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Implementing translanguaging strategies in the English writing classroom in higher education
A systematic review

Xin Tang, Audrey Rousse-Malpat & Joana Duarte
University of Groningen

Over the past two decades, translanguaging has become a powerful concept in applied linguistics, enabling teachers and students to respond to linguistic and cultural diversity in the classroom. However, how teachers and students prepare for translanguaging pedagogy and practice in writing has so far received less attention (Huang & Chalmers, 2023). Therefore, this systematic review focuses on the application of translanguaging strategies in the English as a Foreign/Second Language (EFL/ESL) writing classroom. Following the PRISMA guidelines for systematic reviews, this study searched five databases to obtain articles spanning from 2013 to 2023. We reviewed 23 articles focusing on translanguaging, writing and higher education. Our results show that (1) most studies were conducted in North America and Northern Asia, with qualitative studies being predominant; (2) most researchers implemented translanguaging interventions in the EFL/ESL classroom to study the impact of translanguaging on students’ English writing skills; (3) students applied translanguaging strategies during the writing process to communicate with others on content and vocabulary; (4) translanguaging strategies provided teachers with diverse perspectives and enhanced students’ various skills; (5) the use of digital resources and different types of activities contributed to the application of translanguaging in the writing classroom, but students’ limited language skills in their L2 but also in their L1, and their uncertainty about their linguistic identity limited implementation of translanguaging in the English writing classroom. This systematic review points towards the need for educators to consider the various factors, functions and applications of the use of translanguaging strategies in English writing classrooms.
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1. Introduction

In recent decades, trans languaging, defined both as the fluid use of speakers’ full language repertoire to learn and make meaning as well as a pedagogical approach to teaching in which educators support this ability, has garnered the interest of numerous scholars (Cummins, 2019; Canagarajah, 2011; Creese & Blackledge, 2010; García & Wei, 2014). Translanguaging, both as a bilingual or multilingual language use theory and as a pedagogy, may be key to enhancing comprehension and participation of students (Cenoz & Gorter, 2020). Currently, studies on translanguaging are being carried out in many different educational settings, such as English for Academic Purposes (EAP) classrooms (Hiller, 2021) English for Specific Purposes (ESP) classrooms (Chen, Tsai, & Tsou, 2019) and regular college classrooms (Sun & Zhang, 2022). There is, however, a gap in the synthesis of research exploring how translanguaging supports bilingualism or multilingualism development. For example, Prilutskaya’s (2021) conducted a systematic review of the pedagogical use of translanguaging in English language teaching (ELT) classrooms in different contexts, noting that very few experimental studies have been conducted to assess the effects of translanguaging and calling for more such studies to elucidate the pedagogical effectiveness of this approach. Based on Prilutskaya’s (2021) study, Huang and Chalmers’ (2023) study reviewed the literature at all educational levels (from primary to tertiary) and various intervention foci (e.g., writing, reading, speaking, listening, etc.) and found that applying translanguaging may be helpful in some contexts, but the average methodological quality of the interventions was found to be low, making it difficult to draw reliable causal inferences. The authors do mention that there are some potential benefits of translanguaging in acquiring English grammar and English writing, two pedagogical goals that can be used as a starting point for teachers to implement pedagogical translanguaging. Thus, based on these gaps in the literature, our study reviews the empirical literature on the implementation of translanguaging strategies in English writing classrooms by students and teachers. As more research on translanguaging has focused on primary and secondary education (Mukhopadhyay, 2020; Tai & Wei, 2021; Pun & Tai, 2021), we focus on higher education.
2. Background

2.1 The concept of translanguaging in applied linguistics

“Translanguaging”, originating from the Welsh word “trawsieithu”, was coined by Cen Williams in 1980 to delineate the systematic alternation between two languages within a classroom session. Baker (2001) subsequently rendered the concept as “translanguaging,” denoting the intentional movement across languages used for both receiving and producing linguistic information within an educational environment. In this sense, receptive language skills (i.e., input) would be expressed in one language, while productive skills (i.e., output) are done in the other (Baker, 2011). One example is that learners listen to a Chinese recording and then make a summary in English. The primary motive underlying this translanguaging framework is to augment comprehension of educational material by employing two or more languages. In other words, translanguaging is a cognitive process of elevated complexity, whereby learners are required to assimilate and adjust to incoming information. The use of translanguaging in educational settings not only facilitates a more profound comprehension of the subject matter, but also fosters the interplay between the less proficient and more proficient languages within a second or foreign language instructional environment (Turnbull, 2019).

In recent years, the term “translanguaging” has been further developed by various researchers (Canagarajah, 2011; Creese & Blackledge, 2010; García & Wei, 2014; Cenoz & Gorter, 2021) to include the intricate linguistic and educational practices of bi- or multilingual people and groups. With technological advances and the Internet, globalization in the 21st century has grown to the extreme, and multilingualism has begun to be increasingly seen as an important competence. In addition, applied linguistics began to challenge the ideas of analyzing the behaviors and practices of bi- and multilinguals through the framework of named languages (Kley & García, 2019). García and colleagues (García & Otheguy, 2014; Otheguy et al., 2015) argue that bilinguals, multilinguals, and monolinguals are the same as the structural knowledge associated with the sociopolitical manifestation of two discrete languages actually reflects a single, internally undifferentiated system. Beyond that, they understand code-switching as multilinguals having fully discrete, non-overlapping linguistic systems. However, MacSwan (2017) argues that bilinguals or multilinguals have a single system with many shared grammatical resources but also some internal language-specific differences. Similarly, Auer (2022) demonstrates that the two or more languages of bi-/multilinguals are clearly separated by the speakers themselves who use switch between languages for interactional purposes. By studying Bilingual First Language Acquisition (BFLA),
Genesee (2022) also found that not only do children possess complex knowledge of how to blend their two languages, but they also possess language-specific syntactic knowledge at an early developmental stage. This also means that the concept of a unified base language cannot easily be used to explain how bilinguals or multilinguals use their languages. Therefore, we categorize in this study the way these different terms are operationalized in the included literature into two main forms: strong and weak (García & Lin, 2017). A weak translanguaging stance represents classrooms in which the use of each language is separated according to the specific function each language has in the learning environment. Strong translanguaging stances represent classrooms in which any and all designated languages are allowed and systematically used to help learners develop the weaker or target language. Strong translanguaging does not mean “random switching” between languages (Garcia, 2009), but rather systematically allows learners to use their full language repertoire in the learning process.

Furthermore, translanguaging has recently also been conceptualized as an educational approach. The term ‘pedagogical translanguaging’ (Cenoz & Gorter, 2021) has been put forward to refer to a pedagogical theory and practice that relates to teachers’ design and integration of teaching strategies in two or more languages or varieties (Cenoz & Gorter, 2017). Therefore, translanguaging refers to “an umbrella term that embraces a wide variety of theoretical and practical proposals” (Cenoz & Gorter, 2020, p.2). In this study, we will review teachers’ pedagogical translanguaging designs and students’ application of translanguaging in EFL/ESL writing in higher education.

