Journal of English Teaching
e-ISSN: 2622-4224 | p-ISSN: 2087-9628
http://ejournal.uki.ac.id/index.php/jet
Volume 12. Number 1, February 2026, pp. 26-40

Lecturer's Perspectives and Implementation of Translanguaging in English Education Study Program: A Chase Study at Universitas Palangka Raya

Misericordias Domini[1]*, Olga Dona Retsi[2]

Article History:
Received: 16/11/2025
Revised : 18/01/2026
Accepted: 22/01/2026
Available Online: 12/02/2026

Keywords:
Translanguaging, EFL, English language teaching, classroom discourse.

ABSTRACT
Translanguaging is increasingly recognized as a way to support learning in multilingual EFL classrooms, yet its concrete implementation in grammar instruction and lecturers' perspectives in under-researched regions such as Central Kalimantan remain unclear. This study examines how translanguaging is used in an Intermediate English Grammar class at a public university and how the lecturer evaluates its role in English language teaching. Using a qualitative case study, data were collected through nonparticipant classroom observations and a semi-structured interview, then analyzed using structural and planning-based classifications of translanguaging. The findings show that translanguaging is highly patterned at the sentence level through inter-sentential, intra-sentential, insertion, and tag uses, with English maintained as the main medium of instruction. The lecturer employs brief, targeted use of Bahasa Indonesia to clarify complex grammar, scaffold understanding, and enhance engagement while keeping its proportion low. These results suggest that principled translanguaging can strengthen comprehension and participation without hindering target language development.

[1] Universitas Palangka Raya, Indonesia, Email: miseririco@gmail.com *Corresponding author
[2] Universitas Palangka Raya, Indonesia, Email: olga.retsi@edu.upr.ac.id

INTRODUCTION

In recent years, translanguaging has gained significant attention in language education, especially in multilingual contexts. According to García and Wei (2014), translanguaging involves using various languages fluidly, treating bilingualism not as two separate systems but as a unified linguistic repertoire from which features are strategically selected to enhance communication. It enables bilingual or multilingual individuals to draw upon their entire language knowledge rather than separating languages.

In Central Kalimantan, especially Palangka Raya, classrooms operate inside a multilingual ecology. Indonesian coexists with Dayak languages and Banjarese, which often functions as a regional lingua franca. Student repertoires reflect inter-regency mobility and mixed home languages, so shared non-English codes are available for quick clarification and participation in English-medium lessons (Barasa & Sumbung, 2024). The lecturer's perspective and in-class implementation matter for learning and equity. Purposeful translanguaging can lower anxiety, stabilize classroom affect, and make complex grammar comprehensible without undermining English-medium goals (Li, 2018; Emilia & Hamied, 2022). Recent Indonesian EFL evidence also links well-timed translanguaging with higher enjoyment, motivation, and collaborative engagement, which is critical for cohorts with uneven prior exposure to English in Central Kalimantan (Hidayati et al., 2024; Putrawan, 2022).

At Universitas Palangka Raya, particularly in the English Education Study Program, lecturers frequently employ translanguaging during lessons. This method appears to enhance student comprehension and facilitate a more inclusive classroom environment. However, limited research has examined how translanguaging is specifically implemented in this context. Guided by Lewis, Jones, and Baker (2012), this study aims to explore the extent and manner of translanguaging usage by lecturers in the classroom.

In multilingual classrooms, translanguaging allows students to utilize their first (L1), second (L2), and additional languages to process new information, engage in critical thinking, and actively participate in discussions. For example, students might use L1 to understand complex grammar rules or develop ideas before expressing them in English. This strategy not only deepens comprehension but also affirms students' linguistic and cultural identities.

As a pedagogical approach in EFL classrooms, translanguaging supports both language development and subject mastery. By integrating native languages with English, educators can help students overcome language barriers, engage more deeply with the material, and gain confidence in English usage. García and Lin (2016) emphasize that translanguaging improves comprehension, vocabulary retention, and collaborative learning.

Indonesian research on translanguaging in tertiary settings has either mapped practices across programs or synthesized multi-site evidence. Emilia and Hamied (2022) conducted an ethnographic investigation across four online courses in Bandung with seventy-five participants, documenting functions of translanguaging that include interpretive, managerial, and interactive roles, and reporting strong student preference for instruction that mixes Indonesian and English. Anjarsari (2022) examined Indonesian for foreign learners at Universitas Negeri Yogyakarta in a qualitative case design with twenty-eight beginners and identified several types and functions of translanguaging that support motivation and facilitate problem diagnosis in that context. Complementing these primary studies, Putrawan (2022) synthesized evidence from Indonesian English as a foreign language classroom and concluded that benefits are common when the first language is used judiciously, that repertoires often include Indonesian, English, and local languages, and that attitudes toward monolingual norms remain mixed.

