

The Nature of Translanguaging Affordances in Multilingual Secondary English Class: A Discourse Analysis

Geralyn T. Familgan¹, Teresita Q. Adriano²

¹Teacher Education, UM Peñaplata College, Island Garden City of Samal, Philippines

²Graduate School, University of Immaculate Conception, Davao City, Philippines

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.47772/IJRISS.2026.100300389>

Received: 26 March 2026; Accepted: 31 March 2026; Published: 10 April 2026

ABSTRACT

This qualitative study aimed to determine the translanguaging affordances in multilingual secondary English class, its benefits, the challenges and coping mechanisms in its implementation, and how it shapes learners' socioemotional development and multilingual identities. The study is gleaned through Wei's Practical Theory of Language," which suggests that multilinguals have unified linguistic repertoire rather than separate language systems. Employing sociocultural discourse analysis, this study gathered data from five multilingual secondary English classes through video-recorded classroom interaction and in-depth interviews with 5 teachers and 15 students. Results showed that teachers' translanguaging pedagogical practices included conceptual scaffolding, contextualizing content, and elaborating instructions, while students practices translanguaging in inquiry, meaning-making, and peer collaboration. Benefits of translanguaging included cognitive, affective, behavioral, communicative, and equity-based gains. Meanwhile, challenges involved linguistic leniency, learner variability, instructional constraints, and linguistic diversity, with coping mechanisms including behavioral adaptability, learner agency, strategic adjustment, and linguistic flexibility. Translanguaging practices also shaped students' socio-emotional development and maintained their multilingual identity through redistribution of participation power, negotiation of interactional authority, repositioning of learner identity, regulation of emotional expression, transformation of classroom norms, reconstruction of social relations, and disruption of linguistic hierarchies. Data implied that strategic scaffolding, collaborative learning, inclusive design, and student-centeredness are important educational practices in implementing translanguaging. Overall, the study highlights how translanguaging transform classrooms into psychologically safe spaces that celebrate student identity and foster both academic and social-emotional growth.

Keywords: quality education, translanguaging affordances, multilingualism, secondary English education, Philippines

INTRODUCTION

Translanguaging is a complex process of transcending boundaries between distinct languages and modalities by drawing from complete linguistic and semiotic properties to make meaning (Wei, 2018). According to Nufus (2023), translanguaging is a novel multilingual pedagogical strategy that allows more opportunities for language learning. Hence, many educators implement translanguaging in their English classes. However, several issues were reported regarding pedagogical translanguaging, such as a lack of awareness among teachers and students on the benefits of translanguaging in second language learning (Tabatabaei, 2020); complexities of the implementation process and the support needed to professionally learn translanguaging practices (Kirsch, 2020); and English-only pedagogies, policies, practices, and expectations (Yuvayapan, 2019). These issues of translanguaging in English secondary classrooms transpire on a global scale.

In Sweden, the study of Tabatabaei (2020) revealed that Swedish students are not acquainted with the benefits of translanguaging because it is not widely used in schools, thus they agree on English-only policy in the classroom. Meanwhile, in Netherlands, Ticheloven et al. (2021) asserted that stakeholders need to discuss

strategic implementation of translanguaging in multilingual classrooms because of its pedagogical challenges which include side effects, goal formulation, learning the language of schooling, English and other semiotic resources, affective functions, effort, and confusion. Also, in Kazakhstan, Karabassova & San Isidro (2020) found that teachers don't fully agree with translanguaging, yet they utilize it to scaffold content delivery, allow smooth classroom transitions, and counter their language proficiency limits. On the contrary, in Turkey, Yuvayapan (2019) found that English teachers agree on translanguaging, yet they did not frequently use it in their classrooms because of the expectations of the institution, colleagues, parents, and students. On the other hand, in Bangladesh, the study of Kabir & Sultana (2021) revealed that most young adults agree with translanguaging in informal conversations, but they disagree on using it in academic or formal communications.

In the Philippines, Parma (2023) found that English teachers view translanguaging as a way for greater communication in the classroom, as it improves learners' linguistic capabilities. This is partly supported by the study of Aniceto (2023) which revealed that translanguaging practice helps students express their thoughts and ideas during classroom interactions, but it does not help improve students' speaking and writing skills.

In Davao Region, recent studies were conducted on the perspectives of high school teachers on the implementation of translanguaging. A case study on translanguaging in Davao Oriental revealed that teachers utilize translanguaging because it is student-centered, it ensures comprehension, encourages student participation, acknowledges cultural and linguistic diversity, and caters to diverse learning needs (Deniega & Neri, 2024). Meanwhile, a phenomenological study in Davao de Oro revealed that teachers perceive translanguaging as a pedagogy that enhances language learning, facilitates comprehension, fosters collaborative learning, builds language confidence, and shows greater accessibility than traditional methods (Magadan et al., 2025).

Apparently, several studies have already been conducted regarding translanguaging, which revealed various issues of its implementation. On this note, Cenoz and Gorter (2022) emphasized the need to do further research on translanguaging in diverse contexts. Furthermore, research on how translanguaging would facilitate the social, psychological, and emotional needs of learners entails further research (Fang et al., 2022; Oliver et al, 2021). Likewise, Santos et al. (2022) asserted that translanguaging is not yet thoroughly studied in the Philippines since studies are only focused teachers' perspectives. Thus, this study distinctly delved into the translanguaging affordances of teachers and students in secondary multilingual English classes and how these strategies and practices shape the social and emotional development of learners, and their multilingual identities.

