

72. Translanguaging strategies with pre-service EFL teachers in EMI classrooms: An emic perspective¹

Serdar TEKİN²

APA: Tekin, S. (2023). Translanguaging strategies with pre-service EFL teachers in EMI classrooms: An emic perspective. *RumeliDE Dil ve Edebiyat Araştırmaları Dergisi*, (35), 1242-1257. DOI: 10.29000/rumelide.1342277.

Abstract

Translanguaging has recently gained widespread acceptance as an effective approach to learning and teaching across various contexts, leading to a surge in research interest. Nevertheless, investigations into translanguaging within English-medium instruction contexts remain relatively scarce. This study aims to delve into the translanguaging strategies of a teacher educator, the evolution of these strategies over time, and the educator's sentiments regarding their use of translanguaging. Through the analysis of audio recordings of classes and reflective notes, the study reveals that translanguaging was strategically employed for primarily three purposes: explanation, individual feedback, and encouragement. These applications facilitated successful conveyance of meaning and the maintenance of a natural conversational flow. Furthermore, the study illustrates that translanguaging was employed to varying degrees in teaching lesson objectives, accompanied by a sense of contentment. The findings underscore the significance of teachers engaging in reflective practice and provide a point of reference to mitigate any potential negative emotions arising from the use of translanguaging.

Keywords: Translanguaging, English as medium of instruction (EMI), reflective teaching, emic perspective

Eğitim dili İngilizce olan sınıflarda çift dil kullanma stratejileri: İçsel bir bakış açısı

Öz

Yabancı dil eğitiminde çift dil kullanımı, son zamanlarda çeşitli bağlamlarda etkili bir öğrenme ve öğretme yolu olarak yaygın bir şekilde benimsenmiş ve çok sayıda araştırmaya yol açmıştır. Fakat eğitim dili İngilizce olan derslerde çift dil kullanımına odaklanan araştırmalar nispeten nadirdir. Bu çalışma, bir öğretmen eğitimcisinin çift dil stratejilerini (Türkçe ve İngilizce), bu stratejilerin zaman içindeki değişimini ve çift dil kullanımına ilişkin duygularını keşfetmeyi amaçlamıştır. Derslerde yapılan ses kayıtlarından ve sonrasında alınan yansıtıcı notlardan yararlanan çalışma, çift dil kullanımının stratejik olarak başlıca üç amaç için (açıklama yapma, bireysel geri bildirim ve teşvik etme) kullanıldığını, böylece anlamın başarılı bir şekilde aktarılabilmesini ve konuşmanın doğal akışının sağlanabilmesini sağladığını ortaya koymuştur. Ayrıca bu çalışma, ders konularını ve içeriğini öğretmen adaylarına öğretmek için değişen derecelerde çift dil kullanımı stratejilerinin herhangi bir pişmanlık duygusu olmadan kullanıldığını göstermektedir. Bu çalışma, literatürde

1 ETİK: Nevşehir Hacıbektas Veli Üniversitesi Bilimsel Araştırmalar ve Yayın Etik Kurulu tarafından 25.10.2021 tarihli, 298 sayılı kararla etik izni verilmiştir.

2 Dr. Öğr. Üyesi, Nevşehir Hacı Bektaş Veli Üniversitesi, Eğitim Fakültesi, İngiliz Dili Eğitimi (Nevşehir, Türkiye), srdrtkn@gmail.com, ORCID ID: 0000-0003-4625-4324 [Araştırma makalesi, Makale kayıt tarihi: 07.06.2023-kabul tarihi: 20.08.2023; DOI: 10.29000/rumelide.1342277]

yaygın bir şekilde var olan yabancı dil öğretiminde birden fazla dil kullanımından kaynaklanan olumsuz duygulardan kaçınmak için bir referans görevi görmektedir.

Anahtar kelimeler: Yabancı dil öğretimi, Çoklu/Çift dil kullanımı stratejileri, Yansıtıcı öğretim

1. Introduction

Translanguaging has risen to prominence in recent decades, challenging the traditional monolingual ideology that advocated exclusive use of the target language (L2) while disregarding the first language (L1). Unlike previous terms like codeswitching, code-meshing, and code alternation, which referred to the use of dual languages, translanguaging encompasses multiple codes, drawing on them without according priority to any particular one (Zhou & Mann, 2021). In this manner, it blurs language boundaries, emphasising the flexible deployment of language repertoire for effective communication and conveying of meaning (Creese & Blackledge, 2010), thus presenting a novel paradigm in additional language education (Cenoz, 2017; Wei, 2022).

The burgeoning interest in translanguaging has spawned a wealth of research from diverse perspectives, including those of students (Macaro, 2009; Wang, 2019; Zhou & Mann, 2021), parents (Wilson, 2021), and teachers (Liu & Fang, 2020). Empirical investigations have also been conducted across various educational contexts such as immersion programs (Bourgoin, 2014), second language contexts (McManus, 2015), foreign language classrooms (Bruen & Kelly, 2014), and Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) environments (Zhou & Mann, 2021). Nevertheless, a research gap persists in the realm of translanguaging practices within English as a medium of instruction (EMI) settings. Addressing this gap, Zhou and Mann (2021) advocate for further research within EMI contexts to enhance comprehension of translanguaging strategies and practices, as well as the impact of institutional language policies on educators' language choices.

Given this gap in the existing literature, the current study endeavours to investigate the translanguaging strategies employed by a teacher educator within tertiary EMI classrooms. Furthermore, it delves into the cognitive processes and psychological states involved in the utilisation of translanguaging practices while instructing pre-service English teachers. These aspects are examined from an emic perspective (Dewaele, 2010), aiming to provide valuable insights into translanguaging, the influencing factors, and the emotional responses elicited by its application within EMI settings.

