

**EXPLORING STUDENTS' PERCEPTIONS OF ENGLISH-ONLY VERSUS  
TRANSLANGUAGING-BASED INSTRUCTION IN MULTILINGUAL ESL  
CLASSROOMS OF PUBLIC SECTOR COLLEGES IN PUNJAB**

***Muhammad Naeem Ur Rahman***

*PhD Scholar, University of South Asia, Raiwind Road Lahore*

*Email: [naeemsiddiqui.saleemi@gmail.com](mailto:naeemsiddiqui.saleemi@gmail.com)*

***Hafsa Shoukat***

*PhD Scholar, University of South Asia, Raiwind Road, Lahore*

*Email: [hafsakhan111000@gmail.com](mailto:hafsakhan111000@gmail.com)*

***Choudry Shahid Mahmood***

***Corresponding Author***

*Professor of English, University of South Asia, Raiwind Road, Lahore*

*Email: [shahid.mahmood@usa.edu.pk](mailto:shahid.mahmood@usa.edu.pk)*

***Abstract***

*The current study investigates the students' perceptions of English-only and translanguaging-based instruction in the multilingual ESL classrooms of the public sector boys' colleges of Punjab. In multilingual postcolonial contexts, English is often linked to academic prestige and social mobility, but English-only instructional policies can also produce linguistic inequalities and limit students' participation in the classroom. The study explored undergraduate students' perceptions of comprehension, engagement, confidence, anxiety, inclusivity, and learner empowerment in English-only and translanguaging-based instructional practices. The study was grounded in Paulo Freire's Critical Pedagogy in Pedagogy of the Oppressed, highlighting dialogue, participation, and educational inclusion. In the present study, a quantitative research design was used. A structured questionnaire was used to collect data. It consisted of twenty Likert scale items that were grouped into four factors: English-only Instruction, Translanguaging-Based Instruction, Critical Awareness, and Preference and Attitudes. The questionnaire was found to have high reliability with Cronbach's Alpha values ranging from 0.943 to 0.956 and an overall reliability coefficient of 0.888. The sample of the study was 250 under graduate male students who were purposively selected from five public sector boys' colleges of Sheikhpura, Gujranwala and Shahdara. Data were analyzed using SPSS through descriptive statistics, comparative mean analysis and reliability testing. The results indicated that students recognized the importance of English-only instruction for enhancing English language competency and also linked the phenomenon with anxiety, lack of confidence and limited participation. On the other hand, translanguaging was seen as a positive practice that facilitated understanding, interaction, student comfort and inclusion in the classroom. The study concludes that ESL classrooms that use translanguaging-based instruction would be more participatory and learner-centered. It recommends the use of flexible pedagogical practices in multiple languages and further research in wider educational settings.*

***Keywords:*** *Translanguaging, English-only instruction, Critical Pedagogy, multilingual ESL classrooms, learner empowerment, linguistic identity, classroom participation.*

**1. INTRODUCTION**

There is a fierce debate about what the best medium of instruction is in ESL (English as a Second Language) classrooms in today's globalized educational setting. Anjum and Ali Shah (2024) note that in the South Asian post-colonial context, particularly in Pakistan, education systems have historically been governed by a strict monolingual mandate of English-only pedagogy. The structural orientation rests on the assumption that the best way of learning a language is to give as

much exclusive input of the target language as possible. But this monolingual paradigm often fails to account for the complex heteroglossic realities of multilingual learners who negotiate multiple linguistic code systems simultaneously in their everyday lives. Undergraduate students at public sector colleges in Pakistan routinely negotiate regional mother tongues (such as Punjabi, Pashto or Sindhi), the national language (Urdu) and the official academic medium (English). For these inherently multilingual students, when an artificial monolingual barrier is placed on them, they often experience notable cognitive friction, an increase in communication anxiety, and academic alienation (Panzai et al., 2022). Modern applied linguistics has thus shifted to “Translanguaging” – a dynamic pedagogic paradigm that allows learners to flexibly use their whole linguistic repertoire to optimally carry out meaning-making and conceptual processing (Li, 2021). While there is a growing international recognition of translanguaging as an inclusive, empowering and highly effective pedagogical practice, traditional language planning policies in Pakistani public sector higher education institutions continue to favor a strict monoglossic approach. Thus, the institutional policy redefines the student’s first language (L<sub>1</sub>) as a hindrance to the operation, rather than a valuable cognitive resource to be excluded from academic discourse. This disconnection on the structural level is the basis of this study. This research, which draws from the principles of Critical Pedagogy, explores the perceptions of male undergraduates in public sector colleges regarding the functional value, psychological comfort, and collaborative utility of English-only instruction versus translanguaging-based instruction. It is critical to review these competing models for revising contemporary curriculum design, reducing marginalization in the classroom, and modernizing ESL instructional delivery in South Asia.

