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ABSTRACT

This study aims to examine the existing attitudes and practices of translanguaging, the use of the students’ native language in the English language classroom, by 19 English language teachers in the state of Iowa. Teachers from both mainstream and dual language programs responded to a survey that collected information regarding the importance that they place on various uses of translanguaging (both by the students and by the teacher), and also information regarding the frequency with which these teachers felt it was practiced in their classrooms. Existing research in the field includes a study conducted by McMillan and Rivers (2011), which focused on examining attitudes and/or uses of translanguaging in an English as a foreign language context; the current study aims to collect similar data in the different, more diverse context of English as a second language classrooms.

The investigator used a survey to collect both quantitative and qualitative data. The quantitative data were collected using multiple-choice and Likert scale questions, and the qualitative data were collected through open-ended responses. The qualitative data were used to help explain and support the quantitative findings from the study, to provide a more holistic view of the attitudes of participating teachers towards translanguaging, and to offer a description of their current practices using translanguaging in their classrooms.

Findings indicated a division between the attitudes and practices of the participants regarding translanguaging. While the majority of the participants believed that nearly every use was important, only a small (less than half) portion of the participants implements these practices in the classroom. While the small number of participants
suggests caution in interpretation, these findings have implications nonetheless for theory and practice.
CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

Current statistics (recorded in 2010) concerning bilingual school-aged children indicate that 21% (one in every five) 5-to-17-year-olds in the US identify as bilingual by the US Census Bureau (May, 2014). Nationally, English Language Learner (ELL) students make up 10% of school enrollment from kindergarten through 12th grade (Rios-Aguilar, Gonzalez Canche, & Moll, 2012). With the significant and still rising immigrant population in the United States, one of the predominant issues facing educators is that of ensuring that ELL students receive a quality education.

Existing literature about the role of English language learners’ use of their native language has examined its use in aiding students to develop proficiency in their target language, English. In English language classrooms, an idea of promoting English-only practices has become increasingly common, instilling a sense of guilt in teachers who allowed students to use their native language while acquiring proficiency in English (Cook, 2001; Moore, 2013). However, there have been studies that show that it is important and valuable for students to be able to use their native language in order to make connections between their dominant language and the one they are learning, and to build on the linguistic knowledge that they have available to them in order to become proficient communicators in English (Cook, 2001). Cook, a supporter of native language use in the classroom, asserts that it is time to bring the students’ native languages into the classroom; he claims that it is a natural process for students to use their native language, and he encourages teachers to maximize the use of the target language (English), rather than painting the use of the native language as negative by minimizing it (Cook, 2001).
Other scholars, such as Cummins, have suggested that excluding or minimizing the use of the students’ native language will hinder students from being able to activate previously existing structures and knowledge from that first language and utilize these in their development of English (Cummins, 2009). He pointed out that not only does it assist with the understanding of grammatical structures, but also with vocabulary acquisition in English. Tian and Macaro (2012) conducted a study which supported this point; they found that students who received input in their native language during vocabulary acquisition benefited more than students who received input only in the target language. This illustrates just one example of how students’ native language can contribute to English language acquisition.

Another common concern that is rising up is that of the monolingual bias, which is which hold monolingual speakers as the model for language acquisition and expect multilingual learners to acquire proficiency and practices akin to that of a monolingual (Cummins, 2009). Cummins (2009) addressed this by explaining that monolingual speakers of English have become the model from which teachers attempt to instruct English language learners. He argued that this monolingual bias does not value the foundation that students’ native languages provide, and asserted that it is time to move towards more bilingual-centered approaches in English instruction, one of which is translanguage, which is the act of switching between languages in the classroom.

Other scholars have examined the standards that are in place for English language learners and identified possibly problematic elements within them. For example, García and Flores (2014) have examined the Common Core State Standards, which are a set of educational standards that has been adopted by some states, and identified two
contradictory forces within them: uniformity and diversity. The uniformity in the standards is that the standards are uniform and the expectations of the students do not vary at all, despite the diversity that exists in each students' linguistic background. As a result of these standards and expectations, the authors argued that the needs of bilingual students are being ignored, and their status as emergent bilinguals (students with a bilingual potential to meet the CCSS) is neglected. The authors proposed the use of translanguage in classrooms to help students learn and to ensure that bilingual and multilingual students are receiving an education equitable to that of their monolingual peers (May, 2014).

As the literature illustrates, several different researchers in the field of language acquisition and English language teaching have recommended the use of students’ native language to aid students in acquiring proficiency in English. However, there is a lack of research regarding how teachers feel towards this practice in an English as a Second language context, and whether teachers implement it in their own classrooms. One study in particular, conducted by McMillan and Rivers (2011), examined the attitudes of English as a foreign language instructors at a university in Japan regarding the use of the students’ native language in the classroom; this study, although interesting, was conducted in a context that differs from that of an English as a second language classroom. This current study examines what practices and attitudes exist among teachers in the state of Iowa where, as will be described later in this chapter, the demographics are rapidly changing in the schools.
1.1 About Translanguaging

Translanguaging is a practice in which educators allow the mixing of languages in bilingual educational settings; this practice is also known among some linguists as “code-switching” (Adamson & Fujimoto-Adamson, 2012, p. 59). The term translanguaging was coined in Welsh as *trowsieithu* by Williams (2002). Literature in the fields of education and linguistics does not have a universal term to refer to the practice defined in this section, so it is difficult to properly evaluate all of the viewpoints, as the practices may change slightly as the terminology varies, and it can be challenging to distinguish which practice fits each term. Adamson and Fujimoto-Adamson drew a distinction between codeswitching and translanguaging, marking code-switching as a tool used by translanguaging, a pedagogical approach to negotiating meaning making by multilingual language learners in an educational setting. García preferred the term translanguaging over codeswitching and extends the former and its practice beyond the educational settings, considering this process of switching between languages to be the norm in multilingual communities (Creese & Blackledge, 2010). She argued that language practices in the 21st century are “more dynamic, with the hybrid, overlapping, and simultaneous use of different languages” (Baker, 2011, p.72). Li Wei (2010) also expressed a broader view of the practice, believing that translanguaging includes a variety of linguistic performances for a broad range of purposes. Canagarajah preferred the term “codemeshing” to refer to this practice, claiming that this term indicates the fluidity between the languages, depicting them as meshed together or interwoven “as part of a single integrated system” (Cenoz & Gorter, 2011, p. 341). Creese and Blackledge (2010) extended this even further, to state that translanguaging goes beyond a basic acceptance or tolerance of the learner’s native
language to the “cultivation of languages through their use” (p. 103). The authors argued that it is the combined use of both of the languages that is the driving force behind the task; both languages are needed in some capacity to fill in where the other language is limited.

Though the terminology is certainly diverse, all of the aforementioned terms refer to a practice that advocates the use of both the language learners’ native language(s) and the target language in the process of language acquisition. For the sake of consistency throughout this study, the term translanguaging will be used to refer to such practices.

1.2 ESL Versus EFL

In the field of English language teaching, there are two different contexts in which English is taught. The first, English as a Foreign Language (EFL), refers to English instruction in schools that are located in nations or regions in which English is taught as a subject, but has no official or necessary use outside of the classroom (Nayar, 1997). This is the case in foreign nations such as Japan (where the McMillan and Rivers study was conducted), where students study English in school, but do not need to use the language to navigate communicative situations outside of their learning environment.

English as a Second Language, on the other hand, refers to a context in which English language learners are working to acquire proficiency in English, which they will need to use regularly to communicate outside of their classrooms. This is the context that is examined in the current study, as the English language learners are in public schools throughout the state of Iowa, with at least part of their instruction in English. The two types of schools from which participants were recruited are mainstream schools, where the
entirety of instruction is delivered in English, and dual-language schools, where half of the
day is taught in English and the other half in Spanish.

Besides the differences between these two contexts regarding what students face
outside the classroom, the context within the classroom also varies. For example, in an EFL
context, the students learning English typically share a common native language, as
opposed to ESL classrooms, where though many students may share a native language, it is
possible to encounter a variety of different native languages. Translanguaging has the
capacity to occur in both of these situations, and is currently more documented in the EFL
context; however, due to these differences between the two teaching contexts, it cannot be
assumed that what is true in one context applies to the other. As such, it is imperative to
further examine this practice in an ESL context, which is what this current study aims to do.

1.3 Rationale for Choice of Research Topic

The use of students’ native language to support and facilitate their acquisition of
English has always been one of my primary research interests. When reviewing literature
on this topic, I noted a pronounced gap in the existing research regarding translanguaging
in an English as a Second Language context. As shown earlier, one study in particular,
McMillan and Rivers (2011), examined the attitudes of native English-speaking teachers
towards the use of their students’ L1 (Japanese) in the classroom; this study provided
insight into the views of these English as a Foreign Language teachers, and was able to
examine the reasoning behind their choice of whether to use or avoid using Japanese in the
classroom as well as the purposes for which they found it acceptable. While there has been
research conducted regarding teacher’s attitudes towards students’ native language in
English as a Foreign Language classrooms, there appears to be a lack of studies conducted in an ESL situation. This prompted me to pursue a study that involved surveying the attitudes towards and practices of translanguaging in a local ESL context.

I chose to examine this in Iowa, due to the steadily increasing number of English language learners in the state (State Data Center of Iowa, 2013). Between the 1999-2000 school year and the 2008-2009 school year, the population of students with a native language other than English more than doubled, increasing from 10,310 to 20,774 students (State Data Center of Iowa, 2013). Iowa’s economy and work opportunities in agriculture and factory work have served to attract migrant workers, whose children enroll in public school districts throughout the state. This has led to some areas of concentrated populations of Spanish-speaking students, such as the Iowa towns and cities of Marshalltown, Sioux City, and Tama. I decided to focus my study primarily on schools in counties with notable populations of Latinos (State Data Center of Iowa, 2013), as they are likely to have higher populations of English language learners in the schools.

1.4 Significance of the Study

As there is currently a lack of studies conducted on this topic, this current study aims to uncover some basic information regarding the attitudes and practices of translanguaging by teachers in Iowa schools. With this project, I intend to provide a foundation of knowledge about translanguaging in one specific ESL context and examine whether there is an interest among teachers in these practices. Although this is examining translanguaging in a new context, it is sampling a small population of ESL teachers in a specific geographic area, and thus should not be used to make generalizations regarding all
classrooms in this context. Rather, I aim to use the results to provide a first look into translanguaging in a new and under-researched context. Thus far, researchers have examined the attitudes of EFL teachers towards translanguaging, and it is important to delve into the ESL context to see whether it is similar, or whether the context changes how teachers value and practice the use of the students’ native language in the classroom.

1.5 Format of the Study

This study will be written up in five chapters. The first chapter, the introduction, offers a brief background of the information relevant to the study. The second chapter is the literature review; this chapter will examine current literature in the field regarding translanguaging. Although there are not any similar studies to this current one, other studies that measure similar ideas in different contexts will be described and discussed. Chapter three will review the quantitative and qualitative methods of data collection and analysis used in this study; this chapter will also provide a description of the participants who responded to the survey, and the criteria with which they were selected. Chapter four will present the results from the survey, and analyze the responses to each question individually. Chapter five will address the specific research questions posed in chapter two, and will discuss the implications of the results presented in the chapter four. It will also present the principal investigators’ comments on the study, as well as suggestions for future research on translanguaging.
CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW

Although a detailed discussion of the debate between the English-only stance and the benefits of using the L1 in teaching is beyond the scope of this thesis, this chapter will provide a brief examination of current literature in the field regarding approaches to language learning, benefits of translanguageing, and the challenges of implementing translanguageing in the classroom. It will also discuss current studies that have been done on the use of translanguageing in the classroom, and identify gaps in the research regarding translanguageing in an ESL context.

2.1 Existing Pedagogical Approaches Towards Language Learning

Language instruction currently faces several challenges in the education of bilinguals and multilinguals. One of the predominant issues is the use of the monolingual speaker of English as the model of proficiency, something which English language learners should strive to meet. This expectation of bilingual and multilingual students to acquire monolingual proficiency is referred to as “monolingual bias.” This transfers into schools; Cenoz and Gorter (2013) explained that English teachers are often required to use only English and avoid any other references to elements of any other languages.

Several linguists have noted drawbacks and issues that stem from this viewpoint, such as the ethical and validity issues mentioned by Ortega (2013). The main ethical issue that she referred to is the subordination of the language learner’s native language to English. Cenoz and Gorter asserted that multilingual students should not be considered as “imitation monolinguals,” as their language competence is unique, not substandard (Cenoz
This classification of their language competence as substandard devalues the students’ cultures and can have negative effects emotionally on the students themselves, in addition to damaging the identity that they form for themselves as bilingual or multilingual students (Ortega, 2013). The validity issue concerns assessment; bilingual and multilingual students are being assessed by standardized tests that were constructed for monolingual students. This causes an issue with validity because the instrument was constructed for one purpose (assessing monolingual students’ proficiency in English and other content areas), and is being used for another purpose (assessing the same constructs, but in a different group of participants).

There are negative effects of forcing English on students, such as the loss of motivation, lowered proficiency, and emotional challenges, among many other obstacles. One example that illustrates the negative aspects of the English-only rules is the study conducted by Adamson and Adamson-Fujimoto (2012); the authors collected data through questionnaires from 240 students, as well as audio recordings of conversations between student volunteers and mentors, between students, and between a student and mentor (in the context of an advisory meeting) at a language resource center at a Japanese university. The center provided space and resources for students to develop their English proficiency, and briefly implemented an English-only rule over a zone in their center. The researchers found that students with lower proficiency and lower motivation stopped using the center as often, which then indicated that the center was not fulfilling its goal to serve as a source of support to students who are studying other languages by providing content and any advice that they may need in their studies (Adamson & Fujimoto-Adamson, 2012). This loss of the lower-proficiency and lower-motivation students illustrates a point made by Martin
(2005), who argued that the classroom (or a learning environment of another sort) should be a safe zone for students to practice language without risking embarrassment. Logically, this would entail the use of the native language, as students may feel more confident articulating their questions in a language in which they are proficient (García & Li, 2013). When their native language is “banned,” some students become reluctant to speak or they lose motivation; this can lead to a decrease in the learner’s participation, which is an integral part of language learning (May, 2014). Once the rule in the language center from Adamson and Adamson-Fujimoto’s study was repealed, both students and staff expressed relief; the students were relieved because they did not need to struggle and avoid their native language any longer, and the staff members were relieved because they were uncomfortable enforcing the restrictive policy on students. By insisting that English language learners function and communicate as English-speaking monolinguals do, educators can negatively impact learners’ motivation to acquire that target language. These negative effects stem from a lack of use or appreciation of the students’ native language, which is something that can be combatted through the use of translanguaging.

These negative effects are not limited to monolingual approaches; some forms of bilingual education also pose challenges to language learners, as they attempt to keep the languages separate in the educational setting. The rationale behind the separation is to help the learner better grasp and absorb the target language (Creese & Blackledge, 2010). Some educators have felt that the use of both languages simultaneously would overwhelm and confuse the language learner. Creese and Blackledge found that there is still a negative view towards using both languages together in the classroom, and the practice is frowned-upon in many schools. They cited a study that found that teachers who accidentally or
occasionally slip into the other language feel a certain sense of guilt, as if they are hindering their students' learning or depriving them of exposure to the target language (Creese & Blackledge, 2010).

Creese and Blackledge (2010) also introduced the “two solitude” model initially referred to by Cummins (2008) in describing the separation of L1 and L2 in many language-learning environments. The authors introduce a term coined by Heller (1999, as cited in Creese and Blackledge, 2010) called “parallel monolingualism,” which is an idea that maintains that each language is separate and proposes that each be used for specific functions. The authors, however, pointed out several emotional implications for this determination to keep the languages separate. For example, multilinguals who accidentally switch between or mix languages may feel guilty or embarrassed about their codeswitching, which can in turn impact their identity, which becomes arguably more important in second language acquisition. The authors cited Cummins, who called for bilingual instructional strategies that allow for cross-language transfer, and introduced several of the important terms that have since been used by other researchers in the field.

Creese and Blackledge (2010) conducted four interlocking case studies in the United Kingdom with two researchers working in two complementary schools each, for a total of four different complementary schools: Gujarati, Turkish, Cantonese and Mandarin, and Bengali. They recorded and interviewed participants and identified two key participants in each school to study. In these communities, the pedagogy adopted a translanguaging approach, and teachers/administrators and students were observed switching between English and the heritage language. The results showed that the boundaries between the two languages used (language of the school and English) were permeable and the students
seemed to navigate between the two languages. The pedagogy appeared to emphasize the overlap in languages rather than condemn it, and as such, the students used whatever language skills they had to communicate with others in the community. There are also examples in the study where it was necessary to reach across languages and draw from all of the linguistic resources that the students had at their disposal. The authors argued that this is an important attitude to include and the pedagogy of these schools enabled movement beyond the squandering of bilingual resources, which is something that Cummins warned against.

