Vildan Inci-Kavak
Gaziantep University, Turkey
Yasemin Kırkgöz
Cukurova University, Turkey

ATTITUDES TOWARDS TRANSLANGUAGING PRACTICES: A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF LITERATURE AND FOOD ENGINEERING CLASSES[1]

Summary. With an increase in the number of colleges and universities offering courses in English in the education market globally, higher education institutions face serious challenges. In non-native settings where English is favoured as a prestigious choice for the medium of instruction, learners struggle with the huge barrier between demanding course contents and necessary language proficiency levels, which encourages them to use translanguaging and alternative strategies extensively in and out of classrooms. In this light, this study aims to look at an under-researched topic by questioning how university students' and lecturers' views on translanguaging practices show parallels and differences in literature and engineering courses from a comparative perspective. The data of the study were collected at English Language and Literature (ELL) and Food Science (FS) programmes of Gaziantep University (GAUN) in Turkey through face-to-face interviews and class observations. The classrooms were visited and observed for 21 lesson hours. 15 students and 6 lecturers from each department volunteered to participate in the study. The recorded and transcribed data were analysed then by using content analysis. The results show that while the lecturers from the FS programme stress that L2 use is vital for students to develop content knowledge and linguistic skills, the lecturers from the ELL programme claim it to be a context-sensitive practice, so some courses might necessitate more frequent use of L1 or translanguaging during the delivery, analysis or comprehension of the specific content or in formal or informal exchanges. The study has thus revealed how lecturers' and students' views in different departments change substantially based on the requirements of/expectations from the courses and how translanguaging functions as an effective and essential learning/teaching tool in the content-based courses. Accordingly, the findings should encourage teachers, lecturers and policy-makers in countries such as Turkey to reconsider the nature of bilingual teaching and learning in different areas of tertiary level education.

Keywords: attitudes; bilingual education; content-based classroom; higher education; translanguaging.

Introduction

English has become a widely preferred language and a prestigious choice for

---

[1] This study has been adapted from the corresponding author's Ph.D. dissertation.

education providers and policy-makers shaping academic course contents around the world. Universities often compete with each other ruthlessly to offer programmes taught entirely in English (Doiz et al., 2011), for which more and more students and families are lured by international recognition of their education and purported career prospects.

Multilingual learning and teaching have entered the agenda in recent years thanks to the globalisation and internationalisation of higher education. Studies such as the one by Mazak and Donoso (2015) suggest that "multilingual learning, far from being confusing as a monolingual perspective would see it, actually opens up higher education to more discourses and has the potential to expand students' academic mastery of those discourses" (p. 712). The functions of translanguaging took the attention of Creese and Blackledge (2010), who highlight the importance of researching what "teachable pedagogic resources" are available in the contexts in which learners and teachers freely use all their linguistic collections (p. 113).

This study contributes to translanguaging research by offering a focused perspective on two separate and distinct fields in academia and by providing insights into the nature of bilingual and multilingual interactions and exposing challenges faced by both students and lecturers in following formal requirements and engaging with academic tasks. The amount of research on English as the medium of instruction (EMI), English as a foreign language (EFL) or content-based classes is relatively high, but the issues of translanguaging in these contexts have not been touched adequately by researchers thus far.

Literature Review

To use or not to use L1?

Studies have shown that L1 is widely used in language and content-based classrooms whether an agreement on its use is reached or not (Kırkgöz, 2018; Sert, 2005). Teachers and students frequently utilise L1 since it "facilitates both communication and learning" (Eldridge, 1996, p. 310). Translation in language classes, for example, is seen as "a natural phenomenon and an inevitable part of second language acquisition" (Harbord, 1992, p. 351).

A group of researchers including Cook (2006) underline the positive impact of L1 on language learning. They believe that banning learners' mother tongues in the classroom, where they spend most of their time, is not a benevolent act. When L2 is strictly enforced, the learners' right to speak or ask questions would be limited (Cook, 2000) as it can be used as a strategy to compensate for the low level of English proficiency. Thus, L1 should not be seen as a barrier, but teachers should look for ways in which they could benefit from translanguaging practices. Therefore, having bilingual students can bring richness into the classroom, not a problem (Cook, 2006) as translanguaging serves various functions such as increasing participation, dealing with problems and negotiating meaning (Atkinson 1993; Chambers, 1992; Dickson, 1996; Macaro, 1996, 2003, 2009; Mitchell, 1988).

Mother tongue use is more common and spontaneous when students interact with each other, especially in monolingual classes where students speak a common mother tongue. Studies show that students use their L1 unconsciously (Jingxia, 2010; Sert, 2005; Skiba, 1997). Significant differences between students' levels of L2 and L1 tempt them to use L1 to check whether they understand spoken interaction correctly. This is an important function of L1 use by students when they feel stuck in the class (Simon, 2001). Their L1 thus covers the gap of knowledge they have in L2 as a compensation tool (Heredia & Brown, 2005). Otherwise, communication breakdowns become inevitable and classroom interaction may come to a halt.

A bilingual speaker is no more considered a speaker of two single languages today as bilingual language inventories are not considered as "two autonomous language systems" (Garcia & Wei, 2014, p. 2). Rather, it is claimed that bilingual speakers actually have only one unique linguistic repertoire but these can be "societally constructed as belonging to two separate languages" (p. 2). Baker (2011) defines translanguaging as "the process of making meaning, shaping experiences, gaining understanding and knowledge through the use of two languages" (p. 288). He claims that traditional structuralist ideologies are counter-effective because they do not help learners "accelerate the learning process" (p. 288). Garcia and Wei (2014) also support this claim by defending that using L1 can help learners improve their L2.

Translanguaging

As a reaction to the structuralist views, translanguaging broadens and deepens our understanding of the interactional practices of bilinguals. Leung and Valdes (2019) state that translanguaging is "a rapidly expanding conceptual-cum-theoretical, analytical and pedagogical lens that directly draws from contemporary perspectives on bi/multilingualism and that in many ways both informs and challenges existing theoretical positions and pedagogical practices" (p. 1). There are three main hypotheses of the translanguaging theory (Vogel & Garcia, 2017):

- Speakers select and deploy resources from their unitary linguistic repertoire for communication.
- Speakers' dynamic linguistic and semiotic practices should get more attention to understand bilingual behaviour, not the named languages of nations and states.
- However, it does not ignore the material effect of the named languages which are constructed by the societies and also the influence of the structural approach to languages.

Translanguaging advocates speakers' utilisation of their unitary linguistic repertoires rather than separate mental units for meaning-making and fulfilling particular communicative purposes. Translanguaging has the potential for challenging the current theories of bi- and multilingualism by not accepting the traditional lines of demarcation and divisions among languages. Therefore, translanguaging has recently caught the attention of scholars. While some scholars have embraced it with enthusiasm and thus have deepened, built upon and elucidated the notions and limits of translanguaging (Garcia & Wei, 2014; Hornberger & Link, 2012), the others who have embraced structure-based language theories have resisted or have tacitly acceded to these efforts.

Attitudes towards Translanguaging

Opinions about L1 use in the class have vacillated between hegemonic and

counter-hegemonic ideologies for years. However, students' profiles and the linguistic nature of classrooms have gone through a transformation (Garcia, 2009). "Language classrooms in the twenty-first century are moving from monolingualism towards translingualism, encouraging flexible concurrent language use rather than continuing to keep students' linguistic knowledge separate or treating prior languages as non-existent or purely negative influences" (Wang, 2019, p. 2). Accordingly, the traditional attitudes towards L1 use or flexible language use should be reconfigured because these practices can contribute to pedagogical success (Canagarajah, 2011).

Macaro (2009) proposed a "continuum" model in lecturers' attitudes towards multiple language use in EFL classes, featuring three different positions on translanguaging. In the first position called the "virtual position", lecturers believe that the best practice is to use L2 exclusively in the class and expect the same from students. In the second called "maximal position", lecturers think that they never have ideal classroom conditions to make their "only English" dream realise, so they use L1 when necessary, feeling guilty about it (Doiz & Lasagabaster, 2017). In the last one called "optimal position", lecturers use both languages strategically and sensibly with the purpose of improving and facilitating learning. The speakers in this group are considered to have multilingual perspectives and they adopt a welcoming attitude towards translanguaging practices (Doiz & Lasagabaster, 2017).

