T.R

ISTANBUL SABAHATTIN ZAIM UNIVERSITY

GRADUATE EDUCATION INSTITUTE

DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH LANGUAGE TEACHING

TRANSLANGUAGING IN EFL CLASSROOM: THE PERSPECTIVES AND PRACTICES OF TEACHERS AND STUDENTS

MA THESIS

Hekmah ABUSWEIREH

Istanbul

July-2025

T.R

ISTANBUL SABAHATTIN ZAIM UNIVERSITY

GRADUATE EDUCATION INSTITUTE

DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH LANGUAGE TEACHING

TRANSLANGUAGING IN EFL CLASSROOM: THE PERSPECTIVES AND PRACTICES OF TEACHERS AND STUDENTS

MA THESIS

Hekmah ABUSWEIREH

Supervisor

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Hidayet SARANDİ

Istanbul

July-2025

This study has been approved in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the MA Degree in English Language Teaching

Supervisor	Assoc. Prof. Dr. Hidayet SARANDİ
Member of jury	Assoc. Prof. Dr. Emrah GÖRGÜLÜ
Member of jury	Asst. Prof. Dr. Şükrü NURAL

Approval by

Signature

Prof. Dr. Erhan İÇENER

Director, Graduate Education Institute

DECLARATION OF SCIENTIFIC ETHICS AND ORIGINALITY

This is to certify that this MA thesis titled “Translanguaging in EFL Classroom: The Perspectives and Practices of Teachers and Students” is my own work and I have acted according to scientific ethics and academic rules while producing it. I have collected and used all information and data according to scientific ethics and guidelines on thesis writing of Sabahattin Zaim University. I have fully referenced, in both the text and bibliography, all direct and indirect quotations and all sources I have used in this work.

Signature

Hekmah ABUSWEIREH

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Praise be to Almighty Allah, who hears my silent cries in the darkness and, through His love and mercy, enabled me to complete this work.

Hekmah ABUSWIREH

Istanbul, July 2025

ABSTRACT

TRANSLANGUAGING IN EFL CLASSROOM: THE PERSPECTIVES AND PRACTICES OF TEACHERS AND STUDENTS

Hekmah ABUSWEIREH

M. A., Department of English Language Teaching

Supervisor: Assoc. Prof. Dr. Hidayet SARANDİ

July-2025, 78 Pages

This study explores translanguaging as a pedagogical tool in English as a Foreign Language (EFL) classrooms, focusing on the perspectives and practices of teachers and students in three international schools in Istanbul, Turkey. As multilingualism becomes increasingly prevalent in educational contexts, this research investigates how translanguaging supports comprehension, reduces foreign language anxiety, and fosters a more inclusive classroom environment. This study used a mixed-methods approach, which combines qualitative data from semi-structured interviews with five Arab EFL teachers and quantitative data from student online questionnaires completed by 53 high school students, in grades 10, 11 and 12, the majority of whom are native speakers of Arabic. Classroom audio recordings were also used to capture translanguaging in practice.

The findings revealed that translanguaging is not solely a practical strategy for addressing linguistic challenges but also a meaningful act that affirms students' identities and promotes learner autonomy. All five teachers emphasized the value of using students' L1 strategically to clarify complex grammar and vocabulary, manage classroom dynamics, and ease students' emotional discomfort. Students, in turn, expressed appreciation for the use of their first language (Arabic) in supporting their understanding and active participation. The Arabic used in these exchanges is not formal Modern Standard Arabic

(MSA), but various spoken dialects familiar to the students and teachers. The research contributes to the growing body of work on translanguaging by offering a dual perspective within a rarely studied educational context, emphasizing its role in equitable language education.

Key terms: Translanguaging, English as a Foreign Language, English as a Lingua Franca, Foreign Language Anxiety, Teacher Autonomy, Learner Autonomy, Monolingualism, Multilingualism.

ÖZET

YABANCI DİL OLARAK İNGİLİZCE ÖĞRETİLEN SINIFLARDA DİLLER ARASI GEÇİŞLİLİK: ÖĞRETMENLERİN VE ÖĞRENCİLERİN GÖRÜŞLERİ VE UYGULAMALARI

Hekmah ABUSWEIREH

Yüksek Lisans, İngiliz Dili Eğitimi

Tez Danışmanı: Doç. Dr. Hidayet SARANDİ

Temmuz-2025, 78 Sayfa

Bu çalışma, İngilizcenin Yabancı Dil (EFL) olarak öğretildiği sınıflarda pedagojik bir araç olarak translanguaging (dil geçişkenliği) uygulamasını incelemekte olup, Türkiye'nin İstanbul şehrindeki üç uluslararası okulda görev yapan öğretmenler ve öğrencilerin bakış açıları ile uygulamalarına odaklanmaktadır. Eğitim bağlamlarında çok dilliliğin giderek yaygınlaştığı günümüzde, bu araştırma translanguaging'in anlama becerisini nasıl desteklediğini, yabancı dil kaygısını nasıl azalttığını ve daha kapsayıcı bir sınıf ortamını nasıl teşvik ettiğini ortaya koymayı amaçlamaktadır. Çalışma, beş Arap EFL öğretmeniyle yapılan yarı yapılandırılmış nitel görüşmelerden ve 10, 11 ve 12. sınıflarda öğrenim gören, çoğunluğu Arapça anadili olan 53 lise öğrencisinin çevrim içi anketlerinden elde edilen nicel verilerle harmanlanmış karma yöntemli bir araştırma yaklaşımı benimsemiştir. Ayrıca, sınıf içi translanguaging uygulamalarını belgelemek amacıyla ses kayıtları da kullanılmıştır.

Bulgular, translanguaging'in yalnızca dilsel zorlukları aşmaya yönelik pratik bir strateji olmadığını, aynı zamanda öğrencilerin kimliklerini onaylayan ve öğrenen özerkliğini teşvik eden anlamlı bir eylem olduğunu ortaya koymuştur. Beş öğretmenin tamamı, öğrencilerin anadilini stratejik bir şekilde kullanmanın, karmaşık gramer ve kelime bilgilerini açıklamada, sınıf dinamiklerini yönetmede ve duygusal sıkıntıyı hafifletmede

önemli olduğunu vurgulamıştır. Öğrenciler de, birinci dilleri olan Arapçanın (Modern Standart Arapça değil, öğrencilerin ve öğretmenlerin aşina olduğu çeşitli konuşma lehçeleri) kullanımı sayesinde dersleri daha iyi anladıklarını ve daha aktif katılım sağladıklarını belirtmişlerdir. Bu araştırma, translanguaging ile ilgili artan literatüre, nadiren çalışılan bir eğitim bağlamında hem öğretmenlerin hem de öğrencilerin bakış açılarını sunarak katkı sağlamaktadır ve dil eğitiminin eşitlikçi yönüne dikkat çekmektedir.

Anahtar Sözcükler: Translanguaging, Yabancı Dil Olarak İngilizce, İletişim Dili Olarak İngilizce, Yabancı Dil Kaygısı, Öğretmen Özerkliği, Öğrenci Özerkliği, Tek Dillilik, Çok Dillilik.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

CHAPTER IV

FINDINGS

CHAPTER V

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

LIST OF TABLES

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

EFL: English as a Foreign Language

ELF: English as a Lingua Franca

FLA: Foreign Language Anxiety

L1: First Language / Native Language

L2: Second Language / Target Language

SLA: Second Language Acquisition

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

As the world of education changes and students in English as Foreign Language (EFL) classes come from diverse cultural and linguistic backgrounds, it becomes even more important to change how we teach to fit this new reality. This shift has prompted teachers to seek innovative pedagogical strategies that address their students' linguistic diversity and enhance their learning experiences. One way to reveal this ideology is through translanguaging. Translanguaging is the flexible and intentional use of two or more languages in classroom instruction. As conceptualized by García and Wei (2014), translanguaging challenges monolingual ideologies and promotes flexible bilingual education. At its core, it is not just a way to communicate with people; it is a shift in how teachers approach teaching, advocating for students' home languages to be used in the classroom alongside English. This method is built on the idea that using students' language skills can help them learn more deeply and meaningfully. Translanguaging also breaks down the barriers often faced by students who may otherwise feel alienated or less capable in an English-only learning environment (Palmer, Martínez, Mateus, & Henderson, 2014). As it is clear, the use of translanguaging in education is closely tied to cultural identity. It helps students preserve and thrive their cultural background while acquiring new languages, which makes them feel that they belong and are accepted in the classroom (Menken & Sánchez, 2019). This is very important for the students' emotional and social health (Velasco & García, 2014). It also promotes students and teachers to connect in a more dynamic way, which helps both individuals from different cultures and languages work together and respect other cultures.

To use translanguaging in EFL classes, the curriculum, teaching techniques, and methods of testing must go under changes. There are two main things that need to be thought about. First, teachers should learn how to spot and exploit their students' language skills. This could mean changing class plans in order for bilingual or multilingual interactions go effortlessly. Additionally, assessment strategies need to change so that they accurately show what they are learning in these settings (Li, 2018). However, adding translanguaging

to EFL classrooms might be difficult. Some of these are opposition from individuals who may have conventional beliefs on separating languages, the need for more teacher training, and the creation of materials and resources which support translanguaging practices (Flores & Rosa, 2015). Nonetheless, the potential benefits of making the learning environments more welcoming, interesting and useful demand to be an important goal in today's education.

Translanguaging also makes students rethink what it means to know and be good at using a language. Because they are focused on monolingual criteria, traditional tests sometimes do not show how well multilingual students really know a language. Adding translanguaging to some tests can make them more accurate in showing how well students can move between and combine different language environments, which is a better way to show how well they can communicate. Additionally, using multiple languages in the classroom helps students think critically and solve problems. Students are not learning how to translate word-for-word from one language to another, but they are being taught how to combine knowledge and articulate it in ways that are culturally and contextually acceptable (Hornberger & Link, 2012). Furthermore, translanguaging fits with the new approaches in education around the world toward more individualized learning. It calls teachers who are open to the method to change their way of teaching to fit the needs of each student, since each student has different ways to interact with languages. This personalization can lead to better results since students are more interested and driven to learn in an environment that respects and reflects how they speak. Translanguaging can also help students become global citizens; when students learn to speak more than one language, they become more aware of and sensitive to other cultures, which leads students to view the world with greater openness and understanding.

It is important to know that while some schools might try to create a standard model of students based on their ideological frameworks, students naturally pursue learner autonomy, which affects every part of their lives, including how they learn (Little, 1995). Students' desire for independence shows out in their desire to have control over their learning environments, choices, and methods, which can be very different from the standardized methods that schools usually use. This autonomy in learning fits with modern educational theories that stress learner-centered approaches, which means that education

is adjusted to meet the unique requirements, backgrounds, and preferences of each student (Nunan, 1999). Also, understanding how learner autonomy is important to learning encourages moving toward more holistic ways of teaching.

These practices consider the aspects of learning, emotional, social and cognitive, to integrate them to create a comprehensive learning experience which supports the development of the individual. Such an approach acknowledges that learning is not just about acquiring knowledge but also about developing skills and attitudes that support lifelong learning and personal growth. Encouraging learner autonomy in learning environments could lead to innovative, resilient, and adaptive individuals who are qualified to navigate the complexities of the modern era. Thus, instead of forcing students into strict, one-language rules, translanguaging encourages them to use their full linguistic abilities freely and pushes them forward to reflect on how they learn best, encouraging critical thinking, self-expression, and personal growth, which leads to producing autonomous students.

1.1 The Statement of the Problem

With the increase of learners adopting English as a Foreign Language (EFL) surpassing the number of its native speakers, classrooms are becoming globally diverse (Crystal, 2003; Graddol, 2006; Jenkins, 2015). However, monolingual teaching methods that just focus on the target language, both linguistically and culturally, are not always effective in handling this diversity. This often makes it difficult for some students to understand, makes them anxious, and less interested. It is very important to look into teaching methods like translanguaging that allow student's language skills to make learning more fun, give them more freedom, and lower their stress levels.

1.2 The Rationale of the Study

This study aims to explore what issues linguistic variety causes in modern classrooms, especially when the students' first language is a minority language, such as the case of Arabic in Turkey. Translanguaging is a useful way to learn about teaching approaches that

respect and include students' language identities, which makes educational settings more inclusive and effective.

1.3 The Significance of the Study

This study contributes to the understanding of how to teach languages in multilingual environments that meet the academic and social needs of students from different language backgrounds. In addition, despite that there are research studies on translanguaging, most of it has been done in bilingual or Western schools. There has not been much research done in postcolonial, multilingual settings like Turkey, where English is a foreign language. Also, there are not many studies that look at translanguaging among speakers of minority languages, such as Arabic-speaking students in private international schools in Turkey. These classrooms in these schools are increasingly getting more varied in terms of language and culture. Further, most existing research examines either teachers or students perspectives in isolation, and they often overlook how both groups experience, interpret, and negotiate translanguaging practices in the same educational context. This study fills in these gaps by giving a dual-perspective analysis in a situation that has not been studied much before. This adds much-needed empirical evidence to a subject that still needs more context-specific, practice-oriented insights into translanguaging in formal EFL teaching.

1.4 The Limitations of the Study

The study acknowledges limitations, including that it only looked at three private international schools. This means that the results may not be applicable to other schools with different cultural or language dynamics. Also, using self-reported student questionnaires means that there is a chance of response bias. In addition, student interviews were originally planned to add to the data, but it could not be done due to time constraints. Besides, recordings of classrooms supplied practices of translaguaging, however, not all teachers used translanguaging during those sessions, which may have limited the range of actual language activities in the classroom.

1.5 The Research Questions

1. How do teachers perceive the role of translanguaging in supporting students' language learning?
2. What reasons do teachers give for using translanguaging in the classroom?
3. What are students' perspectives on the use of translanguaging in the foreign language classroom?
4. What specific translanguaging practices students claim to use and what reasons do they give for their application?

1.6 The Outline of the Study

This thesis is divided into five chapters:

Chapter 1: Introduction – Provides an overview of the study, statement of the problem, its rationale, significance, limitations of the study, and key definitions.

Chapter 2: Literature Review – Reviews the theoretical basis and relevant literature on translanguaging.

Chapter 3: Methodology – Outlines the research design, data collection methods, and analysis procedures.

Chapter 4: Data Analysis and Findings – Presents findings from teacher interviews and student questionnaire.

Chapter 5: Discussion and Conclusion – Discusses the results with theoretical frameworks and existing research and identifies the limitations of the study, implications of the study and the conclusion.

1.7 The Definition of Key Terms

English as a Foreign Language (EFL): Teaching and learning English in contexts where English is not the dominant language for daily communication.

English as a Lingua Franca (ELF): The use of English as a common means of communication among speakers of different first languages.

Foreign Language Anxiety (FLA): The emotional discomfort experienced by learners, characterized by fear, stress, and apprehension when learning or using a foreign language.

Learner Autonomy: Learners' ability to independently control and direct their learning processes, making decisions based on their preferences and needs.

Monolingualism: The ideology or practice of using only one language within a communicative or educational setting.

Multilingualism: The ability of an individual or the presence in a society to use multiple languages effectively.

Teacher Autonomy: The professional freedom and decision-making power educators have in planning, implementing, and evaluating their instructional practices.

Translanguaging: The Flexible and intentional use of two or more languages in classroom instruction.

CHAPTER II

LITERATURE REVIEW

This chapter delineates the theoretical framework and examines the literature relevant to the investigation. It is structured into eight subsections: Defining translanguaging, the evolution of translanguaging, monolingualism in language education, translanguaging and emotional engagement, translanguaging in language acquisition and cognitive development, challenges in implementing translanguaging in education, teachers' perceptions on translanguaging practices, students' perspectives on translanguaging practices in EFL classrooms, and finally addressing the research gap.

