



Available online at <https://lce.dsigma.gr/index.php/lce>

Functions of Translanguaging in Primary School CLIL and EFL Settings

Gema Gayete Domínguez

Universitat Jaume I

<https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8171-9858>

Abstract

This study investigates the functions of the translingual practices performed by young learners and their teachers in primary school CLIL and EFL contexts. We also aimed to explore if differences in translanguaging purposes existed between both educational programs. 22 7-year-old students from the 2nd year of primary education and their EFL and CLIL science teachers took part in the study. Participants belonged to a public school from the city of Alcora, in the Valencian Community (Spain), which offers three teaching languages (Catalan, Spanish, and English). Classroom observations and video-audio recordings were conducted in 8 EFL (6 hours) and 8 CLIL lessons (6 hours). Data was transcribed and analysed employing two taxonomies that we have adapted, Sampson's (2012) and Sahan and Rose's (2021) classifications of language use. Qualitative data was examined through deductive and inductive analytical approaches. Quantitative data was analysed using the SPSS programme. Findings indicate that translanguaging was employed by participants in both contexts to accomplish particular teaching, learning, and communicative functions. However, translanguaging episodes were more frequent in EFL than in CLIL. Results from several Pearson's chi-square tests and post hoc Bonferroni adjustments demonstrated differences in specific subfunctions of translanguaging between CLIL and EFL settings, dealing with certain aspects of students' metalanguage and teacher's content transmission and classroom management. This study suggests the adoption of a more multilingual approach in early language and content learning, as well as the need for teacher training on the use of effective translanguaging strategies.

Keywords: translanguaging, language functions, primary school context, CLIL, EFL.



Licensing details: Licensing Details: Author retains the right of this article. The article is distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-Non Commercial 4.0 License (<http://www.creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>) which permits non-commercial use, reproduction and distribution of the work without further permission provided the original work is attributed as specified on the Journal open access page.

1. Introduction

Recent research on multilingual education has delved into the use of translanguaging in CLIL and EFL classrooms (Aoyama, 2020; Bieri, 2018; Gallagher & Colohan, 2017; Gierlinger, 2015; Karabassoba & San Isidro, 2020; Kumpulainen, 2023; Nikula & Moore, 2019; Sahib, 2019; Sobkowiak, 2022; Yuan, 2024; Yuvayapan, 2019). These studies reported that students and teachers tend to employ multiple resources from their multilingual repertoire to enhance language and/or content learning and achieve specific communicative and affective functions. However, as far as we know, only two studies have contrasted the functions of translanguaging in CLIL and EFL (Gené-Gil, Garau & Salazar-Noguera, 2012; Kontio & Sylvén, 2015) to determine if translanguaging purposes varied among both educational approaches. The fact that these studies were conducted in secondary schools suggests that more research involving young learners, as well as their teachers, is needed. As the wide and enlightening research career of Savić (2013, 2014, 2019, 2021, 2022, among others) demonstrates, early levels of education require special attention since they constitute the beginning of students' educational practices which may shape their attitudes and future educational experiences.

Moreover, to the best of our knowledge, no studies conducted in Valencian education have investigated the purposes of translanguaging in CLIL and EFL. Since we believe that this multilingual region, characterised by the presence of two official languages (Catalan and Spanish), requires a more multilingual perspective in CLIL and EFL investigation, the present descriptive study aims at exploring the functions of young learners' and teacher's translanguaging episodes in Valencian CLIL and EFL primary school contexts to determine possible differences in the use of translanguaging between both educational programmes.

2. Literature review

2.1. Translanguaging

Translanguaging has its origins in the 1980s when Cen Williams described the use of two languages (English and Welsh) in the same lesson for developing simultaneous language competence. Williams (1994) named this language use as *trawsieithu* to classify the bilingual alternation of input and output found in Welsh schools. From this initial notion, translanguaging has adopted many forms to interpret theoretical and practical multilingual practices inside and outside the classroom (Cenoz & Gorter, 2020; Portolés, 2020). According to translanguaging, multilingual speakers are allowed to make use of multilingual discursive strategies to understand the world around them (García, 2009). A widespread definition of translanguaging is suggested by Canagarajah (2011), who defined translanguaging as "the ability of multilingual speakers to shuttle between languages, treating the diverse languages that form their repertoire as an integrated system" (p. 401).

Cenoz (2019) differentiated two types of translanguaging practices that include pedagogical and spontaneous translanguaging. Whereas pedagogical translanguaging deals with the simultaneous and systematic use of several languages as a planned and purposeful teaching strategy, spontaneous translanguaging is based on the natural, unplanned, and non-purposeful use of speakers' multilingual repertoire. Therefore, while pedagogical translanguaging only takes place inside the classroom, spontaneous translanguaging occurs both inside and outside educational contexts and, although it is not planned, it can also have a didactic effect.

Translanguaging represents a challenge for the ruling monolingual tradition in worldwide education since it proposes the adoption of a more multilingual perspective in language and content learning to adapt to the current multilingual turn in education (Cenoz & Gorter, 2020; Cenoz & Santos, 2020; Con-teh & Meier, 2014). Through the application of a translanguaging approach, students' multilingual reper-

toire and previous experience as language learners are considered and used as potential resources in the classroom (Portolés & Gayete, 2024).

Due to the burgeoning relevance of translanguaging in recent literature on multilingual education, several studies have explored translingual practices in CLIL and EFL, as the two educational approaches examined in our study. The next sections will present the findings of these studies.

2.2. Translanguaging in CLIL

Research on translanguaging has gained prominence in CLIL contexts where the vehicular language is not one of students' L1s but a foreign language. This suggests a special need for employing students' multilingual repertoire to reinforce content and language learning. Coyle, Hood, and Marsh (2010) supported the idea of blended instruction in CLIL through code-switching as the "systematic shift from one language to another" (p.16), which was associated with translanguaging. However, a more updated approach to translanguaging has been adopted in the present study by considering translanguaging as a planned, purposeful, and systematic multilingual practice but also as a spontaneous, natural, and unplanned practice (Cenoz, 2019).

Prior studies revealed that translanguaging is not only present in CLIL classrooms but it also serves specific functions that enrich CLIL lessons at different levels (Bieri, 2018). Several investigations have addressed this issue by exploring students' and teachers' use of translanguaging in CLIL programmes (Bieri, 2018; Gallagher & Colohan, 2017; Gierlinger, 2015; Karabassoba & San Isidro, 2020; Kumpulainen, 2023; Nikula & Moore, 2019, among others).

