

Beyond Monolingual Pedagogy: How Teachers Mobilize Multilingual Resources for Inclusive English Language Learning

Helendra^{1*} Ibrahim Saad Ahmed²

Kampus Universitas Musi Rawas (UNMURA), Indonesia,

Alrofayeda Private College, Sudan

*Corresponding author: bohalsaja@gmail.com

ARTICLE HISTORY

Received: 02 Juli 2026

Revised: 16 Agustus 2026

Accepted: 01 September 2026

KEYWORDS

translanguaging; multilingualism; inclusive pedagogy;
English language teaching; linguistic repertoire;
qualitative case study

HOW TO CITE

[Author, F.] (20XX). Beyond monolingual pedagogy: How teachers mobilize multilingual resources for inclusive English language learning. *Educational Review: Research and Innovation (ERRI)*, Volume(Issue), page range.
<https://doi.org/10.xxxxx/erri.vXiX.xxx>

ABSTRACT

Despite growing scholarly attention to translanguaging, classroom practice in English language teaching (ELT) remains largely shaped by monolingual ideologies that position learners' home languages as obstacles to English acquisition. Drawing on translanguaging theory and inclusive pedagogy, this qualitative case study examined how three secondary school EFL teachers in Indonesia mobilized students' multilingual resources and how such practices fostered inclusive English learning. Data were generated through 15 classroom observations and semi-structured interviews, including stimulated-recall sessions. Thematic analysis produced three themes: (1) translanguaging as pedagogical scaffolding for comprehension and participation; (2) translanguaging as affective and identity inclusion, lowering anxiety and affirming learners' linguistic identities; and (3) strategic negotiation of institutional monolingual norms, in which teachers positioned translanguaging as purposeful scaffolding rather than deficit practice. The findings show that teachers' translanguaging moves expanded participation opportunities for linguistically minoritized learners and reconfigured the classroom as a plurilingual space. The study contributes to research on multilingualism and inclusive ELT by empirically documenting translanguaging as inclusive pedagogy in an under-researched Global South context, and offers implications for teacher education and language-in-education policy.

1. INTRODUCTION

English has become the preeminent language of global communication, academic knowledge, and economic participation, and English language teaching (ELT) has expanded accordingly across national education systems. Yet the pedagogical cultures that govern ELT remain deeply shaped by monolingual assumptions. The legacy of the Direct Method, the “target-language-only” principle, and native-speakerism have long positioned learners’ first and home languages as sources of interference to be suppressed rather than as resources to be mobilized (Auerbach, 1993; Holliday, 2005; Phillipson, 1992). These ideologies are reproduced in curriculum documents, teacher education programmes, classroom routines, and assessment regimes, producing what Gogolin (1997) famously termed the “monolingual habitus” of modern schooling: an institutional disposition that treats linguistic homogeneity as the norm and renders students’ multilingual repertoires invisible. In many EFL contexts, this habitus manifests as an implicit or explicit “English-only” classroom policy in which the use of learners’ other languages is framed as a deficit, a crutch, or a failure of pedagogical discipline.

Such monolingual imaginaries stand in stark contrast to the sociolinguistic reality of most classrooms, particularly in the Global South, where learners routinely navigate complex linguistic repertoires. In Indonesia—the context of the present study—students typically move between Bahasa Indonesia as the national language of instruction, one or more regional languages (e.g., Javanese, Sundanese, Minangkabau, Balinese), and English as a school subject. Far from being a barrier to English acquisition, these repertoires constitute the semiotic and cognitive raw material through which learners make meaning, build concepts, and negotiate identity. Cummins’s (2007) critique of monolingual instructional strategies, and his broader argument that learners’ languages are interdependently related, underscores that excluding home languages from the classroom wastes a powerful pedagogical resource and may actively disadvantage linguistically minoritized learners.

