



T.C.
NECMETTİN ERBAKAN ÜNİVERSİTESİ
EĞİTİM BİLİMLERİ ENSTİTÜSÜ



Yabancı Diller Eğitimi Anabilim Dalı

İngiliz Dili Eğitimi Bilim Dalı

Yüksek Lisans Tezi

**A NEW STRATEGY TO DEVELOP EFL LEARNERS' SPEAKING SKILLS AND
TO INCREASE WILLINGNESS TO COMMUNICATE: TRANSLANGUAGING
PEDAGOGY**

Afife GÜLVEREN
ORCID: 0000-0002-3056-9076

Danışman
Dr. Öğr. Üyesi Tuba YILMAZ
ORCID: 0000-0003-2844-1230

Konya – 2023

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

First and foremost, it gives me great pleasure to convey my sincere gratitude and respect to my thesis supervisor, Assist. Prof. Dr. Tuba YILMAZ, for providing the appropriate direction, ongoing supervision, and helpful criticism that helped to form this study in this context. She was constantly available to offer timely counsel, thorough examination, scholarly suggestions, and a scientific approach, all of which greatly aided me in completing this assignment. She became a great inspiration and encouraged me to gain various point of view. This study could not have been completed without her.

I also want to express my deep gratitude to Assoc. Prof. Dr. Galip KARTAL, a professor in the Department of English Education and my external supervisor, for his advice, comments, tolerance and support in the development of this study. He was always there for his timely advice and encouraged me to study harder.

I am also thankful to my esteemed committee members, Assist. Prof. Dr. Emine Eda ERCAN- DEMİREL, Assist. Prof. Dr. Abdulhamit ÇAKIR and Assist. Prof. Dr. Abdulkadir ÇAKIR for their insightful advice and guidance.

I should express my gratitude to my family, especially my mother and father, Gülay and Fatih GÜLVEREN, for their endless support and patience during this journey. I owe the most specialist thanks to my fiancé, Burak TORUK, for his endless love and trust. I could not get through this process without him. I owe much to my beloved friend Didem KÜRKCÜ who is my best friend, for her encouragement and belief. Finally, I am thankful to Nida Nur IŞIK and Merve BÜYÜKYARMA with whom we worked together from undergraduate education years for their ongoing support.

My final thanks for all my lecturers from undergraduate and graduate for their insightful advices and ideas which shed light on my education process. I am also grateful to my students who were participants and helped me to collect data in this study.

Afife GÜLVEREN
DECEMBER, 2023

CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	ii
CONTENTS	iii
TEZ ÇALIŞMASI ORJİNALLİK RAPORU	v
BİLİMSEL ETİK BEYANNAMESİ	vi
ABBREVIATIONS	vii
ÖZET	viii
ABSTRACT	ix
1. INTRODUCTION	1
1.1. Problem Statement	1
1.2. Purpose of the Research	2
1.3. Significance of the Research	4
1.4. Assumptions	5
1.5. Limitations	5
1.6. Definitions	5
2. LITERATURE REVIEW	6
2.1. Language Orientations	6
2.2. Approaches to L1 Use in English Language Teaching	7
2.2.1. Monolingual ideologies	8
2.2.2. Multilingual Turn	9
2.3. Translanguaging	9
2.4. Teaching Speaking	11
2.5. Teaching Speaking Through Translanguaging	13
2.6. Teaching Speaking in Turkey	16
2.7. Problem Statement	17
3. METHODOLOGY	19
3.1. Research Design	19
3.2. Research Context and Participants	20
3.3. Data Collection Tools	21
3.3.1. Willingness to communicate (WTC) questionnaire	21
3.3.2. Semi-structured interviews	22
3.4. Data Collection Process	22
3.5. Data Analysis	24
4. RESULTS	28

4.1. Survey Results	28
4.1.1. Background information about the experimental and control groups	28
4.1.2. The comparison of the pre-test and post-test scores within groups	30
4.1.3. Comparisons of the pre-tests and post-tests scores between groups	32
4.2. Interview Results	34
4.2.1. Backgrounds of the students	34
4.2.2. Participants' experiences with English language learning	36
4.2.3. Participants' experiences after translanguaging as a teaching strategy	40
4.2.4. The contradictory views about the impacts of translanguaging as a teaching strategy on students' oral fluency	51
5. DISCUSSIONS, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	57
5.1. Discussion	57
5.1.1. The impact of translanguaging as a teaching strategy on students' communication confidence and willingness to communicate	57
5.1.2. The impact of translanguaging as a teaching strategy on students' oral fluency	58
5.1.3. The contradictory views about the impacts of translanguaging as a teaching strategy on students' oral fluency	66
5.2. Conclusion	68
5.3. Implications	69
5.4. Limitations	71
GENİŞLETİLMİŞ TÜRKÇE ÖZET	72
REFERENCES	73
APPENDICES	86

TEZ ÇALIŞMASI ORJİNALLİK RAPORU

A New Strategy To Develop EFL Learners' Speaking Skills and To Increase Willingness to Communicate: Translanguaging Pedagogy başlıklı tez çalışmamın toplam **86** sayfalık kısmına ilişkin, 7/11/2023 tarihinde tez danışmanım tarafından **Turnitin** adlı intihal tespit programından aşağıda belirtilen filtrelemeler uygulanarak alınmış olan orijinallik raporuna göre, tezimin benzerlik oranı **%18** olarak belirlenmiştir.

Uygulanan filtrelemeler:

1. Tez çalışması orijinallik raporu sayfası hariç
2. Bilimsel etik beyannamesi sayfası hariç
3. Önsöz hariç
4. İçindekiler hariç
5. Simgeler ve kısaltmalar hariç
6. Kaynaklar hariç
7. Alıntılar dahil
8. 7 kelimedenden daha az örtüşme içeren metin kısımları hariç

Necmettin Erbakan Üniversitesi Tez Çalışması Orijinallik Raporu Uygulama Esaslarını inceledim ve tez çalışmamın, bu uygulama esaslarında belirtilen azami benzerlik oranının (%30) altında olduğunu ve intihal içermediğini; aksinin tespit edileceği muhtemel durumda doğabilecek her türlü hukuki sorumluluğu kabul ettiğimi ve yukarıda vermiş olduğum bilgilerin doğru olduğunu beyan ederim.

20/12/2023

Afife GÜLVEREN

Dr. Öğr. Üyesi Tuba YILMAZ

BİLİMSEL ETİK BEYANNAMESİ

Bu tezin tamamının kendi çalışmam olduğunu, planlanmasından yazımına kadar tüm aşamalarında bilimsel etiğe ve akademik kurallara özenle riayet edildiğini, tez içindeki bütün bilgilerin etik davranış ve akademik kurallar çerçevesinde elde edilerek sunulduğunu, ayrıca tez hazırlama kurallarına uygun olarak hazırlanan bu çalışmada başkalarının eserlerinden yararlanılması durumunda bilimsel kurallara uygun olarak atıf yapıldığını ve bu kaynakların kaynaklar listesine eklendiğini beyan ederim.

20/12/2023

Afife GÜLVEREN

ABBREVIATIONS

Abbreviations

EFL: English as a foreign language

L1: Home language

SLA: Second Language Acquisition

TR: Translanguaging

WTC: Willingness to communicate



ÖZET

Necmettin Erbakan Üniversitesi, Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü
Yabancı Diller Eğitimi Anabilim Dalı
İngiliz Dili Eğitimi Bilim Dalı
Yüksek Lisans Tezi

İNGİLİZCEYİ YABANCI DİL OLARAK ÖĞRENEN ÖĞRENCİLERİN İLETİŞİM KURMA İSTEKLİLİĞİNİ ARTIRMA VE KONUŞMA BECERİLERİNİ GELİŞTİRMEK İÇİN YENİ BİR YÖNTEM: DİLLER ARASI GEÇİŞ PEDAGOJİSİ

Afife GÜLVEREN

Türkiye bağlamında, dil öğrenme süreci boyunca konuşma en az ilgi gören beceri olmuştur. Uzun yıllardır İngilizce eğitimi almalarına rağmen Türk öğrencilerin çoğu hala İngilizceyi akıcı ve yetkin bir şekilde konuşamadıklarını düşünmektedirler. Bu sebeple, bu çalışmada diller arası geçiş stratejisinin İngilizceyi yabancı dil olarak öğrenen hazırlık öğrencilerinin iletişim istekliliği ve konuşma akıcılığı üzerindeki etkisi araştırılmıştır. Bu çalışma, Konya'da bulunan özel bir üniversitede öğrenim gören 76 öğrenci ile gerçekleştirilmiştir. Hem nitel hem de nicel yöntemlerin uygulandığı yarı deneysel ve karma yöntemli bir araştırma tasarımına sahiptir. Deney grubundaki öğrencilere dört hafta boyunca öğretim stratejisi olarak diller arası geçiş stratejisi, kontrol grubundaki öğrencilere ise geleneksel öğretim yöntemleri uygulanmıştır. Uygulama aşamasında gruplara 2 saat konuşma dersi verilmiş ve deney gruplarındaki öğrenciler için göreve dayalı etkinlikler, sunumlar ve tartışma teknikleri kullanılmıştır. Mystkowska-Wiertelak ve Pawla (2016) tarafından uyarlanan likert tipi iletişim kurmaya isteklilik anketi, her iki grup için uygulamadan önce ve sonra kullanılmıştır. Uygulama süreci sonrasında deney grubu ile kontrol grubu arasında ve ayrıca grupların kendi arasında iletişim istekliliği açısından anlamlı bir fark olup olmadığı kontrol edilmiştir. Nitel kısımda ise, bir öğretim stratejisi olarak diller arası geçiş stratejisinin öğrencilerin konuşma akıcılığı üzerindeki etkisini ortaya çıkarmak amacıyla deney gruptan kasten seçilen dokuz öğrenciyle yarı yapılandırılmış görüşme uygulanmıştır. Veriler SPSS programı ve içerik analizi yöntemiyle analiz edilmiştir. Ön ve son testin nicel bulguları, deney grubu ve kontrol grubu öğrencilerinin uygulama sonrasında iletişim kurma isteklilikleri arasında anlamlı bir fark olduğunu ortaya çıkarmıştır. İçerik analizi yoluyla elde edilen nitel veriler, deney grubundaki öğrencilerin çoğunun, konuşma dersleri sırasında kaygıyı azalttığı, motivasyonu ve katılımı arttırdığı için, bir öğretim stratejisi olarak diller arası geçiş stratejisinin akıcı konuşmaları açısından oldukça etkili bulunduğunu ortaya koymuştur. Görüşülen kişiler diller arası geçiş stratejisi sayesinde konuşurken duraklamalar yaşamadıklarını ve bu stratejinin kültürel ve deyimsel ifadelerin ifade edilmesinde de oldukça faydalı olduğunu belirtmişlerdir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: İletişim kurma istekliliği, Konuşma akıcılığı, İngilizceyi yabancı dil olarak öğrenen öğrenciler, Konuşma kaygısı, Katılım, Motivasyon

ABSTRACT

Necmettin Erbakan University, Graduate School of Educational Sciences
Department of Foreign Language Education
English Language Education Program
Master Thesis

A NEW STRATEGY TO DEVELOP EFL LEARNERS' SPEAKING SKILLS AND TO INCREASE WILLINGNESS TO COMMUNICATE: TRANSLANGUAGING PEDAGOGY

Afife GÜLVEREN

In the Turkish context, speaking has received the least attention throughout the language learning process. Although Turkish students receive an English as a foreign education for several years, most students still think they cannot speak English fluently or competently. Thus, this study investigated the effect of translanguaging strategy on EFL preparatory students' willingness to communicate and oral fluency. The study was carried out with 76 participants in a private university in Konya. It had a quasi-experimental and mixed-method research design which both qualitative and quantitative methods were implemented. For the students in experimental group, translanguaging as a teaching strategy was applied for four weeks, while traditional teaching methods was conducted for the students in control group. In the intervention phase, the groups had two hours of speaking classes, and task-based activities, presentations, and discussion techniques were used for the students in experimental groups. A modified version of the likert-type willingness to communicate questionnaire, adapted by Mystkowska-Wiertelak and Pawlak (2016), were employed before and after the intervention for both groups. In the data analysis process, whether there was a significant difference between the experimental group and control group and within the groups after the treatment process was checked. For the qualitative part, a semi-structured interview was applied for nine students who were chosen purposefully in the experimental group to find out the effect of translanguaging as a teaching strategy on students' oral fluency. The data were analyzed with the SPSS program and content analysis method. The findings of the pre and post-test showed that there was a significant difference between the students' willingness to communicate in the experimental group and the control group after the intervention. The qualitative data gathered through content analysis revealed that most of the students in experimental group found translanguaging as a teaching strategy rather effective for their speaking fluency since it reduced anxiety, increased motivation and participation during speaking classes. It was stated by the interviewees that through the translanguaging strategy they did not have pauses while speaking and it was also very beneficial for expressing cultural and idiomatic expressions.

Keywords: Willingness to communicate, Speaking fluency, EFL learners, Anxiety, Participation, Motivation

CHAPTER 1

1. INTRODUCTION

This research study aimed to understand the effect of translanguaging strategy on EFL students' fluency and willingness to communicate during speaking activities. This chapter discusses the research study's problem statement, purpose, significance, and limitations.

1.1. Problem Statement

Communication is one of the most important social skills for people, as this is how people express their needs, wishes, and thoughts. While people from the same linguistic backgrounds use their mother tongue to communicate, people from diverse linguistic backgrounds communicate in English due to its widespread use and status as the universal language. Thus, many people in different countries learn English to communicate in various contexts, from education to entertainment.

English is also a popular foreign language in Turkey. Students in Turkey start taking compulsory English language courses in the second grade of elementary schools, and they take approximately 1000 hours of English classes until the end of their high school education (Coskun, 2016; Ministry of National Education, 2013). Yet, most students in Turkey still have poor English skills, specifically verbal English (Dincer & Yesilyurt, 2013; Kirkgöz, 2008; The British Council, 2014). Mahdi (2014) blamed test-oriented teaching in schools for this result and suggested that “the main purpose of learning a foreign language is to use it for meaningful and effective communication both inside and outside the classroom” (p.17). Therefore, students must participate in communicative activities and continually practice the language.

Studies revealed that two factors influencing students' communication skills are learners' willingness to communicate and fluency (Kim et al., 2022; Yousefi & Kasaian, 2014). Willingness to communicate (WTC) is viewed as learners' intense eagerness to communicate and is defined by Ningsih and colleagues (2018) as "a situation when someone is ready to utilize the target language (TL) they are learning to speak without force and burden" (p.812). Researchers found that some students are eager to communicate while others are reluctant, generally silent, and less willing to communicate.

To determine the impact of WTC on the L2 speaking abilities of EFL learners in Turkey, Bergil (2016) conducted a study and found that students' WTC levels were related to their

speaking abilities. It was also highlighted that students' speaking abilities in preparatory classes were generally weak and inadequate, which may be related to the curriculum or the activities designed by the instructors. Cetinkaya (2005) examined the connection between WTC and motivation and found that students who had speaking anxiety were more reluctant to communicate. Moreover, it was noted by Uymaz (2020) that Turkish EFL students' "willingness to communicate" greatly influenced their speaking ability.

Fluency is the second factor that can influence students' communication in Turkey. According to Richards (2006), fluency is the use of language that comes effortlessly when a speaker participates in and maintains meaningful dialogue. According to Fillmore (1979), "a fluent speaker can communicate without stopping to think often" (p. 377). Additionally, fluency is defined by Baily (2003) as the ability to speak swiftly and confidently with few pauses. "One of the most difficult challenges in teaching an L2 is finding ways to help students improve their oral fluency" (Al-Sibai, 2004, p. 2). Therefore, fluency can be a challenging skill for students with inadequate exposure to the target language and may even influence the communication of EFL learners inside the classroom.

As a result, numerous efforts have been made by both language teachers and researchers to give students greater chances to improve their speaking skills. However, the majority of students in Turkey believe that they still cannot speak English fluently (Atalar, 2013). Moreover, a significant number of students in oral English language classrooms were reluctant to answer questions and stayed silent during the discussions for a variety of reasons, including low English proficiency, low self-esteem, public anxiety, fear of receiving a poor grade, shyness, a lack of confidence and preparation, and the fear of making mistakes (Hamouda, 2013; Leong & Ahmadi, 2017). Even though various techniques were proposed to improve EFL students' speaking skills (Tokoz-Goktepe, 2014; Atalar, 2013; Bergil, 2016; Cetinkaya, 2005, Dikilitas, 2021), only few studies explored the impact of translanguaging strategy on EFL students' fluency and willingness to communicate. Thus, this study aimed to close this gap by investigating the impact of translanguaging strategy on EFL preparatory class students' fluency and willingness to communicate.

1.2. Purpose of the Research

Translanguaging is defined as "the process of making meaning, shaping experiences and gaining understanding and knowledge through the use of two languages" (Baker, 2011, pp.

288), Studies revealed that using translanguaging strategy had many benefits for students' speaking skills (Masna, 2020; Mirhasani & Jafarpour, 2009). In the observational study conducted by Ha and colleagues (2021), students at a university in the south of Vietnam were encouraged to utilize translanguaging to improve their speaking fluency. It was found that students welcomed the translanguaging strategy and using L1 increased their self-confidence and conversational competence as they learned English. Moreover, translanguaging might encourage students to speak while helping them deal psychologically with their limited linguistic competence (Ortega, 2020). Finally, translanguaging aided learners in the growth of their language competency (Canagarajah, 2011a; Creese & Blackledge, 2010; Lewis, Jones & Baker, 2012).

The potential of Translanguaging in foreign-language classrooms where students and instructors spoke the same first language received relatively little attention, although much was written about the advantages of translanguaging in bilingual education programs (Garcia & Wei, 2014). Thus, the role of translanguaging strategy in increasing EFL students' willingness to communicate and developing fluency skills still needed to be understood. Moreover, because English-only policies were still dominant in EFL classrooms, translanguaging received little attention in Turkey (Dikilitas & Yuzlu, 2021; Yuvayapan, 2021). Thus, this study explored if translanguaging as a teaching strategy influenced EFL students' fluency and willingness to communicate. The researcher looked for the answers to the following research questions:

- 1- Does Translanguaging as a teaching strategy have any statistically significant effect on Turkish preparatory EFL students' willingness to communicate and communication comprehension in a speaking course?
- 2- How do EFL preparatory students perceive the effect of Translanguaging as a teaching strategy on their willingness to communicate, communication comprehension, and oral fluencies?

A quasi-experimental research approach was used to investigate the impact of translanguaging on EFL preparatory students' fluency and willingness to communicate. Data collection tools included a WTC questionnaire (Mystkowska-Wiertelak & Pawlak, 2016) and semi-structured interviews. While the questionnaire was given to all participants (35 participants in the control group and 41 participants in the experimental group) twice (pre- and post-intervention), semi-structured interviews were conducted only with nine participants in the

experimental group after the intervention. The quantitative data was analyzed with the SPSS program, and the qualitative data was analyzed with the content analysis method.

1.3. Significance of the Research

Language acquisition is fundamentally about communication. Students exercise their language skills more when they communicate, which aids in the development of fluency. It's an opportunity for them to use the words and phrases they've acquired in authentic contexts. Turkish students struggled to communicate in English and were reluctant to communicate in English (Cepik & Yastibas, 2013; Kara et al., 2017; Uztosun et al., 2014). Additionally, speaking in a foreign language can be frightening for many students at first because they are afraid of making errors or seeming incompetent. Understanding idioms, non-verbal clues, and cultural conventions is also frequently necessary for effective English communication. Communicating eagerly can result in a greater comprehension of language and culture. Furthermore, English is widely utilized in today's globalized world for everyday needs including social interactions, travel, and commerce. Students who are willing to communicate and able to speak in English fluently will be more equipped to handle these circumstances. EFL students may interact with English speakers both formally and informally when they speak the language fluently. For social, intellectual, and professional contacts, this can be quite important.

This study, therefore, aimed to explore if translanguaging strategy could support the development of students' speaking fluency and willingness to communicate. This way, it can serve as a starting point of speaking skills development for future researchers in the field of English Language Teaching. This may shed lights on not only the teachers whose students do not participate in speaking activities but also the students who are anxious and stressed while speaking in English since it is the main problem in Turkish education system. It is also an opportunity to pave the way for further investigation on translanguaging in the Turkish higher educational context. This study can be helpful for primary and secondary schools and higher education institutions that use English as a medium of instruction. Additionally, it might decrease instructors' misconceptions about the value of L1 in the classroom. It could also be used as a guide for language instructors and lecturers who work in an EFL setting to stay updated about the most recent interpretations of second language acquisition and new approaches to teaching languages that go against the grain of the traditional monolingual instructional ideologies that rule classroom instruction and impose rigid limits on students' language use.

Finally, this study provided a novel and adaptable method for teaching foreign languages, which may help policymakers examine the curricula and linguistic standards used in foreign language classes. The results may guide researchers and curriculum developers. By making the results of this study accessible to public, a gap in Translanguaging research in higher education in Turkey and other countries may be filled.

1.4. Assumptions

1- Translanguaging as a teaching strategy have statistically significant effect on Turkish preparatory EFL students' willingness to communicate.

2- Translanguaging as a teaching strategy have statistically significant effect on Turkish preparatory EFL students' communication confidence.

1.5. Limitations

Every research study includes limitations regarding the field of investigation, the research methodology, and the target audience (Queirós et al., 2017). Furthermore, due to time, resources, and reasoning constraints, one researcher may not investigate all aspects of a topic. Therefore, future researchers who plan to conduct similar studies need to consider the limitations below:

1. The research context is limited to a private university in Konya, Turkey.
2. 76 preparatory class students as a control and experimental group were participants and only 9 students were specifically interviewed.
3. The gender of the students in each group was not equal.
4. The intervention phase took only four weeks.
5. The results and conclusions may not be generalized.
6. It was completed using only the specific data collection and analysis techniques.

