

Translanguaging in EFL Classrooms: Practice and Implications for Lecturers from Students' Lens

Pham Huong Ngoc Uyen^{1*}, Nguyen Trang Dung²

¹ Ho Chi Minh City University of Economics and Finance, Vietnam.

² Ho Chi Minh City University of Technology, Vietnam.

*Corresponding author's email: uyenphn@uef.edu.vn

 <https://orcid.org/0009-0003-3659-4656>

 <https://doi.org/10.54855/ijte.24443>

© Copyright (c) 2024 Pham Huong Ngoc Uyen, Nguyen Trang Dung

Received://...../2023

Revision://...../2023

Accepted://...../2023

Online: 07/10/2024

ABSTRACT

Translanguaging, introduced by Cen William, refers to using two or more languages in the same lessons in a bilingual classroom. Although sharing certain similarities with code-switching as a phenomenon, Translanguaging has been developed to be a teaching method in EFL classrooms as an adaptive, innovative response to the dynamic changes in the modern scenario in which internationalization and digitalization are the central influential factors. However, in the Vietnamese context, Translanguaging is still questionable among stakeholders as it challenges the well-established ELT traditional approaches. The study sought to uncover contextual insights regarding the use and efficacy of translanguaging in EFL classrooms by analyzing quantitative and qualitative data. An online survey, with both Likert-type items and open-ended questions, was administered to collect data from 183 university students from a university in Ho Chi Minh city. In addition, qualitative data were obtained from semi-structured interviews with ten students from the same group. Although the findings show positive aspects of translanguaging in action, they also reveal the challenges that the theories provide for both the instructor and students in acquiring English at the tertiary level.

Keywords:

translanguaging, EFL, code-switching, pedagogy

Introduction

Globalization and digitalization these days have altered the landscapes of educational systems worldwide in the most dramatic way ever. Advances in technology and the Internet have allowed opportunities for mutual connections, collaborations, and internationalization among institutions far beyond national boundaries and time zones. In response to these dynamic changes, bilingualism and multiculturalism, on the one hand, are welcomed as a significant part of the process, and English as a Global language, on the other hand, has become dominant in most educational settings. These pose challenging questions to relevant stakeholders on how the teaching and learning of English will be adapted and what decisions to make on the language policy to optimize such a vibrant global educational scenario.

CITATION | Pham, H. N. U., & Nguyen, T. D. (2024). Translanguaging in EFL Classrooms: Practice and Implications for Lecturers' Lens. *International Journal of TESOL & Education*, 4(4), 54-68. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.54855/ijte.24443>

Regarding English Language Teaching, various pedagogical approaches have been constantly developed and adapted over time, from the Grammar Translation focusing on the complete practice of L1 to Direct Method and Communicative Approaches emphasizing the English-only learning environments in the last century, from state-of-the-art Blended Learning, where learning space and time are extended beyond a classroom, to Flipped Classroom, where there is a shift in targets on in-class activities. Also, the project-based approach has been implemented to foster more meaningful outcomes and student engagement in the L2 learning process. In the midst of such a variety, translanguaging has grown in popularity as a pedagogical approach that has the potential to respond well to the dynamism of contemporary global educational settings. The central concept underlying this approach is the adaptable utilization of two or more languages by individuals from diverse cultural backgrounds to convey meaning and actively participate in communication within specific contexts. (Vogel & Garcia, 2017, p1).

In the Vietnam context, issued in 2008, the “National Foreign Language Project Scheme 2008 to 2020 Period” (known as the Project 2020) Decision by the Ministry of Education and Training (MOET) of Vietnam has led to remarkable changes among Vietnamese English users in terms of their English proficiency, their potential exposure to various English varieties, and their subsequent attitudes toward them. According to the National Foreign Language Project 2020, most Vietnamese youths “will gain the capacity to use a foreign language independently,” “be more confident in *communication*, further their chance to study and work in an *integrated and multicultural environment* with a variety of languages” (MOET, 2008, p1). Despite unsatisfactory achievements, Project 2020 has triggered a number of subsequent immense changes, such as the Integrated Programme, launched in 2014, offering *English* as the medium of instruction for obtaining *knowledge of interdisciplinary science subjects* to primary and lower secondary public schools in Ho Chi Minh City. Moreover, the nationwide Decision 2080 in 2018, the adjusted version of Project 2020, focused on a foreign language curriculum aiming to develop students’ *communicative competence* and form their *sense of global citizenship* (Van, 2022). What is more, in response to the need to prepare students to be competent *global citizens*, many private institutions have offered bilingual or international programs that have been adapted from the British or American curriculums for those who plan to study and work *internationally*, i.e., *multiculturally* (Chi, 2017). Evidently, the increasing number of transnational collaborative programs and English language centers that have welcomed a multicultural environment in Vietnam during the last 10 years is one vibrant reflection of this tendency.

In this context, translanguaging could be considered an effective teaching approach alongside other innovative ones. However, the act of translanguaging implemented during teacher-student interactions has still been understudied and misunderstood as the old-fashioned Grammar-Translation method and, therefore, has long been avoided. Also, there has been little empirical research on the choice of languages and their effects on students’ learning outcomes, especially at the university level.