Against this background, the present study at Universitas Palangka Raya focuses on a single lecturer and traces when and why translanguaging is triggered in tertiary English as a foreign language. English remains the default instructional code, while Indonesian is used strategically to unpack complex grammar, repair comprehension breakdowns, and stabilize classroom affect. This contingency driven and episode focused account contrasts with the broader mapping in Emilia and Hamied (2022), by specifying the linkage between trigger and function, for example grammar clarification aligning with interpretive support and anxiety relief aligning with interactive or managerial aims (Emilia & Hamied, 2022). It also remains within an English as a foreign language domain rather than the Indonesian for foreign learner's domain examined by Anjarsari, which prevents cross domain conflation and clarifies applicability to typical Indonesian undergraduate cohorts (Anjarsari, 2022).

The study contributes three advances. First, it extends geographical coverage to Central Kalimantan, which is underrepresented in national syntheses that emphasize sites such as Bandung and Yogyakarta and several other provinces (Putrawan, 2022). Second, it offers detailed classroom evidence that shows how careful use of the first language works as planned scaffolding with clear cognitive and socio affective goals. It provides practical links between specific classroom triggers and their functions that instructors can apply in similar English as a foreign language context (Emilia & Hamied, 2022; Putrawan, 2022). Third, this study shows that Indonesian can be used strategically alongside an English centered approach without weakening the goals for the target language. It also offers a clear bridge from classroom practice to policy for programs that still struggle with English only ideology, and it stays consistent with research that supports careful use of the first language when it helps learning (Putrawan, 2022). In line with these aims, this study asks two research questions within the literature review frame to guide its analysis and claims for contribution, namely (1). How is translanguaging used in the classroom? and (2). What are the lecturer's perspectives on translanguaging in English language instruction?

RESEARCH METHODS

Research Design

A qualitative research approach was employed for this study. Creswell (2013) defines qualitative research as interpretive, aimed at understanding the meanings individuals assign to social phenomena. The case study method was chosen because it allows for an in-depth and contextualized understanding of complex phenomena within their real-life settings. This method is particularly effective for exploring contemporary issues in education where the boundaries between the phenomenon and the context are not clearly defined (Yin, 2018). It is well-suited to investigate how translanguaging is implemented in classroom settings, as it accommodates multiple sources of data and perspectives (Creswell, 2009; Yin, 2018).

Participants

The study was a qualitative case study conducted in the English Education Study Program, Faculty of Teacher Training and Education, Universitas Palangka Raya, Central Kalimantan, Indonesia. Data were collected during the fourth and fifth weeks of the 2024–2025 academic year in Intermediate English Grammar classes led by a qualified lecturer whose identity is withheld to meet ethical standards. The class had a total of 35 students from different ethnic backgrounds (6 men and 29 women), making the class a rich environment for the study of translanguaging as a result of the linguistic diversity. Most students' English proficiency was around CEFR B1 (Intermediate) to B2 (Upper-Intermediate) levels. The selection of the lecturer and this class was due to the fact that Intermediate English Grammar is usually

involve with conceptually difficult explanations that can lead to language alternation and the fact that the lecturer teaches this course on a regular basis and was available and willing to collaborate for extensive observation in a real teaching context.

Data Collection Methods

Data were gathered using interviews and classroom observations both providing primary data for lecturer perspective and implementation. Semi-structured interviews were conducted after teaching sessions to collect lecturers' perspectives. This method ensured consistency and provided reliable insights (Creswell, 2008). Non-participant and semi-structured oobservations were which administered to capture the activities of the classroom as they unfolded and without directing the classroom interactions (Creswell, 2009). Two main tools were employed: (1) real-time field notes, and (2) a digital camera in a mobile phone for video and still picture recording. Field notes included the phase of the lesson, task, discussant, and the pedagogic rationale for each episode of translanguaging, and they also included some contextual information (classroom environment and teaching prompts). Video recordings enabled the researcher to document classroom interactions which she could analyze at a later time for transcription and detailed coding of language changes and also provided contextual documentation that was needed for the seating chart, classroom materials, and instructional materials. Reliable and valid coding of translanguaging and episodes was documented in the raw video recordings and also in the cross-checked data, video, and notes in the field notes. Individual transcripts were verified with the video to make sure that all coded instances of translanguaging were documented in the raw data. In addition, the researcher used the cross-recording data to document the observations to the interviews. This helped to document a pattern and a confirmation in the data to minimize the observational data bias. All interactions with the above purpose were documented to create a data trail for analysis.

