

**TC. KOCAELİ ÜNİVERSİTESİ  
SOSYAL BİLİMLER ENSTİTÜSÜ  
YABANCI DİLLER EĞİTİMİ ANABİLİM DALI  
İNGİLİZ DİLİ EĞİTİMİ BİLİM DALI**

**AN INVESTIGATION OF EFL TEACHERS' PERSPECTIVES  
ABOUT TRANSLANGUAGING IN THE AGE OF  
MULTILITERACIES: A SOCIO-CULTURAL PERSPECTIVE**

**(M.A. THESIS)**

**Rabia Damla ÖZYER**

**KOCAELİ, 2021**

**TC. KOCAELİ ÜNİVERSİTESİ  
SOSYAL BİLİMLER ENSTİTÜSÜ  
YABANCI DİLLER EĞİTİMİ ANABİLİM DALI  
İNGİLİZ DİLİ EĞİTİMİ BİLİM DALI**

**AN INVESTIGATION OF EFL TEACHERS' PERSPECTIVES  
ABOUT TRANSLANGUAGING IN THE AGE OF  
MULTILITERACIES: A SOCIO-CULTURAL PERSPECTIVE**

**(M.A. THESIS)  
English Language Teaching Program**

**Rabia Damla Özyer**

**Associate Professor Doctor DOĞAN YÜKSEL**

**KOCAELİ, 2021**

**TC. KOCAELİ ÜNİVERSİTESİ  
SOSYAL BİLİMLER ENSTİTÜSÜ  
YABANCI DİLLER EĞİTİMİ ANABİLİM DALI  
İNGİLİZ DİLİ EĞİTİMİ BİLİM DALI**

**AN INVESTIGATION OF EFL TEACHERS' PERSPECTIVES  
ABOUT TRANSLANGUAGING IN THE AGE OF  
MULTILITERACIES: A SOCIO-CULTURAL PERSPECTIVE**

**(M.A. THESIS)**

**English Language Teaching Program**

**Tezi Hazırlayan: Rabia Damla ÖZYER**

**Tezin Kabul Edildiği Enstitü Yönetim Kurulu Karar ve No:**

**10/11/2021 - 23**

**KOCAELİ, 2021**



Cennetin en güzel abisi  
NEJAT ÖZYER'e

## **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

As a person who tries to be grateful for what I have in my life, I would like to express my thanks to each person for their contributions to me during this challenging process. Firstly, I would like to thank my thesis advisor, Assoc. Prof. Dr. Dođan Yüksel for his support and encouragement in my academic and career life by supporting extra materials and constant suggestions. I would like to thank my committee members Assoc. Prof. Dr. Banu İnan Karagül and Asst. Prof. Dr. Cihat Atar for their feedback.

Next, I am sincerely thankful to my sister, Gamze Özyer and my mother, Jale Özyer for their trust in me and for making things easier in my life when I am in need. I would like to thank my father, Mazhar Özyer, who always invested in my education. Even though he received little, he always spent his last coins for my books without hesitation. I thank my dearest brother, Nejat Özyer for everything he did for my school life. He would have been the most proud one of me if he were alive now.

Additionally, I would like to thank my best friends Burak Bařar and Çiđdem Meriç for their never-ending patience and support in every aspect of my life. I am also thankful to my significant other, Sercan Karaçeper for his uplifting feedback and greatest effort in motivating me at all times.

Last but not least, I would like to express my eternal gratitude to the founder of our country, the head teacher Mustafa Kemal ATATÜRK. As a teacher, I swear I will try to walk incessantly towards the aims he has set on the path he has paved. Legends never die.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS</b> .....	<b>I</b>
<b>TABLE OF CONTENTS</b> .....	<b>II</b>
<b>ÖZET</b> .....	<b>V</b>
<b>ABSTRACT</b> .....	<b>VI</b>
<b>LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS</b> .....	<b>VII</b>
<b>LIST OF TABLES</b> .....	<b>VIII</b>
<b>INTRODUCTION</b> .....	<b>1</b>
<b>CHAPTER I</b> .....	<b>2</b>
<b>1. INTRODUCTION</b> .....	<b>2</b>
<b>1.2. BACKGROUND STUDY</b> .....	<b>2</b>
<b>1.3. PROBLEM STATEMENT</b> .....	<b>6</b>
<b>1.4. SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY</b> .....	<b>7</b>
<b>1.5. RESEARCH QUESTIONS</b> .....	<b>8</b>
<b>1.6. LIMITATIONS &amp; ASSUMPTIONS</b> .....	<b>8</b>
<b>1.7. DEFINITIONS OF TERMS</b> .....	<b>9</b>
<b>CHAPTER II</b> .....	<b>12</b>
<b>2. LITERATURE REVIEW</b> .....	<b>12</b>
<b>2.1. INTRODUCTION</b> .....	<b>12</b>
<b>2.2. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK</b> .....	<b>12</b>
<b>2.2.1. Vygotsky’s Sociocultural Theory</b> .....	<b>13</b>
<b>2.2.2. Multiliteracy Theory</b> .....	<b>18</b>
<b>2.3. TRANSLANGUAGING AND RELATED TERMS</b> .....	<b>21</b>
<b>2.4. TRANSLANGUAGING IN THE WORLD</b> .....	<b>24</b>
<b>2.4.1. Translanguaging in Content Courses</b> .....	<b>24</b>
<b>2.4.2. Translanguaging among Bilingual / Multilingual Learners</b> .....	<b>25</b>
<b>2.4.3. Translanguaging among Students with Special Needs</b> .....	<b>29</b>
<b>2.4.4. Translanguaging with Multimodalities</b> .....	<b>31</b>
<b>2.4.5. Translanguaging in Digital Platforms</b> .....	<b>33</b>
<b>2.4.6. Translanguaging with Paralinguistics</b> .....	<b>34</b>
<b>2.4.7. Translanguaging and Assessment</b> .....	<b>35</b>
<b>2.4.8. Translanguaging and Monolingual Bias</b> .....	<b>35</b>
<b>2.5. TRANSLANGUAGING IN TURKEY</b> .....	<b>39</b>

2.6. CONCLUSION.....	42
CHAPTER III .....	44
3. METHODOLOGY.....	44
3.1. RESEARCH QUESTIONS .....	44
3.2. PARTICIPANTS AND SETTING .....	44
3.3. DATA COLLECTION INSTRUMENTS .....	48
3.4. PROCEDURE .....	49
3.5. DATA ANALYSIS .....	49
3.5.1. Quantitative Analysis .....	49
3.5.2. Qualitative Content Analysis.....	51
3.5.3. Triangulation .....	52
3.6. INTERRATER RELIABILITY .....	53
3.7. SUMMARY .....	54
CHAPTER IV.....	55
4. RESULTS .....	55
4.1. FINDINGS RELATED TO RESEARCH QUESTION 1.....	55
4.1.1. Results related to the teachers’ perspectives about the frequency of students’ L1 use on the school basis.....	55
4.1.2. Results related to the teachers’ perspectives about the importance of students’ L1 use on the school basis.....	57
4.1.3. Results related to the teachers’ perspectives about the frequency of their L1 use on the school basis .....	60
4.1.4. Results related to the teachers’ perspectives about the importance of their L1 use on the school basis .....	62
4.2. FINDINGS RELATED TO RESEARCH QUESTION 2.....	65
4.2.1. Results related to the teachers’ perspectives about the frequency of students’ L1 use on the level basis .....	65
4.2.2. Results related to the teachers’ perspectives about the importance of students’ L1 use on the level basis .....	67
4.2.3. Results related to the teachers’ perspectives about the frequency of their L1 use on the level basis .....	68
4.2.4. Results related to the teachers’ perspectives about the importance of their L1 use on the level basis.....	71
4.3. FINDINGS RELATED TO RESEARCH QUESTION 3.....	72
CHAPTER V .....	86
5. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION .....	86

<b>5.1. INTRODUCTION.....</b>	<b>86</b>
<b>5.2. GENERAL OVERVIEW .....</b>	<b>86</b>
<b>5.3. DISCUSSION OF THE FINDINGS IN REFERENCE TO RESEARCH QUESTION 1.....</b>	<b>89</b>
<b>5.4. DISCUSSION OF THE FINDINGS IN REFERENCE TO RESEARCH QUESTION 2.....</b>	<b>90</b>
<b>5.5. DISCUSSION OF THE FINDINGS IN REFERENCE TO RESEARCH QUESTION 3.....</b>	<b>92</b>
<b>5.6. PEDAGOGICAL IMPLICATIONS .....</b>	<b>93</b>
<b>5.7. FURTHER RESEARCH.....</b>	<b>96</b>
<b>CONCLUSION.....</b>	<b>98</b>
<b>REFERENCES.....</b>	<b>100</b>
<b>APPENDICES .....</b>	<b>109</b>
<b>CV .....</b>	<b>121</b>



## ÖZET

Bu çalışma Türkiye’de farklı okul türlerinde çalışan EFL öğretmenlerinin dil alışımına karşı bakış açılarını ve tutumlarını keşfetmeyi amaçlamaktadır. Google Form aracılığıyla farklı devlet ve özel okullarında çalışan öğretmenlere içinde Likert ölçekli ve açık uçlu sorulara cevap verebilecekleri bir anket gönderilmiştir. Likert ölçekli sorulardan elde edilen nicel veri SPSS 25 aracılığıyla analiz edilmiştir. Bulgular öğretmenlerin dil alışımı uygulamalarına yönelik tutumlarının okul türü ve seviyeye göre değişip değişmemesine göre gösterilmiştir. Anketin sonundaki iki açık uçlu sorulardan elde edilen nitel buluntular ise çalışmanın nitel buluntularını desteklemek amacıyla incelenmiştir. Buluntular, öğretmenlerin tutumları hakkında genel sonuçlar çıkarmayı ve öğretmenlerin dil alışımı kullanımındaki amaçları ve sebepleri üzerine daha fazla ayrıntı bilgiye ulaşmayı sağlamıştır. Sonuçlar devlet okullarında çalışan öğretmenlerin dil alışımına, özel okulda çalışan öğretmenlerden daha büyük önem verdiğini ve bu yüzden sınıflarında öğrencilerin ana dillerine daha sık başvurduklarını göstermektedir. Seviye açısından bakıldığında ise, ilkokul ve üniversite öğretmenlerine karşın, orta okullarda ve liselerde çalışan öğretmenler dil alışımının uygulamalarının büyük önem taşıdığını ve sınıflarında daha sık kullandıklarını ifade etmektedirler. Ek olarak, özel okul öğretmenleri dil alışımının kaçınılması gerektiğine inansalar da, devlet okulu öğretmenlerinin çoğu dil alışımının kullanılmasını ya da dengeli kullanılmasını vurgulamaktadır. Sonuç olarak, öğretmenlerin cevaplarındaki pozitif çağrışımlar göz önünde bulundurulduğunda, dil alışımı okul türüne bakılmaksızın öğretmenlere çekici gelmektedir. Özellikle sonuçlara dikkat edildiğinde, bu araştırma farklı okul türlerindeki durumları iyileştirmek için dil alışımının etkin kullanımına yönelik öğretmen eğitim programları ihtiyacı çağrısını yapmaktadır.

**Anahtar Kelimeler:** dil alışımı uygulamaları, devlet okulu öğretmenleri, özel okul öğretmenleri, İngilizce dili öğretimi

## **ABSTRACT**

This study aims to explore EFL teachers' attitudes and perspectives about translanguaging practices in different school types in Turkey. The teachers working in various state schools and private schools were sent an online questionnaire in which they were able to respond to Likert-scale questions and open-ended questions through Google Forms. The quantitative data obtained from the Likert-scale questions were examined through SPSS (Statistical Package for Social Science) 25. The findings were represented regarding whether teachers' perspectives about translanguaging practices differed according to school type and school level. The qualitative data gathered from the two open-ended questions at the end of the questionnaire were also investigated in order to support the quantitative findings of the study. The findings enabled to draw general conclusions about teachers' attitudes and elaborate more on the purposes and reasons for teachers' use of translanguaging. The results show that state school teachers attach much more importance to translanguaging than private school teachers, and therefore, they more frequently resort to students' native language in the classroom. On the level basis, teachers working in secondary and high schools express that translanguaging practices are of great importance, and they use it in the classroom more frequently than the teachers working in primary schools and universities. Moreover, it is emphasized that translanguaging should be used or balanced by the majority of state school teachers, while the majority of private school teachers believe that it should be avoided. Overall, translanguaging appeals to the teachers regardless of the school type given the positive connotations in teachers' responses. By paying special attention to the results, this study calls for the urgent need for teacher training programs about the effective use of translanguaging in order to ameliorate the conditions in different school types.

**Keywords:** translanguaging practices, state school teachers, private school teachers, English language teaching

## **LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS**

CLD: Culturally and Linguistically Diverse

CLIL: Content Language Integrated Learning

EAP: English for Academic Purposes

EFL: English as a Foreign Language

ELL: English Language Learners

ELT: English Language Teaching

ESL: English as a Second Language

FFL: First Foreign Language

IDZ: Intermental Development Zone

L1: First Language / Mother tongue

L2: Second Language

L3: Third Language

ML: Multiliteracy theory:

SCT: Sociocultural Theory

SFL: Second Foreign Language

TL: Target Language

ZPD: Zone of Proximal Development

## LIST OF TABLES

Table 1.....	45
Table 2.....	46
Table 3.....	47
Table 4.....	55
Table 5.....	57
Table 6.....	60
Table 7.....	62
Table 8.....	65
Table 9.....	67
Table 10.....	69
Table 11.....	71
Table 12.....	73
Table 13.....	75
Table 14.....	75
Table 15.....	77
Table 16.....	81

## **INTRODUCTION**

Translanguaging has been one of the most frequently investigated research areas across the world; however, there is still a paucity of research from a Turkish context in the existing literature. Therefore, this study aims to explore EFL teachers' attitudes and perspectives about translanguaging practices in different school types in Turkey. The teachers working in different state schools and private schools across the country took part in the study by filling out an online questionnaire. The questionnaire includes 5-Likert-scale questions as well as two more open-ended questions.

The quantitative data obtained from the Likert-scale questions were examined through SPSS (Statistical Package for Social Science) 25. The findings were represented in respect to whether teachers' perspectives about translanguaging practices differed according to school type and school level. The qualitative data gathered from the two open-ended questions at the end of the questionnaire was also investigated through written content analysis in order to support the quantitative findings of the study. The findings enabled to draw more reliable conclusions about teachers' attitudes and elaborate more on the purposes and reasons for teachers' use of translanguaging. The triangulation method was employed in data analysis so as to provide more reliable and stronger interpretation of the findings.

The results show that state school teachers attach much more importance to translanguaging than private school teachers, and therefore, they more frequently resort to students' native language in the classroom. On level basis, teachers working in secondary schools and high schools express that translanguaging is of great importance and they use it in the classroom more frequently than the teachers working in primary schools and universities. Moreover, it is emphasized that translanguaging should be used or balanced by the majority of state school teachers, while the majority of private school teachers believe that it should be avoided. It can be concluded that teachers, in general, do not have sufficient knowledge about translanguaging and its practical use in the classroom.

## **CHAPTER I**

### **1. INTRODUCTION**

In this chapter, with the central focus on translanguaging, the importance of L1 use in language classrooms and different classroom contexts is discussed and explained prior to the rise of the translanguaging term. Related terms and identical theories to translanguaging are also mentioned to give the background knowledge of translanguaging. In order to explain the importance of this paper, problem statement, significance of the study, research questions, hypothesis, limitations, assumptions, and definitions have been respectively given in detail.

### **1.2. BACKGROUND STUDY**

English has become a fundamental property of the whole world since the introduction of English as a lingua franca. This phenomenon has given rise to the urgent need of learning English for every country, especially for developing countries in order to maintain the financial stability and welfare of their nations. In the new global world, teaching English has become a central issue for educators. Policy makers, curriculum designers and educators are assigned with all-out missions so as to meet the educational challenges of the societies. Some countries in the world are successful at teaching English while some still have a long way to achieve. According to the latest publication of The English Proficiency Index (2016), the Netherlands, Denmark and Sweden are the top three countries with the highest English proficiency and teaching English quality around the world by 72.16, 71.15 and 70.81 points in “very high” index group. Turkey fails to achieve on the Europe average, which is 53.49, as its index has been recorded as 47.89 in the group of “very low”.

In Turkey, 2<sup>nd</sup> graders started to be taught English with the new system change, namely 4+4+4, in 2013-2014 educational year. With this great change, it has been

aimed to employ a wide variety of teaching approaches, methods and techniques in language classes. Numerous private courses have been established in order to better supplement the national educational system, and parents have cast their money on their children's education starting from an early age. Despite all the efforts, learning English has remained to be a classic problem in the field of teaching English as long as the students prefer speaking in Turkish no matter how much the teacher is trying to push them to respond in English. However, the literature has proven the evidence of using the native language in English classrooms has quite ameliorating effects on the improvement of English proficiency. Learners are highly dependent on their first language (L1) while formulating and internalizing the features of the target language. According to Gass and Selinker (1994), learners employ a set of mental strategies using their L1 in order to understand what works in the target language. Learners' use of L1 possesses cognitive, communicative and social attributions on the process of L2 learning. Supportive studies of native language use show that students insist on using their native language to make connections with the target language.

Cook (2001) claims that the use of native language in foreign language classrooms is a natural process for students to be proficient communicators in English as they try to build up their linguistic and grammatical knowledge through using their native languages. Furthermore, he recommends that teachers should not give up on speaking in the target language (English); instead, they should maximize their use of English to help students internalize more. From a Turkish setting, Sali (2014) investigates the function of mother tongue in three English classes and finds out that L1 serves academic, managerial and social/cultural assets. The teachers depend on multiple factors as to when and why to switch to L1 so that students can benefit from the planned and limited amount of Turkish use in classrooms, receive clearer instructions, have a lower level of anxiety and save time when dealing with the tasks.

Turnbull and Arnett (2002) explored teachers' use of target language and first language in ESL and EFL language classrooms with respect to "*exposure to target language input, student motivation, cognitive considerations, code-switching, and appropriate teacher use of L1*" (p. 204). The review showed that a consensus occurred over the teachers' beliefs as to the use of L1, and it was mainly preferred to explain grammar, clarify the meaning, discipline the students, interact informally, build up trust in students. In this direction, Sert (2005) proposes that educators must have an

understanding about the underlying factors of teachers' code-switching between the native language and the target language. He further claims that this understanding will provide them with the consciousness of its use, thus will "lead to betterment of instruction" (p.1). Similarly, Akkaya and Atar (2015) augmented the number of teachers' reasons for code-switching to 13 pedagogical reasons: "ensuring comprehension, checking comprehension, eliciting L1 equivalent, giving expanded explanation, giving feedback, classroom management, shift to main topic, encouraging learners to use L2, for humour, dealing with procedural trouble, time management, expressing cultural identity and providing metalanguage information" (p.53). In a parallel study, Yuksel and Inan-Karagül (2017) aimed to identify the functions of L1 use of teachers and students in EFL classrooms in a Turkish university. They pointed out that teachers preferred L1 use while teaching grammar, referring the borrow words, assisting comprehension as well as dealing with classroom management along with affective and social reasons. As for the L1 use of students, floor holding, equivalence and conflict control were among the observed reasons.

The views towards the role of L1 in language classrooms are considerably varied among English language teachers (Duff & Polio, 1990; Ellis & Shintani, 2014; Turnbull & Dailey-O'Cain, 2009). Macaro (2009) labels these variations among the teachers as virtual, maximal and optimal. He explains that the teachers who adopt virtual stance believe that L1 use has no room in the classroom, which should be abstained no matter why. Then, he explains the teachers who hold maximal stance advocate that exclusive use of L2 is the best practice, but L1 use cannot be avoided because of the nature of L2 classrooms. However, the teachers who argue in favour of optimal stance consider L1 use as an enhancement for the second language acquisition since a plausible degree of codeswitching is a notable element in communicative classrooms.

McMillan and Rivers (2011) investigated the attitudes of teachers towards 'English-only' ideology at a Japanese university and illustrated that the selective use of L1 played a major role in enhancing L2 learning in contrast to the official policies and curricula. The amount of L1 use could be based on a scale bearing such factors as students' proficiency levels and the difficulty of the tasks in mind. Despite teachers' resistance to continue in the target language, students were able to benefit from



learning effectively when guided with ‘English-mainly’ rather than ‘English-only’ ideology. As Cummins (2007: p.233) claims: “learning efficiencies can be achieved if teachers explicitly draw students’ attention to similarities and differences between their languages”. Based on this viewpoint, Gallagher (2020) investigated the twenty-four EFL teachers’ views about code-switching in the classrooms from both shared-L1 and multilingual contexts. The findings of the extensive interviews suggested that EFL teachers should hold fluid, flexible and mixed views regarding the use of L1, which polished the need for more explicit attention to this area in teacher development and training. Up till now, the studies in the literature review have shown that native language – either under the name of code-switching or simply L1 use – has favorable effects on second language learning and teaching processes. Although the reasons for L1 use in the classrooms may differ, it can be said that the general attitude towards translanguaging is more welcoming than the total avoidance of native language use.

Investigating the failures of teaching English is a continuing concern within countries' policies regarding the context in which English is taught. In the field of teaching English, ESL (English as a Second Language) and EFL (English as a Foreign Language) are the most commonly referred acronyms, and they are adopted on the basis of the status and function of English in the countries. ESL refers to the field of English as a second language context in which courses, classes and/or programs are designed for students learning English as an additional language. According to Nayar (1997), the students' exposure to English is not only limited within the borders of their learning environments, and they have to use English officially for communicative purposes apart from the classroom contexts.

On the other hand, EFL refers to the field of English as a foreign language context in which students are taught English as a subject such as other contents like history, geography, and so on. In this context, the only chance for learners of English to be exposed to the target language is the learning environment: language classrooms. EFL learners, like in Turkey, do not have to use English necessarily out of their classroom, which lowers the amount of exposure to the target language and chances of being proficient communicators.

In spite of the distinctions between these two different contexts, the native language of the students in EFL contexts is an all and only source for teachers to

exploit in order to make meanings understood and the conversations flow in a problem-free way. From this standpoint, translanguaging seems to be a promising process since it promotes deeper and fuller understandings of the subject matter and helps the development of the weaker language. Therefore, translanguaging can be a key practice to be employed in both contexts because it enables a space where students bring different dimensions of personal histories, attitudes, beliefs and ideologies, cognitive and physical capacities, experiences and environments into a meaningful performance as Wei (2011) suggests.

### **1.3. PROBLEM STATEMENT**

Translanguaging has been subject to much research in English language teaching in bilingual and multilingual classrooms within ESL and EFL contexts across the world for over two decades (Fang & Liu, 2020). The shifts between the languages among multilinguals and bilinguals have always been in my attraction zone, wondering why, when and where they change in between the languages. When reviewing the literature on this specific issue, it is clear that little attention has been paid to translanguaging in Turkey, while quite a lot enlightening studies have been carried out in the world. One of them is the unique study of Nambisan (2014), in which she probes into teachers' attitudes towards translanguaging and its uses in English classrooms in an ESL context in Iowa. This particular study inspired me in terms of what English teachers' attitudes in Turkey can be towards translanguaging and what practices they adopt in their language classrooms.

Based on Nambisan's study, Yuvayapan (2019) made a contribution to Turkish literature, bringing translanguaging to the surface of research interests. In her study, she only worked with 50 EFL teachers using the same methodology as Nambian's. However, the generalizability of much-published research on this issue will remain problematic as long as the studies are conducted with a small number of participants. This prompted me to chase after a far-reaching study including more EFL teachers to be able to draw a general picture of the current educational climate towards translanguaging and its practices in Turkey.

#### **1.4. SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY**

With this current study, it is firstly aimed to arouse curiosity among the teachers who have never heard of what translanguaging is. As a very under-researched topic in Turkey, it is quite expected that Turkish teachers will be unaware of the term ‘translanguaging’. My aim is to help them name what their practices are, and find out if they - unconsciously or not - use translanguaging in their classrooms. Secondly, since it is a freshly investigated area in the world, more up-to-date studies should be dedicated to the literature from Turkish settings to be able to be a part of new English language teaching trends in the world. Providing the literature with such studies may help teacher education programs in that pre-service teachers may gain more insights about the current flows of English language teaching. Teacher educators also may take on the incorporation of translanguaging in some of their classrooms to explore its potentials. Thirdly, when compared to that of Yuvayapan (2019), this study was performed with a greater sampling which makes it easy to grasp confidential deductions about the genuine practices of teachers in Turkey.

The literature proves that translanguaging activities are employed by many scholars and have plenteous pedagogical advantages on second language teaching and learning (Baker, 2011). In view of all the studies presented so far, one may deduce that translanguaging plays a critical role in a wide domain of areas from skill learning to abstract concepts of the languages. Since it is a freshly introduced approach, forthcoming studies related to translanguaging practices will be of great importance in expanding the boundaries of translanguaging itself as an approach and the opportunities of its use in more classrooms as practice. English is taught as a second language in Turkey, which enable Turkish students and teachers to make use of translanguaging practices efficiently with the help of multiple modes.

Although translanguaging has been a de facto intriguing area to be investigated, few studies have been able to draw on any systematic research into translanguaging in Turkey when the relevant background is reviewed. By highlighting the need, this present study aims to see the teachers’ perspectives towards translanguaging in Turkey based on Nambisan’s study (2014) in Iowa. This study aims to shed light on what teachers know, think about translanguaging and when they implement it in the

classrooms. It also uncovers how English is taught through translanguaging practices with their benefits and drawbacks.

## **1.5. RESEARCH QUESTIONS**

In particular, this paper seeks to address the following research questions:

1. Do the EFL teachers' perspectives towards translanguaging vary according to the school type?
  - a. What are the EFL teachers' perspectives about the frequency and importance of L1 use by the students?
  - b. What are the EFL teachers' perspectives about the frequency and importance of L1 use by the teachers?
2. Do the EFL teachers' perspectives towards translanguaging vary according to the level of the school?
  - a. What are the EFL teachers' perspectives about the frequency and importance of L1 use by the students?
  - b. What are the EFL teachers' perspectives about the frequency and importance of L1 use by the teachers?
3. What are the EFL teachers' general attitudes towards translanguaging practices?
  - a. Do the perspectives of state school teachers and private school teachers towards translanguaging differ?
  - b. For which situations do they think translanguaging is beneficial / detrimental?

## **1.6. LIMITATIONS & ASSUMPTIONS**

There is still too much to discover about the translanguaging practices in the classrooms. One of the greatest limitations of this study is that it solely investigates

the perspectives and attitudes of teachers. Further research is needed to uncover those of students' in order to better assist them. As the most important limitation, this study fails to include examples from classroom discourse practices, which would significantly backbone the study qualitatively. Instead of genuine examples taken from the classrooms, this study included additional notes provided by teachers in the open-ended questions.

In this research, it is assumed that the participants answered the personal questions and completed the questionnaire sincerely. The researchers did not add or omit any subject or data for malicious intentions during the processes of data collection and analysis. The unrelated factors which could undermine both the process of questionnaire complementation of participants' and data interpretation are supposed to be eliminated in order to present scientific results.

## **1.7. DEFINITIONS OF TERMS**

The following terms are used and emphasized throughout this study.

*Translanguaging*: is a term used to define the pedagogical practices in which students rely on their full linguistic repertoire besides spoken languages in language classrooms (Garcia & Wei, 2017). In this study, translanguaging simply refers to the use of L1 (Turkish) as well as English and other communicative modes such as body language, symbols and digital tools.

*Code-switching*: is a “simple shift or shuttle between two separated language systems” (Garcia & Wei, 2017: p.22). It is also called as the selection and alteration of the linguistic elements to contextualize talk in interaction.

*Code-meshing*: is a strategy for “merging local varieties with standard written Englishes in a move toward gradually pluralizing academic writing and developing multilingual competence for transnational relationships” (Canagarajah, 2006: p.586).

