Translanguaging in English for Specific Purposes Classrooms in the Chinese Context: Teachers' and Students' Perceptions

Yiqian Cao [a], Wei Wei [b]

[a] Trinity College, The University of Melbourne, Melbourne, Australia,
cao.katherine@gmail.com

[b] Faculty of Applied Science, Macao Polytechnic University, Macao, China,
weiweitesting@hotmail.com

Abstract

This article reports on a study examining teachers' and students' perceptions of pedagogical translanguaging in an EAP programme at an English-medium Chinese university. Twelve teachers and thirty-three students participated in this study and four types of data were collected; videotaping of class interactions, teacher interviews, stimulated-recall interviews with student and researcher's field notes. Results reveal that teachers had mixed views about pedagogical translanguaging. A number of teachers could put positive beliefs about translanguaging into practice and their translanguaging strategies included scaffolding from students' first language for construction and transmission of knowledge. Results also show that some students engaged in translanguaging both in class and out of class freely, but their perceptions of translanguaging appeared to be negative. This article concludes with a discussion of the challenge of pedagogical translanguaging in bilingual classrooms, pedagogical implications and directions for future research.

Keywords: translanguaging; spontaneous translanguaging; pedagogical translanguaging; plurilingualism; second language pedagogy

INTRODUCTION

In the current globalised era when English is seen as a pluracentric language, with a multilingual turn, there is a growing understanding of bilingual and multilingual speakers drawing on their repertoire of languages in daily communication and in classroom learning. This language practice is referred to as translanguaging, a discourse practice centred on the natural, observable communicative practices of bilinguals and multilinguals (Garcia 2009a, 2009b) and this practice occurs naturally as "individuals use the communicative potential of all languages at their disposal as they attempt to make meaning" of their daily experiences (Garrity et al., 2015, p. 178). From

this point of view, the goal of modern language education is not only to produce proficient users of a second language, but strategic and resourceful bilingual and multilingual users who are capable of utilising all of their linguistic resources and abilities in meaningful interactions and to make sense of their bilingual/multilingual worlds.

LITERATURE REVIEW
THE MULTILINGUAL TURN

Traditional language teaching practitioners have treated languages as separate and bounded entities to avoid contamination of one language by the other (Garcia, 2009; Makalela, 2015). This monoglossic view of language (Cummins, 2007) entails a bias that hinders students and teachers to make connections to their existing knowledge of other languages (Woll, 2020). Since 1990s, there has been increasing recognition that this monolingual principle should be challenged (Piccardo, 2013) and language teaching professionals are increasingly questioning the appropriateness of monolingual ideology of second or foreign language teaching (Cenoz & Corter, 2014; Garcia, 2009; Taylor, 2009).

Garcia (2009) is the representative of this shift of thinking in rejecting monoglossic language ideologies and advocating for replacing them with heteroglossic language ideologies in multilingual contexts. A heteroglossic conceptualization of language positions multilingualism or plurilingualism as the norm and emphasizes the complex and dynamic language practices of bilingual and multilingual speakers (Garcia, 2009; Garcia & Wei, 2914). The concept of "Dynamic bilingualism" is used by Garcia (2009) to highlight the differentiated, multiple and flexible language proficiency of bilinguals rather than a model of bilingual proficiency that maintains first and additional languages as discrete or separate. This dynamic meaning-making practice by bilingual or multilingual users is referred to as "translanguaing" (Garcia, 2009; Garcia & Wei, 2014; Wei, 2011) and it is defined as "a purposeful pedagogical alternation of languages in spoken and written, receptive and productive modes" (Hornberger & Link, 2012, p.262). The concepts of translanguaging and dynamic bilingualism are useful for moving beyond conceptualizing languages as discrete and toward an understanding of hybrid language practices of bilingual and multilingual speakers.

Translanguaging practices have been studied largely by leading proponents of this model in Anglophone universities from the UK (e.g., Li Wei), the USA (e.g., Ofelia Garcia, Suresh Canagarajah) and Australia (e.g., Alastair Pennycook). This line of research has focused largely on how diverse languages are mixed with English (e.g., in Southeast Asian and European contexts). In the East Asian professional and academic contexts, however, it has been found that languages often interact with each other without the presence of English (Canagarajah & Gao, 2019, p.1). For example, Fei and Weekly (2020) have suggested that the parameters of translanguaging can be extended to non-English bilingual speakers in the Asian context and findings from their study have revealed translanguaging practice between Chinese Mandarin and Wu Chinese, the second largest Chinese dialect in East China.

PEDAGOGICAL TRANSLANGUAGING

Some researchers have made a distinction between spontaneous translanguaging and pedagogical translanguaging (Cenoz, 2012; Galante, 2020). This means that translanguaging practice can be understood on two different levels (Flores & Schissel, 2014). From a sociolinguistic perspective,

it describes the fluid language practices of bilingual or multilingual speech communities. Translanguaging is a diverse and strategic social practice when bilingual/multilingual users adopt forms of communication that are appropriate and feasible in their own settings, shuttling across diverse languages in one's cognitive process and social networks to generate ideas (Canagarajah & Gao, 2019). From a pedagogical perspective, it describes the process whereby teachers build bridges between several languages and the language practices desired in formal instruction (Flores & Schissel, 2014). Pedagogical translanguaging is "planned by the teacher inside the classroom and can refer to the use of different languages for input and output or to other planned strategies based on the use of students' resources from the whole linguistic repertoire" (Cenoz, 2017, p. 194). When students are allowed to use their first and additional languages to chat in class or after class, this can be considered as spontaneous translanguaging as there is no pedagogical value attached to it (Galante, 2020). In another word, what translanguaging conceptualizes is the ways in which bilingual or multilingual users creatively and strategically renegotiate the norms. Students and teachers adopt translingual practices to create incremental spaces for representing their knowledge and identities more effectively (Canagarajah & Gao, 2019).