2. Translanguaging as a Pedagogical Strategy

Translanguaging has garnered substantial global popularity in language education since its introduction by Williams nearly four decades ago (Conteh, 2018). Its influence has extended beyond classroom language use to encompass everyday bilingual or multilingual practices (García & Li, 2014). Translanguaging fundamentally promotes the full utilisation of existing linguistic resources, transcending the prioritisation or imposition of L2 or any single language. At its core, translanguaging revolves around tapping into diverse linguistic sources and employing them strategically through flexible manoeuvres to foster effective communication among interlocutors (García & Li, 2014).

Described as "the ability of multilingual speakers to shuttle between languages, treating the diverse languages that constitute their repertoire as an integrated system" (Canagarajah, 2011 p. 401), translanguaging is progressively solidifying its status as a widely embraced practice for both students and educators in multilingual education. While Canagarajah's aforementioned definition still implies

certain boundaries between languages, it perceives languages as an integrated resource for use by multilingual speakers (Liu & Fang, 2020).

Within educational contexts, specific attention has been dedicated to pedagogical translanguaging, a concept defined as "intentional strategies that incorporate two or more languages, aiming to cultivate the multilingual repertoire alongside metalinguistic and language awareness" (Cenoz & Gorter, 2020 p. 300). As discerned from this definition, language switching in pedagogical translanguaging is premeditated and executed deliberately by educators, rather than arising spontaneously from the linguistic repertoire based solely on immediate context. Canagarajah (2011) thus outlined several deliberate pedagogical strategies associated with translanguaging, including recontextualization strategies, voice strategies, interactional strategies, and textualization strategies.

Recent insights from Zhou and Mann (2021) indicate that translanguaging is harnessed to enhance students' learning experiences, particularly for explanatory purposes (such as in textbook-related contexts), for rekindling attention (when students' focus wanes due to exclusive L2 use), and for fostering rapport. Their findings further revealed that both teachers and students initiate translanguaging, especially when grappling with challenges in comprehending L2 usage or expressing themselves in L2. Previous research has unveiled a broad spectrum of strategies that educators employ to facilitate learning, encompassing compensation for comprehension gaps (Edstrom, 2006), language contrast (Wilden & Porsch, 2020), elucidation of vocabulary or grammar (Copland & Neokleous, 2011; Izquierdo et al., 2016; Sali, 2014), and even classroom discipline management (Campa & Nassaji, 2009; Liu et al., 2004).

In addition to examining in-class practices, previous studies exploring classroom translanguaging have delved into teachers' viewpoints, revealing a diverse range of positions (Creese & Blackledge, 2010; Liu & Fang, 2020; Tekin & Garton, 2020; Wang, 2019). While a significant portion of teacher participants exhibit positive attitudes toward translanguaging, thus advocating and integrating bilingual language instruction (Creese & Blackledge, 2010; McMillan & Rivers, 2011), some studies show that teachers find no benefit in using translanguaging, feel guilty, and hence try to avoid it by sticking to monolingual language teaching (Copland & Neokleous, 2011; Littlewood & Yu, 2011; Macaro, 2005; Tekin & Garton, 2020; Tekin, 2022).

According to Liu and Fang (2020), several constraints impede teachers' adoption of translanguaging. These constraints encompass monolingual institutional policies, lack of guidelines for implementing bilingual language instruction, perceived notions of linguistic purity, and apprehensions about potential drawbacks (such as excessive L1 usage). In light of these complexities and other contextual factors—namely learners' proficiency level, motivation, age, and the focus of the lesson—Copland and Neokleous (2011) contend that teachers' decision-making process regarding language usage is intricate, demanding careful consideration of multiple influencing factors.

The studies mentioned above have contributed valuable insights into translanguaging and attitudes surrounding its usage. However, many of these studies predominantly employed an etic perspective—researchers utilized questionnaires or interviews to gather participants' external viewpoints, beliefs, and thoughts. The resulting data passed through the researchers' interpretive "lens" or "filter" (Yin, 2016 p. 288). Equally important is the exploration of translanguaging practices and the unveiling of emotions from an emic perspective. This approach allows for a deeper understanding of the intricate thought processes during the utilisation of translanguaging.

While Zhou and Mann (2021) embarked on a study examining their own translanguaging practices in an Action Research (AR) design, the investigation was confined to a CLIL context. Consequently, a research gap remains, necessitating further exploration of language practices in English as a Medium of Instruction (EMI) settings (Fang, 2018; Zhou & Mann, 2021). Delving into translanguaging practices within EMI contexts could enrich our comprehension of how translanguaging is applied, the contextual factors influencing such practices, the cognitive mechanisms at play, and consequently aid educators in acknowledging and customizing their own practices. In light of this, the current study is designed to address the following research questions (RQs):

1. What translanguaging strategies does the teacher educator employ within an EMI context?
2. How do the translanguaging practices of the teacher educator evolve over time?
3. What are the emotional experiences of the teacher educator when utilizing translanguaging with pre-service English teachers?

3. Method

This study is framed within a qualitative research framework, aiming to comprehensively explore the utilisation of translanguaging, encompassing employed strategies, observed changes over time, and the emotional responses elicited (Brown, 2010). Specifically, the research adopts a single case study approach, which involves an in-depth and exhaustive investigation of an individual, group, event, or phenomenon (Stake, 2005). The main aim of this approach is to attain a profound understanding of the case being examined and to extract insights that hold relevance for similar contexts. In this context, it is believed that this research design harmonises effectively with the fundamental objective of this study—namely, to extensively delve into the intricacies of translanguaging use.

3.1. Sampling and Participants

The present study employed a convenience sampling method which is widely used in social sciences (Dörnyei, 2007). This non-probability sampling approach offers researchers convenience in terms of time, availability, and location (Silverman, 2013). While convenience sampling is often critiqued for its limited generalisability, it's crucial to note that this study's objective isn't to extrapolate findings to a broader population. Instead, the primary aim is to deeply explore the use of translanguaging, and in line with Perry's (2011) notion, it can serve its purpose without necessarily seeking generalisability.

