

TO TRANSLANGUAGE OR NOT TO TRANSLANGUAGE? THE MULTILINGUAL PRACTICE IN AN INDONESIAN EFL CLASSROOM

Rasman

Universitas Negeri Yogyakarta, Indonesia
rasman@uny.ac.id; rassman@yahoo.com

First received: 24 September 2017

Final proof received: 30 January 2018

Abstract

Translanguaging, the use of learners' full linguistic repertoire in language learning, has recently been theorized as an effective pedagogical practice because it creates more learning opportunities for multilinguals. Despite the growing number of research on this topic, less attention has been paid on the actual use of translanguaging in the classroom. This study aims to fill this gap by investigating translanguaging practice in an EFL classroom in Indonesia where learners used their full repertoire (English, Indonesian, Javanese) to negotiate meaning in learner-learner interactions. Specifically, this research attempts to find out both the effectiveness and the challenges of applying translanguaging to promote learning. The data were collected from the video-recording of naturally-occurring interactions among junior high school students (14-15 years old) in an EFL classroom in Yogyakarta, Indonesia. The data were analyzed using discourse analysis technique and perceived using ecological approach to explain the dialectical relationship between local interaction and the wider socio-political context. The findings show that translanguaging could help learners to develop their multilingual competencies (including the English language). However, the different socio-politically constructed status of English, Indonesian, and Javanese is still prevalent among students and thus, it inhibits them from maximizing their full repertoire when learning English. Further pedagogical implications related to the translanguaging practice for teachers are also suggested in this article.

Keywords: translanguaging; multilingualism; superdiversity; pedagogical practice

Multilingualism has recently become a global phenomenon. The rapid growth of the neoliberal economy and the advancement of technology increase the people's mobility from one place to another (Cenoz & Gorter, 2015; García, Flores & Woodley, 2015). This more globalized world forms a superdiverse society (Blommaert & Rampton, 2011) whose identities and language practices could not be accurately identified and neatly categorized.

As a result, research focusing on re-examining basic concepts in Applied Linguistics such as language, learning, native speakers, bilinguals, and learners (Firth & Wagner, 1997; García, 2009; May, 2014) has mushroomed since the last decades. More researchers are now studying speakers' actual language practice in a given context rather than socio-political constructions of the language. As a consequence, alternative concepts trying to explain this actual language practice such as codemeshing (Canagarajah, 2006), flexible bilingualism (Creese & Blackledge, 2011), and translanguaging (Creese & Blackledge, 2010; García, 2009) emerge. All these concepts focus on the language practice from the perspective of the language users.

Despite the growing number of research on the importance of understanding these concepts to face multilingual era, only few studies explain ways to apply these concepts in the educational setting,

which might be challenging (Canagarajah, 2011; Martin, 2005). One of the challenges is that translanguaging space at schools, the space where students translanguage, is not easy to build and its boundaries is fluid, depending on how the learners construct the boundaries in a given socio-political context (Wei, 2011). Teachers should not only focus on building translanguaging space but they also need to know whether students make use of the space. Also, since the socio-political context would be different from one place to another, the generalization on how to implement the translanguaging should be avoided as well (Lin, 1999). This implementation is particularly more challenging in the EFL/ESL context where monolingual bias occurs more frequently (Wei & García, 2014).

In this study, I attempted to investigate the language practice in a classroom setting in Yogyakarta, Indonesia. This classroom is situated in the Island of Java where Javanese, Indonesian, and English (framed as a foreign language) are practiced. Using ecological approach to find link between classroom context and wider socio-political context, I would like to find out if translanguaging practice helps the language learning in the learner-learner interactions, and whether the socio-political context affects the practice. By understanding the

impact of the translanguaging practice on language learning, it could inform teachers about the strategic method of implementing translanguaging particularly in Indonesian context. This study aims to address the following questions: (1) In which ways does the translanguaging practice in a group interaction in an EFL classroom in Yogyakarta facilitate language learning?; (2) How do the students construct the translanguaging space and what is the role of socio-political context in shaping the boundaries of the space?

Monolingual bias, multilingual ages, and language classroom

A multilingual here refers to a person who speaks two or more languages. The term ‘multilingual’ subsumes the term ‘bilingual’, a term that commonly only refers to individuals who speak two languages. The purpose of using multilingualism rather than bilingualism, trilingualism, or plurilingualism is to distance itself from the traditional concept of language separation, a discussion explained in the next subheading.

