

Teaching English Language Journal

ISSN: 2538-5488 – E-ISSN: 2538-547X – <http://tel.journal.org>

© 2023 – Published by Teaching English Language and Literature Society of Iran



Please cite this paper as follows:

Memari, M. (2023). Language skills development via translanguaging: A case of EFL context.

Teaching English Language, 18(1), 39-68. <https://doi.org/10.22132/tel.2023.369483.1409>

Research Paper

Language Skills Development via Translanguaging: A Case of EFL Context

Mehran Memari¹

*Department of English Language Teaching, Farhangian University,
Tehran, Iran*

Abstract

Many aspects of the effect of translanguaging have been examined in TESOL and EFL contexts, but few studies have looked at the impact of translanguaging on students' perceptions in the Iranian context; using the evidence of practice-based empirical studies on translanguaging pedagogies, this study attempted to confirm these assertions. The study consisted of ten weeks of contact with 60 pre-intermediate students in one group and 60 upper-intermediate students in the second group at *Farhangian University*. Half of the students were in the experimental group, and the other half were in the control group. A 10-week translanguaging pedagogy course was administered to the experimental groups, whereas the two control groups received traditional EFL instruction (grammar translation and communicative instruction). The data were gathered through two skill tests according to the curriculum in A2 and B2 level objectives for pre-intermediate and upper-intermediate students, and an interview which elicited the participants' perception toward translanguaging use. Mixed-methods quasi-experimental design was utilized in this study. A paired samples t-test and an ANCOVA showed that translanguaging significantly improved students' English language skills. Semi-structured interviews uncovered that the students expressed positive outcomes from using translanguaging pedagogy. They reported experiencing constructive, cognitive, interactive, and affective advantages. This approach allowed students to utilize their full linguistic knowledge to create and negotiate meaning, resulting in a feeling of ease and

¹ Corresponding author: m.memari@cfu.ac.ir

motivation when using English. Teachers will benefit from understanding how translanguaging plays a role in teaching English.

Keywords: Translanguaging, Traditional Methods, Cognitive, Interactive, Constructive, Affective

Received: July 30, 2023

Accepted: October 2, 2023



1. Introduction

There has been a shift from teaching foreign languages as a process of analysis (e.g., Grammar Translation Method or GTM) towards teaching language as a tool for communication (Communicative Language Teaching) (Celce-Murcia, 2001). As a result of the shift from analysis to utility, monoglossic ideology (Bakhtin, 1981) has gained importance, which refers to proficiency in two languages as per monolingual norms (Garcia, 2009), because classrooms are the only place where students encounter the target language. According to Wang (2019), this argument has led to monolingualism in classes that teach foreign languages. Due to the monolingual bias present in language classrooms around the world, communicative language teaching (CLT) inevitably dominates language classrooms. Language use is encouraged here, while language analysis is the objective of the Grammar Translation Method (Hu and McKay 2012) and pedagogical knowledge is more important to EFL learners than the knowledge about language (Alibakhshi, 2019). Consequently, in the English as a foreign language context, use of learners' first languages has been systematically avoided on the basis that they should be taught in their target language context so that they can communicate effectively (Macaro, 2009).

The language compartmentalization concept is questioned by Garcia (2009), who argues that translanguaging, or simultaneous language use in

language learning, is a better method of teaching languages, especially in pre-school and K12 contexts, which is based on bilingualism as a model of instruction and interaction (Moore, 2018). Both languages can provide teachers with a more dynamic learning environment, since they can use strong (native) and weak (English) languages for separate yet overlapping pedagogical objectives, according to Garcia (2009).

The benefits of translanguaging have been documented in a number of studies (Moore & Nikula, 2016). As noted by Inbar-Lourie (2010), language learning can overcome the disadvantage that current pedagogy ignores or even suppresses bilingual and multilingual options. Using translanguaging to operationalize the theory of language as a practical concept (Wei, 2018), the researcher examines how translanguaging impacts language learners (Nikula & Moore, 2019). According to heteroglossia (Bakhtin, 1981), language is re-conceptualized as a multilingual, multi-semiotic, and multi-modal resource created by learners in a holistic fashion.

2. Literature Review

According to Lewis, Jones, and Baker (2012), there is a distinction between translanguaging, which is primarily used by learners, and code switching and translation, that happens while analyzing languages or when communicating with others who speak foreign languages. Instead of seeing translation as harmful to communication and in conflict with the core principles of the communicative approach, it can be seen as a valuable and advantageous tool in second language (L2) teaching. Its inclusion can be seen as beneficial, supporting and improving the development of communicative competence rather than obstructing it (Bolkvadze, 2023). The researcher argues that translanguaging promotes active learning by engaging learners in meaning-making. In Garcia's opinion (2019), translanguaging includes code-switching and also other forms of bilingual language use and bilingual

contact, such as bilingual contact, despite the term code-switching having been used. Despite the significance of a strict division of languages, Mazak (2017) asserts that translanguaging in conventional classrooms objects to traditional theories of L2 learning. Accordingly, translanguaging opposes the traditional understanding of L2 acquisition that views teaching in second language only as satisfactory, deeming other methods inadequate or insufficient (Kawafha & Al Masaeed, 2023; Mitchell, 1988).

Translanguaging is used as a qualitative research methodology by Kevin (2022). By engaging critical frameworks and multidisciplinary methodologies, he describes how translanguaging inquiry can depict translanguaging pedagogies for multilingual learners.

