

TOWARDS MULTILINGUAL EDUCATION: PRE-SERVICE ENGLISH TEACHERS' PERCEPTIONS OF TRANSLANGUAGING PEDAGOGY

Wulandari Santoso¹, and Fuad Abdul Hamied²

^{1,2}Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia
wulandarisantoso@upi.edu

ABSTRACT

Recent research has shown a paradigm shift towards the rise of translanguaging pedagogy as opposed to the so-called monolingual principles. Translanguaging pedagogy in educational contexts refers to the utilisation of all the linguistic and semiotic resources of students to foster learning. This crosslinguistic approach, thus, challenges language separation and softens the boundaries between languages. Translanguaging is also seen as a transformative pedagogy as it empowers multilinguals to embrace their whole repertoires. This present study involved the pre-service English as a Foreign Language (EFL) teachers in an Indonesian private university taking the English language teaching programme designed to prepare them to be future English teachers. This research aimed to investigate their perceptions of translanguaging pedagogy in order to promote reflections in pre-service English teachers regarding their own views of English language teaching. Six pre-service English teachers were invited to participate in a group interview to shed light on future teachers' reflective stance regarding the potential use of translanguaging pedagogy. The research results demonstrated that the participants held the maximal position, which put a strong emphasis on maximising the use of English. They, however, expressed their interests in the implementation of translanguaging pedagogy in their own classrooms, but solely for a scaffold to learn rather than seeing it as opportunities to create a safe space for students to legitimate their multilingual dynamic practices.

Kata kunci: translanguaging pedagogy, multilingualism, multilingual education

ABSTRAK

Penelitian terkini menunjukkan adanya pergeseran paradigma menuju pedagogik translanguaging dari prinsip-prinsip monolingual. Pedagogik translanguaging dalam konteks pendidikan mengacu pada penggunaan seluruh sumber daya linguistik dan semiotik siswa untuk menunjang pembelajaran. Pendekatan lintas linguistik ini menentang pemisahan bahasa dan mengurangi batasan-batasan antar-bahasa. Translanguaging juga dianggap sebagai pedagogik transformatif karena memberdayakan siswa multi-bahasa untuk menggunakan repertoar bahasa mereka secara utuh. Penelitian ini melibatkan calon guru Bahasa Inggris di sebuah universitas swasta di Jakarta yang sedang mengambil program pengajaran Bahasa Inggris untuk mempersiapkan mereka menjadi guru Bahasa Inggris. Penelitian ini bertujuan untuk meneliti persepsi calon guru Bahasa Inggris tentang pedagogik translanguaging untuk mendukung refleksi tentang pandangan mereka terhadap pengajaran Bahasa Inggris. Enam calon guru Bahasa Inggris berpartisipasi dalam wawancara kelompok untuk membahas sikap mereka terhadap penggunaan pedagogik translanguaging. Hasil penelitian menunjukkan bahwa responden memiliki maksimal position yang menekankan pada penggunaan bahasa Inggris secara maksimal. Namun demikian, responden juga menyatakan ketertarikan terhadap implementasi pedagogik translanguaging di dalam kelas mereka akan tetapi hanya sekedar untuk membantu pembelajaran. Mereka tidak menganggap pedagogik translanguaging sebagai kesempatan untuk menciptakan ruang yang aman bagi siswa untuk melegitimasi penggunaan multi-bahasa mereka secara dinamis.

Kata kunci: pedagogik translanguaging, multilingualisme, pendidikan multilingualisme

INTRODUCTION

Recent theorisation in applied linguistics has demonstrated a paradigm shift from monolingual ideologies, which favours the target language as the only language for instruction (Cummins, 2007), to dynamic multilingualism (Cenoz, 2017; Cenoz & Gorter, 2020; Garcia & Wei, 2014). This multilingual turn that promotes linguistically inclusive pedagogies is deemed needed to better reflect “the increased plurality of practices- linguistic, educational, cultural that characterise students in the multilingual/multicultural classrooms of today” (Garcia & Silvan, 2011, p. 386). In addition, globalisation, internationalisation of education, people mobility, and technology have significantly contributed to the diversity of linguistic and multilingual landscapes, influencing many scholars to find ways of capitalising on students' language and cultural resources (Cenoz, 2013; Vallejo & Dolly, 2019).

Among terminologies that focus on the idea of language integration in which speakers draws on a single repertoire rather than discrete languages, translanguaging has arguably become one of the most widespread pedagogical approaches that has gained much attention among scholars. In general, it refers to the utilisation of one's full semiotic repertoire to communicate strategically (Garcia & Wei, 2014). The notion of translanguaging goes beyond additive multilingualism, where additional languages were

separately added to previously acquired languages; and subtractive multilingualism, taking away students' home languages (Garcia & Lin, 2016; Garcia & Wei, 2014). Therefore, this new trend in the study of multilingualism is a form of reaction against the traditional view of language teaching based on the reference to the ideal monolingual speaker and the isolation of the target language (Cenoz & Gorter, 2020).