Translanguaging provides several benefits that the separated or English-only model cannot produce, such as the ability to maximize the language learners’ resources, but there remains a lack of research regarding how translanguaging is being implemented in classrooms, and what attitudes teachers have regarding whether they allow students to use both of their languages in class. This current study aims to address this by surveying not only teachers’ use of translanguaging in the classroom, but their attitudes towards it as well; it may be that there is a discrepancy between teachers’ use of translanguaging in the classroom and their attitudes towards it. Uncovering this theory/practice mismatch may mean that teacher education needs to better address the use of translanguaging and how to implement such a practice to help language learners.

2.2 Benefits of Translanguaging

Translanguaging has a base in second language acquisition theory and offers many benefits to language learners, ranging from helping students develop strategies for navigating conversation to helping them bridge their identity as a speaker of their native
language and as a learner and speaker of English. It also has benefits to offer instructors, such as helping to cultivate their students’ knowledge by acknowledging and utilizing the diverse base of knowledge that students have in their native language. Translanguaging can also help students by projecting a safe environment where their identities and cultures are valued, which helps the more reserved students take a more active and involved role in their education (Martin, 2005). In addition, translanguaging allows students to use their native language as a positive linguistic resource that will be an asset to them and aid them in developing ways that can help them negotiate meaning and communicate in English. Unlike the two solitudes approach, in which it is argued that both languages “should be kept rigidly separate,” translanguaging allows for students to use their native language as a tool to help them excel in their target language (Cummins, 2008, p. 65).

May (2014) stated in the introduction to his book that translanguaging emerged from sociocultural second language acquisition theory. Cummins (2008) pointed to a significant proposal he made in a previous publication about developmental interdependence (Hawkins, 2013). Essentially, Cummins’ argument proposed that in order to develop a child’s second language, the native language must also be well developed. Even though two languages may have different aspects such as pronunciation, fluency, and so on, there is still an underlying cognitive/academic language proficiency that is common to both (Cummins, 2008). Developing students’ native languages not only strengthens the base for English (or another target language), but also develops learners’ literacy skills in their native languages.

By delegating the choice of language to the students, the teacher is assisting the language learners in becoming autonomous, thus helping them integrate their knowledge
in their native language with their growing knowledge in the target language (White, Hailemariam, & Ogbay, 2013). As learners become more autonomous and exercise the opportunity to make language choices, they claim an active role in their own education. Levine (as cited by Adamson and Fujimoto-Adamson, 2012), believed that the students’ right to make their own strategic language choices develops into and serves as useful resources for future communication. Norton (2014) proposed that language learners cannot simply build a list of structures, rules, and vocabulary; rather, they need to “struggle for ownership of meaning making” and “learn to command the attentions of their listeners” in addition to using and negotiating language as both a system and social practice (p. 104). This struggle forces the learner to become more invested in their language learning and provides a source of motivation. In these cases, translanguging can allow English language learners to choose how to express themselves using all of the linguistic resources available to them, whether it is in their native language or in the target language.

Reyes (2012) took translanguging one step farther and discussed its use in developing biliteracy in bilingual students; she defined biliteracy as “the ability to decode and encode meaning from written texts in two languages” (p. 249). She advocated that with teacher support and the creation of a learning environment that valued both languages equally (in this instance, English and Spanish), students were able to acquire spontaneous biliteracy. Reyes presented two ethnographic case studies that she followed for four years; each student was a young Latino English language learner. Both students were involved in translanguging and transliteracy practices during their schooling, which led to their early biliteracy. Neither student spoke any English upon enrolling, and both came from low-income households with parents who did not have much formal schooling;
all of these were at-risk traits, which serve as indicators of possible low academic achievement.

Humberto, one of the two students that Reyes studied, refused to speak English during his first three years of schooling; he clung to his Spanish but acquired comprehension in English. He participated in class, but provided answers or comments in Spanish. He acquired good letter-sound correspondence and was able to form polysyllabic words in Spanish, but still did not speak any English. One day, when testing his comprehension of science content, Humberto was able to recount facts very clearly with precise vocabulary, but again, in Spanish instead of English. This showed evidence that despite his refusal to talk, he was learning the content and gaining proficiency. Reyes used this recount, alongside that of the other student, to argue that their translanguage and transliteracy throughout the earlier years of their education served to develop their bilingualism and biliteracy to the point where they could perform similar functions in either language. The author stressed that the key to the students’ progress and achievement was the respect paid to the native language and culture, and that they were used as aids for learning.

Reyes’ example is a strong example of how the language learners’ native languages are important to helping affirm students’ identities. Cummins (2009) built on the concept of identity and self-value and stated that it is important to recognize and validate the learners’ native languages as a valuable resource in order to upset the former imbalance put in place by the monolingual bias in which the native language was considered subordinate to the target language. Norton asserted that language “is a social practice in which experiences are organized and identities negotiated” (Norton, 2014, p. 103). As seen
throughout the literature, the students’ identities need to remain highly valued and seem to be a theme that is supported by translanguaging. Norton concluded her argument by stating that it is important for language teachers to consider and implement pedagogical practices that will help language learners develop and imagine their identities. Through translanguaging, a student can create an identity as a language learner who incorporates his or her native language and home culture, as well as the target language and culture to navigate social situations and opportunities for communication.

2.2.1 Description of current studies regarding translanguaging in the classroom

Ahmad (2009) conducted a study to learn more about instructors’ use of codeswitching in their English classrooms in Malaysia. The author’s objectives were to investigate the learners’ perceptions of the teachers’ codeswitching, the relationships between that codeswitching and the learners’ affective support, the relationship between the code switching and language learners’ success in learning the language, and to examine the potential future uses of codeswitching in teaching English language through a questionnaire administered to 299 students. The questionnaire addressed the various situations in which the learners believed codeswitching could be used beneficially, the provision of affective support in their learning, the learning success due to its use in the classroom, and possible uses of codeswitching in the future. Close to 75% of the participants indicated that codeswitching was widely used to check for understanding in a classroom; approximately another 73% stated that it was used to explain the meaning of new words or concepts. Just under 70% of participants said that code switching was used when explaining grammatical structures; nearly an equal amount of learners indicated that
it was used to establish contact with students. This shows that there are many uses for codeswitching in the classroom. Concerning academic success of the students, 72% of participants acknowledged that codeswitching helped them understand new words better; 71% felt that their teachers’ use of codeswitching helped them comprehend more difficult concepts that were covered in class. Students’ perceptions of codeswitching were primarily positive, and they felt that its continued use would be beneficial in the classroom. This supported the author’s argument that codeswitching helps to facilitate management and flow of the classroom because it enables teachers to use the best linguistic resources available to them or their students to explain procedures, material, or to communicate with the students in general, and assists the author in establishing that codeswitching is an effective teaching strategy for instructors of low English proficient learners.

In Greggio and Gil (2007), the authors conduct a qualitative study to investigate the use of codeswitching in interactions between teachers and learners in two different English as a foreign language (EFL) classrooms: one group was made of beginners, and the other consisted of pre-intermediate learners. The study aimed to investigate whether teachers and learners used codeswitching in the EFL classroom, the types of codeswitching that they did use, when codeswitching was frequent, and the functions of any codeswitching that was used. Greggio and Gil’s study collected data in the form of classroom observations, talking with participants informally, field notes, and audio recordings.

The results showed that all of the learners and teachers made use of codeswitching, although it was minimal at some times (perhaps using the other language for a word or sentence) and more prevalent at others (for example, if the teacher reverted to the L1 to give extended directions for an activity). The authors found that the beginner group used
code switching in four particular situations: when explaining grammar, when providing instructions, when monitoring or assisting students, and when correcting learners during the course of an activity. The results indicated that this switching from the L2 to the L1 by the teacher was in response to a need to clarify words, expressions, structures, or rules to make sure that the learners understood her clearly. The learners also used codeswitching in the same situations, and also when requesting assistance. The pre-intermediate group teacher used little codeswitching in his classes; he used it primarily in two situations: when explaining grammar, and when correcting activities. The learners in that group used codeswitching to communicate and participate in the class, as well as to clarify their understandings of the topics being discussed. Although the frequency of the use of codeswitching was different between the groups, some functions of their use were similar. In both groups, learners used codeswitching to maintain the flow of conversation, to fill a linguistic gap, to translate or explain vocabulary, to ask about grammar rules, and to clarify their understanding of grammar rules or structures. Overall, this study provided insight into the various uses of codeswitching by teachers and learners at two different levels of language proficiency in an EFL context. The authors concluded by arguing that professionals in the realm of foreign or second language learning should be open to the benefits that codeswitching offers in facilitating classroom interaction and language learning.

In Qian, Tian, and Wang (2009), the authors conducted a small-scale study of codeswitching as it occurs between Chinese and English in English classrooms in China. They defined three types of codeswitching: tag-switching, inter-sentential switching, and intra-sentential switching. Tag switching, which is also known as emblematic switching or
extra-sentential switching, involves the insertion of words or a phrase from one language into a sentence that is composed in another language. Inter-sentential switching consists of switching languages at a sentence boundary (for example, inserting an English sentence into a conversation that is otherwise in Chinese). The last kind, intra-sentential codeswitching, refers to a switch in languages within a sentence; this kind is more syntactically demanding and usually requires that the speaker be fluent or highly proficient in both languages.

The research questions put forth by the researchers intended to investigate (1) the kinds of codeswitching that are used by teachers in primary English classrooms, (2) whether there is any change in the quantity of teachers codeswitching as the students’ proficiency levels advance, and (3) the function that codeswitching serves in classroom interaction. The participants involved were two young female teachers who taught classes of between 30 and 40 students. The classes were videotaped and then transcribed into Microsoft Word in order to use the wordcount tool to help tally up the part of the lesson in which each language was used. The researchers did this to determine the functions of each occurrence of codeswitching within the lesson and coded the switched units.

Findings for the first research question were that there was much more inter-sentential switching (82% of occurrences) than either other type of codeswitching. Relating to their second research question, there was a decrease in the amount of codeswitching as the proficiency levels of the students rose. In the first year, there was a significant amount of codeswitching (up to slightly over 40% in a class period), but by the last two years, the use of the students’ L1 was minimal. In response to the third research question, the functions of codeswitching by teachers included for translation, clarification,
highlighting, and efficiency; teachers also used codeswitching for praise (returning to the L1 so that the student will understand that they are receiving positive feedback), and for social functions such as to establish authority. This study allowed for a view into how teachers may use codeswitching in the classroom, and also some of the situations in which teachers feel the need to ensure comprehension by switching to the L1.

Tian and Macaro (2012) used a pre-test/post-test experimental design to examine the effect of teachers’ use of codeswitching on the L2 vocabulary acquisition during listening comprehension activities at Chinese universities. The research questions related to (1) the extent to which a lexical focus on form is beneficial during a focus on meaning activity, (2) whether students’ receptive vocabulary learning was better facilitated by teachers’ use of codeswitching, and (3) whether lower proficiency students benefit more than higher proficiency students from teachers’ use of codeswitching.

The authors defined incidental learning, as it relates to a focus on form, as when a learner may be focused somewhat, but not exclusively, on the message being communicated rather than the form through which it is being conveyed. In the case of intentional learning, however, the attention is mainly focused on the form-meaning relationships and the properties of the word(s). They also introduced codeswitching not as a deficit where the teacher cannot think of the correct expression in the target language, but rather the mastery over more than one language by the teacher. They also addressed the topic of L2 exclusivity, or the idea regarding whether teachers should allow the L1 to be used in class or restrict interaction to the target language; they cited arguments from Phillipson and Canagarajah and took the stance that the L2 develops alongside the L1, rather than separately, making it a useful tool in the classroom.
The method used in the study was to establish baseline proficiency tests and then administer the vocabulary pretest. One week after that, the instructional treatment would begin and last for six weeks. Two weeks after the instruction ends and the posttest, a delayed test was carried out. The instruction provided was additional to students’ regular course work and was provided by an experienced bilingual instructor. It lasted one and a half hours each week and focused on listening comprehension activities. The new vocabulary introduced was focused on, whether students requested it or not.

Regarding research question 1, the results from the study showed that although the two groups receiving instruction made large gains, they were not sustained to the delayed test. There was a significant rise from the pretest to the posttest, but the effects dropped before the delayed posttest. As for research question 2, both groups improved their vocabulary knowledge between the pretest and posttest, but again the effect did not extend to the delayed posttest. Concerning research question 3, the results showed that students who received some L1 (codeswitching) input benefitted more than students who were only provided input in the target language. The findings suggested that L1 use such as codeswitching is beneficial to learners, but the authors stated that there needs to be research done within more narrow parameters to learn more about it.

In McMillan and Rivers (2011), the authors surveyed 29 participants (all native-speaker EFL instructors) about their beliefs regarding the role of the native language in the EFL classroom. The authors argued that despite recent publications that support judicious use of the L1 in the classroom, there still exist many instructors who favor an English only policy in their classroom. In Japan, where the survey was administered, an overuse of the L1 is viewed as counter-productive for developing proficiency in English, possibly due to
several factors including English teachers’ limited proficiency in the students’ L1 or the emphasis placed on preparing students to pass college entrance examinations. The authors introduced literature that supports the use of the learners’ L1 in the classroom, claiming that the L1 can serve as a linguistic tool that can allow learners to make predictions about the target language. The authors cited the argument by Cook (2001) that instructors should take advantage of the L1-L2 connections and allow L1 use in the classrooms.

The method used in this Japanese study was a survey, which featured six open-ended questions related to various teaching issues. The survey was anonymous to encourage honest responses. Instructors were also asked to indicate how many years of teaching experience they had in Japan and to rate their own proficiency in Japanese, using a four point scale. The authors believed that some of the instructors who are hesitant to allow the L1 into the classroom may be preoccupied about how to incorporate it if their proficiency is low, so that portion of the questionnaire allowed for data collection to draw an inference on that topic. The responses, however, disproved that hypothesis that the authors had suggested; interestingly, the teachers who held a more positive view of L1 use in the classroom had lower self-reported proficiency scores in Japanese, whereas the teachers who opposed L1 use had a higher proficiency rating.

Other results of the study provided insights into the arguments held by the teachers in favor of their L1 use and against it. Twenty teachers provided arguments in favor of teacher L1 use in the classroom, including the belief that the L1 can facilitate successful communication between the instructor and learners, help the instructor build rapport with students, aid students in learning vocabulary, allow for translation and comparison exercises, and promote bilingualism or multilingualism. Nineteen teachers provided
arguments for student L1 use, including that it can facilitate interaction between learners, allow for peer-review or assistance, provide clarification during portions of the lesson, assist with needs analysis, and allow students to build rapport with each other. Thirteen teachers shared arguments against the teachers’ L1 use in the classroom, including that students would want the additional exposure to English, that it would lead to more student use of the L1, that teachers need to adhere to the university’s English only policies, and that prohibiting L1 use would result in more use of the target language. Fifteen teachers provided reasoning against student L1 use, including that it would encourage off-task behavior, that it should only be allowed in emergency situations, and that it would hinder students from thinking in English. Overall, this study provided valuable insight into the minds of teachers and helped share their viewpoints on why they agree with or oppose the presence of the L1 in the EFL classroom.

McMillan and Rivers’ (2011) study influenced and guided this current study on translanguaging; just as their findings highlighted teacher attitudes towards the use of students’ native language in the EFL classroom, this current study aims to uncover some information regarding similar attitudes (or differences in attitudes) among Iowa teachers.

2.2.2 Relevance of current studies in translanguaging

Recent studies on the practice of translanguaging have brought to light several reasons that teachers choose to use translanguaging in the classroom, and address its benefits for learners. One reason why teachers choose to use translanguaging is to check for understanding (Ahmad, 2009; Greggio and Gil, 2007; McMillan and Rivers, 2011; Qian, Tian, and Wang, 2009); after introducing new material in the target language, the instructors use translanguaging to the L1 in order to ensure that the students grasped the
material and understood what was being discussed. This ensures that students are not misunderstanding the material, and attempts to guarantee that they comprehended the subject at hand before moving on to another part of the topic. The authors explained that this can have several benefits for students; it ensures that they do not fall behind in class, and also helps eliminate the “lost” feeling that some students may experience when they are overwhelmed by the material being covered (Ahmad, 2009).