Over the past two decades, the “translanguaging turn” in applied linguistics has provided a robust conceptual vocabulary for rethinking this exclusion. Translanguaging rejects the notion of bilinguals as possessing two separate language systems and instead conceptualizes speakers as having a single, integrated linguistic repertoire from which they strategically select features to communicate (García & Li Wei, 2014; Li Wei, 2018; Otheguy, García, & Reid, 2015; Vogel & García, 2017). As pedagogy, translanguaging involves *stances* (beliefs that position bilingualism as a resource), *designs* (planned integration of repertoires into instruction), and *shifts* (moment-by-moment responsive moves by teachers and learners) (García, Johnson, & Seltzer, 2017). Empirical work in bilingual and higher education settings has shown that translanguaging can deepen comprehension, expand participation, and affirm learners’ identities (Creese & Blackledge, 2010; García, 2009; Mazak & Carroll, 2017), and a growing body of scholarship has begun to explore translanguaging in ELT and EFL classrooms, including in Asian contexts (Canagarajah, 2011; Tian, Aghai, Sayer, & Schissel, 2020; Wang & Curdt-Christiansen, 2019). Collectively, these studies suggest that judicious, purposeful mobilization of learners’ repertoires can support rather than undermine English development.

In parallel with the translanguaging turn, inclusive education has undergone its own conceptual shift—from a concern with the placement of marginalized learners toward a concern with the participation, achievement, and well-being of all learners (UNESCO, 2020). Inclusive pedagogy, as articulated by Florian and Black-Hawkins (2011), emphasizes extending what is ordinarily available to everybody rather than providing separate or remedial provision for some, and

it treats learner difference as a resource for teaching rather than a problem to be managed (Florian, 2014). Within this framework, language is a central—yet frequently overlooked—dimension of inclusion. Monolingual pedagogy restricts who can participate, whose knowledge counts, and whose identity is affirmed; by contrast, pedagogies that legitimize learners’ repertoires can widen participation, reduce affective barriers, and redistribute epistemic authority in the classroom (Flores & Schissel, 2014; García et al., 2017). Translanguaging can therefore be read not merely as a language-teaching technique but as an inclusive pedagogical move.

Indonesia offers a compelling site for examining this intersection. Indonesian education policy formally embraces character education and inclusion through the *Kurikulum Merdeka* and its *Profil Pelajar Pancasila*, while English is taught as a foreign language within a highly multilingual society. Yet classroom norms, supervisory expectations, and popular discourses frequently privilege “English-only” instruction, positioning teachers’ and students’ use of Bahasa Indonesia or regional languages as a deviation from good practice. In everyday practice, however, teachers routinely draw on students’ languages to explain concepts, manage the classroom, build rapport, and check understanding. This disjuncture between monolingual policy imaginaries and multilingual classroom realities makes teachers’ translanguaging practices an important, yet under-examined, site for studying inclusive ELT.

Despite the growth of translanguaging scholarship, several gaps remain. First, much of the existing research is theoretical or located in Western bilingual and higher education contexts; classroom-based empirical studies in school EFL settings, particularly in the Global South, remain comparatively limited. Second, existing EFL studies have tended to focus on teacher beliefs, policy discourse, or isolated instances of code-switching, paying less attention to how teachers moment-by-moment mobilize students’ multilingual repertoires as part of their pedagogical repertoire. Third, and most importantly for the present study, the intersection between translanguaging and inclusive pedagogy is under-theorized in ELT: few studies examine teachers’ translanguaging practices explicitly as inclusive pedagogy, attending to participation, equity, and identity affirmation alongside language learning.

Addressing these gaps, this qualitative study examines how secondary school EFL teachers in Indonesia mobilize students’ multilingual resources in classroom interaction, and how such practices function as inclusive pedagogy. Drawing on classroom observations and semi-structured interviews, the study is guided by three research questions:

1. How do EFL teachers mobilize students’ multilingual resources in classroom interaction?
2. How do teachers understand and negotiate these practices within institutional monolingual norms?
3. In what ways do these practices foster (or constrain) inclusive English language learning?

The study contributes to the literature in three ways. Theoretically, it bridges translanguaging scholarship and inclusive pedagogy, conceptualizing translanguaging as an inclusive pedagogical move in ELT. Empirically, it provides classroom-based evidence from an under-researched Global South context. Practically, it offers implications for teacher education, language-in-education policy, and materials design that seek to move beyond monolingual pedagogy toward linguistically inclusive English teaching.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW AND THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

2.1. Monolingual Ideologies in ELT and the Multilingual Turn

English language teaching (ELT) has historically been organized around monolingual assumptions. The target-language-only principle, the framing of learners' other languages as "interference," and native-speakerist ideals have positioned monolingualism as both the means and the goal of English instruction (Flores & Schissel, 2014; García & Li Wei, 2014; May, 2014). May (2014) describes this as the "monolingual bias" of SLA and TESOL: an institutional disposition that treats the idealized monolingual speaker as the norm and renders learners' multilingual repertoires invisible or problematic. Within such orientations, classroom practice routinely suppresses the very linguistic resources that learners draw on to make meaning.