Literature review

The Concept of Translanguaging and the Transformation from CodeSwitching to Translanguaging:

The idea of codeswitching was first coined in 20th-century when it was viewed as a linguistic practice outside of the classroom (Goodman & Tastanbek, 2021). Codeswitching refers to the practice of switching between languages during a conversation, with a particular emphasis on

grammar. It occurs when two different languages are used, each serving a distinct purpose, while one language may appear more dominant. (Ferguson, 1959; Kamwangamalu, 2010; Goodman & Tastanbek, 2021).

In that sense, code-switching maintains a monoglossic perspective on languages, where monolingualism is accepted as the norm. Multilinguals use named languages to identify language elitism, dominance, or proficiency in relation to others (Myers-Scotton, 1993; Gardner-Chloros, 2009). In light of this, code-switching was eventually included in studies on language acquisition; however, because it generally observed the exchange of languages within and between sentences while paying attention to linguistic structures, researchers felt constrained by its basic principles (Del Valle, 2000; Lewis et al., 2012). According to Creese and Blackledge (2010), code-switching was merely a spontaneous communicative phenomenon, which is insufficient to satisfy pedagogical purposes. They further stated that code-switching in the classroom was often characterized as a sort of language interference that overlooks a person's linguistic background and argued that employing L1 impedes language acquisition. Williams (1994, 2000) then introduced translanguaging through his studies on bilingualism in Welsh-English classrooms. Since then, a considerable number of translanguaging descriptions and its potential in bilingual education have been presented, challenging both the well-established traditional approaches reflecting the monoglossic view and the conventional methods of defining languages that heavily relied on social and political boundaries. (García, 2009; Lewis et al., 2012; García & Li, 2014). Unlike code-switching, translanguaging combines the first and the second languages into a complete unity in a systematic manner, and it includes those language processes as "meaning-making, shaping experiences, gaining understanding and knowledge through the use of two languages" (Baker, 2011, p. 288). According to Garcia (2014, p3), translanguaging is not only regarded as the "discourse practices of bilinguals" but also perceived as the "pedagogical practices that use the entire complex linguistic repertoire of bilingual students flexibly in order to teach rigorous content and develop language practices for academic use." Accordingly, translanguaging considers languages that are utilized in the teaching and learning of another language as heteroglossic and interconnected, looking beyond the limiting concepts in code-switching to allow for effective target language growth (García, 2009).

Translanguaging – An innovative pedagogical approach in EFL contexts

In the past, language teaching for English as a Foreign Language (EFL) did not explicitly consider translanguaging as a pedagogical tool, although certain traditional English Language Teaching (ELT) methods did encourage the use of the learners' first language (L1) while teaching them a foreign language (L2). The well-known methodologies, such as the GTM (Grammar Translation Method), CLT (Communicative Language Teaching), and Natural Approach, suggest that incorporating the first language (L1) in teaching can foster mutual interactions and enhance comprehension in language learning. However, some methodologies in the 21st century discourage teachers from using L1 as learners progress or restrict its use solely for translation (Matamoros-González et al., 2017). Accordingly, Audiolingualism was described as a method that rejected the use of students' native language by teachers and learners and purposefully immersed students in the target language as an essential to boost their speaking skills.

Meanwhile, in today's world, it has become increasingly essential for people to be proficient in more than one language. This has led to increased hybridization in all areas and domains of human existence, resulting in a highly diverse situation referred to as "superdiversity" (Piller, 2016, p.21). Consequently, schools or educational institutions, as microcosms of society,

exhibit the bilingual or multilingual characteristics of a community within their classrooms. In response to that global context, translanguaging has emerged as a practice in English language teaching, particularly in classrooms with a larger population of multilingual students. Kleyn and García (2019) suggested incorporating translanguaging practices into the instruction of English as a New Language (ENL), English to Speakers of Other Languages (ESOL), or English as a Second Language (TESL), aiming to reform English language teaching and learning, which traditionally focused on monolingual approaches, and recognizes the valuable learning practices of bilingual and multilingual individuals by utilizing their full linguistic capabilities. Translanguaging practices for English as a Foreign Language (EFL) are readily apparent and achievable in classrooms when learners are able to learn or use English with other languages as much as they wish to comprehend the target language materials.

Ofelia García's and Hesson's (2015) proposed a framework of translanguaging for educators, in which there are examples of how bilingual or multilingual students can use their language skills to access multilingual materials, ask questions, and express themselves before, during, and after English language tasks involving speaking, listening, reading and writing. Regarding teachers, they can offer instructions or feedback in both L1 and L2, therefore establishing a secure environment for interactions, allowing students to confidently express themselves using their linguistic abilities, and assigning peer support while employing translanguaging. In the end, students are able to comprehend and connect with the content of the four English language skills.

Previous Studies on Translanguaging

There have been many disagreements between practitioners of second languages regarding the use of L1 in L2 classrooms (Üstünel and Seedhouse, 2005). The major disagreement has been over whether switching back and forth between the mother tongue and the target languages in a foreign language classroom is helpful or inhibitive (Jingxia, 2010).