Data Analysis Methods

Qualitative data analysis is an iterative process that involves immersion in the dataset, systematic coding, categorizing, and developing themes to construct credible and nuanced interpretations of participants' experiences (Braun & Clarke, 2019). Following Yin's (2018) qualitative case study analytic framework, case-based analysis has been documented step by step from detailed descriptions of event sequences in the classroom to the recognition of explanatory patterns. The descriptive data from the classroom video observations were aligned with the field notes, as the notes may have detailed context that specified the tasks, speakers, and instructional goals. For each of the translanguaging episodes documented, analysis involved structural coding and planning classification (pedagogical vs. spontaneous). For each of the episodes, instructional function coding (clarification, scaffolding, engagement, classroom management, etc.) was performed and then attributed at the pedagogical discourse level. Interview data were aligned with the observations, transcribed, and the lecturer's rationales, belief systems, evaluative comments on translanguaging, and the themes were coded, as the comments were closely associated with the observational coding, and the comments were synthesized in a way to develop rational and descriptive case-based accounts on the patterns that explain the occurrence of translanguaging and the reasons provided.

The study implemented data triangulation across the different data collection sources, field notes, videos, still images, and the semi-structured interview to aid trustworthiness. Convergence, in this case, referred to the key episodes in the field notes and the video

record, the transcripts in relation to the recorded interaction, and the contextual claims and the photographs. Most importantly, the observations (what was done) and the interview narratives (why it was done) and, in this case, the discrepancies were rectified by going back to the primary recordings. This proves the existence of an audit trail and reduces the bias of relying on a single source.

FINDINGS

The findings of this study are based on a classroom observation and a semi-structured interview with one lecturer in the English Study Program at Universitas Palangka Raya. The results are presented in relation to the two central research questions: (1). How translanguaging is used in the classroom? and (2). What the lecturer's perspectives are on translanguaging in English language instruction?

Question 1: How is translanguaging used in the classroom?
Based on the classroom observation data, the researcher categorized the translanguaging practices into two types: structural-type translanguaging and planning-based translanguaging, described as follows.

Structural-type translanguaging

In this study, structural translanguaging is conceptualized as the categorization of translanguaging according to the specific positions within the linguistic structure where language shifts occur. This analytical perspective facilitates a systematic description of how multilingual speakers draw on their linguistic repertoire at the word, phrase, and sentence levels during classroom interaction (Anjarsari, 2022; Liando et al., 2023). The following presents the structural types of translanguaging identified in the classroom observations.

Table 1
Structural-Type Translanguaging Frequency

Translanguaging Structural types	Frequency	Percentage
Inter-sentential Translanguaging	28	26,42%
Intra-sentential translanguaging	30	28,30%
Insertion Translanguaging	18	16,98%
Entire Translanguaging	10	9,43%
Tag Translanguaging	20	18,87%

Table 1 summarizes the distribution of structural-type translanguaging observed in the classroom discourse. Intra-sentential translanguaging took the lead of the observed categories, with 30 occurrences (28,30%). This suggests that most instances of language alternation occurred within the confines of a singular discourse unit. The next most frequent category was inter-sentential translanguaging, which accounted for 28 occurrences (26,42%), indicating a noteworthy percentage of alternations across multiple discourse units. Tag translanguaging had 20 recorded instances (18,87%), and insertion translanguaging had 18 instances (16,98%). The former reflects a relatively low use of mixed language short tags, while the latter also reflects a relatively low use the of unidirectional discourse of a language with the switching of an inserted language token (lexis) or a language chunk (phrasal). The entire translanguaging category counted the least with 10 occurrences (9,43%), which in

this case indicates that extended stretches of discourse in a singular language were switched with far greater frequency than entire translanguaging stretches.

Inter-sentential Translanguaging

Inter-sentential translanguaging refers to the use of an English sentence that is followed by a separate clause in Indonesian in the subsequent sentence or turn. Inter-sentential Translanguaging used by lecturer shown in the following example.

> "The clause that cannot stand alone and it should be completed with another clause, *jadi harus disertai dengan klausa yang lain, oke*." (TL1)

> "Subordinating conjunction is connecting word to show cause and effect, *jadi sebab akibat biasanya menggunakan apa?"* (TL2)

Intra-sentential translanguaging

Intra-sentential translanguaging involves several shifts between L1 and L2 within a single sentence, so that both languages appear in the same syntactic unit. Intra-sentential translanguaging is expressed in the following example.

> "It depends, *berarti tergantung ya, tergantung dengan clausa lainnya*, so it's called dependent clause." (TL3)

Insertion Translanguaging

Insertion translanguaging occurs when brief Indonesian phrases are embedded within an English sentence as glosses or near-synonymous expressions to support students' comprehension. Insertion translanguaging expressed in the following example.

> "Subordinating conjunction that express contras are 'although' and 'even though, *walaupun demikian."* (TL4)

> "On the other hand, *dengan kata lain*." (TL5)

Entire Translanguaging

Entire translanguaging refers to instances where only L1 or only L2 is used in a complete utterance while still forming part of the broader multilingual flow of classroom interaction. This type of translanguaging is illustrated in the following example.

