

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.26529/cepsj.1833>

Examining Indonesian English as a Foreign Language Lecturers' Attitudes Towards Translanguaging and Its Perceived Pedagogical Benefits: A Mixed-Methods Study

MOHAMMED YASSIN MOHD ABA SHA'AR¹ AND NUR LAILATUR ROFIAH^{*2}

∞ The present study examines Indonesian lecturers' attitudes towards translanguaging and its pedagogical benefits in their English as a foreign language classroom. It also explores the significant relationships between lecturers' attitudes and the variables of gender, age, experience, university and faculty. The study included English as a foreign language lecturers using surveys ($n = 50$) and in-depth interviews ($n = 5$). The collected data were analysed through mixed-methods analyses. The findings reveal that, in general, Indonesian lecturers hold optimal, virtual and maximal attitudes towards translanguaging. They perceive translanguaging as beneficial, as it facilitates student-student and student-teacher interactions, scaffolds students' understanding, and creates a familiar and secure classroom atmosphere. Integrating translanguaging supports the development of students' critical thinking skills and self-confidence. The lecturers' feel a sense of agency to reclaim their identity and question the perceived linguistic hierarchy that dominates their English as a foreign language landscape. Additionally, the findings revealed a disparity in the perceived benefits of translanguaging depending on the lecturers' age and experience, indicating a potential generational gap that might influence their adaptability to multilingual teaching methodologies.

Keywords: attitudes, English medium instruction, English as a foreign language classroom, multilingualism, translanguaging, translingual practices

1 School of Education and Liberal Arts, Walailak University, Thailand.

2 *Corresponding Author. School of Languages and General Education, Walailak University, Thailand; nr.lailatur@gmail.com.

Preučevanje stališč indonezijskih visokošolskih učiteljev angleščine kot tujega jezika do čezjezičnosti in njenih zaznanih pedagoških prednosti: študija mešanih metod

MOHAMMED YASSIN MOHD ABA SHA'AR IN NUR LAILATUR ROFIAH

Študija preučuje stališča indonezijskih visokošolskih učiteljev do čezjezičnosti in njenih pedagoških prednosti pri pouku angleščine kot tujega jezika. Raziskuje tudi pomembne povezave med stališči profesorjev ter spremenljivkami spol, starost, izkušnje, univerza in fakulteta. V študijo so bili vključeni visokošolski učitelji angleščine kot tujega jezika z uporabo anket ($n = 50$) in poglobljenih intervjujev ($n = 5$). Zbrani podatki so bili obdelani s pomočjo analize mešanih metod. Ugotovitve na splošno kažejo na optimalna, virtualna in na maksimalna stališča do čezjezičnosti pri indonezijskih visokošolskih učiteljih. Čezjezičnost dojemajo kot koristno, saj olajšuje interakcije med študenti samimi ter študenti in učitelji, spodbuja odranje razumevanja pri študentih ter ustvarja znano in varno vzdušje v razredu. Vključevanje čezjezičnosti podpira razvoj zmožnosti kritičnega mišljenja in samozavesti študentov. Profesorji čutijo, da lahko ponovno pridobijo svojo identiteto in postavijo pod vprašaj zaznano jezikovno hierarhijo, ki prevladuje v njihovem okolju angleščine kot tujega jezika. Poleg tega so ugotovitve razkrile razlike v zaznavanju prednosti čezjezičnosti glede na starost in izkušnje profesorjev, kar kaže na morebitno generacijsko vrzel, ki bi lahko vplivala na njihovo prilagodljivost metodologijam večjezičnega poučevanja.

Ključne besede: stališča, poučevanje v angleščini, pouk angleščine kot tujega jezika, večjezičnost, čezjezičnost, čezjezične prakse

Introduction

In recent years, the resurgence of the multilingual turn has challenged the prevailing monolingual paradigm in both English as second language (ESL) and English as a foreign language (EFL) contexts (Fang & Lui, 2020). As a pedagogy, new terminology has emerged to encapsulate the intricacy of the multilingual reality within various educational contexts, such as polylingualism (Pun & Tai, 2021), metrolingualism (Wang, 2019), plurilingualism (Wei, 2023), code-switching (Canagarajah, 2011) and translanguaging (García, 2009). This shift has exposed power imbalances, linguistic hierarchies and inequities among students with dissimilar linguistic backgrounds (Fang et al., 2023). Current scholarship questions the strict separation of languages and supports multilingual pedagogies to balance content understanding and language learning (Fang & Lui, 2020). It highlights how a translanguaging space encourages students' engagement, enhances their confidence to use the target language, and fosters student-student and student-teacher interactions (Yuvayapan, 2019). In the field of English Language Teaching (ELT), attention is shifting towards multilingualism, which describes the individual's ability to use, comprehend and communicate proficiently in two or more languages, reflecting a diverse linguistic repertoire (Fang & Lui, 2020).

As a pedagogical approach, translanguaging fosters an inclusive learning environment and advocates equity. The term 'translanguaging' refers to "the deployment of a speaker's full linguistic repertoire without regard to the socially and politically defined boundaries of named languages" (Otheguy et al., 2015, p. 283). It views languages not as isolated entities but as a unitary meaning-making system that bi/multilingual speakers utilise to make meaning of their worlds (García, 2009). Translanguaging is often used both spontaneously and pedagogically to facilitate learning, offering a comprehensive and versatile approach to instruction. In Indonesian classrooms, translanguaging is utilised to support teaching and learning processes despite the monolingual-oriented education policy, standardised testing requirements and societal perceptions that favour the monolingual approach (Halim et al., 2023). Little is known about how Indonesian stakeholders perceive pedagogical translanguaging and its impact on students' learning outcomes. Examining stakeholders' attitudes towards translanguaging would significantly contribute to filling this research gap. Furthermore, exploring the perceived benefits of integrating translanguaging in Indonesian higher education is still an emerging area that has not yet been extensively researched or widely discussed.

The present study will contribute to adding new knowledge to this research void and shed light on the practical implications and potential strategies

for effectively integrating translanguaging practices within Indonesian higher education. Raising lecturers' multilingual awareness is important, as it legitimises translanguaging practices in their EFL classrooms. The study will provide insights into lecturers' attitudes and their crucial role in facilitating the learning process and improving students' retention. Understanding the perceived benefits of translanguaging assists students' language acquisition and promotes inclusive learning environments. The study specifically seeks to answer the following research questions:

1. What are Indonesian lecturers' attitudes towards translanguaging?
2. What are the perceived benefits of translanguaging practices in their EFL classroom?
3. Are there significant differences in lecturers' perceptions with respect to gender, age, experience, university and faculty?