1.6. Definitions

Oral Fluency: It is a concept that means speaking without pauses in the natural flow.

Translanguaging: It refers to the dynamic and natural use of full linguistic repertoire.

Willingness to Communicate: It refers to the intention and motivation to participate in speaking.

CHAPTER 2

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

This chapter overviewed the literature regarding EFL students' experiences in learning to speak in English. It first presented *Language Orientations and Approaches to LI Use in English Language Teaching, including Monolingual Ideologies and Multilingual Turn*. Secondly, literature related to *teaching speaking* in English was discussed with references to both national and international scholarly literature regarding teacher and learner practices to support learning/teaching speaking in EFL classrooms. Based on this review, as a new teaching strategy, Translanguaging was proposed to develop English speaking skills of Turkish EFL students. Finally, a summary was provided.

2.1. Language Orientations

Ruíz (1984) proposed three basic orientations toward language as a way of guiding critical analysis and reflection about “what is thinkable about language in society”: 1) language-as-problem; 2) language-as-a right, and 3) language-as-a resource (p. 16). A collection of values originating from a monolingual ideology and assimilationist approach is known as the "language as problem orientation" (Hornberger, 1990, p. 24). According to this viewpoint, linguistic diversity endangers national unity, which can only be attained by speaking a single, common language (Ruíz, 1984, p. 21). Furthermore, it is asserted that multilingualism should be restricted or eliminated to promote the growth of the language spoken by most of the population (Ruíz, 2010, p. 166). Mother languages are a challenge that must be overcome to teach the target language (TL) (Ruíz, 1984, p. 19). Students who are not proficient in the target language are considered deficient. Ruíz (1984) suggests that the language-as-problem orientation is an influential orientation specifically in English-dominant countries.

The second orientation is language-as-a right. The idea behind the language as problem method is that a linguistic disadvantage may be overcome by putting an emphasis on assimilation and the switch to a dominating majority language. In contrast, the language as right orientation aims to use legal tools to redress linguistically-based inequalities (Hult, 2016). “Language is a fundamental factor in one’s ability to access the life chances afforded by a society through, *inter alia*, employment, healthcare, jurisprudence, voting, education, and media” (Ruiz, 1984, p. 22). According to sociolinguists, the "right to use your language(s) in the activities of communal life" and the "right to freedom from discrimination on the basis of

language" (Macas, 1979, p. 89) are two examples of positive and negative rights that are identified by legal theory. In the second orientation, students are seen as having the legal, ethical, and personal right to preserve their native tongue in a language-as-rights viewpoint.

Ruiz (1984) proposed the language-as-resource orientation as a third orientation in part as a reaction to the significant limitations of two other language policy orientations. Ruiz (1984) criticizes language-as-problem orientation because of its deficit orientation and inability to establish regulations that respect linguistic and cultural resources belonging to both the individual and the community. The language-as-resource orientation aims to change how minority languages are perceived, from being seen as deficiencies (or problems) to assets for the individual and the community. A language-as-resource orientation encourages the use of multilingual speakers' linguistic skills as resources for achieving political, social, economic and cultural goals (Burton & Rajendram, 2019). Ruiz (1984) emphasized that "a closer look at the idea of language-as-resource could reveal some promise for alleviating some of the conflicts emerging out of the other two orientations: it can have a direct impact on enhancing the language status of subordinate languages; it can help ease tensions between majority and minority communities; it can serve as a more consistent way of viewing the role of non-English languages in U.S. society; and it highlights the importance of cooperative language planning." (pp. 25-26). One program that openly encourages this orientation in educational settings is bi/multilingual language education. For academic learning and minimizing intergroup conflict, bilingualism is a valuable tool. To sum, language as a resource orientation may have a great impact on social cohesion and cooperation (Ruiz, 1984).

2.2. Approaches to L1 Use in English Language Teaching

One of the most contentious issues in English language teaching (ELT) field is the role of students' first languages (L1) in English language learning. To understand the historical ideologies about the roles of L1s in ELT, it's important to gain a clear and historical understanding of how foreign language education pedagogies have changed over time and how "multilingual movement" evolved. Thus, this part briefly discusses the relationship between the second language acquisition theories and the dominant monolingual ideologies in teaching languages. Then, it discusses the rise of multilingual turn in the ELT.

2.2.1. Monolingual ideologies

English language teaching started with traditional approaches like the “Grammar Translation Method.” The main purpose of the grammar-translation method was to improve one’s competence in comprehending literature of the target language (Følsvik, 2022). As the language contact improved, so did the necessity for spoken language proficiency and verbal communication. Therefore, the direct method emerged next, and language teaching approaches started to focus more on daily language usage than on overly constructed sentences and obscure grammar rules. Until the 1960s and 1970s, the emphasis was more on the practical use of language, which is communicative, than instruction and explicit habits in forming grammatically correct sentences.

In the 1970s, the idea of real-life communication and the label ‘communicative’ became more prominent and shifted foreign language teaching’s goals to real-world applications (Howatt & Smith, 2014). Language was considered a tool for communication, and the practical use of language in daily life was emphasized. Educators wanted language learners to be exposed to the target language as much as possible, so they moved away from using their mother tongue in English language classes. Krashen (1992)’s Input Hypothesis was one of the most well-known and influential ideas of the time. According to this theory, the ideal level of instruction and materials employed in language teaching (i.e., the input) need to be above the students' competency. The ideal level of input was described by Krashen (1992) as $I + 1$, where I represented the learner's current competence level and $+ 1$ represented a level that the learner could comprehend with the knowledge they already had but might not have been able to create on their own. In English language teaching, Krashen's idea gained enormous support and led to the restricted use of the mother tongue in ELT classrooms.

Krashen’s SLA theory led to the development of ‘Communicative Language Teaching’ and “Task-Based Language Teaching,” which prioritized oral and communicative skills over accuracy and written language (Hall & Cook, 2012). According to these teaching approaches, learners must communicate to complete a task. Instead of grammar exercises, reading assignments, or writing assignments, these approaches prefer oral activities since they involve student interaction and spontaneous, creative replies. They encourage communication, pleasure, and fluency in the target language. These approaches suggest the necessity of authentic, meaningful communication as a language learning method.

2.2.2. Multilingual Turn

Innovations for language education emerged during the “multilingual movement” in the late 20th century when the mother tongue to “English language teaching” once more took center stage. In light of recent findings (Følsvik, 2022), the perception of languages and how one's linguistic capacity develops have changed. As an early contributor to the “multilingual turn,” Garcia & Field (2014) suggested that one's knowledge of two or more languages was not to be considered separate from each other but as one linguistic repertoire. Suggesting interdependence between languages led to further research on the cognitive aspect of using two or more languages and how knowledge of the different languages was interrelated with each other (Følsvik, 2022). Therefore, it was understood that linguistic proficiency was transferrable between languages (Garcia & Wei, 2014), which means using both L1 and the target language may facilitate language learning.

Theories and research that called for using L1 in “English language teaching” further improved teaching techniques to suit the demands of more multilingual classrooms and emphasized the “highly technology globalized world” as a major component. The multilingual movement was separated into a societal development and a turn into a language teaching technique (Følsvik, 2022). Conteh and Meier (2014) explained the multilingual turn as a recognition of the globalized world where societies and most people could be considered multilingual, at least to some extent (Meier, 2014). Meier (2014) asserted migration waves in response to global events and trends, as well as technology advancements, have led to a rise in multilingualism in populations, which naturally increased the diversity of classrooms. Due to the diversity seen in language learning environments, theories and methods have been developed to utilize diversity as a tool for language learning and to create inclusive learning environments (Meier, 2014). As was previously indicated, the monolingual viewpoint and exclusion of the learners' L1 were thought to be obsolete in the field of English language teaching, and it was argued that bringing the L1 into English language teaching would be more appropriate for the development in classroom diversity (Følsvik, 2022).

2.3. Translanguaging

Ofélia García (2009), a pioneer in the study and advancement of “multilingual turn,” introduced translanguaging lens to the ELT field. According to this lens, “one's linguistic knowledge of different languages was not separate as own entities, but one linguistic repertoire that can be enhanced as language learners increase their proficiencies in different languages.

Garcia (2009) asserts that bi/multilinguals use their linguistic resources dynamically, naturally, and intentionally in communication to create meaning and promote an in-depth understanding of the content. It is a dynamic process in which multilingual language users mediate complex social and cognitive activities through the strategic work of various sources of semiotics for action to know and be (Garcia & Wei, 2014).

Translanguaging presents a pedagogical approach that does not treat different languages as separate pieces of knowledge or proficiencies, but rather, “the enaction of language practices that use different features...that now are experienced against each other in speakers’ interactions as one new whole,” (García & Wei, 2014, p. 21). It is implied that teachers using translanguaging methods must encourage learners to use and expand their full linguistic repertoire. It is also highlighted that multilingual classroom methods can help minorities and recently arrived learners feel more at home and included in their new place (Sobkowiak, 2022). Additionally, multilingual instructional strategies can also promote identity investment among both majority and minority students in bilingual/immersion programs by encouraging them to express themselves through both of their languages by means of collaborative multimedia projects that are accessible to a wider audience (Cummins, 2007).

Rabidge (2020) claims that a translanguaging perspective “allows learners access to the cognitive tools of their L1 to acquire the target language better” (p. 2). Over the years, translanguaging as a central theoretical concept in the multilingual turn in TESOL and EFL has proven to be an effective pedagogical practice in various educational contexts (Wei, 2018). Although translanguaging can be used in various methods, such as task-based language learning or English for Academic Purposes, it should not be viewed as a single technique (Tian et al., 2020). In the EFL classroom, combining languages impromptu might boost students' cognitive involvement with learning tasks and subsequently improve their linguistic performances (Sobkowiak, 2022). Translanguaging may be used to speed up the process of problem-solving, meaning- and sense-making, and production of knowledge for learners as a helpful scaffold for learning and comprehending a lesson (Tian et al., 2020).

Contrary to multilingual students for whom it is “natural” to translanguage at home and in their community contexts (Bhatia, 2004), EFL students need to be taught how to intertwine their linguistic resources in schools (Canagarajah, 2018). To that aim, educators must demonstrate to learners how to constructively integrate language translation into the construction of meaning as well as the organization and mediation of speaking, listening, and

learning. Teachers should create spaces in the classroom for learners to use their full linguistic repertoires to demonstrate their understandings and skills and perform bi/multilingually in various multimodal contexts. This should help students engage in cognitively powerful learning experiences and facilitate their higher-order, creative, and imaginative thinking, leading to generating new knowledge (Garcia & Kleifgen, 2018).

According to Garcia (2010), in the EFL classroom, students are seen as speakers and authors who employ their authority to develop new and inventive forms of the English language. It is necessary to acknowledge translanguaging as a method that permits the adoption of "a bilingual discursive norm." "An English-only, monolingual approach" is discarded in a multilingual EFL classroom, and students are seen as productive individuals with multilingual repertoires, skills, and capacities rather than as inadequate, non-native speakers of English who are characterized by what they lack (Garcia & Kleifgen, 2018). They are encouraged to use their full linguistic abilities, maintain their cultures, and express their identities while broadening their linguistic horizons by learning English characteristics. Teachers need to know when to let their learners using their existing linguistic resources and when to return their focus back to the target language. Depending on the fluid, communicative context, students may be required to use simultaneously a hybrid of two or more languages/ modalities or stick to one language or modality (Llanes & Cots, 2020). Baker listed four benefits of translanguaging (2011, pp. 281-282):

- It may promote a deeper and fuller understanding of content
- It may help students develop skills in their weaker language
- It may facilitate home-school cooperation
- It can develop learners' second language ability concurrently with content learning.

2.4. Teaching Speaking

Speaking has been regarded as one of the crucial skills students should develop, along with other abilities in the second language learning (Mudra, 2016). Teaching speaking skills is a key component of preparing learners to talk or utilize language in communication. Language instructors' primary responsibility while teaching speaking in a new language is to organize class activities that can help learners develop, enhance, and expand their speaking abilities (Khamkhien, 2010). Therefore, Harmer (2000) suggests teachers to encourage learners to speak or practice the language they are learning. It is evident, nonetheless, that teaching speaking to EFL students in particular poses difficulties for English teachers (Yusuf & Zuraini, 2016).

One issue that frequently arises in EFL environments is the unwillingness of EFL learners to speak English in the classroom. Students consequently have less chances to learn through speech. According to research, they tend to have more unfavorable attitudes toward learning and are less likely to be motivated to put more effort into it (McCroskey & Richmond, 1991). According to MacIntyre, Clément, Dörnyei, & Noels, the definition of willingness to communicate (WTC) is "a ready to participate into discourse at a particular time with certain person or persons using an L2" (1998, p. 547). To put it differently, the degree to which a person is willing to interact with others in various communication circumstances is referred to as WTC. According to MacIntyre and his colleagues (1998), the primary objective of language training should be to promote WTC in the L2. MacIntyre, Baker, Clément, and Donovan (2002) suggest that the higher a student's WTC, the more frequently L2 conversation occurs in the classroom.

'Communication apprehension' and *'perceived communicative competence'* are the two main components of the WTC (MacIntyre, 1994). Communication apprehension (CA), commonly known as language anxiety when it occurs in L2 learning, is described as anxiety related to existing or expected communication events (McCroskey, 1977). This phenomenon is connected to those who are afraid to interact with others and are generally hesitant to talk in a certain setting, in the present study, the classroom. According to Noorbar and Mamaghani (2016), if an L2 learner is extremely anxious about speaking in a second language, it's conceivable that they will avoid speaking that language. On the other hand, a person's self-assessment of their communication skills is referred to as the "Self-Perceived Communication Competence" (McCroskey, 1982). Deci (1995) asserts that "people must feel sufficiently competent at the instrumental activities to achieve their desired outcomes" (p. 64). Anyadubalu (2010) discovered that people who felt more positive about themselves were more likely to have lower anxiety levels and perform better. The learners could comprehend the course objectives as specified in the curricula and be aware of the purpose and outcomes they were expected to have, both in the short and long terms, to develop Self-Perceived Communicative Competence (Palacios, 1998).

Unfortunately, intermediate-level EFL students and even some advanced-level students can struggle to communicate in English since they feel pressure in English-only classes (Worthy et al., 2003). Due to this problem, the students' ability to communicate fluently and accurately may need to be improved (Shanehsazzadeh & Darani, 2017). Accuracy and fluency are the two fundamental subcategories of speaking, a production skill. Accuracy is demonstrated by the

correct use of vocabulary, grammar, and pronunciation in a variety of activities, while fluency is defined as "the capacity to continue speaking spontaneously" (Gower et al., 2005, p. 100).

According to Zhang (2009), speaking was still the most challenging ability for most English language learners to master, and they were still unable to communicate effectively in oral English. Ur (1996) identified a number of characteristics that could contribute to speaking difficulties, including the following:

1. Reticence. Students are shy, dread criticism, and worry about making mistakes.
2. Nothing more to add. There is little encouragement for students to express themselves.
3. Uneven or low participation. Due to enormous class sizes and the propensity of some students to dominate while others speak very little or not at all, only one participant can speak at a time.

Additionally, Rababa'h (2005) noted that various factors contribute to EFL students' fear of speaking English. These factors are about the students themselves, the curriculum, the environment, and the methods of instruction. For instance, many students are unable to continue an interaction because they need more vocabulary to communicate their meaning. Another cause for inability to maintain the communication is a lack of strategy and communication competence. Marzuki (2017) suggests that English teachers should address several issues that learners regularly experience breakdown and misunderstanding while communicating in English (Marzuki, 2017). Marzuki (2017) claims that there is a widespread belief among learners that English is an extremely challenging and complex language. This situation is almost the same in Turkey since students' focus is to pass the exams, they overlook communicating in English.

From Marzuki's (2017) point of view, the effectiveness of a language teaching program is significantly influenced by the teaching methods used. For example, strict monolingual instruction in an EFL classroom may make students feel threatened and stressed. Therefore, they may hesitate to participate in activities and experience barriers to communication. Thus, applying the right teaching methods may result in positive results.

2.5. Teaching Speaking Through Translanguaging

Translanguaging can be used in a variety of activities to develop speaking, writing, reading, and listening as well as other language abilities. Translanguaging approaches aim to

free language learners from the constraints of needing to conform to the standard of an idealized, native-like speaker, allowing them to make the most of their linguistic abilities. For example, Dikilitas (2021) emphasized that translanguaging was successful in helping students improve their four English language proficiency skills including speaking.

Studies that explored the impact of translanguaging on the development of speaking skills found important benefits. For instance, in Ha and colleagues' (2021) observational study, the lesson that used translanguaging resources and encouraged speaking among the students was well received by the students. The use of L1 was found to be a helpful strategy for boosting their confidence and conversational proficiency while they acquired English. Another research study by Masna (2020) highlighted that translanguaging is a helpful strategy that enabled the students to communicate their views in a way that was clear and significant during the engagement process. Ariffin and Galea (2009), who investigated the functions of translanguaging and how it was applied to achieve speakers' communicative intentions in bilingual Bahasa Melayu and English discussions, stated that speakers used translanguaging to structure and improve their speech. Gamotin (2021) also concluded that translanguaging was a communicative, educational strategy that could address linguistic demands in the classroom.

Furthermore, the translanguaging strategy has a specific effect on students' fluency. Ogane (1997) revealed that translanguaging enabled learners to express their multiple identities as students and individuals in the classroom while managing and smoothing the flow of conversation as their speech "accuracy and fluency." Similarly, Noorbar and Mamaghani (2016) showed that translanguaging positively impacted the participants' speaking abilities and increased their oral fluency, accuracy, and communicative openness.

Moreover, translanguaging can have a positive effect on WTC. For example, Vrikki (2012), who examined the effect of learners' translanguaging on "L2 oral fluency in task-based activities," stated that Willingness to Communicate was improved with the introduction of translanguaging. In the same vein, Mirhasani and Mamaghani (2009)'s experimental research study aimed to determine whether translanguaging used as a communication technique caused students to enter the communication phase earlier and, eventually, resulted in the development of early oral proficiency. They stated that translanguaging could be utilized as a tool to improve EFL learners' speaking abilities.

Translanguaging may also be a successful strategy for encouraging learners to talk and assisting them in somewhat overcoming the psychological challenges posed by their limited linguistic proficiency. Ortega (2020) stated that it was likely to lower the affective barriers of those who lacked confidence in the L2 use and reduce the feeling of alienation, anxiety, and tension. Students can express their opinions and gain an in-depth understanding of class material, encouraging higher-order thinking and comprehension. For example, Torres and colleagues (2020) found that using one's mother tongue was a benefit rather than a barrier to learning a second language.

In the same vein, Sobkowiak (2022) research revealed that translanguaging encouraged students with inadequate English proficiency to participate, speak and aided them in negotiating meaning as a scaffolding approach. Combination language practices may have a positive effect on developing rapport between students and teachers. Additionally, translanguaging can contribute to students' engagement in content by creating a laid-back learning environment that facilitates students' comprehension (Infante & Licona, 2021). Moreover, utilizing the L1 along with, not in place of, the target language, translanguaging can enhance classroom communication, allow for better participation between weaker and stronger learners and transform teacher-student relations (Palmer et al., 2014). For example, Elashhab (2020) demonstrated that translanguaging facilitated the development of students' communication and proficiency skills in the target language.

Furthermore, in Jamshidi's (2013) study, findings emphasized that learners who spoke L1 in class felt more at ease and were more proficient. As well as creating a relaxing environment, translanguaging might scaffold students and improve their self-confidence. Similarly, Arumugam (2017) stated that translanguaging improved academic discussion and provided flexibility for students with low proficiency levels to hold a stronger grasp of L2 discussion. According to structured interview responses, students' academic speaking and conversation abilities improved when given the freedom to utilize their native language in ESL (L2) classes.

Making use of L1 from both students and teachers can improve interaction and have a favorable effect on the student-teacher relationship. For example, translanguaging, according to Abad (2005) and Metila (2009), reduced the effective filter, which fostered rapport and an informal attitude between teachers and students in the classroom. In the same vein, Atas (2021) emphasized that both teachers and students employed translanguaging in the classroom for

pedagogical and communicative purposes, specifically to improve communication, convey curriculum, and address issues with classroom management.

It may be stated that using L1 in English classes is a successful method for raising students' self-esteem and improving their academic debate skills. Følsvik (2022) revealed that the use of Norwegian to facilitate teaching and establish secure, comfortable environments, and the perceived urgency regarding whether to use English or Norwegian was considered to be pleasant. Cummins (2008) states that translanguaging allows students to use their native language as a positive linguistic resource that will aid them in developing ways that can help them negotiate meaning and communicate in English. Thus, by employing the language of the minority in the classroom, translanguaging aids in boosting the learners' confidence and maintaining their sense of self-worth. It helps humans to interact, language learners learn and educators deal with issues that arise in a multilingual classroom.

Finally, using L1 in the classroom can provide clear content meaning and improve learning capacity. For example, Masna (2020) stated that switching between codes helped minimize communication misunderstandings and clarify crucial information that could not be expressed in a single language or code. Consequently, EFL students could express a relevant message or feeling of the classroom as bilinguals through translanguaging techniques. Similarly, Moghadam and his colleagues (2012) found that students translanguaged because of their limited word knowledge and their unofficial environment, which compelled them to use language for a variety of purposes. As a result, translanguaging was utilized for socializing, confirming understanding, and seeking explanation.

