

TRANSLANGUAGING FOR HIGHER EDUCATION LEARNING: PERSPECTIVES FROM INTERNATIONAL STUDENTS IN THAILAND

Daron Benjamin Loo*

*Centre for English Language Communication, National University of Singapore,
10 Architecture Drive, Singapore
daronloo@gmail.com*

Anita Sundaresan

*Faculty of Arts and Humanities, Asia-Pacific International University, Muak Lek, Saraburi, Thailand
anita@apiu.edu*

Leong Jin Jee

*Faculty of Arts and Humanities, Asia-Pacific International University, Muak Lek, Saraburi, Thailand
leongjinjee@apiu.edu*

Received: 04-04-2022

Accepted: 19-05-2022

Published: 30-05-2022

Abstract: International student mobility is a common phenomenon observed globally, especially in higher education settings where English is used as the main medium of instruction. In such settings, international students may find themselves using English along with their first language for social or academic purposes. This study examines international students' perspectives towards translanguaging in a university setting. With a mixed-methods approach, an anonymous online questionnaire and open-ended survey were distributed to international students. A total of 74 international students comprising 16 nationalities completed the survey. From the quantitative data, the students indicated a generally positive perspective towards translanguaging, especially to become more confident in English use and to relate better with other international students. Further quantitative analysis indicated that the perceptions differed significantly across years of study. The qualitative data provided further insights regarding translanguaging, namely the suitability of using a shared language in a formal learning context, such as in the classroom. All in all, this study was able to provide further insights into international students' perspectives towards translanguaging.

Keywords: *Translanguaging; higher education; international students; student perspectives*

INTRODUCTION

While English is considered an integral medium for academic instruction and interaction in higher education, there is compelling evidence to indicate that it is used alongside other languages. This phenomenon is especially relevant in higher education contexts with an international make-up, whether it be the faculty members or the students. The presence of a variety of languages will naturally create a learning ecology where other languages may be utilized (Wei, 2018; Kao, 2022). Despite this, there remains a resistance to fully recognizing the value of these other

languages, mainly from national-level discourses that urge the improvement of English language competency at all educational levels (Canagarajah, 2011; Kuteeva, 2020). Yet, research has shown that top-down language policies in education may not be entirely relevant to the actual teaching or learning practices (Byrnes, 2020). As such, this study sets out to analyze the perspectives of international university students towards translanguaging.

Findings from this study will provide insights into international students' use of languages other than English to engage in academic activities, thus offering a more

*Corresponding Author:
daronloo@gmail.com



realistic view of a higher education learning ecology that comprises a variety of languages (Carstens, 2016; Loo, 2021b). The findings will be of value to current literature on translanguaging, as most studies have focused primarily on teachers' classroom practices. While useful, research findings and discussion on teachers' practices may not be sufficient for insights into their beliefs or that of students' (Liu & Fan, 2020).

Translanguaging for University Learning

Broadly speaking, translanguaging refers to the use of multiple languages to facilitate learning, where even if English is present, equal access is given to other languages (Creese & Blackledge, 2015; Kao, 2022). As such, "[t]ranslanguaging helps us adopt orientations specific to multilingual and appreciate their competence in their own terms" (Canagarajah, 2011, p. 3). Since translanguaging acknowledges students' linguistic resources, it offers a useful and holistic linguistic theory that bridges the broad concerns arising from language cognition and language use. Wei (2018) states that translanguaging provides 'a fluid approach that transcends the belief that social structures that govern language are stable, and that languages can be used in a meaningful and transformative way' (p. 27).

The allowance of translanguaging may enhance classroom activities, especially those where interaction or collaboration between students' needs to be open and unrestrictive (Kwihangana, 2021). Translanguaging is also suitable for students' development of intercultural communication competence (Ou et al., 2020). Hence, by allowing students to bring into a learning environment their own linguistic resources, a translanguaging pedagogy is able

academically, and it also transforms them from being positioned as inferior learners to being recognized as having valuable language and literacy practices and ways of knowing that extend beyond mandated curricula and standardized exams." (García & Kleifgen, 2020, p. 559).

The learning environment becomes more inclusive when affordances are given to students' linguistic resources or repertoires. In a language learning environment, especially for English, translanguaging moves the deficient perspective away to one that recognizes the value of other linguistic resources (Kao, 2022). This type of learning is valuable, especially for students from minority language groups, as translanguaging processes can provide a space where knowledge may be exchanged through their own linguistic resources (Carstens, 2016; García & Kleifgen, 2020), which can be empowering for teachers as well (Karabassova & San Isidro, 2020; Kao, 2022).