Translanguaging has been discussed as a multimodal, transemiotic practice and methodology (Ascenzi-Moreno & Vogel, 2019; Sabrina & Zhongfeng, 2023; Sherris & Adami, 2019; Wu & Lin, 2019). A third aspect of Turnbull's work is to develop and implement professional development projects and practical materials for translanguaging pedagogy across New York in both monolingual and bilingual schools (Turnbull, 2022; Sanchez & Menken, 2019).

As Flores (2014) explains, strong forms of translanguaging pedagogy recognize translanguaging as an inherently political act. Translanguaging pedagogy must challenge dominant narratives about languages and bilingualism for multilingual learners of color to achieve social justice (Fu et al., 2019). Through the disruption of monolingual assumptions about bilingualism and literacy, Garcia and Kleifgen (2019) demonstrate how teachers engage in social justice with marginalized multilingual students by enabling them to become educated multilingual students, able to apply their whole semiotic supply (Saragih et al. 2022). As a result, translanguaging pedagogy can and should be desired at improving academic outcomes as well

as disturbing hegemonic language standards (Al Masaeed, 2022; Poza, 2018; Prada & Nikula, 2018) by converting the power dynamics between the languages spoken in the classroom.

In a study conducted by Galante (2020), 127 international students participated in a *Canadian English for Academic Purposes* program. Statistically significant differences were found in the academic English vocabulary test scores at the end of the course for those in the translanguaging group compared to those in the English-only group. In their diaries, students in the translanguaging group expressed a sense of normalization and inclusion. Using their full repertoire, they were able to make more linguistic senses, developed better metacognitive awareness of the similarities and differences between vocabulary items across languages (particularly idioms and discourse markers), and felt more proactive during vocabulary learning as a result of translanguaging.

It is possible to achieve positive effects through translanguaging and alternating languages both in the receptive as well as the productive modes of learning (Baker, 2011). TESOL and EFL contexts have examined many aspects of the effect of translanguaging- speaking (Galante, 2020), writing (Sun & Lan 2020), listening (Galante, 2020), and reading (Vaish & Subhan 2015), but few have looked at the impact of translanguaging on students' perceptions (Muhammet & Kenan, 2022; Rivera & Mazak, 2017). Using the evidence from practice-based empirical studies on translanguaging pedagogies, an attempt is made to see whether these assertions can be confirmed.

In this mixed methods research, four language skills - listening, speaking, reading, and writing - are studied as a result of translanguaging. In this study, the following research questions are investigated in relation to participants

whose education is directed by grammar-translation instruction and the Communicative Approach:

1. Are students exposed to grammar-translation likely to exhibit any significant improvement in their fluency in receptive and productive foreign languages after the translanguaging experience?
2. Are students exposed to communicative language teaching likely to exhibit any significant improvement in their fluency in receptive and productive foreign languages after the translanguaging experience?
3. In what ways does translanguaging pedagogy impact the perception of language learning among learners?

3. Method

3.1 Design

To identify the impact of the translanguaging intervention, the adopted embedded quasi-experimental design (Creswell & Plano, 2007) was used. According to their semesters, all the participants were placed in pre-intermediate (18–19 years old) and upper-intermediate (21–22 years old) level. Students in the pre-intermediate classes were given a sample Preliminary English Test (KET; Carne et al., 1996) and those in the upper-intermediate classes received a sample Cambridge English (Ireland, 2000). Participants were divided into four intact classes, with two groups in each proficiency group, pre-intermediate and upper-intermediate. Classes were randomly assigned to experimental or control conditions at each level. In these two experimental groups, translanguaging instruction was provided based on Garcia's (2009) model, whereas the two control groups received traditional EFL instruction (grammar translation and communicative instruction). First language was purposely blended into teaching, but translanguaging was not discussed with students. Using languages to teach all four classes was done by the co-researcher.

3.2 Context and Participants

This inquiry was done in *Farhangian University* in Iran in the fall of 2021 with 60 pre-intermediate and 60 upper-intermediate students. They gained admission to *Farhangian University*, being accepted via *Konkoor* (University Entrance Exam). There were 10 students in each class of 30 who volunteered to be interviewed. Pre-intermediate students were taught in grammar-translation for one year, while upper-intermediate students were taught in communicative language method, again for one year. Natively Persian, the teacher who teaches these classes was also proficient in English, with 21 years of English teaching involvement in training in bilingualism and translanguaging. As participants do not speak any other languages, Persian and English were used during the translanguaging process.

3.3 Instruments

3.3.1 Skills evaluation tools

Pre-intermediate skills tests require students to fulfill A2 objectives, while upper-intermediate skills tests require students to fulfill B2 objectives. An additional group of students was used to pilot the test. Cronbach's Alpha internal consistency coefficient of test items was .96, which meant the mean item difficulty index of the test was .59; the mean item distinguishing index of the test was .91; and the average item difficulty index was .59. An evaluation rubric was used to evaluate writing scores based on overall organization, coherence, vocabulary, grammatical accuracy, content, format and length, while a speaking skill assessment was conducted by evaluating pronunciation, fluency and coherence, vocabulary, and grammatical range. Two English teachers independently assessed all groups with the same skills test as a pre- and post-test. Using Pearson correlation analysis, it was determined that the pre- and post-tests were ($r = .92$; $r = .86$) for speaking ($r = 0.81$; $r = 0.73$), which displayed rather high correspondence between the scores of the two instructors.

3.3.2 Attribution Interview Questions

A total of five questions were asked in order to determine how students perceive translanguaging. The post-test interviews were conducted with 20 volunteer students. In order to explore possible multiple factors, 10 people from each group were selected to make sure the broadest credible series of scores.

