



**Republic of Turkey
Burdur Mehmet Akif Ersoy University
Institute of Educational Sciences
Department of Foreign Language Education
English Language Teaching Master's Program**

**STUDENTS' ATTITUDES TOWARDS TRANSLANGUAGING
IN HIGHER EDUCATION IN AN EFL CONTEXT**

**Kadir BAL
A Master's Thesis**

**Thesis Supervisor
Assist. Prof. Dr. Yusuf Emre YEŞİLYURT**

Burdur, 2025

T.C.
Burdur Mehmet Akif Ersoy Üniversitesi
Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü
Yabancı Diller Eğitimi Anabilim Dalı
İngiliz Dili Eğitimi Tezli Yüksek Lisans Programı

**YÜKSEKÖĞRETİMDE YABANCI DİL OLARAK İNGİLİZCE
BAĞLAMINDA ÖĞRENCİLERİN DİLLER ARASI GEÇİŞLİLİK
UYGULAMALARINA YÖNELİK TUTUMLARI**

Kadir BAL
Yüksek Lisans Tezi

Tez Danışmanı
Dr.Öğretim Üyesi Yusuf Emre YEŞİLYURT

Burdur, 2025

 MAKÜ EĞİTİM BİLİMLERİ ENSTİTÜSÜ	YÜKSEK LİSANS JÜRİ ONAY FORMU
---	--------------------------------------

M.A.K.Ü. Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü Yönetim Kurulu’nun 27/05/2022 tarih ve 20 sayılı Yönetim Kurulu kararıyla oluşturulan jüri tarafından 23/01/2025 tarihinde tez savunma sınavı yapılan Kadir BAL’ın “Yükseköğretimde Yabancı Dil Olarak İngilizce Bağlamında Öğrencilerin Diller Arası Geçişlilik Uygulamalarına Yönelik Tutumları” konulu tez çalışması Yabancı Diller Eğitimi Anabilim Dalı’nda YÜKSEK LİSANS tezi olarak kabul edilmiştir.

JÜRİ

ÜYE (TEZ DANIŞMANI): Dr.Öğr. Üyesi Yusuf Emre YEŞİLYURT

ÜYE : Doç.Dr. Nihan ERDEMİR

ÜYE : Dr. Öğr. Üyesi Ecehan CANDAN

ONAY

M.A.K.Ü Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü Yönetim Kurulu’nun/...../.....
tarih ve/..... sayılı kararı.

İMZA / MÜHÜR

BİLDİRİM

Tez yazma sürecinde bilimsel ve etik ilkelere uyduğumu, yararlandığım tüm kaynakları kaynak gösterme ilkelerine uygun olarak kaynakçada belirttiğimi ve bu bölümler dışındaki tüm ifadelerin şahsıma ait olduğunu taahhüt edip, tezimin kaynak göstermek koşuluyla aşağıda belirttiğim şekilde fotokopi ile çoğaltılmasına izin veriyorum.

[x] Tezimin/Raporumun tamamı her yerden erişime açılabilir.

[] Tezim/Raporum sadece Mehmet Akif Ersoy Üniversitesi yerleşkelerinden erişime açılabilir.

[] Tezimin/Raporumun yıl süreyle erişime açılmasını istemiyorum. Bu sürenin sonunda uzatma için başvuruda bulunmadığım takdirde, tezimin/raporumun tamamı her yerden erişime açılabilir.

Kadir BAL

23.01.2025

İmza

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

In this journey, I would like to express my deep gratitude to my supervisor, Assistant. Prof. Dr. Yusuf Emre YEŞİLYURT for his guidance, motivation, support, trust, patience and contributions at first. Without his support, it would have been difficult to continue on this journey. Thanks to his valuable feedback, I was able to direct my thesis and complete my thesis. Thanks for everything. Also, I would like to thank my previous supervisor, Prof. Dr. Mehmet ÖZCAN, for his support, trust and contributions. It was a privilege for me to be his student. Also, I feel obliged to express my gratitude to Assoc. Prof. Dr. Ali KARAKAŞ, who supported and helped me during the Academic Term.

I would like to express my thanks to the jury members, Assoc. Prof. Dr. Nihan ERDEMİR and Assist. Prof. Dr. Ecehan CANDAN, who contributed to my thesis with crucial and beneficial feedback on my thesis. Their precious comments provided me with different approaches to my thesis from different perspectives.