Multilingualism is a widespread phenomenon pushed forward by the globalization, the advancement of technology, and the people’s mobility (Cenoz & Gorter, 2015; García et al., 2015). Blommaert and Rampton (2011) coined the term ‘superdiversity’ defined as a phenomenon of intensive people’s migrations which eventually blur the categorization of their socio-cultural feature. As a result, it is now unsurprising and not hard to find people who can speak more than one language in almost any context.

Classrooms are the context where language contact could easily be found, particularly between local language or national language and foreign or second language (Cenoz & Gorter, 2015; Levine, 2011). Schools usually have not adapted itself to the multilingualism phenomenon, thus, various languages are usually contested inside the classroom. Wei and García (2014) argue that EFL or ESL contexts often impose language separation by “othering the languages of those who spoke them within the nation” (p. 54). The practice of the so-called code-switching is perceived as a linguistic deficiency. The use of home languages is considered as the ‘contamination’ for the learning of second/foreign languages (Levine, 2011).

May (2014) uses the term monolingual bias in second language acquisition (SLA) in particular and in TESOL field in general to demonstrate the problem of separating the languages. This bias is associated with the phenomena of putting ‘deficient’ label on students simply because they do not achieve the native-like standard. In their seminal article, Firth and Wagner (1997) highlight our bias in favoring the so-called native speakers (NS) and non-native speakers (NNS) interactions as the only ideal interactions where learning could take place.

The mismatch between the emerging multilingualism norm in this superdiverse world and the monolingual bias maintained in the educational setting is the on-going challenge in the field of language education. Failure to address this issue would affect the students’ language development in particular and the schools’ inclusiveness in general. To address this challenge, some pedagogies for multilingualism practice have recently been developed by some researchers including García’s (2009) proposal that suggests the use of translanguaging.

Translanguaging: Language use (f)or language learning?

The critique towards monolingual bias is mainly triggered by Firth and Wagner’s (1997) seminal article that has significantly affected the field of applied linguistics. This article re-examines the most fundamental concepts of language learning such as the concepts of ‘learners’, and ‘competence’. The concept of ‘learners’ is problematized because second language learners already have their first language. Thus, the outcome of learning should be multilingual competence, instead of monolingual competence. Also, the fact that it is impossible to have a native-like competence (Levine, 2011) means that the label of ‘learners’ would always be adhered to them no matter how effective they have communicated in English (they are always perceived as linguistically deficient speakers). Thus, the term ‘emerging bilinguals’ rather than ‘learners’ and ‘multilingual competence’ instead of ‘monolingual competence’ are preferred (García, 2009). It focuses on the language use of the students and the creative use of their full repertoire to make meaning.

In response to Firth and Wagner’s critique, Gass, Lee, and Roots (2007), despite their acknowledgement that the NS-NNS categorization is not helpful, argue that it is hard to show how language learning and language use could occur simultaneously. Thus, they explain further that the concern is not which one is more preferable between language learning and language use. Rather, future studies have to focus on finding out if language use could maximize language learning. Indeed, I believe that the shift in conceptualizing the language, learners, or learning, should be followed by the explanation on the extent to which it could actually help students in the classroom. Thus, I would mainly review how translanguaging (García, 2009), a concept rooted in the language use paradigm, could actually provide more opportunities to the students in the language learning context instead of romanticizing it as the best pedagogy for every language classroom (Canagarajah, 2011).

Translanguaging is originally a pedagogical practice in Wales where both English and Welsh become the primary medium of instruction (Wei & García, 2014). Translanguaging is recently adopted and extended by many scholars of bilingualism

(e.g., Creese & Blackledge, 2010; García, 2009). The translanguaging concept reflects significant changes in conceptualizing language and multilingualism, a view that emphasizes the importance of using the full linguistic repertoire.

The term 'language' as a fixed entity is replaced by the term 'languaging' that is more dynamic in nature (Blommaert, 2014). Language is traditionally perceived as an entity bound to an established nation (Otheguy, García & Reid, 2015). English, Chinese, and Arabic, for instance, are languages owned and practiced only by countries like England, China, and Saudi Arabia respectively. This misleading view is "socio-politically constructed, maintained, and regulated" (p. 286). It does not take into account the actual language practice in the society which is constantly changing through the process of meaning-making in the interactions (Wei & García, 2014), and it has nothing to do with its lexicon and structure (Otheguy et al., 2015). Languaging is a more dynamic and fluid term focusing on people's creative and active use of languages that is different across time and space.

