

ENGLISH LANGUAGE TEACHERS' ATTITUDES TOWARDS TRANSLANGUAGING IN SECONDARY LEVEL ESL CLASSROOMS AT MIANWALI

Muhammad Kamran Khan

MEN-S24-21 – M. Phil Scholar at University of Mianwali

Email: kamranniazi746@gmail.com

Tariq Usman

Corresponding Author

Assistant Professor of English, University of Okara

Email: tariq.usman@uo.edu.pk

Abstract

The teaching of English language in Pakistan takes place in a multilingual environment, yet official language policies favour a monolingual, English-only approach. Translanguaging emerges as an approach that does not see learners' first languages as a hindrance but an asset to the acquisition of a second language (English). In this study, the attitudes of secondary-level English Language Teachers (ELTs) towards translanguaging were explored, alongside their beliefs, and the challenges they faced. 106 ELTs from public and private schools participated in the study who were selected via random stratified sampling. The data for this mixed-methods study was collected through questionnaires and semi-structured interviews. The data for this study was analyzed using SPSS and was interpreted through the theoretical framework of translanguaging. A significant majority of ELTs agreed that the integration of learners' first languages helped in the comprehension of English grammar; increased retention of vocabulary and reduced student anxiety while also bolstering their participation in the ESL classroom. However, teachers reported working in a "climate of fear" owing to stern linguistic "policing" from school administrators, particularly in private educational institutes. ELTs also reported that the current teacher training programs did not prepare them to teach English in a multilingual ESL classroom. This study concluded that translanguaging serves as an important, albeit covert, means to enhance the proficiency of the English language among secondary-level English Language Learners (ELLs). This study recommends that the use of multilingual resources should be allowed and encouraged by the School Education Department (SED) in ESL classrooms.

Key words: *Translanguaging, Multilingualism, ESL Classrooms, School Education, ELT*

Introduction

The English language has emerged as a lingua franca in this interconnected, globalized world of the 21st century. English is taught in a multilingual context in Pakistan, where learners are exposed to their regional languages, such as Punjabi, Sindhi and Pashto, and the national language, Urdu, from an early age. This multilingual context makes teaching English as a Second Language challenging both for teachers and for the students, as traditional ESL methodologies favour monolingual approaches of the exclusive use of the English language in the ESL classroom at the expense of the marginalization of students' L1 (Phillipson, 1992). Translanguaging has emerged as one of the significant responses to the English-only instruction of teaching English. Translanguaging reconceptualizes bilingualism, not as two disconnected and separate linguistic systems, but as a holistic and well-connected repertoire of communicative resources. Translanguaging as a teaching methodology encourages the utilization of the linguistic resources from learners' L1 to facilitate the acquisition of working proficiency in the English language.

Background of the Study

In the numbers made accessible by Gallup Pakistan of prevalent local languages in Pakistan, it is revealed that Punjabi has emerged as the most prominent mother tongue of around 37 % of the whole population. The data was obtained from the most recent census that was conducted in 2023 and further showed that Pashto had around 18 % of the speakers, Sindhi had 14 % and Saraiki just 12 %. Rahman, in his report about the distribution of languages in Pakistan, has asserted that Urdu has been a second language for more than 105 million residents. Pashto has been the most dominant language spoken and understood across Khyber Pakhtunkhwa (KPK), whereas in certain districts, such as Bannu, Abbotabad, Haripur and Kohat, Hindko has risen in prominence. While Baluchistan is a multilingual province, similar to Punjab where Balochi, Brahvi and Pashto are spoken and understood (Rahman, 2002). The Mianwali district, which is the geographical focus of the study, also presents a unique linguistic profile. Saraiki is the most dominant L1 in the whole district whereas the influence of Pashto can be seen in the northwestern part of the district, and Urdu is the dominant second language of the inhabitants. Thus, ELLs, even from the secondary level, have obtained a linguistic repertoire that combines the features of Saraiki and Urdu, and for some ELLs, even Pashto.

The language policies in Pakistan, despite the overt multilingualism, have favoured a monolingual, English-only instruction policy; thus, a tension between policy and practice is created. The utilization of English in academia as MOI and in other professional settings has culminated in the formation of an ideology where English is positioned as a superior and most desired language to be learnt at the expense of the devaluation and marginalization of the local languages in formal educational settings. Nowhere has this ideological battle been more visible than in the “Urdu/English medium divide”, in which even English is set as an MOI in public schools in Punjab, much to the dismay of the students and the teachers (Mushtaq et al., 2015). The English-only instruction policy put an immense burden on the teachers and the students in educational institutes and areas where the proficiency in English is low. To make learning materials accessible to the students with low proficiency in English, teachers are left with no choice but to draw upon students’ L1s, namely Urdu and Saraiki/Punjabi for clarification and explanation of the lessons and the classroom management.

