REPUBLIC OF TURKEY
ÇUKUROVA UNIVERSITY
THE INSTITUTE OF SOCIAL SCIENCES
DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH LANGUAGE TEACHING

INVESTIGATING TRANSLANGUAGING AS A TEACHING AND LEARNING PRACTICE IN AN ENGLISH MEDIUM HIGHER EDUCATION CONTEXT IN TURKEY

Ceylan KÜÇÜK

MASTER OF ARTS

ADANA / 2018

REPUBLIC OF TURKEY
ÇUKUROVA UNIVERSITY
THE INSTITUTE OF SOCIAL SCIENCES
DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH LANGUAGE TEACHING

INVESTIGATING TRANSLANGUAGING AS A TEACHING AND LEARNING PRACTICE IN AN ENGLISH MEDIUM HIGHER EDUCATION CONTEXT IN TURKEY

Ceylan KÜÇÜK

Supervisor:Prof. Dr. Yasemin KIRKGÖZ
Member of Examining Committee:Assist. Prof. Dr. Abdurrahman KİLİMCİ
Member of Examining Committee: Assist. Prof. Dr. Ali KARAKAŞ

MASTER OF ARTS

ADANA / 2018

To the Directorship of the Institute of Social Sciences, Çukurova University;

We certify that this dissertation is satisfactory for the award of degree of Master of Arts in the subject matter of English Language Teaching.

Supervisor: Prof. Dr. Yasemin KIRKGÖZ

Member of Examining Committee: Assist. Prof. Dr. Abdurrahman KİLİMCİ

Member of Examining Committee: Assist. Prof. Dr. Ali KARAKAŞ

I certify that this dissertation confirms to the formal standards of the Institute of Social Sciences

Prof. Dr. Serap ÇABUK
Director of the Institute

NOT: Bu tezde kullanılan ve başka kaynaktan yapılan bildirişlerin, çizelge, şekil ve fotoğrafların kaynak gösterilmeden kullanımı, 5846 sayılı Fikir ve Sanat Eserleri Kanunu'ndaki hükümlere tabidir.

ETİK BEYANI

Çukurova Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Tez Yazım Kurallarına uygun olarak hazırladığım bu tez çalışmasında;

- Tez içinde sunduğum verileri, bilgileri ve dokümanları akademik ve etik kurallar çerçevesinde elde ettiğimi,
- Tüm bilgi, belge, değerlendirme ve sonuçları bilimsel etik ve ahlak kurallarına uygun olarak sunduğumu,
- Tez çalışmasında yararlandığım eserlerin tümüne uygun atıfta bulunarak kaynak gösterdiğimi,
- Kullanılan verilerde ve ortaya çıkan sonuçlarda herhangi bir değişiklik yapmadığımı,
- Bu tezde sunduğum çalışmanın özgün olduğunu bildirir, aksi bir durumda aleyhime doğabilecek tüm hak kayıplarını kabullendiğimi beyan ederim.

15/11/2018

Ceylan KÜÇÜK

ABSTRACT

INVESTIGATING TRANSLANGUAGING AS A TEACHING AND LEARNING PRACTICE IN AN ENGLISH MEDIUM HIGHER EDUCATION CONTEXT IN TURKEY

Ceylan KÜÇÜK

Master Thesis, Department of English Language Teaching
Supervisor: Prof. Dr. Yasemin KIRKGÖZ
November 2018, 173 pages

This study aims to discuss and examine existing translanguaging practices within Turkish higher educational context with reference to Adana Science and Technology University (Adana STU). Research objectives of the study are: (i.) to determine language related challenges faced by the first year EMI students, (ii.) to discuss students' attitudes on translanguaging as a learning strategy (iii.) to examine translanguaging strategies used by the first year undergraduate students during their academic studies, (iv.) to discuss lecturers' attitudes on translanguaging as learning and teaching strategy and (v.) to determine the purposes of translanguaging practices used by lecturers when teaching content courses in English medium instruction (EMI).

In order to achieve the research objectives, data collection of this study was carried out during the first semester of 2017-2018 academic year. The research collection tools included questionnaire, interviews and observations. As a first step, a Likert-type questionnaire was adapted for the study. Consistency among the items of the questionnaire prepared for the students was taken into account. Data gathered via questionnaires were analyzed through SPSS (Version 21.0). For the analyses of the quantitative data, mean and standard deviation scores via "Descriptive Statistics" were used. The second data collection tool was the semi-structured interview conducted with students and lecturers. Consistency between the items of the questionnaire and interview questions prepared for the students was taken into account. The semi-structured interviews with students were conducted by means of focus group discussion while lecturers were interviewed individually. The third data collection tool was non-participant observation. Content subject lessons of five lecturers were video-taped and

patterns of translanguaging strategies used by lecturers and students were closely observed via non-participant observation. Qualitative data were analyzed via inductive content analysis method in a qualitative manner. The findings of the study revealed that the most occurring troubles that students face were inadequate use of technical English vocabulary and accent and pronunciation which hinder content mastery and communication in the classroom. The results of the study have also shown that translanguaging practices have widely been used by students and lecturers. While the majority of the lecturers held optimal positions towards translanguaging, students held maximal position towards translanguaging which gives priority to maximization of English use in EMI classrooms; however, they have still have positive attitudes towards benefits of translanguaging. Translanguaging practices used by students were revealed to be scaffolding with peers and lecturers, translation and use of bilingual materials and note taking in L1. Students use translanguaging with their classmates and lecturers mainly for understanding and clarifying the complicated parts of the content. Finally, it was also revealed that lecturers use translanguaging mostly for instructional and affective purposes such as clarifying and conveying the meaning to facilitate better comprehension of content, explaining new words and concepts, giving voice and increasing students' participation and encouraging and comforting students. The results of the study provide implications for university lecturers, students and authorities in terms of how they can adopt translanguaging practice as learning and teaching strategy in EMI programmes.

Keywords: Higher Education, English Medium Instruction, Monolingual Education, Bilingual Education, Translanguaging Strategies

ÖZET

İNGİLİZCEYİ ÖĞRETİM DİLİ OLARAK KULLANAN BİR TÜRK YÜKSEKÖĞRETİM KURUMUNDA ÖĞRETME VE ÖĞRENME UYGULAMASI OLARAK DİLLERARASI GEÇİŞLİLİĞİN ARAŞTIRILMASI

Ceylan KÜÇÜK

Yüksek Lisans Tezi, İngiliz Dili ve Eğitimi Anabilim Dalı
Danışman: Prof. Dr. Yasemin KIRKGÖZ
Kasım 2018, 173 Sayfa

Bu çalışma, İngilizceyi öğretim dili olarak kullanan Adana Bilim ve Teknoloji Üniversitesi'ne (Adana BTU) atıfta bulunarak, Türk Yükseköğretim bağlamında mevcut Diller Arası Geçişlilik uygulamalarını tartışmak ve değerlendirmeyi amaçlamaktadır. Çalışmanın araştırma hedefleri şunlardır: (i.) Birinci sınıf lisans öğrencilerinin İngilizcenin öğretim dili olarak kullanıldığı bağlamda dil ile alakalı karşılaştıkları zorlukları belirlemek (ii.) öğrencilerin, öğrenme stratejisi olarak dillerarası geçişlilik uygulamaları hakkındaki yaklaşımlarını tartışmak (iii.)Adana BTU birinci sınıf öğrencilerinin akademik çalışmaları sırasında kullandıkları dillerarası geçişlilik stratejilerini incelemek (iv.) öğretim elemanlarının, öğrenme ve öğretme stratejisi olarak dillerarası geçişlilik uygulamaları konusundaki yaklaşımlarını tartışmak (v.) öğretim elemanlarının kullandığı diller arası geçişlilik uygulamalarının amaçlarını belirlemektir.

Araştırma hedeflerine ulaşmak için, bu araştırmanın verileri 2017-2018 öğretim yılının güz döneminde toplanmıştır. Araştırma teknikleri, röportaj, anket ve gözlemi içermektedir. Çalışma için ilk aşamada, Likert tipi bir anket adapte edilmiştir. Öğrenciler için hazırlanan anketteki maddelerin birbirine uyumlu olmasına dikkat edilmiştir. Anket verileri SPSS (Versiyon 21.0) programı ile analiz edilmiştir. Nicel veri analizinde 'Betimsel İstatistik' araçlarından ortalama ve standart sapma kullanılmıştır. İkinci veri toplama aracı ise öğretim elemanları ve öğrencilere uygulanan yarı yapılandırılmış görüşmelerdir. Öğrencilere uygulanan görüşme sorularının anketteki sorular ile uyumlu olmasına dikkat edilmiştir. Öğrencilerle gerçekleşen görüşmeler odak grup görüşmeleri, öğretim üyeleri ile gerçekleşen görüşmeler ise bireysel görüşmeler şeklinde gerçekleştirilmiştir. Çalışmanın üçüncü veri toplama aracı ise gözlemdir.

İngilizce alan dersi veren beş öğretim elemanının dersleri hem katılımcı olmayan gözlem yoluyla gözlemlenmiş hem de kaydedilmiştir. Çalışmanın nitel verileri tümevarımsal içerik analizi yoluyla analiz edilmiştir. Elde edilen sonuçlar, dillerarası geçişlilik uygulamalarının hem öğrenciler hem de hocalar tarafından sıklıkla kullanıldığını ortaya çıkarmıştır. Hocaların çoğunluğu çok dilli bir anlayışı desteklerken, öğrenciler çoğunlukla derslerde İngilizce kullanımının arttırılmasını desteklemiştir. Fakat yine de öğrencilerin dillerarası geçişlilik uygulamalarının faydalarına karşı pozitif bir bakış açısına sahip oldukları ortaya çıkmıştır. Öğrenciler tarafından kullanılan dillerarası geçişlilik uygulamaları, sınıf arkadaşları ve hocalarla öğrenme desteği, çeviri ve çift dilli materyallerin kullanımı ve son olarak anadilde not alma olarak bulunmuştur. Öğrenciler dillerarası geçişlilik stratejisini sınıf arkadaşları ve hocalarıyla konunun karmaşık taraflarını açığa kavuşturmak ve anlamak için kullanmaktadır. Son olarak, hocaların, dillerarası geçişlilik uygulamalarını daha çok konunun daha iyi anlaşılmasını kolaylaştırmak için anlamı iletmek ve açığa kavuşturmak, yeni kelime ve terimleri açıklamak, öğrencilerin derse katılımını arttırmak gibi eğitimsel, onları cesaretlendirmek ve rahatlatmak gibi de duygusal nedenlerle kullandığı ortaya çıkmıştır. Çalışmanın sonuçları, öğrenci, öğretim üyeleri ve yetkililere dillerarası geçişlilik uygulamasının bir öğretme ve öğrenme stratejisi olarak İngilizcede öğretim yapan bölümlerde nasıl kullanılacağı konusunda öneriler sağlamaktadır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Yüksek Öğretim, İngilizce Dilinde Öğretim, Tek dilli Öğretim, Çift Dilli Öğretim, Diller Arası Geçişlilik Stratejisi

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

There are many people to thank for their support, encouragement and guidance during preparation of my study.

I would like to express my deepest gratitude to my advisor Prof. Dr. Yasemin KIRKGÖZ for her constant guidance and support through my research process. I would not have started this process without her encouragement and motivation. Thank you for instilling a drive for pursuing my studies.

I would like to express my greatest appreciation to authorities of Adana STU for letting me conduct my research in the institution.

I am especially indebted to the staff and students of Adana STU for sharing their thoughts with me and for their participation in my study.

I am also grateful to my coordinator, Assoc. Prof. Dr. Susran Erkan EROĞLU for supporting all my efforts and for giving me permission to visit the departments during the data collection process.

I would like to express my gratitude to Assist. Prof. Dr. Bilge AKSAY for her constructive comments and contribution to my study from the beginning up to the completion of this thesis. Thank you for your time and insightful and excellent supervision.

I extend my heartfelt thanks to my beloved friend Mithat BİLİK. No combination of words can express my gratitude toward you. Thank you for shaping me into the person now I am and leading me to the right path. Your love will light my way and your memory will forever be with me. You are missed every hour of every day.

I extend my heartfelt thanks to all my beloved family members for their unmeasurable love and care. Thank you for giving me the motivation and strength to push further on my studies all through my life. I would not be where I am today without your help and support.

This study was supported by Scientific Research Projects Coordination Unit of Çukurova University. Project number: SYL-2017-9237

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

ETİK BEYANI iii
ABSTRACT iv
ÖZET vi
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS viii
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS xii
LIST OF TABLES xiii
LIST OF APPENDIXES xiv

CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

1.1. Background to the Study 1
1.2. Statement of the Problem 3
1.3. Aim of the Study 6
1.4. Research Questions 7
1.5. Significance of the Study 7
1.6. Operational Definitions 8

CHAPTER II
LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1. Introduction 10
2.2. Theoretical Framework 10
2.2.1. Vygotsky's Sociocultural Theory 10
2.2.2. The Monolingual Bias in L2 Settings 13
2.2.3. Cummins' Theoretical Framework for Bilingualism in Education 16
2.2.4. Language Policy Framework 17
2.3. Language Related Challenges faced by EMI Students 18
2.3.1. Background to EMI in Turkey 21
2.4. The concept of Translanguaging 24
2.4.1. Students' Attitudes towards Translanguaging 28

2.4.2. Types of Translanguaging Practices Used by EMI Students 32
2.4.3. Lecturers' Attitudes towards Translanguaging 33
2.4.4. Lecturers' Purposes for Translanguaging Practices in EMI Classrooms 35

CHAPTER III
METHOD

3.1. Introduction 38
3.2. The Design of the Study 38
3.3. Context of the Study 41
3.4. Participants 42
3.5. Data Collection Instruments 43
3.5.1. Classroom Observation 43
3.5.2. Interview Instruments 45
3.5.2.1. Interview Questions for EMI Students 45
3.5.2.2. Interview Questions for EMI Lecturers 46
3.5.3. The Adapted Questionnaire 46
3.5.3.1. Questionnaire Prepared for the Present Study 49
3.6. Data Collection Procedures 51
3.7. Pilot Work 52
3.8. Data Analysis 53

CHAPTER IV
FINDINGS

4.1. Introduction 55
4.2. Analysis of the Questionnaire Administered to EMI Students 55
4.2.1. Background Information of Participants 55
4.2.2. Students' Attitudes towards Translanguaging 56
4.2.3. Types of Translanguaging Practices used by EMI Students 62
4.3. Analysis of Interviews Administered to EMI Students 63
4.3.1. Background Information of the Students 63
4.3.2. Language Related Challenges Faced by EMI Students 63
4.3.3. Students' Attitudes towards Translanguaging 67

4.3.4. Types of Translanguaging Practices used by EMI Students 85
4.4. Analysis of Interviews Administered with EMI Lecturers 91
4.4.1. Background information of the lecturers 91
4.4.2. Lecturers' Attitudes towards Translanguaging 92
4.4.3. Lecturers' Purposes for Translanguaging Practices in EMI Classrooms 98
4.5. Analysis of Observation Data 106
4.5.1. Types of Translanguaging Practices used by EMI Students 107
4.5.2. Lecturers' Purposes for Translanguaging Practices in EMI Classrooms 109

CHAPTER V
DISCUSSION

5.1. Introduction 112
5.2. Language Related Challenges faced by EMI Students 112
5.3. Students' Attitudes towards Translanguaging 114
5.4. Types of Translanguaging Practices used by EMI Students 117
5.5. Lecturers' Attitudes towards Translanguaging 119
5.6. Lecturers' Purposes for Translanguaging Practices in EMI Classrooms 122

CHAPTER VI
CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTIONS

6.1. Overview of the Study 125
6.2. Conclusions 125
6.3. Implications 126
6.4. Recommendations 127
6.5. Limitations of the Study 130
6.6. Suggestions for Future Research 130
REFERENCES 132
APPENDICES 142
CURRICULUM VITAE 173

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

EMI	**:** English Medium Instruction
EME	**:** English Medium Education
CLIL	**:** Content and Language Integrated Learning
TMI	**:** Turkish Medium Instruction
L1	**:** First/Home Language (In the present study, it refers to Turkish)
L2	**:** Second Language (In the present study, it refers to English)
TL	**:** Target Language (In the present study, it refers to English)
Adana STU	**:** Adana Science and Technology University
SFL	**:** School of Foreign Languages
ETP	**:** English-taught Programme
HEI	**:** Higher Education Institution
SCT	**:** Sociocultural Theory
ZPD	**:** Zone of Proximal Development
FL	**:** Foreign Language
EFL	**:** English as Foreign Language

LIST OF TABLES

Page

Table 1. Summary of Research Questions and Methodological Approaches 40
Table 2. Undergraduate Programs Offering Fully EMI Courses at Adana STU 41
Table 3. Sampling of the Study 43
Table 4. Adapted Questionnaire and Resources of Items 48
Table 5. Reliability, Mean and Standard Deviations of the Variables in the Study 50
Table 6. Background Information about Participants 55
Table 7. Language Proficiency of the Participants 56
Table 8. Students' Attitudes towards English Only Policy 57
Table 9. Students 'Attitudes towards Translanguaging 59
Table 10. Translanguaging Practices used by EMI students 62
Table 11. Translanguaging Practices used by EMI Students 108
Table 12. Lecturers' Purposes for Translanguaging Practices in EMI Classrooms 109

LIST OF APPENDIXES

Page

Appendix 1. Turkish Version of the Questionnaire for EMI Students..... 142
Appendix 2. English Version of the Questionnaire for EMI Students..... 145
Appendix 3. Turkish Version of the Interview Questions for EMI Lecturers..... 148
Appendix 4. English Version of the Interview Questions for EMI Lecturers..... 150
Appendix 5. Turkish Version of the Interview Questions for EMI Students..... 152
Appendix 6. English Version of the Interview Questions for EMI Students..... 154
Appendix 7. Observation Check List..... 156
Appendix 8: Sample from Individual Interview with Lecturers..... 157
Appendix 9: Sample from Focus Group Interview with Students..... 160
Appendix 10. Sample of Interview Consent Form..... 166
Appendix 11. Sample from Frequencies and Percentages of Questionnaire Results..... 167

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

1.1. Background to the Study

Higher education institutions have increasingly been bilingual in the last 20 to 30 years because of global use of English in academic context, international student exchanges and increasing foreign student numbers in the universities which force the institutions to apply the lingua franca or "bilingual modes of teaching and learning" (Oostendorp & Anthonissen, 2014, p. 69). These reasons have led to a change towards English-medium instruction (EMI) in higher education even in the countries where the native language is not English (Hughes, 2008). Language of instruction has always been a controversial issue in many countries. EMI has also been discussed in Turkish Higher Education context. Many scholars from around the world (Evans & Morrison, 2011; Hellekjær, 2010; Kılıçkaya, 2006; Kırkgöz, 2014; Marie, 2013; Sert, 2008; Tatzl, 2011;Vu & Burns, 2014) have revealed that EMI poses huge linguistic problems to students whose mother tongue is not English and whose English language proficiency is not sufficient to follow the content in a foreign language. These challenges were found to cause deficient content mastery, inadequate knowledge of academic vocabulary and pronunciation, feeling of alienation and superficial learning. The same challenges are also available in English as Second Language (ESL) classrooms. One of the reasons lying under these problems is the instructional methodology adopted by lecturers and institutions and students' low proficiency in language of instruction.

Instructional methodologies in language classrooms have undergone lots of changes through the years. After Grammar Translation Method which values translation between native language and second language and highlights writing over speaking lost its prestige in language teaching contexts, an inclination to monolingual methodologies started to appear in 19th century. Mass immigration from Europe to America also played an important role on this change as lecturers faced with more multilingual classrooms and under these circumstances they could not follow Grammar Translation Method anymore because of the presence of various first languages in the classrooms and had to use a common language, English, as a medium of instruction. Furthermore, people who immigrated to America were forced to learn English to live under better circumstances.

All these reasons triggered English language to spread all around the world and claim its superiority over other languages.

In the light of these developments, English only instructional policy and language separation has gained popularity over the decades. Using English only in second language (L2) setting has had a prevailing status in language teaching context around the world. For instance, supporters of the direct method advocated that only target language should be used in the L2 settings and the use of first language (L1) in these classrooms would hinder students' L2 improvement. The same case also happened with the presence of audio-lingual method which relies on speaking and listening skills. Later, supporters of the Total Physical Response approach advocated that "meaning could be conveyed through action and demonstrations and used commands to elicit a physical response from the learners" (Lasagabaster, 2013, p. 2). In the 1970s, communicative language teaching methodology became popular relying on the belief that the best way to learn English is to communicate only in English. All these methodologies emerged as a reaction to Grammar Translation Method. The scholars supporting monolingual perspective mainly adopted the idea that languages of bilinguals are stored in different systems in the brain and bilinguals should have two isolated language competences. According to this perspective, a bilingual person is two monolinguals in one person and also, bilinguals are expected to have the same proficiency as a native speaker. This separation of languages has led teachers to separate languages and minimize or prohibit students' use of L1 in the classrooms.

However, the popularity of monolingual policies in language teaching context has started to decrease with the latest reconceptualization of second language acquisition. In the last two decades, scholars have revealed that languages of bilingual people are not separately stored in the brain and new linguistic practices can only come out in relation with the old ones and monolingualism in L2 settings is undesirable and unrealistic. Also, new terms emerged as a reaction to monolistic practices in the classrooms. One of these terms; translanguaging came to fore in 1994 by Cen Williams as a teaching and learning strategy. This term supported the systematic simultaneous use of both languages in the classrooms. Translanguaging provides a space to students for using their all linguistic repertoire and has lots of potential benefits for bilingual students. It provides a better comprehension of content, facilitates acquisition and improvement in first and second language and empowers home-school links (Baker, 2011).

In terms of Turkish EMI context, it was revealed that students face linguistic troubles especially during their first year of study in EMI which pushes them to find strategies to facilitate their learning. Furthermore, lecturers teaching subjects in English also have to find out instructional methodologies opting to their students to be able to deliver their knowledge and provide students' content mastery and pursue students' motivation towards the lecturers (Kırkgöz, 2009).

In the light of this information, this study aims to find out language related challenges that students face during their studies in EMI context, translanguaging practices used by students in overcoming these challenges, students' and lecturers' attitudes towards bilingual practices and lecturers' purposes for using these practices in EMI classrooms.

1.2. Statement of the Problem

Globalization and the dominant role of English as *a lingua franca* has impelled its adoptation as a medium of instruction at higher education institutions of a growing number of non-English speaking countries where English is a second or foreign language to learners. Doiz, Lasagabaster, and Sierra (2012) stated that most institutes seem enforced to offer EMI programmes in different academic levels. The most prevalent facts leading this popularity in global use of EMI are "globalization, economic development, internationalization, technological development and the expansion of education" (Vu & Burns, 2014, p. 2). In case of students, several reasons like desire for obtaining higher qualification, better job opportunities and parental guidance encourage them to choose programs offering EMI at higher education.

Language utilized for instruction plays a significant role for students in terms of their acquisition of knowledge and demonstration of their academic abilities in examinations and assignments. In EMI and second language classrooms, there has been a widely accepted assumption that all language lectures should be carried out entirely in L2; however, in recent years studies showed that utilizing L1 to a limited extent can mediate a deeper comprehension and increase the efficiency of classroom management. Conducting lessons exclusively in target language poses huge problems to students whose mother tongue is not English when dealing with learning academic courses through a language that they are not proficient enough. Some scholars withstand EMI by stating that it decreases ability of comprehension of notions, low level of

comprehension of content, and waste of time, decrease of class participation due to low level proficiency in English (Kırkgöz, 2014). These are not the only language related challenges that students face during their studies in EMI context. There is also a heated argument regarding whether or not (and to what extent) use of L1 is appropriate in the L2 classroom. On the one hand, some scholars have supported for excessive use of L2 arguing that excessive exposure to L2 provides language learning to be accurate and fluent (Krashen, 1985). On the other hand, other scholars made an effort to create a space for the role of use of L1 in foreign language classrooms (Escobar & Dillard-Paltrineri, 2015). Using mother tongue in second language teaching has been controversial after grammar translation method fell into disuse in which students make translation between their mother tongue and target language and communicative language approach has gained popularity. This popularity in excessive use of L2 in foreign language classroom has led English only teaching methodology to be the basis of many higher education programs for many years without taking account of language proficiency of students. This philosophy of separation of L1 and L2 ignores the domestic language use and promotes exclusively the use of the additional language and leads to using mother tongue in English centric classroom to be seen as linguistic and cognitive deficiency and carelessness. This rapidly spreading trend has also led lecturers to reduce or abolish student use of L1 in the classroom with the aim of increasing the amount of time spent using L2 and thus improve learning efficiency. According to Poza (2018) these restrictions posed by teachers on students' language use are supposed to improve "learning of scientific skills and discursive practices" (p. 2). In his study, Cummins (2007) states three related suppositions about best practice in foreign language teaching classrooms which is still dominating classroom instruction as "(a) the target language (TL) should be used exclusively for instructional purposes without recourse to students' first language (L1); (b) translation between L1 and TL has no place in the language classroom; and (c) within immersion and bilingual programs, the two languages should be kept rigidly separate" (p. 222-223). These assumptions that Cummins (2007) stated in his study make students to utilize their L1 in the classroom to undergo linguistic shame as they have been trapped by ideologies that appreciate only monolingualism (Garcia, 2009b). Students struggling to develop both academic and linguistic skills simultaneously under these restrictive monoglossic ideologies are forced to adopt effective learning strategies to overcome linguistic and academic burden. They adopt these strategies to get a better understanding of the

technical terminology, facilitate understanding lectures, and meet disciplinary requirements in the language that they are not proficient enough.

According to Garcia (2009b), lecturers also feel refrained from using L1 in their classrooms and conceal their translanguaging practices from administrators because they have been trained to believe that only monolingual ways of speaking are good and valuable.

However, the latest reconceptualization of second language acquisition started to weaken the dominance of such "static boundaries" (Poza, 2018, p. 2). As an opposition to monolingual point of view trying to keep the languages separate and ignore the potential benefits of using the first language or prohibiting the use of it in English centric classrooms, in the last two decades, international scholars have finally established that "new language practices only emerge in interrelationship with old language practices" (Hesson, Seltzer, & Woodley, 2014, p. 3). Thus, translanguaging as a pedagogic practice which can be defined as a practice providing opportunities for students to use their entire linguistic repertoire for coping with learning in a less proficient language has accordingly been a critical issue particularly in the contexts where the foreign-language teaching tradition excludes the integration of the L1 in the English-medium class. Translanguaging is a new and developing term. Contrary to the traditional views in second language acquisition which consider the linguistic practices of bilinguals as "two autonomous language systems", Garcia and Wei (2014) support the view that translanguaging is an approach to language use of bilingual learners proposing that learners have "one linguistic repertoire with features that have been societally constructed as belonging to two separate languages" (p. 2). Baker (2011) defines translanguaging as "the process of making meaning, shaping experiences, gaining understanding and knowledge through the use of two languages'' which means that combined use L1 and L2 in second language classroom facilitates mental processes rather than decelerating second language acquisition as traditionally monolingual ideologies would see it (p. 288). In their studies, Anton and Di Camilla (cited in Garcia & Wei, 2014) have shown that utilizing L1 in a foreign language classroom may foster the acquisition of a 'second' language. Mazak and Donoso (2015) also supported that "through the use of translanguaging in classrooms, professors can disrupt the accepted social order that positions English monolingualism as 'the language of science" (p.700). In their study, Mazak and Donoso (*ibid*) stated that "multilingual learning, far from being 'confusing' as a monolingual perspective would

see it, actually opens up higher education to more discourses and has the potential to expand students' academic mastery of those discourses"(p.712). However, as a new and developing concept, there is a big research gap globally regarding translanguaging particularly in Higher Education EMI context. In her study, Mazak (2017) stated that "almost no literature exists on translanguaging in higher education context, since most (though not all) of the existing literature explores translanguaging in primary and occasionally secondary classrooms in the US and the UK" (p. 6). Currently, research on translanguaging is flourishing. In case of Turkey, although there are studies regarding English Medium Instruction, almost no study was encountered regarding translanguaging practices in EMI context. In addition to the lack of research on translanguaging, Canagarajah (2011) stresses that the attitudes to translanguaging should also be studied in order to understand the possibilities for pedagogical success.

Furthermore, Canagarajah (*ibid*) states that further research should be carried out on pedagogical part of translanguaging to figure out how to develop these practices among students. In the same vein, Creese and Blackledge (2010) stress "the need for further research to explore what 'teachable' pedagogic resources are available in flexible, concurrent approaches to learning and teaching languages bilingually" (p. 113) Aiming to contribute to this under researched area and global gap on translanguaging, the present study investigated students' attitudes towards translanguaging strategy they use to mediate their learning in EMI classrooms and lecturers' attitudes towards translanguaging as a teaching strategy in assisting students to construct knowledge and foster their comprehension of domain specific content learnt through the medium of English in the Turkish Higher Education context.

1.3. Aim of the Study

The main aim of this study is to contribute to the research gap on global translanguaging practices in Higher Education by discussing and examining existing translanguaging practices within Turkish higher educational context with reference to Adana STU. This study has two different dimensions within its scope. The first dimension is linked to first year undergraduate students who follow their courses under EMI policy and the second dimension is related to the lecturers who teach EMI courses at higher education. Under these dimensions, research objectives of the thesis are: (i) to determine language related challenges faced by first year EMI students, (ii.) to discuss

students' attitudes on translanguaging as a learning strategy (iii.) to examine translanguaging practices used by the first year undergraduate students during their academic studies, (iv.) to discuss lecturers' attitudes on translanguaging as learning and teaching strategy and (v.) to determine the purposes of translanguaging practices used by lecturers when teaching content courses in EMI.

1.4. Research Questions

This study aims to find answers to the following questions:

1. What are the language related challenges faced by EMI students?
2. What are the students' attitudes on translanguaging as a learning strategy?
3. What types of translanguaging practices are used by the first year undergraduate students during their academic studies?
4. What are the lecturers' attitudes on translanguaging as learning and teaching strategy?
5. What purposes is translanguaging used for by lecturers when teaching content courses in EMI?

1.5. Significance of the Study

This study aiming at providing a comprehensive insight to translanguaging as a learning and teaching strategy in Turkish Higher Education context can be significant in extending our perspective about translanguaging in EMI contexts. This study aims to provide a comprehensive examination about translanguaging in EMI context which has not yet received enough attention both in Turkey and global contexts. Based on this current lack of studies on translanguaging in Higher Education context, this study aims at contributing to the research gap on this topic in local and global Higher Education context by discussing and examining existing translanguaging practices and attitudes of students and lecturers towards translanguaging in one higher education context. This study is also a chance to pave the way for further investigation on translanguaging in Turkish higher educational context as there are different studies conducted on EMI or EFL (English as a Foreign Language) but none of them has given attention to the translanguaging in Turkish higher education EMI context.

This study can also be valuable for higher education institutions utilizing foreign language as a medium of instruction and primary/ secondary schools offering foreign language instruction. As this study introduces a new and more flexible approach to teach foreign language, it may assist authorities to review the language policies and curriculums of foreign language classrooms. It may also make a positive contribution to breaking lecturers' prejudices against the use of L1 in the classroom. It may also serve as a guide for language teachers and lecturers teaching in EMI context to keep up with the latest reconceptualization of second language acquisition and new language teaching methodologies which challenge ongoing monolingual instructional ideologies dominating classroom instruction and placing strict boundaries on students' language use. Furthermore, this study can shed a light for academics and policy makers to go beyond the monolingual ideologies that have characterized higher education for years. This study can also play an important role for lecturers to reduce students' cognitive overload they face in EMI contexts.

Furthermore, it is also necessary to add that according to United Nations Refugee Agency (2018), Turkey has been hosting 5,615,147 Syrian immigrants by 15.03.2018 which means that a growing number of students have been following their studies in Turkey. As Turkish is second language of Syrian students, both teachers and students may face huge linguistic barriers in the classrooms. This study may assist teachers giving lecturers in multilingual classrooms to find out the most appropriate teaching strategy, value diversities and use first language to facilitate the linguistic overload of students.

1.6. Operational Definitions

EMI (English Medium Instruction): is used to define Higher Education system which utilizes English as a medium of instruction where English is not the mother tongue of the students and is learnt as a foreign language in Turkish context.

English Only Policy: The term "English-only" is used to refer the educational practice using English as the only medium of communication and instruction within the classroom. English Only Policy bans the use of the students' home language practices and promotes exclusively to use the target language. Lecturers following this policy in their classes tend to reduce or abolish student use of their mother tongue (Turkish) in

the classroom with the aim of increasing the amount of time spent using the target language (English), and thus improve learning efficiency.

Monolingual Principle in English Language Teaching: This principle refers to the instructional use of the target language (English) to the exclusion of students' L1, with the goal of enabling learners to think in the English with minimal interference from Turkish.

Coping Strategies: is used for defining students' own strategies to understand the technical terminology, facilitate understanding lectures, and meet disciplinary requirements in the English Medium context where they are not proficient enough in the language of instruction.

Translanguaging: is a term used to describe "pedagogical practices" where students use more than one language in a classroom. In Turkish EMI context, it refers to use of Turkish alongside with the official language of the classroom (English) in systematic way with the aim of mediating learning and understanding in the classroom.

Bilingual: refers to the first year undergraduates at Adana STU that are literate in English language and Turkish and have different proficiency levels in both languages. Garcia (2009b) defines bilingual as an umbrella term including people who have "a number of different language skills, having in common only that they are not monolingual" (p. 11). Garcia (*ibid*) also states that bilingual means "knowing and using two autonomous languages and students who are learning English are indeed becoming bilingual" (p. 11).

Bilingual Classroom: In this study, bilingual classroom refers to EMI classroom where students speak both English and Turkish languages. Garcia and Wei (2014) defines bilingual classrooms as places in which individuals are multilingual.

CHAPTER II

LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1. Introduction

This chapter presents a review of current literature in the field regarding translanguaging as a learning and teaching strategy in English medium context. The chapter also presents the literature regarding the debate between English only policy and bilingualism in classrooms.

2.2. Theoretical Framework

The present study was mainly grounded in two theoretical points of views to provide scientific insights in research problems. Theoretical points of view on which the arguments in this study were based on the socio-cultural perspective and bilingualism.

2.2.1. Vygotsky's Sociocultural Theory

Sociocultural theory (SCT) developed by Russian psychologist and psycholinguist Lev S. Vygotsky in the early 20th century was selected as the theoretical framework for understanding and refining the notions about translanguaging practices in Turkish Higher Education context. Sociocultural theory was selected as it is mainly centered upon language as a mediational tool, its support for learners' prior knowledge, interaction to mediate learning; and the social nature of learning.

Mediation is the central concept of sociocultural theory. According to Vygotsky (1978), "all specifically human psychological processes (so-called higher mental processes) are mediated by psychological tools such as language, signs, and symbols" (Karpov & Haywood, 1998, p. 27). These tools and signs in one's sociocultural milieu mediate new patterns of thought and overall human mental functioning (Smith & Pourchot, 1998). Moll (2000) describes the mediation in learning as follows:

> *"Human beings interact with their worlds primarily through mediational means; and these mediational means, the use of cultural artifacts, tools and symbols, including language, play crucial roles in the formation of human intellectual capacities".* (p. 257)

Lantolf (2000) describes language as the most pervasive and high-powered tool that people have to "mediate their connection to the world, to each other, and to themselves" (p. 201). SCT perceives the language as a whole and according to Vygotsky (1978), language is not just a communicative tool, it is also a powerful tool that mediates cognition and affectivity (Escobar & Dillard-Paltrineri, 2015). It can be inferred from this statement that the use of the first language in second language classroom should be regarded as an asset rather than a defect in L2 settings. In the case of language learning, initially unfocused learning actions may become adjusted and modified based on how the learning of the language is mediated. Mediation is, thus, the instrument of cognitive change (Donato & Mccormick, 1994).

