

# **Translanguaging Pedagogy in the EAP Classroom of Private Universities in Bangladesh**

**Srabosti Saha  
Brac University**

**Mohammad Mosiur Rahman  
University of Liberal Arts Bangladesh**

*Translanguaging has become a topic of discussion in recent decades. Private institutions at Bangladesh's tertiary level have adopted English as the Medium of Instruction (EMI) to strengthen students' language abilities and make them proficient in English so they may confidently face the world. However, English remains the only language of instruction in educational institutions, as students only converse in English with their teachers but use their mother tongue with their classmates. Recent international research has demonstrated that when the target language is taught in the mother tongue, translanguaging is an effective technique. This study adopted a mixed-methods technique to determine teachers' and students' views toward translanguaging. The statistics indicate that students have a favorable opinion of the technique, whereas teacher perceptions differ. Nonetheless, it also suggests that students demand maximum exposure to their original language, which is not attainable in EAP contexts. Due to their existing knowledge and experience, teachers cannot accept translanguaging. The research indicates that there is a moderate amount of mother language usage in EAP classrooms.*

*Keywords: translanguaging, language attitudes, EAP, pedagogy, L1, target language*

## **INTRODUCTION**

Due to the expanding phenomenon of internationalization in higher education (EMI), programs or courses on English for academic purposes (EAP) have been adopted and implemented in non-native English-speaking contexts as a result of education and linguistics research (Kirkpatrick & Liddicoat, 2017; Hamid et al., 2013; Hu & lei, 2014; Macaro et al., 2018; Rahman, Singh, & Karim, 2018; Rabbidge, 2019). Due to the emphasis on education and linguistics research, programs or courses on English for academic purposes (EAP) have been adopted and implemented in non-native English-speaking situations (Kirkpatrick & Liddicoat, 2017; Hamid et al., 2013; Hu & lei, 2014; Macaro et al., 2018; Rahman, Singh, & Karim, 2018; Rabbidge, 2019). Similarly, globalization's impact on Bangladesh's educational system has likely increased the significance of English as a tool that can facilitate the country's and its people's further economic development (Hamid & Rahman, 2019; Rahman & Pandian, 2018). English as a medium of instruction (EMI) and English for academic purposes (EAP) implementation is centered on English-based monolingual teaching principles that inhibit the use of other languages in classrooms (Liddicoat, 2016; Rabbidge, 2019), including Bangladesh (Rahman et al., 2020), which separates the linguistic

repertoire of the speakers and the view that different languages of instruction should be kept separate (see Wei, 2018). Translanguaging pedagogy involves questioning monolingual beliefs and conventions in language instruction in language teaching classrooms (such as EAP courses in this study) (Canagarajah, 2018; Garcia & Li, 2014; Wei). Translanguaging defines the phenomena as the use of an entire linguistic repertoire or a variety of speakers across socially and politically determined parameters of designated or named languages or several languages (Wei, 2018). Translanguaging pedagogies may therefore contradict and modify English-only techniques in TESOL courses (Tian et al., 2020).

This research endeavors to investigate the potential benefits of translanguaging as an EAP teaching tool considering the aforementioned context and will also investigate how instructors and students make effective use of translanguaging in the context of instruction and learning and their perspective in university-level EAP classrooms. Alongside this, it also intends to assess the efficacy of applying the translanguaging process in EAP classes at the university level and relate it to the perspectives of various stakeholders towards the translanguaging process. There are a few works on the relationship between translanguaging, transglossia, and translation in the context of Bangladeshi society (Sultana, 2015; Kabir, 2019), translanguaging in STEM classrooms (see Rahman & Singh, 2022), but little research on teachers' and students' attitudes toward translanguaging in the ESP classroom at the university level in Bangladesh.

## CONCEPTUALIZING TRANSLANGUAGING

Translanguaging is a relatively new phenomenon in the realm of language education and instruction. It has gained popularity due to linguists' belief that learning a second language is never meant to replace L1. Rather than being monolingual in another language, the purpose of learning a new language is to become multilingual (Wei, 2017). Thus, the concept of translanguaging, which encourages the use of previously acquired language and experience while learning a new language, becomes a significant term in this discipline. Cen Williams (1994) discovered that translanguaging existed in Welsh schools in the 1980s. Later, it was advocated by two books: Baker's (2001, 2006, 2011) *Foundations of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism* and Garcia's (2009a) *Bilingual Education in the 21st Century*. Translanguaging is the process of constructing meaning, influencing experiences, and acquiring comprehension and knowledge using two languages (Baker, 2011). Translanguaging is fundamentally concerned with communication and function rather than form, cognitive activity, and language formation (Lewis et al., 2012). According to William (1994), translanguaging contributes to the maximization of the learner's and the teacher's linguistic resources for problem-solving and knowledge construction because it is a language education pedagogy in which students hear or read a lesson in one language and produce work in the other. Translanguaging has been discovered to be highly effective in educational institutions where the style of language instruction differs from the languages of the students. Translanguaging transforms power dynamics and focuses the teaching and learning process on meaning-making, experience enhancement, and identity development; it also empowers both the student and the teacher (Garcia 2009; Creese and Blackledge 2015).

As both translanguaging and code swapping are components of multilingual practices, it is frequently observed that many consider supplanting them (Wei, 2011). Nevertheless, the two conceptions are distinct. The fundamental distinction between translanguaging and code-switching is that, in the case of translanguaging, designated languages such as Bangla, Hindi, French, or English are acknowledged as social constructions, which are natural to the language user (Makini & Pennycook, 2006). Regarding code-switching, however, the language acts as a distinct entity inside the bi- or multilingual user population (Otheguy et al., 2015). Translanguaging differs from code-switching in that it does not adhere to the monolingual preconceptions that have traditionally oppressed bilingual speakers (Garcia & Wei, 2014). Overall, a more inclusive, nondeficit account of language use as compared to traditional code-switching literature has been described as having translanguaged (Creese & Blackledge, 2015; Garcia & Wei). Translanguaging represents the single coherent language system within a language user as an idiolect or linguistic repertory to portray the character more truly. In contrast, code flipping is based on the labels that society assigns to languages, which are essentially language usage generalizations (Makoni & Pennycook, 2006). These lexical variations are significant because they influence how experiences are analyzed and

portrayed (Creese & Blackledge, 2015; MacSwan, 2017). Therefore, translanguaging is a phenomenon in which language users can be more casual and at ease with the target language. It also increases the confidence of the bilingual speaker in their language usage.