Researchers have reported the rejection of the employment of L1 by L2 students since they view it as a limitation of their L2 experience (Nazary, 2008). However, according to Canagarajah (2011), a monolingual educational policy is not effective at keeping the L1 out of the L2 classroom even when they are strongly endorsed. This could be explained by the fact that low-level students who benefit from the use of L1 in L2 classes always make opportunities for this to occur, as illustrated by Üstünel and Seedhouse (2005). It is in line with the study by Portoles and Marti (2017) examining the practice of translanguaging at the early stages of the language learning process and demonstrating that different functions can be served by employing L1, L2, and L3. To put it another way, the monolingual approach does not actually support the teaching of English. Moreover, according to a study conducted in Malaysia, the continuous use of L1 in classrooms can result in learning anxiety and negatively affect learners who are exposed to classroom expectations that they must continuously and accurately use English (Wong & Yoong, 2019).

In contrast, a considerable number of studies have claimed the opposing views. Advocates of L1 argue that L1 inclusion increases the L2 learning rate, reduces L2 errors, and facilitates L1 grammar and vocabulary acquisition (Wong & Yong, 2009; Du, 2016). Having students explain the content in L1 and vice versa also allows teachers to assess their students' learning. As Holi Ali (2020) further explains, translanguaging with L1 serves the purpose of summarising, clarifying, emphasizing, and repeating crucial academic information. This is in accordance with Baker's (2011) conclusion that translanguaging may foster a more insightful comprehension of content as well as develop learners' L2 skills simultaneously.

Indeed, the practice of immersing learners in an English-only environment while limiting the interference of their first language has been a longstanding skepticism among practitioners and students in regard to the effectiveness of L1 as a means of learning English. Proponents of L1 exclusion claim that L2-only classrooms provide learners with an environment that is almost natural and full of unpredictable language experiences, which develop and activate the L2 learners' language schema, thereby increasing their opportunities for L2 learning (Escobar and Dillard-Paltrineri, 2015; Matamoros-González et al., 2017). Therefore, the application of intermittent translanguaging in the classroom can be a good way for EFL teachers to reduce learners' anxiety and encourage English language learning by making use of a variety of means. Through the alternation of L1 and L2 in the classroom, learners may gradually become comfortable or confident using L2 skills (Akbar & Taqi, 2020; Nguyen, 2022). Moreover, Huan & Joseph (2024) emphasized the additional benefits of translanguaging in social interactions by claiming that Translanguaging facilitates a variety of social activities in the classroom from peer to peer: group discussion, turn-taking, peer repairs, and so on. Similarly, Maryvone et al. (2023) concluded that Translanguaging helped students communicate freely and critically in a dynamic social environment. For this reason, studies on students' perceptions found that they have preferences for the use of Translanguaging in their English classrooms. (Yamagami, 2023).

Hence, one of the most important elements that needs to be taken into account is teachers' perceptions in this new approach. Indeed, positive perceptions towards translanguaging among EFL teachers is vital in order to effectively practice this pedagogy in the classroom. Many studies have been conducted to explore the necessity of teachers' awareness in the use of translanguaging. Holdway and Hitchcock (2018) emphasized that teachers should be aware of the beneficial potential of allowing L1 purposefully in both teaching and learning activities. Therefore, they claimed, the focus should be switched to the effective utilization of translanguaging models in the classroom, regardless of a student's native language. Tsang and Lo (2020) claim that teachers who practice translanguaging pedagogy in their classrooms can improve both learners' L1 and L2 skills, at different levels, by having them contrast different aspects of both L1 and L2 languages. As a result, they can explicitly teach their learners transferable skills between L1 and L2, and conduct repetition of these skills as consolidations in a bilingual program with a pluricentric approach. If L1 is the only language used in a classroom, then it may create a more significant language barrier between the teacher and the student (Qiu & Fang, 2019). To put it in another way, translanguaging in the EFL classroom has a positive impact on classroom management, fosters in-class bonding, and avoids possible conflicts taking place in the classroom (Ali,2020; Tan & Low,2017).

In the context of Vietnamese classrooms, a study by Kim & Petraki (2009) concluded that both teachers and students believed that L1 plays a significantly beneficial role at the early stages of learning English as a foreign language. EFL teachers and students in Vietnam, however, have reported little use of translanguaging due to the principle of a monolingual approach. The placement of the L1 in our context is still overlooked, which undermines the vital role it plays in a student's identity and linguistic repertoire as an L2. In addition, EFL students and teachers are prone to utilizing translanguaging in a spontaneous, unplanned manner in the classrooms due to skepticism regarding its benefits and a lack of well-researched conceptual frameworks for planning translanguaging practices. In our research on instructions for pedagogical translanguaging, we have drawn on the gaps left in previous studies as well as a lack of empirical studies in the Vietnamese context for inspiration.

Research Questions

This study aims to investigate learners' perception of translanguaging use and how the approach is actually practiced in EFL classrooms in Vietnam from the undergraduates' perspective. In light of the research findings, some practical implications will be recommended for future studies and the effective practice of English language teaching in Vietnam, aiming to meet the long-term goals that were mentioned above.

