

12-31-2022

Teachers' Perspectives on Translanguaging as a Pedagogical Resource in Senior High School English Classes

Karen Lynn G. Macawile

City Schools Division of Dasmariñas, Cavite, Philippines, karen.macawile@deped.gov.ph

Sterling M. Plata

De La Salle University, sterling.plata@dlsu.edu.ph

Follow this and additional works at: <https://animorepository.dlsu.edu.ph/jeal>



Part of the [Applied Linguistics Commons](#), [Bilingual, Multilingual, and Multicultural Education Commons](#), [First and Second Language Acquisition Commons](#), [Language and Literacy Education Commons](#), and the [Secondary Education Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Macawile, Karen Lynn G. and Plata, Sterling M. (2022) "Teachers' Perspectives on Translanguaging as a Pedagogical Resource in Senior High School English Classes," *Journal of English and Applied Linguistics*: Vol. 1: No. 2, Article 7.

Available at: <https://animorepository.dlsu.edu.ph/jeal/vol1/iss2/7>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the DLSU Publications at Animo Repository. It has been accepted for inclusion in Journal of English and Applied Linguistics by an authorized editor of Animo Repository.

RESEARCH ARTICLE

Teachers' Perspectives on Translanguaging as a Pedagogical Resource in Senior High School English Classes

Karen Lynn G. Macawile¹ and Dr. Sterling M. Plata²

¹City Schools Division of Dasmariñas, Cavite, Philippines

²De La Salle University, Manila

karen.macawile@deped.gov.ph

sterling.plata@dlsu.edu.ph

Abstract: Translanguaging has been documented in previous research as a pedagogical resource in language classrooms. However, the monolingualistic culture prevents the leveraging of this resource in language learning. In addition, despite the extensive research on translanguaging, its use as a pedagogical resource is limited, particularly in the Philippine context. This study explores teachers' perspectives on translanguaging in Senior High School subjects where English is the medium of instruction. Findings from focus group discussions reveal that the participants leverage translanguaging as a resource to help students in knowledge construction, meaning-making, and problem-solving. This study concludes with implications for policymakers and language teachers who believe only English will help language learning.

Keywords: pedagogical resource, translanguaging, senior high school, language learning, meaning-making

English was introduced into the formal education system in the Philippines during the American colonization and was taught to be the language that would "civilize" Filipinos (Martin, 2012). It was promoted "as the language that would provide the Filipinos access to civilization... the life of reason and prudence" (Martin, 1999, p. 134). The English language was assumed to be a unifying language that would respond to finding common ground of understanding

among the different languages and regional dialects of Filipinos. Furthermore, the English language was used and retained as the medium of instruction for its advantages in international communication, economic advancement, technology, and globalization (Madrugno et al., 2016). One evident example is the notable rise of the Philippines' business process outsourcing (BPO) market.

However, the monolingual culture embedded in language education policies (LEPs) of the country still impedes bilingual and multilingual learning of the students, given the diverse linguistic landscape of the Philippines. Bernardo (2008) believed that developing English language proficiency to produce Filipinos competent in local and global careers does not entail that Filipino and all other local languages be put aside. He argued that “the manner by which English might be used as a potent resource for the education of Filipinos will need to be grounded in a sound and sophisticated understanding of the bilingual/multilingual experience of Filipinos, the complex network of competencies that Filipinos need to learn in schools, the relationship between languages used in learning and instruction” (Bernardo, 2008, p. 44).

An approach to bridge this gap is translanguaging. According to Li Wei (2011):

Translanguaging is both going between different linguistic structures and systems, including different modalities (speaking, writing, listening, reading, remembering) and going beyond them. It includes the full range of linguistic performances of multilingual language users for purposes that transcend the combination of structures, the alternation between systems, the transmission of information and the representation of values, identities and relationships. The act of translanguaging then is transformative in nature; it creates a social space for the multilingual language user by bringing together different dimensions of their personal history, experience and environment, their attitude, beliefs and ideology, their cognitive and physical capacity into one coordinated and meaningful performance, and make it into a lived experience. (p. 1223)

The following are the arguments for translanguaging in language education. First, translanguaging acts as a bridge in learning languages, as in the case of Mother Tongue-Based Multilingual Education (MTBMLE) in the Philippines (Perfecto, 2020). Perfecto (2020) observed that teachers would use visual tools, direct translation, code-switching, and metalinguistic explanation to provide scaffolding and elucidate the topic. The second argument is that translanguaging not only develops a more expansive ability to use named

languages such as English, Filipino, or Ilocano in the context of the Philippines

but also beyond thinking simply in terms of dual sets of linguistic resources or linguistic systems. Translanguaging engages with the acts of deployment of features that are most appropriate to communicate a message to a listener... translanguaging also looks at the entire range of multimodal resources that make up the speaker’s full communicative repertoire – gestures, gazes, posture, visual cues, and even human-technology interactions. (Garcia & Otheguy, 2020, p. 10).

In this argument, the goal is not to make language learners proficient in the target named languages. The ultimate objective is to help them be cognizant that they can make decisions about all the resources (linguistic plus more) available to them when they communicate in various settings in various modes with different interlocutors. The third argument is that translanguaging helps teachers meet some quality indicators in the Philippine Professional Standards for Teachers (PPST). The PPST aims to set clear expectations for basic education teachers and become the source documents for assessing teachers’ performance and their needs for support in professional development (Department of Education, 2017). The PPST has seven domains, and translanguaging has the potential to address the first three: content knowledge and pedagogy, support for learner participation, and diversity of learners. The fourth argument is that translanguaging solves decades of debates in the Philippines that teaching English will lead to less nationalistic citizens. It also addresses competing debates about privileging Filipino as the national language. Translanguaging breaks “the traditional ideologies of language separation” (Cenoz & Gorter, 2020). They further explained that:

Boundaries between languages have traditionally been hard in education and have not reflected the discursive practices of multilinguals, who often use a wide range of elements from their multilingual repertoire. In some situations it may be difficult to distinguish different languages because multilinguals use elements from their whole linguistic repertoire but in other situations and depending on the social

context, multilinguals can use only one language (p. 306).