In addition to students and their teachers, translanguaging involves other social actors or material entities at different levels. For instance, in Kaufhold's (2018) study, a student was found to be interacting with peers, supervisors, and institutional policies that afforded such practice to be initiated and maintained. Kaufhold urges that such pervasive involvement of different actors, including the institution, is pivotal for students' development of voice, which includes opportunities to communicate as well as to have different perspectives. In another example, Carstens (2016) reported how translanguaging was viewed favorably, given that the use of multiple languages along with English provided a scaffold for students to understand concepts, as well as to interact with other students in a more meaningful manner.

Given the prospect that translanguaging may already be occurring across different spaces in a higher education institution, it would be safe to assume that

"to support learners' subjectivities and ways of knowing as active, agentic bilingual subjects. This pedagogy positions translanguaging as a right of learners to bring themselves with their linguistic repertoires fully into the classroom so as to grow and thrive

this process is a natural outcome from a multilingual and international setting. Even if there are prevailing policies that encourage or insist on the use of English, the reliance on other linguistic resources can never be completely resisted (Canagarajah, 2011). Furthermore, Kuteeva (2020) argues that in contexts where there are other languages present alongside English used as the main medium for instruction, there will naturally be a context-specific ‘language regime’, where the English language “is not static and can move along the standard – non-standard continuum.” (p. 298). Besides, insisting only on English will be detrimental to the positive potential of creating a bilingual or multilingual learning environment (Rahman & Singh, 2021), and a clear demarcation between English language and other potentially useful linguistic resources may displace meaningful interactions, and even take away valuable insights that can help teachers plan the classroom’s learning trajectory (Carroll & Sambolín Morales, 2016).

When students are allowed to relate with and work on learning materials through their own linguistic or cultural resources, their engagement with the learning process is highly likely to be positive, leading to a better understanding of the learning task but also a greater experience in the classroom (Carroll & Sambolín Morales, 2016; Amamah et al., 2021). Hence, institutions will need to find ways to support translanguaging spaces that are not conventionally linked with formal classroom learning. This is crucial for students’ development of a “robust multilingual and multimodal communicative competence to navigate increasingly complex intercultural communication in [students’] lifeworlds.” (Ou et al., 2020, p. 16).

Nonetheless, while translanguaging can be helpful, it can also be exclusionary, especially against those who do not share the same linguistic resources. It also discloses other social issues related to language use, such as language superiority and social

standings within groups (Kuteeva, 2020). Furthermore, introducing translanguaging, even if it is a natural process that occurs among students, may be challenging given the pervasive discourse that supports a monolingual language learning environment (García & Kleifgen, 2020).

Students’ Perspectives towards Translanguaging for Language Learning

Looking at translanguaging as an integral aspect of communication in an international setting moves away from the emphasis on English language accuracy or proficiency, as it also takes into consideration interlocutors’ ability to leverage other semiotic sources for meaning-making (Carstens, 2016; Ou et al., 2020). In some contexts, bilingual practices may be recognized at the national level. Such recognition encourages and cultivates students to be competent ‘English knowers’, and might reduce the competition of students striving to be highly proficient users of English for professional purposes (Wang & Curdt-Christiansen, 2019). It should be noted that students’ perceptions towards translanguaging may change over time, such as that reported by Adamson and Coulson (2015), where they found that students were able to realize the potential of translanguaging after three years of being provided opportunities to use their first language in various English language learning settings at the university.

Nonetheless, translanguaging may be viewed as destabilizing since it challenges incumbent ideologies of what constitutes academic or professional communication. Hence, there might be ambivalence or resistance toward translanguaging, especially if the discourse of multilingual practice or the use of other languages in an English instruction setting is viewed unfavorably (Palfreyman & Al-Bataineh, 2018).

Even though students may see the value of their first language, they may view an English-medium class as superior, and those other languages should not be present. This probably stems from the view that the

viable route to increasing proficiency in English is through a strict English-only environment (Palfreyman & Al-Bataineh, 2018; Kwihangana, 2021). To do this, students may self-assess their English ability, which they will use to determine their extent of involvement in translanguaging activities. Involvement may range from not wanting to resort to translanguaging means to being an intermediary for students whose English language proficiency is not high (Kuteeva, 2020).

METHODOLOGY

With the aim of analyzing the perspectives of international students regarding translanguaging, a mixed-methods approach is selected. A mixed-methods approach is suitable given that it provides a link between quantitative and qualitative data (Almalki, 2016). Moreover, it is flexible in the sense that it may address different aspects of the phenomenon being researched. While this may give seemingly disparate outcomes, they are still relevant as they contribute towards the same research purpose (Lund, 2012). The mixed-methods approach of this study comprised of a questionnaire and an open-ended survey. The research questions that this study seeks to address are

1. What are international students' perceptions towards translanguaging?
2. Does students' year of study affect their perceptions towards translanguaging?

