



Translanguaging: Students as Meaning-Making Contributors

Shahzad Ahmad

Assistant Lecturer, University of Technology and Applied Sciences

Ibri, Preparatory Studies Centre (PSC)

Sultanate of Oman

shahzadstrikes@gmail.com

DOI: <http://doi.org/10.36892/ijlls.v6i1.1512>

APA Citation: Ahmad, S.(2024). Translanguaging: Students as Meaning-Making Contributors. *International Journal of Language and Literary Studies*. 6(1).15-28. <http://doi.org/10.36892/ijlls.v6i1.1512>

Received:

23/12/2023

Accepted:

20/02/2024

Keywords:

Language learning capacity,
Translanguaging continuum, meaning-making activity.

Abstract

This research study aims to highlight the dynamics of translanguaging that exploit the collective linguistic output of learners and potentially add to their language learning capacity. It has emerged as an empowering tool for bi/multilingual learners of a language. The participants of this research constituted 26 students representing University of Technology and Applied Sciences, Ibri, Oman at level 1 Foundation Group associated with the Preparatory Studies Centre (PSC) of the same university. They were divided into 3 focus groups with equal representation using Anderson's (2017 as cited in Turnbull, 2019) translanguaging continuum as a reference point. The study focuses on the mixed method approach employing a semi-structured questionnaire administered through Google Forms along with 3 interviews with one member from each focus group. The results were collated to examine the difference in responses and to see which strategy produces more favourable outcomes. This study, to a certain extent, facilitated consideration of the use of translanguaging in the classroom as a means of maximizing students' potential for meaning-making activity.

1. INTRODUCTION

In this increasingly globalized world where diversity and coexistence have become significant factors of growth and survival, there is a need to reorient the framework governing the learning system of a second or a foreign language. Jørgensen et al (as cited in Creese & Blackledge, 2015) insist that sociolinguistic investigation of multilingualism no longer considers languages as disparate entities governed by limitations of use. On the contrary, it permits language users to engage with all the linguistic resources that they can possibly deploy to accomplish their linguistic goals. According to Makoni & Pennycook (as cited in De Los Ríos & Seltzer, 2017) English medium spaces are strongly influenced by the colonialist mindset. They claim that languages in the literal sense were created to advance the colonial/nationalistic projects at a global scale. Therefore, post-structuralists make an attempt to 'disinvent' English in order to find some space for the survival and use of other languages while promoting the same goals. The existence and gradual permeation of this colonial mindset seems to be a valid observation since the use of English language alone is willfully promoted (across a broad spectrum of classrooms) while learning this language to the detriment of any association with other languages without even considering their positive contribution to learning English itself.

Translanguaging: Students as Meaning-Making Contributors

Under these conditions, translanguaging has emerged as an informed alternative practice to the concept of monolingualism in EFL/ESL pedagogy. The term was first used in Welsh (*trawsieithu*) by educator Williams (1980s) as a pedagogical strategy that legitimized the use of both their native language and the Target Language (TL) to reinforce student learning. In this context, students were asked to read a particular text in one language (Welsh) and then articulate their impressions about the text in another (English). Of late, translanguaging pedagogies have challenged William's (1980s) contention regarding the separability of the two languages.

To put things into perspective, translanguaging seeks the use of combined linguistic resources of a language learner while learning the TL. This approach contradicts the modern practices of Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) that stresses the use of English alone as a medium of instruction in Second Language Acquisition (SLA). It positions itself as a positive strategy that excludes the negative perceptions that one traditionally associates with 'code-switching' and is meant to enrich language learning through making references to one's sociocultural environment and other significant background influences.

This research study used Anderson's (2017) translanguaging continuum as the guiding framework. It is important to understand its features and dynamics since respondents for this piece of research were divided into groups based on this distinction. This continuum represents three different linguistic practices. The extreme left end exhibits the monolingual group that exclusively uses one language. The middle point in the continuum is reserved for bilinguals/partly translanguals who blend two languages [William's (1996) model; weak translanguaging] whereas the extreme right side is occupied by multilinguals using highly translanguing practices [Garcia (2009) model; strong translanguaging].

Using Anderson's (2017 as cited in Turnbull, 2019) translanguaging continuum mentioned above, students were divided into three groups with one group exclusively focusing on the English language for both brainstorming and production. The second group brainstormed in Arabic and produced their answers in English (restricted use of code meshing/switching) whereas the third group used both Arabic (together with any other regional intelligible languages) and English to brainstorm and then produced their answers in English (free code-mixing/code sharing).