These conceptual changes of the language alter the way multilingualism is perceived. Within the socio-politically constructed definition of language, a multilingual's mind is divided into two or more separate slots of monolingual repertoire (e.g., Cummins 1979; Lambert, 1974). The concept of code-switching, which is defined as using two codes back and forth in the utterances, emerges out of this view. In contrast, conceptualizing multilingualism using dynamic view means perceiving one's linguistic system as complex and interrelated (Wei & García, 2014). Translanguaging, the term emerging out of the dynamic view, is not merely a shift from one language to another as in code-switching. The speakers translanguage by using their full repertoire at their disposal which cannot be assigned to any traditionally defined language (Wei & García, 2014).

While viewing the language through this perspective is important, the questions still remain particularly on the application of translanguaging in the language classroom context. Canagarajah (2011) is even questioning if translanguaging is teachable since translanguaging is conceptualized as a naturally-occurring phenomenon. The questions such as how much the space of translanguaging should be provided, to what extent this space helps learning, and more importantly, how the learners make use of this space need to be taken into account (Palmer, Mateuz, Martinez & Henderson, 2014). Also, it is important to see how a particular socio-political context influences the effectiveness of translanguaging space in schools.

Translanguaging space and language learning

As discussed earlier, language education is commonly in favor of separating the use of two languages. This

limitation of the translanguaging practice could result in the stigmatization on learners as deficient speakers and could eventually inhibit the development of the students' linguistic repertoire because they are not allowed to benefit from their existing language (Otheguy et al., 2015).

Thus, translanguaging is transformative in nature since it provides a space for the multilingual users to bring their personal belief, history, experience or ideology (Wei, 2011). This translanguaging space could be built either through official translanguaging (teacher deliberately creates it) or natural translanguaging (the learners naturally communicate with their peers) (Wei & García, 2014). The teacher-learner translanguaging practice is likely to provide less space than the learner-learner translanguaging since the boundaries of the space would be strictly constructed. Thus, it is important to focus more on the students' construction of the translanguaging space while at the same time, taking into account the socio-political conditions that might influence the boundaries of the translanguaging space the students created (Wei, 2011).

Therefore, this case study focuses on students' interactions in an EFL classroom in Indonesia with a particular focus on not only how the translanguaging practice helps the language learning, but also how the socio-political context in Indonesia could influence the boundaries of translanguaging space where the students interact.

METHOD

Research Approach

A qualitative case study was chosen because it gave an in-depth analysis of a particular language practice in a specific context (Hua & David, 2008). The aim was, therefore, not to generalize the findings to another context. However, the findings of this research might shed light on the general language practices in the country.

The data were perceived from the ecological approach point of view (van Lier, 2008) because it could explain how this classroom language practice was situated, shaped, and interrelated with the socio-political context of the country. Ecological approach tries to explain the dialectical relationship between local interaction and the wider socio-political context, a relationship that refers to the term affordances (Creese & Blackledge, 2010; van Lier, 2008). The speakers' choice of the linguistic codes might be indexical to social negotiations since the speakers understand the ideological rights and responsibilities in their context (Myers-Scotton, 2000). This approach was suitable for the purpose of this study which was to find out how translanguaging was practiced and whether it reflected or challenged particular socio-politically constructed hierarchy of language.

Research Method

The data were collected from video-recording of the interaction of EFL learners in a group discussion to better interpret the learners' language practices in the discussion (Clemente, 2008). Because at that time I could not directly record the classroom activities in Indonesia, I asked my colleague who was the teacher of the class to record the classroom activities. The video recording could help me capture the whole students' language practices.

The video-recording was then transcribed and analyzed. The analysis followed the procedures of analyzing discourse for bilingual data (Rymes, 2010; Wei and Moyer, 2009) particularly using classroom discourse analysis technique (Rymes, 2010). First, the classroom events were identified. Then, the language in those events was characterized. Finally, the variations in the language were identified particularly in relation to the wider socio-political context. This procedure was aimed to understand the students' repertoire, which went beyond the language. Also, it could help me understand how they constructed the translanguageing space when they were having a discussion with their peers.