There are two kinds of translanguaging in the classroom: spontaneous and pedagogical (Iversen, 2020). The former refers to “the reality of bi/multilingual usage in naturally occurring contexts where boundaries between languages are fluid and constantly shifting” (Cenoz & Gorter, 2017, p. 904). However, when teachers do not understand the importance of translanguaging as a pedagogical resource for student understanding and participation, this resource may be wasted. On the other hand, pedagogical translanguaging is defined as:

intentional instructional strategies that integrate two or more languages and aim at the development of the multilingual repertoire as well as metalinguistic and language awareness. Pedagogical translanguaging considers learners as emergent multilinguals who can use English and other languages depending on the social context. Their linguistic resources are valued, and learners are not seen as deficient users of English but as multilingual speakers. (Cenoz & Gorter, 2020, p. 300)

The uses of pedagogical translanguaging have been documented in research. For example, it has been used as a bridging discourse where students study science in an English medium school (Probyn, 2015), as a facilitator of deep understanding of the content (Makalela, 2015), and as a means to help students appreciate their multilingualism (Cenoz & Santos, 2020).

In addition, pedagogical translanguaging is employed in (a) scaffolding through the use of the mother tongue in language learning, (b) assisting students’ learning in vocabulary and grammar, and (c) creating a positive and safe space for learning through building rapport and collaborative activities (Duarte, 2018; Karlsson et al., 2018; McMillan & Rivers, 2011; Madriñan, 2014; Ryoo, 2017; Pablo-Wrzosek, 2017). According to Nambisan (2014), students use translanguaging to discuss content or activities in small groups, brainstorm during class activities, respond to the teacher’s questions, provide assistance to peers during activities, translate for a lower proficiency student, enable participation by lower proficiency

students, explain problems not related to the content, and ask permission. For teachers, translanguaging is used to praise students, build bonds with students, give feedback to students, help low-proficiency students, explain concepts, describe vocabulary, quickly clarify during activities, give directions, and for classroom management.

Studies viewed translanguaging practice to maximize linguistic resources of both teachers and students in knowledge construction as well as problem-solving. Wei and Ho (2018) supported that the purposeful alternation of languages helps construct knowledge and maximize learners’ and teachers’ linguistic resources in problem-solving. Mazak (2017) deviated from the traditional language perspective, implying that language teaching is not a linear process but a dynamic process in which students engage in multiple resources of meaning-making..

Translanguaging was found to be helpful as a pedagogical resource for meaning-making and knowledge construction; however, there are only a few studies that explore these uses. The present study addresses the lack of studies on translanguaging as a pedagogical resource, limited teacher participants (Alhebaishi, 2017 Nambisan, 2014; Yuvayapan, 2019), and minimal studies in secondary schools, specifically in senior high schools where there is the more prevalent use of L1 (Alhebaishi, 2017 Turnbull, 2018) because most of the studies have already explored translanguaging pedagogy and practice on the elementary and tertiary level. The present study aims to uncover senior high school teachers’ perceptions of the uses and benefits of pedagogical translanguaging in the classroom.

Literature Review

Despite the positioning of language separation in English classrooms, translanguaging transpires naturally in bilingual and multilingual classrooms (Garcia & Wei, 2014). Cenoz et al. (2017) claimed that translanguaging is dynamic and discards the hard boundaries of languages. Garcia and Wei (2014) asserted in their founding work on translanguaging that the bilingual, multilingual, and plurilingual communities use their languages flexibly and dynamically. Because most of the learners in the Philippines are multilingual, translanguaging is

beneficial for them to expand their strategies in navigating conversations in English classes and bridge their identity of being native speakers and English language learners. This is congruent to the study of Garcia (2012), where he mentioned that multilingual learners have only “one linguistic repertoire from which they select features strategically to communicate effectively” (p. 1).

Several studies highlighted the potential of translanguaging as a pedagogical resource in the teaching and learning process. In the study of Nambisan (2014), students typically use translanguaging in discussing content or activities in a small group, brainstorming in a small group, responding to a teacher’s question, providing assistance to peers during activities, translating for a lower proficiency student, enabling participation by lower proficiency students, explaining problems not related to the content, and asking permission. Moreover, teachers use translanguaging for praising students, building bonds with students, giving feedback to students, helping low proficiency students, explaining concepts, describing vocabulary, quick clarification during activities, giving directions, and classroom management.

Previous studies contend that translanguaging can also be used as a pedagogical resource in knowledge construction, meaning-making, and problem-solving in classrooms. Duarte (2018) identified that translanguaging is used to leverage the knowledge construction process in classrooms where it is being utilized to (a) set forward a particular formulation in terms of content, (b) hypothesize, (c) recast and correct previous information, (d) negotiate meaning, (e) quote from sources and worksheets, (f) show disagreement/agreement and appraisal, (g) providing counterarguments, and (h) discussing appropriate wording. For problem-solving, translanguaging is employed in paraphrasing tasks in the worksheet, identifying and describing available knowledge in solving tasks, and solving managerial aspects. Garcia and Kleifgen (2010) uncovered uses of translanguaging in meaning-making, which include: (a) shifting discussion from one language to another, (b) moving across texts that feature a different language, (c) explaining in one language but checking comprehension in another, (d) reading in one language and writing in another, (e) discussing in one language and writing in another, and (f) integrating students’

language resources and using both languages flexibly in micro alternation, and code-switching.

Based on the literature, translanguaging has been recognized as a pedagogical tool for meaning-making, problem-solving, and knowledge construction. However, its uses in these areas are underexplored in SHS English classrooms. Although there are studies on translanguaging in problem-solving, most focus on Mathematics and Science classrooms. Hence, this present study delves deeper into identifying the uses and benefits of translanguaging as a pedagogical resource, specifically in these areas.

Theoretical Underpinnings

Translanguaging was initially coined in Welsh as “trawsiethu” by Williams (1994). This term was later on translated by Baker (2011, p. 288) as “translanguaging.” This paper is grounded on the description of Garcia and Wei (2014) and Wei and Ho (2018) of translanguaging as a process of meaning-making that entails flexible and integrated use of the learner’s linguistic repertoire that goes beyond the borders of named languages; it, therefore, permits the purposeful shifting of languages to aid knowledge construction and enhance learners’ and teachers’ linguistic resources in problem-solving.