There have been several calls for reconceptualizing language pedagogy during the multilingual/plurilingual turn in applied linguistics (Kubota, 2016; Piccardo, 2013) and translanguaging is one of the most popular pedagogical approaches (Galante, 2020). Translanguaing as a pedagogical practice goes back to Williams (1994) who used the term "translanguaging" (trawsiethu) to denote a pedagogical practice in Wales where teachers and students systematically alternated between English and Welsh. Garcia's translanguaging pedagogy was built on the Welsh model but with a social and political agenda in mind (Kirsch, 2020). Translanguaging has been applied to these bilingual settings where minority languages are to be protected (Cenoz, 2017). As Galante (2020) maintains, translanguaging pedagogy is similar to other teaching strategies with a focus on metalinguistic awareness such as cross-linguistic comparison and translation and this approach allows students to use their entire repertoire and not only their first language. Ferguson (2019) has also identified three pedagogical functions for translanguaging including constructing and transmitting knowledge, classroom management, and maintaining of interpersonal relationships.

More recent implementation of translanguaging pedagogy include a collection from Frost et al. (2020), in which studies that explored how a translingual disposition can be facilitated in English-medium writing classrooms and programs were included. Galante (2020) investigated the implementation of a translanguaging pedagogy in an English language programme in a Canadian university based on data collected from class observations, field notes, student diaries and teacher interviews. The results show that teachers were willing to implement pedagogical translanguaging, but they needed time to be familiar with the approach because they felt uncertain about its effectiveness. The findings also reveal that students engaged in spontaneous translanguaging outside the classroom but pedagogical translanguaging was more controlled and limited to the language shared in the classroom. In another study, Woll (2020) examined the pre-service ESL teachers' reflections regarding the implementation of a crosslinguistic approach to language teaching in Quebec. The findings show that when given the opportunity to explore their multilingual repertoire, learners became aware of the positive impact of such practice on their understanding of target language features, which triggered a sense of success.

However, as Taylor and Cutler (2016) have argued, despite the growing recognition of plurilingual realities among applied linguists, bilingual users are still viewed as two monolinguals without recognizing the dynamic interactions that go on between the languages in their linguistic

repertoires. They go on to argue that translingual pedagogy is still in its infancy and there is no consensus about how best to incorporate translingual methods.

TEACHER BELIEFS ABOUT MULTILINGUALISM AND TRANSLANGUAGING PRACTICE

As Gorter and Arocena (2020) have noted, there have been very few publications concerning beliefs about multilingualism of language teachers. Haukas (2016) concluded based on her review of four studies on teachers' beliefs on multilingualism that teachers often have positive beliefs about multilingualism, but they do not act according to these beliefs in practice. Similarly, Degi (2016) found that English language teachers have some knowledge about multilingualism but they fail to apply this knowledge in their classrooms. Otwinowska (2017) investigated Polish English teachers' attitudes toward the principles of multilingual pedagogy and found that these English teachers had a certain degree of multilingual awareness and a readiness to use the multilingual pedagogical approach. Tarnanen and Palviainen (2018) conducted a meta-analysis of four studies of Finnish teachers' beliefs between 2016 and 2018 and the results show that the teachers in different studies acknowledge the language competencies of multilingual children, but they do not use them in the classroom.

Arocena (2017) examined teachers' beliefs about multilingualism from interviews with observation data on code-switching in the classroom. This study has found that teachers hold strong beliefs about the exclusive use of the target language to ensure maximal input and exposure. Moreover, teachers are hesitant to allow for the use of the first and second languages in the third language classroom. However, several of the same teachers use Basque or Spanish through frequent code-switching in the English language classroom. The researcher noted from her observations some obvious missed opportunities where teachers could have used an intentional code-switching strategy to enhance "reading comprehension in English".

More recently, Gorter and Arocena (2020) investigated how an in-service professional development course can change in-service teachers' beliefs about insights into multilingualism and principles of translanguaging. Based on questionnaire results, it was found that some teachers participating in the training course progressed towards implementing a form of pedagogical translanguaging. This study demonstrated that positive beliefs could be put into practice, but there also existed resistance from some teachers who were not convinced of the new ideas on multilingualism and translanguaging advocated in the training programme. Some teachers were prevented from putting their beliefs into practice by some situational constraints.

Overall, the research on teachers' beliefs about multilingualism and translingual pedagogy has so far yielded mixed results. There still exists a gap between institutional commitment to multilingual pedagogical approach and teachers' actual practice. According to Taylor and Cutler (2016), this is particularly true in the Asian context where most of the newcomer native English-speaking teachers are monolinguals with little understanding of their students' languages and cultures. Therefore, this current study aims to investigate language teachers' beliefs about translanguaging and their pedagogical decisions in class. The secondary aim of this research is to explore students' perceptions of translanguaging in English classes.

This study specifically focuses on addressing the following questions:
RQ1: What are teachers' beliefs about translanguaging practice in the classroom?
RQ2: Is there a discrepancy between teachers' beliefs about and their pedagogical decisions for translanguaging practice in class?

RQ3: What are students' perceptions of translanguaging practice in the classroom?

METHOD
CONTEXT

This study forms part of a larger research project that investigated students' classroom participation in English for Specific Purposes classrooms in China. Unlike traditional Chinese universities where the medium of instruction in content programmes is Chinese, this university offers courses accredited by a British university and taught exclusively in English. Some of the students are expected to complete the four-year undergraduate study at this university, whereas others are enrolled in a 2+2 programme to complete the first two years of study in China and the last two years in the UK. All the Year 1 and Year 2 students are required to take an EAP and academic skills course, with 10 hours per week for Year 1 and 8 hours per week for Year 2 students. The EAP and academic skills programme is intended to prepare the students for academic studies in English and equip them with the necessary skills to succeed in their further studies in the academic context in the UK. The programme includes developing skills in notetaking in lectures, oral presentations, communication techniques in tutorials and seminars, group projects, writing academic essays and research reports.

PARTICIPANTS

12 English tutors and 33 students at the university English Language Centre volunteered to participate in this study. The students were the sample groups from a total population of 240 Year 1 and Year 2 undergraduate students. Each EAP class consisted of less than twenty adult Chinese learners of English between the ages of 18 and 19. All the 12 tutors came from a variety of linguistic and cultural backgrounds. Seven of these teachers are bilingual (e.g., Chinese and English speakers) or multilingual speakers (e.g., Malaysian, Indonesian, Dutch or Spanish speakers) while four of them share the same language with the students. All of them had an MA in TESOL or Applied Linguistics and two of them held a PhD in Applied Linguistics. They had a range of teaching experience from five to 40 years, with experience in secondary, tertiary and corporate sectors (see Table 1).

