

Translanguaging in English Medium Instruction Schools: Attitudes and Practices of Iraqi Teachers

Alla Faris Hadi, Ph.D. Candidate, Department of English Language, Urmia University, Urmia, Iran

lo94losh94@gmail.com

Javad Gholami*, Assistant Professor, Department of English Language, Urmia University, Urmia, Iran.

j.gholami@urmia.ac.ir

2024/11/14

2025/01/18

Abstract

'Translanguaging' has been promoted as a prominent term in Teaching English as a Foreign Language (TEFL) studies. It describes how learners of a new language effectively utilize their entire range of languages to convey meaning and communicate. Additionally, it serves as an educational strategy to harness these language repertoires as valuable resources for learning. In the last twenty years, multiple empirical investigations have been carried out to investigate pedagogical translanguaging strategy in language learning classes across the world. However, there is limited knowledge of this occurrence in English as a Medium of Instruction (EMI) in the educational context of Iraq, where TEFL policies prohibit using students' first language and perceive them as a hindrance to language acquisition. By examining the views of English language teachers regarding pedagogical translanguaging, this study seeks to close this gap. Additionally, it investigates the extent to which these perspectives are manifested in their instructions. A total of 120 English language instructors at an Iraqi university willingly took part in this research. The findings highlight a significant disparity between the attitudes that teachers claim to have and the teaching methods that they use, based on the survey. The results also illuminated the barriers that prevented the participants from using translanguaging in their instruction.

Keywords: EMI, Iraqi context, Teachers' perspectives, Translanguaging,

1. Introduction

Teaching English has addressed a wide range of topics from many angles, including L2 students, teaching approaches, L2 teachers, learning environments, and more. Translanguaging techniques in foreign language classrooms from the viewpoint of instructors is one subject that merits more study. The primary topic of this study is how many factors contribute, either directly or indirectly, to translanguaging techniques in foreign language classrooms.

One of the numerous teaching methods that have drawn criticism from experts on language learning and acquisition is translanguaging, which is used in language learning classrooms. The notion that studying foreign or second languages is like learning our own tongue is one of the primary objections (Rajendram, 2021). As a result, most research studies support the monolingual approach to teaching foreign or second languages, which allows learners to speak the language exclusively in the classroom context. As a result, their perspective primarily concerns the objective of giving students as much exposure to the language being learnt as feasible. On the other hand, some argue that denying students access to their mother language might have unfavorable effects, especially for those who are just starting out. Furthermore, they contend that enforcing a target-language policy alone is neither sensible nor practicable. In contrast to the prevalent school of target-language policy alone, the use of translanguaging seems to support the multilingualism-promoting second/foreign language teaching technique.

It is fascinating that language acquisition experts have given this strategy a lot of attention, especially in multilingual nations. However, given the novelty of this method and the paucity of study on the subject from both the viewpoints of instructors and students, as well as how these practices are implemented in language learning classrooms, a research gap is evident here (Hu & Lei, 2014).). To close this gap and advance the domains of language learning in situations including other languages, this study was conducted. Furthermore, the use of technology in data analysis may demonstrate the potential influence of these discoveries on several domains, such as information technology and education.

The significance of the present study lies in its emphasis on the dearth of research on translanguaging from the viewpoint of teachers. Specifically, it highlights the valuable contributions of multi-level analysis strategies such as multivariate, structural equation modeling, and correlational analysis, which can strengthen and enhance the study's conclusions.

2. Review of the literature

Translanguaging is a practice that promotes mutual understanding not just across other languages but also within dialects of the same language or ordinary conversations (Anderson & Lightfoot, 2021). Mahboob (2014) argues that both translanguaging and the communication accommodation theory share the same goal of enhancing efficient meaning delivery.

In our context, language alternation procedures, including translanguaging, have been subject to many perspectives about the merits and downsides of their implementation. While most scholarly research on language alteration acknowledges the presence of both good and negative aspects of translanguaging in the classroom, it is uncommon to come across a balanced perspective that presents a thoughtful theoretical rationale for translanguaging. Advocates against the use of translanguaging language learning typically highlight their concerns over the detrimental impact of translanguaging on learners' fluency in their second language learning. Conversely, the second group often emphasizes the possible effects of permitting translanguaging in the classroom on students' confidence, motivation, and the creation of an atmosphere free from worry, which would lead to improved learning results. I endorse both perspectives presented by the group. However, a more pragmatic and feasible approach would be to evaluate learning situations individually and strive to accommodate learners' requirements to the greatest extent possible. Therefore, it is impossible for anyone analysis to include all students equally, given their significant variations in objectives, learning contexts, previous knowledge, personality, and so on.