In line with this sampling method, three teacher educators working in tertiary EMI contexts were invited to participate in the study. However, due to practical constraints and challenges, two were unable to take part. Therefore, this study included only one participant and was based on a teacher educator's translanguaging practices. The teacher in this case was a male practitioner with extensive language teaching experience in primary and secondary levels as well as two years of experience in teaching at tertiary level following study-abroad experience in an English-speaking country.

3.2. Context

The study was conducted in the English Language Teaching department of a state university in Turkey. Data were collected from two distinct courses: "Listening and Phonetics" and "Teaching English to Young Learners (TEYL)." The "Listening and Phonetics" course aimed to enhance students' awareness

of phonetic alphabet sounds, refine their pronunciation of phonemic symbols, improve their English pronunciation and speaking skills, and cultivate an understanding of potential pronunciation and intonation issues, along with heightened awareness of various English accents. On the other hand, the TEYL course focused on fostering an understanding of young learners' characteristics, identifying diverse teaching strategies, addressing classroom management challenges, and acquainting students with child development theories. These courses were mandatory components for first and third-grade pre-service English teachers, respectively.

Both classes comprised approximately 30 students each. While the majority of students had Turkish as their L1, a few possessed different L1s, such as German and Arabic. Despite these variations, all students were proficient in speaking and understanding Turkish. Participants in both courses were pre-service teachers enrolled in a 4-year Teaching English as a Foreign Language (EFL) programme. Although their English proficiency wasn't formally assessed during the research, they underwent language exams prior to starting university, implying a solid command of English was expected.

As per the guidelines set by the Council of Higher Education (CHE), English served as the medium of instruction within the department (CHE, 2022). Nevertheless, the institution upheld a flexible language policy, stipulating a minimum of 70% English use in courses. Consequently, the use of L1 wasn't restricted, granting students the freedom to express their thoughts in either Turkish or English during class discussions. As for the instructor's language of instruction, they predominantly employed English in alignment with the EMI policy. However, they were also at liberty to incorporate L1 while adhering to the language policy's parameters.

3.3. Data Collection Tools and Data Collection Procedure

This study drew on two primary data sources: audio recordings of 20 hours of classes conducted over a six-week period and reflective notes. Reflective teaching stands as a cornerstone of professional development (Edstrom, 2006), encompassing the elicitation of self-reflections to unveil unobservable cognitive processes, encompassing emotions, thoughts, and underlying motivations within a specific context (Dörnyei, 2007). Reflective practice serves as a potent means of comprehending teachers and their instructional methodologies, as well as revealing and documenting concealed aspects that might remain elusive through alternative methods (Borg, 2001).

Recognising the advantages of reflective teaching, the participant maintained a journal after each class throughout the study. This journal served as a platform for recording feelings and opinions regarding the participant's use of translanguaging. Aligned with the participant's preference, the journal entries were composed in Turkish and subsequently translated into English by the researcher. The journal entries were comprehensive, encompassing contextual elements during the classes, including impressions, learners' mood, engagement, focus of the lesson, and various other aspects.

Classroom recording serves as an effective means to meticulously capture the language utilized by participants during the teaching and learning process (Dörnyei, 2007). Notably, audio recording offers the advantage of being non-disruptive compared to video recording, rendering it the preferred choice for capturing participant language use. Audio recordings were executed through a lapel microphone in both classes over the span of an academic term (comprising eight and 12 classes, respectively). Each class extended for 45 minutes, during which the teacher employed various translanguaging strategies.

3.4. Data Analysis

The analysis of reflective notes utilised the thematic analysis technique, which entails identifying, organizing, describing, and effectively reporting themes within the data (Nowell et al., 2017). This process involved a meticulous examination, encompassing multiple readings of each journal entry to discern patterns, contradictions, and meaningful insights.

Particularly, an emic stance was embraced to analyse the emotional responses arising from translanguaging use. This analysis employed an autoethnographic approach, a common form of postmodern ethnography situated within the interpretivist framework (Bryman, 2016). Characterised by high reflexivity, this approach taps into insider knowledge of an individual actively engaged in decision-making processes (Adams et al., 2017; Macnamara, 2021). The self-reflections drew on the participant's personal experiences and decisions regarding language choice, as well as first-hand audio recordings of in-class actions—an aspect that may remain hidden to external researchers (Adams et al., 2017). An assiduously conducted emic analysis can yield valuable insights and a profound understanding of the researched issue (Dewaele, 2010).

Concerning the audio recordings, a process of repeated listening was undertaken to familiarize with the data and identify instances of translanguaging use. Segments featuring translanguaging were transcribed and analysed to unveil patterns in translanguaging strategies, divergent practices, and potential variations across different classes. Translanguaging strategies deployed during the recorded classes were inductively identified, with the process entailing initial data examination followed by a categorisation phase.

4. Findings

The study's findings were structured into three sections, aligning with the research questions: translanguaging strategies employed by the teacher, evolution of translanguaging practices over time, and the teacher's emotional responses toward translanguaging. These results were elucidated through the integration of reflective notes and classroom transcripts. For ease of understanding, instances of switching between languages are accompanied by their English translations enclosed in square brackets.

4.1. Translanguaging Strategies

According to the detailed analysis of the classroom transcripts, the teacher employed translanguaging strategies for four main purposes which are explanation, individual feedback, and encouragement. These categories are explained below successively.

4.1.1 Explanation

The teacher purposefully employed translanguaging as a tool for explanation across various contexts. This encompassed elucidating the specific focal points of the class, providing in-depth discussions on topics linked to the lesson, and delivering explanatory monologues concerning examinations and micro-teaching. The scope of particular topics tied to each course engendered distinct dynamics, thereby shaping the reasons behind employing translanguaging for explanation. In the Listening and Phonetics course, the explanations primarily revolved around English speech sounds and phonetics. Conversely, in the TEYL course, translanguaging was harnessed to elaborate on terminology and examination-

related matters. The subsequent extracts highlight instances of the teacher's use of translanguaging in both courses.