Statement of the Problem

Proficiency in the English language is an important determinant in the Pakistani education system, necessary not just for the academic achievement but for the socioeconomic opportunities both in Pakistan and around the globe. This monolingual, English-only approach, views the first languages of the ELLs, such as Urdu, Saraiki and Pashto, as a hurdle to be removed and as a source of interference. Yet the monolingual language policies stand at odds with the actual linguistic realities of Pakistani ESL classrooms, which are multilingual. Translanguaging, both as a theory and as a pedagogy, not only validates students using their L1s to drive the TL learning but also sees their first language(s) not as a hindrance but as a cognitively helpful resource to enhance proficiency in the target language. Thus a conflict is created in which educational institutions demand a monolingual approach to be used, while the scholarly discourse suggests translanguaging to be an effective methodology in multilingual classrooms. Teachers are caught in this conflict, as they are the ones whom the institutional policies target.

Research Objectives

1. To investigate the attitudes of secondary school English Language Teachers (ELTs) in Mianwali towards the use of learners’ L1 (Saraiki/Urdu) in ESL classrooms.

2. To explore the challenges ELTs face during the implementation of translanguaging at secondary-level ESL classrooms in Mianwali.

Significance of the Study

The findings and insights obtained from this research contribute with regard to translanguaging in Pakistani ESL contexts and globally as well. The main contribution of this research lies in bridging the gap between top-down monolingual language-in-education policies and the multilingual environment of ESL classrooms in Pakistan. Having explored the attitudes of the teachers regarding translanguaging, this study has negated the use of L1 as a “deficit” or a “shortcut” to advance the language skills in the TL. Their strategy of drawing upon students’ L1s, albeit unplanned for the most part, is validated upon the theoretical foundation that translanguaging has provided, thus empowering the teachers to transition from the guilt-ridden and unplanned use of Saraiki and Urdu into using them as a deliberate and resourceful pedagogy that enhances the comprehension among the students across languages. Through the promotion of a pedagogy that does not disparage their mother tongues and their linguistic identities, this study will help build a (language) learning environment that will not only reduce learner anxiety but will also improve proficiency in the English language, thus indirectly contributing to the mitigation of the socio-economic disadvantages that have been associated with the “Urdu/English medium divide”.

Literature Review

A tension between monolingual ideals and the multilingual realities of the language learners is observed, especially in places where English is being taught as a second language. The influence of the “monolingual imperative” or the “monolingual bias” has been felt in the 20th century and even in the present day in teaching a language (Cummins, 2008; García, 2011). The monolingual ideology of teaching a language asserts that languages are separate and independent systems, and the most suitable way to learn a second language is consistent exposure to as well as the usage of the target language. The monolingual perspective of language learning, although it appeared logical at first glance, had certain limitations that made it open to criticism. The cognitive reality of bilinguals was different from what the monolingual view of language learning proposed as the languages bilingual learners know are interconnected, rather than being compartmentalised (Cook, 1992). The adherence to an English-only approach to teaching made the explanation and comprehension of new concepts difficult for the teachers and learners without using their first language (Macaro, 2006). It also devalued the linguistic and cultural identities of the ELLs due to the creation of an environment where their L1 was viewed as a deficit, not an asset (García, 2011).

The monolingual view of language started to decline when the scholarly discourse in sociolinguistics and psycholinguistics advanced. The term ‘translanguaging’ emerged from Welsh bilingual education and was coined by Cen Williams (1994). García and Li Wei (2014) denied translanguaging being simply code-switching or hybrid language use; they argued that bilingual and multilingual people do not possess separate and different linguistic systems for each language they know. Instead, they have an integrated “unitary linguistic repertoire” which they use to select specific features to not only communicate effectively but also to make meaning of what they are communicated with. Translanguaging challenges the “language as a container” narrative and the view of two language systems among bilinguals. From a pedagogical perspective, translanguaging becomes a resourceful device that encourages (language) learners to use their entire linguistic “repertoire” even their L1 to aid in boosting comprehension of the target language with activities such as using learners’ first language to explain the rules of grammar in another language, reading text in the target language while

discussing it in their first language or brainstorming an idea in L1 and writing about it in L2, etc.

