

PEDAGOGICAL ISSUES OF TRANSLANGUAGING PRACTICE IN INDONESIA: THE VOICE OF FOUR EFL TEACHERS

Putu Sita Witari^{1*} and Katharina Endriati Sukamto²

^{1,2}Atma Jaya Catholic University of Indonesia, Jakarta, Indonesia

put.sita@gmail.com¹ and katharina.sukamto@atmajaya.ac.id²

*correspondence: put.sita@gmail.com¹

<https://doi.org/10.24071/ijiet.v7i2.5814>

received 30 January 2023; accepted 5 July 2023

Abstract

In Indonesia, many pedagogical stakeholders may not be familiar with translanguaging practices in EFL education. Indonesian EFL teachers may unconsciously have practised translanguaging in their classrooms, but they may not be aware that they have practised the activity. To explore the perspectives and beliefs about translanguaging, this study involves four Indonesian EFL teachers from four different geographical areas in Indonesia. Two of them teach EFL in formal education, while the other two in informal education settings. The data was collected by conducting an in-depth interview with each of them. Based on their perspectives, this study reveals four main pedagogical issues in translanguaging practice. They are (1) confusion of the concept, (2) institutional policy, (3) cognitive and social gains, and (4) complication. These four issues indicate that while theoretically translanguaging is said to potentially encourage learning, it still creates some controversies about whether or not it can lead success to in EFL learning. This study suggests that the implementation of translanguaging practice in the Indonesian context should depend on typical situations in every EFL classroom. Teachers should consider, among others, learners' diverse backgrounds and also their existing linguistic repertoire, including their L1 knowledge. In making EFL learning meaningful, learners' needs should be a priority.

Keywords: EFL teaching, EFL learning, Indonesian EFL teachers, pedagogical challenges, translanguaging

Introduction

In this globalisation era, the translanguaging practice has become an option in foreign language pedagogy. It has been quite often applied by teachers to replace the monolingual ideology in teaching a foreign language (Cenoz & Gorter, 2020; Putri & Rifai, 2021; Raja et al., 2022; Sahib, 2019; Ticheloven et al., 2019; Wei, 2011, 2022; Yuvayapan, 2019). A number of pedagogical scholars believe that by engaging students' full linguistic resources in learning English, teachers have a more dynamic approach to teaching more complex content (Canaragajah, 2011; Emilia & Hamied, 2022; García, 2009; García & Lin, 2016; Ticheloven et al., 2019; Wei, 2011). Some other scholars align with the concept of translanguaging to be



implemented in language learning as it can provide sufficient training to educators and policymakers in designing the curriculum, developing teaching materials, and evaluating the students' language skills (Turnbull, 2018; Yuzlu & Dikilitas, 2021).

On the other side, quite many policy-makers in schools or institutions worldwide discourage the use of first language in EFL classrooms (Fallas-Escobar & Dillard-Paltrineri, 2015; Solhi & Büyükyazi, 2011; Yuvayapan, 2019). They believe in the theory that the target language must be consistently used as the only medium of communication as it can facilitate the effectiveness of learning the target language. One reason why translanguaging should not be implemented is that EFL learners may not have many opportunities to use the target language outside the classroom, and so "maximizing the use of FL in the classroom is very important" (Solhi & Büyükyazi, 2011, p. 860).

For EFL learners, the translanguaging instructional approach offered in multilingual classrooms has also received different reactions. Several students in Ticheloven et al.'s study (2019) expressed their "joy in mixing languages", but some others reported their confusion "when alternating languages" (p. 17). Such attitude was also found in Carstens's (2016) work, in which most university students in South Africa found that translanguaging practice assist them in 'meaning making' (p. 211) and 'making sense of the concept' (p. 214). However, some other students found that translanguaging does not help them in 'developing competence and confidence in English' (p. 216).

Whether educational stakeholders would acknowledge the cognitive and affective gains of translanguaging (Liu & Fang, 2022; Wei, 2017, 2022) or not, teachers are expected to adapt to the situation inside the classrooms and face the true identity of their learners. Otherwise, the application of methodological theories into practice may bring no benefits to the students. Teachers should also be aware that learning a foreign language is process-based, and therefore, if they believe in the application of translanguaging, the way they practice it may differ from one class to another (Rasman, 2018).

Meanwhile, EFL teachers normally see the use of the first language as a 'nuance' to be either embraced or banished from EFL teaching (Raja et al., 2022). Many hold positive perspectives about this teaching methodology, yet on the other side, some teachers perceive this as impractical (Fallas-Escobar & Dillard-Paltrineri, 2015). Those who agree would say that translanguaging is a good resource for learning which can encourage students to get connected in the global society (García & Wei, 2014). On the other hand, those who are against it may argue that translanguaging is an "underdeveloped" pedagogical approach (Canaragajah 2011b, p. 8) or that it is too "simplistic" (Ticheloven et al., 2019).