As for my colleagues, I express my gratitude with my sincerest feelings to the head of department, Instructor Hatice ÇELİKKANAT and Assist. Prof. Dr. Ali KURT, who reduced my burden at school and made it possible for me to study effectively.

Lastly, I would like to express my heartfelt gratitude to my spouse, Müberra, and her family, as well as to my parents, for their unwavering financial and emotional support throughout my entire master's education and thesis studies. I also extend my sincere thanks to my son, Emir Asaf, who may be small in size but has a big heart, for his patience, understanding, and support.

**Yükseköğretimde Yabancı Dil Olarak İngilizce Bağlamında Öğrencilerin Diller
Arası Geçişlilik Uygulamalarına Yönelik Tutumları
(Yüksek Lisans Tezi)**

Kadir BAL

ÖZ

Bu çalışma, İngilizceyi Yabancı Dil (EFL) olarak öğrenen öğrencilerin translanguaging (dil geçişi) stratejilerine ilişkin bakış açılarını inceleyerek, bu stratejilerin dil öğrenme deneyimleri, anlama ve katılım üzerindeki etkilerini değerlendirmeyi amaçlamaktadır. Araştırma, öğrencilerin perspektiflerini ve tepkilerini analiz ederek etkili translanguaging stratejilerinin anlaşılmasını geliştirmeyi ve kapsayıcı, çok dilli öğrenme ortamlarını teşvik etmeyi hedeflemektedir. Bu amaçla, nicel verilerin 5 dereceli Likert ölçeği ile oluşturulan bir anketten elde edilmesi ve açık uçlu görüşmelerden elde edilen nitel bilgilerle birleştirilmesiyle karma yöntem yaklaşımı benimsenmiştir. 461 katılımcıdan elde edilen verilere, tanımlayıcı ve çıkarımsal yöntemleri içeren istatistiksel analizler uygulanmış; görüşme yanıtları ise tematik içerik analiziyle değerlendirilmiştir. Araştırma, öğrencilerin yalnızca İngilizce kullanımına karşı anadillerinin dahil edilmesine yönelik çeşitli görüşlere sahip olduğunu ortaya koymaktadır. Birçok öğrenci, dil geçişinin karmaşık konuları anlamada ve kaygıyı azaltmada sağladığı faydaları kabul ederken, bazıları anadil kullanımına aşırı bağımlılığın İngilizceye tam anlamıyla maruz kalmayı engelleyebileceği endişesini dile getirmiştir. Cinsiyet ve dil yeterlik düzeyinin önemli faktörler olduğu görülmüş; kadın öğrencilerin daha olumlu tutumlar sergilediği ve düşük yeterlilik düzeyine sahip öğrencilerin dil geçişi stratejilerini daha yaygın bir şekilde kullandığı belirlenmiştir. Araştırma, öğrencilerin not alırken ve sınıf arkadaşlarıyla iş birliği yaparken doğal olarak dil geçişi yaptığını göstermektedir. Görüşmeler, translanguaging'in karmaşık konuları açıklığa kavuşturmadaki, sosyal bağlantıları güçlendirmedeki ve öz güveni artırmadaki rolünü vurgulamaktadır. Ancak, aşırı kullanım endişeleri, dengeli bir yaklaşım ihtiyacını ortaya koymaktadır. Öneriler arasında translanguaging'in dikkatli bir şekilde uygulanması, farklı yeterlilik seviyelerine uygun stratejilerin geliştirilmesi ve öğretmenlerin etkili iki dilli uygulamalara yönelik eğitimi yer almaktadır. Bu özellikler ele alındığında, translanguaging, kapsayıcı ve çok dilli EFL sınıflarını teşvik eden başarılı bir araç olarak işlev görebilir ve küresel yükseköğretim bağlamlarında daha geniş bir uygulama alanı bulabilir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Çokdilli Öğrenme, Diller arası Geçişlilik, Karma Yöntem Yaklaşımı, Tutum, Yabancı Dil Olarak İngilizce, Yükseköğretim.