*Translingual practice*: is an umbrella term -*translingual practice* - for all these terms that are surrounded by language activities in multilingual contexts (Canagarajah, 2013).

*Translanguaging space*: is a social space into which different dimensions of personal histories, attitudes, beliefs and ideologies, cognitive and physical capacities, experiences and environments are brought using different linguistic structures, systems and modalities (Wei, 2011).

*Crosslinguistic pedagogy*: is an approach for encouraging “bilingual learners to draw on all of their linguistic resources regardless of the focus of instruction or the status of the target language” (Ballinger, Lyster, Sterzuk, & Geneseen, 2017: p. 30).

*Multiliteracy theory*: is a freshly introduced theory that can be seen as an extension of the socio-cultural theory. It refers to the way of combining local diversity and global connectedness together to teach through multiple forms of communicative technologies (New London Group, 1996).

*Multilingual/Multilingualism*: Multilingual is a person who speaks more than two autonomous languages, and the practice of alternately using more than two languages is called multilingualism.

*Bilingual/Bilingualism*: Bilingual is a person who speaks two autonomous languages, and the practice of alternately using two languages is called bilingualism.

*Monolingual/Monolingualism*: Monolingual is a person who only speaks one language, and the practice of speaking only one language is called monolingualism.

*English-only-policy*: refers to the use of English as the medium of communication and instruction in the classroom. It simply rejects the use of other languages other than English and advocates the extensive use of English.

*Multimodality*: means the application of multiple literacies and modes in a medium. It is the combination of written and spoken languages, symbols, and other artefacts that contribute to understanding a context to a greater extent.

*Multidisciplinary*: addresses employing “multiple disciplines to redefine problems outside of normal boundaries and reach solutions based on a new understanding of complex situations” (Sadkhan & Abbass, 2013: p.464).



## **CHAPTER II**

### **2. LITERATURE REVIEW**

#### **2.1. INTRODUCTION**

This chapter will reflect the theoretical framework and perspectives on translanguaging pedagogy firstly. The definition of translanguaging and other related terms are explained and compared prior to the discussion of studies existing in the literature. Previous studies about translanguaging will be discussed in two sections: translanguaging in the world and translanguaging in Turkey. The benefits and challenges of the implementation of translanguaging, teachers' and students' beliefs towards the use of translanguaging from multiple educational settings and different points of views will be shown in depth as a basis for the current study.

#### **2.2. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK**

This current study was mainly grounded in two theoretical points of view: Sociocultural Theory (SCT) and Multiliteracy theory (ML). In order to provide scientific insights into research questions, these two theories were employed in accordance with the nature of translanguaging practice. Multiliteracy theory, which can be seen as an upgraded and modern term to socio-cultural theory, and socio-cultural theory - the older theory from which multiliteracy emerged- were discussed in detail. The rationales that both theories have in common were shown to demonstrate the reason for selecting these theories as the theoretical framework for this study.



### 2.2.1. Vygotsky's Sociocultural Theory

Taking its origins in the writings of the Russian psychologist and psycholinguist L.S. Vygotsky and his colleagues in the early 20th century, SCT treats language as a “tool for thought” that mediates the human mind since it enables to organize, structure and focus the attention of our thinking (Lantolf, 2000; Luria, 1982). It is evident that the development of verbal mediation starts with private speech for behaviour regulation (Vygotsky, 1978). It continues with more recent terms such as languaging (Becker, 1988) and translanguaging (Li, 2011, 2016). The fact that sociocultural theory and translanguaging bear three strong connections in common makes the selection of SCT as a theoretical framework unveiled. Garcia and Wei (2014) juxtapose these connections as a) language is seen as a socially constructed symbolic artefact to interact with and within the world, b) an activity for effective communication, and c) a multidisciplinary tool.

SCT has had an immense effect on the field of education, especially on foreign language teaching and learning processes. Vygotsky (1978) emphasizes the importance of socio-cultural factors in the development of mental processes along with the biological factors as socio-cultural settings are essential and determinant between the interaction of learners and the environment. Not denying the biological and neurobiological factors, Vygotsky puts greater stress on the importance of interactions within social contexts for human's cognitive ability development (Lantolf and Thorne, 2007). According to SCT, learning occurs *in* rather than *as a result of* the interaction (Lantolf, 2000).

There are five fundamental concepts in SCT. As the central notion of sociocultural theory, *mediation* is identified as the use of ‘tools’ (Fahim & Haghani, 2012). “All specifically human psychological processes (so-called higher mental processes) are mediated by psychological tools such as language, signs, and symbols” (Karpov & Haywood, 1998: p. 27). Vygotsky stated that humans can control their consciousness by using such tools as language, literacy, numeracy, etc., which play as a buffer role in mediating between humans and their social milieu (Lantolf and Thorne, 2007). Overall, these tools and signs in humans' sociocultural environment mediate

new patterns of thought (Smith & Pourchot, 1998) and human mental functioning is mediated by these cultural artefacts, activities and concepts (Lantolf, 2000).

SCT treats language as a chief means of mediation. Lantolf (2000) refers to language as the most pervasive tool through which people “mediate their connection to the world, to each other, and to themselves” (p. 201). Even though the languages are artefacts or symbolic, they reflect such cultural, social and historical attributions of their users (Turuk, 2008). Since languages play a crucial role by bringing all linguistic and paralinguistic repertoire that language users possess into interaction, learners are significantly mediated if they are enhanced with a wide range of linguistic diversity and enrichment. Such kind of interaction is accomplished by the unification of social and cultural mediations, which is also referred to as *activity*, which is an important term in the scope of SCT. This term was coined by Leontev, who was one of Vygotsky’s students and extended by Luria (1979) as the occurrence in the brain controlled by the most important cultural artefact: language.

In the same manner as Luria (1979), Lantolf (2000) also advocates that an activity can be inspired and driven because of not only biological needs such as the need for food or shelter but also social needs, like the need to socialize and get literate. It is, thereupon, believed that social interaction is an activity, which is reinforced by natural needs and motives and performed with the mediational tool: language. From social-interactional perspectives in the domain of Second Language Acquisition (SLA), language is viewed as a mode of communication that enables students to express themselves and transmit information from one to another. Each student relies on and brings their unique cultural characteristics to the interaction setting, including different languages and communicative resources such as mimics, gestures and so on. That is why, any tool that helps students mediate and ultimately internalize (e.g. mother tongue, home culture) cannot be dissociated from the interaction setting. Swain and Lapkin (2000) propose the functions of the use of first language in the foreign language classrooms as a facilitator both in interpersonal interaction and internalization of the task needed for learning and development. Escobar and Dillard-Paltrineri (2015) state that language is not only a communicative tool; it is a high-power tool that mediates cognition and affectivity as well. Similarly, it can be deduced

from that statement that the use of more than one language in the process of language learning may leverage the effectiveness of learning.

SCT offers a holistic view about learning in that skills and knowledge should be taught with all its complexity instead of in isolation. According to Vygotsky, the key to the effective learning is hidden in the nature of social interaction between people who have distinctive levels of skills and knowledge (Wertsch, 1985). Learning arises from the interactions and interplays between the students and teachers and what they bring from their backgrounds to the learning situation. In this sense, individual's cognitive development is affected by the social interaction as to where and by whom it is accomplished (Donato & McCormick, 1994). As Vygotsky claims, learning per se does not take place in the individuals' minds; instead, it is polished and fostered in the social territory via interaction. Not tellingly, since social interaction is regarded as the beginning point of the cognition development, it can be said that *internalization* occurs as a result of social interaction with others (i.e., adults, capable peers and other artefacts). Regarding this issue, Karpov and Haywood (1988) summarize the process of internalization with adults teaching tools to learners, and then the learners internalizing these tools and finally these tools mediating the learners' psychological processes. In the adaptive schooling context, students are assisted during a new task by their more capable peers or teachers first, and then students internalize the task in order to perform it on their own eventually (Ellis, 2000). This unique phenomenon serves as proof that social interaction functions to mediate learning.

In order to reveal the students' internalization of the tools, Vygotsky (1978) introduced a notion called *The Zone of Proximal Development* (ZPD). ZPD is the distinction that Vygotsky (1978) made clear between the children's actual and potential levels of development. Lantolf (2000) defines ZPD as "an activity frame that relates the current developmental level to the potential development that is possible through collaboration with a more competent tutor" (p. 211). With the help of the social interaction, learners are able to move into or through the next level of knowledge, gain understandings and insights. The major role of language as a mediational tool is to help learners move into and through their ZPD, which is of particular importance in learning (Williams & Burden, 1997). Furthermore, Cook (2008) elaborates on Vygotsky's ZPD by underlying the fact that ZPD is "the gap

between the learner's current state and their future knowledge is bridged by assistance from others; learning demands social interaction so that the learner can internalize knowledge out of external action" (p. 229). As can be understood, social interaction is acknowledged as the milestone for students' ZPD where interpsychological functions are developed into intrapsychological functions. On account of learning, these functions are activated only when students interact with their peers or the adults in their environment. Commenting on the issue of these learning environments, Ortega (2009) points out that "what matters in the linguistic environment is not simply 'what's out there' physically or even socially surrounding learners, but rather what learners make of it, how they process (or not) the linguistic data and how they live and experience that environment" (p. 8).

The major pedagogical implications of ZPD hold robust links with social interaction and collaboration with other people. According to Newman, Gleitman and Cole (1989), dialogic interaction and social mediation are the core elements for learning and development to occur (as cited in Lantolf & Thorne, 2006). Arising from the social interaction, an important constructed process which can be interpreted as social assistance is needed to maintain the dialogic interaction and social mediation. This kind of social assistance is named as *scaffolding* and offered by Bruner (1986). He spots the similar process of children's acquiring their first language with parents' continuous scaffolding through conversations. Scaffolding is an undeniably fundamental conception in SCT, and it is steadily associated with ZPD because, according to Walqui (2006), "creating contexts for linguistic and academic learning in the ZPD occurs in part through the scaffolding of social interaction" (p. 163). In the collaborative tasks, learners are scaffolded by their more competent peers or the teacher in order to accomplish the task that they would not manage to do on their own. Such collaboration engenders the co-construction of the linguistic knowledge in their ZPD.

The aforementioned social assistance has been defined under various terms such as 'scaffolding' (Wood, Bruner & Ross, 1976), 'collaborative dialogue' (Swain, 2000), 'instructional conversation' (Donato, 2000) and 'assisted performance' (Ohta, 2001); however, scaffolding is the most oft-cited term of all in the connotative perspectives of SCT. Using scaffolding as a strategy in the educational settings where

the responsibility is handed down from teachers or competent peers to the students provides plentiful assets. According to McKenzie (1999), “scaffolding a) provides clear directions for students, b) clarifies the purpose of the task, c) keeps students on task, d) offers assessment to clarify expectations, e) points students to worthy sources, f) reduces uncertainty, surprise and disappointment, g) delivers efficiency, and h) creates momentum” (para.11).

In their seminal book, Ellis and Shintani (2014) mention the ways that teachers can scaffold their students’ contribution to interaction and feature six elements of scaffolding as Wood et al.’s (1976) list: “(a) recruiting interest in the task, (b) simplifying the task, (c) maintaining pursuit of the goal, (d) marking critical features and discrepancies between what has been produced and the ideal solution, (e) controlling frustration during problem-solving and (f) demonstrating an idealized version of the act to be performed” (p. 213). The studies relevant to corrective feedback have also justified the effectiveness of scaffolding (Aljaafreh & Lantolf, 1994; Nassaji & Swain, 2000). The common findings of these studies suggest that a kind of scaffolding that is modified over time eventually makes learners take their own responsibility for learning.

In a nutshell, the far-reaching concept of scaffolding simply means that a more knowledgeable person assists the less knowledgeable one to be successful in an activity or a task which the latter would not achieve by themselves without any assistance (Lantolf, 2007). As a result, it is plausible to sense the fact that scaffolding functions as a mechanism to bridge “the distance between the actual developmental level as determined by independent problem-solving and the level of potential problem-solving abilities as determined through problem-solving under adult guidance or in cooperation with more capable peers” (Vygotsky 1978: p. 86).

In view of all that has been mentioned so far, this present study was grounded in SCT with respect to its resemblance in viewing language as “mediational tools to create expanded zones” (Martin-Beltran, 2014: p. 211) or powerful means of communication used in “translanguaging space” (Wei, 2011: p.1223). Teachers’ attitudes towards the uses of translanguaging were attempted to be found and explained under the five important concepts of SCT: *mediation*, *activity*, *internalization*, *ZPD* and *scaffolding*, which were all demonstrated in detail in this part. Translanguaging

strategy and SCT both acknowledges language as a “socially constructed symbolic artefact that individuals use both for interacting with and within the world”, “an activity rather than an independent structure” (Swain, Kinnear, & Steinman, 2011: p. 51), and multidisciplinary mode of communication in which “language learners select features from a single array of disaggregated features that is always activated rather than a set of discrete and static features to be mastered” (Garcia & Wei, 2014: p. 15).

### **2.2.2. Multiliteracy Theory**

Translanguaging practices enhance the productive acts for teachers and students to benefit from multiple linguistic resources which are essential to literacy development (Working Group on ELL Policy, 2009). The great developments under the name of globalization have caused literacy to grow beyond the traditional print medium and gain new understandings, practices and pedagogies. These innovations in pedagogy emphasize the conception of learners who are socially, culturally, historically and at last critically aware students being responsible for their own learning and users of digital multimodal texts skillfully. New London Group (1996) called these practices ‘*multiliteracies*’, which refers to the way of combining local diversity and global connectedness together to teach through multiple forms of communicative technologies. The most necessary skill in the 21<sup>st</sup> century to acquire is to be able to interact through multiple and diverse communicative modes with audiences from a wide variety of cultural backgrounds speaking different languages. Therefore, teachers, as the greatest stakeholders of education, should guide students with the appropriate skills of this new digital age. Teaching English, henceforth, is gaining importance at an unprecedented speed as it is neither spoken by only a minority nor does it belong to a single community.

In this global village, as the recent term suggests, learning has been affected by social, economic and technological changes. The ways in which people used to communicate have started to leave their places to the black mirrors. The inevitable consequence of these changes has also been observed in educational settings, specifically in language learning, causing a sensation that “English is no longer a foreign language, but a basic skill” (Lasagabaster, Doiz & Sierra, 2014: p.2). As a

corollary, this rapidly changing world calls for new educational dimensions and responses to communication barriers that arise from the lack of focus on expanding notions of literacy because “it is no longer possible to think about literacy in isolation from a vast array of social, technological and economic factors.” (Kress, 2003: p.15). It is consequentially significant to comprehend what literacy has meant so far and will mean as the age advances and to what extent it will broaden its definitions. The New London Group (1996) defines literacy as traditionally having been only limited “to read and write in page-bound, official, standard forms of the national language” (p. 61). It is, by definition, “monolingual and monocultural and rule-governed forms of language” (p. 61). However, literacy does also include negotiating a multiplicity of discourses; that is why the scope of literacy should be extended culturally and linguistically in globalized communities across the world.

The term ‘multiliteracies’ refers to the way of combining local diversity and global connectedness together to teach through multiple forms of communicative technologies. Traditional literacy consists of reading, writing, listening and speaking. Multiliteracies theory, on the other hand, emphasizes the importance of creativity, technology and reflection of students besides only four skills. It simply focuses on real communication irrespective of linguistic or cultural differences, using multiple Englishes and multiple forms of communication. With the help of technology, the ultimate aim is to raise socially, culturally and historically aware students who are responsible for their own learning.

The New London Group (1996) proposes that multiliteracies pedagogy includes four components. The first, situated practice, practices on the experience of meaning-making in specified contexts. This meaning-making is unique for each participant and authentic to their contexts in that they combine the new with the known. The second component, overt instruction, develops an explicit meta-language to back up active interventions that pave the way for student learning. The third component, critical framing, makes sense of situated practice and overt instruction by rendering the social contexts and purposes pertinent to meaning-making. The ultimate goal is the last component, which is to “enact transformed practice where students, as meaning makers, become designers themselves and responsible for their own learning” (p. 87).

This pedagogy is comprised of three crucial processes for students. The available designs are first examined and redesigned with appropriate technologies. The students are asked to critically reflect on both of the available designs and designing processes. At the end of this critical reflection, the redesigned process shows that the students are capable of remaking and transforming sets of representational resources instead of just consuming or using the stable systems. The redesigned process employs a plethora of multiplicity of modes that are yielded in textual compositions. Teachers are required to equip students with the necessary skills to help them successfully participate in these processes. It is a must for teachers and teacher educators to develop “nuanced and critical understandings of these technologies and the literacies with which they are associated” (Swenson, Young, McGrail, Rozema, & Whitin, 2006: p. 353). With this specific and significant reason, examining the practices of teachers in order to gain insights into English education is vital in this dynamic world. Parallel to this, Gu (2018) addressed the crucial processes of multiliteracy pedagogy in an international conference on contemporary education. The paper focused on the prior designs, the process of designing and redesigns in a progressive way. It was announced that students could actively participate in social activities, and subsequently, they could gain automatic communication skills. They could also acquire the ability to compare original sources and reconstruct their own knowledge by redesigning the available designs and frameworks.

The term multiliteracy has gained importance since the world started to be more multicultural and multilingual as a result of the most basic yet simple need for people to survive with ease in this 21st-century technology. New London Group (1996) calls “multiliteracies”, “one in which language and other modes of meaning are dynamic representational resources, constantly being remade by their users as they work to achieve their various cultural purposes” (Cope & Kalantzis, 2000: p. 5). This digital era, fortunately, helps one reach the far end of the world, but “the key communicative challenge is to be able to cross-linguistic and cultural boundaries, both in the real and virtual world” (Dupuy, 2011: p.22). To be able to help our students cross these boundaries, as educators who are the most responsible stakeholders of the learning process, we should employ more authentic tasks in conformity with the needs of the students, basing our teaching on the robust theories, which can be managed through multiliteracies theory.



Translanguaging practices take its roots in multiliteracy theory as the rationales of what multiliteracy theory bears and translanguaging practices focus are overlapped and executed for the same purpose: to boost communication. “Multiliteracies creates a different kind of pedagogy, one in which language and other modes of meaning are dynamic representational resources, constantly being remade by their users as they work to achieve their cultural purposes” (New London Group, 1996). So far, the communicative capacity of operating multiple languages and multimodalities along with the integration of digital skills has been unfolded and supported by many researchers (Curiel, 2017; Tsimpli et al., 2019). In her dissertation, Curiel (2019) seeks the impacts of the translanguaging multiliteracies approach to teaching and learning using multimodal texts across content areas. She suggests that “translanguaging multiliteracies pedagogy takes from both theories and contemplates collaboration and cultural and linguistic resources for authentic student engagement and meaningful learning” (p.185). In a large longitudinal study by a group of Indian researchers, Tsimpli et al. (2019) proposed that possible solutions such as translanguaging or switching between two varieties of the same language could raise the learning outcomes to a higher extent in challenging learning settings.

### **2.3. TRANSLANGUAGING AND RELATED TERMS**

The term translanguaging was coined by Cen Williams in 1994 in his unpublished thesis and developed by many scholars (e.g., Canagarajah, 2011a; Garcia, 2009; Lewis, Jones & Baker, 2012; Wei, 2011). The definitions slightly differ, but in general, it refers to pedagogical practice in which students alternate languages for the purposes of receptive or productive use (Garcia & Wei, 2014). Baker, who first translated Welsh term as ‘translanguaging’, defines it as “the process of making meaning, shaping experiences, gaining understanding and knowledge through the use of two languages” (2011: p. 288). Lewis, Jones and Baker (2012) argue that both languages are utilized in a dynamic and functionally integrated way to organize and mediate mental processes in understandings, speaking, literacy, and, not least, learning. Translanguaging concerns effective communication, function rather than form, cognitive activity, as well as language production. Translanguaging is the new language practice which promotes

the language exchanges among people with different stories and understandings which are coded within their fixed language identities. It is neither a combination of two languages nor two distinct languages. Canagarajah (2011a) sees translanguaging as “the ability of multilingual speakers to shuttle between languages, treating the diverse languages as an integrated system” (p. 401).

Translanguaging is also different from *code-switching* in that it refers not simply to a shift or shuttle between two languages, but that construct the speakers’ complete language repertoire. García (2009) defines “translanguaging are multiple discursive practices in which bilinguals engage in order to make sense of their bilingual world” (p.44). These multiple discursive practices cannot be handled with one or two traditional definitions; therefore, translanguaging differs from code-switching as being a new whole approach for meaning-making. Wei (2011) suggests that translanguaging goes both between different linguistic structures, systems and modalities and goes beyond them. It is an act of bringing different dimensions of personal histories, attitudes, beliefs and ideologies, cognitive and physical capacities, experiences and environments into a meaningful performance creating a social space, which is called translanguaging space. Garcia and Lin (2017) explain that “translanguaging works by generating trans-systems of semiosis and creating trans-spaces where new language practices, meaning-making multimodal practices, subjectivities and social structures are dynamically generated in response to the complex interactions of the 21st century” (p.43).

Another term that is often encountered together with code-switching and translanguaging is *code-meshing*. Unlike code-switching, code-meshing is viewed as an integrated system among languages. Communicative modes and symbol systems are used in code-meshing, whereas only shifts and shuffles between languages are known to exist in code-switching. Canagarajah (2006) defines code-meshing as “a strategy for merging local varieties with standard written Englishes in a move toward gradually pluralizing academic writing and developing multilingual competence for transnational relationships” (p.586). Likewise, Young (2004) explains it as an approach to be called on for writing and interpreting passages that are blended in language codes in social contexts. In one of his seminal studies of Canagarajah (2011b), an Arabian student Bhutainah used translanguaging in her writing drafts,

which enabled her to organize her ideas better thanks to the possibility of using her own language flexibly. She did not leave her identity and language; instead, she treated the languages as a whole system and moved on with her writings, leaning on both languages. Parallel to the findings of this study, Valesco and Garcia (2014) recommend bilingual learners to use translanguaging as a self-monitoring mechanism in their writing tasks as it is proven to be efficacious in improving writing skills.

Overall, to try to add clarity about the terminology, Canagarajah (2011b) claims that translanguaging and code-meshing deal with the languages as a single unified system while code-switching, as its name signifies, means altering the language using two different systems which can be observed as transfer, borrowing or interference between languages. In translanguaging and code-meshing, other sources of communication such as body language, gestures, mimics, sign languages or symbols are also recruited besides spoken languages because they broaden the lens by embracing various communicative modes. However, Canagarajah (2013) introduced an umbrella term *-translingual practice* - for all these terms that are surrounded by language activities in multilingual contexts. He advocates that the term translanguaging has been acknowledged in cognitive terms as if it was a cognitive competence. In fact, translanguaging is transdisciplinary, which adds a social competence as well. It emerges in the complicated interactions of multilingual people in order to make meaning and goes further. That is why, he offers the adoption of this new term as it “conceives of language relationships in more dynamic terms. The semiotic resources in one’s repertoire or in society interact more closely, become part of an integrated resource, and enhance each other. The languages mesh in transformative ways, generating new meanings and grammars” (8).

In their book, Garcia and Lin (2017) explains that “like translanguaging, code-meshing signals one single integrated system, but whereas code-meshing is seen as a form of resistance, translanguaging is positioned as the discursive norm that names a reality other than a monolingual one” (p.40). Therefore, it is plausible to use translanguaging and code-meshing interchangeably, but such practices will be referred as translanguaging throughout this current research for the sake of consistency.

## **2.4. TRANSLANGUAGING IN THE WORLD**

“Translanguaging as pedagogy can be used in different kinds of educational settings, and with different kinds of students” (Garcia & Wei, 2014, p.94). In this part, the studies are analyzed, categorized and presented in a rapport with their common peculiarities. Numerous studies have attempted to explain translanguaging and its relationship with content courses [Bradley, Moore, Simpson&Atkinson, 2017; He, Lai& Lin, 2016], bilingual and multilingual learners [Esquinca, Araujo& Teresa de la Piedra, 2014; Lin& He, 2017], students with special needs [Holmström&Schönström, 2017; Murray, 2017], multimodalities [Zhang& Chan, 2015; Guzula, McKinney & Tyler, 2016], digital platforms [Kim, 2017; Schreiber, 2015], paralinguistic [Creese&Blackedge, 2015], assessment [Lopez, Turkan& Guzman-Orth, 2017] and monolingual bias [Duarte, 2016; Charamba, 2019].

### **2.4.1. Translanguaging in Content Courses**

Bradley, Moore, Simpson and Atkinson (2017) inquired a collaborative research with young people to explore the linguistic landscapes of Leeds. In their study, they used one of the creative arts methods – collage - to see how communicative repertoires and linguistic landscapes are employed in order to move beyond the margins. They figured out that young people made their voices audible and visible by using languages and modalities. The collages that were created demonstrate new meanings and understandings, which can be regarded as an innovative transdisciplinary educational arts-based project based on CLIL practices. In addition, as a prior sampling, He, Lai and Lin (2016) conducted research on the analysis of PowerPoint design due to the lack of sufficient research in this area. They solely concentrated on Professor Liu's presentations, a mathematics education professor at a university in Hong Kong. The professor used translanguaging and trans-semiotizing in that presentations supported multimodal mathematics discourse and visual grammar. Through these multimodalities, intercultural communication and academic development of bilinguals were facilitated. This unique study also shows that

translanguaging in education avoids regarding education as a separate concept of literacy that is disentangled from cultural and ideological contexts.

On the contrary, Lyster (2019) questions the function of translanguaging pedagogies whether they have put the minority language use in danger in Canadian and US immersion programs where students learn content through L2. As English is not only the majority language but also the lingua franca in the world, Lyster discusses whether translanguaging is seen as cognitive support for content learning or manifested in order to weaken the societal imbalance. The findings from his research-based example alert that translanguaging may have the potential to reduce immersion, students' desire to use their home languages owing to the power and identity-related issues. Such issues raise the possibility of the fact that translanguaging is used for social prestige rather than cognitive support. Alternatives of translanguaging are presented as scaffolding comprehension and production as well as counterbalanced instruction with the integration of language and content. It could be unintended, but this potential risk may be logical to avoid. Students should feel free to revert to the language they demonstrate their understandings because "illustrated notion of a common underlying proficiency or the idea that knowledge is not language bound" (Cummins, 2000: p. 112).

#### **2.4.2. Translanguaging among Bilingual / Multilingual Learners**

Garcia (2012) claims that a translanguaging framework claims that bilingualism is a property that can be developed and conserved by educators. According to Garcia and Kleifien (2010), translanguaging involves activities such as reading in one language and discussing or writing in another, employing texts written in different languages, reading or listening in one language but checking comprehension in another language, integrating students' language resources, code-switching and using both languages convivially. Esquinca, Araujo and Teresa de la Piedra (2014) conducted a study on the U.S.-Mexico Border to analyze meaning-making practices in a two-way dual-language (TWDL) program focusing on the data taken from observations of Ms. O's fourth-grade TWDL classroom. In their field notes, they witnessed multiple activities and strategies by the teacher to teach science content in English and reported the interactions in these situations. They also gathered

student work related to science; for example, journals, pictures with science content, word walls and science experiment reports were valuable sources of content in order to better see the examples of students when they translanguage. The findings of this specific study showed that social interactions in both Spanish and English allowed students to construct understandings about the concepts. Every time the students used English, they were scaffolded by Ms. O so as to create social environment and promote higher-order thinking, which enabled students to transfer from the position of an apprentice to an autonomous learner. Students used translanguaging practices in science, including translating, multimodality, paraphrasing, and code-switching, proving that bilingual pedagogies mediate understanding.