According to Howatt's (1984) monolingual principle, bilingual speakers are always evaluated against the linguistic proficiency of the native speakers, and they are regarded as unaccomplished monolinguals rather than having a diverse range of competence as bilinguals. William's (1996) weak form of translanguaging embraces the multicompetence of bilingual speakers despite maintaining the essential independent orientation of both the TL and the national languages. At the extreme right side of the spectrum, Garcia and Wei (2014) state that the precincts between named languages are only social constructs and bilinguals use a shared linguistic collection of words in any communicative exchange.

The participants of this research activity were assigned a writing task, purportedly testing their ability to write a descriptive paragraph about 'my friend'. To collect data, an online questionnaire was distributed to the respondents through Google Forms eliciting their responses about the efficacy of translanguaging towards their academic output. Besides, one representative from each group of the target population was interviewed to establish any emergent pattern in their responses that further illuminated the pragmatic appeal of this pedagogical strategy.

The results were collated later to examine the difference in responses and to see which strategy produces more favourable outcomes. This study helped to legitimize considering the

use of translanguaging in the classroom as a means of maximizing students' potential for meaning-making activity central feature of this research activity.

The results of this study illustrated at least a marginal improvement over the immediate or the short term in those students' academic performance who used translanguaging to discuss ideas and exchange information. This marginal development is likely to further consolidate over the long term. Therefore, it is likely to reestablish the role of students as active contributors of knowledge in the transmission of information across a traditional classroom setting. Some other advantages accrued in the form of a realization of the value of their indigenous linguistic resources, and this has the potential to act as a transformative influence in raising their confidence and eagerness to learn a foreign or a second language.

The following research questions were framed to investigate the different ways in which translanguaging makes an impact on students' understanding of the subject matter in the classroom.

- 1) How can translanguaging enrich students' writing skills in the TL?
- 2) What are the drawbacks that may be encountered?
- 3) How does translanguaging go beyond the conventional approach to classroom learning?

Here is an analysis of these three research questions.

1.1. How can translanguaging enrich students' writing skills in the Target Language?

Translanguaging treats languages in complementary roles rather than competitive ones. It supports the views of Garcia and Wei (2014) regarding the critical post-structuralist paradigm shift in translanguaging. Supporters of this ideology believe that languages are not separate entities but have certain overlapping integrative features. Corresponding to the same pattern of thinking, Blommaert & Rampton (2011) contend that translanguaging incorporates movement, blending and historical interconnectedness. Otheguy, Garcia & Reid (2015) posit that translanguaging allows people to use their full linguistic range without extending any significant attention to the social and political limitations. Therefore, it removes apparent inhibitions of communication imposed by the rigid focus on the use of TL alone in the classrooms. This research study is also premised on Lewis, Jones and Baker's (2012) argument that the use of both languages through translanguaging helps develop the TL. Hussein (2013) argues that it helps students to have a far greater understanding of new words as well as grammar rules. In the same way, Storch and Wigglesworth (2003) have concluded that the utilization of L1 in EFL/ESL classrooms helps students get a firmer grounding in cognition. It is quite obvious that the permission to use the full range of one's linguistic resources eases communication practices since they are grounded in their socio-cultural orientations and contribute to the creation of familiar learning experiences which, in turn, improve the quality of learning and retention. In the long run, they are likely to have a substantial impact on their critical and cognitive abilities.

This paper presents translanguaging as a pedagogical tool that enhances the writing ability of ESL/EFL learners.

For ESL/EFL students, the development of writing skills needs sustained practice and entails adherence to grammatical rules, stylistic appropriateness, and coherence of thoughts, to name only a few significant elements. Translanguaging has the potential to facilitate this intellectually monumental task in certain ways. In this context, (Silva 1993, Crossley, Kyle & McNamara, 2016 as cited in Motlhaka & Makalela, 2016) provide an interesting study. They contend that a significant amount of research on L2 writing has illustrated that its writing

Translanguaging: Students as Meaning-Making Contributors

traditions are based on L1 writing although L2 writing is strategically, rhetorically and linguistically disparate from L1 writing. Another important point is the crucial role of cultural understanding of the TL. (Myles 2002 & Simeon 2016 as cited in Motlhaka & Makalela, 2016) support this perspective by focusing on the fact that the ability to write well in TL does not stem from natural acquisition. Rather, it occurs through cultural diffusion in the form of certain practices in formal instructional settings. Therefore, a grounding in the cultural context of the TL is an essential component to acquiring a degree of proficiency in that language.

Translanguaging makes a constructive use of multiple languages. In this context (Canagarajah 2016, as cited in Motlhaka & Makalela, 2016) believes that translingual orientation synergizes languages by adding new grammar and meanings through the process of intermingling thus establishing its value in expanding the range of language learning.