Translanguaging has a beneficial impact on students' confidence, motivation, and security, hence facilitating the process of learning (Back & Weng, 2020). Prior research has typically shown beneficial results on the use of alternating between L1 and L2 during class time. Barbu et al. (2020) demonstrated that the frequency of language alteration is closely connected to the cognitive flexibility skills of the speakers. Additionally, Ponzio & Deroo (2021) discovered that students responded favorably to the use of translanguaging or code-switching in their oral presentations. However, there are still studies that view translanguaging as an obstacle to achieving fluency in a second language. They argue that the use of translanguaging in classrooms can restrict learners' exposure to the second language and result in limited vocabulary in that language (Fang & Liu, 2020).

Final consideration of the influence of gender and its role in the practice of translanguaging inside foreign language classrooms. Various research has examined the impact of gender on the acquisition of second/foreign languages. However, few studies have shown any significant association between gender and the practice of translanguaging. Additional research has shown that there is no association between gender and translanguaging (Hu & Lei, 2014). This discovery reinforces the necessity for further examination to rectify the deficiency in the present study from the viewpoint of instructors. Hence, the decision to examine this matter from the perspective of instructors is motivated by their significant role in enhancing the process of foreign language learning, along with the dearth of research conducted from this position.

2.3. EMI and translanguaging

Various universities in Europe and other regions have been recognized for their growing focus on English as a Medium of Instruction (EMI) policy. Examples include the works of Airey et al. (2015). The term "EMI" describes the practice of teaching academic courses in countries where the majority of people do not speak English (Dearden, 2014). EMI, as in contrast to CLIL, mandates the utilization of English as a non-native language for education, without considering its sociological and geopolitical consequences. The use of English is not intended to enhance individuals' proficiency, but rather serves as a means for users to describe, explain, defend, and verify their practices in a certain context and period (de Prat, 2020).

The global increase in EMI may largely be traced to many incentives, often linked to the significance of English in promoting international exchange and economic development. The inclusion of EMI is seen as an approach for institutions can use to improve their international presence and rankings. This strategy has been supported by several studies (Airey et al., 2015; Costa & Coleman, 2012). Toh (2016) observed that the recent increase in EMI programs can be attributed to the perception of English as a lingua franca, as well as the linguistic, financial, and, more importantly cultural advantages of the language. English is seen as an attractive option for both foreign and local students. It functions as an economic influence for promoting academia and as a potential tactic for EMI institutions to enhance their status and get worldwide visibility. In many respects, it exhibits neocolonial characteristics since many countries worldwide still regard English as their official language, hence reinforcing its esteemed status. This unavoidably fosters new methods of exacerbating global inequality, because English-speaking nations are frequently

regarded as sources of information, while the other parts of the world are seen as recipients of knowledge (Alexander, 2013; Kubota, 2016).

According to Phillipson (2009), using English can help establish it as the worldwide 'lingua academica.' However, this often poses a danger to the status and context of other prevalent languages. It has functioned as a kind of 'interpellation', as defined by Althusser (2006), wherein the discourses of universities summon individuals to adopt specific identities in alignment with the ideologies they suggest. Bilingual speakers frequently adhere to monoglossic practices, which involve using two distinct autonomous languages. However, there are instances where resistance is shown through flexible practices of language (García et al., 2014). Nevertheless, in order to comprehend the worldwide trends of English and their potential impacts on other languages in academic institutions, it is imperative to examine the local movements that are striving to internationalize themselves.

This also encompasses issues regarding the influence of electromagnetic interference (EMI) on national identity. This point is crucial in acknowledging and comprehending the English language and its varied usage in diverse regions (Dearden, 2014; Pennycook, 2010). House (2014) previously described the definition of EMI as inadvertently overlooks the involvement of teachers, and the students' first language as a commonly spoken language. From this perspective, this definition does not question the conventional understanding of individuals' bilingual abilities as distinct and separate entities. This is a crucial aspect of the concept of translanguaging in educational systems (Al-Bataineh, 2020).