Over the past decade, however, the field has undergone a "multilingual turn" that repositions bilinguals and multilinguals not as two monolinguals in one person but as speakers with complex, integrated repertoires (Conteh & Meier, 2014; May, 2014). This turn reframes multilingualism as the normal condition of communication and as a resource for—rather than an obstacle to—language learning. It provides the intellectual backdrop for the two constructs that anchor the present study: translanguaging and inclusive pedagogy.

2.2. Translanguaging and Linguistic Repertoire: From Theory to Pedagogy

Translanguaging offers the most developed conceptual vocabulary within the multilingual turn. It rejects the premise that bilinguals possess two separate language systems and instead conceptualizes speakers as having a single, integrated linguistic repertoire from which they strategically select features to communicate (García & Li Wei, 2014; Otheguy, García, & Reid, 2015; Vogel & García, 2017). In this view, what are conventionally named "English," "Bahasa Indonesia," or "Javanese" are social and political constructions, while speakers' actual practice draws fluidly on their full repertoire (Otheguy et al., 2015). Li Wei (2018) further develops translanguaging as a "practical theory of language" that foregrounds speakers' agency and creativity in deploying repertoires, and its analytical utility for understanding classroom interaction.

As pedagogy, translanguaging is not simply "using two languages" but a deliberate orientation to leverage bilingualism for learning. García, Johnson, and Seltzer (2017) distinguish three interrelated dimensions: *stances* (the beliefs and attitudes that position students' bilingualism as an asset), *designs* (the planned integration of repertoires into curriculum and instruction), and *shifts* (the moment-by-moment, responsive moves teachers make to include and challenge learners). This triad provides a workable analytic for classroom research: it allows researchers to examine not only whether teachers use multiple languages, but whether their practices are underpinned by asset-oriented stances, deliberate designs, and responsive shifts.

Empirical work across contexts supports the pedagogical value of translanguaging. Studies in higher education show that translanguaging practices deepen comprehension, expand participation, and affirm learners' identities (Mazak & Carroll, 2017), while edited collections on TESOL document how translanguaging pedagogies can be enacted across diverse EFL and bilingual settings (Tian, Aghai, Sayer, & Schissel, 2020). Collectively, this scholarship suggests that judicious, purposeful mobilization of learners' repertoires supports—rather than undermines—English development.

2.3. Inclusive Education and Translanguaging as Inclusive Pedagogy

In parallel, inclusive education has shifted from a concern with the placement of marginalized learners toward a concern with the participation, achievement, and well-being of all

learners (UNESCO, 2020). The UNESCO (2020) Global Education Monitoring Report frames inclusion as a process that addresses the diversity of all learners and removes barriers to participation, while Ainscow (2020) emphasizes that inclusion and equity must be treated as guiding principles that reshape how education systems identify and respond to difference.

Within this agenda, inclusive pedagogy offers a classroom-level framework. Florian and Black-Hawkins (2011) define inclusive pedagogy as an approach that extends what is ordinarily available to everybody, rather than providing separate or additional provision for some, and that treats learner difference as a resource for teaching rather than a problem to be managed (see also Florian, 2014). Crucially, this framework shifts attention from “most learners plus some” to “all learners,” and it positions teachers’ pedagogical choices as central to inclusion.

Language is a central—yet frequently overlooked—dimension of inclusion. Monolingual pedagogy restricts who can participate, whose knowledge counts, and whose identity is affirmed; by contrast, pedagogies that legitimize learners’ repertoires widen participation, reduce affective barriers, and redistribute epistemic authority (Flores & Schissel, 2014; García et al., 2017; Tian et al., 2020). Translanguaging can therefore be read not merely as a language-teaching technique but as an inclusive pedagogical move: it extends participation to linguistically minoritized learners by making their repertoires a legitimate resource for learning. This conceptual linkage—between translanguaging and inclusive pedagogy—is the theoretical core of the present study.

2.4. Empirical Landscape and the Gap

Despite this promise, two limitations persist. First, much translanguaging research originates in Western, bilingual, or higher-education contexts (Mazak & Carroll, 2017); classroom-based studies in school EFL settings, particularly in the Global South, remain comparatively limited (Tian et al., 2020). Second, existing EFL studies have tended to examine teacher beliefs or isolated instances of L1 use, paying less attention to how teachers moment-by-moment mobilize students’ multilingual repertoires, and rarely connecting such practices to inclusive pedagogy.