Study Site and Participants

The study context is a private higher education institution located in Thailand. This institution offers undergraduate degree programs in the areas of arts and humanities, education, science, nursing, business administration, and religious studies. As of 2022, there are 33 nationalities represented at this institution. While this university is located about 120 kilometers away from Bangkok, there are many international organizations in the area, which is also observed throughout the nation (Ferguson, 2018; Trakulkasemsuk, 2018; Jampaklay et

al., 2022). Hence, it is common to find English alongside Thai on signages and in communities where English speakers are present (Meemongkol, 2020). Even though English and possibly other languages may exist in small pockets around Thailand, recent relevant studies have reported that translanguaging may not be viewed as valuable, particularly in Thai higher educational institutions, despite their aims for university students to be global citizens (Ra & Baker, 2021). Nevertheless, there is at least one study done in Thailand where it reported that the use of translanguaging led to greater independence on the part of the students in carrying out interactions (Kampittayakul, 2019). While informative, these studies do not disclose much about the perceptions held by international students.

Convenience sampling was employed to recruit participants. As this study intends to analyze the perspectives of international students, there are no requirements for who the students are, as long as they are enrolled in any one of the international programs mentioned earlier. The co-authors of this study shared the data collection tool (questionnaire and open-ended survey) with other colleagues, who then distributed it to their students.

Data Collection and Analysis

The anonymous questionnaire and open-ended survey were distributed through an online form. It was distributed at the beginning of March 2022 and was open for two weeks. This form was made up of three parts: the first collected students' demographic data (gender; nationality; study program; year of study; and perceived English language proficiency); the second was the questionnaire; and the last part was the open-ended survey. More details of the questionnaire and open-ended survey are provided below.

Questionnaire (Quantitative Data)

A questionnaire is utilized to collect quantitative data. The questionnaire was built

based on the findings of Carstens (2016), whose study examined the perceptions of students towards translanguaging as a tool for L2 (English) acquisition. Carstens' study identified three themes, all of which consist of several 'codes' – situations where translanguaging occurs. The three themes are translanguaging for meaning-making (4 items); for learning and English development (5 items); and for socialization (3 items). While Carstens' study was done in South Africa, the findings are suitable for this current study, given the relevance of the themes to the study site. This provided a basis for the reliability of the questionnaire as Carstens' (2016) research reported phenomena that may also occur in the current study setting. As stated by Dörnyei and Taguchi (2002), reliability is partially determined by the plausibility of the research phenomena affecting, or being understood by, the participants or sample's domain. Each code in the questionnaire was presented as an item for which students had to rate their level of agreement along a 5-point scale, which was then analyzed for its mean and standard deviation scores. To further validate the reliability of the questionnaire, Cronbach's Alpha was calculated, which yielded a value of 0.93. This is considered 'Excellent' in terms of the internal consistency between items.

Open-ended Survey (Qualitative Data)

The second part of the data collection was that of students' qualitative perspectives. This was conducted through an open-ended survey, presenting three short case studies

aligned with the three themes mentioned above. These case studies were also derived from Carsten (2016). Students' qualitative responses would then be thematized based on the respective case studies and their extent of agreement so as to complement the quantitative data. To ensure the validity of the coding, the three researchers coded the qualitative responses separately, after which individual codes were compared and consolidated. Doing this allowed the researchers' intersubjectivity to determine shared meanings (Döös & Wilhelmson, 2014).

RESULTS

A total of 74 international undergraduate students responded to the survey, which consisted of 39 female students (52.7%) and 35 male students (47.3%). The demographic details are provided in Table 1, Table 2, and Table 3. Many of the participants in this study were in their 1st or 2nd year of their four-year undergraduate degree. Furthermore, a majority of them were studying business administration (n=24). The participants represented 16 nationalities, with the top three being Burmese (n=15), Chinese (n=14), and Thai (n=11). It should be noted that the nationalities making up the majority of the participants are from contexts where the general view towards translanguaging may not be that optimistic due to the preference to demarcate English as a language of globalization and modernity (Soe, Ko, & Myint, 2020; Boonsuk & Ambele, 2020 for Thailand; Myanmar; Zhang & Pladevall-Ballester, 2022 for China)

Table 1. *Study Years of the Participants*

Study Year	Total (n)	Percentage (%)
First	26	35.1
Second	27	36.5
Third	10	13.5
Fourth	11	14.9