Numerous studies have been conducted to investigate the effects of translanguaging in EFL pedagogy, including the ones that took Indonesian EFL classrooms as the setting (e.g., Berlianti and Pradita, 2021; Emilia & Hamied, 2022; Khairunnisa and Lukmana, 2020; Putri & Rifai, 2021; Rasman, 2018; Sapitri et al., 2018; Saputra, 2020; Saputra & Akib, 2018). The participants involved in those studies were all Indonesian teachers or students in formal schools. To date, EFL learning in informal education is underexplored. Furthermore, as far as our knowledge is concerned, no comparative studies on translanguaging practice have been conducted across regions in Indonesia. This present study, therefore, fills the gap in the literature as it involves four Indonesian teachers from both formal and

informal education in four different regional locations in Indonesia. Two of them represent formal education and the other two represent informal education settings. This study, which is based on an in-depth interview with each of the four teachers, explores the perceptions of the teachers in terms of their beliefs in translanguaging practice. This study will answer the question: What pedagogical issues can be found based on the four Indonesian EFL teachers' perspectives of translanguaging practice?

In this study, the term L1 is interpreted as Bahasa Indonesia, the national language of the country and the medium of instruction used in schools. Other languages which exist in the teachers' and students' linguistic repertoire are ignored, as both teachers and students may speak different regional languages.

Literature review

Before the 1990s, traditional monolingual ideology has gained momentum in ESL/EFL classrooms (Liu & Fang, 2022; Wei, 2022). Such ideology prohibits the use of students' L1 because of the belief that the use of L1 was detrimental to L2 learning (Wei, 2017). Some studies have reported that there are cases of resistance towards L1 intervention in L2 learning (Creese & Blackledge, 2010; García, 2020; García & Wei, 2014; Rubdy, 2009). Two teaching approaches which were quite popular at the time were Direct Method and Communicative Language Teaching (Emilia & Hamied, 2022). The fundamental principle of the Direct Method is that the way learners learn a new language should be the same as when they learn their first language. In Communicative Language Teaching, the fundamental goal is learners' fluency in the target language, and thus both teachers and learners are required to use the target language (Larsen-Freeman, 2000).

In 1994, Dr Cen Williams introduced the Welsh term *trawsieithu* (Conteh, 2018; García & Lin, 2016) to refer to 'a pedagogical practice where students in bilingual Welsh/English classrooms are asked to alternate languages for receptive or productive use' (García & Lin, 2016, p. 2). In the Welsh educational context, such practice facilitated the use of students' linguistic resources in the Welsh learning process, where both Welsh and English were used (Wei, 2017). The Welsh term was then translated into English as *translanguaging* (Conteh, 2018, p. 445). Since then, many scholars have started to articulate translanguaging practices to replace the monolingual view (Emilia & Hamied, 2022; Sugiharto, 2022). As a result, language practitioners then started to practice translanguaging in their classrooms, in which they allow 'the use of two languages for teaching and learning' (Conteh, 2018, p. 445).

Generally speaking, quite many scholars believe that translanguaging can help teachers reach their primary teaching goals. They viewed translanguaging as a methodological practice which can enhance learning and develop students' cognitive abilities (Baker, 2001; Mickwitz et al., 2021; Putri & Rifai, 2021; Ticheloven et al., 2019; Wei, 2017, 2022), in the sense that by making use of all linguistic resources available, the practice can potentially reinforce students' critical thinking, creativity, and knowledge-building (Creese & Blackledge, 2010; Wei 2017). The fact that there is some kind of flexibility in language use may lead to a dynamic and creative practice (Wei, 2017), which results in a deeper and fuller understanding of the subject matter (Baker, 2001; Sahib et al., 2020).

Apart from the development of learners' cognitive skills, translanguaging is also perceived as a pedagogical approach which could lower learners' effective resistance and support teachers in building rapport with the learners (Yuan & Yang, 2020). In other words, trust between learners and their teachers could be established (Duarte, 2016), and more friendly and engaging activities between them could be created (García & Lin, 2016). Likewise, translanguaging pedagogy was also perceived positively by the students and teachers of Polish EMI (English as a medium of instruction) classrooms in three different schools in Poland (Romanowski, 2020). The findings indicate that both students and teachers found that the approach creates a more flexible learning situation.

Other studies also reported that translanguaging provides ample opportunities for students at a lower proficiency level, especially those who learn the language at adolescent or adult age (Baker, 2001; Khairunnisa & Lukmana, 2020; Yuvayapan, 2019). The translanguaging practice was also perceived as acknowledging the presence of minoritised communities who speak minoritised languages (Cenoz & Gorter, 2020; Flores & García, 2013; Khairunnisa & Lukmana, 2020). In a different context, translanguaging is viewed by Ke and Lin (2017) as a beneficial pedagogical tool in TESOL because, in this globalized community, students are very likely to 'translanguaging in their future workplace and their use of English will not be in a monolingual English environment.'" (p. 41).

However, there are reports about the ineffectiveness of translanguaging practice in EFL classrooms across countries. The Turkish EFL teachers surveyed in Yuvapan's (2019) study, for example, did not show any enthusiasm towards translanguaging pedagogy due to 'the expectations of their institutions, colleagues and parents of their students' (p. 678), in that monolingual norm is believed to enhance the students' English proficiency. Likewise, Fallas-Escobar and Dillard-Paltrineri's (2015) study also indicates that the Spanish EFL teachers and students also considered translanguaging ineffective because the presence of Spanish in the EFL learning process caused the learners' brains 'to become lazy' (p. 312). They further argued that the brain will not get stimulated when learning is not completely conducted in English. In a different context, Schissel et al. (2018) pointed out in their study that some EFL teachers in Mexico believe that translanguaging methodology can help students to acquire L2 competence, but the use of L1 (in this case Spanish) 'is considered a failure because if students are unable to produce a monolingual register of English in particular, teachers fear they will not succeed on the standardized, monolingual tests that are crucial to academic achievement both within and beyond Mexico' (p. 8).