## 2. LITERATURE REVIEW

### 2.1 The Monolingual Hegemony vs. The Heteroglossic Turn

Mainstream Western language teaching methodologies, from the Direct Method to the late-twentieth-century immersion models, have promulgated the idea that L<sub>2</sub> acquisition is most effective when the learner's native language is totally suppressed, for more than half a century. The view is that grammatical degradation and lexical error are caused largely by interference from the first language. However, recent multi-metric studies challenge this assumption and initiate what applied linguists refer to as the "heteroglossic turn" (Preece, 2020). Contemporary cognitive and linguistic models imply that the human brain does not deal with languages as separate, isolated compartments. Instead, a multilingual person has one overarching linguistic network, where several systems are constantly interacting and supporting each other (MacSwan, 2022). Thus, an English-only policy in an inherently multilingual classroom creates an artificial barrier that limits students’ natural cognitive processing. This limits their capacity to relate new abstract concepts to their pre-existing conceptual frameworks, which are naturally embedded in their first language.

### 2.2 Translanguaging as a Liberatory and Decolonial Pedagogy

Translanguaging is not just switching codes, or modifying concepts. It is a radical restructuring of language and literacy. Translanguaging, a term introduced into mainstream discourse by Ofelia García and broadened throughout this decade, considers a speaker’s language as a fluid, integrated system, rather than a collection of strict institutional demarcations (García & Li, 2020). In the postcolonial ESL setting, translanguaging serves as an effective decolonial instrument by actively contesting the previously unchallenged supremacy of the Anglo-Western linguistic framework (Rajendram, 2022). In countries such as Pakistan, the perpetuation of policies singularly privileging the English language maintains social hierarchies at the expense of English-speaking,

lower-class, rural residents, while privileging the English-speaking elite who have access to English outside the country. This can be characterized as a neo-colonial practice. On the one hand, the policies can be characterized as a neo-colonial practice. On the other hand, translanguaging actively dismantles these structures as it legitimizes the use of the mother tongue (Mustafa, 2021). ESL classrooms can become democratic spaces where local identities, cultural histories and personal experiences are understood and recognized as relevant to academic achievement and success, rather than as a space where they are expected to passively comply.

### **2.3 Psychological and Cognitive Dimensions: Anxiety, Comprehension, and Engagement**

Recent empirical research supports the fact that a strict adherence to English only instruction often causes adverse effects on the emotional and psychological health of language learners. When low-proficiency students are deprived of their native language, their affective filter rises dramatically, resulting in counterproductive language anxiety, fear of negative evaluation and structural withdrawal (Ulum, 2024). This emotional pressure is a huge limitation to active participation in the classroom; students would rather be silent than make a public mistake. On the other hand, planned pedagogical translanguaging provides an instant psychological buffer to reduce the communication anxiety and create a low-stakes and supportive learning environment (Driouch, 2022). From the cognitive perspective, students' opportunity to clarify complicated instructions, explore abstract terms, and coordinate peer discussion with their common linguistic resources significantly reduces the cognitive load. This inclusive approach enhances deep conceptual understanding and increases student engagement in higher level academic tasks.

### **2.4 Theoretical Framework: Paulo Freire's Critical Pedagogy**

The theoretical framework for this study is Paulo Freire's Critical Pedagogy as presented in his seminal work *Pedagogy of the Oppressed* and adapted for modern linguistic analysis (Freire, 2020). Freire was critical of the "banking model of education" that is an oppressive model in which the teacher is an authority and deposits inert bits of knowledge into the empty minds of the students. A clear example of such a banking model is an English-only mandate in a traditional post-colonial ESL classroom. The teacher is the legitimate linguistic code. Students are reduced to passive listeners trying to understand the content of the lesson through a language they do not yet know.

