequalities, speakers of linguistic minorities may be deprived of a full education (YIP; GARCÍA, 2018). In this bias, the translanguaging perspective defends the development of spaces that allow the emergence of the minority language learner's voice as fundamental, because, as argued by Yip and García (2018), learning only occurs when one has a voice.

Considering the theory of translanguaging in education refers to allowing learners to leverage their complete linguistic repertoires in the process of constructing meanings (GARCIA, 2009). This conception, as already mentioned, goes beyond the simple intercalation between named languages (with socially and linguistically defined limits), which is known as alternation of linguistic codes. Translanguaging concerns the internal perspectives of what speakers do with the language that is simply theirs (YIP; GARCÍA, 2018, p. 169), as can be seen in the example below:

(...) when Ofelia talks at home, she talks about the grandchildren, the food, the son-in-law, the hija, to sleep, to have breakfast, etc. For Ofelia, these are not simply Spanish words and Portuguese words. It's your words, your repertoire for making sense. Of course, Ofelia knows when to use words to talk to different people. When speaking to her son-in-law, she uses words that some would call Portuguese. When speaking to her husband's mother, his suegra, she uses words that some would call Spanish. But when she speaks in her bilingual home, she uses her full repertoire because no one is monitoring or ranking her language practices. She simply uses whatever traits she has at her disposal. This is a common pattern of language use in all bilingual communities (YIP; GARCÍA, 2018, p. 169).

Often, the ways students use language are not recognized by schools, which “constantly delegitimize bilingual practices, as if they were corrupted” (YIP; GARCÍA, 2018, p. 169). The authors argue that educators understand “the students' complete linguistic repertoire as an additional resource for learning, and not as a problem to be solved” (YIP; GARCÍA p. 170). In this sense, they emphasize that in reading written texts, for example, that by being able to use language in the ways they prefer to discuss ideas (regardless of whether or not it is the same language as the text) students will have a more complete understanding of reading the text. In the same way, it occurs in the production of texts, having authorization to pre-write with all the language resources at their disposal, students are better writers. Still according to the authors, “bilingual students are better thinkers if encouraged to research topics in any language” (YIP; GARCÍA, p. 170).

It can be said that these practices would also be relevant in contexts of foreign language classes in Brazilian schools, for example. Often, in these contexts, teachers do not allow the use of the mother tongue during classes, thus restricting the participation of most students in the proposed activities. This



practice harms learning, because the student loses understanding, discussing, taking a stand, in other words, it has damage in his construction of meanings in a broad perspective. In other words, students are prevented from playing an active role in knowledge construction.

Freire (1997) recommends that individuals perceive themselves not only as objects, but also as subjects in their learning relations which are influenced by their sociocultural identities. Still according to the author,

One of the most important tasks of the educational-critical practice is to provide the conditions in which students, in their relationships with each other and everyone with the teacher, rehearse the profound experience of coming out. Assume oneself as a social and historical being, as a thinking, communicating, transforming, creator, dream-fulfilling being, capable of being angry because capable of loving. Assume yourself as a subject because you are able to recognize yourself as an object (FREIRE, 1997, p. 46).

According to Yip and Garcia (2018), bilingual students can only acquire new language skills in the interrelationships with which they already have access. It is when students can reflect on all of their language practices that language development can emerge. According to the authors, translanguaging go beyond the typologies of classrooms, teachers, or even students, interrupting structural realities and promoting a multilingual context in all educational settings. This educational approach can be adopted by bilingual or monolingual teachers, it is only necessary to take a greater risk when putting yourself in a position as a co-learner . The authors emphasize that “a lot can be learned from students who have become minorities through language (YIP; GARCÍA, p. 172)”. This perspective considers that “there is no more knowledge, no less knowledge, there are different types of knowledge”, as advocated by Freire (1987, p. 68).

