Journal of Education and Educational Research
ISSN: 2957-9465 | Vol. 10, No. 3, 2024

Investigation of Teachers' Perceptions and Practices of the Use of Translanguaging in CLIL Classrooms

Xiang Li

Institution of Education, University College London, United Kingdom

Abstract: This study explores teachers' perceptions and practices of translanguaging in Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) classrooms. Focusing on three empirical studies conducted in Kazakhstan, Taiwan, and Spain, it investigates how teachers view translanguaging and how these perspectives shape their instructional methods. Utilizing both qualitative and quantitative methods, the studies found varying levels of acceptance and implementation of translanguaging, influenced by local language policies, teachers' educational level, and teacher-student linguistic differences. The research highlights the need for clear policy guidance and teacher training to effectively integrate translanguaging into CLIL classrooms. Implications for future research are also discussed, emphasizing the importance of minority language inclusion and student feedback in translanguaging practices.

Keywords: Translanguaging; Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL); Teacher Perceptions and Practice; Language Policy; Multilingual Education.

1. Introduction

The umbrella term "Multilingual education" encompasses various practices (Melo-Pfeifer, 2018, p.194), typically utilizing "an additional language as the medium of instruction, rather than treating it as a separate subject"(García, 2009, p. 6). This challenges traditional language teaching models where languages are taught separately, leading to clear language boundaries (Cenoz& Gorter, 2017). This shift aligns with the emergence of the multilingual turn (Conteh & Meier, 2014; May, 2013), a critical movement in education that originated in the United States. It emphasizes multilingualism as "coexistence interaction with different languages" (Wei, 2013, p. 26), and regards languages as a contextual and dynamic activity, encouraging the use of all available linguistic repertoire in interaction with others in given social contexts (Canagarajah, 2011).

Content and language integrated learning (CLIL) is one of the multilingual education approaches, which was initially coined in European Union (EU) documents to describe instruction conducted in an additional language (Nikula, 2017). In other words, CLIL focuses on integrating subject content and language learning to develop both linguistic abilities and cognitive flexibility (Coyle et al., 2010). Through the use of an additional language as the medium of instruction, students explore various subjects, facilitating learning in a foreign language context. According to Coyle, Hood, and Marsh (2010), the flexible nature of CLIL allows for its application across different linguistic environments, contributing to its widespread adoption not only in Europe but also globally, catering to various educational needs and purposes.

Numerous studies support the effectiveness of CLIL in improving both language proficiency and subject content learning. Previous research suggests that CLIL strengthens various competences, including improved communicative abilities, fluency, and enhanced reading and listening skills (Ruiz de Zarobe, 2015). Additionally, CLIL students demonstrate better acquisition of new vocabulary more effectively compared to non-CLIL students (Ruiz de Zarobe, 2015). However, criticisms emerged regarding the vagueness and heterogeneity of CLIL, citing perceived similarities to previous immersion programs, as they share a similar rationale of emphasizing the integration of language acquisition with academic content to simultaneously enhance linguistic and subjects proficiency (Bruton, 2013). Moreover, previous studies revealed various implementation challenges including a shortage of qualified teachers (Banegas, 2012), potential negative effects on students' self-esteem and feelings of competence (Seikkula-Leino, 2007), and cognitive burdens associated with learning new topics in a foreign language(Aguilar& Rodríguez, 2012), leading to anxiety among both teachers and students. Nonetheless, these arguments have been contested in response articles (Hüttner & Smit, 2014; Pérez Cañado, 2020).

Influenced by the multilingual turn, teachers have increasingly adopted flexible linguistic practices in the classroom (Conteh & Meier, 2014; Karabassova & San Isidro, 2020), integrating translingual practices into CLIL pedagogy (Karabassova & San Isidro, 2020; Nikula & Moore, 2019). Translanguaging originates from "trawsieithu," a Welsh term used by Cen William to describe the bilingual use of Welsh and English (García and Wei, 2014, p. 20). Defined as "the process of making meaning, shaping experience, gaining understanding and knowledge through the use of two languages" (Baker, 2011, p. 288), it has been recognized as a significant feature of bilingual/multilingual communities and educational domains. García and Wei (2014) further define translanguaging as the flexible and dynamic use of languages in communication, considering languages not as separate systems but as one integrated system. Recently the concept of translanguaging practices have been further expanded by to consider interlocutors' diverse semiotic repertoires, including body language and visual aids. This introduces a spatial aspect to understand translanguaging (Blackledge & Creese, 2017; Canagarajah, 2018a, 2018b; Pennycook, 2017). To conclude, the above definitions reflect multilingual, multisemiotic, and pedagogical perspectives on translanguaging. Regarding the classroom context, translanguaing refers to the systematic switching between

languages by teachers and students (San Isidro & Lasagabaster, 2019a), aligning with the flexible linguistic practices of multilingual individuals (García & Wei, 2014). In other words, learners incorporate classroom language learning into their language repertoire, integrating personal experience, attitudes, and beliefs (Wei, 2011), fostering an inclusive and supportive learning environment for multilingual speakers (Prada & Turnbull, 2018).