## **TRANSLANGUAGING FUNCTIONS IN LANGUAGE TEACHING IN AN EAP CONTEXT**

In the preceding discussion, we attempted to define translanguaging. However, there is no common definition of translanguaging as of present. Translanguaging in education refers to the use of a single language to enhance the other language, hence increasing the student's comprehension and activity in both languages (Williams, 2020). According to NAGY (2018), there are numerous approaches to integrating translanguaging in the classroom, depending on the student's linguistic background and language proficiency. Thus, the purpose of translanguaging is to enable language learners to utilize their linguistic abilities to the maximum by removing the need to become native-like and allowing the speaker to adhere to the norms. In addition, translanguaging in the classroom serves as a bond between participants with diverse linguistic backgrounds and as a scaffolding mechanism that encourages emerging bilinguals to keep up with more advanced students while simultaneously demonstrating and developing their linguistic skills and abilities.

Implementing translanguaging pedagogies in a classroom of English for Academic Purposes (EAP) has both advantages and obstacles, as noted by numerous eminent academics. Baker (2011), a multilingual specialist who coined the term translanguaging in English, asserts that in an institutional setting, translanguaging enables students to get a deeper grasp of the subject. Reading and discussing a topic in one language and then writing about it in another requires processing and digestion of the subject matter.

Baker (2001) cites further advantages of translating in the classroom, such as strengthening the weaker language, facilitating home-school linkages and cooperation, and integrating native speakers with early learners. In addition, Stathopoulou (2015) stresses the significance of translanguaging in testing and the significance of tests that favor cross-language mediation methods.

Translanguaging strategies can be utilized in a variety of speaking and listening practices, as well as reading and writing skills, to allow or encourage the use of other languages and the target language (L2). Practicing translanguaging enables students to use their full linguistic capabilities within a scheduled classroom activity and encourages weaker students to participate in more learning activities. As translanguaging approaches create a more relaxed environment by not strictly adhering to monolingual conventions, the learning process becomes a creative one depending on the language skills of everyone who interacts to construct and negotiate meaning.

NAGY (2018) identifies a substantial barrier to implementing translanguaging in the classroom. The thought of allowing multilingual language use in the classroom can be intimidating for teachers who have been instructed following monolingual language standards that discourage the use of other languages in the classroom. Also, teachers may feel overwhelmed by the presence of speakers of multiple languages conversing in their language. In a multilingual classroom, if the instructor does not know most of the languages, it may be difficult for the teacher to manage the classroom. According to a study conducted by Ticheloven, Blom, Leseman, and McMonagle (2019), students' attitudes toward translanguaging are divided. It is considered an excellent form of emotional release. However, linguistic isolation, misunderstanding, and a lack of willingness to learn the language are noted as obstacles. Nonetheless, it is essential to recognize that translanguaging activities, when executed effectively, do not degrade language skills in a particular language; rather, they promote language development by exposing speakers to new vocabulary. This allows students to participate in learning exercises more effectively and to use their language abilities with greater confidence in any setting. The introduction of translanguaging strategies alleviates the pressure of articulating in perfect English and creates a more comfortable environment in the classroom, allowing students to take an active role in class and use their language abilities with greater confidence (NAGY, 2018). Therefore, it is evident that implementing translanguaging pedagogies in the classroom has certain benefits. However, the difficulty of educating instructors to implement the subsequent procedure cannot be overlooked.

## **STAKEHOLDERS' ATTITUDE TOWARDS TRANSLANGUAGING**

Numerous studies have been conducted on the attitudes of stakeholders, primarily teachers, students, and parents, toward the practice of translanguaging. In terms of their attitudes toward translanguaging, the research reveals a wide variety of results. It should also be considered that the majority of these findings were derived from the actual behaviors of instructor participants, rather than a systematic and in-depth investigation of their views. This concept can be linked to Macaro's (2005) concept of a "continuum of perspective," which explains such different beliefs. Additionally, investigations uncovered a diversity of instructor jobs. Like, Creese and Blackledge (2011) examined supplementary schools in the United Kingdom (also known as heritage language schools, community language schools, and supplementary schools) and discovered that while some teachers adopted flexible bilingual pedagogy, others insisted on separate bilingualism. In addition, Wang (2019a, b) found that while many teachers were positive about translanguaging strategies, others felt there was no need for them or felt guilty about using them because they had been trained for years to conduct monolingual classrooms; consequently, they continued to use monolingual approaches. This occurs for three reasons: a. virtual position, a monolingual perspective favoring exclusive use of L2; b. maximal position, understanding the importance and benefit of using multiple languages followed by a sense of shame in using non-L2; and c. ideal position, a strong belief that learning can be enhanced by using multiple languages at various times. In addition, the research identifies the barriers that prevent teachers from adopting a translanguaging posture in the classroom (Deroo and Ponzio, 2019; Tian, 2020; Wang, 2019a; Wang and Kirkpatrick, 2012). For instance, the institutional language policy, the absence of implementation instructions, personal linguistic puritanism, or ideology, as well as assumptions and perceived risks. Alongside the professors' opinion on translanguaging, there is also a diminished interest in asking pupils about this topic.

On the attitudes of pupils, a tremendous quantity of study has been conducted. According to Carstens (2016), most university students in South Africa believe that translanguaging tactics facilitate conceptual learning, enhance emotive experiences, boost confidence and vocabulary, and enhance group cohesion. The research by Moody, Chowdhury and Eslami (2019) suggested that graduate students saw translanguaging as a natural, language-learning-beneficial practice. However, there is a counterargument that translanguaging does not aid in the understanding of their major's terminology due to the complexity of their L1; several respondents opted to utilize English since they regarded it to be the universal language (Fang & Liu, 2020).

As a result, research investigating parental attitudes has been done. Wilson (2020) discovered that while the monolingual approach is still present in the worldview of some parents, a substantial proportion of parents consider bilingualism as a normal translanguaging activity. They argue that certain notions cannot be accurately transmitted by translation and that language usage is contingent upon the situations in which it is acquired. According to Fang & Liu (2020), it is essential to investigate the attitudes of parents to determine if they would support the use of translanguaging strategies in the language acquisition process of their children. In conclusion, the studied research reveals that numerous stakeholders, particularly students, have a generally favorable view toward translanguaging techniques. In conclusion, the reviewed research reveals that diverse stakeholders, particularly students, have a generally favorable attitude toward translanguaging behaviors. Even though the stakeholders recognized certain educational roles of translanguaging, obstacles such as a monolingual policy, a lack of institutional guidance, the instability of L1 as a resource for subject learning, and the ubiquity of L1 usage prohibited translanguaging activities.