2.1 Translanguaging

There are big differences between language systems in terms of how they are built and how they work, but they all do the same basic thing, which enables people to communicate and share ideas. This point of view shows that all linguistic systems have the same purpose, even though they are different (Hymes, 1972). The idea that a learner's first language acts as a cognitive scaffold is at the core of this paradigm. This is true for individuals who want to learn a new language later in life. Therefore, the mother tongue is an important part in exploring and understanding the difficulties of learning another language, since it allows learners to use the language skills they already have (Spada & Lightbown, 2006). As a crucial element in language acquisition, when there is room for learners to draw upon known syntactic structures, vocabulary, and communicative practices, the native language facilitates the development of fluency and comprehension of the target language. This shows the importance of including the native language or first language into instructional strategies to foster an effective multilingual education (Hornberger & Link, 2012). In this context, translanguaging is a new path of thinking about language that goes against the traditional ideas about individualizing languages. As García, Flores, and Chu (2011) argued that translanguaging is the intentional blending of languages to make the input easier to understand. In other words, it is the flexible use of

two or more languages to make meaning, build knowledge and share ideas (García & Wei, 2014). These definitions show how multilingual individuals can use their language skills to communicate with others and understand their environment. Gutiérrez (2008) also argued about how translanguaging is a mix of many languages and how useful it is for helping students to use their language skills to learn and write academic and creative works.

Further, translanguaging is not limited to the first language use. It includes a range of semiotic resources, besides spoken language, which makes it possible to make sense of some issues in many ways. For example, gestures, facial expressions, body language, visual aids like pictures and diagrams, and digital tools like multimedia platforms are some of these resources (Kalan, 2022). Teachers typically use gestures and body language to make statements clearer or stronger in the classroom. Visual aids like infographics, drawings on whiteboards, or writings give students other ways to understand difficult ideas. Digital resources like movies and interactive apps can promote translanguaging by using text, images, and audio altogether. Also, tone, intonation, and rhythm add to communication by conveying subtle differences in meaning and emotion that spoken words alone might not be able to. This is an important and strong aspect of communication that shows how someone feels and what they intended (Dash & Davis, 2022). It also affects how the listener or receiver understands the message (Guyer, Briñol, Vaughan-Johnston, Fabrigar, Moreno & Petty, 2021).

Another point is that the cultural symbols and environmental artifacts can assist in enhancing shared understanding, particularly in educational settings (Creese & Blackledge, 2010). Items such as culturally relevant texts, or even classroom decorations can remind students of their backgrounds and encourage them to use what they know about their culture to help them associate with what they are learning. Many get confused between translanguaging and code-switching. To clarify this, translanguaging views a student's whole linguistic and semiotic repertoire as one system, while code-switching means switching between two different language systems. This shows that students who speak a language do not keep their linguistic resources separate; instead, they mix them with other signs in a way that makes sense and works in that specific situation. Thus,

translanguaging paves the way for the creative and flexible use of various communicative modes, aligning with the complexities of real-world interactions (García & Wei, 2014).

Translanguaging is not confined to a single modality or interactional schema; it adapts to the context, whether student- or teacher-directed, across different subject matters and within varying socio-political language environments (Schissel, De Korne, & López-Gopar, 2021). This ability of adaptation shows how important it is for creating educational settings that are open to everyone and responsive.

2.2 Evolution of Translanguaging

Translanguaging has its roots in the Welsh school system of the 1980s, where teachers used bilingual pedagogical practices (Williams, 2000). In 1994, Cen Williams introduced the term Trawsieithu to describe a method that combined Welsh and English in a single learning environment. The goal was for students to use both languages for understanding, expressing themselves, and thinking critically (Lewis, Jones, & Baker, 2012). Building on this, García (2011) redefined translanguaging as the process by which multilingual individuals use their language skills to make sense of subjects and question language hierarchies. Following García, Wei (2011) and Canagarajah (2011) further expanded the concept by focusing on how the idea could change and create new ways of thinking and adapting, encouraging students to connect and go beyond different languages and modes.

Also, translanguaging extended to touch on other theoretical frameworks that can be used in many fields. For example, translanguaging has been used in sociolinguistics to look at how individuals communicate in more than one language in real life, language ideologies and power structures, and criticizes linguistic hierarchies that prioritize dominant languages and push others to the side (Pennycook, 2010). Researchers like Creese and Blackledge (2010) believed that translanguaging is a way to assist students to build their identities in multilingual environments. Similarly, Poza (2017) argued that translanguaging could help to fix language issues in educational settings. This clarifies that translanguaging has changed how scholars and educators view language learning and teaching as a revolutionary project. To illustrate, the traditional Second Language Acquisition (SLA) theories, which are based on monolingual criteria, have focused on

how good enough a learner can speak a target language, ignoring the role of their first language (Cook, 2001). Translanguaging goes against this idea by recognizing that using more than one language is a cognitive and teaching tool instead of a hindrance (García, 2011). As a result, translanguaging has become more popular as a teaching method that respects the language and cultural identities of students. García and Lin (2017) discussed that translanguaging teaching methods do not only improve language and academic skills, but they also promote social justice by challenging the negative views of bilingual or multilingual learners.

In addition, translanguaging is connected to the English as a Lingua Franca (ELF) movement. English as a Lingua Franca criticizes the standards for native speakers in English language training and stresses that different types of English are valid for usage in global communication (Jenkins, 2003). This conforms with the translanguaging concept. Translanguaging calls for language use, and it should be open to everyone. Also, translanguaging is related to postcolonial ideologies, which also criticize the dominance of monolingual standards that were forced on learners through colonial language policy. Many researchers have argued that language instruction should be decolonized. For example, Pennycook (2002) emphasized that multilingual practices should be seen as valid. Similarly, Canagarajah (2012) supported translanguaging as a way to fight linguistic imperialism and bring back languages that have been pushed to the margins. As it is clear and written in history books, colonial powers imposed their languages as vehicles for governance, education, and cultural assimilation, sidelining indigenous languages in the process (Phillipson, 1992; Pennycook, 2002). For example, English, in particular, was positioned as the language of intellectual and economic advancement in British colonies, creating a socio-linguistic divide (Makoni & Pennycook, 2005; Canagarajah, 1999). In addition to that, colonial elites who spoke English were able to achieve political and economic power, while the rest of the population did not (Ngũgĩ wa Thiong'o, 1986). Despite these policies, colonized populations developed translanguaging practices as a pragmatic response to their multilingual realities. This kind of resistance assisted people in getting around colonial systems while keeping their cultural identities. Therefore, translanguaging became a way to negotiate meaning and fight against linguistic

assimilation, with minor acts of resistance happening in everyday interactions (Canagarajah, 2012; Makoni & Pennycook, 2005).

Today, postcolonial education systems are fixing these historical issues by using local languages in their lessons and encouraging linguistic diversity. In the same way that translation approaches were used in schools in countries that had been colonized (see Bandia, 2023; Alhamad, 2022), the translanguaging approach is also becoming a key part of this effort, that promotes inclusive and fair learning environments that value the linguistic and cultural resources that students bring to the classroom (Heugh, 2018). One goal of education lies in strengthening the relationship between the learners and their environment, fostering a sense of belonging, identity, and purpose. In this sense, translanguaging is more than a teaching methodology; it is a socio-political practice that challenges dominant linguistic ideologies and monolingual frameworks.

When education does not acknowledge the students' cultural and linguistic backgrounds, it makes them question who they are and what they want to do, which can lead them to feel distant from their roots. This lack of connection can shake the learner's confidence, self-esteem, and the desire to learn because it makes them feel that their language and culture are less important than the language they are learning. This means that one of the most important ways that education connects students to their environment is by giving their first language value. The mother language is more than just a way to talk; it is also a repository of cultural knowledge, values, and identity. According to Shaull (in Freire, 2005, p.33), education that ignores a learner's native language might create a "Culture of silence", in which students believe that their cultural and linguistic identities are less than the others. This might be tough for them to know their goals and place in society. Conversely, when the mother tongue is respected and integrated into the learning process, it reinforces the learner's sense of identity and, therefore, helps them feel valued as contributors to their educational journey (Heugh, Harding-Esch, & Coleman, 2021). Thus, translanguaging replaces the notion that views languages as autonomous and bounded entities with the notion that all languages are equal (García & Lin, 2017). It affirms the learner's identity and promotes the idea that mastering English or any dominant language does not require erasing one's cultural and linguistic heritage but instead dismantling fixed boundaries between languages (Rosa & Flores, 2017).

2.3 Monolingualism in Language Education

Throughout the history of language education, monolingualism has held a dominant position, particularly within English Language Teaching (ELT). The notion that many people used to think that the best way to learn a second language (L2) was to completely immerse themselves in it, frequently to the point of not using their first language (L1) (Auerbach, 1993; Cook, 2001). The Direct Method and the Audiolingual Method were two early teaching approaches that were based on this idea. They both made it clear that L1 should not be used in the classroom (Howatt & Widdowson, 2004). The theory behind this method is derived from Krashen's (1985) Input Hypothesis, which emphasizes that the necessity of comprehensible input in L2 is a key requirement for learning the language. Thus, it is thought that exposing learners exclusively to the target language would make the learning environment more real and successful within this framework. Scholars and practitioners, on the other hand, have been increasingly questioning this devotion to L2-only instruction. Cook (2010) identifies four core assumptions that underlie the monolingual approach: Monolingualism, naturalism, native-speakerism, and absolutism. He argues that these are often ideologically driven rather than factual. These assumptions portray L1 use as detrimental to learning, despite growing evidence suggesting the contrary. In reality, the complete exclusion of students' first languages often proves not only impractical but also pedagogically counterproductive. Also, Macaro (2001) gives a more nuanced view by discussing three different views on using L1 in language education: The virtual, maximal, and optimal positions. In practical classrooms, the virtual position, which requires exclusive L2-only instruction, is very hard to reach or useful. Many teachers, on the other hand, naturally use methods that are closer to the maximal or optimal positions, where the strategic use of L1 helps students learn better.

There are also deeper social and political effects of monolingualism's ideological basis. For instance, Auerbach (1993) and Phillipson (1992) argued that regulations that only allow English instruction are typically linked to linguistic imperialism, which is when English is kept in charge by institutions that do not teach other languages. From this point of view, language policies should be looked at critically. It shows how judgments on teaching can be affected by power structures and historical disparities, not only by how well they work. Further, contemporary research increasingly supports techniques that are

more flexible and bilingual. For example, Lee (2016) observed that experienced Korean English teachers often did not use monolingual instruction in practice because it did not fit with the way their classrooms worked or the demands of their students. Also, Agudo (2017) emphasized that code-switching by non-native English teachers is not a deficiency but a responsive way to teach. The monolingual approach is now viewed as a restrictive legacy of outdated paradigms, while more flexible and open frameworks, like translanguaging, are becoming more popular as viable alternatives.

2.4 Translanguaging and Emotional Engagement

Translanguaging has been shown to offer emotional and social benefits in multilingual classrooms. One of the main issues which has been raised in the EFL context is Foreign Language Anxiety (FLA). Foreign Language Anxiety (FLA) is a concept which strongly related to translanguaging and is a well-documented phenomenon in language learning that can significantly hinder learners' progress and engagement. It is defined by Horwitz, Horwitz and Cope (1986) as "A distinct complex of self-perceptions, beliefs, feelings, and behaviors arising from the uniqueness of the language learning process". Foreign Language Anxiety often stems from fear of making mistakes, negative evaluation from the teacher and classmates, and difficulties in understanding and expressing oneself in the foreign language. The socio-educational model of language acquisition by MacIntyre and Gardner (1994) shows how motivation and anxiety affect language learning. They argued that high levels of anxiety can affect three important stages. First, the intake (processing new language information), second, the processing (thinking about the material), and third, the output (using the language to talk to people). Communication apprehension and fear of poor evaluation are two types of anxiety that can lead to avoidance behaviors and lower academic performance. For instance, a study by Elkhafaifi (2005) showed how listening comprehension anxiety made it harder for the students to understand spoken language in the foreign language classroom. This study supports the fact that FLA puts a lot of emotional pressure on students, which makes them neglect language classes and participate less. Guo and Xu (2014) also conducted a multi-dimensional study on FLA among college students in China. Their results showed that FLA affects cognitive,

affective, and behavioral areas, which supports the idea that anxiety is not just a temporary emotional state but a long-term problem that affects language confidence. From the existing literature, translanguaging is a viable way to lower FLA by boosting students' confidence and motivation. During moments of emotional discomfort or linguistic breakdown, their first language can be a retreat for them to calm down and slowly start to communicate again in the target language. In other words, it helps learners get their minds and feelings back on track by acting as a stabilizing tool. This not only lowers tension, but it also improves their focus and memory; students can understand better what they are learning, reengage with the learning task with greater clarity and confidence.

Further, Krashen (1982) posits that anxiety acts as a filter that keeps verbal input from being processed correctly, while motivation helps to lower anxiety. Students who are intrinsically motivated are more likely to get over FLA and keep studying a language with more determination and strength. Self-efficacy, or the belief in one's ability to do well on certain tasks, is another important idea that helps reduce FLA (Bandura, 1997). It encourages learners to show what they know and can do in both their first language and the target language. Thus, when students see their language skills as strengths instead of weaknesses, they naturally feel more confident in their ability to learn the language. This allows them to communicate in the language they are most comfortable with and creates a fair and supportive learning environment (Moore, Bradley & Simpson, 2020). Also, self-determination theory posits that intrinsic motivation is higher when learners have autonomy (they can choose how to use their language resources), competence (they can handle language challenges, which makes them feel more in control), and relatedness (they feel more connected to their peers and teachers, which makes the learning community more supportive) (Deci & Ryan, 2013). There have been several studies that suggest using the first language in EFL lessons can boost motivation and language engagement among learners. In South Africa, for instance, translanguaging has been used successfully in classrooms to help students understand and connect with the language of instruction by bridging the gap between their home languages and the language of instruction (Heugh, 2018). Also, Margana and Rasman (2021) found that teaching English besides the students' native languages in Indonesia encouraged language-minority students to participate. In addition, Mendoza and Parba (2019) looked at how

translanguaging works in a multilingual classroom in the Philippines. They found that when students were allowed to use their language skills, including Tagalog and regional languages, they engaged more and understood the content better.

2.5 Translanguaging in Language Acquisition and Cognitive Development

Learning any language is not just about memorizing words and understanding grammar rules. It is about making sense through communication. According to Vygotsky's Sociocultural Theory (SCT) (1978), learning is an individual process, and it occurs naturally through social interactions that are shaped by the cultural surroundings we live in. Language is the main tool that assists people in internalizing knowledge in this process. Another concept in this matter is the Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD). It is a key concept in SCT that shows the gap between what learners can do on their own and what they can do with the assistance of experts (Vygotsky, 1978). This means that translanguaging works within the ZPD by connecting what learners already know with new information (García & Wei, 2014). This method encourages active participation and meaningful engagement because students can use their linguistic skills to explain difficult concepts. This is similar to Swain's (2006) idea of Languaging, which explains how learners use language to help them overcome difficult mental tasks, whether in speaking or writing. In addition, collaborative discourse is a type of languaging in which students work together to solve problems or express ideas and co-construct knowledge. Using more than one language in this process makes it easier and comfortable by helping students understand each other better and communicate clearly. To support this, Makalela (2018) showed that translanguaging activities helped the students acquire more vocabulary and improve their reasoning skills. Also, Probyn (2019) found that encouraging translanguaging made classroom conversations more interesting and helped students understand the content better.