Mazak (2017) observed that translanguaging encompasses several aspects. It is important to make a serious effort to understand what 'many things' are and how they are expressed in people's real use of language. This is true in various situations, including EMI universities. Historically, translanguaging has been associated with bilingual education. Botha (2013) initially introduced it as a "teaching strategy" to enhance language and topic understanding. According to Mazak (2017), this definition does not encompass the whole scope of what translanguaging entails. Translanguaging, as a concept in psycholinguistics, uses language as a strategy for humans to express their thoughts and meaning in a specific situation and for a specific purpose.

In accordance with Cenoz and Gorter (2020), translanguaging refers to a potential approach that erases distinctions between languages and utilizes all linguistic resources in both language and

topic learning and teaching situations. This approach prevents the adoption of restrictive and monolingual ideas, allowing for the inclusion, promotion, and protection of diverse English usage and minor/local languages. It also increases students' awareness of linguistic diversity in their academic environments. Nevertheless, this pedagogy is contingent on the specific context, the subject being taught, and the extent to which the teacher strategically incorporates "translanguaging cues" to support the learning of bilingual learners, leading to improved conceptual understanding (Lewis et al., 2012). It is an instructional approach that relies on the teacher-student relationship characterized by mutual concern for each other's well-being, with the goal of achieving improved educational results (Graham & Eslami, 2019, p. 11).

Translanguaging EMI offers users a social environment where they may turn language usage into a tangible experience (Li, 2016). Furthermore, García et al. (2014) argue that social space extends beyond the combination of languages spoken by individuals (as discussed by Bhabha, 1994) to also encompass the concept of 'Thirdspace.' Space, in this context, is constantly changing and being given significance through the diverse linguistic and cultural backgrounds, experiences, attitudes, and ideological beliefs of language users. These factors are reflected in human interactions.

This is the mechanism by which the prefix 'trans' in the concept of translanguaging facilitates the bridging of social boundaries, as explained by Chang (2019). The trans-system is a complex framework that reflects the dynamic, adaptable, and interdisciplinary nature of our language activities. Translanguaging enables individuals to critically and creatively challenge and disrupt the established and conventional norms of behavior, particularly those related to language, by using evidence in an appropriate, methodical, and perceptive manner (Li, 2011).

3. Method

This study utilizes a mixed methods research (MMR) strategy, where data collection, analysis, and integration are conducted utilizing both qualitative (QUAL) and quantitative (QUAN) data. The current study utilizes a convergent parallel design, which includes two separate phases. In other words, the researcher employs concurrent timing to collect QUAL and quantitative QUAN data simultaneously while ensuring that each strand remains separate during data collection and analysis. The data is then combined during the interpretation phase.

3.1.Participants

In the initial stage of the study, 120 teachers were chosen to respond to the scale used in the research. During the second phase of the study, 5 instructors were asked to collect information on their beliefs regarding the use of translanguaging EMI for learning in the university setting. The participants were selected based on their proficiency in teaching any of their undergraduate topics in English, as demonstrated by their involvement in this field. To uphold the ethical standards of the university being investigated, the personal information of all participants was excluded to ensure their anonymity. Prior to obtaining their consent, the teachers who participated in the study were provided with information regarding the objectives, the assurance of anonymity, and their prerogative for withdrawal from the study at any time.

3.2.Instruments

The study utilized a set of meticulously crafted equipment that enabled the collection of data from the participants. The selection of these tools was made to guarantee a thorough investigation of the research objectives and to collect dependable and accurate information. The following instruments were used:

3.2.1. Questionnaire:

This study utilized an online questionnaire that was modified from the ones developed by Nambisan (2014) and Moody et al. (2019). The teachers who took part in this survey were requested to provide answers to a grand total of 28 items. The initial inquiries were designed to gather demographic data, including gender, teaching experience, and certifications. The other questions had 28 Likert-scale items, each rated on a five-point scale. The close-ended questions aimed to ascertain instructors' perspectives on the potential advantages, disadvantages, purposes, motivations, and justifications of translanguaging in EMI classes. The instructors' responses to the closed-ended questions (i.e., questions with predetermined answer options) were examined using a descriptive methodology to assess quantitative data.

3.2.2. Interview

A request was sent to five members of the teaching staff to learn more about their opinions about the translanguaging of EMI for the purpose of learning in an academic setting. The selection of participants was based on their academic background and experience instructing college English

courses (Stille et al., 2016). To maintain participant anonymity, all participant details were withheld in line with the ethical guidelines of the university under research. Teachers who agreed to be part of this study were told about its purpose, confidentiality, and ability to withdraw at any time. This was done prior to obtaining their agreement.