Gierlinger (2015) investigated primary school teachers' L1 use during several CLIL lessons in Austria. The scholar found that teachers switched between the TL and L1 to scaffold content knowledge, accomplish affective functions, and manage tasks as well as students' behavior. Gallagher and Colohan (2017) also found specific functions of translingual practices in CLIL geography classrooms from the educational context of Northern Italy. Translanguaging represented an effective tool to focus on specific linguistic forms worked on during the lessons and acquire an improved bilingual vocabulary related to the content subject.

The investigation carried out by Bieri (2018) explored students' and teachers' translanguaging practices in CLIL and non-CLIL biology lessons at an upper-secondary school in Switzerland. Findings showed that translanguaging practices, involving the TL and the L1, were encouraged in CLIL classrooms to negotiate and clarify meaning, focus on technical vocabulary and key lexis, promote linguistic creativity, and take advantage of students' knowledge. Translanguaging was also employed to provide metacomments and discourse markers, as well as to reproduce the source languages of the scientific vocabulary (Greek or Latin).

Furthermore, Nikula and Moore (2019) analysed extracts from CLIL classrooms in Austria, Finland, and Spain and observed that both interpersonal and pedagogical purposes affected students' and teachers' language choices. Teachers made use of translanguaging to provide L1 equivalents for key terminology, create spaces for discussion and communication, and provide task instructions. Students employed translanguaging to talk about off-content-related topics, summarise the core points of the lesson, structure their discourse, and work in groups.

Karabassova and San Isidro (2020) examined teachers' perceptions and functions of translanguaging in CLIL contexts from Kazakhstan. Results indicated that, although teachers denoted an ambiguous stance about translanguaging, they relied on translanguaging to scaffold content learning, perform transitions, and solve teachers' language difficulties and lack of proficiency. More specific functions of translanguaging related to content scaffolding included facilitating students to make meaning, serving as a discursive practice, and providing peer scaffolding.

A more recent study conducted by Kumpulainen (2023) investigated primary school teachers' use of translanguaging in CLIL contexts from Helsinki. Findings demonstrated that translanguaging was frequent among Finnish instructors to provide translations and translate aspects of speech. Other less recurrent functions of translanguaging included making comparisons, expressing inner speech, and encouraging collaborative dialogue.

The literature described in this section shows that even though previous studies were carried out in contexts depicting different language constellations, similarities exist among the functions of translanguaging performed in CLIL classrooms. Some of these functions refer to scaffolding content knowledge, negotiating meaning, teaching and learning technical and bilingual vocabulary, conveying discourse practices, and promoting collaborative and group work. Hence, translanguaging seems to serve useful purposes in CLIL.

2.3. Translanguaging in EFL

Although the EFL programme has been traditionally advocated as a monolingual educational approach characterised by the exclusive use of English, recent multilingual views in education support the use of other languages in EFL to enhance TL development (Pan & Pan, 2010). This is why the examination of translingual practices has received some attention in EFL classrooms (Aoyama, 2020; Sahib, 2019; Sobkowiak, 2022; Yuan, 2024; Yuvayapan, 2019, among others).

Yuvayapan (2019) examined EFL teachers' perceptions of translanguaging and the purposes underlying their translingual usage in several primary schools in Turkey. The author found that, even though practitioners denoted favourable opinions towards the use of translanguaging for specific learning situations, they did not normally apply translingual strategies during their classroom pedagogies, mainly because of the expectations of colleagues, institutions, and student's parents. Practitioners only made occasional use of students' L1 to accelerate content clarification and manage the classroom and students' interactions.

Comparable results were found in the study of Sobkowiak (2022), which investigated the purposes of the translingual practices of EFL students and teachers in several Polish educational institutions. Findings revealed that all participants gave priority to the exclusive deployment of English, so a scant number of translingual practices were found in EFL lessons, which were predominantly produced spontaneously by students and represented exceptional practices. Similarly, teachers punctually relied on students' L1 to explain vocabulary and grammatical aspects.

In contrast to the previous studies, Aoyama (2020) found that Japanese secondary school students made frequent use of translanguaging during communicative L2 activities to fulfill particular functions, which include asking for help, providing language equivalents, producing metalanguage, backchanneling, and filling classroom discourse. These communicative purposes of translanguaging suggest that dynamic multilingual communication can be fostered in EFL classrooms by introducing students' L1s.

A more recent investigation conducted by Yuan (2024) identified several functions of translanguaging performed by EFL teachers and adult students in an ESL language center in the United States of America. Participants, who held positive attitudes towards translanguaging, accomplished specific language functions through translanguaging: (i) adding new meanings in oral presentations, (ii) substituting words or sentences due to a lack of TL knowledge, (iii) easing anxiety, (iv) recognising others as multilingual speakers, (v) enhancing comprehension in oral presentations, (vi) making language comparisons, and (viii) showing understanding or clarifying misunderstandings.

Moreover, Sahib (2019) explored teachers' reasons for employing translanguaging and the benefits of these multilingual practices in Indonesian EFL contexts. Findings showed that instructors made use of translingual resources to improve students' participation and attention, encourage effective classroom communication, help the least proficient students while learning English vocabulary, and accommodate the local

language in the lessons. Indeed, translanguaging made students more active, participative, and engaged in language learning and created an enjoyable classroom atmosphere that benefited students' interactions.

Overall findings from the previous studies demonstrate that, although no recurrent use of translanguaging occurred in all EFL contexts, varied functions of students' and teachers' translanguaging were found in many EFL settings to enhance foreign language learning and classroom management.

2.4. Translanguaging in CLIL and EFL

As far as we are concerned, only two published studies have compared students' and teachers' translanguaging practices in CLIL and EFL programmes (Gené-Gil, Garau & Salazar-Noguera, 2012; Kontio & Sylvén, 2015).

The first study was carried out by Gené-Gil, Garau, and Salazar-Noguera (2012) in the secondary education context of the Balearic Islands (Spain). Scholars explored the oral use of the TL and L1s during CLIL and EFL lessons. Differences in language choices were noticed among both language programs. Whereas in EFL the TL was more frequently employed, a higher use of the L1s was performed in CLIL to cope with the difficulty of learning the content subject through English. In contrast, specialised vocabulary taught in CLIL was always presented and referred to in English.

A later investigation conducted by Kontio and Sylvén (2015) at an upper secondary school in Sweden demonstrated that similar to the study of Gené-Gil, Garau and Salazar-Noguera (2012), translanguaging episodes were more usual in CLIL, whereas EFL classrooms followed a more rigid and monolingual use of the TL. Language alternations in CLIL proved to be systematic and linked to communicative strategies. In addition, CLIL students used to play around with their multilingual repertoires and employed their languages to ensure they were understood.