Indonesia offers a compelling site for addressing this gap. Indonesian classrooms are profoundly multilingual—students navigate Bahasa Indonesia, regional languages (e.g., Javanese, Sundanese), and English—while policy discourse (e.g., *Kurikulum Merdeka*) increasingly emphasizes inclusion and character education. Yet classroom norms and supervisory expectations frequently privilege “English-only” instruction, producing a disjuncture between monolingual policy imaginaries and multilingual classroom realities. How teachers navigate this disjuncture, and whether their translanguaging practices function as inclusive pedagogy, remains under-examined.

2.5. Theoretical Framework of the Study

Integrating the above, the study uses translanguaging—operationalized through *stances*, *designs*, and *shifts* (García et al., 2017)—as the primary lens for analyzing how teachers mobilize multilingual resources, and inclusive pedagogy (Florian & Black-Hawkins, 2011; Florian, 2014; UNESCO, 2020) as the lens for interpreting the inclusive effects of those practices. Together, these lenses enable the study to examine not only *what* multilingual moves teachers make, but *whether and how* such moves extend participation, affirm identity, and redistribute epistemic authority in EFL classrooms.

3. METHODOLOGY

3.1. Research Design

This study employs a qualitative multiple-case study design (Stake, 2006; Yin, 2018) situated within an interpretive paradigm. A case study design is appropriate because the research seeks to understand how teachers mobilize students' multilingual resources as situated, context-dependent practice, and how they make sense of those practices within institutional norms, rather than to measure predefined variables (Creswell & Poth, 2018; Merriam & Tisdell, 2016). Each teacher constitutes a bounded case, and cross-case analysis enables the identification of both shared patterns and case-specific nuances in translanguaging practice and inclusive pedagogy.

3.2. Context and Participants

The study was conducted in three public secondary schools in Lampung, Indonesia—a sociolinguistic context in which students routinely navigate Bahasa Indonesia, one or more regional languages (e.g., Javanese or Sundanese), and English as a school subject. Purposive sampling was used to select three English teachers who (a) teach EFL at the secondary level, (b) work in classrooms with linguistically diverse students, and (c) were willing to engage in reflective dialogue about their language choices. Table 1 presents the participants (pseudonyms).

Table 1. Research Participants

Pseudonym	School	Teaching Experience	Students' Linguistic Repertoire
Rina	Public junior high	12 years	Bahasa Indonesia, Javanese, English
Sari	Public junior high	8 years	Bahasa Indonesia, Javanese, English
Dedi	Public senior high	15 years	Bahasa Indonesia, Sundanese, English

3.3. Data Collection

Data were generated over one semester through two primary sources. First, classroom observations: five lessons per teacher (15 lessons in total; approximately 80 minutes each) were observed and audio-recorded, with field notes documenting translanguaging moments (teacher and student use of Bahasa Indonesia, regional languages, and English), the interactional context of those moments, and participation patterns. An observation protocol guided note-taking on (a) the language(s) used, (b) the pedagogical function (e.g., explaining, scaffolding, managing, rapport-building), and (c) student participation and responsiveness.

Second, semi-structured interviews: two interviews per teacher (approximately 60 minutes each) were conducted. The first explored teachers' beliefs about multilingualism, language use in ELT, and inclusion; the second employed stimulated recall (Dempsey, 2010), using selected observation notes and audio clips to elicit teachers' reasoning for specific language choices. Interviews were conducted in the language the teacher preferred (Bahasa Indonesia) to enable rich, nuanced accounts.

3.4. Data Analysis

Audio recordings were transcribed verbatim; portions in Bahasa Indonesia and regional languages were translated into English, with translations checked iteratively against the originals to preserve meaning, tone, and contextual nuance. Data were analysed using reflexive thematic analysis (Braun & Clarke, 2006, 2019, 2021): (1) familiarisation through repeated reading of transcripts and field notes; (2) initial coding of meaningful segments across the data set; (3) development of focused codes and an evolving codebook; (4) clustering codes into candidate themes; (5) reviewing themes against the full data set, including attention to divergent cases; and (6) defining and naming themes. Translanguaging theory—particularly the dimensions of *stances*, *designs*, and *shifts* (García, Johnson, & Seltzer, 2017)—and inclusive pedagogy principles (Florian & Black-Hawkins, 2011) served as sensitising concepts that informed interpretive attention during coding, while themes were developed inductively from the data rather than imposed a priori. Cross-case analysis was then conducted to identify patterns across the three cases (Stake, 2006).