This study is gleaned through the lens of Wei's (2018) theory of translanguaging framed as "Practical Theory of Language," which suggests that multilinguals have unified linguistic repertoire rather than separate language systems. This theory will help establish the study's purpose of exploring the translanguaging affordances in secondary multilingual English classes. Also, this study is viewed through MacSwan's (2017) Integrated Multilingual Model, which argues that multilingual people possess one linguistic repertoire with richly diverse mental grammar. This theory will support the idea that translanguaging allows an open utilization of learners' and teachers' already acquired communication features and practices to enhance classroom interaction.

The purpose of this discourse analysis study is to determine the translanguaging affordances in multilingual secondary English classes, its benefits, and how teachers and students deal with its challenges, as well as how it shapes students' social and emotional development and multilingual identities. Specifically, this study sought to answer the following questions:

1. What translanguaging affordances are observed in secondary multilingual English classes?
2. How do teachers and students in these classes benefit from the use of translanguaging affordances?
3. What are the challenges and coping mechanisms of teachers and students in the use of translanguaging affordances?
4. How do the use of translanguaging affordances shape students' social and emotional development, and multilingual identities?

METHODOLOGY

This study utilized qualitative research design employing sociocultural discourse analysis. Qualitative research is a cyclical process where the scientific community's understanding is deepened through the continual identification of new, significant distinctions, resulting from a closer examination of the phenomenon under study (Aspers & Corte, 2021). On the other hand, sociocultural discourse analysis as Johnson and Mercer (2019) posit, looks at how language is used for teaching-learning, constructing knowledge, creating ideas, sharing understanding, and collaboratively discussing problems, therefore it gathers discourse evidences in content, time, joint intellectual action, and impact. Hence, this study is not concerned on the linguistic structure rather on how translanguaging is utilized by teachers and students to attain a shared understanding.

Data Sources

The main data sources in this study were five video-recorded classroom interactions. As Lackovic (2018) suggested, there should be 5-10 materials for video analysis in educational research. The video-recorded classroom interaction data was documented by the researcher according to the preset inclusion criteria. To enrich the data, detailed field notes were taken with essential information including student population, seating arrangements, classroom atmosphere, relationships among students, teachers' and students' behaviors and utterances during classroom activities, and translanguaging affordances. Consequently, in-depth interviews (IDI) were conducted with 20 participants, as recommended by Clarke & Braun (2013). Specifically, research participants were 5 English teachers and 15 students, who were selected through a homogeneous purposive sampling technique, which aims to produce homogeneous data from participants with the same traits or properties (Thomas, 2022).

Data Analysis

In this study, discourse analysis was utilized to determine the translanguaging affordances observed in secondary multilingual English classes. This data analysis followed Norris' (2020) four-step framework, which involves rich description of the instructional concept, video viewing with the sound off, selection of the analytic focus, and layering on verbal communication. In this study, the instructional concept is a secondary multilingual English class, and the analytic focus is the translanguaging affordances as observed from the teachers and students during classroom interactions.

Meanwhile, thematic analysis was used to determine the benefits that teachers and students get from translanguaging affordances in the classroom, as well as the teachers' and students' ways of dealing with the challenges they encounter. In doing this analysis, the study employed Clarke and Braun's (2013) six-phase framework of data analysis, which includes familiarizing the data, generating initial codes, searching themes, reviewing themes, defining themes, and writing results.

Furthermore, power relations analysis was employed to answer how the teachers' use of translanguaging affordances shapes students' social-emotional development and multilingual identities. This analysis applied Fairclough's (2013) three-stage framework involving description of textual features, interpretation of the relationship between text and interaction, and explanation of the social context.

RESULTS

Translanguaging Affordances in Multilingual Secondary English Classes

The first research question examined translanguaging affordances by teachers and students in multilingual secondary English classes. In presenting the results, the utterances of the participants in the vide-recorded classroom interactions were classified according to Rajendram's (2023) framework which involves the following translanguaging affordances: cognitive-conceptual, planning-organizational, affective-social and linguistic-discursive.