2.6. Teaching Speaking in Turkey

Since 2004 in Turkey, elementary education curricula have seen significant revisions (Aktürkoğlu, 2019). English language education in secondary education curricula has been updated in response to developments in elementary education. Through reorganizing the educational system, the “Ministry of National Education” (MoNE) seeks to provide students a communicative English teaching environment necessary to help them survive in the fast-changing global environment. Teachers are expected to emphasize communicative activities in the redesigned curricula by giving learners meaningful assignments rather than having them memorize isolated information without context. Additionally, there have been initiatives to move away from teacher-centered instruction and toward student-centered instruction (Koral &

Mirici, 2021). Students are now expected to be responsible for their own learning because teachers are no longer viewed as the main source of knowledge.

Turkish foreign policy, interactions with global powers and European nations, as well as technological and economical advancements, have directly impacted English language instruction in Turkey (Kirkgöz, 2009). As a result of the educational reform in 1997, students were first exposed to English in the fourth grade, and then in the second grade in 2012. With these adjustments, the MoNE hoped to improve student learning of English by exposing learners to it earlier and over longer periods of time. Because of this, English is being taught in the new curriculum as a medium of communication (Koral & Mirici, 2021). In the updated curriculum, emphasis is placed on developing student autonomy and problem-solving abilities through appropriate assignments and authentic resources. Instead of concentrating on the grammar rules of the structures, teachers encourage their students to interact with the language. In summary, the redesigned curriculum intends to help students become "effective English communicators" and "independent" learners (Koral & Mirici, 2021).

Although MoNE noticed the importance of communicative English and the subject of English has been mandatory subject for years, students still have low ability to communicate in English (Coskun, 2016). Despite the importance of learning a language to communication, language classrooms, particularly those that do not emphasize the use of spoken language can be full of reluctant learners who are not willing to participate in any communicative activity and who have English language learning fear. The term "mute English learners" (Wolff, 2010) is therefore created to describe the students in the outer-circle nations who are not able to speak in English (McKay, 2002). Dincer (2010, p. 98) claims that "mute learners can write and read English effectively but cannot communicate orally effectively with foreigners." Therefore, in Turkey, there are a lot of "mute English learners" who can read and write but cannot speak in English.

2.7. Problem Statement

From primary school to higher education, scholars studied translanguaging practices and students' perceptions of translanguaging in detail. Nevertheless, very few studies were conducted to understand the impact of translanguaging pedagogy on EFL learners' oral skills in English language classrooms in Turkey. Furthermore, although most students in Turkey struggle to speak English and teachers could not fully use the target language in English

language classrooms, translanguaging only received a small amount of attention in Turkey (Dikilitas & Yuzlu, 2021; Yuvayapan, 2021). Thus, this study explored how translanguaging strategy affected Turkish students' WTC and oral fluency. This way, it served as the starting point for future researchers in the field of translanguaging. Additionally, the study made an effort to close the current gap by investigating the impact of translanguaging on preparatory class students' speaking ability.



CHAPTER 3

3. METHODOLOGY

This study aimed to investigate the effect of translanguaging as a teaching strategy on EFL students' WTC and oral fluency. Thus, it sought for answers to the following research questions:

1. Does translanguaging as a teaching strategy have any statistically significant effect on Turkish preparatory EFL students' willingness to communicate and communication comprehension in a speaking course?
2. How do EFL preparatory students perceive the effect of translanguaging as a teaching strategy on their willingness to communicate, communication comprehension, and oral fluencies?

This chapter first discussed the research design, the participants, and the sampling process. It, then, explained the data collection and data analysis procedures in detail.

3.1. Research Design

According to Kumar (2012), a research design is a plan, structure, and investigation strategy created to find solutions to research questions or problems. Moreover, a research design is a thorough strategy employed by the researcher to produce answers to the research questions that are trustworthy, accurate, and economical (Kumar, 2012). Since this study examined the changes in learners' willingness to communicate and fluency skills through questionnaires and interviews, it had a quasi-experimental research design.

The current study chose a mixed-method approach to incorporate both quantitative and qualitative methodologies. While qualitative research tries to get a deeper knowledge of the underlying beliefs and causes of the issues being researched, quantitative studies are concerned with facts that may be expressed mathematically (Blair, 2016). Combining quantitative and qualitative research can strengthen the conclusions by deeply and comprehensively examining the study problem, making up for the shortcomings of each approach (Fraenkel, 2011), and balancing out the shortcomings of each strategy (Dörnyei, 2007; Vrikki, 2013). Thus, using a mixed method can raise the study's internal and external validity (Dörnyei, 2007).

The study's quantitative component was experimental and aimed to reveal cause-and-effect relationships. The intervention study, often known as a randomized control trial (RCT),

is a popular experimental design (Vrikki, 2013) and a good fit for this study because the main goal of the current study is to understand the impact of the translanguaging strategy on students' willingness to communicate during speaking activities. This required at least two groups: an "experimental or control group" that the researcher manipulated or treated in some way, and a control group that was left alone and was used as a reference point for comparison. Willingness to communicate questionnaire adapted from Mystkowska-Wiertelak and Pawlak (2016) used before and after the treatment to measure EFL learners' willingness to communicate in speaking English. Therefore, it was determined whether the experimental alteration had an impact by comparing the outcomes of these two questionnaires.

The qualitative component of the study included a semi-structured interview to understand the effect of the translanguaging strategy on EFL learners' speaking fluency comprehensively. In the semi-structured interview, the questionnaire's results were further developed. Through interviews, the researcher aimed to comprehend and present the complicated interrelationships between Turkish EFL learners' willingness to communicate in English and the translanguaging strategy from the students' perspectives.

3.2. Research Context and Participants

This research took place at a mixed-level EFL preparatory school in a private university in Turkey. All students at different programs attended the preparatory school in their first years at the university to learn English. The school provided 24 hours of English lessons per week during the EFL preparation year. Each classroom included around 30 students. The courses were allocated as listening-speaking and reading-writing. Appropriate-level, well-qualified course books were used in each classroom to expose students to the target language profoundly. Extra teaching materials and task-based activities were utilized during the speaking lessons of one classroom to implement translanguaging pedagogy.

For the quantitative part of this study, a sample of 76 preparatory students was chosen randomly from the EFL preparatory school. The participants were divided into two groups—an experimental group and a control group. The participants' ages ranged from 19 to 22, and their proficiency levels were identified as A2. Most of them spoke Turkish, Turkey's official language, as their first language while only a student is from Mali whose native language was different from others. On the other hand, for the in-depth analysis of the impact of translanguaging strategies on students' speaking skills, nine students from the experimental group were chosen purposefully for the interview. Students were selected purposefully based

on their personalities, motivation levels and abilities to speak English in the WTC survey. Students who were shy, introverted and lacked motivation; who could speak languages other than English; and who struggled to speak in English were chosen for the focused-group interview. The data they provided in the questionnaire were taken into consideration as criteria in order to choose these nine students.

3.3. Data Collection Tools

This study utilized a WTC questionnaire and semi-structured interviews as data collection tools.

3.3.1. Willingness to communicate (WTC) questionnaire

To understand students' WTC, a modified version of the Likert-type willingness to communicate (WTC) questionnaire was employed before and after the intervention (Mystkowska-Wiertelak & Pawlak, 2016). The Polish questionnaire was adopted from eight pre-existing scales, including assessments of L2 WTC in the classroom (Peng & Woodrow, 2010), L2 WTC outside of the classroom (expressed as a percentage, MacIntyre & Charos, 1996), communication confidence including anxiety and perceived communication competence, (Horwitz, Horwitz, & Cope, 1986; Woodrow, 2006), and learner beliefs about behaviors that could encourage or inhibit L2 WTC during class (Sakui & Gaies, 1999; Peng, 2007), the ideal L2 self (Dörnyei, 2010), the ought-to L2 self (Dörnyei, 2010), the classroom environment (including the teacher, peers, and learning activities, Fraser, Fisher, and McRobbie, 1996), and international posture/interest in foreign affairs (Yashima, 2002, 2009). The questionnaire contained 104 items in a six-point Likert style (1 = entire disagreement, 6 = total agreement). The questionnaire was found valid and reliable (Cronbach's alpha = .797-.913) (Glassey & MacIntyre, 2019).

Only two sections of the WTC questionnaire were used for this study (see Appendix A). Since this study focused specifically on students' WTC at school, only the items that measure WTC and communication confidence in the classroom were used. Thus, the questionnaire used in this study included 27 items in total, and the participants chose the option(s) that best captured their emotions. The options were: 1. Not at all true, 2. Very marginally true, 3. Slightly true, 4. Moderately true, 5. Very much true, and 6. Extremely true about me. The questionnaire was translated orally into Turkish to increase their grasp of the items and remove any misunderstandings due to the participants' limited proficiencies. This questionnaire was given

to the control and experiment groups pre- and post-interventions to determine the changes in students' willingness to communicate before and after the intervention.

3.3.2. Semi-structured interviews

An interview is “a specialized form of communication between people for a specific purpose associated with some agreed subject matter” (Anderson, 1990, p.222). According to Anderson (1990), compared to other methods of gathering data, such as questionnaires, observation, etc., interviews can be a valuable tool for learning about people's true attitudes and feelings. Furthermore, Wisker (2001) highlights that using interviews is highly recommended for gathering information based on emotions, sensitive topics, insider experience, privileged insights, and experiences.

At the end of the intervention, semi-structured interviews (see appendix B) were conducted with nine EFL students individually. The interviews included eight open-ended questions and participants were allowed to answer the questions in the language they preferred. Each interview took about 20 to 25 minutes. Participants of the interviews included nine students, five female and four male students. They were selected purposefully based on their answers to the surveys. The selection criteria included their reluctance to speak during classes and their motivation and confidence levels. With the interviews, then study gained a more detailed understanding of the effect of the translanguaging strategy on students' oral fluency and WTC.

3.4. Data Collection Process

The data collection process started with distributing the WTC questionnaire developed by Mystkowska-Wiertelak & Pawlak (2016) to control and experiment groups at the beginning of the semesters. In the intervention phase, the groups were exposed to various speaking activities using the course book, visuals, and audios (see Appendix C). The same activities but different teaching strategies were applied to the experimental and control groups for four weeks. While translanguaging as a teaching strategy was used in experimental group, traditional teaching strategies were used in the control group. Students in the experimental group were allowed to use their L1 strategically while students in the control group were allowed to use only English.

In the first week of the intervention phase of the experimental group, EFL learners brainstormed and discussed stereotypes regarding people from different nationalities in groups

of four. In the preparation part of the activity, they thought about generalizations for the people worldwide and in Turkey. They shared their ideas with their group friends in English. However, in this stage, they spoke other languages to express cultural and unknown words such as “*eyvallah, merci, kara sevda, samba and bonjour!*”. Following this part, they chose a nationality, googled the stereotypes about that country in Turkish, and chose the most interesting stereotype for the group. They used only Turkish in the search process and only English in the post-search discussions. Next, they designed a poster using the “*Canva*” application about a stereotyped situation and found a motto for it. At the end of the session, groups presented their posters (see Appendix D) in English sharing the cultural expressions and unknown words from other languages such as *mamma mia pizzeria* and *çekik göz* in the original language.

The “Utopian city” was the topic of the second week. Students thought about and discussed the problems in their hometowns and the characteristics of the city they would like to live in in groups of four. They were allowed to note the problems in any language but discussed them in English. Then, they created a city as a group and named it. Students determined population, the rules and policies, living standards, and currency. In the discussion part, they spoke other languages for clarifications. Then, they presented and explained that city at the end of this session using “*PowerPoint slides*”. In the presentation part, they used English, but if necessary, they were allowed to use expressions from other languages to name or write the characteristics of the cities they created. Furthermore, the cities created by groups were voted by the rest of the students, and the best city was chosen through discussions in English.

In the third week, students imagined that they experienced a nuclear war in their country and thought about potential outcomes individually. Then, they watched a video about nuclear wars and the subtitle of the video was in Turkish. Next, students in groups of four discussed the imaginary situation of surviving a nuclear war in Turkish. There were four people at the airport but only three of them would be able to go to an uninhabited island that was not influenced by radiation. Based on the occupations each student was assigned, the group had to discuss who would get on the plane and live, and who would die. At the end of the discussion, they wrote a dialogue about the situation, they used expressions from other languages and acted out their decisions and reasoning. During this stage, they had opportunity to use idioms or traditional expressions in other languages. Students who were chosen to stay in the city used “*eyvallah!*” to express their sadness and acceptance. They also made some Turkish jokes during the

discussion. One of the student also used the expression “bacanak” in Turkish but could not find the English equivalence.

In the last week of the intervention, students shared their favorite cartoon characters such as Nasrettin Hoca, Temel Reis, Casper and Spider Man) and their superpowers with the teacher-researcher in English, and they used other languages to share their superpowers. While students giving examples about cartoon characters, they could not explain “*mayalamak and yoğurt çalmak*”. They also could not find the equivalence of “*ağ atmak*” while they were talking about Spider Man. In the following part, they thought and took notes about the most important problem in the world in Turkish individually, shared and discussed their notes as groups of four later in English. After the discussion process, they created a character as a group who would fix these problems with his/her superpowers. Finally, the characters and the problems were presented in English, but superpowers and cultural and traditional expressions were explained in other languages.

At the end of the intervention, the WTC questionnaire was distributed again. The pre- and post-questionnaire results were compared, and nine students were selected for interviews in order to understand and investigate the effect of translanguaging strategy on their fluencies in detail.

3.5. Data Analysis

The quantitative data of this study was analyzed with the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) program to understand whether the differences between the experimental and control groups’ willingness to communicate were significant or not. The program's ability to manage a significant collection of data with numerous linked variables is SPSS's biggest advantage (Jasrai, 2020). To determine the students' willingness to communicate, the mean scores and standard deviations of the questions were computed in this software. After the data collected for the research was transferred to the IBM SPSS 26 program, it was checked whether there were any reverse items in the scale used first to prepare the data for analysis. There are no reverse items in the “WTC during a Speaking Class” and “Communication Confidence Scales”. It was checked whether there was any missing values and no missing value was found. After checking the test assumptions, parametric tests were found to be applicable.

The paired-groups t-test was used to determine whether there was a significant difference between the pre-test and post-test scores of the experimental and control group

students, and the independent sample t-test was used to determine whether there was a significant difference between the pre-test and post-test scores of the experimental and control groups. Additionally, the independent samples t-test, which compares the mean scores of two groups in a given variable, was utilized to find out whether there was a significant difference between the data adopted from both the experimental and control group. In order to test whether the t-test was usable, the test assumptions were checked. According to the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test results performed to test the normality of distribution, the scores showed a normal distribution ($p > .05$). Boxplots were examined to check whether extreme values were present, and it was seen that there were no extreme values in the data set. Therefore, the data was used as it was.

On the other hand, a qualitative approach (Merriam & Tisdell, 2016) was adopted to gain a deeper understanding of the effect of the translanguaging strategy on EFL preparatory learners' willingness to communicate and oral fluency. The content analysis method was administered to analyze the interview data. "Content analysis seeks to analyze data within a specific context in view of the meanings someone, a group or a culture, attributes to them" (Krippendorff, 1989, p. 403). On the other hand, Hsieh & Shannon (2005) defines the technique as "a research method for the subjective interpretation of the content of text data through the systematic classification process of coding and identifying themes or patterns" (p. 1278). Unlike statistical analysis, content analysis does not quantify or measure correlations. It is based on analyzing viewpoints and ideas on numerous topics.

The procedures to analyze qualitative data included transcription, defining the unit or theme of analysis, developing categories and coding scheme, coding, drawing inferences on the basis of coding or themes and data description (Datt and Chetty, 2016). Thus, data gathered from the interview was transcribed and a general concept was formed to relate them to the research questions. For the following step, patterns and themes were recognized and classified to form a general framework and broader patterns. According to the students' answers, the themes were created for each question, such as nervous or comfortable, increased motivation or decreased motivation (see Table 1). Subsequently, all themes were categorized as affective or linguistic impacts. Overall, the data was interpreted, and conclusions were reached using content analysis. Students' reflections about the effect of translanguaging strategy on their oral fluency were presented based on linguistic and affective factors. Consequently, the findings of the analysis of the data gathered from the questionnaire and the interview were carefully examined to identify the effect of the translanguaging strategy on EFL learners' willingness to communicate and their speaking skills.

Table 1. Themes of interview questions

	Themes	Student Number	Impact
Q1: Students' feelings when they need to use only English to communicate	Nervous	7	Affective
	Comfortable	2	
Q2: Students' feelings when they are allowed to use L1 /other languages in some activities	Relaxed	6	Affective
	Interrupted	2	
Q3: Situations students want to use their L1/ other languages	Vocabulary	8	Linguistic
	Colloquialism and idiomatic expressions	3	
	Comprehension	1	
	Completing a sentence (grammar)	1	
Q4: The effect of the freedom to speak any language in class on Ss' motivation to speak/participate	Motivation increases	6	Affective
	Motivation decreases	2	
	Did not change	1	
Q5: Students' own evaluation of their speaking performance throughout the semester	Developed	8	Linguistic
	Did not develop	1	
Q6: Students' opinions on using L1/ other languages and English at the same time in a lesson	Good	5	Affective
	Bad	2	
Q7: Effect of using L1/ or other languages on speaking fluency	Positively affected	6	Linguistic
	Interrupted	3	

CHAPTER 4

4. RESULTS

This chapter primarily discussed the findings from the pre-test and post-test analysis. Next, the content analysis results of the interviews were shared.

4.1. Survey Results

The results gathered from pre- and post-tests showed that translanguaging as a teaching strategy had a statistically significant effect on Turkish preparatory EFL students' willingness to communicate in the classroom. In this section, firstly, the characteristics of participants were shared. Secondly, the experimental group's pre-test and post-test scores were compared to understand the changes in the students' willingness to communicate (WTC) and communication confidence at a speaking course. Thirdly, the control group's pre-test and post-test scores were compared to understand the changes in the students' WTC and communication confidence at a speaking course. Finally, experimental and control group student's pre-test and post-test scores were compared to understand the impact of translanguaging on experimental groups' students' WTC and communication confidence.

4.1.1. Background information about the experimental and control groups

There were 41 students in the experimental group. The number of male participants in the experimental group was 22 (53.7%) while the number of female participants was 19 (46.4%) (see Table 2). Five students (12.2%) defined their personality as "*Shy*", 15 (36.6%) as "*Outgoing*" and the remaining 21 (51.2%) as "*Balanced*". Moreover, 40 students (97.6%) chose Turkish as their mother tongue and one student (2.4%) spoke another language as mother tongue. 16 students (39,1%) speak other languages except from English while 25 (60,9%) students don't speak any other language. 37 students (90.3%) considered themselves as motivated to learn English while four students (9.7%) considered themselves not motivated to learn English. Finally, 16 students (39.1%) were motivated by their "*Social Environment*" to learn English, five students (12.2%) were motivated by "*Classmates and Teacher*", and 20 students (48.7%) had "*Personal Motivation*".

Table 2. The characteristics of the experimental group.

		Frequency (N)	Percentage (%)
Gender	Male	22	53,7
	Female	19	46,4
	Total	41	100
My Personality is	Shy	5	12,2
	Outgoing	15	36,6
	Balanced	21	51,2
	Total	41	100
My first language is	Turkish	40	97,6
	Other	1	2,4
	Total	41	100
I can speak other languages	Yes	16	39,1
	No	25	60,9
	Total	41	100
I am motivated to learn English	Yes	37	90,3
	No	4	9,7
	Total	41	100
My motivation comes from	Social Environment	16	39,1
	Classmates and Teacher	5	12,2
	Personal Motivation	20	48,7
	Total	41	100

There were 35 students in the control group. The number of male participants is 27 (77.1%) and the number of female participants is 8 (22.9%) (see Table 3). Among the participants, 6 people (17.1%) defined their personalities as "*Shy*", 11 people (31.4%) as "*Outgoing*" and the remaining 18 (51.5%) as "*Balanced*". Furthermore, 34 students (97.1%) chose *Turkish* as their mother tongue, and 1 (2.9%) chose "*other*". Furthermore, 15 students (42,9%) could speak other languages except English, while 20 students (57,1%) could speak any other language. 23 students (65.7%) considered themselves as motivated, while 12 of them (34.3%) considered not motivated to learn English. Finally, 16 students (45.7%) were motivated by "*Social Environment*" for learning English, 13 students (37.2%) had "*Personal Motivation*", and 6 students (17.1%) were motivated by "*Classroom and Teacher*".

Table 3. The characteristics of the control group.

		Frequency (N)	Percentage (%)
Gender	Male	27	77,1
	Female	8	22,9
	Total	35	100
My Personality is	Shy	6	17,1
	Outgoing	11	31,4
	Balanced	18	51,5
	Total	35	100
My first language is	Turkish	34	97,1
	Other	1	2,9
	Total	35	100
I can speak other languages	Yes	15	42,9
	No	20	57,1
	Total	35	100
I am motivated to learn English	Yes	23	65,7
	No	12	34,3
	Total	35	100
My motivation comes from	Social Environment	16	45,7
	Classroom and Teacher	6	17,1
	Personal Motivation	13	37,2
	Total	35	100

4.1.2. The comparison of the pre-test and post-test scores within groups

Paired Samples t Test was used to test whether the difference between the pre-test and post-test scores of the students from the WTC During a Speaking Class and Communication Confidence scales was significant. In order to test whether the t-test can be used, test assumptions were checked. According to the results of the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test performed to test normality, the scores showed a normal distribution ($p > .05$). Boxplots were examined to check whether extreme values existed, and it was seen that there were no extreme values in the data set. Therefore, the data was used as is.