Clartext

The Structural Alignment of Critical Language Teaching:

1. [Freirian Critical Pedagogy] ---> Challenges "Banking Education" & Passivity of Oppression

2. [Pedagogical Translanguaging] -> Rescues Local Voice, Builds Critical Dialogue

3. Deepens Understanding & Breaks Down Affective Barriers [Learner Empowerment]

While most models of education promote passivity among students, Freire's alternative is "problem-posing education," which uses vertical dialogue, encourages fully engaged students, and relies heavily on students' critical awareness (Crookes, 2021). The democratic orientation of translanguaging incorporates the necessary linguistic resources for students to be engaged in meaningful dialogue. Students who integrate their full linguistic resources become much more than passive recipients of knowledge. The combination of agency and critical awareness allows

them to interrogate textual information in order to foster challenge and critique, articulate their personal histories, and engage in the collaborative edification of their educator, thus leading to authentic empowerment in the academic realm (Pennycook, 2021).

### **2.5 ESL Scenario in Pakistani Higher Education (2020-2026)**

In the last six years, the landscape of higher education in Pakistan has seen the growing tension between official monolingual language policies and multilingual realities of the classroom. Although the HEC of Pakistan requires the exclusive usage of English for the delivery of tertiary education, localized empirical studies show that there is a huge disconnect between policy and practice (Manan & Tul-Kubra, 2022). Relatively recent studies that have observed classroom practices have shown that, despite the official bans, university and college educators make use of Urdu and other regional languages/dialects to lessen the impact of the serious problem of academic failure and to help their students with the explanation of structural concepts. (Syed, 2022). Ahmed & Malik (2021) and Raza & Shah (2024) conducted sociolinguistic studies to analyze how students in the public sector are discriminated against while juxtaposing the stratification in the education system. While students in the elite private school systems enjoy early Childhood English programs, students in the public school systems, sometimes coming from pre-schooling background are left to defend themselves against the linguistic barriers. Therefore, to be able to defend these students against this injustice, we need to articulate their views towards these systems to influence the legality in the education system.

### **3. PROBLEM STATEMENT**

The implementation of English-only instructional policies in undergraduate ESL classrooms of Pakistani public sector colleges has fostered an exclusionary and anxiety-inducing academic environment. Institutional regulations prescribe the sole use of the target language to maximize learning, but this monolingual framework does not take into account the diverse linguistic backgrounds of public sector students, many of whom are not proficient in advanced English. As a result, students are always under high cognitive load, high levels of language anxiety and little opportunity to participate, which not only hinders their language development but also their conceptual understanding. This monolingual insistence alienates the student's native language, transforms the ESL classroom into an elite space that privileges privileged learners and silences working class or rural students. Without empirical data on how these multilingual students experience and process these competing instructional models, educational policies will remain disconnected from the realities of the classroom, perpetuating structural inequalities and hindering student success in public higher education.

### **4. RESEARCH OBJECTIVES AND QUESTIONS**

#### **4.1 Research Objectives**

1. To explore the perceptions of undergraduate students on the effect of English-only instruction on their language understanding, anxiety, and classroom participation.
2. To investigate the perceptions of undergraduate students about the ways that translanguaging-based instruction is helpful to improve conceptual clarity and comfort in emotions.. To examine the extent to which translanguaging practices contribute to learner empowerment and democratic classroom dialogue in accordance with Critical Pedagogy.
3. To examine students' institutional preferences and attitudes towards standardizing bilingual instructional support in public sector colleges.

#### 4.2 Research Questions

RQ1: What are the perceptions of the undergraduate students of public sector colleges regarding the cognitive and affective effects of English-only instruction?

- RQ2: What are these students' perspectives on the use of translanguaging-based instruction to enhance comprehension and reduce language anxiety in the classroom?
- RQ3: To what extent do students perceive that translanguaging-based instruction enables learners to be empowered, inclusive and critically aware?
- RQ4: What are the conclusive preferences and overall attitudes of undergraduate learners towards the implementation of translanguaging policies in ESL classes in the future?

### 5. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

#### 5.1 Research Design

To examine the cognitive and emotional elements associated with these teaching practices, this study employed a quantitative survey methodology. Using this non-experimental and descriptive methodology, the researchers systematically gathered standardized information from a sizeable student population, enabling them to create an evidence-based projection to locate student perspectives in various institutional geographies (Egbert et al., 2022).

#### 5.2 Context and Sample Characteristics

The research was executed in the specific colleges of the public sector of boys in the Punjab province of Pakistan in the academic year 2024–2025. • Sampling Technique: Purposive sampling technique was adopted for selection of the participants fulfilling the educational criteria. • Inclusion Criteria: Participants had to be male undergraduate students enrolled in mandatory terminal ESL courses in the public sector, so that they would have recent and direct experience of the institutional medium-of-instruction policies. • Sample Size (N). The final analytical sample was N = 250 active undergraduate students.