For Garcia and Wei (2014) translanguaging involves a process of constructing meanings, shaping experiences, gaining understanding and knowledge through the use of two languages. Another question presented by the authors refers to the translanguaging regarding the use of languages, showing an integrated way of organizing mental processes in understanding, speaking, literacy and also in learning.

### **3 The ecological, complex, transcendent and hybrid character of the act of meaning making from a translingual perspective**

Communication transcends individual languages and also transcends words, involving various semiotic resources and also ecological recognition (CANAGARAJAH, 2013). Thus, based on a post-



structuralist paradigm, Canagarajah (2017) argues in favor of a spatial orientation that situates communication in time and space. This perspective considers all resources operating together as an assembly in the construction of meanings. According to the author, in the context of mobility,

Scholars are considering languages as loose (or unbound, untied) - that is, they are striving to understand the flows of semiotic resources through time and space, detached from an imposed structure. In order to do so, they treat these resources (of which verbal resources are also a part) as floating signifiers. They can be appropriated by people in a specific place and time for their meaning-making purposes. They become sedimented into grammars, and index values and norms over time, through a history of social usage. Such a perspective would resist the territorialization of languages as belonging to a place or community, with static norms and meanings deriving from a pre-constructed structure. (CANAGARAJAH, 2017, p. 7).

Multilingualism suggests that languages, even in contact, maintain their separate structures and identities. In contrast, in the translanguaging view, verbal resources interact collectively to generate new grammars and meanings, in addition to their structures separately. In view of this understanding and a gradual change in the structuralist paradigm, the author, in order to explain the meanings of translanguaging, presents four different definitions for the prefix 'trans': 1. Transcending communicative practices beyond autonomous languages (transcending borders linguistics of named languages), in other words, to go beyond monolingualism and imaginary territories between named languages; 2. Transcend verbal resources and consider that other semiotic resources and modalities also participate in communication; 3. Transcend text/context distinctions and include how various semiotic characteristics, previously relegated to the space-time context, actively participate in communication (BLOMMAERT, 2013; PENNYCOOK; OTSUJI, 2015); 4. Transcending social structures (WEI; ZHU, 2013), this perspective indexicalizes transformations and challenges understandings of language as regulated or determined by existing contexts of power relations.

Bearing in mind the transcendence encompassed by the prefix 'trans' in the term translanguaging, Canagarajah proposes the reformulation of models and norms beyond abstract, homogeneous and closed structures, in a movement of rupture with the order and control in material life imposed by structuralism. In a perspective opposed to structuralism, translanguaging refers to mobility and fluidity, in which the various linguistic and semiotic resources employed in the processes of communication and meaning interact with each other and modify themselves as they connect (in constant movements of fusion/dispersion/approximation, overlay, attenuation/amplification).

Thus, as in the metaphor of rhizomatic thinking in the terms of Deleuze and Guattari (1995, p. 17), "there are no points or positions in a rhizome as found in a structure, a tree, a root. There are only lines". In the same way, there is no moment of beginning and end of the use of a language and the





continuation in another language or with a gesture, in translanguaging practices, to build meanings, all elements are used in an integrated way, making it impossible to separate them.

In this context, space emerges as a holistic construct that includes geography, history and society. This living perspective of space, self-generating and regulating, shapes social life as people shape the material environment. Furthermore, space includes time, and when they act together, overlapping and dynamic, they refer to the notion of chronotope discussed by Bakhtin (1986). This spatiality that involves the connection of things and beings refers to the mediation and co-construction of multiple sources as an assemblage in the terms of Deleuze and Guattari (1987) and Latour (2005). In this bias, when questioning the power of mind over matter, knowledge is understood as distributed across bodies, objects and social networks, leading to distributed practice in thought and communication.