The idea of translanguaging

The concept of translanguaging originated from Welsh revitalisation programmes (1994), where students received information in English and then reflected their understanding (e.g., speaking or writing) using their first language or the other way around (Williams, 1994; Wei, 2023). Since then, it has undergone significant development and gained more attention and recognition within academic circles, educational settings and linguistic research due to its inclusive pedagogies (Gorter & Arocena, 2020). Translanguaging challenges the monolingual ideology and approach that maintains distinct boundaries between the learned languages (Veliz, 2021). It has been defined in various ways within different ESL and EFL contexts due to the variations in teaching approaches, cultural contexts and languages spoken in each setting. Baker (2011) defined translanguaging as a "process of making meaning, shaping experiences, gaining understanding and knowledge through the use of two languages" (p. 288). However, this definition does not address the complex and multifaceted concept that goes beyond the named languages. García (2009) broadened the scope of the concept and defined translanguaging as "multiple discursive practices in which bilinguals engage in order to make sense of their bilingual worlds" (p. 45). She emphasised the aspect of practice, as the prefix 'trans' highlights fluid practices that go beyond socially constructed language systems and structures (Gorter & Arocena, 2020). Li (2018) further highlighted the complex nature of language, illustrating how individuals draw on their repertoires to convey ideas. He viewed language not as a single entity, but rather as a multilingual, multisemiotic, multisensory and multimodal resource utilised by individuals for both thinking and communicating thoughts.

This challenged the assumption that named languages reflect social or psychological realities. Code-mixing and code-switching are often mistakenly perceived as synonymous with translanguaging, as they describe the simultaneous use of two or more languages in one's speech (Li, 2018). However, translanguaging is a broader approach that emphasises a fluid and flexible use of language that incorporates diverse linguistic repertoires without strict boundaries or limitations (García, 2009). Code-switching refers to the alternation between two or more languages within a conversation, sentence or discourse, retaining L1 and L2 as separate linguistic systems. However, translanguaging transcends these learned boundaries between languages and bridges the worlds of multilingual learners within and outside the classroom by using their full linguistic and cognitive repertoires. This helps them to engage in heteroglossic practices that facilitate their academic learning (Fang & Liu, 2020; Yuvayapan, 2019).

Medium of instruction in the Indonesian EFL classroom

Indonesia's linguistic diversity and education policy reveal significant differences in dictating the medium of instruction (MOI) in education (Rusydiyah et al., 2023). Unlike other Southeast Asian countries, which have adopted policies that include students' L1s as a medium of instruction, Indonesian education policy excludes local languages due to the huge diversity of local languages, the complexity of language ecologies, and the variance of their applicability in literacy education. However, the teaching practice and MOI in actual classrooms are not in line with these policies, especially in the country's remote areas (Haryanto et al., 2016). Teachers often use Bahasa Indonesia to facilitate teaching and learning processes and serve classroom-oriented and student-oriented purposes (Raja et al., 2022). In their study, Halim et al. (2023) reported that most Indonesian teachers have heard of the term translanguaging, but need to familiarise themselves with its pedagogical implementation in the classroom. There is a lack of research examining Indonesian stakeholders' attitudes towards translanguaging amid the dismissal of the local language(s) as a viable medium of instruction by education policies.

Institutional and social pressure, particularly within English Programmes (EP) aimed at internationalising education and engaging in a globalised economy, have led schoolteachers and university lecturers to perceive translanguaging as a barrier (Fang & Liu, 2020). Findings reported by Ubaidillah (2018) concur with this argument, citing that overusing the students' L1 hinders language acquisition. Thus, the researcher suggests that teachers should maximise English use in order to compensate for students' lack of exposure.

Fernández (2015) found that the excessive use of the students' L1 limited progress in students' communicative skills, impairs their language accuracy and demotivates them to use the target language. In contrast, Raja et al. (2022), reported that Indonesian teachers have positive attitudes towards teacher-directed and student-directed translanguaging. Teacher-directed translanguaging refers to the teacher's intentional inclusion of the students' first language in order to achieve particular pedagogical goals. Student-directed translanguaging occurs when students themselves employ their first language to improve their understanding, communication and learning during classroom activities (Yuvayapan, 2019). Teachers acknowledge the value of L1s in enhancing students' understanding and encouraging them to participate in classroom activities and discussions. Translanguaging supports low-level students by leveraging their native language as a resource to build connections between languages and support their communicative skills. Teachers reject the monolingual approach, as it contradicts the nature of how bilinguals think, understand and interact in real-life contexts (Tabatadze, 2019). They anonymously endorse the judicial and pedagogical use of translanguaging to scaffold students' linguistic development, achieve learning goals and support students' learning experience. Extensive research is needed to explore the perceived advantages of translanguaging that can be achieved within this balanced approach in the Indonesian context.

Translanguaging for inclusion and equity

Prior studies by Fang and Liu (2020), Gorter and Arocena (2020), Halim et al. (2023), and Raja et al. (2022) have widely documented the role of translanguaging in achieving inclusion and equity in various ESL and EFL contexts. Veliz (2021) reported that integrating translanguaging creates a more inclusive learning environment and provides equitable opportunities for students, despite their English proficiency level. It gives students a sense of belonging to the classroom community, creating a space that enables opportunities to interact with peers and teachers (Yasar & Dikilitas, 2022). This facilitation makes students feel secure and motivates them to improve their English proficiency. Moody et al. (2019), indicated that the use of translanguaging creates a safe and familiar learning environment, especially for low-level students, as it removes the apprehension associated with speaking English in unfamiliar situations. It helps students with limited proficiency to enhance their understanding through interactive communication (Pun & Tai, 2021).

Additionally, translanguaging creates a space that bi/multilingual speakers utilise to communicate and make meaning of their learning. Pun and Tai

(2021) reported that students can interact with their peers and teachers in scientific enquiry, as they can mobilise their linguistic and semiotic repertoires. Translanguaging facilitates communication flow, as students are not restrained by a language with which they are unfamiliar. This process supports students' engagement and develops their identity, as they progress from novice to expert scientists who can effectively articulate arguments and counterarguments. In another context, Cenoz et al. (2022), found that integrating students' multilingual and multimodal resources reduces their anxiety and increases their confidence, although the researchers did not provide clear evidence for this connection. They attributed this relationship to students' engagement and comprehension, achieved through utilising their existing linguistic and semiotic resources.