The international literature on translanguaging showcases a multitude of pedagogical utilities of this multilingual approach. English Language Teachers (ELTs) around the globe make use of translanguaging in many ways to facilitate the development of proficiency in the English language, such as instructing students in their local languages or encouraging them to mix their first language with the target language. Yin (2024), for instance, conducted a study in middle-school English as a Foreign Language (EFL) classrooms in China in which he observed teachers making use of translanguaging through code-mixing and translating from the target language to their first language to simplify the content. His research showcased that translanguaging was advantageous for learning English in exam-orientated environments. Moving to Indonesia, research from Hidayati et al. (2024) and Kuncoroningtyas et al. (2025) also explored translanguaging in EFL classrooms to show its positive impact on students' enjoyment, confidence, motivation and language proficiency. Kuncoroningtyas et al. (2025), on the other hand, conducted a study on vocational college students in which he found that translanguaging helped improve vocabulary acquisition and knowledge development. Students feel comfortable, confident and less anxious when they are allowed to take full advantage of their linguistic repertoire (Musanti & Rodríguez, 2017; Kuncoroningtyas et al., 2025).

The successful integration of translanguaging in ELT is dependent on teachers' opinions and attitudes. As mentioned before, many teachers generally show a positive attitude toward translanguaging while also acknowledging its usefulness in multilingual classrooms. Yuvayapan (2019), discovered that teachers in Turkey showed their favour towards translanguaging. ELTs admired translanguaging for improving upon weaker language skills in the target language, supporting students' bilingual identities, increasing their metalinguistic awareness and helping them understand content better even if it is in the target language, but if it is scaffolded in their L1 first. Although teachers held positive attitudes towards translanguaging, their actual practices of translanguaging were scarce. Yuvayapan (2019) further reported on this aforementioned "misalignment" in the Turkish context, where despite their positive opinions, their actual utilization of translanguaging was not frequent due to pressure from colleagues and the institutions to not use their local languages. Ngo (2024) also noted a phenomenon similar to this in Vietnamese English Medium Instruction (EMI) programs where the actual practices of translanguaging co-existed and collided with top-down monolingual policies.

The research on translanguaging in Pakistani ESL context is mainly concentrated on higher education sector. Numerous studies have reported a positive attitude among Pakistani university teachers towards the utilization of translanguaging. Batool et al. (2022) conducted a survey among private university teachers in Lahore. Mushtaq (2023) also explored the role of translanguaging as a pedagogical tool in Pakistan's higher education system, showcasing positive attitudes among the ELTs who believed that translanguaging was helpful in enhancing communicative competence, increasing metalinguistic awareness, promoting inclusivity and acceptance of the culture. Khan and Akram (2024) also conducted a quantitative study on ELTs teaching at the university level. This study further confirmed the positive outlook shown by the teachers who believed that translanguaging helped the preservation of originality in students' ideas and it also promoted socialization as well as cognitive development. Alam and Razaq (2025) also found that students supported translanguaging because it helped them engage better in the classroom, reduced their language anxiety and improved their comprehension of the lessons they were taught. There are many interesting methods of teaching the English language

which can improve the autonomy of the learners; however, the teachers mostly rely upon the traditional methods (Usman et al, 2025). The quantitative study conducted by Nadeem et al. (2024) is very relevant to the current study as this study specifically explored the perceptions of secondary school ELTs in Lahore about the effectiveness of translanguaging regarding the development of proficiency in English among ELLs. Although their study gathered opinions from secondary level ELTs regarding translanguaging, it was purely quantitative in nature and did not explore the actual practices of the educators through qualitative exploration. Thus, a significant gap is formed in the national scholarship regarding translanguaging even though such educational stages serve as the base for the development of language skills among ELLs.

Theoretical Framework

The bulk of the exploration in this study, be it the quantitative surveys or the qualitative interviews, is anchored onto the theoretical contributions of translanguaging, particularly those of García and Wei (2014). The theory of translanguaging suggests that the languages in a bilingual person do not operate within their own space. The switching between languages does not make these languages separate but interlinked and well-connected to a centralized unitary repertoire, through which a bilingual/multilingual person draws upon specific features of either of the two languages, such as the lexicon and the structure, etc. However, translanguaging is not merely a social phenomenon; it is also conceptualized as a pedagogical stance. In this view, the aforementioned repertoire is recognized as a resource for enhancing competency in the Target Language (TL), not at the “expense” of the local languages of the ELLs but by viewing them as essential scaffolding during the ESL journey. This particular study makes use of the framework of translanguaging to analyze teachers’ pedagogical beliefs, specifically investigating whether they perceive the presence of L1s in the classroom as chaotic “mixing of languages” or as a legitimate, asset-based approach to English language teaching in a multilingual South Asian context.