T: Probably, it will be much easier compared to the previous sound. Just “ʌ” sound. Fonetikte “ʌ” böyle yazılacak, normal “a” gibi değil. Yani, [In phonetics, “ʌ” is written like this, not like normal “a”. It means that] when you see this vowel in writing, “u”, you will probably pronounce it as “ʌ”. For example, but, duck, brush, fun, nun, funny.

In the earlier monologue, the teacher strategically embraced translanguaging to elucidate the pronunciation nuances of the vowel “u” as “ʌ” in certain instances, along with its corresponding phonetic transcription. Given the intricate nature of English phonetics and specific sounds, such as in this case, learners—particularly those whose native language is Turkish—may face challenges due to the disparities between the two languages. In light of this, the utilisation of both English and Turkish for explanation emerges as a practical instructional approach to effectively convey the targeted concept to learners.

A distinct example of translanguaging employed for explanatory purposes in the TEYL class is demonstrated below.

T: TESOL means that İngilizce bilmeyenlere İngilizce öğretimi. [teaching English to those who do not know English]. We are EFL, ESL, or TESOL teachers. EFL is English is a foreign language. Yani Türkiye'deki İngilizce öğretmenleri. [Namely, English teachers who work in Turkey]. ESL is English is as a second language. The teachers who are in India. Because English is regarded as a second language in India.

In the provided example, students encountered various terms related to teaching English (EFL, ESL, and TESOL), prompting the teacher to recognise the need for clarification. The teacher took the initiative to expound on the meanings of these terms by furnishing their Turkish translations initially (teaching English to those unfamiliar with the language) and then offering a tangible example for an EFL teacher (English teachers working in Turkey). This approach aimed to facilitate learners' comprehension of the terms' significance and nuances, pre-empting any potential confusion.

Translanguaging was also harnessed to elucidate the intricacies of the TEYL exam. Given the multifaceted nature of the final exam—comprising components like micro-teaching, lesson plans, observation and reflection forms, and peer-feedback—the teacher chose to explain critical points in Turkish. Notably, unlike the aforementioned translanguaging instances, the teacher leaned more toward using Turkish rather than English while elaborating on the exam details. A pertinent example is detailed below.

T: You do not have to fill every part in the lesson plan. Look at the phonology part, for example. Pronunciation ile alakalı bir şey öğretecekseniz, bu kısmı doldurabilirsiniz. Eğer oraya dikkat çekmek istemiyorsanız, sorun değil. Yeni kelime öğreteceğinizde belki bazı phonology point, mesela “th” sound var İngilizce'de, ona dikkat çekmek istiyorsanız, buraya yazabilirsiniz. [If you teach something related to pronunciation, you can fill in this part. You do not have to if you do not want to teach it. If you want to teach new vocabulary related to some phonology points such as “th” sound in English, you can write it in this part.]

In the presented excerpt, the teacher provides a comprehensive breakdown of the process involved in crafting a lesson plan for micro-teaching. While the explanation commences in English, the teacher transitions to Turkish to ensure clear comprehension among all students. Such instances of translanguaging, predominantly observed during the final class session, likely emerged due to the

imminent micro-teaching sessions, demonstrating a shift toward increased Turkish use as the micro-teaching period approached.

4.1.2. Individual feedback

This particular form of translanguaging strategy predominantly revolved around furnishing students with feedback on their responses within activities tied to the lesson's focal point. These activities encompassed individual and group tasks, such as composing written assignments in phonetics and enunciating vocabulary items in the Listening and Phonetics course, along with participating in group discussions in the TEYL course. During these engagements, the teacher actively circulated among students, reviewing their work and answers, and offering feedback. This dynamic engendered a reciprocal interaction between the teacher and the students. A depiction from a Listening and Phonetics class further exemplifies this approach.

S: Şurada bunu yaptım. [I did this here.]

T: Regular “e”?

S: Şurada “a” ile “e” yazdım. [I did “a” and “e” in this part.]

T: But we do not have this sound in Turkish so it should be regular e.

S: Peki ya bu? [What about this one?]

T: This is not “e”, this is schwa, “ə”. Normal e yazmaya çalışır mısın? [Would you like to write normal “e”?]

S: Yazılışı bu mu acaba? [Is it written like this?]

T: Hayır, o diphthong. [No, it is a diphthong.] There it is. That is OK. Just do it.

In the highlighted instance, students were tasked with transcribing their own names into the phonetic alphabet. One student encountered challenges in this endeavour, particularly with the phonetic symbols for certain letters (“a,” “ə,” and “e”). Recognising the student's confusion, the teacher approached her to offer assistance. While the teacher initially employed English consistently, the student continued to communicate in Turkish. In order to facilitate smoother communication and comprehension, the teacher transitioned into Turkish, culminating in the student successfully identifying the correct phonetic representation of the intended letter from the phonetic table.

Similar instances of translanguaging for feedback during individual and group activities also manifested within the TEYL classes. In the provided example below, students were individually tasked with contemplating and designing their micro-teaching topics, alongside the activities they intended to incorporate. A student shared her prospective teaching concepts with the teacher in Turkish (abbreviated for brevity), followed by the teacher offering feedback in English. However, as the student's response remained unresponsive for a brief period, the teacher subsequently switched back to Turkish to ensure effective communication.

S: Sınıfı iki gruba ayırıp meyveleri ve renkleri öğreteceğim. Öncelikle ... [I will split the class into two groups. First, ...]

T: That is a very nice idea. Let me ask you a question. Do you think that 20-25 minutes is enough to teach both topics? Maybe, you can assume that they already know the colours, so you can teach fruits based on colours. (...) Zaten bildiklerini farzedebilirsin. İki konuyu da 20-25 dakikaya sığdırayım derssen olmaz. [You can assume that they already know it. You cannot teach both topics in 20-25 minutes.]