2.2 Translanguaging and writing

Writing is considered the most demanding skill by language learners and native speakers (Graham et al., 2005). Yüce (2020) further underscored the motivating challenges faced by non-native speakers in the context of writing compared to speaking, which highlighted the need for significant attention to writing. Writing in a second or foreign language is a difficult skill for language learners due to the need to integrate many abilities, such as topic knowledge, vocabulary, structure, and experience gained during the learning process (Psyarchyk & Yamshynska, 2015). However, Velasco and García’s study (2014) showed that translanguaging transfer existed even if languages did not share the same writing system. Students used their multilingual repertoire and multimodalities – spoken, written, visual, musical and dramatic – made a conscious effort to acquire vocabulary, and self-regulated their choice of language for internal and external speech (Velasco & García, 2014). For example, Chen et al. (2019) noted that students used translanguaging strategies and online resources to express more ideas in their writing.
and learn more academic words. In addition to this, the application of translanguage in writing helped students consider audience positioning, establish bi- or multilingual identities, and implement sociolinguistic and meta-linguistic viewpoints (Lee & García, 2021). By allowing students to express themselves in their native language, they could also improve their thinking, which was as important as improving target language skills (Fu, 2003). These findings suggest that bilinguals or multilinguals apply translanguage strategies during their writing in a second and foreign language to improve their writing skills.

Also in higher education, writing is not an easy skill for students. Many will systematically learn to write various genres and types of English for the first time, and the difficulty and length of their writing will gradually increase. In this process, how they use translanguage in ESL/EFL writing is worth studying and discussing. Therefore, we searched the literature on writing in higher education and translanguage strategies. We conducted a systematic review of studies published between 2013 and 2023 following the guidelines of Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis (PRISMA) (Page et al., 2021) and addressed the following research questions:

1. How are translanguage strategies implemented in ESL/EFL writing classes? (educational settings, geography, research objectives, and methodology)
2. What are the translanguage strategies that have been implemented in ESL/EFL writing teaching and learning? (researchers designing translanguage writing classes, teachers translanguage pedagogies and students translanguage strategies)
3. How have the translanguage strategies impacted ESL/EFL writing teaching and learning?
4. What are the factors enabling and constraining the classroom application of translanguage?

3. Methodology

This systematic review is reported in line with PRISMA reporting guidelines (Page et al. 2021).

3.1 Inclusion and exclusion criteria

We included studies focused on:

- Publication date – The review examined past ten years studies from 2013 to 2023, conducted by the first author on January 25, 2023.
– Study type – Qualitative studies, quantitative studies and mixed-method studies.
– Context – Focused on school context in higher education, teacher and students use translanguage strategies in writing classes. English was the subject of teaching in writing classes. Studies were included if the lessons were described as ESL/EFL, English for Academic Purpose (EAP), and content-and-language-integrated learning (CLIL).
– Participants – Students in undergraduate, postgraduate and doctoral level.
– Outcomes – Referred to outcomes of translanguage strategies on student writing and teacher teaching.

We excluded studies focused on:
– Research type – Dissertations, conference papers, literature reviews, etc.
– Outcomes – Studies were excluded if they had no empirical results.

3.2 Search strategy

We searched the following databases: Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC), Web of Science, SAGE, ScienceDirect, and JSTOR.

The following search terms were used to search the databases for literature published between 2013 and 2023: In the search string representation, we used the terms (translang* AND writ* OR compos*) to search for relevant literature.

3.3 Selection process

In the screening process, we first found 991 articles and then excluded 52 duplicate articles and gray literature. Later, after reading the titles, keywords, and abstracts, articles not related to translanguage writing were filtered out, and a total of 168 articles met these criteria. Furthermore, by reading the abstracts and content, we selected articles related to translanguage and writing, where the selection criteria included research conducted in school settings or educational institutions, teachers teaching English writing or students learning how to write in English, and empirical articles with results and impact. In addition, we narrowed the scope of the articles to higher education, including undergraduate students, graduate students, and teachers in this context. After this phase, 44 articles remained eligible. To further review the eligibility of these articles, we removed the articles that ultimately did not meet the criteria \( n = 21 \) from the dataset by reading the retrievable full-text articles. Data were extracted from the final remaining 23 articles and recorded in the data extraction form according to Denscombe’s (2021) guidelines. In this process, in order to check the reliability of the screening process, 5% \( n = 47 \) of the titles and abstracts were randomly selected, as well as 30%
(n=13) of the full text were selected and screened by two independent reviewers. Consistency of title and abstract screening was 85%. Results were compared and disagreements were resolved through discussion. Consistency for the full-text sample was 100%. Reports that met all inclusion criteria were retained for data extraction and synthesis. Figure 1 summarizes the screening and selection process.

**Figure 1.** Preferred reporting items for systematic reviews and meta-analyses (PRISMA) chart of selection process

### 3.4 Data extraction and data items

We recorded three categories of data: (1) general information: title, authors, year of publication, and location/geography. (2) descriptive data: type of writing skills, type of study, research design, research objectives/aims, and participants. (3) analytical data: pedagogical strategies that students and teachers used, results, conclusion and limitations.
3.5 Quality assessment

We independently assessed the quality of the selected articles using the Mixed Methods Assessment Tool (MMAT) (Hong et al., 2018). Included studies were scored on a scale ranging from 1 to 5 by summing up the total number of “Yes” items and categorized as high (5), moderate (3–4), and low (0–2) methodological quality based on the score (Shrestha & Fick, 2020). If there was disagreement in the assessment, a third researcher was contacted to resolve the conflict.

3.6 Synthesis

Based on our understanding of the literature prior to the start of the review and the nature of the review questions, we anticipated that eligible studies would be heterogeneous in terms of the characteristics of the interventions and the types of outcomes measured. Therefore, we chose to use a narrative synthesis approach (Popay et al., 2006). To address RQ1, we summarized the literature looking for mentions of educational settings, geography, research objectives, and methodology in the eligible literature. To address RQ2, we found researchers designing based on research design translanguage writing classes, teachers translanguage pedagogies and students translanguage strategies. To address RQ3 and RQ4, we analyzed the research’s result and conclusion sections of the studies.

4. Results

4.1 Overview of the included studies and quality assessment

After the process of identification and screening, a total of 23 studies were assessed as having met all eligibility criteria and were included in the synthesis. Table 1 summarizes the characteristics of all included studies. The final column of Table 1 reports the result of quality assessment and more detailed information about scoring can be found in Appendix. 20 studies were rated high and 3 moderate quality. We coded the studies according to their methodologies (see Table 1), i.e., qualitative, quantitative, and mixed method studies. We found that 12 studies (52%) employed qualitative methods, 4 studies (17%) employed quantitative methods, and 7 studies (30%) employed mixed methods. Among the qualitative methods, ethnographic studies, case studies, and longitudinal studies were utilized in the majority of these studies. We included ethnographic studies as they generally involves ‘immersion’ in the field for long periods of time (Gray, 2021) and can explore translanguage influences on English language writing (Priluskaya,
Quantitative studies primarily employed questionnaires, experimental and control groups for comparison, pre- and post-test designs and investigation reports lasting several years. More specifically, almost all studies employed a combination of the following data collection methods: semi-structured or in-depth interviews, observations, video recordings, teachers’ or students’ reflections, writing samples, writing performance analysis, questionnaires, field notes, and focus group interviews. As for mixed-methods research, it is a combination of quantitative and qualitative analyses.

Our conclusion is that the included studies are mostly of fairly to quite high quality. Of the 23 studies, qualitative research predominated.

