



A Transformational Shift through Pedagogical Translanguaging: English Language Teaching and the Content of Courses

Mohammad Iman Askari^{1*}, Mahsa Ranjbar²

^{1*}Department of English Language, Central Tehran Branch, Islamic Azad University, Tehran, Iran

²Department of English Language, Allameh Tabataba'i University, Tehran, Iran

Received: June 15, 2022

Accepted: July 20, 2022

ABSTRACT

Due to the Covid-19 pandemic and considerable reliance on virtual education and communication, the language acquisition contexts are focusing on the transformational shift in pedagogies applying multilingual communicative capacities like 'translanguaging'. Perhaps the best academic resources to explore about the issue are translation-oriented courses taught through typical teaching strategies in academic English programs. The issue led to the reinforcement of considering pedagogical translanguaging within the English Language Teaching (ELT) context among EFL learners who attend the related courses of the ELT programs focusing on translation skills. Thus, a sequential explanatory mixed design was selected to study the possible transformation resulting from translanguaging among EFL learners and teachers in the current study. As the pedagogical implications of the study, it is possible to declare that translanguaging within the EFL context is considered an influential strategy in helping teachers and learners to benefit from bilingual capacities in providing and understanding the content of courses. The issue also emphasizes on the transformational shift among the scholars and experts of the EFL context to have a new look over the role of translation, as an interactive code-switching procedure between First Language (L1) and Second Language (L2), which does not ban the language learners' linguistic repertoire application.

Keywords: English as a Foreign Language (EFL); English Language Teaching (ELT); First Language (L1); Second Language (L2); Translanguaging

INTRODUCTION

For decades, the monolingual approaches were dominant in teaching languages (e.g., English) to speakers of other languages in order to incline the teaching process to fulfill students' social, communicative, and academic purposes in the target languages, by which not sufficient attention was paid to the learners' linguistic backgrounds or First Language (L1) (Kleyn & Garcia, 2019). Pedagogically, the issue was rooted in the teachers' beliefs on teaching languages as structural systems which require a pack of skills, needless of the necessary

practices (Pennycook, 2010). Simultaneously, the stakeholders in the context of language teaching keep concerns over the native-like mastery of the Target Language (TL) among the learners as the main objective of their programs development. This is naturally occurred in educational context, while the instructors automatically attempt to empower the learners to become advanced English speakers at the cost of oppressing the possible bilinguals training (Garcia, 2009). Pedagogically, the issue was concerned as a shift between the different language systems or a deviation from the norm that turned into the systematic alteration called 'code-switching' acting as a

*Corresponding Author's Email:
miman.askari@gmail.com

facilitator in the second/target language acquisition (Martin, 2005). Accordingly, the context of language teaching adapted towards the multilingual norms and the studies on behavioral and communicative aspects of bilingual learners took a more prominent role in the application of multi-languages in learning contexts, as a result translanguaging was proposed as a learning strategy (Garcia & Li Wei, 2014).

To be more focal, within the higher education context, where most instructors and students speak Persian as their mother tongue, and English as their Second Language (L2), professors of various English language disciplines such as English Language Teaching (ELT) have always expressed their concerns about the strategies to convey the content of the courses in English-Persian (or Persian-English), which are included in the curriculum of the program and are obliged to be taught to students with different first and second languages. Thus, different language strategies have been implemented in English as a Foreign Language (EFL) classrooms, depending on the students' linguistic abilities in L1 and L2 as well as the linguistic perspectives of the course, all of which put emphasize on the educational strategies of the programs/courses. Pedagogically, since the concerns of instructors and learners, specifically in providing EFL, are dealt with the emergence of translanguaging as a teaching and learning strategy, the current study seeks to investigate the transformational shift occurred through translanguaging within ELT and course content providing/ understanding contexts. Via declaring the purpose of the research, the following questions were proposed to find out more the possible answers to the study's subject:

RQ1: *Does Translanguaging' significantly affect Iranian EFL learners' foreign language acquisition?*

To answer to the quantitative questions of the study, the following null hypothesis was proposed:

Ho: Translanguaging does not significantly affect Iranian EFL learners' foreign language acquisition.