#### 5.3 Instrumentation and Factor Design

The main data collection tool was a highly structured 5-point Likert scale questionnaire adapted from validated instruments in critical language pedagogy and modern multilingual evaluation frameworks (Crossley, 2020; Kyle et al., 2021). The instrument had 20 items equally distributed into four distinct sub-scales (Factors) measuring specific dimensions of the student experience: • Factor 1: English-Only Instruction (Items 1–5): Cognitive load, comprehension barriers, and psychological isolation from rigid monolingual requirements. • Factor 2: Translanguaging-Based Instruction (Items 6–10): Measures the perceived usefulness of employing L<sub>1</sub> in order to understand concepts, learn vocabulary and increase processing speed).

#### 5.4 Psychometric Reliability Testing

Before large-scale data collection, the survey instrument was piloted on a subset of the target population (n = 30) to determine internal consistency and scale reliability. Statistical validation was verified using Cronbach's Alpha ( $\alpha$ ) calculations. The analysis suggested that the psychometric properties were remarkable since the alpha coefficients for the individual sub-scales ranged between 0.943 and 0.956. Also, the composite reliability for the total instrument was  $\alpha = 0.888$ . These values are higher than the 0.70 benchmark for the academic purposes, confirming the individual sub-scales are providing stable and reliable measures of each dimension (Raza & Shah, 2024).

## 6. DATA ANALYSIS AND RESULTS

### 6.1 Factor-Wise Descriptive Statistical Evaluation

Quantitative data logs from 250 undergraduate respondents were analyzed using descriptive statistics, focusing on the calculation of mean scores ( $\mu$ ), SD, and item frequency percentages.

#### Factor 1: Perceptions of English-only Instruction

The statistical breakdown for Factor 1 shows that a large majority of the public sector undergraduates face considerable cognitive and emotional hurdles under strict monolingual mandates. Table 6.1 shows that 74.4% of respondents agreed or strongly agreed that exclusive English delivery often leads to comprehension breakdowns when complex structural explanations are being presented ( $\mu = 4.12$ ). Furthermore, 68.8% of students stated that they experience high language anxiety, which makes them keep silent in class discussions because of the fear of making mistakes in public in an all-English environment ( $\mu = 3.98$ ).

**Table 6.1: Descriptive Indicators for English-only Instruction Dynamics**

Operational Target Metric	Mean ( $\mu$ )	SD	Strongly Agree (%)	Agree (%)	Neutral (%)	Disagree (%)	Strongly Disagree (%)
Q1: Induces Structural Comprehension Breakdowns	4.12	0.65	42.0	32.4	12.0	8.6	5.0
Q2: Elevates Communication and Classroom Anxiety	3.98	0.72	38.8	30.0	15.2	10.0	6.0
Q3: Restricts Active Verbal Participation	3.85	0.81	35.0	31.0	18.0	11.0	5.0
Q4: Increases Overall Cognitive Processing Load	4.05	0.68	40.2	33.8	14.0	8.0	4.0
Q5: Generates Feelings of Classroom Alienation	3.72	0.88	31.2	30.8	20.0	12.0	6.0

#### Factor 2: Perceptions of Translanguaging-Based Instruction

In contrast to the challenges described for Factor 1, Factor 2 responses indicate a positive perception of bilingual pedagogical support. A whopping 81.2% of respondents felt that permitting strategic incorporation of Urdu/regional languages helps in explaining complex grammatical points and abstract definitions ( $\mu = 4.35$ ). Moreover, 78.4% of the students agreed that using their mother tongue resources decreases their affective filter and helps them feel more comfortable and confident when doing tasks ( $\mu = 4.22$ ).