The students' willingness to communicate (WTC) and communication confidence scores were compared at the beginning and end of the intervention period to determine whether there was a significant change in time. The comparison of experimental group's pre-test and post test scores showed that the difference between the average scores was significant $t(40) = -$

4.967, $p < .05$ (see Table 4). This finding implied that translanguaging as a teaching strategy significantly increased the students' WTC at a speaking course.

Table 4. A comparison of the pre-test and post-test scores for the experimental group students' WTC.

		N	\bar{X}	Ss	Std. Error	t	p	Cohen's d
WTC DSC	Pre-test	41	51,44	16,21	2,532	-4,967	0,00	0,29
	Post-test	41	65,29	9,73	1,521			

According to the Paired Groups t-Test results implemented to determine whether the difference between the pre-test and post-test scores of the experimental group's communication confidence was significant, the difference between the means was also found significant $t(40) = -4.675$, $p < .05$ (see Table 5). It indicated that the translanguaging strategy significantly increased the students' communication confidence. Furthermore, Cohen's d value calculated to measure the effect size was found to be 0.29. This value indicates a medium effect size.

Table 5. A comparison of the pre-test and post-test scores for the experimental group students' communication confidence.

		N	\bar{X}	Ss	Std. Error	t	p	Cohen's d
CC	Pre-test	41	46,46	15,34	2,397	-4,675	0,00	0,28
	Post-test	41	59,83	10,89	1,700			

On the other hand, the Paired Groups t-Test results showed a difference between the control group's WTC levels before and after the intervention period at a speaking course; however, it was not significant $t(34) = 0.783$, $p > .05$. (see Table 6). This finding implied that traditional teaching strategies did not significantly influence students' willingness to communicate in a speaking course. Cohen's d value calculated to measure the effect size was found to be 0.28. This value indicates a medium effect size.

Table 6. A comparison of the pre-test and post-test scores for the control group students' WTC.

		N	\bar{X}	Ss	Std. Error	t	p
WTC DSC	Pre-test	35	51,20	15,79	2,669	0,783	0,439
	Post-test	35	48,43	15,51	2,621		

Similarly, the Paired Groups t-Test results showed that there was no significant difference between the control group's communication confidence before and after the intervention period $t(34) = 0.638, p > .05$ (see Table 7). This finding also implied that traditional English-only teaching strategies did not significantly influence students' communication confidence in a speaking course.

Table 7. A comparison of the pre-test and post-test scores for the control group students' communication confidence.

		N	\bar{X}	Ss	Std. Error	t	p
CC	Pre-test	35	45,66	15,81	2,672	0,638	0,528
	Post-test	35	43,23	16,68	2,820		

4.1.3. Comparisons of the pre-tests and post-tests scores between groups

The Independent Samples t-Test was used to understand whether the differences between the pre-test and post-test scores of the students in the experimental and control groups were significant. Since Levene's test of equal variances did not give a significant p value, homogeneity of variances is determined. Therefore, the option with equal variance assumption was considered.

In order to test whether the t-test can be used, test assumptions were checked. According to the results of the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test performed to test normality, the scores showed a normal distribution ($p > .05$). Boxplots were examined to check whether extreme values existed, and it was seen that there were no extreme values in the data set. Therefore, the data was used as is.

A comparison of experimental and control groups' pre-test scores indicated that the students' WTC did not differ significantly $t(74)=0,065, p > .05$ (see Table 8). The average of the experimental group's WTC was 51.44 ($n = 41; SD = 16.21$), while the average of the control group students' WTC was 51.20 ($n = 35; SD = 15.79$).

Table 8. A comparison of the experimental and control group students' scores in the pre-tests about the WTC.

		N	\bar{X}	Ss	Std. Error	t	p
WTC DSC	Experimental	41	51,44	16,21	2,532	0,065	0,948
	Control	35	51,20	15,79	2,669		

On the other hand, the experimental group students' WTC was significantly higher than the control group students' WTC in the post-tests $t(55,407)=5.565$, $p < .05$ (see Table 9). While the average of the experimental group students' WTC scores was 65.29 ($n = 41$; $SD = 9.737$), the average of the control group students' WTC scores was 48.43 ($n = 35$; $SD = 15.57$). This finding showed that translanguaging as a teaching strategy increased students' WTC significantly.

Table 9. A comparison of the experimental and control group students' scores in the post-tests about the WTC.

		N	\bar{X}	Ss	Std. Error	t	p	Cohen's d
WTC DSC	Experimental	41	65,29	9,737	1,521	5,565	0,00	1,29
	Control	35	48,43	15,57	2,621			

Finally, the experimental and control group students' communication confidence levels did not significantly differ in the pre-tests $t(74)=0.225$, $p > .05$ (see Table 10). While the mean score of the experimental group students' communication confidence was 46.46 ($n = 41$; $SD = 15.35$), the mean score of the control group students' communication confidence was 45.66 ($n = 35$; $SD = 15.81$). Cohen's d value calculated to measure the effect size was found to be 1.29. This value indicates a high level of effect size.

Table 10. A comparison of the experimental and control group students' scores in the pre-tests about the communication confidence.

		N	\bar{X}	Ss	Std. Error	t	p
CC	Experimental	41	46,46	15,35	2,397	0,225	0,823
	Control	35	45,66	15,81	2,672		

However, the experimental group students' communication confidence was significantly higher than the control group students' communication confidence in the post-

tests $t(56,831)=5,041$, $p < .05$ (see Table 11). While the mean score of the experimental group's communication confidence was 59.83 ($n = 41$; $SD = 10.89$), the mean score of the control group students' communication confidence was 43.23 ($n = 35$; $SD = 16.68$). This finding showed that translanguaging as a teaching strategy increased students' communication confidence significantly. Cohen's d value calculated to measure the effect size was found to be 1.17. This value indicates a high level of effect size.

Table 11. A comparison of the post-test scores of the experimental and control group students from the communication confidence scale with the independent samples t-Test.

		N	\bar{X}	Ss	Std. Error	t	p	Cohen's d
CC	Experimental	41	59,83	10,89	1,700	5,041	0,00	1,17
	Control	35	43,23	16,68	2,820			

4.2. Interview Results

This part presented the outcomes of qualitative data from nine students. Backgrounds of the students and their experiences before and after the translanguaging strategy were given.

4.2.1. Backgrounds of the students

This study aimed to explore how translanguaging as a teaching strategy influenced students' WTC, communication confidence, and oral fluency. To understand the impact of translanguaging strategy on students' oral fluency, nine interviews were conducted, each taking 15-20 minutes. The information related to the students interviewed is as follows:

S1 was a 20-year-old female student who majored in computer engineering. Her personality was quiet and shy in the classroom. Her native language was Turkish and she did not speak another language. She learned English in a public school and thought her social environment was the most important motivation for learning English. However, she was afraid of taking risks to speak in the classroom because she felt anxious.

S2 was a 20-year-old male student whose personality was shy and introverted. His major was computer engineering. He learned English in a private school and did not speak another language. He believed the social environment was the most important motivation to learn English. Therefore, he listened to his friends' opinions and feared being judged. That's why he sometimes stayed silent and hesitated to participate in the activities.

S3 was a female student whose major was computer engineering. Her personality was quiet in the classroom. Her first language was Turkish, and she could not speak another language except English. She thought her motivation to learn English came from the classroom and teacher. She needed scaffolding and positive reinforcement during the classes.

S4 was a 22-year-old male student from Mali. His major was computer engineering. Moreover, his personality was outgoing and active in the classroom. He could speak four languages: Bambara, French, English, and Turkish. His motivation to learn English came from his social environment. He was not afraid of taking risks and participating in the activities.

S5 was a 19-year-old male student who loved speaking English a lot. His major was computer engineering. He was an outgoing person, but he made many grammatical mistakes while speaking English. That's why he hesitated to speak during the classes. He believed his social environment was the most important motivation to learn English.

S6 was a 19-year-old female student who was very shy and quiet in the classroom. Her major was industrial engineering. Her native language was Turkish and she did not speak any other language. She believed she could not speak English fluently and always hesitated to speak. In her opinion, personal motivation was the most important motivation to learn English.

S7 was a 19-year-old female student whose major was computer engineering. Her native language was Turkish, and she did not speak any other languages. She was active and outgoing in the classroom. As the student mentioned, even if she was motivated to speak, she made many mistakes and needed more fluency. These situations affected her motivation negatively. She claimed that the most important motivation to learn English was teacher and classroom.

S8 was a 19-year-old male student who was rather quiet and shy. His major was mechatronics engineering. His native language was Turkish, and he did not speak other languages. His speaking ability was weak even if he struggled hard, in his opinion. To him, his motivation to learn English came from his social environment.

Finally, S9 was a 20-year-old female student whose major was mechatronics engineering. His native language was Turkish; as a second language, he did not speak any other languages. His personality was balanced; he was neither outgoing nor shy. However, she felt a need for more motivation to speak English since she felt stuck while speaking. She believed the most important motivation to learn English was classroom and teacher.

4.2.2. Participants' experiences with English language learning

The students (n=9) were asked about their feelings and the situations they needed to use their native languages while speaking English only during speaking classes. The students' experiences were presented from affective and linguistic perspectives.

Affective impacts

Most students (n=7) stated that they felt nervous when they needed to use only English to communicate. There were three main reasons why they felt nervous: feeling inadequate linguistically, low self-confidence and fear of making mistakes. Feeling linguistically inadequate typically refers to a person's assessment of their language skills or linguistic competence. It is related to how well they are perceived to be able to read, write, comprehend, and speak a specific language. Conversely, low self-confidence is a more comprehensive notion associated with an individual's whole sense of self and self-worth. It's more than just language skills; it includes how a person thinks about themselves in other spheres of life. It might show itself as hesitation, a lack of self-belief, and a reluctance to speak when it comes to language. Finally, fear of making mistake is the fear of making errors in front of classmates or teachers that prevents someone from speaking up or participating in class discussions, particularly in a classroom context.

Firstly, students (n=3) emphasized that they felt nervous because of feeling inadequate linguistically while they were speaking. They expressed they could not use required vocabulary and grammar structure practically since the two pieces of grammar were not combined as one by the students, whether intentionally or unintentionally while they were speaking English. It was also stated that they compared themselves to advanced English speakers and this led to feelings of inadequacy. The students' answers and examples of feeling inadequacy are presented below:

Yesterday we encountered a Russian family. My dad and mom told me to speak with them. I thought I cannot speak with this family, but they made allegation on me. So, I got close to them and I tried to speak. Sometimes I couldn't tell what I mean and couldn't find the meaning of the words. On the other hand, I sometimes didn't understand when they use the words that I don't know. In these cases, I felt so nervous (interview, S1).

Above, student 1 expressed that she felt anxious when she forced herself to speak with people from other nationalities because of the feeling of inadequacy. Finding the appropriate

words to adequately explain herself or having trouble understanding native English speakers could be frustrating for her.

When I come across a native speaker or someone who speaks English very well, I feel inadequate and think that I cannot express myself since I can't make sentence that I really want to say (interview, S8.)

The example of Student 8 above said that when he compared himself with native speakers, his limited linguistic knowledge led to anxiety and feeling of inadequacy. English grammar rules can be complicated, and it takes time and effort to master them completely. Making mistakes with word order, verb tenses, or sentence structure can make his feel incompetent.

Secondly, some students (n=2) stated that they felt unconfident while they were speaking English. They reported that they lacked confidence in their public speaking abilities, particularly when there were few opportunities for practice or receive feedback. This lack of confidence could lead to pressure when confronted with situations requiring English communication. The following examples showed students' lack of confidence while speaking:

I feel nervous when I have to use English to communicate because I was afraid. I have no practice since I have never communicated with a foreigner, so I am insecure about it. I always feel like I'm going to be judged, I'm afraid of making mistakes. I prefer not to speak English in public areas (interview, S2).

Last time I went to Arabia and I had to use English for communication at the reception and asking for something. I realized that I am shy and I don't feel myself good while I am speaking English. Additionally, in the classroom, I don't want to participate the activities since I think that other students will make fun of me (interview, S6).

As students 2 and 6 mentioned, they feared criticism or ridicule from others. This fear could be intense for those who had had unpleasant past experiences or received criticism for their language abilities (MacIntyre & Gardner, 1991). Additionally, an individual's confidence could be negatively impacted by prior traumatic events like harsh criticism or mocking for grammatical mistakes.

Finally, another factor for feeling nervous was the fear of making mistakes while speaking English. Some students (n=2) highlighted the fear of making mistakes while speaking English, and that's why they felt stuck and did not want to speak. Additionally, they stated that this fear could create a sense of pressure, as individuals could worry about being laughed at or judged for their language abilities. Some representative quotes are as follows:

Speaking English was so exciting for me because, at that time, everyone watched me and waited for me to say something. If I could not complete a sentence or make pauses, I thought that everyone would be bored and not want to listen (interview, S7).

As student 7 stated above, EFL students frequently set high standards for themselves and expected to reach a particular level of English proficiency immediately. They could have higher expectations than their proficiency level and worried that making mistakes would disappoint them. This external pressure may increase their fear of making grammatical errors and limit their willingness to take risks with the language.

Linguistic impacts

Some participants (n=8) stated that it was difficult to express themselves with a limited vocabulary accurately. This resulted in people speaking in general terms or utilizing circumlocution (talking around a word) to express their ideas. They also believed that they had difficulty in using English idiomatic terms and phrases. Conversations might seem awkward or result in misunderstandings if they were unaware of this. The examples are below:

While speaking only English, I lose my concentration if I don't remember a word. The more words you learn, the better sentences you make and speak fluently. (interview, S3)

As students 3 and 5 stated, lacking enough words and idiomatic expressions might lead to loss of fluency. Additionally, they stated the importance of word acquisition and learning idiomatic expressions to avoid misunderstandings.

I wanted to use the idiom "acele işe şeytan karıştır" but I could not find the equivalence of it. I lost my speech fluency. (interview, S5)

Some students (n=2) expressed that having trouble with grammar caused several difficulties when speaking English. They believed that an incorrect word choice changed the meaning of a phrase or made it hard to understand. Their inability to compose complex sentences might hampered their capacity to communicate intricate concepts or arguments. As a

result, poor grammar could make their speaking less fluid and persuasive, affecting how other people perceived them. They also, thought that because of the difference between sentence structure of Turkish and English, some misunderstandings happened.

I was confused by making sentences in English. Sometimes, I used object before verb in my sentences, which should be vice versa. I, also, could not make long and complicated sentences. (interview, S2)

If I did not know the grammar structure of a sentence in speaking activities, I needed to use my native language (interview, S9).

The students 2 and 9 expressed that making sentences was rather difficult for them since the syntax and word order were different in both languages. During the activities, students mostly struggled to make sentences correctly since the word order of English was quite different from that of the Turkish language. For the following weeks, they stated that they got accustomed to using English sentence structure and felt more relaxed.

As for speaking English, idioms and collocations might be difficult for non-native speakers. Some students (n=3) thought that idioms from their native language could not be translated well into English if they were translated directly. Moreover, they stated that it was difficult to communicate using cultural metaphors and idiomatic phrases. This led to miscommunications or incorrect interpretations of what was being said. Additionally, they believed that making jokes was hard for them since some cultural jokes couldn't be translated. Furthermore, sarcasm might be misinterpreted, and what is humorous in one culture may not be in another since sarcasm and humor can vary by culture.

In an activity that I was allowed to speak only English, I wanted to say “ağırdan almak” but I couldn't tell it in English (interview, S1).

I really like making jokes, and sometimes I wanted to make Turkish jokes during speaking classes, but I could not since I couldn't translate it into English (interview, S5).

The students 1 and 5 said that some cultural and idiomatic expressions might not be translated into other languages, and not being able to express their ideas clearly may be

disappointing. This might affect their motivation and eagerness during speaking classes. The more they made jokes during the classes, the more willing to communicate they were.

Ultimately, a participant mentioned that he needed to use his native language to comprehend his partner's speech better. He said that fluent speakers talked quickly, making it difficult for him to follow along and comprehend the discourse. Additionally, it was expressed that if he was unfamiliar with the language, using extensive vocabulary, especially specialized terminology, was confusing for him.

In the Nuclear war activity, we watched a video in English. I think the speech was too fast and the speaker's accent was different. I needed some Turkish explanation for the video. Furthermore, during the discussion activity, my partner used words (come out, decrease) that I did not know. In these situations, I needed to return to Turkish to understand better (interview, S9).

The student 9 said that fast speech, unfamiliar accents, and limited vocabulary might cause misunderstandings or restricted comprehension for EFL learners. When they could not be understood, they felt more stressed. This affected students' participation and eagerness during speaking classes.

4.2.3. Participants' experiences after translanguaging as a teaching strategy

The students' feelings and opinions were asked after translanguaging as a teaching strategy was used. Their experiences were presented below as affective and linguistic views.

Affective impacts

Students' oral fluency might be influenced by the translanguaging strategy, which entails using the learners' native language or other languages in language learning activities.

Reduced anxiety

Most students (n=6) stated that they felt comfortable and relaxed when using another language during a speaking class. They noted that they might find it helpful to reduce stress, improve comprehension, and close communication gaps by utilizing their native language or other languages. They mentioned that using to their L1 enabled them to communicate more clearly and efficiently when they had trouble expressing themselves in English. This helped them to lower anxiety and encourage mental relaxation.

Moreover, some participants mentioned that it could be difficult to communicate some complex or culture-specific ideas in English. They were able to communicate more clearly and accurately in the L1, maintaining the intended meaning, thanks to translanguaging. By doing this, linguistic barriers that could cause misconceptions or misinterpretations can be reduced.

On the other hand, participants pointed out how rapport-building and a sense of connection with other speakers who speak the same native language could be facilitated by using the native language or other languages during English interactions. They said that it can foster a culture of support and promote more open communication, creating a comfortable atmosphere for language acquisition. Here are some excerpts:

In some part of speaking activities, we were free to use native language/other languages. When I cannot remember the word, I used Turkish version of this word. So, I felt more free and comfy. I don't feel nervous. I could speak easily. I could explain myself better (interview, S1).

As student 1 stated, translanguaging strategy could relate new English vocabulary to their prior language knowledge when they were permitted to speak their mother language in addition to English. They may access a greater variety of terms, idiomatic expressions, and nuanced meanings thanks to translanguaging, which resulted in a more substantial growth of their English vocabulary.

I felt really comfortable and confident when I had a chance to use another language. For example, while we were presenting our poster, we started our presentation with a French greeting word. Even if French was not our native language, it attracted my friend's attention and we had fun (interview, S6).

When there was no obligation to speak only English, we made some jokes and used some Turkish idioms. This made me really motivated and I thought that I could express myself in a best way (interview, S9).

According to students 6 and 9, translanguaging encouraged a greater understanding of their linguistic and cultural origins. It promoted a comfortable learning environment in the classroom that values linguistic diversity by recognizing and validating the worth of students' home languages. It was also stated that a more helpful and engaging learning environment may result from this inclusive approach.

When we used our mother tongue, we spoke more comfortably, we conveyed what we wanted to say better, but when we needed to speak only English, we kept silent because of the fear of not being able to speak, even if we thought of things we want to say (interview, S8).

Above, student 8 said she concentrated on efficient communication rather than strictly adhering to a particular language. She could communicate their thoughts, ideas, and feelings more fluidly because they had a wider vocabulary from which they could draw on to determine the most relevant words and expressions for a given task. Their listening, speaking, and comprehension skills may all be improved thanks to this activity.

Participants, additionally, stated that translanguaging not only reduced anxiety but also supported confidence. When they were given the freedom to utilize their L1 strategically in order to express cultural expressions, jokes and idioms, they became more comfortable speaking up in class and getting involved. They also said that when they struggled to express themselves in English when they could not remember the word or complete the sentence, using their L1 enabled them to do so effectively, establishing meaningful interactions and a supportive learning environment. Therefore, it strengthened communication in the classroom.

Using both languages in the lesson made me feel really comfortable. Since I didn't feel anxious, I noticed that I speak without stopping (interview, S2).

Having freedom to speak both languages made me feel so at ease that I participated in discussion activities actively. During the activities, it was quite fun to decide and produce something with my friends (interview, S3).

Above, students 2 and 3 mentioned that they felt more confident and competent in communicating effectively when they were allowed to use their native language as a scaffolding tool. The increase in confidence may stimulate engagement, taking risks, and general English speaking skill improvement.

Motivation

Several participants (n=7) noted that they could use their native language proficiency to enhance their comprehension of English through translanguaging. They claimed they might increase their comprehension and develop confidence in their English competence by utilizing

their native or other languages to explain ideas, clarify meanings, or give examples. They might become more engaged in speaking activities due to their boosted confidence.

Furthermore, it was stated that translanguaging enabled them to convey their ideas and views more realistically and genuinely because they could draw upon their own cultural and personal experiences and the native language. Their desire to participate actively and express their opinions during speaking sessions can be increased by personal connection and cultural relevance in communication.

Participants also noted that translanguaging could encourage their participation and engagement in speaking lessons. When encouraged to use their L1 strategically during discussion and group activities, they could help and gain from one another in a collaborative learning setting. Due to the learners' sense of empowerment to participate in debates and learn from their peers, this dynamic interaction can promote motivation and a sense of community. The examples are presented below:

When speaking English in the classroom, especially in the preparatory class, when I could not remember a word, instead of stopping and thinking, telling the word in Turkish contributed to my motivation. Being able to use my mother tongue in classroom activities increased my participation and motivation (interview, S2).

Above student 2 stated that by enabling him to use words and concepts from his native language, translanguaging strategy improved his comprehension. He was more motivated to participate actively in English conversations when he could completely comprehend the subject or instructions.

When we were free to use translanguaging strategy, I felt myself more confident. I thought I could make more sentences, I raised my hands more to participate the activities and I was even able to present our task voluntarily (interview, S1).