SCT also supports that social interaction is the basis of learning and development. SCT maintains that social interaction and cultural institutions, such as schools, classrooms, etc., have important roles to play in an individual's cognitive growth and development (Donato & Mccormick, 1994). Vygotsky (1978) claims that learning/development is not created in the individual minds alone but also fashioned in the social realm through interaction. Vygotsky (1978) also describes learning as a social process and according to him, social interaction is a springboard to the development of cognition and thus, an internal construction of reality is the result of interaction with adults, tools and more capable peers. Adults teach these tools to children in the course of their joint activity, the learners internalize them, and these tools then function as mediators of the children's more advanced psychological processes (Karpov & Haywood, 1998). Thus, it can be inferred that students perform the new task with the help of another person, internalize them and then, they can perform it on their own which means social interaction is used to mediate learning.

In order to understand how these mediational tools are appropriated and internalized, Vygotsky (1978) developed a metaphor called The Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD). ZPD is defined as;

> *"The distance between the actual developmental level as determined by independent problem solving and the level of potential development as determined through problem solving under adult guidance or in collaboration with more capable peers."* (p. 33)

Lantolf (2000) describes ZPD as "an activity frame that relates the current developmental level to the potential development that is possible through collaboration with a more competent tutor" (p. 211). The potential level of development is suggested by the kinds of assistance needed to carry out the activity and the visible ability of the learner to utilize forms of external assistance. In his study, Lantolf (2000) states that several scholars are now calling for a broader understanding of the scope of ZPD to include more than just novice-expert interaction and adds that ZPD is more appropriately is conceived of the collaborative construction of opportunities for individuals to develop their mental abilities. According to Swain, Kinnear and Steinman (2011), the way Garcia and Wei (2014) define the concept of translanguaging provides important connections with SCT. The first connection between translanguaging strategy and SCT is that both accepted language as a "socially constructed symbolic artifact that individuals use both for interacting with and within the world" and also as "a tool in the process of cognitive transformation" (p. 51). Contrary to traditional second language acquisition theory, translanguaging and SCT approach language as "an activity rather than an independent structure" (Swain, Kinnear, & Steinman, 2011, p. 51). Garcia and Wei (2014) proposed "the idea of dynamic bilingualism where language learners select features from a single array of disaggregated features that is always activated rather than a set of discrete and static features to be mastered"(p. 15).

Scaffolding is another fundamental concept that should be mentioned under SCT because according to Walqui (2006), scaffolding is an instructional act which is dependent, collaborative and interactive and "creating contexts for linguistic and academic learning in the ZPD occurs in part through the scaffolding of social interaction (p. 163). Walqui (*ibid*) stresses that scaffolding and ZPD are strongly connected to each other and scaffolding comes out merely in ZPD. While ZPD means that person gets assistance from more skilled people to accomplish more than s/he will do alone, scaffolding means the comprehensive cases of such work in ZPD. Wood, Bruner and Ross (1976) identified six fundamental elements of scaffolding: "(a) recruiting interest in the task, (b) simplifying the task, (c) keeping to the goal, (d) marking critical features of discrepancies between the produced and the ideal solution, (e) controlling frustration and risk during problem solving, and (f) demonstrating an idealized version of what is produced" (p. 98). Learners should be provided support from teachers or peer collaboration via scaffolding until they become independent problem solvers (Esquinca, Araujo, & Piedra, 2014).

The current study was grounded in SCT to look at how translanguaging practices are used as "mediational tools to create expanded zones" (Martin-Beltran, 2014, p. 211) and facilitate EMI students' learning and cognitive transformation. Secondly, it was also aimed to find out how social interaction and scaffolding through translanguaging with EMI lecturers and classmates affect the knowledge to be constructed and internalized in an EMI context.

2.2.2. The Monolingual Bias in L2 Settings

Monolingual view of bilingualism treats a bilingual as the one who has or should have two distinct and isolated language competencies; "these competencies are (or should be) similar to those of the two corresponding monolinguals; therefore, the bilingual is (or should be) two monolinguals in one person" (Grosjean, 1989, p. 4). Monolingual view is quite common among scholars and caused by dominant monolingual bias in linguistic sciences; however, this view has various negative results. Grosjean (1989) points out that real bilingual are conceptualized as the person who has a full fluency in both languages. According to this view, emergent bilinguals who are still learning the language are compared with "idealized native speakers whose monolingual upbringing granted them a superior language competence: native-ness" (Escobar & Dillard-Paltrineri, 2015, p. 302). Therefore, bilingualism is perceived as "mastery of two separate and distinct languages and is measured against the languaging practices and sociolinguistic realities of monolinguals" (Gort, 2015, p. 2).Thus, in both languages, bilinguals are expected to have the same language proficiency with monolingual native speakers. Baker (2011) states that it is not fair as bilinguals utilize their languages in different contexts and with different agents so they may have more competence in each language they use in different contexts. Under these conditions, language proficiency of the L2 learners is defined as inadequate and inferior (Baker, 2011). The other consequence of monoglossic approach is that any contact between two languages of the bilingual is perceived as unsuitable and accidental as bilinguals are defined as "two separate monolinguals in one person" (Grosjean, 1989, p. 5). According to Garcia and Wei (2014), under this perspective, any contact that may occur between native language (L1) and second language of bilinguals is perceived as a linguistic inadequacy. Underlying reason is the perception which supports autonomy and separation of two language systems. Thus, any contact between languages is referred as

“linguistic interference” and explained as “product of careless language” (Grosjean, 1989, p. 5).

This double monolingual approach expanded also to bilingual education across the world (Escobar & Dillard-Paltrineri, 2015) and thus, use of L1 by teachers and/or learners in L2 classrooms has been a hot debated issue. Both cognitive second language acquisition (SLA) theory and other L2 teaching methodologies have promoted "English only” “where the use of LI is seen as a "problem" to be avoided, and teachers' lapses into LI result in feelings of guilt” (Moore, 2013, p. 239). Perceptions on the use of L1 in L2 settings have regular changes in the history. Several hundred years ago, bilingual teaching was fundamental under principles of Grammar Translation Method where students were learning through translation. Grammar Translation Method in language teaching was widely used and accepted around the world where the focus was given on writing over the speaking; however, this trend started to become reversed with the inclination to monolingual perspectives in education in the 19th century. Later, the effect of mass migration and colonialism made the monolingual approach more apparent in 20th century.

The effect of mass migration from Europe to America has led educators to review their lessons and change them from Grammar Translation method to larger classrooms where there were various first languages. This situation has led educators to abandon L1 as a mediator in learning and pursue L2 as a medium of instruction. Moreover, people who immigrated to America were forced to assimilate in order to have a better life in America. Under these circumstances, English declared its superiority over all languages and caused the emergence of the assumption that only English should be utilized in the English language classrooms. This rapid spread and worldwide dominance of English was called as Linguistic Imperialism (Phillipson, 1992).

“English only” maintains its prevailing status in teaching contexts where students and lecturers are precluded from utilizing the students’ L1 in classrooms (McMillan & Rivers, 2011) and continues to dominate education policy and practice for emergent bilinguals (Gort, 2015). Cummins (2007) presented three monolingual suppositions referred as “monolingual principle” by Howat (1984) which is still dominating classroom instruction. These propositions are referred as “(a) the target language (TL) should be used exclusively for instructional purposes without recourse to students’ first language (L1); (b) translation between L1 and TL has no place in the

language classroom; and (c) within immersion and bilingual programs, the two languages should be kept rigidly separate"(p. 221). Cummins (2007) termed the third assumption as "two solitudes" assumption" (p. 229). This "two solitudes" assumption gained popularity more than 100 years ago with direct method and has protected its dominance on different language teaching approaches since then (Cummins, 2007). Direct method had a lasting impact on EFL/ESL teaching classroom by increasing oral production and minimizing grammar and translation in the classrooms. The argument on the use of L1 was generated by Krashen who supported the maximum exposure to target language. He claimed that lessons should be conducted exclusively or as much as in L2 and stressed the connection between comprehensible input in L2 and proficiency (Krashen, 1985). This assumption on teaching entirely in L2 and maximum exposure to L2 has been the base of the arguments of monolingual teaching supporters. Phillipson (1992) has described five tenets which were perceived as the true and best practices in English language teaching. These tenets are "a) English should be tought in a monolingual classroom b) the ideal teacher should be a native English teacher c) the earlier English taught the better d) the more English used in the classroom during the lessons, the better e) if the other languages are used English standards will drop" (p. 185).

By the 1970s, communicative approach dominated English language classrooms and integrated these tenets in its principles. In communicative approach, the best way to teach English was communication in L2 through monolingual instructional strategies. Scholars supporting communicative approach believe that L1 is an interference to L2 acquisition and comparing and contrasting between languages hinder L2 learning; however, the dominance of English Only Policy has started to decrease and scholars have started to advocate first language of learners as a tool to mediate learning and as a vital resource (Baker, 2011; Caldwell & Butzkamm, 2009; Canagarajah, 2011; Creese & Blackledge, 2010; Cummins, 2007; Garcia, 2009b; Makalela, 2015; Macaro, 2014). Various studies have revealed the useful functions of use of L1 as a mediation tool on deeper comprehension of content, classroom management and strengthen lecturers-students interaction (Kim, Kweon, & Kim, 2017). Cummins (2007) also opposed to monolingual instructional strategies by stressing that these principles are not in rapport with learning and added that "when we free ourselves from exclusive reliance on monolingual instructional approaches, a wide variety of opportunities arise for teaching languages by means of bilingual instructional strategies that acknowledge the reality of,

and strongly promote, two-way cross-language transfer" (p. 222). However, the amount of L1 used by students and teachers is also controversial. Cook (2001) stressed the judicious use of L1 and supported the use of first language in L2 settings but also added that "it is clearly useful to employ large quantities of the L2, everything else being equal" (p. 409). Turnbull (2001) also supported the use of L1; however, stressed the amount of L1 to be used in L2 classrooms. He argues that large amount of L1 use may decrease the time allocated to the use of L2.

2.2.3. Cummins' Theoretical Framework for Bilingualism in Education

In contrast with the scholars supporting the separation of the bilinguals' languages, Cummins (1979) advocated that languages of bilingual people are not independent from each other and they are not two systems stored separately in the brain at the beginning of the research on bilingualism. He argued his position towards bilingualism stating that only by improved skills in L1, cognitively and academically useful form of bilingualism can be obtained. Cummins (1979) formulated the "Threshold Hypothesis" to improve his "Developmental Interdependence Hypothesis". With the "threshold hypothesis" he proposed that "there may be threshold levels of linguistic competence which a bilingual child must attain both in order to avoid cognitive disadvantages and allow the potentially beneficial aspects of bilingualism to influence his cognitive and academic functioning" (p. 222). This hypothesis posits that high proficiency in both languages provides more positive cognitive effects; however, Baker (2011) stated that "threshold hypothesis" failed in defining the level of competency which will lead to negative and positive cognitive effects. Garcia (2009a) also stated that it is unclear if this level is for both languages or for each language.

Regarding "the developmental interdependence hypothesis", Cummins (1979) supported that the linguistic improvement in L1 proficiency is interrelated to the improvement in L2. That is, there is an interdependence between L1 and L2 therefore, learning in the first language mediates and improves proficiency in that language and that proficiency in L1 transfers to L2 as long as if there is sufficient exposure and motivation to learn L2. Moreover, Cummins (1981) formed the Common Underlying Proficiency (CUP) model which is the basis of his developmental interdependence hypothesis. This model is also called ""one balloon theory" and presented with a "dual iceberg metaphor"(Cummins, 1981, p. 24). It verifies that two languages of a bilingual

person operate from the same central cognitive engine. Cummins utilized an image of two icebergs separated above the surface and unified under the surface to visualize his theory. Cummins (1981) indicated that “although on the surface the structural elements of the two languages might look different, there is a cognitive interdependence that allows for transfer of linguistic practices” (p. 21). Therefore, the knowledge learned in one language does not necessarily have to be learned in another language. The expansion of CUP in any language will lead to a beneficial effect on the other language(s) and as Cummins (2000) states: "Conceptual knowledge developed in one language helps to make input in the other language comprehensible” (p. 39). So if a child already understands the concepts in her first language she does not have to acquire both the label and the concept in her second language. The only thing that she has to do is to acquire the label of these concepts in English.

2.2.4. Language Policy Framework

Language policy is defined by Spolsky (2012) as “an officially mandated set of rules for language use and form within a nation-state” (p. 3). Spolsky (2004) conceptualized language policy as consisting of “all the language practices, beliefs (ideologies) and management decisions of a community or polity” (p. 9). Each of these three dynamically interconnected components of language policy is an impetus for language choice (Hu & Lei, 2014). The first component-language beliefs- is composed of intimately held attitudes and tenets regarding what compromises the suitable language choice in a context of interaction (Spolsky, 2004). According to Spolsky (2009), the prestige and value assigned to particular languages and their linguistic features have tremendous impact on language management and practices. The second component of this framework, language practices are observable language acts compromising “what people actually do” rather than “what people think should be done” (Spolsky 2004, p. 14). The final component language management, refers to “the explicit and deliberate effort made by an individual or institution invested with authority to regulate other individuals’ language practices and/or modify their language beliefs” (Hu & Lei, 2014, p. 553).

This tripartite framework provides the ground to investigate language policy from different perspectives. In this study, Spolsky’s language policy framework was used to investigate attitudes of students and lecturers towards language policy prescribed in

EMI departments and language practices of the participants to see what they actually do.

2.3. Language Related Challenges faced by EMI Students

With the relentless internationalization and marketization of higher education in the past decades, English has been increasingly adopted as a medium of instruction at universities across the world (Hu & Lei, 2014). The European University Association (2013) surveyed more than 170 European Higher Education Institutions about their internationalization process, and two out of three universities have reported increasing their offerings of EMI courses (Doiz & Lasagabaster, 2017). Asian and African Higher Institutions are not an exception of it.

EMI differs from EFL where the fundamental aim is the language acquisition. In EMI, the purpose is to give priority to the acquisition of content while language abilities are improved. EMI students have linguistic challenges which have detrimental effects on content acquisition (Marie, 2013; Moragh, 2009; Yeh, 2013). Therefore, utilizing L1 in a bilingual or multilingual classroom is a "naturally occurring phenomenon" (Canagarajah, 2011, p. 8). Thus, it must be recognized and utilized as a legitimate, effective instructional strategy (Kim, Kweon, & Kim, 2017).

In a European context, Tatzl (2011) conducted a study at three business and engineering masters' degree programs at the Fh Joanneum University of Applied Sciences, Graz, Austria to find out experiences and challenges regarding English-medium higher education. The results of the study showed that students indicated that they have language related challenges in English-medium instruction. It was revealed from the study that deficiency in vocabulary and technical terminology and comprehension issue were the most frequently mentioned challenges faced by students. Therefore, students need more explanations by lecturers.

Similarly, Hellekjær (2010) investigated whether using English as a medium of instruction has detrimental impact on learning. The study was conducted with Norwegian and German university level students. The findings revealed that the majority of the students face difficulties in comprehension of lecture. The most common sources of students' linguistic problems were revealed to be lecture comprehension resulting from poor pronunciation and specialized vocabulary.

For African context, Marie (2013) investigated students' perceptions about their copying strategies with EMI at University in Rwanda utilizing group work discussions

and interviews with students. The findings revealed that students have difficulties in making sense of content and one of the most powerful strategy used by students to overcome the challenges in learning with EMI was the use of other languages to mediate content learning. Using more than one language in EMI classroom called as translanguaging was utilized by students during class or in collaborative peer groups to facilitate completing complex academic tasks. Another study regarding African EMI context was conducted in economics department of University of Cape Town by Moragh (2009). The results of the study similarly revealed that students do not understand the concepts of their disciplinary area clearly as teaching is restricted to second language only and memorizing seems to be their only option. The collected data also revealed that learning should be scaffolded and students should be permitted to get access to both English and other languages which will prove them negotiate the meaning of new notions in their area.

In the Asian context, Evans and Morrison (2011) conducted a study for examining linguistic challenges that first year EMI undergraduate students face in Honk Kong. The study revealed that students had challenges in understanding technical vocabulary and comprehending lectures. The most serious challenge that hinder students' understanding the content was found to be lecturers' use of unfamiliar technical vocabulary. To cope with vocabulary problem, students adopted strategies such as recording new words in a notebook. The students faced challenges with some lecturers' accents, and their often rapid and unfocused style of presentation. The most apparent strategy used by students was found to be peer support to cope with the demands of university study.

Vu and Burns (2014) implemented a study with EMI lecturers to investigate the implementation of EMI in a Vietnamese public university. Four difficulties in implementing the EMI were founded in this study. They are "lecturers' language abilities, students' language abilities and learning styles, pedagogical issues, and resources". The lecturers in the study pointed out that they always seek for suitable strategies such as codeswitching and translanguaging and they turn to mother tongue Vietnamese when they notice challenges in instructional interaction. Another study in Asian context was conducted by Yeh (2013) with Chinese-speaking university instructors' to find out their attitudes and experiences with EMI. Results of the study revealed that the global dominance of English has been the core motivational factor to offer EMI courses. The study also showed that code switching was utilized as a tool to

mediate students' comprehension and empower student-teacher interaction. Regarding the effect of EMI on students' English development, some participants were optimistic while the other lecturers were concerned about its negative impact on content learning especially of students' with low level of English. Tavares (2015) also highlighted importance of systematic use of first language in EMI classrooms to mediate L2 interaction and understanding. The study carried out with participation of one bilingual teacher and her group of students in Hong Kong. The result of the study revealed that bilingual teachers' teaching strategies have played an important role in assisting students' comprehension of subject mathematics. The strategies that she used for assisting students' learning in L2 settings are creating a supportive environment for learners increasing student–student interaction to make them work in collaboration to reach a solution, activating students' classroom participation by letting them discuss on problems with term, questions, solutions and notions. Thus, she aimed to enable students to work through peer-peer interaction for a deeper comprehension of notions and clarification of doubts. During her classes, she was mainly tolerant for the use of L1 and she used linguistic scaffolding using students' L1 to facilitate learning and create a safe environment in the classroom. In the Korean context, Kim, Kweon and Kim (2017) conducted a survey with five hundred twenty-four undergraduate engineering students from three Korean HEIs with the aim of evaluating students' attitudes towards EMI. The study revealed that majority of students do not feel confident about their English Language abilities and they prefer Korean-medium instruction over EMI. Furthermore, the majority of students pointed out that first language should be utilized to mediate their learning and clarify difficult concepts.

Joseph (2015) also investigated language related challenges of first year bilingual students following their studies with EMI and strategies to overcome these challenges. The findings of the studies indicated that students have trouble in English academic writing, vocabulary and accent and pronunciation in English. Students participated in the study were found out to adopt translanguaging as a coping strategy. They use academic collaboration among each other and consider translanguaging as helpful and related to their specific language challenges.

2.3.1. Background to EMI in Turkey

Turkey has also responded to the global dominance of English as "the language of international communication, the language of business, technology, and science by introducing English-medium education (EME) at Higher Education" (Kırkgöz, 2009, p. 81). In Turkish higher education context, teaching subject courses in English started with the foundation of Middle East Technical University (METU) in 1956. This step towards EMI has triggered private sector and Turkey's first private EMI University, Bilkent University was founded in 1984 (Karakaş, 2016a). Also, with the official membership to the Bologna process in 2001, Turkish government has supported the foundation of EMI programs in Turkish universities (Karakaş, *ibid*). Also, increasing internationalization, marketization and globalization in HEIs have later impelled an extensive drive to adopt EMI. In the last decade; most private universities in Turkey have been increasingly adopting EMI in their programs in full or part.

In Turkey, students are required to take a national exam to be admitted to EMI programs. Based upon their ranks, they make their university and program preferences. Studying in programs offering Turkish as a Medium Instruction (TMI) or EMI is up to preferences of the students. After their admission to EMI programs students are expected to prove their English Language proficiencies with the exams held in the universities. If they cannot obtain the minimum required grades from these exams they have to study in preparatory programs that universities offer in order to ensure students can follow their studies in their departments.

Turkish students choose EMI programs particularly for instrumental reasons like getting better job opportunities as it is widely accepted that English is a requirement of most of the jobs in Turkey, as in most of other countries (Kırkgöz, 2005). The instrumental factors of learning in English such as being the language of science and being a must for career opportunities cannot be denied; however, there is a heated debate on pros and cons of studying in foreign language in Turkey. The studies revealed that EMI has more detrimental consequences than positive ones on Turkish students (Kırkgöz, 2014). Some scholars have identified that EMI causes reduced ability to understand concepts, low-level of knowledge about the subject studied, excessive consumption of time, feelings of alienation and separation, and the least amount of participation in the classes due to low level proficiency in English. For instance, Kırkgöz (2005) conducted a study to find out students' main motivational sources for

studing in an EMI context and their perceptions of challenges they may face during their studies. The results showed that students have a mixed but primarily instrumental motivation towards EMI; however, it was also found that the students were particularly concerned about the detrimental effects of EMI on learning academic content such as reduced ability to understand specific details, superficial learning rather than deep learning, reduced ability to understand general concepts, and distance from their native language and culture.

Similarly, Sert (2008) implemented a study to find out the impact of English on mastering language skills and acquisition of academic content in three different approaches (English medium instruction, English aided instruction, and Turkish medium instruction). The study conducted with lecturers and students using both questionnaire and interviews showed that EMI was stated to be the more effective than other formal language instructions regarding teaching English; however, all the approaches were reported to be insufficient. Students in EMI did not overwhelmingly believe that EMI improves their language skills. They also pointed out some challenges regarding of comprehending the academic content. They reported that they feel uncertainty about understanding the academic content clearly. On the other hand, Başıbek et al. (2014) conducted a questionnaire to compare attitudes of lecturers in engineering faculties of two universities offering partial EMI. The result of the study showed that lecturers believe that because of their low language proficiency students fail to learn subject courses in English so, lecturing in their mother tongue is thought to provide a deeper content comprehension.

Another study was conducted by Kılıçkaya (2006) in order to find out the attitudes of lecturers from universities in Ankara towards EMI. The results of the surveys showed that lecturers tend to be in favor of utilizing TMI for a better learning and a faster and deeper coverage of academic content. In this study EMI was criticized for being time consuming, leading challenges in comprehending academic notions and causing low level of academic knowledge. Furthermore, EMI was stated to decrease students' classroom participation. It is also suggested by the lecturers that adopting a bilingual program (English-Turkish language of Instruction) should be taken into consideration.

Collins (2010) implemented a study to identify students' and lecturers' attitudes towards EMI at a private university in Turkey. The findings of the study revealed that the majority of the lecturers held positive attitude towards EMI while only 41% of the

students favored English as a medium of instruction. Regarding the effects of EMI on students' learning, it was revealed that learning in a foreign language decreases students' comprehension and their success. Also, lecturers agreed on some detrimental effects of EMI, such as decreased self confidence and creativity of students.

In her another study, Kırkgöz (2014) investigated differences and similarities between students' perceptions receiving their higher education using EMI versus TMI. She utilized triangulation of methods including questionnaire, examination papers and focus-group interviews to find out students' perceptions on both opportunities and difficulties in learning academic content through EMI and TMI. The results of the study showed that TMI students understand academic content more easily and deeper and achieving a long term memorization of the content. On the other hand, although EMI students tend to have positive attitudes towards EMI like improvement in English language proficiency, tapping into English sources and catching up with global improvements in their area; they also reported that they face challenges in deeper comprehension of disciplinary details which causes a superficial rather than effective learning and short term retention of content knowledge.

Raman and Yiğitoğlu (2015) conducted a qualitative study with the lecturers and students at an EMI context to explore lectures' and students' attitudes towards codeswitching and its functions. It was concluded that codeswitching is used for several instructional purposes and both lecturers and students held positive attitudes towards functions of codeswitching in teaching and learning subject courses.

Finally, Karakaş (2016b) investigated the attitudes of the lecturers from three EMI universities in Turkey regarding the use of Turkish in EMI classes. The findings of the study showed that the majority of lecturers held highly positivite attitudes towards integration of Turkish into EMI lectures and they let their students to utilize their first language to different extents. The lecturers holding positive attitude towards the use of Turkish in EMI classroom tended to give higher priority to the content knowledge rather than language itself. On the other hand, the study also revealed that the views of the lecturers holding negative attitudes towards use of L1 in EMI classroom were shaped by institutional policy regulation and the presence of international students in their classrooms.

Abovementioned studies showed that core arguments on EMI in Turkish context were based on students' and lecturers' attitudes (Collins, 2010; Karakaş, 2016b; Kırkgöz, 2005; Raman and Yiğitoğlu, 2015) and the effect of EMI on students'

academic content mastering (Sert, 2008). It is also clear that findings of the studies are in accordance with each other particularly on the academic content mastery issue. It can be concluded that despite the instrumental factors that make EMI attractive, its pedagogical effectiveness should be questioned. It can also be inferred that students have serious challenges in mastering content with a foreign language because of their low level of English proficiency.

2.4. The concept of Translanguaging

The monolingual instructional methodologies have been dominant in second language teaching classrooms "under the influence of predominant national ideologies and language policies across different countries" (Wang, 2016, p. 1). Levine (2011) argues that increasing monolingualism in second language classrooms is 'undesirable, unrealistic and untenable' (p. 70). Also, Garcia (cited in Wang, 2016, p. 2) stated that "language classrooms in the twenty-first century are moving from monolingualism towards translingualism, encouraging flexible concurrent language use rather than continuing to keep students' linguistic knowledge separate or treating prior languages as non-existent or purely negative influences". As a reaction to monolingual attitudes in second language classrooms, new terms were coined to define bilingual reality in different environments. These terms are "codemeshing (Canagarajah, 2011), metrolingualism (Otsuji & Pennycook, 2010), continua of biliteracy (Hornberger, 2003) and translanguaging (Garcia & Wei, 2014; Hornberger & Link, 2012; Wang, 2016). From these new notions, translanguaging is the core concept of this study. An increasing number of studies has been conducted on the term of translanguaging in bilingual education (Creese & Blackledge, 2010; Mazak & Herbas-Donoso, 2015) and EMI classrooms (Carroll & Hoven, 2017; Doiz & Lasagabaster, 2017).

A new and expanding concept, translanguaging was coined by Cen Williams in his PhD. thesis in 1994 and utilized in education as a Welsh word "*trawsieithu*" and then it was translated into English as "translanguaging" by Colin Baker (Lewis, Jones, & Baker, 2012). Cen Williams used the term to refer "a teaching practice of deliberately changing the language of input and the language of output" (Garcia & Lin, 2016, p. 3). He argues that purposeful simultaneous usage of two languages provides benefits to language skills in two languages and provides learners to get a deeper comprehension of the content. Translanguaging particularly supports flexible foreign language instruction.

In this practice, information is given in one language and written or oral production by learners was provided in another language so that learning through meaning could be fostered. Baker (2011) exemplifies the translanguaging practice as "hearing or reading of a lesson, a passage in a book or a section of work in one language and the development of the work (i.e. by discussion, writing a passage, completing a work sheet, conducting an experiment) in the other language" (p. 281).

Translanguaging came into prominence especially by two books: Baker's Foundations of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism (2001, 2006, and 2011) and Ofelia Garcia's (2009b) Bilingual Education in the 21st century and then, the term has been popularized and has been increasingly utilized and extended by scholars in the literature (Canagarajah, 2011; Creese & Blackledge, 2010; Hornberger & Link, 2012; Lewis, Jones & Baker, 2012) referring to "both the complex and fluid language practices of bilinguals, as well as the pedagogical approaches that leverage those practices*"* (Garcia & Lin, 2016, p. 1). These scholars base their assumptions on Vivian Cook's (1990) "notion of monolingual competence" to contend with Chomskyan orientation which presents "language competence as innate, monolingual and arising from a homogeneous environment and multilinguals parallel process the diverse languages in their repertoire even when they function in a relatively homogeneous language" (Canagarajah, 2011, p. 4).

Various perceptions about the notion of translanguaging were stated by scholars for years. For example, Baker (2011) defines translanguaging as "the process of making meaning, shaping experiences, gaining understanding and knowledge through the use of two languages'' (p. 288), which means combined use of languages facilitates mental processes. Also, Garcia and Wei (2014) extended the frame of translanguaging and defined the term as:

> *"Translanguaging is an approach to the use of language, bilingualism and the education of bilinguals that considers the language practices of bilinguals not as two autonomous language systems as has been traditionally the case, but as one linguistic repertoire with features that have been societally constructed as belonging to two separate languages"* (p. 2).

Garcia (2012) also conceptualized translanguaging as "the discourse practices of the bilinguals, as well as pedagogical strategies that use the entire linguistic repertoire

of bilingual students flexibly in order to teach both rigorous content and language for academic use" (p. 2). Martin (2005) defined translanguaging as "the use of local languages alongside the official language of the lesson" (p.88). Mazak and Donoso (2015) identified the term as 'the use of multiple 'languages' in discourse, which goes beyond what has been traditionally known in linguistics as 'code-switching,' 'code-mixing,' or 'language alteration.'

According to Garcia (2009a), translanguaging is "an approach to bilingualism that is centered, not on languages as has often been the case, but on the practices of bilinguals that are readily observable in order to make sense of their multilingual worlds" (p. 44). Her use of the concept includes "multilingual practices which have traditionally been described as codeswitching, code-mixing, crossing, creolization, etc." (Wei, 2011, p. 2). However, Garcia (2009b) points out that translanguaging differs from the term called codeswitching in some cases. She sets the difference between these two notions as follows:

> *"Translanguaging includes code-switching, the shift between languages in context and it also includes translation; however, it differs from these simple practices in that it refers to the process by which bilingual students perform bilingually in the myriad ways of classrooms− reading, writing, taking notes, discussing, signing, etc. Translanguaging is not only a way to scaffold instruction, to make sense of learning and language; rather translanguaging is part of the metadiscursive regimes that students in the twenty first century must perform"* (p. 147).

Lewis, Jones, and Baker (2012) advocate that there is a clear overlap between two terms and they stated that;

> *"There is also the ideological movement in that code-switching has associations with language separation while translanguaging celebrates and approves flexibility in language use and the permeability of learning through two or more languages. Particularly in the bilingual classroom, translanguaging as a concept tries to move acceptable practice away from language separation, and thus has ideological – even political – associations"* (p. 659).

Van der Walt (2006) also states regarding the difference between translanguaging and codeswitching that translanguaging is "a conscious and intentional switch to paraphrase texts (both oral and written), to elaborate on cognitively challenging content or to simply repeat something in another language" (p. 220).

In terms of types of translanguaging, Lewis, Jones, and Baker (2012), and Garcia and Wei (2014) categorized the types of translanguaging strategies as a) "teacher-directed translanguaging to give voice, clarity, reinforce, manage the classroom and ask questions and b) student-directed translanguaging to participate, to elaborate ideas, to raise questions" (Wang, 2016, p. 3). Cook (2001) framed three dimensions to explain the function of L1: (1)" teachers use L1 to convey meaning; (2) teachers use L1 to organize the class and (3) students use L1 within the class" (p. 413–419).

Baker (2011) discusses four advantages of translanguaging. The first advantage he states is that translanguaging provides a deeper comprehension of content being studied. He mentions that learners may respond to questions or write about a topic via just copying or adapting rather than fully comprehending the content in monolingual instruction context. So, reading and discussing a subject in one language and then writing about this subject in another language provides the content to be digested by students and promotes a deeper understanding of the subject. The second advantage of translanguaging is that it improves students' weaker language skills and also academic language skills in both languages. Thirdly, Baker (*ibid*) states that translanguaging can "facilitate home–school cooperation and finally, it provides learners develop their second language ability concurrently with content learning with the integration of fluent English speakers and English learners" (p. 282).

Based upon the definitions provided by scholars, translanguaging concept was framed as a "naturally occurring phenomenon" (Canagarajah, 2011, p. 8), and it was used for making meaning in EMI classrooms. Furthermore, translanguaging can be utilized for a better understanding of content, improved flow of communication and teaching. This study investigates translanguaging practices in the Turkish context where English is utilized as a medium of instruction. Students and lecturers in this study share similar linguistic backgrounds and they are Turkish native-speakers, English knowing and/or learning bilinguals.

2.4.1. Students' Attitudes towards Translanguaging

Students using translanguaging during their studies feel ashamed because of monolinguistic instructional ideologies that they are exposed to; however, it is quite important for students and lecturers to recognize the benefits and value of translanguaging practices (Lewis, Jones, & Baker, 2012).

According to Lewis, Jones, and Baker and Garcia and Wei (cited in Wang, 2016, p. 3) translanguaging provides students to "participate, to elaborate ideas, to raise questions". Similarly, Lin and Martin (2005) and Arthur and Martin (2006) documented the potentials of codeswitching as "it increases the inclusion, participation, and understandings of pupils in the learning processes; developing less formal relationships between participants; conveying ideas more easily; and accomplishing lessons" (Ellis& McCartney, 2011, p.189). Maillat and Serra (2009) stated regarding the advantage of translanguaging to students that it provides an integration between competent L1 users and L2 learners of different levels and added that if translanguaging is used strategically in the classroom both language abilities and content learning improve simultaneously. However, it is also important to determine how students reflect on the translanguaging practices and its benefits.

In terms of students' opinions towards translanguaging (the use of L1 and L2 in the classroom, Escobar and Dillard-Paltrineri (2015) conducted a study with learners from the English Department in a state university in Costa Rica. Learners in L2 classroom were interviewed and the results showed that they had conflicting attitudes towards translanguaging. While some of the students accepted that translanguaging is an inevitable factor in being bilingual, the majority of students held a negative attitude towards translanguaging and reported that use of translanguaging inhibits the progress in L2 acquisition and calls forth the laziness of students and therefore, it should be restricted. They also perceived translanguaging as an old fashion methodology like Grammar Translation Method.

Dykhanova (2015) also investigated students' perspectives regarding using more than one language at an English medium university in Kazakhstan. The result of the questionnaire conducted with students revealed that most of the students held negative attitude toward lecturers' using L1 in EMI classroom. Almost half of the participants indicated that using more than one language in the classroom strengthens their English

proficiency level while many of the students could not decide whether using first language facilitates their learning process.

Ngcobo, Ndaba, Nyangiwe, Mpungose, and Jamal (2016) conducted a qualitative study in a South African Higher Education to find out learners' views regarding their translanguaging experiences. In this study learners were expected to write their reflections about translanguaging. The results of the study showed that students have positive attitudes towards translanguaging. Advantages of translanguaging were reported as translanguaging provides the transition of knowledge and skills between languages, equality in learning and develops literacy in both the students' African languages and English and contributes to vocabulary improvement through collaboration. Storch and Aldosari (2010) also revealed that students hold positive attitudes towards first language use in foreign language classroom because use of L1 facilitates language learning. The findings of this study revealed that L1 is useful for task management and students' vocabulary skills. It helps students to reach a joint understanding to complete the complicated tasks and comprehend the meaning of the vocabulary better and thus, facilitates learning in general. Similarly, Xhemaili (2017) in his comparative study conducted at the Language Center - South East European University in Tetova evaluated students' attitudes towards use native language and translation during their studies in EFL. The study focused on recognizing, describing and explaining transfer-induced lexical and syntactic patterns that occur in writings of Albanian University level students. The result of the study showed that students hold positive attitudes towards use of L1 in EFL classes. The students in the study indicated that they utilize their first language when they do not comprehend an academic term or a particular word, to negotiate meaning with their classmates, to raise questions, and to express themselves when they are not able to do in English. Students also stated their opinions regarding the benefit of the first language on self-confidence and better comprehension. They indicated that the use of L1 increases their self-confidence and provides them understand the lecture easier. They also stressed the challenge in understanding when English Only Policy was followed. Students also stated that their teachers use translanguaging practices to explain difficult concepts and to check comprehension. In the observation conducted in the study it was founded that students' participation decreases and only few students were interacting with teachers in English regarding content. It was evident in the study that students seek for peer support when

they have trouble in English. They also use their mother tongue to forward questions to their lecturers. Teachers answer their questions in English or in their mother tongue.