Teachers could employ translanguaging strategies for various purposes, such as establishing background knowledge, fostering critical thinking, and constructing new knowledge (García and Wei, 2014). Coyle, Hood, and Marsh (2010) also claimed that translanguaging would boost confidence, deepen understanding, and scaffold student learning. García and Wei (2014) suggest various ways in which teachers can integrate translanguaging into their instruction. They recommend using materials and resources that facilitate comprehension and allow learners to generate multimodal and multilingual texts. Additionally, teachers can incorporate translanguaging into oral communication by intentionally codeswitching between languages, thus eliciting students' L2 output (Makalela, 2015). Furthermore, by facilitating interpersonal communication they can cultivate a linguistic environment that highlights different languages and provides students with visual support (García and Wei, 2014), as well as manage classroom discipline (Probyn, 2019). However, Lasagabaster (2017) and Lin (2020) argued that alongside spontaneous translanguaging pedagogies, more systemic and strategic translanguaging approaches should be carried out.

Research on CLIL has expanded globally; however, the role of translanguaging in CLIL classrooms remains understudied (Karabassova & Isidro, 2020; Lin & He, 2017; Liu, 2020; Nikula & Moore, 2019), particularly regarding pedagogy and classroom practices and conduct methodologically (San Isidro, 2019; San Isidro & Lasagabaster, 2020). Additionally, existing studies on practitioners' perceptions have primarily focused on teachers' motivation and engagement in translanguaging (Ackerl, 2007; Lasagabaster & Doiz, 2017; Pladevall-Ballester, 2015), and the study on their views of translanguaging in the CLIL context is still scarce.

The purpose of this essay is to critically examine recent studies on teachers' perceptions and practices regarding translanguaging in CLIL classrooms. In the next section, I will carefully overview three profound empirical studies conducted by Karabassova & San Isidro (2023), Kao (2023), and San Isidro (2021) to answer two main questions (1) How do teachers view translanguaging in CLIL? (2) how do these perspectives influence teachers' instructional practices in CLIL classrooms? Finally, the synthesis of the findings of these empirical studies as well as critical discussion of the findings will be proposed.

2. Summaries

2.1. Empirical Study of Karabassova & San Isidro (2023)

This study delves into the nuanced realm of translanguaging within the CLIL framework in Kazakhstan's multilingual education system. Although recent years have seen a gradual growth of research on translanguaging with CLIL settings, the scarcity of the studies is particularly evident where both students and teachers do not share the same L1, a common scenario yet underexplored in the field (Gablasova, 2014; Gallagher & Colohan, 2017). Additionally, the studies focus on how teachers' attitudes toward the of translanguaging pedagogy ifluence their classroom praxis are still limited (Bieri, 2018; Nikula & Moore, 2019). These two gaps were informed in this study.

Research questions:

1: What are teachers' attitudes towards utilizing translanguaging pedagogy in NIS CLIL contexts?

2: How do teachers' attitudes toward translanguaging impact their pedagogical practices?

Research design and methods:

The research context: This research delves into Kazakhstan's CLIL-based educational reforms, aiming to utilize the nation's rich linguistic diversity by integrating Kazakh, Russian, and English within the national curriculum. Following post-independence de-Russification and de-Sovietization (Kissane,2005), Kazakh was elevated to official status, while Russian continued to play a critical role in interethnic exchanges (Smagulova, 2008). However, Russian prevails as the L1 for many ethnic Kazakhs, overshadowing Kazakh's official role and its identity significance (Smagulova, 2008). The Nazarbayev Intellectual Schools (NIS) trilingual approach, initiated in 2008, promots one subject, one language instruction in Kazakh and Russian for Grades 7–10, and increasingly English thereafter. Despite the trilingual framework and the multilingual nature of classrooms, minority languages are not officially included, making the NIS an ideal context for translingual practices research

Research design: This study is part of a larger mixed-methods study followed by a quantitive-qualitative sequential explanatory design. The study first quantitively collected 275 teachers' willingness to take part in the qualitative phase and 11 teachers were purposefully selected. Then teachers' conceptualization and implementation of CLIL was qualitatively collected based on the interview and classroom observation.

Participants: The study involved 20 NIS schools, with 275 teachers contributing across a range of subjects, including world history, chemistry, Kazakhstan in the modern world, STEM, and so forth. Among those participants, the researcher selectively recruited 11 teachers who instructed subjects in either the students' L2 (Russian or Kazakh) or L3 (English). These teachers were distinguished by their common practices of utilizing a language other than the students' first language for instruction.

Instruments and procedures: Four Semi-structured interviews and detailed classroom observations were conducted with each teacher to explore their perceptions and practices regarding translanguaging in CLIL. The initial interview, conducted before the classroom observation, allowed teachers to share their teaching strategies and objectives for content and language instruction. The post-observation interviews were conducted one or two days after the observation to reflect classroom dynamics and instructional outcomes. The two follow-up interviews, conducted one year and two years after the classroom observation, aimed to examine the longer-term perspectives of teachers on CLIL implementation.

Key findings: Concerning the first research question, the study revealed that teachers' perceptions of translanguaging were ambiguous, and do not have a shared knowledge of translanguaging. This ambiguity largely stems from a conflict between the 'one teacher/one language' policy and the

inherently multilingual classroom environments, which lead teachers to be self-guided and try to find a balance between school language policy and curriculum content.