Not many lecturers keep an optimal position for multilingual use in practice (Macaro, 2014). Wang and Kirkpatrick (2012) explored teachers' attitudes towards language choices by using Macaro's continuum model in four universities in Beijing. Their findings confirm that teachers display a positive attitude towards L1 use although the school strictly enforces a Chinese-only policy. They use L1 to make courses more interactive, stating that the systematic use of L1 is a must in such a setting (Spolsky, 2012).

Raman and Yiğitoğlu (2015) conducted a study at a university in Nothern Cyprus regarding the functions of code-switching by examining classroom interactions in a classroom that adopts English as the medium of instruction. They concluded that code-switching serves vital functions such as expressing feelings, creating a feeling of connectedness and liberating teachers' inner voices. The study also highlighted that all the participants

consider code-switching as an asset to learning and teaching.

A recent study in a Turkish university context investigated lecturers' attitudes in three universities that have an English-only policy (Karakaş, 2016). The lecturers in these universities have positive attitudes towards students' purposeful L1 use as they tend to value content mastery more than language choice. The lecturers who hold a negative attitude justify their position with the presence of institutional language policy as well as with international students who do not share the same L1 with the others.

However, there is still a large gap in comparative studies in the Turkish tertiary education context. To address the need for comparative research, two diverse fields of university education were represented in this study. The participants from the FS programme represent natural sciences/engineering departments and those from the ELL programme represent social sciences/humanities departments at Gaziantep University. The selection criteria for these programmes could be summarised as follows:

a. These departments are commonly run in English across comparable state and private universities in Turkey. This is an advantage for the researchers to offer resonance for similar groups of participants at different institutions.

b. These two programmes enable us to compare divergences and convergences in the attitudes of the stakeholders of the departments in a comparative manner.

c. These departments accommodate large numbers of students and teaching staff, which confers a clear advantage for reaching more participants who could help us explore the issues at greater length.

This study aims to investigate and compare the perceptions of lecturers and students in the selected programmes on translanguaging practices in EMI courses. Hence, the study will seek answers to the following research questions.

1. What are the ELL students' and lecturers' attitudes towards translanguaging practices?

2.   What are the FS students' and lecturers' attitudes towards translanguaging practices?

3.   What are the differences in student and lecturer attitudes towards translanguaging in ELL and FS programmes?

Methodology

Context

The study was conducted at Gaziantep University, which is one of the prestigious universities offering English-only (EMI) courses in several undergraduate and postgraduate programmes. A fundamental reason for selecting the university for such a study is that one of the researchers had direct access to the research setting, which contributed to the study by providing comprehensive and reliable data collection.

Research Design

The research adopted a qualitative approach, so the data were collected by two methods (semi-structured interview and observation), which were complementary and helped the researchers cross-check the data (Johnson et al., 2007). Methodological triangulation can be seen as a key strength of the study, which aims to compensate for the weaknesses of each method (Dörnyei, 2007; Payne, 1994).

Participants

The participants of the study were selected randomly from among the ELL and FS lecturers and students. Random sampling gives the opportunity of an "equal probability of selection" to all participants in the population, which increases the reliability of research (Kish, 1965). This helps draw a comprehensive picture of attitudes and in-class practices.

Table 1

A Sampling of the Study in ELL and FS Programmes

Programme	Total Number of Students	Interviewed students	Observed classes	Interviewed lecturers
English Lang. and Literature	156	15	21	6
Food Sciences	158	15	21	6
Total	314	30	42	12

As shown in Table 1, about 10% of the total number of students contributed to the study by being interviewed (Total f:30 students, f:12 lecturers).

Data Collection Tools

The data for the study were collected through interviews and classroom observations, which were examined by using inductive content analysis (Creswell, 2014). The semi-structured interview consisted of six parts, covering questions about the participant's background information, the participant's L1 use in the class, the participant's frequency of L1 use, the participant's attitudes towards L1 use, the participant's problems and his/her personal solutions as well as final comments. The student interview questions were adapted to be used for lecturers with minor changes.

Semi-structured interviews were designed and conducted to gather data from the participants (Henerson et al., 1987), which has some key benefits: it allows the researcher to make any adjustments by not limiting the freedom of the researcher (Berg et al., 2012; Dörnyei, 2007; Turner, 2010) and to take "on-the-spot decisions" during the interviews (Kvale, 2007, p. 34; Kvale and Brinkmann, 2009).

Observation is another tool used to explore attitudes and practices in their natural settings. In this way, the researcher can "see events, actions, and experiences" clearly (Ritchie et al., 2013, p. 35). A checklist adapted by Küçük (2018) was used to gather and arrange the data. A total of 21 teaching hours, each lasting 45 minutes, of content classes were observed in the course of the study.

Data Analysis Techniques

Inductive content analysis was utilised for the data analysis of this study (Creswell, 2014). The interview data were recorded, transcribed and coded sequentially. Hatch (2002) claims that "codes should not be defined as rigid regularities with sharp boundaries; they can also cover varying forms" (p. 198). Adopting an "exploratory problem-solving" (Saldana, 2008) attitude allowed the researchers to set up a network of connections and relations. According to Richards and Morse, coding leads us "from the data to the idea and from the idea to all the data pertaining to that idea" in a cyclical manner (2007, p. 137).

Colour-coding was also an important technique for categorisation and interpretation of the data. The items in the same colour were grouped together to identify common themes.

Member-checking and peer debriefing were carried out from time to time (Creswell 2017; Merriam, 1998). The co-author and a group of colleagues from the field checked the codes and transcriptions of the data, which aimed to contribute to the trustworthiness and credibility of the study (Janesick, 2004; Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Spall, 1998; Spillett, 2003).

Results

The data have revealed the students' and lecturers' attitudes towards translanguaging practices in literature and engineering classes. Table 2 shows the summary of the themes derived from the student statements in the interviews. Following the analysis of the data collected in literature and engineering classes, the results of the data from the ELL programme are compared with the results of those collected from the FS programme in the discussion section.

Interview Results of ELL Students

Table 2

The Summary of the Themes (ELL Student Interviews)

Themes	Frequency (f)
a. Translanguaging is a common practice in and out of the class.	15
b. Studying in the EMI context is not challenging.	15
c. Lecturers should provide only English class materials.	15
d. Translanguaging helps deeper understanding, internalising and personalising.	15
e. Translanguaging has a detrimental effect on L2 oral skills.	10
f. Lecturers should be stricter about English-only policy.	9
g. I use translanguaging for note-taking.	7

Translanguaging is a common practice in and out of the class.
ELL students declare that they use L1 in the classroom when they are with their friends and lecturers (f:15). They assert that the lecturers use translanguaging strategically to gain the students' attention.

> Lecturers use L1 for holding our attention because we lose it very quickly in the EMI context. (Student 9, Year 3)

They also state that these fluid practices are common even outside the school when they come together with their classmates to study a topic or revise for exams. This statement is very likely to be accurate as the students share a mutual academic repertoire, through which they communicate with each other practically and comfortably.

> If the lecturers and most of the students are Turkish and we live in a country where Turkish is the mother tongue, translanguaging is a natural thing, so it is inevitable, I think. (Student 15, Year 4)

Translanguaging enhances creativity, and in this way, the students use what they learn at school in their everyday lives without restrictions. In other words, they construct a unique space for inventiveness in their conversations by translanguaging and using terminology spontaneously and frequently out of its immediate context.

