

Translanguaging and CLIL: Examining Power and Criticality

Corey Fegan

Toyo University, Department of Information
Networking for Innovation and Design

Reference Data:

Fegan, C. (2025). Translanguaging and CLIL: Examining power and criticality. In B. Lacy, R. P. Lege, & M. Swanson (Eds.), *Moving JALT Into the Future: Opportunity, Diversity, and Excellence*. JALT. <https://doi.org/10.37546/JALTPCP2024-19>

Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) (Coyle et al., 2010) is making inroads in Japan and being adapted for the Japanese context (Tsuchiya, 2019). Translanguaging is the utilization of multiple languages, for both pedagogic and non-pedagogic purposes (Cummins, 2021; Juvonen & Källkvist, 2021; García & Wei, 2014). These multilingual interactions have various theories relating to how they should occur, with symbolic power (Kramsch, 2021) relating to academic genre expectations, and anti-abysal thinking translanguaging (AATT) (García et al., 2021) viewing comprehension of content as more important than languages or language features used. A multiple case study was conducted over one year examining three grades of a junior high school CLIL science program. Interactions revealed that symbolic power was able to guide students towards realistic goals and outcomes, whereas AATT served as a linguistic ideal but did not apply to interactional issues.

内容言語統合型学習 (CLIL) (Coyle et al., 2010) は日本に浸透しつつあり、日本のコンテキストにも適応しつつある (Tsuchiya, 2019)。トランスランゲージングとは、教育学的および非教育学的目的の両方で複数の言語を利用することである (Cummins, 2021; Juvonen & Källkvist, 2021; García & Wei, 2014)。これら多言語の相互作用には、それがどのように使われるべきかに関するさまざまな理論があり、そのうち象徴的権力 (Kramsch, 2021) は、学術ジャンルの期待に関連し、反深淵的思考に基づくトランスランゲージング (AATT) (García et al., 2021) は、使用される言語や言語の特徴よりも、内容の理解を重視する。本研究では、ある中学校の CLIL 科学プログラムにおいて 3 学年を調査する 1 年間に及ぶ複数のケーススタディを検証した。結果として、相互作用により、象徴的権力は生徒を現実的な目標と結果に導くことができるのに対し、AATT は言語上の理想としては機能するものの、相互作用の問題には適用できないことが明らかになった。

This study focuses on multilingual interactions within a Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) classroom, examining how students use their multiple languages to achieve understanding within a junior high school science program. These interactions are investigated by utilizing two different conceptualizations to account for how languages can afford power and recognition, in order to explain why certain language forms are taught. One concept, symbolic power (Kramsch, 2021), emphasizes practitioners adopting expected norms of a community and integrating these forms into the users' own to achieve legitimacy, while the other, anti-abysal thinking translanguaging (AATT) (García et al., 2021), instead encourages acceptance of an individual's unique language system into a community without trying to impose restrictions in terms of the acceptability of that individual's lexicogrammatical and pragmatic linguistic choices. CLIL is a form of teaching that emphasizes the integration of language-focused learning and teaching into a classroom that also has a focus on content learning and understanding (Coyle et al., 2010; Dalton-Puffer, 2013). While initially a European construct (Marsh, 2002; Tsuchiya & Murillo, 2019), CLIL has been adopted by Japanese practitioners and adapted to fit Japanese needs (Tsuchiya, 2019). CLIL operates on a scale, ranging from classes that are language-focused but include content (soft CLIL) through to content-focused classes that also include language (hard CLIL) (Ball et al., 2016).

Translanguaging is, in essence, both a system of practices where multilingual speakers use their multiple language systems in a variety of ways and for a variety of purposes, and an examination of these practices. (García & Wei, 2014). While the initial concept of translanguaging was an input/output switch to help with the learning of a foreign language (García & Wei, 2014; Moore & Nikula, 2016), it has grown to also include multilingual speakers' rights (García & Wei, 2014; García et al., 2021), though a focus on pedagogic and classroom uses remains (Baker, 2011; Baker & Wright, 2017; Cummins, 2021; Duarte, 2020). This study examines how translanguaging is used as a multilingual scaffold, as well as how classroom interactions using multiple language can be examined

with regards to the ideas of symbolic power and AATT. If educators are able to see how these practices fare when exposed to real classroom practices, it would allow for more focus on practices which will better help students inside the classroom and prepare them for the realities that exist outside the classroom as well.