Regarding teachers' attitudes towards translanguaging influence their teaching practices, the study found no distinct teaching strategies universally applicable in classroom settings for pedagogical translanguaging. However, result also revealed four key themes illustrating the influence of teachers' views of translanguaging on their teaching methods. The first one is teachers largely agree on the exclusive use of the target language as an ideal aligns with the policy of one teacher one language, thus expecting high expectations on students' L2 and L3 fluency. However, KMI (Kazakh as a medium of instruction) teachers are concerned about the ethnic Kazakh students' insufficient skills in Kazakh to learn in KMI classes, suggesting possible socio-linguistic inequity (Prada & Turnbull, 2018) in the current language policy affecting the promotion of marginalized Kazakh. The second is the use of translanguaging as an approach to scaffold academic content. To be specific, translanguaging is perceived as a strategic strategy to help students in meaning-making, facilitating discursive practices, and enabling peer scaffolding. The third observation demonstrated that teachers regard translanguaging as a transitional practices and code-switching. While they recognize students' code-switching, there is an ambiguous attitude towards its acceptance due to their perceptions that code-switching might impede the acquisition of the target language. The fourth one regards the use of translanguaging as compensation for teachers' limited language skills especially for STEM subjects: non-bilingual teachers see translanguaging as an inevitable approach, while bilingual teachers regard it as an intuitive action to enhance students' understanding.

Implications: The findings suggest that despite schools' efforts to enforce a monolingual module of instruction, both teachers and students resort to translanguaging when meaning-making some specific topics in this complex linguistic background. This highlights the necessity for the government to set out clearer policy guidelines that acknowledge the benefits of translanguaging, as well as offer training programs regarding the use of translanguaging, which would facilitate teachers' understanding and implementation of translanguaging as a pedagogical tool.

Strengths and weaknesses and future research:

Strengths: The qualitative methodology employed provided in-depth insights into teachers' perceptions and multilingual classroom practices, highlighting the challenges of implementing translanguaging within policy constraints and navigating toward effective pedagogical approaches. Moreover, the diversity of participants, encompassing teachers from varied linguistic backgrounds, further riches the study, especially those teaching content subjects not in the student's first language. Furthermore, the utilization of multiple data collection methods, including four rounds of interviews and detailed observations strengthens the trustworthiness of the results (Shenten, 2004), contributing to the depth and richness of the findings.

Weaknesses and future research: Firstly, the timing constraints led to classroom observations being conducted late in the academic year, by which time students may have already adapted to instruction in L2 and L3 and have an impact on the research's validity. Thus, classroom observation during different stages of the semester is necessary to thoroughly explore translanguaging across different stages of learning. Furthermore, the elite NIS initially served the purpose of piloting CLIL in Kazakhstan, and this approach has since been adopted across all schools for STEM subjects from the 2019–2020 school year (Lasagabaster,2017). Therefore, investigating translingual practices in all mainstream schools with diverse ethnic and linguistic backgrounds could serve as a gap for future research.

2.2. Empirical Study of Kao (2023)

Kao's (2023) study investigated 422 in-service teachers' perceptions and practices of translanguaging in CLIL elementary and secondary school settings in Taiwan. In 2019, the Ministry of Education (MOE) in Taiwan promoted bilingual education through the CLIL framework, signifying a shift in educational practices and ideology. This policy emphasizes the importance of understanding educators' approaches to both multilingual (L1 Chinese or Taiwanese with English as the target language) and multimodal resources, including non-verbal behaviors and linguistic signs, which are parts of a person's semiotic repertoire and all carry meanings (García & Li, 2014). Lin (2015) expanded this through the lens of trans-semiotizing, prompting a shift in the perception of translanguaging from isolated linguistic systems to an integrated semiotic system. Under such context, this study responds to the need for strategic and systematic pedagogical approaches to translanguaging in actual classroom settings, aiming to provide insight into the application of these practices by Taiwanese CLIL educators.

Research questions:

How Taiwanese elementary school teachers perceive translanguaging within CLIL settings?

2. How secondary school teachers' views on the translanguaging concept in CLIL contexts?

3. How do the application of translanguaging as a pedagogical technique been integrated by in-service teachers in CLIL classrooms?

Research design and methods:

Research design: A mixed-methods approach was applied in this study incorporating the quantitative data from a questionnaire and qualitative data from classroom observations.

Participants: This study involved 422 Taiwanese teachers to evaluate their perspectives on translanguaging and trans-semiotizing. Among them, 70% were from elementary and 30% from junior high schools, primarily English teachers (82%) with content subjects teachers (18%) like art and physical education. Furthermore, three educators—Rose (elementary English), Ariel (middle school English), and Ann (middle school art)—conducted a detailed twenty-week classroom observation in rural southern Taiwan to further explore translanguaging implementation.

Instruments and procedures: An online questionnaire, informed by Nambisan (2014) and Yuvayapan (2019), assessed perceptions of translanguaging among primary and secondary teachers, utilizing a five-point Likert scale to explore their attitudes towards first language use, non-verbal behaviors, and various semiotic tools. Additionally, three teachers, selected for their involvement in data collection as well as CLIL programs, participated in a twenty-week observation to capture the real-world enactment of translanguaging strategies, which was video-recorded for analysis.

Key findings: Based on the findings, two key themes were

identified: (1) the perception of elementary and middle school teachers regarding translanguaging. (2) the specific translanguaging strategies preferred by content and English teachers in CLIL courses.