3.3.Procedure

The study was approved ethically by the appropriate institutional review board prior to its start. Informed permission was acquired from the participants, guaranteeing their anonymity, confidentiality, and voluntary involvement. Throughout the whole study, the guidelines for informed consent, privacy, and data protection were scrupulously followed. Participants were emailed the link to the Google Form, which was used to compile the questionnaire. The decision to take part was entirely voluntary. There was no collection of personally identifying information. 200 instructors received the questionnaire when it was first circulated. One hundred and twenty instructors agreed to take part in the study, with a reasonable degree of uncertainty left.

For the gathering of the qualitative data, interviews that were semi-structured were done. Participants were asked to explain their opinions about teaching using "English and Arabic" or "English-only" approaches. They were also asked to explain who made the decision about the teaching approach, what criteria were used to make the decision, what advantages and disadvantages the approach might have, and how they could use and encounter the approach. Interviews took place on the campus of the institution. They were all audio recorded, with an average duration of fifteen to twenty-five minutes. The researcher translated and transcribed the respondents from the Arabic-language interviews.

The qualitative information gathered from the interviews was transcribed, carefully examined, and subjected to theme analysis. Theme analysis is the most common technique for examining data gathered using a variety of approaches. Qualitative research is complex and multifaceted. This thematic analysis is an approach for locating, looking over, and revealing patterns in data.

4. Results

4.1. Quantitative analysis

The descriptive findings for the overall scores of the questionnaire are demonstrated in Table 1. As the table shows, the Cronbach alpha value is 0.84 suggesting that the responses to the

questionnaire enjoy a relatively high internal consistency. Moreover, the value of the KS test is 0.05 illustrating the normality of distribution for the collected data.

Table 1

Descriptive statistics of the scale

	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	SD	Alpha	KS Sig.
Scale	1.20	5	3.32	1.03	0.84	0.05

For every questionnaire category, an analysis using SPSS version 26.0 revealed Cronbach alpha values greater than 0.85 (Table 2).

Table 2

Value of reliability for questionnaire items

Category	Number of items	Alpha
Teachers' general attitudes towards pedagogical translanguaging	6	0.85
Teachers' attitudes towards the importance of translanguaging	14	0.89
Teachers' self-reported use of translanguaging	8	0.86

4.1.1. Instructors' attitudes on translanguaging

According to Table 3 of the questionnaire, instructors were generally in favor of using languages other than English. For example, 70.2% of the instructors strongly agreed or agreed that it is permissible to use the learners' first language; just 17.5% disagreed. The greatest degree of

agreement was seen on the function of transanguaging for language acquisition. The majority of participating instructors (71.9%) agreed—strongly—that transanguaging was necessary in order to acquire a new language. Similarly, most instructors (64.2%) believed that bilingual and multilingual learners would benefit from the usage of their original language or languages. Consistent with the answers to the preceding questions, 66.2% of the educators thought that transanguaging would increase students' confidence in their English. Just 21.8% of the instructors indicated strong agreement and agreement with the proposition, while 71.3% of them strongly opposed and disagreed with it. In a similar vein, 41.2% of the instructors strongly disagreed, 34.5% disagreed, and just 11.7% (n=14) agreed or strongly agreed when asked whether they thought that utilizing students' first language was a sign of a lack of proficiency. When combined, these findings show that instructors thought transanguaging was a beneficial linguistic resource for language acquisition rather than a barrier.

Table 3

Teachers' perspectives about transanguaging

	Strongly agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly disagree
Using students' native language(s) in the classroom is an appropriate practice	33.2%	37.1%	12.2%	9.2%	8.3%
Using students' native language(s) is essential for learning a new language	33.7%	38.2%	10.8%	6.5%	10.8%
Teachers' use of students' native language(s) in class would be helpful for bilingual/multilingual learners	32.4%	31.8%	13.9%	12.6%	9.3%
Using students' native language(s) develops the learners' confidence in English	31.6%	34.6%	11.9%	11.6%	10.3%
Language teachers should avoid using the students' native language(s) because it will prevent English language learning	8.6%	13.2%	6.9%	36.2%	35.1%
Using students' native language(s)	7.6%	9.1%	7.6%	34.5%	41.2%

indicates a lack of linguistic proficiency in English

The purpose of the following questionnaire part was to gauge the significance that educators attach to their own application of pedagogical translanguaging in instructional contexts. Table 4 illustrates that, on average, instructors rated their usage of translanguaging for instructional reasons as "important" or "very important" with a mean score of 3.6. "Explaining concepts" and "helping low proficient students" had the highest mean scores (M=4.02 and 3.82).