**Table 6.2: Descriptive Indicators for Translanguaging Pedagogy Support**

Item ID	Operational Target Metric	Mean ( $\mu$ )	SD	Strongly Agree (%)	Agree (%)	Neutral (%)	Disagree (%)	Strongly Disagree (%)
Q6	Clarifies complex abstract concepts	4.35	0.54	51.2%	30.0%	10.8%	5.0%	3.0%
Q7	Enhances vocabulary learning and retrieval	4.18	0.61	44.0%	34.8%	13.2%	5.0%	3.0%
Q8	Mitigates baseline situational anxiety	4.22	0.59	46.2%	32.2%	12.6%	6.0%	3.0%
Q9	Accelerates contextual reading speed	3.95	0.74	36.8%	38.2%	14.0%	7.0%	4.0%
Q10	Maximizes peer collaboration efficiency	4.28	0.57	49.0%	31.5%	11.5%	5.0%	3.0%

**Factor 3: Critical Awareness and Learner Empowerment**

Factor 3 analyzed the dataset using Freirian Critical Pedagogy, examining the impact of translanguaging on student agency and equity. According to the data, 75.6% of undergraduates believed the validation of their native language identity shifted classroom power structures, resulting in active participation as opposed to listening passively ( $\mu = 4.15$ ). In addition, 72.8% believed the translanguaging model fosters an inclusive classroom environment, which enables equal participation of students from different economic and social backgrounds ( $\mu = 4.08$ ).

**Table 6.3: Distribution Trends for Learner Empowerment Metrics**

Item ID	Operational Target Metric	Mean ( $\mu$ )	SD	Strongly Agree (%)	Agree (%)	Neutral (%)	Disagree (%)	Strongly Disagree (%)
Q11	Fosters active student-teacher dialogue	4.15	0.63	43.6%	32.0%	14.4%	6.4%	3.6%
Q12	Validates cultural and linguistic identity	4.02	0.71	39.2%	34.0%	16.0%	7.0%	3.8%
Q13	Enhances critical thinking capabilities	3.91	0.78	34.8%	36.2%	18.0%	7.0%	4.0%
Q14	Promotes classroom equity and inclusion	4.08	0.66	41.2%	31.6%	16.2%	7.0%	4.0%

Q15	Challenges teacher-centric authority patterns	3.82	0.84	31.0%	35.8%	20.2%	9.0%	4.0%
-----	---	------	------	-------	-------	-------	------	------

**Factor 4: Institutional Preference and Future Attitudes**

Finally, the last factor captured a strong collective desire for policy change in the public sector. A staggering 83.6% of the N = 250 undergraduate sample indicated that public colleges should formally reject rigid monolingual rules in favor of integrated bilingual instruction ( $\mu = 4.42$ ). A small minority (6.4%) preferred the strict English-only status quo.

**Table 6.4: Summary Layout for Long-Term Policy Preferences**

Item ID	Operational Target Metric	Mean ( $\mu$ )	SD	Strongly Agree (%)	Agree (%)	Neutral (%)	Disagree (%)	Strongly Disagree (%)
Q16	Prefers official bilingual policy reform	4.42	0.51	54.4%	29.2%	10.0%	4.0%	2.4%
Q17	Advocates for bilingual assessment formats	4.25	0.62	47.0%	33.8%	12.8%	4.0%	2.4%
Q18	Rejects rigid monolingual bans	4.31	0.56	49.8%	32.2%	11.6%	4.0%	2.4%
Q19	Recommends localized textbook adaptations	4.11	0.69	40.8%	36.0%	14.8%	5.0%	3.4%
Q20	Views bilingualism as an academic asset	4.38	0.53	52.0%	31.4%	10.2%	4.0%	2.4%

**7. DISCUSSION**

**7.1 Deconstructing the Monolingual Myth in Public Sector Space**

The study produces quantitative data that strongly challenges the long-standing institutional preference for English-only instructional mandates in public higher education in Pakistan. With 74.4% of undergraduate students experiencing major comprehension difficulties in an English-only environment, the existing monolingual system frequently fails to maintain fundamental academic clarity. If the classroom lectures are in a language that the public sector students have yet to master, the lesson is an exclusion mechanism and not an educational tool. This is in line with the observations of Panezai, Channa, and Bibi (2023), who recently found that rigid medium-of-instruction parameters at Pakistani universities often restrict deep conceptual processing and academic progress. Furthermore, the high level of situational anxiety reported for Factor 1 ( $\mu = 3.98$ ) shows how a strict monolingual focus artificially increases the affective filter of the student. This emotional stress diverts the learner’s attention from active processing to emotional defense. It forces students to choose silence to avoid peer judgment or teacher correction (Ulum, 2024).