In Hong Kong, a case study by Yuan and Yang (2020) about the perspectives of a Chinese teacher educator reveals that the implementation of a translanguaging strategy in his EMI classes was not well-received by his students due to their doubts and resistance to his attempt to bridge academic theories and practice. In a similar vein, university students and teachers at the University of the Basque Country in Spain also showed more negative rather than positive attitudes towards translanguaging education (Serna-Bermejo & Lasagabaster, 2022).

In the Indonesian context, the translanguaging practice has received different reactions. Generally speaking, both teachers and students reacted positively to translanguaging practice (Berlianti and Pradita, 2021; Emilia & Hamied, 2022; Khairunnisa and Lukmana, 2020; Putri & Rifai, 2021; Raja et al., 2022; Rasman,

2018; Sahib et al, 2020; Sapitri et al., 2018; Saputra, 2020; Saputra and Akib, 2018). However, those who view translanguaging practice negatively commonly believe that L1 intervention would hinder EFL learning, and thus full exposure to English is a must (Carstens, 2016; Renandya & Chang, 2022).

Controversies regarding translanguaging practice in EFL pedagogy have been raised by a number of scholars. For example, in a quite recent article, Liu and Fang (2022) highlights the importance of re-examining the significance of translanguaging practice in English language teaching. They argued,

[...] whilst the stakeholders recognized some pedagogical functions of translanguaging, constraints including monolingual policy and ideology, lack of institution guidance, uncertainty of L1 as resources for subject learning, frequency of L1 use, have prevented translanguaging practices (p. 395).

In other words, although they agreed that monolingual practice is not ideal, they think that there should be an in-depth discussion concerning the implementation of translanguaging in EFL education.

Another scholar who recently also addressed the controversies of translanguaging practice is Renandya and Chang (2022), who raised two intriguing questions: (1) Would translanguaging work in the EFL contexts? (2) Would it help learners develop confidence in using the target language for social and academic communication? The two scholars came up with the following conclusion:

Hard to say. Research on translanguaging to date seems to be done mostly in non-EFL contexts. In addition, the focus of the research seems to be more on content rather than language learning. Translanguaging research is typically done in EMI (English as the Medium of Instruction) contexts. While there is focus on language, the primary goal of instruction is more on the mastery of course content than language development. A popular approach of CLIL (Content and Language Integrated Learning), where content is presented using simplified language and further supported by the use of visual or graphical information to make the lessons more palatable.

Our thought is that translanguaging is probably more applicable in immersion or semi-immersion contexts (e.g., EMI, CLIL, or other Bilingual programmes) when students already have a certain level of proficiency in two or three languages. In these contexts, allowing students to translanguage when learning content makes a lot of sense.

(<https://tesl-ej.org/wordpress/issues/volume26/ej103/ej103a25/>)

Translanguaging is meant for pedagogical equipment for an effective learning process. Therefore, controversies about the translanguaging practice will always exist as the success or failure of the practice depends upon many factors, among others, geographical location, learners' social backgrounds, learners' L1, teachers' experience, etc.

Method

This study follows a qualitative case study design. It aims to address the question “What pedagogical issues can be found based on the four Indonesian EFL teachers' perspectives of translanguaging practice?”

Participants

Four Indonesian EFL teachers were interviewed voluntarily through an online communication platform, Zoom. Their teaching experience ranged between 7 to 17 years. All of them have received a CELTA (Certificate of Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages) from Cambridge. CELTA is a globally recognised English teaching qualification and has been frequently requested by employers. All participants have taught different levels of EFL classrooms, and their students ranged from five-year-old children to adults in their fifties. Two participants represent teachers from formal institutions, while the other two are freelance private teachers. As previously mentioned, even though the teachers and students may speak different local languages, in this study the languages used for translanguaging practice are Bahasa Indonesia and English.

Table 1. Participants

NNESTs	Gender	Age	Ethnic Background	Current Place	Teaching Experience
T1	F	28	Chinese Indonesian	Kediri, East Java	7 years. Freelance private teacher, currently teaching private online/offline classes
T2	F	39	Javanese	Sumba, East Nusa Tenggara	17 years. Currently an EFL teacher in a vocational institution
T3	M	35	Kutainese	Kutai, East Kalimantan	15 years. Currently a lecturer at a private university in Kalimantan
T4	F	38	Chinese Indonesian	Malang, East Java	17 years. Freelance private teacher, currently teaching EFL on an online application

Data collection and data analysis

An in-depth interview method was chosen to explore the four teachers’ opinions about the translanguaging practice. Since the teachers live in different places, each of them was interviewed via Zoom application in December 2021. Each interview lasted for about one hour. The interview started with an introduction about themselves. This is the moment for them to share the years they have been in their career. Afterwards, the questions became more specific in exploring their perspectives on translanguaging practices, especially in the Indonesian context.

Once the interview was over, the recording was stored in a well-secured online storage provided by Google One.

The next step was to transcribe the four recordings. After that, the teachers' responses were qualitatively analyzed and categorized into some pedagogical issues which were raised during the interview.

Findings and Discussion

This section analyses and discusses the in-depth interview results from the four teachers' responses. For privacy's sake, their names are replaced with 'T', which stands for 'Teacher', and followed by their turn number. From the interview, we identified four pedagogical issues of translanguaging practice, namely (1) confusion of the concept, (2) institutional policy, (3) cognitive and social gains, and (4) complication.

