ARTICLE

Exploring Emerging Translanguaging Practices among International Undergraduates in EAP Courses in South Korea

Jinsil Jang 🆔

Division of Liberal Arts and General Education, Gangneung-Wonju National University, Gangneung-si 25457, Republic of Korea

ABSTRACT

As the number of international students in South Korean universities increases, top-tiered institutions are gradually adopting English-Medium Instruction (EMI) policies without considering the linguistic diversity of these students. Similarly, my English for Academic Purposes (EAP) courses were initially designed to be solely conducted in English, assuming that it would be the most effective medium of instruction. However, this English-only approach created tensions between academic and local language practices, which affected language use in my classes. These tensions mainly arise from the differences between students' local and academic language practices, making it challenging for EAP instructors to design courses that cater to both Korean and international students. To address these gaps, this autoethnographic case study draws on the frameworks of EAP, translanguaging, and action research. The study explores the challenges faced in EAP classes at a regional Korean university and how a bilingual Korean-English instructor addressed them. Throughout one semester in 2022, I conducted action research and redesigned my EAP course to create a translanguaging space for multilingual students. The findings revealed that English-only practices hindered students' ability to fluidly switch between languages, limiting their proficiency in using English for everyday and academic communication. Monolingual values embedded in EAP courses also hindered meaningful communication among students with different language backgrounds. To address these challenges, a transition from English-only to multilingual practices was necessary in EAP courses, requiring the development of pedagogical approaches that activate students' multilingual resources in English as a Foreign Language

(EFL) context. This study suggests the need for more action research in EAP and EFL settings to improve classroom teaching practices and enhance students' learning experiences.

Keywords: Multilingual Undergraduates; EFL; EAP; Translanguaging; Action Research

1. Introduction

With a growing number of international students attending Korean universities, EAP has recently received considerable attention in South Korea. However, EAP practices in EFL contexts are still an emerging area of research regarding local communications and academic practices[1–3]. This trajectory aligns with the contemporary trend where both scholarly investigations and practical applications in the realm of EAP have pivoted towards addressing context-specific nuances and broader requisites, transcending the exclusive focus on attaining English fluency[4–6]. Additionally, current EAP research is increasingly informed by translanguaging pedagogically[1]; however, despite the importance of the implementation of translanguaging pedagogy in EAP classes in EFL contexts, very little has been researched with respect to EAP instructors' use of multilingual resources with local relevance.

To explore the commonly encountered challenges in EAP classes in a regional Korean university and how the challenges can be addressed by a Korean-English bilingual instructor over the course of one semester, this autoethnographic case study draws upon the conceptual frameworks of EAP, translanguaging, and action research. As Canagarajah[1] notes, since teachers and students affect and are affected by academic practices and local communications, having students participate in "multiple discursive practices"[7] (p. 140) is a crucial learning process, especially in a multilingual space. However, as illustrated by Lee and Lee[6], many of the top-tiered universities across South Korea increasingly move toward EMI by offering a number of EAP courses that are constrained by English-only policies, focusing on internationalizing their programs without much consideration of international students from different language backgrounds. Namely, the gap between students' local and academic language practices brings enormous challenges for EAP instructors in designing and developing courses for both Korean and international students.

As one of the EAP instructors at a Korean university, the author came to recognize the tensions between academic and local language practices, which heavily influence language use in EAP classrooms. Since her EAP courses were initially planned for Korean students who were highly interested in jobs that required professional English skills, English was the main medium of instruction. Yet, in actual classrooms, a diverse spectrum of English proficiency levels was observed, accompanied by the utilization of various languages among students.

This diversity highlighted that those students with limited English proficiency encountered obstacles in engaging fully with English-only teaching and learning methods. Furthermore, it's worth noting that nearly one-third of the student population comprised international students hailing from China, Mongolia, and Uzbekistan, and the majority of these students were learning Korean as a second language and participating in courses delivered in Korean. This factor significantly impacted their language dynamics and approaches to learning within the classroom.

The multilingual nature of language contact in a local space caused me to reconsider monolingual values and beliefs in English language teaching[1]. In line with this idea, in this study, action research is employed as "[the] small-scale intervention in the functioning of the real world and a close examination of the effects of such intervention"[8] (p. 32), and simultaneously the author's EAP course curricula are redeveloped with the focus of providing a translanguaging space.

This autoethnographic case study aims to illustrate the challenges that the author, as an EAP course instructor, has both observed and faced. It also aims to showcase how these challenges can be effectively tackled through a shift from English-only teaching to incorporating multilingual language practices within EAP courses, as evidenced through action research. By delving into the realm of linguistically and culturally varied language and teaching methodologies in Korean EAP courses, the outcomes of this study are anticipated to underscore the imperative need for devising translanguaging pedagogical strategies that facilitate the active utilization of

multilingual resources within tertiary English as a Foreign Language (EFL) context. The overarching questions are as follows:

1) What challenges do I encounter in teaching EAP courses in non-NES settings?

2) How are the challenges addressed through the intervention of a translanguaging pedagogy?

2. Review of Literature

2.1. EAP at Tertiary Level in EFL Contexts: Challenges in Korea and Other Asian Countries

Within the context of the Korean education landscape, EAP courses have undergone restructuring primarily to cater to students' distinct requirements, including the enhancement of job-related English skills, academic achievements, and alignment with their chosen academic disciplines and future career paths[9]. Nevertheless, it has been contended that the impetus behind organizing and altering English programs at universities has, in some instances, been driven by government evaluations and institutional rankings[9]. Such an atmosphere has contributed to the widespread advocacy for English-only instruction within EAP classrooms.

The monolingual approach inadvertently results in students underestimating or diminishing the value of their diverse linguistic abilities, regarding their L1 knowledge as an impediment to acquiring proficiency in academic English. Thus, EAP instructors find themselves grappling with the challenge of harmonizing their teaching practices with the dual demands of students' requirements and institutional directives, which involve careful consideration of the linguistic resources in place, such as the students' native language (e.g., Korean). Consequently, the implementation and transformation of English programs have not always unfolded seamlessly, introducing complexities in its execution and adaptation[10]. In other words, concerning the goals of EAP courses at the tertiary level in Korea, the significance of acknowledging and addressing students' individual needs in teaching practices stands as a critical aspect. However, this aspect tends to be given insufficient attention and exploration within Korean university contexts[10].