Table 1. Summary of the characteristics of included studies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author(s), Location, year</th>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Form of trans-languaging</th>
<th>Educational settings</th>
<th>Type of study</th>
<th>Results</th>
<th>Quality assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adamson &amp; Coulson (2015) Japan</td>
<td>180 undergraduate students</td>
<td>Weak</td>
<td>CLIL English language preparation courses</td>
<td>Mixed (questionnaire, portfolio)</td>
<td>Favored translanguaging</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Akbar &amp; Taqi (2020) Kuwait</td>
<td>34 undergraduate students</td>
<td>Weak</td>
<td>Psycholinguistic courses</td>
<td>Mixed (written tasks, video conference sessions, questionnaires)</td>
<td>Favored translanguaging but no help in improving language proficiency</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atta &amp; Naqvi (2022) Pakistan</td>
<td>200 undergraduate students</td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>ESL classrooms</td>
<td>Qualitative (classroom observations, video recording, interviews)</td>
<td>Favored translanguaging</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown &amp; Lally (2019) America</td>
<td>67 undergraduate students</td>
<td>Weak</td>
<td>College English composition courses</td>
<td>Mixed (writing assignments, evaluation rating formats, reflective journal)</td>
<td>Favored translanguaging but no qualitative difference in the quality of student performance</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chen, Tsai &amp; Tsou (2019) Taiwan, China</td>
<td>21 undergraduate students</td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>English for Specific Purposes (ESP) writing courses</td>
<td>Quantitative (writing tasks)</td>
<td>Favored translanguaging</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dong (2022) America</td>
<td>1 PhD student</td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>Reflecting on one’s own writing process</td>
<td>Qualitative (reflective journal entries, interview recordings, reflective conversation audio recordings)</td>
<td>Favored translanguaging</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author(s), year</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Participants</td>
<td>Form of translanguaging</td>
<td>Educational settings</td>
<td>Type of study</td>
<td>Results</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hiller (2021)</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>Not Specific number undergraduate students</td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>Academic writing courses (EAP)</td>
<td>Qualitative (observations, writing assignments, team projects)</td>
<td>Favored translanguaging</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kafle (2020)</td>
<td>America</td>
<td>37 undergraduate students</td>
<td>Weak</td>
<td>Academic writing courses (EAP)</td>
<td>Qualitative (reflective journals, interviews)</td>
<td>Disfavored translanguaging</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karabulut &amp; Dollar (2022)</td>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>63 undergraduate students</td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>College English composition courses</td>
<td>Mixed (writing tasks, questionnaire)</td>
<td>Favored translanguaging</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaufhold (2018)</td>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>2 postgraduate students</td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>Academic writing courses (EAP)</td>
<td>Qualitative (interviews, writing tasks)</td>
<td>Favored translanguaging</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kim &amp; Chang (2022)</td>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>24 undergraduate students</td>
<td>Weak</td>
<td>Academic writing courses (EAP)</td>
<td>Mixed (writing tasks, interviews, peer-reviewed feedback)</td>
<td>Favored translanguaging</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Llanes &amp; Cots (2022)</td>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>54 undergraduate students</td>
<td>Weak</td>
<td>English for Specific Purposes (ESP) writing courses</td>
<td>Quantitative (writing samples, questionnaires)</td>
<td>Favored translanguaging</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McCarty (2018)</td>
<td>America</td>
<td>6 undergraduate students</td>
<td>Weak</td>
<td>Reflecting on one’s own writing process</td>
<td>Qualitative (interviews, writing samples)</td>
<td>Favored translanguaging</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motlakha &amp; Makalela (2016)</td>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>8 undergraduate students</td>
<td>Weak</td>
<td>Academic writing courses (EAP)</td>
<td>Qualitative (interviews, writing tasks)</td>
<td>Favored translanguaging</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parmegiani (2022)</td>
<td>America</td>
<td>12 undergraduate students</td>
<td>Weak</td>
<td>ESL classrooms</td>
<td>Qualitative (interviews)</td>
<td>Favored translanguaging</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rafi &amp; Morgan (2022)</td>
<td>Bangladesh</td>
<td>30 undergraduate students</td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>Academic writing courses (EAP)</td>
<td>Qualitative (observation, writing samples, interviews, discussions)</td>
<td>Favored translanguaging</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sun &amp; Zhang (2022)</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>79 undergraduate students</td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>College English composition courses</td>
<td>Mixed (interview, scores)</td>
<td>Favored translanguaging</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tsai (2022)</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>64 undergraduate students</td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>College English composition courses</td>
<td>Quantitative (questionnaire, writing samples)</td>
<td>Favored translanguaging</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turnbull (2019)</td>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>30 undergraduate students</td>
<td>Weak and strong</td>
<td>Compulsory courses on English research-based writing</td>
<td>Mixed (scores, group discussion)</td>
<td>Favored strong translanguaging</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 1. (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author(s), year, Location</th>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Form of trans-languaging</th>
<th>Educational settings</th>
<th>Type of study</th>
<th>Results</th>
<th>Quality assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Van der Walt &amp; Pf eiffer (2019) South Africa</td>
<td>Not specified Postgraduate students</td>
<td>Weak</td>
<td>Writing classes in Postgraduate Certificate in Education</td>
<td>Quantitative (questionnaires)</td>
<td>Favored translanguaging</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wang &amp; Li (2022) China</td>
<td>12 undergraduate students and 1 tutor</td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>Writing tutorials</td>
<td>Qualitative (writing samples, recordings)</td>
<td>Favored translanguaging</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zhang &amp; Hadjoannou (2022) America</td>
<td>4 undergraduate students</td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>Academic writing courses (EAP)</td>
<td>Qualitative (interviews, writing samples)</td>
<td>Disfavored translanguaging</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zheng (2017) America</td>
<td>2 international teaching assistants</td>
<td>Weak</td>
<td>College English composition courses</td>
<td>Qualitative (interviews, observations, video recording, survey, course-related documents)</td>
<td>Favored translanguaging</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.2 Implementation of translanguaging strategies-educational settings, geography, research objectives, and methodology

The first research question referred to how translanguaging strategies were implemented in ESL/EFL writing classes. Regarding educational level, all selected studies focused on higher education, with 19 articles concerning the undergraduate level, 2 on the postgraduate level, 1 on the doctoral level and 1 on the international teaching assistants. When examining the educational settings, we also looked into the types of programs/courses. The findings can be found in the Table 1, it can be found that studies concentrated on academic writing courses (n=7) and college composition courses (n=5) are the most frequent.

Then, we categorized the literature according to geographical settings (Figure 2). There were a few countries that were representative of overarching regions. For example, the main location for research in North America (n=7) was the United States (n=7); in addition, Japan (n=3) and China (n=5) were the major locations for research in the South Asian (n=8) context.

Subsequently, we categorized the literature for research purposes and analyzed several objectives or themes related to translanguaging and writing skills (see Table 2).

In sum, with regard to educational settings, most studies on translanguaging are found in college English composition courses and EAP courses, located mostly in North America and North Asia. As for research objectives, most of the
studies explored the relationship/application of translanguaging and L2 writing and learning, and the perceptions of translanguaging among teachers and students in L2 writing classes.

Figure 2. Distribution of articles by research location

Table 2. Frequency of objectives reported in the literature

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Themes of the studies</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Author(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Emphasis on the relationship/application of translanguaging and L2 writing and learning (how students use translanguaging strategies in L2 writing)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Atta &amp; Naqvi; Karabulut &amp; Dollar; Van der Walt &amp; Pfeiffer; Dong; Turnbull; Brown &amp; Lally; Zhang &amp; Hadjioannou</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceptions of translanguaging among teachers or students in L2 writing classes</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Hiller; Motlhaka &amp; Makalela; Kaufhold; McCarty; Parmegiani; Kafle; Adamson &amp; Coulson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exploring the impact of translanguaging on students’ L2 writing performance and language learning</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Akbar &amp; Taqi; Turnbull; Llanes &amp; Cots; Brown &amp; Lally</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Examining the extent to which the application of translanguaging in online peer feedback helps improve L2 writing performance</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Sun &amp; Zhang</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exploring the impact of translanguaging on students’ L2 writing in teacher oral corrective feedback (OCF)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Wang &amp; Li</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2. (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Themes of the studies</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Author(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How teachers use their translinguaging identity as an instructional resource in writing classes and how they use their translinguaging identity to implement translinguaging pedagogy in their composition classrooms</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Zheng</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exploring the role of translinguaging pedagogy in navigating students’ tensions and struggles in L2 writing classes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Rafi &amp; Morgan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exploring the effectiveness of using Google Translation as a translinguaging Computer Assisted Language Learning (CALL) tool in L2 writing</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Tsai; Chen, Tsai &amp; Tsou</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exploring students’ application of translinguaging in written peer feedback</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Kim &amp; Chang</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.3 Translinguaging strategies for ESL/EFL writing teaching and learning

We summarized the translinguaging strategies that were implemented by researchers, teachers and students. Among these studies were quantitative studies examining the effectiveness of translinguaging: the application of translinguaging in writing improved performance in English writing with larger effect sizes, compared with English-only teaching (Turnbull, 2019; Sun & Zhang, 2022). Similarly, the application of translinguaging pedagogies showed large effect sizes in task achievement, grammatical range and accuracy, cohesion and coherence (Karabulut & Dollar, 2022).