Teachers' pseudonyms	Class	Qualifications	Years of teaching experience	Monolingual Bilingual or Multilingual	Shares the language with the students or not
Maria	Year 1 Finance	MA in TESOL	40 years	Multilingual	No
Ian	Year 1 Engineering	PhD in Applied Linguistics	15 years	Bilingual	Yes
Hui	Year 1 Finance	PhD in Applied Linguistics	5 years	Bilingual	Yes
Elit	Year 1 Science	MA in TESOL	10 years	Multilingual	Yes
Joe	Year 1 Finance	MA in Applied Linguistics	7 years	Multilingual	Yes
Emily	Year 1 Business	MA in Applied Linguistics	15 years	Multilingual	No
Shawn	Year 1 Engineering	MA in Applied Linguistics	20 years	Multilingual	No
Lawrence	Year 1 Business	MA in Applied Linguistics	15 years	Monolingual	No
Ray	Year 1 Business	PhD in Science	30 years	Monolingual	No
Jackson	Year 2 Finance	MA in Applied Linguistics	20 years	Monolingual	No
Tim	Year 2 Economics	MA in Applied Linguistics	30 years	Monolingual	No
Andy	Year 2 Electrical Electronics Engineering	MA in Applied Linguistics	20 years	Monolingual	No

Table 1. Teacher participant information

INSTRUMENTS

This research study is informed by the qualitative interpretative approach to understand the phenomenon from the participant's view, not the researcher's (Merriam, 2009, p. 4). A number of instruments were employed to collect data, including video recordings of classroom interactions, semi-structured interviews with teachers, stimulated-recall interviews with students, and field notes taken by the researchers during the classroom observation. Interview protocols (see Appendix A and Appendix B) were developed to include a list of questions to be addressed which guided the data collection in a systematic and focused manner (Lodico et al., 2010). In the teacher interviews, a number of questions were intended to elicit teachers' views of students' participation and non-participation in class. The student interview guide also included questions to investigate their participation in class. During class observations, students' and some teachers' use of mixed languages was noted and further questions were asked in the teacher and student interviews to explore the translanguaging practice in more detail. During the interviews, the researchers changed

the order of questions, changed wordings and added further questions to probe unexpected issues that emerged during the interviews (Lodico et al., 2010).

DATA COLLECTION

Data collection involved classroom observations with field notes taken, stimulated-recall interviews with students, and semi-structured interviews with teachers. Eleven 60-minute lessons were observed and video-recorded with the consent of all participating teachers and students. Videotaping was abandoned in one class as one student in that class declined to give consent to video recording. Two cameras were set up in the front corners of each classroom to capture the students and the videos from the two cameras were then synchronised. Author 1 also observed each class, sitting at the back of the classrooms to take field notes during the observation. After each observation, two to four students in each class (a total of 45) volunteered to take part in a stimulated-recall interview with Author 1 (Appendix A). The students were asked general questions about their participation in English classes, and they were also played excerpts of video-recorded classroom interaction and made comments on translanguaging practice between Chinese and English. They had the opportunity to either speak English or Chinese or switch between these two languages during the interviews. Each interview lasted from twenty to forty minutes depending on how elaborate the answers were. All the teachers took part in a semi-structured interview after the class observations, for their views of the students' participation, and translanguaging practice in class (Appendix B).

DATA ANALYSIS

The main sources of data of this study consist of video recordings of classroom interaction, interviews with teachers, stimulated-recall interviews with students, class handouts and Author 1's field notes. Triangulation of different data sources was employed in the data analysis process. As this paper focused on perception and practice, the teacher and student interviews and the teacher-fronted activities in the videotaped classes were transcribed verbatim, coded and analysed.

The interview data were coded and analysed using content analysis (Guba & Lincole, 1994). Prior to coding and analysis of the interview data sets, the researchers gained familiarity with the data in the process of transcribing, reading and re-reading the transcripts. Salient and recurring ideas, and especially the occasions/incidents when the teachers and students commented on the tranlanguaging practice were identified. The initial step of coding involved the identification of the incidences. Then codes were assigned to the incidents and an attempt was made to discover patterns or categories between the codes.

RESULTS

To address the three research questions, results from inductive analysis of interviews and deductive analysis of transcribed class interactions are presented. The results from teacher and student interviews are triangulated with classroom interaction excerpts. Among the 11 observed classes, three teachers were observed to either engage in translanguaging practice with students or responded to students' translanguaging practice in class. These three representative cases are selected and presented below.

MARIA'S CLASS

Maria had 40 years of teaching experience at both secondary and tertiary levels in Malaysia. Apart from being a teacher trainer in ESL, she was also a corporate trainer teaching soft skills to company and university staff for 15 years. The class Maria taught was Year 1 Finance. During the observed lesson, Maria started with a teacher-led activity to elicit responses from students regarding the pictures of different brands of cars. Maria instructed the students in English, but she recognized the linguistic resources that students were bringing to the classroom. She encouraged the students to provide the answers in Chinese if they lacked the linguistic resources in English. She even mimicked the pronunciations of the Chinese words to sustain the students' motivation. The students were obviously engaged and eager to participate in this warm-up activity. Excerpt 1 below detailed how Maria (T1) communicated with the students in this activity:

Excerpt 1
1. T1: Now open your book, let's talk a bit. Do all your family own cars? Your fathers all own cars? They have cars?
2. SS: Yes.
3. T1: What car does your father drive?
4. S1: Nissan
5. T1: Nissan (0.2) S2, Chinese car?
6. S2: No, it's a German German car.
7. T1: A German car. I'm very bad, I don't know anything about cars (Ss laugh) what car does your father drive (S3)
8. S3: BMW
9. T1: Oh WOW (Ss giggle)
10. (T1 invites students from another table to answer this question by using a hand gesture)
11. S4: Nissan
12. S5: No car
13. T1: No car, e-bike?
14. (Two students whisper to each other)
15. T1: What what car does your father have?
16. S6: I don't know how to say it?
17. T1: You don't know? Help (look at her group members)
18. S6: I don't know how to spell it
19. (T1 moves on to another table)
20. T1: What's your car?
21. S7: I don't know how to (her gesture suggests she's trying to describe a word)
22. T1: How to say it in Chinese then?
23. *S7: 雪佛，雪佛兰 (Chevrolet)*
24. T1: Xue Fu Lei (trying to mimic) (SS giggle) oh my that's a good car
25. (T1 moves to another table)
26. T1: come on, give us some more cars
27. S8: Audi
28. T1: Audi
29. S9: I don't know how to say it
30. T1: Say it in Chinese, it probably sounds the same