Regarding students' attitudes towards translanguaging, Wang (2016) also conducted a study to find out students' attitudes towards translanguaging in the multilingual beginners' classes of China's universities. The result showed that the majority of students favor translanguaging practices where they can use their all linguistic resources for meaning negotiation. Students were found to use scaffolding techniques which increase student-student and student- teacher interaction and keep the class communicative. Students in this study were found to be willing to support their peers and translanguaging practices was found to provide giving voice to students for meaning negotiation at different levels and help to acknowledging students' input and the importance of support between students.

Makalela (2015) investigated students' attitudes on the use of translanguaging in learning a 'new' language in a multilingual teacher education program at the University of the Witwatersrand, South Africa. In the study, participants were permitted to use their first language to break the linguistic borders put in the monolingual classrooms. The findings of the study showed that the student' hold positive attitudes towards translanguaging as a teachable strategy to fasten L2 acquisition. It was reported that students could make use of contrastive elaboration, an explicit language comparison strategy during the classroom interactions. By comparing and contrasting between both languages, the students were able to break the linguistic boundaries and to develop knowledge of grammar and usage of both Nguni and Sotho languages simultaneously. Translanguaging was also found to increase metalinguistic awareness of the students.

In another study at the University of Cape Town which offers English Medium Instruction, Madiba (2014) permitted mother tongue speakers of Tshivenda and isiXhosa, who were learning English as a second language, to use their home languages to learn concepts related to engineering with the aim of finding the role of multilingual glossaries on concept literacy. The result of the study showed that translanguaging practices among Tshivenda and isiXhosa speakers learning English as a second language are beneficial in increasing the quality of scientific concepts in an academic support program at the University of Cape Town.

Shifidi (2014) conducted a study with the aim of finding out translanguaging practices happening in Namibian schools. The findings showed that participants held positive attitudes towards translanguaging and thought that this strategy provides

students to comprehend the content and difficult concepts and encourages them to participate and interact with each other during lessons. Shifidi (2014) concluded that translanguaging is necessary as a communication strategy in the classrooms. Kim, Kweon, and Kim (2017) conducted a study to find out Korean engineering students' attitudes towards EMI and L1 use in EMI classes in three Korean major engineering universities. The results showed that results showed that the majority of the students felt insufficient about their English ability for following their studies in EMI and did not think that EMI has a positive effect on their language ability and do not increase participation; however, regarding use of translanguaging in the EMI classroom, almost all students agreed on the idea that it should be permitted as they think that translanguaging is necessary for explaining difficult materials and facilitate their learning.

Al Sharaeai (2012) conducted a study in order to find out students' perspectives on L1 use in L2 settings and the reasons of L1 use. The results of the study showed that most of the students were neutral regarding use of L1 in English classroom and most agreed that English only policy should be followed in their classrooms. They stated that they sometimes used their first language to explain and ask about the new ideas and concepts and when they felt they could not find the fitting word in English.

Mazak and Herbas-Donoso (2015) also conducted a case study to investigate university students' attitudes towards translanguaging at psychology classroom at the University of Puerto Rico, Mayaguez. The survey result showed that students hold a neutral to positive outlook on translanguaging. The result of the survey was interpreted by the scholar as the huge number of neutral responses may show that students are indifferent to translanguaging or they are accustomed to work in an environment where translanguaging happens frequently.

Regarding the effect of translanguaging on language improvement, Rolin-Ianziti and Varshney (2008) carried out a study in a context where lecturers were encouraged to use monolingual instructional strategies in the classroom. The study aims to evaluate attitudes towards use of L1 and L2 of first year students following their studies in French course. The findings of the study showed that although students believe in beneficial part of being under exposure to L2 and think that L1 may be detrimental to their language improvement such as pronunciation and fluency, they also accepted that the L1 provides them gain linguistic features like grammar and vocabulary. On the contrary, Kim (2011) in his study to investigate students' views regarding EMI at

universities in Seoul revealed that the majority of the students objected to EMI as they believe comprehending the content was their priority over than acquiring English skills. Rukh (2012) also revealed in the case study regarding business students' attitudes towards lecturers' use of two languages and its effect on their L2 improvement that students have positive attitudes towards lecturers' use of more than one language and a positive impact on their L2 improvement.

2.4.2. Types of Translanguaging Practices Used by EMI Students

Bilingual people utilize various strategies like the monolinguals do in order to making meaning and form a clear and coherent message (Pontier & Gort, 2016). Bilingual people use translanguaging strategies to mediate their communication with others and set up a deeper comprehension and to make sense of world (Garcia, 2009a). They use their all linguistic repertoires to increase their understanding and performance in various environments and to shape their experiences (Gort & Sembiante, 2015).

Creese and Blackledge (2010) identified translanguaging strategies as using "whatever signs and forms the participants had at their disposal to connect with one another, indexing disparate allegiances and knowledges and creating new ones" (p. 112). According to Lewis, Jones and Baker (2012) and Garcia and Wei (2014), translanguaging practices used by students are 'student-directed translanguaging' to participate, to elaborate ideas, to raise questions' (Wang, 2016, p. 3). Furthermore, Garcia and Kleifgen (2010) stated that translanguaging practices include strategies such as (a) shifting between text in one language and discussion in another; (b) moving across texts that feature different languages; (c) discussing in one language but checking comprehension in another; (d) reading in one language and writing in another, discussing in one language and writing in another; (e) integrating students' language resources, and (f) using both languages flexibly in micro alternation, or code-switching (Esquinca, Araujo, & Piedra, 2014, p. 167). Martin-Beltran (2014) investigated translanguaging practices of English and Spanish learners in one high school program. Findings of the study revealed that students utilized translanguaging as a tool to copy with linguistic problems and think about, compare, and defend their word choice. It was evident in the study that students' translanguaging to work in collaboration with their classmates and teachers, to participate and to make meaning in the activities. Olmedo (2003) examined communicative strategies of some emergent bilingual students in a

dual language classroom. The result of the study revealed that learners utilized various strategies called “bilingual echoes” (p. 150). These strategies included translation, scaffolding, and modeling behaviors to increase the understanding and interaction with their classmates. Similarly, in the study of Esquinca, Araujo and Piedra (2014) which was conducted with the aim of investigating the meaning-making practices in a two-way dual-language (TWDL) program on the U.S.-Mexico border was found out that emergent bilingual students engaged in bilingual strategies to facilitate the comprehension of scientific content. Students in this study utilized translanguaging practices such as translating, multimodality, paraphrasing, and code switching.

2.4.3. Lecturers’ Attitudes towards Translanguaging

Dominance of English Only Policy which values monolingual teaching methodologies in L2 setting led teachers to hide their any possible translanguaging practices in classroom from the administrators. Furthermore, monolingual assumption in second language teaching triggered the limitation or prohibition of L1 use in language classrooms for years. However, as Garcia (2009b) stated, “language classrooms in the twenty-first century are moving from monolingualism towards translingualism, encouraging flexible concurrent language use rather than continuing to keep students’ linguistic knowledge separate or treating prior languages as non-existent or purely negative influences” (Wang, 2016, p. 2). Canagarajah (2011) stressed that the attitudes towards translanguaging should also be studied in order to understand the possibilities for pedagogical success. For evaluating lecturers’ attitudes towards translanguaging, Macaro’s (2009) “continuum of perspectives on multiple language use” has been widely utilized to assess lecturers’ attitudes towards language choices in the classrooms (Wang, 2016, p. 3). This continuum includes three positions towards translanguaging ranging from monolingualism to multilingual perspectives. The first position is “virtual position”. Lecturers holding this position prefer exclusive use of target language which is English only in the context of this study. This position represents the lecturers who believe that they have to use only target language in the classroom and expect the same from their students and exclude L1 in the classroom. The second position of Macaro’s (2009) continuum of perspectives on multiple language use is the “maximal position” which represents the lecturers supporting the idea that using only the target language in L2 classroom is not possible as the perfect conditions do not exist in L2 classes.

Teachers holding maximal position are flexible to use L1 to some extent; however, with sense of guilt (Doiz & Lasagabaster, 2017).

The last position in this continuum is the "optimal position" which represents the teachers holding a multilingual perspective. These teachers do not have any regret of using L1 in their classroom and also believe that judicious use of L1 in the classroom can improve and facilitate learning. Teachers supporting optimal position value and embrace translanguaging. However, in his study, Macaro (2014) indicated that lecturers who support optimal position and adopt translanguaging pedagogy are in minority. Wang and Kirkpatrick (2012) conducted a study using this continuum with the aim of finding out teachers' perspectives of language choice from four Beijing universities. The result of the interviews showed that although a strict Chinese-only language policy was followed, teachers believed that a systematic use of English as a lingua franca could play an important role to keep the class interactive. The study also showed that teachers were in necessity of practical support for a more effective instruction.

Escobar and Dillard-Paltrineri (2015) also conducted a study also to investigate attitudes of lecturers from the English Department in a state university in Costa Rica towards translanguaging. The findings of the study revealed that from the five professors interviewed, none expressed unabashed support for translanguaging. They held negative attitude towards translanguaging as they think that use of translanguaging hinders the progress in L2 acquisition and causes the laziness of students and therefore, it should be restricted. They also perceived translanguaging as an old fashion methodology like Grammar Translation Method.

Wang (2016) also investigated lecturers' attitudes towards translanguaging in the China's universities. The findings of the semi-structured interviews with teachers revealed that teachers have ambivalent attitudes towards translanguaging. That is, some teachers found it hard to include translanguaging practices in the classroom while others included and developed translanguaging pedagogy.

Mendez & Pavon (2012) investigated first language use in a content and language integrated learning (CLIL) program in Andalusia and the result of the interview conducted with 15 (language, content and language assistant) teachers in primary and secondary education showed that L1 was utilized as a facilitator to students to be able to comprehend complicated ideas and concepts. Although these teachers are not trained regarding the benefits of L1 use and their use of L1 was not systematic, they were positive towards this practice in the classroom. Similarly,

Lasagabaster (2013) also found out his study investigating 35 teachers' attitudes towards use of first language in a CLIL context in Colombia that participants were quite positive and aware of the benefits of using L1 in CLIL classrooms on comprehension, increasing participation, comforting students, making meaning.

2.4.4. Lecturers' Purposes for Translanguaging Practices in EMI Classrooms

As the pedagogical part of translanguaging is under investigated yet, more research is needed to determine how translanguaging can be applied as an instructional methodology in the classrooms; otherwise, unsystematic and random use of translanguaging practices used by both lecturers and students can pose challenges in language classroom. In their study, Creese and Blackledge (2010) also emphasized the necessity for further research for exploring instructional translanguaging strategies for learning and teaching languages in bilingual classrooms. Baker (2011) supported the idea that lecturers should let their student use their both languages during their learning; however, "in a planned, developmental and strategic manner, to maximize a student's linguistic and cognitive capability" (p. 290). Lecturers' translanguaging was conceptualized by Lewis, Jones, and Baker (2012) and Garcia and Wei (2014) as "teacher-directed translanguaging to give voice, clarity, reinforce, manage the classroom and ask questions" (Wang, 2016, p. 3). Garcia and Wei (2014) in their study identified the purposes of lecturers for utilizing translanguaging strategies and stated that translanguaging was used to reach the equality among students with different proficiency level and adjust the lecture to different types of students, to activate "background knowledge" of the students in order to provide them to make meaning of their content, to contribute a deeper comprehension, sociopolitical inclusion, improve new knowledge and critical thinking and consciousness. Lectures also use translanguaging strategies for "cross-linguistic metalinguistic awareness, cross-linguistic flexibility and identity investment and positionality" (p. 121). Thus, they could engage learners, provide linguistic and social equality and help learners meet their communicative needs and use language practices proficiently.

Polio and Duff (1994) investigated lecturers' use of students' native language in classroom in the United States (US) at the university level. The result of the study revealed that lecturers use first language of the students for classroom management, explaining grammar, vocabulary and complex and difficult notions and setting up

rapport with the students. Wang (2016) also investigated translanguaging practices in the China's universities under three categories as:

> *"Explanatory strategies to provide cognitive or metalinguistic scaffolding for meaning-making activities such as explaining and elaborating grammar rules and lexical uses, translating new words, and interpreting cultural meaning, secondly, the managerial strategy to provide operational classroom instructions such as giving instructions for an activity, giving feedback, praising, disapproving, checking the comprehension of learning content and planning assignments and lastly, interpersonal strategy for classroom participants to interact with each other using multiple languages*" (p. 7-8).

The findings of the study revealed by scaffolding strategies, participation increased and rapport among all classroom participants improved in the classroom. Also, the data revealed that translanguaging practices in L2 settings provided to giving voice to students for meaning negotiation at different levels.

Lasagabaster (2013) in his study investigated 35 teachers' attitudes towards use of first language in CLIL context in Colombia. The findings of the study revealed that teachers hold positive attitudes and they use L1 for various reasons. Lasagabaster (2013) grouped these reasons under five categories. The first and most commonly referred category by teachers was found to be to help the learners comprehend better. Teachers in this study were quite aware of how beneficial and practical L1 can be during explaining and clarifying the difficult and abstract concepts in CLIL classroom. The other four categories were found to be to help students compare the meaning in L1 and L2, to comfort students, to increase participation in class debates; and to cope with disciplinary issues. Participants stated that English Only classrooms may lead students feel anxiety which hinders their learning. They use students' first language to comfort students and help them overcome this tension. They also use students' first language as a scaffolding tool to permit them make comparisons between L1 and L2 for making meaning. L1 is perceived by teachers in this study as a tool to provide students with lower English proficiency to increase their language use in the classroom. Therefore, they are taking the advantage of students' prior knowledge. Moreover, they indicated that they use L1 for increasing students' participation in classroom debates. They stated that it is sometimes challenging to motivate students to talk about difficult topics

because of their low language proficiency therefore; using L1 can mediate this process and help students to participate more in classroom activities. Finally, the teachers use L1 of students for management of classroom and set up disciplinary matters in the classroom. Similar results were found out in the study of Xhemaili (2017) conducted at a Language Center - South East European University in Tetova. Xhemaili (2017) evaluated mainly learners' perspectives of using L1 and translation in L2 settings. It was indicated that English teachers use L1 for explaining difficult terms and check understanding, increase students' motivation joking etc., and to give instructions.

Inbar-Lourie (2010) also found out the similar results regarding lecturers' purposes of using L1 in L2 settings. She investigated use of L1 by six teachers giving English classes to young learners in Hebrew and Arabic medium schools. In this study, the aim was to argue the monolingual teaching principles hindering bilingual and multilingual voices in the classroom. As a result of the interviews, teachers' self-reports and classroom observations, it was revealed that teachers are using L1 for three purposes. These purposes were found to be "instructional, managerial and affective purposes". Teachers' instructional purposes to use L1 were ranged from mediating understanding, explaining a clarifying grammar and new notions. Teachers use L1 also for providing the classroom management and feedback. They also use L1 for effective purposes for encouraging and make the students feel comfortable.

This chapter provided the detailed information regarding the theoretical background lying under translanguaging and some studies conducted in the same area of the study. Related studies were reviewed according to research questions from general ones to specific ones. The next chapter will cover the methodology followed in the current study.

CHAPTER III

METHOD

3.1. Introduction

This chapter presents information about the design and the context of the study, participants involved in the study, data collection tools, data analysis methods and pilot work.

3.2. The Design of the Study

The design of the present study was prepared according to primarily qualitative method and supported by quantitative methods approach so that diverse viewpoints can cast light upon the topic. Combination of data types is also known as mixed method to assist confirming the claims occurred in a pilot study (Olsen, 2004). Mixed method is accepted as the third approach following the qualitative and quantitative research methods (Johnson, Onwuegbuzie, & Turner, 2007). According to Morse (1991), triangulation has gained importance because it is utilized to ensure the most extensive approach in generating a solution to research problems when a single method stays inadequate.

This method combines the strengths of both qualitative and quantitative research (Creswell, 2009). As all data collection methods have their own limitations and strengths, it can be deduced that mixing of data and methods can negate some of the deficiencies of a certain method. The strength of quantitative method is that it produces factual, reliable outcome data that are usually generalizable to some larger populations. Also, Steckler, McLeroy, Goodman, Bird and McCormick (1992) introduce the strengths of qualitative method as "they generate rich, detailed, valid process data that usually leave the study participants' perspectives intact" (p. 2). Integrating the strengths of two forms of approaches provides a more complete understanding of the research problem than an approach alone.

In the present study, mixed method approach was adopted; that is, a combination of quantitative and qualitative methods was used in order to ensure that the most comprehensive way is taken to solve the research problem. There are various strategies of mixed methods. In this study, convergent parallel mixed method was chosen for this

study as it is the most familiar strategy of the mixed method approaches. Convergent parallel mixed method is a form of mixed methods design in which the researcher gathers the qualitative and quantitative data at the same time and analyzes them separately and then compares or relates the obtained information during interpretation of overall result to see if findings confirm each other. In the present study, a questionnaire was implemented in order to determine students' attitudes towards translanguaging as a learning strategy and translanguaging practices used by the first year undergraduate students during their academic studies. The questionnaire was analyzed according to the quantitative approach while data obtained from interview and observation was analyzed according to the qualitative approach. As for analyzing the qualitative data obtained from observation and interviews, 'inductive content analysis' was utilized. Creswell (2014) defines inductive logic of qualitative research as follows:

1. Researcher gathers information(e.g., observation, interview)
2. Researcher asks open-ended questions of participants or record field notes
3. Researcher analyzes data to form the message or categories
4. Researcher looks for broad patterns, generalizations or theories from the themes or categories
5. Researcher poses generalizations or theories from the past experiences and literature.

During the analysis, the quantitative findings were presented first and then were related to the qualitative results. According to Creswell (2014) "presenting firstly one set of findings then the others is called a side-by-side approach" (p. 273).

An interpretive/constructivist approach was used in the analysis of the qualitative data of the study. Interpretivist/constructivist approaches in research have the scope of comprehending "the world of human experience" (Cohen, Manion, & Morrison, 1994, p. 21). The interpretivist/constructivist researcher takes the "participants' views of the situation being studied" as a basis (Creswell, 2014, p. 37).

Another essential factor to be mentioned is the weight given to the qualitative and quantitative aspects. As illustrated in Table 1, three research problems were analyzed according to the qualitative method while the rest two problems were analyzed according to mixed method. Therefore, it can be said that the priority weight is given to

the qualitative research method. Summary of the research questions and methodological approaches are illustrated below:

Table 1.

Summary of Research Questions and Methodological Approaches

Research Questions	**Aims**	**Methodological Approaches**	**Data Collection Tools**
1. What are the language related challenges faced by EMI students?	To determine language related challenges faced by EMI students during their studies.	Qualitative Approach	Focus Group Interviews
2. What are the students' attitudes on translanguaging as a learning strategy?	To discuss students' attitudes on translanguaging as a learning strategy	Qualitative Approach Quantitative Approach	Focus Group Interviews Turkish Version of questionnaire for EMI students
3. What type of translanguaging strategies are used by the first year undergraduate students during their academic studies?	To examine translanguaging strategies used by the first year undergraduate students during their academic studies	Qualitative Approach Quantitative Approach	Focus Group Interviews Turkish Version of questionnaire for EMI students Observation
4. What are the lecturers' attitudes on translanguaging as learning and teaching strategy?	To discuss lecturers' attitudes on translanguaging as a learning and teaching strategy	Qualitative Approach	Individual semi-structured interviews
5. What purposes is translanguaging used for by lecturers when teaching content courses in EMI?	To determine the purposes of translanguaging practices used by lecturers when teaching content courses in EMI	Qualitative Approach	Individual semi-structured interviews Observation

As illustrated in Table 1, there were five research questions and all of them had their own purposes to come to existence at the end of the study. It can be said that the present study had two different dimensions as students' dimension and lecturers' dimension. Mixed method was used in research problems related to students and for lecturers' dimension, only qualitative method was used. Because of the limited number of lecturers teaching EMI lectures to first year students of five EMI departments integrated to this study, quantitative data collection tools could not be implemented.

3.3. Context of the Study

The study was conducted in the Fall Semester of 2017-2018 Academic Year at Adana STU. Adana STU was chosen for the study for two reasons. First of all, it is one of the universities using English as a medium of instruction in Turkey and it offers courses fully in English in its most of the undergraduate programs (as illustrated in Table 2). Secondly, it was chosen because of the researcher's convenience of access and prior understanding of the culture in the institution.

Table 2.

Undergraduate Programs offering 100 % EMI courses at Adana STU

Faculty of Engineering	**Faculty of Business**
Electric and Electronic Engineering	Management and Information Systems
Materials Engineering	
Bioengineering	
Computer Engineering	

All EMI departments in the Faculty of Engineering and Management and Information Systems department of Faculty of Business were chosen for this study. In order to get comprehensive and deeper insights regarding translanguaging practices in the institution, all the departments offering courses fully in English were intended to be included in this study. Regarding students' entry to EMI departments, students in Turkey are registered to the departments with their choices based on their ranking in the national university entrance exam which means EMI is not compulsory in Turkey but optional.

Studying in programs offering TMI or EMI is up to preferences of the students. Higher Education Institutions in Turkey constructs comprehensive preparatory programs to make certain that students meet the minimum English language proficiency requirement before attending to their studies in faculties (Kırkgöz & Dikilitaş, 2018). At Adana STU, School of Foreign Languages (SFL) offers a one-year English Preparation Program with the aim of preparing students for their departments. For institutions offering English taught programs (ETPs), SFL plays a fundamental role in terms of ensuring students to have enough linguistic knowledge to use in their English content classes. At Adana STU, students should obtain 70 out of 100 points to complete their English Preparation Program and starts their studies in their departments which corresponds to B1 level according to the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (CEFR).

3.4. Participants

The participants of the study were chosen randomly from the Faculty of Engineering and Faculty of Business at Adana STU. As it is believed that first year undergraduate students are the most challenged students who struggle with coping in a less proficient language in EMI context, the sampling groups were constituted of the first-year engineering and management students. Students pursuing their studies in Electric and Electronic Engineering, Materials Engineering, Bioengineering, Computer Engineering and Management and Information Systems and lecturers who are teaching English content courses to first level BA students in the afore mentioned departments participated in this study. As stated in the Table 3, all available students studying afore mentioned departments were asked to participate in this study. The number of the first year students participated in this study was 72 out of 96 students. Apart from the students, 10 lecturers teaching content courses to first year undergraduate students in this context were involved in the study.

Furthermore, a pilot study was conducted with the participation of 63 second year students studying at EMI programs. Apart from interviews and questionnaire, classroom observation was also carried out. Five English content lessons in EMI departments were observed. More information about participants of the study is stated in Chapter IV.

Table 3.

Sampling of the Study

Name of the Department	Total Number of Students in the department	Interviewed students	Surveyed students	Students in pilot work	Interviewed lecturers	Observed classes
Electric and Electronic Engineering	24	4	19	13	2	1
Materials Engineering	15	4	7	11	2	1
Bioengineering	18	4	15	20	2	1
Computer Engineering	20	4	14	11	2	1
Management and Information Systems	19	4	17	8	2	1
Total	96	20	72	63	10	5

3.5. Data Collection Instruments

Multiple forms of data were gathered in this study instead of relying on a single data source with the aim of getting a comprehensive insight into the research problems. As data collection instruments, observation, interviews and a questionnaire were implemented. Before the adapted questionnaire was conducted, a pilot study was implemented to ensure the validity and reliability of the research tools. More comprehensive information about the data collection tools is given below.

3.5.1. Classroom Observation

Observation enables the researchers to record and analyze behavior and interactions as they occur in a certain time. According to Ritchie and Lewis (2003), “observation also allows events, actions and experiences and so on, to be 'seen' through the eyes of the researcher, often without any construction on the part of those involved” (p. 35).

In this study, non-participant observation was used. Non-participant observation was chosen in this study so as not to interfere with the behavior of the students. It was conducted overtly which means the observed group was aware of the presence of the

researcher and that their behavior was observed to be able to obtain the informed-consent.

An observation checklist as illustrated in Appendix 7 adapted from the study of Shifidi (2014) was utilized in order to regulate the data collected during the observation. Non participant observation was used with the aim of determining and analyzing translanguaging patterns used by students and lecturers. So, the main focus during the observation was the language use of the lecturers and students in the classroom. This method of data collection is particularly useful in this study in terms of experiencing what happens in classes regarding language use of students and lecturers. As illustrated in Table 3, five English content classes from each department included in this study were observed closely.

Observation was also supplemented with video recording. All lectures were also video recorded in order to have the chance of watching the contents over and over and strengthen the findings and capture examples of translanguaging and experience real language use in these classrooms and thus get a more comprehensive insight into actions.

According to Jacobs, Kawanaka and Stigler (1999), video provides the opportunity to capture visual and verbal classroom occurrences and then captured data can be watched again repeatedly and discussed. Jacobs, Kawanaka and Stigler (*ibid*) also stated that "as a permanent data source, video data can be watched, coded, and analyzed in multiple passes. Videos enable researchers to watch the same sample of events over and over, each time looking into a different dimension of the recorded verbal and physical behavior" (p. 721). Observation checklist (see Appendix 7) utilized in this study was divided into two parts: lecturers' part and students' part. Lecturers' part contains language use of the lecturers when greeting learners, explaining class objectives, drawing learners' attention and building rapport, introducing new lessons, explaining difficult concepts, asking questions, defining new concepts, when learners seem not to understand and when summarizing the lesson and dismissing the learners. Learners' part includes students' language use when asking questions to the lecturers, answering lecturers' questions, and interacting with other learners in the class, asking other learners and note taking. After the observation, translanguaging examples come to existence during the class were analyzed according to the qualitative approach.

3.5.2. Interview Instruments

Aiming to discuss the lecturers' and students' attitudes towards translanguaging as learning and teaching strategy, purposes of lecturers' use of translanguaging, translanguaging practices used by students and students' language related challenges during their studies in EMI, a qualitative research interviews were conducted. Kvale (cited in Opdenakker, 2006, p. 1) defines the qualitative research interview as "an interview, whose purpose is to gather descriptions of the life-world of the interviewee with respect to interpretation of the meaning of the described phenomena". The goal of conducting interview is to see the research topic from the perspectives of the interviewees.

In this study, two types of interviews, focus group interviews with EMI students and individual interview with EMI lecturers were conducted. In this study, focus group interviews and focus group discussion are used interchangeably. In the case of students, five focus groups were conducted for the interviews. Each focus group included four students from the same classroom (see Table 3). Participant selection was done randomly among volunteer students. In the case of lecturers, 10 lecturers teaching EMI courses to first level students participated in this study. Two lecturers from each department were interviewed. Participant selection was also carried out randomly among volunteer lecturers.

Both types of interviews were carried out as face to face conservation with respondents and the semi-structured interview method was utilized to get students' and lecturers' opinions on translanguaging. Questions in the interviews were designed as open-ended in order to get a comprehensive insight of respondents' views regarding the topic and to let them freely express their views. All conducted interviews were recorded. Recorded conversations were then transcribed into written conversation and the findings are presented in Chapter IV.

3.5.2.1. Interview Questions for EMI Students

Interviews designed for EMI students consisted of six sections. Each section of the interview has its own aim to reach the research problems. Section 1 of the interview included questions prepared with the aim of obtaining demographic information of the participants. Questions in the section 1 were about gender, first and second language, faculty/department, language of instruction, self-assessed language proficiency, and use

of English outside of the classroom. Section 2 of the interview was prepared in order to get information about occurrences of translanguaging practices in the classroom while the Section 3 seeks answers about the frequency of translanguaging practices. Section 4 seeks an answer to the attitudes of students to translanguaging. Section 5 consisted of questions about language related problems faced by students and strategies applied by students in EMI context in order to cope with these problems. Finally, Section 6 was prepared to give the chance for final comments on translanguaging.

Interview questions for students were adapted from the study of Shifidi (2014) and by the researcher herself according to the studied topic. In the adaptation process of students' interview questions, correspondence with the questionnaire was taken as a basis in order to gain a deeper understanding about translanguaging. Interview questions directed to the EMI students are illustrated in Appendix 6.

3.5.2.2. Interview Questions for EMI Lecturers

Interview designed for EMI lecturers consisted of 5 sections. Section 1 of the interview included questions prepared to obtain personal information and educational background of the participants. Section 2 of the interview was prepared in order to get information about occurrence and frequency of translanguaging practices used by lecturers while Section 3 sought answers about occurrence and frequency of translanguaging practices used by students. Section 4 was designed to get answers about attitudes of lecturers towards translanguaging. And finally, Section 5 consisted of questions about final comments on translanguaging. Interview questions for lecturers were also adapted from the study of (Shifidi, 2014) and some questions were prepared by the researcher herself. Interview questions directed to the EMI lecturers were illustrated in Appendix 4.

3.5.3. The Adapted Questionnaire

In order to meet the purpose of the study, a questionnaire for EMI students was prepared taking into account the literature review. The items in the questionnaire were adapted from the studies of Baker (2011), Dykhanova (2015), Levine (2003) and Van der Walt (2006). These studies were chosen as they were appropriate for the purposes of the present study. The questionnaire prepared by Levine (2003) was implemented to measure first and second year foreign language (FL) students' and instructors' beliefs

and their attitudes about target language use, first language use and anxiety. The questionnaire contained seven sections for a total of 63 items. Section 1 in the questionnaire is comprised of biographical information of the students and composed of 17 items. Section 2 included 1 item which is about FL use in FL classes while section 3 included 20 items about use of the FL in students 'current FL classes. Part 4 composed of 8 items related to students 'opinions about FL use in the classroom. Section 5 in the questionnaire comprised of 5 items about Course Grade and Classroom Communication while part 6 included 5 items about FL acquisition and classroom communication. Finally, section 7 included 7 items regarding students' feelings about FL use in the classroom.

Four items of part 4 were adapted to the questionnaire of the present study. The items were used with the aim of determining students' attitudes about first language use and English only policy which were the core issues in the present study.

The second questionnaire adapted to the present study was prepared by Van der Walt (2006). In her study, Van der Walt (2006) examined university students' attitudes towards and experiences of bilingual classrooms. The questionnaire contained 17 items. The questionnaire started with two questions; one about students' academic performance and the second about their preferred study language. The second part of the questionnaire consists of 5 point Likert-scale statements to determine students' agreement and/or disagreement with 13 statements which were about lectures, teaching materials and lecturer-generated study materials. The four statements in the last part required an indication of the frequency with which students make use of certain study techniques.

8 items of this questionnaire were adapted to the present study. The adapted items were about lecturer use of translanguaging, lecturer-generated study materials and study techniques.

The third questionnaire adapted was prepared by Dykhanova (2015) which aims to find out functions of code-Switching and attitudes toward them. The first part includes 7 items and deals with the students' background while the second part comprised 18 items prepared to find out students' attitudes to the teachers' use of code-switching and its functions in the classroom. 9 items of the questionnaire were adapted to the present study. Adapted items were used in the questionnaire of the study to determine students' attitudes towards translanguaging and its functions.

Finally, in order to determine attitudes towards functions of translanguaging, one item was added from the study of Baker (2011). Adapted Questionnaire and their resources were illustrated in Table 4.

Table 4.

Adapted Questionnaire and Resources of Items

1. I think my English content class should have an "English Only Policy." (This means only English is allowed in the classroom.)	(Dykhanova, 2015)	12. It helps me when the lecturer use English and my first language simultaneously in lectures	(Van der Walt, 2006)
2. I believe the more English students use in the classroom the more their English will improve	(Levine,2003)	13. It helps me when the lecturer uses study materials both in my first language and English	(Van der Walt, 2006)
3. I believe that in order to master English students must use English a great deal in the classroom	(Levine,2003)	14. I will derive more benefit from classes if the lecturer provides a bilingual subject glossary (both in my first language and English) beforehand.	(Van der Walt, 2006)
4. I believe that there are no situations in which the first language should be used in the classroom	(Levine,2003)	15. Using more than one language in the classroom (translanguaging) increases my understanding of class content	(Baker, 2011)
5. I believe that the students should use only English when working together on a task in the classroom.	(Levine,2003)	16. Using more than one language in the classrooms strengthens my English	(Dykhanova, 2015)
6. It wastes a lot of time when the lecturer switches from one language to another.	(Van der Walt, 2006)	17. I make notes in my first language irrespective of the language used by the lecturer or used on the transparencies.	(Van der Walt, 2006)

Table 4. Continued

7. It confuses me when the lecturer switches from English to Turkish (or vice versa) in lectures	(Van der Walt, 2006)	18. I make notes in English and Turkish, depending on the language used by the lecturer at that stage	(Van der Walt, 2006)
8. Using more than one language (translanguaging) in the classroom leads to the weakness of my English.	(Dykhanova, 2015)	19. I see in my class notes that I've switched from English to Turkish (or vice versa) without noticing.	(Van der Walt, 2006)
9. I want to be able to use my first language in English content class when I feel I need to.	(Dykhanova, 2015)	20. I speak my first language in English class because I am explaining a new point in the lesson to a classmate.	(Dykhanova, 2015)
10. It's not important to use only English in class as long as I am completing the course tasks	(Dykhanova, 2015)	21. I speak my first language in English class because I need to ask a classmate to explain a point in the lesson for me.	(Dykhanova, 2015)
11. Speaking my first language with my classmates between and during class activities should be okay.	(Dykhanova, 2015)	22. I speak my first language in English class because I need to check the meaning of a new word or concept during the lesson.	(Dykhanova, 2015)

3.5.3.1. Questionnaire Prepared for the Present Study

With the adapted items, a Likert-scale questionnaire was prepared for EMI students (see Appendix 2). The questionnaire contained 4 parts with 28 items in total. Detailed information about the questionnaire is presented below:

Items in the questionnaire for EMI students were adapted from the studies of Baker (2011), Dykhanova (2015), Levine (2003) and Van der Walt (2006). Correlation between items was taken into account in order to reach the research purpose. Section 1 of the questionnaire was about demographical information of students. This part included 6 items which were about gender, home/first language, second language, faculty-department; language used as a medium of instruction and perceived language

proficiency of students. Section 2 and 3 were designed as a five point Likert-scale to determine students' agreement or disagreement with 8 statements about translanguaging in the lectures and 8 items regarding English Only Policy. Items in this part were adapted from the studies of Baker (2011), Dykhanova (2015), Levine (2003) and Van der Walt (2006). The last part in the questionnaire included six statements adapted from Dykhanova (2015) and Van der Walt (2006) which requires an indication of the frequency with which students make use of certain study techniques. Minor changes were done in the items during adaptation. After adaptation of the questionnaires, the researcher translated the adapted questionnaire in to Turkish. Then, three native Turkish speakers were asked to give their expression about the items if they are clear enough. Moreover, these native speakers compared Turkish and English Versions of the questionnaire in order to minimize any loss of meaning. Moreover, three experts were asked to analyze the Turkish Version of the questionnaire in terms of content, language and lay out. After this process, necessary changes and adjustments were done.

After collection of questionnaires, reliability was also calculated. Reliability, mean and standard deviations of the variables in the study were stated below:

The English only policy scale consisted of 8 items (α = .83), the translanguaging scale consisted of 8 items (α = .85). Since the types and frequency of translanguaging practices in classroom was measured as a categorical variable, correlations among raters (ICC3) had been considered for measuring reliability. ICC (3, 2) = ,638. Therefore, 63,8 % of the variance in the mean of the respondents are real.

Table 5.