3.4 Procedure

In a paired samples t-test, both experimental and control groups at each level had equal pre-test means. Everyone was keen to try with the new instruction method after being informed about the intervention. After that, we implemented 10 weeks of translanguaging instruction - three hours per week. Continuous translation of the instruction from English to Persian was offered in control groups, whereas English-only instruction was offered in communicative groups. According to translanguaging principles (Garcia, 2009), input and output in the experimental groups were deliberately switched, along with an equal allotment of both languages.

To teach each skill bilingually, the following practices were used: reading (reading bilingually, gaining experienced knowledge, permitting reciprocal cooperation as language helper, constructing Frayer model), listening (dialogues and stories that use bilingual characters, listening stations in L1, small group instruction, reciprocal cooperation as language helper), writing (note-taking, prewriting by utilizing all language abilities, giving reciprocal cooperation as language helper, developing connections), and speaking (gaining knowledge of background, documenting ideas, small group activity, personal conferences). In addition, bilingual resources such as different kinds of dictionaries, translation apps, and websites were utilized, as well as word walls for common terms in Persian and English with examples and visuals. A literary text was translated, reading comprehension tasks were answered,

antonyms and synonyms were found, cognates were found, rules were applied deductively, blanks were filled in, new words were memorized, and sentences were composed. CLT classroom activities included role plays, information gap activities, interviews, discussions, language games, problem-solving tasks, quizzes, surveys, and language learning simulations. Throughout the intervention, the research questions were unknown to the students.

3.5 Qualitative and Quantitative Data Analysis

Our data were normal, linear, and homogeneous. The paired samples t-test was therefore used. Additionally, Cronbach's Alpha internal consistency coefficient of achievement test items was .89, which implies reliability and validity. The post-test was applied to all groups after the pre-test and intervention, comparing the dissimilarity between each group at each level using a one-way analysis of covariance (ANCOVA) with statistical control of the covariate (pre-test) on the dependent variable. To measure effect size, partial eta squares were used. In light of these findings, .01, .06, and .14 are classified as having small, moderate, and large effects, respectively.

To explore whether translanguaging instruction could have an impact on students, the researcher applied grounded theory to the interview data (Charmaz, 2006). To generate preliminary open codes, all 166 responses iteratively and simultaneously were coded into a table. This table was categorized to produce grouping. A process of axial coding was applied to compose conceptual categories from the summaries. This gave rise to 23 first categories, which were then reduced to 15 categories. Ultimately, the researcher reorganized these categories into four particular codes as the major themes, that are, constructive, cognitive, interactive, and affective dimensions, in order to develop a theoretical perception (Saldaña & Omasta, 2017) of the possible impression of translanguaging. The frequency of

emerging themes was also counted to detect the demonstrative of each of the 15 categories. The total inter-coder reliability was 90%. Negotiations led to a consensus on coding disagreements.

Lincoln and Guba (1985) identified four criteria for trustworthiness that the researcher addressed to. The etic stance of the co-researcher supported the researcher's emic stance in the classroom, which ensured credibility. The objective was to maximize transferability by providing detailed depiction of the context, participants, and instruments. To increase dependability and confirmability, details about the research procedures, including data gathering and analysis were provided, which implied several rounded of interrogating and member checks. In this way, the co-researcher was prevented from having a bias induced by his attendance in the classroom.

4. Results and Discussion

To conclude if the groups were identical, the first statistical analysis was conducted. Table 1 and 2 show these pre-test scores.

As shown in Table 1, there was no statistically significant difference between pre-test means and standard deviations of the two experimental and control groups (for Experimental one, mean = 73.47; SD = 6.74, and for Control one mean = 75.08; SD = 5.48). Thus, test scores before intervention are equal for the experimental and control groups in the pre-intermediate phase.

Table 1
Pre-test Score of the Two Pre-intermediate Groups

Groups	N	Mean	SD	df	t	p
Experimental	30	73.47	6.74	58		.8738
Control	30	75.08	5.48			

* $p < .05$.

As shown in Table 2, there was no statistically significant difference between the experimental group's mean and standard deviation (Mean =

74.87; SD = 3.85) and the control group's mean and standard deviation (Mean = 75.87; SD = 4.98). As a result, we begin presenting our results for each research question after making sure that the two groups are equal on the basis of the pre-test scores.

Table 2
Pre-test Score of the Two Upper-intermediate Groups

Groups	N	Mean	SD	df	t	p
Experimental	30	74.87	3.85	58	.39	.70
Control	30	75.87	4.98			

* $p < .05$.

4.1 Students' Receptive and Productive Foreign Language Abilities After Translanguaging: The Grammar Translation Group

In the translanguaging group and in the grammar-translation group, the difference in pre-test and post-test scores were calculated and analyzed. According to Table 3, pre- and post-test scores are descriptively compared.

Table 3

Pre- and post-test achievement of pre-intermediate experimental and control groups

Tests		Experimental Group				Control Group				
		N	M	SD	t	N	M	SD	t	p
L2	Pretest	30	73.47	6.74	22.12*	30	75.08	5.48	4.23*	.000
Skills	Posttest	30	89.05	5.54		30	83.53	5.23		

* $p < .05$.

Based on Table 3, there is a significant difference between the pre-intermediate experimental group students' pre-test scores (M = 73.47; SD = 6.74) and post-test scores (M = 89.05; SD = 5.54) in favor of the post-test scores ($t(29) = 22.12$; $p < .05$). The control group students' scores (M = 75.08;

SD = 5.48) and post-test scores (M = 83.53; SD = 5.23) were significantly different ($t(29) = 4.23$; $p < .05$). After translanguaging instruction, learners' performance in the experimental group significantly improved, as indicated by the significant value (.000) below the significance level ($p < .05$). The Cohen's d value was calculated using Thalheimer and Cook's (2002) effect size calculator based on the difference between the experimental and control groups. Four skills scored higher after receiving translanguaging instruction, resulting in a Cohen's d value of 1.03.

