PASAA Journal
Volume 69, July – December 2024, 413–444

Translanguaging with Purpose: An Exploratory Study on Student Translanguaging Practices and Perceptions in the Thai ELT Context

Dalton Le

Chulalongkorn University, Thailand

Corresponding author: daltonjle@protonmail.com

Article information	
Abstract	This study employed a mixed-methods approach using questionnaires and semi-structured interviews to explore students' translanguaging practices and perceptions in the Thai English language teaching (ELT) context. In this study, translanguaging practices and perceptions were each categorized under three elements: translanguaging stance, design, and shift. Based on these elements, the translanguaging practices questionnaire was constructed and then administered to 430 Thai upper-secondary level students at a public school. To verify the validity and reliability of the constructed translanguaging practices questionnaire, an exploratory factor analysis was conducted on the results, which revealed two factors within each of the three elements. Semi-structured interviews were also conducted with six students to collect more detailed information. The findings indicated that Thai students generally practiced translanguaging quite often and almost unanimously perceived it as beneficial to language learning, especially when it was used purposefully. However, students' translanguaging practices were limited by teachers' receptiveness to aspects of translanguaging for knowledge collaboration and content discussion.
Keywords	translanguaging, Thailand, ELT, practice, perception

E-ISSN: 2287-0024

APA citation:	Le, D. (2024). Translanguaging with purpose: An exploratory study on student translanguaging practices and perceptions in the Thai ELT context. *PASAA, 69*, 413–444.

1. Introduction

The concept of translanguaging as a language pedagogy originated as a practice from a Welsh language classroom that involved the alternation of language input and output (Lewis et al., 2012a). This conception later evolved into a transformative practice based on the natural discursive practices of bilinguals and multilinguals, which then extended to the ways in which these discursive practices are utilized in the language teaching classroom (García & Li, 2014). Within classrooms, translanguaging practices soften the barriers between languages; learners are allowed to use their full linguistic resources across multiple modalities and semiotic tools much as they would in real life communication (García & Li, 2014). In recent years, these translanguaging practices have been organized into flexible pedagogies that guide teachers in the process of designing and managing the language classroom and the moments in which translanguaging occurs (García et al., 2017).

In the Thai ELT context, translanguaging pedagogies are an emerging field of research with only a handful of available empirical studies. Previous studies have explored the views of Thai teachers (Ambele, 2022; Sahan et al., 2022; Thongwichit & Ulla, 2024) and students (Sahan et al., 2022) in university contexts as well as how translanguaging can improve secondary students' interactional competence (Kampittayakul, 2018). These studies have revealed generally positive perceptions of translanguaging, especially when implemented with purpose, and positive effects of translanguaging on students' listening and speaking skills have been confirmed. However, many gaps remain in the Thai context, with little information on the primary and secondary levels of schooling and the specific types of translanguaging practices utilized in the language classroom by both students and teachers. Nevertheless, calls have been made to support the exploration and

development of translanguaging pedagogies (Ambele, 2022) as well as to reevaluate rigid monolingual policies prevalent in the Thai ELT context (Thongwichit & Ulla, 2024). These calls, in conjunction with recent reports of declining English proficiency and test scores, demonstrate a need to continue exploring teaching approaches and pedagogies such as translanguaging that could bolster Thailand's English proficiency (EF EPI, 2023).

This article intends to contribute towards filling the gap in translanguaging research in Thailand by observing the translanguaging practices of students at the secondary level as well as their perceptions of translanguaging for language learning. To address this gap, this study proposed the following research questions:

1. What translanguaging practices do students use in the Thai ELT context?
2. How do students perceive the use of translanguaging practices in the Thai ELT context?

By adopting the translanguaging stance, design, and shift pedagogical framework by García et al. (2017), this study explored the ways in which Thai students practiced translanguaging on both general and moment-to-moment levels as well as elaborated upon the beliefs that shaped their language practices.

2. Literature Review

2.1 ELT in Thailand

In Thailand, English is used as a link to the global economy, a method of creating and maintaining distinctions between social classes, and a safeguard for the country's cultural hegemony (Akkakoson, 2019; Rafael, 2019). These roles have grown with the rise of globalization and have created a positive perception of English as an indicator of class and power as well as a prominent language in popular media, education, and cosmopolitan spaces (Jarunthawatchai & Baker, 2024; Snodin et al., 2024). This is reflected in English's sole status as a compulsory foreign language subject as well the rise in the number of bilingual schools and

English as a medium of instruction (EMI) programs (Jarunthawatchai & Baker, 2024).

However, the Thai ELT landscape is also designed to maintain the cultural hegemony of the country by emphasizing a sense of Thainess (Kirkpatrick & Lixun, 2021). Despite its prevalence in the country, English is not designated as an official second language and is largely considered to be a bridge language that does not threaten the status of the Thai language (Snodin et al., 2024). This has led to a mismatch between the usage of English in everyday communication, which is oriented towards multilingual non-native speaker norms, and the type of English emphasized in ELT and assessment, which is oriented towards monolingual native speaker norms (Akkakoson, 2019; Jarunthawatchai & Baker, 2024; Todd & Darasawang, 2020). Currently, calls have been made for the implementation of non-native models such as Global Englishes, which align more closely with the communicative skills used in the ASEAN community as well as the local culture (Akkakoson, 2019; Ambele & Boonsuk, 2021; Boonsuk et al., 2023). However, there are still concerns regarding the general perception of non-native models, which are still viewed in some circles as deficient or less effective than the native-speaker model despite evidence of the contrary (Ambele & Boonsuk, 2021; Todd & Darasawang, 2020).

2.2 Translanguaging in ELT

Modern approaches to translanguaging focus on the observable linguistic practices of bilinguals, viewing them as valuable sources of language and cultural knowledge in the language classroom (García et al., 2017; Li, 2018). García defines translanguaging as both natural discursive and planned pedagogical practices that encompass a wide range of meaning-making modalities and semiotic tools (García & Li, 2014) These modalities and tools include aspects of the linguistic repertoire such as lexicon and morphology and aspects of the communicative repertoire such as gestures, body language, and—more recently—interactions with technology (García et al., 2017; Lewis et al., 2012b).