Moreover, the existing body of literature documents the fact that translanguaging facilitates classroom management, as the teacher explains classroom instructions using the common language. Yuvayapan (2019) indicated that teachers use the Turkish language to give feedback, provide classroom guidance and enhance students' understanding of deadlines. According to Pun and Tai (2021), this disrupts linguistic hierarchies that delegitimise translanguaging practices used as a resource for learning in ESL and EFL classrooms. Additionally, embracing students' linguistic diversity promotes a student-centred approach, enhances classroom participation and empowers students' critical thinking skills (Pun & Tai, 2021; Yuvayapan, 2019). However, Rabbidge (2019) challenged this argument, indicating that the use of translanguaging does not provide space for critical thinking, as teacher-directed translanguaging limits the translanguaging space to freely initiate discussion, comment or debate arguments in the classroom. It is still teachers who initiate interaction, impart knowledge, ask for information and declare whether the given information is correct or not.

Method

The present study was framed by a mixed-methods design. The data were collected through a survey and in-depth interviews. This particular design was adopted because it leveraged the strengths of both qualitative and quantitative methods (Fetters et al., 2023). It provided a more comprehensive understanding of the lecturers' perceptions of translanguaging and produced robust and validated results (Doyle et al., 2016).

Context and Participants

The study was conducted in the 2023–2024 academic year. The data were collected from 10 public and 24 private universities across the Sumatra and Java Islands, Indonesia. Like other universities nationwide, these institutions grapple with implementing EMI to advocate internationalisation and translanguaging for inclusive teaching. This context was specifically selected because most Indonesian EFL lecturers are still unfamiliar with pedagogical translanguaging and often rely on unplanned, spontaneous translanguaging practices.

The sample of participants in the study comprised 50 Indonesian EFL lecturers (Table 1) who voluntarily participated in the data collection and completed the survey. In order to enhance the viability of the study's findings, two criteria were implemented: (1) the participants had experience in teaching English in language or content classrooms, and (2) they were affiliated with any of the public or private universities in the western part of Indonesia. Additionally, five lecturers (Table 2) were voluntarily recruited for in-depth interviews. The participants' profiles are presented below in Tables 1 and 2.

Table 1

Demographic characteristics

| | | Frequency (n) | Percentage (%) |
|------------|--------|---------------|----------------|
| Gender | female | 36 | 28 |
| | male | 14 | 72 |
| Age | 20–30 | 3 | 6 |
| | 31–40 | 26 | 52 |
| | 41–50 | 12 | 24 |
| | 51–60 | 7 | 14 |
| | 61–70 | 2 | 4 |
| Experience | 1–10 | 19 | 38 |
| | 11–20 | 21 | 42 |
| | 21–30 | 7 | 14 |
| | 31–40 | 3 | 6 |
| | 41–50 | 0 | 0 |

| | Frequency (n) | Percentage (%) |
|---------|---------------|----------------|
| IKIP | 7 | 14 |
| ULM | 1 | 2 |
| UG | 2 | 4 |
| IAI | 1 | 2 |
| UMS | 1 | 2 |
| PNP | 1 | 2 |
| UIN | 4 | 8 |
| UII | 1 | 2 |
| UKM | 1 | 2 |
| HU | 1 | 2 |
| UNTAS | 1 | 2 |
| BU | 2 | 4 |
| UAI | 1 | 2 |
| ULAM | 1 | 2 |
| MP | 1 | 2 |
| UJG | 1 | 2 |
| UNUL | 1 | 2 |
| USAT | 1 | 2 |
| HMU | 1 | 2 |
| UINSU | 1 | 2 |
| UJS | 1 | 2 |
| USB | 1 | 2 |
| UINRIL | 2 | 4 |
| US | 1 | 2 |
| TSM | 1 | 2 |
| STIKH | 1 | 2 |
| SIIM | 2 | 4 |
| UPR | 1 | 2 |
| IAIAS | 1 | 2 |
| SGDSIUB | 1 | 2 |
| UINPSZ | 1 | 2 |
| SPJ | 1 | 2 |
| IAIAI | 3 | 6 |
| UMPSH | 1 | 2 |

| | | Frequency (n) | Percentage (%) |
|---------|------------------------------------|---------------|----------------|
| Faculty | Faculty of Education | 32 | 64 |
| | Faculty of Humanities | 6 | 12 |
| | Faculty of Information Technology | 1 | 2 |
| | Faculty of Art | 3 | 6 |
| | Faculty of Language and Literature | 3 | 6 |
| | Faculty of Economics | 2 | 4 |
| | Faculty of Public Health | 2 | 2 |
| | Faculty of Engineering | 1 | 2 |

Table 2*Interview participants*

| Interviewees | Pseudocode | Subject | Experience |
|--------------|------------|----------------------|------------|
| Interviewee1 | LC1 | language | 8 |
| Interviewee2 | LC2 | language and content | 7 |
| Interviewee3 | LC3 | language | 30 |
| Interviewee4 | LC4 | language | 8 |
| Interviewee5 | LC5 | language and content | 23 |

Instruments*Questionnaire*

In order to examine the Indonesian lecturers' attitudes towards translanguageing and its perceived pedagogical benefits, a questionnaire with a five-point Likert scale was adapted from Fang & Liu (2020), Gorter and Arocena (2020), Wang (2019) and Yuvayapan (2019), with some statements being adapted to address the objectives and context of the present study. The questionnaire consisted of three sections: the participants' profiles, the lecturers' attitudes towards translanguageing, and the perceived benefits of translanguageing. It was specifically used in this study because it helped to access and collect insights from the target participants across the Sumatra and Java Islands. Moreover, it ensured consistency in data collection, reduced bias and made it easier to capture diverse perspectives and analyse the results efficiently (Marshall, 2005). The questionnaire was piloted with non-target participants ($n = 10$) before data collection, and Cronbach's alpha was employed to check the statements' reliability and internal consistency. The Cronbach's alpha was .845 for section two

and .973 for section three, indicating a very high internal consistency among the survey items. All of the items were therefore considered for data collection and data analysis. The survey items were also adjusted in a Google Form and set to be shared with the participants.