Confusion of the concept

The first pedagogical issue concerns with the confusion of the concept of translanguaging. The four teachers reacted differently when asked what they believed in the concept of translanguaging. T1, who is a freelancer, expressed that she was more familiar with the term code-switching or code-mixing: *"I'm familiar with the other terms, like code-switching and code-mixing."* T2, an experienced teacher in a vocational school, was somewhat confused about whether there was a difference between translanguaging and being bilingual: *"... what is the difference between translanguaging and bilingual."* On the other hand, T3, who is a university lecturer, is quite familiar with the term: *"Translanguaging, as far as I know, is a pedagogical approach that a teacher uses to teach a new language to students, especially to bilingual students. Translanguaging is, in my perspective, is not only translating."*

In contrast with T3, T4 believed that translanguaging is a translation activity: *"I suppose translanguaging is used when you are not a monolingual, so you may use translation or other words to help the students to understand a word..."* Interestingly, she expressed her pessimistic view that translanguaging is no longer needed in the future: *"Translanguaging is not going to be needed in the future. By that time, many will go to the international schools."* T3, on the other hand, had a different view about the future of translanguaging: *"I think this pedagogical approach has a prospect in the future."*

The teachers' beliefs in translanguaging represent how much they see the prospect of this teaching pedagogy in the future. Of the four teachers, only T3 had a clear understanding of translanguaging. This is most probably due to his educational background. When the data was taken, T3 was doing his postgraduate study in Taiwan. Being a postgraduate student outside the country, he had a positive view of translanguaging in FL learning. However, T2, who is teaching at a vocational school in Sumba – an island in the eastern part of Indonesia – is not familiar with the term. But after the interviewer explained what it was, she immediately expressed her positive view: *"It is beneficial in English language teaching [...]. It has prospects, especially when we talk about teaching English in the eastern part of Indonesia"*. T2, who has a Javanese background, is quite aware of the fact that teaching English to vocational students is not an easy task, and therefore, the use of L1 – in this case Indonesian – in teaching is unavoidable.

T4 was the only teacher who was against the implementation of translanguaging practice in the EFL classrooms. For her, this pedagogical practice would go downhill along with the increasing use of English in this globalized world, especially by the younger generation. She said, *“To be honest, I don’t agree with this. I can simplify my instructions.”*

When we observe T4’s background as a freelance teacher, we may assume that the choice of using the target language in EFL learning is based on her own belief that learners should predominantly focus on the target language rather than their L1. As a freelancer who has long been used to teaching in a one-to-one setting, T4 has more freedom to decide her techniques for teaching the language. This has probably made her believe in the concept of monolingualism in the EFL context which was quite strong in the 20th century (García, 2009). At that time, popular teaching methods in EFL were Direct Method and Communicative Language Teaching, which require the only use of the target language in the teaching-learning process (Emilia & Hamied, 2022).

Institutional policy

The next pedagogical issue that was addressed by the four teachers is institutional policy. This issue concerns the internal language education policy in some institutions which hinders EFL teachers from implementing translanguaging in their EFL classrooms. T1, a freelance teacher in a non-formal language institution, said:

“In a few years of the beginning of my teaching career, I always feel like using English all the time is the key. You have to be a role model to your students, not use the L1 a lot in the classroom. We practise English all the time, then we should use English all the time. [...] And of course, there is a policy from the English centres. [...] We are not supposed to use two languages in one class. And the language centres always promise one hundred per cent in English environment...”

T2, who is teaching at a vocational school, did not encounter any problems with the institutional policy. The EFL subject at a vocational school is not taught as one of the main subjects, and therefore, she had more freedom in teaching the subject. However, she found herself in an awkward position when her colleagues underestimate her for her capacity as an English teacher due to the fact that she is not a native speaker of English.

“My colleagues seem to underestimate my teaching partner and me because we’re Indonesians teaching English. And the fact that we incorporate Bahasa in class even makes them doubt about our teaching methods and professionalism.”

In this case, the comments made by T2’s colleagues indicate that there are still some people who believe in native-speakerism, a concept which believes that EFL learners should have a native-speaking model (Lim & Park, 2022). It is even suggested that both foreign and native English teachers ought to have a harmonious relationship which supports fostering a more conducive learning environment for both students and teachers (p. 19).

As for T3, although he did not experience strict regulation to use only English from his institution, he admitted that there are some schools which prohibited the

use of L1 in class: *“Some of the problems may come from, if you talk about the outsiders, or the external causes, such as policy from the schools and the administration.”*

T4, a freelance teacher who has been working in a number of English language centres, claimed that although there was no written rule to use full English in the classrooms, she believed in monolingual practice. When students did not understand what she said, she would just simplify her instructions in the English language.

Cognitive and social gains

The second pedagogical issue concerns the cognitive and social gains of translanguaging practice. This issue emerged after an initial discussion about the teachers’ philosophy about EFL education. All four teachers showed their commitment to their teaching profession by prioritizing their students’ needs above all. The following are their statements.