4.3.1 Researchers designing translinguaging interventions

Some researchers designed experimental studies with control groups, pre- and post-tests, and direct interventions in writing classes. There are nine articles in total in this section. Five studies applied translinguaging in experimental and control groups (Atta & Naqvi, 2022; Karabulut & Dollar, 2022; Turnbull, 2019; Llanes & Cots, 2022; Brown & Lally, 2019): three studies compared using a translinguaging-based pedagogy group and an English-medium-instruction (EMI) group (Atta & Naqvi, 2022; Llanes & Cots, 2022; Brown & Lally, 2019), one of which divided students into low-intermediate and high-intermediate groups based on their different levels, and then had translinguaging experimental and EMI control groups within these two groups (Brown & Lally, 2019). The researchers in this study assigned several English paragraph writing for low-intermediate groups and genre writing tasks for high-intermediate groups, and
the whole program lasted for 15 weeks. At the end, it was found that there was no significant difference in the students’ performance, and that there may be differences in writing speed and willingness to use the L1. In another study (Turnbull, 2019), researchers categorized the students into an academic writing group and a creative writing group, and then within these two groups they divided them into three groups: the EMI group, the weak translanguaging group (separating two languages) and the strong translanguaging group (two languages viewed as one language reservoir). The students were given 20 minutes for group discussion and 40 minutes for individual English writing. It was found that the strong translanguaging group scored the highest marks, writing more concise essays with fewer lexical errors. The last study was conducted to design courses through the translanguaging instructional design cycle designed by García et al. (2017). The cycle contained five steps: explore (explorar), evaluate (evaluar), present (presentar), imagine (imaginar) and implement (implementar). During the exploring phase, students were encouraged to investigate a novel subject. The evaluating phase was carried out by using their language skills to think critically about the topic to assess what they had learned during the exploration phase. The third phase was the imagining phase, which involved brainstorming, planning, drafting, and using all of their language repertoire for further research. In the presenting phase, students presented their work, during which peer revision and revising could occur. The last phase was the implementing phase, which guided students in applying what they had learned to meaningful activities (García et al., 2017). Based on this cycle, Karabulut and Dollar (2022) designed a control group (a traditional instructional writing class which included a design involving stages of explicit teaching- familiarization, controlled practice, guided writing, and free writing-in EMI classes) and two experimental groups (translanguaging pedagogy group and EMI group, both having the same content of translanguaging instructional design cycle, but different in languages. Students in the translanguaging pedagogy group finished writing tasks by using different languages). The entire research process lasted 10 weeks, and had students complete 4 English writing tasks in 50 minutes in class: narrative paragraph, opinion essay, advantage and/or disadvantage essay, cause and/or effect essay. The final results found that the translanguaging group had more positive results in task achievement, lexical and grammatical range and accuracy, and cohesion and coherence.

One study employed a pre- and post-test. In Akbar and Taqi’s study (2020), the comparison was done mainly through a single-group pre- and post-test. The pre-test phase consisted of students reading three articles on the topic of ‘translanguaging’, discussing them in groups in English, and then completing three writing questions in English of varying difficulty, which were also related to the topic of ‘translanguaging’. After one week, the students repeated this step but were allowed
to apply translanguaging (using L1 and L2) in the oral and writing sections. The entire research process lasted 10 weeks, and had students complete 4 English writing tasks in class: narrative paragraph, opinion essay, advantage and/or disadvantage essay, cause and/or effect essay according to these steps.

Three studies were direct interventions in the classroom without experimental or control groups. In Hiller’s study (2021), translanguaging was incorporated into the EAP curriculum in an academic English course through three components: a deliberate exploration of translanguaging, a concise written task focused on an extended definition of a Chinese concept, and a collaborative research project aimed at testing a generalization about Chinese culture. All students were encouraged to use all their linguistic resources (using different languages) to communicate and write and the whole process lasted for at least 2 years. According to the comments provided by students, these assignments had a tendency to the improvement of students’ cultural knowledge, writing and communication abilities, and the development of their identities as translingual and transnational learners. In Rafi and Morgan’s study (2022), researchers designed an hour-long translanguaging instructional intervention on English paragraph writing. The steps of the intervention encompassed the introduction of translanguaging, instruction on composing topic sentences and supporting details, and guidance on transitional words through translanguaging strategies, and a requirement for students to write a related writing task in English. The results showed that the intervention strategy might enhance students’ meta-linguistic, metacognitive, and sociolinguistic awareness, and develop their multiple competencies to promote engagement in the writing task. In Motlhaka and Makalela’s study (2016), a combination of dialogic pedagogy and translanguaging strategy intervention was applied. Students wrote two English descriptive essays on two different topics, using their L1 and English as they needed. It was found that L2 writers were able to engage in constructive interactions with both their peers and tutors. It also contributed to the development of their identities and communicative resources, which were deemed relevant to their social functioning and provided them with increased agency (Martin-Beltrán & Chen, 2013; Canagarajah, 2016).

4.3.2 Teachers applying translanguaging strategies in teaching

After our categorization of the literature, there were a total of 3 pieces of literature that included how teachers applied translanguaging strategies in English writing classrooms.

4.3.2.1 Sharing translanguaging strategies applied in writing courses

In Zheng’s study (2017), two international teaching assistants each shared their different approaches to teach writing; one focusing on monolingual instruction
and the other on translinguaging instruction. While teaching writing through translinguaging, the teacher selected ‘Language, Identity and Representation’ as her classroom topic and encompassed a substantial amount of material about language, culture, race and gender, so that no one felt excluded. In addition, she advocated translinguaging, provided chances for students to develop consciousness about their language choices, and assigned assignments that allowed students to reflect on their language choices. Also, she shared her own translinguaging strategies with her multilingual students. For example, when students have difficulties in locating appropriate English vocabulary for their English essays, she proposed the use of Chinese phonetic alphabets (Chinese Pinyin) in their drafts. After students finished their writing, they could think and find the appropriate wording in English. These methods allow students to better understand and learn to write in English.

4.3.2.2 Combining online tools with translinguaging strategies
There are two studies which both resort to Google Translate to assist with English writing. Tsai’s study (2022) involved showing English majors and non-English majors a five-minute video and then asking them to write reflective essays. Chen et al.’s study (2018) was to have English majors write an essay related to international trade. Both studies then asked students to write a draft in Chinese first and later in English, and then to improve English draft with the help of Google Translate. This process of revising drafts was a way for students to use translinguaging strategies, and the use of digital technology might help students write faster, easier, and more accurate.

4.3.3 Students applying translinguaging strategies in their writing
There are three main purposes for which students applied translinguaging strategies.