3.5. Trustworthiness

Trustworthiness was supported through several strategies (Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Shenton, 2004): triangulation of data sources (observations and interviews); member checking, in which preliminary interpretations were shared with participants for feedback; peer debriefing with a colleague familiar with multilingualism research; reflexive journaling to attend to how the researcher's assumptions and positionality could shape interpretation (Berger, 2015; Pillow, 2003); and thick description of contexts and practices. An audit trail of coding decisions was maintained throughout.

3.6. Ethical Considerations

Participants received an information sheet, had opportunities to ask questions, and provided written informed consent. Pseudonyms were used for participants and schools, and participants could withdraw at any time without consequence. Audio data were stored securely and accessible only to the research team.

4. FINDINGS

Thematic analysis of classroom observations and stimulated-recall interviews generated three themes: (1) translanguaging as pedagogical scaffolding for comprehension and participation; (2) translanguaging for affective and identity inclusion; and (3) negotiating monolingual norms through strategic, purposeful translanguaging. Together, these themes describe how teachers mobilized students' multilingual resources and how such mobilization functioned as inclusive pedagogy.

4.1. Translanguaging as Pedagogical Scaffolding for Comprehension and Participation

Across all three cases, teachers systematically drew on Bahasa Indonesia and regional languages to scaffold comprehension of vocabulary, grammar, and task instructions. These moves were most visible when abstract or technical English items threatened to block participation. In one session, a group stalled on the word carved in a descriptive text:

Excerpt 1 (Observation, Rina, Lesson 2)

Rina approached the group: "Carved... dipahat. In Javanese you would say diukir. So the artisans diukir the stone—they carved the reliefs." Students nodded and resumed writing.

Such glossing moves were not incidental translations but deliberate scaffolds that kept the task moving in English. Dedi similarly used cross-linguistic comparison as a springboard for English production:

Excerpt 2 (Observation, Dedi, Lesson 3)

A student asked whether persuade and convince were the same. Dedi wrote both on the board, invited comparisons in Indonesian (membujuk vs meyakinkan), then asked pairs to produce one English sentence for each. The L1 comparison became a springboard for English output.

In interviews, teachers described these moves as planned rather than accidental. Rina articulated an explicit scaffolding logic:

Excerpt 3 (Interview, Rina)

"I plan when to use English and when to use Indonesian or Javanese. It is not random. If the concept is abstract, their language is the bridge. My goal is that every student follows—that is inclusion for me."

Sari operationalized scaffolding through task design, permitting L1 brainstorming followed by English presentation: students drafted ideas in the language they were "most comfortable with" and then re-presented them in English. Field notes repeatedly recorded previously silent students resuming task engagement after a translinguaging move, suggesting that scaffolding widened participation rather than merely easing comprehension.

4.2. Translinguaging for Affective and Identity Inclusion

The second theme concerns the affective and identity work of translinguaging. Teachers used home languages to build rapport, lower anxiety, and affirm students' linguistic identities—conditions participants linked directly to participation.

Excerpt 4 (Observation, Sari, Lesson 1)

Sari opened the lesson with a Javanese greeting: "Sugeng enjang, bocah-bocah!" The class responded with laughter and a louder "Good morning, Miss!" The switch set a relaxed tone for the lesson.

Humor and local-language address were used deliberately to invite quieter students into interaction. In one session, Dedi used a Sundanese joke to re-engage an off-task student, who then produced an English utterance in the subsequent pair work (Observation, Dedi, Lesson 4).

Perhaps the most inclusive move observed was Sari's practice of recasting students' L1 contributions into English rather than correcting the language of the contribution:

Excerpt 5 (Interview, Sari)

"When quiet students answer in Indonesian or Javanese, I recast their idea in English instead of correcting the language. Their voice enters the lesson. That is the point."

This practice validated students' ideas while modeling the English form, allowing linguistically less confident learners to participate in whole-class discussion without their linguistic identity being positioned as deficient. Teachers interpreted these moves as central to inclusion:

Excerpt 6 (Interview, Dedi)

"When I greet them in their language, their faces change. They feel the classroom is also theirs."