Another reason teachers choose to make use of translanguaging is to explain complex concepts, vocabulary, and grammatical features or structures (Ahmad, 2009; Greggio and Gil, 2007; McMillan and Rivers, 2011; Tian and Macaro, 2012). When teaching new vocabulary terms, it is helpful for instructors to codeswitch into the L1 to use definitions that are easier for the students to comprehend; this helps the students grasp the meanings and allows them to better understand what they are learning (Ahmad, 2009). In the case of grammatical features and structures, the use of the L1 can be of assistance in many ways. It is important for students to understand the grammar of the target language, and explaining it in the L1 can provide the best chance of comprehension for language learners. In addition, discussing and explaining grammar often involves a lot of metalanguage (for example, parts of speech and punctuation terms); using the target language to explain these terms may cause some students to be confused, so making use of the L1 can be beneficial to the learners. Cook (2001), an avid proponent of encouraging appropriate L1 use in the classroom, argued that translanguaging is a natural practice and allows students to make connections between their L1 and L2. Students in the study conducted by Ahmad (2009) claimed that their instructor’s use of translanguaging to their L1 was helpful to them as they were trying to understand more difficult grammatical
concepts. In the cases of vocabulary and grammatical features, it is helpful for students to be allowed to draw upon the linguistic resources that they have available to assist them, and the vocabulary and grammar structures of their L1 can serve as valuable building blocks to acquiring these features in the target language.

In addition to arguing that translanguaging is a natural practice, Cook (2001) also asserted that it is time to consider bringing language learner’s L1 back into the classroom. He addressed the current situation (at the time his article was written) of avoidance of L1s in the classroom. He argued that this is a task that is bordering on impossible, and advocated a more positive alternative of maximizing the L2 use in the classroom, no longer painting the L1 as a negative influence. He claimed that like nature, the L1 will creep back into the classroom, so it is important not to fight it, but rather find positive ways to encourage L2 use.

Cook (2001) also proposed teaching methods that deliberately include the L1. For example, he suggested switching from the L2 to the L1 to review points that have been made, or presenting a rule that the instructor wants to ensure that students understand. This also brings forth translanguaging as a normal L2 classroom activity and encourages students to engage in the practice. He also offered ways of using the L1 positively in language instruction. He asked teachers to consider efficiency, learning, naturalness, and external relevance when deciding whether to use the L1 in an activity. Some uses include using the L1 to explain the meaning of a confusing word or phrase, explaining grammar points, organizing tasks, giving praise, and discipline; in each of these instances, the L1 makes certain that the students understand what is being communicated. Cook finished by discussing acceptable student use of L1s in the classroom, such as part of the main learning
activity (for example, using translation as a teaching technique), and during some classroom activities (such as codeswitching during a group discussion).

Other supporters of L1 use in the classroom for clarity when providing feedback and instructions include Greggio and Gil (2007) and McMillan and Rivers (2011). Allowing full use of a language with which the students are familiar provides the teacher a broader range of registers or vocabulary to use during feedback, ensuring more conductive input for students. McMillan and Rivers (2011) also raised the point that permitting students to use their native languages enables the students to engage in peer-review, which is something that would be significantly limited and less effective if the language learners were restricted to use of the L2 when they gave feedback. The use of the L1 in this effect is also of use when giving instructions for activities (Ahmad, 2009; Greggio and Gil, 2007); it ensures that the students will have a better chance of staying on task if they understand the directions more clearly. Although several of the reasons for L1 use are related to the students’ acquisition or understanding of the language, there are other benefits that L1 use can provide.

For example, Qian, Tian, and Wang (2009) found that often, teachers codeswitch into the L1 when giving praise to students. This is positive for their identities and encouraging to students as they navigate the challenge of learning a new language. By switching into the L1, teachers can ensure that students will understand the praise directed at them, which in turn can boost morale among classmates. McMillan and Rivers (2011) received feedback from participants who felt that L1 use in the classroom also helps the teacher build rapport with the students, creating a positive learning environment that is conducive to aiding the students’ acquisition of the language. Overall, the authors provided
clear, descriptive reasons for teacher use of translanguaging in the language-learning classroom and showed that this strategy goes beyond simply teaching the material to also involving and encouraging the students.

Although there are certainly arguments in favor of L1 use in the classroom, there are also arguments in opposition. McMillan and Rivers provided a comprehensive view of several key reasons that teachers give for choosing not to use the L1 when teaching English, mostly surrounding the idea that the time spent speaking the L1 should instead be spent speaking and practicing the target language. While it certainly is important to use valuable class time to practice English, it is also important to consider the aforementioned beneficial uses of translanguaging in the classroom. Although there were several arguments against translanguaging provided by participants of McMillan and Rivers’ study, each was counteracted by a benefit found among the collected studies. McMillan and Rivers’ study was unique among the others in its subject area because it assessed teachers’ attitudes specifically towards the use of the students’ L1 in the classroom by teachers, and also separately assessed teachers’ attitudes towards students’ L1 use by the students themselves.

McMillan and Rivers’ study was eye-opening and unique, but it fit neatly with the remainder of the studies in that all of these involved English as a Foreign Language (EFL) contexts. Whereas this is not surprising, given that EFL contexts are usually dealing with a common L1 that teachers may share with their students, it would be beneficial to examine and compare, using methods similar to McMillan and Rivers (2011), when and how teachers in an English as a Second Language context choose to use translanguaging, both themselves and when they encourage their students to use it in the classroom. The current
study thus aims to provide a much needed foundation for exploring resources and training for ESL teachers who seek answers to the question of L1 use in L2 classrooms.

2.3 Challenges of Implementation

As with any pedagogical approach, there are downsides to using translanguaging. Given the research results, however, the benefits of using translanguaging are significant enough to merit a closer look. One issue is that the use of such a student-centered pedagogy can be extremely challenging for teachers (White, Haliemariam, & Ogbay, 2013, p. 642). An activity’s level of success is tied to the students’ comprehension and motivation in the task. White, Hailemariam, and Ogbay stated that if students are overwhelmed or have wandered off-track from the lesson, the responsibility falls on the instructor to work them through it (as with activities in any class).

An additional challenge with translanguaging use in the classroom has been the teachers’ proficiency in the students’ native language. Teachers with lower proficiency in the students’ native language may be more hesitant to allow students to switch between languages or use their native language during class; this was explored further by McMillan and Rivers (2011). However, it should be noted while that low proficiency may hinder teachers from using their students’ native language, in an ESL context, students are expected to use the target language despite a low proficiency level. Thus, low proficiency in the students’ L1 is only a drawback for teachers, and not for students.

Another drawback is one that is common to many English as a Second Language classes: a diverse group of native languages. However problematic it seems, refusing to acknowledge the diverse language resources of students and their families can limit
students’ potential for academic achievement (Hornberger & Link, 2012). Hornberger and Link (2012) proposed the biliteracy continua as a pedagogical aid; the authors stated that the lens reminds educators of the diverse backgrounds of their students and the strategic need to consider all dimensions and resources to foster biliteracy in students. The suggestions available in the literature are not explicit about the implementation or specific use; therefore, despite the articles that attempt to cover the topic, implementation or actual use of translanguageing by teachers in ESL contexts still remains a gap. The current study attempts to examine what attitudes teachers hold towards translanguageing in the classroom and whether teacher practices reflect their attitudes towards translanguageing.

Examining connections between theory and practice has been at the heart of much research, particularly in ethnography (see, for example, Spradley, 1980), and has more recently been used in educational research, particularly from a linguistic perspective (see, for example, Mohan, 1986, 2007, 2011). In a nutshell, all social practices—including translanguageing in teaching—involve the participant knowing (or not knowing) something about the practice (i.e., theory or cultural knowledge) and doing (or not doing) the practice (i.e., practice or cultural behavior/action). Research methodology has typically probed social practices by using observations to identify the doing and interviews to identify the knowing. The current study, given that it employed surveys alone, constructed questions that aimed to get at participants’ self-assessed knowing and doing as much as possible, and ensured that these questions appeared on different pages of the survey, much as observing and interviewing were separated temporally.

Probing both the theory and practice aspects of the social practice of translanguageing was considered important in light of Cho’s (2008) findings. She used a
social practice analysis to help her understand why some families experienced success with heritage language learning while others did not. She discovered that in families where there was a mismatch between parents’ theories and practices, the children struggled to acquire their heritage language, Korean. But in families where there was a close match, the children excelled. Cho’s work thus suggested that looking at matches and mismatches between participants’ theories and practices may help researchers shed light on patterns and issues in data. The survey questions in this current study were therefore designed to target both the attitudes that the teachers had (their theories about the importance of translanguaging) and their frequency of practice, and to explore the matches and mismatches to raise further questions.

2.4 Challenges and Complications of Translanguaging Research

As shown in the review of literature relevant to the practice of translanguaging, it is becoming a more accepted and advocated approach to helping educate language learners. However, despite the existing literature in the field, there is plenty of room for additional study. Research needs to address whether ELL teachers in ESL contexts are familiar with the practice of translanguaging, what their opinions are of the practice, and which terms teachers use to identify it, given the variety of terms available in the literature.

One initial task to address the current gap in the literature is to survey the mindset of English language teachers in ESL contexts towards including translanguaging into their classrooms. Before moving to make translanguaging an accepted part of English teaching, it is important to understand the viewpoint of the instructors. As stated earlier, Creese and Blackledge (2010) provided an example of a teacher who experienced feelings of guilt
when slipping into the native language of the students. It is vital to determine whether this is still a widely held perspective, and if so, it may be important to ensure that through teacher education there is access to literature that outlines the benefits of translanguaging so that instructors may read of the benefits (and drawbacks), and make informed choices in their classrooms.

Concerning the literature available, there are studies and articles that examine the theoretical background behind translanguaging and many that give reasons for why it should be practiced in language teaching, but there are very few (if any) articles available to instruct educators on how they can begin to implement this practice into their teaching. Without literature or training available to educators, it is difficult to expect the practice of translanguaging to spread; with the presence of such articles, teachers who are interested in using translanguaging may have guidance on how to implement in their classrooms.

Another complication hindering the introduction of translanguaging into classrooms is the varied terminology that exists to refer to the practice of using and cultivating learners’ native languages. The existing literature on the subject is spread across the several terms, making it difficult to access the entire spectrum of research without conducting numerous different searches in order to get a more complete view of the topic. This can exacerbate the previous drawback, as teachers who are aware of this practice and who would like more information may conduct a search for one of the terms (such as codemeshing, code-switching, or other variations of translanguaging) and receive a limited range of results if they are not familiar with the various terms that are used to refer to this practice. In order to see this approach adopted by educators of language learners, it is important to make the literature readily available for their perusal.
As stated by Garcia and Flores in their article, “Translanguaging, if properly understood and suitably applied in schools, can in fact enhance cognitive, language, and literacy abilities” (Garcia & Flores, 2014, p.155). While translanguaging appears to be an extremely valuable practice, it still needs to be determined whether it is being properly understood and suitably applied; in order to facilitate this, there is a need for further research in the field so that English language learners may begin to benefit from what it has to offer them.

Though there is an abundance of published material regarding the use of translanguaging in EFL contexts, it is much less documented in the ESL context. A good starting point would thus be a replication of the McMillan and Rivers (2011) study, which has been modified slightly given that their survey was not published. To ascertain teacher perspectives on L1 use in the classroom in an ESL context at schools in Iowa, this study was somewhat replicated in Iowa. The research questions guiding the study are as follows:

1. Do teachers feel that use of the students’ L1 in the classroom is beneficial/detrimental?
   a. What are teachers’ attitudes towards use of the students’ L1 by the teacher?
   b. What are teachers’ attitudes towards use of the students’ L1 by the students?
   c. What are teachers’ perceived benefits of using the student ‘s L1 in the classroom?
   d. What uses of the students’ L1 in the classroom do teachers believe to be detrimental?
2. When is it appropriate to use translanguaging in the classroom?

   a. When is it important for students to be able to use their L1 in the classroom?

   b. When is it important for teachers to be able to use the students’ L1 in the classroom?

The current study aims to provide insight into the current attitudes of teachers towards translanguaging in the classroom, and also uncover information regarding any current use of the practice in the classroom. Results from a study such as this may help inform policy by showing school districts and educational institutions the advantages and disadvantages of translanguaging, and can also shed light on the common or preferred uses; this can also help shape teacher education programs by educating them on potential uses and benefits of incorporating translanguaging into the classroom.

2.5 Summary

This chapter described relevant literature on translanguaging (and its synonyms) and argued that whereas many theorists have discussed translanguaging and its benefits, most research on its use have been carried out in EFL contexts, where the L1 is typically common among all students in the English language classroom (and often shared by the teacher as well). The proposed study was thus conceived and its research questions, which aim to explore the attitudes and practices of English language teachers in Iowa, were presented. The next chapter outlines the methods used, which were designed with the aim of conducting a study similar to McMillan and Rivers (2011), but in an ESL context.
McMillan and Rivers’ study was chosen due to its focus on the attitudes of the teachers towards the practice of allowing student L1 use in the English language classroom.
CHAPTER 3: METHODOLOGY

This study aims to replicate a previous study conducted by Brian A. McMillan and Damian J. Rivers (2011) in which the researchers surveyed native English-speaking instructors of English language classes at a Japanese university to gauge teacher attitudes towards the use of the students’ first language (L1) in the classroom. The current study collects similar data, but in an English as a Second Language (ESL) context in the state of Iowa— which has rapidly changing demographics related to English language learners— rather than the English as a Foreign Language (EFL) context that McMillan and Rivers studied. As most studies on translanguaging (a practice in which educators allow the mixing of languages in educational settings) are conducted in an EFL context, this study provides more information about this practice in another, less researched, context.

Fig. 3.1: Process of conducting current study
3.1 Rationale for Method Selection

The data for this study were collected through a survey, which was delivered electronically through Qualtrics. The survey was sent to principals at bilingual or dual language programs and mainstream schools throughout the state of Iowa, and these principals forwarded it to their teachers of English language learners. The investigator used a survey for three main reasons: its common practice for this purpose in studies in the field, its ease of participation for teachers, and the anonymity it offers participants. The current study was modeled on a previous study (McMillan and Rivers, 2011) that used a survey effectively for data collection pertaining to research questions that are similar to the ones guiding this study; as such, the principal investigator felt that a survey would be a relevant and applicable method of data collection for this current study. Mackey and Gass (2005) supplied a definition of surveys and questionnaires based on Brown (2001) as “any written instruments that present respondents with a series of questions or statements to which they are to react either by writing out their answers or selecting them among existing answers” (Brown, 2001, p. 6). This method of data collection is one of the most common in the field to collect information regarding attitudes and opinions from a large group of participants, as surveys allow participants to report information about themselves (Gass & Mackey, 2011; Rea & Parker, 2005). This method was selected in part because of its history of use for this purpose, as it has been shown to help collect the same kinds of information that this study intends to collect and analyze regarding attitudes and practices of the participating teachers.
3.1.1 Advantages of using a survey

Mackey and Gass (2005) have shown that this method offers an ease of distribution, which allows for greater flexibility in data collection. Surveys are efficient to distribute to teachers at multiple schools, as they could be sent through e-mail to the principals, who could pass it on to their teachers if they approved of their participation. Since this study aimed to reach a wide range of teachers throughout the state of Iowa, it was necessary to find a method that would make it easiest for the participants to receive the survey and submit responses. The simplicity of the participant recruitment process allowed the investigator to potentially recruit participants from a large number of schools throughout the state, more so than if the recruitment and data collection had taken place face-to-face. This data collection method was also chosen because it was convenient for the participants, as they could take the survey whenever and wherever best suits their schedule and comfort (Gass & Mackey, 2011; Rea & Parker, 2005). They were not required to take time out of their schedules to meet with an interviewer, and they could choose to participate during any short spans of time they might have had available. This reduced the workload for the participants, which is important for teachers with many demands on their time. A survey approach could thus also potentially increase the number of participants and the response rate.

Yet another benefit to using a survey is that data can be collected anonymously (Rea & Parker, 2005). Since the questions in the survey asked teachers about their attitudes towards and practices of a debated language teaching technique, teachers may be hesitant to provide any information that may show that their view opposes the common view held by their school. Using an anonymous survey allows the investigator to protect the identities
of the participants; this has also been shown to elicit more honest responses from participants (Babbie, 1990). By using an anonymous survey, the responses cannot be reported back to the schools, nor can they be traced back to the individual participant; this provides participants an opportunity to be honest about their views and discuss points that they may not feel comfortable discussing in an interview.