Another SLA theory that explains how translanguaging can help learners with their language learning process is Krashen's (1985) Input Hypothesis. This theory confirms that language acquisition happens when learners are exposed to comprehensible input language, which is, to some degree, beyond their current proficiency level. Further, as

Chen, Fang, and Zhang (2024) found in their study, translanguaging facilitated engagement with the subject matter in Chinese English for Specific Purposes (ESP) classrooms. This was believed to enable students to access and internalize complex concepts effectively. Also, Ortega (2019) looked at an EFL classroom in Colombia where the teacher used translanguaging techniques. The study showed that students who were allowed to use both Spanish and English had better understanding and engagement with the material. In Mexico, Mora Pablo, Lengeling, Rubio Zenil, Crawford, and Goodwin (2011) investigated the use of translanguaging in bilingual education settings. Their findings indicated that students who engaged in translanguaging were better at understanding complex concepts and participated in class discussions, and this resulted in improved academic outcomes and a greater sense of empowerment.

Some scholars believed that using familiar language structures with the other language structure makes it easier to learn and remember the new language forms. For example, Cummins (2000) argued that students who learn to read and write well in their first language are able to do the same in the second language. This is because the basic cognitive skills developed in the first language are likely to be used when learners start learning new languages. Translanguaging is also believed to attract students' attention to compare and contrast other languages' grammatical structures, vocabulary, and conversation patterns (Cenoz & Gorter, 2017). This means that translanguaging enhances students' metalinguistic awareness (the ability to reflect on and analyze language as a system). This heightened awareness leads to the development of what is called Cognitive Academic Language Proficiency (CALP). This assists learners in engaging more with academic content (Cummins, 2000). In their longitudinal research on bilingual education in the U.S., Thomas and Collier (2002) discovered that by the end of high school, students who received first language instruction in their early years surpassed their peers in academic subjects, including second language learning. Also, Pinnock and Vijayakumar (2009) presented evidence that children who were taught in their mother tongue during the foundational years perform better academically, with stronger comprehension and higher retention rates.

In addition, translanguaging has become an increasingly important topic in Turkish environments, especially in English as a Foreign Language (EFL) and English Medium of

Instruction (EMI) settings. For example, Karabulut and Dollar (2022) explored how translanguaging affects Turkish EFL writing classes. They discovered that when students used Turkish and English together, their writing greatly improved; they used a wider range of words and organized their ideas better. Most importantly, the students were less nervous and more confident, which is believed it had a great impact during the writing process. This leads to the point that allowing students to write only in English in writing lessons would not help their writing skills improve. A similar theme emerged in Tekin's (2024) study, which focused on teacher educators in Turkish EMI universities. Many teachers said they used translanguaging to help their students understand abstract ideas and encourage them to participate in conversations. However, several were apprehensive about depending on L1, fearing that it might hinder their students' English progress. Also, Kırkgöz, Inci-Kavak, Karakaş and Panero (2023) investigated translanguaging in EMI classrooms in different academic fields to give another point of view. Their results showed that in science and technical topics, translanguaging was mostly used to explain concepts and solve problems. In social sciences and humanities, on the other hand, it was more important for conversations, debates, and critical thinking. Further, Ataş (2023) explored how translanguaging assisted students in EMI programs who were studying English literature. The students expressed that switching between languages assisted them in analyzing literary themes better and connecting stories to their cultural backgrounds. Instead of struggling with difficult texts in a strict English-only environment, they were able to engage with the content in a way that felt natural and meaningful.

2.6 Challenges in Implementing Translanguaging in Education

Some teachers still have doubts about translanguaging, even if its benefits are acknowledge. This is generally due to the rules at workplace and the pressure to do well on standardized tests. Also, teachers who are used to teaching in only one language do not want to change. Many teachers have been taught how to teach languages in a traditional approach that keeps them apart, and which supports the idea that immersion in the target language is the best way to become proficient (García & Wei, 2014). Some teachers were hesitant to employ translanguaging because they were concerned about the linguistic

interference. They believed that allowing students to use their first language might slow down their progress in learning the target language (Doiz & Lasagabaster, 2017). Yuvayapan (2019) found that teachers in Turkey recognize that translanguaging is helpful, but they were careful not to use it extensively so that the English language would still be the predominant language used. Also, Deniega and Neri (2024) discovered that teachers in multilingual classrooms were worried that students who use their first language extensively might not be motivated to become fluent in English. This concern is understandable, as learners frequently perform better when they push themselves out of their comfort zones. Similarly, in Mexico, Schissel, De Korne, and López-Gopar (2021) found that some teachers felt they had to stick to monolingual norms because standardized tests like the Test of English as a Foreign Language (TOEFL) put a lot of emphasis on sounding like a native speaker of English. Other teachers avoided translanguaging, opting for English-only instruction to produce proficient English speakers, viewing translanguaging as a temporary aid to be phased out as students gained target language proficiency. This resistance is further exacerbated by the lack of professional training in translanguaging pedagogy, leaving teachers uncertain about how to balance the use of students' linguistic resources while maintaining exposure to the target language (García & Lin, 2017). As some researchers suggest, for translanguaging to work, instructors need clear lesson plans, instructional methodologies, and professional development programs to help them find the right balance between using L1 and exposing students to the target language, instead of marginalizing it (Creese & Blackledge, 2010; Cenoz & Gorter, 2020).

Moreover, translanguaging is even harder to use because of educational rules. Institutional policies and assessment methods do not always allow for translanguaging, and many institutions still use monolingual evaluation, which only evaluate students' performance in the target language without their skills in other languages (Canagarajah, 2011). Because of this, teachers may be less likely to use translanguaging if their students are graded on monolingual criteria. For instance, Nyimbili and Mwanza (2021) found that in Zambia's multilingual literacy classrooms, rigid adherence to monolingual language norms made it hard for the teachers to make the most of their students' language skills. Even in situations where translanguaging is supposed to be helpful, many teachers still doubt its effectiveness. Makalela (2015) observed that some teachers in South African

classrooms did not want to use translanguaging because they thought it meant that the students were not good at English. This way of thinking comes from the historical prestige of monolingual English education, especially in postcolonial settings where English is still linked to academic performance and economic mobility (Pennycook, 2002; García & Lin, 2017). But in some cases, some teachers stayed away from institutional policies and instead followed their teaching experience. This was a way for them to resist policymakers who see them as implementers of predetermined goals instead of as independent professionals. For example, Sarandi (2013) found a discrepancy between teachers' teaching styles and the school's policy. Even though this was the official regulation, many teachers used their professional judgment to stay with their teaching styles, which often included using the students' first language.

2.7 Teachers' Perceptions on Translanguaging Practices

It is important to know how teachers perceive and use translanguaging practices. Teachers are not merely individuals who help students learn a language; they are also the main decision-makers who use their values, training, and the rules of the school to decide how to teach. Their views on translanguaging can either make it easier or harder for their students to use more than one language in classroom. New studies showed that many teachers, especially pre-service teachers, are becoming more supportive of translanguaging. For example, Alemania, Beltran, Betancor, Eli, Escueta, Espiritu, and Mendoza (2022) found that most of the pre-service English language teachers they studied acknowledged that translanguaging could be a very useful teaching tool for teaching content and help students to communicate, and making the classroom more welcoming for multilingual students. These teachers' perspectives align with Macaro's (2001) maximal position. However, this willingness to employ L1 is not without concerns. Another point Alemania, Beltran, Betancor, Eli, Escueta, Espiritu, and Mendoza (2022) came up with is the term "Guilty translanguaging" to describe the internal conflict that many teachers feel when their teaching choices go against institutional expectations or held monolingual beliefs. Even if teachers believe that translanguaging helps their students, they could feel guilty or doubt themselves because they are concerned that using

L1 could be regarded as unprofessional or as hindering immersion in the target language. This mental load reveals how prevalent ideas in English language teaching, like English-only policies and native-speaker norms, still affect and occasionally limit what teachers do in their classroom.

Further, Agudo (2017) also explored the perspectives of non-native English-speaking teachers. The study found that teachers often switch to the students' first language to make the concepts clearer, ease their fear, or encourage them to participate. Still, a lot of the teachers believe that using L1 means they are not good at the target language. This assumption comes from a bigger set of ideas that put native-speakerism first and L2 after, sometimes ignoring the fact that real classrooms are multilingual. Lee (2016) also adds to a comparative view by pointing out the distinctions between pre-service and in-service teachers. Her research showed that experienced teachers are less likely to support strict monolingual approaches because they typically see them as impractical and not relevant to the reality of their students. These teachers, who are used to the daily problems of teaching language, tend to be more practical and focused on the needs of their students. They know that sometimes meaningful learning needs to be flexible, especially when there is more than one language spoken. Strict language barriers might make it harder to understand and get involved. These studies show how complicated the situation is. On the one hand, more teachers are recognizing the benefits of translanguaging in helping students study, boost their confidence, and make them feel welcome. On the other hand, systemic constraints, such as prescriptive language policies, outdated pedagogical training, and enduring ideological pressures, continue to limit the full embrace of multilingual practices in the classroom. Overcoming these challenges will require more than individual acceptance and cooperation. It also needs reforms within the institutions, supportive leadership, and teacher education programs that equip teachers with the new skills and theoretical grounding to implement it effectively.

2.8 Students' Perspectives on Translanguaging Practices in EFL Classroom

In the ongoing debate between educators and policymakers about translanguaging and how hard to put it into practice, it is important to consider how students feel about it since

their experiences have a huge impact on how well they learn and how engaged they are in the classroom. Some researchers took the path of research into this matter. For example, in India, Antony, Ramnath and Ellikkal (2024) investigated students' opinions of translanguaging in a multilingual classroom at Pondicherry Central University. The researchers used semi-structured interviews to find eight main themes and thirty-five subthemes related to translanguaging. One of the key findings in the study was that most of the students viewed translanguaging as a support to understand and participate in class. Many students reported that switching between their first language and the target language made their learning easier, especially when dealing with difficult concepts. They were surer of their knowledge since they could first think about new ideas in their first language and then articulate it in English. Students also stated that translanguaging made the classroom a welcoming and supportive place where they could speak freely without worrying about making mistakes in the target language. Similarly, Liu, Deng, and Wimpenny (2024) explored translanguaging in English for Academic Purposes (EAP) settings in China. In such settings, students often learn in high-pressure contexts that put a lot of emphasis on their English competence. Their research showed that students felt positively about how their native languages were used in the classroom because it made them feel less anxious when speaking and more comfortable to participate during class discussions. Also, many of the students admitted that translanguaging was a safety net which allowed them to use their language skills while also getting better at English.

Even though it has certain clear benefits, some students are concerned about the possible problems with translanguaging, especially when it comes to language immersion and proficiency. Some students are concerned that relying on their first language would make it harder for them to learn English, especially in college, where being proficient in English is very important to earn good grades. For instance, Deniega and Neri (2024) observed that students in multilingual classrooms with strict English-medium instruction (EMI) policies were concerned about how to balance translanguaging with complete language immersion. Students agreed that using their first language sometimes helped them in their study, but they were also concerned that using too much L1 could lead them to be dependent on it, which would prevent or struggle them from improving their English skills. This is part of a larger conflict between translanguaging and monolingual teaching

styles. Students know that using more than one language is helpful, but they also feel pressure to meet English-dominant standards (Deniega & Neri, 2024). In addition, Moody, Chowdhury, and Eslami (2019) explored graduate students' views on translanguaging. They mentioned their concern about finding the right balance between translanguaging and English immersion. The researchers found that graduate students in technical and academic subjects considered translanguaging as a great assistance, especially in topics where abstract ideas and complicated terms needed to be explained in more than one language. Many students said that translanguaging helped them understand course material better, express their views more clearly, examine concepts, and were able to work with other students. Some students, on the other hand, wanted to limit their use of their first language in formal academic settings because they thought that they needed to be fully immersed in English in order to do well in school and at work (Moody, Chowdhury & Eslami, 2019). This shows that there is a big difference between how students naturally talk to each other in casual settings and how they are supposed to talk in formal settings. Students might feel free to speak their original language in casual settings, but they might also feel they have to switch to English completely when they are in structured sessions.

Further, Mazak and Carroll (2016) studied how translanguaging works at colleges and universities in the United States. Their research showed that students saw translanguaging as a way to boost their language skills, especially in subjects that needed them to think critically and creatively. Many of the students thought that monolingual policies in educational settings made it hard for them to completely express themselves, especially when they were discussing complicated topics. This supports Cenoz and Gorter's (2020) claim that translanguaging should not be considered as a barrier to learning a target language but as a way to improve cognitive engagement and knowledge generation. This shows another important gap: The lack of communication between administrators, instructors, and students about language practices. School administrators often make tough language rules without knowing how hard it is for teachers and students to use those rules in real situations. Without open discussions among all parties involved, these issues will not be recognized, which shows that there is a strong need for conversation to close this gap and make regulations that really represent what happens in the classroom.

Most of the research on translanguaging in Turkey has been done on Turkish-speaking students in EMI or bilingual classrooms (for example, Karabulut & Dollar, 2022; Kırkgöz, Inci-Kavak, Karakaş & Panero, 2023; Tekin, 2024). However, there is still not enough real-world study on minority language speakers, including Arabic-speaking students, who are becoming a growing linguistic community, especially in private international schools due to increased migration and globalization. This study fills in the gaps by exploring how Arabic-speaking teachers and students think about and use translanguaging. Also, most research on translanguaging sees it as a teacher-led activity, and there are not enough research has been done on how much students have control over their translanguaging choices. This study explores how students use translanguaging and whether they see it as a necessary learning tool or a fallback strategy. Since effective language learning relies on meaningful interaction between teachers and students, further research is needed to explore how translanguaging operates as a two-way communicative tool, not just as an instructional strategy used by teachers but as a negotiated practice that emerges within teacher-student interactions, and how their translanguaging practices influence one another.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

This chapter provides a detailed presentation of the research methodology employed in the study. It outlines the research design, the sample of the study, the data collection instruments and data collection procedures and an overview of the data analysis.

3.1 The Research Design

This research adopts a mixed-methods approach. It is primarily based on original, first-hand data collection and analysis, making it a primary research study. Data were directly gathered through semi-structured teacher interviews and student online questionnaire after audio recordings in EFL classrooms.

3.2 The Participants of the Study

The participants in this study consisted of both teachers and their students who were actively involved in EFL classrooms. The researcher used purposeful sampling to select participants, allowing her to intentionally include teachers and students with direct experiences and relevant insights regarding translanguaging practices in EFL classrooms. Purposeful sampling was chosen for its effectiveness in qualitative research, where detailed, information-rich data from specific participants enhances the depth and validity of the findings. The respondents of this research were selected from international schools, which are mainly Arab-administered and include high school levels. These schools provide EFL instruction to students, the majority of whom are native Arabic speakers, under the guidance of non-native English-speaking teachers who are also native Arabic speakers. Specifically, five female Arab English teachers participated in semi-structured interviews. Arabic is their first language, and they learned English as a foreign language in their home countries, Syria, Lebanon, Jordan, and Egypt. They were between 26 and 38 years old, and they had been teaching English as a second language for 2 to 11 years.