In terms of sociolinguistics, translanguaging posits that languages are not strictly separate structural and cognitive entities, but a unitary system of communicative resources from which individuals select linguistic features depending on the communicative needs of a situation (Otheguy et al., 2019; Li, 2018). From this perspective, named languages are simply socially constrained objects and boundaries (Li, 2023; Otheguy et al., 2019). By allowing them to maneuver away from the confines of strict language separation, learners are then given the freedom to engage with a wider range of subjective meaning-making interactional strategies (Li, 2018).

To take full advantage of the benefits of translanguaging in the language classroom, translanguaging has been organized by García et al. (2017) into a pedagogical framework consisting of three interconnected components: translanguaging stance, translanguaging design, and translanguaging shift. Translanguaging practices within these components work and flow together in the language classroom for four primary purposes: to support students as they try to understand complex content and texts, to assist students in developing academic language skills, to utilize students' bilingualism to engage in critical thinking, and to support students' social, emotional, and identity development (García et al., 2017). The translanguaging stance is "the philosophical, ideological, or belief system that teachers draw from to develop their pedagogical framework," especially with regards to classroom language practices and language collaboration (García et al., 2017, p. 78). The various stances that teachers take then influence their translanguaging design, which is described by García et al. (2017) as the strategic, flexible translanguaging practices that teachers use in their instructional and activity design. However, stances and designs alone cannot always account for the wide range of experiences and knowledge that students bring to the classroom, which are generally accommodated by translanguaging shifts (García et al., 2017). García et al. (2017) describe these as flexible, unplanned decisions made on a moment-to-moment basis that change and shift

language practices, meaning-making conversations, activities, and lesson plans to accommodate any immediate language learning needs.

To properly implement a translanguaging pedagogy across stance, design, and shift, consideration must also be given to learners' characteristics within their specific social, linguistic, and cultural domains (Creese & Blackledge, 2022; Hornberger, 2022). These characteristics can range from level of schooling, language proficiency, curriculum aims and goals, subject content, and student motivation to history, society, and geography (Canagarajah, 2017; Lewis et al., 2012a). However, this process has context-specific challenges such as monolingual language policies and conflicts with traditions of language separation (García & Li, 2014). The concepts of 'weak' and 'strong' translanguaging have been used in research to describe the degrees to which translanguaging is implemented in these different contexts, with 'weak' translanguaging generally only softening language boundaries and 'strong' translanguaging fully acknowledging language as a single unitary linguistic repertoire (Cenoz, 2019; Cenoz & Gorter, 2020). As such, translanguaging in ELT is a complex landscape that is influenced to varying degrees by a variety of factors at local and national levels (Jones, 2017).

Research in various ELT contexts have revealed a wide range of translanguaging practices and benefits that, despite differences in the sociolinguistic landscapes of each country, provide possible direction for future studies in the Thai context. In the Hong Kong context, strict monolingual policies are generally regarded as unnecessary, and translanguaging is acknowledged as a beneficial pedagogical strategy that can bridge gaps in communication, foster student motivation, encourage creative thinking, affirm cultural identities, and provide students with opportunities to utilize their full communicative repertoires to navigate difficulties in the language classroom (Lin & He, 2017; Pun & Tai, 2021). Translanguaging as a practice has also been highlighted for specific uses such as addressing student misbehaviors (Tai, 2023b) and connecting and utilizing knowledge across subjects (Tai, 2023a).

Perception studies in the Malaysian and Chinese contexts have also reported positive views as well as a variety of concerns (Fang & Liu, 2020; Fang et al., 2023; Jiang et al., 2022; Too, 2023). Students generally accepted translanguaging and felt that it helped facilitate their language learning through native language explanations and scaffolding, but also expressed a desire to uphold monolingual classroom policies, believing that using only English would be beneficial to them (Fang & Liu, 2020; Fang et al., 2023; Jiang et al., 2022). Teachers, while holding similarly positive views of translanguaging, also expressed concerns about overreliance on the L1 and felt that translanguaging was more appropriate in content lessons and with low proficiency students (Fang & Liu, 2020; Fang et al., 2023; Too, 2023). Moreover, teachers in the Malaysian study expressed fears of negative repercussions and discrimination when translanguaging due to national directives conveying a monolingual ideology (Too, 2023).

Outside of Asian contexts, translanguaging studies have revealed some similar practices and perceptions among both students and teachers in EMI, CLIL, and EFL programs across several levels of schooling (Karabassova & Isidro, 2020; Kuteeva, 2019; Tannenbaum et al., 2020; Yuvayapan, 2019). Translanguaging in an EMI program at a university in Sweden frequently occurred during group work and was commonly practiced to regulate communication between students for clarity and comprehension (Kuteeva, 2019). Positive perceptions were also found among upper-secondary school students and teachers in a study done in Israel, with many noting that the use of other languages in the EFL classroom is sensible for increasing understanding and involvement (Tannenbaum et al., 2020). Secondary school CLIL teachers in a study in Kazakhstan also reported that, despite mandated monolingual policies, translanguaging practices could be helpful for accessibility and often practiced it for scaffolding and meaning-making purposes (Karabassova & Isidro, 2020). EFL teachers from state and private schools in a study done in Turkey also reported similar practices and perceptions of translanguaging that were respectively limited and influenced by the monolingual

ideologies and beliefs of their institutions, the public, and their peers (Yuvayapan, 2019).

Though current translanguaging research in the Thai context is scarce, it has been suggested that teachers regularly utilize translanguaging in the language classroom and consider it to be a natural, beneficial practice (Ambele, 2022; Thongwichit & Ulla, 2024). However, more information is needed to elaborate on the details of these translanguaging practices across both teachers and students and frame them within the Thai ELT context. To contribute towards addressing this gap, this study investigates the translanguaging practices students use in the Thai ELT context as well as students' perceptions of the use of translanguaging practices in the Thai ELT context.