Reliability, mean and standard deviations of the variables in the study

Scale	Number of items	Reliability coefficient	Mean	Std. Dev.
English only policy	8	.825 (α)	23.82	6.211
Translanguaging	8	.846 (α)	17.28	5.798
Frequency of translanguaging in classroom	6	.638 (ICC3,2)	13.57	8.530

3.6. Data Collection Procedures

Implementation and the procedure of data collection process were unproblematic in all phases. The first step taken was to identify the study context and population which were EMI students and lecturers at Faculty of Engineering and Faculty of Business at Adana STU. In this process, firstly departments offering fully English Medium Instruction were determined, then course catalogs of these departments were analyzed in order to be able to determine the courses to be observed. Following the course determination, lecturers giving these courses were identified. The second step was to get the official permission from the dean of the Faculty of Engineering and Faculty of Business in order to conduct the observation, interviews and pilot work and then the actual survey. For the pilot work, second year students following their studies at the departments offering EMI were determined to collect the data. Then, adequate copies of the questionnaire were prepared and distributed to the students. After ensuring the validity and reliability of the questionnaire, it was distributed to the first year EMI students for actual work. The aim and the topic of the study were made clear to EMI lecturers and students in all phases of data collection procedures so that they could know what was expected from them in their responses in both questionnaires and interviews. For interviews, 10 EMI lecturers from Faculty of Engineering and Faculty of Business were voluntary so timing was arranged according to their timetables before the interviews were conducted. The same case happened in focus group interviews. Students were asked when they were suitable and accordingly the interviews were arranged. Interviews with EMI lecturers and students were conducted in Turkish upon the request of the respondents which was beneficial for this study as views of the participants are crucial in this study. Any possible linguistic barriers that they may encounter during interview might have caused participants to give overbroad responses. Thus, letting them to respond in their native language provided them to express themselves in a more detailed manner. In order to raise the sound quality, interviews were recorded by a sound recorder in a silent environment so that responses could be hearable and clear enough during the transcription process. After the implementation of the interviews was completed, interviews were translated to English by the researcher. The third data collection tool in the study was observation. Before participating in the classroom, informed-consent was obtained from both lecturers and students. An observation checklist was used during this process and five lessons each of which lasted

45 minutes were recorded via a camera. The researcher did not participate in the classroom activities not to interfere the naturality of the context. In all phases of data collection process, ethical issues were put into consideration. First of all, necessary permissions were taken from the authorities of the institution to be able to conduct the questionnaire, interviews and observation. The participants' privacy was respected and maximum confidentiality and anonymity were guaranteed to them. All participants in the study were informed about their rights. As stated before, overt observation was carried out in which participants were aware of the researcher. This kind of observation was chosen not to deceive the participants through covert observation. Informed-consent was obtained from all participants via a consent form prepared for this study (see Appendix 10). Intention of the researcher and aim of the study were explained before conducting the interviews and observations that is to say, respect and dignity of the participants were particularly sustained.

3.7. Pilot Work

Pilot work of this study was conducted with second year students following their studies in five EMI departments at Adana STU. 63 students participated in the pilot study. Views of two experts were taken regarding content validity of the questionnaire and three native Turkish speakers examined the questionnaire in terms of the language used in items. In the light of this, the necessary changes were made in the questionnaire. Then, the questionnaire was implemented in order to reach results about how clear and relevant the items in the questionnaire were. After the implementation, the reliability test was conducted and assessed to reach the alpha coefficient by utilizing Cronbach's Alpha Statistic. According to the results, reliability of the items in the questionnaire was founded as .731 for overall scale. The reliability coefficient for English only policy scale was .816, for translanguaging .842, and ICC (3,2) for frequency of translanguaging practices in classroom was .657. Moreover, no item was removed from the questionnaire as removing any items in the questionnaire did not change the reliability to a large extent. That is why, no modification was done. To make sure of the reliability of the items in the questionnaire and questions in the interview, two experts were consulted. The first expert is the supervisor of the study. She is a professor in ELT department of Çukurova University and she has extensive knowledge and research studies about EMI in Turkish context. The other expert is an assistant professor in the

Faculty of Business at Adana STU. She lectures on research methods and she has lots of studies in social sciences and she is highly experienced in qualitative and quantitative research methodology. Other contributors of the study are three native speakers. One of them is a Turkish instructor at Adana STU giving Turkish language lectures to foreigners. The other contributors are an associate professor at the faculty of political sciences and a student from translation and interpretation department of Adana STU. The student was purposefully consulted to be able to see any incomprehensible part from a student's eye. To sum up, they were consulted to figure out if the questionnaire is comprehensible enough.

3.8. Data Analysis

This section presents information about analysis of collected data. Mixed method was used in this present study and the acquired data was analyzed with the appropriate data analysis methods according to the nature of the data. Analyses of the qualitative and quantitative data were done separately and then obtained information were related during interpretation of overall result to see if findings confirm or disconfirm each other.

Close-ended questions were analyzed with the principles of Descriptive Statistics via Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS, Version 21.0). A numerical value was given for each variable in close-ended questions in order to code the data in SPSS. Then, the number of participants that answered the questions and standard deviation and mean scores for each close-ended item were presented in tables.

As for analyzing the qualitative data obtained from observation and interviews, 'inductive content analysis' was utilized. Interviews and data from the observation were transcribed and filed separately. Different codes were assigned to represent the participants such as 'LA (Lecturer A) and SA (Student A). Then, written form of data was read over and over in order to get a general sense of the information. During this step, short notes were taken and general thoughts about the data were recorded. The results were sorted out into categories in order to interpret and discuss the findings. The findings from lecturers and from learners were analyzed separately. The findings were categorized under themes derived from gathered data according to the research questions and literature review.

Content analysis was carried out in the light of procedures defined by Creswell (2014). He summarizes the content analysis procedure as follows:

1. Organize and prepare the data for analysis
2. Read or look at all the data
3. Start coding all of the data
4. Use the coding process to generate a description of the setting or people as well as categories or themes for analysis.
5. Advance how the description and themes will be represented in the qualitative narrative
6. Make an interpretation in qualitative research of the findings or results (p. 247).

In the light of the procedures stated above the raw data gathered via interviews and observations was analyzed and interpreted and findings were reported by representing appropriate excerpts.

This chapter has given information regarding the methodology of the present study. İt was about the design of the study, participants and context of the study, data collection instruments, data analysis methods and pilot work. The next chapter covers findings obtained from students and lecturers and observation.

CHAPTER IV

FINDINGS

4.1. Introduction

This chapter presents the findings of the present study. Firstly, the findings from both the questionnaire and focus group discussion administered to EMI students are presented. Then, findings from interview with EMI lecturers are introduced. Finally, the findings from the observation of the EMI classes are given.

4.2. Analysis of the Questionnaire Administered to EMI Students

4.2.1. Background Information of Participants

To collect data about background information, six questions at the beginning of the questionnaire were administered to all of the participants. These six questions were about gender, first language, second language, department, language of instruction of the department, perceived language proficiency. Descriptive statistics of background information of students are presented in Table 6 and 7 below in detail.

Table 6.

Background Information about Participants

Variables		f	%
Gender	Male	46	63.9
	Female	26	36.1
First language	Turkish	71	98.6
	English	0	0
	Other	1	1.4
Second Language	Turkish	0	
	English	68	94.4
	English and Other Languages	4	5.6

Table 6 shows background information of 72 students who are following their studies in EMI programs at Adana STU. Regarding the gender of the participants, the majority of the students (63.9%) participated in the study were male students. This result was expected as departments in faculty of engineering were mostly preferred by male students in Turkey. Almost all students' first language was revealed to be Turkish (98.6 %) and 94.4% of students indicated their second language as English. Only a small number of students (5.6%) stated to be multilingual of Turkish, English and other languages. This result shows that the majority of students participated in the questionnaire are monolingual Turkish native speakers and bilingual English users.

Table 7.

Perceived Language Proficiency of the Participants

Variables	f	%
Low Intermediate	54	75.0
High Intermediate	15	20.8
Advanced	3	4.2

As illustrated in Table 7, a high majority of students (75.0 %) indicated to have a low intermediate proficiency in English. While 20.8% of students perceived their language level as high intermediate, only 4.2 % of the students indicated that they have advanced level of English. This was also an expected result as the language requirement to enter to departments at Adana STU is B1 level according to CEFR.

4.2.2. Students' Attitudes towards Translanguaging

In total, 72 first year students participated in the study and responded all the items in the questionnaire. In the light of descriptive statistics mean and standard deviation scores of the items in each section in the questionnaire were illustrated below. Table 8 and Table 9 show to what extent students favor English only policy or translanguaging in EMI classrooms. The results of the findings are firstly presented separately and then, overall findings are presented. The frequencies and percentages of the questionnaire results are presented in Appendix 11.

Table 8.

Students' Attitudes towards English Only Policy

English Only Policy	Mean	Median	Std. Deviation
1. I think my English content class should have an "English Only Policy." (This means only English is allowed in the classroom.)	3.56	4.00	1.232
2.I believe the more English students use in the classroom the more their English will improve	4.39	5.00	0.958
3.I believe that in order to master English students must use English a great deal in the classroom	4.19	4.00	0.929
4.I believe that there are no situations in which the first language should be used in the classroom	2.49	2.00	1.175
5. I believe that the students should use only English when working together on a task in the classroom.	2.96	3.00	1.215
6. It wastes a lot of time when the lecturer switches from one language to another.	2.10	2.00	1.165
7.It confuses me when the lecturer switches from English to Turkish (or vice versa) in lectures	2.15	2.00	1.195
8. Using more than one language (translanguaging) in the classroom leads to the weakness of my English.	2.35	2.00	1.334

As illustrated in Table 8, items 1, 2 and 3 had the highest mean (X1=3.56, X2=4.39, X3=4.19). This means that participants mostly favor English Only Policy in their EMI classroom and they strongly believe that the more English they use in the classroom, the more their English will improve and therefore, they must use English a great deal in the classroom in order to master English language. Regarding standard deviation of this three items, item 2 and item 3 had the lowest standard deviation scores (std2=0. 958 and std3=0. 929); however, item 1 had one of the highest scores (std2=1. 232) which means students prefer only English to be used in content classrooms; however, still there were differentiating ideas on it. On the other hand, items 6, 7 and 8 had the lowest mean scores(X6=2.10, X7=2.15, X8=2.35). That is, students do not agree with the idea that the lecturer consume a lot of time when s/he switches from one language to another. It means that students do not believe that translanguaging is a time consuming strategy. Moreover, students also do not support the opinion that translanguaging strategy used by lecturers leads to confusion among students. Item 8 which was related to the effect of translanguaging on language skill was another opinion which students do not agree with. Students believe that using more than one language (translanguaging) in the classroom does not lead to weakness in their English language abilities. Regarding standard deviation scores of these items, item 7 and 8 are among the highest scores (std7=1.195 and std8=1.334) while item 6 had one of the lowest standard deviation scores (std6= 1.165).

The results of this part of the questionnaire showed that although students seem to favor English only policy in EMI classrooms they have conflicting ideas on it. Moreover, the results show that they appreciate the translanguaging practices and do not hold strict negative attitudes towards it. On the contrary of English only policy, attitudes towards translanguaging strategy were also evaluated in the questionnaire. The findings of students' attitudes towards use of more than one language in the classroom are described in the Table 10 below:

Table 9.

Students 'Attitudes towards Translanguaging

Translanguaging	Mean	Median	Std. Deviation
9. I want to be able to use my first language in English content class when I feel I need to.	3.94	4.00	0.977
10.It's not important to use only English in class as long as I am completing the course tasks	3.18	3.00	1.191
11. Speaking my first language with my classmates between and during class activities should be okay.	3.83	4.00	0.979
12.It helps me when the lecturer use English and my first language simultaneously in lectures	4.10	4.00	1.064
13.It helps me when the lecturer uses study materials both in my first language and English	4.29	4.00	0.777
14. I will derive more benefit from classes if the lecturer provides a bilingual subject glossary (both in my first language and English) beforehand.	3.97	4.00	1.021
15. Using more than one language in the classroom (translanguaging) increases my understanding of class content	4.01	4.00	1.120
16. Using more than one language in the classrooms strengthens my English	3.75	4.00	1.172

As illustrated in Table 9, items 13, 12 and 15 could be seen to have the highest mean (X12=4.10, X13=4.29, X15=4.01). This result shows that students mostly agreed on the idea that it helps when the lecturer use English and their first language simultaneously in lectures and when s/he uses study materials both in their first language and English. Furthermore, it was also revealed from the questionnaire that students are aware of the benefit of translanguaging on content learning. They mostly agreed on the opinion that using more than one language in the classroom (translanguaging) increases their understanding of class content. In terms of standard deviation of these three items, item 13 had the lowest score (std13=0.777); however, items 12 and 15 did not have the lowest scores (std12=1.064 and std15=1.120) which means that students think translanguaging of the lecturer and providing bilingual study materials are beneficial for their studies; however, it is clear that there were still conflicting ideas on these two items.

When the overall findings of the questionnaire compared it is evident from the Table 8 and 9 that students have more disposition to translanguaging strategy. Students connect English improvement with the amount of its use; however, they hold more positive attitudes towards translanguaging practices than English Only Policy. They do not think translanguaging has negative effects on their learning. On the contrary, they value L1 use on content learning and they agree on the opinion that bilingual study materials and lecturers' use of translanguaging support and facilitate their learning in EMI classrooms. It can be seen from the two tables that means of items in translanguaging part of the questionnaire is higher than those in English Only Policy. For example, when the means and standard deviation of two items (1 and 9) are contrasted, it can be seen that item 1 had a higher mean (X9=3.94) and lower standard deviation score (0.977) than item 1 (X1=3.56 and std1=1.232). This result shows that there is a tendency among students towards using their first language when they feel they need to rather than using only English in the classroom. The other comparison was done between other set of contrast expressions 12, 13 and 6, 7. It be seen from the tables that items 12, 13 had the higher mean scores (X12=4.10, X13=4.29) and the lower standard deviation scores (std12=1.064 and std13=0.777) while items 6, 7 had the lower the higher mean scores (X6=2.10, X7=2.15) and the higher standard deviation scores (std6=1.165 and std7=1.195). That is, students do not think that lecturers waste time with translanguaging and leads to confusion while using the first language of the students. On the contrary, it is evident that they believe lecturers' translanguaging is

beneficial and helpful for their learning and also, lecturers' use of bilingual study materials contributes to their learning. The other items which should be contrasted are 8 and 16 which are about the effect of translanguaging on language skills. It can be seen from the tables that item 16 had a higher mean (X16=3.75) and lower standard deviation score (std16=1.172) while item 8 had a lower mean (X8=2.35) and a higher standard deviation score (std8=1.334). That is, students do not think translanguaging leads to the weakness of English language; on the contrary, it has positive effects on its improvement.

To sum up, it is evident from the findings that students give high importance to English use in EMI classroom as they believe that the more English they use the more their English will improve and also, English should be used extensively in EMI classroom. However, they are also aware of the benefits of translanguaging for their content learning and language skills. They mostly agree on the idea that lecturers' use of bilingual materials and other translanguaging strategies are not time consuming or confusing on the contrary, they think that it facilitates their studies in EMI. It is evident from the results of the questionnaire that students have pragmatic attitudes towards translanguaging and the majority of students hold maximal position to translanguaging practices. Finally, the types of translanguaging strategy were also evaluated in the questionnaire. The findings of types of translanguaging used by students are described in the Table 10:

4.2.3. Types of Translanguaging Practices used by EMI Students

Table 10.

Translanguaging Practices used by EMI students

Translanguaging Practices	Mean	Median	Std. Deviation
17. I make notes in my first language irrespective of the language used by the lecturer or used on the transparencies	2.13	2.00	0.821
18. I make notes in English and Turkish, depending on the language used by the lecturer at that stage.	2.81	3.00	0.816
19. I see in my class notes that I've switched from English to Turkish (or vice versa) without noticing.	2.31	2.00	0.973
20. I speak my first language in English class because I am explaining a new point in the lesson to a classmate	3.06	3.00	0.837
21. I speak my first language in English class because I need to ask a classmate to explain a point in the lesson for me.	3.17	3.00	0.919
22. I speak my first language in English class because I need to check the meaning of a new word or concept during the lesson.	2.97	3.00	0.934

As illustrated in Table 10, items 20, 21, 22 could be seen to have the highest means (X20=3.06, X21=3.17, X22=2.97); however, not the lowest standard deviation scores (std20=0.837, std21=0.919, std22=0.934). Although the presence of the different frequencies in translanguaging strategies, this means that students mostly use translanguaging to clarify concepts to classmates and to ask for peer support for explaining a point in the classroom. They also speak their first language in English class

when they need to check the meaning of a new word or concept during the lesson. On the other hand, items 17, 18 and 19 had the lowest mean scores(X17=2.13, X18=2.81, X19=2.31). Standard deviation scores of these items were found to be (std17=0.821, std18=0.816, std19=0.973).That is, students do not make notes irrespective of the language used by the lecturers or used on the transparencies and also, they do not make notes in English or Turkish depending on the lecturer's language use. Moreover, they do not switch from English to Turkish (or vice versa) without noticing on note making.

4.3. Analysis of Interviews Administered to EMI Students

4.3.1. Background Information of the Students

Four students from each department were interviewed for acquiring a deeper understanding on translanguaging strategy. Totally, 20 students from Management and Information Systems, Computer Engineering, Materials Engineering, Electric and Electronic Engineering and Bioengineering participated in the interview. The groups of students from each department were interviewed separately. 12 male and 8 female students were interviewed. The majority of the students (f=18) indicated their native language as Turkish while the other students stated that they are bilingual of Turkish, Arabic and Kurdish. All students' second/foreign language was found out to be English. This result showed that the majority of the students is monolingual Turkish native speakers and bilingual English users. Regarding perceived English language proficiency of students, it was found that the majority of the students (f=14) perceived their language level as low intermediate level while the remaining students indicated that they have high intermediate level (f=5) and beginner level (f=1). Regarding use of English outside of the classroom, some students indicated that they never use English outside the classroom (f=5). Other students stated that they try to practice their language skills via surfing on the internet (f=2), social media (f=3), and to research for their school work (f=5), talking to English knowing family members (f=2), and talking foreign people (f=3).

4.3.2. Language Related Challenges Faced by EMI Students

In this part, language related challenges encountered by first year students while receiving academic instruction in English were presented. Almost all of the students (f=18) stated that they have language related challenges while following their studies in

EMI. The remaining two students stated that they had no trouble regarding language of instruction. Language related challenges of EMI students were found to be unfamiliar words and inadequate use of vocabulary (f=13) and accent and pronunciation (f=5). These two challenges were indicated to cause problems in understanding the content. Challenges faced by students during their academic studies in EMI are discussed below.

Unfamiliar technical words and inadequate use of Vocabulary in English hindered communication and fully understanding of content

According to the data collected for this study, it is evident that the main cause of language related challenges in the current study is in being able to use English for academic purposes sufficiently. Inadequate use of vocabulary in English and unfamiliar technical words were revealed to be the highest occurring language problem which interviewees expressed during the interviews (f=13). This challenge regarding English vocabulary is what led to the inability of first year bilingual students to be able to recognize new words, difficulty in finding fitting words in writing or speaking and not able to spell words precisely and thus, deficiency in understanding the content. It was indicated that students who have difficulty in finding fitting words in writing or speaking and not able to spell words precisely feel hesitated to freely express their thoughts and ideas amidst people. Especially those that were non confident in speaking in English did not ask and answer questions. Thus, questions remain unanswered and deficient learning happens.

One participant (SA) stated that as he feels deficient in his academic vocabulary skills, he mispronounces the words and this situation decreases his motivation for classroom participation. He also stated that the fear of making mistakes while speaking in English leads to feeling of anxiety to speak English in class. He explained his opinion in Excerpt 1 in detail.

Excerpt 1:

The vocabulary does not come to my mind that is why, I mispronounce it. I am not able to participate in classroom as I feel anxiety of speaking English in class. (SA)

Another participant (SB) also indicated his challenge in academic vocabulary which leads to challenges in keeping up with lecture and fully comprehending the

content in EMI classrooms. Thus, he loses his attention in the lesson and it causes withdrawal of the students. SB's explanation about language related challenges was stated in Excerpt 2:

Excerpt 2:

Sometimes I do not understand the content because of deficiency in my vocabulary skills and this leads to lose my attention to the class. Then, the lesson does not mean anything to me. Sometimes, I cannot catch up with lecturer when I try to find out the meaning of any vocabulary that I do not know. (SB)

Similarly, SM stated that he has problem in understanding the questions in exams and assignments and answering them because of his inadequate vocabulary knowledge. His expression is stated in Excerpt 3:

Excerpt 3:

When I encounter with an unfamiliar word in questions during exams and assignments I have problems in answering it. When I meet with a term that I am not familiar with I do not understand the whole question. (SM)

SP stated that she has difficulty in finding fitting words in speaking. She indicated that she has to paraphrase the word in order to move the communication on. Her statement is stated below in Excerpt 4:

Excerpt 4:

Sometimes I cannot express myself clearly and cannot ask anything because I cannot find the fitting word. When this happen I try another way and paraphrase it to explain what I mean. (SP)

SL expressed that he has been unsuccessful from two of his exams as he misunderstood the questions in Excerpt 5:

Excerpt 5:

I got low grades in two of my exams as I misunderstood the questions. Some vocabularies has great importance in the question. When I could not recognize these new words I cannot fully understand the questions. (SL)

Accent and Pronunciation

Accent and pronunciation were the second highest (f=5) occurring language problems which interviewees expressed during the interviews. It was revealed from the interview data that students have trouble in both understanding the pronunciation and recognizing the vocabularies used by the lecturers and their own use of correct words and spelling. As speaking is crucial for understanding of most academic content by students, this language problem in comprehending what was told form a huge barrier in the lectures. As students do not perceive correctly what is taught during lectures, they cannot relate to what has been learnt and can not absorb knowledge that is not adequately understood. As indicated by students, they also have deficiencies in their own pronunciation skill which hinder them from speaking confidently in the lecture. SN stated that he has difficulty in understanding accent and pronunciation of the lecturers and also, he has challenge in pronouncing some vocabularies that he is not familiar with. His expression is stated in Excerpt 6:

Excerpt 6:

I think pronunciation and accent is a common language related problem among EMI students. We may have problems in understanding and recognizing the vocabulary. I cannot understand the English of the lecturer and this situation is the same for me. As I am not familiar with new terms in English I may mispronounce them. (SN)

SA explained his opinion in Excerpt 7. He stated that pronunciation problem affects participation in class. When he does not know how to pronounce the word he feels hesitated in responding to questions.

Excerpt 7:

The vocabulary does not come to my mind because I am not familiar with it. That is why, I mispronounce it. I am not able to participate in classroom as I feel anxiety of speaking English in class. (SA)

SK also had a similar problem in pronunciation. She indicated that when the lecturer speaks fast she does not understand what s/he means. Her expression is stated in Excerpt 8:

Excerpt 8:

I do not have too much language related problems but sometimes I cannot understand the pronunciation of some vocabularies. I have trouble in understanding the lecturer when s/he speaks fast. (SK)

4.3.3. Students' Attitudes towards Translanguaging

All students participated in the interview indicated that they use their first language in EMI classrooms for various purposes. When the frequency of using translanguaging in EMI classrooms was asked to students, most of the students (f=14) indicated that they **sometimes** utilize translanguaging practices. The remaining students responded to question as they **always** (f=3) and **often** (f=3) use translanguaging. None of them stated that they **never** use this practice. When they are asked with whom they use the strategy, it was found that the majority of the students (f=14) use translanguaging both with classmates and their lecturers while the rest of the students (f=6) stated that they use their first language only with classmates. It was a remarkable point that students prefer asking any complicated point of the content first to their classmates but if the trouble continues they ask their lecturers as a second option (f=5). This result showed that as the use of first language is seen as a linguistic deficiency, students may feel hesitation for asking clarification from the lecturers or asking questions in English in front of their classmates. Regarding attitudes towards translanguaging in EMI classroom, it was revealed that although all the students (f=20) were aware of the benefits of translanguaging and they use this advantage during their studies, they have confusing opinions and hold different positions on using their first language in EMI classroom. In evaluation of students' general perspectives on

translanguaging, Macaro's (2009) continuum of perspectives on multiple language use was modified according to the students 'responses. This continuum included positions from monolingualism to multilingualism. The virtual position represented the **exclusive use of the target language** and **prohibition of use of L1**. Virtual position also represented the opinions of the students who think that translanguaging is **bad** and **detrimental** practice for their learning. The maximal position subscribes to the idea that students should maximize L2 use in EMI classrooms. These students use their first language as they do not have enough proficiency for fully understanding the content; however, with the feeling guilty and regret for switching between L1 and the L2. Maximal position mainly included the opinions of the students who think English should be used a great deal as they believe that the more English they use the more they improve their language skills; however, they are also aware of that exclusive use of L2 is not possible as perfect learning conditions such as their language proficiency in L2 classes do not exist and therefore, they use their L1 with sense of guilt. The optimal position holds a multilingual perspective, recognizing value in L1 use but without any regrets in using it. These students think that translanguaging is **good** and **beneficial** for their learning without any doubt. These students also believe that translanguaging does not have any negative effect on language skills. According to Macaro's (2009) continuum of perspectives on multiple language use, the majority of the students (f=10) were found to hold maximal position towards use of translanguaging while rest of the students were revealed to hold virtual (f=5) and optimal positions (f=5). This result showed that the majority of the students think that the use of target language should be maximized and support the idea that the more English is used the more it is improved. However, they use translanguaging as their language abilities are not sufficient for exclusive use of L2 and they are also aware that translanguaging has a positive effect on their content mastery. A specific evaluation of students' responses revealed that translanguaging is considered to have a positive effect on a deeper content comprehension (f=20), improvement of target language and metalinguistic awareness (f=16), flow of communication (f=11) and increasing participation and interaction in class (f=18). On the other hand, negative sides of translanguaging strategy were indicated as leading laziness that hinders cognitive processes in L2 (f=11) and Turkish is useful but it has to have restrictions (f=5).

Section 1. Some General Attitudes towards Translanguaging

Virtual Position to Translanguaging

Students who hold virtual position towards translanguaging (f=5) supported that L2 should be used exclusively and L1 should stay outside the classroom and should not be permitted inside the classroom so that they can improve their language skills. These students believe that English content class should have an "English Only Policy" and the more English students use in the classroom the more their English will improve and also they believe that students should use only English when working together on a task in the classroom.

Regarding the negative effect of use of L1 on improvement of English SH stated his perspective in Excerpt 9:

> Excerpt 9:
> *Translanguaging is detrimental for our English improvement. We can improve our language skills only if we do not give up when we have trouble and keep making an effort. For that reason I do not support use of L1 in L2 classroom. I think only English should be used as I believe that if we do not have trouble we do not learn. If the content is too complicated to understand in English, it would be the same in Turkish. Therefore, using L1 or doing translations for facilitating learning in English will not provide a solution for any problem faced regarding target language.* (SH)

Similarly, SN opposed to use of L1 strictly by stating that L1 should be forgotten in order to maximize the time for using the target language. He also supported the idea that the more English students use in the classroom the more their English will improve. He also stated that the reason why the people attending to exchange programs speak English well is that they are more exposed to language. Therefore, L1 should be prohibited in EMI. SN indicated her view in Excerpt 10:

> Excerpt 10:
> *I think use of L1 in EMI is very bad. They thought us if we want to learn English we have to forget our native language. That is why people attend to exchange programs. They learn English better abroad as they are exposed to language. I think the more we use the language the more we improve it.* (SN)

SL also supported English Only classroom by stressing its importance on language learning. It was remarkable in SL's statement that she gives priority to language learning over content learning. She stated that even if we do not understand the content English only should be followed for our language acquisition. SL' expression is stated in Excerpt: 11

Excerpt 11:

I think classes should be English only so that we could faster our target language acquisition. We can learn the missing parts of the content from friends or internet after the class but I prefer English Only classroom for improving my English. (SL)

SD also one of the students who held virtual position against translanguaging. She expressed that fluency in English is only possible with using only English in classroom. SD' statement is presented in Excerpt 12:

Excerpt 12:

I think translanguaging is detrimental. If we use our L1 in class we cannot be fluent in English. Even if we do not know the term we have to make an effort and paraphrase it. Thus, we catch the fluency and learn. (SD)

Maximal Position to Translanguaging

The majority of the students (f=10) held maximal position against translanguaging strategy which means that students favor maximization of English in the EMI classroom; however, they also think that use of L1 is inevitable in any case of trouble in EMI. These students use their first language as they do not have enough proficiency for fully understanding the content or set up communication; however, they feel guilty and regret for switching between L1 and the L2. SO expressed her opinion on translanguaging in Excerpt 13.

Excerpt 13:

Actually, I do not prefer using L1 in the class but when I have challenges in expressing myself, I feel as if I do not have any other option. Thus, I have to use it. (SO)

Similarly, SM expressed his opinion about language use in EMI classroom. He stated that he favors maximization of English; however, he uses L1 for a deeper understanding of content. SM' opinion is stated in Excerpt 14:

Excerpt 14:

If we want to reach a good English proficiency we have to us English in the classroom no matter how much trouble we face; however, we use translanguaging for facilitating of understanding the lecture. (SM)

Similarly, SB expressed his opinion for his preference of maximization of English in the classroom but he also stated the reason for this preference as it is what expected from him. He explained his perspective in Excerpt 15:

Excerpt 15:

We can talk in English by paraphrasing with a little bit more effort; however, we take the easy way out and escape. I use translanguaging to understand the lecture but I do feel guilty because it is not what the lecturer expects from us. (SB)

When students asked whether L1 should be permitted or not in L2 classroom. SC stated that English Only Policy may improve English proficiency on one hand; however, may also lead to deficiencies in content mastery. SC's opinion on translanguaging was stated in Excerpt 16:

Excerpt 16:

Translanguaging should be permitted in EMI classrooms as English Only Policy may faster my English acquisition; however, it leads deficiencies in content mastery. Restriction in L1 use decelerates my content mastery and makes acquisition of the content difficult. It is a dilemma. If restrictions are put on use of L1 we improve our English but miss a more important thing: content mastery. (SC)

Optimal Positions to Translanguaging

Students holding optimal position (f=5) recognize the value of L1 use without any regrets in using it. Students holding this position do not feel guilty for using L1 and appreciate its importance for their learning. They think that translanguaging is good and beneficial for their learning. SG expressed his opinion on translanguaging opposing to restrictions on use of L1 in Excerpt 17:

Excerpt 17:

Although we are following our studies under EMI policy, content mastery is crucial for us. I think it is not reasonable to insist on English learning and ignore the content. We have to master our profession that is why, we have to fully acquire the content. I support the use of L1 in EMI classroom and do not think it has any detrimental effect on our L2 improvement. We can improve our language skills in other ways. Therefore, strict rules for language use should not be followed. (SG)

Similarly SJ expressed her opinion about translanguaging stressing the value of L1 use on content learning in Excerpt 18:

Excerpt 18:

I support translanguaging. When we miss some parts in English and the lecturers summarize it in Turkish, we understand the content better. L1 should be used for a deeper understanding the content. (SJ)

Moreover; SK stated that it is advantageous and beneficial for their profession to learn academic terms in both languages. She believes that translanguaging improves both languages concurrently. In Excerpt 19, SK expressed her view in detail.

Excerpt 19:

I think translanguaging is beneficial. We will be engineers in the future. Learning both English and Turkish equivalents of the academic terms is advantageous for us. Thus, we could improve both languages concurrently. (SK)

Section 2. Some Specific Attitudes towards Translanguaging

Positive Attitudes towards Translanguaging

Although five students out of 20 students held virtual position against translanguaging, it was founded in specific evaluation of students' responses that all interviewed students use translanguaging as an advantage for their learning. They stated that translanguaging provides a deeper understanding of content (f=20), increases participation (f=18) and flow of communication in class (f=11) and improves language skills in the target language (f=16).

Translanguaging for a Deeper Comprehension of Content

All students agreed on advantage of the translanguaging on better comprehension of the content and they all showed positive attitudes regarding benefit of translanguaging on content mastery. They stated that switching between languages provides transition of knowledge between languages and contributes to reinforcing the knowledge in both languages. They stated that they have challenges regarding content mastery as they are not competent enough with language of instruction. It was found that this incompetency in English naturally leads to missing some important parts of content. Students pointed out that inability in fully understanding creates feeling of alienation against the lecture and also causes withdrawals from the lecture. It was also revealed that the inability of deeper understanding of content decreases students' motivation against the lecture sharply as they lose their control over the content. SA stated in Excerpt 1 that following English Only Policy may lead students to bypass the unperceived parts of the content which may cause deficient learning. Therefore, translanguaging should be used for students to keep their attention on the subject. The perception of SA was given in Excerpt 20:

> Excerpt 20:
> *Translanguaging is absolutely provides the content to be understood better. Students just bypass the parts of the content that they did not understand in English; however, if the lecturer summarizes the content in Turkish, students understand it better and keep their concentration on the topic.* (SA)

Students indicated that English Only Policy in EMI classroom decelerates their content learning and makes learning difficult. SE stated the advantage of translanguaging on content acquisition in the Excerpt 21:

Excerpt 21:

In my opinion, translanguaging in the classroom is beneficial to my learning. When the lecturer notices that we do not understand some parts of the content, s/he explains it in Turkish and helps us checking comprehension of it. (SE)

SK stressed the importance of translanguaging on making meaning and establishing connection between knowledge in both languages in Excerpt 22:

Excerpt 22:

I have sometimes difficulties in understanding some points of the content. When I ask it and lecturer answer it in Turkish, I can make meaning of it and set up connection and transition between knowledge in both languages and understand complicated part better. Therefore, I think using first language should be utilized in EMI classroom. (SK)

SJ focused on retention of knowledge through translanguaging. She stated that using L1 in EMI classroom increases retention of knowledge and deeper comprehension of content. SJ's statement is indicated in Excerpt 23:

Excerpt 23:

Translanguaging is good for our understanding of topic. It provides permanent learning of content. Therefore, it should be permitted. (SJ)

SI stressed that learning content in an incompetent language causes problems in being sure of the acquired knowledge. SI stated that translanguaging is beneficial for checking the comprehension of the knowledge and reinforcing the meaning in Excerpt 24:

Excerpt 24:

Because of my English level, I cannot be sure whether I understood the topic correctly or not. I always have a doubt in my mind. However, when the lecturer summarizes the content in Turkish, I can verify the acquired knowledge and be sure of what I understood. So, translanguaging is beneficial for reinforcing the meaning. (SI)

SF also agreed on the benefit of translanguaging on verification of acquired knowledge stated in the Excerpt 25 that:

Excerpt 25:

I think it is good to use first language in EMI classroom. Sometimes I do not understand the questions and instructions in English because of deficiency in my vocabulary skills. That is why; when the lecturer summarizes the content in Turkish I can verify the meaning. (SF)

SQ also mentioned about the benefit of translanguaging on make sense of meaning She stated that she has some challenges in fully understanding the content and she can be sure of fully understanding of missing parts after Turkish explanation of lecturers. SQ's explanation is stated in Excerpt 26:

Excerpt 26:

I am not sure of impact of translanguaging on language improvement but it is definitely providing advantage for understanding the content. After English explanation, I have some missing parts that I cannot understand. When the lecturer revises the subject in Turkish, the missing parts of the content fit together in my mind. Thus, I can reinforce the acquired knowledge. (SQ)

Furthermore, some students stated that translanguaging strategies used by the lecturers provide students to maintain their attention on the lesson. They stated that when they cannot understand the lesson because of their English language proficiency they lose their motivation and attention during the class. Therefore, they perceived lecturers' translanguaging strategies as beneficial to maintain their attention to their studies. SD indicated her ideas in Excerpt 27 in detail.