> "Yes, I give you two instructions, to write based on the pattern, and put it in the sentence." (TL6)

Tag Translanguaging

Tag translanguaging denotes the use of very short items, such as tags or particles, from another language that function as discourse markers in an utterance. Tag Translanguaging are expressed in the alternation between "yes" and "ya" (TL7).

Planning-based Translanguaging

Planning-based translanguaging classification in this study distinguishes two types of classrooms translanguaging based on the degree of prior planning: Pedagogical

Translanguaging (planned, teacher-directed) and Spontaneous translanguaging (unplanned, interaction-driven) (Cenoz & Gorter, 2020)

Pedagogical Translanguaging

Pedagogical translanguaging refers to the planned and intentional use of students' full linguistic repertoire in teaching, where the teacher strategically uses L1 and L2 to support content understanding, scaffold learning, and foster bilingual literacy. It is a learner-centered instructional approach that aims to improve both language and subject-matter competences by systematically activating all of learners' languages and softening the boundaries between them during instruction (Cenoz & Gorter, 2020)

> "The clause that cannot stand alone and it should be completed with another clause, *jadi harus disertai dengan klausa yang lain, oke."* (TL1)
>
> "Subordinating conjunction is connecting word to show cause and effect, *jadi sebab akibat biasanya menggunakan apa?"* (TL2)
>
> *"It depends, berarti tergantung ya, tergantung dengan clausa lainnya,* so it's called dependent clause." (TL3)

Spontaneous translanguaging

Refers to unplanned, fluid language shifts that arise naturally in classroom interaction, when teachers and students draw on all their languages to make meaning, without being scripted in the lesson plan (Cenoz & Gorter, 2020). The example of this translanguaging occurred in the usage of "no problemo" *(TL8)*, and the alternation between "yes" and "ya" *(TL7)* when student ask, or when in the informal moment.

Question 2: What are the lecturer's perspectives on translanguaging in English language instruction?

In the interview, the lecturer expressed a clear and measured view on translanguaging. She acknowledged its necessity in specific teaching contexts but emphasized restraint. According to her, the use of Bahasa Indonesia in English class should not exceed 5–10%. She views translanguaging as a helpful tool, particularly for clarifying abstract or difficult concepts in subjects such as grammar:

> "It's okay, we can use more than one language as long as the rules are clear. Maybe the use of that language (Bahasa Indonesia) will make things clearer for students to understand. But we must remember, we are in the English Department. At least we use no more than 5% or 10% of mixed language. As long as it is used to clarify the delivery of the material, I think it's still reasonable, because these students—English is not their first language; it's a foreign language for them. So, if we fully explain in English, sometimes it's hard for them to understand. So, I think it's still acceptable to mix a little, but only about 5% to 10%." (A1)

She also emphasized that translanguaging is mostly applied *spontaneously* rather than through pre-planned strategies. It is typically triggered by the students' visible confusion or difficulty in grasping a concept:

> "Usually, it's spontaneous. In English language instruction, we typically explain concepts in English. But because students have different learning speeds and methods, translanguaging is used on the spot. If there's a definition or concept that's hard for them to understand, then it's better to use translanguaging. If it's easy, then there's no need to use it." (A2)

From her perspective, translanguaging enhances student engagement and comprehension. She observed that when she used Bahasa Indonesia in parallel with English explanations, students became more enthusiastic and responded more actively:

> "When I explained the material fully in English, they understood, but they had to think longer. But when helped a little with Bahasa Indonesia, it sped up their understanding and made them more enthusiastic because they could compare two languages. It served as a kind of trigger for understanding." (A3)

She also noted a clear difference in the level of comprehension before and after using translanguaging:

> "When using full English, only a few students understood. But when translanguaging was applied, almost everyone could understand." (A4)

Regarding concerns that translanguaging might hinder students' development in English proficiency, she dismissed such worries, reaffirming that controlled use actually supports learning:

> "The use of Bahasa Indonesia is only 5–10%, so I don't think it will hinder them. On the contrary, it helps their development by aiding understanding." (A5)

Finally, she confirmed that she plans to continue using translanguaging selectively in future grammar classes, particularly where deeper conceptual understanding is required:

> *"Definitely, because in classes that require extra understanding and comprehension... translanguaging is still necessary." (A6)*

DISCUSSION

There are several useful frameworks in previous studies from Indonesia for analysing the current case. In their ethnographic study covering four online courses in Bandung with seventy-five respondents, Emilia and Hamied (2022) documented several functions of translanguaging in three of the four roles as interpretive, managerial, and interactive, and a strong preference from students for a mixed code pedagogy of Indonesian and English. Using a qualitative case study with twenty-eight participants in a beginners Indonesian for foreign learners' course at Universitas Negeri Yogyakarta, Anjarsari (2022) documented several different types and functions of translanguaging which, as supported, assisted in motivation and real-time problem diagnosis by teachers. In his study of Indonesian EFL classrooms, Putrawan (2022) reported that when the first language was used with care there were benefits, that code pedagogies of Indonesian, English, and a local language were common, and that attitudes towards a monolingual pedagogy were mixed.