This paper focuses on exploring pre-service teachers' perceptions of the crosslinguistic approach to trigger reflections on language choice in the English classroom. This study serves as a preliminary stage of a larger project, aiming to identify how their views have changed after experiencing multilingual classroom practices. This current research contributes to providing a glimpse at student teachers' views of what constitutes 'best practice' in the English classroom and the possibility of integrating translanguaging pedagogy in their future careers.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Translanguaging and Its Development

The conceptualisation of translanguaging has been under constant development over the last 20 years. Translanguaging was first introduced as a pedagogical strategy in Welsh bilingual schools where students alternate between two languages for both receptive and productive purposes (Lewis et al., 2012). Since then, it has been used to describe fluid language practices in the context of multilingual education in other parts of the world. The term translanguaging has often been confused with code-switching, while these two concepts imply a different epistemological perspective. Code-switching, defined as switching back and forth from one language to another, still reflects the traditional perspective of bounded language codes underpinned by the monoglossic norm (Garcia & Wei, 2014; Garcia & Lin, 2016). Such a rigid separation of languages has become a predominant pragmatic practice and unfortunately is "rarely institutionally endorsed or pedagogically underpinned" (Creese and Blackledge, 2010, p. 105). In contrast, translanguaging regards multilinguals as having "*one linguistic repertoire* from which they can select features *strategically* to communicate effectively" (Garcia & Wei, 2014, p. 22, emphasis in original). In other words, translanguaging takes up a holistic view of language in which languages are used in a dynamic integrated manner, being always heteroglossic (see Bailey, 2007). Rather than starting from the viewpoint of autonomous languages, translanguaging takes up the perspective of dynamic multilingualism, acknowledging the use of unique language repertoire to develop identities and sustain multilingual performances (Garcia & Wei, 2014).

Recently, the conceptualisation of translanguaging has been extended to include a semiotic rather than a linguistic repertoire (Garcia & Otheguy, 2020). It views linguistic signs as part of a wider repertoire of multimodal resources that plays a significant role in communicative practices. Drawing on Halliday's notion of trans-semiotic, Lin (2019) develops the term trans-semiotizing to describe "an assemblage of agents and resources all entrained (i.e. drawn or pulled along) into the fluid, dynamic flow of meaning making" (Lin, 2019, p. 8). This involves a whole spatial repertoire of meaning making signs such as gestures, visuals, and human bodies; and encompasses speech styles, grammars, genres, and utterances. This fluid view of language is also portrayed by Garcia et al. (2017) as *la corriente*, a current in the flow of water, meaning that students' dynamic multilingualism continues to shift and move between and beyond language features. These perspectives thus have an implication for broadening our understanding of the teaching and learning processes as co-evolving in the dynamic meaning-making activity, which has challenged the deficient viewpoint of conscious selection within language systems by speakers.

Therefore, translanguaging has a transformative power that challenges the traditional conceptualisation of separate multilingualism and legitimates the dynamic flows of multilingual practices (Garcia, 2017; Garcia & Lin, 2016). In its transgression, translanguaging pedagogy has the potential to crack institutional structures that have imposed monolingual norms on multilingual individuals (Garcia & Otheguy, 2020). As some scholars (e.g. Flores, 2014; Flores & Rosa, 2015) argue, translanguaging is a political act which transforms the so-called standard language for language learning and assessment. In the context of ELT, Wei (2021, p. 2) highlights the capacity of translanguaging pedagogy to challenge "raciolinguistic ideologies", which have stigmatised racialised multilinguals as incompetent of mastering the English language. This framing has caused the widespread idea that one's ownership of a language largely depends on his/her racial identity.

Following Wei (2021), translanguaging is not merely about acknowledging the use of multiple named languages in the monoglossic educational setting. It is indeed reconstitutive in three senses: (1)

reconstitutive of language structures through mixing of language features, genres, and styles; (2) reconstitutive of language status enforced by states; and (3) reconstitutive of hegemonic power relations between language users who have unequal access to symbolic capital. This translanguaging stance has therefore raised our awareness of the importance of mobilising the diverse linguistic and cultural knowledge of students to promote equity and transform students' subjectivities. Language is socio-politically constructed, thus is not value neutral (Otheguy et al., 2015; Wei, 2021). As Wei (2021) argues, the policies and practices of ELT are an ideological act which should attempt to legitimate creativity and criticality of creating new language practices with the use of different named languages and semiotic resources. In its practice, translanguaging offers a more equitable view of multilingualism where all students' whole repertoires are valued and respected, thus contributing to decolonialising the field of ELT.

The emergence of translanguaging has thus shifted power dynamics focusing on the real language practices of speakers rather than on standardised linguistic forms and varieties. It also legitimates the use of minority languages in educational contexts where such practices are not the norm. In other words, translanguaging could provide better tailored instruction to the needs of multilingual students (Garcia & Leiva, 2014). Promoting translanguaging classroom discourse can be used for the empowerment of multilingual students, enabling them to validate their identities, experiences, and multimodal resources in a safe translanguaging space (Garcia, 2017, 2019).