> For example, we learn the Freudian drives in the lesson, so we joke around about what we have learned and say "death drive ım harekete geçti" (my death drive has been triggered) before the final exams. (Student 15, Year 4)

Studying in the EMI context is not challenging. All the interviewees confirm that the students enrolled in the ELL programme as a personal choice. However, they claim that it is not the language, but often, the content of courses that is challenging for them (f:15). When they encounter unfamiliar terms during courses, they easily get confused. However, the more experienced students claim to have different studying strategies to succeed in such courses as illustrated below in the interview comments. The interviewed students overcome the difficulties they face in the courses by note-taking during the lectures and revising them afterwards, translating resources before and after class, story making, and coding key terminology prior to the exams to help themselves with memorisation and strategical learning. Some examples of this phenomenon are provided below:

> For Dr. Moreau, we say Dr. Moron because he is a mad scientist. Coding helps us memorise words quicker in exams. (Student 8, Year 3)
>
> For example, Hades in Greek mythology has a three-headed dog, called Cerberus /ˈsɜːrbərəs/ but we call it /ˈdʒerberəs/ (like it is pronounced in Turkish) because that's a wild dog. (Student 3, Year 1)
>
> We use coding for literary terms and definitions in literature and mythology. For instance, James Joyce. Joyce (جوز) means a kind of tree (walnut tree) in Arabic and we imagine Ulysses as the fruit of that tree. (Student 14, Year 4)

Lecturers should provide only English class materials. Some students state to prefer studying and learning English the hard way, so all the materials should be exclusively in English for them (f:15). They are expected to write, discuss and present in English. One states that "English only materials are the best for us. Otherwise, we would only read the Turkish version, which would be a 'fatal' mistake for our learning" (Student 8, Year 3).

The students confess that even if understanding an English text entails extra effort, they are enthusiastic to make an effort to learn better.

> English-only materials are effective because they are primary sources. Imagine a novel; it can be loosely or erroneously translated. Translated works are limiting for primary sources but they are good to be worked on in terms of word choice, etc. (Student 13, Year 3)

They also declare to have read the Turkish translations of the resources at times so that they can compare and contrast the literary works with a critical eye. However, if the lecturers provide them with bilingual materials, this could encourage lethargy and lack of motivation for them to read the texts in L2, in which case the students would only read the text in their mother tongues.

Translanguaging helps deeper understanding, internalising and personalising the content. All the interviewees agree that translanguaging facilitates a deeper understanding of the courses with challenging contents (f:15). As seen below, the interviewees use all resources available to them to be able to grasp the specifics of the reading material.

> When we are learning about a novel, for example, Dracula, we read it in English, in Turkish with different translations and watch the movie, so we learn it better. (Student 10, Year 3)

Some students claim that translanguaging is inevitable, particularly in the courses such as translation, poetry and linguistics, the course texts of which demand more individual resources and abilities to decipher meaningfully and successfully. Knowing keywords and other terminology is vital in the content-based context considering that whenever the students misinterpret the key concepts, understanding the text properly becomes a major hurdle.

> Lecturers have to use L1 because some terminology is not available in our home language for example extended metaphor, uncanny, etc. (Student 12, Year 3)

For some courses, the lecturers use local examples to build connections between the known and the unknown. To illustrate, as the students study Linguistics, the lecturer offers examples in their L1 to build a bridge with the target language. This facilitates their learning by facilitating their

accumulated knowledge as a base and continue building new knowledge upon it.

> If there is more terminology in the course such as Linguistics, we need L1 more for support. (Student 13, Year 3)

The students (f:6) claim that when the class tries to understand the lecture or an English text, the students use their L1 and L2 (even L3 if available). They translate the written or spoken text, which helps not only their writing but also their oral skills as well. But, the students also allege that when they have lecturers coming from the Turkish literature programme to give a presentation or a lecture, they, as students, struggle because they do not have a grasp of the relevant terminology in Turkish. A knowledge of terms in Turkish would be highly beneficial to them.

> We as EMI students, struggle to understand talks given in L1 because we only master key terminology in English. (Student 11, Year 3)

Translanguaging has a detrimental effect on L2 oral skills. The students stress that translanguaging gradually becomes a habit, so they feel as if they forget how to speak English appropriately, with no interference of words from their mother tongues –Turkish and Arabic in the selected context (f:10). One declares that "If a native speaker came here, s/he wouldn't understand our English (Student 8, Year 3)." This newly compiled language affects their performance negatively, especially in the exams, in which they profess to receive poor scores from time to time.

Lecturers should be stricter about English-only policy. More than half of the interviewees expect lecturers to be stricter by compelling them to speak English only in the class (f:9) as they believe not to have other opportunities to communicate in English outside the classroom (f:6).

> School is the only place where we are exposed to the language so lecturers should help us maximally on that. Therefore, they should force us to speak English in class. (Student 11, Year 3)

They express that if they are exposed to the target language more, their English will improve. Also, the majority of the students aim for a career in teaching, yet their oral skills are one of their weaknesses, which weakens their self-confidence. Thus, they expect lecturers to offer an L2 atmosphere to help them at every opportunity.

> Lecturers shouldn't provide the Turkish equivalence straightaway; they should simplify the complex language first. For me, explaining something in Turkish should be the last resort. (Student 2, Year 1)

Another point made by an Arab student is that when the lecturer translanguage, the Arab students feel excluded and ignored due to their limited Turkish. She asserts that the lecturers sometimes use a mixture of Turkish and English. For international students, translanguaging (Turkish/English) makes comprehension even harder as the interviewees state that they might not be proficient in English, Turkish or both. Accordingly, translanguaging between these languages is not effective each time for all the students as they do not speak the same mother tongue with the lecturer and the rest of the class.

I use translanguaging for note-taking. Translanguaging can be seen frequently in the students' notes as well (f:7). All the lesson materials are provided in English, but it is very common to see hand-written notes that belong to some students' L1. Many adopt a combination of words from their mother tongues and the target language for note-taking. Because it is an exclusively personal habit; how, what and how much they take notes vary considerably. Some use L2 more commonly whereas others use L1 to highlight and clarify what is written in L2. Some take notes in the same code the lecturer uses at that moment. Some others do simultaneous translations in the flow of talk and take notes in the meantime. Each student has a unique note-taking style that is particular to her/him. We can see the samples of this elaborately in the interview extracts:

> I take notes of what the lecturer has said in the class, they are generally in English, then I translate it in my head to Turkish. After that, I summarise and rewrite the sentences in my own words. This is how I learn best. (Student 7, Year 1)

> I take personal notes in Turkish on the English text. (Student 5, Year 1)

Interview Results of ELL Lecturers

All ELL lecturers state to use L1 in the classroom now and then. The views of the lecturers are discussed below in detail with the extracts taken from the interviews. As only 6 lecturers were interviewed, the frequency is not provided in the study in order not to mislead the reader (See Table 3).

Table 3

The Summary of the Themes (ELL Lecturer Interviews)

Themes
a. Translanguaging is highly personal and content-sensitive.
b. Translanguaging is used strategically.
c. Student participation is more important than the preferred language.
d. The English-only policy has some challenges.

Translanguaging is highly personal and content-sensitive. All the lecturers openly state that L1 use and its amount are shaped and determined by the content of the course and participants of that specific class. Their justifications differ significantly from each other. Half of them assert to translanguage more for scaffolding in order to improve the low-level students' comprehension of the content.

> Translanguaging can only be suitable for low levels. At high levels, only L2 should be used. There's no exposure to L2 out of the school, which negatively affects students' speaking performances. (Lecturer 2)

Yet, the other half confess to having a much stricter approach to the freshman students who need more exposure to L2. The students can easily abuse the language policies, so the lecturers state that they generally stick to the use of L2 in the class. As for the final-year students, the lecturers confess to being more flexible as these students tend to be more attentive and conscious of the course objectives.

> "We don't want to encourage them to speak only in L1, so there
> must be an acceptable balance". (Lecturer 3)

The lecturers claim that course content determines the amount of translanguaging. Some courses requiring translation, grammar activities, linguistics concepts or discussions on literary theory hearten or entail the students to translate, analyse, compare and contrast expressions in their L1 and L2.