In-depth interview

An individual in-depth interview (IDI) was employed to examine the Indonesian lecturers' attitudes towards translanguaging and its perceived pedagogical benefits in their EFL classrooms. The interview was specifically adopted in this study because it provided an opportunity to build a rapport with the participants, thus allowing for a more straightforward expression of non-conformity and improving the data quality (Stokes & Bergin, 2006). It also enabled the researchers to delve into the controversy of the monolingual approach, to uncover motives behind marginalising the student's L1, and to gain a comprehensive understanding of the participants' attitudes, experiences and viewpoints (Boyce & Neale, 2006). The interview was guided by an interview protocol that comprised (1) introduction, (2) consent and confidentiality, (3) background information, (4) interview questions, (5) follow-up questions, and (6) closing. Due to ethical considerations, the interviewees' names are replaced with codes LC1–LC5 in order to uphold ethical standards and protect the rights and wellbeing of the research participants.

Research design

The data were collected at the beginning of the first semester, from 10 July to 19 October 2023. The quantitative data were collected at the end of an online workshop about research methodology. Before data collection, the researchers followed the research protocol, explained the purpose of the study, and assured the participants about the anonymity and confidentiality of their responses. The questionnaire was then shared using a Quick Response code (QR code) and administered through Google Forms. Responding to the survey questions took the participants 15 to 20 minutes. The researchers obtained 50 responses from different private and public universities in Sumatra and Java.

The interview sessions were administered online through Zoom. The IDI session took 30 to 35 minutes. Five interviewees were conducted with lecturers from five different universities (Table 2). Invitations to the interviews were sent to the lecturers through email with the help of the workshop committee. Seven lecturers initially accepted the invitation to participate in an interview. However, two of them later excused themselves from taking part due to personal

reasons. The interviews were conducted between October and November 2023, with the time and date selected by the participants. For consistency and due to ethical concerns, the researchers followed the interview protocol and reassured the interviewees about the confidentiality of their responses. The interviews were conducted in English and Bahasa based on the interviewees' choice. The interview recordings were transcribed manually, translated into English and then prepared for data analysis.

The quantitative data were analysed using IBM SPSS 25. Once the data collection process was complete, data cleaning was implemented. This involved removing repeated responses and incomplete entries. The cleaned data was then imported into SPSS software and prepared for further analysis. A reliability analysis was also performed to determine the internal consistency of the questionnaire items. Statements with less than .70 were not considered for analysis. However, all of the items were included in the data analysis, as the Cronbach alpha displayed very high consistency in the lecturers' attitudes ($\alpha = .831$) and perceived pedagogical benefits of translanguaging ($\alpha = .945$). Subsequently, descriptive statistics, including means, standard deviation, frequency and percentage, were performed to answer the first and second research questions. Additionally, inferential statistics, including ANOVA and independent tests, were conducted to answer the third question.

The qualitative data from the in-depth interviews were analysed through thematic analysis. This type of analysis was specifically employed because it provides a rich, detailed, yet complex data account (Vaismoradi et al., 2013). By providing a systematic framework, it facilitates the identification of patterns, connections and nuanced themes within data, enabling researchers to derive thorough insights into the topic studied (Alhojailan, 2012). After the interviews, the recordings were transcribed and translated, and the data analysis steps proposed by Clarke and Braun (2017) were followed. First, the researchers familiarised themselves with the data by reading the transcripts thoroughly. Second, they generated initial codes, which involved highlighting the statements that captured key concepts. Third, they searched for themes by categorising the highlighted codes based on their relevance to the potential themes. To enhance the trustworthiness of the findings, the researchers shared themes and codes amongst themselves to verify their validity and relevance to the research questions. Fourth, the themes were refined and clear definitions of each theme were generated. At this stage, some sub-themes were merged and irrelevant sub-categories were dropped. Fifth, themes and codes that contributed to answering the research questions were selected and reported.

Results

Based on the survey data (Table 3), it was found that the Indonesian EFL lecturers surveyed held optimal, virtual and maximal positions about the use of translanguaging in their English classrooms.

Table 3

Lecturers' attitudes towards translanguaging

| Survey Items | Mean | SD | Value |
|---|------|------|-------|
| Translanguaging is a common practice in our EFL classroom. | 4.32 | 0.55 | High |
| Translanguaging maximises our teaching effectiveness. | 4.16 | 0.68 | High |
| Translanguaging promotes a student-centred approach. | 3.94 | 0.62 | High |
| Translanguaging should be implemented in teaching content and language courses. | 4.14 | 0.63 | High |
| Translanguaging is necessary, but it should be judiciously incorporated. | 4.30 | 0.61 | High |
| Translanguaging improves the student's English proficiency. | 2.92 | 1.20 | low |
| Translanguaging transcends the linguistic boundary caused by colonial ideology. | 2.80 | 0.85 | low |
| Translanguaging promotes metalinguistic awareness. | 3.21 | 0.81 | High |

The data in Table 3 indicate that some of the participating Indonesian lecturers have an optimal position regarding translanguaging, as they believe that the use of translanguaging maximises their teaching effectiveness ($\bar{x} = 4.16$, $SD = 0.68$), encourages students' involvement ($\bar{x} = 3.94$, $SD = 0.62$), helps both teaching content and language subjects ($\bar{x} = 4.14$, $SD = 0.63$), and promotes metalinguistic awareness ($\bar{x} = 3.98$, $SD = 0.71$). In contrast, the lecturers who have a virtual position doubt the role of translanguaging to enhance students' English proficiency ($\bar{x} = 2.92$, $SD = 1.20$) or help transcend the linguistic boundaries between L1 and L2 ($\bar{x} = 2.80$, $SD = 0.85$). Meanwhile, the lecturers who have maximal attitudes acknowledge that the use of translanguaging is a common practice in the Indonesian EFL classroom ($\bar{x} = 4.32$, $SD = 0.55$), but believe that it should be judiciously incorporated according to the students' proficiency level ($\bar{x} = 4.30$, $SD = 0.61$).