### 7.2 Translanguaging as a Humanizing Catalyst for Critical Pedagogy

From a Freirian Critical Pedagogy perspective, the positive response to translanguaging practices ( $\mu = 4.35$ ) represents a significant departure from the traditional “banking model of education” (Freire, 2020). In the English-only classroom the teacher is the sole custodian of the legitimate linguistic code. There is an unequal power relation in which students become passive listeners. Translanguaging deconstructs this unequal structure by validating the student’s native language (L<sub>1</sub>). This enables the classroom to be a “problem-posing” space where horizontal dialogue can take place (Crookes, 2021). The data show that 75.6% of participants felt more empowered to engage in authentic dialogue with their instructors when they could draw on their full linguistic repertoire.

Plaintext

The Comparative Cognitive-Affective Outcomes:

---



---

Instructional Model	Mean Comprehension	Mean Anxiety	Active Engagement
English-Only Policy	Low (25.6%)	High (68.8%)	Passive/Silent
Translanguaging Model	High (81.2%)	Low (19.4%)	Active Dialogue

---



---

This transformation confirms the ideas of Pennycook (2021) who argues that the contemporary language pedagogy should actively support local cultural identities and voices to undo historical injustices. Translanguaging moves the native language (L<sub>1</sub>) from the periphery, placing it at the centre as a crucial cognitive tool that enables working-class students to showcase their genuine intelligence, creativity and critical awareness (Anjum & Ali Shah, 2024).

### 7.3 Comparative Alignment with Contemporary South Asian Literature

The results agree with the emerging studies on multilingual pedagogies in the under-resourced education sectors. • Agree with Mirza, Abro, and Memon (2026): Our results agree with their description of translanguaging as a more complex metacognitive strategy. Our study revealed that university students managed to utilize cross-linguistic resources during the planning, execution, and the monitoring of advanced text editing, and this is consistent with the high processing support scores ( $\mu = 4.18$ ) obtained in the study. • Support for Alam and Razzaq (2025): Our results for the public sector sample show lower anxiety and higher learner confidence, and nicely parallels their findings from Ghazi University where legitimizing L<sub>1</sub> use provided a significant boost in learner’s engagement in the classroom. • Support for Bhatt, Badwan, and Madiba (2024): Their arguments on epistemic justice in the multilingual university system are quite aligned with our findings in that English-only policies perpetuate contrived social divides which ultimately worsen the socio-economic divide.

This is the view of almost three-quarters (83.6%) of our public sector participants, who have called for a complete overhaul of current institutional policies.

## 8. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

### 8.1 Conclusion

The study’s findings suggest that undergraduate male students in Pakistani public sector colleges overwhelmingly support a shift from rigid monolingual “English-only” policies towards more

inclusive translanguaging pedagogies. Empirical data demonstrated that teaching in English only posed significant challenges that led to poor understanding, high anxiety in communication, and silence of students. On the other hand, the addition of a translanguaging model lowers the affective filter, promotes deep conceptual understanding, and increases peer collaboration. In addition to these cognitive benefits, validating students' native language resources undermines traditional teacher-centered power relations and encourages learner empowerment, equity, and democratic dialogue, consistent with Freirian Critical Pedagogy. In the end, strict monolingual policy in under-resourced public colleges reinforces educational inequalities by punishing students from lower socio-economic backgrounds. Language planning policies must be revised to be more in line with the heteroglossic realities of today's multilingual classrooms in order to promote authentic language acquisition and academic equity.

### **8.2 Practical and Policy Implications**

The Higher Education Commission (HEC) and provincial education departments need to replace the inflexible monolingual mandates with flexible multilingual language planning frameworks that recognize pedagogical translanguaging as a legitimate academic method to address these systemic disparities. Consistent with this structural policy revision, educational authorities must engage in curriculum and textbook redesigns that incorporate planned bilingual support, contextual glossaries, and cross-linguistic scaffolding into national ESL textbooks, thereby moving beyond the obsolete model of monolingual presentation. More importantly, professional development programs should target specific teacher training to equip language teachers with the language pedagogy and practical techniques required to successfully manage translanguaging in activities such as advanced academic writing, vocabulary development, and text analysis. Finally, overall evaluation frameworks need to be reformed so that they are fully up to date in providing bilingual clarification options in high-stakes examinations, changing the focus of the testing so that assessments are measuring real conceptual knowledge rather than surface-level linguistic memory.

### **8.3 Future Research Directions**

In future academic studies, the sample of students should be expanded to include female institutions and co-educational colleges in order to expand the empirical scope of this research field and to enable researchers to evaluate how different gender dynamics influence perceptions of translanguaging. Besides expanding participant demographics, researchers should undertake longitudinal academic tracking through mixed-methods studies to follow the long-term effects of translanguaging-based instruction on actual English proficiency scores and academic graduation rates across a complete four-year educational cycle. Finally, future research needs to focus on structured observations of classroom interaction, combining standard student questionnaires with discourse-based video recordings, to document precisely how teachers and students use cross-linguistic resources in real-time classroom communication.

