
An Investigation of Translanguaging Practices in EFL Classroom: A Multiple Case Study of Junior High Schools in Kotamobagu

Firjinia Putri Utami Sukirman^{1*)}, Mister Gidion Maru², Nihta V. F. Liando³

¹ English Education Department, Universitas Negeri Manado, Indonesia

^{*)} Corresponding Author: firjiniaputri@gmail.com

Article History

Submitted : November 7th, 2025
Revised : November 17th, 2025
Accepted : November 25th, 2025

KEYWORDS

Translanguaging, English Language Teaching, English as Foreign Language, Teaching Strategies.

ABSTRACT

The present study aims at investigating the implementation of translanguaging as a pedagogical approach in EFL classroom from perception and experiences of the teachers and students in Junior High School in Kotamobagu. This study employs a qualitative approach, specifically a case study. The data sources consisted of 2 English teacher and 40 students from two classes (20 students per class) selected through purposive sampling technique. For this case, there are three data collection methods which are: Classroom observation, Semi-structured interview, and Documentation. The data analysis was guided by thematic analysis consists of: transcribing, reading and tagging, open coding, thematic identification and thematic reviewing/deepening and interpretation. The results have shown the implementation of pedagogical translanguaging contributes significantly because it helps students build an inclusive classroom environment through the use of classroom linguistic resources. In addition, educators and students have equal perspective on the translanguaging approach compared to the monolingual method to reduce affective barriers in the context of proficiency and preparation for global communication. The study indicates that transcoding practices affect English language learning, especially in areas of inclusive practice, vocabulary, etc. Integrated practices promote inclusive growth, while the monolingual approach encourages setbacks in fluency, listening, and overall communicative competence. This why study assumes that teacher who use translanguaging in pedagogy can understand that students' anxiety in English as a Foreign Language (EFL) lessons decreases, thereby encouraging student participation in learning.

INTRODUCTION

Translanguaging remains as an innovative strategy in the reconfiguration of English as a Foreign Language (EFL) instruction, particularly within multilingual contexts, such as Indonesia. In the Indonesian EFL classroom context, students switching between the language of the nation, local vernaculars, and English, makes translanguaging an epistemic space from which pedagogic potentials can be developed with linguistic diversity. As García and Wei (2014) point out, translanguaging as a sociocognitive process operates on the frontier of practice with language and crosses the traditional domains of language use and the education of language.

In recent years, critical research within applied linguistics investigates the disconnect between classroom language policies and students' complex linguistic realities. In Indonesian classrooms, especially in Manado, students engage in communicative practices that encompass superdiverse configurations of Bahasa Indonesia and regional languages (Minahasan, Sangihe, and Mongondow) interwoven with English. In these contexts, teaching approaches that overly rigidly apply target language borders may reproduce inequities and alienation that arise from marginalizing students' abundant pre-existing linguistic skills. In these contexts, the ethnographic study of practices that shifts the paradigm of EFL instruction as transcending exclusion and alienated 'responding' becomes cognitively more

assimilated as integration eases within the pedagogy of translanguaging. As Liando et al. (2023) eloquently observe, translanguaging is much more than occasional code-switching; it is the integration of purposeful and cohesive pedagogy that mobilizes the entire spectrum of learners' linguistic resources in a classroom to scaffold understanding, co-construct knowledge, and raise critical language awareness.

Numerous studies document the effectiveness of translanguaging as a strategy to support conceptual understanding while addressing linguistic challenges. For instance, Liando et al (2022) described how students became more proficient and confident with idea expression when teachers used Bahasa Indonesia during English grammar instruction. In the same context, Yasar and Dikilitas (2022) described how students became deschooled and gained metalinguistic awareness as they analyzed frameworks of different languages and made cross-linguistic comparisons. In Indonesia's pluralistic classrooms, the integration of such metacognitive strategies is imperative to address linguistic inequities involving dominant and subordinate languages and ensure all students are legally entitled to cognitive equity by contributing to knowledge construction. In the many classrooms of Indonesia, translanguaging strategies permit teachers to shift from being mere language regulators to becoming cognitive guides, and validating their students' linguistic flexibility.

Nonetheless, the use of translanguaging in the classroom within Indonesia's formal education system is still tenuous and lacks solid theoretical foundations. Although Indonesia is officially recognized as a multilingual nation, teaching English in schools is still influenced by ideologies which place English, and its associated cultures, as a marker of modernity and global mobility, overlooking local identities. Many teachers see translanguaging practices as pedagogically invalid or even as a compromise to the purity of the language, which reflects the institutional anxiety around proficiency and standardization. Putrawan and Putrawan (2022) highlight the emotional and communicative breakdowns students experience when English is isolated in the classroom to the exclusion of structures and culturally available frameworks that help students make sense of the content.

This situation is part of a larger issue relating to the development of appropriate teaching approaches within the context of EFL classrooms in Indonesia, and in particular, Junior High School at Kotamobagu, where the situation is one of high linguistic diversity. From the researcher's observations, during EFL classes in the Junior High School at Kotamobagu, teachers seem to be in a position where they need to satisfy the institutional requirement of creating English-only teaching environments, while at the same time, teaching to students who incorporate multilingual code switching to understand and actively engage with the lesson. Liando et al., (2023) observes that within the context of EFL in Indonesia, teachers face the situation of adhering to a monolingual methodology that espouses the exclusive use of English, or moving to a translanguaging pedagogy that legitimizes the use of the students' mother tongue as a linguistic resource. Although the monolingual approach is considered to be able to form an immersive target language environment, the reality is that this approach often ignores the linguistic reality of multilingual students and has the potential to cause language anxiety (Zaretsky & Russak, 2024). On the other hand, translanguaging is starting to be looked at as an inclusive and relevant approach, but there has not been much research that critically compares its application with the monolingual approach in the EFL classroom (Kato & Kumagai, 2022). Therefore, the researcher interesting to it examine in depth how these of the two Implementation of Translanguaging Approaches, Teachers' and Students' Perception Toward Translanguaging Approach, and Impact of Translanguaging Approach on Students' English Skills.