L1 is used strategically. The lecturers state to use L1 strategically as a linguistic and educational tool. They use it for building rapport, joking around or as an attention-getter. All stress that they accept questions in either language as they do not want the students to go silent due to loss of motivation. Lecturer 6 states that "interfering students, while they are making a point, is very disappointing for them. They wouldn't participate next time." Correspondingly, Lecturer 2 reports, "I never silence them with L2, it breaks motivation". She clarifies that she first provides an answer in L2 with challenging vocabulary, and then, simplifies it with more basic equivalents in L2. She translanguages as a final resort. She summarises "when the students ask Turkish questions, I answer them in L1 for different levels". However, the lecturers use different strategies to manage the questions in L1. They all agree that they would never stop the students to ask them for answers in L2, which could break their self-confidence and motivation to speak in front of their classmates, so tailoring answers for those at different levels of proficiency is critical and highly beneficial.

Student participation is more important than the preferred language. The lecturers highlight the merits of student participation in the courses. Within the flow of the lessons, they acknowledge discussing controversial issues and avoid worrying about the code of the language now and then. Nonetheless, they do not mean to abuse the language policy as they claim that the amount of L1 use never exceeds that of L2.

> In the department, we expect students to analyse, synthesise,
> comment on and develop critical skills. (Lecturer 5)

> A lecturer has stated to be sharing the same cultural and linguistic background with the students regarding nationality, language and identity, so she prefers to use L1 with no hesitancy and regret by declaring that "if a Turkish expression fits the best to the context, why should I use it furtively?" (Lecturer 1).

Another lecturer also favours this stance by maintaining that the books and poems they analyse often feature instances of translanguaging. Thus, they need to approach texts with this metalinguistic awareness. They read such texts with a critical eye to decipher the hidden meaning behind the manuscript and attempt to figure out how the meaning is constructed and manipulated by these different language codes.

> In some lessons, authors or poets translanguage in their works purposefully, and thus, we question that too in our discussion because there must be a message underneath. (Lecturer 4)

The English-only policy has some challenges. Half of the lecturers mention that English-only teaching is not a well-working strategy for themselves as they have difficulty expressing themselves in Turkish. They explain this by stating that when they read reference books in L1 or when they attend a conference in Turkish, they struggle with the terminology to be presented in their mother tongues.

> When I read a theory book in Turkish, I don't understand it because I realise I am unfamiliar with its specific terminology, so reading and writing theory in Turkish are always more challenging for me. Then I realise I am alien to the specific terminology of that language. (Lecturer 3)

Interview Results of FS Students

Table 4

The Summary of the Themes (FS Student Interviews)

Themes	Frequency
a. Translanguaging is a common practice in and out of the class.	15
b. Translanguaging helps deeper understanding, internalising and personalising.	15
c. Lecturers should provide only English class materials.	13

Themes	Frequency
d. Translanguaging has a detrimental effect on L2 oral skills.	9
e. Studying in the EMI context has some challenges.	8
f. Lecturers should be stricter about English-only policy.	7
g. I use translanguaging for note-taking.	7

Translanguaging is a common practice in and out of the class.
All the students who participated in the interview agree that they
translanguage in and out of the school for various reasons (f:15). The main
reason for using such a fluid language is that they are highly exposed to English
in written and spoken forms in their departments. They highlight that
the terminology they use is always in English and the language around it is
regularly in L1. The entries of the keywords are made in English, so they stay
as they are, and they do not have to be translated into Turkish. The students
prefer to learn, memorise and use the concepts of high significance in English.

> As I learn the keywords for the first time in the department,
> when I translanguage, they are always in English. We don't
> even remember their Turkish equivalence. (Student 9, Year 3)

> We say "melting point neresi?" instead of "where is the melting
> point?" we don't want to get stressed speaking English, such
> expressions are understood by everybody. (Student 10,
> Year 3)

The students also reveal that the lecturers often translanguage, but they use
key vocabulary in English only even when they speak Turkish. This unique
programme-specific language is contagious, and the students seem to take
the lecturers as role models for themselves in this regard.

> Even lecturers say "beaker" or "tube" when they are speaking
> Turkish, we don't know what they are in Turkish. (Student 11,
> Year 3)

***Translanguaging helps understanding, internalisation and
personalisation.*** All the interviewed students claim that translanguaging
helps them understand better (f:15). In lessons delivered in English
exclusively, they accept that they fail to understand the content wholly, so they
feel like missing important points of the content (f:15). Consequently, they feel

obliged to study more and spend extra effort to comprehend the delivered lesson and written materials.

> I generally understand 50% in lessons. I read, listen and write in both languages, and then, I finally understand. (Student 8, Year 1)

> With the help of translanguaging, we accommodate the information. (Student 5, Year 1)

They confess that some lecturers embrace a critical attitude towards L1 use in the class. In those classes, verbal interaction is limited, and the students feel to be silenced by the target language.

> I really struggle when the lecturer explains my Turkish question in English again in the same way, I don't understand again, so I give up asking any more questions, there's no point. (Student 12, Year 3)

They are observed keeping quiet, whispering the answer to their desk mates or plucking up enough courage to answer questions in their mother tongue.

> If lecturers stop us from speaking Turkish and force us to speak English, we'll go silent and wouldn't ask questions anymore. (Student 2, Year 1)

The students habitually translanguage in applied courses in laboratories where any misunderstanding of the instructions can end up in accidents and physical injuries. These students deal with explosive and inflammable gases or dangerous chemical solutions. For that reason, they often check their comprehension with their peers by asking questions to each other. In negotiating the meaning, they make sure what they have understood is correct and be safely put into practice.

> Especially in the lab, translanguaging is vital for checking if we have understood the instructions correctly. (Student 2, Year 1)

The students claim that not only their L1 or L2 (f:6) but also their overall linguistic skills develop intuitively with the help of translanguaging. They believe that lecturers should not be strict about L1 use because L1 helps the students keep on track (f:8).

> Lecturers should allow students to speak flexibly because this helps me improve my skills in different languages. (Student 4, Year 1)

> When we try to understand, we use all skills available to use. (Student 7, Year 1)

***Lecturers should provide only English class materials*.** Nearly all the students indicate that they do not prefer bilingual materials -English and Turkish in this case- as this would trigger indolence and mental inactivity, which will end up in procrastination (f:13).

> If we used bilingual materials for studying, it would make us even lazier because we would only read the Turkish half of the content. (Student 10, Year 3)

> We are in an EMI department, we need to study texts in English only. (Student 8, Year 1)

The students also stress that the lecturers should provide them with the English materials with high-quality explanations, model questions, clear examples and easy-to-follow layouts. They state to have English texts they could extensively exploit as resources for unpacking the meaning and maximise their learning.

> When lecturers provide English-only materials, we can translate, take notes on, highlight, research the parts we don't understand and learn better this way. (Student 1, Year 1)

***Translanguaging has a detrimental effect on L2 oral skills*.** More than half of the students think that translanguaging has a negative impact on their L2 oral skills (f:9). They assert to have no opportunity to practice their L2 with a native speaker in order to improve their speaking skills (f:12), and there is no exposure to the target language in and out of the school.

> There is nowhere in which we can improve our speaking. Courses are often delivered as lectures. We only listen and take notes. (Student 6, Year 1)

The English-only policy has some challenges. More than half of the students stress the problems they face with the English-only policy (f:8).

In the EMI context, they are familiar with the English forms of field-specific vocabulary, but they lack such knowledge in their mother tongue. They justify their points by mentioning that they are assigned to local factories, some of which belong to internationally known companies, and they often employ qualified and multilingual staff. However, some institutions are categorically small-scale workplaces where almost nobody speaks English, thus they complain about the difficulty of adapting to such work environments.

> Lecturers should have a proper understanding of us using L1 because many of us will end up working in local places. (Student 13, Year 3)

> I prefer bilingual lesson materials because when we go to the factories for training, we don't understand when they say "plakalı eşanjör" for "plate heat exchanger". Terminology is totally different in local and international work settings. (Student 11, Year 3)

Another challenge mentioned by some students is that they generally memorise to be able to write in the examinations (f:3), they do not internalise the lesson content, so after a while, they forget what they have learned by heart.