3. Methodology

3.1 Research Design

This study utilized a mixed-method approach to analyze, explain, and elaborate upon the complexities of students' translanguaging practices and perceptions (Creswell & Creswell, 2018). A four-point Likert scale questionnaire was used to gather quantitative data on the frequency of students' translanguaging practices and their perceptions of translanguaging for language learning, and semi-structured student interviews were used to gather qualitative data to elaborate on students' translanguaging practices and perceptions.

3.2 Participants

All participants in the study were students aged 15-18 from the same large public secondary school in the central region of Thailand. The students were selected through purposive sampling criteria based on their level of schooling, the English language curriculum they had been studying, and their accessibility to the researcher. These students were all studying the same standard English curriculum under the Thai Basic Education Core Curriculum and were not taking any extra English classes under special initiatives such as the English Program

(EP) or Mini English Program (MEP). Under the standard English curriculum at this school, the students had been studying English with both Thai and foreign teachers, with the foreign teachers only providing additional conversational support and practice.

For the questionnaire portion of the study, 430 students were selected to complete the questionnaire based on the previously mentioned purposive sampling criteria. These students were then split into two groups: one high-performing group (N = 261) and one low-performing group (N = 169). Students that received an overall score of 3.50-4.00 in their standard English courses were considered high-performing, while those that received an overall score of 1.00-3.49 were considered low-performing.

Of these 430 students, six students—three students each from the high- and low-performing groups—were selected to be participants in the student interviews. These students were randomly selected from the top scoring 10% and bottom scoring 10% of the high- and low-performing groups, respectively, in order to determine if there were any significant differences between the highest and lowest performers.

3.3 Research Instruments

3.3.1 Translanguaging Practices Questionnaire

The translanguaging practices questionnaire is a four-point Likert scale questionnaire designed to gather information on students' translanguaging practices and perceptions based on the stance, design, and shift framework as proposed by García et al. (2017). This questionnaire was constructed by the researcher by first analyzing the relevant literature on translanguaging to develop a conceptual framework (García et al., 2017). This framework was then used to structure several classroom observations and semi-structured teacher interviews at the same school as the participants of the main study, with the classroom observations occurring in classes that contained students that would later

complete the questionnaire. The information from these observations and interviews was used to inform the construction of the questionnaire items.

This questionnaire was split into two parts, with the first part gathering information on the frequency of translanguaging practices and the second part gathering information on perceptions of translanguaging practices. The items concerning frequency of translanguaging practices were constructed by combining the practices observed in the classroom observations and reported in the semi-structured teacher interviews. The items concerning perception were written to directly correspond with the translanguaging practice items. All questionnaire items were written and delivered in Thai to prevent language barriers. Prior to distribution in the main study, the questionnaire was piloted with a separate group of 35 students to ensure item clarity, resulting in minor changes in wording. The final questionnaire consisted of 36 items. Six questions each were devoted to translanguaging stance, design, shift, and their corresponding perceptions.

After distribution of the translanguaging practices questionnaire, an exploratory factor analysis was performed to identify possible factors within the translanguaging stance, design, and shift subscales as well as their corresponding perception subscales. Maximum likelihood (ML) was chosen as the extraction method to best identify factors that could be generalized to a larger population in future studies utilizing a confirmatory factor analysis (Field, 2018). An oblique promax rotation method was chosen due to the expectation that there would be strong correlations between any possible factors identified under stance, design, and shift, and factors with eigenvalues greater than or equal to 1 were used to determine the number of factors in the questionnaire (Field, 2018).

Overall, the results of each analysis yielded Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) measure of sampling adequacy values ranging from 0.58 to 0.86 as well as Bartlett's test of sphericity values of <0.001, which indicated that each subscale was, at minimum, suitable for a meaningful exploratory factor analysis (Field,

2018). Both the pattern and structure matrices were analyzed according to the .40-.30-.20 rule suggested by Howard (2016). However, considerations were also given to the suggestion that factor loadings as low as 0.3 are acceptable if the sample size is greater than 350 (Hair et al., 2019).

The exploratory factor analyses identified two factors within the translanguaging stance, design, shift, and perceptions of translanguaging stance subscales (see Table 1). No additional factors were identified within the perceptions of translanguaging design and perceptions of translanguaging shift subscales. The factor loadings ranged from 0.38 to 0.95, indicating acceptable convergent validity at minimum for the sample size (N = 430). Additionally, the Cronbach's alpha coefficient value for the subscales ranged from 0.51 to 0.84, indicating acceptable reliability at minimum according to the recommendations of Hinton et al. (2014).

Table 1

Validity and Reliability of Translanguaging Practice and Perception Factors

Factor	Number of Items	Factor Loading Range (N = 430)	Cronbach's Alpha
Translanguaging stance			
Stance on use of linguistic resources	3	0.38 – 0.66	0.54
Stance on knowledge and language collaboration	3	0.38 – 0.59	0.51
Translanguaging design			
Design for meaning-making strategies	3	0.69 – 0.85	0.80
Design for content discussion	3	0.42 – 0.70	0.56
Translanguaging shift			
Shift to seek translation assistance	2	0.67 – 0.95	0.79
Shift to change activities and plans	4	0.52 – 0.76	0.72
Perceptions of translanguaging stance			
Perceptions of stance on use of linguistic resources	3	0.39 – 0.67	0.58
Perceptions of stance on knowledge and language collaboration	3	0.39 – 0.71	0.52
Perceptions of translanguaging design	6	N/A	0.84

Factor	Number of Items	Factor Loading Range (N = 430)	Cronbach's Alpha
Perceptions of translanguaging shift	6	N/A	0.83

Overall, the results of the exploratory factor analysis and the Cronbach's alpha coefficient value indicated that the translanguaging practices questionnaire was a valid and reliable instrument for gathering quantitative data based on the conceptual framework derived from García et al. (2017).

3.3.2 Semi-Structured Student Interviews

A total of eight student interview prompts were also constructed based on the translanguaging stance, design, and shift conceptual framework in combination with the same classroom observation and teacher interview responses used to construct the translanguaging practices questionnaire.