This study seeks to understand how concepts of symbolic power and AATT interact with data from classrooms that must focus on correct use of both content knowledge and language. The research questions are as follows:

- RQ1. How do symbolic power and AATT interact with in-situ multilingual interactions within a CLIL science classroom?
- RQ2. What benefits or detriments could symbolic power and AATT have on students inside and outside of the classroom?

Literature Review

CLIL and the 5th C

CLIL is based on the 4Cs framework, a system of ideas that serve to focus on how classes should be taught (Coyle et al., 2010). This framework helps define and guide how a CLIL class operates. The 4Cs consist of content (the subject material being taught), communication (all the language processes required to communicate ideas), cognition (the processes that move students through understanding) and culture (the situated classroom and its place in its community). Communication is further defined by the languages *of*, *for*, and *through* learning (Coyle et al., 2010). The language *of* learning is the words and grammar necessary to discuss or write about the content being studied, *for* learning is the language necessary to participate in learning activities, and *through* learning refers to any new/incidental language the student can encounter through participating in a class or activity. Unfortunately, the language *of* learning is sometimes the only type of language focused on within some CLIL programs (Morton, 2020).

Language and content are further addressed in the literature by focusing on basic interpersonal communicative skills (BICS) and cognitive academic language proficiency (CALP) (Cummins, 2008), as well as through discussions, such as Bloom's revised taxonomy, which emphasize the importance of scaffolds helping learners develop their subject understanding (Anderson & Krathwohl, 2001). CLIL researchers (e.g., Dalton-Puffer, 2013) have also developed a framework for showing how academic language understanding and proficiency are expressed linguistically, known as cognitive discourse functions, which includes such categories as define, report, and evaluate. These CDFs help students express understanding through utilizing academic language,

and are central in classes where discourse, language, and content are all of importance (Cammarata & Cavanagh, 2018).

Through the integration of CDFs into CLIL, the C of 'culture' was changed by CLIL researchers to reflect subject-specific literacies (Coyle & Meyer, 2021). This change in focus led to a conceptual gap, because it removed a feature of analysis that had allowed researchers to reflect on how CLIL was affecting students. In other words, whereas before it was possible to examine ways to better tailor the course to benefit students, now only a focus on subject-specific literacies remained. To close this gap, a 5th C was proposed by Sakamoto (2022) to allow for a connection to a class's situated environment, as well as to examine how the class was affecting students, while allowing for critical reflection and change to CLIL programs. This 5th C, criticality (Sakamoto, 2022) examines what features in the class are helping or hindering students.

Translanguaging and Ideas of Power

Translanguaging is expected within CLIL classrooms (Coyle et al., 2010; Lin, 2015; Lin, 2016). As translanguaging theory advanced, two distinct branches formed within the research. The first branch is defined as Universal Translanguaging Theory, or UTT, and the second as Cross-Linguistic Translanguaging Theory, or CTT (Cummins, 2021). In UTT, languages are seen as "named languages," (García & Lin, 2017) or a top-down construct where a host of language varieties are grouped together, given a name, and defined by a political state. Multiple language systems are fully integrated within a multilingual speaker to the point that they cannot be separated, and a focus on academic language is not possible. This is because defining academic language is problematic as the same language features do not appear in all different academic registers (Cummins, 2021b; García et al., 2021). Further, languages are not to be used to scaffold one another, because languages are integrated and thus should be utilized as fluid communicative tools rather than rigidly separated into language systems that may not be regarded as correct (García, 2017; García et al., 2021). Within CTT, on the other hand, languages are viewed as discrete systems within a multilingual speakers' linguistic repertoire, with integration occurring that allows for transfer of L1 surface abilities into the L2, as well as a shared resource of common underlying proficiencies. This form of translanguaging theory views languages as potential scaffolds of one another, utilized as classroom practices which teach academic language proficiency (Cummins, 2021).