Similarly, Lin and He (2017) examined the role of translanguaging in facilitating CLIL in multilingual contexts in Hong Kong. The analysis of their study challenged the monolingual pedagogical principle in traditional language education and boosted translanguaging as pedagogical scaffolding resources. They released new insights as opposed to the old-fashioned views of communication that regards languages as isolated systems. Lemke (2016) focuses on seeing speakers with all their physical beings, linguistic and multimodal resources, tools, and physical and symbolic artefacts as dynamically entangled in the flow of collective meaning-making in speech or action events. Translanguaging in CLIL classrooms, according to Lemke's explication, is inherent in dynamic and effective learning activities, and thus, teachers should feel free to allow multimodal and multilingual interactions to foster a classroom environment in which learners are expanding their resources for communication, to overcome the communicative obstacles, to motivate learning and to affirm learners' cultural identities. Valesco and Garcia (2014) analyzed five written texts produced by young bilingual writers in order to see when and how translanguaging occurs and what the possible effects are on the development of writing skills. The texts shed light on the perceptions of learners' identities, and translanguaging activity did not threaten them either in Korean or in Spanish. Learners used both languages interchangeably so as to address their audience using their bilingual voice. Finally, they concluded that translanguaging accelerated the process of developing abilities for understanding, thinking and meaning-making.

As for the significance of basing translanguaging pedagogies on multilingualism, Yilmaz and de Jong (2020) explain how translanguaging facilitates crossing the so-called insurmountable linguistic borders through a case study with a multilingual six-year-old girl, Elif, in the USA. Through interviews with her teachers in her mainstream school and Turkish heritage school and observations in each setting, including her home where the main language was Turkish, it was intended to present what obstacles Elif faced in these three different settings and which mechanisms she drew on to get over them. Although she managed to have a smooth transition between her home and heritage school, where the dominant language was Turkish, she experienced discontinuities in learning and unwillingness to communicate at her mainstream school because of the overwhelming boundaries. However, researchers found out that translanguaging gave voice to Elif by means of which she was able to express herself and manifest her identity. As evidenced by this unique study, translanguaging connects cultural and linguistic practices that may seem distant in an assembling space. Furthermore, this study also suggests that teachers should take time understanding culturally and linguistically diverse students' practices in their multilingual milieus and discursive areas.

Throughout history, many societies have been subjected to linguistic diversity due to economic and political reasons within the worldwide population mobility. This situation has brought up the fact that speakers of different languages have to accomplish communication in different ways, often with more than one language (e.g., Blommaert, 2010; Jørgensen et al., 2011; Rampton, 1995). Correspondingly, Leung and Jenkins (2020) concentrate on the role of translanguaging as the backbone activity in multilingual contexts, principally as to how it mediates interactions pointing to the revised iteration of the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (CEFR). Through the settings of a business video conference and international student society, the researchers inspected the complicated multilingual interactions with regard to three categories of mediation: mediating texts, mediating concepts and mediation communication defined in CEFR. According to the consequences of the conducted research, the complexity and intentionality such as “introducing and explaining translingual terms, negotiating the meaning and use of translingual vocabulary, discussing grammar and building interpersonal relations through translingual play” are not accommodated in CEFR rating scales (Choi, French, &

Ollerhead, 2020: p.5). The authors claim that the CEFR model of mediation does not counterbalance the concept of ‘flexible and dynamic use of multilingualism’ unless multilingualism is conventionally accepted as ‘two solitudes’ and ‘a form of language with a native speaker model’. Additionally, they conclude by recommending that multilingual mediation skills such as co-construction of meaning, intercultural understanding and accommodation should be extensively evaluated with dynamism and contingency.

In her collaborative action research, Lau (2020) investigates the way translanguaging teaching practices foster biliteracy and critical learning in a Canadian English-French bilingual classroom for grades 4 to 6. The significance of this particular research lies under the fact that it depicts a successful teacher model who is free to be guided by their students, making mistakes and learning with them. Although teaching through a translanguaging curriculum may seem appealing even for bilingual teachers, it should be noted that the role of the teachers is to broaden, revoice and reshape their students’ ideologies by providing the language and enriching students’ assets. Furthermore, the author prioritizes the importance of employing multiple modalities and using multiple languages in the development of students’ reflexive thinking and critical literacy, through which students can thrive on personal understandings of social issues, which result in both linguistic and social outcomes.

Having been established as a vehemently sustained pedagogical approach, translanguaging, on the other hand, still seems to lack sufficient research in multilingual classroom contexts. Galante (2020) draws the attention of researchers to the multilingual classrooms where teachers and students do not possibly share all the languages, which makes translanguaging more demanding than bilingual classrooms. The obtained results from the observations, interviews and field notes show that teachers still need time to get familiarity with the term translanguaging. Additionally, students’ translanguaging strategies generally relied on L1, while translanguaging can be achieved through the use of students’ entire linguistic resources.

Despite the positive benefits of translanguaging in multilingual classrooms, Costley and Leung (2020) advocate that there is still no tangible proof of trans/multilingual pedagogy taking place in educational policy, classroom practice or curriculum support in England. They unpacked this monolingual disposition



associated with curriculum and pedagogy in different contexts treating translanguaging as a bridge to connect the gaps between policy and reality of classrooms. Arising findings from their study demonstrated that the policy documents supported the celebration of multilingualism just for the part of the act because they never boosted such a culture that students' full linguistic repertoires were deployed for language learning and assessment. The authors explain the reason behind this scenario with three critical reasons. Firstly, English is a statutory language both in the school and in the world, which reduces the necessity of other languages in official education. Secondly, the curriculum does not require other languages than the target language (TL) in the assessment of multilingual students. Thirdly, monolingual teachers feel stressed about and lose control over classroom management when multilingual students speak their own languages in the classroom. When these factors come together, multilingualism is seen as a threat rather than a benignant resource for learning and assessment. The authors conclude by criticizing the schools and teachers in England as they are not ready to take benefit from translanguaging in terms of teacher training, curriculum development and innovative classroom practices.

### **2.4.3. Translanguaging among Students with Special Needs**

Lewis et al. (2012) align the definitions of and related concepts to translanguaging chronologically. They lay much stress on the advantages of translanguaging activities in multilingual classroom contexts as it is a new way of shaping ideas and making meaning in effective interactions. Furthermore, they suggest a tripartite classification between classroom translanguaging, universal translanguaging, and neurolinguistics translanguaging. They finally conclude the article with wider research areas as to how translanguaging works for deaf children who use with sign languages and for children with special needs (e.g., dyslexia, language delay). Upon their implications and suggestions, Holmström and Schönström (2017) carried out a case study about three deaf lecturers' translanguaging in a higher education setting in Sweden. All the lecturers were bilingual in that they knew Swedish Sign Language (SSL) and Swedish besides being skilled in English. The lecturers were signing in SSL as their primary language predominantly during the class, while the

content was reflected on the board in English or Swedish. The findings indicated that the classroom interaction consisted of a wide range of modes which were all in visual forms, and how these modes were in coaction and created translanguaging practice. Those practices helped the lecturers and students interact within the same cultures and languages, removing the borders. The authors also suggested this type of interaction as a form of *intramodal* translanguaging as both of the languages (English and Swedish) were signed through the same signing mode. This intramodel translanguaging provides convenience for deaf people to “compensate for the lack of spoken or written mode in sign language” (p. 21) because they can easily talk about concepts, phrases or sentences in the national language and borrow words.

Murray (2017), in a similar vein, conducted a case study about translanguaging in a multimodal sign language translation project with the help of an app called The Baobab Tree among deaf learners. This app is presented as bilingual and bimodal because it has American Sign Language (ASL) and English options, both signed and written. The author ran this project to get an accurate translation from ASL and English into Norwegian Sign Language (NSL) and written Norwegian. No matter how many discrete languages or signs were deployed and how flexible the semiotic practices were, the ideologies of language distinctiveness continued to persevere meantime translanguaging activities were successfully completed. The findings suggested that languaging choices are affected by language ideologies, sociocultural values and the history of language practices. As the last deaf-led research in this part, Robinson (2017) gathered field observations and mainly aimed to unfold the translanguaging and multimodal imperatives within the theatre where the sign language and deaf people are treated as the key grounding forces. The findings revealed that spoken English was used so strategically that it never dominated British Sign Language; instead, it complemented it. She argues that meaning is better conveyed through the careful manipulation of different modes and languages, which is an effective example of translanguaging.

#### 2.4.4. Translanguaging with Multimodalities

Translanguaging manifests multilingualism, pluriliteracies, and multimodalities. Here, all the opportunities that people have – i.e., body movements, gestures, visual aids, spoken or signed languages- are used ultimately for the sake of the flow of communication and negotiation of meaning. These instances of multimodalities empower interaction skills and promote translanguaging practices among multilinguals. Gonzales (2015) uses the term translingualism, instead of translanguaging, and states that it does not simply represent students' linguistic backgrounds. According to her, translingualism helps us understand the fluidity of languages and modalities; thus, it gets easier to realize when students feel ambiguity over the words to communicate in the target language. In this study, students were asked to write a composition both in traditional print and multimodal genres, through which the experiences of L2 students, compared to L1 students, could be observed when they combined and crossed various modes. The findings supported that not only L2 but also L1 students demonstrated the examples of translanguaging; nevertheless, the number of L2 students who used multimodality when they did not have the specific words outnumbered L1 students.

As a supportive instance from China, Zhang and Chan (2015) particularly explained multilingual practice in general, extending the framework of separate and flexible multilingualism with an aim to provide new perspectives of understanding multilingualism. They used a collection of 300 posters as a special type of linguistic landscape in Macao in order to analyze the distance of languages in multimodal texts. It was discovered that separate multilingualism characterizes multilingualism, whereas flexible multilingualism appears to be a relatively new phenomenon in Macao. In this study, it was also made clear that translanguaging activities employ creativity in that visual elements facilitate translanguaging practice. However, MacSwan (2017) approaches translanguaging from a far cry standpoint, arguing that political use of language names is to be distinguished from the social idealizations. He proposes an alternative view *multilingual perspective on translanguaging*, which contrasts the unitary and dual competence model. He claims that bilinguals, alongside monolinguals, have a single linguistic repertoire and codeswitching, translation,

borrowing, and other various modalities may be seen as an example of translanguaging.

In Guzula, McKinney and Tyler's (2016) study, in which they created third spaces such as holidays or after-school literacy clubs to legitimize translanguaging, they discussed the paradigm shifts in the conceptualization of language in applied linguistics, adding that monolingual approaches still have an official effect on learning approaches, which negatively affect South African students' participation in the curriculum. Third spaces showed that SA learners manifested translanguaging and multimodalities in order to work on understanding. Smith, Pacheco, and de Almeida (2017) examined how three bilinguals composed through multiple languages and modalities (e.g., images, texts, and sounds) when composing a digital project. In their case study, students profited from their heritage language while composing textually and visually driven projects. They suggested that the use of multimodalities and multiple linguistic resources should be encouraged in the classrooms to make the students more fluent in multiple literacies.

As an important name in the history of translanguaging research literature, Wei (2017) countered some of the criticisms and confusions about translanguaging and discussed the theoretical motivations behind the concept. He specifically focused on two terms Translanguaging Space and Translanguaging Instinct, highlighting the necessity to bridge sociocultural and cognitive approaches to translanguaging practices in reality. He affirms that translanguaging is a practical theory that uses multilingual, multisemiotic, multisensory and multimodal resources that human beings possess for thinking and communicating. It is a natural and inevitable activity for people to get themselves to be understood by others; that is why they use all the resources they have during the interaction. Wei and Ho (2018) examined two examples of how translanguaging transforms language learning. The examples are from self-directed learning of Chinese via online platforms. The volunteers were video-taped during the research, and their speech and cursor movements as well as facial expressions and other relevant happenings were all reported. The findings indicated that learners mostly relied on translanguaging and used different resources and funds of knowledge when their primary focus was to make meaning. In both studies led by Wei, he called

for the need for a transdisciplinary approach to language learning which beats the boundaries between linguistics, psychology, and education.

The use of translanguaging may be of great potential use for the impoverished as it entails flexible, dynamic and responsive modes of communication and boosts identity formation rather than a monolingual realm of language learning. In parallel and with respect to this standpoint, Van Viegen (2020) presents teachers' and students' engagement with translanguaging space and translanguaging instinct as a tool in language learning and literacy development of refugee children and youth. With the insights arising from the observations and interviews with teachers and students at multiple secondary schools in Canada, it was observed that teachers appreciated and paved the way for translanguaging practices with language and literacy learning purposes. The author lists the most successful translanguaging strategies as creating a translanguaging space, modelling the metalinguistic inquiry and integrating learning with students' daily lives. More importantly, he brings forward three axes of practices which are essential in translanguaging pedagogy: the extent to which translanguaging is triggered by students or teachers, the engagement with translanguaging either in a planned way or spontaneously and the function of translanguaging as a scaffold or as a resource for learning.

#### **2.4.5. Translanguaging in Digital Platforms**

The advent of the Internet has undeniable effects on the ways learning is conceptualized and accomplished. It does not only facilitate teachers' job in the classrooms, but also it creates out-of-school environments in which students can be engaged with and responsible for their own learning process. Students can easily get the information it may or may not be educational by establishing a virtual identity through social networking sites. Social networking sites (SNS) allow learners to create a profile and maintain a list of connections, and then be informed about the people they follow. These sites also present the users' demographic information and their personality tracks under the online identity that they created before. Therefore, SNS are of great importance and an escalating issue to be inspected in ELT contexts. For example, Schreiber (2015) had a case study with a Serbian university student on

Facebook and examined how he used multiple varieties of English and Serbian in order to shape his online identity and establish membership both in local and global communities. The findings showed that the student's language practices and attitudes on Facebook might be better categorized as translingual because he used both English and Serbian and created a unified expression of identity, depending highly on the multimodal affordances of digital writing to achieve his communicative goals. In parallel, Kim (2017) carried out an ethnographic case study in the U.S., examining three examples of translanguaging through digital literacy: monolingual or multilingual contexts. This study helps researchers gain insights about the complexity of translanguaging and how Korean youth used broader semiotic options when social and cultural discourses did not overlap. The findings vouched for the results of the previous study in that digital platforms are helpful in employing translanguaging and naturally support communication irrespective of borders of the nationalities.

#### **2.4.6. Translanguaging with Paralinguistics**

Translanguaging is not only limited to the well-use of technology; additionally, it requires the appropriate use of body, gestures and mimics. The way people move their body parts is an essential dimension of the semiotic repertoire in communicative interactions when people's biographical and linguistic histories hardly overlap; therefore, people translanguage through the deployment of wide-ranging semiotic repertoires. Creese and Blackedge (2015) reviewed the latest scholarship on translanguaging, presenting examples from their empirical research in a Panjabi school where the only aim is to teach Panjabi heritage language to the learners. They figured out that teachers and students translanguage and socially engage in discourse that deepens understandings and develops critical thinking to maintain standards of classroom engagement. They also argued that translanguaging extends metalinguistic awareness and cross-linguistic flexibility. Again, by Blackedge and Creese (2017), another study was carried out two years later. The latter study is a four-year, multi-site linguistic ethnography in a butcher's stall where they examined how people communicate in super diverse cities. They found out that commercial activity was not troubled by apparent distinctions between linguistic, cultural or national backgrounds.

The butcher and customers utilized semiotic repertoires- with the greatest focus on the body- which enabled them to translanguage through an expansive variety of gestures, eye gaze, head shakes, nods, smiles and shrugs. As can be understood from this study, translanguageing is not an activity of only two or more languages are in charge; instead, it is a bigger frame in which languages and other resources, like the body in this case, are all used to convey meaning and manage successful interactions.

#### **2.4.7. Translanguageing and Assessment**

Translanguageing can also be used during language assessment practices. Accuracy of measurement is a tiresome issue in educational testing. Although little research has been carried out within the context of applying translanguageing to assessments, Lopez et al. (2017) provide benignant aspects of translanguageing, the practices of which enable emergent bilingual students to display their skills and knowledge in content assessments. According to Otheguy, Garcia and Reid (2015), if proficiency assessment should be accurate, it must adopt a perspective which will reveal the linguistic capacity of individuals no matter what the social rules or named languages qualify or disqualify. In a nutshell, translanguageing provides “a more accurate measure of learners’ linguistic abilities and a fairer and more expeditious way to teach both content and the social construct of named languages” (p. 304).

#### **2.4.8. Translanguageing and Monolingual Bias**

In multilingual countries, the language of education is mostly English due to its being the dominant language in the world. This monolingual policy is seen as the biggest reason for the academic failure insofar as it prevents the proceeds of multilingual and multicultural students from being conceptualized into the classroom. However, it is loomed large that the perpetual and optimal use of L1 not only in L2 classrooms but also in other content classes has proved to be effective contrary to the monolingual based pedagogies of nations wherein students are traditionally not encouraged to use multiple languages (Conteh, Kumar, and Beddow 2008).

Starting from Barack Obama's pre-election speech in their introduction, Hornberg and Link (2012) drew a great deal of attention to the transnational literacies and translanguaging in multilingual classrooms. Because of the fact that English dominated standardized tests, curriculum and instruction language, students' first languages were discouraged and underestimated. Obama's current guidelines, on the other hand, offered novice actions to be taken against this monolingual dominance of English. New programs, curriculum and practices should be adopted that relied on multiple communicative repertoires by which translanguaging was enacted as a resource of teaching and learning.

In her major article, Duarte (2016) conducted research about how to use translanguaging in a German mainstream school from a sociocultural approach. She tried to find answers to whether translanguaging facilitated learning by leveraging the quality of interaction in 'intermental development zone (IDZ)'. IDZ is, according to Mercer (2002), the commonly shared understandings and rules created for interaction to achieve learning. Interaction mechanisms such as questioning, recapping, reformulating and elaborating serve as a central function in shaping these understandings and rules. The results sketched that students used translanguaging to make sense of the given tasks judged from the quality of interactions between peers in collaborative talk. Translanguaging was also used to negotiate meaning, provide arguments and show content/discontent thanks to the flexible shuttle between languages.

Cummins (2014) militates in favour of bilingual instructional strategies and against the monolingual instructional strategies to be taken in learning processes and environments. In their action research, Holdway and Hitchcock (2018) explored perspectives of in-service public school teachers of multilingual learners towards translanguaging in Math courses. The findings provided insights for the teachers about the negative impact of the dominant language on multilingual learners as English monolingualism hindered the opportunities for educational equalizations. The teachers participating in this study became conscious of the significance of students' first language in teaching and its importance in fostering linguistic diversity as a source of teaching.



Charamba (2019) investigated the pivotal role of translanguaging among multilingual students who were taking Physics class in South Africa. It was discovered that monolingual pedagogies hampered the deeper understandings of science concepts and led to students' academic failure. Translanguaging adopted pedagogies, on the other hand, increased students' academic performance as multilingual materials and translanguaging practices enhanced students' linguistic repertoire. By doing so, a translanguaging space, which was referred to as 'a fluid linguistic space' in the study, was created so as to make students benefit from the advantages of multilingualism in the learning process.

"If we want students to think like mathematicians, read like historians, write like scientists, we need to teach them these ways of thinking reading and writing" (Goldenberg, 2008: p. 9). However, this aim seems utopian in the school contexts where the "English only" policy is applied, and English is the main language of content courses. Keeping this reality in perspective, Ollerhead, Crealy and Kirk (2020) oppose the must of mastery of academic language for CLD students in Australian mainstream schools by raising awareness around translanguaging practices. In the light of the collaboration between teachers and researchers and classroom observations, selecting translanguaging as teaching strategies contributed to students' writing and speaking skills in deep, accurate and confidential ways. With this study, the authors attempted to draw attention to the role of translanguaging in content and language learning since it raised students' plurilingual awareness by enabling using different linguistic repertoires. Likewise, French and Armitage (2020) expostulate the "monolingual mindset" (Clyne, 2008), which is still buried in Australian education systems. In their paper, they propose principles for multilingual approaches in CLD classrooms through translanguaging practices and hopefully give impetus to the cooperation of teachers, researchers and students in action research and development of multilingual pedagogies.

Emphasizing the importance of the collaborative process, Seals, Olsen-Reeder, Pine, Ash, and Wallace (2020) underpin the importance of translanguaging in the Reo Māori and Samoan language revitalisation settings in New Zealand. In their micro ethnographic study, they incorporated the worldviews of these languages into children books to maintain fluidity and enable children to shift across both languages. The

authors discovered that the children used their home languages more and transferred core cultural values thanks to the translanguaging materials. This study unfolds the need for more designed translingual resources for the students of such communities. Focusing on early childhood education, Kirsh (2020) conducted a research project that offered professional development for multilingual pedagogies in Luxemburg, where more than half of the preschoolers do not speak Luxembourgish as their mother tongue even though more than two languages are used in teaching. At the end of this longitudinal study, the teachers were observed to change their damaging posture to multilingual education and adopt a social-constructivist approach in the learning environment changing their language use. However, the implementation of translanguaging pedagogy in multilingual classrooms is still viewed as formidable and requires teachers to take special professional development courses.

Cenoz and Santos (2020) argue the potential of translanguaging in language learning and awareness in trilingual Basque schools where Basque, English and Spanish are taught separately. As opposed to this traditional method of teaching, they conducted a study with a group of teachers from different trilingual schools. The teachers prepared lesson plans and activities including three languages, received feedback from the students and reflected on their performance. They found out that translanguaging not only eases language learning; but also shows “the need to protect the minority language” (p. 8). Multilingualism hereby is not a property to be deemed invisible; instead, it should be exploited pedagogically and socially in order to interact. Additionally, Gorter and Arocena (2020) examined in-service teachers’ beliefs about translanguaging and multilingualism (Basque, Spanish and English) before, during and after a professional development course. The authors observed that professional development courses about translanguaging and multilingualism were effective in changing teachers’ traditionally monolingual-biased beliefs into flexible and multilingual-driven ones.

The implementation of cross-linguistic pedagogy can be seen as a goldmine in immersion as a tool “to teach for two-way cross-lingual transfer” (Cummins, 2007: p. 11). In her pilot study, Moll (2020) challenged the beliefs of seven pre-service teachers about crosslinguistic pedagogy in Quebec. The future teachers enrolled in a German course that was designed to counter their monolingual bias and target-language-only rules in their minds. Their tendencies were identified with the post-task questionnaires

and interviews. Although the participants appreciated the use of translanguaging pedagogy and agreed on its positive impact to their success, they ended up maintaining the determined stance to the target-language-only rule in their mind.

As the discussed studies suggest, the teachers lack knowledge of the implementation of translanguaging pedagogy in their classrooms. In order to elaborate on providing this necessary professional support to the teachers in using translanguaging pedagogy in English for Academic Purposes (EAP) contexts, Liu, Lo, and Lin (2020) conducted design-based research, which served as a model of professional development because the teacher and the researchers collaboratively worked together while evaluating the possible advantages and challenges of translanguaging pedagogy in EAP contexts at the universities of China. They echoed for further research and investigations referring to the use of full linguistic and semiotic repertoires of multilingual speakers' both for EAP programs other similar contexts.

Over 40 cohort study analyses were shown elaborately with respect to the nature of translanguaging from as many different contexts as possible, pointing to the challenges and advantages of implementing such a pedagogy in classrooms worldwide. The studies were categorized and supported in accordance with their relevancy to each other in a significant thematic scope. To my best knowledge, this thesis includes the most recent studies, research, research-based projects and the like regarding translanguaging practices across the world.

## **2.5. TRANSLANGUAGING IN TURKEY**

Translanguaging has been a research interest since the 1990s. There has been a large volume of published studies describing the role and the nature of translanguaging in the world since then. However, little is known about translanguaging in Turkey because few writers (Aslan, 2019; Karabulut,2019; Küçük,2018; Yuvayapan, 2019) have been able to accomplish studies into translanguaging. Starting from the oldest study, Küçük (2018) investigated translanguaging as a teaching and learning practice in an English Medium higher education context in Turkey in her master thesis. She aimed to reveal the challenges

that the English Medium Instruction (EMI) students faced regarding language use in their first years, the attitudes of teachers and students towards translanguaging as a teaching and learning strategy, and the purposes of the teacher and students who used translanguaging.

Both qualitative and quantitative methods were used in this investigation in order to obtain consistent results. The findings showed that the students had problems with the technical vocabulary of English as well as pronunciation and accent related issues that prevented them from communicating in the classrooms. To be able to get over these problems, teachers mostly relied on translanguaging by maximizing the use of English in EMI classes, while students used translanguaging mainly for clarifying the complicated parts of the content. In general, the attitudes of both teachers and students towards translanguaging were proven to be positive since it was a helpful pedagogy used to convey meanings and facilitate learning. When it comes to the teachers' purposes for using translanguaging, there were observed two major reasons: instructional purposes and affective purposes. Teachers benefitted from translanguaging from instructional perspectives when they tried to promote participation amidst students, give voice, and make clarifications and explanations of new words and concepts. Teachers also encouraged and relieved their students using translanguaging for affective purposes.

“The English language classroom, as idealized in the discourses of Western ELT theory, is not a place in which languages can be freely used and exchanged but rather has come to reflect a dogmatic belief in a monolingualist approach to language learning” (Pennycook, 1994: p.169). The switches between languages to facilitate students' English language development are viewed as crucial, rather than being forbidden as monolingualistic perspectives advocates. In like manner, Aslan (2019) drew our attention to language equality in classrooms analyzing the translanguaging strategies by employing a 50-50 model of first foreign language (FFL) and second foreign language (SFL) in a German (SFL) class. She aimed to detect what kinds of translanguaging practices and strategies are used by the teacher and whether they are used consciously or not. She also dug out the reasons and purposes of teacher's using translanguaging and in what ways the students responded

Findings from the observations and semi-structured interviews indicated that the vocabulary, syntax-based and multilingual ecology strategies are the predominantly applied strategies by the teacher, while collaborative and writing-based strategies are least used owing to the contents of the coursebook. It was also underlined that the teacher used translanguaging unintentionally but voluntarily despite not knowing what translanguaging was before. The teacher used the amalgam of three languages, L1 (Turkish), L2 (English) and L3 (German) while giving feedbacks to her students. In so doing, she fostered language learning development stimulating students from every possible channel. Teaching in such multilingual contexts, beyond any doubt, made great contributions to the students' choices, identities and cultures on the basis of students' increasing participation and questioning.

Karabulut (2019) examined translanguaging as a pedagogical tool for Turkish EFL students in writing classes in her quasi-experimental study. The first experimental group received translanguaging pedagogy while the second one only had it in the cycle of classroom instructions. On the other hand, the control group solely focused on their writing products with an English-only ruled perspective instead of improving their learning with a process-based approach. The results obtained through the questionnaires and semi-structured interviews affirmed that the integration of translanguaging pedagogy helped students in their writing classes to enrich their grammatical and lexical knowledge and to organize what to write and how to improve their thinking skills and planning. It was acknowledged that the more the translanguaging pedagogy was involved in the classes, the more likely better-writing products were obtained. Similar to the results of the studies from a different context, Dikilitaş and Mumford's (2020) also conducted pioneering research in a private pre-school in a western city of Turkey. The findings indicate that preschool teachers can play the role of pedagogue, interactive communicator and translanguaging facilitator by using both languages not only for teaching but also for meaningful classroom interaction.

More to the point and identical to this current study, Yuvayapan (2019) conducted a study on English language teachers' perceptions of translanguaging in a province of Turkey. Yuvayapan's study can be regarded as the extension of Nambisan's study (2014) in that she carried out this study based on using the same

survey, but she also ensured the results by doing observations and interviews with the teachers. She gathered data from 50 EFL teachers by means of questionnaires, classroom observations and semi-structured interviews. The data showed that teachers were not following a regular basis of translanguaging pedagogy for the sake of their students' English performance and proficiency. Although the teachers held positive views towards the use of translanguaging, the main reason to appeal to translanguaging was apparently to save time in the classes to be able to catch up with the curriculum. In the same vein, Nambisan (2014) also discovered that most of the teachers failed to implement translanguaging in their classrooms even though they strongly believed in the importance of it. The standardized curriculum is regarded as being at the center of educational issues for teachers. As for structured environments, consistency through these environments and standardized testing, it definitely offers clear advantages. However, teachers may overlook the real interactive activities in the classroom and hinder the possibilities of student talk so as not to fall behind the curriculum, which is the case in Yuvayapan's study.