1.2. What are the drawbacks that may be encountered?

Using translanguaging in an optimal way is not an easy task. A number of obstacles may be faced that may deprive it of some effectiveness as a pedagogic tool.

Kucukali & Koçbaş (2021) argue that translanguaging pedagogy may result in numerous problems of varying nature. Using multiple languages concurrently may perplex the students. A negative transfer may ensue and TL may be completely abandoned as a medium of communication. It may make the students reluctant to apprehend the TL structure and productive skills may not be learned at all. Moreover, the sensitive balance between TL and native languages may be compromised in favour of the latter and the extra effort to learn the former may appear to be a less attractive option. Some students thought that grammar teaching and the thinking process should exclusively focus on the TL so that it does not pose a challenge to learning. Most of these issues are quite valid and do pose an obstacle to the unfettered use of the translanguaging pedagogy.

This study also faced similar obstacles. It was observed that some students were confused and distracted, thus at least lending credence to the legitimacy of a couple of concerns. Besides, the small size of the population sample and students' subjective impressions acted as considerable limitations.

There were some limitations in terms of enforcing the rules directing the brainstorming sessions for the writing activity in connection with the answers to research question 2. Despite clear instructions and monitoring by the researcher, some students did not appear to abide by the rules. They tended to disregard the restrictions of using a particular language that was assigned to their cohort and sometimes communicated in the other language. Therefore, this factor may have affected the reliability of the eventual results of this writing activity.

Even while answering the questionnaire and replying to the questions posed during the interviews it was suspected that the respondents did not objectively answer all the questions. Since they were informed in the beginning that the purpose of this exercise was a part of a research process and did not in any way affect their potential academic grades, it might have led to a drop in their motivation to be passionate and truthful in their approach.

1.3. How does translanguaging go beyond the conventional approach to classroom learning?

Translanguaging invokes different methods to operate as an alternative means of pedagogy. Motlhaka & Makalela (2016) contend that the use of L1 in L2 writing exploits the holistic range of students' mental faculties rather than putting barriers between the two languages. In the same vein, (García and Wei, 2014, as cited in Seals, 2021) expound that it

emphasizes a multilingual approach to learning acknowledging that speakers have the services of an extensive linguistic repertoire flexibly used.

(Seals, 2020, p.122) states that translanguaging involves using both code meshing and code switching and does not treat them as separate phenomena contrary to how the monolinguals are accustomed to treating them. The use of a different code is legitimized in translanguaging pedagogies that makes it escape from the derision that is customarily accorded to code switching, consciously or unconsciously used in ESL/EFL classrooms. Similarly, Garcia (2009 as cited in Hamman, 2018) argues that the translanguaging tilt towards considering bi/multilingualism as a single linguistic repertoire makes it different from code switching in which two languages alternate with each other. Therefore, translanguaging emerges, in contrast to code switching, at the level of determining the nature of existence. Garcia & Lin (2016) believe that code switching is based on the monoglossic view that bilinguals have two separate linguistic systems. However, translanguaging considers bilinguals as heteroglossic in which the linguistic practices are integrated into a unitary system. Therefore, translanguaging is free from the negative connotations that one attributes to code switching and this gives it a heightened sense of legitimacy. MacSwan (2017) contends that code switching, to a certain extent, allows limited mobility between the two languages.

Furthermore, translanguaging can be termed as a pedagogy. It has its own scaffolding and goals. A translanguaging pedagogy is geared towards how multilingual students and teachers take part in discursive practices that sometimes invoke the use of students' native languages to make teaching and learning intelligible, to communicate and use subject knowledge, and to improve academic language practices. (Garcia, 2014: p.112 as cited in Seals, 2021). It equips students with a robust tool that allows them to use multiple resources and varied linguistic knowledge to expand the range of possibilities of learning.

1.4. Discussion of results (interviews)

The interviews exhibited a clear pattern of preference to using L1 for learning L2. The students were reasonably convinced that using L1 offers considerable assistance in understanding the concepts of L2. The cohorts that used strong translanguaging and weak translanguaging performed marginally better in their writing output in comparison to the monolingual (English alone) group. Their successful use of L1 appears to be inconsistent with the proponents of CLT who completely prohibit the use of L2 in class. On the other hand, it lends support to the view that translanguaging is actually a helpful tool to learn L2 rather than a hindrance.

1.5. Results of the questionnaire

The results of the questionnaire reinforce the trends observed in the answers to the three questions posed in the interviews. An overwhelming majority of the respondents were of the view that using L1 considerably increased their understanding of L2 in almost all areas of learning.