3.1.2 Disadvantages of using a survey

Disadvantages to using surveys for data collection can include low participation rates, ambiguous answers, and incomplete responses (Rea & Parker, 2005). Although short surveys can result in higher participation rates than other collection methods, it is optional, and there are no consequences from lack of participation. In the current study, there was an incentive offered to teachers who chose to respond to the survey, but it was in the form of a chance draw (with the possibility of winning one of three gift cards), and as such, not guaranteed to each participant. Moreover, for this study, it was necessary to contact the principals for permission to recruit participants, so if the principals felt that the survey was unnecessary or irrelevant, they would not forward the survey to the teachers, even if those teachers were interested in the topic being investigated. This is a disadvantage that would have been present in the study, regardless of the data collection method, but as a disadvantage that affected the study significantly, it merits mention in this section.

Ambiguous and incomplete answers can also present a challenge to using surveys for data collection. Responses to open-ended questions can sometimes seem ambiguous or incomplete; this was addressed by including Likert-scale items to collect the attitudes towards the uses of translanguaging that the study was interested in. The Likert scale
questions allow the teachers to use their own experience to assess the importance of attitudes and practices (Richards, Ross, & Seahouse, 2012). This allows teachers to report their attitudes towards translanguaging as a practice, and the frequency with which they (and, when applicable, their students) use it in the classroom. Incomplete responses are also a disadvantage of using surveys; this could be due to participants’ lack of motivation to complete the survey, the participants misunderstanding the item or question, or simply user error on the survey by accidentally skipping the item. Rea and Parker (2005) pointed out that due to the lack of interviewer involvement, unclear questions cannot be explained to the participant, nor can unclear answers be explained to the investigator. These responses could be used to provide more context for any ambiguous answers to longer questions and can serve to fill in any gaps in the responses to the Likert items.

Additionally, it is necessary to mention that with any survey, it is important to pilot test the questions to guard against ambiguity in the wording of the items. Dörnyei (2007) stressed the importance of pilot testing, and asserted that pilot testing surveys or questionnaires (such as the one used in this study) will help ensure that the survey items address all of the variables being studied. Although the survey questions were designed to collect information similar to a study that had already been conducted (McMillan and Rivers, 2011), the survey in that study was not available, and the one used in the current study was not pilot tested for reasons of time.

### 3.2 Description of Survey

The survey used in this study includes items based on the McMillan and Rivers (2011) study, as well as other items which were designed to collect information about the
demographics of the class, the teachers’ experience with their students’ L1s, teachers’ attitudes towards use of L1 in the classroom, and instances in which teachers choose to use the students’ L1. Since the survey from McMillan and Rivers’ study was not available, the investigator in the current study designed one that aimed to explore similar territory regarding teachers’ attitudes towards and practices of translinguaging, by examining the results from McMillan and Rivers (2011) closely and using them to guide in the design of the survey items. As mentioned earlier, this newly created survey, available in Appendix C, was not piloted.

The items in the first section of this study’s survey included seven multiple-choice and short-answer questions to collect information regarding the teachers’ demographic information, such as whether they teach in a mainstream or dual-language school, how many students they teach, and how long they have been teaching. The survey continued by including several Likert scale questions to assess the importance that teachers place on translinguaging in the classroom (to explore their attitudes), and the frequency with which it is used in their classroom (to examine teachers’ practices of translinguaging).

Closed-ended items are ones in which the researcher sets the possible answers, from which the participant can choose the response that best represents their attitudes or practices (Mackey & Gass, 2005). Likert scale questions were chosen, as they present uniform choices to participants, which allows for comparisons across the responses, and have been shown to work well in studies that aim to collect attitudinal information about a subject (Rea & Parker, 2005). Rea and Parker also pointed out that having a fixed list of options helps make the question clearer to the participant; since there was no follow-up interview to clarify questions, it was important that the survey question be as clear as
possible, and the closed-ended questions allowed the principal investigator to do that.

Open-ended questions are items in which the participant may respond in any manner they see fit (Mackey & Gass, 2005); these types of items can yield less predictable, yet more insightful data regarding the topic being investigated (Gass & Mackey, 2011). Items such as this were included as a follow-up to ask teachers to expand on their answers or explain their reasoning for the ratings that they gave the items listed on the Likert scale questions. These open-ended responses serve to collect responses that cannot be submitted in the previous closed-ended questions (Rea & Parker, 2005). These responses can support the quantitative results from the Likert scale items through triangulation, or the use of qualitative findings to validate quantitative results (Cresswell, 2014; Cresswell & Plano Clark, 2011).

3.3 Procedure

Two separate surveys were created with identical questions; they were separated into two groups, for primary school teachers and secondary school teachers. This separation distinguished between the two groups of teachers to see if results might be different due to the differences in teaching contexts between the two levels of schooling. Whereas in primary schools, students usually remain with one or two teachers throughout the day, in secondary schools, students move between several different classes, which could affect the way that teachers consider or respond to the survey questions. By separating the surveys, the primary investigator could also distinguish whether the attitude towards translinguaging varies between the two educational contexts.
As per the Institutional Review Board requirements, the investigator initially reached out to principals and/or language program contacts by e-mail with follow-up phone calls when needed to request participation in the study; contact information for the principals and program contacts was procured through public school district directories on the Internet. The researcher asked for permission to request participation from the teachers at the school and included the link to the study in that initial e-mail (see Appendix A). The principal could thus choose to send the link directly to potential participants at their school. To limit the amount of effort required by the contacts to allow for the survey to be distributed, the researcher provided a draft of a message (see Appendix B) that the principals could choose to send to the potential participants. Compensation for the teachers’ time spent contributing towards the survey was offered in the form of the opportunity to enter into a drawing for one of three $25 Amazon gift cards. Offering a monetary incentive to participants can serve to encourage participation (Rea & Parker, 2005).

Initially nine schools were selected as potential sources of participants because of their high populations of native Spanish-speaking English language learners. The investigator contacted each of these principals by the methods described above, in compliance with the approved proposal to the Institutional Review Board. However, this group of schools did not yield many responses (n=5), and as such, it became necessary to contact additional schools. In a second round of participant recruitment, an additional thirty-one schools were contacted and more responses were elicited. These thirty-one schools were not selected in the initial round, as the investigator was seeking participants from schools that had high populations of Spanish-speaking English language learners; the
schools in this second round had high general populations of English language learners, although not specifically with a native language of Spanish. Of the schools contacted, several chose not to participate for various reasons. One principal stated his/her reluctance to participate due to geographical distance and encouraged the primary investigator to contact schools closer to the university; others were unable to participate, as their schools had finished the academic year, and the teachers had departed for their summer breaks.

As the survey structure was designed to provide anonymity to the participants, the teachers who took the survey were not asked to disclose the name of the school at which they taught, although they listed number of years teaching, the number of students they teach daily, and other demographics (see Appendix C for full survey). It should be kept in mind that it is not distinguishable where in Iowa the participants were teaching when interpreting the results of this study, as the responses cannot be linked to the practices or attitudes of teachers at any particular school or district throughout the state.

### 3.4 Participants

As the study aimed to assess teacher attitudes towards the use of students’ L1 in the classroom, the participants in this study were teachers at dual language or mainstream schools with large ELL (and typically Spanish-speaking) populations. The important criteria considered by the researcher when selecting potential participants were 1) position as a teacher at a dual language school in Iowa or 2) position as a teacher at a school that serves a large population of English language learners, preferably Spanish-speaking. These criteria were important because the aim of the study was to examine the use of translanguaging in classrooms; both dual language programs and English language
learners in mainstream schools provide opportunities for the use of translanguaging (both by students and by teachers) in the classroom. The researcher elected to specify Spanish as the English language learners’ first language, as the dual language programs that are in Iowa are all Spanish-English programs.

Table 1. Demographic information for participants from mainstream schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years of Experience</th>
<th>Native Language</th>
<th>Primary Language of Instruction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>English 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Spanish 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>English and Spanish 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>English and Spanish 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21+</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>English and Spanish 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. Demographic information for participants from dual language schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years of Experience</th>
<th>Native Language</th>
<th>Primary Language of Instruction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>English 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>English 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Spanish 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>English and Spanish 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21+</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>English and Spanish 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The survey generated 23 responses; 17 of the responses were from teachers in a primary education context, and the remaining six were from teachers in a secondary education context. Four of the responses were entirely blank (three from the primary education group and one from the secondary education); these surveys were discarded, and the final count of responses that were used for the data analysis is a total of 19 (14 from the primary school participants and five from the secondary school participants). The
McMillan and Rivers (2011) study which guided this current study gathered data from 29 participants from within one university. As this study has fewer responses from a larger number of schools, it is important to note that the results and implications should be interpreted with caution, as a sample size of 19 is too small to make generalizations regarding the entire population of ESL teachers in the state of Iowa.

Concerning the educational contexts in which the participants taught, eight teachers responded that they taught in a mainstream school, and the remaining eleven teachers reported that they taught in a bilingual or dual-language school. The primary language of instruction in most participants’ classes was English (in 15 of the 19 responses); of the remaining participants, two teachers taught using Spanish as the primary language of instruction, and two teachers used both English and Spanish as languages of instruction in their classroom.

Table 3. Self-assessed proficiency levels in Spanish

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proficiency levels</th>
<th>Number of participants at this level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 I only know a few basic words and phrases.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 I am able to have limited conversation on everyday topics.</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 I am able to discuss a variety of topics without too much trouble.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 I have no problem communicating with native speakers on a wide range of topics.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of the teachers who used Spanish as a language of instruction, two of the four (one who used Spanish as the primary language of instruction, and another who used both English and Spanish) rated themselves as having a high proficiency level of four (see Table 3). The teacher who taught using Spanish as the primary language of instruction identified as a native speaker of Spanish. One of the other teachers (who used both Spanish and
English as a language of instruction) self-assessed their proficiency at a level three (see Table 3); the remaining teacher, who used Spanish as the primary language of instruction, self-assessed proficiency at a level two. Because of the survey format, no assessment of proficiency level could be carried out.

3.5 Data Analysis

To analyze the data, the responses were examined by survey question item. Surveys, when used for data collection, can yield both quantitative and qualitative insights (Gass & Mackey, 2011). In this study, the investigator relied primarily on quantitative methods to address the research questions that guided the study, but used qualitative analysis of open-ended responses to enhance and support the findings from the quantitative analysis of the Likert responses, providing a form of triangulation which can strengthen the interpretation of data (Cresswell, 2014; Cresswell & Clark, 2011), as will be described. In chapter four, each survey question will be addressed in turn.

3.5.1 Quantitative analysis of results

This study used primarily quantitative methods to collect data to respond to the research questions that guided the research and analysis. Quantitative methods can be described as methods from which data can be analyzed numerically (Mackey & Gass, 2005). To collect data regarding the first research question, which measures the teachers' feelings and attitudes towards the use of translanguaging in the classroom, Likert scale questions items were used. The second research question focused on when teachers found it appropriate or important to use translanguaging in the classroom; again, the data were
collected using primarily Likert scale questions, which were used to express attitudes and frequency of L1 use in the classroom (both by the teacher and by the student). These responses reflected the frequency of use of translanguaging in that participants’ classroom.

Responses about attitude were examined quantitatively to determine the portion of teachers who hold a positive or negative attitude towards translanguaging practices in the classroom. The Likert scale items that concern the various potential uses of translanguaging in the classroom were analyzed to determine how many participants allow or practice them in each of the frequency intervals listed (never, not often, often, very often, or not applicable). The Likert scale items addressing the views of the participants were also analyzed quantitatively to determine how many teachers believe that the listed uses of translanguaging are not important, important, or very important. Triangulation using the qualitative results served to further validate and support the trends and findings observed during the quantitative analysis of the responses. An analysis was also carried out to compare responses of translanguaging practice (frequency) with responses of attitudes (importance) to reveal patterns of potential matches and mismatches, as such matches or mismatches have been show to have some explanatory power (e.g. Cho, 2008).

Quantitative data were also collected in the demographic questions, such as the number of years the participant had been teaching, the number of students the participant taught daily, and the number of students they teach with an L1 of Spanish. The results from these questions did not address the research questions, but were instead collected to provide additional information about the participants. Quantitative methods were used to analyze part of the data from the Likert scale questions as well; these showed the number and percentage of participants who chose a particular ordinal category regarding
importance and frequency of use of translanguaging in the classroom. Importance and frequency were ranked on a Likert scale to elicit self-reported data about the teachers’ preferences and behaviors regarding translanguaging.

3.5.2 Qualitative analysis of results

This survey was qualitative in that it aimed to collect open-ended responses regarding teachers’ attitudes towards translanguaging. Qualitative results are often not easily quantified, and are interpretive rather than statistical (Mackey & Gass, 2005). The open-ended questions were used to provide participants more flexibility in their responses, encouraging them to answer honestly without being bound by limitations such as a requirement to choose an answer from a set list of possible answers. Participants were given the option of offering personal responses, which they then ranked using Likert scale categories to express attitudes and frequency of L1 use in the classroom (both by the teacher and by the student); these responses also reflected the frequency of use of translanguaging in that participants’ classroom. These open-ended responses were analyzed qualitatively to support or offer explanation to triangulate for the choices that the participants made in the Likert scale questions.

These participant-offered responses were analyzed qualitatively using a discourse analytical approach based on systemic functional linguistics (Halliday, 1994; Martin & White, 2005) to identify common attitudes and beliefs held by the teachers who participated in this study. Items regarding possible uses of translanguaging were examined to provide a list of its uses that are supported (or not supported) by participants in their classroom. Open-ended responses were analyzed for rationales of those participants’
decisions to allow or not allow the use of translanguaging in the classroom. These responses were further analyzed to examine whether any trends arose in the uses of translanguaging, and the reasons why participants prefer those uses or believe them to be detrimental.

To explain this process more fully, the investigator examined each response for words that could indicate whether the participant held a positive or negative view towards translanguaging. The investigator based this analysis on a framework of evaluative language from Martin and White (2005) related to language of affect; Martin and White (2005) defined affect as being concerned with positive and negative reactions to behaviors or things. This differs from the language of judgment in that judgment is concerned with evaluating behavior or ethics (Martin & White, 2005). The portion of affect that this study is concerned with is satisfaction and dissatisfaction with the use of the students’ native language in the classroom.

Table 4. Positive and negative terms used for qualitative analysis of open-ended questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Positive Terms</th>
<th>Negative terms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>beneficial, aid, help, helpful, useful, facilitate,</td>
<td>detrimental, take away, hinder,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>good, important, positive, need, should use...</td>
<td>stop, shouldn't use, hurt, negative</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Participants’ responses were examined, and the language that construed positive or negative feelings (see Table 4) was noted. Such an analysis brings in an established theory of linguistics into the study to support the intuitions of the researcher. As Halliday (1994) stated,
a discourse analysis that is not based on grammar is not an analysis at all, but simply a running commentary on a text; either an appeal has to be made to some set of non-linguistic conventions, or to some linguistic features that are trivial enough to be accessible without a grammar... or else the exercise remains a private one in which one explanation is as good or bad as another.

This framework was used to identify certain words to be associated with a positive attitude of translanguaging and others to be associated with a negative attitude towards translanguaging; these were sought out in the participant responses to tag sentences or ideas as belonging to one of the two groups; should a sentence not be marked by a positive or negative evaluative term, it was deemed as neutral.

3.5.3 Triangulation

Triangulation can be defined as the use of combining quantitative and qualitative methods to provide coherent information about the topic being researched (Cresswell, 2014; Cresswell & Plano Clark, 2011). It allows the investigator to bring both qualitative and quantitative methods together in a single phase to provide a more comprehensive view of the topic (Mackey & Gass, 2005; Richards, Ross, & Seedhouse, 2012). In this study, triangulation used the qualitative responses to support the findings of the quantitative responses. Johnson (1992) claimed that triangulation reduces investigator bias and enhances the reliability of the findings of a study; using both the qualitative (open-ended) responses to support the data collected from the quantitative (closed-ended) responses, ensures that the investigator more fully understands the attitudes and practices of the participating teachers concerning translanguaging. The qualitative responses allow the
participants to elaborate on the reasoning behind their choices in the closed-ended items, and also allows them an opportunity to provide any information that was not offered in the closed-ended items; this additional information provides the investigator with a more comprehensive view of their attitudes towards and practices of translanguaging, and allows for clarification on any responses that could be ambiguous, not applicable, or misunderstood.