To be more specific, this paper aims to answer the questions below:

1. What are university students' perceptions of the importance of Translanguaging in language learning?
2. How is translanguaging practiced in EFL classrooms from the university students' view

Methods

Pedagogical Setting & Participants

The survey was carried out at a university in Ho Chi Minh City. It collected 183 responses from non-English-majored students at A2 and B1 levels, all of whom are freshmen and sophomores who volunteered to participate in the research data collection. Information relating to students is kept confidential and anonymous. As a result, they can freely express their opinions and attitudes regarding the survey questions without being concerned about maltreatment during the course evaluation process.

Design of the Study

The study employed both quantitative and qualitative methods. The former approach collected data using a five-point Likert scale questionnaire, while the latter one obtained data from in-depth semi-structured interviews of ten students.

Firstly, the questionnaire includes 16 questions adapted from Rivera and Mazak's research (Rivera & Mazak, 2017). Respondents were asked to decide how much they agreed with the 16 statements within the five-point Likert scale: from Strongly Disagree to Strongly Agree. The statements relate to four main subtopics: Students' perception of translanguaging as a general practice, in social settings, and in L2 language learning. The Cronbach's Alpha for the questionnaire items is 0.88, which means that the reliability of the questionnaire is relatively high. Secondly, semi-structured interviews were conducted to elaborate on the results of the quantitative data analysis. Three major questions, with follow-up ones, were formed to gain insights into students' attitudes toward translanguaging and the actual practice of translanguaging in their EFL classrooms.

Data collection & analysis

Regarding the quantitative data collected in the survey, a descriptive analysis was implemented to interpret it. The mean and standard deviation for each item of the questionnaire were calculated. The interval mean scores are 1.00 - 1.80: Strongly Disagree; 1.81-2.6: Disagree; 2.61-3.4: Neutral; 3.41-4.2: Agree; and 4.21-5.0: Strongly Agree. Scores between 2.6-3.4 were considered to indicate neutral perceptions, below 2.6 were interpreted as having negative attitudes, and above 3.4 implied positive views. Regarding the qualitative data, an in-depth transcription of the interview data was first undertaken and then categorized using qualitative thematic analysis. It involves carefully reading the data and identifying critical issues within them before arranging these issues into broader categories. Questions in the questionnaire and

the interview schedule provided a framework within which specific responses could be categorized.

Results/Findings and discussion

Students' perception of the Translanguaging practice in general

The figures in Table 1 indicate most of the respondents believed that the practice of translanguaging was a common activity at their university (overall $M=3.745$). In particular, the majority of the participants said that their English instructors were involved in translanguaging ($M=3.82$), and students often switched between the two languages (English -Vietnamese) when talking to their lecturers, peers, and others at university. ($M=3.67$).

Students' attitudes toward the use of Translanguaging in social settings

The descriptive data presents that the respondents largely had neutral views on the social utility of translanguaging (overall $M=3.234$). Specifically, the participants held neutral perceptions of the ideas that “Translanguaging should be avoided by language users” ($M=3.16$), “Translanguaging in communication indicates the lack of linguistic proficiency in L2” ($M=2.7$), and “Translanguaging is confusing for me in communication” ($M=2.66$). Meanwhile, students tend to agree that engagement in translanguaging in social situations is acceptable ($M=3.86$) and that translanguaging is generally agreeable in society ($M=3.79$).

Students' perception of the use of Translanguaging in target language learning

Generally, the participants positively perceived Translanguaging as a necessary and useful approach for their language learning ($M=3.89$). The practice of translanguaging was believed not only to be an essential factor in learning a new language ($M=4.04$), but also a helpful tool in boosting students' confidence in the classrooms (4.03) and enhancing engagement in their conversations with peers (4.07). Moreover, graduate students held positive perceptions regarding the effective utilization of translanguaging in completing university tasks ($M=3.86$), developing communicative skills in language classrooms ($M=4.04$), and clarifying complicated concepts ($M=4.21$). In terms of the role of instructors' application of translanguaging in the classroom, most of them exhibited their agreement on the positive impact of listening to lectures and instructions in two languages ($M=4.12$), which could help them improve L2 learning experience. Despite this, when being asked if instructors who used Translanguaging were considered unprofessional, the respondents indicated neutral perceptions ($M=2.61$).

Table 1.

Students' Perceptions of Translanguaging

	MEAN	SD
TRANSLANGUAGING IN PRACTICE	3.745	
English Instructors in my university engage in translanguaging	3.82	1.11
I often use translanguaging in social settings	3.67	1.13
TRANSLANGUAGING IN SOCIAL SETTINGS	3.234	
Translanguaging should be avoided by language users.	3.16	1.31
Translanguaging indicates a lack of linguistic proficiency in your second language.	2.7	1.47
Translanguaging is confusing for me in communication.	2.66	1.39
It is okay to engage in translanguaging in social settings.	3.86	1
Translanguaging is socially acceptable.	3.79	1.12
TRANSLANGUAGING IN L2 LEARNING	3.89	
Translanguaging helped me learn a second language better.	3.99	1.06
Translanguaging is essential for learning a new language.	4.04	1.02
Students should be able to engage in translanguaging to complete university assignments.	3.86	1.1
Translanguaging by a university instructor is unprofessional.	2.61	1.49
If an instructor used translanguaging in class, it would be helpful for the students.	4.12	0.99
Translanguaging helps me engage in conversations with my classmates.	4.07	1.02
Translanguaging may help in the development of students' communicative skills in the language classroom.	4.04	1
Translanguaging can be viewed as a tool for clarification in a language classroom.	4.21	0.94
I feel more confident in classrooms where instructors use translanguaging, rather than those who use English all the time.	4.03	1.06