METHOD

This study used qualitative research methods with multiple case study design. This approach was chosen to allow researchers to understand in depth how translanguaging and monolingual approaches are implemented in two different EFL classes, as well as analyze their implications for the learning process. Multiple case studies are used because they allow contextual exploration of phenomena in real-world settings (Yin, 2009). This design concern form was obtained to directly compare the practices, perceptions, and dynamics of learning that occur in two classes that apply different approaches.

This study was conducted in two junior high schools in North Sulawesi, especially in Bolaang Mongondow district, precisely in Kotamobagu, where there are two classes each representing the implementation of translanguaging practices in English language teaching. The research subjects consisted of 2 English teachers and a total of 40 students from two classes (20 students per class). Teachers are selected through purposive sampling techniques, namely teachers who consistently apply

one of the approaches in learning. The students are also selected based on active involvement in the classroom and willingness to participate in interviews and observations.

To collect the data, the researcher used three main techniques: first, Classroom observation, to record language interactions and teaching strategies directly in a natural setting. Second, Semi-structured interviews, conducted with teachers and some students to explore their perceptions and experiences of the approach used. Last, Documentation, such as lesson plans, teaching materials, and teacher notes, to reinforce findings from observations and interviews. Data was analyzed thematically as outlined by Clarke & Braun (2017). This involved a series of steps: transcription of the data, initial reading and tagging, open coding, identification of themes, iterative reviewing and deepening of themes, and retrieval of interpretative meanings.

In this section, the explanatory analysis of the different patterns of language use (translanguaging), learner replies and attitudes, and impacts of pedagogical practices is examined. The researcher has tried to maintain the trustworthiness of the data by using the triangulation technique of sources and methods. This is achieved by cross-validating the outcomes of the observations, interviews, and documents. Informants are also asked to do member checking by verifying the interpretation of the data. The analysis of social and cultural contexts has been the subject of ongoing reflection during the social research process, which ensures research sensitivity. The research describes the principles of solicited ethical affirmation. Informed consent will be sought from each participant. The participants' identity is disguised to protect confidentiality. The school's administration and applicable academic protocols govern the entire observation and interview process.

FINDINGS

Based on the findings obtained by the researcher through classroom observations, interviews, and document analysis, the researcher directly observed how translanguaging emerges and is used in actual EFL learning practices. In each learning process, it was clear that students and teacher utilize linguistic flexibility involving English, Indonesian, and regional languages to aid understanding, build interaction, and complete various academic tasks. This phenomenon shows that translanguaging is not merely language switching, but a living strategy that functions to support their learning process. To provide a clearer understanding of how translanguaging takes place in learning practices, the researcher presents it in the following table.

Form of the Implementation of Translanguaging Approaches

The observations detailed in Table 1 show the diverse methods deliberate translanguaging EFL teachers utilize as part of their instructional practice. Translanguaging involves different languages within a single classroom as an intentional pedagogical strategy aimed at bridging understanding, deepening classroom engagement, and scaffolding instruction. Translanguaging practice within instructional contexts hinges on the goals of instruction, the linguistic proficiency of students, and the overall classroom environment.

Table 1. Teacher Observation Results in the Implementation of Translanguaging Approach

Category	Indicator	Frequency	Percentage (%)	Description
Teacher's Language Use	Teacher speaks 100% English	12	40%	Dominant in monolingual classes
	Teacher mixes English and Indonesian	15	50%	Frequently occurs in translanguaging classes
	Teacher uses local languages when giving examples	3	10%	Occasionally appears, especially to explain culturally specific vocabulary
Translanguaging Strategies	Teacher translates difficult instructions or vocabulary	10	33%	Conducted to ensure faster student comprehension
	Teacher gives synonyms or paraphrases of difficult words	12	40%	Used to support understanding without frequent code-switching

	Teacher allows students to answer in Indonesian	8	27%	Commonly occurs in translanguaging classes
Strategies	Teacher consistently gives instructions only in English	18	60%	Highly dominant in monolingual classes
	Teacher provides feedback only in English	12	40%	Maintains consistency of English exposure
Verbal Interaction	Teacher engages students in Q&A in English	14	47%	More frequently observed in monolingual classes
	Teacher allows students to use two languages	10	33%	Seen in translanguaging classes
	Teacher corrects students' mistakes in two languages	6	20%	A form of scaffolding in translanguaging
Teacher's Attitude	Teacher shows supportive attitude when students translanguage	11	37%	More permissive in translanguaging classes
	Teacher reprimands students for using Indonesian	7	23%	Predominantly in monolingual classes
Learning Objectives	Teacher clearly conveys learning objectives	20	67%	Conducted in both classes, though in different languages
Student Response to Teacher	Students seem to understand teacher's instructions	22	73%	Higher comprehension in translanguaging than in monolingual classes

The overall results suggest that classroom translanguaging in EFL contexts in Indonesia scaffolds collaborative meaning construction and student interaction, and wide understanding of lessons and educational materials. While varying practice between teachers results different usage of translanguaging in the classroom, evidence suggest an environment was created in which the construct the classroom atmosphere was created to show the translanguaging practice provided a flexible responsive environment. The implementation of these practices is a deliberate effort within the school and the teachers as a recognition of classroom practices that pedagogical linguistic 'purity' challenges the idea of the EFL classroom as an 'English only' zone providing linguistic resources to add value to classroom instruction.