Both studies reported in this section reveal parallel results since a stricter attachment to the TL was observed in EFL, whereas a more multilingual and flexible use of languages was found in CLIL. Apart from this scarce literature on translanguaging in CLIL and EFL, to the best of our knowledge, only the study conducted by Safont (2022) focused on translanguaging in the EFL context of the Valencian education system, as the principal setting of our study. This investigation did not explore functions of translanguaging but teachers' reactions to learners' translanguaging, representing sources of incidental pragmatic learning and attitudinal conduct. Similarly, the study of Portolés and Gayete (2024) examined the influence of a pedagogical translanguaging intervention on young learners' multilingual pragmatic awareness in a Valencian primary school. However, this study did not analyse translanguaging instances but implemented a translanguaging treatment based on pragmatics. This lack of investigation is the principal reason why more research on translanguaging should be carried out in CLIL and EFL Valencian classrooms.

3. The study

This descriptive study adopts a multilingual viewpoint by looking into the use of translanguaging in primary school CLIL and EFL programmes. As seen in the preceding literature, a scarce pool of studies compared students' and teachers' purposes of translanguaging in CLIL and EFL contexts. These studies were conducted in secondary schools, whereas primary education did not receive any attention. There is also a lack of research investigating translanguaging in CLIL and EFL classrooms from the Valencian education system.

Taking into account these research gaps, this article analyses and contrasts the functions of the translanguaging practices carried out by young learners and their teachers during CLIL and EFL lessons in a primary school context of the Valencian Community. Considering this goal, our guiding twofold research question is:

What are the functions of the translingual practices employed by primary school students and teachers in CLIL and EFL classrooms? Is there any difference in the use of translanguaging between both educational contexts?

Following previous literature, we suggest a hypothesis that will guide the present study:

Hypothesis: Both students and the teacher will make use of translanguaging in CLIL and EFL classrooms to accomplish specific functions. Translanguaging episodes will be more frequent in CLIL than in EFL and different translanguaging purposes will be noticed in each educational programme.

3.1. Method

3.1.1. Participants and setting

The sample was composed of 22 7-year-old students from the 2nd year of primary education and their EFL and CLIL science teachers. Participants took part in two different learning programmes: CLIL Science and EFL. Hence, learners in both contexts were the same, as well as the teacher. All participants are multilingual since they are competent in, at least, the three languages offered in Valencian education (Catalan, Spanish, and English). Whereas young learners speak and understand both co-official languages of the Valencian Community (Catalan and Spanish), their English competence can be acknowledged as beginner. Regarding participants' L1s, the teacher shares both Catalan and Spanish as their L1s, 54.54% (n=12) of the students are native speakers of Catalan, 36.36% (n=8) have Spanish as their L1, and the remaining 9.1% (n=2) reported having other L1s, such as Arabic (n=1) and Romanian (n=1). Regarding gender distribution, while the primary school teacher is female, 54.54% (n=12) of the learners are female and 45.46% (n=10) are male.

Data came from a trilingual public primary school in the city of Alcora, located in the province of Castelló, in the Valencian Community (Spain). This school follows a multilingual program (PEPLI) by which three languages are offered as language subjects and languages of instruction: Catalan, as the minority language; Spanish, as the majority language; and English, as the main additional language. More specifically, Catalan is the predominant teaching language of our young learners (11.5 weekly hours), followed by Spanish (5.5 weekly hours), and finally, English (3.75 weekly hours), which is the vehicular language in EFL (2.25 weekly hours) and CLIL science lessons (1.5 weekly hours).

3.1.2. Data collection and analysis

To collect the data of the study, we conducted classroom observations and video-audio recordings of 8 EFL and 8 CLIL science lessons. Each lesson had a duration of 45 minutes, representing a total number of 6 hours of classroom observation in EFL and 6 hours in CLIL. The recorded data was transcribed and analysed to identify and classify translanguaging instances produced by students and the primary school teacher in EFL and CLIL subjects instructed through English. Thus, translanguaging practices involving Catalan and Spanish have been considered and examined.

We have employed two different taxonomies for the analysis of translingual practices. With regard to students, we have adapted the classification proposed by Sampson (2012) to analyse the functions of students' L1 use in the L2 classroom (see Table 1 below).

Table 1. Students’ functions of translanguaging adapted from Sampson’s (2012) classification of L1 use.

Students’ functions of translanguaging	
1. L1 equivalents for the lack of L2 lexical items	
2. Metalanguage for classroom activities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 2.1. Ensuring understanding 2.2. Expressing understanding 2.3. Explaining, clarifying and summarising 2.4. Emphasising own knowledge and participation 2.5. Asking the teacher for language or content information 2.6. Answering to teacher’s questions, comments and commands 2.7. Asking for teacher’s feedback 2.8. Providing positive self-feedback 2.9. Giving instructions and commands 2.10. Indicating finishing the tasks 2.11. Lacking certain knowledge and asking for help 2.12. Admitting mistakes
3. Floor holding during conversations	
4. Reiteration requests	
5. Socialising to develop group solidarity	
6. L2 avoidance	
7. Expression of feelings and experiences	
8. Others	

Sampson (2012) suggested six language functions: (i) L1 equivalents for the lack of L2 lexical items, (ii) metalanguage for classroom activities, (iii) floor holding during conversations, (iv) reiteration requests, (v) socialising to develop group solidarity, and (vi) L2 avoidance. After conducting our examination, we added two more categories to the taxonomy, being (vii) expression of feelings and experiences and (viii) others, the last one for describing translanguaging practices that could not be classified into previous categories. Since we noticed that the second function (*i.e.*, metalanguage for classroom activities) proposed by Sampson (2012) was very broad, we decided to incorporate several subcategories to this function that emerged from our data and helped us to interpret our findings. These new subcategories are also listed in Table 1.

As for the examination of teacher’s functions of translanguaging, we followed the taxonomy proposed by Sahan and Rose (2021), which was previously adapted from research dealing with the functions of classroom language (see Canagarajah, 1995; Lo, 2014). As presented in Table 2 below, Sahan and Rose’s (2021) language functions are allocated into three main categories: (i) content transmission, (ii) classroom management, and (iii) social or affective functions. In addition to these categories, we have established a fourth category (*i.e.*, others) to locate translanguaging practices that could not be classified. The original taxonomy also encompasses subcategories that we have adapted, which are enumerated in Table 2.

Table 2. Teachers' functions of translanguaging adapted from Sahan and Rose's (2021) classification.