The translanguaging process is argued to optimize the linguistic resources of teachers and students in knowledge construction and problem-solving. Wei and Ho (2018) emphasized that translanguaging can aid knowledge construction and problem-solving processes in the classroom. Aside from knowledge construction and problem-solving, translanguaging was helpful in meaning-making, where students can utilize multiple languages to negotiate meaning and facilitate learning. In a translanguaging framework, meaning-making involves students’ practices in utilizing their multiple languages and experiences to attain academic comprehension (Hornberger & Link, 2012; Sayer, 2013), amplify or reinforce competency in dual or triple languages (Cummins, 2005), and create identities (Worthy et al., 2013). Vogel and Garcia (2017) affirmed that multilinguals comprehend and make meaning out of communicative contexts by strategically choosing features from their linguistic resources.

Research Design

The study employed a qualitative design to understand and interpret processes and phenomena in particular contexts, such as describing the use of translanguaging in English classes. It was specifically centered on grounded theory, which entailed an inductive data-gathering process to allow the researcher to discover new concepts, categories, and prepositions that align with existing accounts of the observations or data gathered (Glaser & Strauss, 1967).

Setting

The study was conducted in the City Schools Division of Dasmariñas in Cavite, Philippines, which was established on September 5, 2010. The Division of Dasmariñas has eight public senior high schools and 54 private high schools. The Senior High School programs (SHS) offer different academic strands and tracks in the Humanities and Social Sciences (HUMSS), Accounting and Business Management (ABM), Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics (STEM), General Academic Strand (GAS), Technical-Vocational-Livelihood (TVL) track, and Arts and Design Track.

Participants

Because the research utilized a qualitative design, the focus group discussion, which explored how teachers describe the uses and benefits of translanguaging, employed purposive convenience sampling. For purposive sampling, the study recruited participants on two primary criteria: (a) teachers from either public or private senior high schools in the City of Dasmariñas and (b) handling language, literature, or research subjects such as Oral Communication, Reading and Writing, English for Academic and Professional Purposes, Media Information and Literacy, and Practical Research. These subjects were chosen because they all require English as the medium of instruction, and all their outputs require English. The present study also utilized convenience sampling because the study was conducted during a pandemic, so the availability of participants became a challenge.

Six teachers were recruited for each FGD session, and the number of FGDs was based on the principle of data saturation. Data saturation is achieved when there is sufficient information to replicate the study (O'Reilly & Parker, 2012; Walker, 2012), when the

capacity to acquire additional new information has been accomplished, and when further coding is no longer needed or realized (Guest, Bunce & Johnson, 2006). There were a total of 24 teacher participants since four focus group discussions were conducted to reach the point of data saturation.

Data Collection

Informed consent was sought from all participants before the study. The study utilized a single focus group at a time, and to reach data saturation, four single focus groups were conducted. These focus group discussions were administered online because of the COVID-19 pandemic. It was employed in an online environment, specifically Zoom and Google meetings. The online focus groups addressed the current problem of face-to-face focus group discussion. An FGD guide (Table 1) was given to the participants about the meaning of translanguaging and its difference from code-switching to avoid confusion. The guide was also explained to the participants, who were given time to ask questions before the actual FGD.

The protocol was divided into three parts: the introduction of the study and definition of key terms, the actual discussion, and the closing. This protocol was pilot-tested before it was implemented.

The FGDs were conducted by one of the researchers who acted as a facilitator and a trained assistant. The facilitator controlled the flow of the discussion by providing and asking the set of questions provided in the FGD protocol. The assistant took important notes and documented the participants' responses to the discussion. The data collected in the FGD were also audio- and video-recorded.

Intercoder Reliability

To make the analysis more reliable, another coder was recruited and trained to analyze 50% of the FGD transcript. Intercoder reliability was also referred to as interrater reliability. This was a crucial component in the content analysis of the FGD because it helped me identify and conclude objective and valid interpretations of the data. The intercoder was a BSE English graduate with academic units in MA in English as Second Language and was familiar with English language studies, specifically on bilingualism/multilingualism. In the case of the study, the level of knowledge of the intercoder was found to be sufficiently in line with the research objectives.

Table 1*Code-Switching Versus Translanguaging*

Code-switching		Translanguaging	
<i>monoglossic</i> : view of languages that assumes that bilinguals have separate linguistic systems (Auer, 2005; Myers-Scotton, 2005)		<i>heteroglossic</i> : bilinguals or multilinguals have a dynamic and integrated linguistic system (Bakhtin, 1981; Bailey, 2007)	
languages as isolated fragments		linguistic repertoire working in symbiosis	
code-switching has associations with language separation (Lewis et al., 2012)		translanguaging celebrates and approves flexibility in language use and the permeability of learning through two or more languages (Lewis et al., 2012)	
combining separate language entities as an option for students when they lack the vocabulary to express themselves monolingually (Garcia & Wei, 2014)		use of more than one language to fulfill communicative needs and establish cultural identities by means of strategically selecting language features from their language repertoire (Garcia & Wei, 2014)	
preserves named language categories (Vogel & Garcia, 2017) (e.g., Filipino, English, Korean, French)		dismantles named language categories and takes up an internal perspective to describe the <i>linguaging</i> of speakers (Vogel & Garcia, 2017)	
focuses on form and structure		focuses on meaning and function	
Translanguaging is described as a process of meaning-making which involves the use of the learner's linguistic repertoire in a dynamic and integrated manner (Garcia and Wei, 2014).			
Translanguaging provides multilingual learners space where they are allowed to bring together different "dimensions of their personal history, experiences, and environment; their attitudes, beliefs, and ideology; and their cognitive and physical capacity into one coordinated and meaningful performance, transforming language learning and language use into a lived experience (Wei & Ho, 2018, p. 38)			

To ensure the transparency and replicability of the data, the coding and analysis protocol was described to the intercoder. The rules for coding and categorization were explained via the Zoom meeting. The materials for FGD were also given, such as the FGD transcript, notes, protocol, and the initial list of codes. The intercoder organized and categorized themes and codes based on the initial list of codes found in previous studies.