They had taught in Turkey for between one and six years, and three of them had taught in other countries before. Three teachers had a bachelor's degree in English, and two had a Certificate in English Language Teaching to Adults (CELTA). A total of 53 students, six students belonged to level 10, 23 students belonged to level 11, and 24 students belonged to level 12. A total of 48 students reported that Arabic is their native language, and five students reported that Arabic is not their native language, but they understand and speak Arabic. As for their proficiency level in the English language, 7 students classified themselves as beginner-level, 30 students classified themselves as intermediate-level, and 16 students classified themselves as advanced-level. Students' English proficiency levels were self-reported and collected by the demographic part of the questionnaire. Participants were asked to select their current level of English proficiency, beginner, intermediate, or advanced, based on their own perception and classroom experience. This method does not involve a formal assessment, but it was advantageous in finding out how comfortable students were with using language in class and what their personal experiences were like. This shows how important it is to not only look at students' academic levels, but also how they see their language skills.

There were no questions about the participants' gender or exact age on the questionnaire. It was not required to obtain gender data because it was not relevant to the research topics. Adding demographic information like this could have made it easier to misinterpret the results or add bias. The questionnaire also asked about the students' current level of study (10, 11 and 12), which indicates a basic idea of their ages, between 15 and 18 years old. This information was enough to put their level of language learning and cognitive development in context without needing more extensive demographic information. Instead of comparing answers based on gender or age, the focus stayed on getting student voices and finding patterns in translanguaging practices across grade levels.

All participants were informed of the purpose of the study, assured that their responses would remain anonymous and confidential, and reminded of their right to withdraw at any time without penalty. Samples of informed letters are provided in Appendix A for teachers and Appendix C for students. Participation in this study was entirely voluntary, and informed consent was obtained from all individuals and authorities involved. Both the teachers and their students, along with the school administration, expressed strong support

for the research. During the initial contact, several teachers warmly noted that they had never hosted a visitor conducting academic research before and welcomed the opportunity to contribute. A volunteer sampling was used. The participants volunteered without hesitation and showed genuine interest in the study's focus. The student participants also joined willingly, and their participation was facilitated by their teachers, who assisted in distributing the online questionnaire.

3.3 The Setting of the Study

The study was carried out in three private international schools in Istanbul, Turkey. These schools are K-12 schools and were specifically chosen for their rich and diverse linguistic and cultural student populations. These schools serve a linguistically and culturally diverse student population, offer instruction in multiple languages, and follow curricula from outside the Turkish national education system. All nationalities are permitted to enroll in these schools, including Turkish, which contributes to the multilingual and multicultural classroom environment. The schools include students from different countries, like the Levant region, North Africa, Yemen, Iraq, and Gulf countries, and a minority from Kazakhstan, Uzbekistan, Sudan, Somalia, and Chad. The schools follow the Lebanese curriculum for instruction and use its coursebooks accordingly.

These schools included in this study offered two different educational courses. The first course uses English as the main medium of instruction for all subjects (ESL), with Arabic and Turkish taught as separate language subjects. The second one uses Arabic as the primary language of instruction for all subjects, while English and Turkish are taught as additional language subjects. The sample of students who participated in this research was from the second course, which positions English as a foreign language (EFL). In this EFL track, students received five English lessons per week, all taught by the same English teacher.

3.4 The Research Instruments

The study employed three research instruments designed to align with the research objectives and effectively gather comprehensive data. First, an audio recording of the classroom interaction. The researcher was present during the audio recording after teachers and their students' approval. Second, a structured English-Arabic questionnaire, designed by the researcher, aimed to capture the students' perspectives and practices regarding translanguaging in the classroom. It was designed as a context-specific questionnaire by drawing on findings and themes from previous translanguaging studies, then adapting those insights into a format that suits the target participants.

To ensure clarity and accessibility, the researcher conducted a pilot study immediately following classroom interactions. During this pilot, informal feedback was gathered from a small group of students, focusing primarily on their familiarity with key terms such as Translanguaging and the distinction between Native language and foreign language. Students' responses were then used to refine the wording and enhance the readability of the survey items. Building on that, the term Arabic Language was used in place of Translanguaging to ensure comprehension among respondents unfamiliar with specialized academic terminology. The survey consisted of seven questions designed to capture students' perceptions and practices regarding translanguaging in the EFL classroom. The first part of the questionnaire (Items 1–3) collected demographic information, including students' year of study, native language, and self-assessed English proficiency. The second part (Items 4–5) comprised multiple-choice questions aimed at identifying the frequency and purposes of Arabic use in English classes. These questions were structured to capture specific contexts, such as using Arabic for clarification, expressing ideas, reducing anxiety, or responding to teacher cues. The final section (Items 6–7) consisted of two open-ended questions, which invited students to share their personal feelings and preferences regarding teachers' use of Arabic in the classroom. These qualitative responses provided insight into students' emotional engagement, comfort, and learning preferences. Third, semi-structured interviews were conducted in Arabic with the teachers to gather in-depth qualitative data. Interview questions were designed by the researcher based on audio recordings of classroom lessons, and these recordings were replayed during the interviews to prompt detailed reflections and discussions. There were five

interview questions, including: 1. How teachers perceive the role of translanguaging in helping students in their? Here, the teachers acknowledged the benefits of using translanguaging in the classroom. As one commented: “When I explain advanced grammar topics, sometimes students struggle to understand the English explanation alone. If I give them a quick translation or explanation in Arabic, they immediately get it. It saves time and reduces confusion”. Samples of the questionnaire and interview questions are provided in Appendix B and Appendix D.

3.5 The Data Collection Procedures

Data collection proceeded in two main phases to ensure clarity, consistency, and depth. First, classroom lessons were audio recorded to document authentic instances of translanguaging practices. Excerpts from classroom recordings are provided in Appendix E. The device used for audio recording, a mobile phone, was placed on a table in the classroom to ensure clarity and capture both teachers’ and students’ voices. The researcher sat in the back corner of the classroom with no interference during the class to soothe the atmosphere as much as possible. The recorded lessons covered a range of topics, including figures of speech, feedback on students’ writing tests, a mock exam review, and two reading and speaking sessions. There were five classroom recordings. One recording for level 10, two recordings for level 11, and two recordings for level 12. Each recording lasted approximately 45 minutes. The researcher examined the recordings beforehand, chose the instances when L1 was used, and wrote down the timing of each example.

Next, approximately two weeks after the lesson recordings and allowing sufficient time to analyze and prepare relevant interview prompts alongside the initial interview questions, the researcher conducted semi-structured interviews in Arabic with the teachers, using another mobile phone. During these audio-recorded interviews, the audio segments from the recorded lessons were played to stimulate accurate recall, reflection, and in-depth discussion of teachers’ translanguaging perspectives and practices.

Following the teacher interviews, an online survey was administered through the teachers to their students using Google Forms to facilitate accessibility and encourage student participation. The interval of collecting the data between teacher interviews and student

surveys was approximately two weeks. This is due to the fact that the questionnaire for students was distributed online through Google Forms by the participating teachers. However, no student responses were received during the first week after the interviews. This delay is believed to coincide with the closing of the second quarter semester of schools, a period when both teachers and students were preoccupied with exams and school closures, which hindered their availability to participate. Recognizing this challenge, the researcher re-sent the questionnaire to the teachers. This follow-up reminder led to student participation.

3.6 The Data Analysis Procedures

The data gathered from both the teacher interviews and the open-ended responses from the student questionnaires were analyzed using manual thematic analysis, guided by Braun and Clarke's (2006) six-phase approach, as explained in Peel's (2020) guide for applied educational research. Since the interviews were conducted in Arabic and audio-recorded, the researcher chose not to transcribe them fully. Instead, each response was listened to and summarized in English, with close attention paid to preserving the meaning during translation. Recurring phrases and ideas were highlighted and grouped into initial codes based on how frequently they appeared and how relevant they were to the research questions. The same approach was used to analyze the open-ended student responses. After reading through the responses several times, the researcher identified common thoughts, concerns, and preferences, which were then grouped into themes. These reflected students' perspectives on translanguaging, their classroom language practices, and any challenges they faced.

3.7 Conclusion

This chapter describes the methodology used to explore translanguaging practices in EFL classrooms. The study used a mixed-methods strategy, which included both qualitative and quantitative techniques like semi-structured interviews, online questionnaires for students, and audio recordings of classroom sessions. This led the researchers to earn direct information from teachers and students. Purposeful sampling was used to choose

participants. The research was conducted in three private international schools in Istanbul. The research tools were carefully designed to make sure they were clear, easy to use, and suitable for the context. Data were collected following ethical norms and prioritizing participant comfort.

CHAPTER IV
FINDINGS

This chapter presents, analyzes and discusses the data gathered for this research. To answer the research questions posed in Chapter One, the data are organized into two main sections to provide an understanding of the research outcomes. The first section demonstrates the semi-structured interview questions used alongside excerpts from the classroom recordings. The second section examines the students' responses from the online questionnaire, which were analyzed to address the third and fourth questions and explore students' perceptions of using translanguaging and their practices.

4.1 Semi-Structured Interview Data

The first interview questions were formulated to collect data to address the first research question. It consisted of three questions that examined teachers' perception of the role of translanguaging in a) helping students with their language learning in general, b) contributing to a more inclusive and supportive learning environment for diverse learners, and c) reducing students' anxiety and encouraging their participation during classroom activities. Teachers' answers to these questions were examined in turn below.

4.1.1 Responses to Interview Question 1

The first interview question asked how teachers perceived the role of translanguaging in helping students with their language learning. Based on the teachers' responses, several key themes emerged, including: 1. Bilingual reinforcement for vocabulary learning and retention, 2. Enhancing grammar comprehension through L1, 3. Time efficiency and reduced cognitive load, 4. Use flexible language to prevent misunderstanding, and 5. Student-initiated translanguaging as an autonomous learning strategy.

All five teachers described translanguaging as a helpful and practical tool in the EFL classroom. They saw it as especially useful for supporting student understanding and making lessons accessible. One of the main advantages they talked about was how translanguaging helps students grasp difficult grammar topics or understand new vocabulary, particularly when those concepts are complex or abstract.

One teacher spoke about the role of translanguaging in grammar instruction, sharing a common challenge in teaching:

> *When I explain advanced grammar topics, students sometimes struggle to grasp the concept when explained solely in English. However, when I provide a brief translation or explanation in Arabic, they immediately understand. This approach not only saves time but also minimizes confusion.*

Another teacher offered a similar experience, highlighting how quickly a switch to Arabic can clarify difficult concepts: "When I explain certain grammar rules, like verb tenses or conditionals, students sometimes struggle to understand my explanation in English. If I see blank stares, I quickly summarize the rule in Arabic, and suddenly, they get it". These examples show how translanguaging can serve as a scaffold.

One teacher emphasized the usefulness of using students' first language to explain more abstract terms: "For certain words, especially abstract concepts, I find it useful to provide an equivalent term in Arabic. Without it, they might misunderstand the meaning entirely or fail to retain the word in the long term".

It is clear from her experience that when a word does not have a direct or easy-to-understand equivalent in English, switching to the students' first language can help bridge that gap and help to internalize the meaning. It is not just about knowing a word in both languages; it is about understanding it. Another teacher spoke about vocabulary retention more generally, and how using both English and Arabic can make a difference: "I might give other information about the new vocabulary, whether in English or Arabic, to help them remember it better".

Some teachers also stated that sometimes a simple translation may not be enough, and giving students extra context or examples in either language can assist them in remembering and internalizing the meaning. It is a way of making the learning process

more flexible. Also, translanguaging is not always initiated by teachers. One teacher shared how it naturally happens in her classroom when students use online tools to help themselves: “Many students turn to their laptops and use Google Translate to find Arabic equivalents, especially during literature lessons or when dealing with unfamiliar terms”. This shows how translanguaging is also a strategy students rely on instinctively. When they feel stuck or unsure, switching between languages becomes a way to take control of their learning.

4.1.2 Responses to Interview Question 2

The second interview question asked about the opinion of teachers on how translanguaging contributed to creating a more inclusive and supportive learning environment for diverse learners. Based on the teachers’ responses, several key themes emerged, including: 1. Increased student participation through L1 availability, 2. Recognition and validation of students’ identities, 3. Improved equity and access to classroom discourse, 4. Cultural bridge fostering community and connection, and 5. Emotional relief and reduced performance pressure.

All five teachers agreed that translanguaging goes beyond language comprehension, and it plays a powerful role in shaping a classroom environment where all students feel supported, seen, and safe. For many students, especially those with lower levels of English proficiency, being able to rely on their first language provides comfort, reduces anxiety, and builds confidence.

One teacher described how allowing students to use their L1 in class made a noticeable difference in student participation: “I have noticed that when students know they can use Arabic as a backup, they are more willing to participate in discussions. It takes away the fear of making mistakes in English and creates a more positive classroom atmosphere”. Her observation captures a reality that many language teachers witness, which is when the pressure to perform in English is softened, students are more likely to speak and engage meaningfully. The classroom becomes a safer space where the focus shifts from perfection to communication.

Another teacher emphasized the emotional value of making space for students' identities through occasional use of their native language: "Using Arabic occasionally makes students feel that their language and identity are valued. It creates a sense of belonging rather than making them feel that English is the only acceptable way to communicate". This insight reminds us that language is more than a tool for learning; it is also deeply tied to a student's sense of self.

One teacher also shared how translanguaging can support equity in participation. She explained: "When students are encouraged to articulate complex ideas in their native language before I help them express it in English, it not only deepens their understanding but also builds their confidence to engage more in class". This approach, in addition to its role as a simplifier of abstract concepts for struggling students, also honors their thinking. It paves the way to express sophisticated thoughts without being held back by a limited vocabulary. For learners who are still building their confidence in English, being able to process ideas in their first language before translating them into the foreign language offers both cognitive support and emotional reassurance.

The cultural dimension of translanguaging was also highlighted by another teacher, who described it as a bridge that connects people within the classroom:

> *Using Arabic in the classroom is like building a bridge in our classroom; it connects diverse cultures and makes every student feel noticed and valued. Also, many students take private Arabic lessons, a testament to how deeply they value their language and heritage, ensuring that their identity continues to thrive alongside their academic growth.*

The fact that students invest time in private Arabic lessons highlights how important their L1 remains to them, even as they work to become proficient in English. For these learners, English is not a replacement, but another way of communication in a multilingual world.

Finally, one teacher spoke candidly about the emotional relief translanguaging can bring, especially when learners are tired or overwhelmed:

> *Sometimes, as humans, we simply get tired, especially when we are pushing ourselves to use a language that does not come naturally. We might forget a word or feel mentally overloaded. In those moments, being able to fall back on our first*

language can be comforting. It helps ease the pressure and allows us to keep going without feeling embarrassed or stuck.

Her words capture the humanistic side of language learning, and that is navigating mental fatigue, self-doubt, and pressure. In those moments, L1 use becomes a lifeline. Translanguaging, in this context, is not a crutch, but stands for compassion and solicitousness.

4.1.3 Responses to Interview Question 3

The third interview question asked about the ways that teachers believe translanguaging helps reduce anxiety and encourages student participation during classroom activities. Based on the teachers' responses, several key themes emerged: 1. L1 use reduces classroom anxiety and fear of mistakes, 2. Translanguaging increases willingness to engage, 3. The connection between lesson relevance and participation, 4. Cultural and emotional resonance as a participation motivator, and 5. L1 helps ease initial student-teacher rapport building.

The teachers spoke about the emotional side of language learning, particularly how translanguaging can help reduce anxiety and make students feel more comfortable participating in class. Several teachers highlighted that when students can rely on their first language, even briefly, it can ease the pressure and open the door to more meaningful interaction.