Sayfa Sayısı: 135

Danışman: Dr.Öğretim Üyesi Yusuf Emre YEŞİLYURT

**Students' Attitudes Towards Translanguaging In Higher Education
In an EFL Context.
(Mater's Thesis)**

Kadir BAL

ABSTRACT

This study analyses the perspectives of English as a Foreign Language (EFL) students about translanguaging strategies in higher education, aiming to evaluate its impact on language learning experiences, comprehension, and engagement. This research seeks to improve the understanding of effective translanguaging strategies by analysing students' perspectives and reactions, hence fostering inclusive multilingual learning environments. A mixed-methods approach was employed, combining quantitative data from a 5-point Likert scale questionnaire with qualitative insights from open-ended interviews. Statistical studies, encompassing both descriptive and inferential methods, were conducted on data from 461 participants, accompanied with thematic content analysis of interview responses. Research demonstrates that students hold diverse views on the exclusive use of English compared to the incorporation of their native languages. While many acknowledge the benefits of translanguaging for understanding intricate topics and reducing anxiety, some express concerns regarding an overreliance on their native language, believing it may hinder English immersion. Gender and proficiency level were recognised as significant factors, with female students demonstrating more positive attitudes and lower-proficiency learners employing translanguaging strategies more extensively. The research demonstrates that translanguaging often occurs naturally as students switch languages while note-taking and collaborating with classmates. Interviews emphasised its role in clarifying complex topics, fostering social connections, and boosting self-confidence. However, concerns about overuse highlight the need for a balanced approach. Recommendations include the prudent application of translanguaging, tailored strategies for diverse proficiency levels, and teacher training in effective bilingual practices. By addressing these characteristics, translanguaging can function as a successful tool for promoting inclusive, multilingual EFL classrooms and enabling broader application in global higher education contexts.

Keywords: Attitudes, EFL, Higher Education, Mixed-methods Approach, Multilingual Learning, Translanguaging.

Number of pages: 135

Supervisor: Assist. Prof. Dr. Yusuf Emre YEŞİLYURT

TABLE OF CONTENTS

BİLDİRİM	i
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	ii
ÖZ	iii
ABSTRACT.....	iv
TABLE OF CONTENTS	v
LIST OF TABLES	xi
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS	xii
CHAPTER I	1
INTRODUCTION	1
1.1. Background of the Study	1
1.2. The Statement of the Problem	3
1.3. Research Questions.....	4
1.4. The Purpose and the Significance of the Study	4
1.5. Limitations.....	5
CHAPTER II.....	6
LITERATURE REVIEW.....	6
2.1. Theoretical Foundations of Translanguaging	6
2.2. Historical Development and Theoretical Foundations	7
2.3. Pedagogical Applications	7
2.3.1. In higher education.....	8
2.3.2. Reading and writing skills development	8
2.4. Translanguaging in EFL Contexts	8
2.5. Challenges and Resistance.....	9

2.6. Translanguaging, Code-Switching and Code-Meshing Concepts and Differences.....	9
2.7. Students' Attitudes Towards Translanguaging.....	11
2.8. Teacher Education and Professional Development	12
2.9. Empirical Studies on Translanguaging	12
2.9.1. Classroom practices	12
2.9.2. Digital and online learning.....	12
2.10. Advantages and Challenges.....	13
2.11. Research Gaps	13
CHAPTER III	17
METHODOLOGY.....	17
3.1. Design of Research.....	17
3.2. Participants	19
3.3. Research Questions.....	21
3.4. Data Collection Instruments	21
3.5. Open-Ended Interview Questions for EFL Students	22
3.6. Adapted Questionnaire on Translanguaging	23
3.7. Data Collection Procedures	23
3.8. Data Analysis.....	24
3.8.1. Thematic analysis process.....	26
3.8.1.1. Data familiarization.....	27
3.8.1.2. Initial coding.	27
3.8.1.3. Identifying and defining themes	27
3.8.1.4. Reviewing and refining themes.....	28
3.8.2. Writing the thematic analysis.....	28
3.9. Reliability and Validity of the Study	29
CHAPTER IV	31