4.3.3.1 Applying translinguaging strategies in the writing process
The literature that explored how students applied translinguaging strategies in their natural writing process mentioned that students applied translinguaging strategies to generate ideas, plan, structure, brainstorm, interact with other students, outline their drafts and check their writing (Atta & Naqvi, 2022; McCarty, 2018; Karabulut & Dollar, 2022; Mothaka & Makalela, 2016; Chen et al., 2019; Van der Walt & Pfeiffer, 2019). For example, Dong (2022) conducted a personal narrative investigation of her own use of various translinguaging strategies in her dissertation research and writing process through a critical narrative approach. She mentioned that in her study, she traversed the English and Chinese language boundaries through the essay writing process, utilized strategic approaches in bridging potential gaps and actively engaged in activities that facilitated the con-
struction of meaning. Chinese played a key role in facilitating her writing organization. In other words, while she wrote and spoke in English, Chinese was always in her mind, overseeing the structural arrangement of essay writings (Dong, 2022). This showed that her L1 silently supported her English writing as she wrote, and translinguaging allowed her to use all the language resources better in her English writing.

However, in Kafe’s (2020) as well as Zhang and Hadjoannou’s (2021) studies, the students also naturally utilized translinguaging strategies in the process of writing. For example, by accessing and utilizing Chinese resources, using Chinese to support thinking and drafting, and integrating literacy knowledge in the linguistic repertoire. However, they felt that mixing languages in their writing made them feel that they would go off-topic and receive low grades, and made them ambivalent about the overall purpose of academic communication and about their bilingual identities, preventing them from becoming writers.

4.3.3.2 Applying translinguaging strategies in the writing content and vocabulary

In Chen et al.’s study (2019), students wrote first in Chinese, then in English, and later revised their work with Google Translate. Students improved their writing by using previous knowledge of L1 to present more information in the editing session. They enhanced literacy proficiencies through modifying sentence structures and acquiring a more specialized style by learning more academic and business vocabulary (Chen et al., 2019). In addition, in Kim & Chang’s study (2022), Students wrote a 400–450 word five-paragraph opinion essays in English, followed by group written feedback and oral feedback in their L1 and L2. They mentioned that they used translinguaging to reference concepts or expressions learned in L2. For example, when they found that for some words it was difficult to find the same expression in L1, they would explain them by using L2. Therefore, using translinguaging strategies could possibly help students enrich their writing and vocabulary.

4.3.3.3 Applying translinguaging strategies in their interactions with others

In Brown and Lally’s study (2019), the extent to which translinguaging in online peer feedback contributed to improving students’ English writing performance was examined. Through three rounds of online peer feedback in both the EMI control group and the translinguaging experimental group, the study found that most students switched between their native languages and English to complete the assignment, used multiple languages when reviewing homework answers in small groups and used L2 when communicating with others (Brown & Lally, 2019). Moreover, in Sun and Zhang’s study (2022), in the peer assessment of writing, some students mentioned that using translinguaging could provide constructive
feedback easily and help express themselves. Students shared more detailed explanations in Kim and Chang’s study (2022): they would use L1 while giving weaker peers feedback or when reviewers had limited ability in L2; they would also use L1 because of the concern of making errors when reading stronger peers’ writings. Similarly, they would consider L2 instructors with a restricted understanding of learners’ L1 and then use L2 for communicating with teachers (Kim & Chang, 2022).

A summary of these results can be found in Table 3.

Table 3. Translanguaging strategies in ESL/EFL writing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Researchers designing translanguaging interventions</th>
<th>Teachers applying translanguaging strategies in teaching</th>
<th>Students applying translanguaging strategies in teaching</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>– Designing experimental and control groups and pre- and post-test</td>
<td>– Sharing translanguaging strategies that they applied in writing courses</td>
<td>– Applying translanguaging strategies in their writing processes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– Direct intervention in classroom without experimental and control groups</td>
<td>– Combining online tools with translanguaging strategies</td>
<td>– Applying translanguaging strategies in the writing content and vocabulary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– Applying translanguaging strategies in the interaction with others</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.4 Impact of translanguaging strategies in ESL/EFL writing teaching and learning

4.4.1 In teaching practices

4.4.1.1 Providing diverse perspectives

As for how translanguaging affects teachers’ writing instruction, we only found one instance in the literature by Zheng (2017) that mentioned how teachers were affected by the process of translanguaging. In the study, Zheng (2017) explored two International Teaching Assistants’ (ITA) disparate writing pedagogy. One of them found that her translanguaging and transcultural experience provided her the freedom to switch between languages and viewpoints that are distinct from the “typical American perspective”. Then, her students’ varied viewpoints and translanguaging abilities were appreciated and cultivated within the context of the course themes. In turn, this generated a beneficial cycle: the teacher realized that she was not “the only one offering a different perspective” because her students also offered her a different perspective (Zheng, 2017).
4.4.1.2 Creating a “safe” space for students
In Adamson and Coulson’s study (2015), many students mentioned that the use of L1 was beneficial as it created “safe” language practice, especially for the less proficient students. In Parmegiani’s study (2022), the translanguaging program allowed students to participate in academic literacy activities without being limited by language barriers, which might foster an emotionally secure environment and enhance self-esteem among the students as learners (Parmegiani, 2022). Due to this “safe” space creating by teachers, students might be more confident and motivated to complete assigned written tasks when given the opportunity to switch languages (Akbar & Taqi, 2020; Parmegiani, 2022; Tsai, 2022; Mothhaka & Makalela, 2016; Brown & Lally, 2019). This confidence and motivation might help students focus more on the task itself than the meta-discourse, and therefore also reflected the fact that applying translanguaging reduced students’ anxiety (Adamson & Coulson, 2015; Tsai, 2022).

4.4.2 In students’ learning

4.4.2.1 Improving students’ awareness of functional differences in languages/metalinguistic understanding
The functional differences in languages were mainly reflected in the fact that students were aware of and noticed that there were significant differences between L1 and L2 and that these were used differently (McCarty, 2018). In McCarty’s study (2018), some of the students mentioned that through translanguaging, they gained a better understanding of the formal features of Spanish and English and became aware of the way the language worked at the linguistic level, usually in learning grammar and usage or when trying to understand different “correct” ways of writing. In addition, in Mothhaka and Makalela’s (2016) study, they mentioned that the process of translanguaging also provided students with the opportunity to reflect on their own rhetorical conventions of paragraph organization in both L1 and L2 writing. By comparing the differences between the two languages, students developed an effective way of understanding how the two languages were constructed, by using one language to interpret the other or by using one language to think about their writing in the other language (McCarty, 2018). Using translanguaging might enhance students’ meta-linguistic awareness, particularly fostering the development of linguistic competence in both L1 and L2 systems (Yu & Lee, 2014; Canagarajah, 2015).

4.4.2.2 Improving students’ ability of expression/writing speed
Firstly, through translanguaging, some studies inferred that students became better at overall expression, which means they might be able to express themselves
more clearly in different contexts (McCarty, 2018; Akbar & Taqi, 2020). This also played an essential part in their capacity to acquire a language in which they had not yet attained complete mastery (Parmegiani, 2022). In Sun and Zhang’s peer assessment study (2022), students used translanguage strategies to increase the number of comments on material and provide more precise linguistic input. In addition, in Turnbull’s study (2019), students using translanguage resulted in improved organization of ideas and arguments (Kobayashi & Rinnert, 1992), as well as the production of shorter and more succinct writings, and even higher scores. This suggests that the use of translanguage as a strategy for essay planning has the potential to enhance learners’ ability to gather, structure, and articulate their thoughts and arguments with more efficacy and concision (Turnbull, 2019). In addition to students writing more concisely, using translanguage might lead to an increase in students’ writing speed. In Karabulut and Dollar’s study (2022), students mentioned that they wrote more fluently and faster, and in Brown and Lally’s study (2019), the results found that students in the translanguage group tended to finish certain activities at a quicker pace than their control group peers.