Ethical Considerations

Since teachers, learners, and schools were involved in this study, I asked their consent prior to actual data collection. I informed the teacher about my intention as well as the purpose of the study. After that, I asked her to inform and ask for the students' consent.

Context of the study

This study was situated in an EFL classroom in Yogyakarta Province, the former capital city of Indonesia. The participants of the study were Grade 9 students (14-15 years old) of a public junior high school. In the classroom, students were divided by the teacher into several groups of four to discuss the previous English national exam test for the preparation of the upcoming national exam. The teacher did not give any instruction on the languages that should be used in the interactions.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

To answer two questions in this study, ecological approach was employed. "At its heart is the dialectic between the local interactional and social ideological" (Creese & Blackledge, 2010, p. 104). First part deals with the description of classroom interactions with regards to translanguageing practice and explanation on how this practice helps learners learn the language. In the second part, this local practice is then linked to the ideologies that are reflected or challenged in students' language choice. Translanguageing space could be inferred from their

choice of languages, whether they think they are allowed to translanguage or not.

Becoming multilingual: How translanguageing helps language learning

In this part, the translanguageing practice is first perceived as a part of the process of becoming multilingual. This view is closely linked to the study of second language acquisition (Cenoz & Gorter, 2015). In this perspective, translanguageing is seen as the scaffolding, using L1 to help learners study L2. The extracts in this section are parts of conversations among four learners namely Annisa (An), Fatima (Fa), Zulaikha (Zu), and Zahra (Za). All of them are pseudonyms.

The following extract (Extract 1) is a conversation in the group discussion activities. They were discussing a multiple-choice question about the main topic of the text. One student chose an answer and said it in Indonesian. However, it could be seen that they negotiated the meaning of the word 'started' by using their full repertoire at their disposal (Creese & Blackledge, 2010).

Extract 1.

- An (1): Trus yang ini, <and then, this one> the text generally tells about...
(2): apa yo? Apa ini? <what is it? What is it?>
An (3): *Nganu*. Surat tersebut menggambarkan pengalaman yang **diawali** penulis. <The letter tells experiences **started** by the writer>
Za (4): [**dialami**:: <experienced>
Fa (5): [**dialami**:: <experienced>
Zu (6): [**dialami**:: <experienced>
An (7): Oh: ((laugh)) dialami <experienced>
((laugh)) *Nglawak*. <I'm joking>

Lines (4), (5), and (6) indicate that these three students tried to scaffold Annisa who said 'diawali' (started) rather than 'dialami', the actual meaning of the word 'experienced'. In line (7), Annisa accepted this correction by laughing and realizing at her own mistakes. This would hardly be possible if they were not translanguageing using their full repertoire of English, Javanese, and Indonesian. It would also be impossible to achieve the task if the classroom forbade the use of languages other than English, a belief commonly upheld by some EFL teachers in Indonesia.

Extract 2 shows how this scaffolding through translanguageing also applied to a circumstance where no one was sure about the meaning of a word. However, once they did translanguageing and negotiated further about the questions, they finally knew the meaning of the word.

The extract shows how the three students mistakenly translated 'Line 3' as 'paragraf 3' (Paragraph 3). However, when they tried to find the word they searched in line 3, they did not find it. It was not until they used their full repertoire by using both Javanese such as in line 10, 'lho ora ketemu'

(we couldn't find it), and Indonesian such as in line (6) and (7) that they finally understood that they had been wrong in translating the word. Those codes helped them realize that they had made mistakes.

Extract 2.