Table 2. Students Observation Results in the Implementation of Translanguaging Approach

Category	Indicator	Frequency	Percentage (%)	Description
Student language response	Students answer in English	12	24%	Some students are able to respond in English, but the number remains limited compared to code-switching practices.
	Students answer in Indonesian	8	16%	A smaller group of students prefer answering in Indonesian, showing reliance on their native language.
	Students mix two languages (code-switching)	30	60%	Most students employ code-switching between English and Indonesian to express their ideas more clearly.
Active participation	Students ask the teacher	10	20%	Only a few students take initiative to ask questions in class.
	Students answer the teacher's questions	25	50%	Half of the students actively respond when teachers pose questions.

	Students discuss with friends	15	30%	A portion of students engage in peer discussions to support understanding.
Understanding	Students demonstrate an understanding of the teacher's instructions	18	36%	Several students show comprehension of English instructions without difficulty.
	Students seem confused when the teacher only speaks English	20	40%	Many students struggle when teachers avoid using Indonesian, leading to confusion.
	Students request additional explanations in Indonesian	12	24%	Some students explicitly request explanations in Indonesian for better clarity.
Non-verbal response	Students nod or react according to understanding	22	44%	Students often nod or give gestures when they understand the instructions.
	Students show expressions of confusion	28	56%	Confusion is more frequently visible through facial expressions or body language.
Adaptation	Students are used to using English in full	10	20%	Only a minority of students are accustomed to using English without switching.
	Students are more comfortable when translanguaging occurs	40	80%	The majority feel at ease when translanguaging is allowed, supporting learning engagement.
Learning motivation	Students look enthusiastic about participating in lessons	30	60%	Most students show enthusiasm during class activities.
	Students show reluctance to participate	20	40%	Some students remain hesitant or passive during the lessons.

Data summarized in Table 2 shows the patterns students were using, in terms of participation, comprehension, and emotion while implementing the translanguaging approach in EFL classrooms. All the data suggest that translanguaging provides students with agency, ease, and involvement, and the willingness to participate in meaning construction which considers the entire repertoire of their multilingual resources. It also shows that the adaptability and motivation of students seems to strongly correlate with the degree of flexibility and multilingual provision incorporated by the teachers and the learning environment.

As noted by the classroom observations, the researcher finds the implementation of translanguaging in EFL Junior High School at Kotamobagu to be of focus demonstrates dynamic and purposeful pedagogical practices that interweave varying linguistic strategic resources to promote understanding, inclusion, and participation. Such teachers adopt the approach whereby they scaffold meaning, clarify relationships, and enact a dialogic atmosphere where they interchangeably use English and the Bahasa Indonesia, along with regional dialects of the students. Such transitions are purposeful and are designed to meet the immediate cognitive and emotional needs of learners. Trans- languaging positions in practice, therefore, affords the teacher the flexibility and agency to coordinate learning while students remain actively engaged and feeling psychologically safe in the classroom.

There are several distinctive ways translanguaging occurs in the classroom. First, during the explaining of certain complex or abstract concepts especially in the area of grammar and academic vocabulary, teachers make use of translanguaging to achieve conceptual clarity. For instance, teachers know and understand when students struggle with English academic texts, and in those moments switch to more Indonesian as a means to paraphrase or contextualize the central ideas in a more accessible way. This scaffolding technique allows students to construct a meaning framework appropriately in the first language and then expect them to demonstrate their understanding in English. For instance, while explaining certain grammatical rules, a teacher may use Indonesian with contrastive examples, and students will be able to understand and associate certain functional pairs of forms. This instructional use of translanguaging clearly demonstrates the cognitive use of translanguaging to fill comprehension gaps and achieve functional understanding.

Second, academics employ translanguaging during classroom instruction and procedural discourse. Instructors generally issue directives in English and then confirm them in Bahasa Indonesia, trying to avoid any doubt or misrepresentation. Facilitating instruction in two languages allows students to better maximize the understanding of the task at hand and the probability that the task will be completed correctly. This practice does not dilute exposure to English; rather, it clarifies classroom discourse and alleviates the anxiety that accompanies a potential misunderstanding of the language spoken. In this context, translanguaging provides a form of communicative equilibrium in which English serves as the primary medium of instruction and Bahasa Indonesia is used as the language of reference for understanding and emotional support.

The third component involves classroom discussions and translanguaging interactions. Students are able to reply in English, Bahasa Indonesia, as well as in code-switching, and teachers acknowledge these replies by reformulating them into suitable expressions in English. This fosters dialogic interaction where students' focus is on meaning rather than language form, and they progressively assimilate English through experiential correction rather than through correctional enforcement. A translanguaging classroom, therefore, becomes a dynamically constructed bilingual space for the negotiation of meaning, where learners are able to shift across the language in the order of the English language and Bahasa Indonesia directly proportional to the communicative purpose and context.

Observation data similarly shows that the effort translanguaging to assimilate flexible use of everyday English with the communicative structure of formal interaction positively affects classroom inclusivity. Students, for instance, mentioned they had greater self-assurance and greater ease in participating in student activities because they did not feel confined according to their English language proficiency. The flexible and code-mixed range of the communicative language coupled with the translanguaging offered by the formal instruction positively affected students' self, and sense of, community. This sense of community shifted positively toward classroom activities where they took on both peer and teacher-led roles. This inclusivity reflects the work of García and Wei (2014) regarding the role of translanguaging in critical pedagogy.

In transcend pedagogy, translanguaging fosters the provision of differentiated instruction owing to the disparate language and cognitive developmental skills of students. More specifically, adaptive instructional practices that differentiate translanguaging pedagogy hinge on the developmental levels and the differential mastery of the linguistic constructs and concepts encapsulated within the lesson. For instance, in less advanced proficiency instructional clusters, teachers use clarifying Indonesian, while in more advanced groups, teachers predominantly use English, strategically integrating *el trans*. The use of translanguaging in these instructional settings is more contextual and flexible as coined in the literature, less as a model in the sense that it is fixed but as a dynamic responsive to the classroom context and the goals of learning.