Research Trends in Translanguaging

Over the last three decades, research has found that the imposition of monolingual norms in foreign language teaching is “undesirable, unrealistic, and untenable” (Levine, 2011, p. 70). Prior and recent studies have also showed that utilising students' full communicative resources is a naturally occurring phenomenon in multilingual contexts even in the face of monolingual educational policies (Creese & Blackledge, 2015; Lucas & Katz, 1994). From the view of language separation ideology, using students' multiple languages is seen as a linguistic failure to imitate the so-called native speakers (Garcia & Wei, 2014). Nevertheless, some research has revealed that even students with high L2 proficiency would also translanguage in classroom discussions (e.g. Shah et al., 2019).

Existing research has focused on observing and analysing multilingual classroom practices in order to see how translanguaging is used for academic purposes. Numerous studies have revealed the potential advantages of translanguaging in different levels of education, for example: for better cognitive development in content learning (Duarte, 2019, 2020), for developing students' literacy skills (Hornberger & Link, 2012); for recognising migrant languages (Duarte, 2020); for protecting and maintaining minority languages (Cenoz, 2017); for validating students' multilingual identities (Canagarajah, 2011; Creese & Blackledge, 2010; Wei, 2011); for mobilising students' integrated repertoires (Zhou, 2021); for opening up spaces for students to freely express themselves and discuss sensitive topics (Palmer et al., 2014); and for facilitating greater equity and inclusion of all students' communicative resources (Caruso, 2018).

There has been an increasing number of studies that have investigated the stakeholders' perceptions of translanguaging practices. The seminal work of Macaro (2001) on classroom language choice has revealed a continuum of theoretical positions. The continuum reflects virtual, maximal, and optimal positions, illustrating the perspectives ranging from monolingualism to multilingualism (Wang, 2019). The virtual position indicates the exclusive use of L2. The maximal position prescribes the maximal use of L2, but resort to the “othered languages” is deemed tainted (Wei, 2021). The optimal position corresponds to a dynamic view to multilingualism where translanguaging practices are valued and legitimated. Some studies have drawn on this conceptualisation, for example, Wang and Kirkpatrick (2012) found that many Chinese language teachers held the virtual position due to the dominant Chinese-only policy in this context. Galante (2020) examined seven teachers in a Canadian university that applied an English-only policy. When given the opportunity to implement translanguaging pedagogy, the teachers reported numerous positive impacts on the students' engagement and pride. They also acknowledged the urgency of challenging their monolingual orientation resulted from their English-only teaching tradition and unanimously preferred multilingual instruction. Research has also demonstrated the challenges teachers face when adopting a translanguaging stance in classrooms including the educational language policy, the ideological system, and the lack of pedagogical model (Tian, 2020; Wang & Kirkpatrick, 2012).

Contextualising the Present Study

In relation to the Indonesian context, some studies have attempted to investigate teachers' views of translanguaging pedagogy (e.g. Khairunnisa & Lukmana, 2020; Santoso, 2019), while many of them have utilised qualitative approaches to observe translanguaging phenomena that occurred in the English classroom (e.g. Rasman, 2018; Rerung, 2015; Santoso, 2020). Some research has also discussed the crosslinguistic pedagogy from Indonesian students' point of views (e.g. Nursanti, 2021). To promote multilingual practices as a pedagogical tool, however, there needs to be a deliberate action to challenge the pressure of deeply-rooted beliefs about language learning and teaching.

Recent literature in the Indonesian multilingual setting has shown gaps in the context of teacher preparation programme, which aims to equip future English teachers with necessary teaching skills and strategies. As Lortie (1975) argues, the teacher's performance in the classroom is highly influential in shaping student teachers' preconceptions about teaching. The "frontstage behaviours" offer default options for pre-service teachers to imitate in their professional teaching careers (Borg, 2004, p. 274). As a result, there might be conflicting thoughts between establishing a teaching practice reflecting their beliefs or simply applying the model they learnt during the apprenticeship of observation. If the multilingual orientation is to be promoted as a pedagogical tool, one of the main concerns is about scrutinising pre-service teachers' beliefs of their own teaching and raising their awareness of challenging the "folkways of teaching" (Lortie, 1975, p. 62). In the context where monolingualism has become the norm, a crucial step of reflecting on student teachers' beliefs early on in the career is required to familiarise themselves with the emerging paradigm in the multilingual turn.

This research aims to investigate pre-service teachers' perceptions of translanguaging pedagogy. This research is part of a larger study which aims to investigate the changes of how they view this crosslinguistic approach after being exposed to translanguaging. With this aim in mind, this preliminary research has been guided by the following research question:

How do the student teachers perceive translanguaging pedagogy in the English classroom before experiencing dynamic multilingual classroom practices?

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Research Design

This research used a qualitative approach, aiming to obtain a deep and holistic understanding of the phenomenon of interest (Gray, 2014; Robson & McCartan, 2016). This study is designed to gain insights into pre-service teachers' pedagogical stance regarding translanguaging pedagogy. The qualitative approach thus allows the researcher to interact with the participants in order to capture their responses, feelings, and motivation.

To explore their views of dynamic language practices, a case study methodology was utilised to facilitate a detailed examination of the case being studied (Punch, 2005). The case in this research is the pre-service teachers' views towards the dynamic language practices in the English classroom. This study therefore will benefit from the nature of case studies, which allows a defined focus prior to guide the data collection and analysis process (Eisenhardt, 1989). Macaro's (2001) theoretical stances were used to frame the student teachers' positions towards what constitutes best language practices in the classroom. This deductive approach thus enables a firm grasp of theoretical principles, which are used to confirm findings generated in this study. New themes, however, are also expected to emerge since the data collection process offers a greater flexibility of gaining the participants' responses.