3.5.4 Summary of data analysis

This combination of quantitative and qualitative methods was used to analyze the survey responses with the aim of describing a view of Iowa teachers’ practices of and attitudes towards the use of translanguaging in their classrooms. It must be noted that this study is meant to serve as a descriptive presentation of the results from the 19 participants, and that the sample size is not substantial enough to make generalizations about the attitudes and practices of all teachers throughout the state. The results from this study regarding the attitudes and practices of the participating teachers are presented and discussed in Chapter 4.
This chapter will examine individually each of the questions from the main part of the survey and present the results of the study. The first section of the survey (questions 1 through 7) collected only demographic information that was used in Chapter 3 to describe the participants; the information collected in the participants’ responses to these questions were intended to describe the participants and also provide additional information that could possibly indicate trends in responses. However, there were no such trends found based on this information (which included data such as the length of time the participants had been teaching, their proficiency in Spanish, the number of ELLs they teach, etc.), and as such, those responses will not be examined in this chapter.

The data that pertains to the research questions guiding the study were collected in the second portion, or main part of the survey, which consists of questions 8 through 12. Average calculations regarding the uses are placed at the bottom of each table; the values associated with each category are included in parentheses after each category is listed. For tables concerning frequency, an average rating of 3 shows equal use and disuse by participants. Average values over 3 are considered to be used by teachers, and below 3 are considered to be uses that are not practiced commonly. For tables concerning importance, a value of 1 is considered unimportant. Any value above 1 is considered to be important, with values above 2 to be considered very important.

The open-ended responses, which were entered in a text box at the end of the survey, will be examined throughout this chapter in accordance with the survey item for which the response was providing additional information or clarification.
4.1 Survey Question 8: Is translanguaging important?

At the start of the main survey, teachers were asked if they believed that the use of students’ native language is beneficial in the English language classroom. Of the nineteen participants, eighteen responded that they believe it to be helpful. One individual believed that it is not helpful; this individual could be considered an outlier in the data.

This individual teacher has been teaching for 24 years, and currently teaches in the primary-education context in a dual-language school. In the section designated for additional comments, he/she explained:

In a DL school, I believe it is important to strictly stay true to the designated language for that time (English or Spanish) and not to [veer] from it for any reason. The only exception in using the opposite language is at the designated times for bridging.

This participant selected “not often” for all selections on question 9, “not important” for all selections on questions 10 and 12, and “never” for all selections on question 11. Though this individual rarely or never uses these practices, and believes them to be unimportant, he/she still identified an exception from their opinion, which is bridging at designated times.

4.2. Survey Question 9: How often do you observe or encourage use of students’ native language in the classroom for the following purposes?

The first Likert item on the main survey asked teachers to describe how often they observed or encouraged the use of the students’ L1 in the classroom. Participants also had
the option of writing in their own answer and rating the frequency of its use, should that option not be provided in the list of items.

The items that were listed on the Likert scale questions of the survey will be grouped into three types of uses for analysis. The first group of uses (section 4.2.1) encompasses events that correspond to discussing content in class; these uses are to *discuss content or activities in small groups, to brainstorm during class activities, and to respond to a teacher’s question*. The second group of uses of trans languaging (section 4.2.2) involve student participation. The uses of trans languaging that fit into this group are to *provide assistance to peers during activities and to enable participation by lower proficiency students*. The third group of uses (section 4.2.3) relate to discussion that does not pertain to the content being covered in class; these uses include to *explain problems not related to content* and to *ask permission*.

4.2.1. Uses of trans languaging involving discussing content in class

For the first use, *To discuss content or activities in small groups*, most of the participants never or seldom observed or encouraged the use of the students’ native language in the classroom. Five participants selected “never” and six selected “not often,” representing that the majority of the participants seldom observe or encourage this use of trans languaging in their classrooms. Four participants reported using it “somewhat often,” and two participants each responded to using this in their classrooms “often” and “very often.” These results were surprising, given that the studies conducted in EFL contexts reflect this use to be a popular way to assist students and ensure comprehension of class
material (e.g. Ahmad, 2009; Gregio & Gil, 2007; McMillan & Rivers, 2011; Qian, Tian, & Wang, 2009).

The next use relating to discussion of content in class, *To brainstorm during class activities*, was an option that most teachers observe and encourage never or not often. Five participants responded to “never” observing or encouraging this use of the students’ native language in the classroom, and another seven reported “not often.” Two participants reported that they observe or encourage the use of the students’ native language for this purpose “somewhat often,” four did so “often,” and only one claimed to do so “very often.” This was not a frequently used practice of translanguaging in the classrooms of the participants in this study. The responses from the participants are consistent with literature in the field, as it is not a commonly documented or proposed use of the students’ native language in the classroom.

The responses to the following use, *To respond to teacher’s question*, indicated that teachers do not observe or encourage students to use their native language for that purpose very often. Five participants selected “never;” seven selected “not often,” and another five responded “somewhat often”; this left only two teachers who reported encouraging the use of the students’ native language in class for this purpose often or very often. Reyes (2012) shared one use for which responding to a teachers’ question in the native language was beneficial; in her case study of Humberto, it showed that his use of Spanish to respond to a question ensured that he was understanding the content, even if he did not have the linguistic resources in English to express it. Though Reyes found it to be useful, most of the participants of the survey stated they do not use it in their classrooms.
Overall, the use of the students’ native language for purposes related to discussing content in class were not used very often in the classrooms of the teachers participating in this study. While brainstorming and answering teachers’ questions are not uses of translanguaging that are practiced often in the field, the use of students’ native language to discuss content or activities is a use of translanguaging that has been supported in the field thus far. This shows a contrast between existing practices (which have been researched primarily in an EFL context) and the results from the current study’s participants, who teach in an ESL context.

Table 5. Participants’ reported allowance and encouragement of translanguaging involving discussing content in class

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>To discuss content or activities in small groups</th>
<th>To brainstorm during class activities</th>
<th>To respond to teacher's question</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>very often (5)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>often (4)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>somewhat often (3)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>not often (2)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>never (1)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>average</td>
<td>2.473684211</td>
<td>2.421052632</td>
<td>2.263157895</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.2.2. Uses of translanguaging involving student participation

When it came to the first use in this category, *To provide assistance to peers during activities*, this changed; five teachers claimed to observe or encourage this use of the students’ native language very often, and another six claimed that they did often. Only four participants reported using this “not often,” and none of the teachers selected that they “never” use this. One participant did not enter a rating for this item. Responses from
McMillan and Rivers (2011) showed that participants of that study viewed this use of translanguaging to be important and used it in their classrooms, which is consistent with the frequency of use reported by participants of the current study.

The next use, *To enable participation by lower proficiency students*, showed that teachers observe or encourage its participation more often than not. One teacher selected “never” and five more selected that they observe or use that “not often”; six teachers responded that they observe or encourage it “somewhat often.” Four teachers reported observing or encouraging it “often,” and three more selected “very often.” The responses to this survey support findings in McMillan and Rivers (2011) that this use of translanguaging is observed and used in classrooms.

The use of translanguaging to facilitate student participation appears to be used fairly frequently by the teachers in this study. These uses are more frequently observed and encouraged than the uses associated with discussing content in class. These responses support the findings in McMillan and Rivers’ (2011) study, despite the difference in contexts between the two studies.

Table 6. Participants’ reported allowance and encouragement of translanguaging involving student participation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>To provide assistance to peers during activities</th>
<th>To enable participation by lower proficiency students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>very often (5)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>often (4)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>somewhat often (3)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>not often (2)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>never (1)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>average</td>
<td>3.6666666667</td>
<td>3.157894737</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.2.3. Uses of translanguaging involving discussion unrelated to class content

The first use of translanguaging in this group, *To explain problems not related to content*, did not have a specific concentration on either end of the frequency scale. Five participants responded that they observe or encourage the use of the students’ native language in this instance, and seven teachers reported frequency higher and lower. Two teachers reported that they never observe or encourage its use, five teachers reported “not often,” whereas four teachers selected “not often” and three teachers reported observing and encouraging its use often. Although Greggio and Gil (2007) found this use in EFL classrooms, participants in this current study did not show a particular preference for or against this use of translanguaging.

The final item on this item was the use, *‘To ask permission’*; this use of the students’ native language in the classroom rated on the lower side of the frequency scale. Five teachers reported that they never observe or encourage this use of the students’ native language, and another six reported “not often.” Six more participants responded that they observe or encourage the use of their students’ native language for this purpose “somewhat often,” and only two participants responded frequencies higher than that. The responses to this item showed that it is not frequently used in the classrooms of the teachers who participated in this survey. This reflects current literature, which does not support or document the frequent use of translanguaging for this purpose.

Of the uses of translanguaging in this group, its use to explain problems not related to content was more popular than its use to ask permission. However, there was not an overwhelming number of participants who observed the use of the students’ native
language in the classroom to explain problems unrelated to content, despite the support of 
that use by existing studies in the field.

Table 7. Participants’ reported allowance and encouragement of translanguaging involving 
discussion unrelated to class content

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>To explain problems not related to content</th>
<th>To ask permission</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>very often (5)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>often (4)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>somewhat often (3)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>not often (2)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>never (1)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>average</td>
<td>3.052631579</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.2.4. Write-in uses of translanguaging in the classroom

On each Likert item on the survey, there was a write-in option (see Appendix C),
which allowed participants to write in a use of translanguaging that was not provided by
the investigator; they could then respond to the frequency of its use or importance that
they associate with it, as requested by the question. For this item, one participant chose to
write in a use of his/her students’ L1 in the class; the participant stated that they use the
students’ native language during singing activities, and then ranked its frequency as
“somewhat often.” Although this use was not documented in existing literature in the field,
respondents in McMillan and Rivers (2011) stated that they believed that the use of the
native language was helpful at certain points in the lesson. This response shows one unique
way that teachers are making use of the students’ native language through methods that
best suit their lessons and classes.
4.2.5 Summary of survey question 9

For this survey question, the choice or use of trans languaging that was observed most frequently was its use to provide assistance to peers during activities. The next most frequent use was to enable participation by students of lower proficiency levels. Both of these uses were also common in the responses to McMillan and Rivers (2011); this indicates common ground between the use of trans languaging in an EFL and ESL context.

Uses that were least frequently observed included brainstorming during class activities and to ask permission in the classroom, which were not uses that were common in existing literature. Other less frequently observed uses of trans languaging in the classroom included to discuss content or activities in small groups and to respond to teachers’ questions, which were uses that were found in existing literature in the field on trans languaging, both in EFL and ESL contexts. This could indicate a use that is more helpful in one context than the other, and could warrant further research. The next item on the survey will report the importance that the participants associate with each of these possible uses of trans languaging.

4.3. Survey Question 10: How important do you believe it is for students to use their native language in the classroom within the following contexts?

Whereas the previous question asked teachers to respond to the frequency with which they encourage the use of their students’ native language in the classroom, for this item, participants were asked to respond regarding the level of importance they placed on potential use of trans languaging by students. This question was intended to elicit information about which uses of trans languaging are regarded as most important by the
teachers who participated in this study. The results show that the importance associated with each use does not necessarily correspond to the frequency with which it is practiced in the classrooms. The items that were listed on the Likert scale questions of the survey will be grouped into three types of uses for analysis, as described in section 4.1. Comments from the open-ended responses will be added to support or explain the results from the Likert scale items; in these responses, words related to language of affect will be set apart in boldface (positive language) or boldface and italics (negative language) for identification.

4.3.1. Uses of translanguaging involving discussing content in class

In the first group, 13 participants found the use of the students’ native language to discuss content or activities in small groups to be important, with another three participants describing that use of translanguaging as very important. Only three participants responded that they found the use of the students’ native language in the classroom to be “not important.” These results show a discrepancy between the participants’ beliefs and practices regarding translanguaging; in the previous question where participants were asked how often they observed or encouraged this, only four of the participants reported frequencies of “often” or “very often,” while eleven of the participants responded “never” or “not often.” Though the majority of participants found this to be important, the teachers responded that they did not frequently observe or encourage it in their classrooms. Some support in favor of its use came from a participant who believed “It is beneficial (to use the students’ native language) when giving students access to content and exploring their own background knowledge.” Although the attitudes communicated in the responses to this item support the existing literature that argues that this use of translanguaging is a benefit
in the classroom (e.g. Ahmad, 2009; Greggio & Gil, 2007; McMillan & Rivers, 2011; Qian, Tian, & Wang, 2009), the responses regarding their practice show a divide between their attitudes and practices of this use of translanguaging in their classrooms.

The second choice within this group of uses of translanguaging in the classroom, *to brainstorm during class activities*, was also considered important by participants. Ten of the participants responded that they believe this use of the students’ native language in the classroom is important, and another five found it to be very important; four participants believed that this use was not important for students. Overall, the participants found it to be an important use of the students’ native language, yet the majority of participants responded that they do not observe or encourage it frequently. When asked about the frequency with which they observe or encourage this in class, the majority (12 of the 19) of the teachers who participated in this study responded “never” or “not often”; only seven of the 19 participants reported using it “somewhat often,” “often,” or “very often.” This shows that although they believe it to be important, they do not frequently observe or encourage it. Concerning the use of translanguaging during class activities, several teachers believed it to be beneficial, but explain their low use of it through their comments. One participant stated “It is *beneficial* to use a students’ native language when it *contributes* to understanding of the activity and *does not take away* from the learning objectives”; this supported his/her use of students’ native language to discuss content and activities in groups and to brainstorm using translanguaging in his/her class. Though this is a supported use, several teachers who expressed similar value for the practice explained their low use by saying that although it can be beneficial, “it is *detrimental* when it is *keeping them from* accessing and using their second language.” Many of the participants
shared that although they feel it is important, they must encourage and facilitate the use of English in the classroom, and allowing for translanguaging can sometimes deprive the students of time that could have been used interacting in the target language. Although it is not used often (by the participants in this study, or as shown in existing literature), the teachers who responded to this item find this use of translanguaging to be important and beneficial. This shows a deviation between this use of translanguaging in an ESL and EFL context.

The third choice in this group, to respond to teacher’s question, was also found to be important among participants. The responses showed that 12 of the 18 participants who responded to this question (one participant did not mark an importance for this item) ranked this use of the students’ native language in the class to be “important.” The remaining six participants were split evenly between the categories of “not important” and “very important,” suggesting strong opinions on both ends. When compared to the responses from the previous question, regarding the frequency with which it is observed or encouraged in the classroom, there is a discord between the beliefs and practices. Although these teachers found it to be important, the majority (12 of the 19) of the participants reported its frequency as “never” or “not often.” Although teachers do not observe this use of translanguaging often in their classrooms, it was found to be important among the teachers. Existing literature in the field documents this use in an ESL context (e.g. Reyes, 2012) but not in any of the EFL studies that informed this study, showing a possible use of translanguaging that could be more important or acceptable in this particular context.

In this section, each of the uses was found to be important according to the responses of participants on survey question 10. However, there seems to be a gap
between the importance the teachers place on these practices and the frequency with
which they are used in the classroom. This indicates a gap between the attitudes towards
these uses of the students’ native language and the implementation of these practices in the
classroom. Participants were able to provide an explanation for their choices in an open-
ended response box in the survey. Though some participants chose not to explain or
elaborate on their answers, several of the participants did provide some explanation or
justification regarding their choices. These uses were not observed frequently in the
classrooms of the teachers who responded to this survey, but they were found to be
important to the participants.

Table 8. Participants’ reported importance for uses of translinguaging involving discussing
content in class

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>To discuss content or activities in small groups</th>
<th>To brainstorm during class activities</th>
<th>To respond to teacher’s question</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>very important (3)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>important (2)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>not important (1)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>average</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.052631579</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.3.2. Uses of translinguaging involving student participation

The first choice in this group of Likert items is to provide assistance to peers during
activities; this use of the students’ native language in the classroom was found to be
important, with 10 participants finding it “important,” seven participants finding it “very
important,” and only one participant finding it to be “not important” (there were a total of
18 responses on this choice, as one participant did not enter a response for this Likert
item). This is reflected in the participant responses from survey question 9 regarding
frequency of its use in the classroom. Although one participant did not enter a response for that Likert item (on Survey question 9), none of the participants who responded stated that they “never” observed or encouraged the use of the students’ native language for this purpose. All of the respondents had observed or encouraged this use; four participants reported “not often” and three reported “often,” but the majority of the participants fell into the “often” and “very often” categories, with six and five participants, respectively. This shows that among the teachers who participated in this survey, this use of the students’ native language in the classroom is believed to be important, and is one of the uses observed and encouraged in their classrooms the most. This not only shows a good match between attitudes and practices, but it also supports findings from McMillan and Rivers (2011).