> We as students try to pass the courses, we're not trying to improve our English. (Student 15, Year 3)

Less than half of the students (f:6) claim to have started their departments after the English preparation year without getting ready to take the courses. They maintain to take mandatory Freshman English courses which cover English for specific purposes, but all the engineering students attend such courses together in the lecture halls. The content is not programme-specific; thus, they claim not to benefit from those courses. They confess that they need English support during their university education, but there are no such available courses to support their language development.

> Prep school, freshman English and what we have to learn are like cheese and chalk. When we come to the department from prep school, we're like fish out of water, but we have to pick up the language from scratch in the first two years. (Student 15, Year 3)

The students confess that high focus on the EMI education is tough and counter-effective as some lecturers adopt the English-only policy in the class and use a very flat tone and tedious teaching style, so the students cannot grasp what is relevant or superfluous. In the end, they lose their attention and begin not to listen to the lectures with due care.

> While a lecturer is speaking, if I don't know a word, I get stuck and disconnected from the lesson immediately. (Student 10, Year 3)

> EMI context is difficult when the lecturer uses only English with no intonation, I lose concentration very quickly. (Student 14, Year 3)

Lecturers should be stricter about English-only policy. Nearly half of the students claim that the lecturers should not be flexible about the English-only policy (f:7) because the only reason why they chose this department/programme is its policy of English as the medium of instruction. Therefore, if they struggle to understand the course contents, the lecturers should use techniques such as shifting their intonation, using visual aids, presenting the topic on the board, providing handouts or explicating the topic with examples, etc. to support their comprehension.

> Lecturers shouldn't speak Turkish because it is an EMI context and we came here on purpose. (Student 15, Year 3)

> Lecturers should explain complex points in English again by simplifying their languages. Using the mother tongue shouldn't be the first but the final resort. (Student 5, Year 1)

Some international students also stated that they do not prefer lecturers to use L1 and all members of the class should stick with it. Otherwise, they stressed that they think the EMI setting would not benefit them and they feel left out.

Translanguaging is an effective tool for note-taking. Nearly half of the students claim that they translanguage when they are taking notes (f:7). Although all the lesson materials are presented in L2, how students take notes differs significantly. The most frequent note-taking technique is taking notes in

L1 on the lesson material written in L2. Below are provided some interview answers on the students' note-taking habits.

> I take notes in English and Turkish, I use Turkish for my personal notes on English texts. (Student 8, Year 1)

> I take notes in English, when I go home, I translate them into Turkish for better understanding then I write them in English again with my own words. This is how I learn best, I never forget this way. (Student 13, Year 3)

Interview Results of FS Lecturers

Table 5

The Summary of the Themes (FS Lecturer Interviews)

Themes
a. Terminology is always produced in L2.
b. The English-only policy should be followed.
c. Student participation in the class is limited.
d. The English-only policy has some challenges.

Terminology is always produced in L2. Most of the lecturers confirm that as they all had educational backgrounds in the EMI contexts, they struggle with the equivalences of terminology in L1. Using the terminology in English causes minimal communication breakdown in verbal interactions. The students are also influenced by this field-specific and jargon-heavy speech and take their lecturers as role models.

> It's hard to say technical words in Turkish because the equivalence doesn't match them properly. They are technical words even in some Turkish contexts; they are used as they are. (Lecturer 3)

> Like us, our students don't know what "beher" is in Turkish, we just say "beaker". (Lecturer 6)

The lecturers see this speaking style as a natural characteristic of the programme. Thus, all the members of this academic community have been adapted to such a hybrid communication. They justify their points by saying that all input they receive and provide is in English, so this flexible and natural talk (in other words, translanguaging) naturally emerges in academic and daily

interactions in the department. Two lecturers also mention that the students do not know the L1 equivalences of the engineering terminologies until they start internships at physical worksites.

> Students use all keywords in English because they are exposed to them in L2, and they overuse them. (Lecturer 1)

> They don't know how to say static-state in Turkish, which is "yatışkın durum" so they say: "sistem static-state oldu" (the system is in a static state). (Lecturer 4)

The English-only policy should be followed. Half of the lecturers believe to follow the English-only policy firmly. They disapprove of smuggling the EMI context by using the mother tongue.

> L1 use shouldn't be allowed because they (the students) come to this department for EMI. (Lecturer 3)

The lecturers stress how poorly students perform in the examinations due to their low proficiency levels of English. When the students are asked theoretical questions that require them to explain with words, not with numbers or symbols in detail, many of them fail inevitably. Therefore, nearly all the lecturers state to have ignored common grammatical or spelling mistakes as long as the students' exam papers are intelligible to read and their responses are accurate and consistent.

> In exams, we don't mark grammatical problems as long as they explain the main points. (Lecturer 2)

Another point made by the lecturers is that the students have poor verbal skills. If the students are permitted to use their L1 liberally in the classes, they would exploit this seriously. That's why, the lecturers do not appreciate the students' use of L1 widely, especially during their interactions with the lecturers.

> Translanguaging doesn't help students improve their speaking. (Lecturer 5)

All the lecturers agree that the students should be more conscious about why

they should stick with language policy and be aware of the value and prestige of studying in an FS programme offering English as the medium of instruction. They highlight a global vision and the key role of Food Engineering in international markets.

> Students should be familiar with international scientific terminology because these engineering departments are internationally popular and prestigious. (Lecturer 3)

> To be able to compete globally with other countries, we have to be internationally visible. (Lecturer 1)

The lecturers state that a BA diploma in engineering complemented by English proficiency will enhance the students' job opportunities in the local and international markets, so they should not ignore the foreign language element of their degrees by focusing on the course contents only.

> This diploma is nothing if they don't have English because many others have this from Turkish departments. It will make them more preferable and presentable in the international job opportunities arena. (Lecturer 2)

Participation in the class is limited. All the lecturers complain about the low participation levels in the classes, particularly in the first and second years. They stress finding it hard to understand whether the students are motivated adequately. One of the interviewed lecturers asserts that the reason why students do not contribute to the lesson may be psychological reasons rather than the students' low proficiency in English or reluctance to participate in classes regularly. He maintains

> Ideally, students who prefer our department should have no problems with the target language. They learn technical English on top of general English but unfortunately, we are concerned about the state of readiness of the students who come here. They have their hands full with trying to understand challenging lesson content and picking up the language, which makes their job very difficult. (Lecturer 2)

Also, all the lecturers also underline the students' poor state of personal and intellectual readiness for the department affects their participation in

the lessons and automatically their performances.

The English-only policy has some challenges. The majority of the lecturers experience similar problems with their students' understanding of the field-specific terminology in Turkish. They acknowledge to be unfamiliar with some terminology in L1 and fail to communicate with other colleagues successfully stating that "We have problems understanding our colleagues who work in departments in which the language of instruction is Turkish because we don't know the Turkish equivalents of some English technical words" (Lecturer 5). All the lecturers claim that there is no equivalence of a word or terminology in L2 such as some food names that are specific to Turkish cuisine.

> I only use Turkish words when they have no equivalence in English for example "kaşar, pekmez, baklava, şalgam", which are introduced and accepted internationally. (Lecturer 1)

All the lecturers accept that translanguaging helps their students for better understanding. They ask their peers questions, request for further simplifications, discuss with them their solutions, enquire about further phases, interpret visual materials, etc. As the level of the course content and their language proficiency do not match each other, translanguaging operates by compensating for such gaps just like a bridge from the known to the unknown.