Turning to a spatial orientation, according to Canagarajah (2017), implies abandoning the traditional notion of separate structured languages. Words have mobile meanings located in space and time and their status of meaning and grammar are explained by the process of indexicality. Which depends on how people mobilize the words in use in an activity situated in a specific place, that is, it consists of a space-time process. For example, the person may not be proficient in all of the language and still be able to engage in meaningful activities using that language. In short, the union of repertoires formed along the individual trajectory of life to particular places in which these linguistic resources are distributed (PENNYCOOK; OTSUJI, 2015). In that same understanding,

We understand more languages than we can speak. By using our receptive skills we can understand the speaker's language, just as the speaker uses his competence to understand our own language. And the conversation proceeds. Furthermore, communication involves more than words. In many cases, speakers use the context, gestures and objects in the scenario to interpret their interlocutor's utterances (CANAGARAJAH, 2013, p. 5).

In the digital context, for example, interactions between linguistic groups were facilitated by technological developments that made new resources available for mixing languages with other symbolic systems and modalities. In this regard, Canagarajah (2013, p. 2) argues that

All these developments bring interesting possibilities and challenges for communication across language borders. They are engendering new communicative modes as people adopt creative strategies to engage with each other and represent their voices (CANAGARAJAH, 2013, p. 2).

The frequent contact with other languages and cultures allowed by technology makes the borders more and more tenuous. In these scenarios, the constant flows of people, capital and discourses have provided new models of global activity. According to Garcia and Wei (2014), the intensity of interactions led to a new space, called the contact zone. Based on Pratt (1991), the authors clarify that these are



generally virtual zones in which the speakers are people of different origins, characteristics and experiences. Monolingual models, according to Canagarajah (2013), are not enough to handle these contexts of plural needs. Therefore, the author defends the conception of new paradigms to understand how communication works in these contact zones.

Translingual practices, according to the author, are language practices in which “people are working collaboratively towards a construction of meaning for semiotic resources which they are borrowing from different languages and symbol systems.” (CANAGARAJAH, 2013, p. 34). Under these conditions, the author states that people are co-constructing meanings and that the adoption of reciprocal negotiation strategies causes a positive adaptation in interactions between speakers, as words alone are not reliable for understanding communication as a whole. Therefore, according to Canagarajah (2013, p. 65),

There is no stable variety that marks communication in the contact zone. This communication works because speakers are prepared to adopt strategies to co-construct norms in situ, achieving intelligibility through (and not despite) their local varieties and identities (CANAGARAJAH, 2013, p. 65).

With regard to the application of monolingual guidance, Canagarajah (2013) points out that the limitation of languages, due to grammatical structures defined in an orderly manner, constitutes these languages as an easily oriented product. Given the above, the author states that, through the norms and standards inserted, language assessment has become a reference, as well as the classification of people into common social groups. In contrast, translingual guidance aims at practices and processes rather than products. Pennycook (2008) corroborates by stating that

We need to incorporate the idea of communicative repertoires: individual linguistic knowledge must be defined “not in terms of abstract system components, but as communicative repertoires – conventionalized constellations of semiotic resources for action that are formed by particular practices in which individuals engage. engage” (Hall et al., 2006, p. 232). This view insists that language is not a system we rely on when we want to communicate. Practices are habitual activities that take place in cultural and social spaces (PENNYCOOK, 2008, p. 30).

Another concept that challenges the traditional notion of language as static and unitary, showing interfaces with translanguaging, is mobility. Blackledge and Creese (2017) consider language as a complex of mobile resources that enable people to be mobile. According to these authors, mobility goes beyond the movement of people across historical and geographic locations, it involves the mobility of linguistic and semiotic resources in time and space. In order to better understand the mobility of these resources

in the conception of language in use, the authors suggest paying attention to the notion of repertoire in terms of Blommaert (2013) and Rymes (2014):

Blommaert (2013) proposes that the collective resources available to anyone at any point in time constitute a repertoire. In his definition repertoires are biographically emerging complexes of indexically ordered, and therefore functionally organized, resources. Repertoires include linguistic, semiotic, and sociocultural resources used in communication. Rymes (2014) adopts the term 'communicative repertoire' to refer to the collection of ways individuals use language and other means of communication to function effectively in the multiple communities in which they participate. (BLACKLEDGE; CREESE; 2017, p. 35) .

