The Potential of Translanguaging for English Language Teaching in Thailand

Phakhawadee Chaisiri
Khon Kaen University, Thailand
Corresponding author's email: phakha@kku.ac.th
Received July 7, 2022; revised October 30, 2022;
Accepted October 30, 2022; online December 14, 2022

Abstract

Since the early 2000s, translanguaging has received considerable attention, especially in bilingual and multilingual countries where several official languages and some minority languages are used. Despite its growing interest across the globe, the practice of translanguaging has rarely been explored in Thailand. Accordingly, this article offers an overview of the concept of translanguaging and related studies from the field of English language teaching (ELT). Two different views of language learning will be discussed, as well as background information about the conceptualization of translanguaging and how it is featured in ELT. The analysis is based on recent studies of translanguaging in the contexts of English as a second language and English as a foreign language, which have been conducted with different research designs and various analytical frameworks from three educational levels: primary, secondary, and higher education. My discussion points out a need for both a systematic investigation of translanguaging in the Thai context and a promotion of the professional development of teachers to guide ELT practitioners and educators toward the usefulness of this additional pedagogical tool. I conclude by highlighting the importance of an optimal English learning environment that is suitable for our current dynamic era, in which policymakers are aware of the potential of translanguaging for English teaching in Thailand.

Keywords: English language classroom, first language, linguistic repertoire, multilingualism, translanguaging

One of the most controversial issues in the field of English language teaching (ELT) has been the use of the learner's first language in the English as a second/foreign language (ESL/EFL) classroom. Traditionally, a clear distinction between the first language (L1) and the second language (L2) had been valued. In the early years of second language acquisition (SLA) research, exposure to the L2 was promoted as being on par with L1 acquisition. Therefore, it was thought that L2 learners should be exposed to large amounts of L2 input (Krashen, 1985) and produce as much L2 output as possible (Swain, 1985). This monolingual approach emphasized the sole use of a L2 in the classroom and reinforced the discouragement of a L1 as it could prevent learners improving their L2 skills (Macaro, 2005; Phillipson, 1992). However, it should be noted that L2 learners are in the process of becoming "emergent bilinguals", or learners who are acquiring a new language while continuing to function in their L1 (García et al., 2008). In this sense, Cenoz and Gorter (2022) argue that "It is not justified that multilingual speakers should aim to behave as if they were monolingual speakers," (p. 2). Thus, the monolingual principle has been challenged.

The concept of translanguaging, which emphasizes the use of a learner's full linguistic repertoire as one integrated system, is poised to be embraced in the 21st century, where linguistic reality is dynamic and complex (García, 2009; Li, 2018). Moreover, globalization has heightened the need for increased critical attention to multilingualism and translanguaging approaches in education. This worldwide integration has contributed to the proliferation of English as a lingua franca (ELF), which is defined as the use of English as a communication tool among people who do not share the same L1 (Jenkins et al., 2011), resulting in new varieties of English. This advancement has also propelled the internationalization of higher education, where English-Medium Instruction (EMI) is foregrounded (Rose & Galloway, 2019). In Thailand and other countries, the issues of promoting ELF instead of Standard English and applying translanguaging pedagogy rather than English-only policy in EMI courses remains controversial. Systematic investigation is required to better understand the underlying linguistic ideologies within the language policies (Ra & Baker, 2021).

In the past few years, there has been extensive research on translanguaging in many parts of the world, originating in Europe (e.g., Cenoz & Santos, 2020; Cots et al., 2022) and spreading to America (e.g., DeNicolo, 2019; Prada, 2019) and onwards to Africa (e.g., Kwihangana, 2021; Omidire & Ayob, 2022), Asia (e.g., Margana & Rasman, 2021; Rajendram, 2021), and Australia (e.g., Dryden et al., 2021; Oliver et al., 2021). Most ELT practitioners have similarly interpreted and adopted the translanguaging approach as a scaffolding strategy for academic purposes with the goal of best facilitating the construction of knowledge for the learners. For example, enabling learners to understand difficult concepts (Zhang & Wei, 2021), engaging learners in the lessons (Kwihangana, 2021), and motivating them to use the target language (Yuzlu & Dikilitas, 2021).

Some ELT scholars have specifically applied translanguaging in their lessons to create a "translanguaging space" where learners' creativity and criticality are welcomed (Li, 2011; Pun et al., 2022). This transformative power brings about knowledge gains in class, improved sociocritical literacy, and the establishment of new identities. To illustrate, after engaging in the practice of translanguaging in class, some students' level of self-respect increases (Omidire & Ayob, 2022), while some learners were able to assert their cultural identities (Rajendram's, 2021). Despite the potential of translanguaging in learning development and promising outcomes for the identities of emerging bilinguals, existing literature has reported constraints in implementing this approach due to the monolingual orthodoxy (Fang & Liu, 2020; Rajendram, 2021) and insufficient teacher training (Omidire & Ayob, 2022).

To date, there have been only three empirical studies concerning translanguaging practice conducted in Thailand (Kampittayakul, 2018; Khojan, 2022; Liu, 2021). It seems likely that the concept of translanguaging has yet to be examined in practice in Thailand because of several reasons.

The first one could be related to a misleading perception of Thailand as a monolingual country. In fact, Thailand, contrary to popular belief, does not have a single language and is not a monolingual country. The linguistic landscape of Thailand is not homogenous since other languages, apart from standard Thai, such as Chinese, Lao, Khmer and

Malay, are spoken among minority groups (Darasawang & Watson Todd, 2012; Kosonen & Person, 2014). About 40 percent of Thais speak the standard Thai as their L1, while the majority use regional dialects to communicate (Kosonen & Person, 2014).