Table 2. *Study Programs of the Participants*

Study Program	Total (n)	Percentage (%)
Business Administration	24	32.4

Education	16	21.6
Arts and Humanities	15	20.3
Information Technology	9	12.2
Science	6	8.1
Nursing	4	5.4

Table 3. Nationalities of the Participants

Nationality	Total (n)	Percentage (%)
1. Burmese	15	20.3
2. Chinese	14	18.9
3. Thai	11	14.9
4. Cambodian	7	9.5
5. Filipino	5	6.8
6. Indonesian	5	6.8
7. Vietnamese	5	6.8
8. Malaysian	4	5.4
9. Brazilian	1	1.4
10. British	1	1.4
11. Kenyan	1	1.4
12. South African	1	1.4
13. Sri Lankan	1	1.4
14. Togolese	1	1.4
15. Zambian	1	1.4
16. Zimbabwean	1	1.4

Table 4. Interpretation of Mean Score

Mean score	Interpretation
1.00 to 2.33	Low
2.34 to 3.66	Medium
3.67 to 5.00	High

Table 5. Interpretation of Standard Deviation

Standard deviation	Interpretation
<1	Low dispersion
>1	High dispersion

Table 6. Mean and Standard Deviation Scores for Questionnaire Items

No	Questionnaire Item	Mean	Standard Deviation
Translanguaging for Meaning-making			
1.	Translanguaging helps me see the bigger picture of an idea.	3.8	0.8
2.	Translanguaging helps me differentiate related ideas.	3.8	0.7
3.	Translanguaging helps me to express my own understanding of an idea.	3.9	0.9
4.	Translanguaging helps me become more open towards ideas.	3.8	0.8
Translanguaging for English and Learning Development			
5.	Translanguaging helps me become more confident in English.	4.0	0.8
6.	Translanguaging helps me acquire English words.	3.8	0.9
7.	Translanguaging helps me learn independently.	3.9	0.9
8.	Translanguaging helps me to become more engaged with instruction and classroom activity.	3.7	0.9
9.	Translanguaging helps me interact and collaborate better in group activities.	3.9	0.9

Translanguaging for Socialization

10.	Translanguaging helps others understand me better.	3.8	0.8
11.	Translanguaging helps me relate better with others from difficult cultural backgrounds.	4.1	0.8
12.	Translanguaging helps me become more confident of my identity, even though I am away from my home.	3.8	0.9

Table 6 presents the mean and standard deviation scores for the 12 items of the questionnaire. The interpretation of the mean and standard deviation scores are presented in Tables 4 and 5 (Khan et al., 2021). In general, it appears that the respondents had a somewhat agreeable perspective towards translanguaging, with a mean agreement for all items of < 3.5 and a standard deviation of less than 1, which signifies low dispersion and, thus, relatively similar responses given by the participants.

Of the 12 items, items #5 and #11 had a level of agreement of 4 or more. Item #5, under the theme translanguaging for English and learning development, had a mean of 4.0 and a standard deviation of 0.8. In contrast, Item #11, under the theme of translanguaging for socialization, had a mean of 4.1 and a standard deviation of 0.8. The former, Item #5, reflects the presence of other languages, even in a domain where English may be the primary or official language for communication (Canagarajah, 2011; Kuteeva, 2020). More specifically, students' positive disposition toward translanguaging as a means to be more confident in their grasp of English may be an indication of their ease of using linguistic resources to carry out various tasks or processes pertinent to their university education, such as that reported by Ou et al. (2020). This is supported by the extent of agreement in Item #11, which indicates that students who may be using translanguaging strategies can relate better with others. This may be a distinct characteristic for international students, as a commonality that binds them is, in fact, their lack of a shared first language, which may encourage them to be more accommodating towards each other's effort to communicate in English or with other semiotic resources.

As mentioned earlier, it may be the case that students' university experience over time may shape their perceptions towards translanguaging (Adamson & Coulson, 2015). To determine this and to answer the second research question, the quantitative results were analyzed through a One-way ANOVA and a Post Hoc Tuckey HSD analysis. Specifically, the participants' years of study were designated as a variable whose mean was compared. The results of this analysis are presented in Tables 7 and 8. The result of the One-way ANOVA was significant. Subsequently, a Post Hoc Tuckey HSD analysis was conducted for pairwise comparisons. This procedure is to determine whether there was a significant difference between pairs' means from the sample.