Table 4

Instructors' perspectives on the significance of learners' first language

	Very important	Important	Neutral	Not important	Not	Mean
To explain concepts	36.7%	31.6%	13.8%	9.9%	8%	3.82
To describe vocabulary	13.2%	31.5%	15.1%	27.8%	13.2%	3.05
To give directions	34.7%	28.6%	15.7%	12.6%	8.4%	3.75
For classroom management	35.6%	33.1%	12.8%	11.9%	6.6%	3.71
To provide students with feedback	36.8%	29.5%	19.2%	9.9%	4.9%	3.81
Praising students	34.2%	30.1%	16.2%	14.2%	5.3%	3.62
Building bonds with students	31.2%	34.2%	17.4%	11.1%	6.1%	3.76
To help low proficiency students	42.5%	34.6%	10.1%	6.8%	6%	4.02

With mean ratings ranging from 3.62 to 3.81, the instructors also considered other educational scenarios—such as "managing classroom," "praising students," "building bonds with students," "giving directions," and "giving feedback to students" to be significant. Surprisingly, "describing vocabulary" had the lowest mean value (M=3.05), which was rather near to neutral.

The next section of the survey examined the instructors' evaluations of the significance of their students' potential usage of translanguaging for certain educational goals. The majority of instructors supported allowing children to utilize all of their language resources, as seen in Table 5. The instructors' opinions regarding their own usage of pedagogical translanguaging were somewhat higher than the total mean score (M=3.69), but not significant. The results of the analysis showed that when it came to "responding to teacher's questions," and "assisting peers during activities," "explaining problems not related to content," teachers placed the highest value on students using their native language(s) (M=3.81).

Table 5

Teachers' perspectives on the significance it is for learners to speak in their original language or languages

	Very important	Important	Neutral	Not important	Not at all	Mean
Discussing content or activities	30.1%	39.2%	13.1%	8.9%	8.7%	3.69
To help peers during activities	31.2%	38.1%	14.2%	10.1%	6.4%	3.72
To brainstorm during class activities	36.1%	28.2%	16.8%	10.2%	8.7%	3.67
To explain problems not related to content	33.1%	32.1%	17.2%	8.1%	9.5%	3.72
To respond to teacher's questions	36.1%	32.5%	15.1%	9.1%	7.2%	3.81
To ask permission	28.7%	31.2%	14.8%	12.9%	12.4%	3.55

4.1.2. The educational translanguaging reported by teachers

In contrast to the teachers' overwhelmingly positive attitudes toward translanguaging, the findings pertain to the teachers' attitudes on translanguaging. That is, a significant disparity between

instructors reported educational methods and their expressed attitudes was found in the analysis. The instructors expressed a tendency to shy away from employing translanguaging as a strategy to advance language acquisition despite their optimistic outlooks. This ambivalence is demonstrated by the 2.69 overall mean for the items in Table 6. In particular, "describing vocabulary" (M=2.27) was the area in which teachers used students' native language(s) the least frequently.

Table 6

Instructors' self-reported usage of the native language(s) of their students

	Very often	Often	Sometimes	Not often	Never	Mean
Explaining concepts	8.6%	17.1%	18.2%	33.6%	24.3%	2.52
To describe vocabulary	11.1%	10.2%	17.9%	31.2%	29.6%	2.27
To give directions	8.1%	13.4%	21.2%	32.1%	25.2%	2.4
For classroom management	9.8%	11.8%	18.2%	33.1%	27.1%	2.42
To give feedback to students	11.2%	10.7%	21.2%	30.5%	26.4%	2.51
To praise students	6.1%	15.2%	27.2%	27.8%	23.7%	2.48
Building bonds with students	9.8%	13.2%	19.1%	27.6%	30.3%	3.21
To help low proficiency students	24.8%	26.2%	20.1%	16.5%	12.4%	3.38
Discussing content in small groups	6.8%	14.2%	23.5%	26.4%	29.1%	3.05
To help peers	16.2%	25.1%	23.5%	18.1%	17.1%	3.12
To brainstorm during class activities	9.7%	12.3%	24.6%	28.5%	24.9%	2.46
Explaining problems not related to content	6.1%	11.2%	31.2%	27.5%	24%	2.52
Responding to teacher's questions	9.1%	16.2%	19.1%	34.5%	21.1%	2.61
Asking permission	5.1%	15.9%	21.2%	27.5%	30.3	2.84