## **BILINGUAL PRACTICES IN ENGLISH-MEDIUM UNIVERSITIES IN BANGLADESH**

In this aspect, Bangladesh is a monolingual country, with 95% of the population speaking Bangla as their native tongue (Bangladesh, 1998). After the country achieved independence in 1971, the new nationalist administration designated Bangla as the single official language and the sole medium of teaching at all educational levels (Haque, 1989). English was introduced in the sixth grade in 1974 and was taught through the twelfth grade. The National Curriculum (2010) (Rahman & Pandian, 2018a, p. 45) states that

English, as the language of science, technology, and globalization, will play a significant role in achieving the national goal of “Digital Bangladesh 2021.” English is therefore a necessary subject in the elementary through high school national curriculum of Bangladesh (Hamid & Erling, 2016). To improve English communication, the government replaced the Grammar Translation Method (GTM) with Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) in 1996. Despite this, the execution of this phase was riddled with challenges. The primary assumption of CLT is that using a student’s native language in the classroom will enhance their reliance on it and prevent them from attempting to interpret meaning through contextual cues. However, despite the introduction of the new technique, instructors were neglected (Fullan, 2007) since they were accustomed to the teacher-centered approach and the new westernized style of CLT was culturally incompatible (Yasmin, 2009). Several studies claim that students in Bangladeshi schools have trouble acquiring the language. Students acquire affective filters because of teachers’ insufficient grasp of how to provide to students, which is taught at the elementary and secondary school levels. As the Private University Act of 1992, as amended in 2010, promotes the acquisition of English at the tertiary level (Rahman, 2015), these students have difficulty communicating fluently at the university level. Atkinson (1987) proposes three reasons why a small amount of L1 should be allowed in an EAP context: a learner-preferred strategy, a humanistic approach, and a time-saving technique. Harmer (2001) identifies five similar reasons: the class activity involves L1, translation from and into L2 is natural, and students enjoy utilizing L1. Teachers also use students’ L1 to comfort them. The amount of L1 utilized by teachers depends on the student’s learning methods and proficiency levels. Consequently, the establishment of bilingual classrooms at universities can contribute to the strengthening of students’ abilities. In addition, the Private University Act of 1992, as amended in 2010, encourages English study at the tertiary level (Rahman, 2015). In addition, English is a required subject from class one to class twelve in all government and private schools (Mirza, Mahmud & Jabbar, 2012).

There have been many theoretical arguments for and against utilizing the learners’ mother tongue or first language (L1) in second or foreign language instruction. According to some research, the use of L1 hinders the acquisition of L2 (e.g., Mahadeo, 2006; Tsao, 2001). Other scholars (e.g., Baily, 2005) assert that it is difficult to utilize L1 in a multilingual classroom, whereas Atkinson (1987), Harbord (1992), and Nation (2003) concluded that utilizing L1 in a monolingual situation is typical, and advantageous. In a study conducted by Mirza, Mahmud, and Jabbar (2012) on teachers at the tertiary level, they discovered that Bangla plays a crucial role in the teaching of English, as the use of L1 provides learners with a tension-free environment, lowers their affective filters, and thereby aids in the anchoring of L2 concepts.

## **RESEARCH DESIGN**

To better comprehend human nature, this research seeks to understand the instructors’ and students’ viewpoints on translanguaging. For this objective, qualitative research is appropriate. It was impossible to interview pupils because of the pandemic. To follow the requirements of quantitative research, a questionnaire was issued. As a result, both methodologies were combined in the research. This study aims to understand how translanguaging is used in EAP classes from both the instructors’ and students’ viewpoints.

When pursuing a quantitative strand of a study, the mixed approach sampling researcher frequently favors techniques that rely on creating representative samples. The mixed approach sampling researcher, on the other hand, typically employs sampling procedures that create knowledge-rich situations while addressing a qualitative strand of a sample. Combining the two orientations enables the sampler of the mixed approach to generate complementary datasets that give both depth and breadth of knowledge about the phenomena being analyzed (Teddlie & Yu, 2007).

The research site was at various private universities in Bangladesh. The universities chosen were mostly from Dhaka, Rajshahi, and Chittagong and are the best in the respective areas. The language of instruction at the universities is English. All university students are required to take 6 credits of English courses or EAP. Furthermore, English is used as the medium of instruction for their departmental courses.

The study included about 160 students. It included both men and women. Their departments ranged from engineering, science, business, and the arts at the aforementioned prestigious universities. All the students have either completed or are currently enrolled in English classes. The six credit hours of English are divided into two EAP courses. Their reactions to the inclusion of their Mother Tongue in the L2 course will be monitored.

In addition, the online classes of seven teachers were observed, and an interview was conducted. Four of the teachers were female, while the remaining four were male. The teachers all had different work experiences; however, they all had a degree in ELT, though their highest level of qualification differed.

**TABLE 1**  
**INFORMATION ABOUT THE TEACHERS WHO WERE INTERVIEWED**

Name of the teacher for the survey	Experience Gained	The highest level of qualification
T1	6	Master's in ELT
T2	4	Master's in ELT
T3	3	Master's in ELT
T4	2	Master's in TESOL
T5	10	Master's in ELT
T6	20	Master's in TESOL
T7	5	Master's in TESOL

They were conscious of their rights to revoke the information provided, their right to be removed from the study, the benefits they would receive from it, how the research findings would be shared, and ultimately, the secret and confidentiality of the data provided during the study.

## DATA COLLECTION & ANALYSIS

The data was obtained in 2021, during the pandemic through a combination of methodologies. Initially, online classroom observation was undertaken to gain a better understanding of language usage in natural contexts. In addition, a Google Form questionnaire was provided to students to determine their perspectives on translanguaging practice (see Appendix A). Finally, semi-structured interviews with teachers were undertaken to get insight into their perspectives and attitudes toward translanguaging procedures in the classroom (see Appendix B).

Observation of the classroom was undertaken to better comprehend the functions of translanguaging procedures in that educational setting. The research subject, purpose, and follow-up methods, which included classroom observations and face-to-face interviews, were emailed to the teachers. The classes lasted 80 minutes, were observed twice over the course of the trimester, and were recorded. In this study, a total of 360 minutes of classroom teaching were recorded and analyzed.

Then, a bilingual online questionnaire adapted from Moody et al. (2019) and Nambisan was administered to the students to assess their opinions regarding translanguaging in classrooms (2014). One hundred college students volunteered to participate in the online study. The questionnaire was developed as an online survey, and the link was circulated to students at this university using social media platforms with the support of several lecturers and students. Students who took the online survey assessed their level of agreement with the survey statements on a five-point Likert scale (strongly disagree, disagree, neutral, agree, and strongly agree). The questionnaire offered seven questions (Q1–Q7) regarding the students' perspectives on translanguaging procedures in general.