> Translanguaging helps students fill in the gaps in their previous knowledge. (Lecturer 3)

Discussion

Table 6

The Comparison of the Frequency of Themes (ELL and FS Student Interviews)

Themes	Frequency(ELL)	Frequency(FS)
Translanguaging is a common practice in and out of the class.	15	15
Studying in the EMI context is not challenging / has some challenges.	15	8
Lecturers should provide only English class materials.	15	13
Translanguaging helps deeper understanding,	15	15

Themes	Frequency(ELL)	Frequency(FS)
internalising and personalising.		
Translanguaging has a detrimental effect on L2 oral skills.	10	9
Lecturers should be stricter about English-only policy.	9	7
I use translanguaging for note-taking.	7	7

A total of 30 students from the ELL and FS programmes (15 from each) agree that translanguaging is ubiquitous (f:30) in the academic and non-academic university settings. They benefit from this inventive, fluid and hybrid language with any speaker, including lecturers and peers, who can participate in the various forms of interactions (Lin 2019). All the students agree that translanguaging helps them for a better understanding of academic content. In this way, they can personalise and internalise the topics for accommodation (f:30). Nearly half of each group think that the content (through lectures, self-study, lab experiments, etc.) feeds into students' continuously expanding, holistic and linguistic repertoire (L1 and L2) (Lin, 2019), irrespective of no matter what language it is produced in (ELL, f:6; FS, f:6). The students find the lecturers' strict language–policy stances beneficial because as they feel more pressure from the lecturers, which encourages them to produce more English (ELL, f:9; FS, f:7). However, they do not reject the benefits of translanguaging in the classroom. Learning challenging content in a language that is the medium of instruction but not the language used for social interactions is not easy for students (Kim, Kweon and Kim, 2017; Ngcobo, 2016; Makalela, 2015; Rolin-Ianziti and Varshney, 2008; Rukh, 2012; Shifidi, 2014; Xhemaili, 2017).

Furthermore, the students do not prefer their class materials in their mother tongue as they have easy access to L1 materials, but they struggle to reach simplified English-only materials (ELL, f:15; FS, f:13). They highlight the detrimental effect of translanguaging on their L2 oral skills and they conclude that speaking is one of their weakest points and that L1 use makes more harm than good in this respect (ELL, f:10; FS, f:9). They state that their verbal deficiencies and weaknesses in L2 (vocabulary, pronunciation and communication skills) turn them into passive listeners and they habitually refrain from participating in the seminars and class discussion confidently

(Tatzl, 2011). Even the idea of participation puts them under stress when they want to ask or answer a question in L2 because they are not confident about their English proficiency. Their low participation might cause them to lose their attention and get bored of the lesson easily. When they stop paying attention to the subject matter being delivered, the important shares of lesson content go unnoticed. This cycle causes the students to fail and drop the courses. As Tavares (2015) puts it, students should be allowed to collaborate to deal with challenging lesson content, so classroom participation can be activated further by peer scaffolding.

Despite various resemblances, the two themes derived from the student interviews are strikingly different from each other. Participation in the class is more valued than the preferred language in the ELL classroom (f:6), so the ELL students are never criticised or get any negative response from the lecturer regarding their L1 use. However, in the FS classrooms, participation is very limited. The students are studying in a programme in which English is the medium is challenging particularly in verbal lessons (f:6) as they accept that their linguistic abilities are not propitious for mastering the subject matter in this language policy (Evans and Morrison, 2011; Hellekjaer, 2010; Tatzl, 2011). This problem leads the students to miss some important points of the content and to lose their motivation, which prompts a gradual withdrawal in the long run. They are expected to cover a lot of challenging terms in these courses, and they are expected to pass the exams and other forms of evaluations by revisions as most lecturers believe that content mastery is only possible through self-study.

As a final difference, the FS students think that the English-only policy brings some challenges (f:8). The students' lack of terminological knowledge in L2 particularly worries them about working in local worksites. They need to know the key terms related to their discipline in L1 (Lasagabaster, 2013). Some lecturers believe that they would overcome this after their internships in local companies, but the students are worried about time restrictions and course workloads. They feel that covering the four years of content in one go would be very intense and nerve-breaking, especially in their final years when they will have to deal with high-stake exams, graduation work, training reports, career worries, etc.

Four themes have been derived from lecturers' statements in the interviews, two of which are similar to each other, and another two reflect key differences between the mindset of ELL and FS lecturers. To begin with, ELL and FS lecturers confirm that English-only policy carries some challenges both for them and their students. They confess that when they listen or read translated academic works written in their home language, but they cannot understand them properly as some terminology entries are kept in L2. ELL lecturers find translanguaging a useful resource if it is used strategically in the courses, highlighting its context-sensitiveness. The lesson content and its immediate context are key determining factors for the amount of hybrid language and translanguaging practices. While some courses require students to translanguage more often, others encourage far less. Specifically, theory-based lessons are taught in the form of lectures, so student participation and interaction are often very limited. The dynamics of such courses do not create the necessary space for fruitful and meaningful translanguaging.

Some striking differences should also be mentioned here. Similar to what ELL students and lecturers stated in their interviews, class observations reveal that translanguaging increases both participation and interaction in the classroom (Tavares, 2015; Wang, 2019). Students often use translanguaging practices to participate, elaborate ideas and raise questions (Lewis et al., 2012). On the contrary, when the lecturers strictly force the policy, students keep quiet, and thus, both participation and interaction dramatically drop (Kılıçkaya, 2006). ELL students and lecturers justify that as long as students actively participate, they do not consider their translanguaging practices as a distractor that needs to be dealt with (Karakaş, 2016). Lecturers also maintain equality among students with different proficiency levels. By translanguaging, any student can contribute to the lesson, not only the ones whose level of English is superior to the others in some ways (Garcia & Wei, 2014). Accordingly, the differences are levelled out in a way, Students with low proficiency levels contribute to the lesson content profoundly by not being disadvantaged or silenced by L2 anymore.

The observation notes reveal that the FS lecturers are keen to follow the English-only policy, thus they show a stricter and tough attitude towards L1 use in the class. As FS students' participation is limited in classes, they shy

away from speaking in front of their peers. The wide use of translanguaging in the classrooms is seen as "undesirable, unrealistic and untenable" practices, which is in line with Levine's outcomes (2011). The lecturers feel that keeping L2 in the class is one of their duties. In other words, they nominate themselves to tirelessly police students' language practices as their primary responsibility. When they have to use L1 in a few instances, they prefer keeping it clandestine as having been taught to think that they have not made a cogent decision with this move (Garcia, 2009). According to Canagarajah (2011), translanguaging naturally abounds in all classrooms where the content is not delivered in the students' mother tongue. Even if lecturers stick with L2 use, students will still prefer to ask their questions in their L1, as evinced in recorded classes in this study. From an opposing standpoint, the ELL lecturers agree with students' benefiting from their L1, thus they value and embrace translanguaging (Doiz and Lasagabaster, 2017). However, they do not employ it clandestinely and appear to know the criticality of strategic and deliberate use of translanguaging as a teaching and learning aid.

Conclusion

This study offers a comparative analysis of the students' and lecturers' attitudes towards translanguaging practices in literature and food science classes at a public university in Turkey. It has been observed that the selected group of students translanguage strategically in and out of the classes to fulfill various functions. The lecturers in FS and ELL programmes hold divergent views on L1 use and its benefits in their courses. Those in the ELL programme regard students as bilinguals and use L1 tactically in those courses by being conscious of its rewards. They claim that L1 is indispensable for some courses such as Translation, which requires constant translanguaging or Poetry, in which student participation in class discussion and collaborative textual analysis are highly valued. The lecturers state that they employ translanguaging practices for two broad purposes. The first is the pedagogical purposes such as clarifying and conveying meaning to facilitate a better comprehension of the content, explaining new words and concepts and giving voice to students' thoughts and explanations, which increases their participation. The other is the affective purposes such as comforting students

in the challenging contexts of taboo topics and building rapport with them. Accordingly, they adopt flexible instructional methods in their lectures by holding an optimal position towards multilingualism and encouraging translanguaging among students intentionally. Translanguaging thus serves the pedagogical purposes of the courses, so they question the prejudice and reluctance regarding the issue. They consider the target language both as a means and an end, thus they generate a linguistic space in their classes by and for translanguaging practices.