The current single class case demonstrates both convergence and contextual specificity. Like Emilia and Hamied (2022), this class has noteworthy interpretive and interactive functions, as shown by the use of interpreter sentence and intra sentence translanguaging patterns (see Table 1 for intra-sentential translanguaging with 30 occurrences; 28.30 percent; inter-sentential translanguaging with 28 occurrences; 26.42 percent), and the bilingual explanations in TL1 to TL3 and insertion glosses in TL4 and TL5. However, managerial uses are less salient in the observed corpus because lesson management and task directions were largely delivered in English, which concurs with the low entire translanguaging of the corpus (10 occurrences; 9.43 percent), and English-only instructional moves such as TL6. As per Anjarsari (2022), the current findings show similar trends where translanguaging aids in repairing and fostering participation. In this case, the lecturer reports comprehension increased after the brief use of Indonesian (A3 and A4). Lecturer use Indonesian and participant markers of rapport such as the code alternation yes and ya (Table 1 show tag translanguaging 20 occurrence with 18.87%). The informal no problemo (TL8) also serves as a participant marker of rapport. The studies differ in participant profiles and learning domains, for this case an EFL grammar class, students with CEFR levels of B1 to B2; therefore, translanguaging is more about grammar explanation and momentary comprehension checking, as opposed to scaffolding for lower beginning levels. The prevailing patterns in the current findings, similar to Putrawan (2022), confirm the more restricted use of Indonesian in the English dominant instruction. In this case, the lecturer target of 5 to 10 percent Sitz (A1, A5) and the overall distributions confirm Bahasa Indonesia focused shifts over extended single language use, particularly in English dominant clarifications.

The results of this study further demonstrate that translanguaging in this grammar class constitutes more than random code-switching and is a selective and structured activity that illustrates the lecturer's teaching priorities and beliefs, and more aligned with a view of translanguaging as a tactical use of one's integrated linguistic repertoire instead of code-switching (García & Wei, 2014). From a structural standpoint, the majority of cases are at the sentence level as, from the planning standpoint, they are situated on a clear instructional–interactional continuum and like patterns found in the classrooms of Indonesia and other EFL multilingual context (Anjarsari, 2022; Liando et al., 2023). The data suggest that translanguaging in this case keeps English as the main language of the instruction while strategically employing Bahasa Indonesia to aid comprehension, participation, and emotional safety, reinforcing that appropriately employed translanguaging enhances participation and learning in the EFL context (Cenoz & Gorter, 2017).

To begin with, the structural patterns indicate an instructional purpose. TL1–TL3 inter-sentential and intra-sentential translanguaging suggest that the lecturer purposefully provides one key explanation in English and immediately paraphrases, or adds to, that explanation in Bahasa Indonesia. The same pattern has been documented in the research literature whereby teachers are observed to use initial L2 explanations of certain complex grammar rules followed by L1 reformulations to achieve comprehension (Madkur et al., 2022; Llanes & Cots, 2022). Also, as in TL3, within a single utterance, English and Indonesian are seamlessly integrated which allows the teacher to explain, translate, and kernel the teaching point simultaneously, an outcome especially reported with grammar teaching translanguaging in other EFL contexts (Fatima & Miran, 2023; Liando et al., 2023). Insertion translanguaging (TL4, TL5) is aimed at the same outcome, which is to provide a series of brief Indonesian glosses which are incorporated into otherwise English utterances to serve as synonyms or paraphrases of critical discourse markers and conjunctions. These are

described as micro-scaffolding which lessens the cognitive load on learners as idiomatic English is retained as the language of instruction (Madkur et al., 2022).

The data presented reinforce the presenter's assertion that the English Language reigns supreme in the classroom. Comprehensive translanguaging in this situation comprises segments in which only English is utilized, but nevertheless remains a part of the multilingual interactional flow (TL6). These English-only segments, which frequently contain directives and instructions, validate the presenter's assertion that Bahasa Indonesia should only be used for about 5–10 percent of classroom discourse (A1). This ratio maintains the configuration of suggestions that the use of the learner's first language (L1) be incorporated as a supportive scaffolding strategy, while preserving the second language (L2) as the dominant language (García & Wei, 2014; Madkur et al., 2022). Tag translanguaging, and informal phrases such as "yes/ya" and "no problemo" (TL7, TL8) complete this structure. These extremely brief code-switches are not intended primarily for content elucidation, but rather for structural purposes as discourse markers in the form of affective signals that strengthen and maintain rapport, ease the interaction, or signal alignment. This is consistent with literature that suggests that brief first language (L1) insertions and code-switching to English in multilingual classrooms primarily serve the interface of ease and affect (Hafid & Margana, 2022). This sustains the argument that in this situation. translanguaging is not only a cognitive instrument, but a relational and interactive tool (Wei, 2018).