In addition, the five teachers who permitted classroom observation for evaluation participated in the semi-structured interviews. The interviews were performed in both English and Bangla for the benefit of both the researchers and the participants, and so that the participants could answer the questions (Mann, 2011). The participants were notified about the study and its purpose, and their approval to participate in a

verbal interview session was sought, with the option to withdraw. Aware of the conditions and guidelines of the interview, participants volunteered their most suitable time for an interview and assisted with the research by describing their experiences, making observations, and answering research-related questions. The order of these interviews was as follows: personal records, positions on the use of different languages in classrooms, and the intentional or unintentional usage of other languages. Each interview lasted twenty to forty minutes (see Table 1 for the profile of the participants and detailed information about the instruments).

Every single interview was recorded, and the tapes were afterward transcribed word for word and given back to the interviewees for their consideration. These findings were jotted down in field notes for future reference. Gay and Airasian (2003) assert that field notes describe what the observer experienced, perceived, or felt during the observation. The data was retrieved from the questionnaire using Microsoft Excel, and the results were evaluated using contextual thematic interpretation (Corbin & Strauss, 2008; Flick, 2006; Dornyei, 2007). After digesting the evidence, an inductive strategy was utilized to interpret the data. During the study, data from each participant is analyzed separately, and information can be categorized into themes based on interview responses. During the discussion and finding part, the interview data were also analyzed in depth utilizing content analytic techniques.

## **FINDINGS**

### **EAP Teachers' Attitudes Toward Translanguaging**

The first interview question was whether they liked switching between two languages in the EAP classroom. Teachers' opinions ranged from allowing a certain amount of L1 use in the classroom to not allowing L1 use at all at the tertiary level.

#### *Best Possible Position*

T1, T3, T4, and T5 believe that because students see them as role models, using L1 may hinder students' learning; however, they all agreed that they do allow students to convey their understanding in L1 if they struggle to find correct vocabulary, and they help them to restate the sentence in the target language through scaffolding.

*"I also believe that students should be allowed to switch to L1 on occasion if the content/lesson warrants it, or if a specific group of students struggles to generate and share ideas, L1 switching should be permitted within limits." (T5)*

However, another teacher correctly identifies the reason for using L2 in Bangladeshi EAP classrooms. In a monolingual country like ours, where Bangla is the medium of instruction for 95% of students for the past 12 years, introducing English as a medium of instruction throws students for a loop. Bangla practice alongside English should be required in the classroom. English not only causes stumbling blocks in students' understanding, but it also isolates those with limited command of the language. As a result of English, students' active participation in classroom discussions is undermined. Given these claims, English and Bangla should be established as mediums of instruction in higher education.

It was discovered during the online class observation of these teachers that they are not very open to responding in Bangla. They listen to students' points in Bangla but then ask them to translate them into English. While the students translate, the teachers assist them with vocabulary so that they can fully comprehend. The teachers use the Bangladeshi context constantly, but they also mention the global context because there were few foreign students from Africa and other South Asian countries. Because of the nature of online classes, participation was average because the interaction was limited to either asking or answering questions from both ends.

### *Maximum and Virtual Position*

T2, T6, and T7 are adamant that L1 should not be used when teaching a target language. Continuous reinforcement of the target language can help them improve their knowledge of the new language. Because all of the teachers are drawn from institutions with the same ideology, they must adhere to the university's policies. Because the university uses English as the Medium of Instruction (EMI) and believes in Communicative Language Teaching (CLT), the teachers adhere to the university's ideas and teaching method.

*"I believe we should use the target language while teaching in a tertiary EAP classroom."*  
(T7)

*"Switching is not a good technique in my opinion if the goal is to teach a language. However, in this particular case, it may help with other subjects."* (T6)

The teachers' responses above paint a vivid picture of the various beliefs that teachers hold regarding the use of L1 in the classroom. As a result, refraining from using L1 in an EAP classroom can stymie students' comprehension of the material. It is critical to thoroughly understand the content before employing the target language; thus, translanguaging remains an essential component of EAP.

While watching the above-mentioned teachers' online classes It was observed that students who spoke attempted to communicate in English. Teachers discouraged students from speaking in Bangla by stating that they did not understand the language. Although the encouragement forces them to learn the target language, their participation decreases. However, this could be a disadvantage of online classes. Teachers continue to use contextual content for both Bangladeshis and foreign nationals.

### **EAP Students' Attitudes Toward Translanguaging**

The results of question 1 revealed that students were more likely to view translanguaging as a natural practice for bilingual people. We can also see this in their response as a mean of 4.2 and a standard deviation of 0.7, indicating that most students strongly agreed, agreed, and were neutral with the claim. Similarly, for question 3, the students generally perceived translanguaging as an appropriate practice, as evidenced by the mean of 3.94 and standard deviation of 0.93, indicating that most students strongly agreed or agreed with the claim. However, the standard deviation for question 4 is 0.98, indicating that a relatively high proportion of students strongly agreed or agreed. According to question 5, translanguaging indicated low English proficiency, with a mean of 3.64. In question 6, they also implied negative attitudes toward the statement that 'language instructors should avoid translanguaging because it will prevent second language learning,' with a mean of 2.97 and a standard deviation of 1.12, indicating that most students who chose the option strongly agree or agree.

**TABLE 2**  
**STUDENTS' ACCEPTANCE OF THE TEACHERS' TRANSLANGUAGING PRACTICES**

No	Item	Mean	Standard Deviation
1	To explain concept	4.07	0.87
2	To give instructions	3.94	0.89
3	To give feedback	3.94	0.88
4	To praise students	3.98	0.90
5	To bond with students	3.79	0.96
6	To clarify activity rules	4.06	0.88
7	To help less proficient students	4.09	0.81



**TABLE 3**  
**STUDENTS' ACCEPTANCE OF THEIR TRANSLANGUAGING PRACTICES**

No	Item	Mean	Standard Deviation
1	To discuss content in small groups	4.07	0.87
2	To help peers during classroom activities	3.94	0.89
3	To brainstorm during classroom activities	3.94	0.88
4	To enable participation by less proficient students	3.98	0.90
5	To answer teachers' questions	3.79	0.96
6	To ask permission from teachers	4.06	0.88

As shown in Tables 2 and 3, the questions (numbers 8 to 20) on the students' questionnaire were designed to identify students' attitudes toward translanguaging activities in specific classroom situations. Table 2 shows student acceptance of translanguaging practices used by their teachers. The overall mean for Table 2 is 3.98, and the mean standard deviation is 0.1, indicating that the majority of answers are centered on agreement. The highest mean values were for 'explain concepts,' 'clarify activity rules,' and 'help less proficient students,' indicating the need for scaffolding (M = 4.07, 4.06, and 4.09, respectively). In other cases, translanguaging practices were mostly accepted, with mean scores ranging from 3.94 to 3.79.