The adoption of EMI in Korean higher education, while aimed at fostering internationalization and global compet-

itiveness, has generated sociopolitical concerns. Scholars have pointed out that EMI policies can reinforce linguistic hierarchies and exacerbate resource inequalities[11]. The dominance of English in academic settings has been associated with the phenomenon of "language apartheid," wherein local languages are marginalized in favor of English, leading to social stratification among students and faculty[11]. These inequalities are further exacerbated by disparities in access to high-quality English education, particularly affecting students from lower socioeconomic backgrounds who may lack the resources to compete in EMI-dominated academic environments[12].

In their study of an EAP professional development program for Korean graduate students, Lee and Lee[6] note that such programs can provide heightened support to graduate students within both Korean and other comparable environments, particularly where EMI is gaining increased prominence as a consequence of internationalization efforts. Their research highlights multiple challenges encountered by Korean graduate students in terms of their academic and professional communication proficiencies and the potential for addressing these academic needs through targeted EAP support. However, akin to other Korean EAP studies[10], the students' local interpretations and communications, as well as the role of L1 (Korean) in the program, remain unexplored. It underscores the imperative for further investigation into this facet.

Comparable findings regarding challenges within EAP courses have also been reported in Asian nations (e.g., China, Indonesia, Japan, and Vietnam) where English is taught as a foreign language[13, 14]. Similar to the context of tertiary education in Korea, Asian countries have demonstrated a sustained emphasis on English language education with a preference for English-only instruction in EMI classrooms, even in situations where the local language is spoken by a majority of the population. Along with this, notable issues and concerns have arisen regarding the effectiveness of EAP programs, particularly when they are delivered through English-only practices[14].

Instances from Asian countries illustrate that the sole use of English as the medium of instruction contributes to the emergence of social divisions[15], unequal distribution of resources[16], and the phenomenon termed as "language apartheid"[9, 16], where native languages are marginalized by

English within educational settings. Further, challenges such as a dearth of proficient educators and learners, insufficient resources and support, the necessity of balancing content and language, and inappropriate methodologies have been reported as difficulties in implementing EMI in educational settings [12, 14, 17–22].

EAP contexts exhibit variations based on the relationships to the first language (L1) [14]. In essence, in non-native English-speaking countries like Korea, the nuanced consideration of the influence and empowerment of micro-level participants, namely teachers and students, emerges as pivotal in crafting effective EAP educational environments [12, 14, 20]. In particular, students' diverse language abilities can pose challenges for educators when determining an instructional threshold and cultivating students' motivation for English learning (Vu & Burns, 2014). However, these challenges possess the potential to transform into opportunities for effective teaching and learning, under two conditions: 1) when instructors recognize both their own and their students' linguistic repertoires as multifaceted resources and 2) when they adeptly employ appropriate teaching strategies (such as translanguaging) within their EAP courses [23]. This insight suggests a necessary shift in perspective – from perceiving language as a discrete set of isolated skills to understanding it as a communicative tool that evolves within social interactions [24], which will be further explored in the following section.

2.2. Translanguaging in EAP Courses

English for Academic Purposes (EAP) emerged during the 1960s [25]. Given its emphasis on fostering academic language usage and skill refinement [26], and considering the predominant monolingual environment within university settings, EAP courses are commonly delivered using English as a Medium of Instruction approaches [27], which often include formal or informal English-only policies [5]. While the inception of EAP was geared towards catering to the specific needs of students within particular contexts (e.g., graduate schools), its trajectory has transformed into a "much more theoretically grounded and research-informed enterprise" (p. 1), as new and deeper understandings of the intricate interplay between students' needs and real-world contexts within EAP practices have emerged [5].

As highlighted by Hyland and Shaw [5], EAP researchers delve into an array of subjects related to "the communicative needs and practices of individuals working in academic contexts" (p. 1). Consequently, the realm of EAP has embraced diverse perspectives and methodologies in both research and application throughout the preceding years, thereby extending its inquiry "beyond the text into the social and cultural context which surrounds academic genres, in order to fully understand their purpose and use" [28] (p. 92). One of the newer perspectives in EAP is translanguaging. As a theory, translanguaging centers on the examination of the "multiple discursive practices" that multilingual individuals employ to navigate their multilingual worlds [7] (p. 45). It suggests that these practices are strategically employed to fulfil communicative needs in academic environments which enable multilingual students to use linguistic repertoires that encompass all their languages [23].

From a translanguaging perspective, leveraging learners' entire linguistic repertoire—including both L1 and L2—is considered beneficial in pedagogical contexts, as it fosters creativity, critical thinking, and the maximization of multilingual learners' linguistic potential [29]. Empirical studies have demonstrated the effectiveness of translanguaging approaches in EFL academic settings [30–32]. For instance, Sano [30] and Turnbull [31] implemented similar methodologies in which participants first discussed and planned responses to an English writing prompt entirely in their L1 (Japanese) before composing in English. This structured integration of L1 and L2 facilitated deeper engagement with the writing process. Similarly, Yüzlü and Dikilitaş [32] incorporated translanguaging strategies in an EFL course by alternating between Turkish (L1) and English (L2), analyzing bilingual texts, and promoting L1-L2 comparisons through tools such as bilingual dictionaries and translation apps. As noted in the previous section, the landscape of EAP within English as a foreign language (EFL) setting differs from its counterparts in other language education contexts, such as English as a Second Language (ESL) settings. This distinction is attributed to "the unique restrictions and affordances in relation to the use of languages other than English" [33] (p. 2). In essence, the successful implementation of EAP within EFL contexts necessitates the recognition of language users as dynamic agents of communicative creativity across various languages. This signifies that pedagogical approaches in the language classroom should actively involve the acknowl-

edgment and integration of languages present in learners' linguistic repertoires. This entails encouraging learners to develop partial competence in language domains that align with their individual language goals while also fostering metalinguistic abilities such as multicultural mediation and interlanguage[10].

Recent EAP research has consistently highlighted the incorporation of academic L1 materials alongside English language resources within tertiary education. This integration serves as a linguistic scaffold, facilitating comprehension and fostering "bilingual language practices"[34] (p. 80) among students with diverse language proficiencies[13, 22, 35, 36]. For example, Liu et al.[13] investigated students' perceptions and experiences of translanguaging pedagogy in EAP courses at a Chinese University. Their findings reveal that varied translanguaging practices employed by both teachers and students within the EAP classroom contributed to heightened comprehension, improved classroom communication, and increased motivation for L2 learning. Similarly, Siegel's[36] (2020) research on notetaking in EAP courses exemplified instances where English learners listened to academic content in English (e.g., a TED Talk) and took notes using a blend of English and their L1. His research underscores the significance of establishing a translanguaging environment when instructing English to non-native speakers, as it facilitates their enhanced comprehension of the English content covered in the classroom.