One teacher pointed out how hearing their native language in class can change students' behavior almost immediately and encourage them to actively engage in the classroom activities: "Some students remain silent when the lesson is entirely in English, but if they heard even a little Arabic, they feel encouraged to speak". Her experience suggests that translanguaging has a direct, visible effect on how students behave and engage. The moment they recognize that their language has a place in the classroom, they feel safer, more included, and more willing to contribute.

At the same time, three teachers noted that students are more likely to participate when the lesson content feels relevant and meaningful to them. As one teacher explained, "If

students find the content meaningful, they participate naturally, even in English. However, sometimes using a little Arabic can encourage them to start engaging. We need to connect the lesson to their real lives". Another teacher echoed this point, emphasizing that personal and cultural relevance often plays a bigger role than language alone: "Even students with low English proficiency contribute more when the lesson relates to their culture or personal experiences". A third teacher gave a vivid example of how cultural connection sparked unexpected participation:

> *We had a discussion about social traditions in different countries and the moment we started talking about their country, even the weaker students started participating. We ended up discussing political matters that I could not imagine before they had such opinions! They were eager to share their experiences and knowledge, even if it meant switching between Arabic and English.*

These moments indicate that translanguaging works best when paired with meaningful, culturally responsive teaching. Students are more willing to take linguistic risks when the content resonates with their lived experiences, and translanguaging gives them the freedom to express themselves.

One teacher reflected on how important L1 use can be, especially at the beginning of a new course or class. She shared:

> *When students enter a new class and meet a teacher for the first time, the ability to use their native language can ease feelings of fear and anxiety. It helps establish an initial connection with everyone, making the classroom feel more welcoming and less intimidating.*

She also acknowledged that as students build confidence and rapport over time, their reliance on the first language might naturally decrease, but do not disappear entirely. While the first three interview questions collected data in response to the first research question about the overall perceptions of teachers toward translanguaging and its role in language learning, the next two questions aimed at collecting teachers' responses to the second research question, which are about teachers' reasons for using translanguaging in classrooms.

4.1.4 Responses to Interview Question 4

The next interview questions were formulated to collect data to address the second research question. It consisted of two questions that examined the factors or reasons behind the teachers' utilization of translanguaging in their classrooms. Teachers' answers to these questions were examined in turn below.

The fourth interview question asked about the factors that influenced teachers' decisions to use translanguaging during their lessons. Based on the teachers' responses, several key themes emerged, including: 1. Strategic reinforcement of English through L1 mediation, 2. Ideological resistance to native-speaker norms, 3. Responding to students' emotional and cognitive needs, 4. Translanguaging for classroom management and instructional clarity, and 5. Purposeful and context-responsive use of translanguaging.

Most teachers emphasized that English remains the primary language of instruction. However, they also recognized that flexibility is a key, particularly when it comes to supporting student understanding and encouraging meaningful participation.

Three of the teachers shared that while they use to speaking in English during lessons, they allow students to use their first language when it helps them express themselves more clearly or process difficult content. The first example of an excerpt from the classroom recordings used in the interview was student-initiated translanguaging for lexical clarification:

-Student: "Teacher, شو يعني synonyms?". (Teacher, what does 'synonyms' mean?).

-Teacher: "Synonyms are...".

The first teacher expressed her reason behind this event: "I always conduct my lessons in English, but I do not stop students from using Arabic if it helps them articulate their thoughts. What matters to me is that they are engaged and actively thinking about the content".

Another example of an excerpt was for Lexical clarification:

-Student: "What bias يعني?". (What does 'bias' mean?).

-Teacher: "Bias يعني تحيز".

-Teacher: “Can you find another word in the text that means bias متحيز?”.

-Student: “Prejudiced”.

Here, the second teacher described her strategy for reinforcing English while still supporting students’ L1 use: “When students answer in Arabic, I listen, acknowledge their response, and then restate it in English. This way, they get to express themselves comfortably while also reinforcing the target language”.

A third example of an excerpt was a code-switching for clarification and expression:

-Teacher: “Did you finish writing?”.

-Student: “Teacher, أنا ما كتبت, because...”. (Teacher, I did not write, because...).

In this example, the teacher talked about finding the right balance between staying in English and giving students the space they need:

> *I do not use Arabic myself in my classes, but I do allow students to use it when they need to. I always make sure to rephrase or summarize their ideas in English afterward, so they are still practicing the language.*

This method of validating students’ use of Arabic, then echoing or reframing their thoughts in English, accomplishes several objectives. It supports comprehension, reinforces vocabulary and grammar in the target language, and also makes students feel heard and respected. It becomes not just a teaching technique, but a moment of connection.

A fourth example of excerpt was blended code-switching for classroom participation:

-Student: “Teacher, can I حل على السبورة؟” (Teacher, can I solve it on the board?).

-Teacher: “Umr, يلا.”. (Of course, go ahead).

In contrast, one teacher expressed a more open approach to using L1 herself during instruction. Her reasoning reflected deeper pedagogical and ideological beliefs:

> *I use L1 in my classes because I believe in its role for learning any foreign language, and since we are away from the culture of the English language, it is almost impossible for the students, even for teachers, to be like a native speaker, as the people outside my classes think. Simply, the notion of native-English education makes the classroom a kind of performance space, where the English*

language use feels artificial and disconnected from genuine communication. Many students begin to perceive English class as less relevant to their needs and, therefore, may do not take it seriously.

This teacher challenges the widespread idea that English learning should imitate native-speaker models. She suggests that trying to create a native English-only environment in a context far removed from English-speaking cultures can backfire, making classes feel inauthentic or disconnected from students' realities. In her view, translanguaging brings the classroom experience back to something more real, more grounded in the lives of both students and teachers.

Another example of an excerpt was using L1 for encouragement and soft discipline:

Context: The teacher approaches a student during a coursebook activity and says: " ليه كملها!". (Why did you stop? Finish it!).

The teacher highlighted how her decision to use translanguaging depends on the specific needs and emotional states of her students:

My choice often depends on the learners themselves, particularly their level of understanding and emotional state. The nature of the lesson content also matters. Topics like literature, which often involve nuanced meanings or cultural context, are easier to explore through the first language. If students appear confused, I switch to their first language to ensure clarity. The students' emotions play a significant role; when they are shy or anxious, I can see that when I allow them to use their first language, it reduces fear and encourages participation.

In addition, three teachers shared that they use L1 as a tool for classroom management. For example, they mentioned that giving instructions fully in English does not always work, especially with lower-proficiency students. One teacher pointed out:

If I need to explain something important, like what they need to do for homework, I sometimes say it in Arabic as well. Otherwise, some students pretend they understood, but actually, they did not, which could negatively impact their performance. I do not want students to fail an assignment just because they misunderstood the instructions.

An example of a student-initiated translanguaging in response to a teacher:

-Teacher: “Faris, what is the answer to this?”.

-Student: “ما بعرف!”. (I don’t know!).

- Teacher: “إنت بس جيب وجه الشبة بين المشبه والمشبه به!”. (Just give the point of similarity between the tenor and the vehicle!).

Here, the teacher explained that students are sometimes hesitant to ask for clarification in English, and using L1 helps break that barrier: “Sometimes, some students do not fully understand the assessment requirements, but they are too shy to ask in English. When I repeat key points in Arabic, they feel more confident to ask questions”.

Another example of an excerpt using L1 to regain student attention:

Context: A teacher who was initially ignored while asking students to settle down in English, regained immediate control by loudly invoking the phrase “أصبحنا و أصبح الملك لله!”. (She draws on religious expression).

The teacher mentioned how using Arabic helps with maintaining discipline as well: “When students are talking too much or not paying attention, I switch to Arabic for discipline. It is like a wake-up call for them”. Switching to the students’ native language in moments like these can carry a stronger emotional and cultural weight. It is a familiar tone that students associate with seriousness and authority, making it more likely to get their attention.

In all these cases, whether for instruction, emotional support, or classroom management, teachers showed that their use of translanguaging is thoughtful and responsive. It is not used randomly or excessively, but rather purposefully, to make learning more effective and inclusive.

4.1.5 Responses to Interview Question 5

The fifth interview question asked teachers how institutional language policies influence teachers’ use of translanguaging in the classroom.

Based on the teachers' responses, several key themes emerged: 1. Existence of English-only policies with informal flexibility, 2. Internal teacher tension between rules and student support 3. Teacher autonomy prioritized over strict policy adherence, and 4. Teachers are adapting over time to align with real classroom needs

Most teachers pointed to the presence of an English-only policy at their schools. This policy, as they explained, is intended to promote full immersion in the target language. However, in practice, it seems there is some room for interpretation; how strictly the rule is followed often depends on the individual teacher. As one teacher explained: "Our school officially follows an English-only policy, but in practice, some teachers use Arabic when they feel it is necessary. It depends on how strict the teacher is about following the rule". This comment reflects a common theme among teachers who, while officially working within a monolingual framework, find themselves negotiating space for translanguaging when it feels pedagogically necessary.

Still, this flexibility does not always make things easier. Some teachers shared that they often find themselves caught between what they know supports student learning and what they feel they are expected to do. One teacher expressed this inner conflict honestly:

> *I know that using Arabic helps my students, but I also feel like I have to be careful. If I use too much of it, I worry that it might be seen as breaking the rules, so I try to find a balance.*

Another teacher echoed this tension, pointing out how the English-only policy, while well-intentioned, can sometimes get in the way of student progress: "There are times when I feel that the English-only policy makes things harder for students. Sometimes, just one or two words in Arabic would make a big difference, but I feel hesitant because of the school guidelines".

These reflections suggest that even when teachers believe in the benefits of translanguaging, institutional expectations can create hesitation. There is an underlying pressure to maintain a certain image of proper language teaching, one that may not always align with students' real needs in the classroom.

That said, not all teachers feel bound by policy. One teacher was very clear in her stance: "I do not care much about the policies; what matters most to me is my class and my

students' learning. I know them better than anyone else". Her words reflect a commitment to student-centered teaching. For her, the immediate needs of the learners outweigh the abstract requirements of a school-wide policy.

Another teacher offered a particularly thoughtful and honest assessment of how these policies have influenced her over time:

> *When I start working at a new school, I try to align my teaching style with the school's expectations to build a good professional reputation. However, as I become more familiar with the classroom environment and my students, I find that the reality of teaching often requires a shift.*

This response reveals the adaptive nature of teaching. Institutional policies may set the tone; however, real decisions are often shaped by the lived experience of the classroom. Over time, teachers develop their judgment about when and how to bend the rules in ways that benefit their students.

Taken together, these responses highlight a core tension many educators face of how to stay true to both their professional responsibilities and their pedagogical instincts. Despite institutional policies shaping the classroom context, it is the teacher's relationship with their students that ultimately guides how those policies are applied.

4.2 Findings Related to the Questionnaire

This part addresses the third research question on the students' perspectives on the use of translanguaging in the foreign language classroom.

4.2.1 Frequency Level of L1 Usage in The EFL Classroom

The first item in the questionnaire asked students how often they used their native language in the classroom. Table 4.2.1 illustrates the frequency and percentage distribution of respondents categorized by their frequency level of L1 (Arabic) usage in the Classroom:

Table 4.1: L1 use of students

Frequency Level of L1 Usage in The EFL Classroom	**Frequency (f)**	**Percentage (%)**
Always	4	7.5
Often	18	34
Sometimes	15	28.3
Rarely	10	18.9
Never	6	11.3
Total	**53**	**100**

As shown in Table 4.2.1, students who reported that they **always** use L1 in the classroom constitute the smallest group, with 4 respondents, accounting for (7.5%) of the total. Those who stated that they **often** use L1 represent 18 respondents, or (34%) of the sample. Respondents who indicated that they **sometimes** use L1 account for (28.3%) of the sample, with 15 individuals. Students who reported that they **rarely** use L1 represented 10 respondents or (18.9%). Finally, respondents who stated that they **never** use L1 comprised 6 individuals, accounting for (11.3%) of the sample.

4.2.2 Students' Feelings Towards Teachers Using English-only Instruction

The questionnaire asks students how they feel when teachers speak only English in the classroom. Students' responses varied.

A total of 12 students expressed positive attitudes. The students acknowledged that the use of their teacher for English-only instruction for immersion has benefits on fluency and motivation. For these students, the English-only approach was seen as an effective way to improve their language skills and confidence. A number of students said it helped them "feel more confident", "become more interested in English", and "improve their understanding of new words and phrases". Others appreciated the immersive environment

this method creates. One student shared: “It feels like I am in a serious and useful English class”, while another remarked: “It is better for learning and improving skills”. These comments suggest that for many students, monolingual instruction gives the classroom a sense of purpose and professionalism, like stepping into an English-speaking world, even if just for an hour. In addition, some students saw it as a necessary step toward fluency and preparing for real-world situations. One respondent noted: “It helps me understand native English speakers and builds my ability to communicate”, and another explained: “This is what is supposed to happen, and it prepares us for real-life situations”. These students seemed to understand and even embrace the rationale behind English-only instruction. For them, being surrounded by the language is part of the challenge they willingly accept. However, not all students felt strongly about it. Six students described their reactions as neutral, saying they felt “normal”, or that they “do not mind”, when teachers use only English. Others showed a more adaptive mindset: “I try to adapt to them”, and “It is something normal; there is nothing wrong with it”. These responses suggest that while the method may not inspire everyone, many students accept it as a standard part of their educational experience.

On the other hand, 11 students pointed to real challenges that come with an English-only approach. The students believed that teachers should not be strict to L2 instruction for the following reasons: 1. Considering emotional and cognitive challenges, and 2. Occasional L1 support to aid understanding. Feelings like confusion, nervousness, and even frustration came up, especially when dealing with difficult lessons or unfamiliar terms. One student shared: “It makes me feel nervous in the beginning, as I must imitate my teacher”. Another student said: “I do not feel annoyed, but it makes it harder for some students to understand the lessons”. For some students, the pressure to stay in English all the time can slow progress rather than speed it up. One student commented: “It is fine unless some students need understanding in another language, like Arabic. In such cases, the teacher should use a bit of Arabic to make lessons smoother and more accessible”. Another echoed this view: “It is better when the teacher uses Arabic to explain complicated topics, as not all students can understand everything in English”. For these students, occasional use of L1 does not feel like a step backward; instead, it is like an assistor to enhance learning.

Further, 6 students expressed stronger dissatisfaction with monolingual instruction. This might for their resistance to monolingualism and concerns over exclusion. One said: “I feel that teachers who only speak English are limiting students’ opportunities to use and practice their first language, which is essential for learning”. Another shared: “It feels wrong, and I struggle to connect with the lesson”. Others expressed dissatisfaction using words like “ I hate it”. These comments suggest that when students feel disconnected or unable to participate, their overall engagement with the lesson struggles.

4.2.3 Students’ Views on Incorporating L1 by the teacher in the EFL Class

The questionnaire asks students why or why not they would prefer teachers to use some Arabic during English lessons.

Student responses were mixed. 17 students were in favor of occasional Arabic use. The students believed that the occasional use of Arabic was useful for the following reasons: 1. It improved their understanding, 2. It supported students of a lower proficiency level, 3. It created a more relaxed classroom atmosphere, 4. It creates an emotional and cognitive connection with teachers. Some students felt that L1 plays an important role in clarifying complex ideas. One student put it simply: “Yes, using Arabic helps me understand the lesson better and faster, and it makes me feel more comfortable and connected to the teacher”. Another echoed this, emphasizing the need for support: “Yes, because it facilitates understanding for students who struggle to understand lessons entirely in English”. Also, students highlighted the importance of recognizing different language abilities within the same classroom. For example: “Yes, considering the differences in students’ English language levels, using Arabic helps those who need additional support”. Another student added that it can make lessons more engaging and accessible for everyone: “Yes, it makes the lesson more engaging and ensures that everyone understands the topics clearly”.