For researchers and educators, there is still a paucity of research showing the perceptions and understandings of teachers as to the application of translanguaging and the classroom practices by students and teachers based on translanguaging in Turkish settings. As it is emphasized prior to the section of studies based on Turkish-setting, even the literature review from foreign settings suggests that the teachers should be more familiar with the term translanguaging. Therefore, this thesis aims to gain popularity to the term translanguaging among in-service EFL teachers from different educational settings in Turkey and explore their ideas, attitudes and perspectives towards the use and practices of translanguaging. Last but not least, it is also aimed to raise teachers' crosslinguistic awareness and challenge their practices in the classroom.

## **2.6. CONCLUSION**

The literature review part has so far shown an examination of over 50 studies both in the world and in Turkey in order to better rationalize the need for further research in this specific area. The common findings of the studies explained above

strongly signal the advantages of translanguaging, and as a consequence, warn the authorities about the necessity that translanguaging should have a place in the curriculum. Translanguaging practices give a voice to the oppressed and enable them to maintain their home languages and cultural values in spite of the vast English dominance. Since it is cored with the multiple forms and modes that are included in interaction, translanguaging also helps students improve their literacy and communication skills.



## **CHAPTER III**

### **3. METHODOLOGY**

#### **3.1. RESEARCH QUESTIONS**

1. Do the EFL teachers' perspectives towards translanguaging vary according to the school type?
  - a. What are the EFL teachers' perspectives about the frequency and importance of L1 use by the students?
  - b. What are the EFL teachers' perspectives about the frequency and importance of L1 use by the teachers?
2. Do the EFL teachers' perspectives towards translanguaging vary according to the level of the school?
  - a. What are the EFL teachers' perspectives about the frequency and importance of L1 use by the students?
  - b. What are the EFL teachers' perspectives about the frequency and importance of L1 use by the teachers?
3. What are the EFL teachers' general attitudes towards translanguaging practices?
  - a. Do the perspectives of state school teachers and private school teachers towards translanguaging differ?
  - b. For which situations do they think translanguaging is beneficial / detrimental?

#### **3.2. PARTICIPANTS AND SETTING**

The sample of the present study consists of 227 EFL teachers (43 Male and 184 Female). Out of 227 teachers, 135 work in state schools, whereas 92 work in private



schools. This study aims to assess teachers' attitudes towards the use of students' first language in the classroom; therefore, the participants in this study are teachers who work in state schools and teachers working in private schools. The participant teachers work with English Language Learners (ELL) populations who are originally Turkish-speaking students. The majority of the teachers participating in the study are secondary school teachers. As to the more detailed information about the level of schools that the participants work, 55 of the teachers work in the primary schools (27 State School teachers, 28 Private School teachers); 82 of them work in the secondary schools (57 State School teachers, 25 Private School teachers); 49 of them are in the high schools (32 State School teachers, 17 Private School teachers) and 41 of them are in the university (19 State University lecturers, 22 Private University lecturers). The demographic information about the participant teachers by the level of school is well depicted in Table 1 below.

Table 1

*Demographic Information about Participants by Level of School*

Level of School			Type of School					
			State School		Private School		Total	
			N	%	N	%	N	%
Primary School	Gender	Male	3	5.5	2	3.6	5	9.1
		Female	24	43.6	26	47.3	50	90.9
	Total		27	49.1	28	50.9	55	100
Secondary School	Gender	Male	8	9.8	4	4.9	12	14.6
		Female	49	59.8	21	25.6	70	85.4
	Total		57	69.5	25	30.5	82	100
High School	Gender	Male	8	16.3	3	6.1	11	22.4
		Female	24	49	14	28.6	38	77.6
	Total		32	65.3	17	34.7	49	100
University	Gender	Male	11	26.8	4	9.8	15	36.6
		Female	8	19.5	18	43.9	26	63.4
	Total		19	46.3	22	53.7	41	100

Total	Gender	Male	30	13.2	13	5.7	43	18.9
		Female	105	46.3	79	34.8	184	81.1
Total			135	59.5	92	40.5	227	100

Out of 227 EFL teachers, 98 of them can be categorized as novice teachers since their years of experience is maximized to 5 years. 40 of these novice teachers work in state schools, while 58 of them work in private schools. The number of private school teachers in this section is only higher than that of state school teachers. Speaking of more experienced teachers, 60 teachers have teaching experience between 5-10 years; 42 of them work in state schools, while 18 of them work in private schools. 35 teachers participating in the study have teaching experience between 10-15 years; 28 of them work in state schools, whereas 7 of them work in private schools. The last section belongs to the most experienced teachers. 34 of the participant teachers have teaching experience of 15 years and above. 25 of them work in state schools, while 9 of them work in private ones. The demographic information about the participant teachers by the years of experience is well depicted in Table 2 below.

Table 2

*Demographic Information about Participants by Years of Experience*

Years of Experience			Type of School					
			State School		Private School		Total	
			N	%	N	%	N	%
0-5 years	Gender	Male	9	9.2	7	7.1	16	16.3
		Female	31	31.6	51	52	82	83.7
	Total	40	40.8	58	59.2	98	100	
5-10 years	Gender	Male	14	23.3	3	5	17	28.3
		Female	28	46.7	15	25	43	71.7
	Total	42	70	18	30	60	100	
10-15 years	Gender	Male	5	14.3	2	5.7	7	20
		Female	23	65.7	5	14.3	28	80
	Total	28	80	7	20	35	100	
+15 years	Gender	Male	2	5.9	1	2.9	3	8.8

		Female	23	67.6	8	23.5	31	91.2
	Total		25	73.5	9	26.5	34	100
Total	Gender	Male	30	13.2	13	5.7	43	18.9
		Female	105	46.3	79	34.8	184	81.1
	Total		135	59.5	92	40.5	227	100

According to the Table 3, although the native language of most of the participants was Turkish, there were nine different native languages other than Turkish. Six of them were native English speakers, and three of them were Spanish speakers. There were also two French and Kurdish native speakers participating in this study. Additionally, there was one participant native speaker of each language; Russian, Akan, German, Arabic and Persian. All of these 227 participant teachers' answers to the Likert-scale questions were used to analyze the data quantitatively.

Table 3

*The Number of Teachers by their Native Language*

Native Language	Number
Russian	1
Turkish	209
English	6
French	2
Akan	1
German	1
Kurdish	2
Arabic	1
Spanish	3
Persian	1
Total	227

In addition to their contributions to the quantitative analysis of the data, the participants were also asked two more open-ended questions in order to back up the data qualitatively. Out of 227 participant teachers, 207 of them provided additional information to questions 10 and 11, thanks to which more insights were able to be

gained. Only 20 participant teachers refused to respond to the open-ended question 10 without writing anything. On the other hand, 130 teachers didn't provide any additional information to the open-ended question 11.

### **3.3. DATA COLLECTION INSTRUMENTS**

The data were collected through a questionnaire which was adapted from Nambisan (2014) and used in Yuvayapan's (2019) study. The questionnaire was sent to the EFL teachers' groups on Facebook electronically through Google Forms. The questionnaires offer anonymity and easy participation to the participants, which contributes to its widespread use in the field. More importantly, the data of this study were collected during the hard times of the Covid-19 pandemic, which made impossible any face-to-face interviews or observations. Both the advantages of using questionnaires and the circumstances of the data collection period during the pandemic can be deduced as sound reasons for the rationale of selecting a questionnaire as a data collection instrument.

The questionnaire was chosen in order to explore teachers' perspectives about translanguaging best. It is comprised of three parts. The first section of the questionnaire includes items to gather general information about the participants' gender, type of school they work in, the level they teach, years of teaching experience, native language and language of instruction in their schools. The questionnaire continues by including Likert-scale questions which are used to illustrate the importance and the frequency of translanguaging used by teachers in several situations. The importance they place on translanguaging shows their perspectives and attitudes towards translanguaging while the frequency they apply to translanguaging shows their practices of translanguaging in the class. The participants were asked whether they found the use of the native language in English language classrooms beneficial or not. The last section involves two open-ended questions about this specific question. The participants are kindly requested to describe the situations in which translanguaging is beneficial or detrimental in their own words. Ultimately, they are encouraged to share their own perceptions or use of translanguaging. The less

predictable answers to these two open-ended questions can be used to validate the quantitative results of the study through triangulation.

### **3.4. PROCEDURE**

This research aimed to find answers to the research questions, which were created based on the questions of a formerly known and applied questionnaire. The questionnaire was initially planned to be completed on paper; however, due to the outbreak of Covid-19 in the early 2020s, it was sent to the participants through Google Forms. The link was sent to the local teacher groups, officially registered school groups and English teacher platforms on Facebook virtually in the middle of July in 2020. No incentives were given to the participants, and they were randomly asked to participate in the study voluntarily. By the middle of September in 2020, the form had been answered by 227 participant teachers, and then the form settings were switched to accept no more answers. In short, the data was collected online in a two-month period in the middle of 2020. At the end of the data collection, the researcher used the SPSS so as to analyze the Likert-scale questions of the survey; Microsoft Excel to examine, categorize and colour code the responses in the qualitative content analysis part. In order to check the accuracy of the colour codes, interrater reliability was established by an external evaluator who analyzed 10% of the data independently and colour coded the responses. The percentages of the agreements were calculated and reported in the following section. With the two open-ended questions at the end of the survey, the researcher aimed at extending the scope of responses provided by the teacher and drawing general perspectives about the attitudes towards translanguaging.

### **3.5. DATA ANALYSIS**

#### **3.5.1. Quantitative Analysis**

This study mainly aimed to collect data quantitatively to find out answers to the first and second research questions. The survey involved four main questions, to which participants were asked to show their rankings from 1 to 5 by item-based Likert-

scale questions. Independent samples t-test was employed in order to understand whether there are differences in teachers' translanguaging practices caused by school type. The main four questions with their sub-items were entered into SPSS (Statistical Package for Social Science) 25 software for analysis. Independent samples t-test was used to determine whether school type had an impact on teachers' translanguaging practices with the help of the item-based analysis. The findings were reported in detail, including all the results with or without significant differences.

In order to find whether there are significant differences among the teachers who work at different levels of the school, one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was used to analyze the data since the level of school has more than two groups. An average of the purposes of the four main questions in the survey was calculated, and the results were entered into the SPSS 25 software for analysis. A one-way ANOVA was used to determine the descriptives and homogeneity of variance (Levene's test) between groups within the level of school. According to the analysis, the results of the test of homogeneity of variances showed the homogeneity of subsets to be insignificant for the average of Question 6 (Levene's statistic = .743,  $p = .527$  [ $>0.05$ ]). The effect size was reported to be medium ( $\eta^2 = .451$ ). Similarly, the results of the test of homogeneity of variances showed the homogeneity of subsets were insignificant for the average of Question 7 (Levene's statistic = 2.395,  $p = .069$  [ $>0.05$ ]) and the effect size was reported to be medium ( $\eta^2 = .569$ ). The results of the test of homogeneity of variances showed the homogeneity of subsets to be insignificant for the average of Question 8 (Levene's statistic = .311,  $p = .817$  [ $>0.05$ ]), and the effect size was reported to be medium ( $\eta^2 = .739$ ). Lastly, the results of Levene's test for homogeneity of variances came out as insignificant for the average of Question 9, as well (Levene's statistic = .325,  $p = .808$ , [ $>0.05$ ]). The effect size was reported to be medium ( $\eta^2 = .207$ ). The results showed that the assumption of homogeneity of variance was met for all the questions.

When a statistically significant variance was found at the end of ANOVA analysis, a Gabriel post hoc test was performed to determine which of the means of level of school were significantly different in each purpose of the four main questions. Gabriel post hoc test was chosen for this analysis because, as Field (2013) suggests, "Gabriel's pairwise test procedure was designed to cope with situations in which

sample sizes are different. Gabriel's procedure is generally more powerful but can become too liberal when the sample sizes are very different" (p.555). The numbers of the participants of the groups in this study differed, but not in great numbers. Because of this slight difference in sample sizes, Gabriel's procedure was followed because the cramming tip in the book says, "if sample sizes are slightly different, then use Gabriel's procedure because it has greater power" (p.555). Finally, the purposes which were found to be significantly different according to the level of the school were reported.

### **3.5.2. Qualitative Content Analysis**

This study was also intended to collect more data that was not shaped or limited to a certain type of answer, which led to the qualitative analysis of two more open-ended questions that the survey included at the end. With this specific aim, content analysis was chosen for interpretation of the data. Content analysis is a type of research method that is specifically used to make valid inferences from the text using a set of procedures (Weber, 1990). The main idea of content analysis is to classify the many words of the text into fewer content categories.

According to (Ellis & Barkhuizen, 2005), qualitative content analysis follows a common order of "coding for themes, looking for patterns, making interpretations and building theory" (p.259). Dörnyei (2007) lists the steps of qualitative content analysis as "(a) transcribing the data, (b) pre-coding and coding, (c) growing ideas - memos, vignettes, profiles and other forms of data display, and (d) interpreting the data and drawing conclusions" (p.246). For this current study, there was no need to transcribe the data as the teachers were not interviewed face-to-face. Since their responses to the open-ended questions were already written on the forms, necessary reflections were made about them in the pre-coding phase before shaping the data into the final codes. Stake (1995) defines this analysis as a "matter of giving meaning to first impressions as well as to final compilations" (p.71). After the final coding process was completed, the "analytic memos" were noted along with the repeated key words found in the teachers' responses (Dörnyei, 2007: p.254). According to Lynch (2003), these memos were "working ideas, which may or may not pan out in the fullness of your analysis" (p.138). As the final process of content analysis, the data was

interpreted and conclusions were drawn out of teachers' responses. At this stage, the whole process was turned into the product, in other words, the elaborations and interpretations were made on the selected number of main themes.

The open-ended questions enabled the participants to elaborate on what and why they considered translanguaging beneficial or detrimental in the classroom. They were able to provide their genuine responses, personal experiences and further perspectives and suggestions with flexibility. Firstly, each answer was investigated by using the framework of language of affect by Martin and White (2005) in order to reflect teachers' positive and negative views about translanguaging, which could be identified through the associations of certain adjectives with positivity and negativity. This kind of analysis helped to draw a general idea of how translanguaging was valued and perceived by the portion of the teachers who participated in this study. Secondly, the responses were examined and colour-coded with regard to their relevance and coherence to each other. They were categorized under eight different themes, which explained what kind of situations translanguaging was beneficial for, and seven different themes, which explained what they think translanguaging was detrimental to, based on their own perspectives and experiences. This part of the analysis supported the Likert-scale questions in that it enabled teachers to give more specific examples, comment beyond them and give us a chance to other undisclosed situations that the participants faced. Lastly, Question 11 kindly asked the teachers to add further information that they would like to share regarding the use of mother tongue in the classroom. The responses were mainly divided into three groups of conclusions, which were explained in detail later in the results section.

### **3.5.3. Triangulation**

The method of combining quantitative and qualitative methods in order to increase the reliability and validity of the research findings is called triangulation (Mathison, 1988). The term was first coined by Norman Denzin (1978), grounding this theory on the earlier works by Campbell and Fiske (1959) and Webb et al. (1966). The logic behind triangulation had been used in social sciences even before it was introduced and employed (Flick, 2018); therefore, its role in qualitative research both implicitly and explicitly is regarded as a long history.



Various specialists have emphasized the significance of combining methods due to the weaknesses and fallacies of the works based on a single method or assessed by a single observer. According to Johnson (1992), the triangulation method is one of the more practical ways of providing accurateness and trustworthiness of the information (as cited in Yüksel, 2007); displaying a more comprehensive perspective about the topic being examined (Mackey & Gass, 2005); and thus providing coherent information by eliminating the biases (Cresswell, 2014). In this study, the qualitative part of the analysis (the responses to the open-ended questions 10 and 11) were used to reinforce the findings of the quantitative part (Likert-scale answers). The qualitative findings obtained from teachers' genuine answers allowed the researcher to understand and elaborate on the quantitative findings more fully without any limitations belonging to the close-ended questions since the triangulation method gave a chance to the participants to expand their ideas into a broader setting and to show their attitudes towards translanguaging by providing further reasonings.

### **3.6. INTERRATER RELIABILITY**

10% of the overall data was randomly chosen to examine the reliability of the colour codes and the Microsoft Office Excel program was used to calculate the ratios of reliability. Rater I had an undergraduate degree in Foreign Language Teaching, and Rater II had an undergraduate degree in English Language Teaching. Rater I is a student in English Language Teaching Master's Program. Rater II is a college student at the Toronto School of Management and an English teacher at Final Schools. For each theme, there was a colour correspondent, which let them categorize the answers under the codes independently. For the colour codes of the "beneficial" part, there was 95.84% consistency between the raters. Also, the consistency percentage of the "detrimental" part was found as 95.84%. Finally, the last colour-coding was done for the "general attitudes" part, and it was found that the coding 95.84% consistent between the two raters. The average agreement on the codes was 95.84%.

### **3.7. SUMMARY**

This chapter included detailed information about research questions, participants and setting, data collection instruments, procedure and data analysis in order. This section starts with research questions; in the next breath, participants were described in terms of their gender, school type, level of teaching, years of experience, and further demographic details. Data collection instruments and the procedure followed were given in the following titles. The procedure and data analysis sections composed the bulk body of this chapter, and they were also reported by paying special attention to the methodology followed.



## CHAPTER IV

### 4. RESULTS

#### 4.1. FINDINGS RELATED TO RESEARCH QUESTION 1

##### 4.1.1. Results related to the teachers' perspectives about the frequency of students' L1 use on the school basis

Table 4

*Teachers' Perspectives about the Frequency of Students' Use of L1 Differed by School Type*

Items	Type of School	N	X	SS	t	df	p
6.1. to discuss content or activities in small groups	State School	135	2.71	1.085	2.354	178.500	.020
	Private School	92	2.34	1.234			
6.2. to provide assistance to peers during activities	State School	135	2.96	1.032	2.211	186.587	.028
	Private School	92	2.64	1.105			
6.3. to brainstorm during class activities	State School	135	2.73	1.082	2.701	225	.007
	Private School	92	2.32	1.185			
6.4. to explain problems not related to content	State School	135	3.19	1.149	4.146	225	.000
	Private School	92	2.53	1.218			
	State School	135	3.14	1.059	2.460	225	.015

6.5. to enable participation by lower proficiency students	Private School	92	2.79	1.022			
6.6. to respond to teacher's question	State School	135	2.68	1.144			
	Private School	92	2.14	1.297	3.307	225	.001
6.7. to ask permission	State School	135	2.61	1.197			
	Private School	92	2.17	1.427	2.519	225	.012

The questionnaire consists of four main 5-Likert-scale questions, each of which has seven to nine sub-categories in itself. These four main questions were exploited to show whether teachers' translanguaging practices and perspectives vary according to the school type, level of instruction and teachers' years of teaching experience. The first main question aims to show how often state school and private school teachers observe or encourage students' native language use for seven following purposes: *to discuss content or activities in small groups, to provide assistance to peers during activities, to brainstorm during class activities, to explain problems not related to the content, to enable participation by lower proficiency students, to respond to teacher's question and to ask permission.*

There is a significant difference observed between the state school teachers and private school teachers as to their translanguaging practices in the classroom. The mean of state school teachers is higher than that of private school teachers in all of the items, which shows that state school teachers observe and encourage students to use their native language more than private school teachers. It can be said that state school teachers ( $M= 3.19$ ) do observe or encourage students' native language use somewhat more often than private school teachers ( $M= 2.53$ ) when they explain problems occurring naturally in the class rather than content-originating (*item 6.4*). State school teachers ( $M= 2.68$ ) also state that the students often rely on their mother tongue when they respond to teachers' questions (*item*

6.6), whereas private school teachers ( $M= 2.14$ ) report that the students almost never use their mother tongue to respond to themselves.

Additionally, state school teachers ( $M= 2.61$ ) more often enable the use of the first language in the classroom for students to ask permission in the classroom (*item 6.7*) than private school teachers ( $M= 2.17$ ). In conformity with this purpose of practice, state school teachers ( $M= 2.73$ ) are also found to favour the mother tongue for students to brainstorm during class activities (*item 6.3*) more than private school teachers do ( $M = 2.32$ ). During the discussion content or activities in small groups (*item 6.1*), state school teachers ( $M= 2.71$ ) and private school teachers ( $M= 2.34$ ) report that they observe students' dependence on their shared mother tongue to such an extent that can be called somewhat often.

The remaining items also display the significant differences between state school and private school teachers in terms of the frequency that they observe their students using their first language while enabling participation by lower proficient students (*item 6.5*) and providing assistance to peers during activities (*item 6.2*). State school teachers ( $M= 3.14$ ) state that the students frequently switch to the native language when they want their lower proficiency peers to be engaged in the activities, whereas private school teachers ( $M= 2.79$ ) do not so often observe such a shift between languages. Furthermore, state school teachers ( $M= 2.96$ ) witness the situations in which students provide assistance to each other during activities more often than private school teachers ( $M= 2.64$ ) do.

#### **4.1.2. Results related to the teachers' perspectives about the importance of students' L1 use on the school basis**

Table 5

*Teachers' Perspectives about the Importance of Students' Use of L1 Differed by School Type*

Items	Type of School	N	X	SS	t	df	p
	State School	135	1.70	.672	3.558	225	.000

7.1. to discuss content or activities in small groups	Private School	92	1.39	.573				
7.2. to provide assistance to peers during activities	State School	135	1.87	.678				
	Private School	92	1.77	.681	1.034	225	.302	
7.3. to brainstorm during class activities	State School	135	1.65	.705				
	Private School	92	1.49	.703	1.709	225	.089	
7.4. to explain problems not related to content	State School	135	2.03	.712				
	Private School	92	1.76	.747	2.713	189.292	.007	
7.5. to enable participation by lower proficiency students	State School	135	2.05	.673				
	Private School	92	1.90	.712	1.607	225	.109	
7.6. to respond to teacher's question	State School	135	1.62	.690				
	Private School	92	1.47	.733	1.619	225	.107	
7.7. to ask permission	State School	135	1.55	.666				
	Private School	92	1.38	.709	1.815	225	.071	

Question 7 is the second main question in the questionnaire, and it displays teachers' opinions about the importance of students' native language use in the previously investigated contexts, in terms of to what extent teachers do find L1 significant across these contexts. When we look at the overall results, the use of native language is not regarded as crucial by both groups of teachers in the contexts except the first and fourth ones. A significant difference has been found to exist for the first item called "to discuss content or activities in small groups", seeing that the mean of state school teachers is higher than that of the private school for this specific item. According to the results, state school teachers ( $M= 1.70$ ) believe in the power of

students' native language to foster learning and meaning through content discussion and small group activities. As for the private school teachers ( $M= 1.39$ ), it is not necessarily accepted as a potential tool to resort to when the students are assigned to activities in small groups or have a discussion over the content. Additionally, native language use appears to be important mostly for state schools teachers ( $M= 2.03$ ) at one more important point, which is explaining problems not related to content (*item 7.4*) when compared to private school teachers ( $M= 1.76$ ).

However, teachers' opinions about the importance of native language in providing assistance to peers (*item 7.2*) and brainstorming during classroom activities (*item 7.3*), enabling participation by lower proficiency students (*item 7.5*), responding to teacher's question (*item 7.6*) and asking for permission (*item 7.7*) do not cause any contradictory propositions inasmuch as both state school and private school teachers do not attribute any importance to the native language use for the aforementioned items.

To sum up, Questions 6 and 7 have seven items under each, and the answers to them are provided by the teachers. First, the frequency and then the importance of students' native language use in the classroom are questioned under seven sub-categories. Teachers from both different types of schools have shown their preferences towards students' native language use in the classrooms, and it can be concluded that native language is valued and accredited by mostly state school teachers who participated in the questionnaire as an explanatory tool when there occur content related problems because it paves the way for students who have lower proficiency levels; yet still, would like to participate in the activities. Even though the significant differences have been found in every purpose under question 6, which aims to find answers to how often the teachers observe or encourage students' use of native language in the classroom; when it comes to the importance, teachers provide not so significantly different answers as to how important they believe it is to use native language for students in the classrooms. Apparently, no matter how much they think it is not important to use native language in the classroom, they still observe or encourage their students to use native language for the investigated purposes.

**4.1.3. Results related to the teachers' perspectives about the frequency of their L1 use on the school basis**

Table 6

*Teachers' Perspectives about the Frequency of their Use of L1 Differed by School Type*

Items	Type of School	N	X	SS	t	df	p																																																																																
8.1. to explain concepts	State School	135	2.88	.947	9.069	225	.000																																																																																
	Private School	92	1.79	.792				8.2. to describe vocabulary	State School	135	2.69	1.011	5.305	225	.000	Private School	92	1.98	.961	8.3. to give directions	State School	135	2.64	1.104	7.274	217.316	.000	Private School	92	1.66	.905	8.4. for classroom management	State School	135	2.94	1.157	5.873	225	.000	Private School	92	2.04	1.089	8.5. to give feedback to students	State School	135	2.73	1.101	5.757	225	.000	Private School	92	1.89	1.053	8.6. to praise students	State School	135	2.44	1.076	6.024	225	.000	Private School	92	1.57	1.062	8.7. to build bonds with students	State School	135	2.99	1.082	4.296	173.354	.000	Private School	92	2.29	1.280	8.8. to quickly clarify during activities	State School	135	3.04	1.018	5.895	182.285	.000
8.2. to describe vocabulary	State School	135	2.69	1.011	5.305	225	.000																																																																																
	Private School	92	1.98	.961				8.3. to give directions	State School	135	2.64	1.104	7.274	217.316	.000	Private School	92	1.66	.905	8.4. for classroom management	State School	135	2.94	1.157	5.873	225	.000	Private School	92	2.04	1.089	8.5. to give feedback to students	State School	135	2.73	1.101	5.757	225	.000	Private School	92	1.89	1.053	8.6. to praise students	State School	135	2.44	1.076	6.024	225	.000	Private School	92	1.57	1.062	8.7. to build bonds with students	State School	135	2.99	1.082	4.296	173.354	.000	Private School	92	2.29	1.280	8.8. to quickly clarify during activities	State School	135	3.04	1.018	5.895	182.285	.000	Private School	92	2.17	1.125								
8.3. to give directions	State School	135	2.64	1.104	7.274	217.316	.000																																																																																
	Private School	92	1.66	.905				8.4. for classroom management	State School	135	2.94	1.157	5.873	225	.000	Private School	92	2.04	1.089	8.5. to give feedback to students	State School	135	2.73	1.101	5.757	225	.000	Private School	92	1.89	1.053	8.6. to praise students	State School	135	2.44	1.076	6.024	225	.000	Private School	92	1.57	1.062	8.7. to build bonds with students	State School	135	2.99	1.082	4.296	173.354	.000	Private School	92	2.29	1.280	8.8. to quickly clarify during activities	State School	135	3.04	1.018	5.895	182.285	.000	Private School	92	2.17	1.125																				
8.4. for classroom management	State School	135	2.94	1.157	5.873	225	.000																																																																																
	Private School	92	2.04	1.089				8.5. to give feedback to students	State School	135	2.73	1.101	5.757	225	.000	Private School	92	1.89	1.053	8.6. to praise students	State School	135	2.44	1.076	6.024	225	.000	Private School	92	1.57	1.062	8.7. to build bonds with students	State School	135	2.99	1.082	4.296	173.354	.000	Private School	92	2.29	1.280	8.8. to quickly clarify during activities	State School	135	3.04	1.018	5.895	182.285	.000	Private School	92	2.17	1.125																																
8.5. to give feedback to students	State School	135	2.73	1.101	5.757	225	.000																																																																																
	Private School	92	1.89	1.053				8.6. to praise students	State School	135	2.44	1.076	6.024	225	.000	Private School	92	1.57	1.062	8.7. to build bonds with students	State School	135	2.99	1.082	4.296	173.354	.000	Private School	92	2.29	1.280	8.8. to quickly clarify during activities	State School	135	3.04	1.018	5.895	182.285	.000	Private School	92	2.17	1.125																																												
8.6. to praise students	State School	135	2.44	1.076	6.024	225	.000																																																																																
	Private School	92	1.57	1.062				8.7. to build bonds with students	State School	135	2.99	1.082	4.296	173.354	.000	Private School	92	2.29	1.280	8.8. to quickly clarify during activities	State School	135	3.04	1.018	5.895	182.285	.000	Private School	92	2.17	1.125																																																								
8.7. to build bonds with students	State School	135	2.99	1.082	4.296	173.354	.000																																																																																
	Private School	92	2.29	1.280				8.8. to quickly clarify during activities	State School	135	3.04	1.018	5.895	182.285	.000	Private School	92	2.17	1.125																																																																				
8.8. to quickly clarify during activities	State School	135	3.04	1.018	5.895	182.285	.000																																																																																
	Private School	92	2.17	1.125																																																																																			



8.9. to help low proficiency students	State School	135	3.26	1.139			
	Private School	92	2.54	1.235	4.491	225	.000

Question 8 is the third main question in the questionnaire, and it aims to reveal how frequently state school and private school teachers use students' native language for the following purposes: *to explain concepts, to describe vocabulary, to give directions, for classroom management, to give feedback to students, to praise students, to build bonds with students, to quickly clarify during activities and to help low proficiency students*. There is a significant difference found between the state school teachers and private school teachers in every purpose. The mean of state school teachers is higher than the mean of private school teachers, proving that their frequency of using students' mother tongue varies by school type. The items will be explained in-depth with the differences in the means from the highest to the lowest one below.