Teachers' functions of translanguaging	
1. Content transmission	1.1. Introducing new content or concepts 1.2. Checking student comprehension 1.3. Explaining, clarifying and summarising presented content or concepts 1.4. Asking and/or answering questions related to content or language 1.5. Translating (technical) vocabulary 1.6. Presenting or explaining new content or language 1.7. Giving subject-based examples to explain content 1.8. Providing conceptual examples related to daily life to explain Content
2. Classroom management	2.1. Managing discipline 2.2. Providing feedback 2.3. Giving instructions or procedural commands 2.4. Encouraging student participation 2.5. Drawing students' attention or focus 2.6. Providing "off-content" information related to the course
3. Social or affective functions	3.1. Building rapport 3.2. Emphasising the importance of the subject for career or future Studies
4. Others	

Qualitative data, referring to translanguaging practices extracted from classroom discourse, was examined through deductive and inductive analytical approaches. Although most categories were established beforehand based on Sampson's (2012) and Sahan and Rose's (2021) taxonomies, new categories emerged from participants' translanguaging episodes, as previously explained. A coding scheme was proposed for each category. Three different rates, being the author of the study and two experienced researchers in multilingual education, were involved in the coding procedure.

Quantitative data was analysed using the SPSS programme. Descriptive and frequency analyses were carried out. Since our data proved to be non-normally distributed ($p < 0.05$), several Pearson's chi-square tests of homogeneity were run to identify differences in participants' functions of translanguaging in CLIL and EFL programmes. Post hoc Bonferroni adjustments were also conducted to determine further differences among specific categories and subcategories of translanguaging functions. Significance was considered at the level 0.05.

All ethical protocols were followed during this investigation.

4. Results and discussion

This section explores and discusses the results on primary school students' and teacher's functions of translanguaging in EFL and CLIL to identify possible differences in participants' use of translanguaging within each educational approach. Whereas Section 4.1 will present students' findings, Section 4.2 will focus on teacher's translanguaging practices.

4.1. Students' functions of translanguaging

Young learners' use of Spanish and Catalan translingual practices was examined and contrasted in CLIL and EFL contexts. As depicted in Table 3 below, frequency analyses show that students produced a greater number of translanguaging instances in EFL lessons (26.29%) than in CLIL science classrooms (14.86%), highlighting a higher presence of students' L1s in the foreign language learning context. Our findings contradict prior research demonstrating a more multilingual language use in CLIL and a stricter use of the TL in EFL (Gil, Garau & Salazar-Noguera, 2012; Kontio & Sylvén, 2015). Indeed, whereas all translanguaging practices found in CLIL were exclusively in Spanish (100%), Catalan was also employed in EFL (25.71%), although to a lower extent than Spanish (74.29%), pointing out the dominant role of the majority language in Valencian education, even in subjects instructed through English.

Table 3. Frequency of students' translanguaging practices in CLIL and EFL programmes.

	General Translanguaging			Spanish		Catalan	
	N	out of	%	N	%	n	%
CLIL	348	2342	14.86%	348	100%	0	0%
EFL	560	2130	26.29%	416	74.29%	144	25.71%

The use of both students' L1s in EFL indicates that students profited from their multilingual repertoire and previous language learning experiences to develop competence in their L3 (English). In contrast, in the CLIL science context centred on both content and language learning, students only made use of one of their L1s (Spanish). This suggests that, instead of paying more attention to linguistic forms and L1 support, CLIL students gave more importance to content learning, as also seen in the study of Dalton-Puffer (2008).

Functions of students' translingual practices were explored (see Table 4 below). As percentages show, students performed the most recurrent L1 use during task completion and discussion in the form of metalanguage (CLIL: 70.11%, EFL: 66.07%), which was also observed in previous studies investigating students' translanguaging in CLIL and EFL (Aoyama, 2020; Bieri, 2018; Gallagher & Colohan, 2017; Nikula & Moore, 2019; Yuan, 2024). Subfunctions of metalanguage were further examined. As displayed in Table 4, students' translingual contributions in CLIL and EFL aiming at producing metalanguage were predominantly conducted for emphasising their own knowledge and participation (CLIL: 15.52%, EFL: 17.86%), asking the teacher for language or content information (CLIL: 17.82%, EFL: 10.36%), answering teacher's questions, comments and commands (CLIL: 5.75%, EFL: 18.93%) and explaining, clarifying or summarising (CLIL: 16.09%, EFL: 7.86%). Some of these purposes were also observed in preceding literature. For instance, in CLIL, Bieri (2018) found that students made use of their L1s to negotiate and clarify meaning, whereas students' in Nikula and Moore's (2019) study relied on translanguaging to summarise the main aspects of the lessons. Other students in EFL contexts employed their L1s to ask for help (Aoyama, 2020) and clarify misunderstandings (Yuan, 2024).

Table 4. Students' functions of translanguaging in CLIL and EFL programmes.

Functions	CLIL		EFL	
	n	%	n	%
1.L1 equivalents for the lack of L2 lexical items	24	6.90%	30	5.36%
2.Metalanguage for classroom activities	244	70.11%	370	66.07%
2.1. Ensuring understanding	12	3.45%	10	1.79%
2.2. Expressing understanding	0	0%	8	1.43%
2.3. Explaining, clarifying and summarising	56	16.09%	44	7.86%
2.4. Emphasising own knowledge and participation	54	15.52%	100	17.86%
2.5. Asking the teacher for language or content information	62	17.82%	58	10.36%
2.6. Answering teacher's questions, comments and commands	20	5.75%	106	18.93%
2.7. Asking for teacher's feedback	4	1.15%	2	0.36%
2.8. Providing positive self-feedback	4	1.15%	0	0%
2.9. Giving instructions and commands	0	0%	26	4.64%
2.10. Indicating finishing the tasks	8	2.30%	8	1.43%
2.11. Lacking certain knowledge and asking for help	16	4.60%	8	1.43%
2.12. Admitting mistakes	8	2.30%	0	0%
3.Floor holding during conversations	32	9.20%	34	6.07%
4.Reiteration requests	20	5.75%	42	7.50%
5.Socialising to develop group solidarity	20	5.75%	40	7.14%
6.L2 avoidance	0	0%	10	1.79%
7.Expression of feelings and experiences	4	1.15%	32	5.71%
8.Others	24	1.15%	2	0.36%

To identify significant differences between the functions of students' translingual practices in CLIL and EFL, a Pearson's chi-square test of homogeneity and a post-hoc Bonferroni adjustment were run. Statistical findings revealed that there were no considerable differences between general functions of students' translanguaging ($p < 0.080$). Nonetheless, statistically significant differences were found for subfunctions of metalanguage ($p < 0.001$). As discerned, young learners made a greater use of translanguaging in CLIL to explain, clarify and summarise (CLIL: 16.09%, EFL: 7.86%), ask the teacher for language or content information (CLIL: 17.82%, EFL: 10.36%), and admit mistakes (CLIL: 2.30%, EFL: 0%). In contrast, students in EFL employed translanguaging practices on a more frequent basis for answering teacher's questions, comments and commands (CLIL: 5.75%, EFL: 18.93%) and giving their own instructions and commands (CLIL: 0%, EFL: 4.64%).