- An (1): This is a very amazing place. Line 3.
berarti ini baris ketiga. Eh paragraph ketiga.
<so, it's line three. Eh paragraph 3> Line 3.
Tahu enggak, tahu enggak? <Do you know it? Do you know it? Apa berarti? <what's the answer?> kata lainnya this apa? <what the word 'this' refers to?>
- Fa (2): Kata-katanya itu mana? <where is that word?>
- Zu (3): Ini? <this one?>
- An (4): Bukan: <No:> This is very amazing ini loh.
- Zu (5): Di paragraph ketiga, *tho*? <in the third paragraph, right?>
- An (6): Nggak ada yo:: <I can't find it::>
- Fa (7): Nggak ada di sini e. <it's not there, right>
- An (8): Ini lho: <this is it:>
- Fa (9): Ini lho: <this is it:>
- Zu (10): Lho ora ketemu <we couldn't find it>
- An (11): Berarti baris [ketiga <so, it's line 3>
- Zu (12): Berarti baris ketiga <so, it's line 3>
- An (13): Tadi katamu paragraf. <you said it's paragraph>
- Fa (14): Lah maaf salah. <Sorry, I was wrong>
- An (15): Berarti the mount Ke[lud *tho*. <so, it's mount Kelud>
- Zu (16): [B
- Fa (17): ((Crossing option B)) eh?
- An (18): Lah bener:: <Yes, it's correct::>
- Zu (19): B
- An (18): Dah, selesai: <Now, we finished::>

These two examples clearly show that in the interaction, the repertoire of each student were used fully and creatively to scaffold each other so that they could finish their task and at the same time enlarged their existing repertoire by adding/activating more vocabularies. This evidence is in line with the idea that language separation theory might be incorrect in proposing that the use of the students' full linguistic repertoire could not help learners learn the second language (García, 2009; García & Kano, 2014). Without the use of full linguistic repertoire, that is, by only using L2 as the instructions and the only permitted language in the classroom, the learning of new vocabularies in particular would be hardly achieved or at least, the scaffolding mediated by interactions would be inhibited.

Translanguaging here was effective to facilitate language learning primarily because they were not only drawing all of their repertoires but also using it to make meaning in the social accomplishment (Canagarajah, 2011). In this study, participants did not only speak the three languages without any purpose but, as members of the group, they also shuttle from one code to another to finish the group task given by the teacher.

Table 1 briefly describes the simple steps of teaching in an EFL classroom using translanguaging strategy. In this study, the strategy that the teacher used was apparently effective in creating more space for the learners to translanguaging because she did not only let the learners speak in those three languages but also strategically asked them to do the tasks in groups to provide more learner-learner interactions, which, as Wei and García (2014) argue, create more translanguaging space teacher-learner interactions. Based on the extracts above, learners easily activated and acquired new vocabularies in English by shuttling very rapidly from one language to another. This translanguaging practice among learners could be very likely successful as well in the teacher-learner interactions if the teacher also translanguages (using local languages, national languages, and foreign languages) when discussing the lesson with the learners. That said, as Wei and García (2014) suggest, teachers should not give the direct translation of what they say. For example, after saying one sentence in English, she translates the sentence into Indonesian or Javanese language. Translanguaging means using different languages to make meaning and not spoon-feeding learners with the direct translations. Teachers need to let the learners acquire the language through interactions with their peers.

Table 1. Translanguaging Strategies

1. Divide the learners into several groups
2. Give them a group task
3. Ask them to discuss the task with their peers using any language they want
4. Remind the learners that they are allowed to (and even encouraged to) also use their local languages during the discussion

Being multilingual: How translanguaging practice is still constrained by language ideology

The previous discussion has shown that translanguaging practice has achieved the goal of adding more repertoires so that learners could have multilingual competence as well as the strategy that the teachers could use to apply translanguaging in their classroom. In this part, I would discuss the socio-political aspects that might directly or indirectly influence the success or failure of applying the translanguaging practice in the classroom. Using the ecological approach, the following extracts show that the socio-politically constructed statuses of Indonesian, English, and Javanese languages in the country are influential in the micro-context of classrooms.

In the Extract 3, the students discussed a question about the 'main idea' of a text. In line (2), Zulaikha pronounced 'main idea' as 'minida' mimicking the typical Javanese accent when pronouncing the phrase. It was followed by the laughter of everyone in the group. Annisa in line (6) even tried to repeat it.

Extract 3.

- An (1) : Trus yang ini:: <and then, this one::>
 Zu (2) : *Minida::*: [main idea], [exaggerating Javanese accent], ((laugh))
 An (3) : ((laugh))
 Fa (4) : ((laugh))
 Za (5) : ((laugh))
 An (6) : *Maini[da::*
 Zu (7) : [da:: ((laugh))
 Za (8) : [da:: ((laugh))
 Fa (9) : [da:: ((laugh))

We could link this local language practice in the classroom to the wider sociopolitical landscape of the country. The joke indexes their construction of the status of Javanese language compared to English. First, the laughter shows that the Javanese way of pronouncing the word was undesirable. Second, it also indexes their view that the use of Javanese language in the classroom was not appropriate. Indeed, seeing from the whole extract, it could be clearly seen that Indonesian and English language dominated the conversation. It is likely that they learned to construct the status of those languages as such mainly because of the socio-political context where the Indonesian language has been imposed as the official language used in the governmental and educational setting. English, as the main subject of the discussion, is perceived as a language that could only be pronounced in a particular accent by an ideal community that they imagined for themselves (Anderson, 1983).