Excerpt 27:

I think lecturers' translanguaging practices provide advantages to students. There is a great deal of high level vocabularies that we are not familiar with. If the lecturer does not explain the term in Turkish, we lose our concentration and attention during the class. (SD)

Translanguaging for Increasing Participation

The high majority of the students (f=18) stated that interactivity of the classroom decreases when English only policy is followed. Students indicated that they feel hesitated to ask or answer the lecturers' questions in English even if they know the answer because of their English language proficiency level. Lack of participation leads students to lose their attention in the classroom and also decreases students' success. However, they also indicated that translanguaging should be permitted in the classroom but should also have some restrictions. Otherwise it may cause laziness in L2 acquisition. SA expressed his opinion in Excerpt 28:

Excerpt 28:

Using first language in the classroom certainly increases participation in the classroom because expectation from us to use only English causes hesitation to participate and passivation in the classroom. Moreover, this situation creates feeling of alienation to lecture. We do not answer lecturers' questions as we are afraid of using a wrong word in the sentence and any possible social reaction in the classroom. That is why, we withdraw from the lecture and automatically be defective in the lecture. (SA)

SC argued that translanguaging should be permitted in the class and it increases his participation; however, he also added that L1 has to have restrictions as the medium of instruction is English in the department. His opinion is stated in Excerpt 29 below:

Excerpt 29:

If English only policy is followed, it certainly affects the interaction and participation negatively in the classroom. L1 should be used; however, it does not mean that we talk in Turkish whenever we are in trouble with English. The

language of instruction is English in our department so we have to talk in English. (SC)

SK expressed that when first language use is restricted in the classroom her participation decreases. She stated that she feels stressful when she cannot response the lecturer's questions because of her English proficiency even if she knows the answer of the question. Her expression is stated in Excerpt 30:

Excerpt 30:

Translanguaging should be permitted. For example, even if I know the answer, I cannot participate in the class and cannot answer lecturer's question because of my English level. This situation makes me feel stressful and decreases my motivation towards the lecture. Therefore, I think translanguaging is a beneficial strategy for increasing participation to class and for activation of students. (SK)

SJ expressed her positive attitude towards translanguaging in Excerpt 31 stating that English Only Policy in EMI classroom hinders interaction in the classroom and this case leads to deficient learning of content.

Excerpt 31:

I think translanguaging should be permitted because sometimes there are some parts that I cannot fully comprehend. I feel the need to ask it to lecturers; however, I cannot ask as my English is not proficient enough. I have to skip this part without understanding it and this situation leads deficient learning of content. Therefore, students should be able to ask or answer questions in their first language. (SJ)

Some other students also stated that participation in the classroom decreases when English only policy is followed. SH stated in Excerpt 32 that students may feel hesitated and anxious in participating in lecture if they are expected to ask and answer the questions in English.

Excerpt 32:

The level of participation in class depends on the language level of the students. If student does not have enough proficiency in English s/he might feel hesitation regarding expressing herself. Thus, s/he does not ask or answer questions. (SH)

Translanguaging for Flow of Communication

Students stated that they have challenges in fluency and they use translanguaging for the flow of communication (f=11). These students indicated that they use translanguaging when they feel inadequate to express themselves. They indicated that they use Turkish in speaking as they feel unable to express themselves in English sufficiently because of some language related and social challenges like deficiency in vocabulary, problems in making sentences and fear of speaking amidst people, making mistakes and misunderstanding and lack of confidence.

SB shared his opinion regarding the reason why he uses translanguaging in Excerpt 33.

Excerpt 33:

I start to talk in English but when I could not complete the sentence, I continue in Turkish for the flow of communication. (SB)

Some of the students stated that they use translanguaging during the communication because of deficiency of their vocabulary knowledge. SA pointed out her experience in the Excerpt 34.

Excerpt 34:

As my vocabulary knowledge is insufficient, I cannot express myself clearly that is why, I turn to use Turkish when I speak. (SA)

Similarly, ST stressed deficiency of vocabulary and inability of making sentences during the communication. ST's expression is stated in Excerpt 35.

Excerpt 35:

I have to use my first language when I have trouble in finding the fitting word and in making clear sentences. (ST)

SG stated that he uses translanguaging as he has not enough self-confidence for expressing himself in English in Excerpt 36.

Excerpt 36:

I utilize my first language when answering lecturers' questions. This is not because I cannot answer in English. I can understand the lesson and take notes in English. It is mainly because I have lack of self-confidence in answering questions in English in front of my classmates. I feel hesitated. (SG)

SI indicated in Excerpt 37 that he uses translanguaging not to be misunderstood and to express himself clearly.

Excerpt 37:

I use my first language in order to avoid any misunderstanding. It can be problematic to be misunderstood when I try to talk in English. (SI)

Translanguaging for Metalinguistic Awareness and Concept Literacy

Regarding the benefit of translanguaging on improvement on target language the majority of students (f=16) showed positive attitudes. They stated that using first language in EMI classroom provides retention of information in target language, reconstruction of meaning and vocabulary development. The remaining four students believed that using more than one language is detrimental for second language acquisition and they also believe that translanguaging leads to weakness of L2 as they believe that the more they are exposed to L2 the more they will improve it.

SH expressed his opinion on the effect of translanguaging on the retention of knowledge in Excerpt 38.

Excerpt 38:

When we use first language in the classroom we determine a reference to information and it provides retention of the information in the target language. (SH)

Other students stated that when they learn Turkish equivalents of English terms they can reconstruct the meaning in target language. SE stated in Excerpt 39 that:

Excerpt 39:
Using Turkish in EMI classroom contribute to my English skills. For example, when I learn Turkish equivalent of an English term that I am not familiar with, the meaning of this term indurates in my mind. (SE)

SF added the importance of using first language for maintaining motivation in L2 learning. She stated her opinion in Excerpt 40:

Excerpt 40:
When I have trouble in understanding content in English, I lose my motivation towards learning both content and English language. (SF)

When their perception about the effects of translanguaging on their L2 was asked, students stressed the benefit of the translanguaging especially on reinforcing the meaning. SB explained this benefit with an example on Excerpt 41 below:

Excerpt 41:
Translanguaging provides an advantage for our English language skills. For example, when the lecturer uses the term "stakeholder" we do not understand what it means exactly; however, when s/he explains it's meaning as "paydaş" in Turkish we may have the chance to reinforce the meaning of this word in both languages. (SB)

Regarding, translanguaging for improvement of target language, SA also expressed positive attitude; however, he added that it may also cause laziness in L2 acquisition. The opinion of SA was stated in Excerpt 42:

Excerpt 42:
Use of L1 may contribute to foreign language skills; however, it also may lead slackness. Students may not make an effort to improve their English skills when they know use of L1 is permitted. (SA)

SI stressed the advantage of translanguaging on verification of acquired knowledge. He stated in the Excerpt 43 that translanguaging provides him to make comparison between two languages and verify what he understood and this case contribute to improve his L2 skills.

Excerpt 43:

I think translanguaging contributes to our second language skills. When we revise English conducted lecture in Turkish we could be sure whether we understood correctly or not. We can verify and make transitions of the knowledge between both languages. Making this comparison in both languages helps us to improve in both languages. (SI)

Some students also focused on the positive effect of translanguaging on learning vocabulary and pronunciation. According to ST, knowledge remains superficial when they do not know the equivalent in their first language. ST's statement is stated below in Excerpt 44:

Excerpt 44:

When we learn the Turkish equivalent of any English term we could learn its meaning and pronunciation, thus we could add one more term to our vocabulary knowledge. Otherwise, this term would remain superficial in our mind. (ST)

Negative Attitudes towards Translanguaging

Although all students indicated that they use translanguaging in EMI classrooms practically and all agreed its benefit on content learning and most of them indicated its contribution to language improvement, flow of communication and increasing participation, it was also revealed from the interviews that there were also negative attitudes towards translanguaging. Students stated that they have to struggle for using English in the classroom as they believe the more they use English the more they will improve in the language otherwise extensive use of L1 causes **laziness** that hinders cognitive processes in L2 (f=11). The other negative attitude towards translanguaging was that it is useful but it has to have **restrictions** (f=5). Negative attitudes were illustrated below in detail.

L1 use as an act of laziness that hinders cognitive processes in L2

The first negative effect of translanguaging indicated by students (f=11) was that translanguaging causes laziness in the improvement of L2 skills. Students highlighted that they have to make an effort to improve their English as they are studying in EMI. They linked the improvement in L2 to L2 only environment. They stated input and output in EMI classroom should be in English so that they can improve their English skills. They also stated that the extensive presence of the L1 in the classroom, in this case, Turkish causes laziness and hinders cognitive processes in L2 as they believe improvement occurs only when all the lectures conducted in L2. Moreover, some students indicated that translanguaging is detrimental for their language skills. These students believe that the more they use English the more they will improve it. Therefore, any interference of first language in EMI classroom will cause weakness of L2. SB expressed his opinion in Excerpt 45:

Excerpt 45:

I think it is bad. I believe that we can say what we want to say with a little bit more effort or we can paraphrase it; however, we take the easy way out and escape. That is why, I believe that use of L1 causes students to escape from trouble and it leads to laziness for improvement of L2. (SB)

Similarly, SD expressed that fluency in target language depends on making effort on using English in the classroom. Her point of view is stated in Excerpt 46:

Excerpt 46:

I think it is bad. As long as we use translanguaging we cannot be fluent in English. We have to make an effort to use English no matter how many challenges we face. (SD)

SB also expressed his feeling in Excerpt 47 and stated that he feels guilty when he uses Turkish in the class as it is not what expected from him in EMI classroom.

Excerpt 47:

I use translanguaging but I do feel guilty because it is not what the lecturer expects from us. (SB)

SH stated that English only should be the language of the classroom for a better acquisition of target language and it has not any effect on a better comprehension in Excerpt 48:

Excerpt 48:

Using first language in EMI classroom is not good. Because I believe that we have to keep trying and make effort to use only English in the classroom instead of giving up and turning to use Turkish so that we could improve our second language skills. That is why; I do not support using first language in EMI classroom. The more we use English the more we learn. Translation is not a solution for better understanding. If the subject is difficult in one language, it is also difficult in another language. (SH)

The other student claimed that translanguaging provides no contribution to language skills. On the contrary, it causes weakness in our language skills. SL stated his opinion in Excerpt 49:

Excerpt 49:

I do not think translanguaging provides any contribution to our language skills. On the contrary, I believe that it causes weakness in our language skills. (SL)

Finally, SA stated that translanguaging may lead habit formation for using first language extensively and this habit may cause laziness against target language. His statement is stated in Excerpt 50:

Excerpt 50:

Using first language may contribute to some students' learning. However, it may also leads to laziness for L2 acquisition. Students may form a habit of using first language whenever they have a trouble in English without any effort as they know they are permitted to use translanguaging. (SA)

Turkish is useful but it has to have restrictions!

Students (f=5) indicated that although Turkish is beneficial in helping students feel more comfortable in terms of participation in the class, such reversal to L1 requires

restrictions. They clarified that Turkish should not be a gate to escape from using English in any case of trouble. As the language of instruction is English they highlighted the importance of making effort to use English in EMI classroom. SA pointed out his views in Excerpt 51:

Excerpt 51:
I think translanguaging should be permitted to increase interactivity in the class but it should not mean that we can use our first language whenever we have trouble in English. Language of instruction in our department is English therefore, we have to use English and keep Turkish minimal. (SA)

SB stated in Excerpt 52 that translanguaging should be used but not extensively.

Excerpt 52:
I think translanguaging should be permitted to increase participation of the students but only to some extent for supporting us. (SB)

SJ stated that English Only classroom is an advantage for students to improve their language skills. She also added that L1 could be used for different functions but it has to have restrictions. SJ's expression is stated in Excerpt 53:

Excerpt 53:
It is not good to always speak Turkish in English class. EMI provides a big advantage for us. In order to finish our degree with a high English proficiency level, we have to use it. Therefore, use of first language should be restricted and minimized. We could use it only when we have challenge in understanding some points but not always. (SJ)

Similarly, SM also supported the idea that L1 should be minimized and used only for clarification. SM's explanation is stated in Excerpt 54:

Excerpt 54:
L1 should be limited and should only be used for clarifying the complicated parts of the content. (SM)

Finally, SK indicated for the use of L1 that L1 should be tolerated but has to have some limitations. SK's explanation is stated in Excerpt 55:

Excerpt 55:

Translanguaging should be tolerated to some extent but should be limited otherwise it may lead laziness for learning the target language. (SK)

4.3.4. Types of Translanguaging Practices used by EMI Students

It was revealed that the majority of the interviewed students face challenges in copying with EMI instruction. According to the interview, use of L1 to facilitate learning in EMI context and to overcome the obstacles they face during their studies in EMI was revealed to be common among all interviewed students. Although they stated that they feel guilty and mainly do not want to use first language in the classroom, all students accepted that they use first language to facilitate content learning in their classrooms. The translanguaging strategies used by students were founded to be;

- Scaffolding with peers and lecturer's collaboration (f=20),
- Translanguaging through translation (f=9) and use of bilingual materials (f=7)
- Translanguaging through note taking in L1 (f=10)

Scaffolding through Translanguaging with peers and lecturers to negotiate meaning

When students are asked with whom they use the translanguaging strategy, it was found that the most encountered type of translanguaging is to ask for peer support and lecturer's collaboration to negotiate meaning. All students use translanguaging with both their classmates or their lecturers when asking and answering questions to reconstruct the meaning or for clarification of the parts of content that they did not understand during the class. The majority of the students (f=14) use translanguaging both with classmates and their lecturers while the rest of the students (f=6) stated that they use their first language only with classmates. It was a remarkable point that students prefer asking any incomprehensible point of the content first to their classmates but if the trouble continues they ask to their lecturers as a second option (f=5). Students indicated that they use translanguaging with their classmates and lecturers

mainly for understanding and clarifying the complicated parts of the content. SE explained translanguaging practices with her classmates and lecturers in the Excerpt 56:

Excerpt 56:

When I have difficulty in understanding the content I generally ask my classmate sitting beside me and I sometimes ask to my teacher. I understand English but I cannot talk. Therefore, I ask my teacher in Turkish and s/he explains me in English. (SE)

Similarly, SF indicated that she uses translanguaging in case of trouble in understanding the content in EMI classroom. She explained her translanguaging practices in Excerpt 57:

Excerpt 57:

I use Turkish when I have difficulty in understanding in the lecture. I ask in Turkish and the lecturer makes explanation in English. I make notes of the important parts and work on them at home by translating them to Turkish. (SF)

SH also mentioned about his translanguaging practices with his classmates and lecturers. He stated that his use of Turkish in the classroom depends of language choice of the people he is talking to. His expression is stated in Excerpt 58:

Excerpt 58:

I use translanguaging depending on the language choice at that time. I talk in Turkish with the lecturer or friends talking to me in Turkish or vice versa. When I do not understand something during the class, I ask in Turkish, my friends or teachers explain it. (SH)

SN indicated his opinion regarding translanguaging in Excerpt 59. When he was asked whether he has any challenge in studying in EMI, he stated that he does not have and added that if he has any problem he overcomes it with the collaboration of his classmates. He also stated his disagreement regarding asking questions to lecturers in Turkish. He disapproved lecturers' collaboration on learning as he believes that students

should ask their questions only to classmates but have to use only English with the lecturers.

Excerpt 59:

I do not have any trouble regarding EMI because we discuss complicated parts of the lesson and explain incomprehensible terms to each other with my classmates. I think students should not talk to lecturer in Turkish during the class as I believe it hinders the flow of the lecture. We should ask to our classmates sitting beside us if we do not understand. However, if asking to classmates does not work we can ask to lecturer for summary in Turkish after the lecture. (SN)

SM shares the same opinion with SN and states that lecture should be conducted 100% in English by the lecturer; however, students may ask for clarification of complicated parts. His opinion is stated in Excerpt 60:

Excerpt 60:

Students may talk in Turkish among each other during the lecture; however, I prefer everybody talk to lecturers only in English and in the same vein, I believe that the lecturer also should talk to students only in English. (SM)

SL gave priority to language learning and therefore, he pointed out that lectures should only conducted in English for improvement of language skills. Regarding the challenges in content learning in an incompetent language he indicated that he uses translanguaging practices with his classmates and overcomes this challenge via peer support and reading in Turkish. His statement is stated in Excerpt 61 below:

Excerpt 61:

I think classes should only be conducted in English because I believe we could only improve our language skills by using it. Regarding the challenges in content learning, we can find a way to overcome it. We ask to classmates for clarification of incomprehensible parts or we can search and read in Turkish for a better understanding. (SL)

Some students also indicated that they prefer asking for clarification from their classmates or lecturers depending on the difficulty level of content. They stated that they first prefer to ask to classmates; however, if they still continue to have trouble in understanding they ask in Turkish to lecturers as a final option. They stated regarding the reason of this situation that they have a feeling of hesitation to ask to lecturers in Turkish. SK expressed her opinion in Excerpt 62:

Excerpt 62:

Sometimes I have trouble in understanding the pronunciation of the lecturer. When s/he speaks fast I could not grasp what s/he means. I ask the parts that I could not grasp first to my friends as I may feel hesitation to talk to lecturers in Turkish. However, if I still could not be sure of what I understood I have to ask to lecturer. (SK)

Translation and use of Bilingual Materials to Check the Comprehension

The second type of translanguaging practices used by students was revealed to be the use of translation and bilingual materials. Almost half of the students (f=9) indicated that as they have trouble in fully understanding the content during the lecture, they translate the study materials at home to reinforce their understanding and to check their comprehension. They also state that they use bilingual dictionary (f=7) during the class if they can to find the meaning of unknown vocabulary. SA and SB stated that they translate the English presentations provided by lecturers to Turkish in order to reiterate the content. They explained their strategy in Excerpt 63 and 64:

Excerpt 63:

I revise the lecture by translating the presentations provided by the lecturers during the class. I translate them to Turkish in order to fully comprehend the lecture. (SA)

Excerpt 64:

I put some marks on the parts of the materials that I did not understand in the class and I reiterate translating all related parts at home in order to understand better. (SB)

SO stated that translation of the academic vocabulary can be a solution for copying with the challenges faced in EMI. Furthermore, she stated that bilingual books and study materials can contribute to overcome troubles in understanding the content in EMI. SO's statement is stated in Excerpt 65.

Excerpt 65:

Students should translate and see the Turkish equivalents of the academic vocabularies to understand the content; however, if they do not, they can take advantage of bilingual books and materials. They can use them as a final option. (SO)

Some students stated that they use bilingual dictionary for finding out Turkish meaning of the academic vocabulary for a better understanding. SR stated regarding his translanguaging practices for copying with challenges faced in EMI that he uses bilingual dictionary for finding out Turkish equivalents of English terms and he notes them to memorize the meaning when he encounters with it second time. His opinion is stated in Excerpt 66.

Excerpt 66:

The lecturer generally gives the academic keywords in the beginning of the lesson. I note them. I encounter with some of the words that I am not familiar with. I check their meaning from the dictionary and note their Turkish equivalents so that I can recheck their meaning whenever I meet with them until I learn them. (SR)

Similarly, students C, E and J stated that they use bilingual dictionary to find out the meaning of unknown words in Excerpt 67, 68 and 69.

Excerpt 67:

Sometimes, I do not understand what the lecturers mean in English because of vocabulary deficiency. I try to overcome this problem by using dictionary. (SE)

Excerpt 68:

We certainly use dictionary during the class and we do translation at home. (SC)

Excerpt 69:

If I have the chance of looking to Turkish equivalents of unknown words from the dictionary during the lecture, I do it; otherwise, I note the word on the blank parts of my notebook and check the meaning after the lecture. (SJ)

Note taking in L1

Students participated in the interviews indicate also that they take notes in Turkish during EMI classes (f=10). They stated that they write Turkish meaning of the English vocabulary that they are not familiar with. SC explains his language choice in note taking in Excerpt 70:

Excerpt 70:

In some situations I take Turkish notes during the class and check the English equivalent later. (SC)

Differently, SB stated that he takes notes in his native language regardless of the language used by the lecturers or the materials. SB's explanation is stated in Excerpt 71:

Excerpt 71:

I take notes in Turkish without depending on lecturers' language choice. (SB)

On the contrary, SF stated that she takes notes depending on lecturer's language choice. Her expression is stated in Excerpt 72:

Excerpt 72:

I take notes in both Turkish and English. If the lecturer talks in English I take notes in English or vice versa. (SF)

SK indicated in Excerpt 73 that she takes notes in both languages. She notes the Turkish explanation of what the lecturers explain in English during the lecture for a better understanding and retention of the information.

Excerpt 73:

*I take notes in both Turkish and English during the lesson. I generally write Turkish explanation of what the lecturers explain in English during the lecture. Because I can keep the information in my mind by this way and understand it better. (*SK)

SN also stated that he generally takes notes according to the language choice of the lecturer; however, he notes the questions in Turkish and solves them in English and then deletes the Turkish questions. His statement is stated in Excerpt 74:

Excerpt 74:

*I translate the questions and write them on my notebook. I solve the questions in English and then I delete the Turkish questions. (*SN)

4.4. Analysis of Interviews Administered with EMI Lecturers

4.4.1. Background information of the lecturers

Ten lecturers giving EMI subject courses at Electric and Electronic Engineering, Materials Engineering, Bioengineering, Computer Engineering Management and Information Systems departments at Adana STU participated in the interview. Nine of the participants were male and one of the lecturers was female. All the participants indicated that they are Turkish native speakers and English knowing bilinguals. Two of the lecturers stated that they are multilingual of English, Arabic and German. The most experienced lecturer stated that he had 15 years of teaching experience on EMI context. The least experienced lecturer stated that he had 5 months of teaching experience in EMI context. The other lecturers teaching experience under EMI policy ranged from one and half year to ten years.

4.4.2. Lecturers' Attitudes towards Translanguaging

Attitudes towards translanguaging were evaluated under Macaro's (2009) continuum of perspectives on multiple language use. The continuum includes virtual, maximal and optimal positions, demonstrating the perspectives ranging from monolingualism to multilingualism. That is, the **virtual position** prescribes the exclusive use of the target language and disapproves any interference of other languages. These teachers usually do not use and do not let students use their native language in their classroom and repeatedly warn them to use the target language. The **maximal position** subscribes to the idea that teachers should maximize L2 use, while usually feeling guilty for switching between students' L1 and the L2. This includes the beliefs of the lecturers who believe that English only classroom is not possible as there not perfect circumstances in L2 setting; therefore, these teachers use some L1 but with sense of guilt. In this study, lecturers holding maximal positions prefer maximization of English; however, they feel that they have to use Turkish to some extent because students' language proficiency is not sufficient enough to fully grasp the information in EMI. The **optimal position** holds a multilingual perspective, recognizing value in L1 use but without any pedagogical regrets. These lecturers use L1 in the classroom and have no problem with it. In this study, 5 of the participants indicated that they **sometimes** use translanguaging; 2 of them indicated that they **always** use translanguaging and 1 of them stated he **often** uses translanguaging in the classroom. This outcome means that the majority of the participants use translanguaging strategies during their lectures. Regarding Macaro's (2009) continuum, among the participants, 5 of the participants hold optimal, 3 maximal and 2 of them holds virtual position towards translanguaging. It means that the most lecturers at Adana STU hold a multilingual perspective and recognize the value in L1 use without any pedagogical regrets. The attitudes of the lecturers were discussed in detail below.

Virtual Position to Translanguaging

With regard to virtual position to translanguaging, 2 lecturers hold a virtual position. LG stated that he prefers not to use any other language in his classrooms. He warns students and tries to encourage them to use only English in the classrooms. He also thinks that it is his duty to use monolingual instruction because of schools' language policy. He also stated great majority of the students choose to use the Turkish

when they ask questions or when they answer his questions. Although the English only inclination of the lecturer it is evident that translanguaging of the students is inevitable and naturally occurring. His opinion regarding translanguaging is stated in Excerpt 75:

Excerpt 75:

I do not use more than one language in my classrooms. The great majority of the students choose to use the Turkish when they ask questions or when they answer my question; however, I am trying to encourage them to speak in English because of the school's EMI policy. I do not accept questions asked in Turkish. I warn and encourage them to use English as the medium of instruction of the program is English. Teaching in English is my responsibility so I do not think that I have the chance to take the easy way out. As the language of the instruction is English, I think courses should be delivered only in English so that I could fulfill my responsibility to my job. EMI is a very controversial topic; however, my duty is to conduct my course as clearly as possible in English if the course's language is English. That is why; I disagree with using other languages in the classroom. Moreover; using another language in the classroom may cause challenges for the foreign students who do not share the same first language with me and with other students. Therefore, as a principle, I prefer and pay attention not to use even one word of Turkish in the technical part of my class except of some jokes since the beginning of my first teaching experience in the classes. (LG)

LI who also supports English Only Policy in EMI classroom stated that languages should be separated. If the language of instruction of the department is Turkish, lecturers exclusively should be conducted in Turkish or vice versa. Otherwise; using two languages will lead to "contamination of the languages". He also supported that if the lectures are conducted only in English students will form a habit and get used to think in L2. LI's expression regarding languages in EMI classroom is stated in in Excerpt 76:

Excerpt 76:

I think translanguaging should not be utilized in EMI classroom. If the language of instruction is determined as 100% English the whole lesson should be conducted in English. I also graduated from an EMI department and we never

used any other language during our studies from the beginning till the end. I think if we insist on using only English our students will also get used to think and understand the language thus they will improve their language skills. That is why, I support language separation. If the language is determined in Turkish, it should be conducted in only in Turkish or vice versa. Otherwise, using more than one language in the same classroom will leads to "contamination of languages". (LI)

Maximal Position to Translanguaging

3 lecturers hold maximal position against translanguaging. Lecturers holding maximal positions have expectations for maximization of English and trying not to use it as much as possible; however, they feel that they need to use it because of language related challenges of their students. Therefore, these lecturers maximize their use of the target language and minimize the use of first language; however, they generally let students use Turkish when they are in trouble. Although they do not feel comfortable with use of L1, they do not act negatively or put strict rules on students' language use. LB stated regarding his language use in the classroom that he tried not to use Turkish in the classroom; however, he noticed deficiency in content understanding of the students. He also noticed that students get rid of confusion when Turkish is used; therefore, he stated that he started to use Turkish to some extent at least to clarify the complicated parts of content. LB's opinion regarding translanguaging is stated in Excerpt 77:

Excerpt 77:

I have tried a lot not to use Turkish in my classes but I felt that when I use translanguaging students understand the content better and relieve. I felt like they get rid of confusion. For example, out of 20-30 my sentence, sometimes at least 4-5 sentences are not understood. Therefore, I just started to clarify the incomprehensible parts in Turkish. (LB)

LD is also one of the lecturers who support maximization of target language. He favors mainly English Only Policy in the classroom; however, he indicated by stressing the importance of understanding the content that he always prefers responding to questions in English; however, he also permits students' translanguaging when he notices that they are unable to express themselves clearly. LD's expression is stated in Excerpt 78.

Excerpt 78:

I believe that if the language of instruction is English, English only policy should be followed because if translanguaging is permitted students will always choose their native language in the classroom. I always answer the question in English and encourage students to use English; however, if they do not manage to express themselves in English I let them ask in Turkish because our priority is students' full understanding the content. (LD)

Similarly, LJ indicated his effort for finding a compromise between languages in the EMI classroom. He stated that his expectation from the students is their use of English to the maximum extent as they can. He also stated that exclusive use of English leads students to lose their attention while extensive use of Turkish causes laziness for L2 acquisition. LJ's opinion regarding language choice in EMI classroom is stated in Excerpt 79:

Excerpt 79:

I repeatedly remind students regarding my expectation of using the language of the lecture when answering the questions; however, when we put restrictions on language use, students do not participate in the lecture. Therefore, I do not want them to lose their motivation towards the lecture. Actually, I am trying to find out a compromise regarding the languages because when we use exclusively English students lose their attention to the lecture and in contrary, extensive use of Turkish causes laziness for use of L2 and they always intend to use Turkish in the classroom. It is a dilemma and does not have an answer. (LJ)

LJ expressed also that L1 should be used in a systematic way and should be under control. Regarding translanguaging, he stated that it should be permitted to some extent for supporting the learning of first year students because of their language level proficiency; however, he thinks that it should be restricted in students' second year.

Optimal Position to Translanguaging

With regard to optimal position to translanguaging, 5 lecturers were revealed to have optimal position regarding translanguaging practices. That is, they have a multilingual perspective and do not have any pedagogical regrets regarding lecturers' and students' use

of their first language in EMI classroom. They stated that they answer students' questions according to the students' language choice. If the question is forwarded in English they answer it in English or vice versa. They also stressed the idea that their fundamental aim is student' fully understanding the content therefore, they are utilize and let students use translanguaging in the classroom. LA stated in Excerpt 80 that he does not have any problem with the use of translanguaging in the classroom and he follows a flexible instructional method in his lectures.

Excerpt 80:

I do not have any restriction on language use in the classroom. I do not have any problem regarding use of translanguaging practices. Students ask their questions in their preferred language and I answer the questions in both languages. (LA)

LC supported the translanguaging practices by doing a self-assessment and stated that sometimes both lecturers and students may have difficulties in expressing themselves clearly. Therefore, she utilizes translanguaging strategy by revising the content and academic terms in Turkish. LC's opinion regarding language use in EMI classroom is stated in Excerpt 81.

Excerpt 81:

If I do an assessment regarding lecturers' and students' language use, I think that I do not express myself and convey the information as I do in my first language. When I revise the content in Turkish I can be more comfortable in expressing myself; thus, students have the chance to revise the content for the second time in their first language and learn and make comparison of academic vocabulary in both languages. (LC)

Similarly, LE supported the use of Turkish in EMI classroom as he believes that linguistic background of the students cannot be ignored. He also stressed that students have limited opportunities of using English outside the classroom which is an obstacle in the improvement of L2, therefore, expecting a high proficiency level as that of monolingual English speakers will not be fair and this monolingual perspectives hinders sufficient content mastery. He also stated that he prefers to make sure of students' fully

comprehension of their profession rather than focusing only on language. LE supports students centered approach in his teaching by expressing that lecturers have to be flexible and facilitate students' learning. LE's opinion is stated in Excerpt 82.

Excerpt 82:

I answer the students' questions in the language they ask because when I answer Turkish forwarded question in English, student will still not understand it. Therefore, if it is forwarded in Turkish I prefer to answer it in Turkish. I permit translanguaging practice in my classroom. Actually, we are living in Turkey and students are used to learning in Turkish up till now. Students have limited opportunities of using English outside the classroom therefore; it is not fair to expect them to use English with the same proficiency as the monolingual English speakers. The monolingual expectation leads to deficiencies in content mastery. Therefore, I do not have strict rules in language use and do not support English Only Policy in my classrooms. I am also using translanguaging practices. I use English but in any case of not understanding I turn to Turkish. (LE)

LE also stated that even if the language of instruction is English, student-centered approaches should be followed and students should be supported to facilitate their learning. He agreed that English as a lingua franca should be learnt; however, he stressed that the majority of these students will carry out their profession in Turkey. Therefore; the priority should be given to teach them their profession so that they can be successful engineers in the future. Therefore, he stated that flexible teaching strategies should be adopted even if the language of instruction is determined as English.

LF focused on the language proficiency of the students and stated in Excerpt 83 that first year students are in the transitional period from Turkish to English therefore, lecturers should not force them use only English.

Excerpt 83:

I do not have negative attitude towards translanguaging because first year students are in a transitional period from Turkish to English and their English language proficiency is not sufficient yet to follow their all studies in English. Therefore, they should not be forced to use only English in the classroom. (LF)

Finally, LH stated her thoughts regarding translanguaging practices in the classroom and indicated her positive attitude towards systematic use of first language. He stressed that it will be wrong to put all students' language proficiency level in the same equation; therefore, scaffolding should be done and complicated parts of the content should be simplified and summarization in Turkish should be done for facilitating students learning. He also indicated that strict rules in language use may cause huge problems such as decreased motivation level of students and students' dropping out the school. LH's thought regarding translanguaging is stated in Excerpt 84.

Excerpt 84:

I react positively to translanguaging practices in the classroom. For me, full comprehension of content is more important irrespective of languages. Translanguaging should be permitted or at least the content should be summarized in Turkish. It will be wrong to put all students' language proficiency level in the same equation and expect all students to understand everything to the same extent. Therefore, scaffolding should be done when the lecture is delivered in English in order to simplify the knowledge and facilitate students' comprehension and Turkish summary should be done for a few minutes of the lecture. This increases students' self-confidence. Strict rules in classroom language may cause huge problems such as decreased motivation level of students and students' dropping out the school. (LH)

4.4.3. Lecturers' Purposes for Translanguaging Practices in EMI Classrooms

In this part, the purposes of using translanguaging practices by EMI lecturers are presented. The high majority of the lecturers indicated that they use translanguaging to different extents and purposes. Out of 10 interviewed lecturers only two of them stated that they never use translanguaging strategies in the lectures and encourage students to use only English. The findings of the interview revealed that lecturers use translanguaging for firstly, instructional purposes such as facilitating comprehension of content (f=8), explaining and clarifying new words and concepts (f=7), giving voice and increasing students' participation (f=7) and secondly, for affective purposes such as comforting, encouraging and building rapport with students (f=6). Purposes of translanguaging strategies used by EMI lecturers are discussed below.

Translanguaging for Facilitating Comprehension

The most indicated purpose of using translanguaging was revealed to be facilitating better comprehension of content. Lecturers indicated that students may have difficulties in understanding some parts of the content because of their low English language proficiency; therefore, they use first language of students to clarify the complicated parts of the content to mediate students' learning. They stressed that they use translanguaging especially when they notice that students did not understand what they heard. They stated that when the complicated part of the lecture is clarified by the lecturers in students' first language, students have the chance to compare and verify the acquired knowledge thus, the uncertainty felt by students about the acquired knowledge and superficial learning of content could be avoided. Scaffolding through translanguaging was revealed to be used by the lecturers to make comprehension easier. They also stressed the effect of the prior knowledge in making sense of the knowledge in another language. LA pointed out that students with low English proficiency may have challenges in comprehending some analytical and mathematical parts of the lecture. He stated that he makes Turkish explanations to help students understand better. LA's explanation is stated in Excerpt 85:

> Excerpt 85:
> *As the contents of my lectures are mostly analytical and mathematical, it can be hard to grasp the information in English; therefore, I make Turkish explanations when I notice that students did not understand some parts of the subjects.* (LA)

In the same vein, LB also supported the positive effect of translanguaging strategies in EMI classroom for mediating students' learning. He also stated that he tries to scaffold the knowledge to make difficult concept understood more easily by students. LB's expression is stated in Excerpt 86:

> Excerpt 86:
> *I use translanguaging strategies especially to clarify the incomprehensible parts of the content. I noticed that students relieve when I repeat the English content in Turkish. I also use scaffolding trying to make the information easier to be understood and also, I try to paraphrase the sentence for easier comprehension.* (LB)

The other noticeable point indicated by the lecturers was the uncertainty felt by students about the acquired knowledge and superficial learning of content. LC stated in the Excerpt 87 that when the complicated part of the lecture is clarified by the lecturers in students' first language, students have the chance to compare and verify the acquired knowledge.