Table 3 shows students' acceptance of the translanguaging practices they use. The overall mean for Table 3 is 3.96, and the mean standard deviation is 0.1, indicating that the majority of answers are centered on agreement. The highest mean values were for 'discuss content in small groups and 'ask permission from teachers.' (M=4.07 and 4.06, respectively) demonstrates the requirement for scaffolding. In other cases, translanguaging practices were mostly accepted, with mean scores ranging from 4.07 to 3.79.

### **Teachers Characterize the Use of Translanguaging**

#### *Establishing Rapport*

T3 also believes that using L1 for rapport building can help students reduce their affective filters.

"Talking about the local context and using Bangla idioms can help students feel more at ease in class. And I notice that my students become more open to sharing their ideas as they become more familiar with the context or idioms. I used this strategy in the beginning, but as we progressed through the course, I limited the use of L1 in the classroom." (T3)

This allows us to see how Translanguaging can help us build a better rapport with the students. As previously stated, students rarely use English to communicate with others outside of the classroom. Thus, if L1 is used sparingly in the classroom, it may help students transition more smoothly into the new environment.

#### *Content Localization*

Though each teacher had a different perspective on using L1 in the classroom, they all agreed on contextualizing the content for EAP students to preserve the culture and authenticity of the content.

"In my classroom, I never use any foreign context. For example, rather than Christmas, my contents or assessment will focus on Pohela Baishak, and I will discuss Sajek Valley rather than the Alps. It assists me in connecting with my students." (T2)

### **Students Describe the Use of Translanguaging**

#### *Learning New Languages*

Students' perspectives were derived once again from a questionnaire distributed to the students. The level of agreement for question 4 was the highest, indicating that students were thinking about the role of

translanguaging in learning L2. The mean is 4.31 and the standard deviation is 0.79, indicating that most students strongly agreed or agreed that translanguaging was necessary for learning a new language.

### *Building Trust and Rapport*

Furthermore, the answers to question 5 revealed that the students believed Translanguaging increased their confidence in the use of English, with a mean of 4.14 and a standard deviation of 0.91, indicating that the opinion did not vary greatly as it was concentrated on the agreement. For question 7, which discussed students' attitudes toward teachers' translanguaging activities in class, the majority of students agreed that using translanguaging in a class by an educator would be beneficial for bilingual students, with a mean of 4.09 and a standard deviation of 0.72 for building rapport.

## **DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION**

This study studied the attitudes of both professors and students in EAP classrooms at private Bangladeshi institutions. Teachers and students agree that English should be the primary language of communication and interaction in EAP classrooms, but they believe that the use of translanguaging in teaching and learning is advantageous for both.

This study intended to shed light on translanguaging practices and beliefs in EAP classrooms at a university in Bangladesh. Due to the English-only policy, teacher participants avoid translanguaging tactics to facilitate content teachings, such as concept/language point clarification, comprehension checks, and localization of topic knowledge. It is thought that students have already attained a particular degree of language proficiency. As students in Bangladesh are required to take English as a Foreign Language (EFL) courses from grade 1 to grade 12, and English proficiency is also a factor in achieving national objectives, English proficiency is a requirement for Bangladeshi students. According to the National Curriculum (2010), English will play an important part in reaching the national goal of "Digital Bangladesh 2021" because it is the language of science, technology, and globalization, indicating that pupils do learn a certain level of language expertise. Thus, teachers prefer to utilize just the target language in EAP classes to maximize the usage of the target language in their educational environment, as it leads to the successful acquisition of the target language and is very advantageous for the future endeavors of university students (Krashen, 1985; Lightbown and Spada, 2006). However, in some circumstances, teachers continued to use their L1 because few pupils are not proficient enough to take English-only classes (Galloway et al., 2017; Lei and Hu, 2014). In addition, students' comprehensive linguistic abilities are strongly related to their prior experience (Cenoz, 2017), therefore they can be added. Infrequently, translanguaging has been used for localizing material and developing rapport (Greggio & Gil, 2007; McMillan & Rivers, 2011).

Translanguaging is vital in EAP classrooms, according to the majority of students surveyed. The responses to the questionnaire revealed that the majority of students at this university have a neutral to a positive attitude toward translanguaging. The positive attitude toward translanguaging can be seen in stem class classrooms in Bangladesh as found in research (Rahman & Singh, 2022). Translanguaging is widely accepted by multilingual students as a normal and appropriate practice that boosts their confidence and supports their L2 acquisition, but many of them continue to view native English as the norm. The majority of students feel that scaffolding translanguaging, such as clarifying basic concepts and supporting pupils with limited language skills, is essential. Students utilize translanguaging most frequently during group projects or heated debates. This is because they feel more comfortable speaking L1 with their peers, and it becomes simpler for them to formulate their opinions in L1 during heated discussions. In addition, Rasman (2018) noted that decoding learner-learner interaction is typically associated with successful foreign language acquisition. This result satisfies the students' expectations for translanguaging techniques. Saleh (2022) also mentions that translanguaging allows students to get a holistic view of the content.

The teacher's perspective on translanguaging aligns with the research (Nambisan, 2014; Nilsson, 2015). As this study has also revealed, even if teachers agree with the concept of translanguaging, the practice is limited due to their belief in the monolingual approach (Nambisan, 2014). In addition, a situation like that of Nilsson (2015) was observed in this study, where teachers were extremely unfavorable regarding the use

of translanguaging in language classrooms. However, such limitations can hinder some teachers from implementing translanguaging fully in their classrooms. The most essential issue is the policy effect of monolingualism, which has been cited in several prior research (Deroo and Ponzio, 2019; Ticheloven et al., 2019; Wang, 2019a). Many decision-makers and language instructors have frequently been misled by the monolingual paradigm into believing that an English-only immersion environment for language learning is advantageous. Fang argues that the implementation of EMI should consider the linguistic diversity of the multilingual paradigm (2018). Another crucial issue pertains to the students' excessive use of L1. Despite their comprehension of certain translanguaging aspects, a few of the teachers in this study expressed reservations about their pupils' excessive usage of L1. Wang and Kirkpatrick (2012) both concur with this conclusion. Furthermore, Wang (2019b) suggested that such concerns cannot be used as an excuse to hinder educators from pursuing diverse approaches to educating multilingual adult learners. The observation of Wang (2019b) implies that teachers should consider the students' enthusiasm for language learning. This investigation concludes that some instructors employ complementary tactics to counteract the difficulties caused by the monolingual approach. These include the use of unambiguous language to illustrate, the strategic grouping of students for inter-scaffolding, and the posing of questions or conduct of conversations to pique the students' interest.