The underlying motive behind the aforementioned shift to Turkish could be attributed to the student's challenge in comprehending the teacher's English discourse. It's important to note that this occurrence is unlikely to stem from the student's low English proficiency level. Instead, it likely resulted from a transient state of confusion or an immediate comprehension gap intrinsic to spoken interactions. The employment of Turkish served as a rapid and effective remedy to sustain the conversation and attain the overarching objective—providing guidance to students for their assignments.

4.1.3. Encouragement

Another notable strategy in which the teacher employed translanguaging was to motivate students to actively participate in activities or engage with the class content. Students encountered challenges in grasping the essence of the lesson, particularly in the context of phonetics, possibly due to its novelty as a subject within their educational journey. In response, the teacher adroitly leveraged translanguaging to bolster students' confidence and familiarity with the material. The following classroom excerpt exemplifies the teacher's utilisation of a blend of Turkish and English to encourage students and enhance their interaction with the subject matter.

S: The letters (.) are written on the hmm (...)

T: Some sounds you mean? Some sounds are different from yours?

S: Toparlayamadım cümleyi. Buradakiler daha zor geldi, benimkiler biraz farklı. [I could not say it (in English). The ones on the board are difficult. Mine is different from those.]

T: Ah, alright. That is fine. Daha önce söylediğim gibi, “e” harfini farklı yazanlar olabiliyor. Veya uzun “i” de farklı olabiliyor. Sizi anlıyorum. [As I mentioned previously, the symbol of “e” can be written differently. “i” can also be different. I understand you.] If it is too difficult for you to read it, that is OK.

S: Can I read it?

T: Yeah, why not?

In the provided student-teacher exchange, the students were tasked with reading aloud a text inscribed in the phonetic alphabet on the board. One student encountered difficulties in articulating his concern in English, consequently facing an impasse. Despite the teacher's attempt to seek clarification, the student's predicament persisted, prompting a transition to Turkish in the conversation. Subsequently, the teacher extended empathy and encouragement in Turkish, followed by a reinforcement of encouragement in English. The application of translanguaging in this context appeared effective, as evidenced by the student's subsequent willingness to volunteer and read the text aloud.

4.2. Evolution of Translanguaging Practices Over Time

A meticulous analysis of the lesson transcripts yielded intriguing insights into the evolving use of translanguaging throughout the data collection period. By quantifying the instances of translanguaging within each lesson, it becomes evident that there exists no linear progression over time (Table 1 in Appendix). The occurrences of translanguaging instances spanned from zero to 21, indicating a marked variability contingent upon the unique dynamics of each class.

Observing Table 1, it becomes apparent that the employment of translanguaging was notably more frequent in the Listening and Phonetics course compared to the TEYL course, evident from the module averages (approximately 13 versus seven, respectively). This discrepancy could be attributed to the specific focus of the lessons in the Listening and Phonetics course, which predominantly delved into

intricate subjects such as phonetics and technical terminology encompassing homophones, homographs, and rhotic accent, among others. Notably, the highest number of translanguaging instances occurred during the 1st and 8th Listening and Phonetics lessons, dedicated to the phonetic alphabet and challenging English sounds. Given students' relative unfamiliarity with these concepts, the teacher judiciously employed a blend of Turkish and English to enhance the efficacy of teaching and mitigate potential anxiety stemming from unfamiliarity.

Conversely, the TEYL classes held a more generalised nature for students, as their own prior learning experiences had acquainted them with the setting of teaching young learners. The domain-specific terms were less extensive than those encountered in the other course, leading to an increased comprehension of the teacher's English usage by students. Consequently, the teacher limited translanguaging to a minimum or even refrained from its use entirely in certain TEYL classes (e.g., 2nd, 3rd, and 10th classes). In these instances, the teacher predominantly adopted a lecture-style approach to disseminate information on theories and critical aspects of working with children, such as classroom management.

Despite the generally subdued prevalence of translanguaging within the TEYL course, one class stands out—the final lesson—marked by the highest number of translanguaging instances. Delving into the planning of micro-teaching, the intricacies of sequencing, details of crafting lesson plans, and the teacher's expectations from students constituted the core of this lesson. Thus, the teacher endeavoured to ensure optimal comprehension among students, mitigating the potential complications arising from a lack of understanding through strategic use of translanguaging.

4.3. Teacher's Feelings about Translanguaging

The examination of the reflective journals illuminated the teacher's awareness of language use, particularly in the context of translanguaging. While the notes didn't quantify the extent of Turkish usage, they did encompass sections that outlined overarching anticipations pertaining to translanguaging. As an illustration, the entries following the initial session of the Listening and Phonetics course correlated with the elevated count of translanguaging instances observed within the same class (see Table 1). The reflective note is provided below.

It was one of the classes in which I used Turkish a lot, so I felt a little bit different in the lesson. However, following reflecting on it, I came to a conclusion that it was necessary because there were several moments to draw on Turkish such as comparing two languages, phonetics, consonant, and vowel. Since the focus was so technical rather than general, I felt the necessity of using Turkish. And it worked well in terms of achieving a higher level of comprehension for students.

In addition to offering insights into the potential extent of translanguaging, the highlighted journal entry unveils the teacher's well-founded justifications for integrating translanguaging into the teaching process. Notably, the teacher placed paramount importance on effectively conveying the essence of the lesson and thereby facilitating students' comprehension. This approach, rather than rigidly pursuing exclusive employment of English, was driven by the overarching goal of enhancing the learning experience.

While the initial impression might suggest that frequent resort to translanguaging could be perceived as unfavourable, a deeper exploration of the reflective notes elucidates the pedagogical merits it brings to the fore. The teacher's focus shifted towards acknowledging the pedagogical benefits that translanguaging could provide, particularly in terms of rendering teaching and learning more accessible

for students. This transformation implies a sense of contentment with the strategic use of translanguaging, driven by its positive impact on the educational process.