As for the first theme in the elementary school, CLIL teachers showed a strong preference for employing a variety of semiotic resources, like gestures and visuals, to immerse learners in an English learning environment. At the same time, the usage of L1 is also highly supported. Notably, a significant majority of elementary English teachers (95%) and content teachers (89%) endorsed the use of semiotic signs for meaning-making signs, with 88% and 87% respectively favoring non-verbal behaviors. In terms of the second theme, the trans-semiotizing approach could be found in elementary English teacher, Rose's classes. She utilized diverse picture books, various videos, and rich presentation formats, to drive student engagement. Moreover, Rose's careful selection of gestures that related to students' backgrounds and experiences, not only conveyed her semiotic repertoire but also expanded it with students, thus creating a dynamic flow of the interactive meaning-making process (He et.al., 2016)

On the other hand, in the context of middle schools, CLIL teachers considered both L1 usage and other meaning-making resources for learning. Comparing these, with a slight preference for using L1, with 95% of middle school English teachers supported its use, and 92% believed the use of other meaning-making signs for enhancing understanding. Content teachers also emphasized the role of L1 in content learning, thus allowing home and school languages alongside English as learning resources in CLIL classrooms, aligning with Cenoz and Gorter's (2017) finding. Concerning the second theme, middle school teacher Ariel's English course exemplifies the importance of linguistic and non-linguistic learning. While maintaining an English-only instruction policy, she acknowledged the students' native language through rephrasing into English strategies. Non-verbal behavior and other meaning signs were also scaffolded in every lesson, such as using word clouds for new word identification and concept maps for the organization of video clips and group discussions. Additionally, middle school teachers Ann's art sessions displayed a strategic use of various language for specific pedagogical goals. Chinese was used to elucidate instructions and connect students' existing knowledge, significantly facilitating students' understanding. Once the students were familiar with the teaching materials through videos and artwork, Ann could turn to English to achieve the linguistic aims.

In sum, teachers demonstrate a clear understanding of utilizing first language, non-verbal behavior, and various semiotic resources across different contexts. The longitudinal observation reveals that the three teachers implemented a planned and systematic translanguaging approach as pedagogy to reinforce comprehension in the CLIL environment.

Implications: The findings revealed that although many teachers in Taiwan implement the CLIL framework and translanguaging approach in their daily teaching, they may lack a systematic understanding or application of these practices in their CLIL classrooms. This highlights the need for teacher training to raise awareness of the strategic and dynamic use of translanguaging and gestures in instruction. Additionally, allowing teachers to plan ahead and integrate translanguaging practices into CLIL classes can enhance their effectiveness.

Strengths, weaknesses, and future research:

Strengths: By collecting quantitative data on teachers' attitudes and conducting classroom observations, these two sources of data triangulate each other, enhancing the validity of the results. Additionally, the twenty-week duration of class observation provides a more comprehensive understanding and capture of teachers' instructional behaviors.

Weaknesses and future research: Firstly, the planned teaching plans were derived from only three teachers, although they are experienced teachers, may resulted in a limited observation sample. Regarding the teaching content, the study's exclusive focus on two English teachers and one art teacher lacks diversity in subject, potentially leading to sample bias and undermining the validity and generalizability of results to a wider population (Lash et al., 2014). Therefore, observing more CLIL teachers across different subjects is highly recommended in the future (A. Lin, 2015). Additionally, because of the Hawthorne effect (Sedgwick & Greenwood, 2015), the behavior of teachers and students may be affected by the existing of reseachers. Therefore, conducting after-observation interviews and reflective journal on both teachers and students would enhance understanding of teachers' pedagogical choices and students' perception on CLIL classroom. These multiple sources would facilitate comprehensive interpretation of the research results .

2.3. Empirical Study of San Isidro (2021)

This article undertakes a comparative study of CLIL implementation in Spain and Scotland, focusing on teachers' views on CLIL across different educational levels. Spain's approach to CLIL is characterized by its translanguaging practices (San Isidro & Lasagabaster, 2019b), involving strategic switching between Spanish and other languages (often English and some minorities) to enhance comprehension and engagement Coyle, 2010; Lasagabaster & Ruiz de Zarobe, 2010). In contrast, Scotland's CLIL initiatives are in their infancy, with only a few piloting CLIL-oriented projects in Spanish and French (San Isidro, 2015). Under such context, the study aims to investigate teachers' perspectives on translanguing in CLIL context, providing insights to compare such educational strategies in two distinct linguistic and cultural contexts.

Research questions:

The study aims to compare teachers' perspectives on four focal areas, with each area encompassing two research questions. The first focal area explores teachers' views regarding the challenges of developing an integrated curriculum, including their perspective on integrating language and content in a CLIL curriculum, as well as any statistically significant differences between Scottish and Spanish teachers' views on this. The second focal area investigates teachers' perceptions of student performance in CLIL settings and explores whether there are statistical differences between teachers' view on students' performance in two different settings. The third focal area focuses on classroom practices, examining teachers' opinions on pedagogy and collaboration in CLIL classrooms, and comparing the differences between Spain and Scotland. The final focal area examines and compares teachers' views on training needs for additional language competence and CLIL methodology, as well as their statistically differences.

Research design and methods

Research design: this study is a two-phase comparative quantitative investigation into teachers' views on CLIL design

and implementation. The first phase involved developing pilot-testing andvalidating the research tool. The second phase entailed administering the final questionnaire and analyzing the results.

Participants: In 2018, a webinar introduced the Spanish CLIL model to Scottish and Spanish teachers, aiming to explore the potential use of Spanish as an instructional medium in Scotland (Scottish Government, 2012). Participants encompassed language and content teachers across various educational levels, including higher, secondary, and primary education. Following the webinar, a total of 150 responses were collected (96 from Spanish teachers and 54 from Scottish teachers) for a pilot study to validate a CLIL implementation survey. In January 2019, a similar webinar targeted the same profiles of teachers, with 648 professionals participating. Of these, 313 questionnaires were returned regarding their willingness to participate in research. Among them, 127 Scottish teachers showed limited CLIL application, with only 6% of secondary and 5% of primary educators having prior experience with CLIL, while none of the university faculty engaged in CLIL-specific research. This contrasted with the extensive CLIL involvement reported by 186 Spanish educators in the study.