Translanguaging also fosters teachers' assessment of the congruence of their pedagogy with the learning realities their students experience. Teachers often view the approach as a means of bridging the gap between curriculum goals and students' language lived experiences. Through translanguaging, they pursue English learning goals while recognizing students' languages both native and regional— as crucial components of thought that aid understanding. The outcomes of the implementation affirm that translanguaging reconstitutes the teacher's agency not as the enforcer of language purity, but as the provider of equitable access to learning.

Teachers' and Students' Perception Toward Translanguaging Approach

Teachers' Perception

The teachers' perception of the translanguaging approach showed the complexity of understanding the pedagogical value, limits, and effects relating to students' learning. Although both teachers acknowledged the theoretical value of immersion in a strictly monolingual English environment, in simulating authentic contexts, and the benefits of immersion and authentic contexts, they also recognized the necessity of adopting translanguaging practices in EFL classrooms. Teacher A argued that although 'comprehension and engagement' is the main goal and a fully monolingual approach is preferred in logic, at the end of the day, the goal of teaching is to enable students to learn. As she put it:

"I aim to maximize the use of English because I consider immersion to be essential. However, when students do not grasp rudimentary directions, I am compelled to use Indonesian. If I speak only English, a lot of the students will not speak and will become indifferent. Hence, for me, translanguaging is a bridge. It keeps the students engaged, even while I would prefer total immersion in English." (Teacher A)

This point of view attempts to reconcile the idealistic vision of monolingualism with the more realistic view of translanguaging. As noted in the study by Liando et al. (2023), while the goal should be to maximize the use of the target language, there are purposeful, strategic moments when the first language (L1) can be left resting as a learning scaffold. Teacher A illustrates this perspective in balancing the use of translanguaging so that it is not seen as a weakness or failure, but as a means to keep students actively engaged and, vitally, in a state of ongoing understanding.

This viewpoint is shared by Teacher B as well. Nevertheless, she focuses on the psychological dimension of translanguaging for students. She explains students comprehend better and, importantly, the cognitive load and tension associated with challenging texts are lessened when translanguaging is employed. She explains:

"Students seem to experience heightened anxiety during grammar lessons when I exclusively use English. I've had students report being more comfortable and confident when I use Indonesian and then go on to explain things in Indonesian and English. I've noticed that students sometimes start with Indonesian and then respond, over time, in English. This makes me think that, in those cases, I should definitely use translanguaging." (Teacher B).

This excerpt shows the emotional impacts of translanguaging. Liando & Tatipang (2022) states that the L1 strategically should be used because it lowers the affective filter and enhances the class atmosphere. The emphasis on gradual progress also shows that the disengagement of translanguaging should not be the focus, and that pedagogy should view the disengagement of translanguaging positively, in order to encourage student's confidence and independence in English.

Teacher also mentioned the challenges and risks that come with an over-dependence on translanguaging. Teacher A, for example, noted that students may become discouraged from the more active and productive use of English when there is excessive code-switching. She also noted that she had to more clearly delineate the boundaries in her teaching.

"There are occasions when I feel that students are overly dependent on Indonesian. It is because they will begin to lose the motivation to try to comprehend the English language when everything is explained in their native language. Therefore, I tend to begin classes in English, providing a brief Indonesian explanation only when students are having considerable difficulties. It's about balance, and I want them to feel supported and simultaneously feel challenged to use English as much as possible." (Teacher A)

This viewpoint aligns with Liando et al. (2023) as well, which states that although teachers should allow some Translanguaging, it should not be done excessively as it could entail students will completely refrain from engaging with the target language. Teacher A's approach of starting the lesson in English with minimal support in the L1 indicates that a balancing act has been achieved which reflects some thoughtful teaching.

In this discussion Teacher B emphasized some of the contextual factors that shape her perceptions. She pointed out that in the Indonesian contextual sociolinguistics the students are surrounded by the local and national languages which made Translanguaging almost impossible to not happen. She also highlighted the contradictory policies that are nested in the institutions which propagate monolingualism that teachers contend with. She states:

"School policy promotes the use of English "to create an immersive environment", but immersion in English outside of the classroom is limited. Moreover, when it is the only language a teacher is communicating in, it can lead to a disconnection, considering the class is made up of students all communicating with different languages. Students feel more at ease when their teacher is coach switching, and more able to relate the language being taught to their lived realities." (Teacher B)

Institutional ideologies tend to prioritize monolingualism, whereas the situations in the classroom require a more flexible focus. This sentiment is parallel to those in García & Palmer (2017) work where they critique the 'monolingual bias' embedded in policies and propose the need to recognize the practice of translanguaging as valid and functional. Teacher B illustrates the importance of contextual sensitivity that harmonizes institutional goals and students' linguistic capabilities.

Both teachers expressed a similar understanding of the need to regard translanguaging and monolingual approaches as elements of a continuum rather than oppositional extremes. This perspective was encapsulated in Teacher A's reflection:

"I see no tension between translanguaging and monolingual pedagogy. They are complementary. Monolingual instruction allows students to engage with the English language, while translanguaging allows for support and comprehension. In my view, the most skillful juggling and management is about how the teacher synergistically integrates the two without biasing toward either." (Teacher A)

Integration, as Teacher B explained:

"I think a balance is best. There are some speaking practice times where I really think we need English immersion, but there are times where translanguaging really saves the lesson from crashing. It's like a pendulum where we need the flexibility to know when to really push on English only, and when to really let Indonesian in so they can really learn" (Teacher B)

These reflections demonstrate the nuanced and contextually sensitive understandings exhibited by the teachers in question. The recommendation of effective pedagogy for Indonesia's EFL context no longer takes the monolingual perspective as it used to in the past, nor does it require boundless translanguaging. It merely needs both to be weighted in a dynamic interplay, as teacher agency. This is also self-evident in the more recent work of Creese and Blackledge (2015) where translanguaging is highlighted as not a remedial practice.