Nevertheless, instances existed where the teacher deemed translanguaging as non-essential. A case in point is reflected in the notes following the 3rd TEYL class, where the teacher articulated that the need for translanguaging was minimal owing to the effective delivery of the lesson content in English. This determination to maintain exclusive or predominantly English instruction arose from several factors: the teacher's role modelling for students, the general and manageable nature of the lesson, and the high comprehension level exhibited by the students.

I mostly used English in this lesson. There were times when I had difficulty in conveying information, but I still kept using English. The main reasons were my responsibility for setting a good model for students, high comprehension level of students, and focus of the lesson which was not very specific. When I asked myself if it would be better to use Turkish, the answer is no because students were able to understand what I said in English. I also noticed that my English use also encouraged students to speak in English, as they mostly tried to communicate in English with me and their classmates in groupworks.

The insights gleaned from the reflective notes underscore the intricate interplay of various factors that inform the teacher's language use strategies. The noted instances highlight that while the primary objective remained consistent—to effectively convey the lesson's meaning—the language deployment tactics varied significantly. One instance featured the use of translanguaging, while the other leaned towards exclusive English usage. These distinctions were rooted in a series of crucial considerations, further underscoring the multifaceted nature of language choices in educational settings.

Central to the decision-making process were two pivotal factors: the students' level of comprehension and the focus of the lesson. These two dimensions held sway over the teacher's choice to incorporate translanguaging or opt for a monolingual approach. In each instance, the teacher's ultimate satisfaction with the chosen language strategy stemmed from its seamless alignment with the overarching objectives of the courses.

Furthermore, the teacher's contentment could be intrinsically linked to the accommodating EMI policy of the institution. Unlike many traditional EMI contexts, where strict language mandates prevail, this institution's language policy provided leeway for flexibility. Consequently, the teacher could focus on the effective delivery of the course material without the undue burden of conforming to language norms. The decision-making process was largely propelled by the teacher's personal aspiration to utilize English, as succinctly elucidated in a reflective note as follows.

I wanted to feel an English atmosphere. It is an EMI department. However, apart from this, I noticed that I myself wanted to communicate in English. I wanted to create an English atmosphere. I wanted them to meet English as much as possible because I think it is useful for them.

5. Discussion

This study aimed to provide insights into translanguaging practices of a teacher educator in a tertiary level EMI context. It also explored how translanguaging changed over time as well as feelings stemming from using translanguaging in the course of teaching in two courses. Findings regarding the 1st RQ show that translanguaging was employed to facilitate learning and teaching through three main strategies: explanation, individual feedback, and encouragement. In terms of explanation in the Listening and Phonetics course, the necessity for translanguaging arose from the specific focuses of the module, such

as English sounds, phonetics, and pronunciation, since they were quite new to most of the students despite their sufficient proficiency level. From this viewpoint, this study differs from previous research revealing low proficiency level as the main reason for translanguaging use (Fang & Liu, 2020; Galloway et al., 2017; Huang, 2015; Tekin, 2020; Tekin & Garton, 2020). In the case of translanguaging in the TEYL course, the teacher used translanguaging less often, mainly for elaboration of the examination, as it included multiple tasks such as preparing lesson plans, writing observation and reflective notes, and micro-teaching. Translanguaging ensured a fuller comprehension of explanation for students.

In addition to the use of translanguaging for explanatory purposes while addressing the whole class, it was also utilised while dealing with students individually, specifically to provide feedback on their progress or correct answers. This type of translanguaging use could be considered particularly important, as previous research shows that teachers' use of translanguaging has a mitigating effect on students' anxiety (Brooks-Lewis, 2009; Bruen & Kelly, 2014; Hall & Cook, 2012; Huang, 2015). Supporting students by using translanguaging and putting them at ease could be seen as a useful way to engage them in the lesson without falling behind, as they might experience stress or anxiety when unable to comprehend. This finding aligns well with the results of Huang (2015), who investigated students' perspectives on EMI courses and discovered a reverse correlation between learning anxiety and achievement or motivation.

Closely tied to the previously mentioned purpose of translanguaging use is the encouragement of students. The teacher strategically alternated between Turkish and English, intentionally switching between these two languages, to provide encouragement to students who were struggling in English conversation, thereby maintaining the natural flow of the conversation. In this way, students gained more confidence in communicating in English, and as García and Li (2014) emphasized, a high level of communication was achieved through the teacher's use of translanguaging. This type of translanguaging use has also been documented in previous research (e.g., Tekin, 2020).

Regarding the 2nd RQ, while the findings do not indicate a consistent change over time, there was a noticeable variation in the amount of translanguaging across different classes in both courses. The primary determinant of this variation was the specific focus of the classes. For instance, the Listening and Phonetics course addressed technical aspects that were new to the students, necessitating a higher degree of translanguaging compared to the TEYL course. This aligns with the perspective of Cenoz and Gorter (2020), who suggest that teachers should consider such factors and deliberately integrate both languages to optimise student learning. This finding reinforces prior research that highlights the significant influence of contextual factors on translanguaging, with its use varying based on elements like lesson focus, students' existing knowledge, and individual teaching styles (Edstrom, 2006; McMillan & Rivers, 2011; Tekin & Garton, 2020). Given the inherent variability of translanguaging based on contextual factors, Edstrom (2009) underscores the complexity of determining a fixed language choice. Thus, empowering teachers to make informed decisions about when and why to employ translanguaging, while considering multiple variables, becomes paramount.

In response to the 3rd RQ, the teacher expressed a general satisfaction with the use of translanguaging in both courses. This stands in contrast to previous studies that revealed feelings of guilt among teachers when employing translanguaging (Copland & Neokleous, 2011; Littlewood & Yu, 2011; Macaro, 2005; Tekin, 2022; Tekin & Garton, 2020). This contentment can be attributed to several factors. Firstly, the teacher's primary goal was efficient teaching of the course material, irrespective of the language used. This achievement-oriented approach likely contributed to the teacher's satisfaction with successful

course delivery. Secondly, the institution's flexible EMI policy may have positively influenced the teacher's decision-making process regarding language use, providing a sense of relief. The teacher was able to employ translanguaging within the boundaries of the institution's language policy, which required a minimum of 70% English usage. As highlighted by Liu and Fang (2020), institutional policies can pose significant challenges for teachers wishing to implement translanguaging practices and adapt their language choices to the context.