The next use of translanguaging in this category is to enable participation by lower proficiency students. This use was found to be important among the participants in this study, with nine participants responding that they believe it to be “important,” and another nine believe it to be “very important.” Only one participant, the outlier of the study, believed that this use of translanguaging was not important. The frequency with which this use is observed or encouraged in the classroom, however, does not easily portray the importance that these teachers have placed on it. In survey question 9, one participant reported “never” observing or encouraging this in their classroom, five responded “not often,” and six responded “somewhat often”; this shows that the majority (12) of the participants use it only somewhat often or less frequently, despite believing it to be important or very important. Four of the participants respond that they observe and encourage this use of their students’ first language in their classrooms “often,” and another
three participants do so “very often.” In other words, though most of the participants of this study believe this use of translanguage to be important, only seven observe or encourage it often or very often in their classrooms, suggesting somewhat of a mismatch between attitudes and practices. Despite this, it remained one of the more frequently observed and encouraged uses of translanguage in the classrooms (as seen in survey question 9), which again, supports the attitudes communicated by participants in McMillan and Rivers (2011).

Some of the participants described their use of this practice in the open-ended response item. One participant offered justification for his/her rating of this practice as important though their use of it was not frequent; “Most of the students this year have a 3 or higher on the 1-Elda and are (generally) able to share in the class effectively.” Although he/she believed it to be important, he/she had also decided there was no need for it in their classroom, which is what led to their low use of this practice. Several other teachers explained that it is beneficial to allow lower proficiency students to use their native language to access the content that they are familiar with, rather than struggling with the target language to explain concepts that they understand. This allows for the teacher to assess whether the student understands the concepts and material covered in class, even if they do not have the linguistic knowledge to express that in English. One participant explained, “use of native language allows some students to keep up in content area classes and it can also aid in L2 acquisition especially with lower proficiency students.” This participant continued by explaining that there are many other types of scaffolds that can (and must) be used to help bridge this gap in the students’ language proficiency, but explains his/her reasoning for allowing students’ native language use in conjunction with it. Another participant expressed a similar perspective, “Students should
use native language to demonstrate proficiency in a content area.” He or she believes, however, “It is detrimental to use native language as an avoidance of developing proficiency in the second language, students must use the second language as often as possible to become fluent.” This participant explains the reasoning behind the importance, but also shares why he/she does not practice this very frequently in his/her own classroom. The attitudes of these participants reflect concerns that were expressed by participants in McMillan and Rivers (2011), such as the belief that the use of the native language can be detrimental when students do not use English as often as possible.

The final use of translanguaging in this category is the use of the students’ native language to translate for a lower proficiency student. For this use, the majority of the participants (10 teachers) believed it to be very important in their classrooms; another seven believed it to be important. One participant chose not to mark an importance for this item, and only one participant marked their opinion of this use as “not important.” This item did not have a frequency counterpart, so no comparison of the match or mismatch can be made. Still, one participant acknowledged and explained his/her use of this practice in the classroom, “I believe it is helpful when clarifying a concept and I have allowed students (to) use their native language to help other students with more limited English skills”. He/She goes on to disclaimer, however, that there needs to be a balance of supporting students using this practice without enabling them, or there may be consequences, such as not allowing the student to learn and grow. Although Greggio and Gil (2007) explored the use of translating in regards to explaining vocabulary, there is not much existing research on this use of translanguaging; despite this, most teachers in the current study found it to
be a very important use of the students’ native language in the classroom, which could indicate a need for further research on this use of translanguaging in the classroom.

In this section, participating teachers reported the importance they placed on the use of their students’ native language for the purpose of allowing or facilitating student participation in their classroom. Most participants found it important to permit their students to use their native language to allow them to participate despite an inability to communicate their thoughts in the target language. Although these uses have mostly been documented in previous studies, it is curious to note that the least commonly explored use, *to translate for a lower proficiency student*, was found to be the most important use in this group among the participating teachers.

Table 9. Participants’ reported importance for uses of translanguaging involving student participation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>To provide assistance to peers during activities</th>
<th>To translate for a lower proficiency student</th>
<th>To enable participation by lower proficiency students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>very important (3)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>important (2)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>not important (1)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>average</td>
<td>2.3333333333</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.421052632</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.3.3. Uses of translanguaging involving discussion unrelated to class content

The final group of choices in this question related to the use of the students’ native language to allow discussion in class that is unrelated to the content being taught. These uses include *to explain problems not related to content* and *to ask permission*.

The first choice in this group, *to explain problems not related to content*, was found by most participants (n = 18) to be important. Ten of the participants marked this use of
translanguaging as “important” and another eight marked it as “very important.” Only one participant responded that they believe the use of the students’ native language in this context to be “not important.” Although this shows support for this use of translanguaging (observed in Greggio & Gil, 2007), it is not reflected in the frequency of its use as reported in survey question 9. While most teachers reported that this use of the students’ native language was either important or very important, only four and three participants, respectively, recorded observing or encouraging its use “often” or “very often.” Two participants recorded frequency as “never,” five participants chose “not often,” and five participants reported observing or encouraging the use of the students’ native language for this purpose “somewhat often.” Whereas this use was found to be important by nearly all of the participants, its use was not observed or encouraged as often as other uses of the students’ native language in the classrooms of the teachers who participated in this study.

The last use in this group, to ask permission, was found to be “not important” to seven of the participants; eight participants found it to be “important,” and another three believed that it was “very important.” This item received the most “not important” responses of any of the contexts in which students may use their native language, but still showed that a majority of the participants believed it to be “important” or “very important.” The high number of “not important” responses can be a contributing factor to the low frequency with which it is observed or encouraged in the classroom. Responses for survey question 9 show that only one teacher each chose “often” or “very often” regarding its use in their classrooms. Five participants “never” observe or encourage its use, seven teachers chose “not often,” and another five participants chose “somewhat often.” This low rate of frequency in this use of the students’ native language could be illustrated by the fact
that many of these teachers believe that it is not an important use for students. One participant explained that he/she teaches sentence frames related to classroom management, asking permission, or responding to questions. Scaffolding like this could be one reason that using the native language for purposes such as to ask permission would be less important; if teachers have methods for teaching these commonly used phrases or sentence frames, then that would reduce the need (or importance) of students being able to use their native language in class for those purposes. Due to the lack of existing literature on this particular use of translinguaging, there is no indication for why participants chose to use it so seldom, despite the majority of them finding it important.

Of the two uses of translinguaging for discussion unrelated to content that were surveyed, neither use was encouraged or observed frequently in the classrooms; however, both uses were believed to be important or very important, according to the responses to survey question 10 and the open-ended responses provided by the participants.

Table 10. Participants’ reported importance for uses of translinguaging involving discussion unrelated to class content

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>To explain problems not related to content</th>
<th>To ask permission</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>very important (3)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>important (2)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>not important (1)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>average</td>
<td>2.368421053</td>
<td>1.777777778</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.3.4. Summary of survey question 10

In this survey question, participants were asked about the importance they place on certain uses of translanguaging. The uses that were most commonly found as important were to explain problems not related to content, to provide assistance to peers during activities, and to enable participation by lower proficiency students. While findings concerning the aforementioned uses reflected existing literature in the field, the use of translanguaging to translate for a lower proficiency student has not been examined, despite the importance that participants place on this use; this could indicate an area of future study. The uses that were found to be important were not always the ones that were most frequently observed or encouraged in the classrooms of the participating teachers, which shows a gap between attitudes and practices regarding translanguaging.

4.4. Survey Question 11: How often do you use students’ native language in the classroom for the following situations?

For this question, participants were asked how often they use their students’ native language in the classroom for a variety of situations. This question was designed to collect information regarding the practices of translanguaging by participants in their classrooms, and to observe which uses may be most frequent. The options provided in the Likert question will be divided into three groups for analysis: student-oriented purposes, content-oriented purposes, and classroom-oriented purposes. The student-oriented purposes (section 4.4.1) include to give praise to students, to build bonds with students, to give feedback to students, and to help low proficiency students. The content-oriented purposes (section 4.4.2) include the use of the students’ native language to explain concepts, to
describe vocabulary, and to quickly clarify during activities. The final group (section 4.4.3), classroom-oriented purposes, include to give directions and for classroom management.

4.4.1. Uses of translanguaging for student-oriented purposes

The first use of translanguaging for student-oriented purposes, to praise students, was not used very frequently by participants in their classrooms. Four participants reported never using their students’ native language for this purpose; four more participants reported “not often.” Six participants reported frequency of “somewhat often” and two participants each reported frequencies of “often” and “very often.” Only four of these participants reported using translanguaging for this purpose more than “somewhat often,” illustrating that it is not a common use of the students’ native languages in these teachers’ classrooms. These results do not support findings in existing literature, which argued that the use of the native language to praise students is an acceptable and helpful one for students to develop positive identities and understand that they are performing well (e.g. Cook, 2001; Qian, Tian, & Wang, 2009)

The second use in this group is to build bonds with students. More teachers (n=12) reported using translanguaging for this purpose than with the previous use. Five participants reported using their students’ native language for this purpose “often,” and another five selected “very often.” Two participants also selected that they use it “somewhat often.” This shows that the majority of the participants do use translanguaging for this purpose in their classrooms. There was one participant who reported “never” using translanguaging for this reason, and six who responded “not often.” This use of translanguaging seems to be fairly popular among the teachers who participated in the
current study, and is used often by most of the participants. This is congruent with findings from McMillan and Rivers (2011) that show this to be a supported use of translanguaging, as it helps create a positive learning environment for students.

The third use, *to give feedback to students*, seems to be the least popular use of translanguaging in this group. Six of the participants claimed never to use their students’ native language for this purpose, and another four participants responded “not often.” Seven participants responded using this practice “somewhat often,” and only one participant each responded to the frequencies “often” and “very often.” This use of translanguaging seems to be unpopular among these teachers, as the majority of the participants in this study do not use their students’ native language for this purpose frequently. These results are not consistent with existing literature, which showed support for the use of translanguaging in the classroom for this purpose (e.g. Greggio & Gil, 2007; McMillan & Rivers, 2011).

The final use in this group, *to help low proficiency students*, appears to be used by some participants but not others in their classrooms. Six participants reported “never” using translanguaging for this purpose, and three more reported “not often.” Three participants reported using it “somewhat often,” two reported “often,” and five reported using it “very often.” For this use of the students’ native language in the classroom, more teachers seem to use it seldom rather than frequently. However, the responses show that it does occur in most of the classrooms at some frequency, although it may be low. This shows a variation from existing literature, which shows more support for this use of translanguaging (e.g. Ahmad, 2009; Adamson & Fujimoto-Adamson, 2012; McMillan & Rivers, 2011).
Overall, in this group of uses, the most frequent use of the students’ native language in the classroom was to build bonds with students; some teachers also used translanguaging to help low proficiency students. Using the students’ native language to provide feedback was the least popular use of translanguaging, followed by its use to praise students. Although the responses regarding use of translanguaging to build bonds was consistent with existing literature, the responses for the remaining uses in this group show deviation from the documentation and literature that exists on the topic.

Table 11. Participants’ reported use of translanguaging for student-oriented purposes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>To praise students</th>
<th>To build bonds with students</th>
<th>To give feedback to students</th>
<th>To help low proficiency students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>very often (5)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>often (4)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>somewhat often (3)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>not often (2)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>never (1)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>average</td>
<td>2.666666667</td>
<td>3.368421053</td>
<td>2.315789474</td>
<td>2.842105263</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.4.2. Uses of translanguaging for content-oriented purposes

The first use of translanguaging in this group is to explain concepts. Most participants reported low frequency of using this practice, with three participants responding “never” and seven participants reporting “not often.” Five participants disclosed that they use this practice somewhat often, but only three participants used it “often” (one participant) or “very often” (two participants). One participant chose not to respond to this item for unknown reasons. He/she also chose not to respond to the following use of translanguaging as well. The responses did not favor this use of
translanguaging, despite its documented utility in the classroom for this purpose (e.g. Ahmad, 2009).

The second use of translanguaging for content-oriented purposes is to describe vocabulary. Again, the majority of participants did not report using this practice frequently. Three participants responded that they “never” used it, and another seven reported using it “not often.” Two participants responded that they use this practice “somewhat often,” with five responding “often” and only one participant designating that they use this practice “very often.” One participant chose not to respond to this question. The responses to this item suggest that although most participants chose not to use translanguaging for this purpose often in their classrooms, others chose to use it frequently. This is a contrast from existing literature, which shows that this is a common and helpful use of translanguaging in the classroom (e.g. Ahmad, 2009; Greggio & Gil, 2007; McMillan & Rivers, 2011; Tian & Macaro, 2012).

The final use of translanguaging for content-oriented purposes is to quickly clarify during activities. This was the least popular use of translanguaging for this type of purpose; the majority of participants did not use this often in their classrooms. Six participants responded that they “never” use their students’ native language in class for this purpose, and another six participants responded that they use it “not often.” Three participants selected that they use it “somewhat often,” and two participants noted that they use it “often,” and another two claimed “very often.” Although four participants chose to use translanguaging often or very often for this purpose in their classroom, the majority of teachers who participated in this study did not, making this the least popular use by teachers of the students’ native language in the classroom for content-oriented purposes.
While this was not a use that was documented in McMillan and Rivers’ (2011) responses, it was found to be used by Greggio and Gil (2007); however, current findings suggest that it is far less popular in an ESL context rather than the EFL context that Greggio and Gil studied.

Overall, in this group of practices, the use of translanguaging that was most popular among these uses was to describe vocabulary; although this was the most common use in this group, it should be noted that, the majority of the participants still did not use it frequently, despite its common use in the existing literature. Translanguaging was also used at times to explain concepts, although again, the majority of participants did not use this practice in their classrooms. The least popular use of translanguaging for content-related purposes was to quickly clarify during class activities; this use of translanguaging was only practiced often by four participants, but although it is not popular, it is still one a practice of translanguaging that exists in today's classrooms. The popularity of these uses among participants can be ranked from most used to least used as follows: to describe vocabulary, to explain concepts, and to quickly clarify during class activities. Despite the support in the existing literature for these uses of translanguaging, the teachers who participated in this study did not observe or encourage the use of translanguaging for these purposes often in their classrooms.

Table 12. Participants’ reported use of translanguaging for content-oriented purposes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>To explain concepts</th>
<th>To describe vocabulary</th>
<th>To quickly clarify during activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>very often (5)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>often (4)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>somewhat often (3)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>not often (2)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>never (1)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>average</td>
<td>2.555555556</td>
<td>2.666666667</td>
<td>2.368421053</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.4.3. Uses of translanguaging for classroom-oriented purposes

The first of this group’s uses of translanguaging for classroom-oriented purposes is to give directions. This was found to be uncommon in the classrooms of the teachers who participated in the survey; the majority of participants stated they did not use this practice frequently. Five participants recorded “never” using the students’ native language for this purpose, and another six reported “not often.” Three teachers responded that they use this practice somewhat often, with only two participants each selecting the frequency categories of “often” and “very often.” Although a few of the participants did use their students’ native language for this classroom-oriented purpose, the majority of participants commonly did not. The responses from participants in this study do not correspond to other studies, which have used this in EFL classrooms (e.g. Greggio & Gil, 2007; McMillan & Rivers, 2011).

The second and final use of translanguaging for classroom-oriented purposes in this survey is for classroom management. This use of translanguaging was even less common than the previous one. Five participants reported that they “never” use this practice, and another seven chose “not often,” illustrating that the majority of the participants do not use this practice commonly in their classrooms. Four participants chose that they use this practice “somewhat often” and another three participants recorded that they use their students’ native language for this purpose “very often.” None of the participants chose the “often” option for this use of translanguaging. The low use of translanguaging for this reason does not reflect existing literature, which supports its use (e.g. Greggio & Gil, 2007; McMillan & Rivers, 2011).
In this group of uses, neither practice was very popular among the participants in this study, despite support from existing literature on translanguaging as it is used in the EFL context. Although more participants disclosed using the students’ language to give directions than they did for classroom management, the majority of the participants still do not practice either use often.

Table 13. Participants’ reported use of translanguaging for classroom-oriented purposes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>To give directions</th>
<th>For classroom management</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>very often (5)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>often (4)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>somewhat often (3)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>not often (2)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>never (1)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>average</td>
<td>2.444444444</td>
<td>2.421052632</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.4.4 Summary of survey question 11

This survey question was intended to measure how often the participating teachers practiced the listed uses of their students’ native language in their classroom. The results showed that the most common use of their students’ native language was to build bonds with students. Other than that, the remaining uses are not commonly practiced in the classrooms of the teachers who participated in this study.

4.5. Survey Question 12: How important is it for teachers to use their students’ native language in the following situations?

This survey question measures the importance that the participants associate with each use of translanguaging by teachers. The uses will be grouped and analyzed as in
section 4.4. One of the participants in the study chose not to respond to this question, and as such, the total number of responses for these items are 18, with the exception of to describe vocabulary, which only received 17 responses.