Table 4
Perceived benefits of translanguaging

| Survey Items | Mean | SD | Value |
|--|------|------|-------|
| Translanguaging helps us to make meaning of our teaching processes. | 4.22 | 0.54 | High |
| Translanguaging scaffolds students' comprehension. | 4.19 | 0.71 | High |
| Translanguaging is used to explain content and new concepts, to obtain feedback and to initiate discussions. | 4.26 | 0.56 | High |
| Translanguaging is effective for classroom management. | 4.20 | 0.70 | High |
| Translanguaging improves students' weaker language. | 4.24 | 0.59 | High |
| Translanguaging promotes equity, especially for students with low English proficiency. | 4.28 | 0.64 | High |
| Translanguaging encourages reluctant students to engage in the classroom community. | 4.14 | 0.70 | High |
| Translanguaging creates space for meaningful communication with our students. | 4.16 | 0.66 | High |
| Translanguaging assists communication flow, as students can access and draw on their linguistic repertoire. | 4.07 | 0.86 | High |
| Translanguaging makes the classroom atmosphere familiar, secure and comfortable for students. | 4.22 | 0.64 | High |
| Translanguaging develops students' critical thinking skills. | 4.04 | 0.66 | High |
| Translanguaging increases students' self-confidence to speak English. | 4.02 | 0.71 | High |
| Using Bahasa Indonesia helps us to reclaim our identity with our English variety. | 3.74 | 0.92 | High |
| Translanguaging disrupts linguistic hierarchies and questions linguistic inequality. | 3.96 | 0.60 | High |

The data in Table 4 indicate that the Indonesian lecturers surveyed perceive translanguaging as beneficial, as it pedagogically helps them to make meaning of their teaching process ($\bar{x} = 4.22$, $SD = 0.54$), to scaffold students understanding ($\bar{x} = 4.19$, $SD = 0.71$), to explain new content and concepts ($\bar{x} = 4.26$, $SD = 0.54$) and to ensure classroom management ($\bar{x} = 4.20$, $SD = 0.70$). They believe that utilising students' L1 can improve students' weaker language ($\bar{x} = 4.24$, $SD = 0.59$) and assist reluctant and low-English proficiency students to be included in classroom community ($\bar{x} = 4.14$, $SD = 0.70$). Additionally, translanguaging is perceived as helpful because it can facilitate establishing student-student and teacher-student communication ($\bar{x} = 4.16$, $SD = 0.66$) and assist communication flow ($\bar{x} = 4.07$, $SD = 0.86$). They acknowledge that translanguaging creates a familiar, friendly and secure classroom atmosphere for students ($\bar{x} = 4.22$, $SD = 0.64$). Moreover, they believe that using translanguaging develops students' critical thinking skills ($\bar{x} = 4.04$, $SD = 0.66$) and self-confidence ($\bar{x} = 4.02$, $SD = 0.71$) to learn and use the target language. Incorporating

translanguaging supports reclaiming their identity ($\bar{x} = 3.74$, $SD = 0.92$) and disrupts linguistic hierarchies ($\bar{x} = 3.96$, $SD = 0.60$).

Table 5

Overview of the variables

| Situations | Gender | Age | Experience | Faculty | University |
|-----------------------------------|-----------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|
| | Independent t-test | One-way ANOVA | One-way ANOVA | One-way ANOVA | One-way ANOVA |
| | <i>t(df = 48)</i> | <i>F(df = 4)</i> | <i>F(df = 2)</i> | <i>F(df = 5)</i> | <i>F(df = 3)</i> |
| Attitudes towards translanguaging | 0.162 | .987 | 2.295 | 1.018 | 1.133 |
| Perceived benefits | -0.300 | 2.592* | 3.423* | 0.413 | 0.781 |
| Total score | -0.063 | 1.837 | 3.413* | 0.535 | 0.807 |

Note: * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$

Gender

Independent samples t-tests (Table 5) were conducted to identify significant differences in the lecturers' attitudes towards translanguaging and its pedagogical benefits. The results show no significant differences between females and males in all situations and in the total score.

Age

One-way ANOVA (Table 5) revealed that age did not significantly affect the lecturers' attitudes towards translanguaging. However, the results did indicate a significant difference regarding the perceived pedagogical benefits of translanguaging ($F(4) = 2.592$, $p = .049$).

Faculty

One-way ANOVA (Table 5) uncovered that the faculty had no significant impact on the lecturers' attitudes towards translanguaging and its pedagogical benefits in all situations and the total score (all $ps = ns$).

Experience

One-way ANOVA (Table 5) showed that experience had no significant effect on the lecturers' attitudes towards translanguaging. However, the findings highlighted a significant difference between the lecturers with early and advanced experience in the perceived pedagogical benefits of translanguaging ($F(2) = 3.423$, $p = .025$) and in the total score ($F(2) = 3.413$, $p = .025$).

University

One-way ANOVA (Table 5) revealed that the university had no significant impact on the lecturers' attitudes towards translanguaging, its pedagogical benefits in all situations, and the total score (all ps = ns).

Qualitative findings

Lecturers' attitudes

The lecturers' attitudes towards translanguaging reflected the optimal, maximal and virtual positions indicated by the quantitative findings. These three dimensions were organised based on their contribution to addressing the research question.

Optimal attitudes

The findings revealed that the majority of the Indonesian lecturers interviewed have optimal attitudes towards translanguaging. They believe it helps them to teach grammar and new concepts, and to improve the lecturer-student relationship (Excerpts 1 and 2). As presented in Excerpt 3, the findings interestingly indicate that university policy encourages lecturers to use L1 to improve the students' retention.

Excerpt 1 "It is challenging to teach grammar or concepts using English-only because students still do not understand. Using English-only, one or two students understand, and others may get confused, especially first-year students. Even after explaining two or three times, they still may not understand." (LC1)

Excerpt 2 "Using Bahasa enhances students' understanding of the material being taught and improves the teacher-student relationship." (LC2)

Excerpt 3 "We received guidance from the department that we should not use English-only with first-year students because the students will not gain knowledge. They may drop out or transfer to another major or campus, since they do not understand and are uncomfortable in class." (LC3)

Maximal attitudes

As presented in Excerpts 4 and 5, the Indonesian EFL lecturers acknowledged the need for a bilingual approach, but also expressed concern regarding improving the English proficiency of students.