31. S9: 标致 (Peugeot)
32. T1: What's that? (asks another boy at the table and expects him to translate the word)
33. (S10 shakes his head)
34. T1: What's that? (asks the entire table of 6 students and they shake their head.)
35. (T1 continues with the question by pointing at other students at the table)
36. S10: I don't know that brand
37. T1: What's the brand?
38. (S10 mumbles and uses his index finger to write the words in Chinese characters. T1 points at another student at the table)
39. S11: I don't know how to say it
40. T1: Tell me in Chinese, maybe I'll get it.
41. S11: 大众
42. T1: Da zhong
43. (T1 looks at S10 waiting for him to translate)
44. S10: Volv
45. T1: Volvo
46. S11: Volkswagen
47. T1: Volkswagen, German car (points at S10)
48. S10: Poter, Portron
49. T1: A Porsche?
50. S10: Yeah a Porsche.
51. T1: WOW! Have you ever heard of a Toyota?
52. SS: Yes
53. T1: Have you ever heard of Proton?
54. SS: No
55. T1: In my country there is a car called Proton, maybe Malaysia. So I drive a Proton, but I owned two Toyotas before that, one after the other. So that's a very normal car. All right, now if you all turn to Unit 5 (moves on to the next stage of the lesson).

In this exchange, it is evident that a number of students displayed translanguaging practice by drawing on their linguistic resources in both Chinese and English. Student 7 did not know how to say the brand name Chevrolet and Maria encouraged her to say it in Chinese. Maria tried to mimick it as "Xue Fu Lei" (lines 22-24). Similarly, Maria encouraged Student 9 (lines 29-35) and Student 11 (lines 40-47) to say the brand names in Chinese and she made an attempt at getting other students to translate or repeat the names in Chinese. In this activity, Maria seemed to have created an implementational space where the students' knowledge of Chinese was valued and appropriate to use in this interactional space.

In the interview, Maria mentioned that students usually spoke Chinese to each other before class and then they automatically switched to English once class started. She commented,

> *"If I'm not teaching and they are allowed to speak in Chinese before I come to class. It's very loud and I can hear them at the corridor, so it's not that they're shy students. In English they are able to switch into the classroom discipline. So that's why I prefer to let them talk because otherwise they'll be waiting for the teacher to do something."*

Regarding students' automatic switch to Chinese in some class and group activities, Maria expressed a view in favour of translanguaging between the two languages that the students are

competent in. She saw code-switching as a natural norm of behaviour and she considered it unnatural to not code-switch in a normal language environment. According to Maria, in a speech community of multilingual speakers, they code switch between languages and in a monolingual country, people would switch into dialects and regional slang. Maria grew up as a multilingual user in Malaysia and she explained her language ideology in this excerpt below,

> *"I think it's a normal code-switching procedure we all use because I come from a multilingual background, and where I come from I have many codes. I speak I speak good English in the class, but with my friends we all switch within two or three languages. Like when I talk to Pam (another colleague from the same country) I can code-switch in three languages because we speak three languages. So far it is natural for me and Pam it is natural to code switch. So I may start off you know with English, put in a Tamil word, because the vocabulary is easier for me and end up with a Malay word or something. Even prefix or suffix. We've done research in code-switching within multi-languages. Since these children only speak two, maybe they speak their dialect I don't know, could be, so I think it's very natural for them to code switch."*

It seems that she was aware of the pedagogical value of translanguaging in class activities. In the following excerpt from the interview, she explained that she encouraged students to translanguage between their two languages for successful completion of peer or group activities. But she seemed to have an intention to prioritise the use of English and maximize opportunities for exposure in the target language,

> *"I think it's an automatic switch, they just switch automatically. It's not a deliberate thing. And when I say it, they switch back. So you know it's just a reminder, because they will be giving meaning to their friend, or explaining something, so I tell them try and explain it in English to their friend."*

However, students' attitudes towards translanguaging in class was found to be mixed. Student A and B commented that only students with low English proficiency would use Chinese in class because they could not express themselves using English. As can be seen in the following excerpts,

> *"...so some of them might use Chinese instead, this is a big problem. But some students don't have that high level of self motivation...But sometimes they cannot express themselves using English. They use Chinese instead. In Chinese some of my members just ask me questions, what does that mean in Chinese, so I have to answer them in Chinese. But I don't like it"*
>
> *(Student A)*

> *"I think speaking Chinese is bad, because our time we speak English is very limited, I read an article which say if we want to improve our English we should spend more time to speaking or learning vocabulary, so it should be about 8 hours every day on our English learning, so I think 2 hours is very short and if we don't seek this chance to speak English and after class we don't spend more time, our English is still very poor"*
>
> *(Student B)*

Student C reported that she used Chinese when Maria asked her about the brand name of her father's car. She also mentioned that in EAP classes sometimes her team members talked in Chinese. She found it convenient to communicate in Chinese but sometimes she felt guilty switching to her L1.

<div align="center">IAN'S CLASS</div>

Ian held a PhD in Applied Linguistics and he had over 15 years of teaching experience at the tertiary level in both the UK and Asia. He is a proficient speaker of Chinese Mandarin. The class he taught was Year 1 engineering. In the class observed, Ian started with a pre-reading discussion

activity about the topic friction. In the interview, he commented that he found the topic a rather dry-sounding engineering topic, but when they were discussing the advantages and disadvantages of friction, one of the students suggested imagining the world without friction and then that was the moment when Ian took as an inspiring moment to engage all the students as the humor came from the student.