FINDINGS	31
4.1. The Analysis of the Quantitative Questionnaire Applied to EFL Students.....	31
4.1.1. Descriptive information of participants.	31
4.1.2. What are the students’ attitudes towards translanguaging in an EFL context?	35
4.1.3. Do students' attitudes towards translanguaging differ significantly according to the gender variable?	40
4.1.4. Do students' attitudes towards translanguaging differ significantly according to the english proficiency level variable?.....	41
4.2. Analysis of Open-Ended Interviews Applied to EFL Students	42
4.2.1. Demographic information of the participants	42
4.3. Interlingual Practices in Classes.	43
4.3.1. Minimal or no use of native language.....	43
4.3.2. Occasional use of native language.	45
4.3.3. Balanced use of native and target languages.....	46
4.3.4. Frequent use of native language.....	47
4.3.5. Using translanguaging for clarity.....	48
4.3.6. Overcoming language barriers.	49
4.3.7. Context-based use.	50
4.4. Frequency of the Usage of Translanguaging in Classes.....	50
4.4.1. Frequency of translanguaging.	51
4.4.2. Where translanguaging happens.	52
4.4.3. Translanguaging as a tool for understanding.	53
4.5. Attitudes towards Interlingual Use in Class.	54
4.5.1. Translanguaging's significance in EFL classrooms.	54
4.6. Reasons for Using Multiple Languages in Class.....	54
4.6.1. Promoting understanding	54

4.6.2. Filling linguistic gaps.....	55
4.6.3. Retention and cognitive engagement.	56
4.7. Benefits and Challenges of Using Both Languages	57
4.7.1. Enhanced understanding.	57
4.7.2. Concerns about overuse	58
4.8. Instructor’s Use of Both Languages	58
4.8.1. Support for beginners and complex topics.....	58
4.8.2. Grammar specific applications.....	59
4.9. Student Practice of Translanguaging	60
4.9.1. Building confidence and reducing anxiety	60
4.9.2. Embracing cultural and cognitive diversity	60
4.10. Reasons for Avoiding Native Language.....	61
4.10.1. Fostering immersion.	61
4.10.2. Practicality in multilingual classrooms.	62
4.11. Language related Difficulties in an EFL context.....	63
4.11.1. Frequent challenges.....	63
4.11.2. Improvement over time.	64
4.11.3. Vocabulary and grammar issues.	65
4.11.4. Speaking and fluency	66
4.11.5. Using technology.	67
4.12. Students’ Final Comments on Translanguaging.....	67
4.12.1. Translanguaging as a support for understanding.	67
4.12.2. Social and collaborative dimensions.	68
4.12.3. Challenges and concerns.	68
4.12.4. Balancing translanguaging with other strategies.....	69
CHAPTER V.....	70
DISCUSSION	70

5.1. What are the Students’ Attitudes towards Translanguaging in an EFL Context?	70
5.1.1 Do students' attitudes towards translanguaging differ significantly according to the gender variable?	73
5.1.2. Do students' attitudes towards translanguaging differ significantly according to the English proficiency level variable?	74
5.2. What Language-Related Difficulties do EFL Students Encounter?	75
5.2.1. What kind of translanguaging techniques do college students employ in their coursework?	77
CHAPTER VI	79
CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTIONS	79
6.1. Perspectives on the "Just English" Policy	79
6.2. Views on Translanguaging	80
6.3. Variations by Gender and Proficiency	80
6.4. Insights from Open-Ended Interviews	80
6.5. Suggestions:	81
6.6. Suggestions for Future Researches.	83
6.6.1. Translanguaging and cognitive load	83
6.6.2. Emotional and psychological benefits	83
6.6.3. Translanguaging as a multi-sensory tool	83
6.6.4. Translanguaging for accelerated learning	84
6.6.5. Translanguaging in diverse educational contexts	84
6.6.6. Comparing translanguaging and suggestopedia	84
REFERENCES	85
APPENDICES	93
APPENDIX-1	94
ETHICS COMMITTEE PERMISSION	94

APPENDIX-2.....	95
CURRICULUM VITAE	95
APPENDIX-3.....	96
CERTIFICATE OF CONGRESS ATTENDENCE.....	96
APPENDIX-4.....	97
THESIS SCALE PERMISSION	97
APPENDIX 5	98
OPEN-ENDED QUESTIONNAIRE FOR EFL STUDENTS	98
APPENDIX 6.....	101
QUANTITATIVE QUESTIONNAIRE FOR EFL STUDENTS	101
APPENDIX 7.....	107
PROFICIENCY TEST FOR A1&A2 LEVEL.....	107
APPENDIX 8.....	110
PROFICIENCY TEST EXAM RESULTS	110