The following excerpts will exemplify the predominant functions of translanguaging in each educational approach. Excerpt 1 shows how a CLIL student (S1) made use of Spanish to explain to one of her classmates (S2) what they have to do during a specific task because he did not understand the teacher's instructions.

Excerpt 1 (CLIL)

- 1 T: A printer, a keyboard and a disk-drive. What's missing?
- 2 S1: The mouse!
- 3 T: The mouse and the...?

- 4 S2: Computer
- 5 S3: Screen, screen
- 6 T: Screen, well done! So now you have to draw it. Draw the mouse and the screen and colour them, okay? Come on!
- 7 T: You have to draw what is missing, the mouse and the screen. Do you all understand?
- 8 S2: What?
- 9 S1: Eso que acabamos de ver, tenemos que dibujarlo. ¡Esto! (What we just saw, we have to draw it. This!)
- 10 S2: Ah, okay

In Excerpt 2, also belonging to the CLIL context, a young learner (S1) asked the teacher in Spanish for the spelling of a word (*i.e.*, TV). Hence, the student requested language information through a translanguaging strategy.

Excerpt 2 (CLIL)

- 1 T: Next page, okay. Shhh. How does it work? A radio needs electricity, a TV needs electricity, or a book needs electricity?
- 2 SS: A TV
- 3 T: Well done, TV!
- 4 S1: ¿Cómo se escribe a TV? (How do we spell TV?)
- 5 T: Circle and write
- 6 S1: ¿Cómo se escribe?
- 7 T: You have the word under the picture, so you have to copy it

Another example of a CLIL learner's translingual practice is illustrated in Excerpt 3, which exhibits how a student (S1) used Spanish to recognise making a mistake.

Excerpt 3 (CLIL)

- 1 T: A ball is made of...
- 2 S1: *Es que lo tengo mal, me he equivocado. No lo he escrito bien.* (It's just that I have it wrong, I have made a mistake. I haven't written it well)
- 3 T: *Mira, el material está bien, lo que tienes que poner es is made of, ¿vale? En los demás está puesto pero aquí no, ¿vale? ¡Venga va!* (Look, the material is fine, what you have to write is "made of", okay? It is written in the others but here it is not, okay? Come on!)
- 4 S1: Rubber
- 5 S2: *¿Es rubber? (Is it rubber?)*
- 6 T: *A ver* (let see), a ball is made of rubber, well done

Excerpts 4 and 5 present examples of the translanguaging functions that young learners realised to a greater extent in EFL classrooms. As seen in Excerpt 4, several students responded at the same time using their L1s, whether Spanish or Catalan, when the teacher asked them if they were ready to listen to the story.

Excerpt 4 (EFL)

- 1 T: Now we are going to listen to the story, are you ready?
- 2 SS: *Siii* (Yes)
- 3 T: Yes? Okay, listen to the story. Look at this boy, it's a boy

Last, in Excerpt 5, two students (S3 and S4) made use of Catalan to provide instructions to their classmates during the completion of a task in which they had to colour certain items.

Excerpt 5 (EFL)

- 1 S1: Finished!
- 2 T: Very good, great! Come on, Murat. Colour black
- 3 S2: Finished!
- 4 T: Very good
- 5 S3: *Ara* (now) black
- 6 S4: *Després* (then) blue
- 7 T: Yes, close the door, Cassandra. Be careful, be careful. Now colour the wings blue, come on

General results presented in this section demonstrate that students' function of translanguaging most fostered in both CLIL and EFL was the production of metalanguage during task conduction and discussion. Indeed, only statistical significance was found for the differences in specific subfunctions of this category between both educational programmes, which have been described and exemplified in previous paragraphs and excerpts.

4.2. Teacher's functions of translanguaging

Primary school teacher's translanguaging was also explored to obtain a whole picture of the translingual practices occurring in EFL and CLIL contexts. Table 5 below presents the frequency of teacher's multilingual behaviour, which proved to be very similar to that of young learners. Like students and contrary to preceding literature (see Gil, Garau & Salazar-Noguera, 2012; Kontio & Sylvén, 2015), the teacher made use of a greater deal of translanguaging strategies involving students' L1s in EFL (33.73%), whereas translanguaging was not as frequent in CLIL (6.02%).

The fact that students' and teachers' translanguaging followed the same direction may indicate that the introduction of multilingual practices, whether encouraged by the teacher or by students, promotes a more multilingual learning environment. Hence, initiating translanguaging seems to be paramount for the promotion of multilingualism in language and content educational programmes.

Table 5. Frequency of teacher's translanguaging practices in CLIL and EFL programmes.

	General Translanguaging			Spanish		Catalan	
	N	out of	%	N	%	n	%
CLIL	110	1826	6.02%	98	89.09%	12	8.30%
EFL	572	1696	33.73%	402	70.28%	170	29.72%

Furthermore, as also noticed in students’ findings, while teacher’s use of Spanish was predominant in both approaches (CLIL: 89.09%, EFL: 70.28%), Catalan use was more limited (CLIL: 8.30%, EFL: 29.72%). Nevertheless, although CLIL students relied exclusively on Spanish, the teacher employed Catalan in specific moments of CLIL lessons. However, Spanish remained as the dominant L1 employed by all participants in both settings.

A more detailed examination was conducted by investigating specific functions of teacher’s translanguaging. Table 6 below illustrates the results of this analysis, which denote that the principal goal for teacher’s use of translanguaging was classroom management (CLIL: 50.91%, EFL: 61.19%), followed by content transmission (CLIL: 45.45%, EFL: 34.97%), being this last translanguaging function more encouraged in CLIL regardless of the lower number of translanguaging instances found. In contrast, teacher’s multilingual behaviour for conveying social or affective functions was scarce (CLIL: 3.64%, EFL: 1.40%).

Table 6. Teacher’s functions of translanguaging in CLIL and EFL programmes.