Excerpt 2 shows Ian's (T2) interaction with students in the pre-reading activity when he was checking students' understanding of vocabulary in the reading text. Ian seemed to be utilizing his linguistic resources in both English and Mandarin when explaining words such as "talc" and "graphite". In lines 3 to 17, Ian started by providing a definition of lubricant when he mentioned talc. He spelled the word and explained where it could be used. Then, Student 5 said the word in Chinese. Ian continued with the exchange by eliciting the word for talcum powder from students (line 11). Here he used the term both in English and Chinese. Then, he confirmed its Chinese term with the students when Students 3 and 5 repeated the Chinese phrase (lines 12-16). He used the same technique with the word graphite in lines 18 to 26. Based on the interpretation of this exchange, it can be argued that Ian created this implementational space where his students and himself were competently translanguaging between English and Chinese to achieve comprehension of new words.

Excerpt 2

1. T2: Now we all know it's Paragraph 3. I just want to point out one vocabulary point, in Paragraph 3 the top of the bottom of column 1 (point at the table in his book to the class), bottom of column 1 here, there are many types of lubricants, thick or think oil, do we know what a lubricant is?
2. S5: Yes, make something smoothly (accompanied by gesture)
3. T2: Make something smooth, yeah produces friction we use oil in car engines to reduce friction between parts, this is lubricant. And thick or thin oil, powders like talc
4. S5: talk?
5. T2: Talc t-a-l-c,
6. S5: t-a-l-c talc
7. T2: You know we use it on our bodies sometimes
8. *S5: um um 滑石*
9. T2: Yeah
10. S5: Stone, makes stone making um something smooth
11. *T2: So what's that powder, when you buy that powder in the um pharmacy, if your skin is feeling uncomfortable, then you use this kind of talcum powder we call 痱子粉吗?*
12. SS: ah yeah,
13. T2: but when it's used in engineering, what's it called you've said (to S5)
14. *S3: 滑石粉*
15. *S5: 滑石*
16. T2: So that's talc
17. SS: talc
18. T2: Then what else? Solids such as graphite, where do you find graphite? Someone hold up graphite and show me.
19. S4: What's that?
20. S5: I don't know what that means?
21. T2: Okay graphite is substance in um pencil,

22. S5: substance
23. *S4: (to S5) 石墨 substance?*
24. (A student at another table holds up a pencil) S2: Is that it?
25. T2: That's it, very good (shows the pencil to the class) graphite, it's not lead, is it?
26. S7: kind of carbon

Ian's view of translanguaing between English and Chinese was quite positive. In the interview, he acknowledged the usefulness of L1 in the English classroom when students can open up more in class activities. He mentioned that some teachers tried to discourage students from using Chinese and even had quite strict English-only policies, but he thought otherwise. As can be seen in this excerpt:

> *"Another thing, some teachers have sort of policies on speaking Chinese in the classroom, I've never had success in that kind of rule or policy at all. In fact, I think there are a number of reasons why judicious use of L1 is actually quite useful and one of the reasons is they are about to open up more. Obviously, if they just sit at the table talking to each other in Chinese, they stop improving their communication skills."*

In the interview, he reflected on his teaching experience in Taiwan, a similar English as a foreign language environment. He mentioned that switching back to the first language in a certain conversational context is a natural thing to do. If the conversational partners are all Chinese, it would be considered artificial to conduct the conversation in English.

> *"In a way not serving a good example somehow. Coz in Taiwan, I mean they'd say probably most of the faculty most of the colleagues I worked with are Taiwanese, and most of them would teach pretty much exclusively in English, but as soon as break time they'd switch back to Chinese otherwise it'll be artificial. But people do that here, even in after-class contact and everything's all conducted in English but that's because it's an English medium university, so to that point to that extent it's succeeded… talking to someone in the interpreting lab, and someone came in to ask if they could use the lab or use computers that sort of thing and that whole exchange is in English. The teacher's a Chinese a local Chinese person and the student's also a Chinese person. You just assume that English would be the sort of lingua franca."*

Student 5 who took part in the stimulated interview with the first author after the observed class commented on this part of the class interaction. He reported that he knew the word talc in Chinese but not in English. But Ian's knowledge of the Chinese language and his provision of the term in English and Chinese was very helpful for them to figure out what word it was.

HUI'S CLASS

Hui held a PhD in Applied Linguistics and she had five years of teaching experience at the time of the observation. She shared the same linguistic and cultural backgrounds as the students. The class Hui taught was Year 1 Finance and the students were known to each other for about four months. The one-hour lesson focused on the topic of IT and technology. She started by eliciting vocabulary related to this topic in a teacher-fronted activity. Then she paired the students up to for the discussion task, with each student in the pair having a list of questions different from their partners. These questions were related to individual and business use of technology, censorship, cyber security and equity issues. During the vocabulary elicitation activity, the students seemed to be actively volunteering answers, with a few students nominating answers in Chinese.

When the students were engaged in the pair-discussion task, there was evidence of translanguaging from the video recordings, for the purpose of allocating roles and finding words

to express their opinions. As can be shown in Excerpt 3 when a pair tried to decide which student would be B. Also, Student 3 complained that she could not find the word in the dictionary.

Excerpt 3
S1: 你想选哪个？ (which one do you want to choose?)
S2: 我是 B 吧 (I'll choose B then.)
S1: 好的 (All right.)
…
S3: 查不到这个单词 (I can't find this work in the dictionary.)
S4 took out her phone to check the online dictionary

When Hui noticed that some students were translanguaging, she said, "English please, English please alright? And you're going to have speaking test in the coming you know examinations." During the observation, it was noted that Hui reminded the students a number of times to use English only when students switched back to Chinese. From her class instructions, it can be implied that she prioritized English partly because the institution-wide assessments were in English not Chinese.

In the interview, Hui mentioned a student whose English skills were weak. She encouraged him and also his group members to speak English to him rather than using Chinese,

> *"He wanted to speak English but because his English was so poor you know it was not very good. And he was afraid of being laughed at by his classmates, so sometimes even like he answered my question the first time, he tried to answer my question in Chinese. He wanted to speak English but because he didn't know how to organize the sentence well…I also told the group member just in group discussion try to let him speak English rather than Chinese and help him, because he's kind of younger than others and the others understand and they try to help him."*

Hui shares the same language with the students, but her attitude towards the use of Chinese in class seems to be quite conservative. Whether Hui held a monoglossic language ideology even though she shared the same language background as her students, this can be further investigated. However, there is not enough data to understand the ideology underlying her cognition and pedagogical choices at the time of the study.