4.5.1. Uses of translanguaging for student-oriented purposes

The first use of translanguaging for student-oriented purposes, to praise students, was perceived to be largely important among the participants in this study. The majority of participants found this to be an important use, with 13 selecting “important” and another two participants selecting “very important.” Only three participants designated this as “not important,” and one participant did not respond to this entire item. These results do not coincide with the usage of this particular practice; although most of the participants found this practice important, they were found to not use it in their classrooms. This contrasts with existing literature, which supports this use of translanguaging in the classroom and argues its importance (e.g. Cook, 2001; Qian, Tian, & Wang, 2009).

The second use in this group, to build bonds with students, was also found to be important to the participants in this study. Nine participants believed this use of the students’ native language to be “important,” and six more participants believe it to be “very important.” Again, three participants found this practice “not important,” but the majority of these teachers found this practice to be important. Though most participants (n=10) reported using it often or very often, there was still a fair number of participants who did not use it frequently, despite the majority of participants who find this practice to be of importance. Several of the participants who chose to practice this in their classes explained their reasoning further in their open-ended response. One teacher claimed that it is a
beneficial use because it facilitates bonding with both students and their families. Another participant believed it to allow students to build relationships with their peers. One more participant claimed, “It is important when working with students who do not speak English that you are approachable. Let them know that you are willing to let them express themselves in their native language.” He/she also stated, “I also think it is important that parents know you are approachable and that you are willing to take time to find someone who can interpret meetings or even casual visits in the community.” These responses show that the use of translanguaging for this purpose facilitates building bonds not only with students, but with their families as well, which is something that is believed by several participants to be important, and which is documented in the existing literature in the field regarding translanguaging (e.g. McMillan & Rivers, 2011).

The third use of translanguaging in this group is to give feedback to students. The majority of the participants, 14 teachers, found this to be an important use of their students’ native language in the classroom. Two participants considered this to be “very important,” and only two participants found this to be “not important.” Though 16 of the 18 participants (who answered this question) believed this practice to be important and very important, only two participants reported using it with a frequency of often or very often. This shows a discrepancy between the beliefs of the teacher and the practices in the classroom. Although teachers believe this practice to be important, they do not always choose to implement it into their classrooms; its use is far more documented in the EFL context (e.g. Greggio & Gil, 2007; McMillan & Rivers, 2011).

The final use of translanguaging in this category, to help low proficiency students, was also believed to be important among the participants in this study. Nine participants
rated it as “important,” and another seven participants believed it to be very “important.” Only two participants rated it as “not important.” The responses to the previous survey question do not reflect either this level of importance or existing literature in the field (e.g. McMillan & Rivers, 2011); rather, more participants report using it seldom, rather than frequently, although they perceived it as important.

The responses to this question show that the uses of translanguaging by teachers for student-oriented purposes are considered important. Although all of these uses were not necessarily practiced in the classrooms, this question shows that the teachers who participated in this survey believe them to be important uses of the students’ native language in the classroom.

Table 14. Participants’ perceived importance of translanguaging for student-oriented purposes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>To praise students</th>
<th>To build bonds with students</th>
<th>To give feedback to students</th>
<th>To help low proficiency students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>very important (3)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>important (2)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>not important (1)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>average</td>
<td>1.9444444444</td>
<td>2.1666666667</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.2777777778</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.5.2. Uses of translanguaging for content-oriented purposes

The first use of translanguaging in this section is to explain concepts. This was found to be important by the majority of participants; 13 participants deemed this to be an important use of students’ native language in the classroom, and another three found it to be "very important." Only two participants who responded to this question believed it to be “not important.” Though this was believed to be important by the majority of participants
and supported by literature in the field (e.g. Ahmad, 2009), only three teachers reported using it in their classrooms “often” or “very often.” The majority of participants had responded that they use it “never” or “not often.” As with earlier uses, this shows a disagreement between the attitudes and practices of these participants regarding translanguaging. One participant explained, “I am a reading teacher and try to incorporate English in my teaching. At times I may use Spanish to help clarify ideas, but I try to build up their English to make them stronger English readers, writers, and speakers.” This explains why he/she chooses not to use this practice very frequently, despite placing an importance on it. Other teachers expressed that they are Dual Language teachers and must remain in the language of instruction set for their class. Although they find this practice to be important, the teacher who instructs the class during the Spanish half of the day will have the opportunity to use translanguaging; the teacher asserted that the English half of the day should be spent speaking English as much as possible, and that the translanguaging could take place in the other half of the day. This comment also suggests a lack of understanding about translanguaging; their understanding of translanguaging may be guiding them to believe that it is using English in the Spanish portion of their day, and not moving between their languages of use throughout the day, regardless of the language of instruction.

The second use of translanguaging for content-oriented purposes is to describe vocabulary. Apart from the participant who did not respond to this entire question, another participant chose not to respond to this single option on this survey question. Of the responses collected, the majority of participants found this to be important, with only one participant marking it as “not important.” Twelve participants described it as “important”
and another four described it as “very important.” As the use found important by the largest number of teachers of all the uses in this grouping, it was understandable that it was also the most popular; however, it should be noted that though it was the most popular in the grouping, the majority of the participants used it either “never” or “not often.” With nearly all of the participants considering this use important, it is interesting that more of them do not claim to implement it in their classrooms, especially since this is an extremely popular and supported use of translanguaging in existing literature (e.g. Ahmad, 2009; Greggio & Gil, 2007; McMillan & Rivers, 2011; Tian & Macaro, 2012). Some of the participants who choose to use this practice explained their reasoning. One participant claimed, “Native language is beneficial to make connections with vocabulary. In my case in a Dual Language program, it is important to stay in Spanish since I am the Spanish portion.” He/she is able to use students’ native language in the classroom to help with describing vocabulary, as their language of instruction is Spanish (the same as the native language for the majority of his/her students). Another participant stated, “When learning new vocabulary words another student may say a Spanish word to help explain the English vocabulary word.” This illustrates one use of translanguaging for this purpose in a participant’s classroom. Although some teachers viewed this as important, despite not encouraging or practicing it in their classrooms, there were participants who implemented it in their own classrooms.

The third and final use in this grouping is to quickly clarify during activities. Of the 18 participants, 12 noted this use of translanguaging as “important.” Another three participants believed it to be “very important,” and only three participants believed it to be “not important.” Despite most participants classifying this use of their students’ native
language as important, the majority reported using this practice “never” or “not often” in survey question 11. This shows that though most teachers believe it to be important, the majority of these participants do not use this practice often in their classrooms; although this use is not extremely well-documented, these responses do not support the findings from Greggio and Gil’s study (2007) that this use of translanguaging is of value in the classroom.

Table 15. Participants’ perceived importance of translanguaging for content-oriented purposes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>To explain concepts</th>
<th>To describe vocabulary</th>
<th>To quickly clarify during activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>very important (3)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>important (2)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>not important (1)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>average</td>
<td>2.055555556</td>
<td>2.176470588</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.5.3. Uses of translanguaging for classroom-oriented purposes

The first of this group’s uses of translanguaging for classroom-oriented purposes is to give directions. The majority of the participants, 13 of 18, indicated that they believe that this practice is “important.” Two more participants believed that this use of the students’ native language in the classroom is “very important”; the remaining three participants who answered this question believed that this practice is “not important.” Again, as with many of the other uses rated in this question, the importance that teachers place on the use does not line up with its current use in their classrooms. Although most of the teachers find it important, the majority of them do not practice this frequently in their classrooms; this does not reflect the existing literature from studies conducted Greggio and Gil (2007) and
McMillan and Rivers (2011), which showed it to be an important and valuable use of the students’ native language in the classroom.

The last use of translanguaging, for classroom management, elicited the most responses of “not important” from the participants in that five participants believed that this use of translanguaging was not important in their classrooms. The majority (11 of 18) of participants, however, believed that this use was “important,” with two participants classifying it as “very important.” The high number of “not important” responses is understandable, considering that this was one of the least often practiced uses of translanguaging surveyed in question 11. However, it is surprising that it is so seldom practiced, even though the majority of participants still believe it to be important, especially in light of supporting literature in the field (e.g. Ahmad, 2009).

Overall, the use of translanguaging for classroom-oriented purposes was found to be important among the majority of the participants, but these uses were not frequently practiced in their classrooms. This indicates a separation from the practices described and supported by existing literature in the field.

Table 16. Participants’ perceived importance of translanguaging for classroom-oriented purposes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>To give directions</th>
<th>For classroom management</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>very important (3)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>important (2)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>not important (1)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>average</td>
<td>1.944444444</td>
<td>1.833333333</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.5.4 Summary of survey question 12

This survey question aimed to measure the importance that the teachers placed on their practices of translanguaging, as listed in survey questions 11 and 12. The results illustrated that the majority of teachers found these uses important, yet they did not report implementing or practicing them frequently in their classrooms.

4.6 Summary

This chapter explored the responses to the survey questions 8-12 to examine the attitudes towards translanguaging held by the teachers who participated in this survey, and to reveal which uses they practice or observe in their classrooms. Although most participants found each use to be importance, the responses revealed a mismatch between the attitudes of the teachers and their practices of most of the uses of translanguaging. The open-ended responses provided explanations for why teachers choose to (or choose not to) practice certain uses of translanguaging in their classrooms. Chapter five will further discuss the implications of these mismatches.

The following tables outline a summary of the uses of translanguaging by students and by teachers. An X signifies a lack of use or perceived importance for a particular use of translanguaging by the participants. A check mark (✓) represents support by the majority of participants for the use or importance of a particular use of translanguaging. An equal sign (=) stands for an instance in which an equal number of participants did and did not support the use or importance of a particular use of translanguaging (this means that there was no clear trend for or against its use).
Table 17. Summary of uses and importance of translanguaging by teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Used Frequently</th>
<th>Important</th>
<th>Supported by literature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To praise students</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To build bonds with students</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To give feedback to students</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To help low proficiency students</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To explain concepts</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To describe vocabulary</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To quickly clarify during activities</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To give directions</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For classroom management</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 18. Summary of uses and importance of translanguaging by students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Used Frequently</th>
<th>Important</th>
<th>Supported by literature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To discuss content or activities in small groups</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To brainstorm during class activities</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To respond to teacher’s question</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To provide assistance to peers during activities</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To enable participation by lower proficiency students</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To translate for lower proficiency students</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To explain problems not related to content</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To ask permission</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER 5: CONCLUSIONS

5.1 Research Questions

As stated in Chapter 2, the research questions that guided this current study about teachers’ attitudes towards and practices of translanguageing were:

1. Do teachers feel that use of the students’ L1 in the classroom is beneficial/detrimental?
   a. What are teachers’ attitudes towards use of the students’ L1 by the teacher?
   b. What are teachers’ attitudes towards use of the students’ L1 by the students?
   c. What are teachers’ perceived benefits of using the student’s L1 in the classroom?
   d. What uses of the students’ L1 in the classroom do teachers believe to be detrimental?

2. When is it appropriate to use translanguageing in the classroom?
   a. When is it important for students to be able to use their L1 in the classroom?
   b. When is it important for teachers to be able to use the students’ L1 in the classroom?

This chapter will examine what the principal investigator has found in light of the responses to the survey.

5.1.1 Research Question 1(A): What are teachers’ attitudes towards use of the students’ L1 by the teacher?

The participants’ responses to the survey indicated that although teachers do not practice all uses of translanguageing (that were listed in the Likert survey questions) in the classroom, the majority of them believe that they are important. The majority of
participants ranked all of these uses to be important or very important, with only a few participants regarding any of these uses as not important in the classroom. Although the majority considered these all of the listed practices to be important, all but one use (the use of translanguaging to build bonds with students) were not very popular among the teachers who participated in this survey. Some teachers were able to provide explanation for why they did not use certain practices in the classroom through their open-ended responses.

The literature examined in Chapter 2 provides support for the uses of translanguaging that were listed in the Likert items on the survey; the research in the existing studies on translanguaging, however, was carried out primarily in an EFL context.

The similarities in attitudes, yet differences in practice between teachers in an EFL context and those who responded to this survey indicate a need for further research into why there exists a difference between theory (what the teachers attitudes and beliefs regarding translanguaging are) and practice (how and when they choose to implement it) regarding translanguaging in the ESL classroom. See section 5.2 for detailed information regarding the divide between theory and practice. While information may have been collected through previous research in

5.1.2 Research Question 1(B): What are teachers’ attitudes towards use of the students’ L1 by the students?

The results from the survey indicate that the majority of teachers believe that the students’ use of their native languages (for the purposes listed in the survey questions) is important. Although some uses were considered less important (such as the use of students’ native language to ask permission), the majority of participants found all of the
uses listed to be important uses of the students’ native language in the classroom. Despite this, the majority of teachers did not practice these uses frequently in their classroom, but still communicated that they valued the practices; some teachers provided justification for why they personally did not use certain practices in their classroom, even though they held them to be important. The only practice which was supported and implemented or observed in the classroom was the use of the students’ native language to provide assistance to peers during activities; this use was found to be an important practice in McMillan and Rivers (2011), and was shown to be popular among the teachers who participated in this survey as well.

5.1.3 Research Question 1(C): What are teachers’ perceived benefits of using the student’s L1 in the classroom?

Certain perceived benefits to using the student’s native language in the classroom were communicated using both the Likert scale question and also the open-ended responses. One of the perceived benefits that teachers communicated included allowing students to access content or class material that they know in their native language through using their native language to discuss content and activities (Ahmad, 2009; Gregio & Gil, 2007; McMillan & Rivers, 2011; Qian, Tian, & Wang, 2009; Reyes, 2012). Reyes, in particular, asserts that this allows students to keep up with subject material for their grade level despite low proficiency in the language of instruction. Teachers used the open-ended response box to express their support of this use of translanguaging. One participant stated, “I think it is useful to help students whose L2 proficiency is very low but who can understand and work with grade level material in the L1. Use of L1 allows some students to
keep up in content area classes it also can aid in L2 acquisition especially with lower proficiency students.” This response provides insight as to why teachers believe that translanguaging for this purpose is important.

Other benefits named by participants included providing clarification; using the native language for this purpose has been shown to increase comprehension of the topic or material being taught in class (Qian, Tian, & Wang, 2009). One participant stated in his/her response to the open-ended question, “I believe it is helpful when clarifying a concept and I have allowed students to use their L1 to help other students with more limited [English] skills.” This shows not only the importance of the teacher using students’ native language in the classroom, but also illustrates how student use of the L1 can be beneficial to their comprehension and that of other students.

Greggio and Gil (2007) discussed translating for other low-proficiency students as a possible benefit of using translanguaging in the classroom. Although it was not further explored in many other studies, numerous participants shared that a benefit of using translanguaging is that students can assist other lower-proficiency students in class. One participant even stated that they occasionally allow students to submit written assignments in their native language, and will enlist help from another student or translator to decipher it, as he/she is not fluent in her students’ native language. This can also help by encouraging participation by low-proficiency students, which is one attitude that is supported by findings in McMillan and Rivers (2011).

In addition to the aforementioned benefits, the use of translanguaging also assists teachers by providing opportunities to bond with students and their families. McMillan and Rivers (2011) presented results that indicated that teachers found the use of the native
language beneficial for bonding. The responses to this survey support that belief and indicate that it is shared by the participants of this study; one participant shared that the bonding opportunities are not limited to student-student bonding or teacher-student bonding, but that it presents the opportunity for teachers to bond with the families of students through conferences and casual visits.

Overall, this study found that the teachers valued all of the uses of translanguaging listed in the Likert scales, and several teachers elaborated on why those particular uses may be beneficial. Although this sample size cannot be extrapolated to represent the entire ESL teacher population of Iowa, it is important to acknowledge the benefits that they associate with the practice of translanguaging.

5.1.4 Research Question 1(D): What uses of the students’ L1 in in the classroom do teachers believe to be detrimental?

The primary concern that the participants of this study voiced regarding detrimental effects of the use of students’ native language in the classroom was that it keeps them from practicing and accessing the target language. While several teachers supported the use of translanguaging in the classroom and marked its uses as important, many cautioned in their open-ended answer that relying too much on the students’ native language can enable rather than support students in their effort to achieve English proficiency. While seven teachers expressed concern regarding this drawback to using translanguaging, all of those participants also expressed that they found the practice beneficial, provided that it does not interfere with or take away from time spent practicing the target language. This was a finding that is congruent with McMillan and Rivers (2011);
several participants of that study who found a disadvantage of translanguaging to be the distraction that it allows from the target language.