Sampling and Participants

Six student teachers from a private university in Jakarta were involved in this study. Purposive sampling was used as it allows the researcher to recruit the participants based on a degree of judgment about who provides the best perspectives on the phenomenon under scrutiny (Gray, 2014). The participants consist of 6 females, aged ranging from 20-21 years old. During the data collection process, they were taking the teacher preparation programme which equips them with necessary teaching skills, strategies, and techniques.

All of the participants were raised and are currently living in a multilingual environment where multiple languages co-exist and are used for numerous purposes. In the initial interview, the participants reported that they could speak more than one language. All of them at least could use Bahasa Indonesia

and English for both receptive and productive skills. Some of them were reported to master multiple named languages with various degrees of proficiency.

The participants in this study have experienced studying in a monolingual classroom setting where English has become the only language of instruction in learning English. Interestingly, they all admitted that such a policy was flouted since the use of the ‘othered’ languages was unavoidable.

Here are the detailed descriptions of the participants:

Table 1. Participants Information

<i>No.</i>	<i>Name (pseudonym)</i>	<i>Age</i>	<i>Language Acquired</i>
1.	Ayu	20 years old	Bahasa Indonesia (advanced) Manado language (advanced) English (intermediate)
2.	Karla	20 years old	Bahasa Indonesia (advanced) English (intermediate) Mandarin (intermediate) Korean (low)
3.	Mia	21 years old	Bahasa Indonesia (advanced) English (intermediate) Mandarin (intermediate) Korean (low)
4.	Lia	20 years old	Bahasa Indonesia (advanced) English (intermediate) Korean (low)
5.	Dewi	20 years old	Bahasa Indonesia (advanced) English (intermediate) Sundanese (low) Javanese (low) Arabic (low)
6.	Devi	20 years old	Bahasa Indonesia (advanced) English (advanced)

Data Collection

This study is part of subsequent investigations in which translanguaging pedagogy is intentionally planned and applied in the classroom in order to expose the participants to two different ways of utilising previously acquired languages. The data was collected in the first phase of the pedagogical intervention which will set the stage for an in-depth discussion about pre-service teachers’ reflections regarding the English-only policy and the possibility of incorporating translanguaging practices into their future teaching.

Group interviews were conducted with the participants for some reasons. Interviewing in groups facilitates group interaction which could prompt the participants to respond to each other’s answers as well as develop ideas in a dynamic context (Mann, 2016). Moreover, group interviews could offer a less intimidating atmosphere compared to individual interviews, so that the participants are willing to express their thoughts, feelings, and attitudes towards how they perceive language choice in the English classroom. In addition, awareness-raising activities could be more effective if carried out through interactive group interviews since the participants could reflect on their experiences and at the same time, the researcher has valuable opportunities to introduce a different approach to teaching to the participants (Yang, 1995), which in this case is translanguaging pedagogy.

The group interview was carried out and recorded via Zoom Meeting, lasted for one and a half hours. During the interview, the researcher gave some key questions covering the participants’ view of (1) how languages should be used in the English classroom; (2) the monolingual norm being applied in a

multilingual context; (3) the utilisation of students' full semiotic repertoire; and (4) the possibility of integrating translanguaging pedagogy in their own teaching.

Data Analysis

The thematic coding analysis was used to analyse the qualitative data. In this study, the thematic analysis started deductively where codes and themes are pre-determined prior to the data collection process. Nevertheless, the inductive approach was also carried out to look for new codes and themes emerging from the data.

The data analysis procedures followed the framework proposed by Robson and McCartan (2016). First, the interview recording was transcribed, read, and re-read to get familiar with the data. Second, a preconceived framework of codes was used to guide the coding process, while any emerging codes were given codes systematically across the data set. Third, themes were identified and assigned to the coded extracts. Fourth, making comparisons and interpretations between different aspects of the data to explore and describe the patterns.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Perceptions of 'Best Practice'

The results of group interviews provide a more complete picture of pre-service teachers' perceptions of what constitutes best language practice in the English classroom. The participants' statements regarding their pedagogical reflections were analysed with respect to Macaro's (2001) theoretical positions towards classroom language choice: (a) the virtual position, (b) the maximal position, (c) the optimal position. In this study, none of the participants had the virtual position, which treats classrooms "like the target country", nor the optimal position (Macaro, 2011, p. 535). Interestingly, all of the participants seemed to hold the maximal position which reflects the unfortunate practice of students' languages. The participants stated that English should be used as much as possible unless there were certain conditions forcing teachers to resort to the 'othered' languages:

Mia: "... but sometimes, Bahasa Indonesia could be used because there is some [English] vocabulary that students don't know [the meaning in Bahasa Indonesia]."

Devi: "If I were a teacher, I would use English as much as possible. Bahasa [Indonesia] could be used when students have difficulties in their learning."