Coding and Analysis

The first step in analyzing the data was transcribing the discussion, where the facilitator eliminated the words and phrases irrelevant to the topic and discussion. Second, the facilitator and an intercoder coded the transcription. Both deductive and inductive coding was used for the FGD. Before the conduct of the focus groups, a list of initial codes based on

existing tools of previous literature was prepared. After the coding, the data were analyzed by both the facilitator and intercoder through deductive and inductive coding. In inductive coding, open, axial, and selective coding were utilized. First, in open coding, concepts, interactions, and data were compared for their similarities and differences and are also given conceptual labels. Next, in axial coding, categories were scrutinized and linked to subcategories, and their relationships were tested against data. Lastly, categories were integrated and merged around a main category in the last coding step, selective coding (Strauss & Corbin, 1998). For deductive coding, systematic data coding was employed by classifying and organizing the information based on existing categories while discovering its patterns. Finally, a tabular result was created to summarize all the categories, themes, and codes reflected in the focus groups.

Table 2*Interrater Analysis Sample*

Uses of Translanguaging as a Pedagogical Resource	Intercoder 1	Intercoder 2	Agreement	Remarks
<i>Knowledge Construction</i>				
<i>Recast and correct previous information</i>				
<i>FGD1_P4: "Very useful to understand different information"</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>add</i>
<i>FGD1_P4: "help the students.. to comprehend and understand present and previous information"</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>add</i>
<i>FGD2_P3: "better grasp of the topic"</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>remove</i>
<i>Strengthens the weaker language</i>				
<i>FGD1_P2: "It strengthens the weaker language for knowledge construction"</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>add</i>
<i>FGD3_P2: "Outlet to learn more about the language"</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>remove</i>
<i>FGD3_P4: "It will create fuller and greater experience of the language"</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>remove</i>
<i>FGD1_P1: "I allow it in writing (in Literature class) as they write poems, and they need to translate it in English."</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>add</i>
<i>Meaning-Making</i>				
<i>Integrates students' language resources and use of both languages flexibly</i> <i>(deepens understanding and helps provide relevance and context)</i>				
<i>FGD3_P2: "strategy (use of both languages) to deepen different context of language"</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>add</i>
<i>FGD4_P1: "translate (from English to Tagalog and vice versa) for deeper understanding"</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>add</i>
<i>FGD3_P3: "helpful in a way that if we know the context and meaning of words, we can understand better (integrate students' language resource)"</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>add</i>
<i>FGD4_P1: "I need to translate it again for them to understand the context and the lesson that we are talking about"</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>remove</i>
<i>FGD3_P2: "create more meaning and to connect to the students"</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>remove</i>

After categorizing themes, coding, and analysis of the intercoder, the facilitator addressed several discrepancies using an interrater analysis sheet. Figure 1 shows an interrater analysis sample indicating some discrepancies and disagreements on the categorization of themes. The intercoder and facilitator scheduled a video conference call via Zoom meeting to discuss and clarify such disagreements. For example, as shown in Figure 1, there are disagreements on the category “strengthens weaker language,” specifically in the codes below:

FGD3_P2: *“Outlet to learn more about the language”*

FGD3_P4: *“It will create fuller and greater experience of the language”*

Through note-taking and discussion via Zoom meeting, the facilitator and intercoder decided that the codes found were vague and confusing relative to the category; hence, they were removed. At the end conference call, resolutions were made as to whether codes will be removed or added to each specific category.

After reaching a consensus with a 76.19% level of agreement between the intercoder and facilitator, discrepancies in coding and analysis were resolved. After reaching a consensus, a final list of codes and categories was consolidated and presented in a tabular report shown in the results and discussion.

Results and Discussion

This section reports the findings of the focus group discussion on how Senior High School teachers describe the uses and benefits of translanguaging in their classes.

Translanguaging as a Resource for Students

Table 2 shows FGD results, which uncovered the uses of translanguaging as a pedagogical resource for knowledge construction, meaning-making, and problem-solving.

For knowledge construction, participants’ responses about the use of translanguaging in accessing and correcting previous information in class helped them in the learning process. Subsequently, some teachers also mentioned that translanguaging supported the students’

weaker language. These results can be associated with the theory of constructivism, where learners construct their own learning. In this study, one of the teacher participants in the FGD highlighted that through translanguaging, students acquire fuller and greater experience of the language, thus allowing them to aid their weaker language and reshape their knowledge. The use of diverse languages, primarily their native language, in classrooms generates interactive and dynamic experiences for students.

As shown in the results of meaning-making, it was mentioned that translanguaging helps provide context and relevance and deepen the understanding of the learners. When a lesson is being discussed, students are encouraged to use their language resources to fully understand the lesson. It was reported that using their native language and the target language flexibly promotes a richer understanding of the content. Translanguaging enables students to integrate their lessons into their real-life experiences through flexible access and use of the languages they are familiar with. It is agreed that when students make use of their available language resources, they can better make sense and gain a deeper understanding of the lessons beyond their theoretical concepts. Most notably, translanguaging raises students’ metalinguistic awareness. For example, the purposeful alternation of Tagalog and English is viewed to be useful in supporting the Higher Order Thinking Skills (HOTS) of the students. This indicates that students can use their available languages to assist their critical thinking, most especially in answering “why” and “how” questions, which are crucial to their meaning-making process.

In problem-solving, teachers reported that translanguaging is being used as a scaffold in class as this activates students’ schema or background knowledge. This result is similar to the conclusion of Sayer (2013) that translanguaging can be used in activating the background knowledge of the students, which provides a schema that helps them scaffold in learning new and difficult concepts. As frequently observed, teachers mentioned that translanguaging is being used for extending help through translation. According to one of the FGD participants, when students have difficulty understanding and articulating their thoughts, they use their native language before translating it to the target language. As found in the study, translation can be a solution to students’ problems in-class discussions or activities.