RQ2: *How the EFL teachers can get across with translanguaging in their classes?*

LITERATURE REVIEW

During the last decades, most of the foreign language lecturers have witnessed the same problems resulted by different aspects of L1 interference on L2 acquisition through the learners' unconscious preference to benefit from L1 to cope with the difficulties in L2 within all aspects of language learning (Beardsmore, 1982). Besides, the advantages of such a reliance of learners towards their linguistic habits in L1, it is noteworthy to consider the phenomenon as the resource for errors in L2 acquisition and use. To be more precise, the errors resulted by L1 interference, i.e., developmental errors, ambiguous errors, and unique errors with different roots. Thus, in defining the interference as an influential factor in a foreign language learning context, former linguistic habits should be dealt with to avoid a negative transfer occurrence (Dulay et al., 1982).

The interference might change its role when the learners cope with the initial difficulties in L2 acquisition and become ready to think bilingually during the next steps of language mastery and course content learning in L2.

Although, L2 acquisition sounds different from L1 in terms of learning procedures, the errors resulted by the interference between the two languages seem to be similar (Dulay et al., 1982). Meanwhile, the two types of positive and negative transfer from L1 to L2 seem to be influential among the learners during their transformation process to understand the course content in a bilingual mode, i.e., the positive transfer in which L1 is a facilitator in L2 acquisition and negative transfer in which L1 acting negatively in L2 acquisition (Selinker, 1983). Within the two cases, the role of L1 in L2 acquisition is inevitable through considering the potential effects languages might have on each other either as a problem solver or a ban maker in dealing with the possible interactions between the two languages' capacities realized mentally and communicatively as the inter-language skills and linguistic backgrounds (Faerch & Kasper, 1987). This is

the stage where according to Lord, foreign language learning should be investigated through the two way interaction between L1 and L2, i.e., the effects L1 might have on L2 and the converse case as well (2008). This is naturally occurred in educational context, while the instructors automatically attempt to empower the learners to become advanced English speakers at the cost of oppressing the possible bilinguals training (Garcia, 2009). Pedagogically, the issue was concerned as a shift between the different language systems or a deviation from the norm that turned into the systematic alteration called ‘code-switching’ aiming at the L2 ease of acquisition (Martin, 2005). Accordingly, the context of language teaching adapted towards the multilingual norms and the studies on behavioral and communicative aspects of bilingual learners took a more prominent role in the application of multi-languages in learning contexts, as a result translanguaging was proposed as a learning strategy (Garcia & Li Wei, 2014).

Table 1
Demographic Background of the Participants

Group	Gender	No.	Age Range	Field of Study	Nativ Language	Proficiency level
Experimental	Male & Female	30	19-25	EFL	Persian	Intermediate
Control	Male & Female	30	19-25	EFL	Persian	Intermediate

Regarding the qualitative phase of the study, fifteen EFL teachers with at least ten years of teaching experience in providing the common courses of academic English programs consisting of translation studies, English language teaching, and English language literature at Islamic Azad University were selected using purposeful sampling to participate in the interview.

Materials

Since the study consists of EFL learners of BA program, the teaching materials applied in the research involved language teaching and content proficiency of EFL learners taught via the traditional lecture providing (e.g., one-sided translation) and applying translanguaging to benefit from the learners' bilingual repertoire. Further to the context of

METHODS

Participants

For the quantitative phase of the study, sixty EFL learners in two intact classes of English program were selected as the participants of the study from among 120 EFL male and female learners in four classes of the researcher, through which the students from of two classes were selected as the participants on the basis of the results gained in the B1 preliminary test. Thus, one class students consisting of 30 participants were considered for the experimental group, while the students of the other class cooperated as the control group. The participants were selected based on the convenient sampling procedure and they were all the native speakers of Persian language who study in the BA program of English as a Foreign Language at Islamic Azad University in 2021-2022 with the required prerequisites of language proficiency at academic level. The demographic data of the participants are shown in Table 1.

study, the proficiency assessment of the EFL learners was developed to evaluate the effectiveness of applying translanguaging as the strategy for providing and understanding the course content. Accordingly, based on the topic of the courses, the researcher—i.e., the teacher of the program—asked the learners to share their ideas and viewpoints about the topics' content in their native language (Persian). On the next step, the teacher provided the learners with some of the target language resources concerning terminological aspects of the topic and further translational requirements in L1 and L2. Furthermore, the teacher placed the students in the discussion groups and let them to discuss about the topic both in learners' L1 and L2, while mentoring the correct application of the target language.