Therefore, it may be concluded with a fair degree of plausibility that L1 use is more of a virtue than a drawback. It appears to liberate the students from the constricting environment of using L2 alone for SLA and makes a strong case for the successful integration of translanguaging with traditional pedagogical practices in the classroom and beyond.

However, all these apparent benefits of translanguaging need to be viewed with caution. In this context Canagarajah (2011) makes a valid case. He posits that it is wrong to give students

complete freedom to use all their indigenous registers and traditions in academic writing. The codes and values have to be introduced with care resulting in a slow pluralization of the academic text in the classroom. Therefore, extreme pedagogic positions need to be obviated in order to get the maximum benefits of using translanguaging concurrent with L2 use.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

Celce-Murcia (2001) argues that there has been a major shift in Foreign Language Teaching as it has transitioned from an overriding focus on examining a language (e.g. Grammar Translation Method) to a pronounced attention on using the language (e.g. CLT). Bakhtin (1981) & Garcia (2009) posit that in this movement from scrutiny to usefulness, monoglossic ideology which refers to ‘proficiency in the two languages according to monolingual norms’ has been advanced because the classrooms are the only places that allow the students to communicate in their TL. The same sentiment is expressed by Littlewood & Yu (2011). Another scholar, Wang (2019) opines that this argument has given dominance to the monolingual principle where foreign languages are taught. This view is supported by Hu & McKay (2012) arguing that the language classrooms on a global scale exhibit monolingual bias, reinforcing traditional monolingual behaviour and extending a profound focus on CLT. Both GTM and CLT have been made the object of criticism by linguists. The former has been considered inadequate according to the views expressed by Newson (1998) since it does not aim at fluency and communicative effectiveness. On the other hand, Celce-Murcia, Dörnyei, & Thurrell (1997) argue that the CLT also has an ineffective language content base, and its pedagogical treatment of linguistic forms has a few gaps.

Macaro (2009) avers that the learners of EFL/ESL, guided by design, are not allowed to use their first languages as foreign language contexts, so that classroom should reproduce the TL context allowing the students to ultimately learn in that context.

All these views exhibit a clear bias toward bilingualism/multilingualism as an approach towards language learning. They appear to have ignored the multiple benefits that are likely to accrue if all the linguistic resources of students are deployed while learning EFL/ESL.

The exclusive use of L2 in EFL/ESL contexts offers a restricted view in which other dimensions of learning are ignored. Lack of consideration of a speaker’s huge repertoire of his own language can limit the possibilities of growth in the second or a foreign language. It may also lead to the dilution of one’s cultural affiliation and forced adoption of an alien culture that has completely different constituents.

Garcia (2009 as cited in Hamman, 2018) first defined translanguaging as the ‘multiple discursive practices in which bilinguals engage in order to make sense of their bilingual worlds’. It can be safely presumed to be the most authentic way of using the language. Earlier, it was postulated that bilingualism introduced rigid boundaries between two different languages as advocated by Grosjean (1989). He posited that a bilingual brain uses two languages in separate compartments without any interaction. However, translanguaging considers the bilingual mind like a single system with disparate linguistic components. Garcia & Klein (2016) advocate that translanguaging crosses the traditionally defined boundaries of the two named languages and bilinguals/multilinguals are perceived as people with one linguistic system. This unitary linguistic system may well be defined as the inside view whereas the outside view relates to the societal name for two or more named languages.

Adding to its utility, translanguaging is considered to have a better approach towards comprehending the bilingual mind. Recent empirical studies of language use in classrooms have begun to document how and why students engage in translanguaging. For example, in a study of a dual language kindergarten class, by Garcia et al. (2011), it was found that translanguaging was used to assist understanding, include, exclude, and exhibit knowledge. Garcia and Li (2014) & Poza (2016) have documented the use of translanguaging to co-construct meaning among peers.

The use of translanguaging has the potential to transform the traditional role of students in the classroom where they customarily act as passive recipients of knowledge without having the confidence to reconsider the traditional limits of knowledge transmitted in this way. If all conditions are met and translanguaging is applied in the right way, then it can transform this passive character of the students and they can express themselves more confidently in advancing knowledge by regularly questioning constructs and notions given by teachers and books and adding something new to the existing corpus of knowledge. To add credibility to this claim, these conditions need to be explained. They include the passion and intention of the respondents to fully apprehend the purpose of the research and thus complement it through their eager participation. Their honesty and sense of purpose in rigidly following the dynamics of the translanguaging groups will perhaps lend a greater credibility and validity to the results. Also, translanguaging is an extensive and time consuming process and needs absolute institutional support to meet the desired objectives. However, these are ideal elements that are hard to meet since most of the times the institutions are constrained by certain factors that act as limitations to the study.