Methodology

This study made use of a mixed-methods research design to address the research questions in an impactful way. To put it specifically, a sequential explanatory design (QUAN → qual) was utilized. The sequential explanatory research design was considered suitable for the present study due to the combination of the strengths of both the quantitative and qualitative methods. This study targeted the ELTs who were teaching at the secondary level (Classes 9th and 10th) in both public and private schools in the Mianwali district as the population. The participants for this study were recruited via random stratified sampling. The population was divided into three strata based on the the tehsils in Mianwali, namely Tehsil Mianwali, Esa-Khel and Piplan. A sample size of 100-150 ELTs was targeted for the survey questionnaire and 106 participants participated in the study. For the qualitative phase, a sample of 10 ELTs was selected to conduct semi-structured interviews.

Keeping in view the sequential explanatory design, the data for this study was collected in two phases. A cross-sectional survey was administered to a large sample of secondary school ELTs from Mianwali district in the first phase of the study. The primary objective of this phase was to address the first and second research questions regarding the prevailing attitudes of teachers towards L1 use and the extent of the institutional barriers they face. The main instrument of the quantitative phase was a structured and self-administered questionnaire. 5-point Likert scale was used to collect the responses from the participants from 1=Strongly Disagree, 2=Disagree, 3 Neutral, 4=Agree and 5=Strongly Agree. The data obtained from the Google Forms questionnaire was exported as a spreadsheet and was cleaned and coded to be analyzed through Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) Version 26. Semi-

structured interviews were conducted in the second, qualitative phase of this study among a smaller subset of teachers from the initial survey pool. The semi-structured interview protocol was used as the instrument for qualitative data collection. The audio recordings extracted from semi-structured interviews were uploaded to Gemini, a multi-modal LLM, for transcription. The transcribed interviews were, then, analyzed using qualitative content analysis and was organized in themes. NVivo was used to organize and code the data. Ethical principles were strictly adhered to in every step of the research process to protect the well-being and dignity of the participants.

Data Analysis and Results

The findings and analysis of the data collected to investigate the attitudes of English Language Teachers (ELTs) on translanguaging in secondary-level ESL classrooms in the district of Mianwali have been presented in this section. The main objective of this study was to explore the opinions of the teachers, the challenges they face when using the first languages of ELLs, namely Saraiki and Urdu, alongside English to boost learners' proficiency in the TL. The data for this particular study was gathered from a self-administered survey questionnaire on which 106 secondary school ELTs in the Mianwali District responded to and semi-structured interviews with 10 participants.

Quantitative Analysis

Findings alone are meaningless unless they are contextualized into the background of the participants they were obtained from. The demographic data for this study reveals the qualification, teaching experience and the linguistic profiles of the students of secondary level ELTs serving in Mianwali district. As elucidated before, the total number of valid respondents for this study was $N = 106$. The distribution of the age of the participants suggests that there are teachers who are in their early, mid and later stages of their career. The largest age demographic of the ELTs falls under the 31-40 years bracket, which consists of the 45.3% ($n = 48$) of the sample. The new generation of English language teachers in age 20-30 years who have just entered into the system accounts for 22.6% ($n = 24$) of the sample. As far as the distribution of the gender was concerned, the sample was decently balanced to make sure the attitudes from both the genders was equally represented. The male teachers made up 51.9% ($n = 55$) of the sample while the female teachers constituted to the 48.1% ($n = 51$). The academic qualification of the respondents suggest that the English teachers in Mianwali district are very educated and skilled. A substantial majority, 70.8% ($n = 75$) of the ELTs reported to possess a masters degree (MA/BS) in English or equivalent. Moreover, 13.2% ($n = 14$) hold an M. Phil degree and one respondent reported to have a Ph. D degree. Only 15.1% ($n = 16$) reported BA as their highest academic qualification. In terms of teaching experience, almost half of the respondents, 48.1% ($n = 51$) to be exact, stated that they had been teaching from 6 to 10 years. The teachers with more than 10 years of experience consisted of the 29.2% ($n = 31$) of the sample.

The data for this study was also collected from the teachers who served in both the private as well as in the government sector. 68.9% ($n = 73$) of the respondents identified themselves as the government school teachers. Meanwhile 31.1% ($n = 33$) of the teachers reported that they were teaching at the private schools. In terms of geographical representation of the tehsils, the distribution of the participants was fairly equal, with Tehsil Esa Khel accounting for the 34.0% of the sample and 33.0% for both Tehsil Mianwali and Piplan. An important component of this study is the linguistic profile of the students in the ESL classroom in Mianwali district. The results obtained from the survey affirmed the multilingual environment of the Mianwalian ELLs. 100% of the teachers stated that their students knew

both Saraiki and Urdu. Whereas 34.9 % (n = 37) of the teachers, mainly from the Tehsil Esa Khel, shared that their students also knew Pashto.