The FS lecturers appear to be more loyal and adamant about sticking to the English-only policy in their courses. Nevertheless, they shy away from interfering with students' use of mother tongues considering the fact that these practices aid meaning-making and deeper comprehension. Even if the lecturers do not favour the concept and practices of translanguaging personally, L1 use is existent in a clandestine way as a side-product of tertiary engineering instruction. Lecturers' authoritarian attitudes towards English-only policy reveal the fact that EMI is a prestigious choice in the field. The students agree with the lecturers regarding that the English-only policy is an ideal option, yet their practices differ substantially and frequently from their stated views. Despite their need for continual and concentrated exposure to English for improving their English proficiency and specific field repertoire, they tend to see L1 as a valuable resource in their day-to-day and academic interactions and education.

The study, accordingly, provides potential implications for educators, authorities and other researchers in the field. Authorities should revisit and reconsider the principles of monolingual/EMI teaching and design policies with a more welcoming attitude towards multilingualism in tertiary level natural sciences/engineering and humanities/social sciences education in Turkey. Further research with different variables (e.g., language levels, discipline, gender, etc.) on translanguaging habits and practices in university-level education would necessarily contribute to discipline-specific translanguaging studies with new insights and implications.

References

Atkinson, D. (1993). *Teaching monolingual classes*. Longman.

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

Berg, B. L., & Lune, H. (2012). *Qualitative research methods for the social
sciences* (8th ed.). Pearson.

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

Chambers, G. (1992). Teaching in the target language. *Language Learning
Journal*, *6*, 66–67. https://doi.org/10.1080/09571739285200491

Cook, V. (2000). *Second language learning and language teaching*. Foreign
Language Teaching and Research Press and Edward Arnold Publishers.

Cook, V. (2006). Using the first language in the classroom*. Canadian Modern
Language Review*, *57*(3), 402–423. https://doi.org/10.3138/
cmlr.57.3.402

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. (2014). *A concise introduction to mixed methods research*. Sage
publications.

Creswell, J. W. (2017). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing
among five approaches* (4th ed.). Sage Publications.

Dickson, P. (1996). *Using the target language: A view from the classroom*.
NFER.

Doiz, A., & Lasagabaster, D. (2017). Teachers' beliefs about translanguaging
practices. In C. M. Mazak, & Kevin S. Carroll (Eds.), *Translanguaging
in higher education, beyond monolingual ideologies* (pp. 155–174).
Multilingual Matters.

Doiz, A., Lasagabaster, D., & Manuel, J. (2011). Internationalisation,
multilingualism and English-medium instruction. *World Englishes,
30*(3), 345–359. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-971X.2011.01718.x

Dörnyei, Z. (2007). *Research methods in applied linguistics: Quantitative, qualitative, and mixed methodologies.* Oxford University Press.

Eldridge, J. (1996). Code-switching in a Turkish secondary school, *ELT Journal*, *50*(4), 303–311. https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/50.4.303

Evans, S., & Morrison, B. (2011). Meeting the challenges of English-medium higher education: The first-year experience in Hong Kong. *English for Specific Purposes, 30*(3), 198–208. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.esp.2011.01.001

Garcia, O. (2009). *Bilingual education in the 21st century: A global perspective*. Wiley-Blackwell.

Garcia, O., & Wei, L. (2014). *Translanguaging: Language, bilingualism and education*. Palgrave Pivot.

Harbord, J. (1992). The use of the mother tongue in the classroom. *ELT Journal*, *46*(4), 350–355. https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/46.4.350

Hatch, J. A. (2002). *Doing qualitative research in education settings*. SUNY Press.

Hellekjær, G. O. (2017). Lecture comprehension in English-medium higher education. *HERMES-Journal of Language and Communication in Business, 23*(45), 11–34. https://doi.org/10.7146/hjlcb.v23i45.97343

Henerson, M. E., Morris, L. L., & Fitz-Gibbon, C. T. (1987). *How to measure Attitudes* (2nd ed.). Sage.

Heredia, R., & Brown, J. M. (2005). Code-switching. In P. Strazny (Ed.), *The Encyclopedia of Linguistics* (pp. 214–216). Taylor & Francis.

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

Janesick, V. J. (2004). *Stretching exercises for qualitative researchers* (2nd ed.). Sage.

Jingxia, L. (2010). Teachers' code-switching to the L1 in EFL classroom. *The Open Applied Linguistic Journal*, *2*(4), 10–23. https://doi.org/10.2174/1874913501003010010

Johnson, R. B., Onwuegbuzie, A. J., & Turner, L. A. (2007). Toward a definition of mixed methods research. *Journal of Mixed Methods Research*, *1*(2),

112–133. https://doi.org/10.1177/1558689806298224

Karakaş, A. (2016). Turkish lecturers' views on the place of mother tongue in the teaching of content courses through English medium. *Asian Englishes*, *18*(3), 242–257. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/ 13488678.2016.1229831

Kim, E. G., Kweon, S. O., & Kim, J. (2017). Korean engineering students' perceptions of English-medium instruction (EMI) and L1 use in EMI classes. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, *38*(2), 130–145. https://doi.org/10.1080/01434632.2016.1177061

Kırkgöz, Y. (2009). Students' and lecturers' perceptions of the effectiveness of foreign language instruction in an English-medium university in Turkey. *Teaching in Higher Education*, *14*(1), 81–93. https://doi.org/10.1080/13562510802602640

Kırkgöz, Y. (2018). Confronting similar challenges? Exploring students' experiences of studying engineering at a Turkish university: Turkish versus English-Language Medium of Instruction. *Rassegna Italiana di Linguistica Applicata,* 2–3, 145–160. https://dialnet.unirioja.es/ ejemplar/529611

Kish, L. (1965). *Survey sampling*. John Wiley & Sons.

Küçük, C. (2018). *Investigating translanguaging as a teaching and learning practice in an English medium higher education context in Turkey* [Unpublished master's thesis]. Çukurova University.

Lasagabaster, D. (2013). The use of the L1 in CLIL classes: The teachers' perspective. *Latin American Journal of Content and Language Integrated Learning, 6*(2), 1–21. https://doi.org/10.5294/3148

Leung, C., & Valdés, G. (2019). Translanguaging and the transdisciplinary framework for language teaching and learning in a multilingual world. *The Modern Language Journal*, *103*(2), 348–370. https://doi.org/10.1111/modl.12568

Levine, G. S. (2011). *Code choice in the language classroom.* Multilingual Matters.

Lewis, G., Jones, B., & Baker, C. (2012). Translanguaging: Developing its conceptualisation and contextualisation. *Educational Research and Evaluation*, *18*(7), 655–670. https://doi.org/10.1080/13803611.

2012.718490

Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. G. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry*. Sage.

Macaro, E. (1996). Teacher use of the target language. *Languages Forum*, *1*(5), 2–7.

Macaro, E. (2003). *Teaching and learning a second language*. Continuum.

Macaro, E. (2009). Teacher use of codeswitching in the second language classroom: Exploring'optimal' use. In M. Turnbull, & J. Dailey-O'Cain (Eds.), *First language use in second and foreign language learning* (pp. 35–49). Multilingual Matters.

Macaro, E. (2014). Overview: where should we be going with classroom Codeswitching research? In R. Barnard, & J. McLellan (Eds.), *Codeswitching in university English-medium classes: Asian perspectives* (pp. 10–23). Multilingual Matters.

Macdonald, C. A. (1990). *Swimming up the Waterfall: A Study of School-Based Learning Experiences. A Final Report of the Threshold Project.* Human Sciences Research Council.

Makalela, L. (2015). Moving out of linguistic boxes: The effects of translanguaging strategies for multilingual classrooms. *Language and education*, *29*(3), 200–217. https://doi.org/10.1080/09500782. 2014.994524

Mazak, C. M., & Herbas-Donoso, C. (2015). Translanguaging practices at a bilingual university: A case study of a science classroom, *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, *18*(6), 698–714. https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050.2014.939138

Merriam, S. B. (1998). *Qualitative research and case study applications in education*. Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Mitchell, R. (1988). *Communicative language teaching in practice*. Centre for Information on Language Teaching.