Students Perception

Students' voice illustrated how varied approaches to language use affected their experiences in the EFL classroom. Students expressed how the use of translanguaging helped them feel eased and supported, particularly when lessons were difficult in an English-only classroom. Still, some students valued the opportunities presented by English-only lessons, describing it as an impetus to push their limits and improve their English proficiency. These observations suggest that students are not antagonistic to monolingual instruction. They simply argue that translanguaging be made available as a resource for understanding and alleviating some of the load. The following quote illustrates this:

"I lose the thread of explanations when the teacher talks in English. I lose the thread when I encounter new grammar or advanced vocab. Yet, when the teacher talks in Indonesian, I can suddenly capture meaning and continue learning with ease. Otherwise, I might feel more annoyed and probably give up in class." (Student 1)

The same student later expressed their thoughts on monolingual teaching:

"Even though I need Indonesian sometimes, I also think English-only class gives me a chance to improve my listening skills. When a teacher speaks English, I try to concentrate really hard to understand the meaning. It isn't always simple though, and it helps me to feel more earnest about my learning." (Student 1)

This duality demonstrates how students understand translanguaging as a temporary means to a goal and yet, appreciate the benefits of immersive monolingual instruction. by Zhou & Mann (2021) shows how students experience anxiety in monolingual contexts, and yet, feel the need to confront the challenge of using English. For a subset of learners, the need to anxiety in class and the provision of confidence to speak was critical. For Student 2, the following comment encapsulated this experience.

"I feel nervous when I want to answer the teacher's question in English because I am afraid of making mistakes. But when I can mix Indonesian and English, I feel more confident. I know that even if my English is not perfect, the teacher and my friends can still understand what I mean." (Student 2)

This student also reported on the difficulties posed by monolingual instruction:

"When the teacher does the whole class in English, I get shy to ask questions. I don't want to seem stupid to my classmates. I get that listening to English a lot does help, so I think it is good, but scary" (Student 2)

This case illustrates the affective filter of (Yigitbilek, 2022), which suggests that anxiety can serve as a barrier to learning, while translanguaging can lower that barrier, as in the case of Student 3:

"When the teacher uses English and Indonesian, it feels natural to me. I can follow the lesson, and I am not afraid to participate. For instance, I don't know how to say it in English, I just use Indonesian, and the teacher helps me to translate. I enjoy learning this way." (Student 3).

This student cited a case of uncritical reflection on monolingual exposure as follows:

"Every once in a while, a full English class makes me feel unwelcomed. Some classmates grasp the content, but for me, it is a bit too fast. So, I go silent, and I learn nothing. I think translanguaging is better because it is inclusive, and it is not only the fast learners who join." (Student 3)

In the case of Student 3, the explanation for this concrete example of marginalization for lower proficient students demonstrates the inadequacy of a monolingual approach, even if it is the case that for some other students the motivational impact of translanguaging is substantially positive. This is evidenced in the comments made by Student 4.

"Once the teacher uses only English, many of us lose interest because we don't understand. But when we use translanguaging, class is much more interactive. We can laugh, we can ask questions, and we feel connected. It makes me want to join more." (Student 4)

In this case, the use of English only activity is not dismissed.

"Identifying comfort with the practice of translanguaging described the need for practice with English only as "Even though we practice translanguaging, I think we should practice English only. Maybe not all the time, but sometimes, we need it for real situations as exams or speaking with foreign people, or we will be too much in our comfort zone." (Student 4)

The need to balance comfort with the sought after challenge, as described by Student 4, reflects the perspectives of (Ticheloven et al., 2021), where both L1 and L2 should have adjunctive roles in language pedagogy. Student 5, also recognized the benefits of translanguaging in the understanding of advanced ideas:

"It's much clearer when teachers use Indonesian to explain grammar. If it's just the English explanation, the rules are not always clear to me. With translanguaging, we save time and lessons are much faster because we don't get stuck for too long." (Student 5)

In reference to contemplating the long-term benefits of monolingual exposure, this student said:

"Even though it's tough, the English-only class motivates me to learn new words. I remember them more effectively since I have to guess the meaning from the context. If everything is explained in Indonesian, I might get lazy and not learn." (Student 5)

Lastly, Student 6 voiced strong appreciation for translanguaging as a means to inclusivity and learning:

"In our class, not everyone has the same level of English. Some of my friends are really strong, but others find it tough. With translanguaging, everyone is able to stay in the same loop." (Student 6)

Concurrently, this student viewed monolingual practice as vital for readiness to use English in real-life contexts:

"Even though translanguaging is very helpful, I know in the future we cannot always depend on Indonesian. If I want to travel, study abroad, or work with foreigners, I need to be ready with English only. So, I think both methods should be used together." (Student 6)

The collected memories show that students view translanguaging as supportive, confidence-building, and inclusive while monolingually practicing skills and future readiness. There is a need for balance, as their voices suggest. Translanguaging eases anxiety, but monotony, challenge, and frustration exist in all monolingual instruction. In this respect, students' perceptions coincide with those of the teachers, indicating a hybrid approach is probably the most effective way of teaching English in EFL contexts, especially in Indonesia.

Impact of Translanguaging Approach on Students' English Skills

The impacts of translanguaging and monolingual approaches affect students' English skills distinctly. Translanguaging appears to provide the necessary cognitive scaffolding for comprehension and, for some students, especially the lower proficient ones, fosters vocabulary construction and participation to some degree. Conversely, the monolingual approach facilitates immersion and the development of listening to and speaking English fluently, as well as preparing learners for the authentic communicative English.