Sayer (2013) believes that translanguaging fortifies the identity of a community and accords salience to it. Much of the current literature on translanguaging has also regarded it as an effective pedagogical tool.

Research on translanguaging pedagogies has disclosed some favourable features of their use in the classroom. For instance, Palmer et al. (2014) illustrated how translanguaging pedagogies such as modelling dynamic bilingualism and positioning students as competent bilinguals allow the students to be more fearless in their language use. Creese & Blackledge (2010) discovered that the pedagogy of translanguaging enabled teachers in heritage language classrooms to find analogies among the social, cultural, and linguistic spheres of students' lives.

According to the views of García & Li Wei (2014) & Li Wei (2011) the prefix 'trans' communicates the ways that multilinguals' language practices in fact "go beyond" the use of state-endorsed named language systems.

Vogel & Garcia (2017 as cited in Erdin & Sali, 2020) suggest that the translanguaging theory is underpinned by the 3 factors:

1. Individuals communicate with each other by using features from a single linguistic entity.
2. It imbues bi/multilingualism with a perspective that respects the speakers' indigenous linguistic and semiotic resources and considers them superior to those of named languages like English and French.
3. It acknowledges the material effects of named languages for the minoritized language speakers.

To put things together, it questions the traditionally held views about bi/multilingualism and in doing so, raises the inferior position of minoritized language speakers and their indigenous languages.

Cummins (1984,2000) claims that in terms of the traditional cognitive theory of bilingualism, called the “Separate Underlying Proficiency” (SUP) model, bilinguals have two distinct language systems in their minds consistent with nationally approved standards. The theory suggests that instruction transmitted only in L2 and not in L1 would make the learners competent users of the language. This SUP theory spawned some misconceptions about bilinguals’ capacity to learn two languages equally well since human beings have limited acquisitive power in their brains and using two languages concurrently can potentially act as an inhibiting factor in terms of becoming skillful in the use of both languages. Another misconception was predicated on the fact that an increase in proficiency in one language is likely to lead to a decline in the skilful use of the other language.

It is quite evident that translanguaging advances the existing literature on learning a second language by proposing a renewed focus on one’s linguistic heritage and considering it as a stimulating factor rather than a constricting element. Translanguaging is still evolving as a pedagogical practice and its effectiveness in terms of EFL/ESL learning is still being gauged.

3. RESEARCH DESIGN

A mixed-method research design was used to assess the students of the Preparatory Studies Centre (PSC)- a preparatory stage for bachelor studies at the University of Technology and Applied Sciences (UTAS), Ibri, Oman.

3.1.Participants

The students represented Level 1 of this programme. There were 26 students with 16 males and 10 females. Their age group ranged from 18 to 20 years approximately. Most of them were studying English as an EFL/ESL variant but their linguistic proficiency was different from each other based on a variety of factors with school and family background acting as the distinguishing elements, among others. The respondents did not have a foreign academic experience and were educated locally. Their writing responses were evaluated in the context of translanguaging. For this task, the GFP students were asked to produce a descriptive paragraph about ‘my best friend.’ It may be highlighted here that the writing module was preferred over speaking since it was less time consuming and easier to manage in terms of research purposes whereas in a speaking activity conversion of respondents’ responses into transcripts requires additional time and effort. It is also relatively harder to manage since greater use of technology and resources are required.

For the writing task, the participants were divided into 3 focus groups with equal representation using Anderson’s (2017) translanguaging continuum. One group was asked to discuss in English and write in English. For this particular cohort, those students were chosen who were comparatively more proficient in using the English Language in order to make the discussion proceed without encountering any major language-related obstruction. The second group was asked to use the weak translanguaging form where they discussed in Arabic and wrote in English and the third group was instructed to use the strong translanguaging form in which they deliberated in both English and Arabic as well as other commonly understood regional varieties of languages and then wrote in English.

The writing rubric used by the University of Technology and Applied Sciences (UTAS), Ibri, Oman for PSC writing task (level 1) was employed to check the stipulated descriptive paragraphs used in the research.

3.2. Data Collection Tools

Subsequently, one questionnaire was distributed to the respondents to record their impressions about the effectiveness of the task and their responses to the research questions. It was electronically distributed through Google Forms. Three interviews were also conducted with one representative from each of the three focus groups to get more insights into their views about translanguaging as used in this research as well as their answers to the research questions. The interviews were then analyzed. The interviewees' consent for participation was taken by giving them a form where they expressed their willingness to be a part of this research.