One of the participants also mentioned the reasons why English needs to be maximised in the classroom:

Karla: "Because it's an English classroom... I believe [that] practicing [students'] English [skills] can develop [their] confidence in using the language so they become more familiar with and comfortable in using the language."

This research draws on Bakhtin's (1981) notion of 'ideological becoming' to evaluate pre-service teachers' multivoiced discourse to express their perceptions of multilingual classroom practices. This term is used to describe teachers' ideological framing of schooling that continuously develops (Bakhtin, 1981). In this sense, ideology refers to "the way in which members of a given group [such as teachers] view the world" (Morris, 1994, cited in Freedman & Ball, 2004, p. 4). From Bakhtin's perspective, a person's ideologies are contextualised in what he calls as chronotypes, which literally means 'time-space'. A chronotype is a "form-shaping ideology for understanding the nature of events and action" (Morson & Emerson, 1990, p. 367), that is, a set of values, beliefs, and assumptions that an individual has in his/her social and cultural worlds. For teachers, their classroom chronotypes are what they value when they see classrooms in a broad sense based on their personal viewpoint, their imagination, or their memories (Edmiston, 2016).

In this research, the pre-service teachers' chronotypes evolve through dialogic interaction (as can be seen in the following sections). It is important to note that the results of the group interview may be influenced by several factors. For instance, student teachers' statements could be drawn from their theoretical knowledge obtained at the university, from their experiences as students, and from their observations of teachers' professional practices.

English-Only Policy

The following excerpt reflects some of the participants' perceptions of the monolingual policy:

Mia: "The monolingual policy will make students difficult to express their thoughts because some may not be fully proficient [in English]."

Lia: "It [the applicability of the monolingual policy] depends. International schools are okay to use fully English, but national schools should not use English [exclusively] because it is not our mother language."

Devi: "It [whether the monolingual policy can be implemented] depends on the students' level of English proficiency. Students' proficiencies vary."

In addition, Mia and Karla expressed their agreement with the implementation of the monolingual policy in international-standard schools as long as there was no punishment to students who could not adhere to the school's language regulation. Both of them have experienced having a friend who decided to move to a new school due to the pressure of this language policy.

When exposed to the concept of monolingual norm, these four participants seem to have a conflicting position on classroom language choice. They considered using English fully appropriate for certain circumstances (in this case, international-standard schools and high-proficient learners), while arguing at the same time that such a perfect learning condition that occurs exclusively in English does not exist. This contradicting stance appears to portray an attempt to reconcile their justifications for choosing monolingual or translanguaging pedagogy (Woll, 2020).

It could be inferred that the participants had a negative perception towards the use of students' own languages since it only served as a scaffolding tool for less-proficient students to enhance their English learning. This view may have become the result from a long-standing tradition of monolingual instruction whose underlying principles are "unsupported by empirical data and inconsistent with current understandings of the workings of the bi- and multilingual mind" (Cummins, 2007, p. 238). Despite the potential role of using multiple languages, the deep-rooted beliefs of monolingual norm indeed have influenced how the participants perceive multilingual classroom practices. In this research, all of the participants regarded the students' own languages as the last resort and as the easy way out. From the perspective of translanguaging, these views need to be challenged as translanguaging sees students' full semiotic resources as a valuable tool not only to scaffold, but also to express identities, encourage students' full participation in knowledge co-making, and promote equalities (Garcia & Wei, 2014; Wei & Lin, 2019).

Impressions of Classroom Multilingual Practices

When asked about the possibility of using students' integrated communicative resources in the English classroom, the participants mentioned the impossibility of implementing translanguaging practices. All of them stated that not all students shared the same languages:

Dewi: "I think it is difficult for them to communicate with their peers using different languages."

Lia: "Yeah, I think so too. How could they interact with each other if they do not know all the languages?"

Mia: "Yes, not all students are familiar with each other's languages."

The participants' general reaction to the question was indeed anticipated as the notion of translanguaging was new to them. Since the beginning of the group interview, the participants only referred to Bahasa Indonesia when talking about students' language repertoires without realising the other possible languages co-existing in an individual's mind. This finding may indicate the superiority of Bahasa Indonesia that serves as the official language for communication at the national level and the medium of instruction in schools (Hamied, 2013; Zein, 2018). Its status is also in line with the significance of English at the global level, which has gained popularity due to its influential impacts on nearly all domains of life (Hamied, 2012). The intricate existence of Bahasa Indonesia and English along with hundreds of local languages has arguably affected the participants' attitudes towards 'best language choice' in the English classroom. This unique linguistic phenomenon has somewhat made the local languages struggle to be in an equal position with the other dominant languages.

The direct consequence of the ideological ranking of languages is that the medium of instruction in schools has been reduced to a single linguistic norm called academic language (Garcia, 2017; 2019). Garcia (2017) has expressed her concern about normalising the restricted view of language in schools,

that is, how can all students' dynamic flows be recognised and legitimated so that schools can liberate language from its narrow definition to let all students act equitably through their own translanguaging? Perhaps, this question requires an immediate answer as well as a deliberate action which can transform classroom discourses and provide a safe space for all speakers to engage in translanguaging as a way of kicking back the oppression of language education that reflects "a world of standards" (Garcia, 2017, p. 262).