Finally, the groups provide their final comments on the topic whether in their native language or in English as the outcome of drawing on the learners' full linguistic repertoires. In this process, translation is applied as an aid to lead the learners' in applying their potential cognitive and linguistic resources to learn English as a foreign language via a specific content in the target language, through which the teacher is becoming the facilitator in recognizing and building the learners' bilingual identities for a better engagement in the content. The topic and content of the discussion groups were selected from the academic resources for speaking and listening. Thus, the sentences and context of the teaching materials went under the pretesting and posttesting procedures in the parallel mode for both experimental and control groups. The piloting procedure of the tests included 10 participants of the study to check the reliability of tests via KR-21 method. The reliability of the pretest and posttest were 0.86 and 0.79, respectively.

Instruments

Further to the objectives of the research, the following instruments were utilized:

B1 Preliminary Test

A B1 preliminary test was applied to ensure the homogeneity of the participants incooperated in the experimental and control groups of the study. The Cronbach's alpha coefficient (0.79) was estimated to consider the internal consistency of the test results.

Translanguaging Practices

To help EFL learners in applying their L1 vocabulary background in L2 sentence development, translanguaging practices were utilized. Meanwhile, translanguaging was considered as a practice to incorporate students' L1 (Persian) in teaching the L2 (English) content. In applying the practices, translanguaging was not merely focusing on code-switching, but also was concerned as the pedagogical activities of the learners' bilingual repertoires. Adapted from Mazak

and Herbas-Donoso (2014), the related translanguaging practices of the current study could cover the application of L1 key terminologies in providing and discussing the content (course text) in L2 as well as the interchangeable application of L1 and L2 in various language skills (e.g., listening to the content in L1 and Speaking about it in L2).

Foreign Language Course Content Proficiency Assessment in Speaking and Listening

The context of language teaching among EFL learners through translanguaging required the study to consider the assessment of participants whether at pretest and posttest phases of the study. The assessment considered the content proficiency of EFL learners taught via the traditional via one-sided translation and applying translanguaging to benefit from the learners' bilingual repertoire. Further to the context of study, the content proficiency assessment was developed according to the curriculum's objectives for specific English-major students within receptive and productive aspects of listening and speaking skills.

The assessment was piloted among a group of English-major students to consider its feasibility. Out of the piloting study, the means of item difficulty and item distinguishing indexes were calculated by 0.68 and 0.86. Also, the Cronbach Alpha for internal consistency coefficient of the items in the assessment was calculated by 0.91. The piloting procedure was conducted to consider the participants' scores upon the overall organization and coherence, vocabulary range, grammatical accuracy, content, format & length, and the listening & speaking skills rubrics concerning pronunciation, fluency and coherence, lexical resource, grammatical range, and accuracy. Thus, the content proficiency skills assessment was applied as pre and posttests for the participants at experimental and control groups which were evaluated by two English expert teachers independently. The inter-rater reliability analysis (Pearson correlation) between the pretest and posttest results was calculated by $r = 0.82$ and $r = 0.85$ for speaking as well as $r = 0.79$ and $r = 0.73$ for listening tests,

respectively, as an evidence of reliability between the raters.

Interviews

To explain how EFL teachers are getting across with translanguaging, a semi-structured interview was conducted concerning translanguaging, EFL context, as well as course content providing and understanding as the major concepts in a learning environment with the interaction of at least two languages. As the nature of an open-ended interview, EFL teachers were asked to provide the researcher with the core concept of their activities in dealing with learners to provide the course content in a language (L2) different from the learners' native language (L1) and applying translation in an interactive mode.

Procedure

Through the quantitative section of the study the three phases of a quasi-experimental design including pretest, treatment, and the posttest were run. Initially, the participants at the two groups attended at the pretest phase to determine their background knowledge about the content of the courses provided by the researcher in the classrooms. In the second phase, the treatment, including four sessions of teaching the content to the experimental group via applying translanguaging to benefit from the learners' bilingual repertoire, was administered while the participants in the control group followed their learning procedure through the traditional lecture providing in a one-sided translation mode by the teacher according to the curriculum's objectives of EFL programs. Following four weeks of instruction, the posttest was administered among the participants. The pretest and posttest results were scored by two raters and were checked via the inter-rater reliability. The data were analyzed through using SPSS software and reported. After the quantitative phase of the study which was focused on EFL learners and translanguaging, the study proceeded with the qualitative phase using interviews to further explain the findings in the first phase through understanding EFL teachers' viewpoints about the phenomenon and the application of

translanguaging in the related classes aiming at distinguishing the justified beliefs of teachers about the concept.