Student 1 said that when necessary, he could use his native language to help him express himself and communicate his thoughts more clearly. Their motivation to participate in English-language conversations and take chances while speaking was reinforced by this boosted confidence.

I think the environment is very important when it comes to speaking English. Therefore, using native language/ other languages provided more space to communicate especially

in group works. We could express ourselves better and make more jokes using traditional expressions (interview, S6).

Student 6 emphasized that by using his native language, translanguaging enabled him to personalize the language learning experience. Students could support their English speaking and overcome obstacles by focusing on their linguistic abilities. By making learning more personal, students might become active participants in their education and become more motivated to use English.

During the discussion part of the activities, I was so silent when we had to speak only English but when we had the freedom, I participated more actively in group discussion; I gave more examples, I expressed my opinions better. I was eager to speak (interview, S8).

It was mentioned by student 8 that by enabling students to communicate their thoughts, feelings, and ideas accurately, translanguaging encouraged meaningful dialogue. Learning to communicate successfully gave students the satisfaction of improved self-expression. This encouraging experience encouraged them to talk more and look for chances to have meaningful English discussions.

Since I did not feel stuck while speaking English, I caught the fluency and I felt more motivated. Therefore, I actively participated in activities (interview, S5)

Student 5 stated that as she might express herself more naturally, translanguaging enabled smoother and more fluid communication. This created a positive reinforcement loop that increased the learners' communication motivation.

Furthermore, participants expressed that it was good since it increased engagement and participation. They mentioned that it fostered an atmosphere in the classroom where students felt at ease utilizing their first language to convey their ideas and opinions. This inclusiveness and consideration for the language backgrounds of the students promoted active engagement and helped to create a more engaging and dynamic learning environment for them.

My biggest barrier while speaking was not being able to express myself. When I used both languages, I thought it easier for me to express myself. Therefore, I was really eager for the activities (interview, S6).

Student 6 expressed above that translanguaging supported his speaking involvement by acting as a scaffold. He could tackle difficult speaking tasks and overcome linguistic challenges by using his native language as a bridge. The scaffolding offered here may give him the assistance he needed to actively participate in speaking exercises and gradually improve his English-speaking abilities.

Linguistic impacts

The use of translanguaging strategy, which involves incorporating the learners' native language/ other languages in language learning activities, can have an impact on students' oral fluency in terms of linguistic factors.

Vocabulary

Most of the participants (n=8) stated that they used translanguaging strategy when they could not remember or did not know the meaning of a word. They expressed that by enabling them to draw links between their first language and the target language, translanguaging helped speed up vocabulary learning. It was also highlighted by the participants that they could build a wider vocabulary repertoire and improve their oral fluency when they used their native language to comprehend and communicate new words. According to the participants, through translanguaging, they could link new vocabulary in the target language to terms or ideas they were already familiar with in their first language. Participants could more quickly and easily understand the meaning of unfamiliar words by using their native language as a point of reference. They gained a stronger base of vocabulary knowledge in the target language as a result of this procedure.

As for the vocabulary retrieval and retention, participants expressed that using native language built a stronger memory link that facilitated recall by connecting new vocabulary with its L1 equivalents. The L1 reference might act as a mental trigger for learners when they need to recall a certain word, making it easier for them to recollect its counterpart in the target language. The representative quotes are below:

Mostly I needed to use my native language for the words that I do not know. For example, we had a poster presentation about stereotypes of a nationality. In the presentation I didn't know the meaning of the word "çekik göz". When I said the Turkish version, my partner said its English version and after that I learned the meaning of this word (interview, S1).

Above, it was asserted by student 1 that by exposing her to new words in mother tongue that share the same meanings or associations with English vocabulary, translanguaging might expand her vocabulary. This increased exposure to similar terms aided in the development of her vocabulary as well as comprehension of word links and subtleties.

Generally, I used my native language when I did not remember a word in presentations or group discussions. For example, in the utopian city task, I couldn't remember the word "saha". I told it in Turkish and I continued to speak in English. I felt very well since I did not stop and think (interview, S2).

Student 2 said that through translanguaging, she could link and associate words from her native language with their English equivalents. Learners could connect new terminology to their previous knowledge and concepts using their native language. By allowing students to relate new words to their current mental models, these links promoted a deeper grasp of vocabulary and improve retention and recall.

Colloquialisms and idiomatic expressions

Furthermore, some participants (n=4) said that they used native language/ other languages for idiomatic expressions and collocations. They stated that using native language/ other languages in speaking activities could help them to acquire idiomatic expressions and collocations, which were frequently difficult for EFL students to pick up. They believed that they could comprehend the context and suitable collocations by explaining or understanding these expressions in their L1, which improved their fluency in employing idiomatic and natural language.

When we were discussing in Nuclear War task I wanted to use the common expression 'nazar değmesin' in English but I couldn't find the equivalence. Therefore, I told it in Turkish, and it was fun (interview, S6).

Student 6, above, expressed that translanguaging aided him in comprehending idiomatic idioms or culturally specific vocabulary. During the activities, when students expressed them in L1, they were able to speak fluently. They were able to remember the English equivalence of this word for the next time since they did not feel under pressure.

In the speaking activity, we were discussing about who will be left in the bombed city and my friends chose me to be left and I said 'Eyvallah' to express my sadness and

accept. All of my friends understood, and we laughed. There was no better way to tell this word (interview, S8).

I wanted to use the word 'kara sevda' and 'üşenmek' in impromptu speech activity. However, I couldn't translate them (interview, S5).

Student 8 and 5 expressed that translanguaging strategy gave them access to the cultural background that is already present in their mother tongue, providing a deeper comprehension of some vocabulary terms that might have cultural meanings. This cultural connection might improve learners' language and cultural proficiency, allowing them to speak more successfully in a variety of circumstances.

I started presentation with a French word 'Bonjour!' and used 'merci' which is my country's official language. Even if it was not my friends' native language all of them understood and it took their attention a lot (interview, S4).

Student 4 mentioned that integrating different languages into English speaking classes might be attractive for the other students and support their learning. When they used different languages during speaking classes they had fun and relaxed. Therefore, using different languages in classroom might create a positive and comfortable learning environment.

Grammar

For some participants (n=2), using native language worked especially for grammar and sentence structure. Participants stated that using native language can give them a point of reference for comprehending and creating grammatically correct sentences. They can improve their fluency by understanding sentence structure and applying it to their English speaking by comparing structures in the L1 and the target language. The examples are as follow:

In presentations, I felt so nervous that sometimes I couldn't finish the sentences and in these kinds of situations I completed my sentence in Turkish (interview, S7).

It was said by student 7 that translanguaging strategy offered a connection that helped students understand and internalize English language patterns. Therefore, they felt more relaxed and spoke fluently.

Additionally, it was also highlighted that translanguaging had positive effect on metalinguistic awareness. They said that it enabled them to consider and scrutinize the

grammatical and phonological patterns of many languages. In order to compare and contrast the L1 and the target language, it helped them build their metalinguistic awareness. Therefore, a better grasp of language systems is encouraged by this metalinguistic awareness, which improved learners' comprehension of language structures. The representative quotes are as follows:

It was really difficult for me to using proper grammar rule while speaking. Thanks to this strategy, I could compare two languages better and figured out the sentence structure (interview, S8).

As student 8 stated, translanguaging allowed him to contrast and compare the grammatical patterns and structures of his native language and English. He might gain a deeper knowledge of the similarities and contrasts between the two languages by actively participating in translanguaging strategy. This comparison examination encouraged metalinguistic awareness, allowing him to more effectively consider and analyze linguistic structures.

Translanguaging promoted metalinguistic awareness, or the capacity to consider and evaluate linguistic structures. Through translanguaging, learners gained a better understanding of the grammatical structures and norms in both their original language and English. This increased awareness may encourage a deeper comprehension of syntax and encourage more precise usage when speaking English.

Comprehension

Most participants (n=5) stated that using Turkish and English simultaneously in a lesson was good since it had many advantages. They expressed that it enhanced comprehension. They noted that it enabled them to establish connections between their first language (L1) and the target language (English). Therefore, they could more easily comprehend and make sense of novel concepts, vocabulary, and grammatical structures in English by using the L1 as a support. They stated that, as a result, a deeper knowledge of the target language was fostered by this improved comprehension, and this deeper understanding could result in more meaningful and efficient language learning. The representative example is below:

I really liked this strategy since it made the conversation clearer for me. Especially, during discussion part of the activities using any language was quite effective for the speaker and the audience (interview, S1).

As student 1 stated above, by taking advantage of students' entire linguistic knowledge, they could communicate their thoughts, ideas, and feelings in translanguaging. When looking for words, articulating difficult ideas, or coming up with different ways to communicate in English, speakers could draw on their mother tongue. This was made for more precise and nuanced communication, which improved comprehension and fostered meaningful interactions.

Before B2 level, I could not understand the songs but I noticed that I can understand the songs and the books that we used in previous levels are really easy for me. I can understand English books as well, for example, Twilight. I feel I am developed (interview, S1).

As student 1 said that her comprehension ability increased through translanguaging strategy. Thus, the student was able to use English language in everyday life. This made her more willing and confident and led her to speak fluently.

A participant also expressed that he used native language in case of bridging gaps in comprehension. He thought he could employ native language in order to fill in comprehension gaps caused by difficult or abstract language in a conversation. He expressed that he could better understand a word's meaning by briefly moving to the L1, which enabled him to draw connections and relate it to their prior knowledge. The knowledge transfer from the L1 to the target language was facilitated by this bridge.

In group activities, I was explaining something and I used a word (exploit) that my friends do not know. I used Turkish version of the word in order to make the meaning clear for my friends (interview, S2).

Above student 2 expressed that translanguaging enabled her to utilize their native language to explain and comprehend English grammar structures or words. When grammatical rules or concepts were new to students, they concluded from the known structures and understood the meaning by using their prior understanding of analogous structures in their native language.

Speaking fluency

Most of the participants (n=6) declared that translanguaging helped them to overcome communication obstacles such as emotional barriers and cultural difference, which had a good

effect on their speaking fluency. Learners could express themselves more clearly and confidently by using the L1 for a brief period of time. Fluency in the target language may be improved as a result of this greater accuracy and confidence.

It was also stated by the participants that as a result of enabling them to use their existing proficiency in the L1, translanguaging increased their linguistic resources. They said that by giving them access to a greater variety of vocabulary, sentence structures, and communicative tactics in the target language, this linguistic transfer could help them become more fluent. A wider variety of linguistic tools might help them become more fluent and express themselves more naturally. The representative examples are below:

It's good to have freedom to use any language in a conversation. I continued without getting stuck while speaking English because I don't forget what I said afterwards. I felt more satisfied since my speech is more fluid. In my opinion, this strategy improves my speaking fluency (interview, S1).

While using both languages during the speech, my pace is not slowed down. Therefore, I felt more motivated and comfortable. I started to speak more fluently because of feeling relaxed (interview, S2).

Above, student 1 and 2 stated that translanguaging strategy allowed them to use their native language as a support system, which helped them express themselves more freely and confidently. As a result of their greater self-confidence, students might speak more fluidly since they were less likely to pause or struggle to find the correct words.

Furthermore, students also mentioned that the development of overall oral ability, which included fluency, accuracy, vocabulary use, and communicative competence, could be helped through translanguaging. Additionally, according to them, by utilizing the L1, they might concentrate on expressing meaning and having meaningful conversations, which improve their spoken English ability. They said that by bridging language knowledge gaps and promoting more efficient communication, translanguaging can aid them in improving their speaking fluency. The examples are as follow:

Being free to use my native language in some situations made me very motivated and it was really beneficial for me to use some words and some sentence structures in Turkish since I learned them afterward and never forget again. Additionally, as an audience, it

was effective to follow my friends using my native language in some situations because I can compare the languages (interview, S6).

Speaking without pausing made me feel great. While I was speaking English, it was sometimes hard to remember a word or expression. When I used it in my native language, the conversation flew and it made the conversation more attractive and meaningful (interview, S8).

Students 6 and 8 mentioned that translanguaging could assist them in overcoming challenges. Additionally, it preserved an ongoing flow of speech by giving them linguistic resources from their native language. This may reduce learning barriers and make students feel comfortable.

Translanguaging also had a positive effect on fluency in terms of self-correction. Participants stated that it could improve their capacity to keep track of and fix their own linguistic errors. They said that they might identify areas for growth by comparing their L1 with the target language, which helped them become more conscious of their own language output. It was declared that the development of more precise and fluid spoken English is encouraged by this metalinguistic awareness, which also encouraged self-correction. The representative example of the participant is below:

I had a chance to notice my mistakes and weak points during speaking thanks to this strategy and day by day I corrected my mistakes I learned more vocabulary (interview, S9).

As student 9 mentioned above, translanguaging could aid her in recognizing her grammatical mistakes. It's possible for her to detect inconsistencies or errors in her English speaking when switching between languages. When she compared her work to the appropriate forms or patterns in her native language, she became more conscious of her own mistakes.

4.2.4. The contradictory views about the impacts of translanguaging as a teaching strategy on students' oral fluency

Two students stated that they felt comfortable while they were speaking only English. They had self-confidence, and they expressed that they were not afraid of making mistakes. Moreover, they really enjoyed speaking English in the classroom and outside the classroom with native speakers. One student from Mali said:

“I like speaking in English in my daily life because it feels such good that I dream of spending whole my life in a country where I could speak it as a native language. I don’t feel nervous because I am used to use English, and I can’t communicate in Turkish. That’s why I had to communicate in English and I am accustomed to speaking in different languages.” (interview, S4)

Since the student 4 was from a different country and had to communicate in English, he stated that he got used to communicate with people by using different languages. The comfort level of him could be increased by immersion in an English-speaking environment, whether it can be through studying abroad or engaging with native English speakers. Some students were exposed to real language use, everyday idioms, and cultural nuances through immersion. Students who often contacted with native English speakers may become more comfortable and relaxed when speaking the language because they became accustomed to its rhythm, intonation, and natural flow.

“Even if I have difficulties while speaking, I am not afraid of making mistakes. Sometimes I can’t remember some grammar structures but I love speaking English. While I am talking to some foreigners, I feel intellectual and happy. I don’t feel nervous.” (interview, S5)

Above, student 5 expressed that even if he felt incompetent in terms of linguistic information, he gained confidence and comfort when he successfully engaged with others in English and had positive experiences. His comfort and relaxation while speaking English could be reinforced by celebrating minor triumphs, getting encouraging feedback, and seeing his development. He might be aware that making mistakes is a necessary aspect of learning and should not be avoided or felt guilty about. Therefore, his anxiety level was low since he adopted a growth mindset and realized that mistakes offer priceless learning opportunities.

Three of the participants also told that using their native language/ other languages during an English conversation may interrupt the flow of communication for themselves and others. They stated that those who were not familiar with the native language/ other languages might feel excluded or disconnected from the conversation.

They mentioned that some pauses could be the result of annoyance with the language restrictions brought on by translanguaging. It was also stated that when the discourse repeatedly shifted back to the L1, listeners who were keen to practice their English or maintained an

environment where English is spoken may become irritated. They may interrupt to encourage more English language use. Some representative quotes are below:

I can speak four languages. Therefore, I feel normal when I'm permitted to speak in other language during in some activities. As I'm better in any language which I use for communication I speak more clearly without stammering. However, when my friends speak Turkish and make Turkish jokes, sometimes I may feel excluded (interview, S4).

According to student 4, since he is from another country and he was not familiar with the native language of his friends, he felt excluded or disconnected from the conversation. Even if he thought that this may cause interruptions, using different languages in the classroom may lead to multilingualism.

During the activities when I used a Turkish word, I felt really shy and I told myself that why didn't you remember the English version. In those kinds of situations, I thought that I made my friends confused (interview, S5).

Student 5 stated that some pauses might be confusing for audience when she lost fluency of speech. She also said that she felt embarrassed as she could not remember a word or the conversation frequently returned to the L1.

When I translanguaged a word in a conversation, I felt really interrupted and confused (interview, S7).

It was claimed by student 7 that it was really struggling for her to figure out the structural difference between Turkish and English while speaking. This caused pauses and interruptions. In her opinion using different languages made her confused since she thought about the two different sentence structures and word order at the same time.

On the other hand, two students stated that when they used translanguaging strategy, their motivation decreased. They stated that relying heavily on translanguaging may limit their exposure to English in the classroom. In a speaking-focused lesson, consistent exposure to and practice in the target language were crucial for language development. They also expressed that if they consistently reverted to the native language/ other languages, they missed opportunities to engage with English, which could hinder their progress and decrease their motivation to improve their speaking skills.

It really decreased my motivation because I was trying to force myself to speak English and when I went back immediately French or other languages, we didn't force ourselves and it was really easy. My environment could easily affect me more negatively than positively (interview, S4).

As student 4 claimed he might become excessively dependent on the native language if translanguaging techniques are frequently utilized without a clear path towards English-only communication. His drive to utilize English might be hampered by this dependency since he may see it as unneeded or less significant. The idea of forcing to speak only-English in the classroom might supports the monolingual ideology in EFL context.

Using native language was not effective for me. I like using the target language more than native language even if it is challenging for me. If we use the easy way frequently we can't improve in speaking English. That's why using translanguaging strategy did not motivate me (interview, S5).

Student 5 said that if he was frequently encouraged to converse in their native language rather than being forced to use English, he might get complacent and lose the desire to challenge their language skills, which is the crucial idea in monolingual ideology. While translanguaging can offer guidance and scaffolding, it's crucial to establish a balance that encourages students to use English gradually. Therefore, using other languages did not motivate him.

On the other hand, some participants (n=4) stated that translanguaging was not effective for them since it provided limited exposure to target language. They mentioned that when it was utilized frequently, it might reduce the amount of English that they are exposed to. Additionally, they said that it hindered the learning and flow the target language.

It was also mentioned that translanguaging might lead to overreliance on native language. They stated that they may become unduly reliant on their L1 if translanguaging is utilized excessively or without defined instructional objectives, which could impede their development of English proficiency. This may result in a lack of practice and fewer opportunities to utilize the English language, which would ultimately hinder language learning.

I think using both languages was bad because the development of language abilities depends on frequent exposure to and practice in the target language. So, when we used our native language I thought that I could not improve myself (interview, S3).

If you want to speak English, you have to be exposed to that language and force yourself (interview, S5).

Student 3 and 5 declared that the possibility that they had the chance to totally lose themselves in an English-speaking setting might be reduced if translanguaging was frequently used during conversations. Their language development may be hampered by this decreased exposure to English, especially in terms of listening comprehension, communication skills specific to English, and cultural awareness.

Since the pronunciation and sentence structures of both languages are different, it was really difficult for me to focus on both of them. I think we need to be exposed to English more even if we feel uncomfortable with that (interview, S4).

Student 4 stated that when he frequently switched between languages run the risk of unintentionally incorporating terminology, pronunciation patterns, or grammatical structures from the native language into their English speech. This may lead to inappropriate language use and prevent the acquisition of precise and natural English-speaking abilities.

Using both languages is not effective because I feel confused when I do that. Additionally, we need to push our limits to speak English. Using native languages is easy way in a conversation (interview, S7).

Student 7 expressed that it might be less motivating for her to speak in English if she was permitted to speak primarily in her mother tongue during speaking exercises. The ease of communicating in one's native tongue could demotivate learners from pushing themselves to convey their ideas, thoughts, and feelings exclusively in English. The process of becoming proficient and fluent in the target language may be slowed down as a result.

Additionally, some of the participants (n=3) stated that in speaking activities, when they relied too much on their L1, the flow of conversation was interrupted. It was stated that switching back and forth between languages frequently might cause pauses and delayed as they look for the correct translation or struggle to locate the relevant phrases in the target language. The development of fluency and the natural flow of speech might be hampered by this interruption. Additionally, they said that they were confused due to the sentence structure difference of the languages. It was also mentioned that as they cognitively translated their

thoughts, the speech became slower and more interrupted, which can impede the improvement of fluency. The example quotes are below:

I felt perplexed when I used both of the languages since the word order of Turkish and English is different. This situation slowed down the flow of my speech (interview, S5).

As you know I am from Mali. I have native language and I can speak French as official language of my country. When I tried to use translanguaging strategy, I really felt confused because the word order, pronunciation and grammar structures are totally different. If I use other languages except from English, I can't return English anymore. Therefore, it slowed down the fluency (interview, S4).

It was stated above by students 4 and 5 that learning to transition between languages frequently could result in a more considered and intentional style of communication by paying more attention on linguistic structures of the languages. This can make it more difficult to reply quickly and spontaneously in real-time English discussions, which affected the speech's overall fluency and dynamic quality.

When I used a Turkish word in my speech, I could not focus on English anymore and I wanted to use Turkish more (interview, S7).

Student 7 expressed that the development of automaticity and the capacity to think and reply in English directly, which were crucial elements of fluency, might be hampered by constant translation. Thus, the student did not feel relaxed while using translanguaging strategy. He stated that using only English made him more confident.

CHAPTER 5

5. DISCUSSIONS, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This chapter initially presented discussion and conclusion of the research. Next, implications and limitations were shared for further studies.

5.1. Discussion

This study aimed to understand the effect of translanguaging as a teaching strategy on EFL students' willingness to communicate, communication confidence and speaking fluency. This part discussed the outcomes and the effect of translanguaging as a teaching strategy on students' willingness to communicate and speaking fluency.