The ideas of AATT (García et al., 2021) have similarities with UTT: they both hold that academic and non-academic language cannot be differentiated because specific academic language cannot extend through all genres, and L1/L2 are integrated and not

to be used as scaffolds. Of note, AATT sees comprehension as more important than the language used. This is because AATT seeks to legitimize and acknowledge other (read, multilingual) practices, which is extended to the idea that “characteristics of academic language tend to stem from idealized representations of texts produced mostly by white monolingual English-users occupying a socially dominant position” (García et al., 2021, p. 209). Even within the context of Japan, AATT can apply, because within CLIL a second language is being adopted. UTT ideas, linked with AATT, are already problematic when integrated with CLIL, as CLIL requires languages to act as scaffolds and has a focus on learning other content communities’ registers and practices. ‘Abyssal thinking’ here is representing a dominant society ‘othering’ any other societies of lesser influence and labeling their practices as less important/flawed.

Symbolic power examines how discourse affects power and people, with speech acts having the ability to gain, afford, and revoke legitimacy and power within a group. By affording respect to a group (e.g., to biological scientists) and adhering to genres and vocabulary that are considered expected and correct by that group (e.g., correct use of academic terms, structures, or genres of discussion utilized by biological scientists), interlocutors can gain legitimacy from that group. By gaining legitimacy, these interlocutors are afforded power; it is a circular structure where affording power and legitimacy to a group, then adhering to those standards, allows for one to also be afforded power and legitimacy in turn. Kramsch (2021) believes symbolic power can potentially be used by educators to focus on the success of students outside of the school environment, as well as “the extent to which the solving of real-world problems risks being hijacked by professional experts” (Kramsch, 2021, p. 201). Unfortunately, educators may miss this opportunity if they do not explicitly teach towards this concept. As one can see, symbolic power is related to AATT (both view languages and language practices as being afforded different systems of power) but each has a different view as to how this should be approached within a classroom (explicit teaching of ‘idealized’ practices versus expectations of others accepting multiple practices).

Research Site

The research was conducted in a private girls’ junior high school in central Japan, and focused on the school’s science program (an example of hard CLIL). The participants included students in the science program’s first ($n=18$), second ($n=18$) and third ($n=17$) years. The science program was taught by three teachers (referred to as T1, T2, and T3), with two teachers being present for each class. Table 1 below provides information about each teacher.

Table 1

Teacher Information

Teacher	Nationality (sex)	Teaching Experience	Classes Taught
T1	Filipino (male)	14 years / 3 years in program / 4 years as a science teacher in the Philippines	Years 1, 2, 3
T2	Japanese (male)	8 years / master’s in biology and forestry	Years 1, 3
T3	Japanese (female)	18 years, 15 years teaching biology and chemistry	Year 2

Teachers had training about CLIL frameworks when starting their course but received no focused training on using translanguaging for pedagogic purposes. Classes were observed by the researcher every Wednesday for the duration of the school year, leading to 55 classroom observations (17 observations for first year, and 18 each for second and third year). Audio recordings of the class were obtained, with one recording device used per group of students recording their interactions for the whole class, as well as classroom observation notes which were used to situate interactions in class by noting what was happening during the interactions, video recordings which were used to check what was written on the board, and copies of student notes, which were ultimately excluded from the research. Informed consent was gained from all the students as well as from their parents/guardians, and the project was cleared with the institutional review board at the university where the researcher was studying.