The study reveals that teachers prefer to employ translanguaging for specific purposes alone. Their unique usage of translanguaging involves localizing the meaning to improve classroom management and foster class relationships. They cannot fully adopt a translation attitude due to their monolingual philosophies. According to Galloway et al. (2017), English is extensively utilized in multilingual meetings today, and the employment of multiple languages is advantageous. EMI subject instructors and EFL teachers are urged to learn more about this developing trend in bilingual or multilingual education to broaden their ideas and embrace a multilingual vision. Before then, language learners could be exposed to certain multilingualism fundamentals in their language classes.

Overall, the findings of this study indicate that students have a highly good attitude toward translanguaging. However, instructors appear to have a variety of perfective dispositions, which manifest in their classrooms.

This study examines students' and teachers' attitudes and beliefs as they transition to L1 in EAP classes. Another objective was to examine translanguaging in the EAP classroom and its roles to determine whether respondents' comments and actions differ. Teachers use translanguaging to localize context and build connections with students, and many consider it unacceptable to use L1 in a language-learning classroom. Students like translanguaging. The performance of translanguaging in online classroom observations was likewise positive. In classes with translanguaging features, student participation rose. According to the study, translanguaging is a useful teaching technique. A small sample size prevents generalization. This allows for future research on the activities teachers consider relevant and the actual practices in EAP classrooms at public and private colleges with required EAP courses. Researchers can evaluate if the negative attitude of teachers toward translanguaging is linked to administrators' English-only policy through further investigation. This research can benefit educators. Inconsistency among professors could be attributable to a lack of translanguaging expertise. More research can be conducted on translanguaging in the classroom.

## REFERENCES

- Al-Bataineh, A., & Gallagher, K. (2018). Attitudes towards translanguaging: How future teachers perceive the meshing of Arabic and English in children's storybooks. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, pp. 1–15. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050.2018.1471039>
- Asinger, T. (2018). *Translanguaging in the English Classroom: Multilingual Education in Swedish Upper Secondary Schools* (Dissertation). Retrieved from <http://urn.kb.se/resolve?urn=urn:nbn:se:su:diva-157130>
- Atkinson, D. (1987). The mother tongue in the classroom: a neglected resource? *ELT Journal*, 41(4), 241–247. <https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/41.4.241>

- Baily, K.M. (2005). *Practical English Language Teaching: Speaking*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Baker, C. (2011). *Foundations of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism (Bilingual Education & Bilingualism)* (5th ed.). Multilingual Matters.
- Bangladesh. (1998). Wikipedia: The Free encyclopedia. Retrieved December 25, 2009, from <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Bangladesh>
- Canagarajah, S. (2018). Translingual Practice as Spatial Repertoires: Expanding the Paradigm beyond Structuralist Orientations. *Applied Linguistics*, 39(1), 31–54. <https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/amx041>
- Carstens, A. (2016). Translanguaging as a vehicle for L2 acquisition and L1 development: students' perceptions. *Language Matters*, 47(2), 203–222.
- Cenoz, J. (2017). Translanguaging in school contexts: International perspectives. *J. Lang. Identity Educ.*, 16(4), 193–198.
- Cook, V. (2001). Using the First Language in the Classroom. *Canadian Modern Language Review*, 57(3), 402–423. <https://doi.org/10.3138/cmlr.57.3.402>
- Corbin, J., & Strauss, A. (2008). *Qualitative research*.
- Creese, A., & Blackledge, A. (2011). Separate and flexible bilingualism in complementary schools: Multiple language practices in interrelationship. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 43(5), 1196–1208.
- Creese, A., & Blackledge, A. (2015). Translanguaging and identity in educational settings. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 35, 20–35.
- Deroo, M.R., & Ponzio, C. (2019). Confronting ideologies: A discourse analysis of in-service teachers' translanguaging stance through an ecological lens. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 42(2), 214–231.
- Dörnyei, Z. (2007). Creating a motivating classroom environment. In *International handbook of English language teaching* (pp. 719–731). Springer, Boston, MA.
- Fang, F. (2018). Review of English as a medium of instruction in Chinese universities today: Current trends and future directions: New language policies to promote multilingualism and language support for EMI will be needed in Chinese tertiary contexts. *English Today*, 34(1), 32–37. doi:10.1017/S0266078417000360
- 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, 102959.
- Flick, U. (2006). *Qualitative Forschung*.
- Fullan, M. (2007). Change the terms for teacher learning. *The Learning Professional*, 28(3), 35. Retrieved from <https://search.proquest.com/openview/bd8bc2338e4b16812a90e9516585faf2/1?pq-origsite=gscholar&cbl=47961>
- Galloway, N., Kriukow, J., & Numajiri, T. (2017). *Internationalisation, Higher Education and the Growing Demand for English: An Investigation Into the English Medium of Instruction (EMI) Movement in China and Japan*. The British Council.
- García, O. (2009). *Bilingual Education in the 21st Century: A Global Perspective* (1st ed.). Wiley-Blackwell.
- García, O., & Wei, L. (2014). Language, Bilingualism and Education. *Translanguaging*, pp. 46–62. [https://doi.org/10.1057/9781137385765\\_4](https://doi.org/10.1057/9781137385765_4)
- Gay, L.R., & Airasian, P. (2003). *Educational research: Competencies for analysis and application*. New Jersey: Merrill.
- Greggio, S., & Gill, G. (2007). Teacher's and learner's use of codeswitching in the English as a foreign language classroom: A qualitative study. *Linguagen & Ensino*, 10(2), 371–393.
- Hamid, M.O., & Erling, E.J. (2016). English-in-education policy and planning in Bangladesh: A critical examination. In *English language education policy in Asia* (pp. 25–48). Springer. Retrieved from [https://link.springer.com/chapter/10.1007/978-3-319-22464-0\\_2](https://link.springer.com/chapter/10.1007/978-3-319-22464-0_2)
- Hamid, M.O., & Jahan, I. (2020). Beneficiary voices in ELT development aid: ethics, epistemology and politics. *Language Policy*, pp. 1–26. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10993-020-09559-9>