The interview session was conducted with ten students at two levels selected at random. As a result of the transcription, much interesting information is summarized that corresponds with the results of the survey. As a whole, the interviews indicate a significant positive effect of translanguaging on the majority of the students, especially in the confidence they express themselves in the target language, as well as the students' tendency to improve their speaking fluency through linguistic resources rather than through translanguaging once they reached a certain level of fluency in English speaking.

It should be noted that the majority of students (9 out of 10) were in favor of translanguaging. In the interviewees' views, translanguaging was perceived as a natural practice for language learners.

Yes, I often use both English and Vietnamese in my language classrooms. It is very normal to do so. (S1, extract from the interview)

You know, it was easy to change from one language to another. Sometimes I could not translate a word into English and I just used the Vietnamese word in an English sentence.

It was just my natural reaction to do so. (S3, extract from the interview).

I think changing to and fro between Vietnamese and English helps me to communicate and express my thoughts easier. Most of my English instructors also do the same. (S6, extract from the interview)

Translanguaging is also used a great deal by most participants for their social practice, which they are engaged in on a regular basis.

Sometimes when my teacher asked us to do a task in class, she encouraged us to use English, but we still used Vietnamese occasionally to complete the task because when I spoke English with my friends in group, they could not understand and asked me to use Vietnamese. (S9, extract from the interview)

We often chatted in Vietnamese and adding some English words in our conversations. It was fun to do so. (S3, extract from the interview).

My friends will hate me if I use all English when discussing something with them. (S4, extract from the interview).

In terms of the target language learning, it is noteworthy that 9 out of 10 participants in the study explain that they have become more confident or fairly more confident with their ability to speak English.

Only when my teacher asked us a question and allowed us to use Vietnamese to explain part of our opinions, I was confident enough to raise my hand. (S2, extract from the interview)

...At least, I did use a bit of English, and Vietnamese helped myself understood by my friends. (S6, extract from the interview)

In spite of this positive response, four out of ten students at the highest level believed that translanguaging implies a lack of language proficiency in the target language

I personally think that we should use 100% English to improve English speaking skills. Using Vietnamese can do harm to our speaking skills. (S10, extract from the interview)

I don't think we should use Vietnamese so frequently. My friends use Vietnamese all the time and their speaking skills are very bad. (S7, extract from the interview)

I try not to use too much Vietnamese, although it is so hard. If you often change into your mother tongue, this means you can not use English very well. (S8, extract from the interview)

Discussion and Implications

Generally, the quantitative results shown above indicate that students can recognize the existence of the practice of Translanguaging at their university and welcome translanguaging as an acceptable act in social interactions and EFL classrooms. Additionally, as EFL learners, the students believe that translanguaging is a helpful tool in their L2 acquisition and needs to be utilized in different ways in the learning process. These results have further supported a number of previous findings made by Aoyama (2020), who conducted her research in the Japanese setting, Nambisan (2014) in Iowan language classrooms, Romanowski (2020) in Poland, Liu (2021) in Thailand and Zhou et al. (2021) in China. These studies' results all emphasized the pedagogical positive impact of translanguaging in various aspects from

students' perspectives. However, there are still neutral opinions with relatively high standard deviation ($SD=1.47$ and 1.49) regarding two issues: the use of translanguaging showing a lack of language proficiency among language learners and the use of translanguaging in relation to the professionalism and pedagogical skills of English instructors. These findings reflect the still firmly held belief in the "English-only" pedagogy that highlights the significant roles of language teachers and learners in limiting the use of L1 during the learning process.

It is noticeable that the qualitative data also reflects similar results. To be specific, translanguaging was perceived by interviewees as a natural activity when learning a foreign language. The group believes that translanguaging is a typical linguistic resource that does not hinder effective communication. There is no doubt that translanguaging is an invaluable support for low-level students, particularly when the language instructor utilizes translanguaging to clarify the requirements of a task, a complicated grammatical rule, or an abstract linguistic statement to enhance their ability to understand and retain the information. To put it another way, translanguaging enables students to scaffold their concept learning and provides them with support as they engage with complex content and context. Interestingly, these findings have been reported at odds with ones by Carstens (2016) who found that speakers of various dialects in Africa believed that translanguaging could lead to confusion in classroom communication, and consequently, inhibit the promotion of effective learning. Additionally, students interviewed did not perceive translanguaging to be disrespectful, contrary to the findings of Rivera and Mazak (2017). In their study, more than 50% of the respondents at a Puerto Rican university discussed translanguaging as 'disrespectful' or 'somewhat disrespectful', in contrast to two out of ten of our participants who held the same opinion.