4.4.2.3 Improving students’ collaborative skills/ability to process information/problem solving skills

In Kaufhold’s study (2018), the results showed that students who used translanguage in groups felt that their collaborative ability with peers and teachers was enhanced. Students’ problem-solving skills were also evident in their group work, as they effectively used their collective language resources to create meaning and communicate desired outcomes (Turnbull, 2019). In addition, Rafi & Morgan (2022) designed three progressively deeper question-writing topics, and there was a clear difference between students’ question writing after English discussion and question writing after translanguage discussion. As students used their entire linguistic knowledge base through translanguage strategies to understand the concepts presented, it was highly likely that they processed information in its entirety (Baker, 2001; Kleyn & García, 2019). When students tried to write in L1 and L2, it was possible that they developed the ability to process information at a deeper level (Rafi & Morgan, 2022; Akbar & Taqi, 2020).

4.4.2.4 Improving students’ thinking ability in writing

In the study by Karabulut and Dollar (2022), the outcomes of a translanguage pedagogy on students’ writing was explored by setting up a control group and two experimental groups. The results showed that using translanguage might enable students to acquire and implement knowledge about organizing composition, improve thinking skills, and have better and more lasting knowledge (Karabulut & Dollar, 2022; Akbar & Taqi, 2020). In addition, in Dong’s study (2022), her
bilingual resources might serve as both a means of bolstering her academic writing and as a catalyst for engaging in more profound and innovative cognitive processes.

**4.4.2.5 Improving/not improving students’ language learning**

Many studies have clearly shown that the application of translanguaging helps to improve students’ vocabulary skills. In Rafi and Morgan’s study (2022), students learned vocabulary through translanguaging, with a focus on cognates, derivatives, and compound words, enabling them to activate linguistic resources in multilingual pools of which they were not always aware of. In addition, students might also enhance lexical and grammatical accuracy, syntactic structure, and cohesion and coherence in composition (Karabulut & Dollar, 2022; Parmegiani, 2022; Wang & Li, 2022). However, in Akbar and Taqi’s study (2020), students’ use of translanguaging might enhance comprehension and facilitated greater levels of information processing, but their language proficiency did not improve.

**4.4.2.6 Improving/not improving students’ writing scores**

In exploring the relationship between translanguaging and writing performance, the results of three intervention studies (Akbar & Taqi, 2020; Rafi & Morgan, 2022; Turnbull, 2019) showed that writing scores were higher when using translanguaging in writing as all languages remained active in the learners’ thinking during the writing process (Cook, 1992). However, some studies showed that using translanguaging did not improve students’ writing performance. For example, in Brown and Lally’s study (2019), a 15-week longitudinal study was conducted using low-intermediate and high-intermediate level comparison groups, which included both paragraph writing and essay writing. The final results showed that there were no statistically significant variations observed between the treatment and control groups across various metrics.

**4.4.2.7 Raising students’ awareness of their own culture**

Using translanguaging strategies helped students to be more conscious of respecting and expressing their own country’s culture when they wrote. For example, in Dong’s (2022) exploration of self-writing, she came to realize that her identity as a Chinese-English writer does not simply coexist; her identities were intertwined and nurtured her new bilingual identity as a writer. She noticed, under the lens of translanguaging, that her accent was influenced by her historical background, personal beliefs, linguistic abilities, and cultural encounters (Dong, 2022). Furthermore, Dong (2022) demonstrated the incorporation of Chinese and English theories, ideas, and cultural elements inside her written works. These particular translanguage-based writings tended to have promise in enhancing students’ acquisition of cultural knowledge, development of writing
proficiency, and fostering cross-cultural comprehension (Hiller, 2021). Moreover, it can be observed that these practices serve to facilitate the development of one’s sense of self by positioning students as authorities and affording them occasions to articulate their cultural identities and use their linguistic resources (Creese & Blackledge, 2015; Kayi-Aydar & Green-Endix, 2019).

In summary, it can be concluded that there are considerably more empirical results on the students’ perspectives than on the teachers’ perspectives on translanguaging in ESL/EFL writing classrooms (see Table 4). In addition, translanguaging is also seen as having limitations. For example, in one study there was no language enhancement in the translanguaging experimental group (Akbar, 2020); in another, students developed an identity crisis and became confused about their use of multiple languages (Kafle, 2020). However, these challenges could be addressed by implementing longer research observations and making students understand why they are using translanguaging and encouraging them to use it for specific learning functions.

Table 4. Outcomes of translanguaging strategies on writing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>For teachers:</th>
<th>For students:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Providing diverse perspectives</td>
<td>- Improving awareness of functional differences in languages/metalinguistic understanding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Creating a “safe” space for students to write</td>
<td>- Improving ability of expression/writing speed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Improving collaborative skills/ability to process information/problem solving skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Improving thinking ability in writing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Improving/not improving language learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Improving/not improving writing scores</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Raising awareness of their own culture</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.5 Factors enabling and constraining classroom application of translanguaging

4.5.1 Digital resources

Among the 23 articles, three applied digital resources/online platforms and translanguaging strategies to writing and showed a facilitation effect on ESL/EFL writing (Sun & Zhang, 2022; Tsai, 2022; Chen et al., 2019). Among them, Tsai (2022) and Chen, et al. (2019) focus both on writing with the help of Google Translate. The results showed that students were better able to use both their L1 and L2 language resources while employing digital resources and translanguaging (Chen, et al., 2019). Regarding Sun and Zhang’s study (2022), students indi-
cated that they were more willing to give constant feedback to their peers by online platforms, and through translinguaging, they used all linguistic and non-linguistic resources, which improved thoughts expression and communication (Vogel & García, 2017), produced additional opinions on material and offered more detailed linguistic feedback (Cheng & Zhang, 2021; Yu, 2016). Therefore, it is evident that digital resources have the potential to be a good support to translinguaging practices in the ESL/EFL writing classroom.

4.5.2 Different types of activities

Providing students with different activities helped the application of translinguaging in the writing classroom (Hiller, 2021). In Hiller’s study, students were supported in understanding and using translinguaging through group projects and short writing assignments. In the end, the author suggested that the process of students engaging in the activities of creating posters and presentations could be defined as translinguaging as they can use different languages in these writing activities. These activities helped students engage in more conversations about translinguaging practices, encouraged them to reflect on their own translinguaging practices, and made full use of communicative resources, both linguistic and nonlinguistic, both within and outside the classrooms (Hiller, 2021).

4.5.3 Stakeholders

Awareness of translinguaging facilitates translinguaging applications. However, in the 23 studies, the official learning activities of students’ courses rarely invite, encourage, or even approve these translinguaging practices (Song & McCarthy, 2018). The main reason for this lies, according to Fang and Liu (2020), in the stakeholders’ attitudes. Directors, program designers, and teachers, do not encourage and make the most of bilinguals’ and multilinguals’ natural and precious bilingualism or multilingualism by integrating a translinguaging pedagogy that aligns with their teaching goals (Karabulut & Dollar, 2022; Rafi & Morgan, 2022). The main reason for this is attributed to the fact that educators and policymakers around the world believe that we should use target language policies (Akbar & Taqi, 2020).