Beyond comprehension, some students mentioned the emotional comfort that comes from hearing their native language in class. One remarked: “Yes, it makes me feel reassured and more comfortable during the lesson”. Another one shared: “Yes, it helps to build a connection with the teacher through our shared language, making the classroom

environment more relaxed". These responses show that for many learners, using L1 is a way to feel seen, understood, and more at ease when facing an intimidating language learning environment.

On the other hand, 12 students preferred an English-only approach, citing the importance of immersion. The students believed that using English-only was useful for the following reasons: 1. It promotes deeper learning and motivation, 2. Long-term dependency on L1 might hinder their progress. They contended that engaging with the target language could lead to more profound learning and create a stronger motive for language learning. One student explained: "No, because students can learn English better if they are exposed to it exclusively in class, just as we learn our native language". Another stated: "No, because it is an English class, and the teacher should speak English to train students to listen and adapt to the language". Moreover, some students expressed concerns that using Arabic might hold them back in their English development. As one put it: "No, relying on Arabic during lessons makes students dependent on it, which slows their development in English". Another student agreed, suggesting that staying in English builds stronger retention: "No, because when teachers explain words in English, it forces us to deduce the meaning and retain it better, which helps us learn the language more effectively". For these students, struggling through English explanations is part of the learning process; they see the challenge as productive, even necessary. As one student expressed: "No, being under pressure to understand English helps us learn better and makes lessons more effective".

Interestingly, 8 students offered neutral perspectives. They did not reject Arabic outright but felt it should be used sparingly or only when necessary. These students believed that using L1 should be occasional for the following reasons: 1. It supports linguistic struggles, 2. It depends on the context of the classroom. One student suggested: "Yes, but only to clarify concepts or words that students do not understand in English". Another student wrote: "If necessary, teachers can use Arabic, but it should not dominate the lesson to ensure students remain focused on learning English". Finally, a few students suggested that context matters; they were fine with Arabic use during informal moments but preferred English to dominate during instruction. As one respondent explained: "It is not an issue if the class is having a casual conversation or a break, but during lessons, English

should be prioritized". These responses show that while opinions differ, students are generally aware of the switches involved. Most students value purposeful teaching, whether in English, Arabic, or both, as long as it supports their learning goals.

4.2.4 Students' Translanguaging Practices

This section addresses the fourth research question on what specific translanguaging practices students claim to use and what reasons do they give for their application. To answer this question, the data were collected through the multiple-choice, closed-ended part of the questionnaire that students completed online. Table 4.2.4 illustrates the frequency and percentage distribution of respondents based on various situations in which they use L1 in the classroom:

Table 4.2: The reasons for students' L1 use

Statement	Frequency (f)	Percentage (%)
1. To understand difficult concepts or instructions.	26	49.1
2. To explain my ideas when I cannot express them in English.	28	52.8
3. To ask the teacher for clarification.	12	22.6
4. To interact with classmates during group activities.	19	35.8
5. To explain English words or phrases.	15	28.3
6. To reduce anxiety when I feel nervous or stuck.	12	22.6
7. To compare English grammar or vocabulary with Arabic.	8	15.1

8. When the teacher uses Arabic first.	16	30.2
9. When discussing cultural topics.	7	13.2
10. To check my understanding of English texts or tasks.	10	18.9
11. When I need to build confidence before speaking in English.	7	13.2
12. To write notes or summarize information.	4	7.5
13. When I am tired or struggling to concentrate in English.	10	18.9
14. To discuss exam or assignment-related concerns.	13	24.5
15. When I don't know the English equivalent of a word.	24	45.3
16. During informal conversations with classmates.	28	52.8
17. I only use English in the classroom.	6	11.3

As shown in Table 4.2.4, expressing ideas and informal conversation contexts tie for the most frequent use of L1, with 28 students (52.8%) using their first language to explain ideas they cannot express in English and for casual interactions with peers (Items 2 and 16). This suggests that L1 serves as a critical communicative tool when fluency in English is insufficient for clear expression or social interaction. Also, nearly half of the respondents (49.1%) claimed to use L1 to grasp difficult concepts or instructions,

indicating that L1 is crucial for comprehension, especially when the language of instruction poses barriers to learning (Item 1). A significant number of the participants (45.3%) turned to L1 when they lack the English vocabulary, highlighting its role in filling lexical gaps and facilitating continuous learning without disruption (Item 15). The use of L1 in collaborative settings, reported by (35.8%) of students, points to its effectiveness in enhancing communication among peers, leading to more productive group work (Item 4). When teachers initiate L1 use (30.2%), it is likely to permit its use in the classroom, providing students with a model for when and how to employ translanguaging effectively (Item 8). Reducing anxiety and seeking clarification were reported by (22.6%) of students for each context, showing how L1 can relieve anxiety and facilitate clearer understanding, making the learning environment more accessible and less intimidating (Items 3 and 6). Also, L1 helps (18.9%) of students manage their focus and energy levels, indicating its role in aiding cognitive processing under stress or fatigue (Item 13). Students also use L1 to explain English terms (28.3%) and to compare English grammar or vocabulary with L1 (15.1%), which underscores its role in metalinguistic awareness and cross-linguistic analysis (Items 5 and 7). The usage of L1 to discuss assessments (24.5%) points to its role in navigating high-stakes academic tasks (Item 14). Cultural discussions and confidence building, each reported by (13.2%) of students, show L1's role in culturally contextual conversations and as a confidence booster before using English (Items 9 and 11). While less frequent (7.5%), using L1 for note-taking or summarizing suggests that it aids in comprehension and retention of information (Item 12). A small percentage (11.3%) of students reported they only use L2 in the classroom, which might reflect a high proficiency in English or a personal or policy-driven preference for immersion (Item 17).

CHAPTER V

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

This chapter discusses the research findings presented in Chapter 4. The discussion integrates insights from teacher interviews and student questionnaire responses while comparing them with existing literature. It also addresses the limitations of the study, provides some pedagogical implications and provides the conclusion.

5.1 Research Question 1

The first research question asked how teachers perceive the role of translanguaging in supporting students' language learning. To answer this question, teachers were questioned through semi-structured interviews. Findings showed that teachers consider translanguaging an essential pedagogical tool in EFL classrooms for enhancing comprehension and facilitating learning. They emphasized its effectiveness in supporting students' understanding of academic and technical vocabulary and complex grammatical concepts. According to some teachers, translanguaging functions as a scaffolding strategy, which provides students a smoother transition to full English comprehension. This perspective aligns with Vygotsky's Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD), which emphasizes the role of scaffolding in helping learners achieve higher cognitive tasks with the assistance of an expert individual. One teacher stated:

> *When I explain advanced grammar topics, students sometimes struggle to grasp the concept when explained solely in English. However, when I provide a brief translation or explanation in Arabic, they immediately understand. This approach not only saves time but also minimizes confusion.*

Similarly, teachers reported that translanguaging plays an important role in enhancing metalinguistic awareness. A teacher expanded on this point: "When I explain certain grammar rules, like verb tenses or conditionals, students sometimes struggle to understand my explanation in English. If I see blank stares, I quickly summarize the rule in Arabic,

and suddenly, they get it". These findings agree with previous research that emphasizes translanguaging as a powerful tool for supporting cognitive and linguistic development in language learners. As García and Wei (2014) argued, translanguaging not only enhances comprehension but also fosters cognitive flexibility, as students develop understanding of linguistic structures by comparing them across languages; therefore, it is easier to internalize the information. Also, Macaro (2018) emphasized that when translanguaging is used in a balanced way, the first language can facilitate comprehension without impeding English acquisition. This resonates with the experiences shared by the teachers in this study.

Further, teachers emphasized that translanguaging can reduce foreign language anxiety, especially for students with lower proficiency levels who might otherwise feel marginalized in English-only classrooms. They observed that when students are permitted to use their first language as a support mechanism, they become more confident and willing to engage in classroom discussions. One teacher illustrated this point: "I have noticed that when students know they can rely on their first language as a backup, they become more comfortable participating in discussions. The fear of making mistakes in English diminishes, creating a more positive and encouraging classroom environment". This observation is consistent with Krashen's Affective Filter Hypothesis (1982), which suggests that anxiety can inhibit language acquisition by creating psychological barriers to learning. In addition, Turnbull and Dailey-O'Cain (2009) similarly found that students who were occasionally allowed to use L1 experienced lower anxiety levels and greater willingness to speak in the target language.

Furthermore, teachers recognized translanguaging as a means of affirming students' linguistic and cultural identities. One teacher elaborated on this, stating: "Using Arabic occasionally reassures students that their language and identity are valued. It fosters a sense of belonging rather than making them feel that English is the only acceptable means of communication". This comment aligns with Canagarajah's (2011) conceptualization of translanguaging as a social and cultural practice that affirms students' identities in multilingual classrooms. The theoretical foundations of translanguaging also draw from Bourdieu's (1991) ideas of linguistic capital and habitus, which explore how language practices can reshape social structures and empower individuals within those structures.

5.2 Research Question 2

The second research question asked about the factors or reasons behind the teachers' utilization of translanguaging in their classrooms. To answer this question, teachers were questioned through semi-structured interviews. Findings showed that translanguaging was not used arbitrarily, but emerged as a responsive strategy shaped by pedagogical, ideological, emotional, and practical considerations. Many teachers emphasized the importance of flexibility, particularly when students struggle with comprehension or expression. Several teachers expressed how they allow students to use Arabic when needed, especially to articulate complex thoughts or understand difficult concepts. As one teacher shared: "I always conduct my lessons in English, but I do not stop students from using Arabic if it helps them articulate their thoughts. What matters to me is that they are engaged and actively thinking about the content". Most teachers attempted to maintain English as the primary classroom language. However, one expressed a more open and ideologically driven stance. Her reflections offered a critique of monolingual norms that dominate many EFL settings:

> *I use L1 in my classes because I believe in its role for learning any foreign language, and since we are away from the culture of the English language, it is almost impossible for the students, even for teachers, to be like a native speaker, as the people outside my classes think. Simply, the notion of native-English education makes the classroom a kind of performance space, where the English language use feels artificial and disconnected from genuine communication. Many students begin to perceive English class as less relevant to their needs and, therefore, may not take it seriously.*

This perspective aligns with Canagarajah's (2011) view of translanguaging as a pedagogical tool and a way to resist unrealistic linguistic ideologies and reclaim authenticity in multilingual classrooms.

In addition, emotional factors also played a significant role in shaping teachers' decisions. One teacher explained that her use of translanguaging often depends on the individual needs and emotional state of her students: "The students' emotions play a significant role; when they are shy or anxious, I can see that when I allow them to use their first language,

it reduces fear and encourages participation". This response points to the affective dimension of translanguaging, supporting Krashen's (1982) Affective Filter Hypothesis, which suggests that anxiety can inhibit language acquisition. Translanguaging was also used by teachers as a classroom management tool. Several teachers noted that they switch to Arabic to ensure clarity when giving instructions, especially for homework or assessments. One teacher shared: "Sometimes, some students do not fully understand the assessment requirements, but they are too shy to ask in English. When I repeat key points in Arabic, they feel more confident to ask questions". Using the first language in those examples can eliminate misunderstanding and break down communication barriers. One teacher even noted how switching to Arabic was effective to restore classroom discipline: "When students are talking too much or not paying attention, I switch to Arabic for discipline. It's like a wake-up call for them". These examples show how Arabic holds social and emotional weight that resonates with students. From a sociolinguistic perspective, this aligns with Bourdieu's (1991) theory of linguistic habitus and symbolic power, where certain language choices carry more authority or familiarity depending on the social context. As a conclusion, teachers used L1 to a) support student comprehension, b) encourage student expression, c) reinforce learning through recasting, d) create an authentic and relevant learning environment, e) reduce anxiety and emotional barriers, f) address individual student needs, g) improve clarity in classroom instructions, and h) facilitate classroom management.

5.3 Research Question 3

The third research question asked about the students' perspectives on the use of translanguaging in the EFL classroom. To answer this question, students were questioned through an online questionnaire. First, students were asked how they felt about teachers using English exclusively in the classroom, and their responses revealed a wide spectrum of attitudes. Twelve students expressed strong support for English-only instruction, describing it as a motivating factor and beneficial for fluency, confidence, and real-world communication. They associated the immersive environment with seriousness, skill development, and professional preparation, viewing the challenge as an opportunity for

growth. A second group of six students responded with neutral or indifferent views. They accepted monolingual instruction as a normal part of the classroom. Their comments reflected a sense of routine compliance rather than deep engagement or resistance. However, eleven students shared concerns about the cognitive and emotional difficulties they faced in English-only classrooms. They described feelings of confusion, nervousness, and frustration, especially when comprehension was compromised. Some recognized the intent behind monolingual instruction, but also felt that occasional use of Arabic could make lessons more accessible and inclusive. A smaller subset of six students expressed clear dissatisfaction with English-only instruction. Their responses were emotionally charged, expressing feelings of exclusion, disconnection, and even resentment. They argued that denying the use of Arabic limited learning opportunities and made it harder to engage with the content. These reactions highlight the emotional factor that strict English-only policies can have on learners who use their first language for support.

In addition, students expressed different opinions on whether Arabic should be incorporated into English language classes, reflecting different learning styles, emotional needs, and beliefs about effective pedagogy. Seventeen students supported the use of Arabic, particularly for clarifying difficult concepts, aiding low proficiency learners, and fostering a more inclusive and emotionally supportive environment. They emphasized that using their first language helped them feel more connected to their teachers, more comfortable during lessons, and better able to understand the content. These responses highlight the cognitive and relational benefits of translanguaging, aligning with Cummins' (2007) emphasis that bilingual strategies can increase both learning and equity in the classroom. On the other hand, twelve students opposed the use of Arabic, advocating for an English-only approach. They believed that full immersion encourages engagement with the target language, promotes language independence, and accelerates acquisition. These students argued that relying on Arabic could create dependency and reduce the effectiveness of English instruction. Their perspectives align with Macaro's (2001) caution against overuse of the first language, emphasizing the value of productive struggle and the belief that sustained exposure to English leads to better outcomes. A third group of eight students offered a more moderate stance, supporting the selective use of Arabic. They stressed that while Arabic can be helpful for clarification, it should be used

reasonably to maintain the focus on English. Some even suggested that Arabic can be reserved for informal interactions or specific moments when comprehension breaks down. These students demonstrated an understanding of the pedagogical purpose behind language choices, favoring flexibility and intentionality in classroom language practices. In sum, some students thrive in immersive environments, others benefit from occasional L1 support for comprehension and emotional reassurance. What students value most is how and why the language is used, whether it supports their learning, fosters inclusion, and contributes to a more authentic and responsive classroom experience.

The findings also show that students do not all agree on whether or not to use their first language in English language classes. Thus, when students have different opinions on using the first language, teachers might struggle to find a consistent way to teach. Some teachers might be concerned about making students, who expect more integration of their first language, disappointed, while others risk frustrating those who prefer an English-only environment. To overcome this issue, they can start classroom discussions or short surveys early in the school year to find out what their students think and feel about using the first language. This makes students active participants in making decisions about the language policy in the classroom. Teachers can share expectations by working together to create classroom rules that make it obvious when and why the first language will be used. Teachers can also ask students to choose whether or not to use L1 during specific activities, such as group work or individual projects. This kind of openness makes both teachers and students feel they share in decision making and, perhaps, makes them less likely to resist.