This is the first theme of the quantitative survey in which the attitude of secondary school ELTs have been explored regarding the utilization of learners' mother tongues (L1s) for boosting certain aspects of English language, such as the explanation of grammar, retention of vocabulary and preservation of already short teaching time.

Table 1

Teachers' Perceptions of Pedagogical Utility of Translanguaging

Item	Statement	Disagree/SD (%) (n)	Neutral (%) (n)	Agree/SA (%) (n)
Item 1	Explaining English grammar rules using learners' L1 helps understanding.	0.9 (1)	29.2 (31)	69.8 (74)
Item 2	Translating difficult vocabulary into local languages ensures better retention.	1.9 (2)	30.2 (32)	68.0 (72)
Item 3	Using mother tongue is an effective strategy to save time.	1.8 (2)	31.1 (33)	67.0 (71)

This quantitative data shows a strong consensus among the secondary-level ELTs in Mianwali about the cognitive benefits of translanguaging. For Item 1, 69.8 % (n = 74) showed immense agreement on the explanation of English grammar rules in Urdu and Saraiki is much more effective than just explaining them in pure English. Only 29.2 % (n = 31) of the respondents picked the neutral option and n = 1 disagreement from the respondent was recorded. This number of agreements alone challenges the notion of the Direct Method in which the instruction of the L2 grammar is only recommended to be taught by the L2 itself.

These numbers also reveal that the ELTs in Mianwali think the rules of English grammar are too difficult to be understood and grasped by the target language, due to students' low proficiency in English. This level of agreement also continues to emerge in the response to Item 2 in which 68.0 (n = 72) of the participants have endorsed the translation of difficult (unknown for students) English vocabulary into the local and national language for ELLs to better retain its concept. This notion stands in agreement with the "unitary linguistic repertoire" theory, which states that if a new English word, such as "Perception" is linked to the word that describes light rain in both Urdu and English, it helps cementing the meaning of this newly-learned word in a student's long-term memory. Item 3 of the survey moves to assess the role of L1 to manage short teaching time for the period. The 67.0% (n = 71) number of respondents agreed that the utilization of both Saraiki and Urdu when teaching English saved their time during short time-periods of teaching English. Since the coverage of syllabus is prioritized in the secondary-level ESL classrooms, ELTs in Mianwali district have found translanguaging not just as a tool effective for the explanation of the rules of English grammar but also for teaching the maximum amount of content in a short time-period as students will just spend 10 minutes to ask for the meaning of a word if a lesson is presented in English as just taking 2 to 3 minutes to explain it in Urdu or Saraiki.

The conflict between teachers' beliefs and the enforced monolingual policies has been analyzed in this section. Table 2 shows ELTs stance on the monolingual English-only ideology.

Table 2
English-only Policy and Teachers' Beliefs

Item	Statement	Disagree/SD (%) (n)	Neutral (%) (n)	Agree/SA (%) (n)
Item 4	SED should change policy to permit Urdu/Saraiki.	0.9 (1)	30.2 (32)	68.9 (71)
Item 5	“English-only” is the only way to ensure fluency.	65.1 (69)	3.8 (4)	30.1 (33)
Item 6	Letting students use local languages interferes with acquiring English.	68.0 (72)	1.9 (2)	30.2 (32)
Item 7	Friendly environment is impossible with strict “English-only” policy.	28.3 (30)	2.8 (3)	68.9 (71)

The numerical data clearly shows that a significant number of the teachers have rejected the monolingual ideology. 68.9% (n = 73) of the ELTs support the change of policy by the School Education Department (SED) to officially allow the teachers to teach the students in Urdu and Saraiki/(Punjabi) along with English. Teachers have voiced for what is already in practice in the classroom as revealed through the study conducted by Yousaf et al., (2025). The teachers' desire for reform in language policy is backed by the rejection of the “Maximum Exposure” hypothesis, as 65.1% (n = 69, 50.9 % Disagree and 14.2% strongly disagree) openly rejected that an “English-only” environment is the viable option to learn the TL.

The disagreement also is seen in responses to Item 6 in which 68.0 (n = 72) also disagreed that teaching the students through the languages they already know does not interfere with the acquisition of the target language. Thus, secondary-level ELTs in Mianwali do not view students' languages and the target language as competing entities (interference) but as linguistic resources that complement each other. Moreover, Item 7 reveals the practical cost of English-only policies. 68.9% (n = 71) showed their agreement with the notion that a stress-free language learning environment is impossible to establish through a strict English-only policy. Still, some interesting anecdotes can be found within the statistics, as around 28.3% of the teachers showed their agreements for the English-only talents and they also showed their disagreement on the English-only environment as being stressful for the students.