Design and Analysis

The research adopts a sequential explanatory mixed study design consisting quantitative and qualitative phases. Within the first phase, translanguaging, as the strategy in teaching the foreign language content, was considered as the independent variable and the EFL learners' ability to acquire the foreign language was the dependent variable. Furthermore, the participants' language proficiency and gender were considered as the control variables. The two intact classes of participants were randomly assigned as the experimental and control groups of the quantitative phase. The participants in the experimental group were provided with the content of their course via translanguaging, while the participant in the control group followed the conventional methods of teaching the foreign language content via presentation, practice, and product processes. Based on the two groups' outcome, various quantitative analyses were provided in the results section.

Following the quantitative data analyses, experienced EFL teachers were participated the qualitative phase of the study to explain how they would get across with translanguaging in their classes through applying a semi-structured interview to probe (1) the role of translanguaging in providing the EFL context (2) what EFL teachers thought about the role of translanguaging in providing the EFL learners with the course content and (3) what EFL teachers thought about the role of translanguaging in EFL learners' course content understanding. The results in the second phase of the study went under analytical inductive and deductive approaches to explain more about the data found in the first phase.

RESULTS

The reliability assurance between the raters' scores (on pretest and posttest results on the two groups) was considered via the results of the Cronbach alpha as represented in Table 2. The expected consistency on the scores of the

Rater 1 (R1) and Rater 2 (R2) was revealed by the Cronbach's Alpha estimation which was above .70. A significant degree of inter-rater reliability between R1 and R2 was revealed via the average measures of .922 and .913 (intra-class correlation at experimental and control groups). Moreover, the Analysis of Covariance (ANCOVA) was applied to control the potential effect of the covariate, by which it was possible to consider the prior varieties between the two groups of the study. Thus, the potential effect of such differences on Iranian EFL learners' foreign language acquisition

was considered in concluding the validated results obtained from the application of translanguaging as the treatment of the study. Respectively, the two levels of the between-subjects factors of the groups were considered by which, the obtained p values of the analysis (.524 and .601 > 0.5) proved a statistically insignificant interaction between the pretest results (covariate) and the independent variable of the study as the treatment. The research findings, as represented in Tables 3 and 4, emphasized the homogeneity of regressions, indicating the similarities between the groups.

Table 2
Raters and Groups Inter-item Correlation Matrix

Group	Cronbach's Alpha		Cronbach's Alpha Based on Standardized Items		
	.922		.915		
Experimental	R1 Pretest Score	R2 Pretest Score	R1 Posttest Score	R2 Posttest Score	
	R1 Pretest Score	1.000	.670	.711	.741
	R2 Pretest Score	.645	1.000	.733	.716
	R1 Posttest Score	.691	.703	1.000	.768
	R2 Posttest Score	.706	.653	.791	1.000
Control	Cronbach's Alpha		Cronbach's Alpha Based on Standardized Items		
	.913		.901		
Control	R1 Pretest Score	R2 Pretest Score	R1 Posttest Score	R2 Posttest Score	
	R1 Pretest Score	1.000	.716	.619	.555
	R2 Pretest Score	.763	1.000	.414	.464
	R1 Posttest Score	.566	.471	1.000	.601
	R2 Posttest Score	.492	.498	.566	1.000

Table 3
Control Group Tests of Between-Subjects Effects

Source	Type III Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Group	.081	1	.081	1.19	.296
PRETEST	41.86	1	41.86	53.01	.000
Group * PRETEST	.043	1	.043	.518	.524
Error	2.39	31	.077		
Total	401.01	41			
Corrected Total	85.111	49			

Table 4
Experimental Group Tests of Between-Subjects Effects

Source	Type III Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Group	.001	1	.001	.017	.841
PRETEST	33.42	1	33.42	44.19	.000
Group * PRETEST	.019	1	.019	.017	.601
Error	8.74	39	.224		
Total	488.11	46			
Corrected Total	91.13	49			

Table 5 represents the data related to the further assumptions of the study on considering the equalities between the two groups of the study via analyzing the unadjusted group's means and standard deviations. To

do so, the Levine's test of homogeneity of variance was applied based on which, the p values ($>.05$) of the groups were considered to proceed to the next step of the results analysis.