5.4 Research Question 4

The fourth research question asked about what specific translanguaging practices students claim to use and what reasons do they give for their application. To answer the first part of this question, the data were collected from the closed-ended, multiple-choice section of the student questionnaire. The data revealed that students use their first language for a variety of strategic and meaningful reasons in the English classroom. The most common uses include expressing ideas they cannot articulate in English and engaging in informal

conversations with peers (52.8%), highlighting L1's role in supporting communication and social interaction when English proficiency is limited. Nearly half of the students (49.1%) also used Arabic to understand complex concepts, while 45.3% relied on it when they lacked specific English vocabulary. These patterns show how L1 supports comprehension and fills lexical gaps, aligning with Cummins' (2007) view that bilingual strategies scaffold learning. Also, Arabic was frequently used in collaborative settings, with 35.8% of students using it during group work, and 30.2% following the teacher's lead when the teacher used Arabic first, demonstrating the influence of teacher modeling on students' language choices. Other students used Arabic to reduce anxiety and seek clarification (22.6%), manage cognitive load (18.9%), and support metalinguistic reflection, such as checking understanding and comparing grammar. Smaller percentages used Arabic for confidence-building before speaking (13.2%), discussing exams (24.5%), or exploring cultural topics (13.2%). Only 11.3% of participants reported that they never use L1. This suggests that translanguaging is a common and purposeful practice for most students. Overall, these findings support García and Wei's (2014) view of translanguaging as a holistic, identity-affirming resource that helps multilingual learners draw on their full linguistic repertoire to enhance understanding and engagement.

5.5 Limitations of the Study

This study encountered several limitations that are crucial to recognize. These factors may have influenced both the scope of the investigation and the degree to which the findings can be applied beyond the current context.

1. The study was conducted in three international schools chosen for their diverse cultural and linguistic student populations. While this offered valuable insights into how translanguaging occurs in multilingual classrooms, it also implies that the findings are closely connected to these specific environments. Other schools, particularly those with different cultural dynamics or more homogeneous student populations, may not experience translanguaging in the same way.
2. The student data came from the self-reported questionnaire. These responses offered rich perspectives; however, they also carry the potential for bias. Some students may

have unintentionally misrepresented their habits or feelings, whether due to limited self-awareness, misunderstandings, or a desire to give a correct answer.

3. The original research design included plans to conduct interviews with students to gain more insight into their translanguaging practices, particularly to explore the second part of the fourth research question: "What specific translanguaging practices students claim to use and what reasons do they give for their application?". Unfortunately, due to time constraints and logistical challenges in reaching and scheduling interviews with students, this component could not be implemented. Incorporating these interviews would have added a valuable layer of depth to the data, and future research could certainly benefit from continuing where this study left off.
4. Classroom recordings were used to observe teaching practices, but not all teachers employed translanguaging during the recorded sessions. However, some of these teachers later reported that they do utilize translanguaging in other lessons. This suggests that a broader set of classroom recordings, across different days, lesson topics, or class levels, might have provided a more comprehensive picture of how and when translanguaging occurs in practice.

5.6 Pedagogical Implications of the Study

The are several important implications for classroom practice, teacher preparation, curriculum development, and institutional policy in EFL contexts as demonstrated below:

1. The findings suggest that translanguaging can serve as an effective classroom strategy that supports student learning rather than hindering it. Its role in clarifying difficult concepts, reducing student anxiety, and encouraging participation was consistently observed in both teacher interviews and student responses. Teachers may therefore consider integrating students' first language in a purposeful way, particularly when it helps make content more accessible or supports students' engagement. This does not mean replacing English with Arabic, but using Arabic strategically when it serves the learning goals.
2. Given that translanguaging often emerges from teachers' professional judgment, teacher training programs should prepare future educators to understand and apply it

thoughtfully. Teachers must be introduced to translanguaging not only as a concept but also as a practical set of tools that can support their teaching in multilingual classrooms. Opportunities to reflect on language ideologies, classroom experiences, and policy constraints may also help teachers navigate tensions between institutional expectations and students' needs more effectively.

3. The study revealed that while English-only policies exist in many schools, teachers frequently adapt them in practice to serve their students. This gap between policy and practice suggests a need for school leaders to reevaluate rigid language policies and consider more flexible guidelines that acknowledge the realities of multilingual classrooms. Rather than viewing the use of L1 as a failure to enforce English, policies should recognize when and how it can be used to support students' learning processes.
4. Curriculum designers may also take into account the benefits of translanguaging. While English remains the primary language of instruction, students benefit from moments where their home language helps bridge understanding or deepen cultural relevance. Teaching materials that offer bilingual glossaries, allow space for L1 reflection, or include culturally responsive content could enhance both comprehension and student engagement. Such materials would help teachers better respond to the range of proficiency levels present in most classrooms.
5. The findings also point to the emotional benefits of translanguaging. For many students, the occasional use of Arabic made them feel more comfortable, included, and confident in their ability to participate. Creating space for these moments can foster a more supportive learning environment where students feel less pressure and more willing to take risks.

5.7 Recommendations for Further Research

This study has offered insights into how translanguaging functions in EFL classrooms, and it also revealed areas that could be explored more deeply in future research.

First, although this study examined the perspectives of both teachers and students, it relied heavily on self-reported data, especially through student questionnaires. Future research could include student interviews or focus groups to gain a more detailed

understanding of how learners perceive and experience translanguaging in real-time classroom settings. Such methods would allow researchers to explore students' emotional responses, identity negotiations, and language choices in greater depth. Second, Additional classroom observations and video recordings over longer periods would be useful to track how translanguaging unfolds during various stages of instruction and in different subject areas. This would allow researchers to identify patterns and shifts in teacher and student language practices that might not be captured through interviews or surveys alone. Finally, further research could explore the long-term effects of translanguaging on students' language development. Longitudinal studies would be especially valuable in assessing whether the use of L1 in the classroom supports or hinders English language proficiency over time. These studies could also investigate how students' attitudes toward translanguaging evolve as their English skills improve.

5.8 Conclusion

This study aimed to explore how teachers and their students in English as Foreign Language (EFL) classrooms in international schools in Istanbul perceive translanguaging and their use of translanguaging. The results suggest that translanguaging is much more than just a way to fill language gaps. The study used a mixed-methods approach that included audio recordings of classroom sessions, semi-structured interviews with five Arab EFL teachers, and questionnaires filled out by 53 students. The qualitative interviews with teachers offered insight into their instructional choices and motivations, and the quantitative questionnaire revealed trends in student experiences. Teachers in the study all acknowledged that translanguaging was a useful and required tool in the EFL classroom. They stressed that using students' first language in a planned way makes it easier for them to understand, especially when dealing with hard vocabulary and complicated grammar rules. Many teachers said that translanguaging helped them clear confusion, give instructions more quickly, and meet the emotional needs of their students. Some teachers favored English-only rules to some degree, but most stated they used Arabic when it was appropriate for teaching, not just to help students comprehend but also to get them involved in class and build a connection with them. A few teachers entirely

challenged the idea of native-like English instruction, suggesting that translanguaging is better in reflecting the sociolinguistic realities of multilingual learners and helps maintain authenticity in classroom communication. Also, many students reported that using Arabic in class made them less anxious, more confident to talk and participate, understand the content better and feel more confident about what they were learning. However, the findings also revealed that there is a difference in opinions among the students on the use of translanguaging.

Policies that require students to speak exclusively English are meant to help them learn the target language, but they can be a disadvantage for students who have issues with their target language proficiency. Littlewood and Yu (2011) showed that immersion policies may be well-intentioned, but they might unintentionally make it harder for students to learn. This has led many teachers to be more flexible in how they help their students. These results show that teachers often have to balance what the school wants with what is actually happening in the classroom. They have to make decisions that support their students' learning needs, at the same time, focusing on the target language competence. Some teachers follow the policies and only allow students to use L1 when needed as a last option. Others emphasized making sure students understood and were interested, only using Arabic when they thought it was important for teaching. As Brookfield (2001) argued, from Foucault's perspective, self-surveillance and normalization within educational practices are exercised not by force but through subtle norms and expectations that individuals internalize, which can be linked to how language policies and classroom practices may subtly influence learners.

To sum up, this study reveals that translanguaging is more than just a way to teach in the classroom. It is a flexible method that helps students connect with each other across language barriers, value their cultural and linguistic backgrounds, and encourages them to participate. The results support the rising body of research that calls for more flexible language policies in schools. These policies should reflect the different realities of students and give them the tools they need to use their language skills.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Agudo, J. D. M. (2017). Non-native teachers' code-switching in L2 classroom discourse. *Native and non-native teachers in English language classrooms*, 75–97.

Alemania, B., Beltran, J., Betancor, M., Eli, P. J. E. G., Escueta, M., Espiritu, M., & Mendoza, H. (2022). Examining the attitudes towards translanguaging and language positions of pre-service English language teachers. *Asian Journal of English Language Studies*, *10*: 148-170.

Alhamad, A. A. (2022). Postcolonial Literature and Translation: A Grounded Commonality of Multiculturalism. *World Journal of English Language*, *12*(6): 514-521.

Antony, S., Ramnath, R., & Ellikkal, A. (2024). Examining Students' Perspectives on Pedagogical Translanguaging in the Multilingual Classroom Context. *IAFOR Journal of Education*, *12*(1): 199-223.

Ataş, U. (2023). Translanguaging in English-medium instruction (EMI): Examining English literature content classrooms. *Turkish Journal of Education*, *12*(3): 142-157.

Auerbach, E. R. (1993). Reexamining English only in the ESL classroom. *TESOL Quarterly*, *27*(1): 9-32.

Bandia, P. F. (2023). Translation, Postcoloniality, Literary Multilingualism. *PMLA*, *138*(3): 805-810.

Bandura, A. (1997). *Self-efficacy: The exercise of control* (Vol. 604). Freeman.

Bourdieu, P. (1991). *Language and symbolic power*. Harvard University Press.

Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. Qualitative research in psychology. *Qualitative research in Psychology*, *3*(2): 77-101.

Brookfield, S. (2001). Unmasking power: Foucault and adult learning. *Canadian journal for the study of adult education*, *15*(1): 1-23.

Canagarajah, A. S. (1999). *Resisting linguistic imperialism in English teaching.* Oxford University Press.

-------. (2011). Codemeshing in academic writing: Identifying teachable strategies of translanguaging. *The modern language journal, 95*(3): 401-417.

-------. (2011). Translanguaging in the classroom: Emerging issues for research and pedagogy. *Applied linguistics review, 2.*

-------. (2012). *Translingual practice: Global Englishes and cosmopolitan relations.* Routledge.

Cenoz, J., & Gorter, D. (2017). Translanguaging as a pedagogical tool in multilingual education. *Language awareness and multilingualism, 3.*

-------. (2020). Pedagogical translanguaging: Navigating between languages at school and at the university. *System, 92.*

-------. (2020). Teaching English through pedagogical translanguaging. *World Englishes, 39*(2): 300-311.

Chen, Y., Fang, F., & Zhang, W. (2024). Unpacking English Language Teachers' Perceptions and Practices of Translanguaging: A Case Study of Secondary Schools in China. *Journal of English and Applied Linguistics, 3*(2): 1-13.

Cook, G. (2010). *Translation in language teaching: An argument for reassessment.* Oxford University Press.

Cook, V. (2001). Using the first language in the classroom. *Canadian modern language review, 57*(3): 402-423.

Creese, A., & Blackledge, A. (2010). Translanguaging in the bilingual classroom: A pedagogy for learning and teaching?. *The Modern Language Journal, 94*(1): 103-115.

Crystal, D. (2003). *English as a global language.* Cambridge University Press.

Cummins, J. (2000). *Language, power and pedagogy: Bilingual children in the crossfire* (Vol. 23). Multilingual Matters.

-------. (2007). Rethinking monolingual instructional strategies in multilingual classrooms. *Canadian journal of applied linguistics, 10*(2): 221-240.

Dash, B., & Davis, K. (2022). Significance of nonverbal communication and paralinguistic features in communication: A critical analysis. *International Journal for Innovative Research in Multidisciplinary Field, 8*(4): 172-179.

Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (2013). *Intrinsic motivation and self-determination in human behavior.* Springer Science & Business Media.

Deniega, M. G. J. S., & Neri, S. L. (2024). A case study on translanguaging in English as a Second Language (ESL) class among public high schools through the lens of language Teachers. *Cognizance Journal of Multidisciplinary Studies, 4*(8): 9-31.

Doiz, A., & Lasagabaster, D. (2017). Teachers' beliefs about translanguaging practices. *Translanguaging in higher education: Beyond monolingual ideologies,* 157-176.

Elkhafaifi, H. (2005). Listening comprehension and anxiety in the Arabic language classroom. *The modern language journal, 89*(2): 206-220.

Flores, N., & Rosa, J. (2015). Undoing appropriateness: Raciolinguistic ideologies and language diversity in education. *Harvard Educational Review, 85*(2): 149-171.

Freire, P. (2005). *Pedagogy of the Oppressed* (M. Ramos, Trans.). New York, London: Continuum.

García, O. (2011). *Bilingual education in the 21st century: A global perspective.* John Wiley & Sons.

García, O., & Lin, A. (2017). Extending understandings of bilingual and multilingual education. *Bilingual and multilingual education,* 1-20.

-------. (2017). Translanguaging in bilingual education. *Bilingual and multilingual education*, 117-130.

García, O., & Wei, L. (2014). *Translanguaging: Language, bilingualism and education.* Palgrave Macmillan.

García, O., Flores, N., & Chu, H. (2011). Extending bilingualism in US secondary education: New variations. *International Multilingual Research Journal, 5*(1): 1-18.

Graddol, D. (2006). *English next* (Vol. 62). London: British Council.

Guo, Y., & Xu, J. F. (2014). A multidimensional study on English learning anxiety of non-English majors. *Foreign Language World, 4*: 2-10.

Gutiérrez, K. D. (2008). Developing a sociocritical literacy in the third space. *Reading Research Quarterly, 43*(2): 148-164.

Guyer, J. J., Briñol, P., Vaughan-Johnston, T. I., Fabrigar, L. R., Moreno, L., & Petty, R. E. (2021). Paralinguistic features communicated through voice can affect appraisals of confidence and evaluative judgments. *Journal of nonverbal behavior, 45*: 479-504.

Heugh, K. (2018). Conclusion: Multilingualism, diversity and equitable learning: Towards crossing the 'abyss'. *The multilingual edge of education*, 341-367.

Heugh, K., Harding-Esch, P., & Coleman, H. (2021). Southern multilingualisms, translanguaging and transknowledging in inclusive and sustainable education. *Language and the sustainable development goals*, 37-47.

Hornberger, N. H., & Link, H. (2012). Translanguaging and transnational literacies in multilingual classrooms: A biliteracy lens. *International journal of bilingual education and bilingualism, 15*(3): 261-278.

Horwitz, E. K., Horwitz, M. B., & Cope, J. (1986). Foreign language classroom anxiety. *The Modern Language Journal, 70*(2): 125-132.

Howatt, A. P. R., & Widdowson, H. G. (2004). *A history of ELT*. Oxford University Press.

Hymes, D. (1972). *On communicative competence*. Penguin.

Jenkins, J. (2003). *World Englishes: A resource book for students.* Psychology Press.

-------. (2015). Repositioning English and multilingualism in English as a Lingua Franca. *Englishes in Practice, 2*(3): 49-85.

Kalan, A. (2022). Negotiating Writing Identities across Languages: Translanguaging as Enrichment of Semiotic Trajectories. *TESL Canada Journal, 38*(2): 63-87.