Ngcobo, S., Ndaba, N., Nyangiwe, B., Mpungose, N., & Jamal, R. (2016). Translanguaging as an approach to address language inequality in South African higher education: Summary writing skills development. *Critical Studies in Teaching and Learning*, *4*(2), 10–27. https://www.ajol.info/index.php/cristal/article/view/149784

Payne, D. A. (1994). *Designing educational project and program evaluations:*

A practical overview based on research and experience. Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Raman, Y., & Yigitoglu, N. (2015). Friend or foe?: English as the medium of instruction policy versus code switching practices. *The International Journal of Research in Teacher Education*, *6*(3), 1–23. https://dergipark.org.tr/en/pub/ijrte/issue/8572/106262

Richards, L., & Morse, J. M. (2007). *Read me first for a user's guide to qualitative methods*. Sage.

Ritchie, J., Lewis, J., Nicholls, C. M., & Ormston, R. (Eds.). (2013). *Qualitative research practice: A guide for social science students and researchers*. Sage.

Rolin-Ianziti, J., & Varshney, R. (2008). Students' views regarding the use of the first language: An exploratory study in a tertiary context maximizing target language use. *Canadian Modern Language Review, 65*(2)*,* 249–273. http://dx.doi.org/10.3138/cmlr.65.2.249

Rukh, S. (2012). Students' attitudes towards teachers' code-mixing/code-switching to L1 and its influence on their L2 learning: A case of business students in Sargodha. *International Journal of Science and Research, 3*(5), 1111–1116. https://www.ijsr.net/archive/v3i5/MDIwMTMyMDAz.pdf

Sert, O. (2005). The functions of code-switching in ELT classroom. *The Internet TESL Journal*, *11*(8), 1–6. http://iteslj.org/Articles/Sert-CodeSwitching.html

Shifidi, L. N. (2014). *Integration of translanguaging in lessons: an approach to teaching and learning in Namibian junior secondary schools. A qualitative case study in three regions in Namibia*. [Unpublished Master's Thesis]. Hedmark University, Norway.

Simon, D. (2001). Towards a new understanding of codeswitching in the foreign language classroom. In R. Jacobson (Ed.), *Codeswitching worldwide II* (pp. 311–342). Mouton de Gruyter.

Skiba, R. (1997). Code switching as a countenance of language interference, *The Internet TESL Journal*, *3*(10), 1–6. http://iteslj.org/Articles/Skiba-CodeSwitching.html

Spall, S. (1998). Peer debriefing in qualitative research: Emerging operational

models. *Qualitative Inquiry*, *4*(2), 280–292. https://doi.org/10.1177/107780049800400208

Spillett, M. A. (2003). Peer debriefing: Who, what, when, why, how. *Academic Exchange Quarterly, 7*(3), 36–40. https://www.thefreelibrary.com/ Peer debriefing: who, what, when, why, how.-a0111848817

Spolsky, B. (2012). What is language policy? In B. Spolsky (Ed.), *The Cambridge handbook of language policy* (pp. 3–15). Cambridge University Press.

Tatzl, D. (2011). English-medium masters' programs at an Austrian university of applied sciences: Attitudes, experiences and challenges. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes, 10*(4), 252–270. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeap.2011.08.003

Tavares, N. J. (2015). How strategic use of L1 in an L2-medium mathematicsclassroom facilitates L2 interaction and comprehension. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, *18*(3), 319–335. https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050.2014.988115

Turner, D. W. (2010). Qualitative interview design: A practical guide for novice investigators. *The Qualitative Report*, *15*(3), 754–760. http://www.nova.edu/ssss/QR/QR15-3/qid.pdf

Vogel, S., & Garcia, O. (2017 December). Translanguaging. In G. Noblit, & L. Moll (Eds.), *Oxford Research Encyclopedia of Education* (pp. 1–22). Oxford University Press.

Wang, D. (2019). Translanguaging in Chinese foreign language classrooms: Students and teachers' attitudes and practices. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, *22*(2), 138–149. https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050.2016.1231773

Wang, D., & Kirkpatrick, A. (2012). English as a lingua franca in teaching Chinese as a foreign language in Beijing: An investigation into teachers' language beliefs. *The Journal of Multilingual Education, 2*(1), 11–18.

Xhemaili, M. (2017). *The influence of mother tongue (Albanian) in learning and teaching EFL*, Pristina, Kosovo. [Unpublished Thesis]. Kolegji AAB, Pristina.

Vildan Inci-Kavak
Gaziantepo universitetas, Turkija
vildan_elt@hotmail.com
Yasemin Kırkgöz
Čukurovos universitetas, Turkija
ykirkgoz@gmail.com

POŽIŪRIS Į TRANSKALBYSTĖS PRAKTIKĄ: LITERATŪROS IR MAISTO INŽINERIJOS PAMOKŲ LYGINAMASIS TYRIMAS

Santrauka. Pasaulinėje švietimo rinkoje augant kolegijų ir universitetų, siūlančių studijas anglų kalba, skaičiui aukštojo mokslo institucijos susiduria su rimtais iššūkiais. Studijoms vykstant ne gimtosios kalbos aplinkoje, kur dažniausiai pasirenkama anglų kalba kaip prestižinė dėstymo kalba, besimokantieji susiduria su didžiuliu iššūkiu: studijų turinio supratimas reikalauja aukštų mąstymo gebėjimų, o daugelio kalbinės kompetencijos lygis, būtinas studijų turiniui suprasti, nėra pakankamas, ir tai skatina studentus plačiai taikyti transkalbystės (angl. *translanguaging*) ir alternatyvias strategijas auditorijose ir už jų ribų. Atsižvelgiant į tai, šiuo tyrimu siekiama pažvelgti į nepakankamai ištirtą temą, lyginamuoju aspektu klausiant, kokias paraleles ir kokius skirtumus rodo universiteto studentų ir dėstytojų požiūris į transkalbystės praktiką literatūros ir inžinerijos dalykuose. Tyrimo duomenys buvo surinkti Turkijos Gaziantepo universiteto (GAUN) anglų kalbos ir literatūros (ELL) bei maisto mokslo (FS) programose, atliekant tiesioginius interviu ir stebėjimus paskaitose. Auditorijose buvo apsilankyta ir stebėta 21 paskaita. Tyrime savanoriškai sutiko dalyvauti 15 studentų ir 6 dėstytojai iš kiekvienos katedros. Įrašyti ir transkribuoti duomenys vėliau buvo analizuojami taikant turinio analizę. Rezultatai rodo, kad nors FS programos dėstytojai pabrėžia, jog anglų kalbos vartojimas yra gyvybiškai svarbus studentams, kad jie įgytų turinio žinių ir kalbinių įgūdžių, ELL programos dėstytojai teigia, kad tai yra kontekstui jautri praktika, todėl kai kuriuose dalykuose gali prireikti dažniau vartoti studento namų kalbą (L1) arba transkalbystę perteikiant, analizuojant ar suvokiant konkretų turinį arba bendraujant formaliai ar neformaliai. Taigi tyrimas atskleidė, kaip iš esmės keičiasi dėstytojų ir studentų požiūriai skirtinguose fakultetuose, atsižvelgiant į dalyko reikalavimus / lūkesčius, ir kaip transkalbystė veikia kaip veiksminga ir būtina mokymosi / mokymo priemonė turiniu pagrįstuose dalykuose. Gauti rezultatai turėtų paskatinti mokytojus, dėstytojus ir politikos formuotojus tokiose šalyse kaip Turkija iš naujo apsvarstyti dvikalbio mokymo ir mokymosi pobūdį įvairiose aukštojo mokslo srityse.

Pagrindinės sąvokos: požiūris; dvikalbis mokymas; turiniu grindžiamas mokymas; aukštasis mokslas; transkalbystė.