Future Teaching Practices

Specifically, all of the participants worried about how teachers could accommodate the different languages students have in their repertoires to support their language learning. They also assumed that teachers would need to be competent in using all linguistic and semiotic resources available in the classroom. The use of group interviews enabled the researcher to clarify the concept of translanguaging to the participants that multilingual classroom practices do not necessarily mean that both teachers and students need to have shared languages. The important aspect of translanguaging pedagogy is to allow students to draw on their full language repertoires to communicate, co-construct knowledge, create new language practices, as well as sustain multilingual performances that surpass categorical dichotomies of two autonomous languages (Garcia & Wei, 2014, p. 66).

Throughout the interview process, it became apparent that the interactive discussion led to the development of the student teachers' chronotypes as their own beliefs and assumptions were contested and confronted with diverse voices through dialogues. They also expressed their expectations regarding their teaching approaches in the future:

Mia: "Actually, I just realised that I do not always use English... I use Bahasa Indonesia too. I'd like to apply translanguaging, so that I could facilitate my students to utilise whatever they have at their disposal."

Karla: "I think I am interested in translanguaging pedagogy. I think learning a language using other languages is super interesting... I guess being multilingual is now common... Translanguaging pedagogy is possible to be implemented in the classroom."

Lia: "Now I have a clearer idea of the concept of translanguaging pedagogy. In the future, I think I will support its use in my classroom... because I myself also translanguage in the English classroom."

The participants' responses seem to indicate that their views of multilingual classroom practices have changed after being exposed with the conceptualisation of translanguaging pedagogy. They also stated that they had become more aware of the multilingual reality existing around them and that translanguaging had actually been part of their everyday language practices. This finding demonstrates that the participants had a meaningful reflection on how they perceived 'good' language teaching and learning, and thus what actions they need to take as a teacher. The aim of this reflection is to foster awareness of how using multiple languages can be beneficial for numerous purposes (Woll, 2020). The changes of their perceptions toward translanguaging is part of the ongoing development of their ideological becoming, which might influence their future teaching practices. However, it should be noted that the introduction to translanguaging through the group interview was carried out briefly by pointing out some of its main features. Thus, it could only serve as a starting point to build their understanding of this emerging multilingual paradigm.

In addition, some of the participants seemed to restrict their perceptions from a holistic conceptualisation of translanguaging:

Dewi: "I disagree with [the] monolingual [policy], but I am not really familiar with translanguaging... I will apply translanguaging, but still for a scaffolding tool. We have one target language. If we use all the languages they [students] know, they will be confused about which language they actually learn."

Ayu: "If I work in an international [standard] school, of course monolingual [I will use English exclusively- read]. But in other schools [than international-standard schools], I will implement translanguaging pedagogy."

For these participants, the full utilisation of translanguaging might not be appropriate for some contexts, e.g. in the classroom where the aim is to master a named language; and in the educational institution that applies the English-only policy. Moreover, the statement emphasising that the role of translanguaging was limited to a pedagogical tool contrasts with Garcia's conceptualisation of translanguaging (see Otheguy et al., 2015; Vogel & Garcia, 2017). In her view, translanguaging is not merely a scaffold for those who struggle to succeed, but it also aims to promote social justice through its transformative power. It is about multilinguals being free to use their own language practices, that is, creating their own path to a

translanguaging safe space (Bonacina et al., 2021; Garcia, 2019). The participants' perception of translanguaging solely as a pedagogy is unsurprising since these multilingual language practices are often seen as a shortcut to communication (Lo, 2015). In this sense, this pragmatic view has consequently placed translanguaging as an alternative instruction rather than as a legitimate way of communication. The overall findings demonstrate that translanguaging pedagogy holds much promise, but it is clear that translanguaging work in this particular research context is in its infancy. Therefore, this preliminary study would serve as an excellent starting point to promote reflective teaching, in which the participants could tap into their beliefs that shape their pedagogical stance as student teachers.

CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTIONS

This present study has shed light on pre-service teachers' perceptions of translanguaging pedagogy in order to generate reflections on their deep-rooted beliefs of best teaching practices. Student teachers' ideological becoming appeared to be shaped by some factors, namely their experiences as English learners, their knowledge obtained through the courses they have taken, and the researcher's statement about translanguaging pedagogy. The varied perspectives revealed in this study were contested through interactive dialogue, facilitating the ongoing development of chronotypes and triggering "an intense struggle" within participants among diverse ideological point of views and values (Bakhtin, 1981, p. 346). The findings of this research may indicate "the ideological divide" between current trends of multilingual practices and folk pedagogy, which can become one of the challenges in the implementation of translanguaging (Woll, 2020, p. 9). Even though all of the participants see the possibility of integrating this pedagogy, they merely regard it as a shortcut to achieving comprehension in the target language. This research result suggests that providing a model of translanguaging pedagogy for pre-service teachers is required to show how it significantly contributes to English learning in particular.