“I always try to make my class comfortable for the students. I don’t want them to feel like a burden and make English sound daunting.” (T1)

“In my classes, I try to provide a safe environment for students to learn and to make mistakes.” (T2)

“... what I have to do is to provide the opportunities to every student in the classroom.” (T3)

“I’m just applying what we call student-centred. I’ve learned that my role is as a facilitator facilitating the students to learn more.” (T4)

As mentioned previously, at the beginning of the interview, T1 and T2 were not quite familiar with the concept of translanguaging although in reality, they have practised a bilingual approach in their EFL classrooms. However, as the interview went on, they became more aware of the concept. So, when asked whether translanguaging could contribute to the success of learning EFL, they responded:

“I know it can enhance the students’ fluency.” (T1)

“... using two languages in a way helps to build this foundation, like step-by-step gradual climb to the English, I think.” (T2)

T3, who is quite familiar with the concept, also stated that this pedagogical tool aims to develop the student’s cognitive skills. He said:

“... we need to use translanguaging pedagogy to make the students understand very well what we are teaching them. [...] it is good for the development of their cognitive abilities.” (T3)

Further, the three teachers mentioned that translanguaging was quite useful for students who encountered problems in understanding a particular concept in the learning process. For T1, the translanguaging technique could encourage students to work together in class:

“I think this is one technique I sometimes use to encourage them to do peer feedback or peer teaching. And the result has been quite good. And they feel like they can explain it to their friends. It can also encourage collaboration among them.”

T2, similarly, found that the translanguaging technique helps to develop the student's vocabulary:

"... the use of L1 is helpful for the students to understand, which eventually helps them learn English faster. [...] using two languages in a way helps to build this foundation, like step-by-step gradual climb to the English, I think."

As for T3, he was confident that translanguaging is a solution for students who were not at the same pace as the other students in the classroom: He said,

"[...] not all students have a similar profile. So how to deal with that? Translanguaging. I cannot use full English, but I try to introduce the concept in English. I also need to give them the freedom to use their mother tongue in their discussions."

"I try to show them how our language is different, and this is how Indonesian expresses the context, expressing the time expressions, and this is how English is expressing their time expressions. So you will see the differences."

Previous studies by Creese and Blackledge (2010), Pacheco and Miller (2015), Yuan and Yang (2020), and Yuvayapan (2019) indicated that allowing the presence of L1 in an EFL classroom, encouraged the students to be more engaged in the classroom activities. Similarly, Emilia and Hamied's (2022) study found that translanguaging benefited students not only cognitively, but also 'socially and psychologically' (p. 47), as students became more active and they were willing to collaborate with their classmates. Furthermore, Omidire and Ayob (2020) found that it develops confidence among students, and they can help each other learn through several languages (Duarte, 2016).

T3 found that students become more active in class: *"I found that more and more students are engaged and also it can help to decrease the problem that might happen in the classroom."* This is in line with Mickwitz et al.'s (2021) claim that translanguaging places students as the centre of attention, in which the teacher actively provides a space for students to communicate and express their ideas. In relation to teaching English to be able to communicate, T1 says:

"There are a lot of communication techniques, and it is our task as a teacher to make them feel that language is meant to be for a communicative purpose, not just because you understand certain grammar and then you are a master of that language. It is all for communication, and it is good that you can speak English and Indonesian, so, to give them a bit of motivation, you are doing great at speaking another language. In the real world, it is amazing that you can use both to express yourself."

As previously mentioned, T4 did not seem to get the idea of translanguaging as a pedagogical concept. Besides that, she consistently disagreed with the implementation of the translanguaging practice. For her, the translanguaging method is the same as the 'translation' approach. When asked whether she could see the benefit of translanguaging or not, she said that 'translation' can only be used in A1-level classes, since the students have limited knowledge of English:

"[...] the benefits are especially for the low levels, let's say in A1 level, they have limited vocabulary and knowledge in English. So, I don't usually give them the translation. I try to dig up from the first, I elicit from them, what is

that in Bahasa? If they can mention, when I say a word, and they say it in Bahasa, then they understand.”

Thus, for T4, using Bahasa Indonesia should come from the students, and not from the teacher. She then continued: *“If we keep on translating everything, from my experience, they didn’t learn a lot.”* This type of pedagogical issue has been addressed by Raja et al. (2022), who exemplified a teacher in their study who thought that ‘translation in an English class’ is not a good practice at all (p. 570).

Complication

The last pedagogical issue which emerged from the interview was a complication of translanguaging practice. Two teachers in this study (T1 and T3) had some experience teaching non-native Indonesian speakers. For both of them, teaching non-Indonesian students was quite challenging since they do not speak the students’ languages. T1 says,

“[...] when I teach Burmese or Thai students, it makes me dive deep into the lesson plan, anticipate what might be the problematic words, vocabs, or expressions, and try to use other words or similar expressions in their language. But it sounds like a lot because I’m not an expert of their language.”

T3, who was doing his postgraduate study in Taiwan, spent some time teaching private English classes to Taiwanese children. He encountered some problems in teaching them because he does not speak Chinese. T3 says,

“I don’t speak Chinese, and the students don’t speak English. So, we don’t need it in a certain place, so what I’m trying to do, for example, like I need translanguaging with the help of the parents, with the help of digital apps. Then, some very concepts need to be introduced to the students, and then it is impossible to do the translation because I cannot do that.”

“There will be some moments when communication is lost. But I usually predicted it, so I prepared it before I go to the class. For vocabulary building, for example, the vocabulary about verbs, are quite easy to teach coz I can mimic them. But for nouns, I use pictures. The same also happens when he could not say what he wants to say. He drew a picture. But if he’s in hurry about what he wants to say, he asked his mom to explain it.”