4.2 Students' Receptive and Productive Foreign Language Abilities after Translanguaging: The Communicative Language Teaching Group

The descriptive statistics related to pre-test and post-test scores for the two translanguaging and communicative groups are shown in Table 4.

Table 4
Pre- and Post-Test Achievement of Upper-Intermediate Experimental and Control Groups

Tests	Experimental group				Control group				
	<i>N</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>
L2	Pretest 30	76.10	4.32	18.98*	0030	76.88	5.33	14.30*	.00
Skills	Posttest30	88.29	5.53		30	86.07	5.61		

* $p < .05$

Table 4 shows that in the upper-intermediate experimental group, there is a significant difference between their pre-test scores (M = 76.10; SD = 4.32) and their post-test scores (M = 88.29; SD = 5.53) in favor of the post-test scores ($t(29) = 18.98$; $p .05$). A significant difference was also observed between the post-test scores and the control group scores (M = 86.07; SD = 5.61) in favor of the post-test scores ($t(29) = 14.30$; $p .05$). In this case, Cohen's d value is significantly smaller than the significance level of (.53). Thalheimer and Cook's (2002) effect size calculator was used to estimate the effect size of the difference between the two groups. Translanguaging

pedagogy was calculated to have a medium influence on students' achievement scores based on Cohen's d value of .53. Additionally, a one-way analysis of covariance (ANCOVA) was conducted since the assumptions had not been violated. The use of ANCOVA reduces the initial group differences in quasi-experimental studies, according to Dornyei (2007). One-way ANCOVA results on the skills test and between-subjects' consequences are presented in Table 5.

Table 5

Post-test analysis of covariance (ANCOVA), dependent variable

Level	Source	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean square	F	p	η^2
Pre-	Pre-test	1202.93	1	1202.93	144.68	.000	.717
Intermediate	<i>GROUP</i>	618.25	1	618.25	73.253*	.000	.575*
	Error	473.8	57	8.4			
	Total	460,899.0	60				
Upper-Intermediate	Pre-test	42.296	1	43.314	1.885	.175	.032
	<i>GROUP</i>	387.210	1	387.21	16.267*	.000	.231*
	Error	1309.619	57	22.97			
	Total	459,704.000	60				

* $p < .05$.

Following adjustment for the pre-test scores, Table 5 illustrates that the one-way ANCOVA results on the skills test revealed significant differences in achievement between the students in the two experimental and control groups, as measured by the post-test. In terms of language skills, the experimental group outperformed the control group on the post-test ($F(1, 57) = 73.253$; $p < 0.05$). There was a partial eta square of .57 calculated for this difference. The experimental group students' post-test scores exhibited a large effect and explained the variance in the results. When pre-tests are controlled, translanguaging instruction explains 57% of the variance in the post-test scores of the experimental group. The experimental group gained considerably greater on the post-test than the control group after checking for the pre-test scores at the upper-intermediate level ($F(1, 57) = 16.267$; $p < 0.05$). It was calculated that the eta square for this difference was .23. An

effect of this magnitude can be seen in the post-test scores of the experimental group, explaining much of the variance. Thus, when the pre-tests were controlled, translanguaging instruction explained 23% of the variance in the post-test scores for the experimental group.

4.3 Translanguaging and Students' Perception of Language Learning

Students' perceptions of translanguaging pedagogy were the focus of the third question. Following are the themes and subthemes that emerged from interviews with learners in both experimental groups who took part in translanguaging activities.

Table 6

Themes and Subthemes in Experimental Groups

Main themes	Density	Sub-themes	Density
Constructive Dimension	17	Making meaning	8
		Promoting autonomous learning	9
		Accessing full linguistic repertoire	9
Cognitive dimension	37	Discovering language system	8
		Bilingual awareness raising	10
		Facilitating learning	10
		Developing interactional language use	14
Interactive dimension	33	Authentic language use	5
		Promoting communicative abilities	14
		Feeling secure during in-class communication	9
Affective dimension	55	Developing sense of comfort while learning English	10
		Sustaining motivation to speak	6
		Volunteering instead of being forced to engage.	6
		Experiencing enjoyment of learning	18
		Developing sense of real language learning	6

4.3.1 Constructive dimension

It was beneficial to have autonomous learning. Student 3 commented,

I learned more from using both languages because I had the autonomy to decide which language to use."

The same priority was highlighted by student 6:

the importance of learning and applying Persian and English lead to my prosperity.

Memari

In addition, student 5 emphasized the importance of authentic conversation:

We had real communication since both Persian and English were spoken. We were familiar with both languages and practiced them together. So, we developed both.

A translanguaging course can be beneficial for some students because it lets them make sense and realize issues, and also express ideas orally and in writing. In the opinion of student 5, the materials were the most significant.

My friends and I were able to discuss the topic together. Translanguaging appears to facilitate communication flow and reading comprehension by increasing understanding. Similarly, student 20 stated: "I enjoyed Persian-English words since they helped me get well and I was able to increase my vocabulary knowledge as well. My understanding of scientific terms is much clearer. I found it very helpful to use and remember four-box graphic organizers.

Besides improving reading comprehension, translanguaging enhances vocabulary knowledge. According to student 12, brainstorming should be conducted in this manner.

It can be in any language. Initially, writing in any language helped me organize my thoughts and write easily, which was a big problem for me.

Translanguaging improved writing skills, as shown in this quote.