3.4 Data Analysis

Quantitative data from the translanguaging practices questionnaire were used to generate descriptive statistics. This information was then organized according to the additional factors under translanguaging stance, design, and shift that were revealed through the exploratory factor analysis. No statistically significant differences were reported between high- and low-performing groups in the quantitative data, so the descriptive statistics were not separated into high- and low-performing groups.

The qualitative data from the student interviews were coded thematically based on the same conceptual framework as the questionnaire data, which included the additional factors revealed through the exploratory factor analysis. The qualitative data were divided between high-performing and low-performing groups for response comparison.

4. Results

This section addresses the two research questions of the study, elaborating on the questionnaire and interview results regarding translanguaging practices and translanguaging perceptions. No statistically significant differences in the questionnaire results were found between the high- and low-performing student groups across both practices and perceptions, while some minor differences were found in the interview responses between the high- and low-performing student groups.

4.1 Translanguaging practices

The results of the questionnaire revealed that, on average, students often practiced translanguaging generally equally across stance (M = 2.73) and shift (M = 2.72) and slightly more often in terms of design (M = 2.92), indicating that they favored translanguaging practices that made purposeful use of their linguistic resources.

Table 2

Student Translanguaging Practices (Stance)

Item	Mean	SD	Meaning
Translanguaging stance			
Stance on use of linguistic resources			
1. I use Thai during English-only activities.	2.39	0.81	Rarely
2. I use translation apps during class.	2.50	0.90	Rarely
3. I work together with friends who are better than me at English.	3.03	0.80	Often
Stance on knowledge and language collaboration			
4. I work together with friends who are worse than me at English.	2.65	0.86	Often
5. I try to think of experiences from everyday life to understand content in the class more easily.	3.33	0.71	Often
6. I try to explain or show new things to my teacher and classmates during class.	2.45	0.94	Rarely

Under translanguaging stance, the most frequent practice was the use of students' own experiences (Item 5, M = 3.33, SD = 0.71) to understand content in

class more easily. All student interviewees across both high- and low-performing groups highlighted this as something they practiced often even if there were few opportunities to do so in the class content:

> I try to use experiences from my life as much as I can. But most of the things we learn in English class don't really involve Thailand. And I've never been abroad, so I can't really use my experiences. In our normal English classes, it's mostly grammar and reading long paragraphs that aren't related to our lives at all. But if there's an opportunity to use my experiences, I always try my best to. (S1, high performing)

> I sometimes use words I hear on YouTube or in daily life to help me understand. I also try to remember words I learn from movies, music, or my experience from talking to foreigners. Like sometimes I'll help foreigners with directions. I try to use all these words in class too, especially when I recognize them in the lesson. (S4, low performing)

The least frequent practices were the use of Thai during English-only activities (Item 1, M = 2.39, SD = 0.81) and trying to explain or show new things in class (Item 6, M = 2.45, SD = 0.94). Student interviews especially highlighted a lack of comfort with sharing new knowledge in language classes:

> We rarely discuss new things with our English teachers because they are not interested. We only share new knowledge with one English teacher because we are comfortable with him. I can discuss many things that I am interested in with him. (S3, high performing)

> I never do this. It's because our education system just wants us to only remember things. They don't teach us how to use things and they only want us to listen to the teachers, not work together with the teachers. So I don't feel comfortable sharing anything with the teacher. (S6, low performing)

Overall, students favored translanguaging stances that valued their knowledge and experiences and made meaningful use of their linguistic resources. Students were hesitant to adopt stances that involved simply using the L1 or a translation app as well as stances that required them to try to engage with what they perceived as an unreceptive classroom environment.

Table 3

Student Translanguaging Practices (Design)

Item	Mean	SD	Meaning
Translanguaging design			
Design for meaning-making strategies			
7. I use Google Translate and other apps to help me understand difficult content.	3.12	0.86	Often
8. My friends and I explain things in class to each other using Thai and English.	3.23	0.77	Often
9. My friends and I ask and answer questions to the teacher in class using Thai and English.	2.99	0.87	Often
Design for content discussion			
10. My friends and I discuss classwork with each other using Thai and English.	2.98	0.88	Often
11. My friends and I talk in Thai and English about societal problems that are presented in the class content.	2.63	0.98	Often
12. My friends and I talk in Thai and English about our experiences and problems in life and school.	2.55	0.95	Often

Under translanguaging design, students most often engaged in design practices for explaining things in class (Item 8, M = 3.23, SD = 0.78). Notably, students highlighted a desire for using Thai meaningfully when explaining things to each other:

> The main point of English class is to study English, so a bit of English practice goes a long way, but not everyone has the same

> level of English, so using Thai can help communicate ideas better and help us better understand each other during activities. (S5, low performing)

> I use Thai to ask for explanations and to try to understand what the teacher is saying about classwork. This is really useful because Thai is our mother tongue. If we communicate in Thai, we can understand each other much better. And we use Thai in almost every English period, but we do also try to use English until it gets too difficult. (S6, low performing)

The least frequent practice was talking in Thai and English about experiences and problems in life and school (Item 12, M = 2.55, SD = 0.95). Students highlighted comfort and approachability as major factors in how often they engaged in these practices:

> It's okay to share things about my life in school, but not my personal life. I'm kind of close to my foreign teacher because she's so kind. I feel very comfortable to talk to her about a little bit of my personal life. It depends on the teacher. (S2, high performing)

> I don't talk about these things with teachers often. I feel a bit more comfortable talking to my Thai English teachers about my life, but overall, I still don't do it often. It's because I'm not really close to any of the teachers. (S5, low performing)

Overall, students were most receptive to translanguaging design practices that helped them make meaning in class. However, similarly to stance, students were more hesitant to engage in design practices that required them to discuss non-academic content due to a perceived lack of interest from the classroom environment.