Although teachers acknowledge the utility of translanguaging and have voiced for change in the language policy, this particular section deals with the external and institutional pressures that stops them from taking full advantage of it in Table 3.

Table 3
Barriers and Constraints in Using Translanguaging

Item	Statement	Disagree/SD (%) (n)	Neutral (%) (n)	Agree/SA (%) (n)
Item 8	I am not allowed by my school to use Urdu/Saraiki.	2.8 (3)	35.8 (38)	61.4 (65)
Item 9	Admin will view me as “incompetent” if I use L1.	15.1 (16)	52.8 (56)	32.1 (34)
Item 10	Parents expect teachers to speak exclusively in English.	13.2 (14)	53.8 (57)	33.0 (35)
Item 11	Colleagues would criticize/judge me for using Saraiki/Urdu.	2.8 (3)	30.2 (32)	67.0 (71)
Item 12	My authority is diminished if I speak too much Saraiki/Urdu.	29.2 (31)	5.7 (6)	65.1 (69)

Answers to Item 8 revealed that 61.4% (n = 65) of the teachers were restricted by administration from using students' L1 in the ESL classroom. It is, thus, confirmed that a top-down ban exists on the use of L1 that stands in conflict with their voice for the change of policy as analyzed in the third theme. Moreover, a significant majority of the teachers reported that the use of L2 is not just mandated by the administrators, but their colleagues also expect them to teach only in the TL. 67.0% (n = 71) of the teachers revealed that their colleagues would judge or criticize them if they were seen using Urdu or Saraiki in the classroom. Thus a culture of "linguistic policing" is observed where the use of English means professionalism and the use of L1 is viewed as a lack of the skill of teaching the target language.

The numerical data for the responses to Items 9 and 10, about the use of L1 being viewed as incompetency by the administrators and the parental expectations respectively, showed a high amount of "Neutral" responses, 52.8% (n = 56) and 53.8% (n = 57) respectively. What this neutrality shows is the uncertainty of the teachers who do not know what exactly the parents think of the use of L1 in an English classroom. Despite a high amount of neutral responses, one-third of the teachers still agreed that they fear the judgement from the parents and from the administrators. A concerning finding emerges from the responses in Item 12, where 65.1% (n = 69) of the teachers reported that their authority is diminished if they speak too much Urdu and Saraiki as English teachers. This statistical evidence stands in contradiction to the findings in the second theme in which teachers felt L1 builds a stronger connection between the teacher and the students. This paradox in the teachers believing in the utility of translanguaging and thinking it undermines their professional authority is the result of the deep-seated "English as prestige" ideology in Pakistan. Thus, an English teacher who teaches through Urdu and Saraiki is seen as "friendly" but not "authoritative" or "scholarly" in the eyes of the students and the system.

Qualitative Analysis of the Semi-structured Interviews

After having analyzed the survey questionnaire, the analysis and findings obtained from semi-structured interviews have been presented in this section of the study. 10 secondary school English language teachers (ELTs) participated in the semi-structured interviews, in which the attitudes, experiences, challenges and rationale behind translanguaging, or the use of learners' local languages in the ESL classroom, were explored at length.

The first theme that emerged from the interviews revealed why ELTs at Mianwali, regardless of their official stance, make use of students' native languages. Teachers agreed on a shared consensus that translanguaging is not a matter of convenience but a necessity to make difficult aspects of the English language accessible to the students. According to the interviews, teachers viewed the explanation of difficult rules of English grammar as the most justified use case for the utilization of learners' home languages. Participant 1, a government school teacher with 12 years of experience, reflected upon his shift from an "English-only purist" to a translanguager after he realized that students would understand nothing if he only taught in the English language. He noted, "When I explain passive voice construction using Saraiki examples... students actually understand the concept and can then apply it to English." Other teachers also shared this sentiment, arguing that the difficulties in English grammar need a conceptual anchor in the language(s) students already have command over.

Learning vocabulary was another area teachers highlighted for translanguaging. Participant 10 explained, "Vocabulary for emotions: 'khuari' in Saraiki encompasses 'sadness,' 'weariness,' 'longing'—no single English word captures it." He further highlighted how translanguaging saves instructional time, adding, "I have 45 minutes to teach 'future perfect tense.' Explaining it through English takes 30 minutes; using Saraiki... takes 5." A private

school teacher offered a counterargument against the utility of L1 for teaching English. He argued that the overreliance on students' local languages would promote laziness among learners, and it would also make them dependent on their languages to understand something in English. Participant 4 stated, "Every time I've used Urdu, students stop trying to deduce meaning from context. They wait for translation. Using L1 is a temporary bridge that becomes a permanent crutch."