Instruments and procedure: A validated online questionnaire, derived from metadata and previous studies from Barreiro & San Isidro (2009) and Calvo & San Isidro (2012), was developed to collect data, which included closed-ended items rated on a 6-point Likert scale. This questionnaire had a pilot test for reliability and validity, with Cronbach's alpha used to ensure internal consistency. The final questionnaire was completed by the teachers after a second webinar, aiming to assess their perspectives on various aspects of CLIL implementation.

Key findings: In the first focal area, teachers evaluated the difficulty of integrating translanguaging in CLIL. Both Scottish and Spanish teachers acknowledge the difficulties in selecting materials with the curriculum. To be specific, Spanish teachers held neutral views on the difficulty, while Scottish cohorts found them more challenging. All teachers agree that designing integrated tasks aligned with the CLIL curriculum could be challenging. However, differences arise when comparing teachers' different levels. In the groups of secondary language teachers and primary language teachers groups, most Scottish participants strongly supported this statement, while Spanish informants ' views were slightly above neutral. Conversely, content teachers' perspectives vary significantly, with Spanish teachers acknowledging the difficulty more than Scottish participants. l. University teachers (UT) from both groups as both groups unanimously acknowledged the challenge of aligning curriculum and task design.

In the second focal area, all teachers concurred that integrating translanguageing in CLIL enhances students 'motivation towards the additional language and improves oral and written skills. They also support the use of L1 and translingual practices among students, with Spanish opinions more positive and Scottish opinions more neutral. Regarding the enhancement of students' learning of other content, Spanish secondary and primary education practitioners expressed more positive views about the impact of CLIL compared with their Scottish counterparts. However, both university teacher cohorts expressed more neutral perspectives.

The third part of the questionnaire examines classroom practices, including text genres, scaffolding, materials diversity, translanguaging, pluriliteracies, and teachers' cross-curricular collaboration during planning lessons. Overall, the findings indicated agreement among all cohorts regarding the conceptual framework of CLIL practices

1. As regards the text genres, except for both UT cohorts, who unanimously supported the use of different genres wae use in various CLIL implementation, significant differences were observed among other groups. Scottish respondents showed a neutral opinion on the importance of text genres when teaching content through an additional language, whereas Spanish teachers favored attention to text genres in task design.

2. While all teachers supported scaffolding for students as a necessary CLIL-related pedagogical practices, Spanish teachers held stronger views than their Scottish counterparts regarding the necessity of providing scaffolding to facilitate meaning-making.

3. Most teachers recognized the significance of collaborative work and the role of language teachers as mentors, with Spanish cohorts showing particularly strong agreement levels.

4. Lastly, both Spanish and Scottish teachers concur on the utilization of students' linguistic repertoire and unanimously acknowledge the importance of diversity, translanguaging, and pluriliteracies.

Regarding the fourth focal area, the result found that the vast majority of teachers agreed on the necessity of enhancing training, encompassing both improving language competence and CLIL pedagogy.

Strengths, weaknesses, and future research:

Strengths: This study contributed to the conceptualization of CLIL through practitioners' views across contexts. By engaging teachers from different educational levels, this research generates rich and significant data, reflecting the diversity inherent in different contexts and across multiple levels of education.

Weaknesses and future research: One limitation is that all teachers were recruited from CLILC academic events, possibly excluding educators who didn't have a chances to participate. Thus, future studies may be more inclusive by including teachers from diverse backgrounds with multiple sample selection techniques. Additionally, the questionnaire was conducted before the actual CLIL classrooms, which may be not consistent with teachers' actual practices in classrooms. Hence, it is strongly advised to conduct follow-up interviews to determine whether teachers' perceptions and practices post-implementation align with their initial perceptions.

3. Discussion:

The preceding sections of the paper provided an overview of the theoretical framework of translanguaging in CLIL contexts, along with empirical studies on teachers' perceptions and practices of translanguaging in CLIL classrooms.

Our first question related to teachers' view on translanguaing in CLIL could be summed up as follows. Karabassova & San Isidro (2023) implied that teachers' perceptions of translanguaging are unclear and ambiguous, whereas the empirical studies of Kao (2023) and San Isidro (2021) present clear opinions, which show a positive attitude towards translanguaging in CLIL. The possible reason could be linked to the strict trilingual language policy adopted by the NIS, where teachers risk reprimand and disciplinary

action if they engage in translanguaging. Consequently, teachers abide strictly by the exclusive use of the target languages. Additionally, the instruction language is not students' L1, it is a practical necessity for teachers to resort to students' L1 to ensure students' comprehension of complex content. Hence, this contrast between the school's regulations and the practical demands of the classroom results in conflicting attitudes among teachers towards translanguaging. However, in Taiwan, Spain, and Scotland, CLIL is supported by policies and teachers share the same L1 as their students. Teachers generally hold positive attitudes toward translanguaging