In the interview with Student D, he commented that he was quite willing to participate in today's discussion because Hui was energetic which could encourage students to open up and take an active part in the discussion. He acknowledged the usefulness of translanguaging between Chinese and English, but he seemed to have a negative view of the use of Chinese in group discussions. He also commended that it was good of Hui to remind them of using English in discussions. As he commented in the following excerpt,

> *"Sometimes group members would use Chinese and we pretty much use half English and half Chinese during class activities, but we are always on task. I feel it's not ideal to use Chinese but without an explanation in Chinese, some classmates can't understand what I'm trying to express…our teacher Hui usually reminds us not to speak Chinese. I like it when she takes part in our group discussions and warns us not to Speak Chinese."*
> *(Translated from Chinese interview data)*

Student E also acknowledged the usefulness of translanguaging both in class and out of class. She reported that switching back to Chinese is very common when the classmates did not know the English words during class activities and when they engaged in social chats after class.

Peer pressure was one of the reasons for translanguaging as nobody wanted to sound different when Chinese was used as a primary language in a discussion,

> *"Sometimes there are many words we cannot express in English, in private all the students are Chinese so it's a common sense to speak in Chinese. And they speak Chinese, so we speak Chinese. I want to speak English all the time, but first you cannot express all the things you want to say in English, and others speak Chinese and you speak English. I think you will feel… I don't know how to express that feeling."*

> *"When all the others are speaking Chinese, it would sound abrupt if I interrupt using English. I might be perceived as being deliberately different. Using Chinese is very common in pair and group discussions, particularly when we were doing small talks"*

> *(Translated from Chinese interview data).*

DISCUSSION

This study has raised three research questions, to explore teachers' beliefs and students' perceptions of translanguaging practice in English classes. In response to these questions, it seems some students in this study engaged in translanguaging practices within a well-functioning plurilingual learning environment. Their use of Chinese was reported to be motivated by a number of factors. One was that Chinese allowed them to convey their meaning more precisely and easily during class activities. Another was that use of Chinese allowed mutual relationships to be foregrounded in peer interaction. Thus, L1 was used to get complex ideas across and also to promote group cohesion (Hafner, Li & Miller, 2015). The fact that these students used their linguistic repertoire, even if it was sometimes their L1 for meaning making and on-task discussions may have given them a sense of the pedagogical purpose (Galante, 2020).

CREATED TRANSLANGUAGING SPACES

The results from Maria and Ian's cases illustrate that they monitored their language use and created translanguaging spaces (Wei, 2011) in language classrooms. They switched languages or allowed students to switch languages if they felt that this could contribute to understanding or communication (Kirsch, 2020). Basically, they used the strategy of scaffolding from the students' L1 in-class interactions (Cenoz & Gorter, 2020). This is in line with Ferguson's (2009) finding that translanguaging served the pedagogical function of constructing and transmitting knowledge. Though the targeted use of Chinese and emphasis on the language learning process was small in scale, and it was not an ideal pedagogical multilingual lesson, Ian and Maria's actions appeared to point to a heteroglossic ideological stance that led them to establish a heteroglossic implementational space where they could encourage their students to demonstrate their dynamic bilingualism and increase their engagement in class activities (Flores & Schissel, 2014). Unlike Woll's (2020) finding that teachers' pedagogical stance was influenced by their professional training rather than their own language learning experiences, some teachers in this study reported that their pedagogical decisions and stance were more influenced by their language learning experience.

PERSISTENT CHALLENGES

This study showed some teachers' support for translanguaging practice but also persistent challenges, including their attempts at controlling the extent of translanguaging by students (Cenoz & Gorter, 2020). Similarly, Galante (2020) found that while some teachers agreed translanguaging had pedagogical benefits, they had concerns about losing control of students' use of their linguistic repertoire and neglecting target language exposure and use. There seems to exist a tension in the EAP programme between creating space for students' L1 as a communicative resource and learning aid, and maximising the use of L2 in class so as not to compromise students' exposure to L2 (Hafner et al., 2015).

PRIORITISING USE OF ENGLISH

The teachers' attempts at prioritizing use of English and controlling extent of translanguaging might be because the aim of the EAP programme was to improve students' academic English levels for successful completion of study at the English-medium university. Galante (2020) acknowledged the valid concern reported by teachers about the discrepancy between pedagogy and assessment. He found it reassuring though that teachers reported the pedagogical value of translanguaging even if the institutions used monolingual assessments and had monolingual academic expectations.

POSITIVE BELIEFS ABOUT TRANSLANGUAGING

In the current study, Maria and Ian were among the minority who held positive beliefs about translanguaging. However, other participating teachers and some students still seem to have a monolingual bias about teaching and learning English as a second language. This confirms Gorter and Arocena's (2020) finding that strong beliefs continued to exist about the benefits of language separation, which is an ideology well rooted in teaching practice, where teachers tried to avoid translation or interactions between languages. Woll (2020) had a similar finding that teacher discourse remained tainted by monolingual ideology even where multilingual practice was successfully implemented and its benefits acknowledged. Teachers' intention to avoid use of L1 might be related to the monolingual principle or the ideas that use of L1 should be minimized or even banned so as to replicate L1 acquisition and maximise target language input (Howatt, 1984). Cenoz and Gorter (2020) have warned that teachers' convictions about monolingualism and maximal exposure to the target language might be hard to change as it is difficult to alter their deep-seated monolingual beliefs.

TEACHERS' USE OF TERMINOLOGY

Another finding from the current study is that the teachers still used code-switching and use of L1 as terminology rather than translanguaging. This implies their view of languages being bounded entities with fixed codes which is different from translanguaging which prefers to emphasise the fluidity of boundaries (Gorter & Arocena, 2020). It shows that teachers continue to think and talk in terms of alternating between given languages and some of them might believe that even if code-switching is something multilinguals engage in, it should be kept outside of the language classroom (Gorter & Arocena, 2020). The findings highlight the discrepancy between teachers' beliefs and their actual practice.