Table 5
Levene's Test Results for the Equality of Error Variances^a

Group	F	df1	df2	Sig.
Control	.584	1	50	.542
Experimental	.619	1	50	.601

Finally, to consider the practical effect of the treatment provided by tranlanguaging on the outcome—i.e., the test of the main hypothesis—the tests of between-subjects effects were run to reach the actual analysis of ANCOVA in the experimental group, the data

of which represented in Tables 6 and 7. The posttest data analysis resulted from the effect of applying translanguaging indicated a significant difference in the scores of the treatment group via the adjusted means and p values ($<.05$).

Table 6
Test of Null Hypothesis via Tests of Between-Subjects Effects (Treatment Group)

Source	Type III Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Partial Eta Squared	Noncent. Parameter	Observed Power ^b
PRETEST	76.62	1	76.62	297.11	.000	.701	285.13	1.000
Group	5.13	1	5.13	20.19	.000	.319	19.76	.913
Error	13.11	46	.31					
Total	791.01	49						
Corrected Total	111.20	47						

Through the final results analysis of the study it is possible to declare that the treatment effect was significant on Iranian EFL learners' foreign language acquisition via applying translanguaging as the strategy for providing the course content via concerning the p value [$p (.000) < (.05)$] and controlling for the effect of pretest, as the covariate, leading the study's finding to reject the null hypothesis.

As it is represented in Table 6, the significant p value ($.000 < .05$) declared the efficacy of applying translanguaging as the teaching strategy among EFL learners emphasized by the effect size of .319 as the strength of independent variable or treatment of the

study. The study could also reject the null hypothesis strongly via the observed power of test (.913).

Furthermore, the partial Eta Squared results emphasized the significance of considering the potential effect of the covariate (the pretest) effect (70 percent) associated with the related significant level of the tests of between-subjects effects for the treatment group ($.000 < .05$). Respectively, the adjusted means of the groups based upon the influence of the covariate were considered on the post hoc tests for the further influential differences between the experimental and control groups, the results of which represented in Table 7.

Table 7
Estimated Marginal Means Between Experimental and Control Groups

Group	Mean	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval	
			Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Experimental	3.157 ^a	.087	3.002	3.312
Control	2.760 ^a	.087	2.540	2.981

PRETEST_AVG = 2.7788

The differences between the groups were also significant on the outcome via the pair-wise comparisons and univariate tests' data resulted from the multiple measurements of p

value (.000 <.05) out of the adjusted means. The results on the differences, controlling for the effect of the covariate, are represented in Tables 8 and 9.

Table 8
Groups Pairwise Comparisons Results

(I) Group	(J) Group	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig. ^b	95% Confidence Interval for Difference ^b	
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Experimental	Control	.571*	.111	.000	.392	.813
Control	Experimental	-.571*	.111	.000	-.813	-.392

Table 9
Groups Univariate Tests Results

	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Partial Eta Squared	Noncent. Parameter	Observed Power ^a
Contrast	5.13	1	5.13	20.19	.000	.319	19.76	.913
Error	13.11	46	.31					

Finally, to explain the findings on the quantitative phase and getting involved with understanding of EFL teachers about the application of translanguaging in classes, the analytical inductive and deductive approaches were administered. To do so, after finalizing the interviews' transcripts, the content revealing the possible proximities between EFL teachers and translanguaging in their classes were thematically analyzed.

In addition to different orientations proposed by EFL teachers on translanguaging in dealing with the dynamic code-switching procedures and providing the course content, the concept was viewed as an appropriate strategy to convey the content when teachers observe the learners' shortcomings in a target language oriented class activity. The issue was emphasized as the practical realization of the benefits resulted from the learners' use of multilingual/bilingual capacities in their integrated communicative system. The thematic analysis of the transcripts made out of the interviews also emphasized on the positive

role of multilingual capacities in providing the course content, since within an EFL context translanguaging was viewed as the pedagogical instrument to convey the content more accurately. The issue might be the result of the teachers and learners' awareness of the similarities and differences between L1 and L2 that led them to use translanguaging as a facilitator within EFL context. Regarding the role of translanguaging in providing and understanding the course content in a two way interaction between instructors and learners, EFL teachers kept considering the language in context, the same way as emphasized by Kramsch that language should not be seen merely as a linguistic system, but should be seen in context as a linked coded system for making meaning. The issue turned to be more sensible in the context of EFL due to the importance of dealing with the content integration and the simultaneous emphasis on the study of language concerning different cultural and the contextual perspectives in learning (2013).