While translanguaging has shown promise in enhancing EFL learners' academic literacy, concerns have been raised regarding its applicability in monolingual-oriented EFL contexts, where strict English-only policies prevail[37]. Additionally, the distinction between translanguaging and traditional code-switching remains a debated issue, with critics arguing that translanguaging may sometimes be conflated with unstructured language alternation rather than a systematic pedagogical approach[38]. Despite these ongoing discussions, research on translanguaging in EFL EAP courses remains scarce, particularly in South Korea, where institutional and cultural factors may shape different pedagogical considerations. Addressing this gap, the present study explores 1) what challenges a Korean English bilingual instructor encounters in teaching EAP courses in non-NES settings, and 2) How the challenges are addressed through the intervention of a translanguaging pedagogy in South Korean EFL

EAP classrooms, contributing to the broader discourse on translanguaging pedagogy in diverse EFL contexts.

2.3. Navigating and Tackling Challenges through Action Research

Action research (AR) can be viewed as a tool for generating meaning and understanding within complex social situations while also enhancing the quality of human interactions and practices within those contexts[39] (p. 57). In the field of education, AR is closely linked to the concepts of "reflective practice" and "the teacher as researcher," which involve adopting a self-reflective, critical, and systematic approach to exploring one's own teaching environment[40] (p. 2). By engaging in AR, teachers are able to adopt a questioning and problematizing stance towards their teaching practice, allowing them to identify issues or problematic situations that participants, such as teachers, students, managers, administrators, or parents, deem worthy of further investigation and development of innovative ideas and alternatives (Burns, 2005, 2009b). Through the AR process, teachers not only act as investigators of their own teaching contexts but also become active participants within them[39, 40].

The primary objective of the action research (AR) process is to bridge the gap between the ideal, which represents the most effective methods of doing things, and the real, which represents the actual practices in the social situation[41]. Furthermore, there is evidence suggesting that AR is generally well-received as an effective form of professional development by teachers who engage in it, as reported by both researchers and teachers (Burns, 2009a). In the field of second-language teacher education, the most common adoption of AR is through individual projects carried out by classroom teachers and teacher educators[41] (p. 293). However, it is worth noting that a significant portion of this type of AR remains localized and unpublished, limiting access to the valuable insights gained from these projects[41].

Additionally, there exists a notable imbalance in current TESOL research, with a greater emphasis on research-informed teaching rather than teaching-informed research[42]. In other words, it is relatively uncommon for teachers to have a significant impact on shaping the future research agenda in the field of TESOL which includes EAP[42]. This calls for a bidirectional flow of knowledge between teachers and researchers, which can be facilitated through the practice

of action research. By actively engaging in action research, teachers are able to contribute to the "evidence of research into practice," and subsequently report on these practices to further expand collective knowledge[42] (p. 898).

As highlighted by Rose[42], AR serves as a powerful means for teachers to gain agency within the field of Second Language Acquisition (SLA) research. AR empowers teachers to critically examine their own pedagogical practices, emphasizing a collaborative approach that involves a "dual commitment to both participation and action, done with, rather than on, the participant"[43] (p. 195). Motivated by a desire to address and find solutions to specific challenges encountered in EAP courses within a Korean university and to bridge the gap between academic research findings and practical applications in the classroom, I have made the decision to employ AR for my current study[39].

3. Methodology

A translanguaging perspective and action research highlight the dynamic, interconnected nature of individuals' linguistic and cultural repertoires[33]. It emphasizes the significance of gaining a deeper understanding of the teacher educator's role as a scholar, practitioner, and researcher in multilingual educational settings. This recognition necessitates the utilization of diverse research frameworks and methods, such as narrative, case study, autoethnography, and action research[44].

Considering the author's research context in EAP courses, where she regularly encountered the challenges of diverse language competences, learning styles among Korean and international students, and resource limitations, she found that autoethnography was the most suitable method to address the research questions in this study[14]. Autoethnography offers a unique opportunity to explore her personal experiences as an instructor and delve into the broader pedagogical issues at hand, including the appropriateness of translanguaging practices.

Using autoethnographic case study as a methodological framework, this research endeavors to explore the challenges encountered by an EAP course instructor in an EFL context. Specifically, the study aims to examine how these challenges can be addressed through the implementation of a translanguaging pedagogy within EAP courses at a university in Korea. The research will intersect with individuals' multilingual repertoires, their experiences, and associated perspectives, thus informing the autoethnographic inquiry, analysis, and findings[33].

3.1. Participants and Researcher's Positionality

3.1.1. The Author as a Focal Participant

As a researcher and educator, the author's personal experiences and professional background have significantly influenced her approach to this study. The author grew up in Korea, where strong monolingual ideologies were deeply ingrained. Learning English through English-only practices was the norm, which continued throughout her training as both a pre- and in-service English teacher. Throughout her undergraduate and graduate studies, all instructional materials were exclusively in English, and there was a strong expectation to speak like a native English speaker. The author fully embraced and this ideology and actively promoted English-only practices in her own classroom.

Yet, the author soon realized that the language practices and processes of emergent multilingual in both school and non-school settings were different from the monolingual ideologies she had been taught and experienced. Despite acknowledging the importance of creating a multilingual space in her EFL classroom, the author faced uncertainty about deviating from the institutional language policy, which heavily favored monolingual values. She questioned whether it would be more beneficial for bilingual and multilingual students to learn languages in a multilingual environment instead of an English-only setting.

The author's ambivalent view towards the dominant language ideology and the effectiveness of English-only policies in teaching English continued to influence my EAP teaching in 2022. It was particularly evident before and at the beginning of the courses. With almost 30% of the students being international, she assumed that English could serve as a shared linguistic resource, leading her to adopt an English-only instruction approach. However, the author soon encountered several challenges arising from the students' diverse linguistic backgrounds, varying language proficiencies, and the difficulty in striking a balance between content and language learning. This situation primarily stemmed from the fact that the majority of international students in

her courses were enrolled in the Korean track. They had been admitted to the university based on a certain level of proficiency in the Test of Proficiency in Korean (TOPIK) and were primarily taking major courses in Korean. Consequently, they lacked familiarity and practice in utilizing English as their primary language of instruction.