Table 1. Translanguaging Affordances in Multilingual Secondary English Class

Translanguaging Affordances	Speaker	Utterances
Cognitive-Conceptual	Teacher	<p>“<i>Kinahanglan even ang grade 3 nga student makasabot</i>” (VRCI-01)</p> <p>“<i>Ano makikita mo pag may physical change?</i>” (VRCI-02_IDI-T02)</p> <p>“<i>Intentional yan... Hindi lang sya basta may narinig ka lang</i>” (VRCI-03)</p> <p>“<i>Baka you would wonder, “Asa man tong main idea diri</i>” (VRCI-04)</p> <p>“<i>The focus... is efficiency para matarong... nimog himo...</i>” (VRCI-05)</p>
Affective-Social	Teacher/Students	<p>“<i>You are writing in Wattpad di ba?</i>” (VRCI-01)</p> <p>“<i>Sino dito mahilig sa tsismis?...</i>” (VRCI-03)</p> <p>“<i>Kinsay nakaagi ani? Kana ganing gahot kaayo elementary...</i>” (VRCI-04)</p> <p>“<i>Dili man na mao. Plot ba. Kanang flow sa story ba.</i>” (VRCI-01)</p> <p>“<i>Okay ra man na. I-narrate ra man kung unsa ang trip.</i>” (VRCI-02)</p> <p>“<i>Informational na. Dili man niya kailangan ug wide vocabulary.</i>” (VRCI-03)</p>
Planning-Organizational	Teacher	<p>“<i>After that, naa koy ipakita sa inyoha nga questions...</i>” (VRCI-01)</p> <p>“<i>What can you say?... Ano ang masasabi nyo sa music?</i>” (VRCI-02)</p> <p>“<i>Pwede naman kayong sumagot using any language...</i>” (VRCI-03)</p> <p>“<i>Compare... Sa gitna, pagkakatulad. Sa sides, pagkakaiba.</i>” (VRCI-04)</p>
Linguistic-Discursive	Students	<p>“<i>Maghunahuna sa ka sir unsa ang himoon nimo nga story sir...</i>” (VRCI-01)</p> <p>“<i>Unsa ang description ma’am? Positive or negative?</i>” (VRCI-02)</p> <p>“<i>For example you are listening to speech tapos you don’t pay attention sa mga parts na dili ka interested, is it biased listening po?</i>” (VRCI-03)</p> <p>“<i>If you’re an achiever, dili... malikayan ang pagka-competitive.</i>” (VRCI-04)</p> <p>“<i>Whenever you feel hopeless, naa juy mga tao nga makatabang.</i>” (VRCI-05)</p>

Benefits from Translanguaging Affordances

The second question explored the benefits that teachers and students gain from the use of translanguaging affordances in multilingual English classes. Consequently, four distinct themes emerged from the in-depth interview data, including cognitive, affective-behavioral, communicative, and equity-based benefits.

Table 2. Benefits from Translanguaging Affordances

Essential Themes	Core Ideas
Cognitive Benefits	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reduction of linguistic barriers • Facilitation of immediate understanding • Deepened comprehension and clarity • Reduced need for repeated explanation
Affective-Behavioral Benefits	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increased classroom interaction • Greater participation in classroom activities • Increased interest and motivation • Reduced fear and passivity
Communicative Benefits	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Freedom to express ideas • Improved clarity and fluency in explanation • Sustained communication breakdown • Reduced hesitation and increased confidence
Equity-based Benefits	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Promotion of linguistic inclusivity • Creation of comfortable learning space

- Equal participation opportunities
- Efficiency in task completion and response

Challenges and Coping Mechanisms in the Implementation of Translanguaging Affordances

With the challenges that participants encountered in the use of translanguaging affordances, four themes emerged namely linguistic leniency, learner variability, instructional constraints, and linguistic diversity. Participants coped with these challenges by applying either behavioral adaptability, learner agency, strategic adjustment, and linguistic flexibility.

Table 3: Challenges and Coping Mechanisms in the Implementation of Translanguaging Affordances

Challenges	Coping Mechanisms	Core Ideas
Linguistic Leniency	Behavioral Adaptability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lenient target language use prompting teacher-guided reinforcement • Limited grammar development addressed through reading practices • Communication stagnation mitigated by self-initiated learning habits • Low learner effort shaped by continuous teacher feedback
Learner Variability	Learner Agency	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Diverse learning preferences accommodated through differentiation • Comprehension difficulty supported by peer assistance • Performance anxiety managed through self-regulated preparation • Accent insecurity eased through continued participation
Instructional Constraints	Strategic Adjustment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rapid instructional pacing addressed through notetaking • Time limitation necessitating content prioritization • Task difficulty managed through simplification strategies
Linguistic Diversity	Linguistic Flexibility	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Language mismatch addressed through multilingual adjustment • Translation difficulty resolved through strategic language choice • Vocabulary gaps clarified through meaning negotiation • Misinterpretation addressed through translation tools • Communication barriers supported through multimodal strategies

Translanguaging Affordances and Students’ Social–Emotional Development and Multilingual Identities

On the fourth question posed regarding how translanguaging affordances shape students’ social-emotional development and multilingual identities, five themes emerged, namely redistribution of participation power, regulation of emotional expression, transformation of classroom norms, reconstruction of social relations, and disruption of linguistic hierarchies.

Table 4. How Translanguaging Affordances Shape Students’ Social–Emotional Development and Multilingual Identities

Essential Themes	Core Ideas
Redistribution of Participation Power	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Access to multiple languages enables students to claim speaking space • Reduced language monitoring allows focus on meaning making • Participation shifts from restricted compliance to active involvement
Negotiation of Interactional Authority	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Meaning-making shifts from teacher control to shared negotiation • Peer interaction becomes a site of knowledge construction • Translanguaging redistribute communicative control

Repositioning of Learner Identity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Classroom discourse becomes dialogic rather than hierarchical • Translanguaging repositions students as competent meaning-makers • Linguistic flexibility legitimizes diverse ways of knowing • Learners reclaim voice through familiar linguistic resources
Regulation of Emotional Expression	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Translanguaging reduces affective barriers to participation • Emotional expression becomes more authentic through translanguaging • Cognitive relief supports emotional stability in interaction
Transformation of Classroom Norms	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Translanguaging normalizes active and expressive participation • Productive noise redefines what counts as legitimate engagement • Classroom atmosphere shifts from controlled to participatory
Reconstruction of Social Relations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Translanguaging enables relational closeness and bonding • Shared language fosters mutual understanding and trust • Collaborative interaction reduces social anxiety
Disruption of Linguistic Hierarchies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Translanguaging legitimizes marginalized languages • Multilingualism expands communicative and social capital • Learners resist monolingual expectations through flexible language use