Teachers observed that while the advantages of translanguaging encompass immediate understanding and the development of confidence, monolingual practice allows for deeper retention of the language. This illustrates the synergistic nature of the approaches, as all the instructors interviewed suggested. As Teacher A highlighted:

"Translanguaging helps my students to understand quickly, especially when we study grammar or difficult texts. They can relate the English structure with their Indonesian knowledge, and this makes learning smoother. But if I always give explanations in Indonesian, they will not practice using English. So, I try to mix: first support with Indonesian, then encourage them to apply it in English tasks." (Teacher A)

This reflection demonstrates that while the adoption of translanguaging practices in the classroom extends students' cognitive capabilities, the monolingual approach, more so than any other, requires and enables students to operate and think in English and interact in real-life contexts. The same idea appears in García & Kleyn (2016), where the authors state that the practice of translanguaging is more than a way of problem-solving; it is a cognitive tool that allows learners to bridge previously acquired knowledge and new language forms.

Translanguaging as described by many learners involves strategies that actively reduce cognitive load and promote participation in class. Several learners described it as helping with understanding complicated concepts and lesson vocabulary. In contrast to profusion of English, learners stated that they enjoyed cognitive and English challenges monolingual shifts. Student 3 described the following experience:

"I acquire new vocabulary more quickly and more effectively when learning Indonesian and English together. When instruction is solely in English, I find it difficult to discern the meaning and often arrive at incorrect assumptions. However, when teachers provide translations, I recollect the concept in both languages, making the meaning more durable." (Student 3)

This illustrates how the use of translanguaging positively impacts the cognitive load, retention, and overall comprehension of the lesson. Research by Zhou & Mann (2021) emphasizes the value of bilingual instructions in fostering cross-linguistic connections as well as deep vocabulary and grammatical understanding. Although, the students felt fluent speaking and listening particularly, monolingual approaches were key. This dual impact was clear for the teachers too. Teacher B shared:

"If we only use translanguaging, the students become too comfortable. They understand, but they don't practice speaking English. I notice that when I push them to answer in English only, their fluency grows little by little. It is hard at first, but later they can answer faster and with more confidence." (Teacher B)

Ticheloven et al. (2021) makes the case immersion in the target language strengthens automaticity and fluency, even if a person feels discomfort at the start. Teachers leaving space in the conversation for students to respond can help students develop spontaneity, and using English without code-switching encourages students to develop accuracy. Students talked about how monolingual instruction 'forced' them to listen and speak, and although this was 'anxiety provoking' at first, it was positive, even if it was 'stressed' at first. Student 5 explained:

"At first, I don't really get what the teacher is trying to say, and I become stressed. Then I started to catch more and more in conversations. It feels great. I am really improving in speaking. I would become really stressed with English if we always used Indonesian because I would become dependent and wouldn't improve." (Student 5)

This is, what we see in the Hansen-Thomas et al. (2021) input hypothesis, testimony fits to the input hypothesis. Meaningful, comprehensible input is essential for language acquisition. Students know that, while comfort of translanguaging they build resilience and independence in English.

Looking at how you described the outcomes, you probably want to highlight how the understanding gained, the vocabulary acquired, and the feeling of belonging received from the use of translanguaging tools contributes to learning English differently, alongside how the lack of cohesive, fluid understanding, and conversational ability in English stems from the use of the monolingual approach. Moreover, both sets of participants recognize the use of 'thick and thin' alternate immersion in the bilingual setting, where thin bilingual immersion refers to the use of translanguaging to support students and thick immersion refers to the monolingual immersion as the desired endpoint. In fact, they should not be viewed as opposing methods. It resonates with the finding of Jiang et al. (2022), as they show how the use of translanguaging in pedagogy embraces the learning of English alongside all other languages rooted in pedagogy. Hence, the focus will not be on the choice of one method at a time, but on how one method will need to be in focus, while the other will be applied at a minimal level to respond to the dynamics of learners driven by the need to communicate, which will most probably suggest the use English.

DISCUSSIONS

The research offers reflections regarding the understanding and use of translanguaging and the experience of translanguaging in EFL classrooms, particularly in the multilingual context of Indonesia. Both observation and interview data provide evidence to demonstrate that translanguaging functions as a conscious instructional practice utilized by educators and learners to draw on and maximize all of their communicational and pedagogical resources to construct meaning, mediate understanding, and actively engage learners. García and Wei (2014) state that translanguaging is not simply code-switching; rather, it is an integrated educational practice whereby multilingualism is no longer viewed as a problem, but rather as an opportunity to be harnessed. The current study demonstrates this practice particularly when teachers weave together English, Bahasa Indonesia, and even local languages during the scaffolding of interaction and comprehension.

As in the work of Kley and García (2019), the participants in this study described the teachers using translanguaging to unpack challenging grammatical or lexical items, paraphrase complex instructions, and affirm students' bilingual replies. These instances of translanguaging showed that this practice is not incidental, but rather purposeful, in pedagogical intent to attain clarity, cognitive accessibility, and affective comfort. In this regard, Yigitbilek (2022) describes the importance of translanguaging as fostering inclusivity through the intermingling of community languages and formal schooling, and thus, making more meaning of the content to be learned. Research has shown the use of more than one language in classroom instruction helps create a context in which students feel acknowledged, valued, and safe to participate, reflecting the perspective of García and Palmer (2017) that translanguaging allows learners to use all the semiotic resources at the intersurface to formulate and communicate their ideas fully.