3.1.2. A Brief Description of Student Participants

For this study, two Korean students named Jihoon and June participated in her two EAP courses. They were both native Korean speakers and demonstrated an intermediate level of English proficiency. Out of the ten international students enrolled in her courses, eight students willingly agreed to participate in the research project's interviews (as shown in **Table 1**). It is worth noting that the remaining participants, apart from John and Artur, were following the Korean track and displayed strong confidence and proficiency in the Korean language. Conversely, John and Artur, who were on the English track, had limited knowledge of Korean but expressed a strong desire to learn the language in order to secure employment opportunities in Korea.

3.1.3. Researcher's Positionality

As the instructor of two EAP courses, namely English Communication and Global Business Communication, the author leveraged her insider position and knowledge to quickly establish a strong rapport with the participants. This enabled her to gain a comprehensive understanding of the data during the analysis phase. However, the author was conscious of the potential risks associated with imposing my insider knowledge on the interpretation process. She was also aware that her familiarity with the participants and the educational contexts could inadvertently lead to overlooking valuable findings.

To address this concern, the author approached her student participants not only as learners but also as observers who could provide valuable and critical perspectives on her teaching practices. This approach allowed for meaningful discussions, which served to mitigate any potential bias and enhance the research validity. Furthermore, by integrating additional voices from the student participants, the author maintained a critical distance from the data and ensured a more comprehensive analysis.

As a researcher, the author's identity, experiences, and theoretical orientations inevitably influence the research process. Recognizing this subjectivity, she positions herself as both an active participant and a reflective observer, striving to maintain transparency, reflexivity, and ethical responsibility throughout the study. Her epistemological stance acknowledges that knowledge is co-constructed through social interactions and contextual influences. Rather than seeking objective truths, the author embraces the idea that multiple realities exist, shaped by participants' lived experiences and sociocultural backgrounds. This perspective allows her to engage deeply with participants' narratives, valuing their voices as central to the research inquiry.

3.2. The Two EAP Courses: English Communication and Global Business Communication

The two EAP courses were developed by me with the intention of addressing both the professional development needs and higher-level English skills of undergraduate students. These skills are crucial for their academic and non-academic career pursuits. Through meetings with the chair of the general education department and discussions with school officials during the program design phase, specific English needs were identified and targeted in my courses. These include job search techniques, interview skills, presentation skills, and the art of crafting statements of purpose for various purposes.

The courses were designed with a specific focus on English for Academic Purposes (EAP) skills, taking into consideration Korea's English as a Foreign Language (EFL) context. The aim was to address the unique English needs of undergraduate students within this context. It involved incorporating various English learning strategies and addressing specific L2 issues that are commonly faced by Koreans in academic writing and speaking. Additionally, the courses addressed the practical aspects of the Korean job market, such as differences in job application materials between Korean and international styles.

These elective courses were worth three credits each and spanned over a single semester. The comprehensive curriculum was designed to tackle linguistic challenges specific to Koreans in English writing and pronunciation, as well as to familiarize students with various academic writing genres relevant to their academic and professional development. To

Table 1. Description of International Students.

Name (Pseudonym)	Nationality	Age	English/Korean Track	Years of Stay in Korea	Major
Wang	China	22	Korean	4 years	Science of Public Administration
Kang	Mongolia	20	Korean	3 years	Information and Telecommunication Engineering
Kuru	Mongolia	21	Korean	2 years	Information & Security
Purav	Mongolia	22	Korean	2 years	Information & Security
Soga	Mongolia	22	Korean	4 years	Computer Science & Engineering
Badim	Uzbekistan	20	Korean	7 years	English Literature
John	Uzbekistan	22	English	4 years	Global Interdisciplinary Studies
Artur	Uzbekistan	22	English	4 years	Global Interdisciplinary Studies

my knowledge, since the courses were offered as electives, the students who chose to enrol in these elective courses generally exhibited a strong motivation to improve their English skills.

3.3. Data Collection and Analysis

Data was collected and analyzed through multiple sources, including student interviews, observations, field notes, and weekly critical reflections pertaining to my teaching practices. The study followed the cyclical nature of action research (plan-act-observe-reflect), ensuring that iterative modifications were made to teaching strategies based on ongoing observations and reflections.

Action Research Cycle Implementation:

Plan: Before the semester began, the author reviewed existing literature on translanguaging pedagogy and designed teaching strategies to incorporate multilingual practices into EAP courses.

Act: During classroom instruction, the author implemented translanguaging techniques, encouraged students to use multiple linguistic resources, and modified instructional strategies based on classroom interactions.

Observe: Observations were conducted during each class session on Tuesdays, and detailed field notes were recorded to document student engagement, language use, and interaction patterns, resulting in a total of 16 field notes per class, along with various documents and artifacts.

Reflect: After concluding classes at 5:00 pm, the author recorded her reflections on the day's lessons, resulting in a total of 16 reflection recordings per class. Upon arriving home, she documented these reflections using the following guiding questions:

1) How did I modify and apply my teaching methods?

2) What actions did I take differently compared to previous teaching approaches?

3) How did students respond to the translanguaging pedagogy?

4) What other outcomes did I discover through the application of this modified teaching approach?

Consent forms were obtained from each student participant in mid-September 2022, and interviews began in the final week of September, continuing twice a week until December 2022. Each interview lasted approximately an hour, with a total of 5-6 one-on-one interview sessions conducted per student by the end of the semester.

To analyze the data, the author employed the constant comparative method as a qualitative data analysis approach[45]. After collecting data from various sources, data were transcribed and analyzed on a daily basis. Using established qualitative research procedures[46], the data was inductively analyzed and coded to identify meaningful patterns and themes. Initial codes encompassed concepts such as teacher's teaching practices, students' dynamic and spontaneous language and learning practices, benefits of multilingual resources, translanguaging in EAP, meaning-making practices for academic development, and the utilization of multiple resources for meaning negotiation.

Through an iterative process, salient themes emerged from the data analysis, including the impact of English-only practices on students' confidence, motivation, and language practices, fostering translanguaging in EAP, and the benefits of multilingual resources. Cross-case analysis was employed to examine the outcomes and processes across the classroom contexts, enhancing the transferability of the findings to other contexts and conditions[47].

By following the action research cycle, I ensured that

the study remained dynamic and responsive to the evolving classroom environment. The systematic and inductive comparative nature of the constant comparative method facilitated the identification of findings aligned with the research questions.