Excerpt 87:

I use translanguaging as I noticed its positive effect on students' comprehension. I also noticed that when students do not fully understand what the lecturer says they feel uncertain about their understanding the academic content clearly. When we clarify the knowledge in their first language they have the change to compare and verify the acquired knowledge. Above all, they have learnt and they know the terms in their first language, therefore, judicious use of first language will absolutely help them understand the content better. (LC)

Similarly, LI stated that he uses scaffolding to help students acquire the difficult concepts and content knowledge easier. He also added that the reason for using these strategies for the first year students depends on the level of students' English proficiency. He turns to English only in upper classes. LI' expression is stated in Excerpt 88:

Excerpt 88:

I use translanguaging because sometimes I notice from the face expressions of students that they did not understand what I said. I ask questions and get no answer. I do my best to scaffold the knowledge and even if I try to convey the knowledge using various methods, still there are some students who do not understand especially when the content is difficult to be acquired. I make Turkish explanations, talk slower and easier in my lessons to first year undergraduate students. Later in the upper classes, when students' proficiency get higher I use only English in my classes. (LI)

LH also supported translanguaging and stated that he uses it for assisting students understand the content better. He also stressed the importance of prior knowledge of students. His indication is stated in Excerpt 89:

Excerpt 89:

I use translanguaging to facilitate understanding process of students. They make an effort to understand what I say and the content simultaneously but language proficiency of the students is not enough yet at the first year of the university. They had their studies in their first language up till now. Moreover, as they learn in Turkish till the university years, making sense of the knowledge in another language may get difficult for them because prior knowledge affects the next learning process and it may cause confusion. Therefore, I support judicious L1 use in the classes. (LH)

Translanguaging for Explaining and Clarifying New Words and Concepts

Lecturers use translanguaging also with the aim of explaining mostly new technical words and concepts that students are not familiar with. Lecturers especially introduce the new concepts in students' first language as they believe it is crucial for students to know Turkish equivalents of the terms. Some lecturers stated that students make better sense of content when they know Turkish equivalents of the concepts while some lecturers believe that as the majority of students will work in Turkey they have to know Turkish equivalents of the terms and fully acquire knowledge of their profession. LA stated in Excerpt 90 that he uses translanguaging to explain and clarify new terms as he believes students have to learn them also in Turkish.

Excerpt 90:

I believe that students should know Turkish equivalents of English term; therefore, I certainly introduce the concepts in Turkish in my EMI classes. (LA)

LB indicated in Excerpt 91 that the majority of students will work in Turkey therefore; he wants them to learn academic concepts in both languages. He also added that knowing the academic terms just in English may lead some challenges during their careers in Turkey.

Excerpt 91:

I want students to know the concepts of their domain in both languages well. Therefore, I write English terms and Turkish equivalents on the board because the majority of the students will work in Turkey in the future. I also got my

degree from an EMI program. As I learnt the concepts only in English, I had to learn their Turkish equivalents later during my career. That is why, I use translanguaging to explain and clarify the meanings of the concepts. (LB)

LC is also one of the lecturers using translanguaging for explaining the unfamiliar terms. She supported that explaining and clarifying the concepts in Turkish provides students to verify and compare the acquired knowledge and abolish the uncertainty in their mind.

Excerpt 92:

We have to use translanguaging during delivering the content. When we explain the terms in Turkish, retention of the knowledge increases and they have the chance to compare the meaning and verify what they have learnt. (LC)

Finally, LF also stated in Excerpt 93 that he introduces concepts in Turkish writing them on the board in both languages.

Excerpt 93:

I write the concepts that I think students are not familiar with and their meanings on the board and explain them in both languages. In general, technical vocabularies are transferred to Turkish from English or French therefore, we may not need such explanation but in any case of necessity I give support. (LF)

Translanguaging to Give Voice and Increase Students' Participation

The majority of the lecturers also agreed on the idea that translanguaging is a beneficial strategy to give voice, increase students' participation and inclusion. They indicated that language barrier hinders the participation of students with low level of English. When they use English exclusively in their lectures, the participation rate decreases sharply and students are buried in silence. Therefore, they stated that they use translanguaging to draw students' attention, to give them voice and to increase teacher-student interaction. Regarding the effect of translanguaging strategies on students' participation in EMI classroom, LD stated in Excerpt 94 that this instructional strategy definitely increases the rate of participation in EMI classroom. According to him, if

restrictions are applied regarding language choice, students do not ask or answer any questions. However, he also stated that lecturers should be careful of using extensively Turkish as it may lead to laziness in students towards L2.

Excerpt 94:

Following strict rules regarding L1 use of students leads decrease in students' participation. Some students may show effort in using L2 when asking and answering questions while some students may give up asking questions because of their English language proficiency. I notice this kind of problems in participating in the class. I use translanguaging to give voice and increase students' participation. However, we should also be careful about the amount of Turkish we use in the class as it may cause laziness of students towards L2 improvement. (LD)

Similarly, LA was one of the lecturers using translanguaging for increasing inclusion of students. He stated that students may have challenges in expressing themselves confidently as they mostly feel hesitation in speaking amidst people in English. He also added that he noticed a sharp increase in the rate of participation when they are permitted to talk in their preferred language at that time. LA's statement is presented in Excerpt 95.

Excerpt 95:

Students feel hesitation to ask or answer questions in English amidst their friends I noticed that they do not express themselves freely. They feel social pressure at that time. Therefore, I use and let them use translanguaging practices to comfort them and help them ask the incomprehensible parts of the lecture directly. Thus, we have a more interactive lecture. (LA)

LB shared his concern regarding the participation of the students in Excerpt 96. He stated that interaction and participation in EMI classrooms decreases sharply when the lecture is conducted exclusively in English. Therefore, he indicated that he uses translanguaging practices to make students ask their questions.

Excerpt 96:

I do not react negatively to students' translanguaging as I am concerned about burying students in silence. In my classroom, I use and let them use these practices to make them feel free to ask any complicated part of the lecture. (LB)

Another lecturer added when English Only Policy followed by lecturers, students lose their attention towards the lecture thus, their comprehension of content, participation in classroom and interaction drop off sharply. LC's statement is presented in Excerpt 97.

Excerpt 97:

Following English Only instructional methods in EMI decreases students' inclusion in the lecture. They are afraid of making any mistake while they ask questions thus, participation decreases sharply. Moreover, strict rules for language choice inhibit interaction and make students lose their attention towards the lecture. I use translanguaging to empower students' interaction and participation in the classroom. (LC)

LE shared his experience regarding his and his students' translanguaging practices in the classroom in the Excerpt 98 stating that if translanguaging practices were not permitted, nobody asks questions as they hesitate to take part in. Therefore, he let them feel free in their language choice when asking or answering questions.

Excerpt 98:

I permit translanguaging practices and I utilize it myself otherwise nobody asks questions as they feel hesitated. They do not ask or answer questions as I believe that they have trouble in speaking and understanding; therefore, I let them free to ask and answer questions in their first language. I have to do it because when they do not ask the incomprehensible points of questions they cannot learn. I use it for increasing the participation and clarifying the content. I show tolerance towards language choices of students because physics is difficult to understand even in Turkish. When I follow exclusive English methods the content is getting even more complicated. For example one day, I asked a student to read the text in the lecture; however, he refused. When I asked him the reason he told me that

it is because of his English language proficiency. Students do not feel confident enough when using English therefore, we should not expect an English only classroom. Students do not perceive their English proficiency enough to participate in the lecture and in reality they are not. They are also afraid of making mistakes when talking amidst their classmates and feel social pressure. It was the only time that I gave a student this kind of task but it backfired. Therefore, I give permission of using translanguaging to keep communication and tasks move on in the classroom. (LE)

Translanguaging for Comforting, Encouraging and Building Rapport with Students

Besides instructional purposes, lecturers were also found to use translanguaging for affective purposes like comforting, encouraging and building rapport with students. Lecturers using this strategy for affective purposes stated that they aim to awake students' attention and comfort them in EMI classrooms. They also stated that when translanguaging practices are applied in the classroom students were relieved and felt more comfortable. LE explained his translanguaging practices for affective purposes in Excerpt 99:

Excerpt 99:

I tell jokes in Turkish and make students do it in the middle of the lecture because when they lose their motivation towards the lecture I have to generate their motivation back otherwise; we could not keep the lecture interactive. Students lose their motivation and become distracted because the content classes in engineering departments are difficult. I do it for drawing their attention back to lecture and help them focus their attention. We have to find different instructional strategies to keep students dynamic in the lecture. (LE)

LB is also one of the lecturers who use translanguaging for comforting the students. He stated that he noticed that students felt relieved and get rid of confusion when he uses and let students use translanguaging strategy. LB's statement is presented in Excerpt 100.

Excerpt 100:

I tried a lot not to use translanguaging because of language of instruction in the department; however, I noticed that when translanguaging was used in the classroom, students understand better and relieved psychologically. Because I think they get rid of the confusion that they face in EMI classes; therefore, I started to use translanguaging for comforting and relieving students when especially they have trouble in understanding the content. (LB)

LI stated that first year students have problems in expressing themselves; therefore, he tries to encourage them using translanguaging. He also added that the more they learn the language the more brave they get in upper classes. His expression is stated in Excerpt 101.

Excerpt 101:

The most common problem faced by the first year students is expressing themselves in English. I always try to encourage them using translanguaging strategies. They try to talk in English but when it is getting complicated I let them use their L1 to catch the flow of communication. We have to do it. However, in upper classes I can notice that they are more confident for using L2 in the classroom. (LI)

The other lecturer stated that he used translanguaging for keep students' motivation towards the lecture and building rapport with students thus, to keep the class interactive. His statement is presented in Excerpt 102.

Excerpt 102:

I remind the students to use as much as English they can but when we do it repeatedly participation and interaction in the classroom decrease sharply. I am trying to find a compromise

4.5. Analysis of Observation Data

Findings collected through observation of EMI classrooms are presented in this section. First, the types of translanguaging strategies by students are presented and later,

purposes of lecturers' use of translanguaging in EMI classrooms are presented in this section.

4.5.1. Types of Translanguaging Practices used by EMI Students

The data gathered from five EMI classrooms revealed that translanguaging practices are widely utilized by the students. The findings from classroom observations presented on Table 11 revealed that students use L1 alongside of English mostly for negotiating the meaning with each other. It is evident from the data that peer support for facilitating and scaffolding the learning is a common practice among students.

In the LB and LD, it was observed that lecturers tended to follow monolingual instructional policy while in LA, LC and LE lecturers followed bilingual methodology. It was revealed that students in English only classrooms prefer to set up communication with only in English with their teachers. In English only classrooms it was notable that students were more silent and tended to participate less in the classes. On the other hand, it can also be seen that in English only classes, students use translanguaging to support their peers, interact with other students in the classroom. They also use translanguaging during their note taking. In LA, LC and LE where it was observed lecturers are following a more flexible language policy, students use only English or translanguaging depending on their own preferences during the interaction with the lecturers. However, again it was revealed that they tended to interact with their classmates in both languages.

Table 11.

Translanguaging Practices used by EMI Students

Language used by Learners when	English	Translanguaging
LA		
Asking questions to the teacher	x	x
Answering questions from the teacher	x	x
Discussing with peers in groups		x
Interacting with others in the classroom		x
Asking other learners		x
Note Taking	x	x
LB		
Asking questions to the teacher	x	
Answering questions from the teacher	x	
Discussing with peers in groups		x
Interacting with others in the classroom		x
Asking other learners		x
Note Taking	x	x
LC		
Asking questions to the teacher	x	x
Answering questions from the teacher	x	x
Discussing with peers in groups		x
Interacting with others in the classroom		x
Asking other learners		x
Note Taking	x	x
LD		
Asking questions to the teacher	x	
Answering questions from the teacher	x	
Discussing with peers in groups		x
Interacting with others in the classroom		x
Asking other learners		x
Note Taking	x	x
LE		
Asking questions to the teacher	x	x
Answering questions from the teacher	x	x
Discussing with peers in groups		x
Interacting with others in the classroom		x
Asking other learners		x
Note Taking	x	x

To sum up, in five observed classes, it was evident that students scaffolding their learning with their classmates and lecturers even in English Only environment. They were also free to take their notes in which language they prefer. The only difference that came out between the English Only and bilingual classrooms was the interaction with the lecturer. When the lecturer use only English in the classroom the students use

English to ask or answer questions as much as they can or they prefer not to ask because of their low level of proficiency in the language of instruction. Students in the lectures where they feel free to use their mother tongue strategically were more eager to participate in the class.

4.5.2. Lecturers' Purposes for Translanguaging Practices in EMI Classrooms

The results from five observed EMI classrooms revealed that translanguaging practices are commonly utilized by the lecturers. The findings from classroom observations presented on Table 12 revealed that lecturers use Turkish language alongside of English mostly for instructional purposes. The most frequent purposes in lecturers' use of translanguaging were found to be explaining difficult terms, defining new concepts and making explanation when students' do not understand and finally to draw students' attention, building rapport and increase participation in the classroom.

Table 12.

Lecturers' Purposes for Translanguaging Practices in EMI Classrooms

Language used by lecturers for;	English Only	Translanguaging
LA		
Greeting learners	x	
Explaining lesson objectives	x	
Drawing learners attention and building rapport		x
Introducing the new lesson	x	
Explaining difficult terms		x
Asking questions	x	
Defining new concepts		x
Learners do not understand		x
Summarizing the lessons	x	
Dismissing the class	x	
LB		
Greeting learners	x	
Explaining lesson objectives	x	
Drawing learners attention and building rapport	x	
Introducing the new lesson	x	
Explaining difficult terms	x	
Asking questions	x	
Defining new concepts	x	
Learners do not understand	x	
Summarizing the lessons	x	
Dismissing the class	x	

Table 12. Continued

LC		
Greeting learners	x	
Explaining lesson objectives	x	
Drawing learners attention and building rapport		x
Introducing the new lesson	x	
Explaining difficult terms		x
Asking questions	x	
Defining new concepts		x
Learners do not understand		x
Summarizing the lessons	x	
Dismissing the class	x	
LD		
Greeting learners	x	
Explaining lesson objectives	x	
Drawing learners attention and building rapport	x	
Introducing the new lesson	x	
Explaining difficult terms	x	
Asking questions	x	
Defining new concepts	x	
Learners do not understand	x	
Summarizing the lessons	x	
Dismissing the class	x	
LE		
Greeting learners	x	
Explaining lesson objectives	x	
Drawing learners attention and building rapport		x
Introducing the new lesson	x	
Explaining difficult terms		x
Asking questions	x	
Defining new concepts		x
Learners do not understand		x
Summarizing the lessons	x	
Dismissing the class	x	

In Table 13, it can be seen that two lecturers, LB and LD followed English Only Policy in their classes while the rest three lecturers LA, LC, LE followed a more bilingual policy. It was noticeable in two classes conducted exclusively in English that there was almost no interaction in the classroom as the students did not ask any questions or had difficulty in answering lecturers' questions. On the other hand, the purposes of lecturers following a more flexible instructional approach in their classes for using translanguaging were revealed to be both instructional and affective. They commonly use translanguaging to explaining difficult terms, define new terms and

mediate comprehension. They tended to use translanguaging mostly to scaffold students learning and facilitate it. Lecturers were also revealed to use translanguaging for affective purposes such as drawing students' attention and building rapport with students to increase their participation in the class.

CHAPTER V

DISCUSSION

5.1. Introduction

This chapter presents the main findings of this study. Findings are interpreted and discussed according to the themes of the research questions. Moreover, studies related to the themes are also discussed and compared with the findings of the present study.

5.2. Language Related Challenges faced by EMI Students

According to the interviews conducted with EMI students, the high majority of the students had linguistic challenges during their studies in EMI programs. These challenges faced by students were found to have a detrimental effect on content mastery the same as mentioned in the studies of Marie (2013), Moragh (2009) and Yeh (2013).

The first and the highest occurring language related problem of students was found to be unfamiliar technical words and inadequate use of vocabulary in English hindering communication and fully understanding of content which is concurrent with the studies of Evans and Morrison (2011), Joseph (2015), Hellekjær (2010), Moragh (2009), Sert (2008) and Tatzl (2011) where it was also revealed that deficiency in vocabulary and technical terminology and comprehension issue were the most frequently mentioned challenges faced by students. It was evident from the findings of the study that the fundamental reason lying behind this trouble was the insufficient proficiency in language of instruction. According to Başıbek et al. (2014), students fail to learn the content in English because of their low proficiency in language of instruction therefore, lecturing them in their mother tongue will provide a deeper comprehension of content. Specifically, this challenge with technical vocabulary caused students not to be able to recognize new words, difficulty in finding the appropriate words in writing or speaking and not able to spell words precisely and thus, it led to challenges in understanding the content and triggered the feel of anxiety to speak and express freely amidst people which is consistent with the study of Joseph (2015). This notable challenge in technical vocabulary also inhibits students' participation in lecture as mentioned in the study of Kılıçkaya (2006), decreases their self-confidence and

motivation towards the lecture. Especially students who feel non proficient in L2 do not ask or answer the questions even if they know the answer well. Therefore, many questions remain unanswered and it leads uncertainty of knowledge and superficial learning which is in the line with the studies of Kırkgöz (2014) and Mauranen (2010). For these challenges, Tavares (2015) concluded in her study that creating a safe and supportive environment by systematic use of mother tongue can activate students' participation and interaction and can also provide students to clarify their doubts about their learning. Students in the study even stated that inadequate knowledge of vocabulary causes not to be able to keep up with the lecture and answering the questions in assignments and exams as some technical vocabularies have great importance in the question. When they could not recognize these new words, they cannot fully understand the questions. Thus, their academic success decreases.

The second language related challenge faced by students was found to be accent and pronunciation. This challenge has also a crucial impact on content mastery. This challenge was also indicated to cause problems in full comprehension of the content. Students were revealed to have problems in both spelling of the vocabularies and recognizing the vocabularies used by the lecturers which is in line with the results of the studies of Evans and Morrison (2011), Joseph (2015) and Hellekjær (2010). As speaking is crucial for understanding of most academic content by students, this language problem in comprehending what was told creates a huge barrier in the lectures. Because of teachers' accents and their rapid and unfocused style of presentation as also mentioned in the study of Evans and Morrison (2011), students do not perceive correctly what is taught during lectures, they cannot relate to what has been learnt and cannot absorb knowledge that is not adequately understood and need more explanations by teachers as stated in the study of Tatzl (2011). They also have deficiencies in their own pronunciation skills which hinder them from speaking confidently in the lecture. Likewise the deficiencies in vocabulary skills, problems in accents and pronunciation were also found to decrease participation rate in the lecture. As the students are not sure how to spell the words they feel hesitated to talk in the class.

In order to overcome these linguistic challenges during their studies in EMI, Moragh (2009) stated that learning in L2 should be scaffolded and students should be permitted to get access to both English and other languages to negotiate the meaning of new notions. In addition, Kılıçkaya (2006) suggests that adopting a bilingual program

should be taken into account. To cope with challenges in technical vocabulary, students in this study were also found to use academic collaboration with their teachers and peers and scaffold their learning through translanguaging as a copying strategy which is in concordance with the studies of Joseph (2015), Marie (2013), Tavares (2015), Vu and Burns (2014) and Yeh (2013).

5.3. Students' Attitudes towards Translanguaging

Students' attitudes towards translanguaging as a learning strategy were evaluated via both a questionnaire and interviews. For all student groups participated in the study, the common points for each section emerged from the interview and questionnaire findings were summarized below.

According to Macaro's (2009) "continuum of perspectives on multiple language use" students were revealed to hold maximal position towards translanguaging practice in EMI classroom which means that students favor maximization of English in the EMI classroom; however, they also think that use of L1 is inevitable in any case of trouble with the language of instruction. Theoretically, they favor maximization of English use as they believe the more the target language they use the more they will improve which is one of the five tenets that Phillipson (1992) has described as the ones perceived as the true and best practices in English language teaching. However, practically, all these students use their first language in EMI classrooms even if with the feeling of guilt and regret. This result might come out because students are trapped by ideologies that appreciate only monolingualism (Garcia, 2009b). They use this strategy as a coping strategy as they do not have enough proficiency for fully understanding the content or setting up communication in EMI classrooms. This result is consistent with the study of Joseph (2015). Although they highlighted the importance of using English extensively in the classroom and connect their English improvement with the amount of its use, they were revealed to hold more positive attitudes towards translanguaging practices, the same as various studies like Kim, Kweon, and Kim (2017), Makalela (2015), Ngcobo et al., (2016), Rukh (2012), Shifidi (2014), Xhemaili (2017) and Wang (2016). This result is also in line with the study of Rolin-Ianziti and Varshney (2008) where it was founded that students believe in beneficial part of being under exposure of target language but also accepted that L1 provides them gain linguistic features like grammar and vocabulary.

Students in this study do not think translanguaging has negative effect on their learning. On the contrary, they value use of L1 on content learning and they agree on the opinion that bilingual study materials and lecturers' use of translanguaging support and facilitate their learning in EMI classroom. It is evident that they believe lecturers' translanguaging is beneficial and helpful for their learning and also, lecturers' use of bilingual study materials contributes to their learning which is in concordance with the results of Rukh (2012). In specific evaluation of students' responses, students indicated four positive and two negative attitudes towards translanguaging.

Regarding their positive attitudes, firstly, they all agreed on the idea that translanguaging provides a deeper understanding of content which is one of the four advantages of translanguaging that Baker (2011) suggested. This result shows that L1 of the students is a tool and a vital resource to mediate learning (Baker, 2011; Caldwell & Butzkamm, 2009; Canagarajah, 2011; Creese & Blackledge, 2010; Cummins, 2007; Garcia, 2009b; Macaro, 2014; Makalela, 2015). Baker (2011) stated that reading and discussing a subject in one language and then write about this subject in another language provides the content to be digested by students and promote a deeper understanding of subject. Students stated that they have challenges regarding content mastery as they are not competent enough with language of instruction (Evans & Morrison, 2011; Hellekjaer, 2010; Tatzl, 2011). It was found that this incompetency in English naturally leads to missing some important parts of content. Students pointed out that the inability in fully understanding creates feeling of alienation against the lecture and also causes withdrawals from the lecture. It was also revealed that inability of deeper understanding of content decreases students' motivation against the lecture sharply as they lose their control over the content and they could not make sure of acquired knowledge which is in line with the study of Sert (2008) where she concluded that students feel uncertainty about understanding the content. Following English only policy may lead students to bypass the unperceived parts of the content which may cause deficient and superficial learning rather than effective learning (Kırkgöz, 2014). Regarding the positive effect of translanguaging on deeper learning, it was indicated by students that it provides transition of knowledge between languages (Ngcobo et al., 2016), contributes to reinforcing the meaning in both languages, facilitates checking comprehension and thus, provides retention of the knowledge. Short term retention of content knowledge is one of the several challenges that students face reported in the study of Kırkgöz (2014), as well.

The second positive aspect of translanguaging indicated by students was that it increases the interaction and participation in the classroom (Tavares, 2015; Wang, 2016). As identified by Lewis, Jones and Baker (2012) students used translanguaging practices students were to participate, elaborate ideas, and raise questions. High majority of the students stated that interactivity of the classroom decreases when English only policy is followed which is in line with the study of Kılıçkaya (2006). Students indicated that they feel hesitated and stressful to ask or answer the lecturers' questions in English even if they know the answer because of their English language proficiency level. The lack of participation leads students to lose their attention in the classroom and also decreases students' success as they skip the complicated parts of content without fully understanding it. Instead of burying students in silence, it was revealed that there is a need to give students a space to work in collaboration to research a solution and activate classroom participation by letting them discuss on their problems on the terms and notions (Tavares, 2015).

Thirdly, students stated that they have challenges in fluency and they use translanguaging for the flow of communication when they got stuck because of deficiency in their academic vocabulary knowledge. Pontier and Gort (2016) stated that bilingual people utilize various strategies like the monolinguals do in order to make meaning and form a clear and coherent message. These students indicated that they use translanguaging when they feel inadequate to express themselves. They indicated that they use Turkish when they feel unable to express themselves in English sufficiently because of some language related and social challenges. These challenges are lack of confidence, deficiency in vocabulary, problems in making sentences and fear of speaking amidst people and making mistakes. This result is consistent with the result of the study of Xhemaili (2017) where students were found out to use their first language to express themselves better. Translanguaging was also revealed to increase students' self-confidence (Xhemaili, 2017). Therefore, translanguaging is an important tool to interact with classroom participants and also to build rapport with them which is in line with Shifidi (2014) where it was also concluded that translanguaging is necessary as a communication strategy in the classrooms. It encourages students to participate and interact with each other during lessons. This result also confirms the statement of Garcia (2009a) who advocated that bilingual people use translanguaging strategies to mediate their communication with others, set up a deeper comprehension and make sense of the world.

Finally, translanguaging was revealed to increase students' metalinguistic awareness and concept literacy (Ngcobo et al., 2016). It improves students' weaker language skills and also academic language skills in both languages (Baker, 2011; Maillat & Serra, 2009). Baker (2011) advocated that translanguaging provides learners develop their second language ability concurrently with content learning with the integration of fluent English speakers and English learners. Students stated that using first language in EMI classroom provides retention of information in target language, reconstruction of meaning and vocabulary development by letting them comparing and contrasting between both languages. This result is in line with the study of Makalela (2015) where translanguaging was also found to increase metalinguistic awareness of the students providing them the opportunity to compare and contrast between both languages. Thus, students were able to break the linguistic boundaries. On the contrary, Escobar and Dillard-Paltrineri (2015) found that students had negative attitudes towards translanguaging on language improvement. They thought that translanguaging inhibits the progress in L2 acquisition and extensive use of L1 causes laziness that hinders cognitive processes in L2 and thus, it has to have restrictions. Although students in this study mostly agreed on the benefits of translanguaging on their learning, there were also some negative attitudes towards it which are common with study of Escobar and Dillard-Paltrineri (2015). They indicated that Turkish use should be restricted as it may hinder target language improvement.

This opinion of the students was exactly clarified by Cook (2001) and Turnbull (2001) who stressed the judicious use of L1 and supported the use of first language in L2 settings but also added that large amount of L1 use may decrease the time allocated to the use of L2 so Cook (2001) stated that "it is clearly useful to employ large quantities of the L2, everything else being equal" (p. 409).

5.4. Types of Translanguaging Practices used by EMI Students

It was revealed that the majority of the interviewed students faced challenges in coping with EMI. According to the interviews and observation results, translanguaging practices to facilitate learning in EMI context and to overcome the obstacles faced by students during their studies in EMI were revealed to be common among all students. The translanguaging practices used by students were found to be; scaffolding with peers and lecturer's collaboration, translanguaging through translation and use of bilingual

materials and translanguaging through note taking in L1. It was observed that students in EMI classrooms where lecturers do not restrict L1 use feel free to express themselves better, participate in classroom, work with the lecturer and their classmates in collaboration and take notes according to the their own language choices.

It was found that the most encountered type of translanguaging strategy was scaffolding with peers and lecturers to negotiate meaning. This result confirms the studies of Evans and Morrison (2011), Marie (2013), Martin-Beltran (2014), Tavares (2015) and Wang (2016) where it was also concluded that students use translanguaging with their lecturers and peer groups in collaboration for negotiating the meaning. Scaffolding creates an interactive and collaborative environment for students. Esquinca, Araujo and Piedra (2014) advocated that learners should be supported through scaffolding until they become independent problem solvers. All students were revealed to use translanguaging with both their classmates or their lecturers when asking and answering questions for meaning making or for clarification and check the comprehension of the parts of content that they did not understand in the lecture. Students indicated that they use translanguaging with their classmates and lecturers mainly for understanding and clarifying the complicated parts of the content.

The second type of translanguaging used by students was revealed to be the use of translation and bilingual materials to check their comprehension which is in line with the studies of Esquinca, Araujo and Piedra (2014) and Olmedo (2003). Students indicated that they translate the study materials at home to reinforce their understanding and to check their comprehension when they have trouble in fully understanding the content during the lecture. They discuss the content in one language but check comprehension in another (Garcia & Kleifgen, 2010). They also stated that they use bilingual dictionary during the lecture for finding Turkish meaning of the academic vocabulary for a better understanding and they note them to memorize the meaning when they encounter with them again.

Finally, students indicated that they take Turkish notes during EMI classroom. They read in one language and write in another or discuss in one language and write in another; thus, students integrate their all language resources (Garcia & Kleifgen, 2010). They stated that they write Turkish meaning of the English vocabulary that they are not familiar with. In some situations, they take Turkish notes during the class and check the comprehension after the lecture.

5.5. Lecturers' Attitudes towards Translanguaging

The high majority of the lecturers participating in this study were seen to use translanguaging in their classes to the different extent which shows that translanguaging is a "naturally occurring phenomenon" at Adana STU as stated by Canagarajah (2011). This widely use of translanguaging in EMI classrooms shows also that monolingual instructional approaches in second language classrooms or in EMI classrooms are 'undesirable, unrealistic and untenable 'which is in line with the statement of Levine (2011). Regarding attitudes of lecturers towards translanguaging, Macaro's (2009) continuum, was used and the results showed that five of the participants hold optimal, three of the lecturers hold maximal and two of them holds virtual position towards translanguaging. In contrast to the study of Macaro (2009), it was evident in this study that most of the lecturers at Adana STU hold a bilingual perspective and recognize value in L1 use without any pedagogical regrets. In his study, Macaro (2014) indicated that lecturers supporting optimal position and adopting translanguaging pedagogy without any feel of guilt are in minority. Similarly, this result is in contrast to the study of Escobar and Dillard-Paltrineri (2015) where it was also concluded that lecturers have confusing attitudes regarding translanguaging practices and they think that use of translanguaging hinders the progress in L2 acquisition and causes the laziness of students and therefore, it should be restricted. The underlying reason for this difference can be that the purpose in EMI is to give priority the acquisition of content while language abilities are improved; therefore, fundamental aim of the lecturers holding optimal position to the translanguaging was revealed to be providing students' fully understanding the content rather than language itself which is in line with the study of Karakaş (2016b). Lecturers' having multilingual perspectives and flexible instructional approaches also conflicts with recent L2 methodologies supporting English only policy and the claims of Krashen (1985) who supported maximum exposure to target language and teaching exclusively in L2. On the other hand, this result is consistent with the results of the studies of Karakaş (2016b), Lasagabaster (2013), Méndez and Pavón (2012) and Wang and Kirkpatrick (2012) where it was concluded that lecturers had positive attitudes towards translanguaging and thought that systematic use of L1 has an important role on class interaction, comprehension, increasing participation, comforting students and making meaning.

Lecturers holding optimal position to the systematic use of L1 in EMI classrooms supported the idea that translanguaging provides a deeper understanding of content which is the same with the discussion of Baker (2011). It was also supported that prior knowledge of students cannot be ignored and languages cannot be separated which is consistent with the sociocultural theory treating languages as a whole. It is also consistent with the statement of Garcia (2009b). Garcia (2009b) supported that "language classrooms in the twenty-first century are moving from monolingualism towards translingualism, encouraging flexible concurrent language use rather than continuing to keep students' linguistic knowledge separate or treating prior languages as non-existent or purely negative influences" (p. 2). Lecturers also supported that students have limited opportunities of using English outside the classroom therefore; it is not fair to expect them to use English with the same proficiency as the monolingual English speakers. Similarly, Baker (2011) states regarding this expectation that it is not fair as bilinguals utilize their languages in different contexts and with different agents so they may have more competence in each language they use in different contexts. Under these conditions, language proficiency of the L2 learners is defined as inadequate and inferior (Baker, 2011). Moreover, lecturers supported that it will be wrong to put all students' language proficiency level in the same equation. Therefore, scaffolding should be done and translanguaging should be used to reach equality between learners with different proficiency levels. In the same line, Maillat and Serra (2009) stated in their study that translanguaging provides integration between competent L1 users and L2 learners of different levels. Otherwise, strict rules in language use may cause huge problems such as decreased motivation level of students and students' dropping out the school. All these results are in the line with the study of Garcia and Wei (2014) where it was concluded that translanguaging was used by the lecturers to reach the equality among students with different proficiency level and adjust the lecture to different types of students, to activate "background knowledge" of the students in order to provide them to make meaning of their content, to contribute a deeper comprehension, sociopolitical inclusion, improve new knowledge and critical thinking and consciousness.

On the other hand, there were two lecturers holding virtual position to the systematic use of L1 in EMI classrooms. One of the two lecturers holding virtual position supported that he prefers to exclude first language of the students and warns and encourages them to use only English in the classrooms because he thinks that it is his duty to use monolingual instruction because of schools' language policy. Garcia

(2009b) states that teachers conceal their translanguaging practices from administrators as they have been taught to believe that only monolingual ways of speaking are good and valuable. However, it was revealed that although English only inclination of the lecturer, a great majority of the students choose to use the Turkish when they ask questions or when they answer his questions which shows that translanguaging is an inevitable factor of being bilingual and a “natural occurring phenomenon” as stated by Canagarajah (2011) . He also disagreed with using other languages in the classroom as it may cause challenges for the foreign students who do not share the same first language with him and with other students. The other lecturer supporting English Only Policy in EMI classrooms stated that languages should be separated and using two languages will lead to contamination of the languages which is in line with the traditional views in second language acquisition identifying the linguistic practices of bilinguals as “two autonomous language systems”; however, the recent studies showed that that “new language practices only emerge in interrelationship with old language practices” (Hesson, Seltzer, & Woodley, 2014, p. 3) and learners have “one linguistic repertoire with features that have been societally constructed as belonging to two separate languages (Garcia & Wei, 2014, p. 2).

Lecturers holding maximal positions have expectations for maximization of English and trying not to use it as much as possible however; they feel that they have to use it because of language related challenges of their students. Although they do not feel comfortable with the use of L1, they do not act negatively or put strict rules on students’ language use. According to Moore (2013), LI is seen as a "problem" to be avoided, and teachers' lapses into LI result in feelings of guilt” in both cognitive second language acquisition (SLA) theory and other L2 teaching methodologies that have promoted "English only” (p. 239). Cummins (2007) adds that “when we free ourselves from exclusive reliance on monolingual instructional approaches, a wide variety of opportunities arise for teaching languages by means of bilingual instructional strategies that acknowledge the reality of, and strongly promote, two-way cross-language transfer”(p. 222). One of the lecturers added that extensive use of Turkish causes laziness for L2 acquisition because students will always choose to use their native languages in the classroom if translanguaging is permitted. This statement is in line with the study of Escobar and Dillard-Paltrineri (2015). Regarding this dilemma about the amount of L1 to be used in L2 classroom, Cook (2001) stressed that use of L1 should be judicious and added that “it is clearly useful to employ large quantities of the L2,

everything else being equal" (p. 409). Turnbull (2001) also supported the use of L1; however, stressed the amount of L1 to be used in L2 classrooms. He argues that large amount of L1 use may decrease the time allocated to the use of L2.

5.6. Lecturers' Purposes for Translanguaging Practices in EMI Classrooms

According to the findings of interviews and observations, the majority of the lecturers were revealed to use translanguaging in their teaching practices to different extents and purposes. The most apparent purpose of lecturers' utilizing translanguaging in their classrooms was found to be for facilitating students' comprehension which is in line with the studies of Baker (2011), Caldwell and Butzkamm (2009), Canagarajah (2011), Creese and Blackledge (2010), Cummins (2007), Garcia (2009b), Macaro (2014), Makalela (2015) and Lasagabaster (2013) who advocated that first language of learners is a vital resource to mediate learning. When students have difficulties in understanding of some parts of the content because of their low English language proficiency, lecturers used L1 of students to clarify the complicated parts of the content to mediate students' learning. They stated that when the complicated part of the lecture is clarified by the lecturers in students' first language, students have the chance to compare and verify the acquired knowledge thus, the uncertainty felt by students about the acquired knowledge and superficial learning of content could be avoided.

They also stressed the effect of the prior knowledge in making sense of the knowledge in another language. These results are in line with the study of Garcia and Wei (2014) where they identified the purposes of lecturers for utilizing translanguaging strategies and concluded that translanguaging was used to activate "background knowledge" of the students in order to provide them to make meaning of their content and to contribute a deeper comprehension. Scaffolding the knowledge through translanguaging to make the difficult concept understood easier by students was revealed to be used by the lecturers which is called as "explanatory strategies to provide cognitive or metalinguistic scaffolding for meaning-making activities such as explaining and elaborating grammar rules and lexical uses, translating new words, and interpreting cultural meaning" by Wang (2016, p. 7-8). Similarly, this result is in line with the study of Lasagabaster (2013) where the teachers used students' first language as a scaffolding tool to permit students make comparisons between L1 and L2 for making meaning. Regarding the scaffolding through translanguaging, Esquinca, Araujo and Piedra (2014)

stated that learners should be provided support from teachers or peer collaboration via scaffolding until they become independent problem solvers.