Second, some might think that Thai EFL learners are not considered bilinguals. Yet, there has been a call to change the perspective on EFL contexts to be bilingual contexts in order to build up a positive sense of growth in language and identity (Turnbull, 2016). This reframing views EFL learners as emerging bilinguals who are developing new language elements within their unitary linguistic repertoires (Turnbull, 2016) and EFL teachers as bilinguals rather than non-native speakers of English (Grosjean, 2013). Since bilingual education is defined as the use of two languages in educational settings with a purpose of developing both languages, Turnbull (2016) argues that EFL contexts should also be included. In this way, both EFL learners and teachers can embrace this renewed sense of agency and the valuable connotations associated with bilingualism.

Third, there might be a misconception taking place, whereby translanguaging is viewed to be the same as code-switching, which it is not. Instead of viewing languages as separate linguistic systems to be switched on and off from an outsider's point of view, translanguaging is an insider's viewpoint concerned with making meaning while utilizing a full linguistic repertoire (Otheguy et al., 2015). In education, translanguaging is perceived as an authentic practice rather than a deviant form of L1 and L2 usage (Anderson, 2018). In addition, translanguaging is considered to be a useful strategy for bilingual learners to make sense of their environment (García, 2009).

On account of the potential for translanguaging's use in ELT, combined with its scant coverage in the Thai context within the existing literature, this article intends to address the background of translanguaging and its developing role in ELT. It also aims to identify areas where empirical research is lacking and provide a clearer view of how translanguaging can enhance English learning in this dynamic age. To give a clear overview, different views of language learning are discussed first, followed by the conceptualization of translanguaging and how this approach figures into in ELT. Finally, the conclusion will suggest

guidelines for the successful implementation of translanguaging in ELT with particular regard to increasing the professional development of English teachers in Thailand.

Views of Language Learning

One main line of inquiry involving the transformative power of translanguaging is related to the differences between code-switching and translanguaging (Lin et al., 2020). Due to their similarity, which concerns the use of linguistic resources of the bilingual or multilingual speaker, it might be confusing to see the differences between these two key terms (Goodman & Tastanbek, 2021). Therefore, it is important to first discuss how these two concepts are distinct from each other in terms of ontologies that underpin views of language learning.

Lin (2020) has construed two different views of language learning, namely a bounded code view and a languaging view. On the one hand, learning languages has traditionally been seen as "bounded autonomous structures in compartmentalized spaces" (Lin, 2020, p. vii) in which the first language (L1), second language (L2) and/or third language (L3) are completely separate and never mixed. This view is claimed to be an idealist, structuralist, substance-based ontology and is called "a bounded code view of language learning". On the other hand, the translanguaging lens takes the dynamic process of languaging, or the focus on meaning-making into account. Lin (2020) points out that this is a new materiality and process-based ontology and named it "a languaging view of language learning" (p. vii), which is emergent, dynamic, fluid, multiplying, and expanding. It is also embodied, non-hierarchical, and heterogeneous. More importantly, its focus is on sensemaking by mixing language features and shifting styles.

From these two different ontologies of language learning, code-switching rightly fits into the bounded code view. The focus is on the ability of a speaker to switch from one language to another, which are both believed to exist separately in their own language systems, while communicating. In the early years of code-switching research, scholars looked at this practice through a diglossic framework (e.g., Akere, 1980; Sgall et al.,1992). Diglossia was defined as a situation where "two varieties of a language exist side by side throughout the

community, with each having a definite role to play" (Ferguson, 1959, p. 325). Emphasis on the separation of language varieties created a certain boundary between languages. After all, this view has been critiqued as not diglossic but rather monoglossic since languages are seen to be separate entities and should be used separately (García, 2009b).

In Thailand, previous studies reveal that code-switching is used among ELT teachers in EFL classrooms to facilitate learning and teaching. From these studies, two main functions of code-switching can be identified. First, the pedagogical functions of code-switching are to ask questions, to introduce new vocabulary or technical terms, to clarify difficult concepts, and to emphasize important content (Domalewska, 2017; Kongbang & Crabtree, 2020). Second, the social functions include directing and reminding learners of behavior expectations in class, generating humor, and creating a relaxing and comfortable learning environment (Promnath & Tayjasanant, 2016; Sittattrakul & Laovoravit, 2018). Noticeably, the analysis of these studies was from the bounded code view or the product of two named languages (Thai and English) used in classes either from the actual discourse (e.g., Promnath & Tayjasanant, 2016) or from the participants' attitudes (e.g., Sittattrakul & Laovoravit, 2018).

In contrast to code-switching, translanguaging as a languaging view rejects the separation of and boundaries among languages. It applies the heteroglossic ideology which encourages diverse linguistics and a multifaceted view of language. According to García and Li (2014), translanguaging is "an approach to the use of language … not as two autonomous language systems as has been traditionally the case, but as one linguistic repertoire with features that have been societally constructed as belonging to two separate languages" (p. 2). Instead of turning one language off and another language on, translanguaging uses all semiotic resources including multimodality to communicate (Li, 2018). From this perspective, translanguaging has represented a paradigmatic shift in conceptualizing language systems and practices.

Furthermore, Li (2016) points out that "translanguaging is not some fancy post-modernist term to replace terms such as code-switching or language crossing to refer to multilingual behaviour" (p. 7) as their structures are different. García (2009) highlights that translanguaging

is a practice that goes beyond code-switching. This means that it does not go between linguistic systems; instead, it transcends them. Simply put, translanguaging is a transformative practice that focuses on meaning-making through the orchestration of languages and their varieties, along with other semiotic, cognitive, and multimodal resources (García, 2009).