Therefore, the repertoires include not only linguistic varieties, dialects and languages, but also gestures, postures, ways of dressing, communicating, eating and drinking, dance movements, phrases and many other patterns that take as great references media personalities, for example. This repertoire perspective, according to Blackledge and Creese (2017), does not link types of communication to types of people, because the more a communicative element is widespread, the more varied are the interactions through it. This is because, as discussed by Rymes (2014), in addition to changing languages and ways of speaking from one activity to another, we use ways of speaking and language fragments to change the way we speak in the same conversation, or even in the same conversation. phrase. In short, people's communicative repertoires expand according to their needs.

Echoing Blommaert and Backus (2011), the authors point to repertoires as registers of mobility, both of people's movement and of linguistic resources in social and learning scenarios. Thus, the repertoires show people's life trajectories, their experiences (opportunities and deprivations), their movement through physical and social spaces and their potential for expression in specific social arenas. In other words, for Blackledge and Creese (2017, p. 36) "repertoires are indexed biographies, and analyzing repertoires is equivalent to analyzing the social and cultural itineraries traveled by people, how they maneuvered and navigated them, and how they positioned themselves in the various arenas". social spaces they have inhabited or visited in their lives". In this way, the subject's mobility expands his repertoire and, consequently, allows him mobility.

Classrooms, for example, are spaces permeated by the varied and complex discursive/linguistic practices of their speakers. In these contexts, García, Johnson & Seltzer (2017, p. 21) propose to follow the *corriente* of translanguaging, a metaphor that refers to the "current or [the] flow of students' dynamic bilingualism that runs through our classrooms". The *corriente* of translanguaging provides speakers with a path of interaction that goes beyond restrictions imposed by what can be considered the official way of using a language. According to Rocha and Megale (2021, p. 19),

This metaphor is used as an allusion to the dynamism and fluidity of river currents. This fluid and pulsating current enhances the creation of new language practices, because it tensions perspectives, voices, stories, knowledge, interests, among many other factors that affect our lives, also in educational contexts, with the purpose of promoting a transformative, critical experience and creative in these translingual spaces. This metaphor helps us to understand that, just as the river has its banks, the translingual educational process is also fluid, while being strategically planned. This planning, however, is not fixed and must go with the flow, that is, it must be malleable enough to change and readjust as many times as necessary, without forgetting to consider the importance of keeping the questioning attitude active in the face of prescribed limits. and, thus, act from a posture oriented towards social justice and the common good. In this bias, students, in turn, by mobilizing their entire translingual repertoire, are freer to engage in the fluidity of the current and to expand their experiential assets.

According to García, Johnson and Seltzer (2017), the translingual *corriente* includes three strands that have implications for translingual pedagogy: 1) adopting a translingual stance, 2) building a translingual instructional project, and 3) engaging in making meaningful translingual changes (GARCÍA *et al.*, 2017). According to the authors, a translingual posture corresponds to a pedagogical approach that encompasses an idea of dynamic and holistic bilingualism aimed at developing a metalinguistic awareness in students. This instructional design integrates students' cultural backgrounds and practices into spaces strategically designed by teachers to enable students to mobilize their entire linguistic repertoire while developing language skills and learning new content.

#### 4 Conclusion

Translingual practices point to a new linguistic reality insofar as they reflect the flexibility of linguistic and semiotic resources to give senses and meanings to the world. They bring to the fore a new way of being, acting and using language, giving space to fluid discourses and new social realities in the most varied contexts (GARCÍA, 2009).

As a sociolinguistic and psycholinguistic theory, translinguistics has a lot to contribute to our understanding of the language of bilinguals, as it favors bilingual performances and not just monolingual ones (VOGEL; GARCÍA, 2017). Translanguaging, as a pedagogical practice, considers that the learners' fluid language deepens their engagement in understanding complex texts and contexts. Thus, according to Yip and García (2018), regardless of the official language of a classroom, a translingual pedagogy would greatly contribute to minority language speakers receiving the education they need.