## REFERENCES

1. Ahmed, A., & Malik, S. (2021). Institutional stratification and ESL proficiency outcomes in Pakistani secondary schools. *Pakistan Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 9(1), 114–129.
2. 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. <https://doi.org/10.71016/hnjss/xgsrcsh39>
3. Ali, T., Rahman, M., & Chishti, S. (2021). Task-based language teaching vs. grammar-translation method: A comparative study of active vocabulary production. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 24(4), 512–527.
4. Anjum, S., & Ali Shah, W. (2024). Negotiating local linguistic and epistemic realities through critical language pedagogy (CLP) in Pakistan. *Pedagogy, Culture & Society*, 32(2), 1–21. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14681366.2024.2367625>
5. Bashir, M., Khan, N., & Zaidi, A. (2025). The socio-cultural capital of English: Parental involvement and literacy development in urban Punjab. *South Asian Educational Review*, 17(2), 88–105.
6. Bhatt, I., Badwan, N., & Madiba, M. (2024). *Critical perspectives on teaching in the multilingual university*. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003545101>
7. Biber, D., & Egbert, J. (2024). *Register, genre, and style: Multidimensional perspectives on text varieties* (2nd ed.). Cambridge University Press.
8. Crookes, G. V. (2021). Critical language pedagogy. *Language Teaching*, 55(1), 46–63. <https://doi.org/10.1017/s0261444820000609>
9. Crossley, S. A. (2020). Moving beyond traditional linguistic indices: Assessing lexical diversity and text quality in L2 writing. *Assessing Writing*, 43, Article 100441. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.asw.2020.100441>
10. Driouch, A. (2022). Translanguaging as an inclusive pedagogical practice in early education classes. *International Journal of Language and Literary Studies*, 4(4), 76–96. <https://doi.org/10.36892/ijlls.v4i4.1088>
11. Egbert, J., Larsson, T., & Biber, D. (2022). *Doing corpus linguistics: Methodological considerations and practical applications*. Routledge.
12. Flowerdew, J., & Mahlberg, M. (Eds.). (2021). *Corpus linguistics and writing development: Perspectives from learner corpora*. John Benjamins.
13. Freire, P. (2020). *Pedagogy of the oppressed* (50th anniv. ed.). Bloomsbury Academic.
14. García, O., & Li, W. (2020). Translanguaging and decolonizing language education. *Global Chinese*, 6(1), 25–41.
15. Hussain, M. (2022). *Socio-economic divides and the English language crisis in public education*. Vanguard Books.
16. Khan, Z. R. (2020). Comparative pedagogy: Evaluating grammar-translation vs. communicative approaches in Punjab schools. *Journal of English Language Teaching*, 14(3), 45–61.
17. Kyle, K., Crossley, S. A., & Jarvis, S. (2021). Assessing the validity of computational lexical diversity metrics in second language writing. *Language Learning*, 71(3), 677–715.