This study resonates with Fang's (2018) assertion that EMI implementation should recognise the linguistic diversity inherent in a multilingual paradigm. This approach contrasts with a monolingual EMI strategy and potentially alleviates any guilt associated with translanguaging. The teacher's awareness of the bilingual-monolingual debate and the pedagogical benefits of a bilingual approach may have also influenced his comfort in developing translanguaging strategies. This highlights the importance of teacher education and training programs that empower educators to make informed decisions about language choice (Tekin, 2022). By doing so, teachers can confidently use translanguaging without negative emotional associations, an aspect emphasized by scholars such as Kumaravadivelu (1994) and Macaro (2005).

6. Conclusion

In conclusion, this research aimed to examine translanguaging strategies employed by a teacher educator, variations in their usage over time, and the emotions associated with using both Turkish and English in delivering two courses. The study revealed that translanguaging played a significant role in successful teaching, depending on the complexity of the lesson, and the teacher exhibited contentment with language choice even when translanguaging was not used in certain classes.

Drawing on the findings, several pedagogical implications can be highlighted. Firstly, translanguaging is a valuable tool in the teaching and learning process, contributing to its facilitation. While this study identified three main purposes for its use – explanation, individual feedback, and encouragement – it's important to acknowledge that translanguaging can serve various other purposes based on learners' needs. Secondly, the decision of whether to integrate translanguaging should rest with teachers, contingent on contextual factors. In some instances, its use might be considered essential for enhancing learners' comprehension, while in others, teachers might perceive it as unnecessary due to influencing factors. Thirdly, in light of the growing prominence of translanguaging in educational settings, teachers should feel comfortable incorporating it when necessary. If the primary goal is to enhance learners' understanding by employing their native language, teachers need not feel constrained by a strict L2-only policy. As demonstrated in this study, the use of translanguaging can be a natural part of teaching even in EMI contexts. Lastly, training that equips teachers to make informed decisions about translanguaging could prove valuable, allowing them to use it effectively without encountering negative emotions.

However, this study does have certain limitations. The primary limitation lies in the subjectivity of the teacher's perspective. Additionally, due to practical constraints, the study's data collection period was relatively short, spanning six weeks. Despite these limitations, this research provides insightful perspectives into the use of translanguaging in EMI contexts, particularly from an emic standpoint concerning emotional dimensions. Future studies could focus on translanguaging practices among both educators and learners in diverse EMI contexts, adopting a longitudinal research design to examine the influence of time and contextual factors on translanguaging. Such endeavours could further enrich our understanding of translanguaging strategies and the viewpoints of various stakeholders.

References

- Adams, T. E., Ellis, C., & Holman Jones, S. (2017). *The international encyclopedia of communication research methods*. John Wiley & Sons. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118901731.iecrm0011>
- Borg, S. (2001). The research journal: A tool for promoting and understanding researcher development. *Language Teaching Research*, 5(2), 156–177. <https://doi.org/10.1177/136216880100500204>
- Bourgoin, R. (2014). The predictive effects of L1 and L2 early literacy indicators on reading in French immersion. *Canadian Modern Language Review*, 70(3), 355–380.
- Brooks-Lewis, K. A. (2009). Adult learners' perceptions of the incorporation of their L1 in foreign language teaching and learning. *Applied Linguistics*, 30(2), 216–235. <https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/amn051>
- Brown, A. P. (2010). Qualitative method and compromise in applied social research. *Qualitative research*, 10(2), 229–248.
- Bruen, J., & Kelly, N. (2014). Using a shared L1 to reduce cognitive overload and anxiety levels in the L2 classroom. *The Language Learning Journal*, 45(3), 368–381. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09571736.2014.908405>
- Bryman, A. (2016). *Social Research Methods*. Oxford University Press.
- Campa, J. C., & Nassaji, H. (2009). The amount, purpose, and reasons for using L1 in L2 classrooms. *Foreign Language Annuals*, 42(4), 742–759. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1944-9720.2009.01052.x>
- Canagarajah, S. (2011). Codemeshing in academic writing: Identifying teachable strategies of translanguaging. *Modern Language Journal*, 95(3), 401–417. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.2011.01207.x>
- Cenoz, J. (2017). Translanguaging in school contexts: International perspectives. *Journal of Language, Identity and Education*, 16(4), 193–198. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15348458.2017.1327816>
- Cenoz, J., & Gorter, D. (2020). Teaching English through pedagogical translanguaging. *World Englishes*, 39(2), 300–311. <https://doi.org/10.1111/weng.12462>
- Conteh, J. (2018). Translanguaging. *ELT Journal*, 72(4), 445–447. <https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccy034>
- Copland, F., & Neokleous, G. (2011). L1 to teach L2: Complexities and contradictions. *ELT Journal*, 65(3), 270–280. <https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccq047>
- Council of Higher Education [CHE] (2022). *ELT undergraduate syllabus* https://www.yok.gov.tr/Documents/Kurumsal/egitim_ogretim_dairesi/Yeni-Ogretmen-Yetistirme-Lisans-Programlari/Ingilizce_Ogretmenligi_Lisans_Programi.pdf
- Creese, A., & Blackledge, A. (2010). Translanguaging in the bilingual classroom: A pedagogy for learning and teaching? *Modern Language Journal*, 94(1), 103–115. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.2009.00986.x>
- Dewaele, J. M. (2010). *Emotions in Multiple Languages*. Palgrave Macmillan. https://doi.org/10.1057/9780230289505_3
- Dörnyei, Z. (2007). *Research Methods in Applied Linguistics*. Oxford University Press.
- Edstrom, A. (2006). L1 use in the L2 classroom: One teacher's self-evaluation. *Canadian Modern Language Review*, 63(2), 275–292. <https://doi.org/10.3138/cmlr.63.2.275>
- Edstrom, A. M. (2009). Teacher reflection as a strategy for evaluating L1 / L2 use in the classroom. *Babylonia*, 1(9), 12–15.
- Fang, F. (2018). Review of English as a medium of instruction in Chinese universities today: Current trends and future directions. *English Today*, 34(1), 32–37. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0266078417000360>