Indeed, the aim of translanguaging is to address the complex linguistic realities of the 21st century (Li, 2018). To support this claim, Li (2018) provides some examples of a language practice called *New Chinglish*, whereby the creation of new words and expressions by Chinese users of English such as "Chinsumer = a mesh [*sic*] of 'Chinese consumer', usually referring to Chinese tourists buying large quantities of luxury goods overseas" (p. 12) and "You ask me, me ask who?, meaning 'Don't look at me. I have no idea.'" (p. 13). These examples look like English but the non-Chinese users of English need to have some sociocultural background to understand them. This is a characteristic that code-switching cannot explain.

In the Thai context, linguistic variations of Thais' use of English are called *Thai English* (Bennui, 2017). One emerging characteristic that is related to translanguaging is a combination of English words to create a new meaning (Trakulkasemsuk, 2012). To illustrate, the term "hi-so" is a blend of "high" and "society" and is used to refer to upper-class people or high-class goods (Bradshaw, n.d.). Some common English phrases transferred by Thai people that might cause confusion to English speakers who do not have any sociocultural background in Thai society are phrases such as "Have you eaten rice yet?" and "Where are you going?". These phrases are used as greetings and can be interpreted as "How are you?" (Trakulkasemsuk, 2012). These examples show how translanguaging is in fact different from code-switching and how it is widely practiced in Thailand.

Up to now, there have been a few review articles on translanguaging in ELT in Thailand. While translanguaging is proposed as a pedagogical tool to promote learners' classroom interactional competence (Kampittayakul, 2017), it is also suggested as a learning strategy in Thai EFL classrooms (Chukwuemeka & Ambele, 2022). Regarding empirical evidence, to my knowledge, only three research

studies have been conducted in Thai educational settings (Kampittayakul, 2018; Khojan, 2022; Liu, 2021). This existing literature shows that translanguaging was found to be useful for EFL classrooms in the Thai context as it fosters students' interactional competence (Kampittayakul, 2018), leverages the emergent bilingual learners' languages (Liu, 2021), and assists students in learning and enhancing classroom participation (Khojan, 2022). Although these studies collected data either from actual classroom discourse (Kampittayakul, 2018) or from the participants' perceptions (Khojan, 2022; Liu, 2021)—like previous studies of code-switching conducted in Thailand—their analyses emphasized the process of language development as a unitary language repertoire rather than the product of two different languages. This existing translanguaging research takes the languaging view of language learning into account.

Conceptualization of Translanguaging

To understand translanguaging in education, Bonacina-Pugh et al. (2021) have conceptualized two approaches: fixed and fluid. First, the fixed approach is related to the emergence of translanguaging in bilingual education as it originally appeared in Wales. Both Welsh and English were valued and purposefully alternated in the classroom setting to develop receptive and productive skills of learners' both languages (Williams, 1994). Baker (2011) defines this approach as "the process of making meaning, shaping experiences, gaining understanding and knowledge through the use of two languages," (p. 288). Simply put, the word "fixed" specifically focuses on only two languages that have been systematically planned for and are practiced by bilingual learners in educational settings. Second, the fluid approach of translanguaging was developed to be applied with more than two specific languages and beyond classroom contexts. This transition was noticed by García (2009) who views translanguaging as "the act performed by bilinguals of accessing different linguistic features or various modes of what are described as autonomous languages, in order to maximize communicative potential," (p. 140). García (2009) emphasizes the purpose of translanguaging as languages used in daily local practices

instead of only two specific languages planned to be used in bilingual educational settings.

This fluid and dynamic approach to translanguaging has transformed the fixed pedagogical practice by drawing on a practical theory of language that is influenced by the input of post-modernism and post-structuralism in sociolinguistics (Li, 2018). The result of which has gained currency in both educational and non-educational settings around the globe (e.g., Canagarajah, 2011; García & Li, 2014; Li, 2018). The focus is on *languaging*, which is seen as a progressive process of making meaning in dynamic and complex situations that is transcending or going beyond, not just filling in between languages (Li, 2018). This approach emphasizes the importance of using all semiotic signs in one's linguistic repertoire to make meaning, and it highlights that languages are not separate but interconnected in one's mind. This fluid approach refers to both complex discursive practices of bilinguals/ multilinguals in general and a pedagogical approach that views those complex linguistic practices as a resource for learning.

Li (2018) further proposes translanguaging as a pedagogical philosophy and approach that goes against the monolingual principle and policy in both teaching and learning. As all languages matter in knowledge construction, translanguaging can transform the way scholars conceptualize languages and human communication, as well as encourage educators to rethink language pedagogy. Translanguaging not only provides an alternative approach to the analysis of language practices, but it can also be perceived as a fundamental reconstitution of language status ideology and authority, as well as inclusivity in the power of learning (Li, 2018).

Regarding ELT in Thailand, previously published studies have been carried out on Thai language use in English classrooms in terms of the role of L1, code-switching, and more recently translanguaging. Research on the role of the Thai language in English classrooms has examined students and teachers' perceptions toward its use in English lectures (e.g., Thongwichit & Buripakdi, 2014; Wangdi & Shimray, 2022), identified purposes of L1 use (e.g., Limtrairat & Aksornjarung, 2015; Thongwichit, 2013), and investigated acceptable practices and appropriate

conditions in applying L1 in a language class (e.g., Nilubol, 2020; Wongrak, 2017).