DISCUSSIONS

Translanguaging Affordances in Multilingual Secondary English Classes

Cognitive-conceptual affordances refers to drawing on full linguistic repertoire to process complex ideas and construct deeper conceptual understanding (Rajendram, 2023). This is evident in the observed classes where teachers elaborate, differentiate, and clarify key concepts using Bisaya and Filipino languages alongside English. In line with this, Bao (2025) discovered that teachers use translanguaging to break down complex ideas. According to Pinho Feller (2022), this practice create interlingual dialogic spaces that foster collaboration, metacognition, and higher-order thinking. Also, Moraczewska (2024) asserted that intentional language shifts activates learners' prior knowledge and experiences which establishes familiarity of the concepts.

Meanwhile, affective-social affordance pertains to the emotional and interpersonal benefits of translanguaging (Rajendram, 2023). This is evident in the study when teachers related contents in the contextual background and experiences of learners as well as when students collaborated with peers during classroom activities. In line with this, Guo & Feng (2025) highlighted that contextualizing and schema building are helpful translanguaging strategies. Also, Zondi & Mbatha (2026) emphasized that translanguaging involves utilization of students' cultural and experiential knowledge in order to create constructive learning environments. Additionally, Hamman-Ortiz et al., 2025 contend that during peer collaboration, multilingual learners use translanguaging to ask questions, negotiate task requirements, and build mutual understanding .

Furthermore, planning-organizational affordance involves how translanguaging helps in managing and organizing learning process (Rajendram, 2023a). This strategy was reflected in the observed classes when teachers elaborated instructions and provided step-by-step guidance while utilizing multiple languages, such as English, Bisaya, and Filipino, to facilitate task completion. This translanguaging strategy is supported by Sahid et al. (2025) who indicated that teacher's use of translanguaging in giving instructions and providing step-by-step guidance deepens comprehension and provides clarity, thus improves task engagement and enhances academic performance.

Moreover, linguistic-discursive affordance refers on leveraging full linguistic repertoire to express ideas, negotiate meaning, and engage in sustained discourse (Rajendram, 2023). This affordance is manifested in the observed classes when learners became active co-constructors of knowledge through inquiry and meaning-making by mixing and switching among English, Filipino, and Bisaya. In support of this, Macawile and Plata

(2022) asserted that allowing learners to shift between English and familiar languages enables them to clarify meaning, ask purposeful questions, and articulate reasoning, which strengthens academic engagement. Additionally, Hamman-Ortiz et al. (2025) argues that translanguaging allows students to utilize their full linguistic repertoire during inquiry and meaning-making during English language instruction.

Benefits from Translanguaging Affordances

Data show that translanguaging results to cognitive benefits particularly reduction of linguistic barriers, facilitation of immediate understanding, deepened comprehension and clarity, and reduced need for repeated explanation. According to Lin & Leung (2024), translanguaging enables learners to flexibly draw on their full linguistic repertoire during meaning-making. Additionally, Tai (2024) argue that translanguaging allows learners to externalize learners' thinking processes in order to visualize concepts. Hence, with the application of translanguaging in secondary multilingual English classes, there is enhanced conceptual understanding, metalinguistic awareness, cognitive clarity, and sustained learning outcomes (Li et al., 2025; Almashour et al., 2026).

Also, translanguaging affordances pose affective and behavioral benefits. Results show increased classroom interaction, greater participation, increased interest and motivation, and reduced fear and passivity. This agrees with the argument of Lin & Leung (2024) that translanguaging enables learners to co-construct knowledge and take ownership of their learning. It enhances engagement, motivation, and language proficiency (Song & Ng, 2023; Hidayati et al., 2024). As a result, learners explore, interact, participate, collaborate more, (Li & Qu, 2024; Hamman-Ortiz et al., 2025; Zhou et al., 2024).

In addition, communicative benefits is also one of the gains of translanguaging affordances. This pedagogical strategy creates freedom to express ideas, improves clarity and fluency in explanation, sustains communication breakdown, and reduces hesitation thus increasing confidence. In this regard, Bouguerra (2024) notes that using students' first language fosters comfort, confidence, and willingness to ask questions. This happens because translanguaging to L1 reduces speaking anxiety and improve oral proficiency, leading to comprehension emotional expression, and collaborative engagements (Gülveren, 2023; Susila & Asari, 2025; Umniyah et al., 2025).

Additionally, teachers and learners noted equity-based benefits of translanguaging affordances. According to them, the implementation of translanguaging promotes linguistic inclusivity, creates comfortable learning space, allows equal participation opportunities, and makes task completion and response efficient. Supporting this, Song & Ng (2023) emphasize that translanguaging allow learners to connect their linguistic, cultural, and social experiences in the classroom hence strengthening inclusivity. Also, translanguaging supports intercultural communication and culturally responsive learning (Javaid et al., 2025) and addresses dialectical and vocabulary differences, supports minor languages, and reduces anxiety (Lin & Leung, 2024).