- Galloway, N., Kriukow, J., & Numajiri, T. (2017). *Internationalisation, higher education and the growing demand for English: An investigation into the English medium of instruction (EMI) movement in China and Japan*. The British Council.
- García O., & Li W. (2014). *Translanguaging: Language, bilingualism and education*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Hall, G., & Cook, G. (2012). Own-language use in language teaching and learning. *Language Teaching*, 45(3), 271–308. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444812000067>
- Huang, D. F. (2015). Exploring and assessing effectiveness of English medium instruction courses: The students' perspectives. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 173, 71–78. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2015.02.033>
- Izquierdo, J., Martínez, V. G., Pulido, M. G. G., & Zúñiga, S. P. A. (2016). First and target language use in public language education for young learners: Longitudinal evidence from Mexican secondary-school classrooms. *System*, 61, 20–30. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2016.07.006>
- Kumaravadivelu, B. (1994). The Postmethod condition: (E)merging strategies for second/foreign language teaching. *TESOL Quarterly*, 28(1), 27. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3587197>
- Littlewood, W., & Yu, B. (2011). First language and target language in the foreign language classroom. *Language Teaching*, 44(1), 64–77. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444809990310>
- Liu, D., Ahn, G.-S., Baek, K.-S., & Han, N.-O. (2004). South Korean high school English teachers' code switching: Questions and challenges in the drive for maximal use of English in teaching. *TESOL Quarterly*, 38(4), 605–638. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3588282>
- Liu, Y., & Fang, F. (2020). Translanguaging theory and practice: How stakeholders perceive translanguaging as a practical theory of language. *RELC Journal*, 1–9. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0033688220939222>
- Macaro, E. (2005). Codeswitching in the L2 classroom: A communication and learning strategy. In E. Llurda (Ed.), *Non-native language teachers: Perceptions, challenges and contributions to the profession* (pp. 63–84). Springer US. https://doi.org/10.1007/0-387-24565-0_5
- Macaro, E. (2009). Teacher use of codeswitching in the second language classroom: Exploring “Optimal” use. In M. Turnbull & J. Dailey-O’Cain (Eds.), *First language use in second and foreign language learning* (pp. 35–49). Multilingual Matters.
- Macnamara, J. (2021). New insights into crisis communication from an “inside” emic perspective during COVID-19. *Public Relations Inquiry*, 10(2), 237–262. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2046147X21999972>
- McManus, K. (2015). L1-L2 differences in the acquisition of form-meaning pairings in a second language. *Canadian Modern Language Review*, 71(2), 155–181.
- McMillan, B. A., & Rivers, D. J. (2011). The practice of policy: Teacher attitudes toward “English only.” *System*, 39(2), 251–263. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2011.04.011>
- Nowell, L. S., Norris, J. M., White, D. E., & Moules, N. J. (2017). Thematic analysis : Striving to meet the trustworthiness criteria. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, 16, 1–13.
- Perry, F. L. (2011). *Research in Applied Linguistics: Becoming a discerning consumer*. Routledge.
- Sali, P. (2014). An analysis of the teachers' use of L1 in Turkish EFL classrooms. *System*, 42(1), 308–318. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2013.12.021>
- Silverman, D. (2013). *Doing qualitative research*. Sage.
- Stake, R. (2005). Qualitative Case Studies. In Denzin, N. K. and Lincoln, Y.S. (Eds.) *The Sage Handbook of Qualitative Research* (443-466). Sage.
- Tekin, S. (2020). *L1 practices of English teachers working in L2 classes in Turkish primary schools: How much, when, how and why?* [PhD Thesis, Aston University]. Aston publications. <https://doi.org/10.48780/publications.aston.ac.uk.00042475>

- Tekin, S. (2022). Translanguaging of pre-service EFL teachers in young learner classroom: A teacher educator perspective. In M. Tunaz & B. Aksu Ataç (Eds.), *Challenging issues in language teaching and learning* (pp. 171–183). Egiten Publishing.
- Tekin, S., & Garton, S. (2020). L1 in the primary english classroom: How much, when, how and why? *Iranian Journal of Language Teaching Research*, 8(3), 77–97. <https://doi.org/10.30466/IJLTR.2020.120935>
- Wang, D. (2019). Translanguaging in Chinese foreign language classrooms: Students and teachers' attitudes and practices. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 22(2), 138–149. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050.2016.1231773>
- Wei, L. (2022). Translanguaging as method. *Research Methods in Applied Linguistics*, 1(3), 1–4. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rmal.2022.100026>
- Wilden, E., & Porsch, R. (2020). Teachers' self - reported L1 and L2 use and self - assessed L2 proficiency in primary EFL education. *Studies in Second Language Learning and Teaching*, 10(3), 631-655. <https://doi.org/10.14746/ssllt.2020.10.3.9>
- Wilson, S. (2021). To mix or not to mix: Parental attitudes towards translanguaging and language management choices. *International Journal of Bilingualism*, 25(1), 58–76. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1367006920909902>
- Yin, R.K. (2016). *Qualitative research from start to finish*. Guilford.
- Zhou, X., & Mann, S. (2021). Translanguaging in a chinese university cil 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>

Appendix

Table 1 Frequency of translanguaging in each class

Courses Lessons	Listening and Phonetics	TEYL
1	18	8
2	7	0
3	11	1
4	16	5
5	16	12
6	16	2
7	2	2
8	17	14
9	-	11
10	-	0
11	-	9
12	-	21
Total:	103	85
Mean:	12,88	7,08