4.3.2 Cognitive dimension

By accessing their whole linguistic collection when learning a language, learners were able to tap into their potential, thereby promoting communication. By translanguaging practices, student 4 is able to distinguish real learning from non-real learning:

"I thought we weren't realizing real learning since we didn't translate anything. However, when I

54 Teaching English Language, In Press

Language Skills Development ...

recognized that I could carry out more than translation, I felt pleased".

Similarly, student 6 expressed his understanding that he could speak and understand English.

As I realized I had never spoken English before, I got I had never tried to do so.

In this saying, the learner describes experiencing oral production for the first time.

A cognitive dimension involves investigation, and making sense is generally associated with cognition. According to student 9, English lessons were more than just a regular class.

Indeed, it was like discovering and implementing something completely different.

The role of translanguaging in triggering inquiry into the language system was emphasized.

Awareness-raising appears to be another cognitive dimension. A positive feeling was engendered by student 4's discovery of her bilingualism: 'When I was able to practice two languages, I felt more powerful. My understanding of bilingualism grew. It gives me a positive feeling.

According to some students, translanguaging facilitates the learning process. In describing their positive experiences, student 10 emphasizes the empirical education gained from the instruction:

Lessons are practical and make learning easier. As a result of the use of materials in two languages, I was able to put the knowledge into practice",

whereas student 15 illustrates how the tasks in two languages enhanced her understanding:

All these materials enabled me to understand things better because I am able to understand graphs and shapes easily.

4.3.3 Interactive dimension

The use of translanguaging in interactional language was highlighted by some students. Student 3 emphasized that,

I had the opportunity to practice English with my teacher and my friends. There was simultaneous use of Persian and English.

Student 7 expressed a novel feeling of enjoyment:

"I had never experienced such a pleasant feeling before" when talking to her classmates. Scaffolding and translanguaging were also pointed out by student 13, who claimed,

There was a great deal of benefits from dialogues and discussions. Our Persian and English lessons were put into practice. Every activity was completed by everyone.

In addition, students 10 and 20 demonstrated authentic language use:

Translanguaging made it easy for me to ask for clarification and I was relieved when I understood everything. My peers and teachers were able to express their ideas without having to speak English.

Language became more tangible and concrete when it was used in authentic ways, according to some students. Specifically, student 7 stressed the concrete aspects of English, saying,

I realized that I had regarded English as an abstract concept before. English has become a part of my everyday life at school and at home. It is an integral part of my life.

As a result of being permitted to apply their entire linguistic store, some students stated that the emphasis was on communication. According to students 10 and 1, they gained the following communication skills:

As we communicated, instructions seemed to flow fluently. We were constantly communicating with our friends in both languages at the same time. It felt great. During lessons, my primary concern was communicating a message and understanding it, so I could convey my message.

Further, some students set about to progressively multiply their contribution, such as student 2. He asserted that, "I noticed that Persian and English were parts of the classes, and this situation helped me build my understanding and made me more open to discussions."

4.3.4 Affective dimension

By having the option of using either language, some students felt more comfortable expressing themselves in English only. As student 8 pointed out: "It wasn't a problem to convey my ideas because I had access to both English and Persian", while student 16 said he was relaxed when the teacher did not make him do so. According to student 17, flexibility contributed to self-confidence, as "I could join the lessons and feel confident". As student 9 expressed, he was set free from the inhibiting upshot of obligatory tasks:

I felt relaxed because I wasn't forced to do anything.

Another aspect of translanguaging is the feeling of ease and mitigation felt throughout translanguaging activities. Learners 8 and 14 emphasized that they felt more comfortable in the lessons. They said respectively,

Due to the fact that nobody felt nervous before, during, and after the English classes, we were able to communicate comfortably in both languages.

The importance of maintaining motivation for foreign language learners cannot be overstated. In addition to increasing motivation, translanguaging created genuine interest for student 11,

At the end of week one, I became accustomed to it, and translanguaging motivated me to participate in activities instead of feigning interest. I used Persian and/or English when necessary and learned.

Bluffing or assuming may be usual when learners avoid earnestly participating owing to their low level of English, impeding their self-statement.

To develop intrinsic motivation for learning, voluntary participation is also important, rather than being pressured. Translanguaging allowed student 12 to engage in lessons more freely:

I liked the lessons because I didn't have to speak English. As soon as I felt ready, I translated my thoughts into English automatically.

Fun was emphasized as a key aspect of language learning by the students. As student 9 agreed, understanding the teacher and the classmates and speaking English contributed greatly to enjoying English classes. In describing the enjoyment, student 12 outlined the difference between earlier and current methods of learning:

It was great. It was fun really. I understood that English isn't just memorizing and translating.

Translanguaging makes students feel honest with themselves as opposed to superficial, non-authentic materials that give students a sense of artificiality in learning. In the words of student 9,

Stop acting as if we are speaking English made me experience virtuous. We used to speak Persian when we were in groups but when the instructor was nearby, we only said "surely" and "me too" with no comprehending. There was nothing real about it.

5. Conclusion

Three research questions were addressed in this study. Those who received translanguaging instruction exhibited higher levels of receptive and productive skills compared to those who received grammar translation

instruction. Based on ANCOVA, translanguaging teaching had a considerable impact (η^2 : 0.49) on language abilities.