Table 6 shows that, on the whole, the teachers discouraged five out of the six things, neither "very often" nor "often" supporting them. For instance, in students' L1, the majority of teachers did not promote "discussion of content or activities in small groups" (M=3.05). Conversely, it appeared

that teachers forbade their students from using their original language(s) in order to "ask permission" (M=2.84). The sole educational scenario where students' utilization of their mother tongue(s) was neither discouraged nor promoted was when they were "assisting peers during activities" (M=3.12).

In their open-ended comments, a few of the instructors who chose to avoid and oppose translanguaging in their classrooms further expressed their thinking. Among the instructors' remarks, one that stood out was how many attributed their decision-making to institutional pressure to follow the "English-only" policy, saying things like "It's not always my choice." The university where I work has its own set of policies and procedures. I have to speak in English exclusively in class, and we have to use English only. I understand that there are situations where speaking Arabic is beneficial, but I don't want to endanger my career.

Some instructors justified their refusal to use the students' original language or languages. Another tiny subset of educators chose not to use translanguaging on purpose because they believed that teaching and learning a language should only take place in its native tongue.

5. Discussion

The current study sought to find out how English language instructors felt about pedagogical translanguaging in EMI classes and, more significantly, how much of those feelings was reflected in the reported pedagogical practices of the teachers. The obvious discrepancy between the answers to these two questions was the most common finding. The findings, which are consistent with those of other research (e.g., Nambisan, 2014; Pinto, 2020), show that teachers' opinions about translanguaging were generally favorable, and they were aware of its benefits and efficacy in the classroom. Nonetheless, and in line with Yuvayapan's (2019) findings, the instructors' favorable views were not reflected in their instructional strategies. A positive stance on translanguaging does not always convert into learner-centered methods, as Prilutskaya (2021) notes, "although teachers' attitudes tend to be powerful mediators of new pedagogical practices in the classroom" (p. 9).

The literature on translanguaging, according to Vaish (2019), rarely documents the challenges encountered by teachers. The experience by Carroll and van den Hoven (2017) in the United Arab Emirates serves as an example since the participants felt it was too hazardous to permit researchers to watch their courses in order to record and report on their translanguaging methods. In contrast

to in-person interviews and observations, the study's participating instructors were more willing to talk openly about their opinions and behaviors because of the anonymity provided by the questionnaire. The constant pressure to impose the "English Only" policy, which forbids any usage of the learners' L1, is a major issue expressed by the research participants, which drove them to behave against their views and beliefs (Deroo & Ponzio, 2019). The majority of Saudi tertiary institutions' ELT policies are still essentially based on unexamined monolingual ideologies, despite the fact that "there is now a reaction against the traditional views of teaching languages based on the isolation of the target language and the reference to the ideal monolingual speaker" (Cenoz & Gorter, 2021, p. 14).

In addition to language policies, instructors cited the lack of disclosure on students' linguistic backgrounds as contributing to the poor adoption of translanguaging in their instruction. Teachers felt that they were not familiar with the students' first language when it came to translanguaging. This demonstrates how little the lecturers knew about the intricate and dynamic nature of translanguaging. Scholars have acknowledged that adopting translanguaging pedagogies does not need instructors to be proficient in their students' first language (L1) (Burton & Rajendram, 2019; Flores & García, 2013).

Instructors cannot feasibly communicate in every language spoken by their students. Wang (2019) contends that educators may establish a classroom environment in which students' voices and contributions are recognized and esteemed. The instructors' commitment to the "monolingual fallacy," which posits that English Language Teaching (ELT) "should be conducted solely in English" to "optimize language acquisition regardless of the learner's other linguistic competencies," constituted an additional obstacle to the implementation of translanguaging (Phillipson, 1992).