Table 4

Student Translanguaging Practices (Shift)

Item	Mean	SD	Meaning
Translanguaging shift			
Shift to seek translation assistance			
13. I ask friends who are better at English to translate for me when I have problems understanding in English class.	3.11	0.90	Often
14. I ask friends who are better at English to translate for me when I don't know how to answer in English to the teacher.	2.93	0.91	Often
Shift to change activities and plans			
15. I have discussions in Thai and English with my teacher or friends when I see new English vocabulary and grammar that I don't understand.	2.91	0.83	Often
16. I talk about my own experiences when I think they are related to the content of the class.	2.58	0.92	Often
17. I ask questions and have discussions with my teacher or friends when I see an important or interesting topic in class.	2.70	0.85	Often
18. I talk to my teacher about how we can change the lessons to be more relatable to us.	2.10	1.00	Rarely

Under translanguaging shift, students most often sought translation assistance, especially for instances when they had problems with understanding (Item 13, M = 3.11, SD = 0.90). This was highlighted by all students in the low performing group:

> I'll almost always ask my friends for help. They help explain the lesson better to me so I can understand it better. I also try to use the internet, but the results of the search are sometimes wrong or not enough. (S4, low performing)

> I will look up answers or explanations in Thai, ask the teacher for help, or ask my friend. If I ask my friend, I'll try to ask for explanations because I still want to try to learn. I won't ask for just the answer. (S5, low performing)

> I always ask my friends to help me. Usually they just explain the lesson to me because it's too difficult for me to understand by myself. But sometimes my friends don't understand too, and we just try to find the answer. (S6, low performing)

However, students in the high-performing group reported that they did not seek translation assistance often, if at all:

> I don't really ask friends, and to be honest, I don't ask my teachers that often either. I feel like I'm pretty talented at English, so to be honest, I get really embarrassed when I get something wrong in English. It's like a sense of pride. (S1, high performing)

> Maybe I'll search it up on Google and try to understand it. Also, I search up pictures and will understand it better when I look at pictures of the words... But I never ask my friends much, usually my friends ask me. (S2, high performing)

> When I see words I've never encountered before, I search for different definitions on Google and compare them to the context of the assignment. If Google isn't enough, I'll search on other sites like Cambridge Dictionary... I don't want to praise myself, but it's difficult for my friends to help me. (S3, high performing)

Among the student interviewees, the frequency of seeking translation assistance was the only major difference in terms of translanguaging practices between the high- and low-performing groups. There was no statistically significant difference in the questionnaire results.

The least frequent practice under shift was talking to teachers about how lessons could be changed to be more relatable (Item 18, M = 2.10, SD = 1.00), which students highlighted as a practice that, while potentially very useful and desirable, was also unusual:

E-ISSN: 2287-0024

> I don't bother asking to change lessons because in my mind, you technically can't change it since it's part of the curriculum. So there's no point in going to the teacher and asking if we can change things because 99% of the time it's going to be a no. (S1, high performing)

> I think nobody ever does this. Learning English is about passion, and some people need a reason to study English. So, I think the problem isn't with the lesson, but with the learner… Someone who wants to learn English is going to learn everything they see in class, but someone who doesn't want to learn English isn't going to care that much even if we can change the lesson. (S4, low performing)

Overall, students seemed to gravitate towards translanguaging shifts that helped them navigate difficult class content and less so towards shifts that were unrelated to academic content or could be perceived as culturally unusual.

4.2 Perceptions of Translanguaging

The second part of the questionnaire consisted of items directly corresponding to the translanguaging practice items in the first part with regards to each specific practice's language learning benefits. The results revealed that students had an overall positive perception of translanguaging across stance, design, and shift. Similarly to translanguaging practices, the most positive perceptions were under design (M = 3.22) but were also highly positive under shift (M = 3.24), indicating that students not only valued purposeful translanguaging, but also translanguaging that allowed for moment-to-moment flexibility in terms of class content and how they used their linguistic resources.

Table 5

Student Perceptions of Translanguaging Practices (Stance)

Item	Mean	SD	Meaning
Perceptions of translanguaging stance			
Stance on use of linguistic resources			
19. It helps me learn better when I use Thai during English-only activities.	2.83	0.87	Agree
20. It helps me learn better when I use translation apps during class.	3.12	0.83	Agree
21. It helps me learn better when I work together with friends who are better than me at English.	3.33	0.66	Agree
Stance on knowledge and language collaboration			
22. It helps me learn better when I work together with friends who are worse than me at English.	2.57	0.93	Agree
23. It helps me learn better when I try to think of experiences from everyday life to understand content in the class.	3.35	0.70	Agree
24. It helps me learn better when I try to explain or show new things to my teacher and classmates during class.	3.04	0.80	Agree

Under translanguaging stance, students were especially receptive to the use of experiences to understand content (Item 23, M = 3.35, SD = 0.70). The usefulness of using experiences was given particular attention during the student interviews:

> Using our experiences is very useful for learning English. Mostly for learning the right context. If you are a Thai person born in Thailand, you will speak like a Thai person. But to learn to speak a new language smoothly, we have to know it in context. (S3, high performing)

> I think this is very useful for learning English because it can help us understand the full meaning of words in the right context. We hear a lot of English words all the time and we know how to use them,

> but we feel like we don't understand them completely until we experience them in real life. (S4, low performing)

The only exceptions to the generally positive perceptions under stance were a relatively neutral perception of the helpfulness of using Thai during English-only activities (Item 19, M = 2.83, SD = 0.87) and near-disagreement for the language learning benefits of working with peers worse than them at English (Item 22, M = 2.57, SD = 0.93). On the topic of using Thai during English-only activities, students elaborated:

> Sometimes I have to translate back and forth between Thai and English to understand new words. Actually, I rarely use Thai to understand English because when you use Thai to understand the English words, it doesn't describe the English words that well. (S2, high performing)

> In all my English classes, I use both Thai and English. Overall, it's helpful to use Thai since it can help me understand what some words mean, but you also kind of lose the nuances, context, and grammar when you translate it. (S4, low performing)

Students' perceptions of translanguaging stance were also the only translanguaging element in which the exploratory factor analysis yielded two factors—perceptions of stance on the use of linguistic resources and on knowledge and language collaboration—indicating that students had a more nuanced perception of its language learning benefits. Similar to the results on the frequency of translanguaging practices under stance, students seemed to have a higher level of agreement with translanguaging stances that valued their knowledge and a lower level of agreement with translanguaging stances that did not make purposeful use of their linguistic resources.