Functions	CLIL		EFL	
	n	%	n	%
1.Content transmission	50	45.45%	200	34.97%
1.1. Introducing new content or concepts	4	3.64%	24	4.20%
1.2. Checking student comprehension	4	3.64%	42	7.34%
1.3. Explaining, clarifying or summarising content or concepts	8	7.279%	44	7.69%
1.4. Asking/answering questions related to content or language	18	16.36%	82	14.34%
1.5. Translating (technical) vocabulary	8	7.27%	8	1.40%
1.6. Presenting or explaining new content or language	0	0%	0	0%
1.7. Giving subject-based examples to explain content	0	0%	0	0%
1.8. Providing conceptual examples related to daily life	8	7.27%	0	0%
2.Classroom management	56	50.91%	350	61.19%
2.1. Manage discipline	26	23.64%	44	7.69%
2.2. Providing feedback	4	3.64%	18	3.15%
2.3. Giving instructions or procedural commands	0	0%	170	29.72%
2.4. Encouraging student participation	14	12.73%	48	8.39%
2.5. Drawing students’ attention to focus	8	7.27%	28	4.90%
2.6. Providing “off-content” information related to the course	4	3.64%	42	7.34%
3.Social or affective functions	4	3.64%	8	1.40%
3.1. Building rapport	4	3.64%	8	1.40%
3.2. Emphasising the importance of the subject	0	0%	0	0%
4.Others	0	0%	14	2.45%

Prior studies also showed that instructors relied on translanguaging strategies to cope with classroom management in CLIL (Gierlinger, 2015; Karabassova & San Isidro, 2020) and EFL classrooms (Sahib, 2019; Yuvayapan, 2019), whereas teachers’ use of translanguaging for content transmission was found in a greater number of studies in both CLIL and EFL (Bieri, 2018; Gallagher & Colohan, 2017; Gené-Gil, Garau & Salazar-Noguera, 2012; Gierlinger, 2015; Karabassova & San Isidro, 2020; Kumpulainen, 2023; Nikula & Moore, 2019; Sahib, 2019; Sobkowiak, 2022; Yuan, 2024; Yuvayapan, 2019). This analogy in our and preceding findings suggests that translanguaging is usual among CLIL and EFL practitioners to scaffold language and/or content learning, as well as to guide and regulate classroom tasks and students’ behaviour.

Regarding differences between teacher's translanguaging purposes in CLIL and EFL, findings from a Pearson's chi-square tests proved that there were no statistically significant differences among general functions of translanguaging (*i.e.*, content transmission, classroom management and social or affective functions) in CLIL and EFL programmes ($p=0.182$). However, a post hoc Bonferroni adjustment proved meaningful differences between specific subcategories ($p<0.001$). More specifically, in CLIL, the teacher made a greater use of translanguaging for conveying two functions of content transmission, that include translating technical vocabulary (CLIL: 7.27%, EFL: 1.40%) and providing conceptual examples related to daily life (CLIL: 7.27%, EFL: 0%), being this last purpose not observed in EFL; and one function of classroom management, referring to handling discipline (CLIL: 23.64%, EFL: 7.69%). In comparison, the teacher only employed translanguaging for giving instructions or procedural commands in EFL (CLIL: 0%, EFL: 29.72%).

Some of our findings go in line with previous CLIL research in which teachers made use of translanguaging strategies to manage students' behaviour (Gierlinger, 2015) and translate technical vocabulary related to the content subject (Bieri, 2018; Gallagher & Colohan, 2017; Kumpulainen, 2023; Nikula & Moore, 2019). Besides, even though in our study translanguaging instructions were only provided in EFL, the investigation of Nikula and Moore (2019) found that CLIL teachers also relied on students' L1s during the explanation of task procedural commands.

A series of excerpts will illustrate the teacher's predominant functions of translanguaging in both educational approaches. In regards to content transmission, in excerpt 6, the CLIL teacher reported the Spanish translation of a technical term (*i.e.*, cuero) since students demonstrated a lack of knowledge of the English word (*i.e.*, leather).

Excerpt 6 (CLIL)

- 1 T: What about the last one?
- 2 S1: What?
- 3 S2: ¿Qué es eso? (What's that?)
- 4 T: What's this? How do you say *cuero* (leather) in English?
- 5 S3: ¿Cuero? (Leather?)
- 6 T: Leather
- 7 SS: Leather
- 8 T: Well done!

This suggests that translating into students' L1s seems to be efficient for enhancing students' acquisition of specialised vocabulary related to the content subject. This function could be expected in CLIL, since one of the learning outcomes of the approach consists of developing knowledge on technical vocabulary (see Gayete, 2022a).

A greater presence of teacher's translanguaging to provide daily life examples was found in CLIL. In Excerpt 7, the teacher provided a daily life example, referring to the wall of the playground where students play every day, to explain the material it is made of (*i.e.*, stones) as one of the vocabulary terms studied. Hence, presenting daily life examples through L1s seems to be useful in CLIL for ensuring students' comprehension of complex concepts.

Excerpt 7 (CLIL)

- 1 T: And this one?
- 2 SS: Rocks, rocks, rocks

- 3 T: No
- 4 S1: Stone
- 5 T: Stone, right! For example, I don't know. Do you have anything that's made of stone here in the classroom?
- 6 S2: The computer
- 7 T: My computer? No, look, look. The wall, the wall of the playground is made of...
- 8 S3: Stone
- 9 T: Stone. *La paret, la paret del pati, on vosaltres jugueu tots els dies. Veritat que té pedres?* (The wall, the wall of the playground, where you play every day. Does it have stones?). Stones. That wall is made of stone.

In relation to classroom management, translanguaging was more frequently employed for managing discipline in CLIL (see Excerpt 8) and providing instructions and procedural commands in EFL (see Excerpt 9). It can be seen in Excerpt 8 that the CLIL teacher made use of Spanish for scolding the children and regulating their behaviour.

Excerpt 8 (CLIL)

- 1 T: It is made of plastic. A block is made of plastic. Excellent, Xavi. *¿Qué estás haciendo? Borra eso inmediatamente y ponlo bien y deja la gomita ya.* (What are you doing? Erase that immediately and put it right and leave the rubber now)
- 2 S1: *Pero* (but)
- 3 T: *No, pero nada, pero nada. No me estás escuchando. Venga que lo estamos hacienda todos a la vez. Si lo hacemos todos a la vez es para algo. Va.* (No, but nothing, but nothing. You're not listening to me. Come on, we're all doing it at the same time. If we all do it at the same time it's because of something. Go.). The ball is made of...

As for EFL, Excerpt 9 shows that the teacher used Catalan to provide task instructions and procedural commands. Accordingly, she relied on translanguaging to ensure students' task comprehension.

Excerpt 9 (EFL)

- 1 T: Okay, sit down. Sit down. *Anem a fer-ho com sempre, no val fer-lo a casa I ja està* (Let's do it as usual, it's not worth doing it at home and that's it). You have to say it in English, okay? *Tenim que contar la story, tenim que contar-lo tot* (We have to tell the story, we have to tell everything). Do you remember this? What's the weather like here?
- 2 S1: *Sol* (sun)
- 3 S2: Sun
- 4 T: Very good! Sunny, it's sunny
- 5 SS: Sunny!