The study's results have important implications for both policy and practice. The study results make it clear that one important question needs to be thought about above all others: how can pedagogical translanguaging be supported by language education programs and in-service professional development courses when there is a strong belief in monolingualism that hurts many languages teaching and learning practices in this study and many others around the world? The first and most important thing is that these programs and courses should give future

teachers the chance to think deeply about and question the common beliefs that are present in many schools around the world, such as English-only rules (Caldas, 2019).

6. Conclusion

The concept of translanguaging within the field of TEFL has received significant attention recently. Although there has been an increase in studies, there has been a lack of study on this issue, specifically on the Iraqi setting. The present study addresses the vacuum in knowledge and contributes to the current academic literature by investigating the perspectives of English language instructors towards pedagogical translanguaging. The study reveals a clear difference between instructors' attitudes toward translanguaging. This provides valuable insights into the intricate relationship between teachers' attitudes and the actual classroom practice.

The participants exhibit a preference for using English when expressing their learning experiences, planning for future workplaces worldwide, and sharing their research. However, they acknowledge their low ability in English, as well as that of their pupils. To establish and implement an improved EMI strategy, it is crucial to do a thorough study on enhancing academic language (English) and abilities in relation to literacy practices. This necessitates a language strategy that transitions from a broad framework of EMI to one that is specifically tailored to the agents' specific requirements, real-life experiences, and difficulties encountered in their professional environments.

References

- Airey, J., Lauridsen, K. M., Räsänen, A., Salö, L., & Schwach, V. (2015). The expansion of English-medium instruction in the Nordic countries: Can top-down university language policies encourage bottom-up disciplinary literacy goals? *Higher Education*, 73(4), 561–576.
- Al-Bataineh, A. (2020). Language policy in higher education in the United Arab Emirates: Proficiency, choices and the future of Arabic. *Language Policy*, 1–22.
- Alexander, O. (2013). Exploring teacher beliefs in teaching EAP at low proficiency levels. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 11(2), J.111.
- Almayez, M. (2019). *The Professional Identity Construction of Non-local NNESTs in the Saudi Context*. (Doctoral Dissertaion). University of Southampton.

- Althusser, L. (2006). Ideology and ideological state apparatuses (notes towards an investigation). *The Anthropology of the State: A Reader*, 9(1), 86–98.
- Anderson, J., & Lightfoot, A. (2021). Translingual practices in English classrooms in India: Current perceptions and future possibilities. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 24(8), 1210–1231.
- Back, M., Han, M., & Weng, S.-C. (2020). Emotional scaffolding for emergent multilingual learners through translanguaging: Case stories. *Language and Education*, 34(5), 387–406.
- Bhabha, H. K. (1994). *The location of culture*. Routledge.
- Blommaert, J. (2010). *The sociolinguistics of globalization*. Cambridge University Press.
- Botha, W. (2013). English-medium instruction at a university in Macau: Policy and realities. *World Engineering*, 32(4), 461–475.
- Burton, J., & Rajendram, S. (2019). Translanguaging-as-resource: University ESL instructors' language orientations and attitudes toward translanguaging. *TESL Canada Journal*, 36(1), 21–47.
- Caldas, B. (2019). To switch or not to switch: Bilingual preservice teachers and translanguaging in teaching and learning. *TESOL Journal*, 10(4), e485.
- Canagarajah, S. (2013). *Translingual practice: Global Englishes and cosmopolitan relations*. Routledge.
- Carrió-Pastor, M. L. (2020). *Internationalising learning in higher education: The challenges of english as a medium of instruction*. Springer.
- Carroll, K. S., & van den Hoven, M. (2017). Translanguaging within higher education in the United Arab Emirates. In C. M. Mazak & K. S. Carroll (Eds.), *Translanguaging in higher education: Beyond monolingual ideologies* (pp. 141–156). Multilingual Matters.
- Cenoz, J., & Gorter, D. (2020). Teaching English through pedagogical translanguaging. *World Engineering*, 39(2), 300–311.