4.3. Negotiating Monolingual Norms: Translinguaging as Strategic, Purposeful Practice

The third theme captures how teachers understood and negotiated their translinguaging within institutional monolingual norms. All three teachers reported supervisory and policy

expectations of “English-only” instruction, and all framed their translanguaging as strategic and purposeful rather than as a deficit or a failure of English-only discipline.

Excerpt 7 (Interview, Dedi)

“The supervisor still expects English-only. But if thirty percent of the class is lost, that is not quality teaching. I use Indonesian strategically, then we return to English. Translanguaging is my scaffolding, not my destination.”

Rina expressed a similar double awareness—of the policy imperative and of the inclusion imperative:

Excerpt 8 (Interview, Rina)

“I must show that English remains the goal; that is our mandate. But I cannot leave students behind. So I use their language to bring them in, and then we move to English together.”

Stimulated-recall sessions showed that teachers could articulate precise reasoning for specific shifts. Reflecting on a moment when she switched to Javanese to re-engage two off-task students, Sari explained:

Excerpt 9 (Stimulated recall, Sari)

“Here I saw they were lost. If I continued in English, I would lose them. So I used Javanese to bring them back. It is not against English; it is for English.”

These accounts indicate that teachers positioned translanguaging as a principled, temporary scaffold oriented toward English development—a stance that allowed them to reconcile monolingual policy imaginaries with the multilingual realities of their classrooms and to treat students’ repertoires as assets rather than deficits.

5. DISCUSSION

The findings show that teachers’ translanguaging was not a departure from English teaching but a pedagogical means of extending participation, affirming identity, and sustaining engagement. Read through the lenses of translanguaging (García & Li Wei, 2014; García, Johnson, & Seltzer, 2017) and inclusive pedagogy (Florian, 2014; Florian & Black-Hawkins, 2011), the three themes can be interpreted as follows.

5.1. Translanguaging as Scaffolding: Extending Access and Participation

Theme 1 indicates that teachers used translanguaging as deliberate scaffolding. Interpreted through García et al.’s (2017) framework, these practices combined planned *designs* (e.g., L1 brainstorming followed by English presentation; cross-linguistic comparison of near-synonyms) with responsive *shifts* (e.g., on-the-spot glossing when abstract items threatened to block participation). This combination is significant because it shows translanguaging operating not as incidental code-switching but as a purposeful pedagogical repertoire oriented toward English development.

Read through inclusive pedagogy, these moves extended “what is ordinarily available to everybody” (Florian & Black-Hawkins, 2011, p. 817). Scaffolds were offered to all learners rather than reserved for a subset, and field notes repeatedly recorded previously silent students resuming engagement after a translanguaging move. This supports and extends prior work showing that translanguaging deepens comprehension and participation (Creese & Blackledge, 2010; Mazak & Carroll, 2017; Tian et al., 2020) by demonstrating its inclusive function in EFL: translanguaging widened access to content and tasks, enabling linguistically less confident learners to participate rather than withdraw. It also resonates with Cummins’s (2007) argument that excluding learners’

languages wastes a powerful pedagogical resource; the teachers in this study treated repertoires as cognitive and semiotic resources for English learning.

5.2. Affective and Identity Inclusion: Affirming Who Learners Are

Theme 2 shows that translanguaging performed affective and identity work. Local-language greetings and humor lowered anxiety and built rapport, while the practice of recasting students' L1 contributions into English validated their ideas without positioning their language as deficient. This is a crucial inclusive move: rather than correcting the language of the contribution, teachers modeled the English form, allowing the student's voice to "enter the lesson." Such practices align with scholarship that frames translanguaging as identity affirmation and a redistribution of epistemic authority (Flores & Schissel, 2014; García & Li Wei, 2014; Li Wei, 2018), and with inclusive education's concern for the affective dimensions of participation and well-being (UNESCO, 2020).

The finding that students "felt the classroom is also theirs" illustrates how translanguaging can transform the classroom into a space where learners' linguistic identities are legitimate. This extends prior work by identifying recasting as a specific, teachable inclusive technique: it simultaneously affirms identity and develops English, resolving the false choice between inclusion and language development.

5.3. Negotiating Monolingual Norms: Strategic Translanguaging within Accountability

Theme 3 reveals the sociopolitical dimension of teachers' translanguaging. All three teachers framed their translanguaging as strategic, temporary, and oriented "for English," a stance that allowed them to reconcile monolingual policy imaginaries with multilingual classroom realities. This reflects an asset-oriented translanguaging *stance* (García et al., 2017) while also exposing the constraining power of monolingual norms: translanguaging had to be legitimized as a scaffold toward English rather than valued in its own right.