Excerpt 4 "I use 50–50 percent Bahasa and English. However, the students'

English proficiency will develop more effectively when teaching in English. Using English makes students think about how to use English.” (LC1)

Excerpt 5 “English should be used at least 70–80 percent because there is a fear that the students’ English proficiency will not be improved if we use too much Bahasa.” (LC4)

Virtual attitudes

However, some of the Indonesian lecturers strongly supported the exclusive use of L2, as it enhances students’ language proficiency and maximises their exposure.

Excerpt 6 “Using Bahasa is not translanguaging. If either the teacher or students switch to another language due to a failure to communicate or understand, it is considered a language deficiency. The use of translanguaging does not guarantee an increase in students’ proficiency.” (LC5).

Perceived benefits of translanguaging

The surveyed Indonesian lecturers perceived translanguaging as beneficial, citing its role in enhancing students’ confidence, scaffolding their understanding, facilitating classroom interactions, and helping lecturers reclaim their identity. Five themes were identified and categorised based on their frequency in the thematic analysis.

Translanguaging assists low-level students

The Indonesian lecturers perceived translanguaging as beneficial, as it created a more inclusive and supportive learning environment (Excerpts 7–8).

Excerpt 7 “It is difficult to use English-only. I always consider the students’ proficiency level and the university’s policy. An English-only approach cannot be implemented.” (LC3)

Excerpt 8 “It helps low-level students and makes the classroom environment relaxed. If we use English without engagement, teaching becomes one-sided and less meaningful.” (LC5)

Translanguaging enhances students’ confidence

As presented in Excerpts 9 and 10, the findings indicate that translanguaging in English classes enhances the students’ confidence to participate in classroom discussions. The Indonesian lecturers therefore incorporate bi/

multilingual strategies to cater to the students' diverse linguistic abilities and learning styles.

Excerpt 9 "Asking the students to respond in English is difficult, and their answers become very short. Conversely, when using Indonesian, they become more confident to ask and answer questions." (LC3)

Excerpt 10 "Using Bahasa especially for reflection makes students more confident. However, when I ask them to switch to English, they hesitate, smile and ask for more time to prepare. Using English-only reduces their involvement". (LC4)

Translanguaging helps scaffold students' understanding

The Indonesian lecturers believe that incorporating translanguaging enhances students' understanding. It helps break down language barriers and enables students to access and give information in a language they are most comfortable with. (Excerpts 11 and 12).

Excerpt 11 "I usually use Bahasa to check students' understanding. The department head often reminds us not to use English-only because students feel insecure and transfer to an Indonesian programme." (LC3)

Excerpt 12 "I use Bahasa Indonesia to help the students understand the lesson content and to give them a chance to ask if they don't understand." (LC4)

Translanguaging facilitates classroom interaction

As shown in Excerpts 13 and 14, the Indonesian EFL lecturers acknowledged the role of translanguaging in increasing lecturer-student and student-student interactions.

Excerpt 13 "When I encourage students to communicate in English, they often remain silent. However, when I use Bahasa, they participate, especially shy and first-year students." (LC3)

Excerpt 14 "Despite the students' fear of their classmates' reactions, the use of Bahasa supports active participation in my classrooms." (LC4)

Translanguaging helps students to reclaim their identity

Moreover, the Indonesian lecturers perceive the use of translanguaging as beneficial because it empowers them to express themselves in their native language(s), which might otherwise be marginalised or ignored (Excerpts 15 and 16).

Excerpt 15 "Translanguaging should be utilised as part of our repertoire. It leverages our teaching approaches, facilitates teacher-student

communication and enhances students' progression." (LC5)

Excerpt 16: "I always tell my students that we must be proud of our identity regardless of our non-English background. Allowing Bahasa to be used encourages students to speak in classroom activities." (LC1)

Discussion

The aim of this study was to offer insights into Indonesian lecturers' attitudes towards translanguaging and its perceived benefits in their EFL classrooms. The study also explored the relationship between lecturers' attitudes and the variables of gender, age, experience, university and faculty. In answer to RQ1, the findings show that Indonesian lecturers hold different positions towards translanguaging. Lecturers with optimal attitudes cited some pedagogical benefits of translanguaging practices, such as teaching complex concepts and structures, facilitating the teaching process, promoting equity and fostering student-teacher rapport (Fang & Liu, 2020). Interestingly, one of the interviewees asserted that the use of L1 was a means to improve students' retention. This finding corroborates Wang's (2019) results, which revealed that reinforcing the monolingual approach and ignoring students' diverse backgrounds leads to student dropout. To ensure the resilience of foreign language programmes within neoliberal higher education, the researcher suggested that the teachers should consider the students' profiles, learning needs and expectations. Our research findings also echo the results of Fang and Liu (2020), revealing that some Indonesian lecturers acknowledge the role of the judicious and pedagogical use of translanguaging to achieve different pedagogical purposes. Similarly, Fernández (2015) and Pappa and Moate (2021) reported that the overuse of the students' L1 slows their proficiency advancement, impacts their language accuracy and demotivates them to use the target language. Additionally, some other Indonesian lecturers with virtual attitudes supported the exclusion of translanguaging, as it was a sign of low English proficiency. In line with this finding, Nel and Muller (2010) attributed students' poor L2 acquisition to teachers' poor teaching styles and limited English proficiency. However, there is a lack of evidence regarding the relationship between lecturers' attitudes and their English proficiency.

In response to RQ2, the findings reveal that Indonesian lecturers perceive translanguaging as beneficial because it facilitates classroom interactions. This finding aligns with Pun and Tai (2021), indicating that integrating translanguaging as a mechanism creates a space for student-student and teacher-student interactions. It facilitates communication flow, as students can access their

linguistic and multimodal repertoires and choose suitable signs that fit various situations. Yasar and Dikilitas (2022) add that this approach fosters equity and enhances students' sense of belonging, as they are able to contribute as valued classroom community members. Consistent with the findings of Moody (2019), the surveyed Indonesian lecturers attributed an inclusive, familiar, friendly and secure classroom environment to the use of translanguaging, as it helps alleviate students' fear associated with speaking English in unfamiliar situations. Concurring with the findings of Yuvayapan (2019), the Indonesian lecturers indicated that translanguaging pedagogies are essential, as they facilitate classroom management. In Turkey, teachers used L1 to give feedback, provide classroom guidance and explain the tasks' deadlines.