Table 6

Student Perceptions of Translanguaging Practices (Design)

Item	Mean	SD	Meaning
Perceptions of translanguaging design			
25. It helps me learn better when I use Google Translate and other apps to help me understand difficult content.	3.22	0.80	Agree
26. It helps me learn better when my friends and I explain things in class to each other using Thai and English.	3.28	0.70	Agree
27. It helps me learn better when my friends and I ask and answer questions to the teacher during class using Thai and English.	3.26	0.72	Agree
28. It helps me learn better when my friends and I discuss classwork with each other using Thai and English.	3.27	0.70	Agree
29. It helps me learn better when my friends and I talk in Thai and English about societal problems that are presented in the class content.	3.09	0.79	Agree
30. It helps me learn better when my friends and I talk in Thai and English about our experiences and problems in life and school.	3.22	0.75	Agree

Table 7

Student Perceptions of Translanguaging Practices (Shift)

Item	Mean	SD	Meaning
Perceptions of translanguaging shift			
31. It helps me learn better when I ask friends who are better at English to translate for me when I have problems understanding in English class.	3.18	0.66	Agree
32. It helps me learn better when I ask friends who are better at English to translate for me when I don't know how to answer in English to the teacher.	3.35	0.67	Agree
33. It helps me learn better when I have discussions in Thai and English with my teacher or friends when I see new English vocabulary and grammar that I don't understand.	3.26	0.72	Agree
34. It helps me learn better when I talk about my own experiences when I think they are related to the content of the class.	3.25	0.73	Agree
35. It helps me learn better when I ask questions and have discussions with the teacher or class when I see an important or interesting topic in class.	3.12	0.69	Agree

Item	Mean	SD	Meaning
36. It helps me learn better when I talk to my teacher about the lessons and how we can change them to be more relatable to us.	3.25	0.79	Agree

Students' perceptions of translanguaging design and shift were consistently positive, with no statistically significant or notable outliers. This was also reflected by the exploratory factor analysis revealing no additional factors within perceptions of translanguaging design and shift. Across both design and shift, students had the most positive perception of receiving translation assistance from friends to answer in class (Item 32, M = 3.35, SD = 0.68) and the least positive perception of using Thai and English to discuss societal issues in class (Item 29, M = 3.09, SD = 0.79), but did not offer any meaningful elaboration on either of these perceptions during the student interviews.

Overall, student perceptions of translanguaging practices were more positive than the frequency at which they used them during class, indicating a willingness to engage in translanguaging despite possible factors restricting or discouraging them from currently doing so. No significant correlations were found between the perceptions of high- and low-performing students across both questionnaire and interview results.

5. Discussion

5.1 Practices and Perceptions of Translanguaging Stance

In terms of translanguaging stance, students adopted stances that indicated the desire and willingness to engage in translanguaging for collaborative purposes and for understanding language in the context of real, relevant experiences (Li, 2021). Crucially, students also did not often practice or positively perceive the use of the L1 in language classes unless it was for a specific, meaningful pedagogical purpose. This was consistent across both high- and low-performing groups, indicating that students understood and believed in the use of translanguaging as something beyond a mere scaffolding tool (Jiang et al., 2022). However, the

interview results indicated that these stances seemed to be suppressed by the current ELT landscape, with some students commenting that teachers and the curriculum did not implement or utilize enough locally relevant materials and experiences (Akkakoson, 2019). As translanguaging stances primarily concern the belief systems of teachers regarding classroom language practices (García, et al., 2017), the lower frequency of student practices compared to their positive perceptions could be attributed to a lack of teacher knowledge about translanguaging.

5.2 Practices and Perceptions of Translanguaging Design

Students' practices and perceptions of translanguaging design practices expanded upon their more generalized stances, revealing similarly positive results that indicated a strong preference for judicious use of the L1 for difficult content, explanation, discussion, and opportunities to bring their lives and experiences into the language classroom (Ambele, 2022; Jocuns, 2021; Li, 2023; Thongwichit & Ulla, 2024). These views aligned with those of Li (2023), which highlighted the value of linguistic flexibility and student subjectivities and perspectives for language learning. However, despite students' positive views of translanguaging design practices, students also felt limited by a lack of interest from their teachers, especially with regards to discussing their lives and experiences with reference to the classroom content. Students' translanguaging practices were, to some degree, influenced by teachers' willingness to use them even if the students perceived them as potentially valuable for their learning (Jiang et al., 2022). As translanguaging design also primarily concerns teachers and the translanguaging strategies that they encourage and employ (García et al., 2017), the lower frequency of student practices and more positive student perceptions could again be attributed to a lack of teachers' translanguaging knowledge.

5.3 Practices and Perceptions of Translanguaging Shift

In alignment with the findings under stance and design, students primarily practiced shifts to seek translation assistance for scaffolding purposes, especially

if they were low-performing students, and less frequently practiced shifts to change activities and plans despite holding generally positive views. Similarly to design, low-performing students that sought translation assistance did not do so for answers, but for explanations and to have discussions to achieve fuller understanding of the content (Jocuns, 2021; Kampittayakul, 2018). This again indicated a preference for judicious use of the L1 (Ambele, 2022; Thongwichit & Ulla, 2024). In terms of changes in activities and plans, however, students practiced these much more infrequently due to a lack of teacher flexibility as well as a perceived lack of the ability to request changes in classroom content. However, the lower frequency of practices under shift seemed to be attributed more to cultural differences rather than a lack of teachers' translanguaging knowledge, as students unanimously felt that despite the possible benefits of being able to change activities and plans, it would be unusual to make such requests. The curriculum and plans were viewed as unchangeable regardless of how positively students felt about its relevance to their interests or needs.