Karabulut, A., & Dollar, Y. K. (2022). The use of translanguaging pedagogy in writing classes of Turkish EFL learners. *Participatory Educational Research, 9*(6): 41-65.

Kırkgöz, Y., Inci-Kavak, V., Karakaş, A., & Panero, S. M. (2023). Translanguaging practices in Turkish EMI classrooms: Commonalities and differences across two academic disciplines. *System, 113*: 1-15.

Krashen, S. (1982). *Principles and practice in second language acquisition.* Pergamon.

-------. (1985). *The input hypothesis: Issues and implications.* Longman.

Lee, J. H. (2016). Exploring non-native English-speaking teachers' beliefs about the monolingual approach: Differences between pre-service and in-service Korean teachers of English. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development, 37*(8): 759-773.

Lewis, G., Jones, B., & Baker, C. (2012). Translanguaging: Developing its conceptualisation and contextualisation. *Educational research and evaluation, 18*(7): 655-670.

-------. (2012). Translanguaging: Origins and development from school to street and beyond. *Educational research and evaluation, 18*(7): 641-654.

Li, W. (2018). Translanguaging as a practical theory of language. *Applied Linguistics, 39*(1): 9-30.

Little, D. (1995). Learning as dialogue: The dependence of learner autonomy on teacher autonomy. *System, 23*(2): 175-181.

Littlewood, W., & Yu, B. (2011). First language and target language in the foreign language classroom. *Language teaching, 44*(1): 64-77.

Liu, D., Deng, Y., & Wimpenny, K. (2024). Students' perceptions and experiences of translanguaging pedagogy in teaching English for academic purposes in China. *Teaching in Higher Education, 29*(5): 1234-1252.

Macaro, E. (2001). Analysing student teachers' code-switching in foreign language classrooms: Theories and decision making. *The modern language journal, 85*(4): 531-548.

-------. (2018). *English medium instruction.* Oxford University Press.

MacIntyre, P. D., & Gardner, R. C. (1994). The subtle effects of language anxiety on cognitive processing in the second language. *Language learning*, *44*(2): 283-305.

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

-------. (2018). Moving out of linguistic boxes: The effects of translanguaging strategies for multilingual classrooms. *Language in Epistemic Access* (pp. 24-41). Routledge.

Makoni, S., & Pennycook, A. (2005). Disinventing and reconstituting languages. *Critical Inquiry in Language Studies: An International Journal*, *2*(3): 137-156.

Margana, R., & Rasman, R. (2021). Translanguaging and minoritized language maintenance: lessons from Indonesia. 3L; Language, Linguistics and Literature, *The Southeast Asian Journal of English Language Studies, 27*(2): 1-15.

Mazak, C. M., & Carroll, K. S. (Eds.). (2016). *Translanguaging in higher education: Beyond monolingual ideologies* (Vol. 104). Multilingual Matters.

Mendoza, A., & Parba, J. (2019). Thwarted: relinquishing educator beliefs to understand translanguaging from learners' point of view. *International Journal of Multilingualism, 16*(3): 270-285.

Menken, K., & Sánchez, M. T. (2019). Translanguaging in English-only schools: From pedagogy to stance in the disruption of monolingual policies and practices. *TESOL Quarterly*, *53*(3): 741-767.

Moody, S., Chowdhury, M., & Eslami, Z. (2019). Graduate students' perceptions of translanguaging. *English Teaching and Learning*, *43*(1): 85-103.

Moore, E., Bradley, J., & Simpson, J. (Eds.). (2020). *Translanguaging as transformation: The collaborative construction of new linguistic realities* (Vol. 3). Multilingual Matters.

Mora Pablo, I., Lengeling, M. M., Rubio Zenil, B., Crawford, T., & Goodwin, D. (2011). Students and teachers' reasons for using the first language within the foreign

language classroom (French and English) in Central Mexico. *Profile Issues in Teachers' Professional Development, 13*(2): 113-129.

Ngũgĩ wa Thiong'o. (1986). *Decolonising the mind: The politics of language in African literature*. Heinemann.

Nunan, D. (1999). *Second Language Teaching & Learning*. Heinle & Heinle Publishers, 7625 Empire Dr., Florence, KY 41042-2978.

Nyimbili, F., & Mwanza, D. S. (2021). Translanguaging challenges faced by teachers and learners in first grade multilingual literacy classrooms in Zambia. *International Journal on Studies in English Language and Literature, 9*(3): 20-31.

Ortega, Y. (2019). "Teacher,¿ puedo hablar en español?" A reflection on plurilingualism and translanguaging practices in EFL. *Profile Issues in Teachers' Professional Development, 21*(2): 155-170.

Palmer, D. K., Martínez, R. A., Mateus, S. G., & 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.

Peel, K. L. (2020). A beginner's guide to applied educational research using thematic analysis. *Practical Assessment Research and Evaluation*, *25*(1): 1-15.

Pennycook, A. (2002). *English and the discourses of colonialism.* Routledge.

-------. (2010). *Language as a local practice.* Routledge.

Phillipson, R. (1992). *Linguistic imperialism.* Oxford University Press.

Pinnock, H., & Vijayakumar, G. (2009). Language and education: The missing link. *Reading: CfBT Education Trust and Save the Children.*

Poza, L. (2017). Translanguaging: Definitions, implications, and further needs in burgeoning inquiry. *Berkeley Review of Education, 6*(2): 101–128.

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

Rosa, J., & Flores, N. (2017). Unsettling race and language: Toward a raciolinguistic perspective. *Language in society, 46*(5): 621-647.

Sarandi, H. (2013). The Use of Turkish in English Preparatory Schools: Where is the Balance?. *The Anthropologist*, *16*(1-2): 325-335.

Schissel, J. L., De Korne, H., & López-Gopar, M. (2021). Grappling with translanguaging for teaching and assessment in culturally and linguistically diverse contexts: Teacher perspectives from Oaxaca, Mexico. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism, 24*(3): 340-356.

Spada, N., & Lightbown, P. M. (2006). *How languages are learned.* Oxford University Press.

Swain, M. (2006). *Languaging, agency and collaboration in advanced second language proficiency* (pp. 95-108).

Tekin, S. (2024). Translanguaging in EMI Classrooms: Exploring Teacher Educators' Practices in the Turkish Higher Education Context. *Multilingual and Translingual Practices in English-Medium Instruction: Perspectives from Global Higher Education Contexts*, 93-111.

Thomas, W., & Collier, V. (2002). *A national study of school effectiveness for language minority students' long-term academic achievement.* University of California.

Turnbull, M., & Dailey-O'Cain, J. (Eds.). (2009). *First language use in second and foreign language learning.* Multilingual Matters.

Velasco, P., & García, O. (2014). Translanguaging and the writing of bilingual learners. *Bilingual Research Journal, 37*(1): 6–23.

Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes.* Harvard university press.

Wei, L. (2011). Moment analysis and translanguaging space: Discursive construction of identities by multilingual Chinese youth in Britain. *Journal of Pragmatics*, *43*(5): 1222-1235.

Williams, C. (2000). Bilingual teaching and language distribution at 16+. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism, 3*(2): 129-148.

Yuvayapan, F. (2019). Translanguaging in EFL classrooms: Teachers' perceptions and practices. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies, 15*(2): 678-694.

APPENDIX-A:

TEACHER CONSENT FORM

BİLGİLENDİRİLMİŞ GÖNÜLLÜ OLUR FORMU

Sizi Hekmah ABUSWEIREH tarafından yürütülen "Yabancı Dil Olarak İngilizce Öğretilen Sınıflarda Diller Arası Geçişlilik: Öğretmenlerin ve Öğrencilerin Görüşleri ve Uygulamaları, Translanguaging in EFL Classroom: The Perspectives and Practices of Teachers and Students" başlıklı araştırmaya davet ediyoruz. Bu araştırmanın amacı öğretmenlerin neden diller arası geçişlilik stratejilerini kullanmayı tercih ettiklerini, anlayış ve katılımı teşvik etmede gördükleri faydaları ve bu stratejileri uygularken karşılaştıkları zorlukları keşfetmeyi amaçlamaktır. Ayrıca, çalışma, öğrencilerin diller arası geçişliliğe nasıl tepki verdiklerini, bunun onların anlama, motivasyon, kaygı düzeyleri ve genel olarak İngilizce öğrenme süreçlerini nasıl etkilediğini anlamayı hedeflemektedir. Araştırmada sizden tahminen 30 dakika ayırmanız istenmektedir. Bu çalışmaya katılmak tamamen **gönüllülük** esasına dayanmaktadır. Çalışmanın amacına ulaşması için sizden beklenen, bütün soruları eksiksiz, kimsenin baskısı veya telkini altında olmadan, size en uygun gelen cevapları içtenlikle verecek şekilde cevaplamanızdır. Bu formu okuyup onaylamanız, araştırmaya katılmayı kabul ettiğiniz anlamına gelecektir. Ancak, çalışmaya katılmama veya katıldıktan sonra herhangi bir anda çalışmayı bırakma hakkına da sahipsiniz. Bu çalışmadan elde edilecek bilgiler tamamen araştırma amacı ile kullanılacak olup kişisel bilgileriniz **gizli tutulacaktır.** Araştırmada Kişisel veri toplanacağından **6698 sayılı Kişisel Verilerin Korunması Kanunu** ve ilgili mevzuat uyarınca kişisel verileri korumak amacıyla gerekli tüm tedbirler alınacaktır. Eğer araştırmanın amacı ile ilgili verilen bu bilgiler dışında şimdi veya sonra daha fazla bilgiye ihtiyaç duyarsanız araştırmacıya şimdi sorabilir veya 521023002@std.izu.edu.tr e-posta adresi ve 552 882 29 24 numaralı telefondan ulaşabilirsiniz.

Yukarıda yer alan ve araştırmadan önce katılımcıya verilmesi gereken bilgileri okudum ve katılmam istenen çalışmanın kapsamını ve amacını, gönüllü olarak üzerime

düşen sorumlulukları anladım. Çalışma hakkında yazılı ve sözlü açıklama aşağıda adı belirtilen araştırmacı/araştırmacılar tarafından yapıldı. Bana, çalışmanın muhtemel riskleri ve faydaları sözlü olarak da anlatıldı. Kişisel bilgilerimin özenle korunacağı konusunda yeterli güvence verildi.

Bu koşullarda söz konusu araştırmaya kendi isteğimle, hiçbir baskı ve telkin olmaksızın katılmayı kabul ediyorum.

Katılımcının**:**

Adı-

Soyadı:.....

...

İmzası:

İletişim Bilgileri: e-posta: Telefon:

Velayet veya Vesayet Altında Bulunanlar İçin;

Veli veya Vasisinin

Adı-

Soyadı:.....

...

İmzası:

Araştırmacının

Adı-Soyadı:

İmzası:

APPENDIX-B:

SEMI-STRUCTURED INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

Question 1: How do you perceive the role of translanguaging in helping students in their language learning?

Question 2: In your opinion, how does translanguaging contribute to creating a more inclusive and supportive learning environment for diverse learners?

Question 3: In what ways do you believe translanguaging helps reduce anxiety and encourage student participation during classroom activities?

Question 4: What factors influence your decision to use translanguaging during your lessons?

Question 5: How do institutional language policies influence teachers' use of Translanguaging in the classroom?

APPENDIX-C:

STUDENT CONSENT LETTER FOR THE QUESTIONNAIRE

Dear Respondents,

I am a graduate student of Istanbul Sabahattin Zaim University, taking up a Master of English Language Teaching under its Graduate School Program.

This questionnaire is designed for students learning English as a foreign language. Its purpose is to gather your opinions and experiences regarding using the first language in your English language classes. Your responses will remain confidential and will only be used for research purposes.

Thank you for taking the time to complete this questionnaire. Your responses are an important part of understanding different perspectives and practices in education. Your input will contribute to valuable insights that can help improve teaching and learning strategies in the classroom.

Sincerely,
Hekmah Abusweireh

APPENDIX-D:

THE QUESTIONNAIRE

PART 1: RESPONDENTS' PROFILE

1. **What is your current year of study?**

   ☐ Grade 10 ☐ Grade 11 ☐ Grade 12

2. **Is Arabic your native language?**

   ☐ Yes ☐ No

3. **How do you rate your English proficiency?**

   ☐ Beginner ☐ Intermediate ☐ Advanced

PART 2: USE OF ARABIC IN ENGLISH CLASSES

4. **How often do you use Arabic when speaking in English class?**

   ☐ Always ☐ Often ☐ Sometimes ☐ Rarely ☐ Never

5. **In which situations do you use Arabic?** (You may choose more than one option)

   ☐ To understand difficult concepts or instructions

   ☐ To explain my ideas when I cannot express them in English

   ☐ To ask the teacher for clarification

   ☐ To interact with classmates during group activities

   ☐ To explain English words or phrases

   ☐ To reduce anxiety when I feel nervous or stuck

   ☐ To compare English grammar or vocabulary with Arabic

   ☐ When the teacher uses Arabic first

☐ When discussing cultural topics

☐ To check my understanding of English texts or tasks

☐ When I need to build confidence before speaking in English

☐ To write notes or summarize information

☐ When I am tired or struggling to concentrate in English

☐ To discuss exam or assignment-related concerns

☐ When I don't know the English equivalent of a word

☐ During informal conversations with classmates

☐ Never; I only use English in the classroom

PART 3: OPEN-ENDED QUESTIONS- OPINIONS AND EXPERIENCES

6. How do you feel when teachers speak only English in the classroom?

7. Would you prefer teachers to use some Arabic during English lessons? Why or why not?

APPENDIX-E:

Excerpts from Classroom Recordings

Excerpt 1: Student-initiated translanguaging for vocabulary clarification

-Student: “Teacher, شو يعني synonyms?”. (Teacher, what does ‘synonyms’ mean?).

-Teacher: “Synonyms is...”. (Explained in English).

Excerpt 2: Lexical clarification through translanguaging

-Student: “What bias يعني?”. (What does ‘bias’ mean?).

-Teacher: “Bias يعني تحيز”.

-Teacher: “Can you find another word in the text that means bias متحيز?”.

-Student: “Prejudiced”.

Excerpt 3: Code-switching for clarification and expression

-Teacher: “Did you finish writing?”.

-Student: “Teacher, انا ما كتبت, because...”. (Teacher, I didn’t write, because...).

Excerpt 4: Blended code-switching for classroom participation

-Student: “Teacher, can I حل على السبورة؟”. (Teacher, can I solve it on the board?).

-Teacher: “Umr, يلا.”. (Of course, go ahead.).

Excerpt 5: Use of L1 for encouragement and soft discipline

Context: The teacher approaches a student during a coursebook activity and says:

Teacher: "ليه كملها!". (Why did you stop? Finish it!).

Excerpt 6: Student-initiated translanguaging in response to teacher prompt

-Teacher: "Faris, what is the answer to this?"

-Student: "ما بعرف!". (I don't know!).

-Teacher: "إنت بس جيب وجه الشبة بين المشبه والمشبه به!" (Just give the point of similarity between the tenor and the vehicle!)

Excerpt 7: Use of L1 to regain student attention

Teacher: (After being ignored) "أصبحنا وأصبح الملك لله!". (She draws on religious expressions).

Students immediately quiet down and refocus on the lesson.

C V

Hekmah ABUSWEIREH

A. EDUCATION

BA: Sohar University**,** Sohar, Oman

English Language and Translation, 09/2016 - 07/2020

MA: Istanbul Sabahattin Zaim University, Istanbul, Turkey

English Language Teaching, 09/2023 - 07/2025

B. EXPERIENCE

***** Palestinian Information Center (PIC).

07/2019 - 09/2023