Existing literature related to code-switching in the Thai context also includes similar kinds of studies regarding the role of L1. Most code-switching researchers in Thailand have investigated types, functions, and frequency of code-switching used in English lessons (e.g., Domalewska, 2017; Kongbang & Crabtree, 2020), as well as attitudes of teachers and students toward its usage in English classes (e.g., Promnath & Tayjasanant, 2016; Sittattrakul & Laovoravit, 2018). With respect to translanguaging research in Thailand, attention has also been paid to students and teachers' perceptions toward translanguaging in the EFL context (Khojan, 2022; Liu, 2021). Liu (2021) further studied factors that influenced the students' use of translanguaging in class. Interestingly, Kampittayakul (2018) was the only one who carefully analyzed the role of translanguaging as a pedagogical strategy to improve Thai students' interactional competence in an English writing course

As presented, a great amount of focus has been placed on views regarding the role of L1, code-switching, and translanguaging in ELT in Thailand. These studies have also discussed the functions, advantages, and disadvantages of these teaching approaches. Most researchers have concluded that the use of Thai in English lessons is beneficial for language learning, but it should be used judiciously (e.g., Liu, 2021; Promnath & Tayjasanant, 2016; Wangdi & Shimray, 2022). The question is how to know whether and when the use of learners' full linguistic repertoire is appropriate. Moreover, the data analyzed in previous studies were mostly from the spontaneous use of the L1. Accordingly, there seems to be a lack of studies on how teachers can properly apply translanguaging in their curriculums and how to systematically plan translanguaging activities. To direct ELT professionals toward employing translanguaging properly in their pedagogical practice, some translanguaging teaching strategies and goals will be provided in the next section.

Translanguaging in English Language Teaching

According to Sayer (2008), translanguaging has pedagogical value because it is used not only as a part of a linguistic toolkit for teachers for academic content learning, but also to promote the students' pride in their ethnolinguistic identities. It is therefore important to keep this pedagogical value in mind when adopting translanguaging in teaching. To start with, some clear goals of translanguaging practices need to be acknowledged before implementation. To use translanguaging as pedagogy, García and Li (2014) categorize seven goals of translanguaging with some possible strategies to accomplish each goal. In this section, the goals and some clear-cut examples of strategies used in previous studies in the field of ELT will be discussed.

The first goal is to differentiate students' proficiency levels and adapt instruction to different groups of students. A possible strategy to achieve this goal is translation. This strategy was implemented with a group of primary students in South Africa where diversity in cultures and languages is common (Omidire & Ayob, 2022). The passages in English textbooks were translated into the majority of students' L1s, which were isiZulu and Sepedi. Then, the teachers printed the translations and audio recorded the translated passages. In class, the translated hard copies were provided to the students while the translated audio recordings were played during the lesson. The idea of learning the same content presented in multiple languages at the same time was promoted in this context. The results show that this practice created a pleasant learning environment where learners gained a better understanding and increased their self-esteem due to the appreciation of their L1s in the educational setting. Additionally, the Rwandan college participants in Kwihangana's (2021) study used the translation strategy in group activities to explain the tasks to the less-proficient learners. They considered this translation service as an act of generosity as it included their slower learning peers in the activities. The explanation in L1 ensured that students from all levels of English proficiency had the same understanding and could engage in tasks assigned to their groups.

The second goal is to build background knowledge so that learners are able to make meaning of the content taught in class. Some achievable strategies include collaborative dialogue and grouping,

reading multilingual texts, multilingual listening, and the use of visual resources. To reach this goal, Rafi and Morgan (2022) conducted a translanguaging pedagogical intervention with a group of first year undergraduate students in Bangladesh. In a reading for comprehension class, three texts concerning the concept of beauty across cultures were provided. The first reading was in English, focusing on general ideas about beauty. The second text was in Bangla, providing details about the concept of beauty in their local context. The third text was in English and presented the issue of skin color and body shaming in American culture. After each reading was carried out through a translanguaging practice utilizing learners' full linguistic repertoires, the findings show students were more engaged and more likely to advance their development in metalinguistics and metacognition. Apart from applying the multilingual reading texts to achieve this second goal, a teacher in Macau used visual resources by presenting images on a PowerPoint slide to explain the terminology "Chindōgu" to the students (Cai & Fang, 2022). Also, the teacher used the Chinese term "珍道具" in the presentation to facilitate students' understanding. This multimodal communication was found to be useful for students to make meaning of the new term introduced in class.

The third goal is to deepen understanding as well as to develop and extend new knowledge and critical thinking. The strategies to reach this goal include those mentioned earlier as well as inner speech and multilingual writing. A study from Liu et al. (2020) provides a clear example of how to apply translanguaging in an English for Academic Purposes (EAP) course by adopting Lin's (2016) Multimodalities-Entextualization Cycle (MEC) for master's degree graduates at a medical college in China. Through the three MEC stages: (1) creating a rich experiential context, (2) engaging students in reading and note-making, and (3) encouraging students in entextualizing the experience, Liu et al.'s (2020) participants became immersed in a series of translanguaging activities. For example, students studied from a PowerPoint presentation with a picture and a translation of the key concept of synthesis in Chinese. Students could also use a thinking map, which allowed them to make notes in Chinese, English, and through symbols while analyzing the texts before writing up the final assignment in English. Finally, students could read multilingual

texts and then make a comparison of different features in Chinese and English academic writing. These reading and writing tasks not only deepened the students' content and language understanding, but also elicited critical thinking. In addition, the findings demonstrate that the students' metalinguistic awareness was enhanced, which is the fourth goal of translanguaging.