6. Limitations and Recommendations

Current research, including this study, suggests that students are ready and willing to engage in translanguaging if they have not already done so. Nevertheless, it remains difficult to extrapolate the results of this study to a larger population. Additional observational data and exploratory factor analyses could reveal a wider range of practices and perceptions in different regions or at different levels of schooling, and further studies may benefit from expanding upon the various categories of translanguaging practices within the stance, design, and shift framework. The questionnaire of this study would also benefit from further testing via confirmatory factor analysis with a larger population, which would better confirm the factor structure and its applicability to the broader Thai ELT context. Moreover, while the questionnaire developed for this study was designed for students, the underlying framework of stance, design, and shift could also be applied to future practice and perception studies centered around teachers.

Implementing translanguaging pedagogies in Thailand will also likely have difficulties. Though numerous studies have highlighted the benefits of translanguaging and called for shifts away from native-oriented language teaching models, native-speaker norms are still heavily favored in educational institutions (Ambele & Boonsuk, 2021; Jarunthawatchai & Baker, 2024; Todd & Darasawang, 2020). Stakeholders must be informed not only of the language learning benefits of translanguaging, but also of the role translanguaging plays in representing the reality of how English is most often used in communication in Thailand (Jarunthawatchai & Baker, 2024). However, providing sufficient professional development for educators, especially with regards to translanguaging, could prove to be a challenging long-term endeavor that requires constant critical re-evaluation of their teaching practices and beliefs (King et al., 2024).

7. Conclusion

Overall, the translanguaging landscape in Thailand remains quite open to further studies despite various obstacles. The results of this study have indicated that, overall, students are already practicing translanguaging in their language classrooms and often make an earnest effort to use their linguistic resources judiciously. Moreover, students in Thailand also seem to have a relatively positive perception of translanguaging and are ready and willing to further engage in the practice as long as it is implemented purposefully. However, whether translanguaging pedagogies can be promoted further seems to be heavily dependent on the practices and views of teachers, who play the most pivotal role in enabling students to bring their linguistic and experiential repertoires to the language classroom. Nevertheless, the results of this study and of current and previous research have indicated a readiness among students to accept and utilize translanguaging to further their language development.

8. About the Author

Dalton Le is currently an international graduate student at Chulalongkorn University, Thailand and is pursuing a Master of Education in Teaching English as a Foreign Language.

9. Acknowledgement

Many thanks to Dr. Apasara Chinwonno for her invaluable support and limitless patience.

10. References

Akkakoson, S. (2019). Thai language learners' sense of English ownership. *PASAA*, *58*, 235–263. https://eric.ed.gov/?q=EJ1227376

Ambele, E. A. (2022). Supporting English teaching in Thailand by accepting translanguaging: Views from Thai university teachers. *Issues in Educational Research*, *32*(3), 871–886. https://search.informit.org/doi/10.3316/informit.654086155484170

Ambele, E. A., & Boonsuk, Y. (2021). Voices of learners in Thai ELT classrooms: A wake up call towards teaching English as a lingua franca. *Asian Englishes*, *23*(2), 201–217. https://doi.org/10.1080/13488678.2020.1759248

Boonsuk, Y., Wasoh, F., & Ambele, E. A. (2023). Repositioning English and teaching practices in global Englishes: A critical perspective from Thai higher education. *Language Teaching Research*, *0*(0). https://doi.org/10.1177/13621688231178364

Canagarajah, S. (2017). Translingual practice as spatial repertoires: Expanding the paradigm beyond structuralist orientations. *Applied Linguistics*, *39*(1), 31–54. https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/amx041

Cenoz, J. (2019). Translanguaging pedagogies and English as a lingua franca. *Language Teaching*, *52*(1), 71–85. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444817000246

Cenoz, J., & Gorter, D. (2020). Teaching English through pedagogical translanguaging. *World Englishes*, *39*(2), 300–311. https://doi.org/10.1111/weng.12462

Creese, A., & Blackledge, A. (2022). Translanguaging: An ideological perspective. In B. Otcu-Grillman & M. Borjian (Eds.), *Remaking multilingualism* (pp. 167–179). Multilingual Matters. https://doi.org/10.21832/9781800410855-018

Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2018). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (5th ed.). SAGE Publication.

Education First (2023). *EF EPI: EF English proficiency index: A ranking of 113 countries and regions by English skills*. Signum International AG. https://www.ef.com/assetscdn/WIBIwq6RdJvcD9bc8RMd/cefcom-epi-site/reports/2023/ef-epi-2023-english.pdf

Fang, F., Jiang, L., & Yang, J. (2023). To impart knowledge or to adhere to policy: Unpacking language ideologies and practices in Chinese EMI courses through a translanguaging lens. *Language Teaching Research, 0*(0). https://doi.org/10.1177/13621688231183771

Fang, F., & Liu, Y. (2020). 'Using all English is not always meaningful': Stakeholders' perspectives on the use of and attitudes towards translanguaging at a Chinese university. *Lingua*, *247*. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lingua.2020.102959

Field, A. (2018). *Discovering statistics using IBM SPSS statistics* (5th ed.). SAGE Publications, Inc. https://collegepublishing.sagepub.com/products/discovering-statistics-using-ibm-spss-statistics-5-260423

García, O., Johnson, S. I., & Seltzer, K. (2017). *The translanguaging classroom: Leveraging student bilingualism for learning*. Caslon. https://doi.org/10.1080/15348458.2021.1930804

García, O., & Li, W. (2014). *Translanguaging: Language, bilingualism, and education*. Palgrave Pivot London. https://doi.org/10.1057/9781137385765

Hair, J. F., Black, W. C., Babin, B. J., & Anderson, R. E. (2019). *Multivariate data analysis* (8th ed.). Cengage Learning EMEA.