When viewed with a planning-centered classification, the same data indicate pedagogical and spontaneous translanguaging are interspersed rather than entirely distinct. Evidence of pedagogical translanguaging is notably present in TL1 – TL3, where bilingual delivery of technical grammatical explanations is presented with a structural pattern. The sequential English then Indonesian clarification indicates this is not a single episode of improvisation, but rather a patterned approach that the lecturer has come to rely on in assisting the learning of complex material and is akin to the planned translanguaging actions of teachers as noted by Cenoz and Gorter (2020). This predominately supports the lecturer's assertion that translanguaging is beneficial in "classes that require extra understanding and comprehension," (grammar) (A1, A6). This orientation equilibrates findings regarding teaching translanguaging as a technique that centres on learners and develops the linguistic and cognitive content within the situation (Cenoz & Gorter, 2017, 2020). Informal 'tags' clauses and switching between 'yes' and 'ya' in a conversational setting (TL7, TL8) illustrates the other side of the coin, where unplanned translanguaging is described by the lecturer as phenomena to do with students 'on the spot' (A2). When learners prompt unplanned shifts with teachers in the classroom by influencing the flow of the interaction in the moment (Wei, 2018), it is in the classroom that this unplanned translanguaging is likely most appreciated, although there may be some asymmetry in the usage of this approach.The lecturer refers to as 'spontaneous' as is often grounded dwelling on stable subroutines as stable patterns of behavior recurring across comparable contexts. Of further consideration is that some scheduling is implicit rather than entirely conscious as raised in translanguaging pedagogy, power, and teacher habitus (Maulana et al, 2025).

The lecturer's perspectives (A1 to A6) are largely consistent with the observed practices and help explain why translanguaging is used in this controlled way. She positions translanguaging as necessary but limited, defining a normative range of 5 to 10 percent Bahasa Indonesia in English class (A1 and A5). The structural evidence supports this. Most utterances remain English dominant, and the Indonesian segments are short, targeted, and tightly linked to difficult concepts or key terms (TL1 to TL5). This resonates with studies in Indonesian EFL contexts where lecturers consciously restrict L1 use while still drawing on it

to clarify key points and sustain student comfort (Liando et al., 2023). Her concern about maintaining the identity of the English Department and not overusing L1 (A1) reflects broader tensions between English only ideologies and translanguaging oriented pedagogies documented in multilingual higher education (García & Wei, 2014; Maulana et al., 2025). At the same time, she explicitly frames translanguaging as a response to the foreign language status of English for her students and the risk that full English explanation may be opaque (A1), which aligns with empirical work showing that monolingual L2 instruction can limit access to complex content for EFL learners (Cenoz & Gorter, 2017, 2020; Ratminingsih et al., 2024). The data from TL1 to TL3 align with this reasoning since translanguaging appears most intensively in the explanation of abstract grammar categories, where misinterpretation would have serious consequences for learning (Fatima & Miran, 2023).

The perceived impact on learning is also supported by the classroom patterns. The lecturer reports that full English explanations are understood only by a few students, whereas almost all students understand once translanguaging is introduced (A3 and A4). This perception is compatible with how translanguaging is actually performed. The bilingual rephrasing in TL1 to TL3 offers multiple entry points to the same concept, while insertion translanguaging in TL4 and TL5 provides quick anchors that help students map unfamiliar English terms onto familiar semantic territory. Similar findings have been reported in Indonesian and other EFL classrooms, where translanguaging has been shown to enhance comprehension, facilitate the achievement of learning objectives, and make students more active in class (Anjarsari, 2022; Liando et al., 2023). The lecturer's observation that translanguaging increases enthusiasm and speeds up comprehension (A3) is consistent with studies indicating that translanguaging boosts engagement, reduces anxiety, and encourages participation by legitimising students' full linguistic repertoires (Ratminingsih et al., 2024). The interactional flavour of tags like yes or ya and no problemo (TL7 and TL8), which signal friendliness, reduce distance, and allow students to participate without fear of losing face, echoes findings that short L1 insertions and hybrid expressions often operate as affective and relational resources in multilingual classrooms (Hafid & Margana, 2022; Wei, 2018). Together, these patterns suggest that translanguaging supports not only cognitive understanding but also affective engagement.