4. Findings & Discussion

During the first week of the courses, I observed that implementing English-only practices increased foreign language anxiety and resulted in students with low English proficiency becoming silent, as it restricted "[their ability…] to shuttle between languages"[48] (p. 401). This monolingual approach to English teaching also hindered their comprehension and use of their L1(s) during academic communication. Consequently, it limited meaningful interactions among speakers of different languages, such as Chinese, Korean, Mongolian, Russian, and Uzbek.

Recognizing the challenges present in the classroom, I realized the need to shift the language environment from a monolingual orientation to a multilingual one, where students could freely draw upon their linguistic repertoire. By integrating translanguaging practices into the EAP courses—such as incorporating multilingual resources, encouraging group discussions, and allowing note-taking in students' native language(s)—I was able to address the challenges. Specifically, the students could use their full linguistic repertoire while preparing for their academic writing assignments, such as statements of purpose for job applications and literary analyses, as well as their final TED Talk presentations, which aligned well with the EAP course objectives. Notably, the students engaged in active and voluntary negotiation of linguistic and cultural resources, fostering meaningful interactions between Korean and international students. Additionally, they gained confidence in expressing their ideas and sharing the sources they used to develop their English writing and presentation skills.

Namely, the implementation of active and voluntary meaning negotiation of linguistic and cultural resources among Korean and international students became a frequent occurrence. This interaction allowed the students to gain confidence in expressing their ideas and openly sharing the sources they utilized to enhance their English writing and presentation skills. Collectively, these findings highlight the necessity of developing diverse pedagogical approaches in order to activate and harness the use of multilingual resources within EAP courses operating within tertiary EFL contexts.

4.1. Anxious and Silent Learners in the English-Only Classroom Environments

In the first meetings of both courses, my primary mode of communication was in English as I introduced the course syllabus and major projects that required completion in English. However, immediately after these meetings, a few students approached me with regrets and expressed their potential need to drop the courses. I was taken aback by this and asked them for the reason behind their decision. One student bravely voiced their concern, stating, "I don't believe I have the proficiency required to understand and successfully complete the tasks" (originally expressed in Korean). The other students nodded in agreement, indicating a shared sentiment. Moreover, another student expressed his fear of misunderstanding crucial information related to the academic tasks, as I had conveyed the information solely in English.

In response to their worries, I reassured them in Korean that I would provide them with the best possible support to actively engage in and successfully complete their academic tasks in English. This impactful experience prompted deep reflection on the language used within the classroom, both by myself and the students, and how it impacted their confidence, motivation, and participation in English learning. This reflection served as a pivotal turning point for my instructional strategies and inspired me to initiate action research to explore these dynamics further.

Similar examples have been identified in various studies focusing on EAP, particularly in contexts where monolingual teaching environments prevail[13, 49]. The translanguaging study conducted by Hurst and Mona[49] in a South African university, for instance, explored the negative consequences of teaching exclusively English to students whose first language is not English. The findings revealed a decrease in confidence, participation, and overall grades among students with limited English proficiency, as they harbored concerns about making mistakes and potentially facing ridicule from their peers. Specifically, EAP students, particularly those with limited English proficiency, tend to experience heightened levels of communicative anxiety compared to students in regular/local language classes[50].

Moreover, as demonstrated by Siegel's findings[23], students enrolled in English for Academic Purposes (EAP) courses exhibit varying levels of language proficiency, leading them to employ different linguistic strategies. Specifically, learners at lower proficiency levels may find it advantageous to listen to the second language (L2) while simultaneously taking notes in their native language (L1). By adopting this approach, students can direct their attention more effectively towards the listening skill while reducing task-related anxiety through the recognition that note-taking in their L1 may be easier. Additionally, the L1 provides a richer and more extensive vocabulary repertoire, particularly for learners with a lower proficiency level. Coupled with a decreased emphasis on spelling accuracy, using the L1 as a resource presents a practical alternative that can enhance learners' confidence[23].

For students who lack confidence in English and may have limited proficiency, it is crucial to adapt different approaches for utilizing multilingual resources in their English learning and teaching. These approaches should align with the purpose and tasks of their meaningful academic interactions[23, 36, 51]. In other words, it is essential to clearly communicate to students in EAP classes, where teachers supervise and evaluate tasks/projects, that the final outcomes must be exclusively in English. It is, however, encouraged to utilize multiple languages during the process of completing their tasks/projects[23, 36, 51]. The significance of considering students' English language proficiency levels and the effective use of multilingual resources in EAP courses is underscored by the examples from existing research which is an aspect that I had overlooked when designing EAP course curriculums. Thus, with these considerations in mind, I have made the decision to establish a translanguaging space for my EAP students starting from the second meeting of the two courses.

4.2. My Reflection of the Students' Different Language and Learning Practices in EAP Courses

Starting from the second meeting, I incorporated both English and Korean as mediums of instruction in my classes. Furthermore, I fostered an environment that encouraged students to utilize their complete linguistic repertoire for meaningful communication within the classroom. Specifically,

I anticipated that students would willingly and actively engage in discussions using their native language during group activities. However, the outcomes observed differed slightly from my initial expectations.

In late September 2022, after the fifth meeting, I noticed that students in my class exhibited diverse language practices. Specifically, Korean students had the option to use either Korean or English, and it was common for them to use Korean when everyone in the group or class understood the language. Conversely, English was only employed when there were international students present who did not comprehend Korean. Since the majority of my students were Korean, it was not surprising that they often engaged in classroom discussions using their native language. These discussions typically revolve around negotiating the meaning of unfamiliar English words and clarifying assignments and tasks. However, it is noteworthy that, contrary to the findings in existing literature regarding the use of L1 in EAP classrooms[52], when students spoke in Korean, their voices tended to be relatively quiet, making them less audible in the class setting.

International students exhibited different language practices compared to Korean students. For instance, international students in the Korean track tended to utilize both Korean and English during group discussions, while their counterparts in the English track predominantly used English to negotiate meanings with Korean and other international students. These international students in both tracks demonstrated a high level of confidence in utilizing their L2 resources, English or Korean. However, similar to the Korean students' use of the Korean language, the international students' use of their L1s was rarely observed or audible in the classroom. Notably, when a group of four Mongolian students engaged in academic discussions, they frequently employed the Mongolian language for negotiating meaning. Nevertheless, their voices were so soft that it was challenging for me to discern their conversation.