Additionally, most of the participating Indonesian lecturers perceived translanguaging as necessary in their EFL classroom in order to scaffold the students' understanding. Interestingly, the interviewees stated that they had received departmental guidelines emphasising the use of translanguaging to enhance and scaffold the students' understanding, especially for first-year students. Raja et al. (2022) confirm this necessity, while stipulating the judicious and pedagogical use of L1 to achieve students' learning goals. Moreover, opening a translanguaging space enhances students' confidence to participate in classroom discussions and use the target language. This corroborates the findings of Cenoz et al. (2022), which show that the integration of students' multilingual and multimodal resources reduces students' anxiety and increases their confidence. The researchers attribute students' confidence to their understanding, which they gain through utilising their existing linguistic and semi-otic resources.

Moreover, the Indonesian lecturers surveyed perceived translanguaging as useful, as it empowers students' critical thinking skills and provides authentic opportunities to interact using languages other than English. Contrary to this finding, Rabbidge (2019) reported that the use of translanguaging cannot support critical thinking skills due to the dominance of teacher-directed translanguaging, which limits the space to initiate conversation, discuss or question an argument freely. The findings of the present study were consistent with those of Pun and Tai (2021), who highlighted the role of translanguaging in affirming their identity. The Indonesian lecturers felt empowered to reclaim their identity by expressing themselves in their native language(s) within their cultural context.

As for RQ3, the findings interestingly revealed a significant difference in the perceived benefits of translanguaging with regard to the age of the lecturers. The disparity in the lecturers' age groups regarding the perceived benefits of

translanguaging could indicate the influence of generational perspectives and the impact of their level of teaching experience on their acceptance and utilisation of translanguaging pedagogies. Moreover, the findings of the present study, in contrast to those of Alrayes (2023), reveal a significant difference between beginner and experienced lecturers regarding the perceived benefits of translanguaging. This discrepancy could be attributed to their exposure to other teaching methods and their flexibility with regard to incorporating multilingual strategies into their pedagogical approaches.

Conclusion and implications

This mixed-methods study examined Indonesian lecturers' attitudes towards translanguaging and its perceived benefits in their EFL classrooms. The study also explored the relationship between lecturers' attitudes and the variables of gender, age, experience, university and faculty. The findings reveal that lecturers have optimal, virtual and maximal attitudes towards translanguaging. They perceive translanguaging as beneficial as it helps to scaffold students' understanding in a familiar, secure and inclusive learning environment. They believe translanguaging is necessary to enhance students' understanding and facilitate student-student and student-teacher interactions. Translanguaging supports the development of students' critical thinking skills and self-confidence. Additionally, utilising their linguistic and multimodal repertoires empowers lecturers to reaffirm their identity and question the perceived hierarchy dominating their EFL classroom. There were significant differences in the perceived benefits of translanguaging among lecturers based on their age and experience, which could be attributed to their willingness and adaptability to bi/multilingual teaching methodologies. These findings have several universal implications that extend beyond the Indonesian context, as they reflect broader trends in multilingual education.

In order to implement these findings, lecturers and policymakers in the Indonesian context as well as in other EFL contexts should reconsider the multilingual turn, which empirically appears to contribute to lecturers' empowerment in reclaiming their identity, while also developing the student's confidence and critical thinking skills. Lecturers should accommodate the universal needs of a bi/multilingual approach, as translanguaging pedagogy is perceived as necessary in order to improve Indonesian students' retention and sense of belonging to the classroom community. The key strength of this study is that it provides evidence that integrating translanguaging in the Indonesian EFL classroom will foster inclusive learning environments, enhance

students' understanding, and encourage shy and low-level students to engage in classroom-based interactions. These benefits are not limited to the Indonesian EFL context, but are relevant to other EFL and ESL linguistic landscapes that are seeking effective strategies to enhance students' learning, encourage student-student and teacher-student interactions, and alleviate the difficulties that students encounter with the English-only approach. While providing insights into integrating translanguaging in the Indonesian classroom, it is imperative to acknowledge some limitations. Firstly, the use of voluntary sampling in this study may have influenced the diversity within the population being studied. It is therefore suggested to employ multiple sampling strategies that could enhance the study's robustness and improve the generalisability of the findings. Secondly, the stakeholders in the present study were teachers only; therefore, we call for more research that further explores the attitudes of Indonesian students and policymakers towards translanguaging and its pedagogical implications in their EFL classroom.

References

- Alhojailan, M. I. (2012). Thematic analysis: A critical review of its process and evaluation. *West East Journal of Social Sciences*, 1, 39-47.
- Alrayes, M. (2023). Correlation factors of translanguaging practices on English as a foreign language contexts: The perception of teachers. *Education and Information Technologies*, 1-12.
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s10639-023-12137-1>
- Baker, C. (2011). *Foundations of bilingual education and bilingualism* (5th ed.). Multilingual Matters.
- Boyce, C., & Neale, P. (2006). *Conducting in-depth interviews: A guide for designing and conducting in-depth interviews for evaluation input* (Vol. 2). Pathfinder international.
- Canagarajah, S. (2011). Codemeshing in academic writing: Identifying teachable strategies of translanguaging. *The Modern Language Journal*, 95(3), 401-417.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.2011.01207>
- Cenoz, J., Santos, A., & Gorter, D. (2022). Pedagogical translanguaging and teachers' perceptions of anxiety. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 1-12.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050.2021.2021387>
- Clarke, V., & Braun, V. (2017). Thematic analysis. *The Journal of Positive Psychology*, 12(3), 297-298.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/17439760.2016.1262613>
- Doyle, L., Brady, A. M., & Byrne, G. (2016). An overview of mixed methods research—revisited. *Journal of Research in Nursing*, 21(8), 623-635. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1744987116674257>
- Fang, F., Jiang, L., & Yang, J. (2023). To impart knowledge or to adhere to policy: Unpacking language ideologies and practices in Chinese EMI courses through a translanguaging lens. *Language Teaching Research*, 1-30. <https://doi.org/10.1177/13621688231183771>