Lecturers use translanguaging also with the aim of explaining new words and concepts that students are not familiar with. This result is in correlation with the study of Polio and Duff (1994) who concluded that lecturers use first language of the students for classroom management, explaining grammar, vocabulary and complex and difficult notions and setting up rapport with the students. This result is also in correlation with the study of Lasagabaster (2013) where lecturers were revealed to use first language of the students for explaining and clarifying the difficult and abstract concepts in CLIL classroom. Lecturers especially introduce the new concepts in students' first language as they believe it is crucial for students to know Turkish equivalents of the terms. Some lecturers stated that students make better sense of content when they know Turkish equivalents of the concepts while some lecturers believe that as majority of students will work in Turkey they have to know Turkish equivalents of the terms and fully acquire knowledge of their profession. They supported that explaining and clarifying the concepts in Turkish provides students to verify and compare the acquired knowledge and abolish the uncertainty in their mind. When the terms are explained in Turkish, retention of the knowledge increases and students have the chance to compare the meaning and verify what they have learnt. These results are in line with the studies of Ngcobo et al., (2016) where it was reported that translanguaging provided the transition of knowledge and skills between languages, equality in learning, develop literacy in both the students' African languages and English and contributes to vocabulary improvement through collaboration. Furthermore, this result was also confirmed by Madiba (2014). Madiba (2014) permitted mother tongue speakers of Tshivenda and isiXhosa, who were learning English as a second language, to use their home languages to learn concepts related to engineering with the aim of finding the role of multilingual glossaries on concept literacy. The result of the study showed that translanguaging practices among Tshivenda and isiXhosa speakers learning English as a second language are beneficial in increasing the quality of scientific concepts in an academic support program at the University of Cape Town.

Lecturers also used translanguaging to give voice, increase students' participation and inclusion. They indicated that language barrier hinders the participation of students with low level of English. When they use English exclusively in their lectures, the participation rate decreases sharply and students are buried in silence. Therefore, they

stated that they use translanguaging to draw students' attention, to give them voice and to increase teacher-student interaction. Regarding the effect of translanguaging strategies on students' participation in EMI classroom, they stated that if restrictions are applied regarding language choice, students do not ask or answer any questions. Following strict rules regarding use of L1 of students leads decrease in students' participation and some students may give up asking questions because of their English language proficiency. They give permission of using translanguaging to keep communication and tasks move on in the classroom. These results are in line with the studies of Lasagabaster (2013) and Wang (2016).

Besides instructional purposes, lecturers were also revealed to use translanguaging for affective purposes like comforting, encouraging and building rapport with students. Lecturers using this strategy for affective purposes stated that they aim to awake students' attention and comfort them in EMI classroom. They also stated that when translanguaging practices are applied in the classroom, students relieve and feel more comfortable. One of the lecturers stated that he tells jokes in Turkish to draw students' attention in the middle of the lecture to generate their motivation back and keep the lecture interactive. The other lecturer stated that he uses translanguaging for keeping students' motivation towards the lecture and building rapport with students thus, to keep the class interactive which is in line with the study of Inbar-Lourie (2010).

It can be seen that results of the present study are similar with the results of other studies conducted in different context. This chapter presented the main findings and their discussion in relation to the literature and research questions. The following will cover the conclusions of the findings, implications, limitations and suggestions.

CHAPTER VI

CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTIONS

6.1. Overview of the Study

The present study aimed to evaluate the attitudes of students and lecturers towards translanguaging strategies at a higher education EMI context by utilizing both qualitative and quantitative methods. In addition, language related challenges of EMI students, their translanguaging practices and lecturers' purposes for using translanguaging strategies were also evaluated in the study. Research problems were examined under themes coming out from literature review and the data gathered from interviews, questionnaire and observation. This chapter presents conclusions, implications, recommendations, limitations and suggestions for prospective research.

6.2. Conclusions

In the present study, it is apparent that translanguaging is widely used as an instructional strategy in Adana STU offering all its courses in EMI. Almost the majority of the students and lecturers indicated that they use this strategy to different extents. This study had two different dimensions as students' dimension and lecturers' dimension. In students' dimension, firstly, language related challenges faced by first year students during their studies in EMI were determined. These challenges were found to be firstly "English technical vocabulary" and secondly "accent and pronunciation". These two troubles in L2 are strongly interrelated with each other. That is, students who are not familiar enough with new technical concepts in English have problems in understanding lecturer's accent and pronunciation. These two interrelated challenges were revealed to cause deficiency in content mastery leading uncertainty of knowledge and superficial learning and feeling of anxiety to ask or answer questions amidst people. This crucial deficiency in the use of technical vocabulary was also revealed to decrease students' participation in lecture, their self-confidence and motivation towards the lectures and even withdrawal of students from the lecture. Despite these troubles in the language of instruction, it was evident that students adopted translanguaging strategies to cope with the difficulties with learning in L2. Regarding the attitudes of students towards translanguaging, the majority of the students were found to hold the maximal

position which means that the use of target language should be maximized and the more English is used the more it is improved. However, they use translanguaging as their language abilities are not sufficient for exclusive use of L2. Students are also aware of that translanguaging has a positive effect on their content mastery, improvement of target language and metalinguistic awareness, flow of communication and increasing participation and interaction in classroom. On the other hand, negative sides of translanguaging strategy was indicated as leading laziness that hinders cognitive processes in L2 and Turkish is useful but it has to have restrictions. Types of translanguaging practices used by EMI students were founded to be **s**caffolding with peers and lecturer's collaboration, translation and use of bilingual materials and note taking in L1. Students use translanguaging with their classmates and lecturers mainly for understanding and clarifying the complicated parts of the content or translate using bilingual dictionary for a better learning of content and checking comprehension. They also take notes in Turkish of complicated parts or vocabularies during and after classes to revise and check them at home or after classes. Regarding lecturers' dimension, it was revealed that the majority of the lecturers hold optimal positions, a positive perspective towards translanguaging which means that they have a bilingual perspective and do not have any pedagogical regrets regarding lecturers' and students' use of translanguaging in EMI classrooms because their fundamental aim is students' fully understanding the content over the language learning; therefore, they are following flexible instructional methods in their lectures.

The high majority of the lecturers indicated that they use translanguaging to different extents and purposes. Lecturers use translanguaging mostly for instructional purposes, such as clarifying and conveying the meaning to facilitate better comprehension of content, explaining new words and concepts, giving voice and increasing students' participation and secondly, for affective purposes to encourage and comfort students and build rapport with them.

6.3. Implications

The findings of the present study show that students experience challenges mostly on academic terminology and pronunciation which hinder them from fully comprehending the content and decrease their motivation towards EMI lectures. This challenge leads to the inability of first year students to be able to find the appropriate

words and recognize new words during the lecture. In order to facilitate students' overcoming these challenges, lecturers in the departments and school of foreign languages have a lot to do. First of all, students should be introduced to academic vocabulary and more familiarity should be provided with their profession in language preparatory year. Therefore, EAP (English for Academic Purposes) and ESP (English for Specific Purposes) courses should be increased and should be part of the curriculum.

Regarding translanguaging practices in EMI classrooms, it is evident from the study that even if students support the maximization of English in EMI classrooms, they indicated their needs for translanguaging practices to overcome their challenges in EMI. Therefore, lecturers should revise and break their exclusive English use taboos and adopt current flexible instructional methodologies. Moreover, students should not be buried in silence in the lecture, therefore, lecturers should give space for a systematic L1 use to give voice to the students, to build rapport with them, also to support co-learning between the lecturer and students and also student-student. By the 21 century, lecturers are not the sole hegemon of the classes; therefore, students should not be limited with monolinguistic perspectives. Instead, they should have the freedom to make their own choices in their learning.

Some lecturers may give higher importance to language learning over the content mastery. There is also a need to set up a balance between content and language learning in EMI classroom. Therefore, being aware of students' needs will be the best solution to provide this balance.

6.4. Recommendations

There are some fundamental aspects which can be recommended to the university lecturers, students, authorities and The Turkish Council of Higher Education regarding adopting translanguaging practices in EMI classrooms and helping students overcome the challenges in learning in foreign language.

For the lecturers teaching in EMI departments, it can be recommended that they should apply suitable instructional methodologies according to the students' needs for supporting their academic vocabulary skills and pronunciation. In addition, English Preparatory School should also offer more courses for preparing students to their academic studies in their departments. Academic vocabulary deficiency of students should also be kept in mind during curriculum design process and necessary support

should be provided to students. Lecturers in academic units and English Preparatory School should work in collaboration to define and fulfil students' academic needs. Regarding language choice in EMI classrooms, it is recommended to lecturers to revise their monolingual teaching principles which are reconfigured by translanguaging practices. Lecturers should be equipped with new developments in second language teaching methodologies to improve their teaching and research quality. They should also be aware of the benefits of letting students use their all linguistic repertoires on language acquisition, content mastery and increasing classroom interaction. Lecturers should also adopt a more multilingual perspective and flexible teaching strategies and employ modern language teaching strategies letting students having a low proficiency in language of instruction use their full linguistic repertories for increasing their comprehension of content, second language acquisition and interaction in the classroom. Thus, lecturers are expected to break the English only borders and collaborate with students in their learning. That is, lecturers will not be the only authority in the lectures. In contrast, they will give voice to the students and support collaboration. Lecturers can handle with teaching challenges at multilingual classrooms with students having different levels of language proficiency at higher education context through translanguaging strategies. It was evident from the findings of this study that students were buried into silence in English Only classrooms. Lecturers should give students a space for systematic multiple language use and should not force students to use only English in the classroom. Otherwise, it may lead to lack of content mastery and superficial learning. Lecturers should set a balance between language and content as they are strongly interrelated to each other in EMI classroom. Moreover, teachers should also integrate scaffolding as a teaching strategy for facilitating students' learning. They should also create a collaborative learning environment supporting student-student and student-lecturer collaboration.

For the students studying in EMI programs, it is recommended that they should make more effort for their second language improvement. Although the benefits of using mother tongue in L2 settings is evident, language of instruction should not be ignored and mother tongue should not be perceived as a way of escaping from using English in classroom. Still, students should use English as much as they can and support their learning with their native language. They should also be aware of their learning style in order to be able to adopt learning and coping strategies with EMI. They also

should use peer support as much as possible which is one of the best strategies to overcome the load of learning in second language.

For university authorities, it is recommended to conduct a needs analysis for EMI students in order to determine their linguistic challenges and support them according to their deficiencies. There is also a need to create a collaborative platform including school authorities, school of foreign languages and departments so that linguistic challenges that students face can be determined easier and solutions and teaching experiences can be shared. Furthermore, EAP and ESP courses should be increased and integrated to English preparatory year. One lecturer from each department can also give a lecture as an introduction to students' profession during English Preparatory year. Regarding translanguaging practices, the institution should revise the language policy and should give a space for translanguaging at least for the first level students who are struggling to learn in English and are not familiar yet with terminology of their profession. If this flexibility in using translanguaging in EMI classrooms is provided students will be able to keep their motivation for learning language and content.

For the Council of Higher Education, it can be recommended that modern language teaching methodologies should be introduced to all Higher Education Institutions having Language Teaching Departments. Such departments in all Turkish Higher Education Institutions should renew their curriculums and integrate a more multilingual perspective in their courses. They should introduce translanguaging as a teaching and learning strategy to prospective language teachers. Furthermore, researchers should be supported for conducting more research on the effectiveness of EMI and strategies to make it more effective such as translanguaging. It is also a necessity to educate university level lecturers teaching content in EMI programs in terms of language teaching strategies and new improvements about language teaching. As the main responsibility of these lecturers is not teaching the language but the content, more conferences should be conducted regarding teaching content in L2 and platforms should be created for them to keep them updated about improvements in language acquisition.

6.5. Limitations of the Study

Although interviews were conducted with enough number of lecturers and students, the questionnaire was conducted with a comparatively small number of students because Adana STU is a newly constructed institution and has a limited number of first year students. Therefore, there is a need to investigate the findings of the questionnaire in a wider context. Secondly, as students and lecturers share the same first language and there is a limited number of the international students in the university, translanguaging practices were evaluated in the framework of use of L1 and L2 in the same classroom. In order to widen the scope of translanguaging strategy in EMI classrooms in Turkish higher education context, there is also a need to conduct research in a more multilingual environment. Furthermore, this study focused only on translanguaging practices of first year students as they are just started to their studies in EMI and as it is believed that they are the most linguistically challenged students. However, there is a need to compare and examine translanguaging practices and attitudes of students from upper classes in order to see the level of inclination to translanguaging as they are improving their language abilities. Moreover, the challenge faced during data collection procedure via observation was that observed lectures in faculty of engineering were based on statistical information and formulations which has limited the quantity of verbal expressions and thus, the amount of observable translanguaging practices was quite limited.

6.6. Suggestions for Future Research

The present study suggests further research to reach a deepen comprehension on translanguaging practices in EMI classrooms. For instance, although the benefits of using more than one language on content mastery and second language acquisition are evident, the amount of L1 to be utilized in these classrooms should be further investigated. More research is also needed on how the L1 can be used in EMI programs to facilitate L2 acquisition and content learning for making lecturers become aware of translanguaging practices and reasons for their translanguaging practices. Also, according to Canagarajah (2011) there is a research gap for “explicit taxonomic structures within translanguaging pedagogies”, which poses confusions and challenges for teaching practitioners to put this into real practice (p. 415). As pedagogical part of translanguaging is not sufficiently developed yet, more research is needed to form a

concrete theoretical-research based guideline for using translanguaging practices because the unsystematic and random use of translanguaging practices used by both lecturers and students may lead undesired outcomes. In the same vein, more research is needed to understand the perceptions of the lecturers and students giving lectures and studying in EMI programs. The effectiveness of the translanguaging practices used by both students and lecturers should also be further investigated. Also, more studies in different educational degrees should be conducted regarding translanguaging in Turkish higher education context. Finally, differences between translanguaging practices of ESL and EMI students and lecturers should also be investigated and compared in Turkish context.

REFERENCES

Al Sharaeai, W. (2012). *Students' perspectives on the use of L1 in English classrooms*. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Iowa State University, Ames, Iowa, United States.

Baker, C. (2011). *Foundations of bilingual education and bilingualism.* Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Başıbek, N., Dolmacı, M., Cengiz, B. C., Bür, B., Dilek, Y., & Kara, B. (2014). Lecturers' perceptions of English medium instruction at engineering departments of higher education: A study on partial English medium instruction at some state universities in Turkey. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 116, 1819-1825.

Caldwell, J. A., & Butzkamm, W. (2009). *The bilingual reform: a paradigm shift in foreign language teaching.* Tubingen: Gunter Narr.

Canagarajah, S. (2011). Translanguaging in the classroom: Emerging issues for research and pedagogy. *Applied Linguistics Review*, *2*(1), 1-28.

Carroll, K. S., & van den Hoven, M. (2017). Translanguaging within higher education in the United Arab Emirates. In C. M. Mazak & K. S. Carroll (Eds.), *Translanguaging in higher education: Beyond monolingual ideologies* (pp.141-156). Tonawanda, NY: Multilingual Matters.

Cohen, L., & Manion, L., Morrison, K. (1994). *Research methods in education.* London: Routledge.

Collins, A. B. (2010). English-medium higher education: dilemma and problems. *Eurasian Journal of Educational Research*, 39, 97-110.

Cook, V. (2001). Using the first language in the classroom. *Canadian Modern Language Review*, *57*(3), 402-423.

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. W. (2009). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (3rd Ed.). Lincoln: SAGE Publications.

Creswell, J. W. (2014). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (4th Ed.). Washington DC: SAGE Publications.

Cummins, J. (1979). Linguistic interdependence and the educational development of bilingual children. *Review of Educational Research, 49*(2)*,* 222-251.

Cummins, J. (1981). Empirical and theoretical underpinnings of bilingual education. *Journal of Education, 163*(1), 16-29.

Cummins, J. (2000). *Language, power and pedagogy: bilingual children in the crossfire*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Cummins, J. (2007). Rethinking monolingual instructional strategies in multilingual classrooms. *Canadian Journal of Applied Linguistics/Revue Canadienne de Linguistique Appliquée*, *10*(2), 221-240.

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

Doiz, A., Lasagabaster, D., & Sierra, J. M. (Eds.) (2012). *English-medium instruction at universities: global challenges*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

Donato, R., & Mccormick, D. (1994). A sociocultural perspective on language learning strategies: The role of mediation. *The Modern Language Journal*, *78*(4), 453-464.

Dykhanova, A. (2015). *Functions of code-switching and attitudes toward them: A case study.* Unpublished Master's Thesis. Eastern Mediterranean University (EMU), Famagusta, Northern Cyprus.

Ellis, S., & McCartney, E. (Eds.). (2011). *Applied linguistics and primary school teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Escobar, C. F., Dillard-Paltrineri, E. (2015). Professors' and students' conflicting beliefs about translanguaging in the EFL classroom: Dismantling the monolingual bias. *Revista de Lenguas Modernas*, 23, 301-328.

Esquinca, A., Araujo, B., & Piedra, M. T. (2014). Meaning making and translanguaging in a two-way dual-language program on the U.S.-Mexico border. *Bilingual Research Journal, 37*(2), 164-181.

Evans, S., & Morrison, B. (2011). Meeting the challenges of English-medium higher education: The first-year experience in Hong Kong. *English for Specific Purposes, 30*(3), 198-208.

Garcia, O. (2009a). Education, multilingualism and translanguaging in the 21st century. In A.K. Mohanty, M. Panday, R. Phillipson, and T. Skutnabb-Kangas (Eds), *Multilingual education for social justice: Globalising the local* (pp. 140–58). New Delhi, India: Orient Black Swan.

Garcia, O. (2009b). *Bilingual education in the 21st century: Global perspectives.* Maiden, MA: Blackwell.

Garcia, O. (2012). Theorizing translanguaging for educators. In C. Celic & K. Seltzer (Eds.), *Translanguaging: A CUNY-NYSIEB guide for educators* (pp. 1–6). Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Garcia, O., & Kleifgen, J. A. (2010). *Educating English language learners as emergent bilinguals: Policies, programs and practices for English language learners*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Garcia, O., & Lin, A. M. Y. (2016). Translanguaging in bilingual education. In O. Garcia & A. M. Y. Lin (Eds.), *Bilingual and multilingual education* (pp.117-130). Dordrecht, the Netherlands: Springer.

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

Gort, M. (2015). Transforming literacy learning and teaching through translanguaging and other typical practices associated with "doing being bilingual". *International Multilingual Research Journal, 9*(1), 1-6.

Gort, M., & Sembiante, S. F. (2015). Navigating hybridized language learning spaces through translanguaging pedagogy: Dual language preschool teachers' languaging practices in support of emergent bilingual children's performance of academic discourse. *International Multilingual Research Journal*, *9*(1), 7-25.

Grosjean, F. (1989). Neurolinguists, beware! The bilingual is not two monolinguals in one person. *Brain and Language 36*(1), 3-15.

Hellekjær, G. O. (2010). Lecture comprehension in English-medium higher education. *HERMES-Journal of Language and Communication in Business, 23*(45), 11-34.

Hesson, S., Seltzer, K., & Woodley, H. H. (2014). *Translanguaging in Curriculum and Instruction: A CUNY-NYSIEB Guide for Educators*. Retrieved from http://www.nysieb.ws.gc.cuny.edu/files/2014/12/Translanguaging-GuideCurr-Inst-Final-December-2014.pdf

Hornberger, N. H. (Ed.) (2003). *Continua of biliteracy: An ecological framework for educational policy, research, and practice in multilingual settings*. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Hornberger, N. H., & Link, H. (2012). Translanguaging and transnational literacies in multilingual classrooms: a biliteracy lens. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, *15*(3), 261-278.

Hu, Guangwei, Lei, Jun (2014). English-medium instruction in Chinese higher education: A case study. *Higher Education, 67*(5)*,* 551-567.

Hughes, R. (2008). Internationalisation of higher education and language policy: Questions of quality and equity. *Higher Education Management and Policy 20*(1), 102-119.

Inbar-Lourie, O. (2010). English only? The linguistic choices of teachers of young EFL learners. *International Journal of Bilingualism, 14*(3), 351-367.

Jacobs, J. K., Kawanaka, T., & Stigler, J. W. (1999). Integrating qualitative and quantitative approaches to the analysis of video data on classroom teaching. *International Journal of Educational Research*, *31*(8), 717-724.

Johnson, R. B., Onwuegbuzie, A. J., & Turner, L. A. (2007). Toward a definition of mixed methods research. *Journal of Mixed Methods Research*, *1*(2), 112-133.

Joseph, D. I. (2015). *A sociolinguistic analysis of the effective translanguaging strategies of some first year bilingual students at University of the Western Cape (UWC)*. Unpublished Master's Thesis. University of the Western Cape, Cape Town, South Africa.

Karakaş, A. (2016a). *Turkish lecturers' and students' perceptions of English in English-medium instruction universities*. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, University of Southampton*,* Southampton, UK.

Karakaş, A. (2016b). Turkish lecturers' views on the place of mother tongue in the teaching of content courses through English medium. *Asian Englishes*, *18*(3), 242 - 257.

Karpov, Y. V., & Haywood, H. C. (1998). Two ways to elaborate Vygotsky's concept of mediation. *American Psychologist*, *53*(1), 27-36.

Kılıçkaya, F. (2006). Instructors' attitudes towards English medium instruction in Turkey. *Humanizing Language Teaching, 8*(6), 1-16.

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

Kim, K. R. (2011). Korean professor and student perceptions of the efficacy of English-medium instruction. *Linguistic Research, 28*(3), 711-741.

Kırkgöz, Y. (2005). Motivation and student perception of studying in an English-medium university. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies, 1*(1), 101-122.

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

Kırkgöz, Y. (2014). Students' perceptions of English language versus Turkish language used as the medium of instruction in higher education in Turkey. *Turkish Studies*, *9*(12), 443-459.

Kırkgöz, Y. & Dikilitaş, K. (Eds.) (2018). *Key issues in English for specific purposes in higher education.* Cham: Springer.

Krashen, S. D. (1985). *The input hypothesis: Issues and implications.* London: Longman.

Lantolf, J. P. (Ed.) (2000). *Sociocultural theory and second language learning*. Oxford, England: Oxford University Press.

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

Levine, G. S. (2003). Student and instructor beliefs and attitudes about target language use, first language use, and anxiety: Report of a questionnaire study. *The Modern Language Journal*, *87*(3), 343-364.

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

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.

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

Macaro, E. (2014). Overview: Where should we be going with classroom codeswitching research? In R. Barnard & J. McLellan (Eds.), *Code-switching in university English-medium classes* (pp. 10-23). Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Madiba, M. (2014). Promoting concept literacy through multilingual glossaries: A translanguaging approach. In C. van der Walt and L. Hibbert (Eds.), *Multilingual teaching and learning in higher education in South Africa* (pp.68-87). Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

Maillat, D., & Serra, C. (2009). Immersion education and cognitive strategies: Can the obstacle be the advantage in a multilingual society? *International Journal of Multilingualism*, *6*(2), 186-206.

Makalela, L. (2015). Breaking African language boundaries: Student teachers' reflections on translanguaging practices. *Language Matters, 46*(2), 275-292.

Marie, K. A. (2013). Coping with English as language of instruction in higher education in Rwanda. *International Journal of Higher Education, 2*(2), 1-12.

Martin-Beltrán, M. (2014). "What do you want to say?" How adolescents use translanguaging to expand learning opportunities. *International Multilingual Research Journal*, *8*(3), 208–230.

Martin, P. (2005). Safe language practices in two rural schools in Malaysia. Tensions between policy and practice. In A.M. Lin and P.W. Martin (Eds.), *Decolonisation, globalization: Language-in-education policy and practice* (pp. 74-97), Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Mauranen, A. (2010). Features of English as a lingua franca in academia. *Helsinki English Studies*, *6*, 6-28.

Mazak, C. M. (2017). Introduction: Theorizing translanguaging practices in higher education. In C. Mazak & K. S. Carroll (Eds.), *Translanguaging in higher education: Beyond monolingual ideologies* (pp. 1–10). Tonawanda, NY: Multilingual Matters.

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

McMillan, B. A., & Rivers, D. J. (2011). The practice of policy: Teacher attitudes toward "English only". *System*, *39*(2), 251-263.

Mendez Garcia, M. D. C., & Pavón Vázquez, V. (2012). Investigating the coexistence of the mother tongue and the foreign language through teacher collaboration in CLIL contexts: Perceptions and practice of the teachers involved in the plurilingual programme in Andalusia. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, *15*(5), 573-592.

Moll, L. C. (2000). Inspired by Vygotsky: Ethnographic experiments in education. In C. Lee & P. Smagorinsky (Eds.), *Vygotskian perspectives on literacy research: Constructing meaning through collaborative inquiry* (pp. 256–268). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Moragh, M. J. (2009). It's easy to learn when you using your home language but with English you need to start learning language before you get to the concept: Bilingual concept development in an English medium university in South Africa. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, *30*(4), 345-359.

Morse, J. M. (1991). Approaches to qualitative-quantitative methodological triangulation. *Nursing Research*, *40*(2), 120-123.

Moore, P. J. (2013). An emergent perspective on the use of the first language in the English as a foreign language classroom. *The Modern Language Journal*, *97*(1), 239 - 253.

Ngcobo, S., Ndaba, N., Nyangiwe, B., Mpungose, N., & Jamal, R. (2016). Translanguaging as an approach to address language inequality in South African higher education: Summary writing skills development. *Critical Studies in Teaching and Learning*, *4*(2), 10-27.

Olmedo, I. M. (2003). Language mediation among emergent bilingual children. *Linguistics and Education, 14*(2), 143-162.

Olsen, W. K. (2004). Triangulation in social research: Qualitative and quantitative methods can really be mixed. In M. Holborn (Ed.), *Developments in sociology* (pp.103-118). Ormskirk, UK: Causeway Press.

Oostendorp, M., & Anthonissen, C. (2014). Multiple voices in bilingual higher education: Language choices of Afrikaans/English bilinguals at Stellenbosch University. *Per Linguam: A Journal of Language Learning*, *30*(2), 69-87.

Opdenakker, R. (2006). Advantages and Disadvantages of Four Interview Techniques in Qualitative Research. *Forum: Qualitative Social Research, 7*(4).

Otsuji, E., & Pennycook, A. (2010). Metrolingualism: Fixity, fluidity and language in flux. *International Journal of Multilingualism*, *7*(3), 240-254.

Phillipson, R. (1992). *Linguistic imperialism.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Polio, C., & Duff, P. (1994). Teachers' language use in university foreign language classrooms: A qualitative analysis of English and target language alternation. *Modern Language Journal, 78*(3), 313-326.

Pontier, R., & Gort, M. (2016). Coordinated translanguaging pedagogy as distributed cognition: A case study of two dual language bilingual education preschool coteachers' languaging practices during shared book readings. *International Multilingual Research Journal, 10*(2), 89-106.

Poza, L. E. (2018). The language of ciencia: Translanguaging and learning in a bilingual science classroom. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, *21*(1), 1-19.

Raman, Y., & Yigitoglu, N. (2015). Friend or foe?: English as the medium of instruction policy versus code switching practices. *The International Journal of Research in Teacher Education*, *6*(3), 1-23.

Ritchie J., & Lewis, J. (2003). *Qualitative research practice: A guide for social science students and researchers*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

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

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

Sert, N. (2008). The language of instruction dilemma in the Turkish context. *System*, *36*(2), 156-171.

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

Smith, M., & Pourchot, T. (Eds.) (1998). *Adult learning and development: Perspectives from educational psychology.* Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Spolsky, B. (2004). *Language policy*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Spolsky, B. (2009). *Language management*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

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

Steckler, A., McLeroy, K. R., Goodman, R. M., Bird, S. T., & McCormick, L. (1992). Toward integrating qualitative and quantitative methods: An introduction. *Health Education Quarterly*, *19*(1), 1–8.

Storch, N., & Aldosari, A. (2010). Learners' use of first language (Arabic) in pair work in an EFL class. *Language Teaching Research, 14*(4), 355-375.

Swain, M., Kinnear, P., & Steinman, L. (2011). *Sociocultural theory in second language education: An introduction through narratives*. Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Tatzl, D. (2011). English-medium masters' programs at an Austrian university of applied sciences: Attitudes, experiences and challenges. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes, 10*(4), 252-270.

Tavares, N. J. (2015). How strategic use of L1 in an L2-medium mathematics classroom facilitates L2 interaction and comprehension. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, *18*(3), 319-335.

Turnbull, M. (2001). There is a role for the L1 in second and foreign language teaching, but…. *Canadian Modern Language Review, 57*(4), 531-540.

Van der Walt, C. (2006). University students' attitudes towards and experiences of bilingual classrooms. *Current Issues in Language Planning*, *7*(2-3), 359-376.

Vu, N. T., & Burns, A. (2014). English as a medium of instruction: Challenges for Vietnamese tertiary lecturers. *The journal of Asia TEFL*, *11*(3), 1-31.

Vygotsky, L. (1978). Interaction between learning and development. In M. Gauvain & M. Cole (Eds.), *Readings on the development of children* (pp. 34–40). New York: Scientific American Books.

Walqui, A. (2006). Scaffolding instruction for English language learners: A conceptual framework. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, *9*(2), 159-180.

Wang, D. (2016). Translanguaging in Chinese foreign language classrooms: Students' and teachers' attitudes and practices. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism.* DOI: 10.1080/13670050.2016.1231773.

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

Wei, L. (2011). Moment analysis and translanguaging space: Discursive construction of identities by multilingual Chinese youth in Britain. *Journal of Pragmatics*, *43*(5), 1222-1235.

Wood, D., Bruner, J. S., & Ross, G. (1976). The role of tutoring in problem solving. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry, 17*(2), 89–100.

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

Yeh, C. C. (2013). Instructors' perspectives on English-medium instruction in Taiwanese universities. *Curriculum and Instruction Quarterly*, *16*(1), 209-231.

APPENDICES

Appendix 1. Turkish Version of the Questionnaire for EMI Students

İngilizcenin Öğretim Dili Olarak Kullanıldığı Ortamlarda Öğrencilerin Dillerarası Geçişlilik Uygulamalarına Yaklaşımı						
Aşağıda görmüş olduğunuz ankette bulunan soruları yanıtlayarak bana yardımcı olmanızı rica ediyorum. Bu anketin amacı İngilizcenin öğretim dili olarak kullanıldığı ortamlarda Dillerarası Geçişlilik Uygulamalarını araştırmaktır. Bu anketin sonuçları sadece araştırma amacı ile kullanılacak olup cevaplarınız saklı tutulacaktır bu nedenle lütfen soruları samimiyetle cevaplandırınız. Yardımınız için çok teşekkür ederim.						
Bölüm 1: Demografik Bilgiler						
1	**Cinsiyet:** Erkek ☐ Kadın ☐					
2	**Anadiliniz:** İngilizce ☐ Türkçe ☐ Diğer(Belirtiniz) ☐					
3	**Yabancı Diliniz:** İngilizce ☐ Türkçe ☐ Diğer(Belirtiniz) ☐					
4	**Fakülte/Bölüm:**					
5	**Bölümünüzün Öğretim Dili nedir?**					
6	**İngilizce yeterliliğinizi nasıl derecelendirirsiniz?** Düşük Başlangıç Seviyesi ☐ Başlangıç Seviyesi ☐ Düşük Orta ☐ Yüksek Orta Seviye ☐ İleri Seviye ☐					
Bölüm 2: Öğrencilerin Tek dilli Eğitim ilgili tutumları		**Kesinlikle Katılıyorum**	**Katılıyorum**	**Kararsızım**	**Katılmıyorum**	**Kesinlikle Katılmıyorum**
1	Derste, yalnızca İngilizce kullanılmalıdır.					
2	Derste İngilizceyi ne kadar çok kullanırsak İngilizce ‘de o kadar ilerleme sağlarız.					
3	İngilizce ‘ye hâkim olmak için İngilizce' nin sınıfta çok					

	kullanılması gerektiğine inanıyorum					
4	Öğrencilerin derste anadillerini kullanmalarını gerektiren herhangi bir durum olduğunu düşünmüyorum					
5	Öğrencilerin derste, birlikte çalışırken yalnızca İngilizce kullanması gerektiğine inanıyorum.					
6	Öğretim elemanı ders anlatırken bir dilden diğerine (İngilizce 'den Türkçe 'ye (veya tam tersi) geçiş yaparken çok zaman harcıyor.					
7	Öğretim elemanı ders sırasında İngilizce 'den Türkçe 'ye (veya tam tersi) geçince kafam karışır.					
8	Derste aynı anda hem anadilimi hem de İngilizceyi kullanmak İngilizcemin zayıflamasına neden olur.					
Bölüm 3: Öğrencilerin Diller arası Geçişlilik ile ilgili Tutumları						
9	Derslerimde, ihtiyacım olduğunu hissettiğimde anadilimi kullanmak istiyorum.					
10	Dersteki sorumluluklarımı yerine getirdiğim sürece sınıfta yalnızca İngilizceyi kullanmak önemli değildir.					
11	Sınıf aktiviteleri sırasında sınıf arkadaşlarımla anadilimizde konuşmak sorun olmamalıdır.					
12	Öğretim elemanının derslerde aynı anda hem İngilizce hem de anadilimi kullanması bana fayda sağlıyor.					
13	Öğretim elemanının İngilizce ve anadilimde ders materyalleri kullanması bana fayda sağlar					
14	Öğretim elemanının, derslerde					

	kullanılan kelimeleri hem İngilizce hem de anadilimde sunarsa derslerden daha fazla fayda sağlarım.					
15	Derste aynı anda hem anadilimi hem de İngilizceyi kullanmak ders içeriğini anlamamı arttırıyor.					
16	Derste aynı anda hem anadilimi hem de İngilizceyi kullanmak, İngilizcemi geliştirmeme yardımcı olur					
Bölüm4: Öğrencilerin Diller arası Geçişlilik Uygulamaları		**Sürekli**	**Sık sık**	**Bazen**	**Hiç**	
17	Öğretim elemanının kullandığı veya aktivitelerde kullanılan dile bakmaksızın anadilimde not alırım.					
18	Öğretim elemanının derste kullandığı dilde not alırım.					
19	Derste not alırken İngilizce ’den Türkçe ’ye (veya tam tersi) fark etmeden geçiş yaptığımı görüyorum.					
20	Derste sınıf arkadaşıma dersle alakalı yeni bir kavramı anlatırken anadilimi kullanırım.					
21	Derste geçen bir kavramı sınıf arkadaşıma sorma ihtiyacı duyduğumda anadilimi kullanırım.					
22	Derste geçen bir kelime veya kavramın anlamını kontrol etmem gerektiği zaman anadilimi kullanırım.					