5.1.1. The impact of translanguaging as a teaching strategy on students' communication confidence and willingness to communicate

The quantitative data showed that using translanguaging as a teaching approach dramatically increased EFL students' WTC ($t(55,407)=5.565, p < .05$). Although pre-test results for the experimental and control groups showed no significant differences in the students' WTC, the WTC of the experimental group students was noticeably greater than that of the control group students in post-tests. This result showed that this finding is consistent with the research of Ahn et al. (2018) that the translanguaging group showed large increases while the English-only group exhibited minimal improvement over time, according to analyses of the WTC ratings. In the same vein, Vrikki (2012), who looked at how translanguaging affected their "L2 oral fluency in task-based activities," concluded that the usage of translanguaging boosted their willingness to communicate. The findings point to the potential of translanguaging as a teaching strategy and method for promoting learners' WTC in an EFL setting.

This study revealed that translanguaging as a teaching strategy increased students' communication confidence significantly ($t(56,831)=5,041, p < .05$). Speaking fluently in English is a main concern and a shortcoming for students in Turkey (Kara et al., 2017). Due to communication difficulties, Turkish students studying English as a foreign language might lack of confidence and not participate fully in class (Öztürk & Gürbüz, 2014). In similar studies, the use of L1 was also found beneficial to increase students' self-confidence and conversational competency while they were learning English. It was also concluded that adopting a native language by incorporating their linguistic resources into formal classroom instruction was especially crucial for developing confidence and collaborative skills (Cummins, 2008; Ha et

al., 2021; Song et al., 2022). Finally, Meletiadou (2022) noted that students felt comfortable showcasing their multilingualism and enhancing their education by calling on their multilingual/multicultural experience when discussing academic topics and ideas for their group presentations.

This study provided empirical evidence that translanguaging as a teaching strategy increased Turkish students' speaking fluency and WTC. Turkish students had monolingualistic views about learning English since the Turkish educational system had always emphasized grammar and vocabulary more than real communication skills (Çapan, 2021). This caused students to perceive English as an academic topic rather than a means of communication in the real world, which triggered students to be reluctant to speak. Integrating translanguaging strategy into the curriculum through speaking activities such as presentations, impromptu speeches, or recorded conversations might increase students' WTC as translanguaging strategy focused on the content rather than the language students used. As Caruso (2018) suggested, students were able to comprehend the content better when multilingual communication in the classroom was employed. Boosted level of students' WTC encouraged the use of active language and oral production. Students were more inclined to practice and support their language abilities when eager to speak or write in English. Language acquisition was accelerated through regular discussions.

5.1.2. The impact of translanguaging as a teaching strategy on students' oral fluency

The analysis results indicated that translanguaging as a teaching strategy had both affective and linguistic impacts on students' learning.

The affective impacts of translanguaging as a teaching strategy on students' classroom experiences

Translanguaging provided the students spaces in which they felt comfortable and relaxed speaking only the target language in class. When students struggled to express themselves in English, using linguistic codes from their home language helped them to speak more effectively. Since anxiety might have a big impact on both the learning process and outcomes, hinders students to focus, receive information, and remember new language abilities (Yilmaz, 2014), this finding is important. This finding is consistent with Cenoz et al. (2022)'s study, which investigated the connections between Translanguaging and the perceived anxiety levels among students and teachers who were instructing and learning in second and third languages. They concluded that translanguaging decreased students' anxiety levels and proved

the effectiveness of emotional scaffolding of native language on reducing anxiety (Lasabaster et al., 2013; Back et al., 2020). Several Turkish students felt worried about having their English language skills criticized or overlooked by their peers or instructors. Their unwillingness to speak in English, particularly in public or academic situations, might be hampered by this fear of criticism, which can trigger anxiety (Yilmaz, 2014). As a solution, the translanguaging strategy may be integrated into the curriculum, which encourages an empathetic learning atmosphere in the classroom where students may make errors without worrying about being judged.

Translanguaging also helped students build confidence while speaking since it reduced anxiety. They felt more at ease speaking up in class and participating when they had the freedom to use their L1 strategically to express themselves. There is a significant relationship between using different languages in a class and students' confidence. Even if using a new language presents several difficulties for language learners, their increased confidence through translanguaging strategy gave them the capacity to solve problems and go through challenges such as unwillingness to participate in activities and fear of making mistake. Students whose confidence improved were more likely to come up with original solutions to these problems in speaking classes. Additionally, translanguaging strategy is effective to increase students' speaking confidence because students and teachers had positive attitudes towards its use (Nordin et al., 2013; Promnath & Tayjasanant, 2016; Nasution & Sirager, 2021). Makarova et al. (2021) suggested translanguaging strategy is a tool to overcome emotional barriers. Since students in Turkey often hesitate to speak generally in speaking classes (Coskun, 2016), translanguaging as a teaching strategy can be used. Students were more likely to be interested in the learning process when their confidence were high in terms of learning and utilizing English thanks to this strategy. Beyond language acquisition, by integrating translanguaging strategy to the English teaching approaches of Turkey, students' increased confidence might foster a sense of self-efficacy and educational opportunities with optimism. Therefore, it enables students to interact confidently in diverse and multicultural settings.

Additionally, translanguaging boosted their engagement and participation in speaking courses. It also increased collaboration among students. They assisted one another and learned from one another when they were encouraged to use their L1 strategically during discussions and group activities. This dynamic connection had the potential to foster motivation and a sense of community since there is no linguistic limitation and the learners felt empowered to take part

in discussions. These findings are important because confident and motivated students were likelier to participate in class activities like group projects, presentations, and discussions. Participation in such activities improved social and critical thinking abilities, which may be inadequate in Turkish students, in addition to linguistic proficiency by integrating students to collaborative tasks. Students are required to think critically, evaluate data, and develop arguments in many speaking exercises and by participating in speaking activities through translanguaging, they developed analytical and problem-solving abilities that are useful in both academic and professional settings. These results are similar to those obtained by Nie et al. (2022), who found that translanguaging increased students' participation. Teachers' use of translanguaging techniques increased students' capacity to engage in class by enhancing their comprehension of teacher talk (Rabbidge, 2019; Tian, 2022). Therefore, translanguaging as a teaching strategy can increase students' engagement and participation during speaking classes.

Translanguaging helped create a climate in the classroom where students felt comfortable expressing their ideas in their first language and scaffolding each other. It promoted “rapport-building” and “sense of connection” between students from same linguistic background. Through translanguaging, an inclusive learning or communication environment was created and all participants felt appreciated and valued, especially those from different language backgrounds. This inclusion fundamental to developing rapport. Translanguaging also allowed students to exchange linguistic experiences, strengthening their bonds. Because students felt linked through their linguistic interactions, these shared experiences helped to establish rapport. Learners also comprehended the target language more effectively when they utilized their L1 to define new terms, ideas, or directions. This comprehension produced a calm and pleasant learning environment, lessened frustration, and increased feelings of success (Vaish, 2019) In the EFL classroom, translanguaging promoted the development of a welcoming and inclusive community. Learners supported one another by explaining difficult ideas in their L1 or offering support in understanding the target language. Students that adopted this cooperative learning style felt more bonded to one another and saw their classmates as partners rather than rivals.

To sum up, all these findings provided further evidence for translanguaging strategies' ability to decrease anxiety and promote self-confidence in speaking classes. Additionally, it enhanced participation and engagement and make students more motivated to speak by creating a positive learning environment. Thus, they could speak more fluently and eagerly.

The impacts of translanguaging as a teaching strategy on students' oral fluency

Translanguaging strategy supported students' participation and speaking when they could not recall or were unfamiliar with a word's meaning. It supported vocabulary learning by allowing students to connect their native language and the target language. Through translanguaging, learners instantly accessed the meaning and context of new words by using their L1 as a bridge. This greatly accelerated the comprehension process and made it possible for them to learn terminology and its intricacies more quickly. This finding is supported by Carstens (2016)'s study, who explored the use of translanguaging strategy in learning academic literacy and word acquisition. He concluded that the most significant benefit of translanguaging was to expand their English vocabulary. Since language is a system of related concepts rather than just a set of separate words, through translanguaging, students investigated these complex relationships between L2 terms and their L1 counterparts. This process of figuring out how other languages express comparable ideas encouraged word acquisition that goes beyond simple memorization to include conceptual understanding and deeper vocabulary knowledge.

By actively participating in the word-acquisition process, students became more autonomous in expanding their vocabulary. Not only English but also French repertoire of students developed during the intervention process since a multilingual setting was provided. Galante (2020) suggested that students demonstrated significant improvements in their academic vocabulary scores compared with monolingual students through translanguaging. Also, students in the translanguaging group engaged in meaning-making across languages and took an active role in language learning, suggesting that translanguaging may provide engagement in vocabulary learning and make the word acquisition permanent in ways that monolingual practices may not since fluency may be facilitated by a large vocabulary, expanded linguistic repertoire can smoothen communication with monolingual English speakers. Thus, it is clear that translanguaging as a teaching strategy is effective for vocabulary which is a crucial part of speaking fluently so that students can be able to communicate and express a wide range of emotions, viewpoints, and ideas. Additionally, this strategy may be a way for decreasing the number of pauses because of unknown words in EFL students' speaking and speed up vocabulary learning. Finally, it valued the students' linguistic resources in line with Ruiz's (1984, 2010) advice to view language as a resource.

Translanguaging facilitated EFL students' learning and comprehension of idiomatic expressions and collocations, which were usually challenging for them to pick up and express.

It gave them opportunities to use expressions that do not have correspondence in English. Some students stated that by explaining or comprehending these statements in their L1, they might understand the context and appropriate collocations, ultimately improving their fluency in idiomatic and colloquial language. Additionally, it provided students with a student-centered classroom in which students were active and this made learning more comprehensive and high qualified. This finding is consistent with Huang (2003)'s study which investigated the effect that cross translation had on Taiwanese college students' knowledge of idiomatic English. Students were required to translate the Chinese of Chinese/English bilingual storybooks into English and then compared their own version of English with that of the book. The students' Chinese language skills had been progressively improved over the course of a systematic comparison and analysis. Therefore, translanguaging as a teaching strategy facilitated to use idiomatic expression and collocations during speaking classes. Integrating translanguaging as a teaching strategy to the school curriculum may be an effective method for creating natural and relaxing learning setting. By including a component of cultural detail, the curiosity of students may be triggered and, language acquisition may be made more engaging and entertaining for students.

Using idiomatic and cultural expressions through translanguaging increased the metacultural awareness of students by providing a supplementary way of teaching technique. Translanguaging recognizes that learners frequently possess a diverse linguistic repertoire comprising both their native language (L1) and the language they choose (L2). Students learn more about their multilingual identities and the cultural components of each language by employing their L1 during the language acquisition process. Makalela and Mkhize (2016)'s research supported this finding and suggested that students' experiences demonstrated their metacultural understanding of rhetorical conventions. Students were encouraged to convey culturally distinct notions, ideas, or subtleties in their L1 that may not have clear translations in their L2. The understanding of how closely language and culture were entwined was fostered by this process. Likewise, the respondents in Makalela (2015)'s research showed that, because they could relate certain target language expressions, translanguaging as a teaching strategy improved students' knowledge of English idiomatic expressions. Since Turkish language has many idiomatic and cultural expressions, students wanted to use them during their speech in order to make the meaning clear or make some jokes which provided insights into the culture, history, and traditions. This cultural awareness fostered a deeper understanding of the language and its nuances. Additionally, numerous idioms and cultural expressions have a strong cultural

or historical context. Students' understanding and cultural awareness were supported by learning these terms and the context in which they were used. As Ruiz (1984) suggests, in his language as a resource orientation, recognizing the relationship between language and culture and advocating for the notion that studying a language entails studying the culture, translanguaging strategy promoted students' cultural awareness.

Translanguaging increased metalinguistic awareness and supported learning grammar and syntax (Yilmaz, 2021). Through translanguaging, L1 was used as a resource (Ruiz, 1984). Students were encouraged to compare and contrast the rules, patterns, and grammar in both their native language and English via translanguaging. This process increased their metalinguistic awareness which is the capacity to view and assess language as a system. Students became more aware of the distinctions and similarities between English and their native language when they compared and contrasted sentences, phrases, or grammatical structures in both languages. Speech that is more fluid might result from this increased awareness. Participants claimed that speaking in their native language provided them with a frame of reference for understanding and structuring sentences correctly. The findings confirmed those of Vaish (2018) who concluded that when rules from one language were applied to English, it provoked metalinguistic awareness and helped the individual children recognize parts of text, meaning, and grammar they had previously overlooked. This function of translanguaging served as a scaffolding function for bilinguals (Cenoz et al., 2022). Garcia & Kleifgen (2020) stated in order to increase students' metalinguistic awareness of their own bilingual procedures and their interaction with texts, a translanguaging literacies approach additionally encompassed strategies like translation and cross-linguistic study of syntax, vocabulary, word choice, cognates, and discourse structure. Although most of the students in Turkey had grammar-focused English lessons (Süzer, 2007; Uysal & Bardakçı, 2014), they were not able to use accurate sentence structure during speaking in English. Therefore, including translanguaging strategy to English lessons may provide crucial effect on students' metalinguistic awareness.

Translanguaging could increase students' autonomy and self-regulation in using English. Students could become aware of variations in word order, phrase length, and grammatical functions, resulting in more precise and complicated sentence constructions. They were able to detect situations where their native language has interfered with or transferred grammatical traits into English. Understanding these possible difficulties helped with focused

language acquisition and more efficient error correction in their speech. In Duarte (2019)'s study, it was revealed that students employed translanguaging in order to recast and correction. Language learners may make mistakes because they misunderstand or misinterpret the language they are learning. Through translanguaging, students explained their intended meaning and add context in their first language, which helped teachers identify the error's cause more easily. Students who are translanguaging were better able to self-correct their mistakes. They can quickly offer an accurate version or explanation using their L1 when they spotted a mistake in their L2. This encouraged the rectification of errors. Therefore, in the view of this study, it may be concluded that translanguaging as a teaching strategy has a positive impact on noticing errors while speaking English.

On the other hand, translanguaging hindered some participants' fluency. Some students expressed that they had difficulties in speaking fluently. This finding contrasts with the findings conducted in ESL contexts. The differences between Turkish and English syntaxes can be a reason for this contrast in results. Turkish is a subject-object-verb (SOV) language while English uses a subject-verb-object (SVO) word order (Allen et al., 2007). This order may require shifts in students' thinking and influence their fluency in the weaker language. Further research is needed to understand the relationship between syntax, fluency and translanguaging profoundly.

Translanguaging facilitated learning new ideas, vocabulary, and grammatical structures in English and development of listening skills. Using their native language to explain or decode information when students met difficult terminology or topics in English improved their understanding. Because they could understand what the lecturers were saying, students who translanguaged found it easier to enjoy the activities (Ahmad & Jusoff, 2009). This finding was approved by Ariffin and Husin (2011)'s study which investigated the frequency of code-switching and students' opinions about it. In their study, majority of the students expressed that using native language assisted them to comprehend the content-based English lessons. From the Turkish students' perspective, it was always challenging to keep up with the teacher in English-only classes and, especially, students in low-level of English proficiency could not follow instructions and they did not engage in activities since they were not able to comprehend (Atik, 2010). Translanguaging as a teaching strategy can provide a scaffolding as a bridge to comprehension for English language learners, particularly for those with lower proficiency levels. They can access content in their native language while progressively switching to

English as their fluency grows. Thus, translanguaging strategy is beneficial for deep comprehension of content may be implied and it can be used in curriculum of schools in Turkey as a teaching strategy.

Finally, most participants (n=6) stated that translanguaging positively impacted their speaking fluency by enabling them a natural and smoother communication. The ability to communicate effectively is the main objective of language acquisition. Speaking fluently may help students communicate effectively in everyday settings by providing them to convey their thoughts, ideas, and feelings in a clear and cohesive manner. Furthermore, fluency in speech encouraged critical thinking and the capacity to communicate sophisticated ideas and viewpoints of the students (Yilmaz, 2021). These results are similar to those obtained by Ha et al. (2021) who analyzed how translanguaging might help students at a university in southern Vietnam increased their speaking proficiency. The study highlighted that translanguaging is a useful technique for assisting the majority of low-level students to enhance their speaking fluency.

“Higher-order thinking skills” were also encouraged by the opportunity for students to examine material, create arguments, and participate in discussions. “Higher-order thinking skills” include “critical thinking”, “problem-solving”, analysis, and creativity in addition to basic memory and understanding (Lewis & Smith, 1993). Translanguaging promoted students to assess ideas and information critically. They engaged in critical thinking by challenging, contrasting, and contemplating the topic when they utilized their first language (L1) to explain or evaluate content in the target language (L2). Translanguaging was also a useful while attempting to solve problems. Learners discussed tactics or came up with ideas for solutions using their L1 in group tasks, which promoted creativity and analytical thinking and helps with higher-order thinking. In addition, through translanguaging, students investigated ideas and concepts in both L1 and L2. By pushing students to contrast, analyze, and draw connections between the two languages, this dual viewpoint fostered analytical abilities. By using sophisticated reasoning and analysis, students engaged in higher-order thinking when they utilize translanguaging to explore difficult subjects or concepts. With the help of their L1, they explored deeper into these subjects. Translanguaging stimulated creativity (Bonacina-Pugh et al., 2021). Students had access to a wider variety of linguistic tools when they utilized both languages for problem-solving and self-expression. This enabled them to approach projects and assignments in a more innovative way. Translanguaging aided in the development

of sophisticated communication strategies in learners, such as negotiation, reasoning, and persuasion. Higher-order thinking required these abilities, especially when talking about complicated topics. This finding is supported by Khair et al. (2020) and it was highlighted that students' use of translanguaging strategies encouraged their higher order thinking skills.

This study supported the principle of L1-as-a-resource orientation by positioning students' diverse linguistic repertoires in EFL classes as a cultural, linguistic and affective-resource in the classroom (Ruiz, 1984). Translanguaging as a pedagogy facilitated the communication of ideas, thoughts, feelings, and information between people and communities because students in this study expressed that translanguaging strategy was a bridge to learn the target language. In conclusion, students' home languages served as a useful tool that ease cross-cultural and interpersonal communication.

Additionally, this research study challenged the monolingual ideologies that positions multilingualism as a problem (Ruiz, 1984). As the "Language as Resource" dimension suggests that using mother tongue was an asset rather than a deficit during speaking activities in this study. It helped not only acquiring and retention of vocabulary but also promoted better expression of idioms and collocations. It also celebrated making use of the language resources that individuals contributed to learning environments. Finally, it provides a more inclusive learning environment as it highlighted the significance of building upon students' preexisting language abilities and cultural backgrounds.

5.1.3. The contradictory views about the impacts of translanguaging as a teaching strategy on students' oral fluency

While most of the students interviewed for the effect of translanguaging strategy on speaking fluency stated positive impacts in terms of affective and linguistic views, a few students expressed its disadvantages. Two students claimed that speaking only English made them feel at ease not feeling anxious. They said that they did not make errors and that they had trust in themselves. Since one of the students from Mali, he became accustomed to communicating with people by utilizing multiple languages despite coming from a foreign nation and having to speak English. Whether by studying abroad or interacting with native English speakers, can raise his level of comfort. Visiting English-spoken countries exposed some students to actual language use, common idioms, and cultural subtleties. Because they were accustomed to the rhythm, intonation, and natural flow of the language, students who often interact with native English speakers may feel more at ease and calm when speaking the

language. Another reason may be that he could be aware that learning requires making errors, which shouldn't be avoided or made feel bad about. As Heydari & Bagheri (2012) suggest since making mistakes may be seen as a tool used by learners to learn, they are indisputable to the learner themselves. Because the student embraced a development mindset and understood that mistakes present invaluable learning opportunities, he had less worry. Additionally, he expressed that he sometimes felt excluded when traditional jokes and idiomatic expressions were translanguaged. Therefore, TR in terms of cultural expressions may be advantageous in bilingual setting instead of multilingual context. If this strategy were applied in the ESL context rather than EFL context, it might be more effective.

A few of the students said that if translanguaging was used often, it might reduce their exposure to English in the classroom. Additionally, they stated that if they frequently switched between their native language and other languages, they lost opportunities to interact in English, which might impede their growth and deplete their enthusiasm to advance their speaking abilities. These students may be still affected by the ideas of monolingual ideologies and perceive language as a problem (Ruiz, 1984). Consistent exposure to and practice in the target language may be essential for language development in a speaking-focused class. However, for this point of view, using translanguaging strategy does not mean using L1 frequently which impedes exposure of the target language. In this strategy the speaking activities were organized as pre, during and post as well as adjusted the language use strategically.

Additionally, when participants overly depended on their L1 during speaking activities, the discourse became more incoherent. As they searched for the accurate translation or struggled to find the pertinent terms in the target language, frequent language switching was said to induce pauses and delays. This interruption may hinder the development of fluency and the natural flow of speech. The reason for overreliance of L1 might be students' feeling of anxiety and they might take advantage of using L1 to their detriment of themselves. In case of these situations, it may be crucial to observe and check students the use of translanguaging strategically.

To sum, it was found that translanguaging as a teaching strategy has a crucial impact on students' communication confidence and willingness to communicate. Additionally, it was interpreted that most students perceived translanguaging as a teaching strategy that was beneficial for their speaking performance because of both affective and linguistic impacts. Therefore, it may be concluded that it reduced anxiety, and increased motivation and

participation to speak. This strategy, furthermore, may be beneficial for not only acquiring new words but also expressing idioms and collocations as well as developing metalinguistic awareness. Integrating this strategy to the schools' curriculum can change the perception of Turkish students to English language learning and, especially, to speaking lessons. Therefore, students in classes should be observed and English-only pedagogy should not be forced. Instead, in English-only speaking classes, teaching strategy should be changed and eclectic methods which includes different strategies should be used in accordance with students' needs. For the speaking activities, translanguaging may be integrated strategically to the lessons by considering students' affective (eagerness, anxiety and participation) and linguistic conditions so that a comfortable learning setting can be created and language acquisition may be sped up.