As for teachers’ perceptions, in fact, some of these 23 studies reflected teachers’ recognition of translinguaging. For example, in McCarty’s study (2018), the researcher learned how multilingual students applied translinguaging skills in their writing by exploring students’ stages from high school to college, giving him a new understanding of the role that translinguaging played. Some of the studies reflected teachers’ focus on monolingualism. For example, in Zheng’s study (2017), there were two international teaching assistants: one who encouraged students to use translinguaging in their ordinary lives and writing processes, and the
other who only allowed students to use English. The former allowed students to be creative, gain a diverse perspective and become better writers, while the latter was more concerned with enhancing students’ English language learning skills. While both were successful teachers, the teacher who used translanguaging was more aware and able to clearly articulate the connections between her identity, pedagogy, and context (McCarty, 2018).

4.5.4 Students’ limited language ability in L1 and L2
Students’ limited L2 but also L1 language knowledge actually hindered the application of translanguaging strategies in the writing classroom as well. In Motlhaka and Makalela’s study (2016), students referred to failing to understand the difference between L1 and L2 writing. For example, students were unable to distinguish between the placement of thesis statements in English and Sesotho writing (Motlhaka & Makalela, 2016). Unexplained differences between specific linguistic practices might lead to confusion and denial of identity positions for students with African language backgrounds (Motlhaka & Makalela, 2016). This is precisely because the students themselves could not distinguish between the linguistic features of L1 and L2, resulting in their inability to apply translanguaging strategies clearly in their writing. In addition, in Chen et al.’s study (2019), with the online tool Google Translate, students wrote in Chinese and then in English. They pointed out the general limitation of online translation software, namely the text quality from Google Translation relied on Chinese text. Several students’ Chinese texts contained problematic sentences that resulted in incorrect Google Translation sentences. Thus, students’ L1 and L2 language proficiency deficits may lead to a lack of better application of translanguaging skills in writing.

4.5.5 Students’ views on their language identity
Some students were very aware of their multilingual identities, while others were not. When students became aware of their multilingual identities, this might facilitate the application of translanguaging strategies in their writing. For instance, in Kaufhold’s study, students positioned themselves as proficient language speakers on the Internet (Wei, 2016), global citizens, and Transnational Higher Education (TNHE) students at EMI universities by using their language resources as indicators of social values and co-create identities (Creese & Blackledge, 2015). This was in line with Ivanić’s (1998) claim that students were constantly negotiating a range of identities and possibilities of self (Kaufhold, 2018).

However, some students also mentioned their doubts about their linguistic identities, and this doubt limited the use of translanguaging in the writing classroom. Even if they sometimes dared to apply translanguaging strategies, they felt that their writing would be seen as deviant and therefore would be scored low
In addition to this, they considered that mixing different languages could confuse readers. Finally, they also stated that mixing languages could create an identity crisis among people and languages (Kafle, 2020). Furthermore, a preference for translinguaging may also lead to struggles and resistance to the dominant norms of English writing in higher education, affecting comfort and confidence in academic writing in English (Garska & O’Brien, 2019).

In addition to confusion about linguistic identity, students also mentioned that when they used their L1 or bilingual resources to write, they felt embarrassed and guilty. For example, a student said she was reluctant to admit to the fact that she used translation software as this felt like cheating, while another student said she felt ashamed of using her L1 as it made her feel like she was not studying hard enough (Kafle, 2020). In conclusion, while students recognized that making full use of their linguistic repertoire was crucial to supporting their studies in EMI courses, their comments revealed a monolingual language ideology that made it clear to them that the application of translinguaging was an unwelcome crutch. Finally, this illustrates that rather than utilizing their process of learning to write in English to expand their bilingual skills and develop as bilingual academics, participants adopted contradictory bilingual identities (Zhang & Hadjioannou, 2022).

In conclusion, the application of digital resources, various activities and students’ positive views on their identity contributed to the application of translinguaging in the ESL/EFL writing classroom, but the thoughts of stakeholders, students’ limited language skills in L1 and L2, and their uncertainty about their linguistic identity limited the implementation of translinguaging in ESL/EFL writing. This section is summarized in Table 5.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors enabling classroom application of translinguaging</th>
<th>Factors constraining classroom application of translinguaging</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Digital resources</td>
<td>Stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Different types of activities</td>
<td>Students’ limited language ability on L1 and L2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students’ positive views on their identity</td>
<td>Students’ uncertainty about their identity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5. Discussion, conclusion and limitations

We conducted the current literature review with the aim of reviewing students’ and teachers’ implementation of translanguage strategies in the ESL/EFL writing classroom in the context of higher education. We rated the quality of the 23 eligible studies as fairly to quite high and can therefore draw reliable conclusions from our review.

Based on previous systematic reviews, Huang and Chalmers (2023) assessed the impact of translanguage on substantive learning outcomes in ESL/EFL classrooms, and a systematic search and selection of the literature identified 10 studies that meet these criteria. The results showed that translanguage was most commonly used in reading and writing instruction. Most of the studies did not find statistically significant differences between these approaches through translanguage, either favoring translanguage by using same research methods, either favoring translanguage in a few highly specific measure. Overall, pedagogical translanguage may be helpful for teaching and learning, but it is difficult to make firm causal inferences due to the low methodological quality of the studies. Huang and Chalmers (2023) recommended that future research could be conducted in the two pedagogical goals of English grammar and English writing which can be used as a starting point for teachers to implement pedagogical translanguage. Therefore, our study focused on English writing in higher education. We found that out of 23 empirical studies, 19 studies proposed that translanguage is helpful to students’ English writing; 2 studies (Akbar & Taqi, 2020; Brown & Lally, 2019) believed that translanguage does bring benefits but the results showed that translanguage did not enhance students’ English language proficiency and there was no change in the writing scores of the students who used translanguage; 2 studies (Kafle, 2020; Zhang & Hadjioannou, 2022) did not believe that translanguage helps students’ writing as it may present students with conflicting bilingual identities, perceptual barriers, and process barriers, and cause contradiction towards the purpose of academic communication.

Prilutskaya (2021) conducted an extensive systematic review of research on pedagogical applications of translanguage in ELT classrooms in different settings. The results of the synthesis of 233 publications suggest that researchers should ensure that they study a wider range and educational and geographical contexts, and we agree with this as most of the research in our study was focused on North America and North Asia, and researchers in other regions could also try this direction. In addition to this, Prilutskaya (2021) mentions that researchers can explore the long-term effects of translanguage pedagogy on learning outcomes in various settings, and we concur, as two studies (Akbar & Taqi, 2020; Brown & Lally, 2019) mentioned that translanguage did not improve students’
English proficiency and writing scores, and this is also something that requires long-term interventions to see if there is an impact.

Our first question aimed at identifying the characteristics of translinguaging empirical research in five areas. We found that in the educational settings of higher education, a translinguaging approach was most common in academic writing and college English writing classes; in the geographical settings, most of the research was focused on North America and North Asia. A possible explanation for this could be that García and other researchers have promoted translinguaging in the context of bilingual classrooms in the United States. Another reason could be the increase in the number of higher education programs worldwide that use EMI due to the internationalization of education (Marina, 2021) and the increasing number of Chinese and Japanese students studying abroad (Zhang & Hadjioannou, 2022). In terms of research objectives, there are 9 areas of concern to researchers (see Table 2). Such a wide range of topics demonstrates the great potential of language and bi- or multilingual translinguaging research. Finally, in terms of methodology, more than half of the studies in the dataset used qualitative methods that included perceived effects in addition to quantitatively shown effects, it was not possible to make assumptions about causality and generalization. Future research could explore how to operationalize these results in a more quantitative way or use a more mixed-methods approach to see if the same results can be found and their effect sizes explained.