LIST OF TABLES

<u>Tables</u>	<u>Page Number</u>
Table 1. Programs Offering EFL Courses at Esenyurt University.....	19
Table 2. Number of the Participants	20
Table 3. Tests of Normality	25
Table 4. Reliability, Mean And Standard Deviations Of The Variables	29
Table 5. Demographic Characteristics of Participants	32
Table 6. Departments of the Participants	33
Table 7. English Level of the Participants	34
Table 8. Participants' Attitudes towards The Policy of Just English.....	36
Table 9. Participants' Attitudes towards Translanguaging	38
Table 10. Participants' Attitudes towards Translanguaging Strategies	39
Table 11. Independent Samples T-Test Results for Students' Attitudes Towards Translanguaging by Gender	41
Table 12. Independent Samples T-Test Results for Students' Attitudes Towards Translanguaging by Level of English.....	42

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

- EFL** : English as a Foreign Language
ELT : English Language Teaching
EMI : English Medium of Instruction
L1 : First/Home Language (In the present study, it refers to Turkish.)
L2 : Second Language (In the present study, it refers to English)
TL : Target Language (In the present study, it refers to English.)

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The introduction is divided into five subheadings in this chapter. The study's background, which is a very important aspect of the research, is stated in the first subheading. The problem statement is explained in the second subheading. Following that, the third and fourth subheadings concentrate on the research questions, the study's purposes and its importance. The study's limitations are then mentioned as the fifth point.

1.1. Background of the Study

Originally introduced by Cen Williams in the 1980s, the term "translanguaging" characterises the process of alternately speaking in one communication action (García & Wei, 2014). In applied linguistics, especially in relation to English as a Foreign Language (EFL) in higher education, this concept has attracted a lot of interest. Translanguaging challenges the conventional wisdom of language acquisition that usually emphasises the separation of languages and advocates a more fluid and dynamic approach that reflects the real-life language practices of bilingual or multilingual persons (Baker, 2011).

García (2009) claims that rather than only a teaching tactic, translanguaging is a natural communicative behaviour among bilinguals. This viewpoint is compatible with Bakhtin's (1981) heteroglossia theory, which claims that language is basically multivoiced and covers a spectrum of social and cultural influences. It has been observed that in EFL education, translanguaging offers several pedagogical benefits. For instance, it helps students to interpret using their whole linguistic repertoire, therefore enhancing their understanding and classroom involvement (Creese & Blackledge, 2010). Research by Canagarajah (2011) indicates that translanguaging can also create an inclusive learning environment whereby students' different linguistic resources are leveraged to facilitate their learning, and their linguistic identities are validated.

Translanguaging is not without challenges in EFL settings, either. The danger of linguistic misinterpretation among pupils still developing their English language competency causes great concern. Learning the target language (L2) in EFL classrooms could be impeded, claims Macaro (2005), by misuse of the first language (L1).

Research conducted by Gorter & Cenoz (2017) indicated that translanguaging is predominantly favourably perceived by higher education students, particularly on its ability to simplify intricate content. However, the same study indicated that other factors, such as students' perceived status of the languages involved, their previous language learning experiences, and their competence levels, can influence their views towards translanguaging.

Research on translanguaging in EFL contexts within higher education reveals that, despite several advantages, students' attitudes and teachers' intentional implementation of this method are critical determinants of its efficacy. Despite existing challenges in ensuring that translanguaging facilitates rather than hinders L2 acquisition, there is an increasing recognition within Turkish higher education of its potential to enhance language learning. Future studies should keep looking at the nuances of students' opinions on translanguaging, with an eye towards the evolution of teaching strategies that maximise its advantages over its drawbacks.

Teaching a foreign language in Turkey comes with significant challenges, largely due to the rigid structure of the national education system. With an overwhelming focus on standardized testing and rote memorization, students often find themselves memorizing grammar rules and vocabulary rather than engaging in meaningful communication. Traditional methods, like the grammar-translation approach, emphasize accuracy over fluency, leaving many learners feeling confident in answering test questions but hesitant when it comes to real-life conversations (Kırkgöz, 2007). Unfortunately, the exam-driven nature of language education further reinforces this problem, as success is often measured by multiple-choice test scores rather than the ability to communicate effectively (Özsevik, 2010).