In this case, T3 facilitated translanguaging practice to the EFL learners, although he did not speak the learners’ languages. Allowing them to make use of their home language with their parents, would help them clarify things which are difficult to be understood by the learners.

Another complication expressed by the teachers is that the use of L1 may hinder the students’ L2 proficiency since they are more comfortable using L1. T2 and T3 said:

“[...] the students can get too comfortable, even when they’re in higher levels, they use Bahasa just because they’re a bit lazy to think or to use English. In a way, it’s difficult because I want to encourage them to use English more. They know I’m Indonesian.” [T2]

[...] because many students feel very comfortable in L1 and then, it is very nice for the students, in their perspective, teachers will translate everything.” [T3]

What was felt by T2 and T3 indicated that teachers saw that speaking in L1 was very tempting for the students, and this could weaken the students’ effort to practice their English and detract them from the communicative language teaching methods (Fallas-Escobar & Dillard-Paltrineri, 2015). In other words, using too much L1 is assumed that it could hinder the students’ L2 proficiency.

In another vein, the complication of translanguaging practice for T4 is that students will not make any progress if they are not forced to use English all the time and to think in the language. She said: *“So, if we don’t help the students, if you want to produce in English, then speak, write, think in English. How can we think in English if you are not used to it?”* In this case, T4’s attitude is similar to the subject in Yuan and Yang’s (2020) study which believed that “English should dominate his classroom teaching” (p. 18).

Discussion

Generally speaking, the teachers involved in this study believe that translanguaging practice can empower both teachers and learners cognitively and socially. Cognitively, translanguaging provides more opportunities for learners to understand the concepts faster. Socially, it can build trustworthy relationships between teachers and learners, making learning activities more effective and fun. Making use of translanguaging techniques can avoid silence, as learners can express their ideas in their language when they encounter problems. One teacher was strongly against the translanguaging practice, although she admits that it can be applied to beginners.

In this study, some teachers initially stated that they were not familiar with translanguaging. Although in reality, they did practice translanguaging, this study did not explore too heavily on their teaching experience. However, this study discovers that teachers who are not involved in formal education may have more flexibility in delivering the subject materials and in their mode of interaction with their students. Some complications will appear when they encounter students who get confused because they do not speak a common language with the teachers. Translanguaging may be a solution to overcome the problem, but in this case, teachers’ creativity to find a solution is more important. This finding conforms with the students’ feeling of confusion in Ticheloven et al.’s (2019) study when students become ‘a bit lost between languages (p. 506) because they do not get clarification in their L1 from their teachers. Similar to what T3 did with his students in Taiwan, the teacher in Ticheloven et al.’s (2019) study also suggested that ‘parents can get involved’ (p. 506) in the learning process.

As shown in previous research (Fallas-Escobar & Dillard-Paltrineri, 2015; Solhi & Büyükyazı, 2011; Yuvayapan, 2019), this study also reveals that monolingual practice is sometimes unavoidable since there is a restriction from stakeholders that ‘English only’ policy must be consistently applied. The restriction does not only come from the institution, but often times it comes from parents or even the students themselves who insist on maximizing the use of English in the classrooms. This may be due to the fact that the position of English in Indonesia is

not a second language but a foreign language, where students do not have much opportunity to communicate in English outside the classroom.

In this study, the four teachers teach in four different geographical areas in Indonesia. Each teacher faces a typical situation in their EFL classrooms. The freelance teachers are not committed to a particular educational policy and thus they are more flexible in delivering the subject materials. As for the other two teachers who work in formal education, their institutions do not apply strict regulations on the use of English as a medium of instruction. Thus, the issue of whether teachers allow translanguaging or not, as stated by Yuan and Yang (2020), should depend on the 'situated teaching context' (p. 1), where teachers have more opportunities for various teaching options which are suitable for their students. Furthermore, to date, there is no policy from the Indonesian Ministry of Education and Culture about the implementation of EMI (English as a medium of instruction) in EFL classrooms, and thus language practitioners have more flexibility in whether to apply EMI or not. This situation differs from that in Japan, where a policy reform has been implemented by the Japanese Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology towards 'a predominantly target language (TL)-based classroom environment to maximise students' exposure to English' (Turnbull, 2018, p. 102).

Conclusion

This study is limited to only four individuals who teach in four different geographical locations in Indonesia. It aims to explore the four teachers' perspectives on their beliefs about translanguaging practice in EFL pedagogy. Two teachers are representatives from formal education, while the other two are from informal education settings. From the in-depth interview with them, we drew four pedagogical issues of translanguaging practice in the Indonesian context.

The first pedagogical issue concerns with the confusion of the concept of translanguaging. Of the four teachers, only one teacher was familiar with the concept. The teacher, who taught EFL in formal education and was a postgraduate student in Taiwan when the data was collected, was knowledgeable about the concept and practised it in his EFL classrooms. The other three teachers were not familiar with the practice. One teacher, who is a freelance teacher, was strongly against the pedagogical concept and referred to that practice as a translation activity.

The second issue deals with institutional policy. This issue deals with the internal policy of 'English use only' as a medium of instruction in some institutions. Two teachers who are teaching in non-formal education expressed their experience with some language centres where they used to work. However, when the interview data were taken, actually the four teachers had the freedom to apply translanguaging or not.

The third pedagogical issue is the cognitive and social gains of translanguaging practice. All teachers except one (T4) agreed that translanguaging practice can assist students in understanding the concepts of the English language faster so that they have more opportunities to use their thinking capacity to the maximum. Translanguaging was perceived as a meaningful strategy in this case because communication breakdown is natural, and it should occur in EFL classrooms as part of the learning process.