This fourth goal—building of cross-linguistic metalinguistic awareness—is done to strengthen the learners' ability to succeed when encountering communication difficulties in socio-educational situations. Some recommended strategies include word walls, cognates, comparing multilingual texts, multilingual vocabulary/syntax inquiry, and morphology inquiry. As presented earlier, the participants in Liu et al.'s (2020) research improved their metalinguistic awareness through the multilingual reading activity in which they had to read and compare academic articles written in Chinese and English. The students had to find the similarities and differences between Chinese and English academic writing and discuss whether they would follow all of the features of English academic writing. During the lesson, the teacher guided students to discuss the task and encouraged them to think about cultural and linguistic explanations for the differences. The teacher also suggested how to critically evaluate and negotiate with the English norms of academic discourse. Similarly, a teacher, in Zhang and Chan's (2021) study carried out in a trilingual context in China, made a cross-linguistic comparison between the English word (L3) "magazine" and the Uyghur word (L1) "magizin" meaning shop. When the students realized that the words had the same pronunciation but different meanings, the teacher summarized the difference between these two terms in Chinese (L2). This result indicates that this multilingual vocabulary inquiry was an effective strategy to learn and memorize new English vocabulary.

The fifth goal is to encourage cross-linguistic flexibility and to be competent in practicing use of one's full linguistic repertoire. The strategies include alternating languages and media, translating, and translanguaging in both writing and speaking. To illustrate, Kampittayakul (2018) applied translanguaging in speaking during brainstorm sessions in an English writing course with a group of secondary learners in Thailand. In this study, the teacher and students

translanguaged through the practice of six interactional features from the Self-Evaluation Teacher Talk (SETT) framework (Walsh, 2011). These features consist of scaffolding, content-feedback, extended wait time, clarification seeking, referential questions, and minimal response tokens, such as yeah and ah. By allowing learners to discuss their ideas toward the written topic in Thai and English, the findings show that the participants produced more extended turns and minimal response tokens resulting in development of interactional competence. Likewise, the multilingual students in Zhang and Chan's (2021) study were encouraged to use Uyghur (L1) or Chinese (L2) to explain some forms of English (L3) and grammatical rules. The teacher allowed this practice of cross-linguistic flexibility during the content review session to check students' understanding.

The sixth goal is to engage learners in identity investment and positionality. The strategies used to empower positive values within individuals are all mentioned above. In this regard, the Malaysian-Indian learners in Rajendram's (2021) study in Malaysia employed translanguaging practice during collaborative activities to reach this goal. Activities related to culture that allowed learners to interact with each other and applied different functions of translanguaging, such as talking about their personal life and interests (i.e., visiting India), getting or suggesting ideas for tasks from local or popular culture (i.e., Diwali, a Hindu festival), and looking for information in cultural books (i.e., Hindu prayer book) were found to affirm and preserve the students' cultural identity. It was highlighted that despite the English-only policy, the teacher in this study would speak Tamil (L1) or Malay (L2) when referring to Indian or Malaysian culture. Using traditional Tamil proverbs was also a strategy that the teacher applied to convey cultural values and knowledge to the students.

The last goal of translanguaging used in education is to interrogate linguistic inequality and to disrupt hierarchies in languages and social structures. These strategies were all mentioned previously. To raise this point, the teachers in Zhang and Chan's (2021) study welcomed learners' multilingual repertoires as a resource for learning. They used three languages (Uyghur, Chinese, English) in class and invited the students to do so with the aims of deepening understanding, developing

metalinguistic awareness and cross-linguistic flexibility, as well as establishing individual identity and positionality. To reach these goals, the teachers were aware that the three languages were equally used in class. Once, the teacher expected the students to give an example of an imperative sentence in Uyghur with the purpose of contrasting it with the approximate English grammar. The students, however, answered in Chinese. Instead of disapproving the use of Chinese, the teacher challenged the students to think in another language by presenting a Uyghur example. To maintain linguistic equality in the class, this teacher applied a strategy called a "translanguaging cue" (Jones & Lewis, 2014). However, to achieve this last goal of translanguaging, Margana and Rasman (2021) suggest that both teachers and learners should strive to holistically value multilingual resources, individual repertoires, and the elimination of a monoglossic ideology. Otherwise, the practice of translanguaging could threaten the regional or minoritized language. In their study in the Indonesian context, Javanese, a regional dialect used in informal settings with family members, was perceived to be an illegitimate language for use in an English class. The findings show that the teacher and most students preferred to use majoritized languages (English and Indonesian) and believed that the use of Javanese could interfere with the development of English skills. Perceived language inequality such as this in the classroom makes it difficult to be succeed in implementing the translanguaging approach.

To summarize, those who adopt translanguaging as pedagogy are not only teachers, but also facilitators who need to strategically plan instructions and activities to maximize the practice of translanguaging in learning (García & Li, 2014). As presented, the strategies and activities for translanguaging mentioned can be adapted into ELT in the Thai context. Instead of merely alternating languages to scaffold instruction in English lessons, more cross-cultural activities such as comparing and contrasting international, national and local practices or beliefs, and possibly more local materials (e.g., news, advertisement or media) need to be provided in class. These multilingual resources have to be purposively selected to bridge the gap between learners' prior knowledge and the new content, and as a means to generate creativity and critical thinking. This way, creation of the translanguaging space can occur

and learners can embrace their national and ethnic identities. Such an approach can also help them become emergent bilinguals who are developing their entire linguistic repertoire as one integrated dynamic system.

Conclusion

In conclusion, translanguaging in education, or a flexible use of complex linguistic practices in a bilingual/multilingual class, should not be understood as solely a strategy used to scaffold new language learning (García & Kano, 2014), nor as another strategy to deal with language problems (García & Li, 2014). To successfully implement translanguaging and promote effective English learning, classroom pedagogy needs to be systematically planned to achieve specific goals. Course materials need to be appropriately prepared to not only serve the purposes of academic learning, but also to valorize learners' bilingual/multilingual identities. In terms of activity type, collaborative learning through group discussion and group activities needs to be facilitated in class. Significantly, multilingual ideologies need to be embraced and explicitly valued in class among teachers and learners. Consequently, if used strategically, this fluid approach to linguistic diversity practices has a transformative potential to develop learners and teachers into proficient emergent bilinguals.