The Extract 4 shows more on how the use of Javanese language was constructed as less desirable language evidenced by the laughter it created in the conversation. In this extract, they were discussing the question, but it seems that one of them looked tired and uninterested. Thus, one of them spoke in Javanese asking her not to sleep. However, this resulted in laughter in the conversation.

Extract 4.

- An (1) : Nah, kita *garap* ini sekarang. <Now we answer this question>
 Fa (2) : *Ojo turu* <don't sleep>
 An (3) : *Ojo turu* ((laugh)) *Ojo turu* ((laugh)) <don't sleep> (2.0) *Kartika, tak kiro adikke* <Kartika, I thought she is the sister>

The word 'ojo turu' which means 'don't sleep', was uttered by Fatima in line (2) and repeated twice by Annisa in line (3). This Javanese sentence is not funny in itself. Interestingly, they constructed it as funny words in that particular educational context. It indicates that they perceived that the use of Javanese language was inappropriate in this context. The way they constructed the function of the Javanese language was apparently learnt from the context where they did the translanguaging. The status of the Javanese language as the local language that could only be practiced at home might be rooted in the history of Indonesian language as the official

language in Indonesia.

The Indonesian language was first introduced in the Second Indonesian Youth Congress in 1928 where delegates passed a resolution called National Youth Pledge. It was then successfully imposed and eventually became the lingua franca with around 197.7 millions speakers in 2010 (Central Bureau of Statistic, 2013) throughout the nation that had about 700 languages. The aim was to have a shared language that could be used to fight against Dutch colonization (Sneddon, 2003). The position of Indonesian language 'has been far firmer than that of national languages in other multiethnic Southeast Asian countries' (p.6).

As a consequence of formalizing it as the official language for educational and governmental settings, the Indonesian language is then perceived as 'a mark of a person's level of education.' (Sneddon, 2003, p. 10). It apparently makes the practice of the Javanese language or other local languages as not desirable particularly in the educational setting unless they want to be perceived as less educated people. This ideological stance was clearly reflected in the way learners communicate in the classroom as shown in the extracts. Table 2 provides the comparison of the number of occurrences between Indonesian and Javanese language. The table shows that the number of words spoken in Javanese language is small, only about one-fifth of those spoken in Indonesian language. It illustrates the hesitance of learners to use their full repertoire when interacting with their peers.

Table 2. The frequency of Bahasa Indonesia and Javanese during the translanguaging process

Languages	Number of words spoken
Javanese	43
Indonesian	217

English language, on the other hand, is viewed as the desirable language with the higher status. It shows from the extract where they made a joke about the typical Javanese accent in pronouncing English words. For them, there is a particular standard of pronunciation and accent that should be followed by learners. The belief that English should be pronounced in a particular way indicates how these students to some extent still strive for monolingualism which probably is the reflection of their monolingual bias. They still perceive that the native speakers of English are homogenous. They see the community of practice as their imagined community (Anderson, 1983). The view that the end of the language acquisition process is the nativelikeness proficiency is clearly still affected by monolingual bias (Firth & Wagner, 2007; May, 2014) which is not only impossible to achieve but also unnecessary 'as the global communications have become more and more multimodal and multilingual' (Kramsch & Huffmaster, 2015, p. 114).

This socio-political construction of language status affects the way the learners constructed the translanguaging space. Even though in this classroom the teacher let them speak any languages to accomplish the task, the learners were still hesitant to use Javanese and embarrassed when their accent influenced their pronunciation of English words. Therefore, it could be inferred that no matter how good the translanguaging space the teacher built, the language ideology of the country, particularly the language status, could still be traced in the way the learners interacted with their peers because it is likely that the ideology has been quite firmly embedded in them.