In addition to mediating learner understandings, translanguaging instruction enables co-constructing concept and demonstrating learning (Garcia, 2009), showing a more authentic and comprehensive image of our learner's linguistic behavior, thereby facilitating language learning. It could also be argued that translanguaging is more inclusive than additive-subtractive dyadic teaching (Garcia & Wei, 2014) for all learners, regardless of their linguistic experience. Based on the results of our study, teachers and students were more likely to communicate with each other, as well as among themselves (Nussbaum, 2014). Translanguaging was also regarded positively by four-fifths of the interviewees. Through organized promotion of translanguaging in classes, students felt more protected, inspired, and eager to learn and improved understanding (Dikilitas & Mumford, 2020) as a result of mastering difficulties of the pedagogical assignment (Creese & Blackledge, 2010), and advancing a wider comprehension (Baker, 2011). A fifth of the interviewees expressed their only criticism due to their unwillingness to employ their native language. The reason is that they believe that learning English must not include other languages, reflecting their thoroughly ingrained monoglossia.

As outlined in the second research question, we found that both receptive and productive skills were significantly more improved in the translanguaging group than in the CLT group, via one-way ANCOVA analysis (η^2 : 0.22). While CLT emphasizes L2 only instruction, translanguaging provides a flexible and systematic approach for integrating first and second language for education and communication, rather than monoglossic (Littlewood, 2014) and monological thinking (Weinreich, 1974). In the applied linguistics discipline and in the proficient dialogue

about the action of language instruction, this approach is seen as upending traditional language ideologies (Poza, 2017). Moreover, Macaro (2005) contends that exclusive use of the target language is built on a dogmatic monolingual method built on pragmatically unpracticed presumption that second language acquisition is an innate course comparable to learning the first language. In accordance with our assured results, L1 can be advantageous in learning (Butzkamm & Caldwell, 2009) as well as in raising awareness about linguistic differences (Scott & Fuente, 2008). The study shows that translanguaging can assist in making meaning, facilitating learning, and promoting communicative abilities. According to Lewis, Jones, and Baker (2012), translanguaging is effective because "the two languages work together in a dynamic and functionally integrated manner to organize and mediate mental processes in understanding, speaking, literacy, and learning". Supporting new language forms and integrating languages allows pupils to achieve greater success with their language abilities (Gort & Sembante, 2015). In light of the results related to the first two research questions, it seems that translanguaging can have a more efficient impact on emergent bilinguals (Garcia & Wei 2014). This conclusion was supported by the first-hand statistical outcomes of this research, namely a 0.57% effect for the GTM group. In addition, there was a significant effect of 0.23% for the CLT group.

To determine the excellent impression of the translanguaging experience on learners' consciousness, the third research question was examined. According to Martin-Beltrán (2010), the affective dimension exhibits positive responses to the fulfillment of translanguaging and positive perceptions of coinciding and exchangeable language usage. The results of the inquiry indicated that translanguaging will lead to confident understanding and somewhat better educational results. The importance of feeling well (such as

encountering the pleasure of understanding) cannot be overlooked (Dewaele, 2015). The use of translanguaging promotes cognitive application in pragmatic instruction by fostering a positive, comfortable, and friendly teaching environment (Peercy, 2016).

As a result, the findings of this study indicate that translanguaging may be a more efficient pedagogical method than monoglossic training. We also found that our findings are consistent with the "multilingual turn" in class activities (Cenoz & Gorter, 2011). Moreover, translanguaging positively affects learners' learning performance and help to overcome the limitations associated with monolingual teaching (Bunch, 2013). As a result, pupil-teacher relationships were strengthened, and meaningful participation was enabled (Palmer 2008), so enabling learning (Garcia & Wei, 2014). Bilinguals are likely to feel prouder of their emerging skills when translanguaging (Fallas Escobar, 2019), as reflected in our qualitative themes.

6. Implications

Through translanguaging teaching, new perceptions were gained into second language instruction in high schools. Utilizing Garcia's (2009) model, it illustrates how foreign language skills improve, promoting the notion of translanguaging in the role of an applied theory of language acquisition. Wei (2018) asserts that by offering a space that facilitates translanguaging, the language instinct metaphorizes the innate potential to learn languages by supplying constructive, interactive, cognitive, and affective insights. According to Carroll and Mazak (2017), the research further provides implications for teacher educators and researchers considering the transturn in Applied Linguistics. Educators and teachers should encourage the systematic switching between L1 and L2 as educational and communicative languages as useful rather than unfavourable (Wach & Monroy, 2020). Improvements in results and excellent innovative perception of English

language learning have been shown through the systematic flexible use of Persian and English. It is also recommended that policymakers and teaching professionals reassess one-language policies, and investigations by incorporating translanguaging activities into syllabuses, materials, and judging standards. To ensure that the second language is used more comprehensively, it may also be important to inform and train teachers about possible uses and benefits of translanguaging. Although high school students were involved in the study, we acknowledge their high performance. As the co-researcher was aware of the research questions, the procedure of ruling and data gathering was undoubtedly influenced. There would, however, be a reduction in subjectivity due to quantitative scores.

References

- Alibakhshi, G. (2019). In-service training professional development needs of Iranian teachers of English as Foreign Language: A qualitative research study. *Teaching English Language, 13*(2), 95-119.
- Al Masaeed, K. (2022). Bidialectal practices and L2 Arabic pragmatic development in a short-term study abroad. *Applied Linguistics, 43*, 88–114.
- Ascenzi-Moreno, L., & Vogel, S. (2019). Pushing the field and practice: Ofelia Garcia's reflective and responsive approach to educational innovation. *Journal of Multilingual Education Research, 9*, 37–145.
- Baker, C. (2011). *Foundations of bilingual education and bilingualism*. Multilingual matters.
- Bakhtin, M. (1981). *The dialogic imagination: Four essays*. University of Texas Press.
- Bolkvadze, L. (2023). Translanguaging as EFL teaching method. *Creative Education, 14*, 270-287. <https://doi.org/10.4236/ce.2023.142019>
- Bunch, G. C. (2013). Pedagogical language knowledge. *Review of Research in Education, 37*(1), 298–341. <https://doi:10.3102/0091732X12461772>.
- Butzkamm, W., & Caldwell, J. A. (2009). *The bilingual reform: A paradigm shift in foreign language teaching*. Narr Francke Attempto Verlag.
- Came, P., Hashemi, L., & Thomas. B. (1996). *Practice tests for first certificate*. Cambridge University Press.