Challenges and Coping Mechanisms in the Implementation of Translanguaging Affordances

Translanguaging does not only pose benefits in secondary multilingual English classes. There are also challenges with its implementation. One of these challenges is linguistic leniency, wherein learners overuse translanguaging that results to limited grammar development, communication stagnation, and low learner effort. Nonetheless, teachers and students coped with this challenge through behavioral adaptability which includes teacher-guided reinforcement, teacher feedback, reading practices, and learner-initiated learning habits. This is supported by Johnson et al. (2017) who advocate for structured translanguaging pedagogy to support both meaning-making and language development. Hence, in implementing this strategy, it is necessary to maintain pedagogical balance between flexible language use and target language competence (Wei & Lin, 2019). This is possible through guided language practices that will help sustain engagement and linguistic growth (Rymes, 2020).

Another challenge encountered by the participants is learner variability. This challenge exists due to diverse learning preferences, comprehension difficulty, performance anxiety, and accent insecurity. However, participants coped with this challenge through utilizing learner agency which involves accommodating diversity

through differentiated activities, supporting comprehension by peer assistance, self-regulated preparing, and continuing participation. On this note, Ryan (2020) argues that motivation and individual difference influence learner agency. Corroborating this, Norton (2019) emphasizes that learner investment and identity shape engagement in multilingual classroom. Thus, learner empowerment through multilingual identity affirmation is necessary to counter the challenge of learning variability (Cummins, 2021).

Moreso, data reveal instructional constraints as one of the challenges of the implementation of translanguaging. This is caused by rapid instruction pacing, time limitation, and task difficulty. Despite these, participants find strategic adjustment as an effective way to manage this challenge. Hence, participants applied note-taking, content prioritization, and simplification strategies. According to Barkhuizen (2021), contextual and instructional constraints shape a teacher's decision-making, including in terms of activities to implemented in the classroom. In this regard, Ellis (2017) emphasizes that task-based pedagogy supports adjustment to learner needs.

Additionally, linguistic diversity was challenging for the participants. They highlighted issues in language mismatch, translation difficulty, vocabulary gaps, misinterpretation, and communication barriers. In spite of these, participants were able to cope through linguistic flexibility, specifically by multilingual adjustment, strategic language choice, meaning negotiation, utilization of translation tools, and applying multimodal strategies. Regarding this, Lin (2021) asserts that multilingual students' linguistic identities are constantly changing and expanding, hence learners have a wide communicative repertoire. Amidst this reality, Hua & Wei (2020) highlight that the combination of translanguaging and multimodality is helpful in meaning negotiation. Hence, educators modify or supplement multimodal materials and implement contingency plans to maintain engagement, while students regulate their emotions, seeks peer support, and adjust study habits to successfully complete tasks (Tai & Li, 2025).

Translanguaging Affordances and Students' Social–Emotional Development and Multilingual Identities

Translanguaging affordances shape students' socioemotional development and multilingual identities through redistribution of participation of power. This means that translanguaging enables students to claim speaking space, focus on meaning making, and become actively involved. This agrees with the argument that translanguaging enables learners to express their ideas in multiple languages, reducing cognitive load, enhancing participation, and supporting peer interaction and meaning-making (Zhou et al., 2024; Hamman-Ortiz et al., 2025; Li & Qu, 2024).

Meanwhile, negotiation of interactional authority also occurs with the implementation of translanguaging. With this, there is shared meaning negotiation, co-construction of knowledge, and communicative control between teacher and students. This is in congruence with the idea that using switching between English and home languages reduces anxiety, fosters emotional security, and strengthens ownership of learning (Sari et al., 2025; Hamman-Ortiz et al., 2025).

Furthermore, translanguaging results to repositioning of learner identity, wherein classroom discourse becomes dialogic, students become competent meaning-makers, linguistic diversity is legitimized, and learners reclaim voice through familiar learner resources. According to De Guzman (2025), translanguaging validates learners' multilingual resources, sustaining linguistic identities, and fostering inclusive classroom. Moreover, Sah & Li (2024) warns about selective translanguaging which may marginalize mother tongues, therefore, teachers should make sure that minority languages are also reinforced.

In addition, regulation of emotional expression becomes possible with translanguaging because it reduces affective barriers to participation, authenticates emotional expression, and supports emotional stability in interaction. Dewaele (2022) emphasized that emotions significantly influence multilingual communication. However, when translanguaging, students' freedom of self-expression is supported, whereby learners can comfortably negotiate meaning and maintain engagement (Li & Qu, 2024). On this note, Yago (2025) strongly argue that translanguaging plays an important role in maintaining psychologically safe spaces.

Moreover, translanguaging allows transformation of classroom norms by normalizing active and expressive participation, redefining productive noise as legitimate engagement, and shifting classroom atmosphere from controlled to participatory. This aligns with the findings of Tai & Wei (2021) that translanguaging transforms classroom interaction norms.

On the other hand, reconstruction of social norms becomes possible since translanguaging enables relational closeness and bonding, fosters mutual understanding and trust, and reduces social anxiety. Thus, switching between English and home languages reduces anxiety and fosters emotional security (Sari et al., 2025; Hamman-Ortiz et al., 2025).

Also, translanguaging enables disruption of linguistic hierarchies as it legitimizes marginalized languages, expands communicative and social capital, and validates learners' resistance of monolingual expectations. In line with this, Flores (2020) criticized linguistic hierarchies in education, meanwhile Cummins (2021) emphasized how translanguaging promotes equity through multilingual education.