Data Analysis

The collected data indicated that translanguaging occurred in all classes observed and was utilized by both teachers and students when discussing content. The data that is presented in this paper was drawn from recorded interactions where multiple languages were used to construct answers or navigate meaning of content and language; all translanguaging that did not discuss content or language specifically was excluded. The data was chosen due to it showing interaction with content-specific language and use of translanguaging within the discussion, and to represent categories of interaction that repeated themselves: Three samples of interaction were selected, each representing one category: scaffolding between students (Table 2), scaffolding by teachers (Table 3), and interaction between students and teachers (Table 4), respectively. All students were/are identified by their year and seat position. Each sample of data is taken from one of the

three-year levels, and the data begins with year one students and moves through to year three. All transcriptions provided show the students' speech, followed by translations in bold as necessary.

Table 2 shows two students discussing 'insoluble.' The students self-select English to answer the question but then use both languages. In line 11, S13 makes a mistake and S12 corrects it. In line 13, S13 takes up the correction, and S12 continues to correct the language, showing a focus on language within CLIL without teacher prompting.

Table 2
Scaffold Between Students

Line	Speaker	Dialogue
1	Y1-S13	日本語?
		In Japanese?
2	Y1-S12	英語で言ってみよう。
		Let's try to say it in English.
3	Y1-S13	Okay okay.
4	Y1-S12	Insoluble は何?
		What is <i>insoluble</i>?
5	Y1-S13	Insoluble とsoluble の違い
		The difference between <i>insoluble</i> and <i>soluble</i>.
6	Y1-S12	違い?
		The difference?
7	Y1-S13	そのexampleも言う。
		That <i>example</i> we also say.
8	Y1-S12	え、example?
		Huh? <i>Example</i>?
9	Y1-S13	受験のことXX。Insoluble is, eh, soluble is
		Examination of XX.
10	Y1-S12	Dissolve.

Line	Speaker	Dialogue
11	Y1-S13	Dissolve in water, but insoluble is don't . . .
12	Y1-S12	isn't
13	Y1-S13	isn't dissolve in water. Example
14	Y1-S12	Example -laughs- for example
15	Y1-S13	for example. Soluble is stir after
16	Y1-S12	ah
17	Y1-S13	after color is clear, but insoluble is not clear.
18	Y1-S12	Mm, mm. Soluble is dissolve in water, and insoluble isn't in water.
19	Y1-S13	違いexample.
		Different <i>example</i>.
20	Y1-S12	Soluble is became clear, but insoluble is became white.
21	Y1-S13	oh
22	Y1-S12	White, 何だっけ
		White, what is it
23	Y1-S13	Particle
24	Y1-S12	Particule, particle. (sounding out pronunciation)
25	Y1-S13	particle
26	Y1-S12	Particle.

The students self-select English to answer the question but then use both languages. In line 11, S13 makes a mistake and S12 corrects it. In line 13, S13 takes up the correction, and S12 continues to correct the language, showing a focus on language within CLIL without teacher prompting. Considering AATT, the student offering language corrections is unnecessary, as comprehension of content is of more importance than focusing on language features. Additionally, there is no reason to specify a language to be used (as AATT and UTT say all languages are integrated regardless). Symbolic power was oriented to by the participants during a discussion of academic language (soluble and insoluble in line 5), as well as discourse being utilized to help with understanding. Concerning symbolic power, corrections of language helped students prepare answers

that would be correct and allowed for claims of legitimacy, which aligns with expected multilingual uses in CTT.

In Table 3, students are listening to a recording discussing how changing air pressure affects the lungs and respiration. Students who could not be identified are marked as S? in the transcript, and choral answers are marked as Ss.

Table 3
Scaffolding by Teachers

Line	Speaker	Dialogue
1	T1	What happens when diaphragms move upward?
2	Y2-S14	Get smaller.
3	T1	What happens when the diaphragm moves downward? Why is that so?
4	T3	このね、聞いたことがある単語が出てた。
		A word you heard before will come out here.
5	Rec	Ribcage elevates, as the volume of the lungs increases, air pressure in the lungs drops below atmospheric pressure and air rushes in. During normal exhalation, the muscles relax, the lungs become smaller, pressure inside them rises
6	T3	はい。むねの、この中の、ribcageの中の気圧が
		Yes. In your chest, in here, in the ribcage the atmospheric pressure
7	Y2-S11	下がる
		Lowers.
8	T1	Pressure
9	T3	圧力に注目してもう一回。
		One more time, focusing on pressure.
10	Rec	normal exhalation, the muscles relax, the lungs become smaller, pressure inside them rises and air is expelled. Boyle's law explains this relationship between volume and air pressure an increase in the volume of a container lowers the pressure of the air inside.