DISCUSSIONS

Recently, the discussions over language acquisition and learning put the researchers' attention on the act of translation and the reformation of the concept on the issues incorporated in the language mastery, as an independent entity, that might result in the concept formation on knowledge transfer within academic contexts.

In this respect, the modern EFL context share the same concerns, by which those who are engaged in the field express their worries, resulted from the ignorance the learners' first language, over the dominance of monolingual perspectives and target-based language teaching on the outcomes expected from the learners (Taylor & Snoddon, 2013). The issue is also emphasized through concerning English language pedagogies as the isolated structured system providing skilled-based approaches towards learning procedures by focusing on grammar and vocabulary. As a result, the learners' L1 might not play the needed role in the L2 development pragmatically (Richards & Rodgers, 2014). Thus, in looking for a medium concerning the role of L1 in L2 acquisition, the experts of EFL attempted to conceptualize the aiding translational activities and strategies in providing the content. This is the place where interactive code-switching and translanguaging come to the field. The discussion over the coincidence of the two concepts in providing the content among EFL learners have been the issue of concern emphasized for the last decade. To be more precise, the potential role of translanguaging on EFL learners' course content acquisition have been concerned by the field's experts, through the comparisons, to integrate or incorporate dynamic code-switching in the teaching process applied in a specific course. On the other hand, although code-switching, according to Garcia and Li Wei (2014) is considered as the shift between L1 and L2 within specific structural peculiarities, it might preserve its effect on the appropriate application of translanguaging. In this view, further enhancement in language acquisition requires further linguistic capacities called "repertoire" not focusing on the changing process in monolingual context. Thus, a more meaningful application of translation benefiting from the optimum linguistic capaci-

ties of learners, i.e., translanguaging, might be needed in the process of language acquisition, specifically in dealing with course content providing. Accordingly, the role of the course content should not be ignored since the pedagogical materials within EFL context are mostly translation-oriented that seek learners' L1 and L2 skills dynamic interchange aiming at a meaningful linguistic concept formation.

Moreover, it is essential to have an overview of the changes that teachers and learners might have experienced by the related translational theories and practices. Although, the realization of translation in the EFL context is the key element in providing the content, the related curricula still suffering from the lack of teaching strategies and methods forming on the basis of translation pedagogies to convey the planned materials in the academic programs and courses.

Furthermore, as the issue of concern in the current study was to consider the specific content and courses of EFL, inclined towards listening and speaking as the practical realization of the foreign language acquisition in the Iranian context, learners and teachers relied on various learning strategies that incorporate the students' background knowledge of the foreign language for a specific content. In this view, applying the linguistic repertoire for the purpose of L2-specific skills' understanding and providing seem to be essential. The findings also emphasized on the role of translanguaging, as the strategy that facilitates the process of course content providing among Iranian EFL learners, through which it is possible to consider the communicative skills applied by the learners and teachers in the training procedure. Obviously, such an interaction between learning and communication is occurred by the aimed teaching strategy in which the teacher acts as the motivator for the intended optimized bilingual learning capacity. Such a learning activity sounds even helpful in grasping the core content of the courses delivered to the EFL learners, when the specific attention is on applying the content for the skills like speaking and listening to that seeks the application of students' full linguistic capacities both in L1 and L2. Within the wider scopes, it is possible to declare that

translanguaging at least in a bilingual context of conveying the content, i.e., the pedagogic communicative norm of classrooms, sounds beneficial among the learners since the courses and the related topics are becoming more tangible by using the L2 specific skills. In this respect, translanguaging seems to play the same role like a language or an interlanguage, acting as the scaffolding mean of communication and strategic-based teaching methodologies and seeking a two-way interaction between languages.