In summary, results reveal that teachers and students generally favor translanguaging affordances despite its challenges, because this pedagogical strategy does not only support cognition and participation, but also fosters inclusive and psychologically safe spaces. These findings are in congruence with Wei's (2018) Translanguaging Theory which is practically concerned with meaningful comprehension and dynamic communication practices of human beings. Results also aligns with MacSwan's (2017) Integrated Multilingual Model which argues that multilingual people possess one linguistic repertoire with richly diverse grammar which naturally allows strategic integration of heritage and target languages, thus sustaining multilingual identities, disrupting monoglossic norms, and supporting cognitive, social, and cultural engagement.

Implications For Educational Practice

The results confirm the importance of translanguaging affordances in secondary multilingual English classes. On this note, several implications for education practice were identified. First, teachers should purposely apply translanguaging to encourage metalinguistic awareness, deeper comprehension, and higher student engagement. Second, teachers should allow multilingual learners to draw on their full linguistic repertoire during classroom discussion and group activities to support knowledge co-construction, promote social interdependence, and encourage collaborative problem solving. Third, teachers should prioritize students' linguistic resources rather than monolingual and text-heavy practices. Furthermore, these findings indicates that classroom communication is beyond written or oral proficiency, hence, if a teacher aims for an inclusive learning environment, teachers should design spaces where linguistic diversity is seen as an asset rather than a deficit. Fourth, despite its beneficial nature, translanguaging also presents certain challenges, thus educators should anticipate potential challenges and prepare flexible approaches. Fifth, since translanguaging shapes social-emotional development and multilingual identities of learners educators should facilitate student-centered spaces where learners actively co-construct knowledge through encouraging the use of all available linguistic resources to promote self-efficacy and meaningful engagement, sustaining multilingual identities, and promoting equity among learners. Finally, the data calls for the attention of educational policy makers to take a look at the beauty of the implementation of translanguaging affordances and create and implement policies that will not only foster knowledge and skill building, but most importantly affirm multilingual identities, and promote psychologically safe educational spaces for every learner.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

Further research is encouraged using quantitative or mixed-methods approaches to strengthen validity and generalizability of translanguaging affordances in secondary multilingual English classrooms, expanding participant base, and including comparative contexts to widen applicability. Ultimately, expanding research on translanguaging affordances will greatly contribute to the development of more inclusive, engaging, and equitable educational environments.

Concluding Remarks

Reflecting on this study, I realize how powerful and transformative translanguaging can be in multilingual classrooms. Observing students confidently switch between languages, clarify ideas, and engage with content in multiple modes made me realize that language is not only a tool for communication but also a means of one's expressing identity. I was amazed by how these strategies foster not only academic growth but also social-emotional development. It is astonishing how translanguaging increase confidence, reduce anxiety, and strengthen collaboration among students. Additionally, I definitely appreciate the deliberate efforts of teachers to implement these strategies effectively in instructional planning, adaptability, and sensitivity to students' linguistic backgrounds. I also admire the learners' efforts to co-construct knowledge through translanguaging. Hence, conducting this study inspired me to advocate for pedagogical approaches that validate and celebrate students' diverse linguistic repertoires. I came to understand that teaching is not only about delivering content but also about empowering learners to express themselves fully, co-construct knowledge, and develop critical thinking skills. Personally, this study has strengthened my commitment to fostering classrooms that value multilingualism, and it has shown me that such practices are essential for nurturing both academic success and the holistic growth of students.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The author expresses sincere gratitude for the providence of the Almighty Father that lead to the success and completion of this research. The author also wish to thank the individuals who granted consent to conduct this study, particularly the research participants.

REFERENCES

1. Almashour, M., Aldamen, H., Jarrah, M., & Al-Deaibes, M. (2026). Translanguaging in Jordanian EFL assessment: Cognitive scaffolding, identity expression, and institutional friction. *System*, 137, 103917.
2. Aniceto, R. G. TRANSLANGUAGING AS A LANGUAGE MANAGEMENT STRATEGY IN A MULTILINGUAL CLASSROOM.
3. Bao, P. (2025). Delineating translanguaging: theoretical distinctions from code-switching and a Vygotskian model of cognitive scaffolding in multilingual classrooms. *International Journal of Multilingualism*, 1–22. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14790718.2025.2575886>
4. Barkhuizen, G. (2021). Language teacher educator identity. Cambridge University Press.
5. Cenoz, J., & Gorter, D. (2022). Pedagogical translanguaging and its application to language classes. *RELC journal*, 53(2), 342-354.
6. Clarke, V., & Braun, V. (2013). Successful qualitative research: A practical guide for beginners.
7. Cummins, J. (2021). Rethinking the education of multilingual learners: A critical analysis of theoretical concepts (Vol. 19). Multilingual Matters.
8. De Guzman, M. L. (2025). Breaking Language Barriers: The Impact of Translanguaging on Student Classroom Engagement and ESL Confidence among Grade 7 Students of Dr. Yanga's Colleges Inc. (2025). *American Journal of Education and Technology*, 4(4), 92-103. <https://doi.org/10.54536/ajet.v4i4.4969>
9. Deniega, M. G. J. S., & Neri, S. L. (2024). A case study on translanguaging in English as a second language (ESL) class among public high schools through the lens of language teachers. *Cognizance Journal of Multidisciplinary Studies*, 4(8), 9-31.
10. Dewaele, J. M. (2023). Psychology of language learning: Personality, emotion, and motivation. *In The Routledge handbook of applied linguistics* (pp. 374-385). Routledge.
11. Ellis, R. (2022). Task-based language teaching. In *Research questions in language education and applied linguistics: A reference guide* (pp. 133-136). Cham: Springer International Publishing.
12. Fang, F., Zhang, L. J., & Sah, P. K. (2022). Translanguaging in language teaching and learning: Current practices and future directions. *RELC Journal*, 53(2), 305-312.
13. Flores, N. (2020). From academic language to language architecture: Challenging raciolinguistic ideologies in research and practice. *Theory into practice*, 59(1), 22-31.