3.3. Data Analysis

It was fairly obvious that the two groups of students that did not restrict themselves to English alone performed relatively better than the exclusive English users. Both these groups responded fairly enthusiastically to the freedom of L1 use (which was Arabic in this case) along with other regional language varieties and their participation together with their interest showed a dramatic increase as compared to the progressively depleting energy levels and interest witnessed during exclusive L1 based classroom work. Therefore, this improved performance to a certain extent validated the claims inherent in the research questions 1 and 3 regarding the improvement of students' writing skills and allowing them freedom to adopt the heteroglossia approach to learning.

3.4.1. Interviewee 1 (exclusive users of Arabic for discussion)

Three interviewees were selected with one from each group and were asked a set of 4 questions. In response to question 1, the respondent from this group commented that the use of exclusive Arabic helped in understanding the subject better and also led to improved collaboration among the participants. In terms of the 2nd question, the respondent remarked that it helped them to comprehend the subject better and also produced a better exchange of information. Regarding the third question, they said that using L1 for discussion did not pose any problems for L2 production. As far as the 4th question was concerned, they answered that using Arabic for discussion helped them to absorb more information and have a more passionate discussion. There was also a fairly improved understanding of the question holistically.

3.4.2. Interviewee 2 (English and Arabic use)

The student cohort that used both Arabic and English said that this approach helped them to juxtapose both the translated material and the original material. For the 2nd question they reiterated the virtues of translating the text in Arabic along with the English variant. Concerning question 3, they stated that a bilingual approach sometimes made it difficult to communicate to the teacher if the latter did not have a firm understanding of L1 and for question 4, they were of the opinion that Arabic was their native language, so it significantly helped them in the overall understanding of both the languages. This highlights the probable drawbacks mentioned in research question 2 while using the native language in communicating with the teacher.

3.4.3. Interviewee 3 (exclusive English use)

The representative from the group that only used English said that L1 helped them to improve their reading skills in terms of the text at hand and also the activities given by the teacher. Regarding the 2nd question, the respondent said that their writing skills improved considerably and they had greater confidence in writing different genres like letters and stories. For the third question, they did not encounter many problems but they were of the opinion that everyone should be given equal opportunity to participate in the class to encourage democratic practice. For question 4, they argued that using L1 improved their understanding since it is

Translanguaging: Students as Meaning-Making Contributors

their mother tongue. It also helped them in the better organization of sentences, acquisition of new words, production of a variety of paragraphs and an expansion of knowledge and experience in writing paragraphs.

3.4. Results from the questionnaire

A questionnaire comprising 8 closed ended questions and 1 open ended question was given to the respondents through Google forms. 23 respondents out of a total number of 26 managed to fill in the forms. The results of the 8 closed ended questions are mentioned in the table below:

Questions	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Agreed/yes	22	21	19	19	19	9	21	20
Disagreed/no	1	2	3	4	4	14	2	3

The results are a fair indication of the fact that L1 (Arabic) is considered to be a great tool for reinforcing the learning of L2. An overwhelming majority of the students appear to be convinced about the effectiveness of using L1 as a platform to raise their competence in using L2.

Regarding the responses to the last open ended question, the respondents expressed a range of ideas. The most popular answer was related to the generation of better ideas in an L1-dominated environment. The other benefits included, among others, creativity of ideas, clarity to the learner, vocabulary improvement, better understanding of questions, free-flowing discussion among the learners, better comprehension of grammar and clarity of meaning.

All these benefits mentioned above positively address the answers to research question 1 and 3.

4. CONCLUSION

Translanguaging lends itself liberally to the multiple linguistic resources that the EFL/ESL learners bring to the classroom and it can potentially act as a constructive component rather than a limiting factor in their learning. It counteracts the principle of exclusive use of the TL proposed by CLT and Audio Lingual Method (ALM). It supports the contention of Garcia & Wei (2014) who consider a strong translanguaging approach to have a transformational character as it deviates significantly from the language control policies and classroom teaching approach to FL learning.

Some illuminating findings were made during the course of this research. The respondents who used the strong and weak translanguaging form crafted better responses in contrast to the respondents who belonged to the monolingual group (English only). They demonstrated a greater degree of freedom and enthusiasm when they realized that discussion was acceptable in their native languages. Therefore, the outcomes of this research corroborate the views expressed by Turnbull (2019) who claims that strong translanguaging helps students to frame relatively better language responses in the classroom. Nevertheless, the results of this exercise cannot claim absolute precision since the respondents did not appear to have followed the rules prescribed for their group fastidiously.