Despite teachers' agreement on the effectiveness of translanguaging for increasing proficiency in the target language, their choices are constrained by the unofficial enforcement of the monolingual ideology. Teachers pointed out that they live in the "climate of fear," not because of the official policy but because of the ambiguity within it. The silence and consistent shift in SED's language policy leaves teachers in a "limbo" where their language choice could be put into question any time. Participant 1 noted, "My headmaster never explicitly says 'don't use Saraiki,' but during observations, he notes 'excessive Urdu usage' in my appraisal." Participant 3 stated, "The institutional barrier is the SED's silence. There's no official ban, but there's no permission. I'm in limbo." This situation compels the teachers to make a "covert" and "in secret" use of translanguaging.

This build-up in pressure is more intensified in the private sector, where the expectations from parents become the main factor behind language enforcement. Participant 2 stated, "My school mandates 95% English-only instruction. This is non-negotiable, the principal monitors via CCTV." He added, "The biggest barrier is parental expectation... My colleague was denied promotion because a parent complained about 'too much Urdu.'" Thus, a "surveillance culture," as pointed out by Participant 2, is created, where teachers' classes are monitored via CCTV and the feedback forms submitted by the parents. ELTs are forced into a state of "hypocrisy," where the requirements of their job stand in direct conflict with their perspectives and practices. Participant 1 asserted that the established monolingual examination system was a formidable "enemy" against multilingual teaching strategies, such as translanguaging. He stated, "The examination system is the greatest enemy... The exam markers, following rubrics from Lahore, penalize Saraiki-influenced syntax."

Conclusion

Through the findings stated above, this study concludes that government teachers hold positive attitudes about translanguaging, as they see it as an effective strategy in secondary-level ESL classrooms in Mianwali. The need for translanguaging is driven by the linguistic needs of the ELLs, not by the official policy. There is enough evidence in the study that clearly confirms that teachers have been utilizing students' home languages, not as "shortcuts" but as scaffolding to make English accessible to the students whose proficiency is limited. Teachers' positive attitudes regarding the utility of using learners' L1s challenge the monolingual stance in which English was positioned as the superior language while marginalizing local languages. The respondents' comments fully confirm that confining multilingual students in Mianwali, who know both Saraiki and Urdu (sometimes Pashto as well), to English-only ESL classes reduces their comprehension of the lessons and participation in the classroom and lowers their academic scores. The teachers' perspectives also imply that the existing language policy in ESL classrooms is currently operating on the assumption that the more a learner is exposed to the English language, the more he will become fluent in it. Data from this study clearly demonstrate that 68.0% of the ELTs have rejected maximum exposure to the TL as being the only way to acquire proficiency in the second language. The respondents indirectly recognized that students' home languages do not interfere with the acquisition of the English language but rather facilitate it.

The prevalence of the English-only mindset, which in itself is a colonial legacy, has created a limbo in which translanguaging is covertly being used, thus inducing anxiety among the English teachers. This misalignment in beliefs and policies shows a failure of the system that undermines teacher confidence and students' ability of language learning. The findings from this study also reveal that the current way of assessment leans more towards monolingual mimicry than genuine communicative competency. Teachers showed their concerns over the examination system that rewards the rote memorization of the content in L2 and penalizes the Saraiki/Urdu-influenced syntax, thus reinforcing a linguistic hierarchy that undermines learners' own linguistic identity. The comparison between the attitudes of teachers from government and private schools also shows the difference in the distribution of the linguistic capital. ELTs from the government school, who taught a linguistically diverse but economically challenged population of ELLs, leaned more towards translanguaging. As compared to the teachers working in private schools, whose opinions are influenced towards the monolingual ideology by the commodification of English. Thus, this research further concludes that the sector of a teacher's institute is the main determinant behind his linguistic stance, such as private teachers facing surveillance and incrimination. What suffers the most is the development of natural interlanguage among the ELLs. Lastly, it is also concluded in this study that the current teacher training programmes do not prepare teachers to make productive use of translanguaging, as confirmed by the 65.1% of the teachers who reported not being trained in translanguaging. Respondents raised concerns that without proper training that would assist them in differentiating between translanguaging and translation, learners would become dependent on their home language instead of developing proficiency in English. The ideal way to combat this, according to them, is to justify their language choice and to assess the bilingual process behind the creation of the final output in English.