Overall findings displayed in this section indicate that, although more translingual episodes were detected in EFL, the principal purposes of teacher's translanguaging were based on accomplishing several dimensions of classroom management. In contrast, even though translanguaging was not as recurrent in CLIL, the CLIL teacher employed translanguaging to a greater extent for fulfilling specific

functions of content transmission, so a more pedagogical direction in teacher's use of translanguaging was observed in CLIL.

After interpreting the results, we could partially confirm our initial hypothesis (*i.e.*, Both students and the teacher will make use of translanguaging in CLIL and EFL classrooms to accomplish specific functions. Translanguaging episodes will be more frequent in CLIL than in EFL and different translanguaging purposes will be noticed in each educational programme). In line with the hypothesis, students and teachers relied on translanguaging strategies in CLIL and EFL for fulfilling particular functions and specific differences in translanguaging subfunctions were noticed between CLIL and EFL programmes. However, translanguaging was more recurrent in EFL than in CLIL, which contradicted our hypothesis.

5. Conclusion

The findings of this descriptive study may contribute to the growing literature on translanguaging in CLIL and EFL settings, being a field of research still not given much attention in the educational context of the Valencian Community. Similar to previous studies, our investigation shows that translanguaging is used by primary school students and their teacher to accomplish particular functions in CLIL and EFL classrooms (see also Aoyama, 2020; Bieri, 2018; Gallagher & Colohan, 2017; Gierlinger, 2015; Karabassova & San Isidro, 2020; Kumpulainen, 2023; Nikula & Moore, 2019; Sahib, 2019; Yuan, 2024). However, opposite to previous research (Gil, Garau & Salazar-Noguera, 2012; Kontio & Sylvén, 2015), participants made a more recurrent use of translanguaging in EFL than in CLIL. This may suggest that students' L1s are considered a valuable resource and support in the foreign language classroom to develop competence in the L3 (English). In contrast, the greater emphasis given to content in the CLIL programme may have caused students not to pay as much attention to language use but to content.

Regarding differences between CLIL and EFL approaches, although no statistically significant differences were identified for general functions of translanguaging, noteworthy differences existed among subfunctions of language use, which were based on several aspects of students' metalanguage production, and specific functions of teacher's content transmission and classroom management. Hence, our findings seem to indicate that the functional use of translanguaging slightly varied between each educational programme under research. Accordingly, we could partly confirm our guiding hypothesis.

This study also suggests the application of a more multilingual approach in CLIL and EFL (see also Cenoz, 2013; Fortanet-Gómez, 2013; Gayete, 2022a; Gayete, 2022b; Karpava, 2022; Merino & Lasagabaster, 2018). Although a monolingual vehicular use of English is established in both approaches, the classroom reality reveals that L1s are frequently employed to scaffold TL learning and fulfil specific communicative purposes. Thus, students' language background and multilingual repertoire should not be left apart in language and content classrooms but fostered through potential teaching and learning strategies to accomplish greater educational outcomes. That is why we believe that teacher training on the application of multilingual strategies in CLIL and EFL is paramount to ensure the proper implementation and use of translanguaging. As stated by Savić (2021), trained teachers, as well as child-friendly materials and curricula, are crucial for the success of early educational programmes.

Our investigation is not without limitations. First, the number of participants and lessons examined may not be representative, so a greater pool of participants and recorded sessions should be considered in future research. Second, data from different levels of education and CLIL subjects should be analysed to obtain more contrastive results. Last but not least, the taxonomies employed may have determined our findings, so other classifications of language functions should be used in further investigation. Therefore, this article suggests the need for more research to contribute to the field of translanguaging in primary school CLIL and EFL programmes.

Acknowledgements

As members of the LAELA (Lingüística Aplicada a l'Ensenyament de la Llengua Anglesa) research group at Universitat Jaume I (Castellón, Spain), we would like to acknowledge that this study is part of the research project PID2023-150279OB-I00 funded by MICIU/ AEI /10.13039/501100011033 and FEDER, UE. This study is also supported by Ministerio de Educación y Formación Profesional [grant number FPU20/00220]. Additional funding has been granted by Projectes d'Innovació Educativa de la Unitat de Suport Educatiu 51020/24.

References

- Aoyama, R. (2020). Exploring Japanese High School Students' L1 Use in Translanguaging in the Communicative EFL Classroom. *Tesl-Ej*, 23(4), 1-18. <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1242655.pdf>
- Bieri, A. (2018). Translanguaging practices in CLIL and non-CLIL biology lessons in Switzerland. *EuroAmerican Journal of Applied Linguistics and Languages*, 5(2), 91-109. <https://doi.org/10.21283/2376905X.9.142>
- Canagarajah, A. S. (1995). Functions of codeswitching in ESL classrooms: Socialising bilingualism in Jaffna. *Journal of multilingual & multicultural development*, 16(3), 173-195. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01434632.1995.9994599>
- Canagarajah, S. (2011). Codemeshing in academic writing: Identifying teachable strategies of translanguaging. *The Modern Language Journal*, 95, 401-417. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.2011.01207.x>
- Cenoz, J. (2009). *Towards multilingual education: Basque educational research from an international perspective*. Multilingual Matters. <https://doi.org/10.21832/9781847691941>
- Cenoz, J. (2013). The influence of bilingualism on third language acquisition: Focus on multilingualism. *Language teaching*, 46(1), 71-86. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444811000218>
- Cenoz, J. (2019). Translanguaging pedagogies and English as a lingua franca. *Language Teaching*, 52(1), 71-85. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444817000246>
- Cenoz, J., & Gorter, D. (2020). Teaching English through pedagogical translanguaging. *World Englishes*, 39(2), 300-311. <https://doi.org/10.1111/weng.12462>
- Cenoz, J., & Santos, A. (2020). Implementing pedagogical translanguaging in trilingual schools. *System*, 92, 102273. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2020.102273>
- Conteh, J., & Meier, G. (Eds.). (2014). *The multilingual turn in languages education: Opportunities and challenges*. Multilingual Matters. <https://doi.org/10.21832/9781783092246>
- Coyle, D., Hood, P., & Marsh, D. (2010). *CLIL: Content and language integrated learning*. Cambridge university press.
- Dalton-Puffer, C. (2008). *Outcomes and processes in Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL): current research from Europe*. In W. Delanoy & L. Volkman (Eds.), *Future Perspectives for English Language Teaching* (p. 1-19). Carl Winter.
- Fortanet-Gómez, I. (2013). *CLIL in higher education: Towards a multilingual language policy* (Vol. 92). Multilingual Matters.
- Gallagher, F., & Colohan, G. (2017). T (w) o and fro: using the L1 as a language teaching tool in the CLIL classroom. *The Language Learning Journal*, 45(4), 485-498. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09571736.2014.947382>