The last issue addresses the complication of translanguaging practice. Two teachers were presented with students who did not speak Bahasa Indonesia, and

since they did not speak the student's home language, then they should find a way to deliver the teaching materials, such as using pictures and other tools. One teacher gave access to translanguaging practice by asking the student's mom to explain in his home language. Another complication is when teachers had to face students who preferred to use Bahasa Indonesia rather than English in the classrooms, which may hinder L2 learning development/progress.

This case study sheds light on the fact that the implementation of translanguaging practice in the Indonesian context should depend on typical situations in EFL classrooms. Teachers should note that students' diverse backgrounds and needs should be acknowledged, and their efforts in learning should be appreciated. What is more, learners' knowledge of their L1 should also be considered important in the acquisition process of L2. As stated by Wei (2022), [...] the knowledge already acquired through the learners' first and/or prior learned languages also plays an important role in foreign-language-medium education (p. 172).

Last but not least, teachers' creativity is 'key to education' (Wei, 2022, p. 181). Whether to translanguaging or not to translanguaging, the teaching approach should try to maximize learners' potential, including their L1 knowledge. Future research should involve more teacher participants as well as students from different geographical areas in Indonesia, including those in remote places.

References

- Baker, C. (2001). *Foundations of bilingual education and bilingualism* (3rd ed.). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Berlianti, D. G. A., & Pradita, I. (2021). Translanguaging in an EFL classroom discourse: To what extent it is helpful for the students? *Communication in Humanity and Social Science*, 1(1), 42–46. <https://doi.org/10.21924/chss.1.1.2021.14>
- Canagarajah, S. (2011). Translanguaging in the classroom: Emerging issues for research and pedagogy. *Applied Linguistics Review*, 2(2011), 1–28. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110239331.1>
- Carstens, A. (2016). Translanguaging as a vehicle for L2 acquisition and L1 development: Students' perceptions. *Language Matters* 47(2), 203-222. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10228195.2016.1153135>
- Cenoz, J., & Gorter, D. (2020). Teaching English through pedagogical translanguaging. *World Englishes*, 39(2), 300–311. <https://doi.org/10.1111/weng.12462>
- Conteh, J. (2018). Translanguaging. *ELT Journal*, 72(4), 445-447.
- Creese, A., & Blackledge, A. (2010). Translanguaging in the Bilingual Classroom: A Pedagogy for Learning and Teaching? *The Modern Language Journal*, 94(1), 103–115. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.2009.00986.x>
- Duarte, J. (2016). Translanguaging in mainstream education: A sociocultural approach. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 22(2), 150–164. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050.2016.1231774>
- Emilia, E. & Hamied, F.A. (2022). Translanguaging practices in a tertiary EFL context in Indonesia. *TEFLIN Journal*, 33(1), 47-74.

- Fallas-Escobar, C., & Dillard-Paltrineri, E. (2015). Professors' and students' conflicting beliefs about translanguaging in the EFL classroom: Dismantling the monolingual bias. *Revista de Lenguas Modernas*, 23. <https://doi.org/10.15517/rlm.v0i23.22355>
- Flores, N., & García, O. (2013). 14. Linguistic third spaces in education: Teachers' translanguaging across the bilingual continuum. In *Managing diversity in education* (pp. 243-256). Multilingual Matters. <https://doi.org/10.21832/9781783090815-016>
- García, O. (2009). *Bilingual education in the 21st Century*. Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.
- García, O., & Wei, L. (2014). *Translanguaging: Language, bilingualism, and education*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- García, O., & Lin, A. M. Y. (2016). Translanguaging in bilingual education. In O. García & A. M. Y. Lin (Eds.), *Bilingual and multilingual education* (pp. 1–14). Dordrecht: Springer.
- García, O. (2020). Translanguaging and Latinx Bilingual Readers. *The Reading Teacher*, 73(5), 557–562. <https://doi.org/10.1002/trtr.1883>
- Ke, I. C., & Lin, S. (2017). A translanguaging approach to TESOL in Taiwan. *English Teaching & Learning*, 41(1), 33–61. <https://doi.org/10.6330/ETL.2017.41.1.02>
- Khairunnisa, K., & Lukmana, I. (2020). Teachers' attitudes towards translanguaging in Indonesian EFL classrooms. *Jurnal Penelitian Pendidikan*, 20(2), 254–26.
- Larsen-Freeman, D. (2000). *Techniques and principles in language teaching* (2nd ed.). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Lim, D. & Park, E.S. (2022). Facts and fictions of native speakerism: Local EFL teachers' experiences and viewpoints. *English Teaching & Learning*. Retrieved from <https://link.springer.com/content/pdf/10.1007/s42321-022-00128-3.pdf>
- Liu, Y. & Fang, F. (2022). Translanguaging theory and practice: How stakeholders perceive translanguaging as a practical theory of language. *RELC Journal*, 53(2), 391-399. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0033688220939222>
- Mickwitz, S., Lehtonen, H., Cvetanović, D., & Toom, A. (2021). Towards bilingual expertise – evaluating translanguaging pedagogy in bilingual degrees at the university level. *Language Learning in Higher Education*, 11(1), 195–217. <https://doi.org/10.1515/cercles-2021-2012>
- Omidire, M. F., & Ayob, S. (2020). The utilisation of translanguaging for learning and teaching in multilingual primary classrooms. *Multilingua*, 0(0). <https://doi.org/10.1515/multi-2020-0072>
- Pacheco, M. B., & Miller, M. E. (2015). Making meaning through translanguaging in the literacy classroom. *The Reading Teacher*, 69(5), 533–537. <https://doi.org/10.1002/trtr.1390>
- Putri, F. I., & Rifai, I. (2021). Translanguaging practices in EFL classrooms: Teachers' perspective. *English Journal Literacy Utama*, 6(1), 460–470. Retrieved from <https://ejl.widyatama.ac.id/index.php/ejlutama/article/view/155>
- Raja, F.D., Suparno & Ngadiso. (2022). Teachers' attitude towards translanguaging practice and its implication in Indonesian EFL classroom. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 11(3), 567-576.