According to the findings, the highest difference found between state and private school teachers is the first item of Question 8. State school teachers ( $M= 2.88$ ) tend to call on students' native language when they explain concepts (*item 8.1*) more frequently than private school teachers ( $M= 1.79$ ). The second highest difference in the means was observed in the item called 'to give directions' (*item 8.3*), which proves that state school teachers ( $M= 2.64$ ) benefit from the mostly-shared language while giving directions in the classroom more than private school teachers ( $M= 1.66$ ). Parallel to this reasoning, state school teachers ( $M= 2.94$ ) also expressed that they use students' native language when they keep students academically focused, organized and productive while establishing discipline in the classroom. However, private school teachers ( $M= 2.90$ ) do not seem to agree on the function of students' native language as a necessary tool to apply so as to handle classroom management related problems (*item 8.4*).

It has also been found out that state school teachers ( $M= 3.04$ ) quickly shift from target language to students' first language in order to clarify the instructions during activities (*item 8.8*), while private school teachers ( $M= 2.17$ ) do not often use this strategy in the classroom. Praising (*item 8.6*) and giving feedback to students (*item 8.5*) are the following items that the mean of state school teachers have been observed

to be higher than that of private school teachers. State school teachers ( $M= 2.44$ ) praise students in their native language, whereas private school teachers stick to the target language for such affective purposes ( $M= 1.57$ ). Once more again, state school teachers ( $M= 2.73$ ) have shown their preferences towards students' native language while giving feedback in the classroom, while private school teachers almost never use students' native language for the same purpose ( $M= 1.89$ ).

Although it is not significantly evident, state school teachers ( $M= 3.26$ ) rely on students' first language more frequently than private school teachers ( $M= 2.54$ ) when they help their low proficiency students (*item 8.9*). State school teachers ( $M= 2.99$ ) have a relatively higher mean than private school teachers ( $M= 2.29$ ) for item 8.7, which is *to build bonds with students*. This tendency is in harmony with the previous items about praising and classroom management, for which state school teachers also value the effectiveness of students' native language. Last but not least, state school teachers ( $M= 2.69$ ) also express that they describe unknown vocabulary (*item 8.2*) by using students' native language somewhat more often than private school teachers ( $M= 1.98$ ), who most likely give synonyms or use visual aids for explaining vocabulary.

#### 4.1.4. Results related to the teachers' perspectives about the importance of their L1 use on the school basis

Table 7

*Teachers' Perspectives about the Importance of their Use of L1 Differed by School Type*

Items	Type of School	N	X	SS	t	df	p															
9.1. to explain concepts	State School	135	1.93	.594	4.054	180.201	.000															
	Private School	92	1.58	.667				9.2. to describe vocabulary	State School	135	1.79	.659	2.778	225	.006	Private School	92	1.54	.670	State School	135	1.70
9.2. to describe vocabulary	State School	135	1.79	.659	2.778	225	.006															
	Private School	92	1.54	.670																		
	State School	135	1.70	.705				5.145	222.181	.000												

9.3. to give directions	Private School	92	1.27	.537			
9.4. for classroom management	State School	135	1.95	.746			
	Private School	92	1.64	.689	3.137	225	.002
9.5. to give feedback to students	State School	135	1.85	.738			
	Private School	92	1.51	.703	3.482	225	.001
9.6. to praise students	State School	135	1.70	.705			
	Private School	92	1.29	.584	4.686	216.406	.000
9.7. to build bonds with students	State School	135	2.06	.731			
	Private School	92	1.68	.710	3.835	225	.000
9.8. to quickly clarify during activities	State School	135	2.01	.658			
	Private School	92	1.59	.632	4.927	200.743	.000
9.9. to help low proficiency students	State School	135	2.16	.704			
	Private School	92	1.83	.689	3.570	225	.000

Question 9 is the fourth main question in the questionnaire, and it seeks to find out how important state school and private school teachers believe the use of students' native language is for the following purposes: *to explain concepts, to describe vocabulary, to give directions, for classroom management, to give feedback to students, to praise students, to build bonds with students, to quickly clarify during activities and to help low proficiency students*. The mean of state school teachers is higher than the mean of private school teachers in each purpose, showing that it appears to be a significant difference between the teachers of both school types. The purposes will be explained in-depth with the differences in the means from the highest to the lowest one below.

The findings suggest that state school teachers ( $M= 1.93$ ) believe in the importance of students' native language when they give directions (*item 9.3*) given the means of private school teachers ( $M= 1.58$ ), who do not think it is important to use

students' mother tongue for the same purpose. State school teachers ( $M= 2.01$ ) also state that they shift to students' native language, especially when they need to quickly clarify during activities (*item 9.8*), whereas private school teachers ( $M= 1.59$ ) do not give as much credence as state school teachers to the students' first language in the event of more clarification during activities. Likewise, private school teachers ( $M= 1.29$ ) are not of the opinion that they should praise students (*item 9.6*) in their mother tongue, while state school teachers believe it is important to motivate students in their first language ( $M= 1.70$ ).

It has been once understood that state school teachers highly believe in the importance of students' first language not only for affective but also for academic reasons. State school teachers admit that they ( $M= 2.06$ ) rely on students' mother tongue when they try to build bonds with students (*item 9.7*) as well as they ( $M= 1.93$ ) explain concepts (*item 9.1*) arisen during teaching. As totally opposite as it is, private school teachers show their abstention regarding the same purposes. They believe it is not a significant tool to build bonds with students ( $M= 1.68$ ) and a functional way of explaining concepts ( $M= 1.58$ ), respectively. Nonetheless, state school teachers ( $M= 1.85$ ) regard students' native language as an important tool to give feedback to students (*item 9.5*), whereas private school teachers ( $M= 1.51$ ) once again do not resort to it.

With regard to the general tendency drawn from the findings so far, state school teachers find students' native language useful for two more purposes, namely to help low proficiency students (*item 9.9*) and for classroom management (*item 9.4*). They ( $M= 2.16$ ) believe it is important to have the inclusion of all students in the classroom regardless of their proficiency level, and that's why they alter the language of instruction when needed. However, private school teachers ( $M= 1.83$ ) do not hold the same views about helping low proficiency students by using students' native language. In the same manner, private school teachers ( $M= 1.64$ ) also do not consider students' native language as a profitable tool to use for classroom management issues. Lastly, there is a significant difference found between the means of state school teachers ( $M= 1.79$ ) and private school teachers ( $M= 1.54$ ) for the last item of the question, which is 'to describe vocabulary' (*item 9.2*).

In conclusion, the answers to Questions 8 and 9 are provided by teachers from their own point of view and have nine items under each question. Teachers from both

different types of schools have expressed their beliefs about the first language as to how frequent and important it is to be used by teachers themselves under nine sub-categories. The insights obtained from the teachers have shown that state school teachers more frequently take on the advantages of students' native language than private school teachers do. State school teachers do also not deny the role of students' native language in social and academic contexts in addition to its importance as an effective tool to create more suitable environments for learning to take place. There is a consistency between how often the teachers observe native language use in the classroom and how important they believe it is to be used in the classroom, as the findings of Questions 8 and 9 suggest.

## 4.2. FINDINGS RELATED TO RESEARCH QUESTION 2

### 4.2.1. Results related to the teachers' perspectives about the frequency of students' L1 use on the level basis

Upon reviewing item by item using ANOVA, Table 8 demonstrates that teachers' beliefs about the translanguaging practices differ according to the level of students that they are teaching for these three items, which are titled as 6.3. *to brainstorm during class activities* ( $p = .011$ ), 6.5. *to enable participation by lower proficiency students* ( $p = .002$ ) and 6.7. *to ask permission* ( $p = .003$ ). The test results revealed that there was no significant difference pertaining to the school level for the items named 6.1. *to discuss content or activities in small groups* ( $p = .454$ ), 6.2. *to provide assistance to peers during activities* ( $p = .131$ ), 6.4. *to explain problems not related to content* ( $p = .358$ ) and 6.6. *to respond to teacher's question* ( $p = .054$ ).

Table 8

*Teachers' Perspectives about the Frequency of Students' Use of L1 Differed by Level*

	Primary school	Secondary school	High school	University
--	----------------	------------------	-------------	------------

Items	$F(3-223)$	$p^a$	$M$	$SD$	$M$	$SD$	$M$	$SD$	$M$	$SD$
6.1	0.87	.454	2.36	1.223	2.63	1.106	2.69	1.176	2.51	1.165
6.2	1.89	.131	2.69	1.184	2.93	.991	3.04	.978	2.59	1.140
6.3	3.81	.011	2.24	1.138	2.73	1.100	2.84	1.143	2.32	1.105
6.4	1.08	.358	2.80	1.353	3.02	1.100	3.08	1.288	2.71	1.167
6.5	5.06	.002	2.76	1.170	3.18	.983	3.29	.935	2.61	1.022
6.6	2.58	.054	2.16	1.183	2.60	1.256	2.73	1.255	2.27	1.162
6.7	4.87	.003	2.05	1.239	2.61	1.359	2.86	1.384	2.10	.995

Note. <sup>a</sup> p values reflect the significance level of ANOVA test

Gabriel Post Hoc test results showed which levels specifically had significant differences per purpose. There was a significant difference between primary school teachers and high school teachers ( $p = .040$ ) for the third purpose, which is called 6.3. *to brainstorm during class activities*. The mean of primary school teachers ( $M = 2.24$ ) was lower than the mean of high school teachers ( $M = 2.84$ ), and it shows that high school teachers observe students' native language use when students brainstorm during class activities more than primary school teachers. A significant difference was found between secondary school teachers and university teachers ( $p = .021$ ) and between high school teachers and university teachers ( $p = .013$ ) for the fifth purpose, which is named 6.5. *to enable participation by lower proficiency students*. The means of secondary school teachers ( $M = 3.18$ ) and high school teachers ( $M = 3.29$ ) were found to be higher than the teachers who work at university ( $M = 2.61$ ). It shows that secondary and high school teachers more frequently observe students when they push their lower proficiency peers to participate in the activities. The last significantly different purpose of Question 6 was 6.7. *to ask permission*. There was a statistically significant difference between the groups of primary school teachers and high school teachers ( $p = .009$ ) and between high school teachers and university teachers ( $p = .032$ ). The mean of high school teachers ( $M = 2.86$ ) was higher than both of the means of the groups, primary school teachers ( $M = 2.05$ ) and university teachers ( $M = 2.10$ ). It demonstrates that high school teachers often witness the situations that their students prefer to switch to their L1 to ask permission more than

the other groups (The sig values used here are taken from Gabriel Post Hoc test, see Appendix A).

#### 4.2.2. Results related to the teachers' perspectives about the importance of students' L1 use on the level basis

As a consequence of the analysis of items in separate by ANOVA, teachers' beliefs about the importance of translanguaging practices differ according to the level of students that they are teaching for the five of total seven purposes as can be understood from Table 9. Significant differences were mostly found among the school levels for items 7.1. *to discuss content or activities in small groups* ( $p = .006$ ), 7.3. *to brainstorm during class activities* ( $p = .019$ ), 7.5. *to enable participation by lower proficiency students* ( $p = .036$ ), 7.6. *to respond to the teacher's question* ( $p = .044$ ) and 7.7. *to ask permission* ( $p = .026$ ). The test results revealed that there was no significant difference pertaining to the school level for the items named 7.2. *to provide assistance to peers during activities* ( $p = .112$ ) and 7.4. *to explain problems not related to content* ( $p = .276$ ).

Table 9

*Teachers' Perspectives about the Importance of Students' Use of L1 Differed by Level*

Items	$F(3-223)$	$p^a$	Primary school		Secondary school		High school		University	
			$M$	$SD$	$M$	$SD$	$M$	$SD$	$M$	$SD$
7.1	4.209	.006	1.36	.485	1.74	.663	1.59	.674	1.49	.711
7.2	2.023	.112	1.65	.700	1.91	.670	1.92	.571	1.78	.759
7.3	3.366	.019	1.36	.557	1.74	.783	1.61	.671	1.54	.711
7.4	1.297	.276	1.78	.712	2.01	.729	1.98	.721	1.85	.792
7.5	2.894	.036	1.96	.744	2.06	.673	2.12	.564	1.73	.742
7.6	2.740	.044	1.38	.527	1.72	.758	1.55	.738	1.49	.746
7.7	3.155	.026	1.33	.546	1.65	.776	1.49	.711	1.34	.575

---

Note. <sup>a</sup> p values reflect the significance level of ANOVA test

Gabriel post hoc tests revealed that there was a significant difference between primary school teachers and secondary school teachers for the items which are listed as 7.1. *to discuss content or activities in small groups* ( $p= .004$ ), 7.3. *to brainstorm during class activities* ( $p= .011$ ), 7.6. *to respond to the teacher's question* ( $p= .035$ ) and 7.7. *to ask permission* ( $p= .042$ ). The means of primary school teachers came out to be lower than the means of secondary school teachers for each purpose; primary school teachers ( $M= 1.36$ ) and secondary school teachers ( $M= 1.74$ ) for first and third purposes, which show that secondary school teachers believe the importance of using students' native language in discussing and brainstorming during class activities. Similarly, primary school teachers ( $M= 1.38$ ) and secondary school teachers ( $M= 1.72$ ) also differed for the sixth purpose, meaning that secondary school teachers believe the important role of students' first language in responding to teachers' questions more than primary school teachers do. Lastly, primary school teachers ( $M= 1.33$ ) and secondary school teachers ( $M= 1.65$ ) for the last purpose, which reveals that primary school teachers do not believe the importance of the use of mother tongue to ask permission as much as secondary school teachers do. There was also a statistically significant difference between high school teachers and university teachers for item 7.5. *to enable participation by lower proficiency students* ( $p= .043$ ). The mean of high school teachers ( $M= 2.12$ ) was found to be higher than that of university teachers ( $M= 1.73$ ). It is understood that it is more important for high school teachers to include lower proficiency students by using students' native language more than university teachers (The sig values used here are taken from Gabriel Post Hoc test, see Appendix B).

#### **4.2.3. Results related to the teachers' perspectives about the frequency of their L1 use on the level basis**

ANOVA test results, as presented in Table 10, show the differences related to how often the teachers across four different levels of school use students' native language for nine different purposes. Significant differences were discovered among the school levels for every item under Question 8. In the aftermath of the analysis on



the basis of item, the significance values are listed as follows: 8.1. *to explain concepts* (p= .001), 8.2. *to describe vocabulary* (p= .000), 8.3. *to give directions* (p= .005), 8.4. *for classroom management* (p= .007), 8.5. *to give feedback to students* (p= .000), 8.6. *to praise students* (p= .003), 8.7. *to build bonds with students* (p= .001), 8.8. *to quickly clarify during activities* (p= .000), and 8.9. *to help low proficiency students* (p= .001).

Table 10

*Teachers' Perspectives about the Frequency of their Use of L1 Differed by Level*

Items	F(3-223)	p <sup>a</sup>	Primary school		Secondary school		High school		University	
			M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD
8.1	6.113	.001	2.18	1.002	2.50	.984	2.90	1.026	2.12	1.005
8.2	7.133	.000	2.05	1.044	2.57	1.054	2.80	1.000	2.05	.865
8.3	4.349	.005	1.91	1.005	2.38	1.118	2.59	1.223	2.00	1.072
8.4	4.089	.007	2.22	1.150	2.77	1.169	2.88	1.218	2.32	1.234
8.5	8.770	.000	1.75	.865	2.62	1.224	2.69	1.176	2.44	1.026
8.6	4.883	.003	1.69	.791	2.37	1.272	2.24	1.182	1.85	1.108
8.7	5.575	.001	2.20	1.161	2.79	1.184	3.12	1.092	2.73	1.285
8.8	6.685	.000	2.27	1.079	2.83	1.086	3.14	1.208	2.41	1.024
8.9	5.704	.001	2.58	1.257	3.18	1.167	3.35	1.200	2.61	1.137

Note. <sup>a</sup> p values reflect the significance level of ANOVA test

Gabriel Post hoc tests uncovered the levels of the school, which differ from each other for every listed item. There is a significant difference found between primary school teachers ( $M= 2.18$ ) and high school teachers ( $M= 2.90$ ) and between high school teachers and university teachers ( $M= 2.12$ ) for the first item called 8.1. *to explain concepts* (p= .002). It can be concluded that high school teachers more often use students' native language to explain concepts than primary school and university teachers. The means of primary school teachers ( $M= 2.05$ ) and university teachers ( $M= 2.05$ ) were significantly lower than those of secondary school teachers ( $M= 2.57$ ), and high school teachers ( $M= 2.80$ ) for item 8.2. *to describe vocabulary*. The

significance values were found to be  $p = .020$  between primary and secondary school teachers and  $p = .001$  between primary and high school teachers. The significance values between university and secondary school teachers and between high school teachers were noted as  $p = .037$  and  $p = .003$ , respectively. It can be deduced that primary school and university teachers resort to L1 the least when compared to secondary or high school teachers when they describe vocabulary.

There is a significant difference found between primary school teachers ( $M = 1.91$ ) and high school teachers ( $M = 2.59$ ) for the item 8.3. *to give directions* ( $p = .011$ ). Significant differences were noted between the means of primary school teachers ( $M = 2.22$ ) and secondary school teachers ( $M = 2.77$ ) and between high school teachers ( $M = 2.88$ ) for item 8.4. *for classroom management*,  $p = .047$  and  $p = .030$  respectively. It is clear that high school teachers more highly depend on students' first language for classroom management and giving directives. There are great differences between primary school teachers ( $M = 1.75$ ) and secondary school teachers ( $M = 2.62$ ), high school teachers ( $M = 2.69$ ) and university teachers ( $M = 2.44$ ) for item 8.5. *to give feedback to students* seeing from the significance values,  $p = .000$ ,  $p = .000$  and  $p = .015$ . For item 8.6. *to praise students* ( $p = .004$ ), a significant difference was found only between primary school teachers ( $M = 1.69$ ) and secondary school teachers ( $M = 2.37$ ). There is a statistically significant difference between primary school teachers ( $M = 2.20$ ) and secondary school teachers ( $M = 2.79$ ) and high school teachers ( $M = 3.12$ ) for item 8.7. *to build bonds with students* ( $p = .024$ ). As clear as it is seen, primary school teachers switch the gears to students' native language the least among the other groups when they motivate or give feedback to students.

Significant differences were observed between primary school teachers and secondary school teachers and between primary school teachers and high school teachers for item 8.8. *to quickly clarify during activities* ( $p = .023$ ) and ( $p = .000$ ) respectively. There was also a significant difference observed between high school teachers and university teachers ( $p = .012$ ). The mean of primary school teachers ( $M = 2.27$ ) was significantly lower than both of the levels, secondary school teachers ( $M = 2.83$ ) and high school teachers ( $M = 3.14$ ). Comparably, the mean of university teachers ( $M = 2.41$ ) was lower than that of high school teachers. The last item on the list is 8.9. *to help low proficiency students*, for which significant differences stood out

between primary school teachers ( $M= 2.58$ ) and secondary school teachers ( $M= 3.18$ ) and between primary school teachers and high school teachers ( $p= .024$ ) and ( $p= .007$ ) respectively. A significant difference was also ( $p= .022$ ) observed between high school teachers ( $M= 3.35$ ) and university teachers ( $M= 2.61$ ). The means and values of both items indicate that primary school teachers and university teachers do not as much use students' native language to clarify and help low proficiency students as secondary school teachers or high school teachers (The sig values used here are taken from Gabriel Post Hoc test, see Appendix C).

#### 4.2.4. Results related to the teachers' perspectives about the importance of their L1 use on the level basis

ANOVA test results, as presented in Table 11, show the results related to how important the teachers across four different levels of the school believe the use students' native language for nine different purposes. No significant differences were discovered among the school levels for most of the items under Question 9 except the two items. The analysis demonstrates the significance values, which are listed as follows: 9.1. *to explain concepts* ( $p= .004$ ), 9.2. *to describe vocabulary* ( $p= .153$ ), 9.3. *to give directions* ( $p= .242$ ), 9.4. *for classroom management* ( $p= .808$ ), 9.5. *to give feedback to students* ( $p= .013$ ), 9.6. *to praise students* ( $p= .062$ ), 9.7. *to build bonds with students* ( $p= .253$ ), 9.8. *to quickly clarify during activities* ( $p= .228$ ), and 9.9. *to help low proficiency students* ( $p= .081$ ).

Table 11

*Teachers' Perspectives about the Importance of their Use of L1 Differed by Level*

Items	$F(3-223)$	$p^a$	Primary school		Secondary school		High school		University	
			$M$	$SD$	$M$	$SD$	$M$	$SD$	$M$	$SD$
9.1	4.521	.004	1.62	.623	1.91	.613	1.92	.640	1.59	.670
9.2	1.774	.153	1.55	.662	1.80	.675	1.71	.677	1.63	.662
9.3	1.407	.242	1.38	.561	1.62	.714	1.53	.739	1.51	.637

9.4	.324	.808	1.78	.686	1.88	.727	1.84	.773	1.76	.799
9.5	3.663	.013	1.47	.634	1.89	.754	1.67	.747	1.73	.775
9.6	2.482	.062	1.42	.629	1.70	.748	1.47	.616	1.44	.673
9.7	1.370	.253	1.75	.775	1.91	.740	1.98	.692	2.02	.758
9.8	1.454	.228	1.75	.645	1.95	.683	1.86	.707	1.73	.672
9.9	2.271	.081	1.85	.731	2.13	.662	2.12	.781	1.93	.685

*Note.* <sup>a</sup> p values reflect the significance level of ANOVA test

Gabriel Post hoc tests showed the differences among levels of the school. Although there was no significant difference reported for seven purposes, teachers' beliefs about the items *9.1. to explain concepts* and *9.5. to give feedback to students* still differed. There was a significance observed between primary school teachers and secondary school teachers ( $p = .43$ ) and between secondary school teachers and university teachers ( $p = .36$ ) for the first item, *9.1. to explain concepts*. The mean of primary school teachers ( $M = 1.62$ ) was lower than that of the secondary school teachers ( $M = 1.91$ ) and university teachers ( $M = 1.59$ ). Additionally, there was a statistical difference between primary school teachers and secondary school teachers ( $p = .007$ ) for item *9.5. to give feedback to students*. The mean of secondary school teachers ( $M = 1.89$ ) was observed to be higher than that of primary school teachers ( $M = 1.47$ ), as well. As can be deductible, secondary school teachers believe in the importance of students' mother tongue as a functional tool to explain concepts and give feedback to students more than the teachers working at any other levels (The sig values used here are taken from Gabriel Post Hoc test, see Appendix D).

### 4.3. FINDINGS RELATED TO RESEARCH QUESTION 3

To be able to bring more insights into light and support the findings analyzed quantitatively, the participants were asked to answer two more optional questions at the end of the questionnaire, which are *10. In your own words, please describe in which situations using the students' native language is beneficial, and in which situations it is detrimental?* and *11. Is there any additional information that you would like to share about your perception or use (either by the teacher or by the student) of the use of students' native language in the classroom?* Teachers' responses

to the second open-ended question were investigated, and three major conclusions were drawn out of 227 entries to demonstrate general attitudes towards translanguaging. In Question 11, teachers were asked to provide any other additional information or experiences that they would like to share about their perception or use of the students' native language in the classroom. When their answers were examined, three major distinct findings appeared, which are *translanguaging should be avoided*, *translanguaging should be balanced*, and *translanguaging should be used*. Table 12 shows the distribution of this distinction with teachers' percentages below.

Table 12  
*General Attitudes towards Translanguaging*

	State school		Private school		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Translanguaging should be avoided	16	7.04	16	7.04	32	14.09
Translanguaging should be used	20	8.81	11	4.84	31	13.65
Translanguaging should be balanced	14	6.16	2	0.88	16	7.04
Irrelevant entry	14	6.16	4	1.76	18	7.92
No entry	71	31.27	59	25.99	130	57.26
Total	135	59.5	92	40.5	227	100

Each response to the “*Question 11. Is there any additional information that you would like to share about your perception or use (either by the teacher or by the student) of the use of students' native language in the classroom?*” was individually perused and placed accordingly to their root idea. Of the study population, 130 of them preferred not to answer to the question, which makes 57.26% of the whole number of participants. 18 of them (7.92%) wrote irrelevant things that couldn't fall under any of the three categories. Therefore, only 79 participants' ideas played role in the distinction of these categories. Out of 79 teachers, 32 of them (14.09%) stated that translanguaging should be avoided as much as possible, emphasizing that the target language should be the classroom language as fits the purpose of the language learning. On the other hand, 31 of them (13.65%) objected to the target-language only ideology, taking shelter behind the benefits of L1. 16 of the participants (7.04%) favoured the

use of multiple languages in the classroom as it brought richness in dynamics in the classroom and helped students gain more understandings.

With an aim to stick to the point of the research question 3, perspectives about translanguaging practices among state and private schools seemed to differ to such an extent that it would be true to say private school teachers had more concerns about using L1 in the classroom than state school teachers given the numbers and percentages in Table 12. For the first finding, the perspective “*translanguaging should be avoided*” has the same number (N=16) of teachers from both school types, which gives us no clue to compare the general attitudes that might have resulted from the school types. However, if we look at the second finding, “*translanguaging should be used*”, it can be seen that state school teachers (N=20) outnumbered the private school teachers (N=11). It’s apparent that there are more teachers in private schools who think translanguaging is something to be avoided rather than it is something to be benefited from. Lastly, it was observed that state school teachers (N= 14) were in greater numbers when compared to private school teachers (N=2) in terms of the balanced use of two or more languages for the third finding, “*translanguaging should be balanced*”. It is understood that private school teachers show their attitudes towards translanguaging by either avoiding or using it, but they don’t lean towards balancing the use of translanguaging in the classrooms.