Table 3*Uses of Translanguaging as a Pedagogical Resource*

Use of Translanguaging in Knowledge Construction	Participants' Responses
Recast and correct previous information	FGD1_P4: <i>"very useful to understand different information"</i> FGD1_P4: <i>"help the students.. to comprehend and understand present and previous information"</i>
Strengthens the weaker language	FGD1_P2: <i>"It strengthens the weaker language for knowledge construction"</i> FGD1_P1: <i>"I allow it in writing (in Literature class) as they write poems, and they need to translate it in English."</i>
Use of Translanguaging in Meaning-Making	Participants' Responses
Integrates students' language resources and use of both languages flexibly (deepens understanding and helps provide relevance and context)	FGD3_P2: <i>"strategy (use of both languages) to deepen different context of language"</i> FGD4_P1: <i>"translate (from English to Tagalog and vice versa) for deeper understanding"</i> FGD3_P3: <i>"helpful in a way that if we know the context and meaning of words, we can understand better (integrate students' language resource)"</i> FGD4_P1: <i>"I need to translate it again for them to understand the context and the lesson that we are talking about"</i>
Strengthens understanding of the features of language and metalinguistic awareness (Reinforces HOTS/ Critical Thinking)	FGD3_P1: <i>"use it when its "why" and "how" questions (critical thinking)"</i> FGD4_P5: <i>"use of translanguaging to target HOTS (higher order thinking skills); exchange of discourse in a critical sense"</i> FGD4_P1: <i>"I allow my students to use L1 in asking questions for them to think critically when they are digesting the lesson of our topic."</i>
Use of Translanguaging in Problem-Solving	Participants' Responses
Identify and describe available knowledge in solving tasks (use of scaffolding and schema)	FGD1_P3: <i>"It can be used as a scaffolding for the students so they can assess what they are going to do, and how they will be able to think and express their ideas."</i> FGD1_P5: <i>"It allows students to use their prior knowledge or schema in problem-solving"</i> FGD4_P3: <i>"The logic is when you know the language that you are using, it is easy for you to understand something, it is easy for you to learn, it is easy for you to express yourself and it is easy for you to solve problems."</i>
Solve managerial aspects (extending help through translation)	FGD4_P5: <i>"extend help through translation; problem-solution setting"</i> FGD1_P2: <i>"It [translation] helps most especially to those who have difficulty understanding the lesson."</i>

Teachers' use of translanguaging

The focus group discussions were able to attest to the existing use of translanguaging, such as (a) to explain difficult concepts, (b) to give instructions, and (c) to give feedback. These findings are in alignment with those of De Los Reyes (2019). She found that teachers used translanguaging to conduct class discussions, give feedback, keep students on track, and give instructions. Table 3 shows some examples of participants' responses.

The data above suggest that using translanguaging as a pedagogical resource is intentional on the part of the teacher respondents. They understand that translanguaging is needed for students to cope with the challenges in their classroom and to provide a scaffold in the learning process. Contrary to Nambisan's (2014) findings where teachers restrict the use of L1 to discuss content and ask or respond to questions, this study found that teachers use L1 to perform these functions. FGD1_Participant 3 discussed that when students participated in recitation, they asked questions in the native language. This was supported by FGD3_Participant 4, saying that they allowed the use of L1, most especially in asking and answering why and how questions. Similar to the findings of McMillan and Rivers (2011), teachers were found to use L1 in providing clarifications to students. FGD3_Participant 1 mentioned that students use their L1 for clarifications.

Benefits of Translanguaging

When the teacher participants were asked about the benefits of translanguaging in promoting PPST, they shared that translanguaging supports the four domains in the PPST content, knowledge, and pedagogy, learning environment, diversity of learners, and curriculum and planning. Table 6 shows examples of their responses.

First, in the domain of learning environment, participants asserted that translanguaging could give opportunities to students to express themselves because translanguaging extends their freedom in speaking and sharing their experiences. Through the use of translanguaging, students' differences are accepted, which results in good rapport and a fair learning environment.

Second, participants highlighted the domain of diversity of learners, which includes students' background, culture, and language. Acknowledging diversity and differences among learners positively affects the understanding of broader and different versions of realities. This can help students understand concepts and view their learning from a perspective they can relate to. Next, translanguaging is said to promote the use of the mother tongue, which helps students understand new concepts during the discussion, contributing to the domain of content, knowledge, and pedagogy.

Lastly, translanguaging was also found to be important in curriculum and planning. During the

Table 4

Uses of Translanguaging

Uses of Translanguaging	Participants Responses
To explain/ understand new/ difficult concepts	FGD1_P2: <i>"it can help in achieving greater understanding in class"</i> FGD2_P1: <i>"for instructions and understanding"</i> FGD3_P4: <i>"it's beneficial during explaining concepts"</i>
To give instructions	FGD1_P3: <i>"giving instructions"</i> FGD2_P1: <i>"for instructions and understanding."</i>
To provide/give feedback	FGD 2_P3: <i>"They appreciate the feedback more if the feedback is in the L1."</i> FGD4_P5: <i>"giving and receiving feedback"</i>

Table 6*Uses of Translanguaging in Promoting the PPST*

Use of Translanguaging in PPST	Participants' Responses
Learning Environment (Fair learning environment; Support for learner participation)	FGD2_P3: <i>"It would embrace the differences of the learners; every language is valid."</i> FGD3_P2: <i>"Provides the freedom to speak your mind and share what we have"</i> FGD4_P4: <i>"We can give the students a chance for expressing themselves"</i> FGD3_P1: <i>"Establishes good connection"</i>
Content, Knowledge and Pedagogy (Mother Tongue, Filipino and English in teaching and learning)	FGD1_P6: <i>"teachers will illustrate on how the learners will understand the new concept"</i>
Diversity of Learners (Learners' gender, needs, strengths, interests and experiences; Learners' linguistic, cultural, socio-economic and religious backgrounds)	FGD2_P3: <i>"Yes, because it acknowledges the diversity of the learners"</i> FGD2_P3: <i>"It would embrace the differences of the learners"</i> FGD4_P3: <i>"We are being inclusive enough as teachers because we are checking their background, cultural background"</i> FGD2_P3: <i>"It would broaden our understanding of different realities."</i>
Curriculum and Planning	FGD2_P3: <i>"Curriculum planning, the way we view English is aligned to the curriculum; It is now time to revisit the curriculum; be flexible on the type of English we want to achieve"</i> FGD3_P2: <i>"It can be applied to curriculum planning because it creates diversified strategies"</i> FGD4_P5: <i>"Translanguaging may help curriculum experts and language planners for language inclusivity...Enrich the potential and value of other languages, given the fact that English language affects other languages here in the Philippines and now, it is about time to encourage the language curriculum to include the basic foundations since learning does not end in the classroom."</i>

focus groups, teachers acknowledged the advantages of translanguaging, given that it is planned carefully and thoroughly in the curriculum. Amid the positive response towards the use of translanguaging in class, teachers have reservations about the implementation of this approach. They emphasized that although translanguaging can bring diverse learning strategies to students, curriculum and language experts and teachers should study, plan, and exhibit a full grasp of translanguaging before its implementation.