CONCLUSION

The current study has examined translanguaging practice in an EAP programme at an English-medium Chinese university and makes some important contributions. It provides samples of pedagogical translanguaging and insights into the actual translanguaging practice in a bilingual context. It includes both teacher and student voices. The findings show that some teachers in our study can put positive beliefs into practice and their translanguaging approach included strategies such as scaffolding from L1 for construction and transmission of knowledge. The present study can also contribute to our understanding of the difficulties that teachers face and obstacles that they have to overcome in language education. They encountered several challenges including a monolingual policy, and some students' and colleagues' negative attitudes towards translanguaging practice. Borg (2017) has mentioned situational constraints that can prevent teachers from putting their beliefs into practice. This is observed in this study that the monolingual language policy and monolingual assessment were such obstacles that some teachers limited students' translanguaging practice in order to maximize target language input and output.

Translanguaging clearly has a constructive role to play in class interaction, even though as a pedagogy, it is still exploratory and remains underdeveloped in the educational context in general (Canagarajah, 2011, p. 8). It is important to establish translanguaging as a legitimate practice in the eyes of key stakeholders in the education domain and explore translanguaging-informed language policy, curriculum development and assessment practices (Garcia & Li, 2014). It should particularly be a compromise for students with a lower level of proficiency. Pedagogical translanguaging should be introduced gradually and adapted to existing school curricula (Gorter & Arocena, 2020). It may need to include extra resources such as technology, printed materials in additional languages, and speakers of the languages in students' repertoire including family and community members (Galante, 2020). This study has examined the EAP context in an English medium university in China, however, the findings could to some extent contribute to further studies in the context of mainstream universities in China, and other countries with multilingual language societies, especially with EAP programmes offered at the universities.

The results of the current study raise important implications for future research and pedagogy. Future research could investigate if teachers can maintain their positive beliefs and practice translanguaging pedagogy over a longer period of time. This study was conducted using a cross-sectional design. Longitudinal data can provide more insights into the ways in which the teachers can transcend their monoglossic view of language, change attitudes and employ translanguaging strategies.

Woll (2011) has proposed that predominant discourse about language teaching must be deconstructed to challenge the monolingual principle. He continues to argue that teachers' personal experiences with translanguaging as learning tool are not enough to challenge the monolingual bias in teacher training. Since teachers play a key role in educational change, at this multilingual turn during the paradigm shift, with proper training and teacher development opportunities, coupled with institutional support, teachers' beliefs are bound to change in the direction of becoming more favourable to multilingual practices and pedagogical translanguaging. These changes can persist over time, which can have consequences for classroom practice (Cenoz & Gorter, 2020).

REFERENCES

Adamson, J., & Coulson, D. (2015). Translanguaging in English academic writing preparation. *International Journal of Pedagogies and Learning, 10*(1), 24-37.

Arocena, E. (2017). *Multilingual education: Teachers' beliefs and language use in the classroom.* [Unpublished Doctoral dissertation]. University of the Basque.

Borg, S. (2017). Teachers' beliefs and classroom practices. In P. Garrett, & J. M. Cots (Eds.) *The Routledge Handbook of Language Awareness* (pp. 75-91). Routledge.

Canagarajah, S. (2011). Codemeshing in academic writing: Identifying teachable strategies of translanguaging. *Modern Language Journal, 95*(3), 401-417. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.2011.01207.x

Canagarajah, S., & Gao, X. (2019). Taking translingual scholarship farther. *English Teaching and Learning*, *43*, 1-3.

Cenoz, J. (2017). Translanguaging in school contexts: International perspectives. *Journal of Language, Identity and Education, 16*(4), 193-198. https://doi.org/10.1080/153484582017.1327816.

Cenoz, J., & Gorter, D. (2014). Focus on multilingualism as an approach in educational contexts. In A. Blackledge & A. Creese (Eds.), *Heteroglossia as Practice and Pedagogy* (pp. 239-254). Springer.

Cenoz, J., & Gorter, D. (2020). Pedagogical translanguaging: An introduction. *System, 92*, 1-7. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2929.102269

Cenoz, J., & Santos, A. (2020). Implementing pedagogical tranlanguaging in trilingual schools. *System, 92*, 1-9. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2020.102273.

Cummins, J. (2007). Rethinking monolingual instructional strategies in multilingual classrooms. *Canadian Journal of Applied Linguistics, 10*(2), 221-240.

Degi, Z. (2016). Teachers' beliefs regarding non-target language use in the EFL classroom. *The Journal of Linguistic Intercultural Education, 9*(1), 19-30.

Fei, Y., & Weekly, R. (2020). Examining parameters of translanguaging in the context of Chinese bilinguals' discourse practices. *International Journal of Multilingualism, 19*(3) 325-345. https://doi.org/10.1080/14790718.2020.1742721

Flores, N., & Schissel, J. (2014). Dynamic bilingualism as the norm: envisioning a heteroglossic approach to standard-based reform, *TESOL Quarterly, 48*(3), 454-479.

Ferguson, G. (2009). What next? Towards an agenda for classroom code-switching research. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism, 12*(2), 231-241.

Frost, A., Kiernan, J., & Malley, S.B. (2020) (Eds.). *Translingual dispositions: Globalised approaches to the teaching of writing*. University Press of Colorado.

Garcia, O. (2009a). *Bilingual education in the 21ˢᵗ century: Global perspectives*. Blackwell.

Galante, A. (2020). Pedagogical translanguaging in a multilingual English programme in Canada: Student and teacher perspectives of challenges. *System, 92*, 1-10. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2020.102274

Garcia, O. (2009b). Emergent bilinguals and TESOL: What's in a name?. *TESOL Quarterly, 43*, 322-326.

Garcia, O., & Wei, L. (2014). *Translanguaging: Language, bilingualism and education*. Palgrave.

Garrity, S., Aquino-Sterling, CR., and Day, A. (2015). Translanguaing in an infant classroom: Using multiple languages to make meaning. *International Multilingual Research Journal, 9*, 177-196.