Line	Speaker	Dialogue
11	T3	量が減少すると圧力が、だから量が減らせると
		As the volume decreases, the pressure, so if you can reduce the quantity
11	T1	High or low?
12	Y2-Ss	Low
13	Y2-S?	High?
14	T1	High pressure.

T3 provides scaffolding in lines 1 and 6, and T1 checks if the students can give the correct answer, which should be 'high' in line 7. There was a focus on scaffolding understanding through multiple languages (lines 5 through 11) and exposure to the correct terms in multiple languages (also expected by CTT), but comprehension was not achieved (line 12). AATT does not provide a solution for this, as L1/L2 scaffolding is not necessary/useful, and UTT also does not provide support, as language practices are to be accepted, not corrected. CTT addresses this lack of correctness by affording more scaffolding, and symbolic power addresses this problem by requiring a greater focus on the necessary vocabulary and explanations required.

Next, Table 4 gives an example of students struggling to answer a question. T1 has provided the topic, which is what would happen if carbon emissions increased while total tree population is reduced.

Table 4
Interaction Between Student and Teacher

Line	Speaker	Dialogue
1	Y3-S2	Global warmingが進むでしょう?そしたら、weed increase、って当てる?だからthere are no trees, butその代わりにweed増える?
		Global warming is going forward, right? So, there are no trees, but instead weeds increase? So, there are no trees, but instead weeds increase?
2	Y3-S3	Treesのweed. かな?

Line	Speaker	Dialogue
		Tree's weed. Maybe?
3	Y3-S2	No? Eh? Weed doesn't need energy to grow up?
4	T1	They need energy.
5	Y3-S2	Eh? Need <i>だけ</i> small energy.
		Eh? Need but small energy.
6	T1	Small amount. They are green plants, they need energy.
7	Y3-S2	でも less energy than trees.
		But, less energy than trees.
8	T1	Not too much energy, okay. You want to replace trees with weeds.
9	Y3-S2	No, replace? We don't want to replace weeds. Most of people will pull up the weeds.
10	T1	Right. Okay.
11	Y3-S2	え、ちょっと待って、その前に global warming が
		Eh, wait a moment, before that global warming is
12	T1	The result of the global warming will be the increase of weed plants?
13	Y3-S2	I'm asking.
14	T1	I'm not sure. Why? Mr. T2, come here. Weed.

Even with a utilization of multiple language systems, communication of concepts was not achieved; T1 could not understand even when using both English and Japanese. Neither AATT nor UTT has recourse to correct this, though symbolic power does. As T1 did not understand the answer due to the mixing of Japanese and English, symbolic power would expect teachers to provide more scaffolding of languages to allow content to be expressed comprehensibly, aligning with CTT, which allows for additional scaffolding through intermixing of languages if required.

Discussion

Of note, in all interactions analyzed within this paper, all languages were accepted as legitimate, which satisfies a condition of AATT. This aligns with UTT, where language is

expected to intermix freely. However, in these interactions L1 is acting as an L2 scaffold, which is not ideal according to AATT and UTT, as languages should not simply be acting as scaffold, but rather as fluid communication.