The use of translanguaging has far reaching consequences for both learners and teachers. It can potentially enlarge the boundaries of the thinking process and in turn provide the learners a more significant role in terms of making a contribution towards classroom learning. Complete freedom to use all the available linguistic resources can help them to construct more meaningful responses and at its most advanced stage where the learners are

maximally facilitated they may reach close to the ideal position of adding to the existing body of knowledge, thus aspiring to become co-constructors of knowledge in the classroom. At another level, the minoritized languages may be able to retrieve their diminishing status amidst the widespread presence of majoritized languages. This will subsequently, empower the learners hailing from supposedly inferior cultural backgrounds and this removal of inhibitions consistent with the views of Sabino (2018) may lead to a liberal use of learners' idiolects thus raising their self-esteem and indigenous linguistic identity.

REFERENCES

- Anderson, J. (2017). Reimagining English language learners from a translingual perspective. *ELT Journal*. doi:10.1093/elt/ccx029
- Bakhtin, M. (1981). *The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays*. Austin, TX: University of Texas Press.
- Blommaert, J., & Rampton, B. (2011). Language and super-diversity. *Diversities*, 13(2), 1-19.
- Canagarajah, S. (2011). Translanguaging in the classroom: Emerging issues for research and pedagogy. *Applied linguistics review*, 2(2011).
- Celce-Murcia, M., Dörnyei, Z., & Thurrell, S. (1997). Direct Approaches in L2 Instruction: a Turning Point in Communicative Language Teaching? *TESOL Quarterly*, 31 (1), 141–152.
- Celce-Murcia, M. (2001). Language Teaching Approaches: An Overview. *Teaching English as a Second or Foreign Language*, 2 (1), 3–10.
- Creese, A., & Blackledge, A. (2010). Translanguaging in the Bilingual Classroom: A Pedagogy for Learning and Teaching? *The Modern Language Journal*, 94(1), 103–105.
- Creese, A., & Blackledge, A. (2015). Translanguaging and identity in educational settings. *Annual review of applied linguistics*, 35, 20-35.
- Cummins, J. (1984) *Bilingualism and special education*. Clevedon : Multilingual Matters.
- Cummins, J. (2000) *Language, Power and Pedagogy*. Clevedon : Multilingual Matters.
- De los Ríos, C. V., & Seltzer, K. (2017). Translanguaging, Coloniality, and English Classrooms: An Exploration of Two Bicoastal Urban Classrooms. *Research in the Teaching of English*, 52(1), 55–76. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/44821287>
- Erdin, Y., & Sali, P. (2020). Translanguaging: Insights into its Theoretical Underpinnings and Classroom Implications. *Journal of Language Research (JLR)*, 1(2), 1-11.
- Garcia, O. (2009). *Bilingual Education in the 21st Century: A Global Perspective*. Oxford: Wiley Blackwell.
- Garcia, O., C. Makar, M. Starcevic, and A. Terry. (2011). "The Translanguaging of Latino Kindergartners." In *Bilingual Youth: Spanish in English Speaking Societies*, edited by J. Rothman and K. Potowski, 33–55. Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Translanguaging: Students as Meaning-Making Contributors

- García, O., Li Wei. (2014). *Translanguaging: Language, Bilingualism and Education*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan
- García, O., and A. Lin. (2016). "Translanguaging in Bilingual Education." In *Bilingual and Multilingual Education (Encyclopedia of Language and Education)*, edited by O. García, A. M. Y. Lin, and S. May, 117–130. Switzerland: Springer.
- García, O., T. Kleyn, eds. (2016). *Translanguaging with Multilingual Students: Learning from Classroom Moments*. New York: Routledge
- Grosjean, F. (1989). Neurolinguists, Beware! The Bilingual is Not Two Monolinguals in One Person. *Brain and Language*, 36, 3–15.
- Hamman, L. (2018) Translanguaging and positioning in two-way dual language classrooms: a case for criticality, *Language and Education*, 32:1, 21-42, DOI: [10.1080/09500782.2017.1384006](https://doi.org/10.1080/09500782.2017.1384006)
- Motlhaka, H. A., & Makalela, L. (2016) Translanguaging in an academic writing class: Implications for a dialogic pedagogy. *Southern African Linguistics and Applied Language Studies*, 34:3, 251-260, DOI: 10.2989/16073614.2016.1250356
- Howatt, A. (1984). *A history of English language teaching*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press
- Hussein, B. (2013). Teaching and learning English as a second/foreign language through mother tongue: A field study. *Asian Social Science*, 9(10), 175–180. <https://doi.org/10.5539/ass.v9n10p175>
- Hu, G., & McKay, S. L. (2012). English Language Education in East Asia: Some Recent Developments. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 33 (4), 345–362.
- Kucukali, E., & Koçbaş, D. (2021). Benefits and issues of translanguaging pedagogies on language learning: Students' perspective. *Turkish Online Journal of English Language Teaching (TOJELT)*, 6(3), 55- 85.
- Lewis, G., Jones, B., & Baker, C. (2012), Translanguaging: Developing its conceptualisation and contextualization. *Educational Research and Evaluation*, 18(7), 655–670.
- Littlewood, W., & Yu, B. (2011). First Language and Target Language in the Foreign Language Classroom. *Language Teaching*, 44 (1), 64–77.
- Li Wei & Angel M. Y. Lin (2019) Translanguaging classroom discourse: pushing limits, breaking boundaries, *ClassroomDiscourse*, 10:3-4, 209-215, DOI: [10.1080/19463014.2019.1635032](https://doi.org/10.1080/19463014.2019.1635032)
- 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
- MacSwan, J. (2017). A Multilingual Perspective on Translanguaging. *American Educational Research Journal*, 54(1), 167–201.