- Chang, S.-Y. (2019). Beyond the english box: Constructing and communicating knowledge through translanguaging practices in the higher education classroom. *English Teaching & Learning*, 43(1), 23–40. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s42321-018-0014-4>
- Coleman, J. A. (2006). English-medium teaching in European higher education. *Language Teaching*, 39, 1-14.
- Costa, F., & Coleman, J. A. (2012). A survey of English-medium instruction in Italian higher Education. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 16(1), 3–19.
- De Prat, J. M. (2020). *Teaching through english: The case of international commerce*. In M. L. Carrió-Pastor (Ed.), *Internationalising learning in higher education: The challenges of english as a medium of instruction* (pp. 179–200). Macmillan.
- Dearden, J. (2014). British Council: English as a medium of instruction – growing global phenomenon [online]. Available online at https://www.britishcouncil.org/sites/default/files/e484_emi_-_cover_option_3_final_web.pdf
- Dearden, J. (2014). *English as a medium of instruction—a growing global phenomenon*. British Council.
- 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.
- Flores, N., & García, O. (2013). *Linguistic third spaces in education: Teachers’ translanguaging across the bilingual continuum*. In D. Little, C. Leung, & P. Van Avermaet (Eds.), *Managing Diversity in education: Languages, policies, pedagogies* (pp. 243–256). Multilingual Matters
- García, O., Wei, L., García, O., & Wei, L. (2014). *Language, bilingualism and education*. In *Translanguaging: Language, bilingualism and education* (pp. 46–62). Palgrave Macmillan.
- Graham, K. M., & Eslami, Z. R. (2019). Attitudes toward EMI in East Asia and the Gulf: A systematic review. *Language Problems & Language Planning*, 43(1), 8–31.

- House, J. (2014). English as a global lingua franca: A threat to multilingual communication and translation? *Language Teaching*, 47(3), 363–376.
- Hu, G., & Lei, J. (2014). English-Medium Instruction in Chinese higher education.
- Humphreys, P. (2017). EMI in Anglophone nations: Contradiction in terms or cause
- Jenkins, J. (2015). *Repositioning English and multilingualism in English as a Lingua*
- Jørgensen, J. N. (2008). Polylingual languaging around and among children and adolescents. *International Journal of Multilingualism*, 5(3), 161–176.
- Kirkpatrick, A. (2011). *English as an Asian lingua franca and the multilingual model*
- Kubota, R. (2016). The multi/plural turn, postcolonial theory, and neoliberal multiculturalism: Complicities and implications for applied linguistics. *Applied Linguistics*, 37(4), 474–494
- 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
- Li, W. (2011). *Moment Analysis and translanguaging space: Discursive construction*
- Li, W. (2016). New chinglish and the post-multilingualism challenge: Translanguaging ELF in China. *Journal of English as Lingua Franca*, 5(1), 1–25.
- Mahboob, A. (2014). Meeting the challenges of English-medium higher education
- Mazak, C. M. (2017). Introduction: Translanguaging practices in higher education. In
- Moody, S., Chowdhury, M., & Eslami, Z. (2019). Graduate students' perceptions of translanguaging. *English Teaching & Learning*, 43(1), 85–103.
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s42321-018-0019-z>
- Nambisan, K. (2014). *Teachers' attitudes towards and uses of translanguaging in English language classrooms in Iowa*. Iowa State University
- Pennycook, A. (2010). *The future of Englishes one, many or none?.* In A. Kirkpatrick
- Phillipson, R. (1992). *Linguistic imperialism*. Oxford University Press.
- Phillipson, R. (2009). *Disciplines of English and disciplining by English*. Asian EFL

- Pinto, J. (2020). Chinese teachers' attitudes towards translanguaging and its uses in Portuguese foreign language classrooms. *Theory and Practice of Second Language Acquisition*, 1(6), 11–30
- Ponzio, C. M., & Deroo, M. R. (2021). Harnessing multimodality in language teacher education: Expanding English-dominant teachers' translanguaging capacities through a multimodalities entextualization cycle. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050.2021.1933893>
- Prilutskaya, M. (2021). Examining pedagogical translanguaging: A systematic review of the literature. *Languages*, 6(4), 180
- Rajendram, S. (2021). Translanguaging as an agentive pedagogy for multilingual learners: Afordances and constraints. *International Journal of Multilingualism*. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14790718.2021.1898619>
- Stille, S. V. V., 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.
- Toh, G. (2016). *English as medium of instruction in Japanese higher education: Presumption, mirage or bluff*. Springer.
- Vaish, V. (2019). Challenges and directions in implementing translanguaging pedagogy for low achieving students. *Classroom Discourse*, 10(3–4), 274–289
- Wang, D. (2019). Translanguaging in Chinese foreign language classrooms: Students and teachers' attitudes and practices. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 22(2), 33–59.
- Yuvayapan, F. (2019). Translanguaging in EFL classrooms: Teachers' perceptions and practices. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies*, 15(2), 678–694.