Although the majority of Taiwanese, Spanish, and Scottish teachers have clear perceptions, differences persist among teachers from different educational levels and those teaching different subjects. Language teachers from Taiwan and Spain found the integration of teaching tasks into the CLIL classroom to be natural, while Scottish language teachers found it challenging. This could be attributed to Scottish language teachers' limited implementation of the mentoring practices, in contrast to their Spanish and Taiwanese counterparts who have already practiced translanguaging in their content-integrated classrooms. However, when considering content teachers, Spanish primary and secondary teachers acknowledged the difficulty of task design in translanguaging classrooms, while Scottish and Taiwanese art teacher Ann's views remained generally neutral. The reason, one would argue, could be account that content teachers in San Isidro's (2021) study, aside from language teachers, are responsible for subjects such as physics, maths, and science. They face the challenge of integrating demanding content and language in the curriculum. Therefore, more experienced Spanish content teachers are more likely to understand the difficulties of balancing content and language learning. Conversely, the neutral opinion of Scottish content teachers may stem from their lack of experience. However, Taiwanese content teachers in Kao's (2023) research exclusively teach non-test-oriented subjects, which are easier to teach due to the abundance of rich class activities available, including watching introductory videos about artifacts in art classes and engaging in games on the playground during PE class. This contrasts with subjects like history and chemistry, which require additional preparation from teachers as these demanding subjects involve exams, necessitating teachers' effective explanation of complex theoretical knowledge in L2. Additionally, in San Isidro's (2021) article, the number of language teachers and content teachers is roughly equal, while in Kao's (2023) study, the proportion of Taiwan content teachers was relatively small, comprising only 18%, and the classroom observation on content teachers was conducted only in Ann's art classroom. Therefore, the data regarding the perceptions of Taiwanese content teachers may be somehow subjective, potentially impacting the final results.

These three articles also shed light on the second research question: how do the perspectives influence teachers' practices in CLIL classrooms? The interview and class observations in Karabassova & San Isidro's (2023) research did not identify distinct teaching strategies but revealed four themes of practices that teachers in Kazakhstan tend to follow. Nevertheless, in Kao (2023), systematic and strategic pedagogies were implemented, and educators also assessed potential classroom practices in San Isidro's (2021) research. The most notable distinction between these approaches is whether teachers support the use of L1 as a way of scaffolding. While teachers in in Kao (2023) and San Isidro's (2021) studies supported this approach, Kazakhstani teachers viewed it as only a transitional practices involving code-switching and regarded it unfavorably. One potential reason could be whether or not teachers share the same native language with students in the above mentioned study. To be specific, Taiwanese, Spanish, and Scottish teachers share the same language with their students, allowing them to switch between L1 and L2 to ensure understanding. However, in Karabassova & San Isidro's (2023) study, teachers' instructional languages differed from students' L1, and some teachers expressed a lack of proficiency in L2 and L3, let alone several minority languages, especially in STEM subjects. Thus, Kazakhstani teachers may perceive the use of L1 as detrimental to students' learning of the target language.

Another noteworthy contrast in teachers' practices in the three articles is whether teachers will use different text genres across various CLIL implementations. While Kazakh educators did not recognize the importance of this aspect, teachers in Taiwan and Spain strongly support it. Spanish teachers' support may stem from their extensive experience. In Spain, as CLIL was implemented at the end of the 1990s, the significance of text genres has already been acknowledged by teachers after years of practices. As for teachers in Taiwan, for instance, language teacher Ariel uses concept maps to help students organize their thoughts and create pictorial scenarios to reinforce certain definitions when teaching expository articles. This can be attributed to the fact that although CLIL was introduced in 2019, parents in Taiwan have long recognized the importance of English as a global lingua franca, thus enrolling their children in English language learning programs from an early age (Oladejo, 2006). Over time, although teachers' awareness and strategic application of translanguaging and trans-semiotizing are still lacking, they have gradually acknowledged the significance of semiotic resources in language instruction, leading to the development of different text genres tailored to different teaching contexts. In contrast, the Kazakh government has only recently begun implementing CLIL-based educational reforms, lacking bilingual and trilingual textbooks, especially for STEM subjects. It is suggested that local language teachers collaborate with educators who are unfamiliar with students' L1 and gradually develop a systematic and strategic translanguaging practice in CLIL classrooms.

4. Conclusion:

This paper investigates teachers' perceptions and practices regarding translanguaging in CLIL classrooms. It begins with a theoretical overview of CLIL and translanguaging, drawing on the work of leading scholars such as García (2009), Wei (2013), Meier, G., & Conteh, J. (2014), Cenoz and Gorter (2017). Three empirical studies by Karabassova & San Isidro (2023), Kao (2023), and San Isidro (2021) are then presented to address two key questions: (1) How do teachers view translanguaging in CLIL? (2) How do these perspectives shape instructional practices? The findings reveal a mix of clear and ambiguous perspectives among teachers on translanguaging in the CLIL context, along with varied instructional practices influenced by various factors, including teachers' different educational levels, experience with the CLIL program, accessible resources, and language policies. Hence, there persists a necessity for further research.

Firstly, further comparative analysis of schools implementing different language policies is warranted to

assess their impact on teachers' attitudes towards translanguaging and its practices in CLIL classrooms. Additionally, the inclusion of minority languages in CLIL classrooms is essential. This practices can foster inclusiveness, promote cultural understanding, enhance cognitive skills, and support students' comprehension of content and awareness of language diversity. Lastly, besides analyzing teachers' attitudes and instructional methods regarding translanguaging in CLIL classrooms, it is valuable to observe students' perceptions and feedback on this new teaching approach, which can help teachers tailor their instruction more effectively.

References

[1] Ackerl, C. (2007). Lexico-grammar in the essays of CLIL and non-CLIL students: Error analysis of written production. *Vienna English Working Papers*, 16, 6–11.

[2] Aguilar, M., & Rodríguez, R. (2012). Lecturer and student perceptions on CLIL at a Spanish university. International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism, 15(2), 183-197.

[3] Banegas, D. L. (2012). CLIL teacher development: Challenges and experiences. Latin American Journal of Content & Language Integrated Learning, 5(1), 46-56.