- Carroll, K. S., & Mazak, C. M. (2017). Language policy in Puerto Rico's higher education: Opening the door for translanguaging practices. *Anthropology & Education Quarterly*, 48(1), 4–22.
- Celce-Murcia, M. (2001). Language teaching approaches: An overview. *Teaching English as a Second or Foreign Language*, 2(1), 3–10.
- Cenoz, J., & Gorter, D. (2011). Focus on multilingualism: A study of trilingual writing. *The Modern Language Journal*, 95(3), 356–369.
- Charmaz, K. (2006). *Constructing grounded theory: A practical guide through qualitative analysis*. SAGE.
- Cook, V., & Wei, L. (2016). *The Cambridge handbook of linguistic multi-competence*. Cambridge University Press.
- Creese, A., & Blackledge, A. (2010). Translanguaging in the bilingual classroom: A pedagogy for learning and teaching? *The Modern Language Journal*, 94(1), 103–115. <https://doi:10.1111/j.1540-4781.2009.00986.x>.
- Creswell, J. W., & Plano. C. V. L. (2007). *Designing and Conducting Mixed Methods Research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Dewaele, J. M. (2015). On emotions in foreign language learning and use. *The Language Teacher*, 39(3), 13–15.
- Turnbull, B. (2022). Translanguaging and transformative teaching for emergent bilingual students: Lessons from the CUNY-NYSIEB project: edited by City University of New York-New York State Initiative on Emergent Bilinguals, Routledge.
- Dikilitaş, K., & Mumford S. E. (2020). Preschool English teachers gaining bilingual competencies in a monolingual context. *System*, 91.
- Dornyei, Z. (2007). *Research methods in applied linguistics: Quantitative, qualitative, and mixed methodologies*. Oxford University Press.
- Fallas Escobar, C. (2019). Translanguaging by design in EFL classrooms. *Classroom Discourse*, 10(3-4), 290–305.
- Flores, N. (2014). Let's not forget that translanguaging is a political act. *The educational linguist*, 7.
- Fu, D., Hadjioannou, X., & Zhou, X. (2019). *Translanguaging for emergent bilinguals: Inclusive teaching in the linguistically diverse classroom*. Teachers College Press.
- Galante, A. (2020). Pedagogical translanguaging in a multilingual English program in Canada: Student and teacher perspectives of challenges. *System*, 92, 102274. <https://doi.10.1016/j.system.2020.102274>.
- García, O., & Kleifgen, J. A. (2019). Translanguaging and literacies. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 55(4), 553–571. <https://doi.org/10.1002/rrq.286>
- Garcia, O. (2009). *Bilingual Education in the 21st Century: A Global Perspective*. Malden/Oxford: Blackwell/Wiley.

- Garcia, O., & Wei, E. G. (2014). *Translanguaging: Language, bilingualism and education*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Gort, M., & Sembiente, S. F. (2015). Navigating Hybridized Language Learning Spaces Through Translanguaging Pedagogy: Dual Language Preschool Teachers' Linguaging Practices in Support of Emergent Bilingual Children's Performance of Academic Discourse. *International Multilingual Research Journal*, 9(1), 7–25.
- Hu, G., and S. L. McKay. 2012. *English Language Education in East Asia: Some Recent Developments*. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 33(4), 345–362.
- Inbar-Lourie, O. (2010). English Only? The Linguistic Choices of Teachers of Young EFL Learners. *International Journal of Bilingualism*, 14(3), 351–367. doi:10.1177/1367006910367849.
- Ireland, S. (2000). *KET Practice Tests: Four Tests for the Cambridge Key English Test. With Answers*. Oxford University Press.
- Kawafha, H, & Al Masaeed, K., (2023). Multidialectal and multilingual translanguaging in L2 Arabic classrooms: Teachers' beliefs vs. actual practices. *Frontiers in Education*. 8:106019.
- Kevin, D. (2022) Translanguaging as a theory, pedagogy, and qualitative research methodology, *NABE Journal of Research and Practice*, 12(6):1-16.
- Lewis, G., Jones, B. & Baker, C. (2012). Translanguaging: Developing its Conceptualisation and Contextualisation. *Educational Research and Evaluation*, 18(7), 655–670. doi:10.1080/13803611.2012.718490.
- Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. G. (1985). *Naturalistic Inquiry*. Newbury Park, CA: Newberry Park.
- Littlewood, W. (2014). Communication-oriented Language Teaching: Where Are We Now? Where do We Go from Here? *Language Teaching*, 47(3), 349–362.
- Macaro, E. (2005). Codeswitching in the L2 Classroom: A Communication and Learning Strategy. In *Non-native Language Teachers*, edited by E. Llurda, 63–84. New York: Springer.
- Macaro, E. (2009). Teacher use of Codeswitching in the Second Language Classroom: Exploring 'Optimal' use. In *First Language use in Second and Foreign Language Learning*, edited by M. Turnbull, and J. Dailey-O'Cain, 35–49. Bristol, England: Multilingual Matters.
- Makalela, L. (2019). Uncovering the Universals of Ubuntu Translanguaging in Classroom Discourses. *Classroom Discourse* 10 (3–4): 237–251.
- Martin–Beltrán, M. (2010). The two-way Language Bridge: Co-Constructing Bilingual Language Learning Opportunities. *The Modern Language Journal*, 94(2), 254–277.