Based on the results seen in Table 8, there appears to be a significant difference between first-year participants with third and fourth-year participants, second-year participants with third and fourth-year participants, as well as between third and fourth-year participants. A probable reason for this difference may be students' gradual familiarity with university teaching and learning processes and other relevant interactions. In other words, as students' progress in their year of study, they become more accustomed to using various semiotic resources, including English and other languages, to facilitate different processes. This was reported by Adamson and Coulson (2015) and Kuteeva (2020), where English, along with other languages, may find its eventual function in students' personal, social, and academic life through university.

Table 7. One-Way ANOVA based on Participants' Years of Study

	SS	Df	MS	
Between-treatments	1.6973	3	0.5658*	F=17.43861
Total	3.1248	47		

*Significant at $p < 0.05$

Table 8. Post Hoc Tuckey HSD Analysis of Participants according to Study Year

Pairwise Comparisons		HSD _{.05} = 0.1963 = 0.2427	HSD _{.01} Q _{.05} = 3.7760 Q _{.01} = 4.6673
T ₁ :T ₂	M ₁ = 3.93 M ₂ = 3.96	0.02	Q = 0.48 (p = .98629)
T ₁ :T ₃	M ₁ = 3.93 M ₃ = 3.49	0.44*	Q = 8.49 (p = .00000)
T ₁ :T ₄	M ₁ = 3.93 M ₄ = 3.73	0.21*	Q = 4.01 (p = .03379)
T ₂ :T ₃	M ₂ = 3.96 M ₃ = 3.49	0.47*	Q = 8.97 (p = .00000)
T ₂ :T ₄	M ₂ = 3.96 M ₄ = 3.73	0.23*	Q = 4.49 (p = .01411)
T ₃ :T ₄	M ₃ = 3.49 M ₄ = 3.73	0.23*	Q = 4.49 (p = .01411)

*Significant at $p < 0.05$

T1 = First Year; T2 = Second Year; T3 = Third Year; T4 = Fourth Year

To build a better understanding of students' perceptions towards translanguaging and to complement the quantitative data, qualitative data was also collected through an open-ended survey, where students had to respond to three separate case studies. The qualitative data was thematized according to the case studies, and in doing so, specific functions for translanguaging and attitudes towards translanguaging could be derived. While there were a number of students who provided elaborated responses towards the case studies, there were also those who gave short responses (e.g., "yes"/ "agree"/ "disagree"). The short responses were not included in the analysis as they did not provide further insights into their perspectives. Some of the students' verbatim responses are presented below. As mentioned, the responses are thematized based on shared meanings or related views (Döös & Wilhelmson, 2014). First, consider the case study that illustrated the first theme, translanguaging for meaning-making. The case study is as follows:

Student A and Student B were discussing a concept that they learned from their class earlier in the day. Since

they spoke the same first language, their discussion was done in both English and their first language. After the discussion, Student A and Student B felt that they could distinguish some peculiar ideas and developed a deeper understanding of the concept.

The first case study is a scenario where students would interact outside a 'classroom setting' to help each other gain a deeper or better understanding of a concept. This may not come as a surprise, given that students who share the same first language would naturally come together, especially in an international setting (Bittencourt et al., 2021). Many of the participants agreed that translanguaging for meaning-making is valuable, as it provides a convenient or comfortable learning process (Response #2; #3; #4; #6), and offers better or deeper clarity of what is being learned (Response #1; #5), and also highlights areas in English language use that students may need to improve (Response #4). These can be observed in the following responses:

Response #1: The process of translanguage helps to learn deeply about the concept.

Response #2: Because they speak the same language, they can communicate more easily and express their ideas in a more specific way.

Response #3: I agree that we should do stuff first in which language and way we are comfortable in so we know how to coordinate things properly and to translate them to the language needed.

Response #4: I agree with this because your first language is the one you are most confident with and combining it with speaking English will help you get better in speaking English and you will better understand the concept by using your own first language that you are comfortable with.

Response #5: I agree with the case study as speaking with a person that has the same first language helps in attaining clarity on things you don [don't] understand or do not have a clear picture of in English.

Response #6: I agree with this way of communication. It helps the students bond and create a deeper understanding with each other. They are able to learn with trying to make their own way the only way. They are able to share ideas and able to understand the concept with any struggles.

Aside from having clarity, or a deeper understanding of what is being learned, translanguaging also offers students opportunities to learn better with others, as seen in Response 6. This would be beneficial for international students who find themselves in a new learning environment, as they would be able to seek support or assurance from others who share the same language. The second case study addressed the theme 'translanguaging for learning and English development'. It is as follows:

Student C is taking a class where many other students, including her professor, speak the same first language. There are times in the class when the first language is used. By using the first language, it was observed that Student C and her classmates had learned the

same (technical) words in their first language.