In short, translanguaging space constructed by the learners still to some extent reflects the wider socio-political context of Indonesia particularly the hierarchy of language status of Javanese, Indonesian, and English. Therefore, teachers need to constantly remind the students that they are allowed to use any languages particularly local languages like Javanese that is not as desirable as other two languages if they want to make sure that the translanguaging practice they apply in the classroom could facilitate the learning of the new language like English.

CONCLUSION

This article has shown how the translanguaging practice helps the English language learning in the context of EFL classroom in Yogyakarta, Indonesia. The use of L1 does not inhibit the learning of the language as assumed by the traditional belief of language separation in education. In fact, it proves the opposite, showing that translanguaging practice could help them add their own repertoire through scaffolding during learner-learner interactions.

In this article, the connection between language practice in the classroom and the language status in the Indonesian socio-political landscape is explained. The language ideology in Indonesia influences the way students construct the boundaries of the translanguaging space. Although they already drew on multiple codes (Javanese, Indonesian, English) to finish the task, I argue that this multilingual practice is still sociopolitically constrained. The end goal to have nativelike proficiency which is rooted in monolingual bias is still apparent and perhaps deeply rooted in the students' belief.

Thus, the major contribution of this study is particularly in answering the question whether translanguaging is teachable (Canagarajah, 2011). This study shows that the learners' agency to shape the boundaries of translanguaging space is central in influencing the way they drew on their language repertoire. Therefore, I believe that amidst these challenges, teachers should attempt to build students' awareness of the danger of this bias instead of only focusing on the establishment of the

translanguaging space (García & Kano, 2014). It is mainly because once the students are aware of their bias, they could freely enlarge their boundaries of translanguaging space.

That being said, I am also aware that challenging the ideology is not an easy task. Moreover, translanguaging concept itself might, to some extent, also ideological in nature (Canagarajah, 2011; Lewis, Jones & Baker, 2012). Thus, while adjusting the power relationship and identity between teacher and students is important (Creese & Blackledge, 2015), this ideological struggle should also be backed up by the reform of language policy at the governmental setting (Wiley & García, 2016). The future research should not only answer the question of 'to translanguaging or not to translanguaging?', but more importantly 'how to translanguaging?'