Namely, the students perceived English and/or Korean as shared linguistic resources and consequently employed these languages during group discussions, task completion, and communication with peers from diverse linguistic backgrounds. For example, Wang, a Chinese student, shared, "I used English and Korean to talk about and complete the course project with my group members as they were all

Korean and because the course materials were in English" (Interview, 11.11.2022, Originally in Chinese). Similarly, Kang, a Mongolian student, expressed, "When I need to find information related to course projects, I prefer using both English and Korean, and occasionally Mongolian... I use Korean when communicating with Korean students, Mongolian when interacting with students from Mongolia, and English when conversing with other international students" (Interview, 11.1.2022, Originally in Korean). These instances of translanguaging align with García's definition, wherein bilinguals access different linguistic features or modes known as autonomous languages to maximize communicative potential[7] (p. 40).

Their statements also highlight the importance of encouraging students to utilize their L1s during group discussions when they share a same language with classmates[53, 54]. It demonstrates the wide variation in their language and learning practices, as they reside in multilingual environments and are exposed to different languages, even though they all listen to lectures delivered in English and/or Korean by the same instructor[24]. Clearly, the diverse language practices appear to stem from the international and domestic students' different academic experiences in South Korea, as well as their prior and current educational backgrounds[53].

Regarding the transition from an English-monolingual to a translanguaging-oriented approach in EAP courses, international students generally welcomed it as a means of simultaneously learning both English and Korean. In contrast, Korean students expressed uncertainty about its effectiveness in enhancing their English proficiency. This response suggests that both international and Korean students may still hold implicit monolingual beliefs about the English language learning despite utilizing their L1s for meaningful communication.

Overall, these students demonstrated a willingness to utilize their complete linguistic resources, including their L1, for meaningful communication. This aligns with the principles outlined in the Common European Framework for Languages, which acknowledges that "the learner of a second or foreign language and culture does not cease to be competent in his or her mother tongue and the associated culture. Nor is the new competence kept entirely separate from the old"[55] (p. 43). Additionally, this finding aligns with previous research indicating that students frequently utilize their L1 during EAP classes for tasks such as clarifying assignments, concept learning, vocabulary development, fostering collaboration, and developing metalinguistic awareness[13, 56]. However, a notable observation is that the students did not openly and explicitly employ their L1, suggesting the influence of a monolingual mindset embedded within the EAP classrooms. Furthermore, it appeared that the limited use of L1 was not solely due to language proficiency but also influenced by educational disparities and differing language values, contributing to communication challenges in the classroom[53].

4.3. Transformative Potential of Translanguaging as Teaching Practices in Korean EAP Courses

Since late September, I had taken steps beyond simply encouraging students to utilize multilingual resources. Specifically, I introduced the distinction between English and Korean writing styles, such as the disparities between English and Korean resumes, in both English and Korean classes. Additionally, I prompted international students to explore the different styles of academic writing across multiple languages, including their respective L1s. To facilitate this process, I introduced various online sources available in multiple languages, enabling students to effectively incorporate them into their academic assignments and projects.

During the interviews I conducted with the international students and two Korean students, Jihoon and June, it became evident that engaging in translanguaging practices had a positive impact on their language learning experience. They expressed that the use of multilingual resources heightened their awareness of the differences between languages, thereby enabling them to consider the influence of their L1s on their English writing. This heightened awareness encouraged them to approach their academic work with greater care and precision. Reflecting on the students' positive feedback during the interview, I felt reassured that embracing and applying all available linguistic resources facilitated their comprehension and processing of disciplinary information[53].

Additionally, international students on the Korean track appeared to embrace the utilization of Korean language in the classroom. They found value in learning the translated expressions of certain English words from an English-Korean bilingual instructor, while also gaining a deeper understand-

ing of the distinctions between English and Korean academic writing. Moreover, the students recognized the value of this knowledge for their future job applications in Korea.

Consequently, the students generally agreed that English should be the primary language, but not the exclusive language, used in the EAP classroom[56]. Their multilingual beliefs seemed to stem from their perception of Korea as an English as a Foreign Language (EFL) society, where English holds significance while Korean remains predominantly spoken. As de Jong[24] suggests, teaching English as an additional language to speakers of the majority (societal) language entails a distinct context for English language acquisition, as is the case in countries like China, Colombia, and Japan[35].

Lastly, I have made efforts to provide extensive multilingual resources in order to effectively teach EAP within multilingual contexts. These resources include TED Talks with subtitles in multiple languages and resume examples available in different language versions. One notable finding from the study is that the students willingly utilized their L1s during question and answer (Q&A) sessions following their final English presentations.

It proves that the students recognized the value of incorporating their L1s in the EAP classroom through the use of such translanguaging resources. It allowed for a better understanding of academic concepts, enhanced social interactions, affirmed their bilingual identities, fostered metalinguistic awareness, increased their sense of empowerment, and ultimately motivated them to learn[57]. As a result, the classroom dynamics shifted towards a more collaborative environment. The finding suggests that the objective of EAP teaching and learning should not solely focus on achieving a native-like proficiency in English, which is often the aim of general English instruction[56].

5. Conclusions

This study explored the transformative potential of translanguaging pedagogy in the context of teaching EAP to Korean and international students in multilingual settings. The research was driven by a significant encounter I had with students who expressed reluctance to continue their studies, primarily due to an English-only instructional approach. This encounter prompted me to create a translanguaging space

aimed at reducing their anxiety about using English as an L2 and encouraging their active participation in L2 learning. The transition from a monolingual to a multilingual classroom environment allowed both the students and myself to establish rapport and utilize our full linguistic repertoires, thereby enhancing academic communication and fostering active engagement in the EAP learning process.

As East Asian countries increasingly embrace multilingualism, the field of EAP has undergone significant transformations[24]. This shift towards multilingualism positions students' home languages and the experiences associated with those languages as valuable resources for language learning, rather than obstacles to overcome[24]. As students increasingly develop multilingual proficiency and bring their home and community language experiences into English classrooms, it is essential for EAP instructors to consider how they can effectively expedite both content and language acquisition by systematically harnessing the rich experiences[58].

The findings of this study indicate that translanguaging is a promising teaching method for EAP students, particularly in EFL contexts, as it allows them to maintain and potentially improve their disciplinary language skills in both English and their native languages[34, 53, 59]. Additionally, the study suggests that EAP instructors should strive to create instructional environments that facilitate the full utilization of learners' communicative abilities to support their language learning[60]. To further strengthen these findings, it is recommended that EAP instructors receive pedagogical training to enhance their proficiency in implementing translanguaging techniques alongside other classroom strategies[14].