[4] Bieri, A. S. (2018). Translanguaging practices in CLIL and non-CLIL biology lessons in Switzerland. *EuroAmerican Journal of Applied Linguistics and Languages*, *5*(2), 91–109.

[5] Blackledge, A., & Creese, A. (2017). Translanguaging and the body. International Journal of multilingualism, 14(3), 250-268.

[6] Bruton, A. (2013). CLIL: Some of the reasons why . . . and why not. System, 41, 587–597.

[7] Seikkula-Leino, J. (2007). CLIL learning: Achievement levels and affective factors. *Language and Education*, 21, 328–341

[8] Calvo, E., & San Isidro, X. (2012). The fusion effect of CLIL on language-building and content learning: Research study. Quality interfaces: Examining evidence and exploring solutions in CLIL, 103-140.

[9] Canagarajah, S. (2018a). Translingual practice as spatial repertoires: Expanding the paradigm beyond structuralist orientations. Applied linguistics, 39(1), 31-54.

[10] Canagarajah, S. (2018b). Materializing 'competence': Perspectives from international STEM scholars. The Modern Language Journal, 102(2), 268-291.

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

[12] Cenoz, J., & Gorter, D. (2017). Minority languages and sustainable translanguaging: Threat or opportunity?. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural development*, *38*(10), 901-912.

[13] Cenoz, J., Gorter, D. & May, S. (eds.) *Language Awareness and Multilingualism. Encyclopedia of. Language and Education,* 3rd ed. Cham: Springer. pp. 309–321.

[14] Chen, F., Kao, S.-M., & Tsou, W. (2020). Toward ELF-Informed Bilingual Education in Taiwan: Addressing Incongruity Between Policy and Practice. *English Teaching & Learning*, *44*(2), 175–191.

[15] Chen, S., & Tsai, Y. (2012). Research on English teaching and learning: Taiwan (2004–2009). *Language Teaching*, *45*(2), 180-201.

[16] Coyle, D. (2010). Foreword. I: D. Lasagabaster och Y. Ruiz de Zarobe (red.). *CLIL in Spain: Implementations, Results and Teacher Training*.

[17] Coyle, D., Hood, P. and David, M., 2010. *CLIL Content and Language Integrated* Learning. Cambridge University Press.

[18] Dornyei, Z. (1995). On the teachability of communication strategies. *TESOL Quarterly*, 29, 55–85.

[19] Meier, G., & Conteh, J. (2014). Conclusion: The multilingual turn in language education. *The multilingual turn in languages education: Opportunities and challenges. Bristol: Multilingual Matters*, 292-299.

[20] Gablasova, D. (2014). Issues in the assessment of bilingually educated students: Expressing subject knowledge through L1 and L2. *The Language Learning Journal*, *42*(2), 151–164.

[21] 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.

[22] García, O., 2009. *Bilingual Education in the 21st Century A* Global *Perspective*. Wiley-Blackwell.

[23] García, O., Wei, L., García, O., & Wei, L. (2014). *Language, bilingualism and education* (pp. 46-62). Palgrave Macmillan UK.

[24] He, P., Lai, H., & Lin, A. M. (2016). Translanguaging in a multimodal mathematics presentation. *Translanguaging in higher education: Beyond monolingual ideologies*, 91-120.

[25] Hüttner, J., & Smit, U. (2014) CLIL (Content and Language Integrated Learning): The bigger picture. A response to: A. Bruton. 2013. CLIL: Some of the reasons why . . . and why not. System, 41, 587–597. *System*, 44, 160–167.

[26] Im, J.-H., & Kim, J. (2015). Use of Blended Learning for Effective Implementation of English-Medium Instruction in a Non-English Higher Education Context. *International Education Studies*, *8*(11), 1.

[27] Kao, Y.-T. (2023). Exploring translanguaging in Taiwanese CLIL classes: An analysis of teachers' perceptions and practices. *Language,* Culture *and Curriculum*, *36*(1), 100–121.

[28] Karabassova, L. (2018). Teachers' conceptualization of content and language integrated learning (CLIL): evidence from a trilingual context. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*.

[29] Karabassova, L., & San Isidro, X. (2023). Towards translanguaging in CLIL: A study on teachers' perceptions and practices in Kazakhstan. *International Journal of Multilingualism*, *20*(2),

[30] Kissane *, C. (2005). History education in transit: Where to for Kazakhstan? *Comparative Education*, *41*(1), 45–69.

[31] Lasagabaster, D., & de Zarobe, Y. R. (Eds.). (2010). *CLIL in Spain: Implementation, results and teacher training*. Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

[32] Lasagabaster, D., & Doiz, A. (2017). A longitudinal study on the impact of CLIL on affective factors. *Applied Linguistics,* 38, 688–712.

[33] Lash, T. L., Fox, M. P., MacLehose, R. F., Maldonado, G., McCandless, L. C., & Greenland, S. (2014). Good practices for quantitative bias analysis. *International Journal of Epidemiology*, *43*(6), 1969–1985.

[34] Li, D., & Zhang, L. (2022). Exploring teacher scaffolding in a CLIL-framed EFL intensive reading class: A classroom discourse analysis approach. *Language Teaching Research*, *26*(3), 333–360.

[35] Lin, A. (2015). Egalitarian Bimultilingualism and Trans-semiotizing in a Global World. *The. handbook of bilingual and multilingual education*, 17-37.

[36] Lin, A. M. Y. (2020). From deficit-based teaching to asset-based teaching in higher education in BANA countries: cutting

through ‘either-or’ binaries with a heteroglossic plurilingual lens. *Language, Culture and Curriculum*, 33(2), 203–212.