To facilitate this possibility, greater efforts need to be put into teacher's professional development. This is especially true in Thailand, where monolingualism is still prevalent and the value of translanguaging practices have not yet been realized, nor have they been fully understood—as evidenced by the insufficient amount of investigation in this area. To raise awareness and encourage language teachers in Thailand to make full use of learners' linguistic resources, initiatives should be taken in several areas. Pre-service teacher education, in-service teacher training courses, and researcher-teacher collaborations should be provided to educate the ELT practitioners to use translanguaging strategically, and to empower them with critical, moment-to-moment use of translanguaging to realize its pedagogical value. Additionally, it should be noted that although Thai is the national language and English is learned as a foreign language, the linguistic landscape is complex.

This sociolinguistic reality needs to be revisited and deserves more recognition. More support is needed to maintain minoritized and regional languages that exist in the country. Most importantly, individual's entire linguistic systems should be viewed holistically in this era of post-multilingualism.

Limitations in conducting this review need to be acknowledged. These are concerned with the narrow focus on the field of English language teaching, the analysis only on the linguistic resources of translanguaging, and a lack of a systematic search. In spite of these shortcomings, this article provides insights into a pedagogical issue that ELT scholars and educators in Thailand seem, for the most part, to have ignored. To substantially contribute to the field, particularly in the Thai context where obvious lacunae need to be filled, future investigation into translanguaging should arise from the emic epistemological stance utilizing qualitative methodology to provide thick description of the issue. In this case, a longitudinal study collecting actual classroom discourse and interaction is highly recommended. Some suggested research designs are, for example, naturalistic case study research in order to capture the complexity of the situation from the participants' viewpoints and design-based research to study the effectiveness of translanguaging practices. Apart from the linguistic resources, other semiotic resources such as textual, spatial, and visual modes of communication should also be collected to yield fruitful findings in terms of using translanguaging and multimodality to make meaning during English language lessons. To enhance the quality of interpretation, proposed data analysis includes classroom discourse or classroom interaction analysis, critical narrative analysis, and conversation analysis. Last but not least, examining the process of language learning (e.g., observations) as well as assessing its outcomes (e.g., learners' performance) could provide important scientific evidence to the field. A comparative study regarding the role of translanguaging in English language learning development compared to other teaching methods is also worth exploring.

References

Akere, F. (1980). Verbal strategies in communal meetings: Code-switching and status manipulation in a bidialectal Yoruba speech community. *Language Sciences*, *2*(1), 102-26. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0388-0001(80)80007-6

Anderson, J. (2018). Reimagining English language learners from a translingual perspective. *ELT Journal*, *72*(1), 26-37. https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccx029

Baker, C. (2011). *Foundations of bilingual education and bilingualism* (5th ed.). Multilingual Matters.

Baker, W. (2012). English as a lingua franca in Thailand: Characterisations and implications. *Englishes in Practice*, *1*, 18-27.

Bennui, P. (2017). Speaking Tinglish for professional communication: A reflection of Thai English used by tour guides along the Andaman sea. *Silpakorn University Journal of Social Sciences, Humanities, and Arts*, *17*(3), 233-266.

Bonacina-Pugh, F., Da Costa Cabral, I., & Huang, J. (2021). Translanguaging in education. *Language Teaching*, *54*(4), 439-471. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444821000173

Bradshaw, A. (n.d.). The word 'Hiso' does not exist in the English language [in Thai]. *Ajarn Adam TV*. http://www.ajarnadam.tv/blog/high-class

Cai, Y., & Fang, F. (2022). TESOL in transition: Examining stakeholders' use of and attitudes toward translanguaging and multimodal practices in EFL contexts. *Taiwan Journal of TESOL*, *19*(1), 7-33. https://doi.org/10.30397/TJTESOL.202204_19(1).0001

Canagarajah, S. (2011). Translanguaging in the classroom: Emerging issues for research and pedagogy. *Applied Linguistics Review*, *2*, 1-28. https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110239331.1

Cenoz, J., & Gorter, D. (2022). Pedagogical translanguaging and its application to language classes. *RELC Journal*, 1-13. https://doi.org/10.1177/00336882221082751

Cenoz, J., & Santos, A. (2020). Implementing pedagogical translanguaging in trilingual Schools. *System*, *92*, 1-9. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2020.102273

Chukwuemeka, O. R., & Ambele, E. A. (2022). Translanguaging as a learning strategy in a Northeastern EFL classroom in Thailand. In Buriram Rajabhat University, *Proceedings of ICON-ELT 2022: the 1st International Conference on English Language Teaching* (pp. 23-35). http://icon-elt-2022.bru.ac.th/wp-content/uploads/2022/06/Full-Proceedings- ICON-2022.pdf

Cots, J. M., Gallego-Balsà, L., & Llanes, A. (2022). Promoting translanguaging (or not) in the ESP classroom: An analysis of monoglossic and heteroglossic practices and discourses. *System, 107*. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2022.102795

Darasawang, P., & Watson Todd, R. (2012). The effect of policy on English language teaching at secondary schools in Thailand. In E.-L. Louw & A. Hashim (Eds.), *English in Southeast Asia: Features, policy and language in use* (pp. 207-220). John Benjamins.