- Newson, D. (1998). "Translation and Foreign Language Learning." In Translation and Language Teaching: Language Teaching and Translation, edited by K. Malmkjær, 63–68. Manchester: St. Jerome Publishing.
- Otheguy, R., Garcia, O., & Reid, W. (2015). Clarifying translanguaging and deconstructing the named languages: A perspective from linguistics. *Applied Linguistics Review*, 6(3), 281–307. <https://doi.org/10.1515/applirev-2015-0014>
- Palmer, D., Martinez, R., Mateus, S., & Henderson, K. (2014). Reframing the Debate on Language Separation: Toward a Vision for Translanguaging Pedagogies in the Dual Language Classroom. *The Modern Language Journal*, 98(3), 757–772.
- Poza, L. E. (2016). The Language of Ciencia: Translanguaging and Learning in a Bilingual Science Classroom. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 1–19.
- Sabino, R. (2018). *Languaging without Languages Beyond metro-, multi-, poly-, pluri- and translanguaging*. Brill, Leiden.
- Sara Vogel and Ofelia Garcia (2017) Languages and Literacies Online Publication Date: Dec 2017 DOI: 10.1093/acrefore/9780190264093.013.18
- Sayer, P. (2013). Translanguaging, TexMex, and Bilingual Pedagogy: Emergent Bilinguals Learning Through the Vernacular. *TESOL Quarterly*, 47(1), 63–88.
- Seals, C. A. (2021). Benefits of translanguaging pedagogy and practice. *Scottish Languages Review*, 36, 1-8.
- Storch, N., & Wigglesworth, G. (2003). Is there a role for the use of the L1 in an L2 setting? *TESOL Quarterly*, 37(4), 760–770. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3588224>
- Turnbull, B. (2019): Translanguaging in the planning of academic and creative writing: A case of adult Japanese EFL learners, *Bilingual Research Journal*, DOI:10.1080/15235882.2019.1589603.
- 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. Yamada, K., 2003, 'What prevents ESL/EFL writers from avoiding plagiarism? Analyses of 10 North American college websites', *System* 31(2), 247–258. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0346-251X\(03\)00023-education](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0346-251X(03)00023-education) and Bilingualism 22 (2): 138–149.
- Williams, C. (1996). Secondary education: Teaching in the bilingual situation. In C. Williams, G. Lewis, & C. Baker (Eds.), *The language policy: Taking stock* (pp. 39–78). Llangefni, UK: CAI.

Appendices

- A. Questionnaire link
- B. Interview questions

C. The writing paragraph question

Appendix A

https://forms.office.com/Pages/.aspx?subpage=design&FormId=-0eUu3vWwEG_DesignPageV2X1jK3LYovJD0fme5hUZMp6tSxuPWg21UQzhIRUk5QkJVRTE3NTZWSkpNQ1NBTlhBOSQIQCN0PWcu&Token=35b61dff29454835ba44568669122bbc

Appendix B.

Interview questions for the research topic.

- 1. How has the use of L1 helped you in developing reading skills in a better way?**
- 2. How has the use of L1 helped you in improving you writing skills?**
- 3. What problems did you face while using L1 during classroom discussions?**
- 4. Do you think the use of L1 helps you to become better learners overall? Explain?**

|Appendix C.

Write a paragraph about your best friend. Write at least 100 words.

- how he/she looks like/height/age etc.**
- personality- kind/helpful etc.**
- Education**
- Hobbies**
- Why you like him/her**