Finally, the lecturer's rejection of the idea that translanguaging harms English development (A5) must be read in light of the tightly controlled way it is implemented. Because Bahasa Indonesia is used sparingly, tied to specific instructional moments, and embedded within predominantly English discourse, the data do not support a shift back to L1 dominated teaching. Instead, translanguaging works as a safety net that enables students to access complex content without abandoning English as the main language of instruction, a role also described in broader work on translanguaging as scaffolding rather than as interference (García & Wei, 2014; Madkur et al., 2022). Her commitment to continue using translanguaging selectively, particularly in grammar classes that demand deeper conceptual processing (A6), reflects an emerging professional stance that reconciles English only ideals with the pedagogical realities of an EFL classroom, similar to the balanced positions reported in recent Indonesian and international studies (Liando et al., 2023). In this sense, the structural and planning based patterns observed in TL1 to TL8 concretely embody the beliefs articulated in A1 to A6 and show that translanguaging, when used in a principled and proportionate way, can function as an integrated part of effective English language instruction rather than as a threat to it (Cenoz & Gorter, 2017, 2020; Wei, 2018).

CONCLUSION

Overall, the findings indicate that translanguaging in this Intermediate Grammar class operates as a principled, lecturer-managed pedagogy rather than arbitrary code-mixing. Structurally, translanguaging is concentrated at the sentence level and realised through inter-sentential, intra-sentential, and insertion patterns (TL1–TL5), which are used to restate complex grammatical explanations and key terms in Bahasa Indonesia while maintaining English as the matrix language of instruction. This pattern supports the lecturer's stated intention to keep Bahasa Indonesia within a limited 5–10 percent range and aligns with views of translanguaging as the strategic use of a unitary linguistic repertoire to scaffold understanding without displacing the L2 (García & Wei, 2014; Madkur et al., 2022). From a planning perspective, pedagogical and spontaneous translanguaging are closely intertwined: bilingual grammar explanations follow a relatively stable, routinised pattern that reflects tacit planning, while informal tags such as "yes/ya" and "no problemo" emerge responsively in interaction to manage rapport and affect (TL7, TL8), echoing work that highlights translanguaging as both a cognitive and relational resource in multilingual classrooms (Cenoz & Gorter, 2017, 2020; Wei, 2018).

The lecturer's perspectives (A1–A6) are broadly consistent with these practices and help explain the tightly controlled nature of translanguaging in this context. She frames translanguaging as a necessary support in a foreign-language environment, particularly for abstract grammar content, but simultaneously emphasises the importance of preserving English as the primary medium of instruction, a stance that mirrors wider tensions between English-only ideologies and translanguaging-oriented pedagogy in higher education (García & Wei, 2014; Maulana et al., 2025). Classroom patterns suggest that this balance is effective: bilingual rephrasing and brief Indonesian insertions appear to increase comprehension, participation, and affective comfort without leading to L1-dominated teaching, which is consistent with studies reporting that well-managed translanguaging can enhance learning outcomes and foster more inclusive participation in EFL settings (Anjarsari, 2022; Liando et al., 2023). In this sense, the integration of structural and planning-based translanguaging observed in TL1–TL8 concretely embodies the beliefs articulated in A1–A6 and shows that, when used in a proportionate and principled way, translanguaging can function as an integral component of effective grammar instruction rather than a threat to students' English development (Cenoz & Gorter, 2017, 2020; Wei, 2018).

This study has several limitations that should be considered when interpreting the findings. As a qualitative case study in a single class with a single lecturer, the results are not intended for statistical generalisation beyond comparable contexts. Classroom data were collected within a limited observation window, so the distribution of translanguaging types may vary across topics, weeks, or assessment periods. Student perspectives were not collected through interviews or questionnaires, so the analysis relies on classroom discourse evidence and the lecturer's reported perceptions. The study also did not quantify learning outcomes, so claims are limited to observed instructional patterns and perceived comprehension support rather than causal effects on achievement.

Several recommendations follow from these limitations and the observed patterns. Future research can include multiple classes and multiple lecturers across courses so that patterns can be compared across teaching styles and content domains. Adding student interviews or surveys can enable triangulation of perceived benefits, constraints, and preferences, and clarify how students experience translanguaging during grammar instruction. A mixed methods design can combine discourse analysis with pre and post measures of grammar comprehension, participation metrics, or affective indicators such as

anxiety and enjoyment. Longer observation periods across a semester can help distinguish stable routines from topic specific practices and capture variation during assessment cycles. For greater comparability, future studies can adopt a standardised CEFR placement tool and report proficiency bands with clearer evidence. At the program level, a practical recommendation is to develop clear classroom guidelines for principled translanguaging, including when Indonesian is used for concept clarification, how proportion is monitored, and how English remains the main medium for sustained interaction and task work.