Students' responses indicate the use of translanguaging in the classroom. When students code switched mixed English and Indonesian, it showed they were actively processing the information, not displaying a language problem. In instances of challenging communicative input, students addressed the teachers in Indonesian asking for clarification, consistent with Liando et al. (2023) findings, which indicate that the use of translanguaging decreases anxiety and enhances understanding. The results fit Sobkowiak's (2022) interpretation of Krashen's affective filter hypothesis that suggests that higher input processing and retention occurs under lower anxiety conditions. By incorporating Indonesian or a regional language in the context of translanguaging, emotional anxiety and the tension of a 'language' barrier were lowered and a motivated and actively participating classroom was formed.

This research said that when students were allowed to use bahasa Indonesia strategically, it eliminated misunderstandings and increased participation from the less confident students. This response is in agreement with Jiang et al. (2022), who critique the "monolingual bias" in EFL teaching and call for more adaptable teaching within multilingual frameworks. Translating for students does not mean that educators are abandoning their students to keep developing their English proficiency. Jiang's and García's (2017) "flexible multilingual pedagogy" describes teaching that balances English proficiency with equitable access to the content for understanding by all learners, and crossing language boundaries to meet student needs is the "flexible multilingual pedagogy" that counters monolingual ideologies. This teaching responds to the "monolingual bias" described by Jiang et al. (2022) because it uses all the students' language resources.

Translanguaging also aids the cognitive process and the transfer of knowledge. Cummins interdependence hypothesis (cited in Susilawati, 2021) argues that first language knowledge and skills will positively contribute to the learning of English, and teachers who promote strategic cross-linguistic

connections will enable that to happen. The research shows that students internalized and retained grammatical concepts more deeply when their learning language pairs were integrated with the explanation of vocabulary or reading texts. Thus, the knowledge differential of fragmenting languages is crossed with translanguaging, which serves to strengthen and amplify cognitive connections in the teaching and learning of a concept.

Culturally speaking, translanguaging attends to the multilingual ecology of Indonesian classrooms, where learners move through linguistic, cultural, and epistemic borders as stated in the literature. It alters the discourse in classrooms from the transmission model of English as a one-way street to a collaboration of meaning-making as a discourse community. As Kuncoroningtyas et al. (2025) indicate, such multilingual pedagogy aligns with the geographical conditions of Indonesia, where education is placed as a mediation between the local realities and global linguistic expectations. The teachers of this study exemplified this mediation by drawing on local culture and explaining English through local idioms and contextual metaphors, thus turning the classroom into a culturally and humanistically relevant learning environment.

Considering the emotional aspects of translanguaging is important. Students noted that when all aspects of their linguistic identity were recognized, their self-confidence soared, along with their comfort with communicative interactions. Students also emphasized that lessons that incorporated translanguaging made learning English more enjoyable and more relaxing. This supports García's (2020) conceptualization of the phenomenon as empowering and emotionally and linguistically empowering. This kind of inclusivity speaks to the academic performance of the learners, and the constructs of their belonging and agency. Finding, as Wang et al. (2025) do, that translanguaging is a mode of presenting knowledge that integrates emotional and cognitive dimensions to facilitate deep learning, adds a further dimension of thought, language, and identity to the previously discussed constructs agency and belonging.

The effectiveness of translanguaging will always depend on the teachers' pedagogical awareness and reflective judgment. As the findings demonstrated, planners and strategic users of translanguaging exhibit greater understanding and enhanced interaction during classroom sessions. Conversely, the lack of coherent structure and planning when multilingualism is implemented will lead to disorder and reduced opportunities to engage with English. This underscores the argument made by García and Wei (2014) concerning the often-absent aim, intentionality, and design of translanguaging; it must not be driven solely by impulse and routine.

The present research builds on the use of translanguaging in EFL (English as a Foreign Language) classrooms as it constitutes a positive change in the pedagogical practices and ideologies in the field. This adds to the increasing literature on translanguaging as it's proven to aid learning, encourage students' active participation, and make English language instruction more humane, particularly in culturally diverse contexts (Liando et al., 2023; Yigitbilek, 2022; Kuncoroningtyas et al., 2025).

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, the researcher sees translanguaging as a transformative pedagogical approach to the reconfiguration of classroom interactions, meaning-making, and engagement of learners in English as a Foreign Language (EFL) contexts. Additionally, the use of translanguaging in English as a Foreign Language (EFL) Junior High School Kotamobagu Integration pedagogical practice in a dynamic purposeful manner incorporates diverse linguistic tools to aid understanding, and promote inclusive and participatory engagement. Practitioners of this approach use English, and Indonesian, and at times regional languages to help learners understand, explain, and make the class more dialogic. Observational data described the impact of translanguaging on inclusive classroom culture. Students describe reduced anxiety and increased confidence to engage in classroom tasks because their English proficiency boundaries no longer restricted them. Moreover, teachers and students hold balanced and contextual perceptions of the translanguaging approach in teaching English as a Foreign Language (EFL) at Junior High School in Kotamobagu.

Students and teachers at Junior High School Kotamobagu agree that the most effective strategy in this EFL context is a hybrid (balanced) approach in which translanguaging is purposefully and strategically used to promote understanding and lessen affective barriers, while at the same time, adopting the monolingual approach to build proficiency and prepare students for communication on a global scale. The Impact of Translanguaging Approach on Students' English Skills enhances understanding, vocabulary, and inclusivity within English learning while the monolingual approach positively influences fluency, listening, and communicative competence. Teachers and learners alike stress the need for equilibrium, whereby translanguaging functions as scaffolding and monolingual

learning is the endpoint for achieving fluency. The proficiencies are viewed not as oppositional but as complementary within the framework of varied stages of the continuum of language skill acquisition. Jiang et al. (2022) focuses on the conclusion that translanguaging pedagogy does not erode English learning but simply incorporates other dialects and languages to enrich the learning experience. The effectiveness of these approaches is not based on the exclusion of one for the other but how they are taught in conjunction with one another to address the learning needs of the students which changes on a regular basis.