REFERENCES

- Anderson, B. (1983). *Imagined communities: Reflections on the origin and spread of nationalism*. London: Verso.
- Blommaert, J., & Rampton, B. (2011). Language and superdiversity. *Diversities*, 13(2), 1-22.
- Blommaert, J. (2014). From mobility to complexity in sociolinguistics theory and method. U Coupland, Nik (ur.), *Sociolinguistics: Theoretical debates*, 242-262.
- Central Bureau of Statistics. (2010). *Penduduk Indonesia hasil sensus penduduk 2010*. Retrieved from https://microdata.bps.go.id/mikrodata/index.php/catalog/2/related_materials
- Creese, A., & Blackledge, A. (2010). Translanguaging in the bilingual classroom: A pedagogy for learning and teaching? *The Modern Language Journal*, 94 (1), 103-115.
- Creese, A., & Blackledge, A. (2011). Separate and flexible bilingualism in complementary schools: Multiple language practices in interrelationship. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 43(5), 1196-1208.
- Creese, A., & Blackledge, A. (2015). Translanguaging and identity in educational setting. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 35, 20-35.
- Canagarajah, S. (2011). Translanguaging in the classroom: Emerging issues and research in pedagogy. *Applied Linguistics Review*, 2, 1-28.
- Canagarajah, S. (2006). Toward a writing pedagogy of shuttling between languages: Learning from multilingual writers. *College English*, 68(6), 589-604.
- Cenoz, J., & Gorter, D. (2015). Towards a holistic approach in the study of multilingual education. In J. Cenoz & D. Gorter (Eds.) *Multilingual education: Between language learning and translanguaging* (pp. 1-15). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Clemente, I. (2008). Recording audio and video. In L. Wei & M. G. Moyer (Eds.) *The Blackwell guide to research methods in bilingualism and multilingualism* (pp. 177-191). Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.
- Cummins, J. (1979). Cognitive/academic language proficiency, linguistic interdependence, the optimum age questions, and some other matters. *Working Paper on Bilingualism, 91*, 121-129.
- Firth, A., & Wagner, J. (1997). On discourse, communication, and (some) fundamental concepts in SLA research. *The Modern Language Journal, 81*(3), 285-300.
- García, O. (2009). *Bilingual education in the 21st century*. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell.
- García, O., & Kano, N. (2014). Translanguaging as process and pedagogy: Developing the English writing of Japanese students in the U.S. In J. Conteh and G. Meier (Eds.), *The multilingual turn in languages education: Benefits from individuals and societies* (pp. 258-277). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- García, O., Flores, N., & Woodley, H. H. (2015). Constructing in-between spaces to “do” bilingualism: A tale of two high schools in one city. In J. Cenoz & D. Gorter (Eds.), *Multilingual Education: Between language learning and translanguaging* (pp.199-224). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Gass, S. M., Lee, J., & Roots, R. (2007). : New Ideas or a New Articulation?. *The Modern Language Journal, 91*(S1), 788-799.
- Hua, Z., & David, A. (2008). Study design: Cross-sectional, longitudinal, case, and group. In L. Wei & M. G. Moyer (Eds.) *The Blackwell guide to research methods in bilingualism and multilingualism* (pp. 73-87). Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.
- Kramsch, C., & Huffmaster, M. (2015). Multilingual practices in foreign language study. In J. Cenoz & D. Gorter (Eds.) *Multilingual Education: Between language learning and translanguaging* (pp. 114-136). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lambert, W. E. (1974). Culture and language as factors in learning and education. In F. E. Aboud & R. D. Meade (Eds.) *Culture factors in learning and education* (pp. 91-122). Bellingham, Washington: 5th Western Washington Symposium on Learning.
- Levine, G. (2011). *Code choice in the language classroom*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- Lewis, G., Jones, B., & Baker, C. (2012). Translanguaging: developing its conceptualisation and contextualisation. *Educational Research and Evaluation, 18*(7), 655-670.
- Lin, A. M. Y. (1999). Doing-English-lessons in the reproduction or transformation of social worlds? *TESOL Quarterly, 33*(3), 393-412.
- May, S. (2014). Disiplinary divides, knowledge construction, and the multilingual turn. In S. May (Ed.) *The Multilingual turn: Implication for SLA, TESOL, and Bilingual Education* (pp. 6-31). New York: Routledge.
- Martin, P. (2005). “Safe” language practices in two ru-ral s schools in Malaysia: Tensions between policy and practice. In A. M. Lin & P. W. Martin (Eds.), *Decolonisation, globalisation: Language-in-education policy and practice* (pp. 74-97). Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Myers-Scotton, C. (2000). Code-switching as indexical to social negotiations. In L. Wei (Ed.) *The bilingual reader* (pp. 137-165). London: Routledge.
- Otheguy, R., García, O., & Reid, W. (2015). Clarifying translanguaging and deconstructing named languages: A perspective from linguistics. *Applied Linguistics Review, 6*(3), 281-307.
- Palmer, D., Mateus, S., Martinez, R. A., & Henderson, K. (2014). Reframing the debate on languages separation: Toward a vision for translanguaging pedagogies in the dual language classroom. *The Modern Language Journal, 98*(3), 757-772.
- Rymes, B. R. (2010). Classroom discourse analysis: A focus on communicative repetoires. In N. Hornberger & S. McKay (Eds.), *Sociolinguistics and language education* (pp. 528-548). Avon: Multilingual Matters.
- Sneddon, J. (2003). *The Indonesian Language: Its history and role in modern society*. Sydney: New South Wales University Press.
- van Lier, L. (2008). The ecology of language learning and sociocultural theory. In A. Creese, P. Martin, & N. H. Hornberger (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of language and education: Vol. 9. Ecology of language* (2nd ed., pp. 53-65). Boston: Springer Science+Business Media.
- Wei, L. (2011). Moment analysis and translanguaging space: Discursive construction of identities by multilingual Chinese youth in Britain. *Journal of Pragmatics 43*(5), 1222-1235.
- Wei, L., & Moyer, M. G. (Eds.). (2009). *The Blackwell guide to research methods in bilingualism and multilingualism*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.
- Wei, L., & García, O. (2014). *Translanguaging: Language, bilingualism, and education*. London: Palgrave Macmillan Pivot.
- Wiley, T., & García, O. (2016). Language policy and planning in language education: Legacies, consequences, and possibilities. *The Modern Language Journal, 100*(S1), 48–63.