With the help of the examination of each answer to these two questions, the researcher was able to draw a general picture over whether translanguaging was a positive or a negative experience in the classrooms, to reveal whether it was favoured by the teachers from a certain level or a certain school type and to provide additional understandings through the teachers’ perceptions. Table 13 summarizes the positive and negative terms provided by the majority of the participant teachers (N= 207) towards translanguaging practices. This analysis was specifically preferred to show the general views according to the language of affect by Martin and White (2005), and they describe affect as “being concerned with positive and negative reactions to behaviours or things” (Nambisan, 2014, p.62). Looking at the data from a general frame, there appear to be 28 different positive terms, outnumbering the negative terms, which are only 15 different ones. The frequency of each term was also calculated in terms of how many times it was used by the teachers. According to the results, the

most frequent adjectives for positive terms are important and necessary, whereas unnecessary and harmful are the most common negative terms.

Table 13

*Positive and Negative Terms about Translanguaging by Teachers*

<i>Positive terms</i>	important, necessary, helpful, supportive, encouraging, motivating, explanatory, advantageous, time-saving, useful, interactive, assisting, quick, positive, comfortable, essential, connecting, inevitable, communicative, clarifying, compulsory, safe, relaxing, wiser, emergency kit, effective, strengthening, bonding
<i>Negative terms</i>	unnecessary, harmful, preventing, blocking, inconsequential, handicap, hard habit to quit, ineffective, inhibitor, hindering L2 development, harmful to language improvement, making students lazy, making students reluctant, problematic, harmful to students' speaking skills

To sum up, teachers in this study were in favor of the use of mother tongue in the classrooms for many bright sides. They mostly stated that using L1 was important and inevitable for the flow of communication between students and teachers in that it helped students relax and feel safe in one regard and provided the advantage of managing the time in the other. On the other hand, they also remarked on the dark sides of using L1 by highlighting its potential to hinder L2 development and deteriorate language improvement. Further to that, they claimed it could be a hard habit to quit if frequently used because it might make students feel lazy and reluctant to use the second language in the classroom, which is the worst scenario.

Table 14

*Is Translanguaging Beneficial or Detrimental?*

		State school		Private school		Total	
		N	%	N	%	N	%
Translanguaging	is only beneficial	52	22.90	26	11.45	78	34.36

Translanguaging is only detrimental	8	3.52	10	4.40	18	7.92
Translanguaging is both beneficial and detrimental	33	14.53	23	10.13	56	24.66
Neutral and irrelevant answers	42	18.50	13	5.72	55	24.22
No entry	0	0	20	8.81	20	8.81
Total	135	59.5	92	40.5	227	100

As a complementary interpretation to the qualitative part of the analysis, each response to the “*Question 10: In your own words, please describe in which situations using the students' native language is beneficial, and in which situations is it detrimental?*” was analyzed and colour-coded under different codes in two main parts. As Table 14 presents, out of 227 teachers, 20 of them (8.81%) preferred to give no answers to any of the questions by writing three dots or hyphens under the questions. 18 of them (7.92%) responded to the questions by solely making negative comments about translanguaging as a detrimental practice not to be used in the classroom whereas 78 of them (34.36%) believed that it was not a harmful strategy to resort to, instead, it yielded a great number of benefits in the class. Out of 111 teachers, there were 55 neutral and irrelevant answers from which nothing could be grasped about translanguaging either being beneficial or detrimental (24.22%). The rest 56 participants’ ideas played a significant role in outlining these codes since the teachers wrote the situations that were both beneficial and detrimental (24.66%). In total, 152 teachers’ ideas were analyzed, color-coded and then categorized under themes by paying attention to certain key words within the answers so as to understand for what specific situations teachers find translanguaging beneficial or detrimental. The comments of a negligible number of participants (6.60%) were found to fit in more than one category because their insights were relatable to more than one theme.

To provide more precise answers to the research Question 3, the number of teachers both in state and private schools was calculated regarding translanguaging beneficial or detrimental. According to the findings, state school teachers (22.90%) doubled up private school teachers (11.45%) in the matter of translanguaging as only a beneficial strategy rather than detrimental. Likewise, the percentage of state school teachers (3.52%) was less than private school teachers (4.40%) in regard to



translanguaging as a detrimental practice. These percentages provided insights about the fact that state school teachers and private school teachers were at odds with each other since translanguaging seemed to be more popular with state school teachers than private school teachers. However, there were another group of teachers who believed in and explained certain situations of the pros and cons of translanguaging at the same time. Private school teachers (10.13%), once again, were outnumbered by state school teachers (14.53%) in respect to translanguaging as being both beneficial and detrimental. Given the numbers, it is evident that state school teachers almost two times more suggest that translanguaging should be used because it is a fruitful practice and it brings about a wider variety of advantageous situations both for students and teachers than it causes undesirable outcomes. From this part on, the situations which translanguaging is beneficial for and detrimental to will be demonstrated under categories, exemplified with teachers' original comments.

In this part of the analysis, the findings are presented first, starting with the teachers' comments who favoured L1 use in the classroom, stating it was a beneficial strategy to be used in the classroom by 59.03%, and continuing the same order for the teachers who believed it was detrimental with a lower percentage of teachers by 32.58% out of 227 teachers. The themes which were created according to the teachers' responses are explained with their keywords and percentages in the related tables along with the teachers' original responses for more exemplification. The responses that were found to gather around the view of translanguaging as a beneficial practice were separated under eight different codes with different colours and keywords.

Table 15

*Colour-coded Themes and Key Words for Translanguaging as a Beneficial Practice*

Colour	Beneficial for	Keywords	Percentages
Pink	Content	introduction, explanation, clarification of the content	36.98
Blue	Classroom environment	anxiety level, students' motivation, warm environment	17.12
Yellow	Low-proficiency students	to help each other, students with no background, insufficient knowledge	11.64
Green	Classroom management	discipline, to manage students, problematic students	9.58
Grey	Emergency	health problems, serious problems	7.53

Red	Classroom activities	to brainstorm, discuss, explain, announce and give instructions during activities	6.84
Orange	Attention	to draw students' attention, to attract students	6.16
Purple	Outside classroom talk	curriculum-related problems, school-related problems, out-of-content daily talk	4.10
<b>Total</b>			<b>100</b>

As the greater portion of the teachers indicates, 59.03% of the teachers who participated in this study believed in the importance of the use of mother tongue in the classrooms for many reasons, as presented in Table 15. To start with, translanguaging was regarded as a benignant tool by 36.98% of the teachers who, in their comments, argued that the use of the first language could be unconventionally exploited especially when teachers introduced, explained and needed to clarify the new content as presented in the example answers below (*Colour Pink*). (*All grammar mistakes and spelling errors are original in the excerpts.*)

*T49: Usually for quick clarification on current affairs topics discussed in class and for vocabulary used in class. (Male, Private primary school teacher)*

*T63: In explaining abstract concepts such as grammatical structures or some vocabulary, native lang. is quite essential. (Male, State high school teacher)*

*T107: It is important to use native language to introduce a new subject in the class because when students don't know that subject they feel annoyed and have difficulty in focusing on the lesson (Female, State secondary school teacher)*

Translanguaging was seen as a sacred recipe by 17.12% of the teachers, the second bigger ratio of the participants, in order to reduce students' anxiety level and encourage them to feel comfortable under a safe and warm environment in the classroom. Below, there are certain comments which represent teachers' perspectives regarding its importance to the classroom environment (*Colour Blue*).

*T13: To clarify the language or maintain classroom interaction it is important to use target language, but sometimes to create a warm atmosphere in the classroom*

*or to maintain classroom management it is important to use native language. (Female, Private high school teacher)*

*T53: Beneficial to help clarify understanding and to lower anxiety among students. (Female, State university teacher)*

*T74: It is beneficial for motivating and participating lesson. (Female, State high school teacher)*

The third theme was specifically created for low proficiency students, for 11.64% of the teachers highly emphasized that translanguaging was effective for students who had no background or inadequate knowledge of the content in the sense that they could use the help of higher proficiency students through translanguaging (Colour Yellow).

*T2: While teaching the target grammar and vocab it is not necessary. However, when there is a confusion or low proficinecy level sts, its beneficial. (Female, Private university teacher)*

*T48: It is beneficial for students to use it and help each other while they are working in peers or groups. It is detrimental if the teacher uses it for explanations or instructions as this will make students demand the use of their mother tongue. And if TL is used for all purposes it will make students see that it is not just a subject to be studied but something to be used in real life. (Female, Private university teacher)*

*T159: It is especially beneficial while scaffolding the students if they do not have enough knowledge. I dont think that it is detrimental. (Female, State secondary school teacher)*

Using native language in the classroom was also seen beneficial for classroom management reasons by 9.58% of the participant teachers as they believed its power to maintain the discipline and manage the problematic students in the classroom (Colour Green).

*T14: To discipline and manage the classroom, it is quite beneficial. However, an excessive use of L1 could hinder the sufficient amount of L2 exposure which is quite*

important during the language learning process. Thus, the teachers should set a balance for their L1 use. (Female, State secondary school teacher)

T76: In classroom management part, or when a student has a problem, we need to solve so in this case to speak in L1 is beneficial. (Female, State high school teacher)

T120: Should there a discipline related problem, using the native language might help. Other than that it is mostly detrimental. (Male, Private high school teacher)

7.53% of the teachers attached a lot of importance to the use of mother tongue in the classroom during an emergency such as health problems or serious sicknesses in order for their students to express themselves quickly (Colour Grey).

T30: Ts may use native language for emergency situations. (Female, State secondary school teacher)

T45: In emergency cases students should be aware of the fact that they are allowed to use their native language. (Female, Private primary school teacher)

The sixth theme is formed about the use of the mother tongue during classroom activities or tasks. According to the 6.84% of the teachers, it enabled students to brainstorm and have a discussion over the topics and teachers to explain further, make important announcements and give instructions easily. Two examples, one from each, are presented below (Colour Red).

T16: Before doing the activity, it's beneficial for students to use their L1 to brainstorm and discuss because sometimes they struggle with finding ideas. However, for the post activities they should try their best to use English. (Female, Private university teacher)

T47: it is beneficial when making very important announcements. it is detrimental when it becomes a habit and encourages students to stick to L1. (Male, Private university teacher)

The last two themes, which include the least teacher percentages 6.16% and 4.10%, are related to attracting students' attention and out-of-classroom talk,

respectively. 6.16% of the teachers asserted that translanguaging could be a very interesting way of drawing students' attention to teaching content or classroom activities if they were distracted or disconnected (*Colour Orange*). 4.10% of the teachers also stated that they could chat with their students about curriculum and school-related problems or have small talks with them outside the classroom in their native language as it relieved the pressure on the students of not being able to express themselves appropriately (*Colour Purple*).

*T8: ....Using Turkish transition words during classes make students more motivated and alert in the classes. I mean using Turkish minimally and unexpectedly make students pay more attention to the class. It can be one of the fine results of using mother tongue in the class. (Female, State high school teacher)*

*T12: When the student needs to communicate outside the class hours, it can be very beneficial. (Female, Private university teacher)*

Table 16

*Colour-coded Themes and Key Words for Translanguaging as a Detrimental Practice*

Colour	Detrimental to	Keywords	Percentages
Pink	The nature of L2 teaching/learning	target language class, teaching contexts, learning situations	44.30
Orange	Students' ability to speak L2	students' communicative competence, speaking skills	13.92
Green	Classroom interaction	doing presentations, discussions, practice	12.65
Blue	Learning concepts	learning vocabulary, learning grammar	12.65
Red	L2 exposure and input	listening skills, only place to expose to L2	10.12
Yellow	Time and motivation	time-consuming habit of escaping L2	6.32
Total			100

The responses which signalled the detrimental sides of translanguaging, on the other hand, were analyzed and categorized under six different codes. Although less than the majority of the participants in this study, 33.48% of the teachers stated that they should refrain from the use of mother tongue by providing valid reasons. Table

16 briefly summarizes the themes with their colours, keywords and the percentages of the teachers who made great contributions to the creation of these themes. To begin with, translanguaging was regarded as a threatening factor by 44.30% of the teachers for the nature of second language teaching and learning processes. Teachers' descriptions of the situations that can be tied around the idea that the use of L1 threatens the L2 learning process are placed below (*Colour Pink*).

*T46: There is no beneficial situation for using the sts's native language (Female, Private secondary school teacher)*

*T98: In my opinion, we need to use target language only to make language learning more effective. (Female, Private primary school teacher)*

*T202: If the teacher talks student's native language, there won't be any need of speaking in target language. The teacher should be a role model, she should use the target language in every situation but she can ask some students to clarify in their own language. (Female, Private primary school teacher)*

The second concern that teachers held against translanguaging was that translanguaging could have a detrimental effect on students' receptive and productive skills, causing unpleasant consequences such as the inability to understand and speak a foreign language. 13.92% of the teachers of this study picked out these anticipated problems, arguing that translanguaging had the potential to damage students' communicative competence and set students back from speaking in the target language (*Colour Orange*).

*T21: ...It's somewhat detrimental in speaking activities (i.e. for fluency ) since the classroom is the only place that the EFL students hear and practice English. (Male, State secondary school teacher)*

*T147: ...However, if they tend to use native language even with the minor issues that they can explain in English, it can be detrimental because they will get used to do this so improving communicative competence may be problematic (Female, Private university teacher)*

*T160: ....detrimental in developing students' speaking skills (Female, State secondary school teacher)*

Interaction in the classroom is acknowledged as a key skill and complex action to be achieved among the participants in this study. 12.65% of them pointed out that the target language should be a must to use instead of depending on students' native language in order to prepare students for classroom presentations, discussions and situational contexts to be able to express themselves easily and interact with others, giving them the chance to practice what they learnt (*Colour Green*).

*T148: ...but native language doesn't help us that much during content presentations and discussions (Female, State secondary school teacher)*

*T161: ...While teacher is doing the activities in class, mimics and the target language is necessary, not the native language... (Female, State primary school teacher)*

*T211: ...However, I always stand behind target language to use interactively no matter what the situation is, because it really works when you find a convenient method which is highly suitable for your own class. (Female, Private secondary school teacher)*

Translanguaging was seen as an obstructive practice for learning concepts, grammar and vocabulary by 12.65% of the teachers of this study. In their open-ended answers, they recommended not to teach concepts in students' native language because it would be detrimental to their capacity to comprehend, describe and process the target vocabulary and the target structure in their mental maps. Instead of taking the easiest way of switching L1, teachers suggested a wide variety of other practices such as visual aids, body language or further verbal explanations (*Colour Blue*).

*T24: ...But if you want to explain vocabulary, it is detrimental to use native language. Because student can't learn how to describe a word by using th target language. Also, directions are so important and should be given with the target language. (Female, State secondary school teacher)*

*T27: ...as a teacher I believe that I can teach unknown words without their native language and make them guess even by using mimics and body language in addition to verbal explanation. (Female, State high school teacher)*

*T187: ...it's detrimental for teaching vocabulary. (Female, State secondary school teacher)*

The fifth theme was comprised of teachers' comments related to how translanguaging could affect L2 exposure and input in the classroom. 10.12% of the teachers in this study believed that the use of their mother tongue was harmful to students as it hindered their L2 exposure by minimizing the input they received. Teachers, in their comments, indicated that the classroom was the only place for students to get the opportunity to listen to someone speaking in the target language and to speak the target language with peers and their teachers, especially in EFL classrooms. That's why they strongly echoed on this particular matter and its relation with translanguaging (*Colour Red*).

*T14: ...However, an excessive use of L1 could hinder the sufficient amount of L2 exposure which is quite important during the language learning process. Thus, the teachers should set a balance for their L1 use. (Female, State secondary school teacher)*

*T59: ...It's detrimental if we use it during the whole lesson. Because it can prevent students from being exposed to the target language. (Female, State secondary school teacher)*

*T78: ...However, when you use it most of The time in the classroom, it prevents students from having enough English input in The classroom, which is mainly the only place they are exposed to English. (Female, State university teacher)*

*T96: I think, the use of mother tongue has no use and benefit in L2 learning. Because the students don't have the enough facility to practice their l2 outside the classroom. (Male, State high school teacher)*

The last theme was created for teachers' other concerns about translanguaging regarding time management and students' motivation to learn L2. 6.32% of them expressed that using L1 might affect the L2 learning process in two different ways. According to the teachers, using students' native language during teaching could extend the learning time more than planned and expected, which was an undesirable outcome when taking the curriculum and syllabus into account. Additionally, it could be a chronic habit for students to switch to L1 as much as possible, avoiding to practice L2 in learning contexts (*Colour Yellow*).



T1: ...On the other hand, I think using native language makes the language learning process longer in Turkish context. (Female, Private university teacher)

T47: ...it is detrimental when it becomes a habit and encourages students to stick to L1. (Male, Private university teacher)

T54: ...however, i believe that using L1 is detrimental when sts start to think that they can use it whenever they need and it becomes a habit of escaping to use L2. (Female, Private university teacher)

T110: ...but it may prolong the duration we have envisioned to reach our teaching goals as well (Female, State high school teacher)



## **CHAPTER V**

### **5. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION**

#### **5.1. INTRODUCTION**

In this chapter, the general overview of the study is given with major findings of the study. Next, the discussion of the findings in reference to each research question will shed light on the similarities and differences between this present study and previous studies. Pedagogical implications and recommendations for further research are also written at the end of the discussion part. This chapter ends with the conclusion part.

#### **5.2. GENERAL OVERVIEW**

The purpose of this current study was to reveal the differences and similarities in the perspectives and attitudes towards translanguaging practices between state school teachers and private school teachers working across four different levels: primary school, secondary school, high school and university. This research was undertaken during online education that Covid-19 pandemic introduced all over the world in early 2020; that's why necessary adaptations were to be made to the questionnaire during the data collection process. The questionnaire was converted to an online Google form and delivered to the teachers through local teacher groups and teacher communities online. At the end of the two-month data collection period, the data were analyzed both quantitatively and qualitatively. In order to support the quantitative findings obtained from SPSS, it was felt necessary to carry out the triangulation method by analyzing the responses qualitatively that teachers gave to the open-ended questions at the end of the questionnaire. On completion of methodology, the findings were reported with respect to research questions.

The major quantitative findings suggested that state school teachers believed in the importance of translanguaging more than private school teachers given the fact that state school teachers, when compared to private school teachers, stated they more frequently observed and encouraged students to use their native language for the investigated purposes under the main questions which are discussing content or activities in small groups, providing assistance to peers during activities, brainstorming during class activities, explaining problems not related to the content, enabling participation by lower proficiency students, responding to teacher's question and asking for permission. Similarly, state school teachers themselves, notwithstanding students, admitted that they also took advantage of students' native language and used it for the specified purposes. It was understood that translanguaging was a highly welcomed and popular practice among state school teachers rather than private school teachers.

After this distinction, it was aimed to determine whether teachers could translanguage at a certain level of education more than any other level. The four main questions with their sub-items were analyzed by using ANOVA and Gabriel post hoc tests. According to the findings, among four levels, high school teachers in state schools observed that students were dependent on their native language and they encouraged their students to resort to translanguaging for such reasons as brainstorming during class activities, enabling participation by lower proficiency students and asking for permission. On the other hand, secondary school teachers in state schools outstood among four levels in terms of believing the importance of translanguaging for such specific purposes as discussing content or activities in small groups, brainstorming during class activities, responding to teacher's questions and asking for permission. This analysis showed the contradictory results between teachers' ideas and practices. Even though secondary school teachers believed in the importance of translanguaging in theory, high school teachers performed more tasks through translanguaging in practice.

It was figured out that secondary school teachers and high school teachers more often observed and encouraged L1 use by students in explaining concepts, describing vocabulary, giving directions, for classroom management, giving feedback to students, praising students, building bonds with students, quickly clarifying during activities and helping low proficiency students in comparison with primary school teachers and

university teachers. What was surprising regarding this finding was that there was not a notable difference among any groups of teachers in believing the importance of translanguaging for the aforementioned purposes, although they showed different attitudes in reality. It was, once again, proved that teachers' thoughts in mind and practices in reality were not overlapped.

The qualitative findings of the study were presented from a more general frame to a more specific detail-based format as they provided deeper insights as to why translanguaging practices differed among different school types and school levels. According to the responses to the open-ended questions, more than half of the state school teachers approved that translanguaging should be either used or balanced in the classroom instead of avoiding it; on the other hand, more than half of the private school teachers objected to the idea of translanguaging to be used or balanced in the classroom. Private school teachers were mostly in favour of avoiding L1 use in the classrooms. For the purpose of drawing general attitudes towards translanguaging, translanguaging was found to be connotated with more positive adjectives than negative adjectives in the teachers' responses.

State school teachers were responsible for the two-thirds of the teachers who believed translanguaging was a beneficial strategy, yet one-third of the state school teachers still disregarded translanguaging. Private school teachers, on the contrary, were in conflict within each other, but even so, the majority of them suggested translanguaging was beneficial. In order to gain understandings as to what it was regarded as beneficial for or detrimental for, special themes were created based on the teachers' responses. Translanguaging was found to be beneficial for eight different themes, namely content, classroom environment, low-proficiency students, classroom management, emergency, classroom activities, attention and outside classroom talk. In other respects, teachers also indicated that translanguaging was detrimental to six different themes, which are called as the nature of L2 teaching/learning, students' ability to speak L2, classroom interaction, learning concepts, L2 exposure and input and time and motivation. These themes were supported with teacher excerpts in the related sections of the findings.

### **5.3. DISCUSSION OF THE FINDINGS IN REFERENCE TO RESEARCH QUESTION 1**

This specific research question aimed to find out whether there is a significant difference between state school teachers and private school teachers regarding translanguaging practices. Because of the paucity of the studies in the literature which focus on this distinction, it is rewarding to compare this present study to the older studies, the focus of which vary at an extensive range such as dual-language schools, bilingual schools or trilingual schools. This present study could be considered as an extension to Yuvayapan's (2019) study in which she revealed the perspectives of 50 EFL teachers working in state and private schools. Although she didn't provide a clear distinction between teacher groups and she handled the participants as a whole, she found out that teachers were not following a regular basis of translanguaging pedagogy for the sake of their students' English performance and proficiency. Similarly, Nambisan (2014) also discovered that most of the teachers failed to implement translanguaging in their classrooms even though they strongly believed in the importance of it. These two studies were unable to demonstrate the perspectives of state school and private school teachers individually. The findings of the current study, on the other hand, give the difference in perspectives and attitudes of the teachers working at two different school types. In this study, it was found out that state school teachers observed and encouraged students to use their native language more frequently than that of private school teachers, who also did not believe in the importance of translanguaging as much as state school teachers. The present results are consistent with those of Nambisan (2014), and Yuvayapan (2019) in that teachers believed in the importance of translanguaging, but still differed in terms of the implementation of translanguaging in the classrooms. Even if they used translanguaging and held positive views towards the use of translanguaging, the main reason to appeal on translanguaging was apparently to save time in the classes to be able to catch up with the curriculum in the previous studies.

These results agree with the findings of other studies, in which translanguaging practices were examined in different types of schools such as mainstream schools, heritage schools and bilingual schools. For example, Duarte (2016) tried to find answers to whether translanguaging facilitated learning by leveraging the quality of

interaction. The results displayed that students used translanguaging to make sense of the given tasks judged from the quality of interactions between peers in collaborative talk. Translanguaging was also used to negotiate meaning, provide arguments and show content/discontent thanks to the flexible shuttle between languages. Yilmaz and de Jong (2020) explain how translanguaging facilitates crossing the so-called insurmountable linguistic borders through a case study with a multilingual six-year-old girl, Elif, in the USA. It was found out that translanguaging gave voice to Elif by means of which she was able to express herself and manifest her identity. There are similarities between the attitudes expressed by state school teachers in this study and those described by Duarte (2016) and Yilmaz and de Jong (2020) towards translanguaging in that state school teachers also stated that being able to translanguage freely enabled students to express themselves, brainstorm during the tasks, clarify the content, provide assistance to their peers and bond with their teachers. As what Garcia (2012) claims, translanguaging framework proposes that bilingualism is a resource that can be developed and conserved by educators. In this present study, the findings of state school teachers attitudes showed parallel results with Garcia and Kleifen's (2010), in which translanguaging offered activities to be performed using multiple languages in a convivial way without setting borders between the languages.

#### **5.4. DISCUSSION OF THE FINDINGS IN REFERENCE TO RESEARCH QUESTION 2**

This specific research question attempted to identify whether translanguaging practices differed by a certain level of education. The teachers in this study were categorized into four different levels they were teaching at. Previous works pointed out that translanguaging was of important service regardless of the level. For instance, at a tertiary level, Küçük (2018) and Karabulut (2019) examined the effects of translanguaging in two different state universities. Küçük (2018) indicated that the attitudes of both teachers and students towards translanguaging were proven to be positive since it was a helpful pedagogy used to convey meanings and facilitate learning. In the same vein, Karabulut (2019) revealed that translanguaging enriched students' writing skills and improved their ability to organize their thoughts. In

contrast to earlier findings, however, no evidence of translanguaging as a helpful pedagogy was detected among the teachers who worked at either state or private universities in this study. The university teachers in this study were greatly under the influence of an English-only policy.

Another group of teachers who showed little interest in translanguaging was primary school teachers in this study. Like university teachers, they also objected to the use of translanguaging at such early ages of schooling because they believed it might hinder the L2 learning process. On the contrary, previous research was carried out even in the pre-schools focusing on early childhood education. Dikilitaş and Mumford's (2020) emphasized the use of more languages in meaningful classroom interactions could affect preschoolers' academic success in the following years. Kirsh (2020) also defended the importance of mother tongue in the pre-schools of Luxemburg by adopting a social-constructivist approach. However, the findings of the current study do not support the previous research in terms of teachers' attitudes working in primary school and pre-service schools towards translanguaging. More discussion could be achieved if there were studies directed at the practices in primary schools.

Although it is formidable to find previous studies whose setting was high schools or secondary schools, there are a few studies that can be compared with this present one. Aslan (2019) proved that language learning could be fostered by using the amalgam of three languages in a high school making great contributions to the students' questioning and participation. Similarly, Lau (2020) investigated the translanguaging teaching practices on secondary school students and found out that students' reflexive thinking and critical literacy improved along with their personal understandings of social issues. This study produced results that corroborate the findings of a great deal of the previous work in this field. In accordance with the results of previous studies, this study also showed that secondary school teachers and high school teachers showed a more positive attitude towards translanguaging than primary school teachers or university teachers. High school teachers in this study admitted that they came across the use of L1 by their students more frequently than any other teacher group, although they didn't believe in its importance. Secondary school teachers

believed that translanguaging was a beneficial tool; however, they didn't observe L1 use in the classroom as frequent as they thought.

### **5.5. DISCUSSION OF THE FINDINGS IN REFERENCE TO RESEARCH QUESTION 3**

This research question tried to estimate the difference between state school teachers and private school teachers as a final conclusion over the debate of translanguaging as a beneficial or detrimental strategy. The findings observed in this study mirror those of the previous studies that have examined the effect of translanguaging as a beneficial strategy to be used in the classroom no matter which institution teachers work. This present study confirms that translanguaging is associated with a better classroom environment and higher academic success as it has been found out that translanguaging helps students discuss content in groups, brainstorm and provide assistance to peers during classroom activities, respond to teachers' questions and enable lower proficiency students to participate in the classroom. It also helps teachers explain concepts, describe content and clarify quickly, praise students and build bonds with students, assist lower proficiency students and have control over the classroom. These results match those observed in earlier studies. The number of state school teachers almost doubled the number of private school teachers who believed translanguaging practices were beneficial in the present study.

All over the world, translanguaging has been employed by not only language teachers but also the teachers of other disciplines. For instance, He, Lai and Lin (2016) conducted research about mathematics education where translanguaging and trans-semiotizing was seen to support multimodal mathematics discourse and visual grammar. Through these multimodalities, intercultural communication and academic development of bilinguals were facilitated. In addition, Bradley, Moore, Simpson and Atkinson (2017) figured out that young people made their voices audible and visible by using languages and modalities as an innovative transdisciplinary educational arts-based project based on CLIL practices. Translanguaging was found to be beneficial even for students with special needs. Robinson (2017) revealed that spoken English



and British Sign Language complemented each other by making meaning conveyed better through the careful manipulation of different modes and languages.