REFERENCES

- Canagarajah, S. (2011). Translanguaging in the classroom: Emerging issues for research and pedagogy. *Applied Linguistics*, 33(1), 1–28. <https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/amr030>
- Clarke, V., & Braun, V. (2017). Thematic analysis. *The Journal of Positive Psychology*, 12(3), 297–298. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17439760.2016.1262613>
- Creese, A., & Blackledge, A. (2015). *Translanguaging and identity in educational settings*. Annual Review of Applied Linguistics, 35, 20–35. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190514000233>
- García, M. S., & Palmer, D. (2017). Translanguaging pedagogies for positive identities in two-way dual language bilingual education. *Journal of Language, Identity & Education*, 16(4), 245–255. <https://doi.org/doi.dx.doi.org/10.1080/15348458.2017.1329016>
- García, O., & Kleyn, T. (2016). Translanguaging with multilingual students: Learning from classroom moments. *Translanguaging with Multilingual Students: Learning from Classroom Moments*, 5(1), 1–235. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315695242>
- García, O., & Otheguy, R. (2020). Plurilingualism and translanguaging: Commonalities and divergences. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 23(1), 17–35. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050.2019.1598932>
- García, O., & Wei, L. (2014). *Translanguaging: Language, bilingualism and education*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Hansen-Thomas, H., Stewart, M. A., Flint, P., & Dollar, T. (2021). Co-learning in the High School English Class through Translanguaging: Emergent Bilingual Newcomers and Monolingual Teachers. *Journal of Language, Identity & Education*, 20(3), 151–166. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1080/15348458.2020.1726759>
- Jiang, L., Gu, M. M., & Fang, F. (2022). Multimodal or multilingual? Native English teachers' engagement with translanguaging in Hong Kong TESOL classrooms. *Applied Linguistics Review*. <https://doi.org/10.1515/APPLIREV-2022-0062/MACHINEREADABLECITATION/RIS>
- Kleyn, T., & García, O. (2019). Translanguaging as an act of transformation: restructuring teaching and learning for emergent bilingual students. *The Handbook of TESOL in K-12*, 69–82.
- Kuncoroningtyas, F. S. A., Sumardi, S., & Putra, K. A. (2025). EFL Students' Attitudes Towards Translanguaging Practice: Its Implications for Willingness to Communicate in Indonesian Vocational Classrooms. *Journal of Languages and Language Teaching*, 13(1), 255–267. <https://doi.org/10.33394/JOLLT.V13I1.12711>
- Liando, N. V. F., Dallyono, R., Tatipang, D. P., & Lengkoan, F. (2023). Among English, Indonesian and local language: Translanguaging practices in an Indonesian EFL classroom. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 13(1). <https://doi.org/10.17509/IJAL.V13I1.58270>
- Liando, N. V. F., Tatipang, D. P., & Lengkoan, F. (2022). A Study of Translanguaging Practices in an EFL Classroom in Indonesian Context: A Multilingual Concept. *Research and Innovation in Language Learning*, 5(2), 167–185. <https://doi.org/10.33603/RILL.V5I2.6986>
- Liando, N., & Tatipang, D. P. (2022). English or Indonesian Language? Parents' Perception Toward Children's Second Language Learning Context. *Lingua Idea*, 13(1), 61–75. <https://doi.org/10.20884/1.jli.2022.13.1.5749>
- Lippi-Green, R. (2012). *English with an accent: Language, ideology, and discrimination in the United States* (2nd ed.). Routledge.
- Putrawan, G., & Putrawan, G. E. (2022). Translanguaging Practices In EFL Classrooms: Evidence From Indonesia. *CaLLs (Journal of Culture, Arts, Literature, and Linguistics)*, 8(1), 69–86. <https://doi.org/10.30872/calls.v8i1.7973>
- Sobkowiak, P. (2022). Translanguaging practices in the EFL classroom - the Polish context. *Linguistics and Education*, 69, 101020. <https://doi.org/10.1016/J.LINGED.2022.101020>
- Susilawati, T. (2021). Pengembangan Pembelajaran Speaking Berbasis Teori Translanguaging Menggunakan Aplikasi English For Kid. *PISCES: Proceeding of Integrative Science Education Seminar*, 345–352. <https://prosiding.iainponorogo.ac.id/index.php/pisces>

- Ticheloven, A., Blom, E., Leseman, P., & McMonagle, S. (2021). 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>
- Ticheloven, A., Blom, E., Leseman, P., & McMonagle, S. (2021). Translanguaging challenges in multilingual classrooms: Practitioner perspectives and pedagogical implications. *International Journal of Multilingualism*, 18(3), 450–469. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14790718.2020.1716774>
- Wang, X., Xia, C., Zhao, Q., & Chen, L. (2025). Enhancing second language motivation and facilitating vocabulary acquisition in an EFL classroom through translanguaging practices. *Applied Linguistics Review*, 1–34. https://doi.org/10.1515/APPLIREV-2024-0292/ASSET/GRAPHIC/J_APPLIREV-2024-0292_FIG_002.JPG
- Yasar, M. Y., & 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;REQUESTEDJOURNAL:JOURNAL:RILL20;WGROUP:STRING:PUBLICATION>
- Yasar, M. Y., & 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;REQUESTEDJOURNAL:JOURNAL:RILL20;WGROUP:STRING:PUBLICATION>
- Yigitbilek, D. (2022). Translanguaging Life Writing: “Auto”biography-Driven Writing Instruction. *TESL-EJ*, 26(3). <https://doi.org/10.55593/ej.26103a7>
- Yin, R. K. (2009). *Case study research: Design and methods* (4th ed.). Sage Publications.
- Zhou, X. E., & Mann, S. (2021). Translanguaging in a Chinese university CLIL classroom: Teacher strategies and student attitudes. *Studies in Second Language Learning and Teaching*, 11(2), 265–289.