Moreover, in-depth interviews revealed that students viewed Translanguaging as an acceptable act in social interactions. In particular, students with low levels of proficiency often use their L1 conversion to interpret the ideas of their peers correctly or to carry on the discussion that has been started in a group in order to complete the tasks given by their teacher. There was little dispute by students regarding the acceptability of translanguaging within social interactions. These findings are aligned with conclusions made by Huan & Joseph (2024), who conducted their research in EFL Chinese university settings, and Maryvone et al. (2023) in Brazilian bilingual schools. These studies emphasized the role of translanguaging in engaging social interactions among peers. Through translanguaging, students are able to engage more actively in class activities and exchange ideas more easily. Translanguaging is sometimes necessary for students of higher proficiency to provide peer support to inferior partners in higher-level courses.

However, being synchronous to the quantitative findings, the results extracted from the interviews implies controversial attitudes toward whether translanguaging implies a lack of linguistic competence in the target language. The interviews indicate that once students have reached a particular level of proficiency, they are less likely to use translanguaging and are more likely to utilize linguistic resources in order to improve their speaking proficiency. The intermediate-level students assert, for instance, that they need autonomy, interaction, and linguistic input rather than relying heavily on translanguaging in order to develop their linguistic abilities steadily and sustainably. They believe that only regular practice can make them improve their level, though they do not look down on their peers who may not be proficient at communicative skills and have to resort to using translanguaging for instruction and feedback.

This paper's findings have provided some thought-provoking implications in the Vietnamese ELT context. The findings have shed light on the potential of applying Translanguaging in EFL

classrooms as an innovative, efficient approach to language teaching and learning. From what was found in the study, Vietnamese students view Translanguaging positively and perceive it as a helpful stimulator that promotes their learning engagement, assists comprehension, and fosters their autonomy in the way that Translanguaging allows a collaborative, relaxing environment without much language anxiety. The study is also a reflection of the local gradual shifting from monoglossic to heteroglossic view as a response to the contemporary, vibrant world of globalization where World Englishes and multilingualism are unavoidable tendencies. This leads to the second implication for educators and teachers when considering Translanguaging as a purposeful pedagogical method rather than a spontaneous phenomenon in their classroom. As a result, this triggers the need for educational managers to implement training projects for teachers to practice translanguaging consciously and effectively in their classrooms with a well-researched conceptual framework for this innovative approach.

Conclusion

The findings reinforce the benefits of translanguaging practice in language learning, which has been increasingly accepted as a practical pedagogical approach rather than a situational phenomenon. In addition, this study reflects a significant shift in perceptions that new generations of Vietnamese English learners have toward using L1 and/or L2 in language classrooms. Most researched language students affirm the positive effects of translanguaging in empowering their learning autonomy, building their dynamic and participatory engagement, and activating their apprehension of the target language. Moreover, translanguaging is perceived to play a pivotal role in nurturing language identity among learners as a manifestation of the contemporary unavoidable shift from the monoglossic to heteroglossic view in education. Therefore, translanguaging is not about the code-switching between languages but intercultural communication. As a result, in EFL classrooms, EFL teachers must employ translanguaging in a more purposeful and well-planned way with conceptual frameworks of translanguaging as an approach. Concerning native English teachers, knowing about students' L1 and their local cultures could be considered an essential strategies to establish a joyful and productive learning environment.

Last but not least, the paper aimed to study within a small population of 183 undergraduates pursuing non-majored English programs. To gain a more holistic insight into the same matter, future studies could also investigate Vietnamese students across proficiency levels in different institutional settings. In addition, considering practical limitations, it is imperative to examine the same issue from the perspectives of other stakeholders, such as school administrators and policy-makers.

References

- Akbar, R. S. S., & Taqi, H. A. (2020). Translanguaging as an ESL Learning strategy: A case study in Kuwait. *International Journal of Higher Education*, 9(6), 54-63.
<https://doi.org/10.5430/ijhe.v9n6p54>
- Ali, H. I. (2020). Omani Students' Coping Strategies in an English Medium Engineering Programme. *Arab World English Journal*, 11(2), 361-382.
<https://doi.org/https://dx.doi.org/10.24093/awej/vol11no2.25>
- Anderson, J. (2017). Reimagining English language learners from a translingual perspective. *ELT Journal*, 72(1), 26-37.