- Mazak, C. M. (2017). "Introduction: Theorizing Translanguaging Practices in Higher Education. In *Translanguaging in Higher Education: Beyond Monolingual Ideologies*, edited by C. Mazak, and K. S. Carroll, 1–10. Tonawanda, NY: Multilingual Matters.
- Mitchell, R. (1988). *Communicative Language Teaching in Practice*. CILTR.
- Moore, P. (2018). Becoming Bilingual in the EFL Classroom. *ELT Journal*, 72(2), 131–140. 10.1093/elt/ccx045.
- Moore, P., & Nikula, T. (2016). Translanguaging in CLIL Classrooms. In *Conceptualising Integration in CLIL and Multilingual Education*, edited by T. Nikula, E. Dafouz, P. Moore, and U. Smit, 211–234. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- Muhammet, Y. Y., & Kenan, D. (2022). Translanguaging in the development of EFL learners' foreign language skills in Turkish context. *Innovation in Language Learning and Teaching*, 16(2), 176-190,
- Nikula, T., & Moore, P. (2019). Exploring translanguaging in CLIL. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 22(2), 237–249.
- Nussbaum, L. (2014). Una Didàctica del Plurilingüisme. *Bellaterra Journal of Teaching & Learning Language & Literature*, 7(4), 79–87.
- Palmer, D. (2008). Diversity up Close: Building Alternative Discourses in the Dual Immersion Classroom. In *Pathways to Multilingualism: Evolving Perspectives on Immersion Education*, edited by T. Fortune, and D. Tedick, 97–116. London: Multilingual Matters.
- Peercy, M. M. (2016). New Pedagogies in Teacher Education for Teaching Linguistically Diverse Learners. *International Multilingual Research Journal*, 10 (3), 165–167.
- Prada, J., & Nikula, T. (2018). Introduction to the special issue: On the transgressive nature of translanguaging pedagogies. *EuroAmerican Journal of Applied Linguistics and Language*, 5(2), 1–7. <https://doi.org/10.21283/2376905X.9.166>
- Poza, L. (2018). Los Dos Son Mi Idioma: Translanguaging, identity, and social relationships among bilingual youth. *Journal of Language, Identity & Education*, 18(2), 92–109. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15348458.2018.1504682>
- Poza, L. (2017). Translanguaging: Definitions, implications, and further needs in burgeoning inquiry. *Berkeley Review of Education*, 6(2), 101–128.
- Rivera, A. J., & Mazak, C. M. (2017). Analyzing Student Perceptions on Translanguaging: A Case Study of a Puerto Rican University Classroom. *How*, 24(1), 122–138.

- Sabrina F. S. & Zhongfeng T. (2023). Translanguaging: a pedagogy of heteroglossic hope. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 26, 1-6.
- Saldaña, J. , & Omasta, M. (2017). *Analyzing Life*. Thousand Oaks: SAGE Publications.
- Scott, V. M., & Fuente, M. J. D. L. (2008). What's the Problem? L2 Learners' use of the L1 During Consciousness-Raising, Form-Focused Tasks. *The Modern Language Journal*, 92(1), 100–113.
- Sanchez, M. T., & Menken, K. (2019). Ofelia García and the CUNY-NYSIEB community: Symbiosis in furthering translanguaging pedagogy and practice. *Journal of Multilingual Education Research*, 9, 157–173. <https://fordham.bepress.com/jmer/vol9/iss1/12>
- Saragih, W., Saragih, N. A., Siregar, R. A., &., Natalia, Ch. H. (2022). Investigating EFL teachers' perception on task-based language teaching for speaking skills. *Teaching English Language*, 16(1), 203-234. <https://doi.org/10.22132/TEL.2022.151148>
- Sherris, A., & Adami, E. (2019). *Making signs, translanguaging ethnographies: Exploring urban, rural and educational spaces*. Multilingual Matters.
- Sun, Y., & Lan, G. (2020). Enactment of a Translingual Approach to Writing. *TESOL Quarterly*. <https://doi.org/10.1002/tesq.609>
- Thalheimer, W., & Cook, S. (2002). How to calculate effect sizes from published research: A simplified methodology. *Work-Learning Research*, 1, 1–9.
- Thompson, B. (2006). *Foundations of behavioral statistics: An insight-based approach*. Guilford Press.
- Vaish, V., & Subhan, A. (2015). Translanguaging in a reading class. *International Journal of Multilingualism*, 12(3), 338–357.
- Wach, A., & Monroy, F. (2020). Beliefs about L1 use in teaching English: A comparative study of Polish and Spanish teacher-trainees. *Language Teaching Research*, 24(6), 855–873.
- Wang, D. (2019). Translanguaging in Chinese foreign language classrooms: Students and teachers' attitudes and practices. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 22(2), 138–149.
- Wei, L. (2018). Translanguaging as a practical theory of language. *Applied Linguistics*, 39(1), 9–30.
- Weinreich, U. (1974). *Languages in contact, findings and problems*. Mouton.
- Wu, Y., & Lin, A. M. Y. (2019). Translanguaging and trans-semiotising in a CLIL biology class in Hong Kong: Whole-body sense-making in the flow of knowledge co-making [Special issue]. *Classroom Discourse*, 10(3–4), 252–273. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19463014.2019.1629322>



2023 by the authors. Licensee Journal of Teaching English Language (TEL). This is an open access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International (CC BY-NC 4.0 license). (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0>).