The second case study presents a scenario where a language other than English might be used in a classroom setting. Unlike the positive responses for the previous case study, many of the responses for the second case study indicated students' hesitation toward the use of translanguaging. It is also through the case study that we observe students' ideologies regarding the use of English, such as that seen in Response #7 and Response #8. Both these responses indicated an obligatory stance for the use of English. Nonetheless, there were also some students who did not appear to take a strong stance against translanguaging, as seen in Response #9. While there is still a reluctance for students to use their 'native' language, there remains the view that international students should seek avenues for improving their use of English.

Response #7: I'm not agreeing with this idea. If a student wants to learn new English terms it is necessary to speak only English in the class.

Response #8: i don't agree they must used English language

Response #9: Although they feel comfortable as they are able to talk in their native language, it is not helpful if they plan to improve their English skills. By communicating in a familiar language, they block the possibilities to learn more and better vocabularies and might even make their English worse than before.

In the responses to the second case study, there were also reasons provided for participants' hesitation towards translanguaging. As mentioned, it may be due to the need to find opportunities to improve the use of English, or translanguaging may inadvertently exclude other students, as discussed by Kuteeva (2020). This is observed in Response #10 and Response #11.

Response #10: i disagree with speaking the same language in class if some students do not understand the same language. it divides the attention of the other students and they may feel left out because of this. it will also create an environment that is weird and awkwardness since inclusivity was taken out of the environment.

It is interesting to point out that the situation where translanguaging might take place is pertinent. In particular, while the first case study did not specify where Student A and Student B were having their discussion, the second case study stated that Student C was in a classroom setting where a professor was present. It could be the case that there exists the view that English should be maintained in a formal setting, and as such, translanguaging should be minimized or avoided. The final case study illustrated the theme of translanguaging for socialization. The case study is as follows:

Even though Student D is an international student in an English-speaking university located in a foreign country, he feels at home given that he uses and hears his first language for different purposes, whether academic or social. This makes Student D feel a greater sense of belonging to his country.

The third case study aims to examine students' perceptions towards translanguaging as a precursor to create a sense of belonging. The responses for this case study appeared to be generally positive, as seen in the responses below.

Response #12: i agree in the sense that students D feels at-home in a foreign country and lessens his longing for his home which the environment makes it somehow familiar to him.

Response #13: I agree as when a student feels a sense of belonging they tend to have a healthier mindset which allows them to study well as opposed to a student who is not comfortable and struggling to survive in a foreign setting.

Response #14: Translanguaging allows students to feel at home as well as share a common language to be able to communicate in and build relationships

As seen in Response #13 and Response #14, having a sense of belonging could be critical for international students, especially if they need to maintain their wellbeing whilst studying in a foreign country, where they are also living among and building relationships with people from various backgrounds. This perspective is reiterated in Response #15 as well, where translanguaging eases the immersion of international students into a new setting, which subsequently may facilitate their learning experience.

Response #15: In this case, the student D would be able to learn faster and help his/her friends really well since it's his/her native language. He would also understand a different language from the friends as well.

Nonetheless, not all respondents agreed with the third case study, as seen in Response #16. This response was similar to some of the perspectives shared in the second case study, where there was a strong preference for English-only usage in an international setting. The reason for this was that students should fully utilize the opportunity to improve their use of English.

Response #16: Disagree, when you are a student in an English-speaking university, you should be more involved in English than your own language. It's not meant to discriminate on your own language but to make use of the opportunity to practice English more.

DISCUSSION

Based on the findings, it could be observed that international students generally hold a positive perspective toward translanguaging. Furthermore, from the quantitative analysis, students seem to view translanguaging more positively as they progress in their study program. This may be comparable to the study of Adamson and Coulson (2015), who

reported that students became more willing to engage in translanguage strategies over the years. The quantitative findings, especially that of Items #4 and #11, were reflected in the qualitative data, where students' responses indicated the use of translanguage as a strategy to ease the learning process or to better understand a concept, as well as to socialize better with other international students. This may be expected, given that these international students do not necessarily share a first language, resulting in a more positive disposition towards the use of multiple languages.

The qualitative data provided further insights regarding translanguage, namely the importance of context, as well as the status of interlocutors involved. This was made apparent in the students' responses to the second case study, where there students perceived that translanguage was inappropriate for use in a classroom setting with a professor (or any teacher for that matter) present. There was also an insistence on English as the only language to be used, reflecting an entrenched language ideology (Canagarajah, 2011). Nonetheless, this perspective may also be driven by an awareness that reverting to one's language may exclude peers from either an academic learning process, or even while socializing with others (Kuteeva, 2020). Despite these, students were aware that translanguage could be beneficial for international students' socialization, as well as for building a sense of self and belonging while studying and living in a foreign context (Ou et al. 2020).