In this age, there is a new emerging concept of students as migrant students. These students are usually forced to move to a new country at early age, and their anxiety levels are higher than those of their classmates. Dryden et al. (2021) suggest that students who have migrant backgrounds are authentically able to share their experiences, problems and inner thoughts through translanguaging and ease the negative effects of foreign language anxiety. It was seen that the participant teachers in the present study stated some certain situations where translanguaging could work the best. These situations included health problems, emergencies during class time and other serious problems that students can only express with the use of L1 easily.

## **5.6. PEDAGOGICAL IMPLICATIONS**

This combination of the findings of previous and current studies provides some support for the conceptual premise that translanguaging should be allowed to be employed effectively in communicative learning situations as the large majority of the works has emphasized. This finding has important implications for developing teacher training programs about effective use of translanguaging, which is highly likely to enable teachers to redefine their prior experiences with L1 use and generate new paradigms, and thus, transform their negative attitudes to milder and even more positive points of view. Some schools have their own policies about not using students' native languages arising from only-English ideologies, whereas some schools serve immersion education programs and promote the use of students' native languages by benefiting from the rich diversity of cultures and languages. If teachers are informed about translanguaging as to balancing between or among languages adequately, they will be of great help to maximize the learning outcomes by establishing translanguaging spaces for their students.

This study has shown the sharp difference lying between state school teachers and private school teachers in terms of L1 use in the classroom. State school teachers, when compared to private school teachers, more frequently observe and encourage

their students to use L1 in the classroom in order to discuss content or activities in small groups, provide assistance to peers during activity, brainstorm during classroom activities, explain problems not related to the content, enable participation by lower proficiency students, respond to teacher's question and ask permission. Although they allow their learners to speak their mother tongue for these purposes, they do not necessarily believe in the importance of using L1 in most of the situations except for discussing content and activities in small groups and explaining problems not related to the content. It is seen that there is inconsistency between state school teachers' beliefs and practices regarding the use of L1 by students. A reasonable approach for state school teachers to tackle this issue could be to guide their students about how to resist the need for using L1 for the purposes that they believe it is unnecessary or unimportant to use L1. Private school teachers, on the other hand, do not observe their students to resort to their mother tongue as often as state school teachers, nor do they believe it is important for students to use L1 for the aforementioned purposes.

Moreover, state school teachers have stated that they use students' native language more often than private school teachers for explaining concepts, describing vocabulary, giving directions, classroom management, giving feedback to students, praising students, building bonds with students, clarifying quickly during activities and helping low proficiency students. In the same manner, they believe it is important for teachers to use students' native language for these purposes. However, private school teachers do not believe in the importance of using L1 for these purposes, and they do not use it for any reason either. Although there is a stable condition for teachers working within two different types of schools in terms of their practices and beliefs, there is a remarkable difference between state school teachers and private school teachers. There is, therefore, a definite need for the equalization of the conditions between state schools and private schools. A key policy priority should therefore be to plan for the long-term improvement of the conditions by reaching an agreement about when, how, why and whether to translanguage or not. If these important changes are made by policymakers and common adoption of the use of translanguage can be achieved by teachers, further research will offer more possibilities for more far-reaching implications to be followed.

Besides findings of the school types, findings of the four different levels also have demonstrated that there are significant differences about L1 use by students among the levels of school. High school teachers, in general, observe and encourage L1 use by students for brainstorming during class activities and asking permission, whereas they do not think it is important for students to use L1 for the same purposes. Secondary school teachers think it is important for students to use L1 for discussing content, brainstorming, enabling participation, responding to teacher and asking permission; nevertheless, they only observe and encourage their students to use L1 when they are to enable participation by lower proficiency students. These contrasts between teachers' beliefs and practices require the need for classroom observation by taking classroom dynamics and other multiple forces into account. By doing so, the reasons behind these contrasts will be better understood as to why a certain type of teachers invest in translanguaging even though they do not believe in its importance, or vice versa. When compared to the teachers who work in primary schools and universities, both high school teachers and secondary school teachers have also stated that they highly depend on students' native language when they explain concepts, describe vocabulary, give directions, manage the classroom, give feedback to students, praise students, build bonds with students, clarify quickly during activities and help low proficiency students. However, only secondary school teachers believe that it is important to use students' native language for explaining concepts and giving feedback to students. It is, once again, evident that teachers' practices and beliefs do not match.

Although the findings of the studies in the relevant literature have proven that translanguaging has a promising effect on language learning and other content courses regardless of the school type or students' levels, this present study has revealed less comparable findings. On the school basis, private school teachers, in general, are not in favour of using students' native language in the language learning process since they do not consider it as a functional strategy, whereas state school teachers attribute great importance to it and use it for investigated purposes as well as additional ones that they stated in their open-ended responses. On the level basis, secondary school teachers and high school teachers attach great significance to and tend to use it for certain purposes which are described above. It can be said that more research results about the use of translanguaging across different settings should be made available to

the teachers so that they can set their standards with respect to how and when to benefit from it.

## **5.7. FURTHER RESEARCH**

Based on the limitations of this study, there will be listed some suggestions for further research. This research was canalized to dig out merely teachers' perspectives and attitudes towards translanguaging. Further research questions that could be asked include students' perspectives and attitudes towards translanguaging, as well. Students are the other significant stakeholders of the teaching and learning processes, so future studies on the current topic are therefore recommended.

Another suggestion could be the call for a further study with more focus on classroom discourse. This study quantitatively collected data from teachers through two open-ended questions, although this was not the initial plan. Due to the outbreak of Covid-19, real classroom practices couldn't be observed, nor could the interviews be done in person. In future investigations, it might be interesting to triangulate the quantitative data with classroom observations and field notes and provide authentic dialogues that translanguaging was needed and used.

This study investigated four different levels of formal schools, but further research could also include the pre-schools in order to ensure integrity among all the levels of education. There are numerous prestigious interactive and digital platforms where life-long learners can improve their linguistic skills. These platforms could be even investigated for translanguaging practices. In ESL countries, translanguaging was found to be welcomed in multilingual or bilingual schools since it brings more richness and easiness into communication because different languages and modes are strongly used during interaction. However, in EFL countries like Turkey, translanguaging could be only dealt with the use of the native language and the target language; thus, it differs across cultures. Further investigation might explore to what extent it is culture-specific, how it differs by countries and their language policies, and what the reasons could be for the anticipated differences.

More importantly, there is a need for a practical questionnaire about translanguaging and its use. The questionnaire which was used for this present study was taken from a previous study (Nambisan, 2014; Yuvayapan, 2019) in which the quantitative data was analyzed more qualitatively through interviews and observations. The questionnaire includes a great number of sub-items under the main questions, yet unfortunately, it was impossible to carry out a factor analysis and reduce them into a fewer number of items. Further research is needed through a proper questionnaire which allows the researcher to carry out an extensive range of analysis in order to make deeper analysis for more accurate results. It would be even interesting to compare the results of the same questionnaire, which is applied across different cultures and countries in order to gain more insights as to how translanguaging is perceived and used by different cultures.

## CONCLUSION

The main aim of this study was to find out the teachers' attitudes and perspectives about translanguaging and how they differ across different school types, i.e. state schools and private schools, and different levels of education, namely primary schools, secondary schools, high schools and universities in Turkey. The findings were attempted to be qualitatively supported with the responses that teachers provided to the two more open-ended questions at the end of the questionnaire. It was intended to draw general attitudes towards translanguaging, to determine whether it was connotated with positive or negative adjectives and to provide more elaboration on the findings through additional codes – beneficial or detrimental – obtained from teachers' responses.

Independent t-tests were employed in order to display the differences between the attitudes of teachers working at state schools and private schools. It was figured out that state school teachers more frequently encouraged the use of students' native language by students for discussing content or activities, providing assistance to peers, brainstorming, explaining problems not related to the content, enabling participation by lower proficiency students, responding to teacher's questions and asking permission; nonetheless, they did not believe in its essentialness except for discussing content or activities and explaining problems not related to content. Private school teachers generally objected to the use of L1 by students, asserting that it was harmful to the L2 learning process. State school teachers believed that it was essential to use L1 under certain situations. Similarly, they claimed that they used students' native language for such purposes as explaining concepts, describing vocabulary, giving directions, managing the classroom, giving feedback to students, praising students, building bonds with students, quickly clarifying activities and helping low proficiency students. By contrary, private school teachers stated that they did not find it important, and thus, they did not use it in their classrooms as often as state school teachers did.

ANOVA and Gabriel Post Hoc tests were also needed to show the differences among different levels of school. In general, it could be said that secondary school teachers and high school teachers were in favour of using L1 in the classroom when compared to primary school teachers and university teachers. Of the findings of this

part of the analysis, there was found more contradictions between teachers' beliefs and practices as to the use and importance of translanguaging. It was clear that secondary school teachers believed in the importance of translanguaging in theory; however, high school teachers performed more tasks through translanguaging in practice. The teachers working in private schools and universities, on the contrary, did not show any preferences towards using L1 in the classroom.

Given the qualitative analysis of the data, general attitudes towards translanguaging were drawn into three conclusions, which are *translanguaging should be used*, *translanguaging should be balanced*, and *translanguaging should be avoided*. The findings showed that the majority of state school teachers emphasized translanguaging should be used or balanced, whereas the majority of the private school teachers exhibited their attitudes towards translanguaging should be avoided. Additionally, translanguaging was found to be connotated with more positive adjectives than negative adjectives in the teachers' responses. In general, they described translanguaging as an important, necessary and clarifying strategy positively, but also unnecessary, harmful and preventing negatively. Overall, most of the state school teachers and private school teachers believed that translanguaging was beneficial for eight different codes, namely content, classroom environment, low-proficiency students, classroom management, emergency, classroom activities, attention and outside classroom talk. However, it was also stated by a smaller number of teachers that it was detrimental to six different codes, which are the nature of L2 teaching/learning, students' ability to speak L2, classroom interaction, learning concepts, L2 exposure and input and time and motivation.

## REFERENCES

### 1. Books

- Baker, Colin (2011). *Foundations of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism* (5th ed.). Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Becker, Alton L. (1988). "Language in Particular: A Lecture". In: Ed. Deborah Tannen. *Linguistics in Context: Connecting, Observing, and Understanding*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex, pp. 17–35.
- Blommaert, Jan (2010). *The sociolinguistics of globalization*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bruner, Jerome (1986). *Actual minds, possible worlds*. Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.
- Cook, Vivian (2008). *Second language learning and language teaching* (4th ed.). London: Hodder Education.
- Cope, Bill, Mary Kalantzis (2000). *Multiliteracies: literacy learning and the design of social futures*. Londres: Routledge.
- Cummins, Jim (2000). *Language, power, and pedagogy: Bilingual children in the crossfire*. Clevedon, England: Multilingual Matters.
- Cresswell, John W. (2014). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches*. Thousand Oaks: SAGE.
- Denzin, Norman Kent (1978). *The research act: A theoretical introduction to sociological methods*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Donato, Richard (2000). "Sociocultural contributions to understanding the foreign and second language classroom". In: Ed. James P. Lantolf. *Sociocultural Theory and Second Language Learning*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 27-50
- Dörnyei, Zoltán. (2007). *Research methods in applied linguistics*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Ellis, Rod, Gary Barkhuizen (2005). *Analyzing learner language*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Ellis, Rod, Natsuko Shintani (2014). *Exploring language pedagogy through second language acquisition research*. London: Routledge.
- Field, Andy (2013). *Discovering statistics using IBM SPSS statistics*. SAGE Publications.
- Flick, Uwe (2018). "Triangulation in data collection". In: Ed. Uwe Flick. *The SAGE handbook of qualitative data collection*. Los Angeles, CA: Sage, 527-544.
- García, Ofelia (2009). *Bilingual Education in the 21st Century: A Global Perspective*. Malden, MA and Oxford: Wiley/Blackwell.
- García, Ofelia, Jo Anne Kleifgen (2010). *Educating Emergent Bilinguals, Policies, Programs and Practices for English Language Learners*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- García, Ofelia, Angel M.Y. Lin (2017). "Translanguaging in Bilingual Education". In: Eds. García Ofelia, Angel MY Lin, Stephen May. *Bilingual and Multilingual Education*. Springer, Cham, 117-130.
- García, Ofelia, Li Wei (2014). *Translanguaging: Language, Bilingualism and Education*. Palgrave: Macmillan.
- Gass, Susan M., Larry Selinker (1994). *Second Language Acquisition: An*



- Introductory Course. Erlbaum, Hillsdale, NJ.
- He, Peichang, Haiyan Lai, Angel M.Y. Lin (2016). "Translanguaging in a multimodal mathematics presentation". In: Eds. Catherine M. Mazak, Kevin S. Carroll. *Translanguaging in higher education: Beyond monolingual ideologies*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters, xiii-187.
- Johnson, Donna M. (1992). *Approaches to research in second language learning*. New York: Longman.
- Kress, Gunther (2003). *Literacy in the new media age*. London: Routledge.
- Lantolf, James P. (2000). *Socio-cultural theory and second language learning*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Lantolf, James P. (2007). "Sociocultural Theory: A unified approach to L2 learning and teaching". In: Eds. Jim Cummins, Chris Davison. *International handbook of English language teaching*. NY: Springer Science +Business Media, LLC, 693-701.
- Lantolf, James P., Steven L. Thorne (2006). *Sociocultural theory and the genesis of second language development*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Lantolf, James P., Steven L. Thorne (2007). "Sociocultural theory and second language learning". In: Eds. Bill VanPatten, Jessica Williams. *Theories in second language acquisition: An introduction*. Mahwah, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 201 – 224.
- Lasagabaster, David, Aintzane Doiz, Juan Manuel Sierra (2014). *Motivation and foreign language learning: From theory to practice*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- López, Alexis, Sultan Turkan, Danielle Guzmán-Orth (2017). *Conceptualizing the use of translanguaging in initial content assessments for newly arrived emergent bilingual students*. Princeton, NJ: Educational Testing Service.
- Luria, Alexander Romanovich (1979). *The making of mind. A personal account of Soviet psychology*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Luria, Alexander Romanovich (1982). *Language and cognition*. New York, NY: John Wiley and Sons.
- Lynch, Brian K. (2003). *Language assessment and programme evaluation*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Macaro, Ernesto (2009). "Teacher use of codeswitching in the second language classroom: Exploring "optimal" use". In: Eds. Miles Turnbull, Jennifer Dailey-O'Cain. *First language use in second and foreign language learning*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters, 35-50.
- Mackey, Alison, Susan M. Gass (2005). *Second language research: Methodology and design*. New York: Routledge.
- Martin, Jeannette R., Peter R.R. White (2005). *The language of evaluation: Appraisal in English*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Mercer, Neil (2002). "Developing dialogues". In: Eds. Gordon Wells, Guy Claxton. *Learning for Life in the 21st Century*. Oxford: Blackwell, 141–153.
- Ohta, Amy Snyder (2001). *Second Language Acquisition Processes in the Classroom: Learning Japanese*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Ortega, Lourdes (2009). *Understanding Second Language Acquisition*. London: Hodder Education.
- Pennycook, Alastair (1994). *The Cultural Politics of English as an International Language*. Abingdon: Routledge.
- Rampton, Ben (1995). *Crossing: Language and ethnicity among adolescents*. London:

Longman.

- Smith, M. Cecil, Thomas Pourchot (1998). *Adult learning and development: Perspectives from educational psychology*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Stake, Robert E. (1995). *The art of case study research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Swain, Merrill (2000). "The output hypothesis and beyond: Mediating acquisition through collaborative dialogue". In: Ed. James P. Lantolf. *Sociocultural Theory and Second Language Learning*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 97-114.
- Swain, Merrill, Penny Kinnear, Linda Steinman (2011). *Sociocultural theory in second language education: An introduction through narratives*. Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Turnbull, Miles, Jennifer Dailey-O'Cain (2009). *First language use in second and foreign language learning*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- Vygotsky, Lev Semenovich (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes*. Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.
- Webb, Eugene J., Donald T. Campbell, Richard D. Schwartz, Lee Sechrest (1966). *Unobtrusive measures: Nonreactive research in the social sciences*. Chicago: Rand McNally.
- Weber, Robert Philip (1990). *Basic content analysis*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Wertsch, James (1985). *Vygotsky and the social formation of mind*. UK: Harvard University Press.
- Williams, Marion, Robert L. Burden (1997). *Psychology for language teacher: A social constructivist approach*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Yüksel, Doğan, & Banu İnan-Karagül (2017). "L1 use by teachers and students in EFL classrooms: A study of university setting". In: Ed. Roberta V. Nata. *Progress in Education*. New-York: Nova Science Publishers, 135-151.

## **2. Journals, Proceedings and Thesis**

- Akkaya, Gökhan, Cihat Atar (2015). "An analysis of code-switching in Turkish EFL classroom interaction". *Annual Review of Education, Communication and Language Sciences*, 12: 53-77.
- Aljaafre, Ali, James P. Lantolf. (1994). "Negative feedback as regulations and second language learning in the Zone of Proximal Development". *The Modern Language Journal*, 78: 465-83.
- Ballinger, Susan, Roy Lyster, Andrea Sterzuk, Fred Genesee (2017). "Context-appropriate crosslinguistic pedagogy". *Journal of Immersion and Content-Based Language Education*, 5(1): 30–57. doi:10.1075/jicb.5.1.02bal
- Blackledge, Adrian, Angela Creese (2017). "Translanguaging and the body". *International Journal of Multilingualism*, 14(3): 250-268. doi:10.1080/14790718.2017.1315809
- Bradley, Jessica, Emilee Moore, James Simpson, Louise Atkinson, (2017). "Translanguaging space and creative activity: theorising collaborative arts-based learning". *Language and Intercultural Communication*, 18(1): 54–73. doi:10.1080/14708477.2017.1401120
- Campbell, Donald T., Donald W. Fiske (1959). *Convergent and discriminant*

- validation by the multitrait-multimethod matrix. *Psychological bulletin*, 56(2): 81-105.
- Canagarajah, A. Suresh (2006). "The place of world Englishes in composition: Pluralization Continued". *College Composition and Communication*, 57(4): 586-619.
- Canagarajah, A. Suresh (2011a). "Translanguaging in the classroom: Emerging issues for research and pedagogy". *Applied Linguistics Review*, 2:1-28. doi:10.1515/9783110239331.1
- Canagarajah, A. Suresh (2011b). "Code meshing in academic writing: Identifying teachable strategies of translanguaging". *The Modern Language Journal*, 95(3): 401-417.
- Canagarajah, A. Suresh (2013). "Negotiating translanguaging literacy: An enactment". *Research in the Teaching of English*, 48: 40-67.
- Cardenas-Curiel, Luria (2017). *Texturing with multimodal texts across content areas: A translanguaging multiliteracies approach to teaching and learning*. Doctoral dissertation, The University of Texas, Austin, the USA.
- Cenoz, Jasone, Alaitz Santos (2020). "Implementing pedagogical translanguaging in trilingual schools". *System*, 92, 102273. doi: 10.1016/j.system.2020.102273
- Charamba, Erasmios (2019). "Learning and language: towards a reconceptualization of their mutual interdependences in a multilingual science class". *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 42(6): 1-19. doi:10.1080/01434632.2019.1707837
- Choi, Julie, Mei French, Sue Ollerhead (2020). "Introduction to the Special Issue: Translanguaging as a Resource in Teaching and Learning". *Australian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 3(1): 1-10. doi.org/10.29140/ajal.v3n1.283
- Clyne, Michael (2008). "The monolingual mindset as an impediment to the development of plurilingual potential in Australia". *Sociolinguistic Studies*, 2(3): 347-366.
- Conteh, Jean, Rita Kumar, Derek Beddow (2008). "Investigating Pupil Talk in Multilingual Contexts: Socio-cultural Learning, Teaching and Researching". *International Journal of Primary, Elementary and Early Years Education*, 3(36): 223-235.
- Cook, Vivian (2001). "Using the first language in the classroom". *Canadian Modern Language Review*, 57: 402-423.
- Costley, Tracey, Constant Leung (2020). "Putting translanguaging into practice: A view from England". *System*, 92, 102270. doi: 10.1016/j.system.2020.102270
- Creese, Angela, Adrian Blackledge (2015). "Translanguaging and Identity in Educational Settings". *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 35: 20-35. doi:10.1017/S0267190514000233
- Cummins, Jim (2007). "Rethinking monolingual instructional strategies in multilingual classrooms". *Canadian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 10(2): 221-240.
- Cummins, Jim (2014). "Rethinking pedagogical assumptions in Canadian French immersion programs". *Journal of Immersion and Content-Based Language Education*, 2(1): 3-22. https://doi.org/10.1075/jicb.2.1.01cum
- Daghan-Aslan, Gülbin (2019). *The reflection of the first foreign language (English) by utilizing translanguaging strategies in the teaching of second foreign language (German)*. Master's thesis, Istanbul University, Istanbul.
- Dikilitaş, Kenan, & Simon E. Mumford (2020). "Preschool English teachers gaining

- bilingual competencies in a monolingual context”. *System*, 91, 102264. doi:10.1016/j.system.2020.102264
- Donato, Richard, Dawn McCormick (1994). “A sociocultural perspective on language learning strategies: The role of mediation”. *The Modern Language Journal*, 78(4): 453-464.
- Duarte, Joana (2016). “Translanguaging in mainstream education: A sociocultural approach”. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 22(2): 1–15. doi:10.1080/13670050.2016.1231774
- Duff, Patricia A., Charlene G. Polio (1990). “How much foreign language is there in the foreign language classroom?”. *The Modern Language Journal*, 74(2): 154-166.
- Dupuy, Beatrice (2011). “CLIL: Achieving its goals through a multiliteracies framework”. *Latin American Journal of Content & Language Integrated Learning*, 4(2): 21-32. doi:10.5294/laclil.2011.4.2.3
- Dryden, Stephanie, Ana Tankosić, Sender Dovchin (2021). “Foreign language anxiety and translanguaging as an emotional safe space: Migrant English as a foreign language learners in Australia”. *System*, 101, 102593.
- Ellis, Rod. (2000). “Task-based research and language pedagogy”. *Language Teaching Research*, 4(3): 193-220.
- Escobar, C. Fallas., Elizabeth Dillard-Paltrineri (2015). “Professors' and students' conflicting beliefs about translanguaging in the EFL classroom: Dismantling the monolingual bias”. *Revista de Lenguas Modernas*, 23: 301-328.
- Esquinca, Alberto, Blanca Araujo, Maria Teresa de la Piedra (2014). “Meaning Making and Translanguaging in a Two-Way Dual-Language Program on the U.S.-Mexico Border”. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 37(2): 164–181. doi:10.1080/15235882.2014.934970
- Fahim, Mansoor, Mastaneh Haghani (2012). “Sociocultural Perspectives on Foreign Language Learning”. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 3(4): 693-699. doi:10.4304/jltr.3.4.693-699.
- Fang, Fan, Yang Liu (2020). ““Using all English is not always meaningful”: Stakeholders’ perspectives on the use of and attitudes towards translanguaging at a Chinese university”. *Lingua*, 247, 102959. doi:10.1016/j.lingua.2020.102959
- French, Mei, Janet Armitage (2020). “Eroding the Monolingual Monolith”. *Australian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 3(1): 91-114. doi.org/10.29140/ajal.v3n1.302
- Galante, Angelica (2020). “Pedagogical translanguaging in a multilingual English program in Canada: Student and teacher perspectives of challenges”. *System*, 92, 102274. doi:10.1016/j.system.2020.102274
- Gallagher, Fiona (2020). “Considered in context: EFL teachers’ views on the classroom as a bilingual space and codeswitching in shared-L1 and in multilingual contexts”. *System*, 91, 102262. doi: 10.1016/j.system.2020.102262
- García, Ofelia (2012). “Theorizing Translanguaging for Educators. In: Eds. Christina Celic, Kate Seltzer. *Translanguaging in the Bilingual Classroom: A Pedagogy for Learning and Teaching*”. *Modern Language Journal*, 94: 103-115.
- Gorter, Durk, Eli Arocena (2020). “Teachers’ beliefs about multilingualism in a course on translanguaging”. *System*, 92, 102272. doi: 10.1016/j.system.2020.102272
- Gu, Z. (2018, November). “Study of Multiliteracy Pedagogy in College English

- Teaching” [Conference]. International Conference on Contemporary Education, Social Sciences and Ecological Studies (CESSSES 2018), Atlantis Press.
- Guzula, Xolisa, Carolyn McKinney, Robyn Tyler (2016). “Languaging-for-learning: Legitimising translanguaging and enabling multimodal practices in third spaces”. *Southern African Linguistics and Applied Language Studies*, 34(3): 211–226. doi:10.2989/16073614.2016.1250360
- Holdway, Jennifer, Caryl H. Hitchcock (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. doi: 10.1016/j.tate.2018.05.015
- Holmström, Ingela, Krister Schönström (2018). “Deaf lecturers’ translanguaging in a higher education setting. A multimodal multilingual perspective”. *Applied Linguistics Review*, 9(1): 90-111. doi:10.1515/applirev-2017-0078
- Hornberger, Nancy, Holly Link (2012). “Translanguaging and Transnational Literacies in Multilingual Classrooms: A Biliteracy Lens.” *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 15(3): 261–278.
- Jørgensen, Jens Normann, Martha Sif Karrebæk, Lian Malai Madsen, Janus Spindler Møller (2011). “Polylinguaging in superdiversity”. *Language and Superdiversity*, 13(2): 137–154.
- Karabulut, Aslihan (2019). *Translanguaging as a pedagogical tool for Turkish EFL students in writing classes*. Doctoral dissertation, Bahcesehir University, Istanbul.
- Karpov, Yuriv V., H. Carl Haywood (1998). “Two ways to elaborate Vygotsky's concept of mediation”. *American Psychologist*, 53(1): 27-36.
- Kim, Sujin (2018). ““It was kind of a given that we were all multilingual”: Transnational youth identity work in digital translanguaging”. *Linguistics and Education*, 43: 39–52. doi: 10.1016/j.linged.2017.10.008
- Kirsch, Claudine (2020). “Opening minds to translanguaging pedagogies”. *System*, 92, 102271. doi: 10.1016/j.system.2020.102271
- Kucuk, Ceylan (2018). *Investigating translanguaging as a teaching and learning practice in an English medium higher education context in Turkey*. Master’s thesis, Cukurova University, Adana.
- Lau, Sunny Man Chu (2020). “Translanguaging as Transmediation: Embodied critical literacy engagements in a French-English bilingual classroom”. *Australian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 3(1): 42-59. doi.org/10.29140/ajal.v3n1.299
- Lemke, Jay (2016). *Translanguaging and flows*. Unpublished manuscript, Department of Communication, University of California, San Diego, California.
- Leung, Constant, Jennifer Jenkins (2020). “Mediating communication – ELF and flexible multilingualism perspectives on the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages”. *Australian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 3(1): 26-41.
- Lewis, Gwyn, Bryn Jones, Colin Baker (2012). “Translanguaging: origins and development from school to street and beyond”. *Educational Research and Evaluation*, 18(7): 641-654. doi:10.1080/13803611.2012.718488
- Lin, Angel M. Y., Peichang He (2017). “Translanguaging as dynamic activity flows in CLIL classrooms”. *Journal of Language, Identity & Education*, 16(4): 228–244. doi:10.1080/15348458.2017.1328283
- Liu, Jiajia Eve, Yuen Yi Lo, Angel M.Y. Lin (2020). “Translanguaging pedagogy in