Hinton, P. R., McMurray, I., & Brownlow, C. (2014). *SPSS Explained* (2nd ed.). Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315797298

Hornberger, N. H. (2022). Researching and teaching (with) the continua of biliteracy. *Educational Linguistics*, *1*(1), 108–133. https://doi.org/10.1515/eduling-2021-0004

Howard, M. C. (2016). A review of exploratory factor analysis decisions and overview of current practices: What we are doing and how can we improve? *International Journal of Human–Computer Interaction*, *32*(1), 51–62. https://doi.org/10.1080/10447318.2015.1087664

Jarunthawatchai, W., & Baker, W. (2024). English language education and educational policy in Thailand. In A. J. Moody (Ed.), *The Oxford Handbook of Southeast Asian Englishes* (pp. 581–598). Oxford University Press. https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780192855282.013.30

Jiang, Z. W., Zhang, L. J., & Mohamed, N. (2022). Researching translanguaging as a feasible pedagogical practice: Evidence from Chinese English-as-a-foreign-language students' perceptions. *RELC Journal*, *53*(2), 371–390. https://doi.org/10.1177/00336882221113653

Jocuns, K. F. (2021). Dialogic teaching as a way to promote students' English language use in EFL classroom. *PASAA*, *62*, 173–203. https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1335002

Jones, B. (2017). Translanguaging in bilingual schools in Wales. *Journal of Language, Identity & Education*, *16*(4), 199–215. https://doi.org/10.1080/15348458.2017.1328282

Kampittayakul, T. (2018). The role of translanguaging in improving Thai learners' interactional competence in dyadic English as a foreign language tutorial sessions. *PASAA*, *56*, 80–111. https://doi.org/10.14456/pasaa.2018.14

Karabassova, L., & San Isidro, X. (2020). Towards translanguaging in CLIL: a study on teachers' perceptions and practices in Kazakhstan. *International Journal of Multilingualism*, *20*(2), 556–575. https://doi.org/10.1080/14790718.2020.1828426

King, N., Song, K., & Child, G. (2024). Enriching preservice teachers' translanguaging stance and practices toward emergent bilingual learners through virtual professional development. *TESOL Journal*, *15*(1), Article e730. https://doi.org/10.1002/tesj.730

Kirkpatrick, A., & Lixun, W. (2020). *Is English an Asian Language?* Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/9781316471166

Kuteeva, M. (2019). Revisiting the 'E' in EMI: students' perceptions of standard English, lingua franca and translingual practices. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, *23*(3), 287–300. https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050.2019.1637395

Lewis, G., Jones, B., & Baker, C. (2012a). Translanguaging: Developing its conceptualisation and contextualisation. *Educational Research and Evaluation*, *18*(7), 655–670. https://doi.org/10.1080/13803611.2012.718490

Lewis, G., Jones, B., & Baker, C. (2012b). Translanguaging: Origins and development from school to street and beyond. *Educational Research and Evaluation*, *18*(7), 641–654. https://doi.org/10.1080/13803611.2012.718488

Li, W. (2018). Translanguaging as a practical theory of language. *Applied Linguistics*, *39*(1), 9–30. https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/amx039

Li, W. (2021). Translanguaging as a political stance: Implications for English language education. *ELT Journal*, *76*(2), 172–182. https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccab083

Li, W. (2023). Transformative pedagogy for inclusion and social justice through translanguaging, co-learning, and transpositioning. *Language Teaching, 57*(2), 1–12. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444823000186

Lin, A. M. Y., & He, P. (2017). Translanguaging as dynamic activity flows in CLIL classrooms. *Journal of Language, Identity & Education*, *16*(4), 228–244. https://doi.org/10.1080/15348458.2017.1328283

Otheguy, R., García, O., & Reid, W. (2019). A translanguaging view of the linguistic system of bilinguals. *Applied Linguistics Review*, *10*(4), 625–651. https://doi.org/10.1515/applirev-2018-0020

Pun, J. K. H., & Tai, K. W. H. (2021). Doing science through translanguaging: A study of translanguaging practices in secondary English as a medium of instruction science laboratory sessions. *International Journal of Science Education*, *43*(7), 1112–1139. https://doi.org/10.1080/09500693.2021.1902015

Rafael, V. L. (2019). Linguistic currencies: The translative power of English in Southeast Asia and the United States. *The Translator*, *25*(2), 142–158. https://doi.org/10.1080/13556509.2019.1654061

Sahan, K., Galloway, N., & McKinley, J. (2022). 'English-only' English medium instruction: Mixed views in Thai and Vietnamese higher education. *Language Teaching Research 38*(3), 435–464. https://doi.org/10.1177/13621688211072632

Snodin, N., Savski, K., & Sameephet, B. (2024). English in Thailand. In A. J. Moody (Ed.), *The Oxford handbook of Southeast Asian Englishes* (pp. 335–350). Oxford University Press. https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780192855282.013.16

Tai, K. W. H. (2023a). Cross-curricular connection in an English medium instruction Western history classroom: A translanguaging view. *Language and Education, 38*(3), 1–30. https://doi.org/10.1080/09500782.2023.2174379

Tai, K. W. H. (2023b). Managing classroom misbehaviours in the Hong Kong English medium instruction secondary classrooms: A translanguaging perspective. *System*, *113*. Article 102959. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2022.102959

Tannenbaum, M., Michalovich, A., & Shohamy, E. (2020). Toward a new multilingual educational policy in Israel: Attitudes and perceptions of teachers and students. *Modern Language Journal*, *104*(3), 581–600. https://doi.org/10.1111/modl.12667

Thongwichit, N., & Ulla, M. B. (2024). Translanguaging pedagogy in Thailand's English medium of instruction Classrooms: Teachers' perspectives and practices. *TESL-EJ*, *27*(4), 1–17. https://doi.org/10.55593/ej.27108a7

Todd, R. W., & Darasawang, P. (2020). English language teacher education in Thailand: A mix of global and local. In A. B. M. Tsui (Ed.), *English language teaching and teacher education in East Asia: Global challenges and local responses* (pp. 195–216). Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108856218.011

Too, W. K. (2023). 'People are already doing it': Malaysian English language teachers' perceptions on translanguaging. *Asian Englishes*, *25*(2), 192–205. https://doi.org/10.1080/13488678.2023.2214769

Yuvayapan, F. (2019). Translanguaging in EFL classrooms: Teachers' perceptions and practices. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies, 15*(2), 678-694. https://doi.org/10.17263/jlls.586811