This tension is analytically important. It shows that teachers act as policy negotiators who navigate supervisory and accountability pressures (May, 2014; Tian et al., 2020). Their strategic framing is both enabling (it permits translanguaging within monolingual accountability) and constraining (it keeps English as the ultimate goal and positions L1 as a temporary means). From an inclusive pedagogy perspective, this is a partial achievement: participation is extended, but the legitimacy of learners' repertoires remains conditional. Efforts to foster linguistically inclusive ELT therefore need to address not only classroom practice but also the policy and supervisory discourses that shape what counts as legitimate pedagogy.

5.4. Synthesis: Translanguaging as Inclusive Pedagogy

Taken together, the three themes show that translanguaging functioned as inclusive pedagogy across cognitive (scaffolding), affective-identificational (rapport, identity), and sociopolitical (negotiation) dimensions. This supports the conceptual linkage proposed in the literature review—between translanguaging and inclusive pedagogy—and offers empirical grounding for reading translanguaging as an inclusive pedagogical move in EFL, particularly in multilingual Global South contexts.

6. CONCLUSION

This study set out to examine how Indonesian secondary school EFL teachers mobilize students' multilingual resources in classroom interaction, how they negotiate these practices within

institutional monolingual norms, and in what ways such practices foster inclusive English language learning. Three overarching conclusions emerge from the study. First, translanguaging functions as pedagogical scaffolding that widens access to complex academic content and sustains task engagement. Second, translanguaging serves as an affective and identity-affirming resource. Third, teachers act as policy negotiators who navigate institutional monolingual expectations by framing translanguaging as a strategic, temporary, and purposeful scaffold “for English,” rather than a deviation from it.

Theoretically, this study bridges translanguaging scholarship and inclusive pedagogy, conceptualizing translanguaging as an inclusive pedagogical move in EFL contexts. While much of the existing literature treats translanguaging primarily as a cognitive or linguistic strategy, this study demonstrates its inclusive function: extending what is ordinarily available to all learners, affirming identity, and challenging the monolingual habitus that traditionally marginalizes students’ repertoires. Practically, the findings carry significant implications for multiple stakeholders in English language education. For teacher education programmes, the study underscores the need to move beyond “English-only” methodologies and explicitly develop pre-service and in-service teachers’ translanguaging stances and design skills. For language-in-education policymakers and school leaders, the study highlights the constraining power of monolingual supervisory expectations and calls for a paradigm shift that legitimizes plurilingual classroom realities. For materials designers, the findings suggest the need to build translanguaging tasks—such as multilingual glossaries, cross-linguistic comparisons, and L1 brainstorming spaces—into ELT resources, thereby providing teachers with legitimate designs to leverage students’ repertoires.

Despite its contributions, this study has several limitations. First, its small-scale, multiple-case design involving three teachers in a specific region of Indonesia limits the generalizability of the findings. Second, the data rely primarily on teacher perspectives and classroom observations; the study did not systematically capture students’ perceptions of how translanguaging affects their learning, engagement, and sense of inclusion. Third, the study focused on classroom interaction and did not examine how institutional policies, high-stakes assessments, or textbook representations (which often encode monolingual ideologies) further constrain or enable teachers’ translanguaging practices.

Future research should address these limitations by incorporating student voices through interviews, focus groups, or stimulated-recall sessions to understand how learners experience and benefit from translanguaging as inclusive pedagogy. Longitudinal studies could examine how teachers’ translanguaging stances and designs evolve over time, particularly following targeted professional development. Furthermore, research should investigate the intersection of translanguaging and materials design, exploring how textbooks and digital resources can be redesigned to explicitly support plurilingual pedagogies.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

[Add acknowledgments here if applicable, including funding bodies and grant numbers.]

AUTHOR CONTRIBUTION STATEMENT

[Author initials] conceived the study and designed the methodology. [Author initials] collected and analyzed the data. [Author initials] drafted and revised the manuscript. All authors reviewed and approved the final version.

AI DISCLOSURE STATEMENT

The authors declare that no generative AI or AI-assisted tools were used in the preparation of this manuscript.

COMPETING INTERESTS STATEMENT

The authors declare no competing interests.