- teaching English for Academic Purposes: Researcher-teacher collaboration as a professional development model”. *System*, 92, 102276, doi:10.1016/j.system.2020.102276
- Lyster, Roy (2019). “Translanguaging in Immersion: Cognitive Support or Social Prestige?” *The Canadian Modern Language Review*, 75(4): 340-352. doi:10.3138/cmlr.2019-0038
- MacSwan, Jeff (2017). “A Multilingual Perspective on Translanguaging”. *American Educational Research Journal*, 54(1): 167–201. doi:10.3102/0002831216683935
- Martin-Beltrán, Melinda (2014). ““What do you want to say?” How adolescents use translanguaging to expand learning opportunities”. *International Multilingual Research Journal*, 8(3): 208–230.
- Mathison, Sandra (1988). “Why triangulate?”. *Educational Researcher*, 17(2): 13-17.
- McMillan, Brian A., Damian J. Rivers (2011). “The practice of policy: Teachers’ attitudes towards “English only””. *System*, 39: 251-263.
- Murray, Joseph J. (2018). “The Baobab: Translanguaging in a multimodal sign language translation project”. *Applied Linguistics Review*, 9(1): 135-156. doi:10.1515/applirev-2017-0085
- Nambisan, Kavitha (2014). Teachers' attitudes towards and uses of translanguaging in English language classrooms in Iowa. Master’s thesis, Iowa State University, Iowa, the USA.
- Nassaji, Hossein, Merrill Swain. (2000). “A Vygotskian perspective on corrective feedback in L2: The effect of random versus negotiated help on the learning of English articles”. *Language Awareness* 9: 34-51.
- Nayar, P. Bhaskaran (1997). “ESL/EFL dichotomy today: Language politics or pragmatics?”. *TESOL Quarterly*, 31(1): 9-37.
- New London Group (1996). “A pedagogy of multiliteracies: Designing social futures”. *Harvard Educational Review*, 66: 60-92.
- Otheguy, Ricardo, Ofelia García, Wallis Reid (2015). “Clarifying translanguaging and deconstructing named languages: A perspective from linguistics”. *Applied Linguistics Review*, 6(3): 281-307. doi:10.1515/applirev-2015-0014
- Ollerhead, Sue, Isobel Crealy, Rebecca Kirk (2020). ““Writing like a Health Scientist”: A Translingual Approach to Teaching Text Structure in a Diverse Australian Classroom”. *Australian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 3(1): 77-90. doi.org/10.29140/ajal.v3n1.301
- Robinson, Kelly Fagan (2017). “Conscious artistic translanguaging onstage”. *Applied Linguistics Review*, 10(1): 73-92. doi:10.1515/applirev-2017-0079
- Sadkhan, Sattar B., Nidaa A. Abbass (2013). “Multidisciplinary prospective in Cryptology”. *Proceedings of the 6th International Conference on Security of Information and Networks - SIN '13*. doi:10.1145/2523514.2523598
- Sali, Pinar (2014). “An analysis of the teachers' use of L1 in Turkish EFL classrooms”. *System*, 42: 308-318.
- Schreiber, Brooke Ricker (2015). ““I am what I am”: Multilingual identity and digital Translanguaging”. *Language Learning & Technology*, 19(3): 69–87.
- Seals, Corinne A., Vincent Olsen-Reeder, Russell Pine, Madeline Ash, Cereace Wallace (2020). “Creating Translingual Teaching Resources Based on Translanguaging Grammar Rules and Pedagogical Practices”. *Australian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 3(1): 115-132. doi.org/10.29140/ajal.v3n1.303
- Smith, Blaine E., Mark B. Pacheco, Carolina Rossato de Almeida (2017). “Multimodal

- codemeshing: Bilingual adolescents' processes composing across modes and languages". *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 36: 6–22. doi:10.1016/j.jslw.2017.04.001
- Swain, Merrill, Sharon Lapkin (2000). "Task based language learning: the use of the first language". *Teaching Research*, 4(3): 251–74.
- Swenson, Janet, Carl A. Young, Ewa McGrail, Robert Rozema, Phyllis Whitin (2006). "Extending the conversation: New technologies, new literacies, and English education". *English Education*, 38(4): 349-367.
- Tsimpli, Ianthi, Lina Mukhopadhyay, Jeanine Treffers-Daller, Suvarna Alladi, Theodoros Marinis, Minati Panda, Anusha Balasubramanian, Pallawi Sinha (2019). "Multilingualism and multiliteracy in primary education in India: A discussion of some methodological challenges of an interdisciplinary research project". *Research in Comparative and International Education*, 14(1): 54–76. doi:10.1177/1745499919828908
- Turnbull, Miles, Katy Arnett (2002). "Teachers' uses of the target and first languages in second and foreign language classrooms". *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 22: 204-218.
- Turuk, Mamour Choul (2008). "The Relevance and implications of Vygotsky's Sociocultural Theory in the second language classroom". *ARECLS*, 5: 244-262.
- Velasco, Patricia, Ofelia García (2014). "Translanguaging and the Writing of Bilingual Learners". *Bilingual Research Journal*, 37(1): 6–23. doi:10.1080/15235882.2014.893270
- Van Viegen, Saskia (2020). "Translanguaging for and as Learning with Youth from Refugee Backgrounds". *Australian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 3(1): 60-76. doi.org/10.29140/ajal.v3n1.300
- Walqui, Aida (2006). "Scaffolding instruction for English language learners: A conceptual framework". *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 9(2): 159-180.
- Wei, Li (2011). "Moment Analysis and Translanguaging Space: Discursive Construction of Identities by Multilingual Chinese Youth in Britain". *Journal of Pragmatics*, 43(5): 1222–1235. doi: 10.1016/j.pragma.2010.07.035
- Wei, Li (2016). "New Chinglish and the post-multilingualism challenge: Translanguaging ELF in China". *Journal of English as a Lingua Franca*, 5: 1-25.
- Wei, Li (2017). "Translanguaging as a Practical Theory of Language". *Applied Linguistics*, 39(1): 9–30. doi:10.1093/applin/amx039
- Wei, Li, Wing Yee Jenifer Ho (2018). "Language Learning Sans Frontiers: A Translanguaging View". *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 38: 33-59. doi:10.1017/S0267190518000053
- Wood, David, Jerome S. Bruner, Gail Ross (1976). "The role of tutoring in problem solving". *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, 17(2): 89–100.
- Woll, Nina (2020). "Towards crosslinguistic pedagogy: Demystifying pre-service teachers' beliefs regarding the target-language-only rule". *System*, 92, 102275. doi:10.1016/j.system.2020.102275
- Yilmaz, Tuba, Ester de Jong (2020). "Translanguaging as a Boundary Crossing Mechanism: A Turkish-American Youngster and her Linguistic Negotiation of Three Discursive Spaces". *Australian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 3(1): 11-25. doi.org/10.29140/ajal.v3n1.284

- Yüksel, Doğan (2007). Nature of literary discussions in an advanced-level foreign language literature course in a Turkish EFL setting. Doctoral dissertation, Florida State University, Tallahassee, Florida. Retrieved from [http://purl.flvc.org/fsu/fd/FSU\\_migr\\_etd-0946](http://purl.flvc.org/fsu/fd/FSU_migr_etd-0946)
- Young, Vershawn (2004). “Your average nigga”. *College Composition and Communication*, 55: 693-715.
- Yuvayapan, Fatma (2019). “Translanguaging in EFL classrooms: Teachers’ perceptions and practices”. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies*, 15(2): 678-694.
- Zhang, Hong, Brian Hok-Shing Chan (2017). “Translanguaging in multimodal Macao posters: Flexible versus separate multilingualism”. *International Journal of Bilingualism*, 21(1): 34-56. [doi:10.1177/1367006915594691](https://doi.org/10.1177/1367006915594691)

### 3. Electronical Resources

- EF English Proficiency Index (2016). A Comprehensive Ranking Of Countries By English Skills [Online]. Retrieved from: <https://www.ef.com.tr/epi/>
- Goldenberg, Claudie (2008). Teaching English language learners: what the research does—and does not—say *American Educator* [Online]. Retrieved from: <http://www.aft.org/pdfs/americaneducator/summer2008/goldenberg.pdf>
- Gonzales, Laura (2015). “Multimodality, Translingualism, and Rhetorical Genre Studies”. *Best J. Rhetoric Comp.*, 1(85). Retrieved from: <https://compositionforum.com/issue/31/multimodality.php>
- McKenzie, Jamie (1999). “Scaffolding for Success”. *From Now On The Educational Technology Journal*, 9(4). Retrieved from: <http://fno.org/dec99/scaffold.html>
- Sert, Olcay (2005). “The Functions of Code Switching in ELT Classrooms”. *The Internet TESL Journal*, 11,(8). Posted on 08/08/2005, Retrieved from: <http://iteslj.org/>
- Working Group on ELL Policy (2009). *The American Recovery and Reinvestment Act: Recommendations for addressing the needs of English language learners* [Online]. Retrieved from: <http://ellpolicy.org/wp-content/uploads/2009/10/ELL-Stimulus-Recommendations.pdf>.



## APPENDICES

### Appendix A

#### *Gabriel Post Hoc Test Results for Question 6*

Dependent Variable	(I) LevelofSchool	(J) LevelofSchool	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.
Q6.1 To discuss content or activities in small groups	Primary school	Secondary School	-.271	.202	.694
		High School	-.330	.228	.617
		University	-.149	.239	.990
	Secondary School	Primary school	.271	.202	.694
		High School	-.060	.210	1.000
		University	.122	.222	.994
	High School	Primary school	.330	.228	.617
		Secondary School	.060	.210	1.000
		University	.182	.246	.975
	University	Primary school	.149	.239	.990
		Secondary School	-.122	.222	.994
		High School	-.182	.246	.975
Q6.2 To provide assistance to peers during activities	Primary school	Secondary School	-.236	.186	.741
		High School	-.350	.209	.451
		University	.106	.220	.997
	Secondary School	Primary school	.236	.186	.741
		High School	-.114	.192	.992
		University	.341	.204	.432
	High School	Primary school	.350	.209	.451
		Secondary School	.114	.192	.992
		University	.455	.226	.237
	University	Primary school	-.106	.220	.997
		Secondary School	-.341	.204	.432
		High School	-.455	.226	.237
Q6.3 To brainstorm during class activities	Primary school	Secondary School	-.495	.195	.066
		High School	<b>-.600*</b>	<b>.220</b>	<b>.040</b>
		University	-.081	.231	1.000
	Secondary School	Primary school	.495	.195	.066
		High School	-.105	.202	.996
		University	.415	.214	.267
	High School	Primary school	.600*	.220	.040

		Secondary School	.105	.202	.996
		University	.520	.237	.162
	University	Primary school	.081	.231	1.000
		Secondary School	-.415	.214	.267
		High School	-.520	.237	.162
Q6.4 To explain problems not related to content	Primary school	Secondary School	-.224	.212	.869
		High School	-.282	.239	.805
		University	.093	.251	.999
	Secondary School	Primary school	.224	.212	.869
		High School	-.057	.220	1.000
		University	.317	.233	.667
	High School	Primary school	.282	.239	.805
		Secondary School	.057	.220	1.000
		University	.374	.258	.613
	University	Primary school	-.093	.251	.999
		Secondary School	-.317	.233	.667
		High School	-.374	.258	.613
Q6.5 To enable participation by lower proficiency students	Primary school	Secondary School	-.419	.179	.112
		High School	-.522	.202	.060
		University	.154	.212	.977
	Secondary School	Primary school	.419	.179	.112
		High School	-.103	.186	.994
		University	<b>.573*</b>	<b>.197</b>	<b>.021</b>
	High School	Primary school	.522	.202	.060
		Secondary School	.103	.186	.994
		University	.676*	.218	.013
	University	Primary school	-.154	.212	.977
		Secondary School	-.573*	.197	.021
		High School	<b>-.676*</b>	<b>.218</b>	<b>.013</b>
Q6.6 To respond to teacher's question	Primary school	Secondary School	-.434	.213	.225
		High School	-.571	.240	.104
		University	-.105	.252	.999
	Secondary School	Primary school	.434	.213	.225
		High School	-.137	.221	.989
		University	.329	.234	.631
	High School	Primary school	.571	.240	.104
		Secondary School	.137	.221	.989
		University	.466	.259	.361

	University	Primary school	.105	.252	.999
		Secondary School	-.329	.234	.631
		High School	-.466	.259	.361
Q6.7 To ask permission	Primary school	Secondary School	-.555	.223	.075
		High School	<b>-.803*</b>	<b>.251</b>	<b>.009</b>
		University	-.043	.264	1.000
	Secondary School	Primary school	.555	.223	.075
		High School	-.247	.231	.860
		University	.512	.244	.189
	High School	Primary school	.803*	.251	.009
		Secondary School	.247	.231	.860
		University	.760*	.270	.032
	University	Primary school	.043	.264	1.000
		Secondary School	-.512	.244	.189
		High School	<b>-.760*</b>	<b>.270</b>	<b>.032</b>

\*. The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.

## Appendix B

### Gabriel Post Hoc Test Results for Question 7

Dependent Variable	(I) LevelofSchool	(J) LevelofSchool	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.
Q7.1 To discuss content or activities in small groups	Primary school	Secondary School	<b>-.380*</b>	<b>.111</b>	<b>.004</b>
		High School	-.228	.125	.348
		University	-.124	.131	.919
	Secondary School	Primary school	<b>.380*</b>	<b>.111</b>	<b>.004</b>
		High School	.152	.115	.701
		University	.256	.122	.186
	High School	Primary school	.228	.125	.348
		Secondary School	-.152	.115	.701
		University	.104	.135	.969
	University	Primary school	.124	.131	.919
		Secondary School	-.256	.122	.186
		High School	-.104	.135	.969
Q7.2 To provide assistance to peers during activities	Primary school	Secondary School	-.260	.118	.152
		High School	-.264	.133	.253
		University	-.126	.139	.933
	Secondary School	Primary school	.260	.118	.152
		High School	-.004	.122	1.000
		University	.134	.129	.873
	High School	Primary school	.264	.133	.253
		Secondary School	.004	.122	1.000
		University	.138	.143	.912
	University	Primary school	.126	.139	.933
		Secondary School	-.134	.129	.873
		High School	-.138	.143	.912
Q7.3 To brainstorm during class activities	Primary school	Secondary School	<b>-.380*</b>	<b>.121</b>	<b>.011</b>
		High School	-.249	.137	.353
		University	-.173	.144	.787
	Secondary School	Primary school	<b>.380*</b>	<b>.121</b>	<b>.011</b>
		High School	.132	.126	.872
		University	.207	.133	.519
	High School	Primary school	.249	.137	.353
		Secondary School	-.132	.126	.872
		University	.076	.147	.996
University	Primary school	.173	.144	.787	

		Secondary School	-.207	.133	.519
		High School	-.076	.147	.996
Q7.4 To explain problems not related to content	Primary school	Secondary School	-.230	.128	.360
		High School	-.198	.144	.675
		University	-.072	.152	.998
	Secondary School	Primary school	.230	.128	.360
		High School	.033	.133	1.000
		University	.159	.141	.825
	High School	Primary school	.198	.144	.675
		Secondary School	-.033	.133	1.000
		University	.126	.156	.961
	University	Primary school	.072	.152	.998
		Secondary School	-.159	.141	.825
		High School	-.126	.156	.961
Q7.5 To enable participation by lower proficiency students	Primary school	Secondary School	-.097	.119	.958
		High School	-.159	.134	.801
		University	.232	.141	.467
	Secondary School	Primary school	.097	.119	.958
		High School	-.061	.123	.997
		University	.329	.131	.065
	High School	Primary school	.159	.134	.801
		Secondary School	.061	.123	.997
		University	<b>.391*</b>	<b>.144</b>	<b>.043</b>
	University	Primary school	-.232	.141	.467
		Secondary School	-.329	.131	.065
		High School	-.391*	.144	.043
Q7.6 To respond to teacher's question	Primary school	Secondary School	<b>-.338*</b>	<b>.122</b>	<b>.035</b>
		High School	-.169	.138	.774
		University	-.106	.145	.976
	Secondary School	Primary school	.338*	.122	.035
		High School	.168	.127	.697
		University	.232	.134	.397
	High School	Primary school	.169	.138	.774
		Secondary School	-.168	.127	.697
		University	.063	.149	.999
	University	Primary school	.106	.145	.976
		Secondary School	-.232	.134	.397
		High School	-.063	.149	.999

Q7.7 To ask permission	Primary school	Secondary School	<b>-.319*</b>	<b>.118</b>	<b>.042</b>
		High School	-.163	.133	.777
		University	-.014	.140	1.000
	Secondary School	Primary school	.319*	.118	.042
		High School	.157	.122	.732
		University	.305	.130	.102
	High School	Primary school	.163	.133	.777
		Secondary School	-.157	.122	.732
		University	.148	.143	.882
	University	Primary school	.014	.140	1.000
		Secondary School	-.305	.130	.102
		High School	-.148	.143	.882

\*. The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.

## Appendix C

### Gabriel Post Hoc Test Results for Question 8

Dependent Variable	(I) LevelofSchool	(J) LevelofSchool	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.
Q8.1 To explain concepts	Primary school	Secondary School	-.318	.175	.344
		High School	<b>-.716*</b>	<b>.197</b>	<b>.002</b>
		University	.060	.207	1.000
	Secondary School	Primary school	.318	.175	.344
		High School	-.398	.181	.153
		University	.378	.192	.247
	High School	Primary school	.716*	.197	.002
		Secondary School	.398	.181	.153
		University	<b>.776*</b>	<b>.212</b>	<b>.002</b>
	University	Primary school	-.060	.207	1.000
		Secondary School	-.378	.192	.247
		High School	-.776*	.212	.002
Q8.2 To describe vocabulary	Primary school	Secondary School	<b>-.519*</b>	<b>.176</b>	<b>.020</b>
		High School	<b>-.741*</b>	<b>.198</b>	<b>.001</b>
		University	.006	.208	1.000
	Secondary School	Primary school	.519*	.176	.020
		High School	-.223	.182	.770
		University	<b>.524*</b>	<b>.193</b>	<b>.037</b>
	High School	Primary school	.741*	.198	.001
		Secondary School	.223	.182	.770
		University	<b>.747*</b>	<b>.213</b>	<b>.003</b>
	University	Primary school	-.006	.208	1.000
		Secondary School	-.524*	.193	.037
		High School	-.747*	.213	.003
Q8.3 To give directions	Primary school	Secondary School	-.469	.193	.089
		High School	<b>-.683*</b>	<b>.218</b>	<b>.011</b>
		University	-.091	.229	.999
	Secondary School	Primary school	.469	.193	.089
		High School	-.214	.200	.861
		University	.378	.212	.358
	High School	Primary school	.683*	.218	.011
		Secondary School	.214	.200	.861
		University	.592	.234	.071
University	Primary school	.091	.229	.999	

		Secondary School	-.378	.212	.358
		High School	-.592	.234	.071
Q8.4 For classroom management	Primary school	Secondary School	<b>-.550*</b>	<b>.207</b>	<b>.047</b>
		High School	<b>-.659*</b>	<b>.233</b>	<b>.030</b>
		University	-.099	.245	.999
	Secondary School	Primary school	.550*	.207	.047
		High School	-.109	.214	.996
		University	.451	.227	.240
	High School	Primary school	.659*	.233	.030
		Secondary School	.109	.214	.996
		University	.560	.251	.148
	University	Primary school	.099	.245	.999
		Secondary School	-.451	.227	.240
		High School	-.560	.251	.148
Q8.5 To give feedback to students	Primary school	Secondary School	<b>-.876*</b>	<b>.192</b>	<b>.000</b>
		High School	<b>-.948*</b>	<b>.216</b>	<b>.000</b>
		University	<b>-.694*</b>	<b>.227</b>	<b>.015</b>
	Secondary School	Primary school	.876*	.192	.000
		High School	-.072	.199	.999
		University	.183	.211	.942
	High School	Primary school	.948*	.216	.000
		Secondary School	.072	.199	.999
		University	.255	.233	.852
	University	Primary school	.694*	.227	.015
		Secondary School	-.183	.211	.942
		High School	-.255	.233	.852
Q8.6 To praise students	Primary school	Secondary School	<b>-.675*</b>	<b>.196</b>	<b>.004</b>
		High School	-.554	.220	.073
		University	-.163	.232	.980
	Secondary School	Primary school	.675*	.196	.004
		High School	.121	.203	.991
		University	.512	.215	.094
	High School	Primary school	.554	.220	.073
		Secondary School	-.121	.203	.991
		University	.391	.238	.468
	University	Primary school	.163	.232	.980
		Secondary School	-.512	.215	.094
		High School	-.391	.238	.468



Q8.7 To build bonds with students	Primary school	Secondary School	<b>-.593*</b>	<b>.205</b>	<b>.024</b>
		High School	<b>-.922*</b>	<b>.231</b>	<b>.001</b>
		University	-.532	.243	.163
	Secondary School	Primary school	.593*	.205	.024
		High School	-.330	.213	.531
		University	.061	.225	1.000
	High School	Primary school	.922*	.231	.001
		Secondary School	.330	.213	.531
		University	.391	.249	.527
	University	Primary school	.532	.243	.163
		Secondary School	-.061	.225	1.000
		High School	-.391	.249	.527
Q8.8 To quickly clarify during activities	Primary school	Secondary School	<b>-.557*</b>	<b>.192</b>	<b>.023</b>
		High School	<b>-.870*</b>	<b>.216</b>	<b>.000</b>
		University	-.142	.227	.989
	Secondary School	Primary school	.557*	.192	.023
		High School	-.314	.199	.511
		University	.415	.211	.250
	High School	Primary school	.870*	.216	.000
		Secondary School	.314	.199	.511
		University	<b>.728*</b>	<b>.233</b>	<b>.012</b>
	University	Primary school	.142	.227	.989
		Secondary School	-.415	.211	.250
		High School	-.728*	.233	.012
Q8.9 To help low proficiency students	Primary school	Secondary School	<b>-.601*</b>	<b>.208</b>	<b>.024</b>
		High School	<b>-.765*</b>	<b>.234</b>	<b>.007</b>
		University	-.028	.246	1.000
	Secondary School	Primary school	.601*	.208	.024
		High School	-.164	.215	.969
		University	.573	.228	.066
	High School	Primary school	.765*	.234	.007
		Secondary School	.164	.215	.969
		University	<b>.737*</b>	<b>.252</b>	<b>.022</b>
	University	Primary school	.028	.246	1.000
		Secondary School	-.573	.228	.066
		High School	-.737*	.252	.022

\*. The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.

## Appendix D

### Gabriel Post Hoc Test Results for Question 9

Dependent Variable	(I) LevelofSchool	(J) LevelofSchool	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.
Q9.1 To explain concepts	Primary school	Secondary School	<b>-.296*</b>	<b>.110</b>	<b>.043</b>
		High School	-.300	.124	.094
		University	.033	.130	1.000
	Secondary School	Primary school	.296*	.110	.043
		High School	-.004	.114	1.000
		University	<b>.329*</b>	<b>.121</b>	<b>.036</b>
	High School	Primary school	.300	.124	.094
		Secondary School	.004	.114	1.000
		University	.333	.134	.077
	University	Primary school	-.033	.130	1.000
		Secondary School	<b>-.329*</b>	<b>.121</b>	<b>.036</b>
		High School	-.333	.134	.077
Q9.2 To describe vocabulary	Primary school	Secondary School	-.259	.117	.148
		High School	-.169	.132	.736
		University	-.089	.138	.988
	Secondary School	Primary school	.259	.117	.148
		High School	.091	.121	.972
		University	.171	.128	.688
	High School	Primary school	.169	.132	.736
		Secondary School	-.091	.121	.972
		University	.080	.142	.994
	University	Primary school	.089	.138	.988
		Secondary School	-.171	.128	.688
		High School	-.080	.142	.994
Q9.3 To give directions	Primary school	Secondary School	-.240	.117	.219
		High School	-.149	.132	.834
		University	-.130	.139	.921
	Secondary School	Primary school	.240	.117	.219
		High School	.091	.121	.971
		University	.110	.129	.946
	High School	Primary school	.149	.132	.834
		Secondary School	-.091	.121	.971
		University	.018	.142	1.000
	University	Primary school	.130	.139	.921
		Secondary School	-.110	.129	.946
		High School	-.018	.142	1.000
Q9.4 For classroom management	Primary school	Secondary School	-.096	.129	.973
		High School	-.055	.146	.999
		University	.026	.153	1.000
	Secondary School	Primary school	.096	.129	.973
		High School	.041	.134	1.000

		University	.122	.142	.944
	High School	Primary school	.055	.146	.999
		Secondary School	-.041	.134	1.000
		University	.081	.157	.996
	University	Primary school	-.026	.153	1.000
		Secondary School	-.122	.142	.944
		High School	-.081	.157	.996
Q9.5 To give feedback to students	Primary school	Secondary School	<b>-.418*</b>	<b>.127</b>	<b>.007</b>
		High School	-.201	.143	.651
		University	-.259	.150	.414
	Secondary School	Primary school	.418*	.127	.007
		High School	.217	.132	.460
		University	.159	.139	.820
	High School	Primary school	.201	.143	.651
		Secondary School	-.217	.132	.460
		University	-.058	.154	.999
	University	Primary school	.259	.150	.414
		Secondary School	-.159	.139	.820
		High School	.058	.154	.999
Q9.6 To praise students	Primary school	Secondary School	-.277	.118	.112
		High School	-.051	.134	.999
		University	-.021	.140	1.000
	Secondary School	Primary school	.277	.118	.112
		High School	.226	.123	.330
		University	.256	.130	.249
	High School	Primary school	.051	.134	.999
		Secondary School	-.226	.123	.330
		University	.030	.144	1.000
	University	Primary school	.021	.140	1.000
		Secondary School	-.256	.130	.249
		High School	-.030	.144	1.000
Q9.7 To build bonds with students	Primary school	Secondary School	-.169	.129	.715
		High School	-.234	.146	.499
		University	-.279	.153	.347
	Secondary School	Primary school	.169	.129	.715
		High School	-.065	.134	.997
		University	-.110	.142	.966
	High School	Primary school	.234	.146	.499
		Secondary School	.065	.134	.997
		University	-.045	.157	1.000
	University	Primary school	.279	.153	.347
		Secondary School	.110	.142	.966
		High School	.045	.157	1.000
Q9.8 To quickly clarify during activities	Primary school	Secondary School	-.206	.118	.396
		High School	-.112	.133	.953
		University	.014	.140	1.000
		Primary school	.206	.118	.396

	Secondary School	High School	.094	.122	.968
		University	.220	.130	.418
	High School	Primary school	.112	.133	.953
		Secondary School	-.094	.122	.968
		University	.125	.143	.943
	University	Primary school	-.014	.140	1.000
		Secondary School	-.220	.130	.418
		High School	-.125	.143	.943
	Q9.9 To help low proficiency students	Primary school	Secondary School	-.280	.124
High School			-.268	.139	.290
University			-.072	.146	.997
Secondary School		Primary school	.280	.124	.136
		High School	.012	.128	1.000
		University	.207	.136	.542
High School		Primary school	.268	.139	.290
		Secondary School	-.012	.128	1.000
		University	.196	.150	.723
University		Primary school	.072	.146	.997
		Secondary School	-.207	.136	.542
		High School	-.196	.150	.723

\*. The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.

## CV

I studied at Hüseyin Bürge Anatolian High School. I graduated from Marmara University, English Language Teaching department. I have been working as an English teacher at public schools of the Ministry of National Education since 2015. Between 2020 - 2021, I taught Turkish as a foreign language at the University of Oregon, USA. I carried out research about students' beliefs about language learning which was published in the Journal of Foreign Language Education and Technology (JFLET). I wrote an article about teachers' successes and struggles adopting multiliteracy in Kocaeli University Journal of Education (KUJE). I also presented a paper about Critical Pedagogy at the 11<sup>th</sup> International ELT Research Conference. My research interests are translanguaging, multiliteracy framework, heritage language, sociocultural theory and critical pedagogy.