The second research question highlighted the translinguaging strategies teachers and students applied in the ESL/EFL writing classroom. The thematic analysis revealed that researchers included experimental and control groups, pre- and post-tests and direct interventions for the ESL/EFL writing class. However, it is worth mentioning that often the interval between the pre- and post-test should be longer as students may look up the answers after the lesson as well as remember what they were tested on earlier, which will affect the results of the experiment. Regarding the teachers, they shared translinguaging strategies in the writing classroom, which showed that teachers’ application of translinguaging in the classroom reflected their multilingual identity and benefited them and their multilingual students, helping students to effectively embrace and build on their diversity (Zheng, 2017). Furthermore, teachers combined translinguaging strategies with online tools. It is evident that the inclusion of digital resources in the classroom or the application of online platforms can contribute to the use of translinguaging in the writing classroom. Regarding how students apply translinguaging strategies in the ESL/EFL writing classroom, we found that students used them in the writing process, writing content and vocabulary, and interaction with others.
The third research question focused on how translanguaging strategies affect student learning and teacher teaching. One study mentioned that translanguaging strategies provided teachers with diverse perspectives and some studies found that translanguaging strategies might create students’ a “safe” environment to write. As such, successful teaching of writing in translanguaging is dependent on the students and the teacher’s own understanding of the language facilitated by the interaction in the implementation of translanguaging pedagogy and a “safe” space for students.

In terms of students’ writing, the application of translanguaging was found to have positive outcomes for students in many ways. An interesting point, however, is that in research on language learning, some studies (Rafi & Morgan, 2022; Llanes & Cots, 2022; Tsai, 2022) have demonstrated that students’ use of translanguaging strategies in writing helped them improve English writing, but others (Taqi, 2020) mentioned that students’ language proficiency did not improve. We suggest that this discrepancy might arise because the latter study was conducted within a limited content and time constraint, so it may be unrealistic to expect language progress to have a positive impact on students’ language proficiency (Akbar & Taqi, 2020). Therefore, the appropriate length of the intervention as well as the content will also have different results on the study. In addition to this, in terms of writing scores, there are studies (Akbar & Taqi, 2020; Rafi & Morgan, 2022; Turnbull, 2019) that prove that students’ application of translanguaging strategies in writing led to an increase in their writing scores, while other studies find the contrary (Brown & Lally, 2019). The latter study, however, was conducted in bilingual countries (Kuwait, Bangladesh, and Japan), and the L1s of these three countries are typologically different from English. The latter study was conducted in the United States. These students had studied in the United States for some time, passed certain exams, and might have better English proficiency than other students. Therefore, the effect of their application of translanguaging was not significant.

The final research question was on the factors facilitating or limiting the use of translanguaging in the ESL/EFL writing classroom. Regarding different types of activities, Hiller (2021) provided some other examples than only writing essays, such as making presentations or posters. These diverse activities are also helping students to express themselves and use their linguistic resources more fully.

In terms of stakeholders, the most important finding was that language educators and policymakers seemed unaware that native languages are valuable resources in second and foreign language classrooms (Turnbull, 2019). Unless educators and policymakers take a proactive approach to translanguaging and wisely embed it in curriculum design, its implementation as an instructional strategy will be elusive (Akbar & Taqi, 2020). As for teachers, they seem to apply their
proactivity and autonomy to create effective pedagogical practices in the language classroom (Wei, 2022; Wei & García, 2022). This review suggests that teachers should embrace and encourage themselves and students to apply translinguaging in English writing classes, for example, providing in-class and after-class learning spaces and adequate resources to help students study English (Karabulut & Dollar, 2022), encouraging comparisons among different languages, using translations, stimulating the inclusion of other languages in the classroom, research and assignments, and motivating the application of sources in other languages (Duarte & van der Ploeg, 2019). Last but not least, highlighting students’ expertise and background knowledge about their cultures and languages plays an important role in helping them develop new knowledge, new languages, and new worlds (Wang & Lee, 2022). It is through the efforts of stakeholders that students can clearly understand and become aware of their bi- or multilingual identity and improve their English writing through translinguaging.

This study had a number of limitations. Our search was limited to English language databases, the database included only five commonly used databases, the search for studies was limited to accessible articles and book chapters were excluded. Therefore, some relevant studies published in languages other than English and some other databases may have been missed. Any future duplication or update of this review should consider expanding the search strategy accordingly. Lastly, this systematic review aims to transparently and accurately synthesize the state of knowledge on translinguaging and ESL/EFL writing research in higher education, with the aim of informing educators about developments in this rapidly growing field. It is also hoped that future research will explore and help students’ English writing, such as whether there are effective translinguaging teaching methods provided for teachers to help students learn English writing, how students use translinguaging strategies in their writing process, whether translinguaging helps students improve English writing proficiency, and what are the attitudes of students towards translinguaging.
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Appendix

Methodological quality of studies using MMAT (Hong et al.2018)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author(s)/methodological quality criteria</th>
<th>Screening questions</th>
<th>Qualitative</th>
<th>Total points</th>
<th>Quality (5-high, 3–4 moderate, 0–2 low)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S1</td>
<td>S2</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atta &amp; Naqvi (2022)</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dong (2022)</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hiller (2021)</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kafle (2020)</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kauflhold (2018)</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McCarty (2018)</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moltshaka &amp; Makalela (2016)</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author(s)/methodological quality criteria</td>
<td>Screening questions</td>
<td>Quantitative non-randomized</td>
<td>Total points</td>
<td>Quality (5=high, 3–4 moderate, 0–2 low)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S1</td>
<td>S2</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Van der Walt &amp; Pfeiffer (2019)</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tsai (2022)</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Llanes &amp; Cots (2022)</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chen, Tsai &amp; Tsou (2019)</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author(s)/methodological quality criteria</th>
<th>Screening questions</th>
<th>Mixed methods</th>
<th>Total points</th>
<th>Quality (5=high, 3–4 moderate, 0–2 low)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S1</td>
<td>S2</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adamson &amp; Coulson (2015)</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>CT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Akbar &amp; Taqi (2020)</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown &amp; Lally (2019)</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karabulut &amp; Dollar (2022)</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kim &amp; Chang (2022)</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sun &amp; Zhang (2022)</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turnbull (2019)</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Y = yes, indicates a clear statement appears in the paper which directly answers the question;
N = no, indicates the question has been directly answered in the negative in the paper;
CT = can't tell, indicates there is no clear statement in the paper that answers the question.

Critical appraisal questions were as follows:

Screening questions:

S1. Are there clear research questions?
S2. Do the collected data allow to address the research questions?

Qualitative:

1.1 Is the qualitative approach appropriate to answer the research question?
1.2 Are the qualitative data collection methods adequate to address the research question?
1.3 Are the findings adequately derived from the data?
1.4 Is the interpretation of results sufficiently substantiated by data?
1.5 Is there coherence between qualitative data sources, collection, analysis and interpretation?
Quantitative non-randomized:
3.1 Are the participants representative of the target population?
3.2 Are measurements appropriate regarding both the outcome and intervention (or exposure)?
3.3 Are there complete outcome data?
3.4 Are the confounders accounted for in the design and analysis?
3.5 During the study period, is the intervention administered (or exposure occurred) as intended?

Mixed methods:
5.1 Is there an adequate rationale for using a mixed methods design to address the research question?
5.2 Are the different components of the study effectively integrated to answer the research question?
5.3 Are the outputs of the integration of qualitative and quantitative components adequately interpreted?
5.4 Are divergences and inconsistencies between quantitative and qualitative results adequately addressed?
5.5 Do the different components of the study adhere to the quality criteria of each tradition of the methods involved?
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