This finding on teacher acknowledgment of the role of translanguaging in helping diverse learners address the gaps in previous research. For example, Gepila (2020) as well as Jorilla and Bual (2021) found that teachers reported the need for more training on student

diversity management. Although student diversity is a broad topic, training on translanguaging can be one of the topics to aid teachers in practicing inclusivity and in creating a supportive learning environment for all kinds of learners.

In addition, the results of the focus group discussions also uncovered the perception of teachers about the other benefits of translanguaging. They also disclosed how translanguaging could bridge the gap of multiple languages inside the class and promote the identity of Philippine culture. This might be why teachers become more tolerant of different language use because of their exposure to a more diverse background (Pohan et al., 2009; Pulinx et al., 2017).

Table 7*Other Potential Uses of Translanguaging in Learning*

Other Uses of Translanguaging	Participants' Response
Bridging the Gap	FGD1_P1: <i>"It bridges the gap (between languages)"</i> FGD2_P1: <i>"processing or to bridge understanding, we can use multiple languages"</i>
Growth of Identity, Culture, and Language (<i>Philippine English</i>)	FGD3_P6: <i>"come up with our own identity; already speaking Philippine English; growth of our own language"</i> FGD3_P4: <i>"social-linguistically, it is ideal, and acceptable"</i> FGD3_P3: <i>"culture and language are enriched; combination of culture and meaning"</i>
Diversity and Inclusivity	FGD3_P6: <i>"inclusive and accepting everybody; it is empowering to have voice"</i> FGD4_P5: <i>"linguistic inclusivity; language is dynamic"</i> FGD4_P5: <i>"We have to embrace that concept because we need to prove that language is dynamic, language dynamic, structural differences."</i>
Organizing thoughts in the native language before articulating it in English (<i>Metacognition</i>)	FGD1_P3: <i>"organize their thoughts in the native language and translate it to English"</i> FGD2_P2: <i>"They think in Filipino but they translate and speak in English."</i> FGD3_P6: <i>"conceptualize in L1 then translate in English"</i>

Most notably, significant responses from the focus group found support for the students' use of translanguaging in their metacognition process. Aside from plain translation (i.e., translation from English to native language or vice versa), L1 is being utilized by students to organize their thoughts in the native language before they translate and communicate them in the English language. Thus, it can be inferred that L1 is being used in the metacognition of the students substantially in processing their ideas before articulating their thoughts in the target language (English). This corroborates with several studies that multilinguals enhance their resources to enable them to perform metalinguistic tasks (Bialystok et al., 2008).

Despite the potential uses and benefits of translanguaging, the teacher participants mentioned some challenges that should be addressed in the implementation of translanguaging. First, most participants were particularly stern in using the students' native language in summative assessments. Second, some teachers mentioned that translanguaging might impede practice and proficiency in the English language. Lastly, the FGD revealed that some teachers were skeptical about using translanguaging because it can be detrimental to students' mastery of the macro skills such as reading, writing, speaking, and listening, which are needed in the pursuit of their careers. These responses show the privileging of English among

the participants. Despite this, it is worth noting that the respondents acknowledged translanguaging as a resource. This perception may play an important role in the future when translanguaging becomes mainstream as a pedagogical practice.

Conclusions and Recommendations

The following are some of the contributions of the present study to the field of translanguaging. First, this paper explored the potential of translanguaging as a pedagogical resource for meaning-making, problem-solving, and knowledge construction, which were not rigorously discussed in previous studies. Second, the use of translanguaging in senior high school has not been explored in previous studies. Moreover, in the process of the data gathering centered on grounded theory, the study was able to operationalize and develop a concept of translanguaging as the utilization of the students' linguistic repertoire, predominantly their native language (i.e., Tagalog), as a pedagogical resource to assist them in content and language learning, perform classroom activities, support knowledge construction, meaning-making, and problem-solving processes in class, and help teachers develop the domains of PPST in employing teaching strategies geared towards a diverse and inclusive learning

environment. Lastly, the present study found clear support for a significant finding that translanguaging can be utilized to enhance the metacognition and higher thinking skills of the students in English classrooms. This claims that students' use of their native language (i.e., Tagalog) does not equate to a lack of competency. Instead, their native language allows them to "bring together different dimensions of their personal history, experiences, environment, attitudes, beliefs, ideology, and their cognitive and physical capacity into one coordinated and meaningful performance which can transform language learning and language use into a lived experience" (Wei & Ho, 2018, p. 38).

The results of this study shed light on the use of translanguaging as a pedagogical resource in knowledge construction, meaning-making, and problem-solving. First, in knowledge construction, translanguaging is being used to recast and correct previous information and strengthen students' weaker language. Consequently, in meaning-making, it is employed to integrate students' language resources and use of both languages flexibly, which helps in providing relevance and context and strengthening the understanding of the features of language and metalinguistic awareness, which reinforces critical thinking and higher-order thinking skills of students. Lastly, in problem-solving, the use of translanguaging is beneficial in identifying and describing available knowledge in solving tasks and solving managerial aspects, which are reflected in extending help through translation.

Translanguaging was also found capable of developing domains of the PPST, which are: (a) content and knowledge; (b) establishing a fair learning environment; and (c) diversity of learners in classrooms.