REFERENCES

Angga Maulana, Wawan Gunawan, & Mahardhika Zifana. (2025). Power through translanguaging in writing class discourse: An Indonesian case study. *Acuity: Journal of English Language Pedagogy, Literature and Culture*, *10*(2), 245 -257. https://doi.org/10.35974/acuity.v10i2.3848

Anjarsari, P. (2022). Translanguaging practices in Indonesian language learning: A case study. *Journal of Language and Education*, 8(2), 45–55. https://doi.org/10.21831/lt.v9i1.61850

Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2019). Reflecting on reflexive thematic analysis. *Qualitative Research in Sport, Exercise and Health*, *11*(4), 589–597. https://doi.org/10.1080/2159676X.2019.1628806

Canagarajah, S. (2011). Codemeshing in academic writing: Identifying teachable strategies of translanguaging. *The Modern Language Journal*, *95*(3), 401–417. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.2011.01207.x

Cenoz, J., & Gorter, D. (2017). Minority languages and sustainable translanguaging: threat or opportunity? *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, *38*(10), 901–912. https://doi.org/10.1080/01434632.2017.1284855

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

Creese, A., & Blackledge, A. (2010). Translanguaging in the bilingual classroom: A pedagogy for learning and teaching? *The Modern Language Journal*, *94*(1), 103–115. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.2009.00986.x

Creswell, J. W. (2008). *Educational research: Planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research* (3rd ed.). Pearson.

Creswell, J. W. (2009). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (3rd ed.). Sage Publications.

Creswell, J. W. (2013). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches* (3rd ed.). Sage Publications.

Emilia, E., & Hamied, F. A. (2022). TRANSLANGUAGING PRACTICES IN A TERTIARY EFL CONTEXT IN INDONESIA. *TEFLIN Journal*, *33*(1), 47–74 : http://dx.doi.org/10.15639/teflinjournal.v33i1/47-74

Fatima, N., & Miran, G. (2023). Impact of Teachers' Partiality on the Learning Process at Undergraduate Level. *Journal of Business and Social Review in Emerging Economies*, *9*(3), 335-350. https://doi.org/10.26710/jbsee.v9i3.2714H

García, O., & Lin, A. M. Y. (2017). Translanguaging in bilingual education. In O. García, A. M. Y. Lin, & S. May (Eds.), *Bilingual and multilingual education* (pp. 117–130). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-02258-1_9

García, O., & Otheguy, R. (2020). Plurilingualism and translanguaging: Commonalities and divergences. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, *23*(1), 17–35. https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050.2019.1598932

Garcia, O., & Wei, L. (2014). Translanguaging: Language, Bilingualism, and Education. New York, NY: Palgrave MacMillan. https://doi.org/10.1057/9781137385765

Hafid, H., & Margana, M. (2022). Code-Switching Practices in Multilingual Classrooms: Exploring Pedagogical Functions. *AL-ISHLAH: Jurnal Pendidikan, 14*(2), 2551-2562. doi:https://doi.org/10.35445/alishlah.v14i2.1326

Hidayati, D., Dharmawan, Y. Y., Prasatyo, B. A., & Luciana, L. (2024). Exploring how translanguaging and multimodal learning improve EFL students. *Journal on English as a Foreign Language*, *14*(2), 446-475. https://doi.org/10.23971/jefl.v14i2.8012

Hornberger, N. H., & Link, H. (2012). Translanguaging and transnational literacies in multilingual classrooms: A biliteracy lens. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, *15*(3), 261–278. https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050.2012.658016

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

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

Liando, N., Dallyono, R., Tatipang, D., & Lengkoan, F. (2023). Among English, Indonesian and local language: Translanguaging practices in an Indonesian EFL classroom. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics, 13*(1), 204-216. https://doi.org/10.17509/ijal.v13i1.58270

Llanes, À., & Cots, J. M. (2020). Measuring the impact of translanguaging in TESOL: a plurilingual approach to ESP. *International Journal of Multilingualism*, *19*(4), 523–538. https://doi.org/10.1080/14790718.2020.1753749

Madkur, A., Friska, Y., & Lisnawati, L. (2022). Translanguaging Pedagogy in ELT Practices: Experiences of Teachers in Indonesian Pesantren-based Schools. *Voices of English Language Education Society*, *6*(1), 130–143. https://doi.org/10.29408/veles.v6i1.5136

Marlina, R., & Galloway, N. (2021). *The pedagogy of English as an International Language: Perspectives from scholars, teachers, and students*. Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003167066

Putrawan, A. (2022). The use of translanguaging in EFL classrooms: A study from Universitas Lampung. *ELT Worldwide*, 9(1), 50–62. https://doi.org/10.30872/calls.v8i1.7973

Ratminingsih, N. M., Padmadewi, N. N., Nitiasih, P. K., Artini, L. P., & Ana, I. K. T. A. (2024). Does Translanguaging Enhance Learning? Examining EFL Students' Perceptions and Success in Bali. *Voices of English Language Education Society*, *8*(3). https://doi.org/10.29408/veles.v8i3.27261

Yin, R. K. (2018). *Case study research and applications* (Vol. 6). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.