CONCLUSION

As conclusion, it is worth mentioning that translanguaging in an EFL context is a comforting element among the learners in the process of knowledge transfer and language acquisition due to the ease of content exchange between their mother tongue and the foreign language. Meanwhile, when the discussion is focused on various language skills such as speaking and listening, it is concerned with the assurance of the bilingual content availability to the learners. Thus, it is possible to witness the pedagogical perspectives of translanguaging in a two-way discourse interactions and speech contexts. Practically, by the application of translanguaging, learners and teachers experienced a kind of novelty in the adaptation of materials and capacities in the skills like speaking and listening. Although in other contexts of learning, the interactive use of L1 might not be as beneficial as it should be, the use of L1 seems to be a supportive element in motivating the teachers and learners to get across with the course content in L2, specifically within EFL context. Accordingly, a transformational shift through pedagogical translanguaging seems to be occurring among EFL learners and teachers through the related activities consisting of language teaching and course content providing/understanding. The fact seeks academic program developers to consider the role of translanguaging in dealing with bilingual content designing and providing.

The findings of the study are also beneficial for the learners and teachers of the EFL context via a thorough understanding of the concept formation in translanguaging within the classrooms. In this view, the related teaching

methodologies could be further adapted to fulfill the learners' needs and to transform the pedagogical methods based on the markets' requirements as the result of the continuous assessments conducted on the educational programs' course content proficiency.

References

- Beardmore, H. B. (1982). *Bilingualism*. Tieto: Avon.
- Dulay, H., Burt, M., & Krashen, S. (1982). *Language two*: New York: Oxford University Press.
- Faerch, C., & Kasper, G. (1987). Perspective on language transfer. *Applied Linguistics*, 8(2), 111-136.
- García, O., Wei, L. (2014). *Language, Bilingualism and Education*. In: *Translanguaging: Language, Bilingualism and Education*. Palgrave Pivot: London. https://doi.org/10.1057/9781137385765_4
- Pennycook, A. (2010). *Language as a Local Practice*. Milton Park Oxfordshire: Routledge.
- García, O. (2009). "Chapter 8 Education, Multilingualism and Translanguaging in the 21st Century". *Social Justice through Multilingual Education*, edited by Tove Skutnabb-Kangas, Robert Phillipson, Ajit K. Mohanty and Minati Panda, Bristol, Blue Ridge Summit: Multilingual Matters, 2009, pp. 140-158. <https://doi.org/10.21832/9781847691910-011>
- García, O., & Li Wei. (2014). *Translanguaging: Language, bilingualism and education*. New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Kleyn, T. & García, O. (2019). *Translanguaging as an Act of Transformation*. In the Handbook of TESOL in K-12, L.C. Oliveira (Ed.). <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781119421702.ch6>
- Kramsch, C. (2013). Culture in Foreign Language Teaching. *Iranian Journal of Language Teaching Research*, 1 (1), 57-78.
- Lord, G. (2008). Second language acquisition and first language phonological modification. *Proceedings of the 10th Hispanic linguistics symposium*. Ed. Joyece

- Bruhn de garavito and E. Valenzuela, 184-193. Somerville, MA: Cascadilla proceedings project.
- Mazak, C.M. & Herbas-Donoso, C. (2015). Translanguaging Practices at a Bilingual University: A Case Study of a Science classroom. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 18(6), 698-714.
- Martin, P. (2005). "Safe" language practices in two rural schools in Malaysia: Tensions between policy and practice. In A. M. Y. Lin, & P. Martin (Eds.), *Decolonization and Globalization: Language in education policy and practice* (pp. 74 – 97). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Richards, J. C., & Rodgers, T. S. (2014). *Approaches and Methods in Language Teaching* (3rd Ed.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Selinker, L. (1983). Language transfer. In S. Gass & L. Selinker (Eds.), *Language transfer in language learning* (pp.33-68). Rowley, MA: Newbury House.
- Taylor, S., & Snoddon, K. (2013). Plurilingualism in TESOL: Promising controversies. *TESOL Quarterly*, 47(3), 439–445.

Biodata

Mohammad Iman Askari is an Assistant Professor in the Department of English Language at Central Tehran Branch, Islamic Azad University, Tehran, Iran. He has been teaching at the university for about eight years as a lecturer and published several papers as well as a book about localization of translation and teaching methods applied in translation courses. His research interests include translation studies, teaching methodologies, TQA, translation criticism, and the possible contributions of translation and methods of teaching to each other.

Email: miman.askari@gmail.com

Mahsa Ranjbar is a Ph.D. Candidate at Al-lameh Tabataba'i University in Tehran. She studied Computer Engineering at the bachelor's level and English Language Teaching at the master's level. Her research interests include applied linguistics, computational linguistics, translation studies, and teaching methodologies.

Email: mim.ranjbar@gmail.com