Appendix 2. English Version of the Questionnaire for EMI Students

Attitudes towards Translanguaging: Questionnaire for students who study in EMI Programs						
I would like to ask you to help me by answering the questions in the questionnaire below. The purpose of the questionnaire is to find out attitudes towards Translanguaging practices at English Medium context. Results of the questionnaire will be used only for research purposes and your answers will be kept confidential so please give your answers sincerely. Thank you very much for your help.						
Section 1. Demographic / Background information						
1	**Gender:** Male □ Female □					
2	**Home/first language:** English □ Turkish □ Other(Mention) □					
3	**Second language:** English □ Turkish □ Other(Mention) □					
4	**What is your Faculty/Department:**					
5	**What is the language of instruction at your department?**					
6	**How would you rate your level of English proficiency?**					
	Low Beginner□ High Beginner □ Low Intermediate□ High Intermediate Advanced □					
Section 2: Students' attitudes towards English Only Policy in the EMI classroom		**Strongly Agree**	**Agree**	**Neutral**	**Disagree**	**Strongly disagree**
1	I think my English content class should have an "English Only Policy." (This means only English is allowed in the classroom.)					
2	I believe the more English students use in the classroom the more their English will improve					
3	I believe that in order to master English students must use English a great deal in the classroom					

4	I believe that there are no situations in which the first language should be used in the classroom					
5	I believe that the students should use only English when working together on a task in the classroom.					
6	It wastes a lot of time when the lecturer switches from one language to another.					
7	It confuses me when the lecturer switches from English to Turkish (or vice versa) in lectures					
8	Using more than one language (translanguaging) in the classroom leads to the weakness of my English.					
Section 3: Students' attitudes towards Translanguaging in the EMI classroom		**Strongly Agree**	**Agree**	**Neutral**	**Disagree**	**Strongly disagree**
9	I want to be able to use my first language in English content class when I feel I need to.					
10	It's not important to use only English in class as long as I am completing the course tasks					
11	Speaking my first language with my classmates between and during class activities should be okay.					
12	It helps me when the lecturer use English and my first language simultaneously in lectures					

13	It helps me when the lecturer uses study materials both in my first language and English					
14	I will derive more benefit from classes if the lecturer provides a bilingual subject glossary (both in my first language and English) beforehand.					
15	Using more than one language in the classroom (translanguaging) increases my understanding of class content					
16	Using more than one language in the classrooms strengthens my English					
Section 4: Translanguaging Practices used bu Students		**Always**	**Often**	**Sometimes**	**Never**	
17	I make notes in my first language irrespective of the language used by the lecturer or used on the transparencies?					
18	I make notes in English and Turkish, depending on the language used by the lecturer at that stage?					
19	I see in my class notes that I've switched from English to Turkish (or vice versa) without noticing.					
20	I speak my first language in English class because I am explaining a new point in the lesson to a classmate.					
21	I speak my first language in English class because I need to ask a classmate to explain a point in the lesson for me.					
22	I speak my first language in English class because I need to check the meaning of a new word or concept during the lesson.					

Appendix 3. Turkish Version of the Interview Questions for EMI Lecturers

İNGILIZCE DERS VEREN ÖĞRETIM ELEMANLARI IÇIN GÖRÜŞME SORULARI

Bölüm 1: Demografik Bilgiler

1. Cinsiyet: Erkek □ Kadın □
2. Anadiliniz İngilizce □ Türkçe □ Diğer □ (Belirtiniz)
3. Yabancı Diliniz İngilizce □ Türkçe □ Diğer □ (Belirtiniz)
4. Fakülte / Bölümünüz nedir:
5. Ne zamandan beri üniversite seviyesinde öğretim yapıyorsunuz?
6. Bölümünüzde öğretim dili nedir?
7. İngilizcenin öğretim dili olarak kullanan yüksek öğretimde kaç senedir çalışıyorsunuz?

Bölüm 2:Öğretim Elamanlarının Dillerarası Geçişlilik Uygulamaları

1. Derslerinizde hangi dili kullanıyorsunuz?
2. Dersiniz sırasında birden fazla dil (dillerarası geçişlilik) kullanıyor musunuz? Nedenlerini belirtiniz.
3. Bu ne sıklıkta oluyor?
   a) Her zaman b) Çoğunlukla c) Bazen d) Hiçbir zaman
4. Dersler sırasında dillerarası geçişliliği (birden fazla dilde kullanılması) ne zaman kullanırsınız?
5. Öğrencilerinize hem İngilizce hem de öğrencilerin anadilinde ders materyali ve terminoloji sağlar mısınız? Lütfen açıklayınız?

Bölüm 3: Öğrencilerin Dillerarası Geçişlilik Uygulamaları

1. Öğrencilerin anadillerinde soru sorması veya soru cevaplaması gibi bir durum yaşıyor musunuz? Açıklayabilir misiniz lütfen?
2. Öğrencilerin anadillerinde soru sorması veya soru cevaplaması ne sıklıkta oluyor?
   a) Her zaman b) Çoğunlukla c) Bazen d) Hiçbir zaman
3. Öğrencilerin anadillerinde soru sormasına veya cevaplamasına nasıl tepki veriyorsunuz?

4. Derste yalnızca İngilizce kullanılması sizce öğrencilerin soru sormasını ya da soruları cevaplamasını etkiliyor mu?

5. Öğrencilerin ders sırasında anadillerini kullanmalarının öğrenme süreçlerini etkilediğini düşünüyor musun? Cevabınızı lütfen açıklayınız.

6. Sizce Öğrencilerin ders sırasında yaşadığı dil ile ilgili problemler nelerdir.

Bölüm 4: Öğretim Elemanlarının Dillerarası Geçişlilik ile ilgili Görüşleri

1. Sizce, derslerde iki veya daha fazla dilin kullanılmasına izin verilmesi gerekiyor mu? lütfen açıklayınız

2. Sizce, derslerde dillerarası geçişliliğin kullanılması (birden fazla dili kullanma), öğrencilerin konu içeriğini daha iyi anlamasını sağlayabilir mi?

3. Lütfen hangi durumlarda öğrencilerin ana dillerini kullanmanın yararlı olduğunu ve hangi durumlarda olumsuz olduğunu açıklayınız.

4. Sizce, derslerde dillerarası geçişliliğin kullanılması (birden fazla dili kullanma), öğrencilerin İngilizce Dil Becerilerini geliştirebilir mi?

Bölüm 5: Dillerarası Geçişlilik ile ilgili Son Yorumlar

1. Derslerde sadece İngilizce kullanımı ile ilgili genel görüşleriniz nelerdir.

2. Derslerde hem İngilizce hem Türkçe kullanımıyla ilgili genel görüşleriniz nelerdir?

Görüşmenin sonu, zaman ayırdığınız için teşekkür ederim!

Appendix 4. English Version of the Interview Questions for EMI Lecturers

INTERVIEW QUESTIONS FOR EMI LECTURERS

Section 1: Demographic / Background information

1. Gender: Male □ Female □
2. Home/first language: English □ Turkish □ Other□(Mention)
3. Second language: English □ Turkish □ Other□(Mention)
4. What is your Faculty/Department?
5. How long have you been teaching at university level?
6. What is the language of instruction at your department?
7. How long have you been teaching at English Medium Instruction Context?

Section 2: Lecturers' Translanguaging Practices in the class

1. What language do you use during your lessons?
2. Do you use more than one language (translanguaging) during your lesson? Give reasons why?
3. How often does it happen?

a) Always b) Often c) Sometimes d) Never

4. When do you use translanguaging (the use of more than one language) during lessons?
5. Do you provide bilingual study material and terminology both in students' first language and English?

Section 3: Learners' Translanguaging in the class

1. Do you experience a situation where learners answer or ask questions in their mother tongues? Can you explain please?
2. How often does it happen? a) Always b) Often c) Sometimes d) Never
3. How do you act in response to the learners asking or answering questions in their mother tongue?
4. Tell me please, do you think English Only Policy in the classroom effects learner's asking or answering questions?
5. Tell me please, do you think learner's mother tongues have an effect on their learning? Explain your answer please

6. What are the language related problems your students have during the English Content Class?

Section 4: Lecturers' views on Translanguaging in the class

1. In your opinion, should the use of two or more languages be allowed in the lessons? Explain please

2. In your opinion, do you think translanguaging (the use of more than one language) in lessons may improve learners' understanding of the subject contents?

3. Please describe in which situations using students' native language in the class is beneficial and in which situations is it detrimental.

4. In your opinion, do you think translanguaging (the use of more than one language) in lessons may improve learners' English language skills?

Section 5: Final Comments on Translanguaging

1. What are your general views and comments concerning English Only Policy in the classroom?

2. What are your general views and comments concerning the use of mother tongues parallel to English in the same lessons?

Appendix 5. Turkish Version of the Interview Questions for EMI Students

ÖĞRETIM DILI İNGILIZCE OLAN ÖĞRENCILER IÇIN GÖRÜŞME SORULARI	

Bölüm 1: Demografik Bilgiler

1. Cinsiyet: Erkek □ Kadın □
2. Anadiliniz:: İngilizce □ Türkçe □ Diğer □ (Belirtiniz)
3. Yabancı Diliniz: İngilizce □ Türkçe □ Diğer □ (Belirtiniz)
4. Fakülte / Bölümünüz nedir?
5. Bölümünüzde öğretim dili nedir?
6. İngilizce yeterliliğinizi nasıl derecelendirirsiniz?

Düşük Başlangıç □ Başlangıç □ Düşük Orta □ Yüksek Orta □ İleri □

7. Okulun dışında İngilizce konuşuyor musunuz? Evet ise, lütfen ne kadar ve kiminle konuştuğunuzu açıklayınız.

Bölüm 2: Derslerde Diller Arası Geçişlilik Uygulamaları

1. Derslerinizde anadilinizi kullanır mısınız?

1. Dersler sırasında dillerarası geçişliliği (birden fazla dilde kullanılması) ne zaman kullanırsınız?

Bölüm 3: Derslerde Diller Arası Geçişliliğin Kullanım Sıklığı

1. Bir dilden diğerine ne sıklıkta geçersiniz? Görüşmeyi yapan kişi uygun kutuyu işaretleyecektir.

a) Her zaman b) Çoğunlukla c) Bazen d) Hiçbir zaman

2. Dillerarası geçişi genellikle kimlerle yaparsınız?

Bölüm 4: Derslerde Diller Arası Geçişliliğe Karşı Yaklaşımlar

1. Lütfen dersler sırasında eşzamanlı olarak birden fazla dili kullanmanızın nedenini açıklayınız?
2. Derste Anadilinizi ve İngilizce'yi aynı anda kullanmanız sizce iyi mi? Kötü mü? Görüşlerinizi Belirtiniz
3. Derste Öğretim elemanlarının Anadilinizi ve İngilizce'yi aynı anda kullanması sizce iyi mi? Kötü mü? Görüşlerinizi Belirtiniz
4. Sizce, öğrencilerin ders sırasında dillerarası geçişlilik kullanmalarına izin verilmeli midir? Görüşlerinizi belirtiniz
5. Sizce, öğrencilerin anadillerini derslerde kullanmamaları için gerekçeler ne

olabilir? Görüşlerinizi belirtiniz

6. Sizce, öğretim elemanlarının derste hem ingilizceyi hem de anadilinizi kullanması, öğrencilerin dersleri daha iyi anlamalarına yardımcı olur mu?

7. Sınıfta anadilinizi ve İngilizceyi aynı anda kullanmanız ders konularını daha iyi anlamanıza yardımcı olur mu?

8. Sınıfta anadilinizi ve İngilizceyi aynı anda kullanmanız İngilizcenizi geliştirmenize yardımcı olur mu?

9. Sizce, öğretim elemanlarının derste kullanılan materyalleri ve kelimeleri hem anadilinizde hem de İngilizce sunmalı mıdır?

Bölüm 5: Derslerde Dil ile İlgili Yaşanan Zorluklar

1. Dersleriniz sırasında dil ile ilgili zorluklarla karşılaşıyor musunuz?
2. Dersleriniz sırasında karşılaştığınız zorluklar nelerdir?
3. Zorlukların her biriyle başa çıkabilmek için kullandığınız stratejileri açıklayınız.

Bölüm 6: Dillerarası Geçişlilik ile ilgili Son Yorumlar

1. Derslerinizde dillerarası geçişlilik ile ilgili deneyiminiz hakkında benimle paylaşmak istediğiniz başka bir şey var mı?

Görüşmenin sonu, zaman ayırdığınız için teşekkür ederim!

Appendix 6. English Version of the Interview Questions for EMI Students

INTERVIEW QUESTIONS FOR EMI STUDENTS

Section 1: Demographic / Background information

1. Gender: Male □ Female □
2. Home/first language: English □ Turkish □ Other□(Mention)
3. Second language: English□ Turkish □ Other□(Mention)
4. What is your Faculty/Department?
5. What is the language of instruction at your department?
6. How would you rate your level of English proficiency?

Low Beginner □ High Beginner □ Low Intermediate □ High Intermediate □ Advanced □

7. Do you speak English outside the school? If yes, please explain how much and with whom you speak?

Section 2. Occurrence of Translanguaging Practices in the class

1. Do you ever use your first language during lessons in your classroom?
2. When do you use translanguaging (the use of more than one language) during lessons?

Section 3: Frequency of Translanguaging Usage in the Classroom

1. How often do you change from one language to the next? The interviewer will tick on the appropriate box

a) Always b) Often c) Sometimes d) Never

2. With whom do you usually mix languages?

Section 4: Attitudes towards Using Translanguaging in the Classroom

1. Please explain the reason why you use more than one language simultaneously during lessons?
2. Do you think using your mother tongue and English at the same time in a lesson is good or bad? Give your opinions.
3. Do you think lecturers' using your mother tongue and English at the same time in a lesson is good or bad? Give your opinions.
4. Do you think learners should be allowed to use translanguaging during lessons? Give your opinions
5. What could be the reasons why learners are not supposed to use their native

language in lessons? Give your opinions

6. Do you think translanguaging of the lecturer will assist learners understand the subjects better? If your answer is yes, give reasons and if your answer is no, give reasons.

7. Do you think using your mother tongue and English in the class will or will not help you understand the subjects better?

8. Do you think using your mother tongue and English in the class will or will not help you improve your English Language Skills?

9. Do you think the lecturer should provide study materials and terminology used in the classroom in both English and your mother tongue?

Section 5: Language Related Challenges in EMI Context

1. Do you face language related challenges during content lessons?

2. What language related challenges do you face/experience during content lessons?

3. Explain the strategies you use in order to cope with each of the challenges

Section 6: Final Comments on Translanguaging

1. Is there anything else you'd like to share with me about your experience using translanguaging in your classes?

End of interview, thank you for your time!

Appendix 7. Observation Check List

LECTURERS	**ENGLISH**	**TRANSLANGUAGING**
Greeting learners		
Explaining lesson objectives		
Drawing learners attention and building rapport		
Introducing the new lesson		
Explaining difficult terms		
Asking questions		
Defining new concepts		
Learners do not understand		
Summarizing the lessons		
Dismissing the class		
STUDENTS		
Asking questions to the lecturers		
Answering lecturers' questions		
Discussing in groups		
Interacting with others in the class		
Asking other learners		
Note Taking		

Appendix 8: Sample from Individual Interview with Lecturers

Interviewer: What language do you use during your lessons?

LC: English but sometimes I have to make explanations in Turkish.

Interviewer: Do you use more than one language (translanguaging) during your lesson? Give reasons why?

LC: If I do an assessment regarding lecturers' and students' language use, I think that I do not express myself and convey the information as I do in my first language. When I revise the content in Turkish I can be more comfortable in expressing myself and thus, students have the chance to revise the content for the second time and learn academic vocabulary.

Interviewer: How often does it happen?

a) Always b) Often c) Sometimes d) Never

LC: It always happens. Because my own methodology in my lectures is to conduct the lecture in English and then, summarize it in Turkish in order to reinforce the understanding.

Interviewer: When do you use translanguaging (the use of more than one language) during lessons?

LC: When I finish explaining the content in English I use translanguaging.

Interviewer: Do you provide bilingual study material and terminology both in students' first language and English?

LC: No. I provide all the materials in English to my students. Later, they make notes from my explanations in Turkish and I suggest them Turkish and English materials and books.

Interviewer: Do you experience a situation where learners answer or ask questions in their mother tongues? Can you explain please?

LC: Yes and I let them use their first language in the classroom.

Interviewer How often does it happen?

a) Always b) Often c) Sometimes d) Never

LC: Often.

Interviewer: How do you act in response to the learners asking or answering questions in their mother tongue?

LC: My priority is students' fully comprehension of content therefore, I permit them use their native language and tell them it is not a problem for me. In the lecture or during the presentation they firstly start in English and when they are get stuck, they ask for permission to continue in Turkish and I let them do it.

Interviewer: Tell me please, do you think English Only Policy in the classroom effects learner's asking or answering questions?

LC: Following English Only instructional methods in EMI decreases students' inclusion in the lecture. They are afraid of making any mistake while they ask questions thus participation decreases sharply. Moreover, strict rules for language choice inhibit interaction and make students lose their attention towards the lecture. I use translanguaging to empower students' interaction and participation in the classroom.

Interviewer Tell me please, do you think learner's mother tongues have an effect on their learning? Explain your answer please.

LC: We have to use translanguaging during delivering the content. When we explain the terms in Turkish, retention of the knowledge increases and they have the chance to compare the meaning and verify what they have learnt.

Interviewer What are the language related problems your students have during the English Content Class?

LC: In my opinion, they have trouble in speaking. They are hesitated to talk amidst their classmates and feel that their classmates will ridicule when they talk.

Interviewer In your opinion, should the use of two or more languages be allowed in the lessons? Explain please.

LC: I think it should be permitted.

Interviewer In your opinion, do you think translanguaging (the use of more than one language) in lessons may improve learners' understanding of the subject contents?

LC: I use translanguaging as I noticed its positive effect on students' comprehension. I also noticed that when students do not fully understand what the lecturer says they feel uncertainty about understanding the academic content clearly. When we clarify the knowledge in their first language they have the change to compare and verify the acquired knowledge. Above all, they have learnt and they know the terms in their first language, therefore, judicious use of first language will absolutely help them understand the content better.

Interviewer Please describe in which situations using students' native language in the class is beneficial and in which situations is it detrimental.

LC: As the medium of instruction is English in our departments, students should know the academic terminology in English and they have to prepare and present their task in English as much as they can. However, during delivering the content translanguaging should also be used to make sure of full comprehension of content.

Interviewer In your opinion, do you think translanguaging (the use of more than one language) in lessons may improve learners' English language skills?

LC: As they learn the academic vocabulary in both languages they have the chance to compare the meanings and empower their memory. This may be can make a positive effect on their language skills.

Interviewer What are your general views and comments concerning English Only Policy in the classroom?

LC: I think English only is a very strict policy. I think we have to also use Turkish if we are living in Turkey. English only decreases students' participation to the lecture sharply. Moreover, I think students should not be separated from their culture.

Interviewer What are your general views and comments concerning the use of mother tongues parallel to English in the same lessons?

LC: Even if the institutional language policy is English Only, I think we should not conduct our lectures exclusively in English. I accept that English is the lingua franca and language of the technology and students should know English equivalents of the academic concepts. However; Turkish has to have a space even in EMI classrooms so that students can fully understand the content.

Appendix 9: Sample from Focus Group Interview with Students

Interviewer: Do you ever use your first language during lessons in your classroom?

SI: Yes

SJ: Sometimes

SK: Sometimes

SL: Sometimes

Interviewer: When do you use translanguaging (the use of more than one language) during lessons?

SI: In general, when I ask questions or solving problems.

SJ: I use it more during problem solving

SK: Similarly, I use it when I am solving problems and also, when I think to myself.

SL: Similarly, I use Turkish during problem solving and when we ask something that we did not understand.

Interviewer: How often do you change from one language to the next?

a) Always b) Often c) Sometimes d) Never

SI: Sometimes

SJ: Often

SK: Sometimes

SL: Sometimes

Interviewer: With whom do you usually mix languages?

SI: With my lecturers and sometimes with my classmates.

SJ: With my lecturers and sometimes with my classmates

SK: I use it more with my classmates

SL: I use Turkish with my classmates in general.

Interviewer: Please explain the reason why you use more than one language simultaneously during lessons?

SI: I use translanguaging in order to overcome the misunderstanding. Because sometimes it can be problematic if a person misunderstands me when I am talking in English.

SJ: I use it as my English language proficiency is not sufficient. When I have trouble in understanding in English I ask the complicated part in Turkish.

SK: Sometimes, the concepts get complicated. I cannot figure out English equivalents of the terms or vice versa. I use translanguaging for finding and understanding the fitting term.

SL: I use translanguaging mostly when I think that I can express myself better in my first language.

Interviewer: Do you think using your mother tongue and English at the same time in a lesson is good or bad? Give your opinions.

SI: I think it is both beneficial and detrimental. Sometimes, using more than one language is useful but sometimes, it may lead wrong learning when we try to translate some English notions to Turkish. Except of that, it is beneficial to use our first language.

Interviewer: How so?

SI: The useful part of the translanguaging is that it provides better learning and comprehension. When we utilize translanguaging we have the chance to compare and contrast the meaning of the notions, learn the equivalents in both languages and thus, it provides long term retention of the knowledge.

SJ: I support translanguaging. When we miss some parts in English and the lecturers summarize it in Turkish, we understand the content better. L1 should be used for a deeper understanding the content.

SK: I think translanguaging is beneficial. We will be engineers in the future. Learning both English and Turkish equivalents of the academic terms is advantageous for us. Thus, we could improve both languages concurrently.

SL: I think classes should be English only so that we could faster our target language acquisition. We can learn the missing parts of the content from friends or internet after the class but I prefer English Only classroom for improving my English.

Interviewer: Do you need any support from your lecturer or classmate to understand the content better?

SL: Yes!

Interviewer: Do you think learners should be allowed to use translanguaging during lessons? Give your opinions.

SI: I think it should not be that strict and translanguaging should be permitted as I do not think it has ant detrimental effect on students.

SJ: I think translanguaging should be permitted because sometimes there are some parts that I cannot fully comprehend. I feel the need to ask it to lecturers; however, I

cannot ask as my English is not proficient enough. I have to skip this part without understanding it and this situation leads deficient learning of content. Therefore, students should be able to ask or answer questions in their first language.

SK: Translanguaging should be permitted. For example, even if I know the answer, I cannot attend to class and cannot answer lecturer's question because of my English level. This situation makes me feel stressful and decreases my motivation towards the lecture. Therefore, I think translanguaging is a beneficial strategy for increasing participation to class and for activation of students.

Interviewer: Do you feel hesitated to answer the questions because of language proficiency?

SK: Yes!

SL: I think classes should only be conducted in English because I believe we could only improve our language skills by using it. Regarding the challenges in content learning, we can find a way to overcome it. We ask to classmates for clarification of incomprehensible parts or we can search and read in Turkish for a better understanding.

Interviewer: What could be the reasons why learners are not supposed to use their native language in lessons? Give your opinions.

SI: Translanguaging should be used only when we have trouble.

SJ: It is not good to always speak Turkish in English class. EMI provides a big advantage for us. In order to finish our degree with a high English proficiency level, we have to use it. Therefore, use of first language should be restricted and minimized. We could use it only when we have challenge in understanding some points but not always.

SK: Translanguaging should be tolerated to some extent but should be limited otherwise it may lead laziness for learning the target language

SL: It can be used to some extent to understand better and clarify the content.

Interviewer: Do you think translanguaging of the lecturer will assist learners understand the subjects better? If your answer is yes, give reasons and if your answer is no, give reasons.

SI: Because of my English level, I cannot be sure whether I understood the topic correctly or not. I always have a doubt in my mind. However, when the lecturer summarizes the content in Turkish, I can verify the acquired knowledge and be sure of what I understood. So, translanguaging is beneficial for reinforcing the meaning.

SJ: Translanguaging is good for our understanding of topic. It provides permanent learning of content. Therefore, it should be permitted.

SK: I have sometimes difficulties in understanding some points of the content. When I ask it and lecturer answer it in Turkish, I can make meaning of it and set up connection and transition between knowledge in both languages and understand complicated part better. Therefore, I think using first language should be utilized in EMI classroom.

SL: I think translanguaging should be used sometimes but not always. It provides us to understand the content better.

Interviewer: Do you think using your mother tongue and English in the class will or will not help you improve your English Language Skills?

SI: I think translanguaging contributes to our second language skills. When we revise English conducted lecture in Turkish we could be sure whether we understood correctly or not. We can verify and make transitions of the knowledge between both languages. Making this comparison in both languages helps us to improve in both languages.

SJ: I agree with my friend it contributes to our language skills.

SK: Yes, it improves our language skills. For example, I encounter with some terms that I am not familiar with. When the lecturers explain the Turkish equivalents of these terms I could understand the English notions better. It provides long term retention of knowledge.

SL: I do not think translanguaging provides any contribution to our language skills. On the contrary, I believe that it causes weakness in our language skills.

Interviewer: Do you think the lecturer should provide study materials and terminology used in the classroom in both English and your mother tongue?

SI: English materials are sufficient.

SJ: Absolutely, English version is enough.

SK: I think Turkish materials should also be provided.

SL: Only English is enough.

Interviewer: Do you take notes in your first language?

SI: If I meet with a notion for the first time, I certainly note its Turkish.

SJ: There is often a transition in the language of my notes. I sometimes note the pronunciation of the term if I do not know what it is.

SK: I take notes in both Turkish and English during the lesson. I generally write Turkish explanation of what the lecturers explain in English during the lecture. Because I can keep the information in my mind by this way and understand it better.

SL: Generally, I take English notes. Rarely, I take Turkish notes.

Interviewer: What language related challenges do you face/experience during content lessons?

SI: I do not have too much trouble regarding language of instruction. I can check the meaning using bilingual dictionary when I need to.

SJ: I also do not have too much trouble with English. But I have some deficiency in vocabulary. I could understand almost every talk but when I meet with a word that I am not familiar with I stuck there.

SK: Sometimes I have trouble in understanding the pronunciation of the lecturer. When s/he speaks fast I could not grasp what s/he means. I ask the parts that I could not grasp first to my friends as I may feel hesitation to talk to lecturers in Turkish. However, if I still could not be sure of what I understood I have to ask to lecturer.

SL: I generally have challenge in exams. One time I got a low score as I misunderstood the question.

Interviewer Please explain the strategies you use in order to cope with each of the challenges.

SI: I check the meaning of unfamiliar terms in my free time.

Interviewer: You look to Turkish equivalents of the terms. Right?

SI: Yes.

Interviewer: Do you ask your classmates for help?

SI: Not during the lecture. During the lecture, I use my dictionary.

SJ: If I have the chance of looking to Turkish equivalents of unknown words from the dictionary during the lecture, I do it otherwise; I note the word on the blank parts of my notebook and check the meaning after the lecture.

SK: I do the same. I cannot check the meaning of the word during the lecture. Sometimes, I keep listening the lecturer to grasp the meaning of the word.

SL: Generally, I highlight the unfamiliar part and check it later.

Interviewer: Does exclusive use of English in EMI classroom effect your participation in the lecture or does it decrease the frequency of asking or answering the lecturers' questions?

SI: Generally, I do not hesitate to ask in which language that I prefer.

SJ: I feel hesitated sometimes. If I have to use only English when asking questions, I have to make the sentence in my mind first. However, this part can be passed until I set up the sentence.

SK: If I feel hesitated to ask the lecturer I ask to my classmates.

SL: I sometimes feel hesitated too. However, I believe that we will overcome it as long as we improve our language proficiency.

Interviewer: Is there anything else you'd like to share with me about your experience using translanguaging in your classes?

SI: Both English only classes and translanguaging is beneficial for us. I do not have any problem with the occurrence of translanguaging in classes.

SJ: I have chosen to study in an EMI department by purpose and I want to have an advanced English proficiency when I graduate from the school. However, it does not mean that I support exclusive use of English in the classroom. It should be okay to use Turkish when I feel I need to. Turkish should be restricted but should also be used at least to ask the complicated parts and to clarify the concepts.

SK: I agree with the opinions of both of my friends.

SL: I think we have to use English as much as possible and should use Turkish only when we have trouble in understanding.

Appendix 10. Sample of Interview Consent Form

Title: Investigating Translanguaging as a Teaching and Learning Practice in an English Medium Higher Education Context in Turkey

Consent Form for Interviews

Thank you for reading the information about the interview. If you are happy to participate then please complete and sign the form below. Please initial the boxes below to confirm that you agree with each statement:

I confirm that I have read and understood the information sheet dated **[]** and have had the opportunity to ask questions.	☐
I understand that my participation is voluntary and that I am free to withdraw at any time without giving any reason and without there being any negative consequences. In addition, should I not wish to answer any particular question or questions, I am free to decline.	☐
I understand that my responses will be kept strictly confidential. I understand that my name will not be linked with the research materials, and will not be identified or identifiable in the report or reports that result from the research.	☐
I agree for this interview to be tape-recorded. I understand that the audio recording made of this interview will be used only for analysis and that extracts from the interview, from which I would not be personally identified, may be used in any conference presentation, report or journal article developed as a result of the research. I understand that no other use will be made of the recording without my written permission, and that no one outside the research team will be allowed access to the original recording.	☐
I agree that my anonymized data will be kept for future research purposes such as publications related to this study after the completion of the study.	
I agree to take part in this interview.	☐

_____	_____	_____
Name of participant	Date	Signature
_____	_____	
Investigator	Date	Signature

Appendix 11. Sample from Frequencies and Percentages of Questionnaire Results

Part1: Students' Attitudes towards English Only Policy

I think my English content class should have an "English Only Policy." (This means only English is allowed in the classroom.)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Disagree	7	9,7	9,7	9,7
	Disagree	5	6,9	6,9	16,7
	Neutral	20	27,8	27,8	44,4
	Agree	21	29,2	29,2	73,6
	Strongly Agree	19	26,4	26,4	100

I believe the more English students use in the classroom the more their English will improve

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Disagree	2	2,8	2,8	2,8
	Disagree	2	2,8	2,8	5,6
	Neutral	6	8,3	8,3	13,9
	Agree	18	25	25	38,9
	Strongly Agree	44	61,1	61,1	100

I believe that in order to master English students must use English a great deal in the classroom

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Disagree	2	2,8	2,8	2,8
	Disagree	2	2,8	2,8	5,6
	Neutral	7	9,7	9,7	15,3
	Agree	30	41,7	41,7	56,9
	Strongly Agree	31	43,1	43,1	100

I believe that there are no situations in which the first language should be used in the classroom

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Disagree	16	22,2	22,2	22,2
	Disagree	24	33,3	33,3	55,6
	Neutral	18	25	25	80,6
	Agree	9	12,5	12,5	93,1
	Strongly Agree	5	6,9	6,9	100

I believe that the students should use only English when working together on a task in the classroom.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Disagree	5	6,9	6,9	6,9
	Disagree	26	36,1	36,1	43,1
	Neutral	21	29,2	29,2	72,2
	Agree	7	9,7	9,7	81,9
	Strongly Agree	13	18,1	18,1	100

It wastes a lot of time when the lecturer switches from one language to another.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Disagree	28	38,9	38,9	38,9
	Disagree	23	31,9	31,9	70,8
	Neutral	10	13,9	13,9	84,7
	Agree	8	11,1	11,1	95,8
	Strongly Agree	3	4,2	4,2	100

It confuses me when the lecturer switches from English to Turkish (or vice versa) in lectures

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Disagree	25	34,7	34,7	34,7
	Disagree	28	38,9	38,9	73,6
	Neutral	6	8,3	8,3	81,9
	Agree	9	12,5	12,5	94,4
	Strongly Agree	4	5,6	5,6	100

Using more than one language (translanguaging) in the classroom leads to the weakness of my English.					
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Disagree	24	33,3	33,3	33,3
	Disagree	23	31,9	31,9	65,3
	Neutral	8	11,1	11,1	76,4
	Agree	10	13,9	13,9	90,3
	Strongly Agree	7	9,7	9,7	100

Part 2: Students' Attitudes towards Translanguaging

I want to be able to use my first language in English content class when I feel I need to.					
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Disagree	7	9,7	9,7	9,7
	Neutral	15	20,8	20,8	30,6
	Agree	25	34,7	34,7	65,3
	Strongly Agree	25	34,7	34,7	100
It's not important to use only English in class as long as I am completing the course tasks					
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Disagree	7	9,7	9,7	9,7
	Disagree	15	20,8	20,8	30,6
	Neutral	17	23,6	23,6	54,2
	Agree	24	33,3	33,3	87,5
	Strongly Agree	9	12,5	12,5	100
Speaking my first language with my classmates between and during class activities should be okay.					
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Disagree	2	2,8	2,8	2,8
	Disagree	5	6,9	6,9	9,7
	Neutral	14	19,4	19,4	29,2
	Agree	33	45,8	45,8	75
	Strongly Agree	18	25	25	100

It helps me when the lecturer use English and my first language simultaneously in lectures

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Disagree	3	4,2	4,2	4,2
	Disagree	1	1,4	1,4	5,6
	Neutral	16	22,2	22,2	27,8
	Agree	18	25	25	52,8
	Strongly Agree	34	47,2	47,2	100

It helps me when the lecturer uses study materials both in my first language and English

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Disagree	3	4,2	4,2	4,2
	Neutral	5	6,9	6,9	11,1
	Agree	32	44,4	44,4	55,6
	Strongly Agree	32	44,4	44,4	100

I will derive more benefit from classes if the lecturer provides a bilingual subject glossary (both in my first language and English) beforehand.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Disagree	1	1,4	1,4	1,4
	Disagree	7	9,7	9,7	11,1
	Neutral	11	15,3	15,3	26,4
	Agree	27	37,5	37,5	63,9
	Strongly Agree	26	36,1	36,1	100

Using more than one language in the classroom (translanguaging) increases my understanding of class content

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Disagree	2	2,8	2,8	2,8
	Disagree	8	11,1	11,1	13,9
	Neutral	8	11,1	11,1	25
	Agree	23	31,9	31,9	56,9
	Strongly Agree	31	43,1	43,1	100

Using more than one language in the classrooms strengthens my English					
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Disagree	4	5,6	5,6	5,6
	Disagree	7	9,7	9,7	15,3
	Neutral	15	20,8	20,8	36,1
	Agree	23	31,9	31,9	68,1
	Strongly Agree	23	31,9	31,9	100

Part 3: Students' Translanguaging Practices

I make notes in my first language irrespective of the language used by the lecturer or used on the transparencies.					
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Never	16	22,2	22,2	22,2
	Sometimes	35	48,6	48,6	70,8
	Often	17	23,6	23,6	94,4
	Always	4	5,6	5,6	100

I make notes in English and Turkish, depending on the language used by the lecturer at that stage.					
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Never	5	6,9	6,9	6,9
	Sometimes	17	23,6	23,6	30,6
	Often	37	51,4	51,4	81,9
	Always	13	18,1	18,1	100

I see in my class notes that I've switched from English to Turkish (or vice versa) without noticing.					
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Never	16	22,2	22,2	22,2
	Sometimes	28	38,9	38,9	61,1
	Often	18	25	25	86,1
	Always	10	13,9	13,9	100

I speak my first language in English class because I am explaining a new point in the lesson to a classmate.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Never	3	4,2	4,2	4,2
	Sometimes	14	19,4	19,4	23,6
	Often	31	43,1	43,1	66,7
	Always	24	33,3	33,3	100

I speak my first language in English class because I need to ask a classmate to explain a point in the lesson for me.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Never	5	6,9	6,9	6,9
	Sometimes	10	13,9	13,9	20,8
	Often	25	34,7	34,7	55,6
	Always	32	44,4	44,4	100

I speak my first language in English class because I need to check the meaning of a new word or concept during the lesson.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Never	4	5,6	5,6	5,6
	Sometimes	20	27,8	27,8	33,3
	Often	22	30,6	30,6	63,9
	Always	26	36,1	36,1	100
	Total	72	100	100	

CURRICULUM VITAE

PERSONAL INFORMATION:

Name and Surname: Ceylan KÜÇÜK
Date/Place of Birth: 02.08.1988-Samandağ
Email: ckucuk@adanabtu.edu.tr

EDUCATIONAL BACKROUND

2015-2018: MA, Çukurova University, Institute of Social Sciences, English Language Teaching Department
2013-Present: MA, Adana Science and Technology University, Institute of Social Sciences, Management and Organization Department
2013-2017: BA, Anadolu University, Faculty of Economics, International Relations Department
2006-2011: BA, Anadolu University, Open Education Faculty, English Language Teaching Department

WORK EXPERIENCE

2007-2011: Responsible Person for Erasmus Incoming Students, Anadolu University, International Relations Office
2011-2012: Comenius Assistantship, Escuela San Jose Jesuitas, Valencia, Spain
2012-2013: International Relations Specialist, Artvin Çoruh University, International Relations Office
2013- Present: Erasmus+ Vice Institutional Coordinator, Adana Science and Technology University, International Relations Office