The study also discussed teachers' perceptions about translanguaging as a pedagogical resource in SHS subjects where English is the medium of instruction. First, the respondents reported the uses of translanguaging to enable low-proficient students' participation, helping low-proficient students, explaining and understanding difficult and new concepts, giving instruction, asking and responding to questions, and providing clarifications. Second, they also agreed that it is a resource for learners for meaning-making, problem-solving, and knowledge construction. In addition, translanguaging is perceived to be "transformative" in a way that it empowers

learners to exhibit critical and creative use of their language resources (Wei, 2018). Third, the respondents also support translanguaging because of its potential to promote specific domains in the PPST: (a) content, knowledge, and pedagogy where mother-tongue is valued as in teaching and learning and classroom communication strategies; (b) establishing a fair learning environment which plans for management of classroom activities and support for learner participation; and (c) diversity of learners which highlights learners' experiences, interests, linguistic and cultural background. This finding coincides with Tan et al.'s (2012) and Woodley and Brown's (2016) that translanguaging allows a positive space for learning where students' cultural and linguistic backgrounds are accepted to help them develop their knowledge and create a "third space" (Soja, 1996) and where students are permitted to generate and explain their own thoughts and become accountable and co-constructors of their learning.

This leads the present study to conclude that translanguaging as a pedagogical resource has potential in Philippine English classrooms, suggesting that language education policies be reviewed to address teachers' and students' linguistic biases, which assume that the English language is superior to local languages (Monje, et al., 2019). As García and Kleyn (2016) emphasized, the school has a crucial role in reinforcing the use of students' linguistic repertoire, encouraging them to develop the competence to appropriately select language and communication features applicable for different purposes and contexts.

Based on the conclusions of the study, specific recommendations are presented for further research and development:

1. Quantitative research may be conducted such as a survey questionnaire or experimentation to discover other uses of translanguaging in English classrooms.
2. The teacher education curriculum may be examined to find out if translanguaging as a resource is taught to future educators.

Declaration of Possible Conflict of Interest

The authors declare that they have no conflicts of interest.

References

- Alhebaishi, S.M. (2017). Investigating the use of L1 in L2 classrooms: An action research project in teaching practicum. *International Journal of English Language Teaching*, 5 (4), 18–25.
- Auer, P. (2005). A postscript: Code-switching and social identity. *Journal of pragmatics*, 37(3), 403–410.
- Bailey, B. (2007). Heteroglossia and boundaries. In *Bilingualism: A social approach* (pp. 257–274). Palgrave Macmillan, London.
- Baker, C. (2011). *Foundations of bilingual education and bilingualism*. Multilingual Matters.
- Bakhtin, M. M. (1981). The dialogic imagination: Four essays, ed. Michael Holquist, trans. Caryl Emerson and Michael Holquist (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1981), 84(8), 80–2.
- Bernardo, A. B. (2008). English in Philippine education: Solution or problem. In M. Bautista & K. Bolton (Eds.), *Philippine English: Linguistic and literary perspectives* (pp. 29–48). Asian Englishes Today.
- Bialystok, E., Craik, F. I., & Luk, G. (2008). Lexical access in bilinguals effects of vocabulary size and executive control. *Journal of Neurolinguistics*, 21(6), 522–538.
- Cenoz, J., Gorter, D., & May, S. (Eds.). (2017). *Language awareness and multilingualism*. Springer.
- Cenoz, J., & Gorter, D. (2017). Minority languages and sustainable translanguaging: Threat or opportunity? *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 38(10), 901–912.
- Cenoz, J., & Gorter, D. (2020). Teaching English through pedagogical translanguaging. *World Englishes*, 39(2), 300–311.
- Cummins, J. (2005). A proposal for action: Strategies for recognizing heritage language competence as a learning resource within the mainstream classroom. *Modern Language Journal*, 89(4), 585–592.
- De Los Reyes, R. A. (2019). Translanguaging in multilingual third grade ESL classrooms in Mindanao, Philippines. *International Journal of Multilingualism*, 16(3), 302–316.
- Department of Education. (2017). *National adoption and implementation of the Philippine professional standards for teachers*. <https://www.deped.gov.ph/2017/08/11/do-42-s-2017-national-adoption-and-implementation-of-the-philippine-professional-standards-for-teachers/>
- Duarte, J. (2018). Translanguaging in the context of mainstream multilingual education, *International Journal of Multilingualism*, 17(2), 232–247. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14790718.2018.1512607>
- García, O. (2012). Multilingual pedagogies. In M. Matin-Jones, A. Blackledge & A. Creese (Eds.), *The Routledge handbook of multilingualism* (pp. 249–263). Routledge.
- García, O., & Kleifgen, J. A. (2010). *Educating emergent bilinguals: Policies, programs, and practices for English language learners*. Teachers College Press.
- García, O., & Kley, T. (Eds.) (2016). *Translanguaging with multilingual students: Learning from classroom moments*. Routledge.
- García, O., & Otheguy, R. (2020). Plurilingualism and translanguaging: Commonalities and divergences. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 23(1), 17–35.
- García, O., & Wei, L. (2014). *Translanguaging: Language, bilingualism, and education*. Palgrave Macmillan. <https://doi.org/10.1057/9781137385765>
- Gepila, E., Jr. (2020). Assessing teachers using Philippine standards for teachers. *Universal Journal of Educational Research*, 8(3), 739–746.
- Glaser, B., & Strauss, A. (1967). *The discovery of grounded theory*. Aldine Publishing Company.
- Guest, G., Bunce, A., & Johnson, L. (2006). How many interviews are enough? An experiment with data saturation and variability. *Field Methods*, 18(1), 59–82.
- Hornberger, N. H., & Link, H. (2012). *Translanguaging in today's classrooms: A biliteracy lens. Theory into Practice*, 51(4), 239–247.
- Iversen, J. Y. (2020). Pre-service teachers' translanguaging during field placement in multilingual, mainstream classrooms in Norway. *Language and Education*, 34(1), 51–65.
- Jorilla, C. D., & Bual, J. M. (2021). Assessing the teachers' competence in Diocesan Catholic Schools relative to the Philippine professional standards for teachers. *Philippine Social Science Journal*, 4(2), 71–79.
- Karlsson, A., Larsson, P. N., & Jakobsson, A. (2018). Multilingual students' use of translanguaging in science classrooms. *International Journal of Science Education*, 41(15), 2049–2069. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09500693.2018.1477261>
- ewis, G., Jones, B., & Baker, C. (2012). Translanguaging: Origins and development from school to street and beyond. *Educational Research and Evaluation: An International Journal on Theory and Practice*, 18(7), 641–654. doi:10.1080/13803611.2012.718488.
- Madrñan, M.S. (2014). The use of first language in second-language classrooms: A support for second language acquisition. *Gist Education Learning and Research Journal*, 9, 50–66.
- Madrñio, M. R., Martin, I. P., & Plata, S. M. (2016). English language education in the Philippines: Policies, problems, and prospects. In R. Kirkpatrick (Ed.), *English language education policy in Asia* (pp. 245–264). Springer.
- Makalela, L. (2015) Moving out of linguistic boxes: The effects of translanguaging strategies for multilingual classrooms. *Language and Education*, 29(3), 200–217. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09500782.2014.994524>