- Fang, F., & Liu, Y. (2020). Using all English is not always meaningful: Stakeholders' perspectives on the use of and attitudes towards translanguaging at a Chinese university. *Lingua*, 247, Article 102959. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lingua.2020.102959>
- Fernández, R. F. F. (2015). The effects of L1 overuse in L2 learning: Evidence from three case studies. *IJAEDU-International E-Journal of Advances in Education*, 1(3), 183-192. <https://doi.org/10.18768/ijaedu.53675>
- Fetters, M. D., Curry, L. A., & Creswell, J. W. (2013). Achieving integration in mixed methods designs—principles and practices. *Health services research*, 48(2), 2134-2156. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1475-6773.12117>
- García, O. (2009). Education, multilingualism and translanguaging in the 21st Century. In T. Skutnabb-Kangas, R. Phillipson, A. K. Mohanty, & M. Panda (Eds.), *Social justice through multilingual education* (pp. 140-158). Multilingual Matters. <https://doi.org/10.21832/9781847691910-011>
- Gorter, D., & Arocena, E. (2020). Teachers' beliefs about multilingualism in a course on translanguaging. *System*, 92, Article 102272. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2020.102272>
- Halim, N., Mayuni, I., & Setiadi, S. (2023, May). A perspective on the practice of spontaneous translanguaging in Indonesia. In *20th AsiaTEFL-68th TEFLIN-5th iNELLTAL Conference (ASIAATEFL 2022)* (pp. 513-523). Atlantis Press.
- Haryanto, E., Sulistiyo, U., Khairani, M., & Wulan, R. (2016). Indonesian or English? EFL student teachers' preference and perception on the language use in the classroom. *Indonesian Journal of English Education*, 3(1), 46-59.
- Li, W. (2018). Translanguaging as a practical theory of language. *Applied Linguistics*, 39(1), 9-30. <https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/amx039>
- Marshall, G. (2005). The purpose, design and administration of a questionnaire for data collection. *Radiography*, 11(2), 131-136. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.radi.2004.09.002>
- Moody, S., Chowdhury, M., & Eslami, Z. (2019). Graduate students' perceptions of translanguaging. *English Teaching & Learning*, 43(1), 85-103. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s42321-018-0019-z>
- Nel, N., & Muller, H. (2010). The impact of teachers' limited English proficiency on English second language learners in South African schools. *South African Journal of Education*, 30(4), 635-650. <https://hdl.handle.net/10520/EJC32249>
- Otheguy, R., García, O., & Reid, W. (2015). Clarifying translanguaging and deconstructing named languages: A perspective from linguistics. *Applied Linguistics Review*, 6(3), 281-307. <https://doi.org/10.1515/applirev-2015-0014>
- Pappa, S., & Moate, J. (2021). Teacher educators' professional identity in English-medium instruction at a Finnish university. *Center for Educational Policy Studies Journal*, 11(3). <https://doi.org/10.26529/cepsj.1053>
- Pun, J. K., & Tai, K. W. (2021). Doing science through translanguaging: A study of translanguaging practices in secondary English as a medium of instruction science laboratory sessions. *International Journal of Science Education*, 43(7), 1112-1139. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09500693.2021.1902015>

- Rabidge, M. (2019). The effects of translanguaging on participation in EFL classrooms. *Journal of Asia TEFL*, 16(4), 1305. <http://dx.doi.org/10.18823/asiatefl.2019.16.4.15.1305>
- Raja, F. D., Suparno, S., & Ngadisio, N. (2022). Teachers' attitude towards translanguaging practice and its implication in Indonesian EFL classroom. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 11(3), 567-576. <https://doi.org/10.17509/jpp.v20i2.27046>
- Rusydiah, E. F., AR, Z. T., & Rahman, M. R. (2023). Literacy policy in southeast Asia: A comparative study between Singapore, Malaysia, and Indonesia. *Center for Educational Policy Studies Journal*, 13(2), 79-96. <https://doi.org/10.26529/cepsj.1214>
- Stokes, D., & Bergin, R. (2006). Methodology or "methodolatry"? An evaluation of focus groups and depth interviews. *Qualitative Market Research: An International Journal*, 9(1), 26-37. <https://doi.org/10.1108/13522750610640530>
- Tabatadze, S. (2019). Bilingual educational policy in Georgia: Can it benefit the process of integration of society? *Center for Educational Policy Studies Journal*, 9(1), 61-82. <https://doi.org/10.26529/cepsj.660>
- Ubaidillah, M. F. (2018). The pedagogy of English as an international language: Indonesian pre-service teachers' beliefs. *Journal of Asia TEFL*, 15(4), 1186. <http://dx.doi.org/10.18823/asiatefl.2018.15.4.23.1186>
- Vaismoradi, M., Turunen, H., & Bondas, T. (2013). Content analysis and thematic analysis: Implications for conducting a qualitative descriptive study. *Nursing & Health Sciences*, 15(3), 398-405. <https://doi.org/10.1111/nhs.12048>
- Veliz, L. (2021). Translanguaging as a pedagogy for equity, inclusion, and social justice in a multilingual classroom. In R. K. Gordon, K. Ahmed, & M. Hosoda (Eds.), *Evolving multicultural education for global classrooms* (137-153). IGI Global. <https://hdl.handle.net/1959.11/54799>
- Wang, D. (2019). Translanguaging in Chinese foreign language classrooms: Students and teachers' attitudes and practices. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 22(2), 138-149.
- Wei, L. (2023). Transformative pedagogy for inclusion and social justice through translanguaging, co-learning, and transpositioning. *Language Teaching*, 1-12. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444823000186>
- Yasar, Y. M., & Dikilitas, K. (2022). 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>
- Yuvayapan, F. (2019). Translanguaging in EFL classrooms: Teachers' perceptions and practices. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies*, 15(2), 678-694.
- Williams, C. (1994). *Arfarniad o ddulliau dysgu ac addysgu yng Nghyfnod Allweddol 3, gyda golwg arbennig ar ddysgu ac addysgu dwyieithog* [An evaluation of teaching and learning methods in Key Stage 3, with a special focus on bilingual teaching and learning] [Unpublished doctoral dissertation]. University of Wales, Bangor.

Biographical note

MOHAMMED YASSIN MOHD ABA SHA'AR, PhD, is an assistant professor in the field of English language teaching at the School of Education and Liberal Arts, Walailak University, Thailand. His research interests include media of instruction (EMI and translanguaging), Teaching English as a foreign language (EFL), Educational Technology, and Arab American literature.

NUR LAILATUR ROFIAH, MA, (Corresponding Author) is an assistant professor in the field of English language Teaching at the School of Languages and General Education, Walailak University, Thailand. Her research interests involve Minority literature, Educational Technology, and Teaching English as a Foreign Language (TEFL).