- Rasman. (2018). To translanguage or not to translanguage? The multilingual practice in an Indonesian EFL classroom. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 7(3), 687-694.
- Renandya, W. & Chang, A. (2022). Translanguaging: Does it work in EFL contexts? In *Teaching English as a Second Language Electronic Journal (TESL-EJ)*, 16(3). <https://doi.org/10.55593/ej.26103a25>
- Romanowski, P. (2020). Perceptions of translanguaging among the students and teachers of EMI classrooms in Poland. *Lenguas Modernas*, 55, 151–165.
- Rubdy, R. (2009). Reclaiming the local in teaching EIL. *Language and Intercultural Communication*, 9, 156-174. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14708470902748822>
- Saputra, W. A. (2020). Exploring the Implementation of translanguaging in EFL classrooms: Perspectives from Higher Education Institutions (HeIs) students in Indonesia. *English Language Teaching International Conference (ELTIC) Proceedings*.
- Saputra, W. A. & Akib, E. (2018). Translanguaging in English as foreign language (EFL) classroom assessment: A discourse analysis in Indonesian University. *The 65th TEFLIN International Conference*, 141–149.
- Sahib, R. (2019). Translanguaging as a pedagogical strategy in EFL classroom. *ELT-Lectura*, 6(2), 139–146. <https://doi.org/10.31849/elt-lectura.v6i2.3032>
- Sahib, R., Nawing, N., Sari, H., & Ukka, S. (2020). West Papuan teachers' perceptions on translanguaging practices in EFL classroom interaction. *ELT-Lectura*, 7(2), 73–84. <https://doi.org/10.31849/elt-lectura.v7i2.4205>
- Sapitri, N. M., Batan, I. G., & Myartawan, I. P. N. W. (2018). Functions of teachers' translanguaging in the EFL classroom at two junior high schools in Singaraja. *Lingua Scientia*, 25(1), 29–36. <https://doi.org/10.23887/lis.v25i1.18821>
- Schissel, J. L., de Korne, H., & López-Gopar, M. (2018). Grappling with translanguaging for teaching and assessment in culturally and linguistically diverse contexts: teacher perspectives from Oaxaca, Mexico. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 24(3), 340–356. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050.2018.1463965>
- Serna-Bermejo, I., & Lasagabaster, D. (2022). Translanguaging in Basque and English: Practices and attitudes of university teachers and students. *International Journal of Multilingualism*, 1–20. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14790718.2022.2086984>
- Solhi, M. & Büyükyazı, M. (2011). The use of first language in the EFL classroom: A facilitating or debilitating device? *Proceeding, 1st International Conference on Foreign Language Teaching and Applied Linguistics, Sarajevo, May 5-7, 2011*, 860-866.
- Sugiharto, S. (2022). Translanguaging practices in composition scholarship and pedagogy: Issues, evidence, and controversies. *Indonesian Journal of EFL and Linguistics*, 7(1), 147-157. Retrieved from <https://www.indonesian-efl-journal.org/index.php/ijefll/article/view/469>
- Ticheloven, A., Blom, E., Leseman, P., & McMonagle, S. (2019). Translanguaging challenges in multilingual classrooms: Scholar, teacher and student perspectives. *International Journal of Multilingualism*, 18(3), 491-514. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14790718.2019.1686002>

- Turnbull, B. (2018). Is there a potential for a translanguaging approach to English education in Japan? Perspectives of tertiary learners and teachers. *JALT Journal*, 40(2), 101. <https://doi.org/10.37546/JALTJJ40.2-3>
- Wei, L. (2011). Moment analysis and translanguaging space: Discursive construction of identities by multilingual Chinese youth in Britain. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 43(5), 1222–1235. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2010.07.035>
- Wei, L. (2017). Translanguaging as a practical theory of language. *Applied Linguistics*, 39(1), 9–30. <https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/amx039>
- Wei, L. (2022). Translanguaging as a political stance: Implications for English language education. *ELT Journal*, 76(2), 172–182. <https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccac001>
- Yuan, R., & Yang, M. (2020). Towards an understanding of translanguaging in EMI teacher education classrooms. *Language Teaching Research*, 136216882096412. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168820964123>
- Yuvayapan, F. (2019). Translanguaging in EFL classrooms: Teachers' perceptions and practices. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies*, 15(2), 678–694.
- Yuzlu, M.Y., & Dikilitas, K. (2021). Translanguaging in the development of EFL learners' foreign language skills in Turkish context. *Innovation in Language Learning and Teaching*, 16(2), 176–190. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17501229.2021.1892698>