Gorter, D., & Arocena, E. (2020). Teachers' beliefs about multilingualism in a course on translanguaging. *System, 92,* 1-10. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2020.102272

Hafner, C.A., Li, D., & Miller, L. (2015). Language choice among peers in project-based learning: A Hong Kong case study of English language learners' plurilingual practices in out-of-class computer-mediated communication. *The Canadian Modern Language Review, 71*(4), 441-470.

Haukas, A. (2016). Teachers' beliefs about multilingualism and a multilingual pedagogical approach. *International Journal of Multilingualism, 13*(1), 1-18.

Hornberger, N., & Link, H. (2012). Translanguaging and transnational literacies in multilingual classrooms: A biliteracy lens. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism, 15,* 261-278.

Howatt, A. (1984). *A history of English language teaching*. Oxford University Press.

Ke, I. & Lin, S. (2017). A translanguaging approach to TESOL in Taiwan. *English Teaching and Learning, 41*(1), 33-61.

Kirsch, C. (2020). Opening minds to translanguaging pedagogies. *System, 92*, 1-11. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2020.102271

Kubota, R. (2016). The multilingual turn, postcolonial theory, and neoliberal multilingualism: Complicities and implications for applied linguistics. *Applied Linguistics, 37*(4), 474-494.

https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/amu045

Lidoco, M., Spaulding, D., & Voegtle, K. (2010). *Methods in educational research: From theory to practice.* John Wiley and Sons Inc.

Liu, Y., & Fang, F. (2020). Translanguaging theory and practice: How stakeholders perceive translanguaging as a practical theory of language. *RELC Journal, 53*(2), 391-399. https://doi.org/10.1177/003368822093922

Makalela, L. (2015). Moving out of linguistic boxes: the effects of translanguaging strategies for multilingual classrooms. *Language and Education, 29*(3), 200-217.

Martin-Beltran, M. (2014). "What do you want to say?" How adolescents use translanguaging to expand learning opportunities. *International Multilingual Research Journal, 8,* 208-230.

Martínez, R.A., Hikida, M. & Durán, L. (2015) Unpacking ideologies of linguistic purism: How dual language teachers make sense of everyday translanguaging. *International Multilingual Research Journal*, *9*(1), 26-42, doi: 10.1080/19313152.2014.977712.

Merriam, S. B. (2009). *Qualitative research: A guide to design and implementation*. Jossey-Bass.

Otwinowska, A. (2017). English teachers' language awareness: Away with the monolingual bias?. *Language Awareness, 26*(4) 304-324.

Piccardo, E. (2013). Plurilingualism and curriculum design: Toward a synergic vision. *TESOL Quarterly, 47*(3), 600-614.

Probyn, M. (2015). Pedagogical translanguaging: Bridging discourses in South African science classrooms. *Language and Education, 29*(3), 218-234. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/09500782.2014.994525

Sun, P., & Zhang, L. (2020). A multidimensional perspective on individual differences in multilingual learners' L2 Chinese speech production. *Frontiers in Psychology, 11*, 1-14.

Stille, S., Bethke, R., Bradley-Brown, J., Giberson, J., & Hall, G. (2016). Broadening educational practice to include translanguaging: An outcome of educator inquiry into multilingual students' learning needs. *The Canadian Modern Language Review*, *72*(4), 480-503.

Tai, K., & Wei, L. (2020). Bringing the outside in: Connecting students' out-of-school knowledge and experience through translanguaging in Hong Kong English medium instruction mathematics classes. *System, 95,* 1-32.

Tarnanen, M., & Palviainen, A. (2018). Finnish teachers as policy agents in a changing society. *Language and Education, 32*(5), 428-443.

Taylor, S. K. (2009). Paving the way to a more multilingual TESOL. *TESOL Quarterly, 43*(2), 309-313.

Taylor, S. K., & Cutler, C. (2016). Introduction: Showcasing the translingual SL/FL classroom: Strategies, practices, and beliefs. *The Canadian Modern Language Review, 72*(4), 389-404.

Wei, L. (2011). Moment analysis and translanguaging space: Discursive construction of identities by multilingual Chinese youth in Britain. *Journal of Pragmatics, 43*, 1222-1235.

Williams, C. (1994). An evaluation of teaching and learning methods in the context of bilingual secondary education. [Unpublished Doctoral dissertation]. Prifysgol Bangor University.

Woll, N. (2020). Towards crosslinguistic pedagogy: Demystifying pre-service teachers' beliefs regarding the target-language-only rule. *System, 92,* 1-11.

APPENDIX A: STIMULATED-RECALL INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

I. General questions
1. How did you feel about today's class?
2. What did you feel happy/unhappy with?
3. Did you feel like talking in today's class? Why/Why not?

II. Stimulated-recall questions:
1. What were you thinking right then/at this point?
2. Can you tell me what you were thinking at that point?
3. I saw you were talking in Chinese to each other in the group discussion. Can you tell me how you felt about switching to Chinese? What's your perception about using English and Chinese in the classroom?
4. Can you remember what you were thinking when she said that/those words?
5. Can you tell me what you thought when she said that?

Probing questions

I was wondering if I could ask you something. I'm just curious. I noticed when you were talking about the recording you mentioned …quite a lot. Is that what you are most concerned about when you are speaking? Can you say a bit more about this?

APPENDIX B: GUIDELINES FOR TEACHER INTERVIEWS

1. How long have you been teaching?
2. How long have you been teaching at this school?
3. Which courses have you taught at this school?
4. Could you describe the goals and content of the course you're currently teaching?
5. What's your general impression on the students' participation in this class?
6. What do you think an active learner in class is like? Can you name some of the students who are active in this class and explain why?
7. Do you have any students in this class whom you would consider very quiet in class? What do you think inhibited them to communicate in class?
8. Can you think of a time when the class is particularly active? When was that? What materials did you use? Could you describe the event?
9. I noticed that some students used both Chinese and English in the class and group activities. How do you perceive teachers or students using all of their languages resources in the classroom?
10. In the class I observed I notice that you used Chinese words in the elicitation activity. How did you feel about that?
11. In the class I observed, I notice that you asked students not to speak Chinese in the group discussion. Can you tell me why you wanted to control their language use and why you wanted to stop them using their first language?