In this way, translanguaging is in line with a decolonial pedagogy, since it questions power relations and subordination of knowledge (linguistic, cultural and racial hierarchies that delegitimize linguistic practices of minority groups) and promotes social justice through language education.



In short, it can be said that creating a space for translingual experiences in the classroom implies: giving the student a voice so that he can learn (YIP; GARCÍA, 2018); transcending individual languages, involving various semiotic resources and ecological recognition in the communication process (CANAGARAJAH, 2013), transforming relationships in learning environments between students and between students and teacher in the classroom, focusing on mutual learning (VOGEL; GARCÍA, 2017); and to promote social justice to students who are at a disadvantage with their peers due to language differences (GARCIA, 2009).

#### CRediT

**Acknowledgement:** Not applicable.

**Financing:** Not applicable.

**Conflicts of interest:** The authors certify that they have no commercial or associative interest that represents a conflict of interest in relation to the manuscript.

**Ethical Approval:** Not applicable.

**Contributor Roles:**

Conceptualization, Data curation, Formal Analysis, Investigation, Methodology, Project administration, Resources, Supervision, Validation, Visualization, Writing – original draft, Writing – review & editing. SILVA, Themis Rondão Barbosa da Costa.

#### References

- BAKHTIN, M. M.. *Speech Genres and Other Late Essays* . VW McGee (trans.). University of Texas Press, 1986.
- BLACKLEDGE, A. & CREESE, A.. *Translanguaging and the body* . International Journal of Multilingualism, 14 (3), 250-268, 2017. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/14790718.2017.1315809>.
- BLOMMAERT, J. *Ethnography, Superdiversity, and Linguistic Landscapes*. Multilingual Matters, 2013.
- BLOMMAERT, J. & BACKUS, Ad.. *Repertoires Revisited: "Knowing Language" in Superdiversity* . 67. 1-26, 2011.
- CANAGARAJAH, S. *Translingual practice: Global Englishes and cosmopolitan relations* . New York: Routledge, 2013.
- CANAGARAJAH, S. *Translingual practice as spatial repertoires: Expanding the paradigm beyond structuralist orientations* . Applied Linguistics, v. 39, no. 1, p. 31-54, 2017.
- CONTEH, J. *Translanguaging as pedagogy. critical review* in A. Creese and A. Blackledge (eds.) The Routledge Handbook of Language and Superdiversity. London: Routledge, 473-87, 2018.
- DELEUZE, G. and F. GUATTARI.. *A Thousand Plateaus* . University of Minnesota Press, 1987.
- DELEUZE, G. and GUATTARI, F.. *A thousand plateaus - capitalism and schizophrenia* , vol. 1 / Translated by Aurélio Guerra Neto and Célia Pinto Costa. 1 ed. Rio de Janeiro: Ed. 34, 1995. 94 p. (TRANS Collection).



DELEUZE, G. and GUATTARI, F.. *A thousand plateaus - capitalism and schizophrenia* , vol. 2 / by Ana Lúcia de Oliveira and Lúcia Cláudia Leão. Rio de Janeiro: Ed. 34, 1995. 96 p. (TRANS Collection).

FREIRE, P. *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*. 17th edition Rio de Janeiro, Peace and Land, 1987.

FREIRE, P. *Pedagogy of autonomy: necessary knowledge for educational practice* . São Paulo: Paz e Terra, 1997.

GARCÍA, O., FLORES, N., AND WOODLEY, H. *Transgressing monolingualism and bilingual dualities: Translanguaging pedagogies*. In A. Yiakoumetti (ed.), *Harnessing linguistic variation to improve education*. Bern: Peter Lang, pp. 45-75, 2012.

GARCIA, O., JOHNSON, I., S., & SELTZER, K.. *The translanguaging classroom: Leveraging student bilingualism for learning*. Caslon, 2017.