- Hamid, M.O., Nguyen, H.T.M., & Baldauf, R.B. (2013). Medium of instruction in Asia: Context, processes and outcomes. *Current Issues in Language Planning*, 14(1), 1–15. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14664208.2013.792130>
- Haque, S.F. (1989, July). *Attitude, Motivation and Achievement in English Language Learning*. Faculty of Arts, University of Durham.
- Harbord, J. (1992, October). The Use of the Mother Tongue in the Classroom. *ELT Journal*, 46(4). <http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/elt/46.4.350>
- Harmer, J. (2001). *The Practice of English Language Teaching* (1st ed.). Pearson Education Limited.
- Hu, G., & Lei, J. (2014). English-medium instruction in Chinese higher education: A case study. *Higher Education*, 67(5), 551–567. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-013-9661-5>
- Hurst, E., & Mona, M. (2017). “Translanguaging” as a socially just pedagogy. *Education as Change*, 21(2), 126–148. <https://doi.org/10.17159/1947-9417/2017/2015>
- Kabir, D.M.M.N. (2019). Reviewing Translation and L1 in Language Pedagogy from Translanguaging Lenses. *BELTA Journal*, 3(1), 32–46. <https://doi.org/10.36832/beltaj.2019.0301.03>
- Karim, A., Kabilan, M.K., Ahmed, Z., Reshmin, L., & Rahman, M.M. (2021). The Medium of Instruction in Bangladeshi Higher Education Institutions: Bangla, English, or Both? *Journal of Language, Identity & Education*, pp. 1–15.
- Khairunnisa, K., & Lukmana, I. (2020). Teachers’ Attitudes towards Translanguaging in Indonesian EFL Classrooms. *Jurnal Penelitian Pendidikan*, 20(2), 254–266. Retrieved from <https://ejournal.upi.edu/index.php/JER/article/view/27046>
- Kirkpatrick, A., & Liddicoat, A.J. (2017). Language education policy and practice in East and Southeast Asia. *Language Teaching*, 50(2), 155–188. <https://doi.org/10.1017/s0261444817000027>
- Krashen, S.D. (1985). *The input hypothesis: Issues and implications*. Addison-Wesley Longman Ltd.
- Lei, J., & Hu, G. (2014). Is English-medium instruction effective in improving Chinese undergraduate students’ English competence? *Int. Rev. Appl. Linguist. Lang. Teach.*, 52(2), 99–126.
- Lewis, G., Jones, B., & Baker, C. (2012). Translanguaging: Origins and development from school to street and beyond. *Educational Research and Evaluation*, 18(7), 641–654. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13803611.2012.718488>
- Liddicoat, A.J. (2016). Translation as intercultural mediation: setting the scene. *Perspectives*, 24(3), 347–353. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0907676x.2015.1125934>
- Lightbown, P.M., & Spada, N. (2006). *How languages are learned* (3rd ed.). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Liu, Y., & Fang, F. (2020). Translanguaging theory and practice: How stakeholders perceive translanguaging as a practical theory of language. *RELC Journal*, 003688220939222.
- Macaro, E. (2005). *Codeswitching in the L2 Classroom: A Communication and Learning Strategy* (pp. 63–84). Springer, Boston, MA. Retrieved from [https://link.springer.com/chapter/10.1007%2F0-387-24565-0\\_5](https://link.springer.com/chapter/10.1007%2F0-387-24565-0_5)
- Macaro, E., Curle, S., Pun, J., An, J., & Dearden, J. (2018). A systematic review of English medium instruction in higher education. *Language Teaching*, 51(1), 36–76. <https://doi.org/10.1017/s0261444817000350>
- MacSwan, J. (2017). A multilingual perspective on translanguaging. *American Educational Research Journal*, 54(1), 167–201.
- Mahadeo, S.K. (2006). English Language Teaching in Mauritius. *The International Journal of Language, Society and Culture*, (18). Retrieved December 12, 2009, from <http://www.educ.utas.edu.au/users/tle/JOURNAL/ARTICLES/2006/18-2.htm>
- Makoni, S., & Pennycook, A. (2005). Disinventing and (re) constituting languages. *Critical Inquiry in Language Studies: An International Journal*, 2(3), 137–156.
- Mann, S. (2011). A critical review of qualitative interviews in applied linguistics. *Applied Linguistics*, 32(1), 6–24. <https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/amq043>
- Mateus, S.G. (2014). Translanguaging: Language, Bilingualism, and Education. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 37(3), 366–369. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15235882.2014.965361>

- McMillan, B.A., & Rivers, D.J. (2011). The practice of policy: Teacher attitudes toward “English only”. *System*, 39, 251–263.
- Mirza, G.H., Mahmud, K., & Jabbar, J. (2012). Use of other languages in English language teaching at tertiary level: A case study on Bangladesh. *English Language Teaching*, 5(9), 71–77.
- Moody, S., Chowdhury, M., & Eslami, Z. (2019). Graduate Students’ Perceptions of Translanguaging. *English Teaching & Learning*, 43(1), 85–103.
- Nagy, T. (2018). On translanguaging and its role in foreign language teaching. *Acta Universitatis Sapientiae, Philologica*, 10(2), 41–53.
- Nambisan, A. (2014). *Teachers’ attitudes towards and uses of translanguaging in English language classrooms in Iowa*. Retrieved from <https://lib.dr.iastate.edu/etd/14230>
- Nation, P. (2003). The role of the first language in foreign language learning. *Asian EFL Journal*, 5(2), 1–8. Retrieved from <http://www.vidya.ca/wp-content/uploads/2015/08/The-role-of-the-first-language-in-foreign-language-learning.pdf>
- National Curriculum & Textbook Board. (2010). National Curriculum. Dhaka: NCTB.
- National Curriculum & Textbook Board. (2012). National Curriculum. Dhaka: NCTB.
- Nilsson, P. (2014). When teaching makes a difference: Developing science teachers’ pedagogical content knowledge through learning study. *International Journal of Science Education*, 36(11), 1794–1814.
- Numanee, I.Z., Zafar, N., Karim, A., & Ismail, S.A.M.M. (2020). Developing empathy among first-year university undergraduates through English language course: A phenomenological study. *Heliyon*, 6(6), e04021. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2020.e04021>
- Otheguy, R., García, O., & Reid, W. (2015). Clarifying translanguaging and deconstructing named languages: A perspective from linguistics. *Applied Linguistics Review*, 6(3), 281–307.
- Rabidge, M. (2019). *Translanguaging in EFL Contexts: A Call for Change* (Routledge Research in Language Education) (1st ed.). Routledge.
- Rafi, A.S.M., & Morgan, A.M. (2022). A pedagogical perspective on the connection between translingual practices and transcultural dispositions in an Anthropology classroom in Bangladesh. *International Journal of Multilingualism*, pp. 1–22.
- Rahman, M.M., & Pandian, A. (2018a). A Critical Investigation of English Language Teaching in Bangladesh. *English Today*, 34(3), 43–49. <https://doi.org/10.1017/s026607841700061x>
- Rahman, M.M., & Singh, M.K.M. (2022). English Medium university STEM teachers’ and students’ ideologies in constructing content knowledge through translanguaging. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 25(7), 2435–2453.
- Rahman, M.M., Islam, M.S., Karim, A., Chowdhury, T.A., Rahman, M.M., Seraj, P.M.I., & Singh, M.K.M. (2019). English language teaching in Bangladesh today: Issues, outcomes and implications. *Language Testing in Asia*, 9(1), 9. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40468-019-0085-8>
- Rahman, M.M., Singh, M.K.M., & Karim, A. (2018). English Medium Instruction Innovation in Higher Education: Evidence from Asian Contexts. *The Journal of Asia TEFL*, 15(4), 1156–1164. <https://doi.org/10.18823/asiatefl.2018.15.4.20.1156>
- Rahman, M.M., Singh, M.K.M., & Karim, A. (2020). Distinctive medium of instruction ideologies in public and private universities in Bangladesh. *Asian Englishes*, 22(2), 125–142.
- Rahman, M.M., Singh, M.K.M., Johan, M., & Ahmed, Z. (2020). English Medium Instruction Ideology, Management and Practices: A Case Study of Bangladeshi Private University. *English Teaching & Learning*, 44(1), 61–79. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s42321-019-00036-z>
- Rahman, M.S. (2015). Implementing CLT at higher secondary level in Bangladesh: A review of change management. *Journal of Education and Practice*, 6(2), 93–102. Retrieved from <http://iiste.org/Journals/index.php/JEP>
- Rasman, R. (2018). To translanguaging or not to translanguaging? The multilingual practice in an Indonesian EFL classroom. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 7(3), 687–694.
- Selinker, L. (1972). Interlanguage. *IRAL - International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching*, 10(1–4), 209–232. <https://doi.org/10.1515/iral.1972.10.1-4.209>