14. Gülveren, A. (2023). A new strategy to develop EFL learners' speaking skills and to increase willingness to communicate: Translanguaging pedagogy (Master's thesis, Necmettin Erbakan University (Turkey)).
15. Guo, Z., & Feng, Q. (2025). Exploring Scaffolding Strategies within Pedagogical Translanguaging in EFL Classrooms. *TESL-EJ*, 29(3), n3.
16. Hamman-Ortiz, L., Dougherty, C., Tian, Z., Palmer, D., & Poza, L. (2025). Translanguaging at school: A systematic review of US PK-12 translanguaging research. *System*, 129, 103594.
17. Hidayati, D., Dharmawan, Y. Y., Prasaty, 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.
18. Hornberger, N. H., & De Korne, H. (2023). Minoritized/Indigenous language revitalization. In *The Routledge handbook of applied linguistics* (pp. 349-361). Routledge.
19. Hua, Z., & Wei, L. (2020). Translanguaging, identity, and migration. In *The Routledge handbook of language and intercultural communication* (pp. 234-248). Routledge.
20. Javaid, A., Khan, A. A., & Yasir, H. S. M. (2025). Translanguaging as a pedagogical tool for enhancing intercultural communication in ESL learners. *Qlantic Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities*, 6(1), 1-11.
21. Johnson, M., & Mercer, N. (2019). Using sociocultural discourse analysis to analyse professional discourse. *Learning, culture and social interaction*, 21, 267-277.
22. Johnson, S. I., García, O., & Seltzer, K. (2019). Biliteracy and translanguaging in dual-language bilingual education. In *Dual language education: Teaching and leading in two languages* (pp. 119-132). Cham: Springer International Publishing.
23. Kabir, F., & Sultana, A. (2021). Emerging issues of translanguaging and speaking English: Perspectives of multilingual Bangladeshi young adults. *English as International Language Journal*, 16(2), 68-87.
24. Karabassova, L., & San Isidro, X. (2020). Towards translanguaging in CLIL: a study on teachers' perceptions and practices in Kazakhstan. *International Journal of Multilingualism*, 20(2), 556-575. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14790718.2020.1828426>
25. Lacković, N. (2018). Analysing videos in educational research: an "Inquiry Graphics" approach for multimodal, Peircean semiotic coding of video data. *Video Journal of Education and Pedagogy*, 3(1), 1-23.
26. Li, D., Xu, G., & Qin, J. (2025). Exploring conceptual understanding in teacher-student mediation in a Spanish as a foreign language classroom in China: A translanguaging perspective. *Language Teaching Research*, 13621688241311999.
27. Li, M., & Qu, Z. (2024). Encouraging translanguaging in collaborative talk in EFL classrooms: An epistemic network comparative study. *Linguistics and Education*, 84, 101360.
28. Lim, F. V., Toh, W., & Nguyen, T. T. H. (2022). Multimodality in the English language classroom: A systematic review of literature. *Linguistics and Education*, 69, 101048.
29. Lin, H. C. (2021). Multilingual students' language use, identities and attitudes in Taiwan.
30. Lin, S. H. C., & Leung, A. H. C. (2024). ESL classroom interactions in a translanguaging space. *Applied Linguistics Review*, 15(6), 2397-2425.
31. Macawile, K. L. G., & Plata, S. M. (2022). Teachers' Perspectives on Translanguaging as a Pedagogical Resource in Senior High School English Classes. *Journal of English and Applied Linguistics*, 1(2), 7.
32. MacSwan, J. (2017). A multilingual perspective on translanguaging. *American educational research journal*, 54(1), 167-201.
33. Magadan, C., Eman, N., & Dayanan, D. (2025). Translanguaging in language learning: IP students' insights and experiences. *International Journal of Multidisciplinary Studies in Higher Education*, 2(1), 56-76.
34. Moraczewska, A. (2024). Pedagogical translanguaging for epistemic inclusion: Scaffolding strategies in bilingual subject instruction in Norway. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*.
35. Norton, B. (2019). Motivation, identity and investment: A journey with Robert Gardner. *Contemporary language motivation theory*, 60, 153-168.