[37] Lin, A. M. Y., & He, P. C. (2017). Translanguaging as dynamic activity flows in CLIL classrooms. *Journal of Language, Identity & Education*, 16(4), 228–244.

[38] Liu, Y. (2020). Translanguaging and trans-semiotizing as planned systematic scaffolding: Examining feeling-meaning in CLIL classrooms. English Teaching & Learning, 44(2), 149–173.

[39] May, S. (2013). The multilingual turn: Implications for SLA, TESOL, and bilingual education. Routledge.

[40] Makalela, L. (2015). Translanguaging as a vehicle for epistemic access: Cases for reading comprehension and multilingual interactions*. Per Linguam: A Journal of Language Learning= Per Linguam: Tydskrif vir Taalaanleer, 31(1), 15-29.*

[41] Mateus, S. G. (2014). Translanguaging: Language, Bilingualism, and Education: Ofelia García and Li Wei. (2014). New York, NY: Palgrave MacMillan, 162 pp. *Bilingual Research Journal*, *37*(3), 366–369.

[42] Meier, G., & Conteh, J. (2014). Conclusion: *The multilingual turn in language* education*. The. multilingual turn in languages education: Opportunities and challenges. Bristol: Multilingual Matters*, 292-299.

[43] Nambisan, K. (n.d.). *Teachers’ attitudes towards and uses of translanguaging in English* language *classrooms in Iowa* [Doctoral dissertation, Iowa State University].

[44] Nikula, T. (2017). CLIL: A European approach to bilingual education. In Van Deusen-Scholl, N., &. S. May (Eds.), *Second and foreign language education: Encyclopedia of language and education* (pp. 111–124). 3rd edition. Springer.

[45] Nikula, T., & Moore, P. (2019). Exploring translanguaging in CLIL. *International* Journal *of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, *22*(2), 237–249.

[46] Oladejo, J. (2006). Parents' attitudes towards bilingual education policy in Taiwan. *Bilingual Research Journal*, *30*(1), 147-170.

[47] Pennycook, A. (2017). Translanguaging and semiotic assemblages. *International Journal* of *Multilingualism, 14(3), 269-282.*

[48] Pérez Cañado, M. L. (2023). What’s hot and what’s not on the current CLIL research agenda: Weeding out the non-issues from the real issues. A response to Bruton (2019). *Applied Linguistics Review, 14*(2), 347-367.

[49] *Pladevall*-Ballester, E. (2015). Exploring primary school CLIL perceptions in Catalonia: Students’, teachers’ and parents’ opinions and expectations. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 18, 45–59.

[50] Prada, J., & Turnbull, B. (2018). The role of translanguaging in the multilingual turn: Driving philosophical and conceptual renewal in language education. *EuroAmerican Journal of Applied Linguistics and Languages*, *5*(2), 8–23.

[51] Probyn, M. (2019). Pedagogical translanguaging and the *construction of* science *knowledge in a multilingual South African classroom: Challenging monoglossic/post-colonial orthodoxies. Classroom Discourse, 10(3-4), 216-236.*

[52] San Isidro, X. (2021). CLIL as a pathway for cross-curricular and translingual classroom practices: A comparative quantitative study on Scottish and Spanish teachers’ views. *Language Teaching Research.*

[53] San Isidro, X., & Lasagabaster, D. (2019a). Monitoring of teachers’ views on both CLIL and the. development of pluriliteracies: A longitudinal qualitative study. *English Language Teaching,* 12(2), 1–16.

[54] San Isidro, X., & Lasagabaster, D. (2019b). The impact of CLIL on pluriliteracy development and content learning in a rural multilingual setting: A longitudinal study. *Language Teaching Research*, *23*(5), 584–602.

[55] San Isidro, X., & Lasagabaster, D. (2020). Lessons to be learned: A professional development. approach to curriculum planning in a multilingual school in Galicia. In: Bower, K., Chambers, G., Coyle, D., & R. Cross (Eds.), *Curriculum integrated language teaching: CLIL in practice* (pp. 145–164). Cambridge University Press.

[56] Sedgwick, P*., &* Greenwood, N. (2015). Understanding the Hawthorne effect. Bmj, 351.

[57] Shenton, A. K. (2004). Strategies for ensuring trustworthiness in qualitative research projects. Education for information, 22 (2), 63-75.

[58] Smagulova, J. (2008). Language Policies of Kazakhization and Their Influence on Language Attitudes and Use. International Journal of Bilingu*al Education and Bilingualism*, *11*(3–4), 440–475.

[59] Tan, M. (2011). Mathematics and science teachers’ beliefs and practices regarding the teaching of language in content learning. *Language Teaching Research*, *15*(3), 325–342.

[60] Williams, M. (2022). Fifth graders’ use of gesture and models when translanguaging during a content and language integrated science class in Hong Kong. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, *25*(4), 1304–1323.

[61] Wei, L. (2011). Multilinguality, multimodality, and multicompetence: Code-and modeswitching by minority ethnic children in complementary schools. *The Modern Language Journal*, 95(3), 370-384.

[62] Wei, L. (2012). Conceptual and methodological issues in bilingualism and multilingualism. research. *The handbook of bilingualism and multilingualism*, 26-51.

[63] Yuvayapan, F. (2019). Translanguaging in EFL classrooms: Teachers’ perceptions and practices. *Dil ve Dilbilimi Çalışmaları Dergisi*, *15*(2), 678–694.