DeNicolo, C. P. (2019). The role of translanguaging in establishing school belonging for emergent multilinguals. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*. https://doi.org/10.1080/13603116.2019.1602364

Domalewska, D. (2017). Discourse analysis of teacher talk: Code switching in content and language integrated learning (CLIL) classrooms in Thailand. *Asian Journal of Education and e-Learning, 5*(2), 36-43. https://doi.org/10.24203/ajeel.v5i2.3962

Dryden, S., Tankosić, A., & Dovchin, S. (2021). Foreign language anxiety and translanguaging as an emotional safe space: Migrant English as a foreign language learners in Australia. *System, 101*. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2021.102593

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

Ferguson, C. A. (1959). Diglossia. *Word, 15*, 325-340. https://doi.org/10.1080/00437956.1959.11659702

Goodman, B., & Tastanbek, S. (2021). Making the shift from a codeswitching to a translanguaging lens in English language teacher education. *TESOL quarterly, 55*(1), 29-53. https://doi.org/10.1002/tesq.571

García, O. (2009). *Bilingual education in the 21st century*. Wiley Blackwell.

García, O. (2009b). En/countering indigenous bilingual. *Journal of Language Identity and Education, 8,* 376-380. https://doi.org/10.1080/15348450903305155

García, O., & Kano, N. (2014). Translanguaging as process and pedagogy: Developing the English writing of Japanese students in the US. In J. Conteh & Gabriela M. (Eds.), *The multilingual turn in languages education* (pp. 258-277). Multilingual Matters. https://doi.org/10.21832/9781783092246-018

García, O., Kleifgen, J. O., & Falch, L. (2008). From English language learners to emergent bilinguals. *EQUITY MATTERS: Research Review No. 1*. Teachers College, Columbia University.

García, O., & Li, W. (2014). *Translanguaging: Language, bilingualism and education*. Palgrave Macmillan.

Grosjean, F. (2013). Bilingualism: A short introduction. In F. Grosjean & P. Li (Eds.), *The psycholinguistics of bilingualism*. Blackwell Publishing.

Jenkins, J., Cogo, A., & Dewey, M. (2011). Review of developments in research into English as a lingua franca. *Language Teaching, 44*(3), 281-315. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444811000115

Jones, B., & Lewis, W. G. (2014). Language arrangements within bilingual education: Advances in the study of bilingualism. In I. Mennen & E. M. Thomas (Eds), *Unravelling bilingualism: A cross-disciplinary perspective* (pp. 141-170). Multilingual Matters.

Kampittayakul, T. (2017). Developing Thai learners' CIC through translanguaging in one-on-one English tutorial sessions. *The New English Teacher, 11*(1), 69-95.

Kampittayakul, T. (2018). The role of translanguaging in improving Thai learners' interactional competence in dyadic English as a foreign language tutorial sessions. *PASAA, 56*, 80-111.

Khojan, S. (2022). *Teachers' perceptions and practices of translanguaging in Thai EFL classroom.* [Master's thesis, Mahasarakham University]. DSpace. http://202.28.34.124/dspace/handle123456789/1592

Kongbang, J., & Crabtree, M. (2020). Code-switching of experienced and less experienced teachers in online EFL classrooms on distance learning television: A case study. *Vacana Journal of Language and Linguistics*, *8*(2), 1-24.

Kosonen, K., & Person, K. R. (2014). Languages, identities and education in Thailand. In P. Sercombe & R. Tupas (Eds.), *Language, education and nation-building: Assimilation and shift in Southeast Asia* (pp. 200-231). Palgrave Macmillan.

Krashen, S. (1985). *The input hypothesis: Issues and implications*. Longman.

Kwihangana, F. (2021). Enhancing EFL students' participation through translanguaging. *ELT Journal*, *75*, 87-96. https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccaa058

Li, W. (2011). Moment analysis and translanguaging space: Discursive construction of identities by multilingual Chinese youth in Britain. *Journal of Pragmatics*, *43*(5), 1222-1235. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2010.07.035

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

Li, W. (2016). New Chinglish and the post-multilingualism challenge: Translanguaging ELF in China. *Journal of English as a Lingua Franca*, *5*(1), 1-26. https://doi.org/10.1515/jelf-2016-0001

Limtrairat, O., & Aksornjarung, P. (2015). Thai L1 use by Thai teachers in upper secondary EFL classrooms, *Veridian E-Journal*, *8*(5), 118-136.

Lin, A. M. Y. (2016). *Language across the curriculum and CLIL in English as an additional language (EAL) contexts: Theory and practice*. Springer.

Lin, A. M. Y. (2020). Foreword: Cutting through the monolingual grip of TESOL traditions – The transformative power of the translanguaging lens. In Z. Tian, L. A. P. Sayer, & J. L. Schissel (Eds.), *Envisioning TESOL through a translanguaging lens: Global Perspectives* (pp. v-ix), Springer.

Lin, A. M. Y., Wu, Y., & Lemke, J. L. (2020). 'It takes a village to research a village': Conversations between Angel Lin and Jay Lemke on contemporary issues in translanguaging. In S. M. C. Lau & S. Van Viegen (Eds.), *Plurilingual pedagogies: critical and creative endeavors for equitable language in education* (pp. 47-74), Springer.

Liu, D. (2021). *A study of graduate students' perceptions towards pedagogical translanguaging at an international university in Bangkok.* [Master's Thesis, Assumption University]. Repository. https://repository.au.edu/handle/6623004553/24818

Liu, J. E., Lo, Y. Y., & Lin, A. M. Y. (2020). Translanguaging pedagogy in teaching English for academic purposes: Researcher-teacher collaboration as a professional development model. *System, 92*. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2020.102276

Macaro, E. (2005). Codeswitching in the L2 classroom: A communication and learning strategy. In E. Llurda (Ed.), *Non-native language teachers: Perceptions, challenges and contributions to the profession*. Springer.

Margana, & Rasman (2021) Translanguaging and minoritized language maintenance: Lessons from Indonesia. *3L: The Southeast Asian Journal of English Language Studies, 27*(2), 1-15. http://dx.doi.org/10.17576/3L-2021-2702-01

Nilubol, K. (2020). The impacts of L1 integration towards general English classroom of Thai public university undergraduate students: An account of learning motivation perspective. *LEARN Journal: Language Education and Acquisition Research Network Journal, 13*(2), 426-444.