35. Nufus, T. Z. (2023, August). Exploring translanguaging as pedagogical strategy in EFL classroom; Challenges and strategies. *In AIP Conference Proceedings* (Vol. 2805, No. 1). AIP Publishing.
36. Oliver, R., Wigglesworth, G., Angelo, D., & Steele, C. (2021). Translating translanguaging into our classrooms: Possibilities and challenges. *Language teaching research*, 25(1), 134-150.
37. Parma, A. (2023). Teachers' Viewpoint: Translanguaging in English-Instructed Classes. *Psychology and Education: A Multidisciplinary Journal*, 13(2), 213-218.
38. Pinho Feller, N. (2022). Translanguaging and scaffolding as pedagogical strategies in a primary bilingual classroom. *Classroom Discourse*, 13(3), 312-335. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19463014.2021.1954960>
39. Rajendram, S. (2023a). The cognitive-conceptual, planning-organizational, affective-social and linguistic-discursive affordances of translanguaging. *Applied Linguistics Review*, 14(5), 1185-1218.
40. Ryan, S. (2020). Motivation and individual differences. *In The Palgrave handbook of motivation for language learning* (pp. 163-182). Cham: Springer International Publishing.
41. Rymes, B. (2020). Watch your language! Students as citizen sociolinguists. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 101(5), 8-13.
42. Sah, P. K., & Li, G. (2024). Toward linguistic justice and inclusion for multilingual learners: Implications of selective translanguaging in English-medium instruction classrooms. *Learning and Instruction*, 92, 101904.
43. Sahid, S., Tracy, N., & Purwanto, B. A. (2025). TRANSLANGUAGING PEDAGOGY IN MULTILINGUAL ELT CLASSROOMS: STUDENT IDENTITY, STRATEGY USE, AND ACHIEVEMENT. *Indonesian Journal of Education (INJOE)*, 5(1), 172-188.
44. Santos, A., Fernandez, V., & Ilustre, R. A. M. I. L. (2022). English language proficiency in the Philippines: an overview. *International Journal of English Language Studies*, 4(3), 46-51.
45. Sari, P., Mashuri, M., Wahyudin, W., & Marhum, M. (2025). Exploring Senior High School Students Speaking Confidence During Pair Work Activities. *Journal of English Language and Education*, 10(6), 887-892.
46. Song, H., & Ng, J. (2023). Multimodality-enhanced teaching: Fostering global citizenship and intercultural competence in ELT. *TESL Ontario's 51st Annual Conference*, Online. <http://contact.teslontario.org/wp-content/uploads/2023/03/Heejinand-Jacqueline.pdf>.
47. Susila, Y. I., & Asari, S. (2025). TRANSLANGUAGING AS EMOTIONAL SCAFFOLDING: REDUCING SPEAKING ANXIETY AND FOSTERING ORAL PROFICIENCY IN AN INDONESIAN EFL CONTEXT. *Indonesian EFL Journal*, 11(3), 567-580.
48. Tabatabaei, R. (2020). Translanguaging in ESL classrooms in Sweden: from the students' point of view.
49. Tai, K. (2024). Documenting students' conceptual understanding of second language vocabulary knowledge: a translanguaging analysis of classroom interactions in a primary English as a second language classroom for linguistically and culturally diverse students. *Applied Linguistics Review*, 15(6), 2775-2822. <https://doi.org/10.1515/applirev-2023-0181>
50. Tai, K. W., & Li, L. (2025). Leveraging mutually shared knowledge through translanguaging in EMI classrooms: combining multimodal conversation analysis with interpretative phenomenological analysis. *Applied Linguistics Review*, 16(5), 2015-2057.
51. Tai, K. W., & Wei, L. (2021). Constructing playful talk through translanguaging in English medium instruction mathematics classrooms. *Applied Linguistics*, 42(4), 607-640.
52. Thomas, F. B. (2022). The role of purposive sampling technique as a tool for informal choices in a social Sciences in research methods. *Just Agriculture*, 2(5), 1-8.
53. Ticheloven, A., Blom, E., Leseman, P., & McMonagle, S. (2021). Translanguaging challenges in multilingual classrooms: scholar, teacher and student perspectives. *International Journal of Multilingualism*, 18(3), 491-514.
54. Umniyah, A., Setiawan, S., & Nugroho, H. M. A. (2025). Enhancing Communication Skills through Translanguaging in Pesantren-Based English Club. *PANYONARA: Journal of English Education*, 7(1), 16-37.
55. Wei, L. (2018). Translanguaging as a practical theory of language. *Applied linguistics*, 39(1), 9-30.
56. Wei, L., & Lin, A. M. (2019). Translanguaging classroom discourse: Pushing limits, breaking boundaries. *Classroom Discourse*, 10(3-4), 209-215.

57. Yago, M. R. C. (2025). Investigating the roles of translanguaging in fostering expressive learning among multilingual senior high school learners. *Divine Word International Journal of Management and Humanities (DWIJMH)*(ISSN: 2980-4817), 4(3), 2095-2108.
58. Yuvayapan, F. (2019). Translanguaging in EFL classrooms: Teachers' perceptions and practices. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies*, 15(2), 678-694.
59. Zhou, J., Lee, S. S., Kew, S. N., & Liew, C. Y. (2024). Multiliteracies-translanguaging conceptual model framework for student agency in English as foreign language contexts. *Int J Eval & Res Educ* ISSN, 2252(8822), 4047.
60. Zondi, S. P., & Mbatha, S. (2026). Probing into ESL teachers' use of translanguaging: Perspectives and operationalisations. *Southern African Linguistics and Applied Language Studies*, 44(1), 12–26. <https://doi.org/10.2989/16073614.2025.2498946>