REFERENCES

- Bailey, B. (2007) 'Heteroglossia and Boundaries' in M. Heller (ed.) *Bilingualism: A Social Approach* (Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave), pp. 257-276.
- Bakhtin, M. M. (1981). Forms of time and of the chronotope in the novel: Notes toward a historical poetics. In M. M. Bakhtin & M. Holquist (Eds.), C. Emerson & M. Holquist (Trans.), *The dialogic imagination: Four essays* (pp. 84–258). Austin, TX: University of Texas Press.
- Bonacina-Pugh, F., Da Costa Cabral., I & Huang, J. (2021). A state-of-the-art review of translanguaging in education, *Language Teaching*.
- Borg, M. (2004). The apprenticeship of observation. *ELT Journal*, 58(3), 274-276.
- Canagarajah, S. 2011b. "Translanguaging in the Classroom: Emerging Issues for Research and Pedagogy." *Applied Linguistics Review*, 2(1), 1–28.
- Caruso, E. (2018). Translanguaging in higher education: Using several languages for the analysis of academic content in the teaching and learning process. *CercleS*, 8(1), 65–90.
- Cenoz, J. (2013). Defining multilingualism. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 33, 3–18.
- Cenoz, J. (2017) Translanguaging in school contexts: International perspectives. *Journal of Language, Identity & Education*, 16(4), 193-198.
- Cenoz, J. & Gorter, D. (2020). Pedagogical translanguaging: An introduction. *System*, 92, 1-7.
- Creese, A. and Blackledge, A. (2010) 'Translanguaging in the Bilingual Classroom: A Pedagogy for Learning and Teaching?' *Modern Language Journal*, 94(i), 103-115.
- Creese, A. & Blackledge, A. (2015). Translanguaging and identity in educational settings. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 35, 20–35.
- Cummins, J. (2007). Rethinking monolingual instructional strategies in multilingual classrooms, *Canadian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 10(2). 221-240.
- Duarte, J. (2019) Translanguaging in mainstream education: A sociocultural approach, *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 22(2), 150-164,
- Duarte, J. (2020) Translanguaging in the context of mainstream multilingual education, *International Journal of Multilingualism*, 17(2), 232-247.
- Edmiston, B. (2016). Promoting teachers' ideological becoming: Using dramatic inquiry in teacher education. *Literacy Research: Theory, Method, and Practice*, 65, 332-347.
- Eisenhardt, K.M. (1989). Building theories from case study research. *The Academy of Management Review*, 14(4), 532–550.

- Flores, N. (2014). "Let's Not Forget that Translanguaging is a Political Act." <https://educationallinguist.wordpress.com/2014/07/19/lets-not-forget-that-translanguaging-is-a-political-act/>.
- Flores, N., & Rosa, J. (2015). Undoing appropriateness: Raciolinguistic ideologies and language diversity in education. *Harvard Educational Review*, 85(2), 149–171.
- Freedman, S. W., & Ball, A. (2004). Ideological becoming: Bakhtinian concepts to guide the study of language. In A. Ball & S. W. Freedman (Eds.), *Bakhtinian perspectives on language, literacy, and learning* (pp. 3–33). Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Galante, A. (2020). Pedagogical translanguaging in a multilingual English program in Canada: Student and teacher perspectives of challenges. *System*, 92, 1-10
- García, O. (2017) Translanguaging in schools: Subiendo y bajando, bajando y subiendo as afterword, *Journal of Language, Identity & Education*, 16(4), 256-263.
- García, O. (2019) Translanguaging: a coda to the code?, *Classroom Discourse*, 10(3-4), 369-373.
- García, O., Johnson, S.I., & Seltzer, K. (2017). *The translanguaging classroom: Leveraging student bilingualism for learning*. Philadelphia: Caslon.
- García, O., Leiva, C. (2014). Theorizing and enacting translanguaging for social justice. In: Blackledge, A., Creese, A. (eds) *Heteroglossia as practice and pedagogy*. Educational Linguistics, vol 20. Springer, Dordrecht. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-007-7856-6_11
- García, O., & Lin, A. M. Y. (2016). Translanguaging in bilingual education. In O. García, & A. M. Y. Lin (Eds.), *Bilingual and Multilingual Education (Encyclopedia of Language and Education, Vol. 5)*. Dordrecht: Springer.
- García, O., & Otheguy, R. (2020) Plurilingualism and translanguaging: Commonalities and divergences. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 23(1), 17-35, DOI: 10.1080/13670050.2019.1598932.
- García, O., & Silvan, C.E. (2011). Pedagogies and Practices in Multilingual Classrooms: Singularities in Pluralities. *The Modern Language Journal*, 95(3), 385-400.
- García, O., & Wei, L. (2014). *Translanguaging: Language, bilingualism and education*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Gray, D. E. (2014). *Doing research in the real world*. London: Sage.
- Hamied, F. A. (2012). English in multicultural and multilingual Indonesian education. In A. Kirkpatrick & R. Sussex (Eds.), *English as an International Language in Asia: Implications for language education* (pp. 63-78). Springer.
- Hamied, F. A. (2013). ELT intricacies within the Indonesian language policy. In T. W. Bigalke & S. Sharbawi (Eds.), *English for ASEAN integration: Policies and practices in the region* (pp. 32–40). IELTS.
- Khairunnisa & Lukmana, I. (2020). Teachers' attitudes towards translanguaging in Indonesian EFL classrooms. *20(2)*, 254-266.
- Levine, G. (2011). *Code choice in the language classroom*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- Lewis, G., Jones, B., & Baker, C. (2012). Translanguaging: Origins and development from school to street and beyond. *Educational Research and Evaluation*, 18, 641-654.
- Lin, A.M.Y. (2019) Theories of trans/languageing and trans-semiotizing: Implications for content-based education classrooms. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 22(1), 5-16.
- Lo, Y. (2015). How much L1 is too much? Teachers' language use in response to students' abilities and classroom interaction in content and language integrated learning. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 18(3), 270-288.
- Lortie, D. (1975). *Schoolteacher: A sociological study*. London: University of Chicago Press.
- Lucas, T., & Katz, A. (1994). Reframing the debate: The roles of native languages in English-only programs for language minority students. *TESOL Quarterly*, 28, 537-561.
- Macaro, E. (2001). Analysing student teachers' codeswitching in foreign language classrooms: Theories and decision making. *The Modern Language Journal*, 85(4), 531-548.
- Mann, S. (2016). *The research interview: Reflective practice and reflexivity in research processes*. London: Palgrave Macmillan
- Morson, G. S., & Emerson, C. (1990). *Mikhail Bakhtin: Creation of a prosaics*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Nursanti, R.R. (2021). Classroom strategies through translanguaging for multilingualism students. *Englie: English Learning Innovation*, 2(1), 17-27