Oliver, R., Wigglesworth, G., Angelo, D., & Steele, C. (2021). Translating translanguaging into our classrooms: Possibilities and challenges. *Language Teaching Research, 25*(1), 134-150. https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168820938822

Omidire, M. F., & Ayob, S. (2022) The utilisation of translanguaging for learning and teaching in multilingual primary classrooms. *Multilingua, 41*(1), 105-129. https://doi.org/10.1515/multi-2020-0072

Otheguy, R., García, O., & Reid, W. (2015). Clarifying translanguaging and deconstructing named languages: A perspective from linguistics. *Applied Linguistics Review*, *6*(3), 281-307. https://doi.org/10.1515/applirev-2015-0014

Phillipson, R. (1992). *Linguistic imperialism*. Oxford University Press.

Prada, J. (2019). Exploring the role of translanguaging in linguistic ideological and attitudinal reconfigurations in the Spanish classroom for heritage speakers. *Classroom Discourse*, *10*(3-4), 306-322. https://doi.org/10.1080/19463014.2019.1628793

Promnath, K., & Tayjasanant, C. (2016). English-Thai code-switching of teachers in ESP classes. *PASAA*, *51*, 97-126.

Pun, J. K. H., Thomas, N., & Bowen, N. E. J. A. (2022). Questioning the sustainability of English-medium instruction policy in science classrooms: Teachers' and students' experiences at a Hong Kong secondary school. *Sustainability*, *14*, 2168. https://doi.org/10.3390/su14042168

Ra, J. J., & Baker, W. (2021). Translanguaging and language policy in Thai higher education EMI programs. In W. Tsou & W. Baker (Eds.), *English-medium instruction translanguaging practices in Asia* (pp. 59-77). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-16-3001-9_4

Rafi, A. S. M., & Morgan, A. (2022). Translanguaging as a transformative act in a reading classroom: Perspectives from a Bangladeshi private university. *Journal of Language, Identity & Education*. https://doi.org/10.1080/15348458.2021.2004894

Rajendram, S. (2021). Translanguaging as an agentive pedagogy for multilingual learners: Affordances and constraints. *International Journal of Multilingualism*. https://doi.org/10.1080/14790718.2021.1898619

Rose, H., & Galloway, N. (2019). *Global Englishes for language teaching*. Cambridge University Press.

Sgall, P., Hronek, J., Stich, A., & Horecký, J. (1992). *Variation in language: Code switching in Czech as a challenge for sociolinguistics*. John Benjamins.

Sittattrakul, J., & Laovoravit, V. (2018). Instructors' code-switching in ESP classrooms for Thai aviation students: Functions and benefits. *Kasem Bundit Journal, 19*(Special Edition), 401-409.

Thongwichit, N. (2013). L1 use with university students in Thailand: A facilitating tool or a language barrier in learning English?. *Silpakorn University Journal of Social Sciences, Humanities, and Arts, 13*(2), 179-206.

Thongwichit, N., & Buripakdi, A. (2014). Perceptions of college students on L1 use with different levels of English proficiency on L1 use in English classrooms. *Journal of Liberal Arts, Prince of Songkla University, Hat Yai Campus, 6*(2), 96-109.

Trakulkasemsuk, W. (2012). Thai English. In E.-L. Low & A. Hashim (Eds.), *English in Southeast Asia: Features, policy and language in use* (pp. 101-111). John Benjamins.

Turnbull, B. (2016). Reframing foreign language learning as bilingual education: Epistemological changes towards the emergent bilingual. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism, 21*(8), 1041-1048. https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050.2016.1238866

Sayer, P. (2008). Demystifying language mixing: Spanglish in school. *Journal of Latinos and Education, 7*(2), 94-112. https://doi.org/10.1080/15348430701827030

Swain, M. (1985). Communicative competence: Some roles of comprehensible input and comprehensible output in its development. In S. M. Gass & C. G. Madden (Eds), *Input in second language acquisition* (pp. 235-253). Newbury House.

Walsh, S. (2011). *Exploring classroom discourse: language in action*. Routledge.

Wangdi, T., & Shimray, R. (2022). Thai EFL school students' perceptions of using L1 in English language classrooms. *The Journal of Asia TEFL, 19*(1), 257-264. http://dx.doi.org/10.18823/asiatefl.2022.19.1.17.257

Wongrak, C. (2017, March). *The role of L1 in the instruction of L2: Perspectives of Thai EFL teachers* [Paper presentation]. The Asian Conference on Education & International Development 2017, Nagoya, Japan.

Williams, C. (1994). *Arfarniad o ddulliau dysgu ac addysgu yng nghyd-destun addysg uwchradd ddwyieithog* [Evaluation of teaching and learning methods in the context of bilingual secondary education]. Bangor, Wales: University of Wales.

Yuzlu, M. Y., & Dikilitas, K. (2021). Translanguaging in the development of EFL learners' foreign language skills in Turkish context. *Innovation in Language Learning and Learning and Teaching.* https://doi.org/10.1080/17501229.2021.1892698

Zhang, Y., & Wei, R. (2021). Strategic use of L1 in Chinese EMI classrooms: A translanguaging perspective. In W. Tsou & W. Baker, (Eds.), *English-medium instruction translanguaging practices in Asia: Theories, Frameworks and Implementation in Higher Education* (pp. 101-118). Springer.

Zhang, R., & Chan, B, H-K. (2021). Pedagogical translanguaging in a trilingual context: the case of two EFL classrooms in a Xinjiang university. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism.* https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050.2021.1978383