It is important to recognize that a translanguaging pedagogical approach cannot be a one-size-fits-all solution[42]. In exam-based educational environments, this approach may not align with curricular outcomes, and limited teaching time may hinder the development of meaningful communication skills, leading teachers to abandon practices that are ingrained in their own educational culture[42, 61]. Furthermore, this study was conducted over the course of a single semester, which limits the ability to fully assess the long-term effects of translanguaging pedagogy. The short-term nature of this research, combined with its specific classroom context, restricts its generalizability to broader EAP settings. Future research in the field of EAP should explore this area in greater depth to provide a more comprehensive under-

standing of the benefits and applications of translanguaging. Due to the scarcity of research in these areas, further action research is also needed in the field of EAP within EFL settings with the aim of improving the practices of classroom teachers and enhancing students' learning experiences[5].

Author Contributions

Conceptualization, J.J.; methodology, J.J.; formal analysis, J.J.; investigation, J.J.; data collection, J.J.; writing—original draft preparation, J.J.; writing—review and editing, J.J.; funding acquisition, J.J. All authors have read and agreed to the published version of the manuscript.

Funding

Institutional Review Board Statement

This study was conducted in accordance with the Declaration of Columbus and approved by the Institutional Review Board (or Ethics Committee) of Ohio State University (protocol code 2018B0161 and date of approval (30 May 2018)).

Informed Consent Statement

Informed consent was obtained from all subjects involved in the study.

Data Availability Statement

The data presented in this study are available on request from the first author. The data is not publicly available due to privacy or ethical restrictions.

Conflicts of Interest

The authors declare no conflict of interest.

References

[1] Canagarajah, S., 2014. EAP in Asia: Challenges and Possibilities. In: Liyanage, I., Walker, T. (eds.). English for Academic Purposes (EAP) in Asia. Brill: Leiden, Netherlands. pp. 93-102.

[2] Rabbidge, M., 2019. Translanguaging in EFL contexts: A Call for Change. Routledge: London, UK. pp. 1-204.

[3] Riazi, A.M., Ghanbar, H., Fazel, I. 2020. The Contexts, Theoretical and Methodological Orientation of EAP Research: Evidence from Empirical Articles Published in the Journal of English for Academic Purposes. Journal of English for Academic Purposes. 48, 1-17.

[4] Hyland, K. 2016. General and Specific EAP. In: Hyland, K., Shaw, P. (eds.). The Routledge Handbook of English for Academic Purposes. Routledge: London, UK. pp. 17-29.

[5] Hyland, K., Shaw, P. 2016. Introduction. In: Hyland, K., Shaw, P. (eds.). The Routledge Handbook of English for Academic Purposes. Routledge: London, UK. pp. 1-13.

[6] Lee, K., Lee, H. 2018. An EAP Professional Development Program for Graduate Students in an English-Medium Instruction Context. TESOL Quarterly. 52(4), 1097-1107.

[7] García, O. 2009. Bilingual Education in the 21st Century: A Global Perspective. Wiley-Blackwell: Malden, USA.

[8] Van Lier, L. 1994. Action Research. Sintagma. 6, 31-37.

[9] Lee, Y.J. 2014. General English or ESP/EAP? Rethinking College Students' Needs for GE and ESP/EAP. English Language & Literatute Teaching. 20(1), 133-156.

[10] Prasad, R., Kobylinski, C. 2019. EAP Outcomes, Instruction and Future Directions at the University Level in Korea. Humanising Language Teaching. 21(6). Available from: https://web.p.ebscohost.com/ehost/detail/detail?vid=0&sid=0cbf092f-8ded-415e-967d-46298e7e0ebb%40redis&bdata=Jmxhbmc9a28mc2l0ZT1laG9zdC1saXZl#AN=140911237&db=eue

[11] Coleman, H. 2011. Developing Countries and the English Language: Rhetoric, Risks, Roles, and Recommendations. In: Coleman, H. (ed.). Dreams and Realities: Developing Countries and the English Language. British Council: London, UK. pp. 9–26.

[12] Hamid, M.O., Nguyen, H.T.M., Baldauf, R.B. 2013. Jr. Medium of instruction in Asia: Context, processes and outcomes. In: Hamid, M.O., Nguyen, H.T.M., Baldauf, R.B. (eds.). Current Issues in Language Planning. Routledge: London, UK. pp. 1-15.

[13] Liu, D., Deng, Y., Wimpenny, K. 2024. Students' Perceptions and Experiences of Translanguaging Pedagogy in Teaching English for Academic Purposes in China. Teaching in Higher Education. 29(5), 1234-1252.

[14] Vu, N.T., Burns, A. 2014. English as a Medium of Instruction: Challenges for Vietnamese Tertiary Lecturers. Journal of Asia TEFL. 11(3), 1-31.

[15] Meganathan, R.2011. Language Policy in Education

and the Role of English in India: From Library Language to Language of Empowerment. In: Coleman, H. (ed.) Dreams and Realities: Developing Countries and the English Language. British Council: London, UK. pp. 57-86.

[16] Coleman, H. 2011. Teaching and Learning in Pakistan: The Role of Language in Education. British Council: Islamabad, Pakistan.

[17] Coleman, J.A. 2006. English-Medium Teaching in European Higher Education. Language teaching. 39(1), 1-14.

[18] Kennedy, C. 2011. Challenges for Language Policy, Language and Development. In: Coleman, H. (ed.). Dreams and Realities: Developing Countries and the English Language. British Council: London, UK. pp. 24-38.

[19] Kyeyune, R. 2010. Challenges of Using English as a Medium of Instruction in Multilingual Contexts: A View from Ugandan Classrooms. Language culture and curriculum. 16(2), 173-84.

[20] Manh, L.D. 2012. English as a Medium of Instruction at Tertiary Education System in Vietnam. Journal of Asia TEFL. 9(2), 97-122.

[21] Sert, N. 2008. The Language of Instruction Dilemma in the Turkish Context. System. 36(2), 156-171.

[22] Vinke, A.A., Snippe, J., Jochems, W. 1998. English-Medium Content Courses in Non-English Higher Education: A Study of Lecturer Experiences and Teaching Behaviours. Teaching in Higher Education. 3(3), 383-394.

[23] Siegel, J. 2023. Translanguaging Options for Note-Taking in EAP and EMI. ELT Journal. 77(1), 42-51.

[24] de Jong, E. 2020. The changing landscape of English teaching. International Journal of TESOL Studies. 2(4), 119-127.

[25] Benesch, S. 2001. Critical English for Academic Purposes: Theory, Politics, and Practice, 1st ed. Routledge: New York, USA. pp. 1-184.