- Stathopoulou, M. (2015). *Cross-language mediation in foreign language teaching and testing*. Multilingual Matters.
- Sultana, S. (2015). Transglossic language practices. *Translation and Translanguaging in Multilingual Contexts*, 1(2), 202–232. <https://doi.org/10.1075/ttmc.1.2.04sul>
- Teddlie, C., & Yu, F. (2007). Mixed methods sampling: A typology with examples. *Journal of Mixed Methods Research*, 1(1), 77–100.
- Tian, Z., & Shepard-Carey, L. (2020). (Re)imagining the Future of Translanguaging Pedagogies in TESOL Through Teacher–Researcher Collaboration. *TESOL Quarterly*, 54(4), 1131–1143. <https://doi.org/10.1002/tesq.614>
- Ticheloven, A., Blom, E., Leseman, P., & McMonagle, S. (2019). Translanguaging challenges in multilingual classrooms: Scholar, teacher and student perspectives. *International Journal of Multilingualism*, pp. 1–24.
- Tsao, F. (2001). Teaching English from Elementary School in an Asian Context: A Language-planning Perspective. *The Language Teacher*. Retrieved December 25, 2009, from <http://www.jalt-publications.org/tlt/articles/2001/06/tsao>
- Wang, D. (2018). *Multilingualism and Translanguaging in Chinese Language Classrooms*. Springer.
- 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.
- Wang, D., & Kirkpatrick, A. (2012). Code choice in the Chinese as a foreign language classroom. *Multilingual Education*, 2(1), 3.
- Wei, L. (2011). Moment analysis and translanguaging space: Discursive construction of identities by multilingual Chinese youth in Britain. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 43(5), 1222–1235.
- Wei, L. (2018). Translanguaging as a Practical Theory of Language. *Applied Linguistics*, 39(2), 261. <https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/amx044>
- Widdowson, H. (2003). *Defining Issues in English Language Teaching (Oxford Applied Linguistics)* (1st ed.). Oxford University Press.
- Williams, C. (1994). *Arfarniad o Ddulliau Dysgu ac Addysgu yng Nghyd-destun Addysg Uwchradd Ddwylieithog*. Unpublished Ph.D. Thesis, University of Wales, Bangor.
- Wilson, S. (2020). To mix or not to mix: Parental attitudes towards translanguaging and language management choices. *International Journal of Bilingualism*, 1367006920909902.
- Yasmin, F. (2009). Attitude of Bangladeshi students towards communicative language teaching (CLT) and their English textbook. *Teacher’s World: Journal of Education and Research*, 34, 49–59.

## APPENDIX: FOR STUDENTS

Please answer the following questions based on the English classes you have done in the past or doing now.

- i. Mention your age**
- ii. Which medium of school and college were you from?**
  - a. English
  - b. Bangla
  - c. Others: \_\_\_\_\_
- iii. Which trimester are you in now?**

Please note: Translanguaging in the questionnaire means switching between languages (mainly from Bangla to English) in the classroom for the betterment of developing a student’s English language skills.

Translated in Bangla: দ্রষ্টব্যঃ এই প্রশ্নাবলীতে ট্রান্সল্যাঙ্গুয়েজিং শব্দটির অর্থ, শিক্ষার্থীদের ইংরেজি ভাষায় দক্ষতা অর্জনের জন্য শ্রেণিকক্ষে ভাষা-এর (মূলত বাংলা থেকে ইংরেজি) পরিবর্তন করা।

**iv. Was the above translation required for you to understand the term ‘Translanguaging’?**

a. Yes. b. No

**v. Questions on students thought over translanguaging**

1 Strongly disagree	2 Disagree	3 Neutral	4 Agree	5 Strongly Agree	
1 Translanguaging in class is a natural practice for bilinguals.	1	2	3	4	5
2 Translanguaging indicates a lack of linguistic proficiency in your second language.	1	2	3	4	5
3 Translanguaging in class is an appropriate practice.	1	2	3	4	5
4 Translanguaging is essential for learning a new language.	1	2	3	4	5
5 Translanguaging develops my confidence in English.	1	2	3	4	5
6 Language instructors should avoid translanguaging because it will prevent second language learning.	1	2	3	4	5
7 If an instructor used translanguaging in class, it would be helpful for bilingual students.	1	2	3	4	5

**vi. It is important for the teacher to use (in the following situations)**

8 To explain concepts	1	2	3	4	5
9 To give directions	1	2	3	4	5
10 To give feedback to students	1	2	3	4	5
11 To praise students	1	2	3	4	5
12 To build bonds with students	1	2	3	4	5
13 To clarify activity rules	1	2	3	4	5
14 To help low-proficiency students	1	2	3	4	5



**vii. It is important for students to use translanguaging in class (in the following classroom situations)**

15 To discuss contents in small groups	1	2	3	4	5
16 To provide assistance to peers during classroom activities	1	2	3	4	5
17 To brainstorm during classroom activities	1	2	3	4	5
18 To enable participation by lower proficient students	1	2	3	4	5
19 To answer teachers' questions	1	2	3	4	5
20 To ask permission from teachers	1	2	3	4	5

**Interview Guide (For Teachers)**

1. Basic information (teaching experience, qualifications)
2. What do you think of the practice of switching between languages in class?
3. Do you switch between English and Bangla in class purposefully or unconsciously? Yes/ No elaborate with examples.
4. Do you have any concerns about switching between languages in class?
5. Do you allow students to use their L1 in class? And why?