- Martin, M. I. (1999). Language and institution: Roots of bilingualism in the Philippines. In E. Pascasio (Ed.), *The Filipino bilingual: A multidisciplinary perspective* (pp. 132–136). Ateneo De Manila University, Department of Language and Linguistics.
- Mazak, C. M. (2017). Introduction: Theorizing translanguaging practices in higher education. In C. Mazak & K. S. Carroll (Eds.), *Translanguaging in higher education: Beyond monolingual ideologies* (pp. 1–10). Multilingual Matters.
- McMillan, B. A., & Rivers, D. J. (2011). The practice of policy: Teacher attitudes toward “English only.” *System, 39*(2), 251–263. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2011.04.011>
- Monje, J. D., Orbeta, A. C., Francisco-Abrigo, K. A., & Capones, E. M. (2019). “Starting where the children are”: A process evaluation of the mother tongue-based multilingual education implementation (Discussion Paper No. 2019-06). Philippine Institute for Development Studies.
- Myers-Scotton, C. (2005). Uniform structure: Looking beyond the surface in explaining codeswitching. *Italian Journal of Linguistics, 17*(1), 15.
- Nambisan, K. A. (2014). *Teachers’ attitudes towards and uses of translanguaging in English language classrooms in Iowa* [Unpublished masteral thesis]. Iowa State University, Iowa, USA.
- O’Reilly, M., & Parker, N. (2012). ‘Unsatisfactory saturation’: A critical exploration of the notion of saturated sample sizes in qualitative research. *Qualitative Research, 19*(2), 190–197. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/1468794112446106>
- Pablo-Wrzosek, M. J. (2017). *Translanguaging and student funds of knowledge as a teacher resource* [Unpublished doctoral thesis]. University of Calgary, Calgary, AB. <http://dx.doi.org/10.11575/PRISM/5256>
- Perfecto, M. R. G. (2020). English language teaching and bridging in mother tongue-based multilingual education. *International Journal of Multilingualism, 19*(1), 107–123.
- Pohan, C. A., Ward, M., Kouzekanani, K., & Boatright, C. (2009). The impact of field placement sites on preservice teachers’ beliefs about teaching diverse students. *School-University Partnerships, 3*, 43–53.
- Pulinx, R., Van Avermaet, P., & Agirdag, O. (2017). Silencing linguistic diversity: The extent, the determinants and consequences of the monolingual beliefs of Flemish teachers. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism, 20*(5), 542–556.
- Probyn, M. (2015). Pedagogical translanguaging: Bridging discourses in South African science classrooms. *Language and Education, 29*(3), 218–234.
- Ryoo, N. (2017). *Understanding translanguaging and identity among Korean bilingual adults*. (Publication Number 412) [Doctoral dissertation, University of San Francisco]. USF Scholarship Repository. <https://repository.usfca.edu/diss/412>
- Sayer, P. (2013). Translanguaging, TexMex, and bilingual pedagogy: Emergent bilinguals learning through the vernacular. *TESOL Quarterly, 47*(1), 63–88. <https://doi.org/10.1002/tesq.53>
- Soja, E. W. (1996). *Thirdspace: Journeys to Los Angeles and other real and imagined places*. Blackwell.
- Strauss, A., & Corbin, J. (1998). *Basics of qualitative research: Techniques and procedures for developing grounded theory* (2nd ed.). Sage.
- Tan, E., Barton Calabrese, A., Turner, E., & Gutiérrez, M. V. (2012). *Empowering science and mathematics education in urban schools*. University of Chicago Press.
- Turnbull, B. (2018). Examining pre-service ESL teacher beliefs: Perspectives on first language use in the second language classroom. *Journal of Second Language Teaching & Research, 6*(1), 50–76.
- Vogel, S., & García, O. (2017). Translanguaging. Oxford Research Encyclopedia of Education. <https://doi.org/10.1093/acrefore/9780190264093.013.181>
- Walker, J. L. (2012). The use of saturation in qualitative research. *Canadian Journal of Cardiovascular Nursing, 22*(2), 37–41.
- Wei, L. (2011). Moment analysis and translanguaging space: Discursive construction of identities by multilingual Chinese youth in Britain. *Journal of Pragmatics, 43*(5), 1222–1235.
- Wei, L., & Ho, W. Y. J. (2018). Language learning sans frontiers: A translanguaging view. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics, 38*, 33–59.
- Wei, L. (2018). Translanguaging as a practical theory of language. *Applied Linguistics, 39*(1), 9–30.
- Williams, C. (1994). *Arfarniad o ddulliau dysgu ac addysgu yng nghyd-destun addysg uwchradd ddwyieithog* [An evaluation of teaching and learning methods in the context of bilingual secondary education] [Unpublished doctoral dissertation]. University of Wales, Bangor
- Woodley, H., & Brown, A. (2016). Balancing windows and mirrors: Translanguaging in a multilingual classroom. In O. Garcia & T. Kley (Eds.), *Making meaning of translanguaging: Learning from classroom moments* (pp. 83–99). Routledge.
- Worthy, J., Durán, L., Hikida, M., Pruitt, A., & Peterson, K. (2013). Spaces for dynamic bilingualism in read-aloud discussions: Developing and strengthening bilingual and academic skills. *Bilingual Research Journal, 36*(3), 311–328.
- Yuvayapan, F. (2019). Translanguaging in EFL classrooms: Teachers’ perceptions and practices. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies, 15*(2), 678–694.