5.2. Conclusion

The study specifically answered the following questions:

- 1- Does translanguaging as a teaching strategy have any statistically significant effect on Turkish preparatory EFL students' willingness to communicate and communication comprehension in a speaking course?
- 2- How do EFL preparatory students perceive the effect of translanguaging as a teaching strategy on their willingness to communicate, communication comprehension, and oral fluencies?

To answer the research questions, the current study chose a mixed-method approach. An experimental research design was adopted for the quantitative part of the study. In total, 76 students participated in the study. 35 students were in the control group and 41 students were in the experimental group. Translanguaging as a teaching strategy was implemented in the experimental group in speaking classes (2 hours per week for four weeks) while the traditional methods were implemented in the control group. Willingness to communicate questionnaire, adapted from Mystkowska-Wiertelak and Pawlak (2016), was given to the students in both groups before and after the treatment to measure their willingness to communicate in speaking class. Moreover, an individual interview was conducted with nine students to understand the effect of the translanguaging strategy on EFL learners' willingness to communicate and their speaking skills comprehensively. Students, for the interview, were selected based on their motivation levels, personalities and speaking abilities, which were gained from the intervention phase. Each interview took 15-20 minutes. Quantitative data from the pre- and post-tests were analyzed with SPSS program to determine the significance of the differences between the

experimental and control groups in terms of the impacts of translanguaging on EFL learners' willingness to communicate. The interviews were analyzed with the content analysis approach, and included transcription, establishing the unit or theme of analysis, creating categories and a coding scheme, coding, drawing conclusions based on the coding or themes, and data description as the steps to access the findings.

The analysis results showed that there was a significant difference in students' willingness to communicate in experimental group before and after the treatment while there was not significant difference in control group's WTC. The interviews showed that translanguaging as a teaching strategy positively affected students' oral fluency since it decreased anxiety, increased motivation and participation. It was also seen that students acquired new words easily, used idiomatic and collocational expressions, which did not have English correspondence, effectively. Additionally, students' metalinguistic and meta-cultural awareness developed thanks to the translanguaging strategy. It also facilitated building rapport among the students from the same linguistic background and gave them opportunities to comprehend each other better by scaffolding peer learning. Students became more autonomous and self-regulated in their learning. To sum up, in this study, it was concluded that translanguaging as a teaching strategy greatly impacted students' WTC, communication comprehension and oral fluency.

5.3. Implications

For instructors and students of second languages, the results of this study have some theoretical and practical implications. The study challenged monolingual ideologies in a significant way. Since it explored the impact of translanguaging pedagogy on the development of speaking skills and willingness to communicate, it contributed to the development of SLA theories, particularly in relation to speaking abilities. The majority of research in the SLA literature has concentrated more on translanguaging as a teaching content strategy, yet, this study shed light on the relationship between translanguaging and Turkish students' speaking abilities and willingness to communicate.

Additionally, this study has some noteworthy educational implications for teachers and policy makers. The purpose of the study was to understand Turkish EFL students' experiences, as well as their perspectives on translanguaging. Research indicated that translanguaging can be an effective teaching strategy to enhance the willingness to communicate and speaking abilities of second language learners. Translanguaging research findings should be known to

L2-speaking teachers in order to include this method into pedagogy. The study's findings demonstrated that, the translanguaging strategy can help learners become more willing to communicate and speak fluently compared to traditional teaching techniques. The results emphasized the significance of translanguaging as a teaching strategy on students' WTC and speaking fluency even though the implementation duration was only four weeks. It was observed that students were more eager to take part in speaking activities, and they were rather relaxed while speaking. Although some students were incompetent in English speaking due to their lack of vocabulary and grammatical knowledge, they gradually were able to express themselves in English-speaking lessons. Therefore, it is important to not underestimate the effectiveness of this strategy in terms of its contributions to the students' improvement of their speaking abilities.

The research is important since not many studies centered translanguaging in the Turkish setting. This research is among the first to include translanguaging pedagogy into English as a Foreign Language (EFL) listening exercises. Therefore, the study revealed the benefits of utilizing the pedagogy for speaking skills to language instructors and curriculum planners. Since the main problem of Turkish students' learning English is not being able to speak English even if they can understand well, their speaking abilities may be strengthened if this strategy could be properly employed in EFL lessons as part of the curriculum. In this sense, it can act as a starting point for future scholars in the subject of translanguaging and provide a chance to open new avenues for further study on translanguaging in the context of Turkish higher education. This strategy may be useful for each level of student even in primary and secondary schools.

It may also change the view of lecturers and EFL teachers about the use L1 in English-speaking classes. Moreover, it could also serve as a resource for lecturers and language teachers who work in the EFL contexts to keep up-to-date on the most recent theories of second language acquisition and innovative methods for teaching languages that run-in opposition to the conventional monolingual instructional ideologies that control classroom instruction and place which has restrictions on students' language use. Finally, this research offers an innovative and flexible approach to teaching foreign languages that policymakers may utilize to reevaluate the curriculum and linguistic requirements for foreign language instruction.

5.4. Limitations

For the further research, there are various factors that should be taken into account since this study is the first study which implemented translanguaging strategy in speaking classes in Turkey and researched its effect on students' WTC and oral fluency. To begin with, this study was conducted in the time when Turkey experienced a devastating earthquake. During the treatment period, the speaking lessons were both online and face-to-face which is called hybrid learning. This may have affected students' motivation and participation. For the further studies, it should be carried out in a regular time.

Secondly, more students participating in experimental investigations will produce more illuminating results (experimental group = 41, control group =35). For the next studies, more participants may be involved. Additionally, the classroom instructor observed and evaluated the speaking performances, which may have affected the students' performances. Testers who are not the students' teachers might be used to determine whether the results are comparable to or different from what was expected.

Gender may be a reason why students' WTC in the experimental group increased more than the control group. While there were 19 female and 22 male students in the experimental group, the control group included 8 female and 27 male students. Maftoon & Sarem (2015) who investigated the relationship WTC and gender, revealed that compared to their male counterparts, Iranian female EFL students were more eager to communicate. Another study was conducted by Alavinia & Alikhani (2014) who analyzed the relationship between gender and WTC as well as emotional intelligence and revealed that the WTC mean in females' group was greater than the one in males' group. Therefore, gender may have a crucial impact on findings.

Last but not least, in hybrid learning context, the speaking lessons were conducted in an online application called zoom. It was rather challenging for researcher to follow the students joining online to the group activities on zoom. Therefore, group activities may be revised if similar research is conducted for the further studies.

GENİŞLETİLMİŞ TÜRKÇE ÖZET

Necmettin Erbakan Üniversitesi, Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü
Yabancı Diller Eğitimi Anabilim Dalı
İngiliz Dili Eğitimi Bilim Dalı
Yüksek Lisans Tezi

İNGİLİZCEYİ YABANCI DİL OLARAK ÖĞRENEN ÖĞRENCİLERİN İLETİŞİM KURMA İSTEKLİLİĞİNİ ARTIRMA VE KONUŞMA BECERİLERİNİ GELİŞTİRMEK İÇİN YENİ BİR YÖNTEM: DİLLER ARASI GEÇİŞ PEDAGOJİSİ

Afife GÜLVEREN

Bu çalışma, bir öğretim stratejisi olan diller arası geçiş stratejisinin İngilizceyi yabancı dil olarak öğrenen öğrencilerin iletişim kurma istekliliği, iletişimde anlama ve akıcı konuşma üzerindeki etkisini anlamayı amaçladı. Mevcut çalışma nicel ve nitel olmak üzere karma yönteme sahiptir. Araştırmanın niceliksel kısmı için deneysel bir araştırma tasarımı benimsenmiştir. Araştırmaya kontrol grubunda 35, deney grubunda ise 41 öğrenci olmak üzere toplam 76 öğrenci katılmıştır. Deney grubunda konuşma derslerinde bir öğretim stratejisi olarak diller arası geçiş stratejisi dört hafta boyunca haftada 2 saat olarak, kontrol grubunda ise geleneksel yöntemler uygulanmıştır. Mystkowska-Wiertelak ve Pawalak'tan (2016) uyarlanan iletişim kurma istekliliği anketi, konuşma dersinde iletişim kurma istekliliklerini ölçmek için her iki gruptaki öğrencilere dört haftalık uygulama sürecinden önce ve sonra yapılmıştır. Ayrıca, diller arası geçiş stratejinin yabancı dil öğrenenlerin iletişim kurma istekleri ve konuşma becerileri üzerindeki etkisini kapsamlı bir şekilde anlamak için dokuz öğrenciyle yarı yapılandırılmış bir görüşme yapılmıştır. Görüşme için öğrenciler, çalışmanın uygulama aşamasından kazanılan motivasyon düzeylerine, kişiliklerine ve konuşma yeteneklerine göre seçilmiştir. Her bir görüşme 15-20 dakika sürmüştür. Ön ve son testlerden elde edilen niceliksel veriler, diller arası geçiş stratejisinin yabancı dil öğrenenlerin iletişim kurma istekliliği üzerindeki etkileri açısından deney ve kontrol grupları arasındaki farkların önemini belirlemek için SPSS programı ile analiz edilmiştir. Görüşmeler içerik analizi yaklaşımıyla analiz edilmiş ve bulgulara erişim adımları olarak transkripsiyon, analiz ünitesi veya temasının oluşturulması, kategorilerin ve kodlama şemasının oluşturulması, kodlama veya temalara dayalı sonuç çıkarma ve veri tanımlama adımlarını içermektedir. Analiz sonuçları, kontrol grubu ve deney grubu öğrencilerinin iletişim kurma isteklilikleri arasında anlamlı bir fark olduğunu göstermiştir. Ek olarak, görüşme sonuçları, diller arası geçiş stratejisinin öğrencilerin yalnızca iletişim kurma istekliliğini değil aynı zamanda konuşma akıcılığını da arttırdığını göstermiştir.

REFERENCES

- Ahmad, B. H., & Jusoff, K. (2009). Teachers' code-switching in classroom instructions for low English proficient learners. *English language teaching*, 2(2), 49-55.
- Ahn, S. Y., Shin, S., & Kang, H. S. (2018, March). Investigating the effects of translanguaging practices on learners' willingness-to-communicate and foreign language anxiety in the EFL context. In *Annual Conference of the American Association for Applied Linguistics, AAAL 2018*.
- Aktürkoğlu, B. (2019). Curriculum in primary education (Turkey). *Bloomsbury Education and Childhood Studies*. <https://doi.org/10.5040/9781474209434.0020>
- Alavinia, P., & Alikhani, M. A. (2014). Willingness to communicate reappraised in the light of emotional intelligence and gender differences. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 98, 143-152.
- Allen, S., Özyürek, A., Kita, S., Brown, A., Furman, R., Ishizuka, T., & Fujii, M. (2007). Language-specific and universal influences in children's syntactic packaging of manner and path: A comparison of English, Japanese, and Turkish. *Cognition*, 102(1), 16-48.
- Anderson, G. (1990). *Fundamentals of educational research*. London: The Falmer Press.
- Anyadubalu, C. C. (2010). Self-efficacy, anxiety, and performance in the English language among middle-school students in English language program in Satri Si Suriyothai School, Bangkok. *International Journal of Educational and Pedagogical Sciences*, 4(3), 233-238.
- Ariffin, K., & Rafik-Galea, S. (2009). Code-switching as a communication device in conversation. *Language & Society Newsletter*, 5(9), 1-19.
- Ariffin, K., & Susanti Husin, M. (2011). Code-switching and Code-mixing of English and Bahasa Malaysia in Content-Based Classrooms: Frequency and Attitudes. *Linguistics Journal*, 5(1).
- Ayers-Glassey, S., & MacIntyre, P. D. (2019). Measuring willingness to communicate in first and additional languages: An annotated bibliography. *Unpublished manuscript*. Cape Breton University.

- Bailey, K. M. (2003). Speaking. In D. Nunan (Ed.), *Practical English language teaching* (pp. 47-66). New York, NY: McGraw-Hill Contemporary.
- Baker, C. (2011). *Foundations of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism (5th ed.)*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Bergil, A. S. (2016). The influence of willingness to communicate on overall speaking skills among EFL learners. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 232(April), 177–187. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2016.10.043>
- Bhatia, R. (2004). Bilingualism in South Asia. In W. R. T. Bhatia, *The Handbook of Bilingualism* (pp. 780-807). Oxford: Blackwell.
- Bonacina-Pugh, F., da Costa Cabral, I., & Huang, J. (2021). Translanguaging in education. *Language Teaching*, 54(4), 439-471.
- Canagarajah, S. (2018). Translingual practice as spatial repertoires: Expanding the paradigm beyond structuralist orientations. *Applied Linguistics*, 31-54.
- Canagarajah, S. (2011). Translanguaging in the classroom: Emerging issues for research and pedagogy. *Applied linguistics review*, 2(1), 1-28.
- Cenoz, J., Santos, A., & Gorter, D. (2022). Pedagogical translanguaging and teachers' perceptions of anxiety. *International journal of bilingual education and bilingualism*, 1-12.
- Cepik, S., & Yastibas, A. E. (2013). The use of e-portfolio to improve English speaking skill of Turkish EFL learners. *The Anthropologist*, 16(1-2), 307-317.
- Cetinkaya, Y. B. (2005). *Turkish college students' willingness to communicate in English as a foreign language* (Doctoral dissertation, The Ohio State University).
- Conteh, J., & Meier, G. (Eds.). (2014). *The multilingual turn in languages education: Opportunities and challenges*.
- Coskun, A. (2016). Causes of the "I can understand English but I can't speak" syndrome in Turkey. *Journal on English Language Teaching*, 6(3), 1-12.

- Creese, A., & Blackledge, A. (2010). Translanguaging in the bilingual classroom: A pedagogy for learning and teaching?. *The modern language journal*, 94(1), 103-115.
- Creswell, J. (2012). *Educational research: Planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research (4th edition)*. USA: Pearson.
- Creswell, J. W. (1999). Mixed-method research: Introduction and application. In *Handbook of educational policy* (pp. 455-472). Academic press.
- Cummins, J. (2007). Rethinking monolingual instructional strategies in multilingual classrooms. *Canadian journal of applied linguistics*, 10(2), 221-240.
- Cummins, J. (2008). BICS and CALP: Empirical and theoretical status of the distinction. *Encyclopedia of language and education*, 2(2), 71-83.
- Datt, S. and Chetty, P. (2016). 8-step procedure to conduct qualitative content analysis in a research. [online] Project Guru. Available at: <https://www.projectguru.in/qualitative-content-analysis-research/> [Accessed 15 Mar. 2023].
- Derwing, T. M., Munro, M. J., Thomson, R. I., & Rossiter, M. J. (2009). The relationship between L1 fluency and L2 fluency development. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 31(4), 533-557.
- Dincer, A., & Yeşilyurt, S. (2013). Pre-service English teachers' beliefs on speaking skill based on motivational orientations. *English Language Teaching*, 6.
- Dincer, A., Yesilyurt, S., & Goksu, A. (2010). Practical Tips on How to Promote Learner Autonomy in Foreign Language Classrooms. *Online Submission*.
- Dogancay-Aktuna, S. (1998). The spread of English in Turkey and its current sociolinguistic profile. *Journal of multilingual and multicultural Development*, 19(1), 24-39.
- Duarte, J. (2019). Translanguaging in mainstream education: A sociocultural approach. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 22(2), 150-164.
- Fairclough, A. (1995). *Martin Luther King, Jr.* University of Georgia Press.

- Fillmore, C. J. (1979). On fluency. In *Individual differences in language ability and language behavior* (pp. 85-101). Academic Press.
- Følsvik, J. (2022). *Teacher and Student Attitudes Towards L1 Use in the Norwegian EFL Classroom* (Master's thesis, Norwegian University).
- Galante, A. (2020). Translanguaging for vocabulary development: A mixed methods study with international students in a Canadian English for academic purposes program. *Envisioning TESOL through a translanguaging lens: Global perspectives*, 293-328.
- Gamotin, F. T. (2021). Speaking performance and the types of code-switching of senior high school students. *International Journal of English Language Studies*, 3(10), 38-71.
- García, O. (2009). Education, multilingualism and translanguaging in the 21st century. In *Social justice through multilingual education* (pp. 140-158). Multilingual Matters.
- García, O., & Wei, L. (2014). Language, bilingualism and education. In *Translanguaging: Language, bilingualism and education* (pp. 46-62). Palgrave Pivot, London.
- García, O., & Kleifgen, J. A. (2020). Translanguaging and literacies. *Reading research quarterly*, 55(4), 553-571.
- Gass, S. M., & Mackey, A. (2000). *Stimulated Recall Methodology in Second Language Research*. London: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Gürsoy, E., & Korkmaz, H. (2018). Speaking anxiety of freshmen and senior prospective ELT teachers. *Eğitimde Kuram ve Uygulama*.
- Gower, R., Phillips, D., & Walters, S. (2005). *Teaching practice*. Macmillan.
- Ha, T. T. T., Phan, T. T. N., & Anh, T. H. (2021). The importance of translanguaging in improving fluency in speaking ability of non-English major sophomores. In 18th International Conference of the Asia Association of Computer-Assisted Language Learning (AsiaCALL-2-2021) (pp. 338-344). Atlantis Press.
- Hall, G., & Cook, G. (2012). Own-language use in language teaching and learning. *Language teaching*, 45(3), 271-308.

- Hamouda, A. (2013). An exploration of causes of Saudi students' reluctance to participate in the English language classroom. *International Journal of English Language Education*, 1(1), 17-34.
- Heydari, P., & Bagheri, M. S. (2012). Error analysis: Sources of L2 learners' errors. *Theory and practice in language studies*, 2(8), 1583-1589.
- Hornberger, N. H. (1990). Bilingual education and English-only: A language-planning framework. *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 508(1), 12-26.
- Howatt, A. P., & Smith, R. (2014). The history of teaching English as a foreign language, from a British and European perspective. *Language & History*, 57(1), 75-95.
- Huang, H. I. (2003). Raising students' awareness of idiomatic English through cross-translation practice. *English Teach. Learn.* 28, 83–100.
- Hult, F. M., & Hornberger, N. H. (2016). Revisiting orientations in language planning: Problem, right, and resource as an analytical heuristic. *The Bilingual Review/La Revista Bilingüe*, 33(3), 30.
- Infante, P., & Licon, P. R. (2018). Translanguaging as pedagogy: Developing learner scientific discursive practices in a bilingual middle school science classroom. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*.
- Jasrai, L. (2020). *Data analysis using SPSS*. Sage Publications Pvt.
- Kara, E., Ayaz, A. D., & Dündar, T. (2017). Challenges in EFL speaking classes in Turkish context. *European Journal of Language and Literature*, 3(2), 66-74.
- Khamkhen, A. (2010). Teaching English speaking and English speaking tests in the Thai context: A reflection from Thai perspective. *English Language Teaching*, 3(1), 184-190.
- Khair, A. U., Rosmayanti, V., & Firman, A. (2020). Translanguaging pedagogy in promoting higher order thinking skill (HOTS) in Indonesian Higher Education.

- Kim, J., Zhao, H., & Diskin-Holdaway, C. (2022). Willingness to communicate and second language fluency: Korean-speaking short-term sojourners in Australia. *Languages*, 7(2), 112.
- Kokini, C. (2019). Translanguaging in the Greek language classroom: The case of foreign schools in Greece. An unpublished post-graduation thesis, Hellenic Open University, Patras, Greece.
- Koral, M. A., & Mirici, İ. H. (2021). Analysis of speaking skills in high school English language curricula and coursebooks in Turkey. *International Journal of Education, Technology and Science*, 1(3), 61-77.
- Kothari, C. R. (2004). *Research methodology*.
- Korucu-Kis, S., & Sanal, F. (2020). Bridging in-class and out-of-class learning through podcast-intertwined collaborative tasks to reduce EFL speaking anxiety among higher proficiency learners. *International Online Journal of Education and Teaching*, 7(2), 636-653.
- Kim, E. (2006). Reasons and motivations for code-mixing and code-switching. *Issues in EFL*, 4(1), 43-61.
- Kirkgöz, Y. (2009). Globalization and English language policy in Turkey. *Educational policy*, 23(5), 663-684.
- Kirkgöz, Y. (2008). A case study of teachers' implementation of curriculum innovation in English language teaching in Turkish primary education. *Teaching and teacher education*, 24(7), 1859-1875.
- Koral, M. A., & Mirici, İ. H. (2021). Analysis of speaking skills in high school English language curricula and coursebooks in Turkey. *International Journal of Education, Technology and Science*, 1(3), 61-77.
- Kothari, C. R. (2004). *Research methodology: Methods and techniques* (2nd edition). New Delhi: New Age International Publishers.
- Krashen, S. (1991). The input hypothesis: An update. *Linguistics and language pedagogy: The state of the art* (pp. 409–431).