From the findings of this study, several classroom and institutional implications are worth mentioning. First, university teachers could look for opportunities for translanguage at the micro-level. This may be done by allowing pockets of time for students who share the same language to discuss what they have learned. Doing so will allow students to be more engaged with classroom instruction or activity (Karabassova & San Isidro, 2020; Loo, 2021a; Kao, 2022). At the institutional level,

there could be efforts put forth to promote an extent of translanguage, especially for the purpose of helping students socialize and learn about their learning environment. To achieve this, conational groups such as that discussed by Bittencourt et al. (2021) could be considered. When other languages are acknowledged, students will be empowered to find utility in the languages that they speak (Palfreyman & Al-Bataineh, 2018). This will foster a respectful multilingual learning environment where international students can thrive academically and socially.

CONCLUSION

As observed in this current study, while students seemed to hold a positive perspective towards translanguage, there were certain situations where it was considered inappropriate. This could be further examined through qualitative methods, where the boundaries of translanguage may be identified and problematized. Other studies could also consider other modes of qualitative data, such as observations and longitudinal interviews, from a cross-sectional population of students at different junctures in their university education. All in all, from this study, we could see that international students are indeed engaging in translanguage processes.

This affirms the view that there are multiple spaces within the larger ecology that houses different knowledge and experiences, along with a variety of resources and processes for learning (Ou et al., 2020). Hence, it should be noted that university learning is not merely an academic process; it involves other forms of interactions, even social, to facilitate students' various university work – all of which take place with different linguistic and semiotic resources.

REFERENCES

- Adamson, J., & Coulson, D. (2015). Translanguage in English academic writing preparation. *International Journal of Pedagogies and Learning*, 10(1), 24-37.
- Almalki, S. (2016). Integrating quantitative and

- qualitative data in mixed methods research—Challenges and benefits. *Journal of Education and Learning*, 5(3), 288-296.
- Amamah, A. I. A., Bouti, S., & Malabar, F. (2021). Code switching in EFL students' proposal seminar presentation. *TRANS-KATA: Journal of Language, Literature, Culture and Education*, 1(2), 68-76. <https://doi.org/10.54923/transkata.v1i2.22>
- Bittencourt, T., Johnstone, C., Adjei, M., & Seithers, L. (2021). "We see the world different now": Remapping assumptions about international student adaptation. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 25(1), 35-50. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1028315319861366>
- Boonsuk, Y., & Ambele, E. A. (2020). Who 'owns English' in our changing world? Exploring the perception of Thai university students in Thailand. *Asian Englishes*, 22(3), 297-308. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13488678.2019.1669302>
- Byrnes, H. (2020). Navigating pedagogical translanguaging: Commentary on the special issue. *System*, 92, Article 102278. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2020.102278>
- Canagarajah, S. (2011). Translanguaging in the classroom: Emerging issues for research and pedagogy. *Applied Linguistics Review*, 2(1), 1-28.
- Carroll, K. S., & Sambolín Morales, A. N. (2016). Using university students' L1 as a resource: Translanguaging in a Puerto Rican ESL classroom. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 39(3-4), 248-262. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15235882.2016.1240114>
- Carstens, A. (2016). Translanguaging as a vehicle for L2 acquisition and L1 development: Students' perceptions. *Language Matters*, 47(2), 203-222. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10228195.2016.1153135>
- Creese, A., & Blackledge, A. (2015). Translanguaging and identity in educational settings. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 35, 20-35.
- Döös, M., & Wilhelmson, L. (2014). Proximity and distance: phases of intersubjective qualitative data analysis in a research team. *Quality & Quantity*, 48(2), 1089-1106.
- Dörnyei, Z., & Taguchi, T. (2002). *Questionnaires in second language research: construction, administration, and processing* (2nd ed.). Routledge.
- Ferguson, M. R. (2018). Simulacra, simulation, and the internationalization of higher education in Thailand. *Thammasat Review*, 21(1), 71-92.
- García, O., & Kleifgen, J. A. (2020). Translanguaging and literacies. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 55(4), 553-571.
- Jampaklay, A., Penboon, B., & Lucktong, A. (2022). Internationalization of higher education in Thailand: Promises and reality. *Kasetsart Journal of Social Sciences*, 43(1), 183-193.
- Kampittayakul, T. (2019). The role of translanguaging in improving Thai learners' interactional competence in dyadic "English as a foreign language" tutorial sessions. *PASAA: Journal of Language Teaching and Learning in Thailand*, 56, 80-111. <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1224429>
- Kao, Y-T. (2022) Exploring translanguaging in Taiwanese CLIL classes: An analysis of teachers' perceptions and practices. *Language, Culture and Curriculum*. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07908318.2022.2033762>
- Karabassova, L., & San Isidro, X. (2020). Towards translanguaging in CLIL: A study on teachers' perceptions and practices in Kazakhstan. *International Journal of Multilingualism*. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14790718.2020.1828426>
- Kaufhold, K. (2018). Creating translanguaging spaces in students' academic writing practices. *Linguistics and Education*, 45, 1-9. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.linged.2018.02.001>
- Khan, M. H., Razak, A. Z. A., & Kenayathulla, H. B. (2021). Professional learning community, trust, and teacher professional development in Malaysian secondary schools. *Jurnal Pendidikan Malaysia* (Malaysian Journal of Education), 46(1), 25-37. <http://dx.doi.org/10.17576/JPEN-2021-46.01-03>
- Kuteeva, M. (2020). Revisiting the 'E' in EMI: Students' perceptions of standard English, lingua franca and translanguaging practices. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 23(3), 287-300. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050.2019.1637395>
- Kwihangana, F. (2021). Enhancing EFL students' participation through translanguaging. *ELT Journal*, 75(1), 87-96. <https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccaa058>
- Liu, Y., & Fang, F. (2020). Translanguaging theory and practice: How stakeholders perceive translanguaging as a practical theory of language. *RELC Journal*. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0033688220939222>
- Loo, D. B. (2021a). Learning academic vocabulary through a sociomaterial approach: Ecological perspectives of the postgraduate experience. *Language Sustainability: Reality, Challenges and Directions in the Digital Technology Era: Proceedings from the International Conference on Language Studies (iCLS) 2021*, 73-78. <http://www.conference.unimas.my/2021/icls2>