In regards to research question one, symbolic power was oriented to by speakers when discussing content, as student correctness was judged by peers and teachers when utilizing either academic or basic register, and this judgement affords power/legitimacy. Symbolic power emphasizes that teachers should focus on helping students with the realities outside the classroom, and this aligns with what was observed, as teachers were concerned with preparing students for the future by having realistic expectations for linguistic output. Furthermore, symbolic power demands focusing on L1 and L2 academic language and allows languages to be used as a scaffold for one another. As for AATT, the main point of translanguaging is clear: do not deny a student's production because it falls outside of expectations. Still, the definition of AATT was problematic when compared to classes observed. Linking academic language to a 'white' concept did not seem supported in this data, in which Japanese teachers were equally interested in having the students learn academic language and terms in both Japanese and English. AATT also insists that languages are not scaffolds for one another, though evidence from the current data proved this claim invalid. Even within classes that are explicitly focused only on content, such as an L1 classroom focusing on biology, academic language is taught and must be utilized by students to allow for validation of their contributions.

In terms of research question 2, symbolic power in the data connects to real-world issues by requiring students to adapt their languages to be afforded legitimacy and power. It also explains how expectations of the community are reinforced by speakers, and how speakers are rewarded by interacting within expected norms. It is a cyclical process where speakers afford power to a group by following expected norms, then being rewarded by those groups with recognition and status by following the expected norms, which aligns with out of class realities. AATT accepts multiple language systems and reinforces their use naturally and without prejudice, but this does not account for realities of the world outside the classroom, and denies the use or existence of academic language, which was an area of focus in the classes. Regarding AATT, it is naïve to assume all types of language use will always be judged as equal. Symbolic power's warning that professional experts can dominate discussions of real-world problems and deny the legitimacy of laypeople is valid, as AATT does just that and denies teachers the use of languages as scaffolds, while insisting academic language does not exist.

Overall, we can see that patterns of translanguaging interaction existed, and use of multiple languages does not guarantee understanding of content. Symbolic power

and CTT allows for legitimization of answers and a focus on academic language, while within AATT and UTT comprehension of content is of more importance than language used, which does not account for miscommunication nor scaffolding incorrect answers through use of academic language features.

Conclusion

There are several limitations within the study. CLIL is a pedagogy that is open to multiple languages interacting within the classroom, while teaching content and language at the same time. Other classroom types that do not generally accept L1 use within a primarily L2 environment may show differing interactions. In addition, this study focused on classrooms that had two teachers teaching one class, allowing for interactions that could not occur when only one teacher is present. Further research into this area is required before broad claims can be generated.

Both theories of practice had applications that were found within the provided in-situ interactions, but these theories did not provide equal access to issues found. Rather than relying on theory crafting of AATT and symbolic power, relying on interactions within classrooms highlights how these theories operate in practice. Without being grounded in real-world examples, it would be possible to claim that a more 'idealized' classroom would afford the opportunities of a practice, without explaining how those classrooms would come to exist. Ultimately, symbolic power allowed users to adhere to groups' expectations of practice and the power/legitimacy that this affords. Symbolic power aligned with users preparing students for the realities of interactions with subject-specific content, whereas AATT linked to an ideal in interaction, without any suggestions for how to adapt when this ideal did not meet reality. The use of multiple languages in a classroom must be guided by expectations of practice. It is necessary for students to be able to express themselves in ways that are deemed correct by specific communities in order to be judged as members of those communities to gain legitimacy and be afforded power.

Bio Data

Corey Fegan is an assistant professor at Toyo University, INIAD, and has an interest in CLIL, translanguaging for pedagogical purposes, and pedagogy.