REFERENCES

- Ainscow, M. (2020). Promoting inclusion and equity in education: Lessons from international experiences. *Nordic Journal of Studies in Educational Policy*, 6(1), 7–16.
- Auerbach, E. R. (1993). Reexamining English only in the ESL classroom. *TESOL Quarterly*, 27(1), 9–32.
- Berger, R. (2015). Now I see it, now I don't: Researcher's position and reflexivity in qualitative research. *Qualitative Research*, 15(2), 219–234.
- Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 3(2), 77–101.
- Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2019). Reflecting on reflexive thematic analysis. *Qualitative Research in Sport, Exercise and Health*, 11(4), 589–597.
- Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2021). *Thematic analysis: A practical guide*. SAGE.
- Canagarajah, A. S. (2011). Translanguaging in the classroom: Emerging issues for research and pedagogy. *Applied Linguistics Review*, 2(1), 1–19.
- Conteh, J., & Meier, G. (Eds.). (2014). *The multilingual turn in languages education: Opportunities and challenges*. Multilingual Matters.
- Creese, A., & Blackledge, A. (2010). Translanguaging in the bilingual classroom: A pedagogy for learning and teaching? *The Modern Language Journal*, 94(1), 103–115.
- Creswell, J. W., & Poth, C. N. (2018). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches* (4th ed.). SAGE.
- Cummins, J. (2007). Rethinking monolingual instructional strategies in multilingual classrooms. *Canadian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 10(2), 221–240.
- Dempsey, N. P. (2010). Stimulated recall interviews in ethnography. *Qualitative Research*, 10(3), 349–367.
- Florian, L. (2014). What counts as evidence of inclusive education? *European Journal of Special Needs Education*, 29(3), 286–294.
- Florian, L., & Black-Hawkins, K. (2011). Exploring inclusive pedagogy. *British Educational Research Journal*, 37(5), 813–828.

- Flores, N., & Schissel, J. L. (2014). Dynamic bilingualism as the norm: Envisioning linguistic heteroglossia in standards-based classrooms. *TESOL Quarterly*, 48(3), 454–479.
- García, O. (2009). *Bilingual education in the 21st century: A global perspective*. Wiley-Blackwell.
- García, O., Johnson, S. I., & Seltzer, K. (2017). *The translanguaging classroom: Leveraging student bilingualism for learning*. Caslon.
- García, O., & Li Wei. (2014). *Translanguaging: Language, bilingualism and education*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Gogolin, I. (1997). The “monolingual habitus” as the common feature in teaching in the language of the majority in different countries. *Per Linguam*, 13(2), 38–49.
- Holliday, A. (2005). *The struggle to teach English as an international language*. Oxford University Press.
- Li Wei. (2018). Translanguaging as a practical theory of language. *Applied Linguistics*, 39(1), 9–30.
- Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. G. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry*. SAGE.
- May, S. (2014). *The multilingual turn: Implications for SLA, TESOL, and bilingual education*. Routledge.
- Mazak, C. M., & Carroll, K. S. (Eds.). (2017). *Translanguaging in higher education: Beyond monolingual ideologies*. Multilingual Matters.
- Merriam, S. B., & Tisdell, E. J. (2016). *Qualitative research: A guide to design and implementation* (4th ed.). Jossey-Bass.
- Otheguy, R., García, O., & Reid, W. (2015). Clarifying translanguaging and deconstructing named languages: A perspective from linguistics. *Applied Linguistics Review*, 6(3), 281–307.
- Phillipson, R. (1992). *Linguistic imperialism*. Oxford University Press.
- Pillow, W. (2003). Confession, catharsis, or cure? Rethinking the uses of reflexivity as methodological power. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, 16(2), 175–196.
- Shenton, A. K. (2004). Strategies for ensuring trustworthiness in qualitative research projects. *Education for Information*, 22(2), 63–75.
- Stake, R. E. (2006). *Multiple case study analysis*. Guilford Press.
- Tian, Z., Aghai, L., Sayer, P., & Schissel, J. L. (Eds.). (2020). *Envisioning TESOL through a translanguaging lens: Global perspectives*. Springer.
- UNESCO. (2020). *Global education monitoring report 2020: Inclusion and education: All means all*. UNESCO.
- Vogel, S., & García, O. (2017). Translanguaging. In *Oxford research encyclopedia of applied linguistics*. Oxford University Press.
- Wang, D., & Curdt-Christiansen, X. L. (2019). Translanguaging in a Chinese EFL classroom. *Language and Education*, 33(2), 126–143.
- Yin, R. K. (2018). *Case study research and design: Design and methods* (6th ed.).SA