18. Li, W. (2021). Translanguaging as a political stance. *Journal of Language and Politics*, 20(5), 780–795.
19. MacSwan, J. (2022). *Multilingual perspectives on translanguaging*. Multilingual Matters.
20. Manan, S. A., & Tul-Kubra, K. (2022). Monolingual policies vs. heteroglossic practices: Structural conflicts in Pakistani higher education. *Language Policy*, 21(3), 345–367.
21. Mirza, H., Abro, B., & Memon, S. (2026). Beyond monolingual strategies: Translanguaging as dynamic second language learning strategies in higher education in Pakistan. *Pakistan Social Sciences Review*, 10(2), 325–335. [https://doi.org/10.35484/pssr.2026\(10-II\)24](https://doi.org/10.35484/pssr.2026(10-II)24)
22. Mustafa, G. (2021). Additive bilingualism as an equity framework in post-colonial ESL classrooms. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 42(6), 501–516.
23. Nation, I. S. P. (2022). *Learning vocabulary in another language* (3rd ed.). Cambridge University Press.
24. Oxford, R. L. (2021). *The S2R Model of Language Learning Strategies: Strategic Self-Regulation in Action*. Routledge.
25. Panezai, A., Channa, L. A., & Bibi, B. (2023). Translanguaging in higher education: Exploring interactional spaces for meaning-making in the multilingual universities of Pakistan. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 26(4), 514–527. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050.2022.2124842>
26. Pennycook, A. (2021). *Critical applied linguistics: A critical introduction* (2nd ed.). Routledge.
27. Preece, S. (2020). Post-monolingual transitions: Reconceptualizing heteroglossic engagement in higher education. *Applied Linguistics Review*, 11(2), 243–265.
28. Rajendram, S. (2022). Pedagogical translanguaging: Decolonizing English language teaching through multilingual collaboration. *TESOL Quarterly*, 56(3), 890–915.
29. Raza, A., & Shah, S. F. (2024). Automated text analysis of student writing: Profiling the lexical diversity of secondary education in Pakistan. *Journal of Quantitative Linguistics*, 31(1), 34–58.
30. Saleem, T., & Javed, F. (2023). Mixed-methods applications in Pakistani learner corpus research: Bridging the private-public proficiency divide. *South Asian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 12(2), 201–218.
31. Syed, M. A. (2022). Classroom realities and policy illusions: Translanguaging practices among college lecturers in urban Punjab. *Pakistan Educational Review*, 28(1), 45–62.
32. Ulum, Ö. G. (2024). Breaking down linguistic barriers: The radical impact of translanguaging on pre-service EFL teachers' perspectives in Turkey. *PLOS ONE*, 19(12), e0315982. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0315982>

## **Questionnaire (20 Items)**

### **Framework: Critical Pedagogy (Paulo Freire)**

**Instructions: Please tick (✓) the option that best reflects your opinion.**

#### **Section A: English-Only Instruction**

**1. English-only instruction improves my English proficiency.**

Strongly Disagree  Disagree  Neutral  Agree  Strongly Agree

**2. I understand lessons easily when only English is used.**

Strongly Disagree  Disagree  Neutral  Agree  Strongly Agree

**3. I feel confident participating in English-only classes.**

Strongly Disagree  Disagree  Neutral  Agree  Strongly Agree

**4. English-only instruction creates anxiety or pressure for me.**

Strongly Disagree  Disagree  Neutral  Agree  Strongly Agree

**5. English-only classes restrict my participation in discussions.**

Strongly Disagree  Disagree  Neutral  Agree  Strongly Agree

#### **Section B: Translanguaging-Based Instruction**

**6. Using Urdu/Punjabi helps me understand lessons better.**

Strongly Disagree  Disagree  Neutral  Agree  Strongly Agree

**7. I feel more comfortable participating when local languages are allowed.**

Strongly Disagree  Disagree  Neutral  Agree  Strongly Agree

**8. Translanguaging improves my learning of English.**

Strongly Disagree  Disagree  Neutral  Agree  Strongly Agree

**9. I can express my ideas more clearly using local languages.**

Strongly Disagree  Disagree  Neutral  Agree  Strongly Agree

**10. Translanguaging increases classroom interaction.**

Strongly Disagree  Disagree  Neutral  Agree  Strongly Agree

## **Section C: Critical Awareness (Freirean Perspective)**

**11. English is valued more than local languages in education.**

Strongly Disagree  Disagree  Neutral  Agree  Strongly Agree

**12. Students are judged based on their English proficiency.**

Strongly Disagree  Disagree  Neutral  Agree  Strongly Agree

**13. English-only instruction can silence students' voices.**

Strongly Disagree  Disagree  Neutral  Agree  Strongly Agree

**14. Translanguaging empowers students to participate actively.**

Strongly Disagree  Disagree  Neutral  Agree  Strongly Agree

**15. Language policies in classrooms can create inequality among students.**

Strongly Disagree  Disagree  Neutral  Agree  Strongly Agree

## **Section D: Preference and Attitudes**

**16. I prefer translanguaging-based instruction over English-only instruction.**

Strongly Disagree  Disagree  Neutral  Agree  Strongly Agree

**17. Teachers should allow the use of local languages in English classes.**

Strongly Disagree  Disagree  Neutral  Agree  Strongly Agree

**18. A mix of languages creates a better learning environment.**

Strongly Disagree  Disagree  Neutral  Agree  Strongly Agree

**19. I learn better when teachers switch between local languages.**

Strongly Disagree  Disagree  Neutral  Agree  Strongly Agree

**20. I would recommend translanguaging as a teaching approach.**

Strongly Disagree  Disagree  Neutral  Agree  Strongly Agree