- Aoyama, R. (2020). Exploring Japanese high school students' L1 use in translanguaging in the communicative EFL classroom. *The Electronic Journal for English as a Second Language*, 23(4), 1-19.
- Baker, C. (2011). *Foundations of bilingual education and bilingualism*. New York: Mc Naughton & Gunn Ltd.
- Canagarajah, S. (2011). Codemeshing in Academic Writing: Identifying Teachable Strategies of Translanguaging. *The Modern Language Journal*, 95(3), 401-417.
- Carstens, A. (2016). Translanguaging as a vehicle for L2 acquisition and L1 development: Students' perceptions. *Language Matters*, 47(2), 203-222.
- Chi, D. N. (2017). Issues in the implementation of bilingual education in Vietnam. *TESOL Working Paper Series*, 15, 96-113.
- Creese, A., & Blackledge, A. (2010). Translanguaging in the bilingual classroom: A pedagogy for learning and teaching. *The Modern Language Journal*, 94, 103–115.
- Del Valle, J. (2000). Monoglossic policies for a heteroglossic culture: Misinterpreted multilingualism in modern Galicia. *Language and Communication*, 20, 105–132.
- Du, Y. (2016). The L1 in L2 Learning and Teaching. *The Use of First and Second Language in Chinese University EFL Classrooms*, 15-44. Singapore: Springer Singapore.
- Escobar, C. F., & Dillard-Paltrineri, E. (2015). Professors' and Students' Conflicting Beliefs about Translanguaging in the EFL Classroom: Dismantling the Monolingual Bias. *Revista De Lenguas Modernas (San José. En Línea)/Revista De Lenguas Modernas (San José. Impresa)*, 23. <https://doi.org/10.15517/rlm.v0i23.22355>.
- Ferguson, C. A. (1959). Diglossia. *WORD*, 15(2), 325–340. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00437956.1959.11659702>
- García, O. (2009). Education, multilingualism and translanguaging in the 21st century. In A. K. Mohanty, M. Panday, R. Phillipson, & T. Skutnabb-Kangas (Eds.), *Multilingual Education for Social Justice: Globalising the Local*, 140–158. Orient Blackswan.
- García, O. (2014). What is translanguaging? Expanded questions and answers for U.S. educators. In *Introduction to Translanguaging in curriculum and instruction: A CUNY-NYSIEB guide for educators*. New York, NY: CUNY-NYSIEB.
- García, O., & Hesson, S. (2015). Translanguaging frameworks for teachers: Macro and micro perspectives. In A. Yiakoumetti (Ed.), *Multilingualism and Language in Education*, 221–241. Cambridge University Press.
- García, O., & Wei, L. (2014). Translanguaging and education. In *Translanguaging: Language, bilingualism, and education*, 63–77. Palgrave Pivot, London.
- Gardner-Chloros, P. (2009). *Code-switching*. Cambridge University Press
- Goodman, B., & Tastanbek, S. (2021). Making the shift from a codeswitching to a translanguaging lens in English language teacher education. *TESOL Quarterly*, 55(1), 29-53. <https://doi.org/10.1002/tesq.571>
- Kamwangamalu, N. M. (2010). Multilingualism and codeswitching in education. In *Multilingual Matters eBooks* (pp. 116-142). <https://doi.org/10.21832/9781847692849-007>

- Kleyn, T., & García, O. (2019). Translanguaging as an act of transformation: restructuring teaching and learning for emergent bilingual students. In L. C. De Oliveira (Ed.), *The Handbook of TESOL in K-12* (pp. 69–82). John Wiley & Sons.
<https://doi.org/10.1002/9781119421702.ch6>
- Holdway, J., & Hitchcock, C. H. (2018). Exploring ideological becoming in professional development for teachers of multilingual learners: Perspectives on translanguaging in the classroom. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 75, 60-70.
- Hornberger, N. H., & McKay, S. (2010). *Sociolinguistics and language education*, 116–142. Springer.
- Huan, Yang., Joseph, Foley. (2024). Translanguaging as Interactional Resources Employed by Students in EFL Student-Led Group Task Interaction. *Journal of English Language and Linguistics*, 5(1), 33-54. <https://doi.org/10.62819/jel.2024.145>
- Jingxia, L. (2010). Teachers' Code-Switching to the L1 in EFL Classroom. *The Open Applied Linguistics Journal* 3,10–23.
- Kim, Y., & Petraki, E. (2009). Students' and teachers' use of and attitudes to L1 in the EFL classroom. *Asian EFL Journal*, 11(4), 58-89.
- Kwihangana, F. (2021). Enhancing EFL students' participation through translanguaging. *ELT Journal*. <https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccaa058>
- Lewis, G., Jones, B., & Baker, C. (2012). Translanguaging: origins and development from school to street and beyond. *Educational Research and Evaluation: An International Journal on Theory and Practice*, 18(7), 641–654.
- Liu, D. (2021). *A study of graduate students' perceptions towards pedagogical translanguaging at an international university in Bangkok*. (Master thesis). Thailand: Assumption University. <https://repository.au.edu/handle/6623004553/24818>
- Lublinter, S., & Grisham, D. L. (2017). *Translanguaging*. Maryland: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Matamoros-González, J. A., Asunción Rojas, M. a., Pizarro Romero, J., Vera-Quiñonez, S., & Soto, S. T. (2017). English language teaching approaches: a comparison of the Grammar translation, Audiolingual, Communicative, and Natural Approaches. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 7(11). <https://doi.org/10.17507/tpls.0711.04>
- Maryvone, Cunha, de, Morais., Lilian, Cristine, Hübner., Anamaria, Kurtz, de, Souza, Welp. (2023). Translinguagem na educação bilíngue: Uma análise das práticas orais nas interações de estudantes do 5º ano. Ilha do Desterro. *A Journal of English Language, Literatures in English and Cultural Studies*, 76(3). <https://doi.org/10.5007/2175-8026.2023.e94548>
- MOET. (2008). *National Foreign Language 2020 Project*. Hanoi, VN: Vietnamese Ministry of Education and Training.
- Myers-Scotton, C. (1993). Common and uncommon ground: Social and structural factors in codeswitching. *Language in Society*, 22, 475–503.
- Nambisan, K. A. (2014). *Teachers' attitudes towards and uses of translanguaging in English language classrooms in Iowa*. Iowa State University, Faculty of Arts.
- Nazary, M. (2008). The Role of L1 in L2 Acquisition: Attitudes of Iranian University Students. *Novitas-ROYAL*. 2(2):138–53