References

- Anderson, L. W., & Krathwohl, D. R. (2001). *A taxonomy for learning, teaching, and assessing: A revision of Bloom's taxonomy of educational objectives*. Longman.
- Baker, C. (2011). *Foundations of bilingual education and bilingualism* (5th Edition). Multilingual Matters.
- Baker, C., & Wright, W. E. (2017). *Foundations of bilingualism education and bilingualism*. Multilingual Matters. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-02258-1_2
- Ball, P., Kelly, K., & Clegg, J. (2016). *Putting CLIL into practice*. Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.15581/004.31.7761>
- Cammarata, L., & Cavanagh, M. (2018). In search of immersion teacher educators' knowledge base: Exploring their readiness to foster an integrated approach to teaching. *Journal of Immersion and Content-Based Language Education*, 6(2), 189–217. <https://doi.org/10.1075/jicb.18009.cam>
- Coyle, D., Hood, P., & Marsh, D. (2010). *Content and language integrated learning*. Ernst Klett Sprachen
- Coyle, D., & Meyer, O. (2021). *Beyond CLIL: Pluriliteracies teaching for deeper learning*. Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108914505>
- Cummins, J. (2008). BICS and CALP: Empirical and theoretical status of the distinction. *Encyclopedia of language and education*, 2(2), 71–83. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-0-387-30424-3_36
- Cummins, J. (2021). Translanguaging: A critical analysis of theoretical claims. In P. Juvonen, & M. Källkvist, *Pedagogical translanguaging: Theoretical, methodological and empirical perspectives* (pp. 40–82). Multilingual Matters. doi.org/10.21832/9781788927383-004
- Dalton-Puffer, C. (2013). A construct of cognitive discourse functions for conceptualising content-language integration in CLIL and multilingual education. *European Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 1(2), 216–253. <https://doi.org/10.1515/eujal-2013-0011>
- Duarte, J. (2020). Translanguaging in the context of mainstream multilingual education. *International Journal of Multilingualism*, 17(2), 232–247. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14790718.2018.1512607>
- García, O. (2017). Reflections on Turnbull's reframing of foreign language education: bilingual epistemologies. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 22(5), 628–638. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050.2016.1277512>
- García, O., Flores, N., Seltzer, K., Wei, L., Otheguy, R., & Rosa, J. (2021). Rejecting abyssal thinking in the language and education of racialized bilinguals: A manifesto. *Critical Inquiry in Language Studies*, 18(3), 203–228. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15427587.2021.1935957>
- García, O., & Lin, A. (2017). Translanguaging in bilingual education. *Bilingual and Multilingual Education*, 5, 117–130. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-02258-1_9

- García, O., & Wei, L. (2014). *Translanguaging: Language, bilingualism and education*. Palgrave Macmillan. <https://doi.org/10.5565/rev/jtl3.764>
- Juvonen, P., & Källkvist, M. (Eds.). (2021). *Pedagogical translanguaging: Theoretical, methodological and empirical perspectives* (Vol. 132). Multilingual Matters. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050.2023.2237646>
- Kramsch, C. (2021). *Language as symbolic power*. Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.24917/20831765.17.21>
- Lin, A. (2015). Conceptualising the potential role of L1 in CLIL. *Language, Culture and Curriculum*, 28(1), 74–89. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07908318.2014.1000926>
- Lin, A. (2016). *Language across the curriculum & CLIL in English as an additional language (EAL) contexts: Theory and practice*. Springer Singapore. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-10-1802-2>
- Marsh, D. (2002). *CLIL/EMILE — The European dimension: Actions, trends and foresight potential*. University of Jyväskylä: UniCOM.
- Moore, P., & Nikula, T. (2016). Translanguaging in CLIL classrooms. In T. Nikula, E. Dafouz, P. Moore, & U. Smit, *Conceptualising integration in CLIL and multilingual education 101* (pp. 211–233). Multilingual Matters. <https://doi.org/10.15581/004.32.8726>
- Morton, T. (2020). Cognitive discourse functions: A bridge between content, literacy and language for teaching and assessment in CLIL. *CLIL Journal of Innovation and Research in Plurilingual and Pluricultural Education*, 3(1), 7–17. <https://doi.org/10.5565/rev/clil.33>
- Sakamoto, M. (2022). The missing C: Addressing criticality in CLIL. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 25(7), 2422–2434. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050.2021.1914540>
- Tsuchiya, K. (2019). CLIL and language education in Japan. In K. Tsuchiya, & M. D. Murillo, *Content and language integrated learning in Spanish and Japanese contexts* (pp. 37–56). Palgrave Macmillan. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-27443-6_3
- Tsuchiya, K., & Murillo, M. D. (2019). *Content and language integrated learning in Spanish and Japanese contexts*. Palgrave Macmillan. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-27443-6>