- Otheguy, R., García, O., & Reid, W. (2015). Clarifying translanguaging and deconstructing named languages: A perspective from linguistics. *Applied Linguistics Review*, 6(3), 281–307.
- Palmer, D. K., Martínez, R. A., Mateus, S. G., & Henderson, K. (2014). Reframing the debate on language separation: Toward a vision for translanguaging pedagogies in the dual language classroom. *The Modern Language Journal*, 98(3), 757–772.
- Punch, K. (2005). *Introduction to social research: Quantitative and qualitative approaches* (2eds), Sage, London
- Rasman. (2018). To translanguage or not to translanguage? The multilingual practice in an Indonesian EFL classroom. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 7(3), 687–694. <https://doi.org/10.17509/ijal.v7i3.9819>
- Rerung, M. K. T. (2015). *Evaluating translanguaging practices in bilingual classrooms*. 5(2). 133-147.
- Robson, C., & McCartan, K. (2016). *Real world research* (4eds). London: Wiley.
- Santoso, W. (2019). Teachers' perceptions of L1 use in monolingual English classrooms: Adhering or flouting the policy? Paper presented at KOLITA Atma Jaya.
- Santoso, W. (2020). Translanguaging through the Lens of Sociocultural Approach: Students' Attitudes and Practices. *Jurnal Pendidikan Bahasa*, 9(1), 1-19.
- Shah, M., Pillai, S., & Sinayah, M. (2019). Translanguaging in academic settings. *Lingua*, 16-31.
- Tian, Z., 2020. Faculty first: promoting translanguaging in TESOL teacher education. In: Lau, S.M.C., Van, S., Viegen, (Eds.), *Plurilingual pedagogies: Critical and creative endeavors for equitable language in education*. Springer, Cham, Switzerland, pp. 215--236.
- Vallejo, C., & Dooly, M. (2020). Plurilingualism and translanguaging: emergent approaches and shared concerns. Introduction to the special issue, *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 23(1), 1-16.
- Vogel, S., & García, O. (2017). Translanguaging. In: Noblit, G. and Moll, L. eds. *Oxford Research Encyclopedia of Education*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Wang, D. (2019) Translanguaging in Chinese foreign language classrooms: students and teachers' attitudes and practices. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 22(2), 138-149.
- Wang, D., & Kirkpatrick, A. (2012). English as a lingua franca in teaching Chinese as a foreign language in Beijing: An investigation into teachers' language beliefs. *The Journal of Multilingual Education*, 2(1), 11–18.
- 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. (2021). Translanguaging as a political stance: implications for English language education. *ELT Journal*, <https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccab083>
- Wei, L., & Lin, A.M.Y. (2019) Translanguaging classroom discourse: Pushing limits, breaking boundaries, *Classroom Discourse*, 10(3-4), 209-215, DOI:10.1080/19463014.2019.1635032
- Woll, N. (2020). Towards crosslinguistic pedagogy: Demystifying pre-service teachers' beliefs regarding the target-language-only rule. *System*, 92, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2020.102275>
- Yang, N.D. (1995). Effective awareness raising in language learning strategy training. Paper presented at the 29 annual Convention and Exposition of Teachers of English to Speakers to Other Languages.
- Zein, S. (2018). English, multilingualism and globalisation in Indonesia: A love triangle: Why Indonesia should move towards multilingual education. *English Today; Cambridge*, 35(1), 48-53. DOI:10.1017/S026607841800010X
- Zhou, X.M. (2021). Engaging in pedagogical translanguaging in a Shanghai EFL high school class. *ELT Journal*, <https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccab054>.

CURRICULUM VITAE

Complete Name	Institution	Education	Research Interests
Wulandari Santoso	Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia, Bandung	S2	Language Teaching, Bi/Multilingualism
Fuad Abdul Hamied	Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia, Bandung	S3	Language Teaching & Assessment