- Nguyen, T. N. T. (2022). A review of studies on EFL teachers' and students' perceptions of translanguaging as a pedagogical approach. *International Journal of TESOL & Education*, 2(3), 324–331. <https://doi.org/10.54855/ijte.222322>
- Otheguy, R., García, O., & Reid, W. (2015). Clarifying translanguaging and deconstructing named languages: A perspective from linguistics. *Applied Linguistics Review*, 6(3), 281-307.
- Piller, I. (2016). *Linguistic Diversity and Social Justice: An Introduction to Applied Sociolinguistics*. Oxford University Press, 21.
- Qiu, X., & Fang, C. (2019). Creating an effective English-Medium Instruction (EMI) classroom: Chinese undergraduate students' perceptions of native and non-native English-speaking content teachers and their experiences. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 1–15. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050.2019.1707769>
- Rivera, A. J. & Mazak, C. M. (2017). Analyzing student perceptions on translanguaging: A case study of a Puerto Rican university classroom. *How*, 24(1), 122-138.
- Romanowski, P. (2020). Perceptions of Translanguaging among the Students and Teachers of EMI Classrooms in Poland. *Lenguas Modernas* 55, 151 - 165
- Tan, N. S., & Low, H. M. (2017). Socio-environmental factors impacting on teachers' attitudes towards code-switching in ESL classrooms in a rural district in Malaysia. *Kajian Malaysia*, 35(2), 105–125. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.21315/km2017.35.2.6>
- Üstünel, E. & Paul, S. (2005). 'Why That, in That Language, Right Now? Code-Switching and Pedagogical Focus'. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics* 15(3),302–325.
- Van, H. V. (n.d.). *Interpreting MOET's 2018 general education English curriculum*. VNU Journal of Foreign Studies. <https://doi.org/10.25073/2525-2445/vnufs.4866>
- Vogel, S., & Garcia, O. (2017). Translanguaging. In G. Noblit & L. Moll (Eds.), *Oxford Research Encyclopedia of Education*. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315752617-9>
- Wong, Y., & Yoong, D. (2019). ESL teachers' perceptions and practices of code-switching in a Malaysian Chinese independent secondary school. *Journal of Modern Languages*, 29, 45–66. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.22452/jml.vol29no1.3>
- Williams, C. (1994). Arfarniad o ddulliau dysgu ac addysgu yng nghyd-destun addysg uwchradd ddwyieithog. *Evaluation of teaching and learning methods in the context of bilingual secondary education*. University of Wales.
- Williams, C. (2000). Bilingual teaching and language distribution at 16+. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 3(2), 129–148.
- Yamagami, T. (2023). The Impact of L2 Motivational Self System and Students' Perceptions of English Proficiency on Attitudes toward Translanguaging. *International Journal of TESOL & Education*, 3(1), 154–170. <https://doi.org/10.54855/ijte.233110>
- Yuvayapan, F. (2019). Translanguaging in EFL classrooms: Teachers' perceptions and practices. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies*, 15(2), 678-694
- Zhou, X. & Mann, S. (2021). Translanguaging in a Chinese University CLIL Classroom: Teacher strategies and student attitudes. *Studies in Second Language Learning and Teaching*, 11 (2), 265–289. <https://doi.org/10.14746/ssllt.2021.11.2.5>

Biodata

Ms. Pham Huong Ngoc Uyen is currently a lecturer at HCMC University of Economics and Finance. For over ten years, she has taught English Linguistics and General English courses in international undergraduate joint programs. She holds a Master's degree in Applied Linguistics from Curtin University, Australia, and earned her Bachelor's degree in English Language Teaching from the HCMC University of Pedagogy. Currently, as she is a Ph.D. candidate at HCMC University of Social Sciences and Humanities, her research fields of interest are the application of innovative methods in ELT, the promotion of students' motivation, and other varied aspects of linguistics, which can change and make an impact in all directions of life.

Nguyen Trang Dung has been a lecturer of English at Ho Chi Minh City University of Technology for 15 years since her graduation from Ho Chi Minh City University of Education in 2008. As a teacher, she is also a source of inspiration, even if not with the actual content of the lesson but with her attitude. Teaching keeps her brain young, allowing her to continue her own journey as a lifelong learner. It was not until obtaining Master Degree in Applied Linguistics from University of Curtin in 2012 that made her aware of the great interest in second language acquisition.