- Krippendorff, K. (1989). Content analysis.
- Kumar, R. (2012). *Research methodology: A step by step guide for beginners*. . New Delhi, India: Sage Publication.
- Leong, L.-M., & Ahmadi, S. M. (2017). An analysis of factors influencing learners' English speaking skill. *International Journal of Research in English Education*, 2(1), 34–41. <https://doi.org/10.18869/acadpub.ijree.2.1.34>
- Lewis, A., & Smith, D. (1993). Defining higher order thinking. *Theory Into Practice*, 32(3), 131–137. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00405849309543588>
- Lewis, G., Jones, B., & Baker, C. (2012). Translanguaging: Origins and development from school to street and beyond. *Educational research and evaluation*, 18(7), 641-654.
- Llanes, À., & Cots, J. M. (2020). Measuring the impact of translanguaging in TESOL: A plurilingual approach to ESP. *International Journal of Multilingualism*, 1-16.
- MacIntyre, P. D. (1994). Variables underlying willingness to communicate: A causal analysis. *Communication Research Reports*, 11(2), 135-142.
- MacIntyre, P. D., Clément, R., Dörnyei, Z., & Noels, K. A. (1998). Conceptualizing willingness to communicate in a L2: A situational model of L2 confidence and affiliation. *The Modern Language Journal*, 82(4), 545-562.
- Mackey, A., Gass, S., & McDonough, K. (2000). How do learners perceive interactional feedback?. *Studies in second language acquisition*, 22(4), 471-497.
- Maftoon, P., & Najafi Sarem, S. (2015). Gender and willingness to communicate. *Iranian Journal of Language Issues*, 1(1), 1-18.
- Mahdi, D. A. (2014). Willingness to communicate in English: A case study of EFL students at King Khalid University. *English Language Teaching*, 7(7), 17-25.
- Makalela, L. (2015). Moving out of linguistic boxes: The effects of translanguaging strategies for multilingual classrooms. *Language and education*, 29(3), 200-217.

- Makalela, L., & Mkhize, D. (2016). Introduction: Translanguaging in the 21st century: New pathways for epistemic access and identity formation. *Southern African Linguistics and Applied Language Studies*, 34(3), iii-v.
- Malaysia, U. S. (2013). Learners' use of code-switching in the English as a foreign language classroom. *Australian Journal of Basic and Applied Sciences*, 7(1), 186-190.
- Martins, I., Monsalve, J. P. P., & Martinez, A. V. (2018). Self-confidence and fear of failure among university students and their relationship with entrepreneurial orientation: Evidence from Colombia. *Academia Revista Latinoamericana de Administración*, 31(3), 471-485.
- Marzuki, A. G. (2017). Developing speaking skill through oral report in an efl class in indonesia. *Al-Ta lim Journal*, 24(3), 243-254.
- Masna, Y. (2020). EFL learners' code-switching: Why do they switch the language?. *Englisia: Journal of Language, Education, and Humanities*, 8(1), 93-101.
- McCroskey, J. C. (1977). Oral communication apprehension: A summary of recent theory and research. *Human communication research*, 4(1), 78-96.
- McCroskey, J. C. (1982). Communication competence and performance: A research and pedagogical perspective. *Communication education*, 31(1), 1-7.
- McKay, S. L. (2002). *Teaching English as an international language: Rethinking goals and perspectives*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Meletiadou, E. (2022). The Utilisation of Peer-Assisted Learning/Mentoring and Translanguaging in Higher Education. *IAFOR journal of education*, 10(1), 135-154.
- Merriam, S. B., & Tisdell, E. J. (2016). Designing your study and selecting a sample. *Qualitative research: A guide to design and implementation*, 67(1), 73-104.
- Metila, R. A. (2009). Decoding the switch: The functions of codeswitching in the classroom. *Education quarterly*, 67(1).
- Mirhasani, A., & Jafarpour, M. H. (2009). Code-switching and Iranian EFL learners' oral proficiency. *Iranian Journal of TEFL*, 21-31.

- Mudra, H. (2016). Enhancing students' speaking skill through task-based Language Teaching (TBLT) at English Tadris Department of Stain Kerinci. *Al-Ta Lim Journal*, 23(1), 78–87. <https://doi.org/10.15548/jt.v23i1.175>
- Nasution, D. K., & Siregar, F. S. (2021). Investigating the impact of code-switching on English foreign language students' speaking confidence. *EduTech: Jurnal Ilmu Pendidikan dan Ilmu Sosial*, 7(2), 194-199.
- Nie, M., Lu, J., Zheng, Y., & Shen, Q. (2022). Facilitating learners' participation through classroom translanguaging: Comparing a translanguaging classroom and a monolingual classroom in Chinese language teaching. *Applied Linguistics Review*, (0).
- Ningsih, S. K., Narahara, S., & Mulyono, H. (2018). An exploration of factors contributing to students' unwillingness to communicate in a foreign language across Indonesian Secondary Schools. *International Journal of Instruction*, 11(4), 811-824.
- Noorbar, S., & Mamaghani, H. J. (2023). The effect of code-switching on Iranian elementary EFL learners' oral fluency, accuracy, and willingness to communicate. *Journal of Modern Research in English Language Studies*, 3(4), 103-75.
- Nordin, N. M., Ali, F. D. R., Zubir, S. I. S. S., & Sadjirin, R. (2013). ESL learners' reactions towards code switching in classroom settings. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 90, 478-487.
- Ofelia Garcia, J. K. (2018). *Educating emergent bilinguals: Policies, programs, and practices for English learners*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Ogane, E. (1997). Codeswitching in EFL learner discourse. *JALT journal*, 19(1), 106-122.
- Ortega, L. (2020). The study of heritage language development from a bilingualism and social justice perspective. *Language Learning*, 70, 15-53.
- Öztürk, G., & Gürbüz, N. (2014). Speaking anxiety among Turkish EFL learners: The case at a state university. *Journal of language and Linguistic Studies*, 10(1), 1-17.
- Pacheco, M. B. (2016). *Translanguaging in the English-centric classroom: A communities of practice perspective*. Vanderbilt University.

- Palmer, D. K., Martínez, R. A., Mateus, S. G., & Henderson, K. (2014). Reframing the debate on language separation: Toward a vision for translanguaging pedagogies in the dual language classroom. *The Modern Language Journal*, 98(3), 757-772.
- Promnath, K., & Tayjasanant, C. (2016). English-Thai code-switching of teachers in ESP classes. *PASAA: Journal of Language Teaching and Learning in Thailand*, 51, 97-126.
- Rabidge, M. (2019). The effects of translanguaging on participation in EFL classrooms. *Journal of Asia TEFL*, 16(4), 1305.
- Rabidge, M. (2020). *Translanguaging in EFL contexts. A call for change*. New York: Routledge.
- Riadil, I. G. (2020). EFL students in speaking skill: identifying english education students' perceptions of the psychological problems in speaking. *JETAL: Journal of English Teaching & Applied Linguistic*, 2(1), 8-20.
- Richards, K. (2006). *Language and professional identity: Aspects of collaborative interaction*. Springer.
- Ruiz, R. (1984). Orientations in language planning. *NABE journal*, 8(2), 15-34.
- Ruiz, R. (2010). Reorienting language-as-resource. In J.E. Petrovic (Ed.), *International perspectives on bilingual education: Policy, practice, and controversy* (pp. 155-172). Charlotte, NC: Information Age.
- Sallinen-Kuparinen, A., McCroskey, J. C., & Richmond, V. P. (1991). Willingness to communicate, communication apprehension, introversion, and self-reported communication competence: Finnish and American comparisons. *Communication Research Reports*, 8(1), 55-64.
- Sanjaya, M. U. M., Nurkamto, J., & Sumardi, S. (2023, June). Students' FLA and their perspectives on translanguaging practices in Indonesian EFL classrooms. In *English Language and Literature International Conference (ELLiC) Proceedings* (Vol. 6, pp. 406-420).

- Savaşçı, M. (2014). Why are some students reluctant to use L2 in EFL speaking classes? An action research at tertiary level. *Procedia-social and behavioral sciences*, 116, 2682-2686.
- Semiante, S. F., & Tian, Z. (2020). The need for translanguaging in TESOL. In *Envisioning TESOL through a translanguaging lens* (pp. 43-66). Springer, Cham.
- Shanehsazzadeh, M., & Heidari Darani, L. (2017). Functions of code-switching strategies among Iranian EFL learners and their speaking ability improvement through code-switching. *International Journal of Foreign Language Teaching and Research*, 5(18), 97-109.
- Sobkowiak, P. (2022). Translanguaging practices in the EFL classroom-the Polish context. *Linguistics and Education*, 69, 101020.
- Song, J., Howard, D., & Olazabal-Arias, W. (2022). Translanguaging as a strategy for supporting multilingual learners' social emotional learning. *Education Sciences*, 12(7), 475.
- Süzer, H. S. S. (2007). Teacher knowledge on grammar teaching: A case study. *Hacettepe University Educational Science Journal*, 32(32), 255-265.
- Tian, Z., Aghai, L., Sayer, P., & Schissel, J. L. (2020). Envisioning TESOL through a translanguaging lens in the era of post-multilingualism. In *Envisioning TESOL through a translanguaging lens* (pp. 1-20). Springer, Cham.
- Tian, Z. (2022). Translanguaging design in a third grade Chinese language arts class. *Applied Linguistics Review*, 13(3), 327-343.
- Tokoz-Goktepe, F. (2014). Speaking problems of 9th grade high school Turkish learners of L2 English and possible reasons for those problems: Exploring the teachers and students' perspectives. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 116, 1875-1879.
- Tucker, J., & Council, B. (2014). Test specifications and item writer guidelines in a multilingual world: issues and solutions. *British Council*: <http://events.cambridgeenglish.org/alte-2014/docs/presentations/alte2014-john-tucker>.
- Ur, P. (1996). *A course in language teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Uysal, H. H., & Bardakci, M. (2014). Teacher beliefs and practices of grammar teaching: Focusing on meaning, form, or forms?. *South African Journal of Education*, 34(1).
- Uztosun, M. S., Skinner, N., & Cadorath, J. (2014). An action research study designed to implement student negotiation to improve speaking classroom practice in Turkey. *Educational Action Research*, 22(4), 488-504.
- Vaish, V. (2019). Translanguaging pedagogy for simultaneous biliterates struggling to read in English. *International Journal of Multilingualism*, 16(3), 286-301.
- Vaish, V. (2019). Challenges and directions in implementing translanguaging pedagogy for low achieving students. *Classroom Discourse*, 10(3-4), 274-289.
- Vrikki, M. (2012). Learner codeswitching: Can it be used as a tool for L2 fluency development?. *Multilingual Theory and Practice in Applied Linguistics*, 255.
- Wei, L. (2018). Translanguaging as a practical theory of language. *Applied linguistics*, 39(1), 9-30.
- Wisker, G. (2001). *The postgraduate research handbook*. U.K.: Palgrave.
- Wolff, M. (2010). China's English mystery—the views of a China ‘foreign expert’. *English Today*, 26(4), 53-56.
- Worthy, J., Rodríguez-Galindo, A., Assaf, L. C., Martínez, L., & Cuero, K. (2003). Fifth-grade bilingual students and precursors to “Subtractive Schooling”. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 27(2), 275-294.
- Yilmaz, K. (2013). Comparison of quantitative and qualitative research traditions: Epistemological, theoretical, and methodological differences. *European journal of education*, 48(2), 311-325.
- Yilmaz, T. (2014). *The Role of fear of negative evaluation and native speaker presence on foreign/second language production and classroom participation* (Unpublished Master’s Thesis). University of Florida, the USA.

- Yilmaz, T. (2021). Translanguaging as a pedagogy for equity of language minoritized students *International Journal of Multilingualism*, 18(3), 435-454, <https://doi.org/10.1080/14790718.2019.1640705>
- Yousefi, M., & Ahmad Kasaian, S. (2014). Relationship between willingness to communicate and Iranian EFL learner's speaking fluency and accuracy. *Journal of Advances in English Language Teaching*, 2(6), pp-61.
- Yusuf, Q., & Zuraini, Z. (2016). Challenges in teaching speaking to EFL learners. *Proceedings of EEIC*, 1(2), 542-546.
- Yuvayapan, F. (2019). Translanguaging in EFL classrooms: Teachers' perceptions and practices. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies*, 15(2), 678-694.
- Zhang, Y. (2009). Reading to Speak: Integrating Oral Communication Skills. In *English teaching forum* (Vol. 47, No. 1, pp. 32-34). US Department of State. Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs, Office of English Language Programs, SA-5, 2200 C Street NW 4th Floor, Washington, DC 20037.

APPENDICIES

APPENDIX- A: “Willingness to Communicate (WTC) Questionnaire” (Mystkowska-Wiertelak & Pawlak, 2016)

Section 1: Background Information

Please answer the questions.

1. What is your name?
2. What is your place of birth?
3. Where do you live?
4. What is your major?

5. Please choose your gender.

Male Female

6. My personality is

Shy

Outgoing

Balanced

7. My personality inside the classroom

Quiet

Active

Anxious

Introvert

8. My favorite subject in Preparatory class is

Reading- Writing

Listening- Speaking

9. What is your first language?

Turkish Other

10. Do you know other languages except from English?

Yes No

11. I learned English in.....

Public School Private School

12. Did you have the opportunity to learn English in abroad?

Yes, in the USA Yes, in England Yes, in another country No

13. Does my desire to learn English increase with a strong motivation?

Yes No

14. I think the most important motivation to learn English is

Social Environment Classroom and teacher Personal motivation

Section 2: WTC During a Speaking Class

The following statements describe tasks or situations inside a speaking class Please choose the box which best describes your feelings: 1 Not at all true about me, 2 Very slightly true of me, 3 Slightly true of me, 4 Moderately true of me, 5 Very much true of me, 6 Extremely true about me.

1. I am willing to present my arguments to the rest of my class.

1	2	3	4	5	6
---	---	---	---	---	---

2. I am willing to give a presentation in front of the class.

1	2	3	4	5	6
---	---	---	---	---	---

3. I am willing to do a role-play in a small group.

1	2	3	4	5	6
---	---	---	---	---	---

4. I am willing to do a role-play in a pair.

1	2	3	4	5	6
---	---	---	---	---	---

5. I am willing to take part in a discussion in a small group.

1	2	3	4	5	6
---	---	---	---	---	---

6. I am willing to take part in a discussion in a pair.

1	2	3	4	5	6
---	---	---	---	---	---

7. I am willing to ask the teacher in English to repeat what s/he said.

1	2	3	4	5	6
---	---	---	---	---	---

8. I am willing to ask the teacher in English about words or structures s/he just used.

1	2	3	4	5	6
---	---	---	---	---	---

9. I am willing to ask my peer in English about forms/words related to the topic.

10. I am willing to ask my peer in English about ideas/arguments related to the topic.

1	2	3	4	5	6
---	---	---	---	---	---

11. I am willing to ask my group mates in English about forms/words related to the topic.

1	2	3	4	5	6
---	---	---	---	---	---

12. I am willing to ask my group mates in English about ideas/arguments related to the topic.

1	2	3	4	5	6
---	---	---	---	---	---

13. I am willing to correct a mistake that I notice in what others are saying.

1	2	3	4	5	6
---	---	---	---	---	---

14. I am willing to modify what I have said in response to an indication of an error.

1	2	3	4	5	6
---	---	---	---	---	---

Section 3: Communication Confidence

1. I am willing to give an oral presentation to the rest of the class.

1	2	3	4	5	6
---	---	---	---	---	---

2. I am willing to take part in a role-play or dialogue.

1	2	3	4	5	6
---	---	---	---	---	---

3. I am willing to contribute to a class debate.

1	2	3	4	5	6
---	---	---	---	---	---

4. I am willing to respond when the teacher asks me a question in English.

1	2	3	4	5	6
---	---	---	---	---	---

5. I am willing to speak without preparation in class.

1	2	3	4	5	6
---	---	---	---	---	---

6. I am willing to speak informally to my English teacher during classroom activities.

1	2	3	4	5	6
---	---	---	---	---	---

7. I am willing to give my peer sitting next to me directions to my favourite restaurant in English.

1	2	3	4	5	6
---	---	---	---	---	---

8. I am willing to do a role-play in English at my desk, with my peer.

1	2	3	4	5	6
---	---	---	---	---	---

9. I am willing to tell my group mates in English about things I do in my free time.

1	2	3	4	5	6
---	---	---	---	---	---

10. I am willing to give a short impromptu speech to my class.

1	2	3	4	5	6
---	---	---	---	---	---

11. I am willing to correct a mistake that I notice in what others are saying.

1	2	3	4	5	6
---	---	---	---	---	---

12. I am willing to modify what I have said in response to an indication of an error.

1	2	3	4	5	6
---	---	---	---	---	---

13. I am willing to lead the discussion.

1	2	3	4	5	6
---	---	---	---	---	---

APPENDIX- B: Semi-Structured Interview for EFL Preparatory Class Students

1. Tell me about yourself.
2. How do you feel when you need to use only English to communicate? (Remember the times when you communicated in English, how did you feel?) Do you feel nervous or at ease? Do you enjoy using English?
3. When you are allowed to speak your native language/or other languages in some activities, how do you feel?
4. In which situations do you want to use your native language?
5. How does the freedom to speak any language in our classes influence your motivation to speak/participate?
6. How do you evaluate your speaking performance throughout the semester?
7. What do you think about using your mother tongue and English simultaneously in a lesson?
8. How do you think using your native language/ or other languages affected your speaking fluency?

APPENDIX-C: Weekly Schedule For Intervention of Translanguaging Strategy

SPEAKING ACTIVITY SCHEDULE OF THE STUDENTS IN EXPERIMENTAL GROUP				
<p>1. Instructions will be given in English mostly. However, in some specific situations, like being unable to understand a word or sentence structure, teacher will use <i>translanguaging strategy</i>.</p> <p>2. During discussion and presentation sessions students will speak in English but they are allowed to use <i>translanguaging strategy</i> when they do not remember a word and feel stuck.</p> <p>3. Students are allowed to use <i>translanguaging strategy</i> when they want to express a traditional expression or joke.</p>				
WEEKS	TOPIC	PRE	DURING	POST
Week 1	Stereotypes	<p>Brainstorming about stereotypes about people from different nationalities.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <i>Students will think about generalization made by people for the people all around the world and the people in Turkey as well. They will share their ideas with the teacher.</i> <p>*Ss' are allowed to speak L1.</p>	<p>As groups of 4 creating a poster including stereotypes and a motto from a specific stereotyped situation.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <i>They will choose a nationality and google the stereotypes about that country. (in English)</i> - <i>They will choose the weirdest stereotype by discussing each other. (permission for L1)</i> - <i>In the following part of the activity they will design and poster about stereotyped situation and find a motto about it. (in English)</i> 	<p>A student from each group shows the poster and present the topic.</p> <p>*Ss' are allowed to use L1 if needed.</p>
Week 2	<i>The Utopian city</i>	<p>Brainstorming about their dream city individually.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <i>Students will think about the problems in their hometown and the city they would like to live. During this process they will be allowed to be unrealistic and use their imagination.</i> 	<p>Drawing the dream city and discussing the information on that city</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <i>As groups of four they will tell each other about city problems, their dream cities and share their ideas. (permission for L1)</i> - <i>By discussing they'll create a city and name it. (in English)</i> - <i>Population, the rules and planning of the city, living standards and currency will be determined by students. (permission for L1)</i> - <i>They will draw that city at the end of this session. (in English)</i> 	<p>Presenting each groups' dream city and voting for each city and discussing the best one and reasons of it.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <i>Each group will present their city and inform other students by showing the picture they draw. (permission for L1)</i> - <i>At the end of the presentation part they are asked to vote for each city and explain the reason why they choose that city. (in English)</i>
Week 3	<i>Deserted Island</i>	<p>Brainstorming about the situations while they are surviving in an island.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <i>Students will think about the situations they may experience and items which help them to survive in an island.</i> 	<p>As a group they will decide 3 items to take.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <i>They will discuss about the items which help them for these situations and decide 3 of them. (permission for L1)</i> 	<p><i>They will explain the items they chose and give reasons for them these items. (in English)</i></p>

<p>Week 4</p>	<p>Nuclear War</p>	<p>Brainstorming about a nuclear war and results of it.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Students will imagine that they will experience a nuclear war in their country and think about what kind of outcomes may happen - A video about it will be watched. 	<p>Discussing about an imaginary situation.</p> <p>-Learners in groups of 4 will work through the imaginary situation of surviving a nuclear war. There will be 4 people at the airport but only 3 of them would be able to go to an uninhabited island that was not influenced by radiation. Based on the occupations each student will be assigned, the group have to discuss who would get on the plane and live, and who would die.</p>	<p>At the end of the discussion they will role-play and tell about their decision and reason of it.</p>
<p>Week 5</p>	<p>Superpower</p>	<p>Brainstorming about superpowers</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Students will think about the cartoon characters and their superpowers. 	<p>Discussing about superpowers.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - As a group of 4 they will think about a problem in the world and create a character who has a superpower to fix this problem. 	<p>They will show their character and present the power of him.</p>
<p>Week 6</p>	<p>Stereotypes</p> <p>https://www.harmony.gov.au/get-involved/arch-ools/lesson-plans/lesson-plan-stereotypes</p>	<p>Introducing and examining the concept of stereotype.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Explaining the meaning of stereotype and asking students to give some examples in public. 	<p>- Reading out the following scenario: Buck's Bar and Grill is full of diners. The owner discovers that a bag of money has been stolen from an area that only staff has access to. The owner suspects that the employee responsible for taking the bag is still in the restaurant as nobody has left the restaurant in the last 30 minutes and Buck saw the bag of money 20 minutes ago.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Each group presents their decision and reasoning to the whole class. -The true culprit is revealed. - Lead a whole group discussion on stereotyping, asking students to reflect on their own thinking.
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Nominate six students to act as the employees and hand each of them a profile. The rest of the class are to act as diners. -The six students introduce themselves to the diners, using the information in the profiles. - Invite the 'diners' to ask the employees questions to try to determine which one is guilty. The 'employees' improvise their answers. - After a period of questioning, the diners form small groups (4-5) and are asked to discuss the information that has been presented and reach consensus on who the guilty employee is. 	<p>rather than reporting on what other individuals had to say in the small group.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Did we stereotype some of these people? How? • What assumptions did we make about individuals? • What sorts of things cause us to stereotype people? • How does it feel to be stereotyped? • Are stereotypes accurate or do they cause us to believe things that aren't based on facts?

APPENDIX-D: Students' Posters in Intervention Phase