- García, O. (2009). Education, multilingualism and translanguaging in the 21st century. In T. Skutnabb-Kangas, R. Phillipson, A. Mohanty & M. Panda (Eds.), *Social justice through multilingual education* (p. 140-158). Multilingual Matters. <https://doi.org/10.21832/9781847691910-011>
- Gayete, G. (2022a). The effect of CLIL on L3 students' oral production and comprehension in a primary school context. In M. Pallarés-Renau, F.J. Vellón & P. Salazar-Campillo (Eds.), *Investigacions transversals i integradores en Ciències Humanes i Socials* (pp. 97-114). Emergents.
- Gayete, G. (2022b). Beliefs towards Multilingual Education: EFL Teachers vs Parents. *ForLingua*, 3, 209-224.
- Gierlinger, E. (2015). 'You can speak German, sir': on the complexity of teachers' L1 use in CLIL. *Language and Education*, 29(4), 347-368. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09500782.2015.1023733>
- Gil, M. G., Garau, M. J., & Noguera, J. S. (2012). A case study exploring oral language choice between the target language and the L1s in mainstream CLIL and EFL secondary education. *Revista de Lingüística y Lenguas Aplicadas*, 7, 133-146. <https://doi.org/10.4995/rlyla.2012.1129>
- Karabassova, L., & San Isidro, X. (2020). Towards translanguaging in CLIL: A study on teachers' perceptions and practices in Kazakhstan. *International Journal of Multilingualism*, 20(2), 556-575. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14790718.2020.1828426>
- Karpava, S. (2022). Multilingualism in EFL classrooms: Perceptions of pre-service teachers. In S. Karpava (Ed.), *Handbook of research on multilingual and multicultural perspectives on higher education and implications for teaching* (pp. 213-235). IGI Global.
- Kumpulainen, M. (2023). Translanguaging in CLIL Classrooms—Teachers' Perceptions and Practices. [Master's thesis, University of Helsinki]. Helsinki University Library. <https://helda.helsinki.fi/server/api/core/bitstreams/4a528bed-2ce9-40c8-860f-9f9d2c3a20f1/content>
- Kontio, J., & Sylvén, L. K. (2015). Language alternation and language norm in vocational content and language integrated learning. *The Language Learning Journal*, 43(3), 271-285. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09571736.2015.1053279>
- Lo, Y. Y. (2014). How much L1 is too much? Teachers' language use in response to students' abilities and classroom interaction in Content and Language Integrated Learning. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 18(3), 270-288. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050.2014.988112>
- Merino, J. A., & Lasagabaster, D. (2018). CLIL as a way to multilingualism. *International journal of bilingual education and bilingualism*, 21(1), 79-92. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050.2015.1128386>
- Nikula, T., & Moore, P. (2019). Exploring translanguaging in CLIL. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 22(2), 237-249. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050.2016.1254151>
- Pan, Y. C., & Pan, Y. C. (2010). The use of L1 in the foreign language classroom. *Colombian Applied Linguistics Journal*, 12(2), 87-96. http://www.scielo.org.co/scielo.php?pid=S0123-46412010000200007&script=sci_arttext
- Portolés, L. (2020). El multilingüisme a l'escola: tendències educatives i nous reptes. *Caplletra. Revista Internacional de Filologia*, (68), 125-147. <https://doi.org/10.7203/Caplletra.68.16474>
- Portolés, L. & Gayete, G. (2024). Enhancing multilingual young students' pragmatic awareness through pedagogical translanguaging. *International Journal of Multilingualism*, 1-18. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14790718.2024.2368060>
- Safont, P. (2022). 'In English!' teachers' requests as reactions to learners' translanguaging discourse. *Language, Culture and Curriculum*, 35(3), 317-333. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07908318.2021.1979578>
- Sahan, K., & Rose, H. (2021). Translanguaging or code-switching?: Re-examining the functions of language in EMI classrooms. In B. Di Sabato & B. Hughes (Eds.), *Multilingual perspectives from Europe and beyond on language policy and practice* (pp. 45-62). Routledge.

- Sahib, R. (2019). Translanguaging as a pedagogical strategy in EFL classroom. *ELT-Lectura*, 6(2), 139-146. <https://doi.org/10.31849/elt-lectura.v6i2.3032>
- Sampson, A. (2012). Learner code-switching versus English only. *ELT journal*, 66(3), 293-303. <https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccr067>
- Savić, V. (2013). Developing intercultural literacy in the young learner classroom. *Integrating culture and language teaching in TEYL*, 16, 35-51. https://pefja.kg.ac.rs/wp-content/uploads/2018/02/ZBORNIK_TEYL_Conferenca_Proceedings.pdf#page=35
- Savić, V. (2014). Total Physical Response (TPR) activities in teaching English to young learners. *Физичка Култура и Модерно Друштво, Пос. Изд, Књ, 17*, 447-454.
- Savić, V. (2019). Young learners' motivation for reading in English and their reading achievement. *Редакцијски одбор*, 193(9), 193-208. <https://doi.org/10.18485/fid.2019.9.ch10>
- Savić, V. (2021). Integrating mathematics content into primary English curriculum through Content-Based Instruction. In N. Vulović & A. Mihajlović (Eds.), *Methodology Aspects of Teaching Mathematics IV* (MATM2017 Proceedings) (pp. 191-211). Faculty of Education in Jagodina. <https://doi.org/10.46793/MANM4.191S>
- Savić, V. (2022). Graphic novels as a teaching tool for raising intercultural sensitivity in primary English classroom. In J. Spasić (Ed.), *Children's literature in science and teaching* (conference proceedings) (pp. 257-271). Faculty of Education in Jagodna. <https://doi.org/10.46793/KDNN21.257S>
- Sobkowiak, P. (2022). Translanguaging practices in the EFL classroom-the Polish context. *Linguistics and Education*, 69, 101020. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.linged.2022.101020>.
- Williams, C. (1994). *Arfarniad o Ddulliau Dysgu ac Addysgu yng Nghyddestun Addysg Uwchradd Ddwyeit-hog* (Publication No. 10310435) [Doctoral dissertation, Bangor University]. ProQuest Dissertations and Theses.
- Yuan, (2024). *Functions of Translanguaging Practices and Teachers' and Students' Perceptions of Translanguaging in ESL Universities*. (Publication No 46) [Doctoral Dissertation, University of Kentucky]. Theses and Dissertations-Curriculum and Instruction.
- Yuvayapan, F. (2019). Translanguaging in EFL classrooms: Teachers' perceptions and practices. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies*, 15(2), 678-694. <https://doi.org/10.17263/jlls.586811>