Another concern from a dual language context was that students should remain in the language of instruction rather than use translanguaging during the English portion of their school day. One teacher believed that the uses of translanguaging listed in the questions were valid and important uses, but stood by their decision not to use it in the classroom, as they provide instruction for the English half of a dual-language school day. He/she stated that it is important for the students to have that half of the school day exposed to as much English as possible. While some other teachers shared this idea, the main concern still remained that the use of the native language would not provide enough practice in English for the students. This was not a concern that was expressed in the existing literature, but seeing as this would not be a concern in the EFL context, it is understandable that this concern would be unique to this context.

Although some of the participants expressed concerns that paralleled results from existing studies, namely McMillan and Rivers (2011), regarding when translanguaging could be detrimental, the majority of the seventeen open-ended responses were positive in nature, and described the teachers’ attitudes towards translanguaging to be positive.

5.1.5 Research Question 2(A): When is it important for students to be able to use their L1 in the classroom?

The uses found to be most important by the teachers (both using the Likert question responses and the open-ended answers) were to provide assistance to peers during activities, to explain problems not related to content, to translate for a lower proficiency
student, and to enable participation by lower proficiency students; for each of these uses, there was only one participant (the outlier participant) who marked these uses as not important. Although these were the only uses that had close to unanimous views of important, it should be noted that the majority of participants found all of the uses, not just the aforementioned, to be important or very important. These other uses are to discuss content or activities in small groups, to brainstorm during class activities, to respond to a teacher’s question, and to ask permission. It should also be noted that to ask permission was the use designated “not important” by the largest number of participants in comparison to the other uses listed. However, even in this case, the majority of the participants found this to be an important use of students’ native language in the classroom.

5.1.6 Research Question 2(B): When is it important for teachers to be able to use the students’ L1 in the classroom?

The use that was found most important by participants in this study was to describe vocabulary; only one participant (the study’s outlier) believed that this use of the students’ native language was “not important.” This reflects the overwhelming support in existing literature regarding the use of translanguaging for teaching or describing vocabulary (e.g. Ahmad, 2009; Greggio & Gil, 2007; McMillan & Rivers, 2011; Tian & Macaro, 2012). Apart from the use of translanguaging to describe vocabulary, the majority of participants found the remaining uses listed on the Likert question to be important uses of the students’ native language by the teacher, but some uses were more popular than others. Other than to describe vocabulary, most of the participants (with the exception of two participants for
each item, one of them being the outlier) found it important to be able to use their students’ native language to explain concepts, to give feedback to students, and to help low proficiency students. Only three participants found it not important to use the students’ native language to give directions; this does not reflect current support from EFL literature regarding its benefits (e.g. Greggio & Gil, 2007; McMillan & Rivers, 2011). Another use that was valued among teachers was to praise students, as discussed by Qian, Tian, and Wang (2009). It was also found that to build bonds with students was an important use of translanguaging, in addition to quickly clarifying during activities (e.g. Greggio & Gil, 2007; McMillan & Rivers, 2011). The least popular of these options was the use of the students’ native language for classroom management purposes; although five of the 18 participants who responded to that question found it to be “not important,” it should be noted that the majority of the participants still found this to be an important use of the students native language by the teacher, aligning their beliefs with the ideas supported by Ahmad (2009). Overall, all of the uses were found to be important by the majority of the participants. Although the participants’ attitudes towards all uses of the students’ native language by the teacher (as listed on the Likert items) were positive, all but one use were not practiced by the majority of the participating teachers in their classrooms. The survey questions in this study were therefore designed to target both the attitudes that the teachers had (their theories about the importance of translanguaging) and their frequency of practice, and to explore the matches and mismatches to raise further questions. The presence of a mismatch indicates a need for further research into the use of translanguaging as a social practice and the match/mismatch between teachers’ beliefs and practices.
5.2 Limitations

The first limitation that should be mentioned regarding this study is the number of respondents, suggesting that the findings should be interpreted with caution. The participants included teachers from various locations throughout the state of Iowa, but with only 19 responses, it is not possible to make generalizations regarding practices and attitudes of translanguaging on a large scale. The results from the study are meant to report the attitudes and practices of these teachers; in order to make assumptions or inferences regarding the practices and attitudes of all Iowa teachers, it would be necessary to collect more responses from more teachers throughout the state, rather than rely on the responses from the teachers who responded to this survey. The teachers who responded to this survey were doing so on an entirely voluntary basis, and it is likely that they were teachers who had an interest or opinion regarding translanguaging in the classroom. To gather a broader range of data, it would be optimal to be able to administer this survey to all teachers throughout the state on a mandatory basis.

Low participation could be addressed in a variety of ways; for example, more participants could be reached by recruiting participants in-person, with the approval of the principals at each of the schools that fit participant requirements. In addition, the time frame for participant recruitment is important, and recruiting at a time in the school year that is more convenient for teachers could yield more participants. Participant recruitment for this study took place towards the end of the school year (due to pending approval from the Institutional Review Board), which tends to be a busy and demanding time for school teachers, as they are wrapping up the school year and have many other duties and requirements to meet from their schools and districts. Recruiting participants towards the
middle of the school year or at a time when teachers are facing fewer responsibilities in addition to their teaching could possibly result in a higher response rate.

In addition to recruiting more participants, it is important to recruit a diverse group of participants. One further limitation of this study is that the vast majority of the participants in this study identified as native speakers of English. This could present issues, as teachers who did not have a language barrier in their early stages of education may hold different attitudes towards translanguaging practices and the need for translanguaging in the classroom. Teachers who were English language learners themselves may bring a different viewpoint to the discussion of the benefits or detriments of translanguaging in the classroom. This limitation could be circumvented in further research by deliberately recruiting participants who are native speakers of English and of other languages as well.

Along with the aforementioned limitations, it should be noted that one limitation of using only a survey method is that participants may provide ambiguous or incomplete answers. This could be remedied in future studies by including an interview portion along with the survey; this would give the investigator an opportunity to rephrase or explain an item better if the participant did not understand it, or to bring up a question that the participant may have unintentionally overlooked. Additionally, the investigator or interviewer may probe for a deeper answer if the one the participant provided was incomplete or did not address the intended point (Babbie, 1990). Although surveys alone can guarantee anonymity and address time limitations, they can lead to incomplete and wrongly interpreted responses. In the current study, findings that could be wrongly interpreted were presented with caution; future studies should consider follow-up interviews to alleviate this possibility more.
An additional possible limitation is that it is unclear whether the participants in this study were specifically ESL teachers or teachers of a subject class with a high number of English language learner students. Future studies can address this limitation and account for it by adding a question (or discussion item in an interview) to verify which type of teacher each participant is. Although it was not specified for the participants in this study, each of the participants had a high number of English language learners in their classes, regardless of whether it was a class specifically for ESL or a content/subject class for all students, some of whom are ELLs. It is important to collect data that will allow researchers to distinguish between these two groups of teachers in the future, however, to examine whether there is a theory/practice difference between mainstream or main subject teachers and ESL teachers regarding the use of translanguaging.

5.3 Implications

5.3.1 For research

Implications from this study for researchers are that there exists a gap in current research regarding translanguaging in an English as a Second Language context. The results from this study show that the participants (though they are only a small group of the teachers in Iowa) are aware of translanguaging as a practice in the classroom and feel that it is important. This leaves room for further research into the practices that are believed to be important by teachers in general, and the current practices that exist in classrooms, not just in Iowa, but in ESL classrooms across the country. The current study suggests that translanguaging is viewed as important throughout schools, but due to the small number of participants, these results cannot be used to make generalizations regarding ESL teachers
as a group. As such, it leaves a gap for future researchers to pursue and investigate. This theory/practice mismatch warrants further investigation to examine whether they occur throughout the entire population of teachers, and if so, its cause should also be discerned.

Further surveys and interviews could provide insight as to whether teachers feel the need to comply with regulations from administrators regarding an English-only policy, and to learn whether that is what is causing the divide between theory and practice in these classrooms. The agreement or disagreement with school policies can be a political minefield. Teachers may be avoiding implementing practices that they value in order not to go against policies that are in practice at the school, district, state, or national levels; further studies should aim to assess whether that has a hand in causing the theory/practice divide that was witnessed in this study. While a survey was a good method, a study such as the current one uncovers limitations to depending solely on this method. Between unclear answers and errors in self-reporting, additional methods should be considered to supplement or clarify responses to a survey. To supplement incomplete answers, interviews can be used, as they provide the interviewer/investigator an opportunity to further probe for the answer to the question, or for additional information that would be important in ascertaining the participants’ attitudes or practices regarding translanguaging. In order to address the possible cause of teachers mistakenly self-reporting their use of these practices as lower than they actually are, observations could take place to verify the actual use of these practices in the classroom; as Egbert et al. (2002) states, “…there is always the potential for error in recall” (p. 121). Whether the teacher does not realize that he/she is using the practice, or if the teacher does not understand that actions in the classroom could be considered translanguaging, an observer
who is educated in the field may be able to provide a more accurate measurement of the use of these practices in the classroom.

5.3.2 For practice

This study has implications in teacher education. There appears to be an inconsistency between the attitudes towards, and practices of, translanguaging in the classrooms of the teachers who participated in this study. Though the majority of participants find these practices to be important or very important, many of the practices are not used frequently in their classrooms. This could be a result of one of a multitude of causes. Unfamiliarity with the subject of translanguaging could make teachers hesitant to implement its practice in their classroom, pressure from school or district rules could discourage teachers from using students’ native languages, or perhaps teachers might be unaware of the benefits of translanguaging altogether; it is also possible that teachers simply may not realize how often they use these practices, and could be implementing them in their classroom without being cognizant of it. However, from this current study, it is not possible to make assumptions.

One participant stated, “I think that there are a lot of misconceptions about language acquisition, and I hope that future teachers have better undergraduate instruction in this area.” He/she found translanguaging to be important, but did not always practice each of the uses in his/her classroom. Teacher education should be increased to provide more insight into how to use these practices in the classroom, or to help inform teachers of possible ways to help students use their native language in the classroom to gain English
proficiency, even if the teacher does not have a notable proficiency in the students’ native language.

Further implications for teaching and pedagogy from this study include that future research could prompt teachers to discover new ways to implement translanguaging into classrooms. Translanguaging was found to be important among the participants in this study, but it is not frequently practiced by all of the participants, even among those who marked it as important. A change in the practices that are viewed as acceptable and valuable could allow these participants, and other teachers who hold the same view, to begin using translanguaging in their classrooms to help their students build their language proficiency with support from their native language, when acceptable. As Creese and Blackledge (2010) stated, pedagogy can be adapted to allow or even emphasize the overlap in the languages, rather than forcibly separate the native language from the target language as in the monolingual-oriented methods that Cummins warns against.

5.4 Concluding Remarks

Though this is a limited study on teachers’ attitudes towards and practices of translanguaging in the classroom, it suggests that there are teachers who hold this practice to be important in English language acquisition. There exists a great gap in research revolving around this practice in an English as a Second Language classroom; the results here show that there is a need for continued research. The use of translanguaging has been documented in an English as a Foreign Language context, but there is very little research done on its use in the ESL classroom. With the growing population of non-native speakers in schools throughout the US, it is imperative to consider the importance of students’ native
language as a resource available to students and prepare teachers to use that as they help their students gain proficiency in English.

As Garcia and Flores stated in their article, “...translanguaging, if properly understood and suitably applied in schools, can in fact enhance cognitive, language, and literacy abilities” (Garcia & Flores, 2014, p.155). While translanguaging appears to be an extremely valuable practice, it needs to be examined why practices that are viewed as important are not being implemented in classrooms; in order to facilitate and explore this, there is a need for further research in the field so that English language learners may begin to benefit from what translanguaging has to offer them.
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Appendix A: LETTER TO PRINCIPALS

Dear ________________,

My name is Kavitha Nambisan and I am a Masters student in the Teaching English as a Second Language/ Applied Linguistics program at Iowa State University. I am currently conducting a study for my thesis on the topic of translinguaging use (a practice in which educators allow the mixing of languages in educational settings) in Iowa dual language programs and mainstream schools. The study aims to provide more information about translinguaging in an ESL context, as opposed to the EFL context in which it has been more frequently examined.

I would greatly appreciate the opportunity to gain insight of the attitudes held by teachers at your school towards the use of translinguaging in the classroom, and hope that you will be willing to send a short message containing the link to the survey to teachers at your school. If they agree to participate, their involvement would only be a 10-15 minute (or shorter) block of time.

If you have any questions about the study, please feel free to contact me via e-mail at kavi@iastate.edu; you can also reach Tammy Slater, my major professor who is overseeing my thesis project, at tslater@iastate.edu. I greatly appreciate your consideration in this matter, and thank you for your time.

Sincerely,

Kavitha Nambisan
Appendix B: LETTER TO PARTICIPANTS

Re: Requesting participation in short survey for teachers

My name is Kavitha Nambisan and I am a Masters student in the Teaching English as a Second Language/ Applied Linguistics program at Iowa State University. I am currently conducting a study for my thesis on the topic of translanguaging use (a practice in which educators allow the mixing of languages in educational settings) in Iowa dual language programs and mainstream schools. The study aims to provide more information about translanguaging in an ESL context, as opposed to the EFL context in which it has been more frequently examined.

This short survey should take between ten to fifteen minutes of your time, and does not request nor require any follow-up actions on your part. The responses will be anonymous, and the data collected will be used to gauge teacher attitudes towards the use of translanguaging in schools. This survey does not intend to evaluate your performance as a teacher, nor your adherence to educational standards. As compensation for your time, you will have the option of entering into a drawing for one of three $25 Amazon gift cards.

If you would like any more information about the survey prior to deciding whether or not to participate, please feel free to contact me via e-mail at kavi@iastate.edu ; you can also reach Tammy Slater, my major professor who is overseeing my thesis project, at tlsater@iastate.edu . I greatly appreciate your consideration in this matter, and invite you to take the survey by clicking the link below. Thank you very much for your time and input.

Thank you,

Kavitha Nambisan
Appendix C: SURVEY

The following images are screenshots of the online survey questions as they were displayed to participants. Each question was displayed on a separate page, and participants were unable to navigate backwards to view or edit previous questions. The double arrow button allowed participants to proceed from one page to the following one. The questions are displayed below in the order in which they were displayed on the survey.

Question 1

How long have you been teaching (years)?

Question 2

What is your native language?

- English
- Spanish
- Other (please specify)
Question 3

Please rate your proficiency in Spanish on the following 4-point scale.

- 1: I only know a few basic words and phrases.
- 2: I am able to have limited conversation on everyday topics.
- 3: I am able to discuss a variety of topics without too much trouble.
- 4: I have no problem communicating with native-speakers on a wide range of topics.

Question 4

Do you work in a bilingual/dual language school, or a mainstream (English-speaking) school?

- Bilingual/Dual Language school
- Mainstream school

Question 5

How many total students do you teach in a day?
Question 6

How many of your students are native Spanish speakers?

Question 7

What is the primary language of instruction in your class?

- English
- Spanish
- Both English and Spanish
- Other (please specify)

Question 8

Do you believe the use of the students' native language is beneficial in the English language classroom?

- Yes
- No
### Question 9

How often do you observe or encourage use of students’ native language in the classroom for the following purposes?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Not often</th>
<th>Somewhat often</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Very often</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To discuss content or activities in small groups</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To provide assistance to peers during activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To brainstorm during class activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To explain problems not related to content</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To enable participation by lower proficiency students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To respond to teachers question</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To ask permission</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please specify)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Question 10

How important do you believe it is for students to use their native language in the classroom within the following contexts?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Not important</th>
<th>Important</th>
<th>Very important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To discuss content or activities in small groups</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To provide assistance to peers during activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To brainstorm during class activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To explain problems not related to content</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To translate for a lower proficiency student</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To enable participation by lower proficiency students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To respond to teacher’s question</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To ask permission</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please specify)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Other (please specify)                                                 |               |           |                |
**Question 11**

How often do you use students’ native language in the classroom for the following situations?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Not often</th>
<th>Somewhat often</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Very often</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To explain concepts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To describe vocabulary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To give directions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For classroom management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To give feedback to students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To praise students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To build bonds with students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To quickly clarify during activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To help low proficiency students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please specify)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question 12**

How important is it for teachers to use their students’ native language in the following situations?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Not important</th>
<th>Important</th>
<th>Very important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To explain concepts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To describe vocabulary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To give directions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For classroom management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To give feedback to students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To praise students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To build bonds with students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To quickly clarify during activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To help low proficiency students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please specify)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Question 13

In your own words, please describe in which situations using the students’ native language is beneficial, and in which situations is it detrimental?

Question 14

Is there any additional information that you would like to share about your perception or use (either by the teacher or by the student) of the use of students’ native language in the classroom?