[021/images/iCLS2021_proceedings_v4_upload_7Sept2021.pdf#page=80](#)

- Loo, D. B. (2021b). The language ecology of graduate students: An exploration through vocabulary contribution. *Issues in Language Studies*, 10(2), 65-82. <https://doi.org/10.33736/ils.3903.2021>
- Lund, T. (2012). Combining qualitative and quantitative approaches: Some arguments for mixed methods research. *Scandinavian Journal of Educational Research*, 56(2), 155-165. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00313831.2011.568674>
- Meemongkol, G. (2020). Linguistic Landscape of a University in Thailand. *Journal of Liberal Arts, Rangsit University*, 15(2), 165-186.
- Ou, W. A., Gu, M. M., & Hult, F. M. (2020). Translanguaging for intercultural communication in international higher education: Transcending English as a lingua franca. *International Journal of Multilingualism*. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14790718.2020.1856113>
- Palfreyman, D. M., & Al-Bataineh, A. (2018). 'This is my life style, Arabic and English': Students' attitudes to (trans) languaging in a bilingual university context. *Language Awareness*, 27(1-2), 79-95. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09658416.2018.1431244>
- Ra, J. J., & Baker, W. (2021). Translanguaging and language policy in Thai higher education EMI programs. In W. Tsou & W. Baker (Eds.), *English-medium Instruction translanguaging practices in Asia: Theories, frameworks and implementation in higher education* (pp. 59-77). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-16-3001-9_4
- Rahman, M. M., & Singh, M. K. M. (2021). English Medium university STEM teachers' and students' ideologies in constructing content knowledge through translanguaging. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050.2021.1915950>
- Soe, T., Ko, T., & Myint, S. (2020). Attitudes towards English as a medium of instruction (EMI): A case study of University of Mandalay. *Myanmar Educational Research and Learning Portal (University of Mandalay Research Journal)*, 11, 108-115.
- Trakulkasemsuk, W. (2018). English in Thailand: Looking back to the past, at the present and towards the future. *Asian Englishes*, 20(2), 96-105. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13488678.2017.1421602>
- Wang, W., & Curdt-Christiansen, X. K. (2019). Translanguaging in a Chinese-English bilingual education programme: A university-classroom ethnography. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 22(3), 322-337. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050.2018.1526254>
- Wei, L. (2018). Translanguaging as a practical theory of language. *Applied Linguistics*, 39(1), 9-30. <https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/amx039>
- Zhang, M., & Pladevall-Ballester, E. (2022). Students' attitudes and perceptions towards three EMI courses in mainland China. *Language, Culture and Curriculum*, 35(2), 200-216. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07908318.2021.1979576>