References

- Alam, M. F., & Razzaq, M. U. (2025). Translanguaging as learning strategy of multilinguals: A study of Pakistani English language classrooms. *Human Nature Journal of Social Sciences*, 6(3), 92-108.
- Batool, Z., Shahzadi, K., & Malik, S. (2022). Teachers' perceptions towards translanguaging strategy in ESL classroom settings of Pakistani private universities. *Pakistan Journal of Social Research*, 4(3), 423-432.
- Cook, V. J. (1992). Evidence for multicompetence. *Language learning*, 42(4), 557-591.
- Creswell, J. W., & Clark, V. L. P. (2017). *Designing and conducting mixed methods research*. Sage publications. (Note: Cited as Creswell & Plano Clark, 2018 in your text)
- Cummins, J. (2008). Teaching for transfer: Challenging the two solitudes assumption in bilingual education. In *Encyclopedia of language and education* (pp. 1528-1538). Springer, Boston, MA.
- Gallup Pakistan. (2023, October 10). *A comparative analysis of Pakistan's mother tongues using census data from 1998, 2017 and 2023*. <https://gallup.com.pk/post/37156>
- García, O. (2011). *Bilingual education in the 21st century: A global perspective*. John Wiley & Sons.
- García, O., & Wei, L. (2014). *Translanguaging: Language, bilingualism, and education*. Palgrave Macmillan.

- Hidayati, D., Dharmawan, Y. Y., Prasaty, B. A., & Luciana, L. (2024). Exploring how translanguaging and multimodal learning improve EFL students. *Journal on English as a Foreign Language*, 14(2), 446-475.
- Khan, M. Y., & Akram, L. (2024). Investigating ELT teacher's perception of translanguaging to enhance socialization among university students: A qualitative study. *Annals of Social Sciences and Perspective*, 5(2), 393-401.
- Kuncoroningtyas, F. S. A., Sumardi, S., & Putra, K. A. (2025). EFL students' attitudes towards translanguaging practice: Its implications for willingness to communicate in Indonesian vocational classrooms. *JOLLT Journal of Languages and Language Teaching*, 13(1), 255-267.
- Macaro, E. (2006). Strategies for language learning and for language use: Revising the theoretical framework. *The modern language journal*, 90(3), 320-337.
- Musanti, S. I., & Rodríguez, A. D. (2017). Translanguaging in bilingual teacher preparation: Exploring pre-service bilingual teachers' academic writing. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 40(1), 38-54.
- Mushtaq, M. (2023). Translanguaging as a pedagogical tool: opportunities and challenges in higher education of Pakistan. *UCP Journal of Languages & Literature*, 1(1), 1-30.
- Mushtaq, M., ul Islam, Q. N., Alam, M. T., & Bukhari, M. A. (2015). Problems of teachers and students due to implementation of English as medium of instruction at primary level in Punjab. *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences*, 5(4), 2222-6990.
- Nadeem, S., Azim, U., & Majeed, A. (2024). Teachers' perception about the effectiveness of translanguaging on secondary school's English language learning. *Pakistan Research Journal of Social Sciences*, 3(3).
- Ngo, P. L. H. (2024). EMI programmes in Vietnamese higher education: a case study of translanguaging practices for inclusive education. *Journal of English as a Lingua Franca*, 13(1), 163-184.
- Phillipson, R. (1992). *Linguistic imperialism*. Oxford university press.
- Rahman, T. (2002). *Language, ideology and power: Language-learning among the Muslims of Pakistan and North India*. Oxford University Press.
- Tashakkori, A., & Teddlie, C. (Eds.). (2010). *Sage handbook of mixed methods in social & behavioral research*. sage.
- Usman, T., Kharal, Q. A., Arsalan, M., & Riasat, A. (2025). Predominance of Lecture Method as a Barrier to Learners' Autonomy: A Survey of Pakistani Universities in the Punjab Province. *Journal of Arts and Linguistics Studies*, 3(3), 3541–3563.
- Williams, C. (1994). *Arfarniad o ddulliau dysgu ac addysgu yng nghyd-destun addysg uwchradd ddwyieithog*. Bangor University (United Kingdom).
- Yin, S. (2024). *Translanguaging pedagogy in teaching English: A case study of a middle-school classroom in China* [Dissertation, The University of Auckland].
- Yousaf, I., Ullah, N., Darazi, M. A., & Mahmood, W. (2025). Exploring the impact of motivation on English language learning achievement: A teachers' perspective from southern Punjab, Pakistan. *Journal of Political Stability Archive*, 3(3), 493-505.
- Yuvayapan, F. (2019). Translanguaging in EFL classrooms: Teachers' perceptions and practices. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies*, 15(2), 678-694.