GARCIA, O.; WEI, L. *Language, bilingualism and education*. In: *Translanguaging: Language, bilingualism and education* . Palgrave Pivot, London, p. 46-62, 2014.

GARCÍA, O. *Bilingual education in the 21st century: A global perspective*. Malden, MA and Oxford: Wiley/Blackwell, 2009.

HALL, J; CARLSON, M. *Reconceptualizing multicompetence as a theory of language knowledge*. *Applied Linguistics*, 27(2), 220-240, 2006.

LATOUB, B.. *Reassembling the Social: An Introduction to Actor-Network-Theory*. OxfordUniversityPress, 2005.

LEWIS, G., JONES, B., and C. BAKER.. *Translanguaging: origins and development from school to street and beyond*. *Educational Research and Evaluation: An International Journal on Theory and Practice*18/7: 641-54, 2012.

MACIEL, RF & ROCHA, CH. *Dialogues on translingual research and practice: weaving threads with Suresh Canagarajah's views*. *REVISTA X*, 15(1), 7-31, 2020. DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.5380/rvx.v15i1.71807>.

MIGNOLO, WD *Local histories/global designs: coloniality, subaltern knowledges and border thinking*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2000.

PENNYCOOK, A. *Translingual English*. *Australian Review of Applied Linguistics*. 31. 10.2104/ara10830, 2008.

PENNYCOOK, A. and E. OTSUJI, 2015. *Metrolingualism: Language in the City*. Routledge.

POZA, L. *Translanguaging: Definitions, Implications, and Further Needs in Burgeoning Inquiry*. *Berkeley Review of Education*, v. 6, no. 2, 2017.

PRATT, ML *Arts of the Contact Zone* . *Profession*. P. 33-40, 1991.

ROCHA, CH *Multimodality, literacies and translanguage: dialogues for contemporary linguistic education*. 2019.

ROCHA, CH ; MACIEL, RF *Teaching a foreign language as a translingual practice: articulations with Bakhtinian theories* . *Revista Delta - Documentation of Studies in Theoretical and Applied Linguistics - Qualis A1*, v. 31, p. 451-485-485, 2015.

ROCHA, CH (Org.); MACIEL, RF (Org.). *Foreign language and citizenship education: between discourses and practices* . 1st ed. Campinas: Pontes, 2013. v. 01. 195p.



ROCHA, C. h . ; LIBERALI, FC ; MEGALE, AH *Bilingualism and translanguage in language education for children* . In: Cláudia Hilsdorf Rocha & Edcleia Basso. (Org.). *Teaching and Learning a Foreign/Additional Language at Different Ages: Reflections for Teachers and Trainers* Vol. 2. 1st edition. Campinas-SP: Pontes, 2021, v., p. 25-58.

RYMES, B. *Communicating Beyond Language. Everyday Encounters with Diversity* . Routledge. New York: Routledge, 2014.

TODD, S. *Learning from the Other: Levinas, psychoanalysis, and ethical possibilities in education* . New York: Sunny Press, 2003.

VOGEL, S; GARCÍA, O. Translanguaging. CUNY Academic Works, 2017. WEI, L.. *Moment analysis and translanguaging space: discursive construction of identities by multilingual Chinese youth in Britain* . *Journal of Pragmatics*, 43, 1222-1235, 2011. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2010.07.035> .

WEI, L. & ZHU H.. *Translanguaging identities and ideologies: Creating transnational space through flexible multilingual practices amongst Chinese university students in the UK* . *Applied Linguistics*, 34(5), 516-35, 2013. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/amt022> .

WILEY, T., & GARCIA, O.. *Language policy and planning in language education: Legacies, consequences and possibilities* . *modern Language Journal* , 100, 48–63, 2016.

YIP, J., GARCÍA, O.. *Translanguaging: recommendations for educators*. *Iberoamérica Social: magazine-network of studios sociales IX*, pp. 164 – 177, 2018. Retrieved from: <https://iberoamericasocial.com/translanguagens-recommendations-educators>.