[26] Airey, J. 2016. EAP, EMI or CLIL? In: Hyland, K., Shaw, P. (eds.). The Routledge Handbook of English for Academic Purposes. Routledge: London, UK. pp. 71-83.

[27] Graham, A. 2018. English for Academic Purposes: A Handbook for Students. Critical Publishing: New York, USA. pp. 1-232.

[28] Paltridge, B. 2004. Academic Writing. Language Teaching. 37(2), 87-105.

[29] Wei, L. 2022. Translanguaging as a Political Stance: Implications for English Language Education. ELT journal. 76(2), 172-182.

[30] Sano, A. 2018. The Effects of Translanguaging in Discussion as a Prewriting Activity for Writing in a Second Language. ARELE: Annual Review of English Language Education in Japan. 29, 193-208.

[31] Turnbull, B. 2019. Translanguaging in the Planning of Academic and Creative Writing: A Case of Adult Japanese EFL Learners. Bilingual Research Journal. 42(2), 232-251.

[32] Yüzlü, Y.M., Dikilitas, K. 2022. Translanguaging in the Development of EFL Learners' Foreign Language Skills in Turkish Context. Innovation in Language Learning and Teaching. 16(2), 176-190.

[33] Schmor, R., Jones, S., Noel, K. 2023. Microaggressions to Microaffirmations: A Trioethnography of Plurilingual EAP Instructors. Journal of English for Academic Purposes. 64, 1-12.

[34] García, O., Wei, L. 2014. Translanguaging: Language, Bilingualism and Education, 1st ed. Palgrave Macmillan: London, UK. pp. 1-162.

[35] Fujimoto-Adamson, N., Adamson, J. 2018. From EFL to EMI: Hybrid Practices in English as a Medium of Instruction in Japanese Tertiary Contexts. In: Kırkgöz Y., Dikilitaş, K. (eds.). Key Issues in English for Specific Purposes in Higher Education. English Language Education. Springer: Cham, Switzerland. pp. 201-221.

[36] Siegel, J. 2020. Appreciating Translanguaging in Student Notes. ELT Journal. 74(1), 86-88.

[37] Macaro, E. 2018. English Medium Instruction. Oxford University Press: Oxford, UK. 1-344.

[38] Flores, N., Rosa, J. 2015. Undoing Appropriateness: Raciolinguistic Ideologies and Language Diversity in Education. Harvard Educational Review. 85(2), 149-171.

[39] Burns, A. 2005. Action Research: An Evolving Paradigm? Language Teaching. 38(2), 57-74.

[40] Burns, A. 2009. Doing Action Research in English Language Teaching: A Guide for Practitioners, 1st ed. Routledge: London, UK. 1-208.

[41] Burns, A. 2009. Action Research in Second Language Teacher Education. In: Burns, A., Richards, J.C. (eds.). The Cambridge Guide to Second Language Teacher Education. Cambridge University Press: Cambridge, UK. pp. 289-297.

[42] Rose, H. 2019. Dismantling the Ivory Tower in TESOL: A Renewed Call for Teaching-Informed Research. TESOL Quarterly. 53(3), 895-905.

[43] Dick, B., Greenwood, D.J. 2015. Theory and Method: Why Action Research Does Not Separate Them. Action Research. 13(2), 194-197.

[44] Peercy, M.M., Sharkey, J. 2018. Missing a S-STEP? How Self-study of Teacher Education Practice Can Support the Language Teacher Education Knowledgebase. Language Teaching Research. 24(1), 105-115.

[45] Glaser, B.G., Strauss, A.L. 2017. Discovery of Grounded Theory: Strategies for Qualitative Research. Routledge: London, UK. pp. 1-282.

[46] Duff, P. 2008. Case Study Research in Applied Linguistics, 1st ed. Routledge: London, UK. pp. 1-248.

[47] Miles, M.B., Huberman, A.M., Saldaña, J. 2020. Qualitative Data Analysis: A Methods Sourcebook, 4th ed.

SAGE: Thousand Oaks, USA. pp. 1-408.

[48] Canagarajah, S. 2011. Codemeshing in Academic Writing: Identifying Teachable Strategies of Translanguaging. Modern Language Journal. 95(3), 401-407.

[49] Hurst, E., Mona, M. 2017. "Translanguaging" as a Socially Just Pedagogy. Education as Change. 21(2), 126-148.

[50] Santos, A., Cenoz, J., Gorter, D. 2018. Attitudes and Anxieties of Business and Education Students towards English: Some Data from the Basque Country. Language, Culture and Curriculum. 31(1), 94-110.

[51] Siegel, J. 2016. A Pedagogic Cycle for EFL Notetaking. ELT Journal. 70(3), 275-286.

[52] Liu, J.E., Lo, Y.Y., Lin, A.M. 2020. Translanguaging Pedagogy in Teaching English for Academic Purposes: Researcher-teacher Collaboration as a Professional Development Model. System. 92, 102276.

[53] Dimova, S. 2020. English language requirements for enrolment in EMI programs in higher education: A European case. Journal of English for Academic Purposes. 47, 1-13.

[54] Shohamy, E. 2012. A Critical Perspective on the Use of English as a Medium of Instruction at Universities. In: Doiz, A., Lasagabaster, D., Sierra, J.M. (eds.). English-medium Instruction at Universities: Global Challenges. Multilingual Matters: Bristol, UK. pp. 196-212.

[55] Council of Europe, 2000. European landscape convention. ETS No. 176, 20/10/2000.

[56] Mayo, M., Hidalgo, M. 2017. L1 Use among Young EFL Mainstream and CLIL Learners in Task-Supported Interaction. System. 67, 132-145.

[57] Zheng, Z.Z., Drybrough, A.G. 2023. Translanguaging in the Academic Writing Process: Exploring Chinese Bilingual Postgraduate Students' Practices at a British University. Journal of English for Academic Purposes. 65, 1-11.

[58] Ferguson, G. 2003. Classroom Code-Switching in Post-Colonial Contexts: Functions, Attitudes and Policies. AILA Review. 16(1), 38-51.

[59] Conteh, J. 2018. What is Translanguaging? 72(4), 445-447.

[60] García, O., Johnson, S.I., Selzer, K. 2017. The Translanguaging Classroom: Leveraging Student Bilingualism for Learning. Caslon Publishing: Philadelphia, USA. pp. 1-224.

[61] Swan, A. 2015. Redefining English Language Teacher Identity. In: Swan, A., Aboshiha, P., Holliday, A. (eds.). (En)Countering Native-Speakerism. Springer: London, UK. pp. 59-74.