Another pressing issue is the strict monolingual approach in classrooms, where students are expected to use only the target language. While this might sound ideal in theory, in practice, it often creates an intimidating environment where students fear making mistakes. Research has shown that allowing learners to use their first language

strategically can actually support their understanding and learning process (Auerbach, 1993; Cook, 2001). However, in Turkey, many teachers still discourage or even penalize the use of the mother tongue, missing an opportunity to help students bridge gaps in comprehension. Additionally, Turkey's rich linguistic diversity is often ignored in classrooms, overlooking the fact that many students grow up in bilingual or multilingual households (Çelik, 2008). Instead of embracing these linguistic resources, the system enforces a rigid, one-language-only rule, which can increase anxiety and reduce engagement.

This is where translanguaging emerges as a much-needed solution. By allowing students to draw on their full linguistic repertoire, translanguaging helps them make deeper connections with the language, boosting their confidence and making learning feel more natural (García & Wei, 2014). Instead of viewing different languages as separate entities, it encourages a fluid and dynamic approach to language use, one that mirrors how multilingual people actually communicate in the real world. For Turkish students who often struggle with the rigid boundaries set in traditional classrooms, this approach can be a game changer. By incorporating translanguaging into language teaching, we can create a more inclusive, engaging, and effective learning environment, one where students are not just learning a language but also learning how to use it with confidence beyond the classroom (Velasco & García, 2014).

1.2. The Statement of the Problem

Translanguaging has attracted a lot of interest as a creative technique of language instruction since it provides a dynamic framework using all of the students' linguistic repertoire. Although its uses in multilingual and bilingual classrooms have been much investigated, not much is known about its use in English as a Foreign Language (EFL) environment. Little is known about how translanguaging in EFL classrooms affects learners' academic performance, motivation, and language confidence.

Many EFL programs' predominance of monolingual ideas sometimes prevents students from using their home languages, therefore compromising effective learning. Apart from their language identities, this rigorous approach limits pupils' capacity to interact with challenging materials. Translanguaging supports inclusive events honouring students' linguistic diversity and encouraging their cognitive and academic development, so providing a possible answer. Still lacking, though, is an empirical

study on the success of translinguaging in EFL settings, especially on students' impressions and experiences.

With an eye towards translinguaging's effect on students' learning outcomes and attitudes, this study seeks to close these gaps in EFL classrooms. This study aims to shed light on its pragmatic uses by investigating how translinguaging techniques might improve engagement, understanding and language acquisition in EFL environments, therefore supporting the continuous debate on multilingual education.

1.3. Research Questions.

- 1- What are the students' attitudes towards translinguaging in an EFL context?
 - What are their attitudes towards translinguaging?
 - Do students' attitudes towards translinguaging differ significantly according to the gender variable?
 - Do students' attitudes towards translinguaging differ significantly according to the English proficiency level variable?
- 2- What language-related difficulties do EFL students encounter?
- 3- What kinds of translinguaging techniques do college students employ in their coursework?

1.4. The Purpose and the Significance of the Study

This study's main goal is to find out how students feel about translinguaging in the context of higher education's EFL (English as a Foreign Language). Translinguaging, or the deliberate use of multiple languages to facilitate learning, is becoming more and more acknowledged as a potent multilingual education tool. By examining how students interpret and respond to translinguaging behaviours in EFL environments, this study will investigate how these techniques affect language learning, understanding, and student involvement in academic environments.

This study aims to contribute to global research on translinguaging practices in higher education, providing insights on effective strategies for integrating translinguaging in EFL classrooms and fostering inclusive, multilingual learning spaces, ultimately supporting its wider adoption and refinement in global higher education.

The current study considerably increases our knowledge of translanguaging in EFL contexts since it offers a thorough awareness of the practice as a learning tool in Turkish higher education. Also, it aims to provide a comprehensive research of translanguaging in an EFL environment, which has not received enough attention in Turkey thus far. By means of analysis and evaluation of present translanguaging practices and student perceptions of translanguaging in an EFL environment, this study aims to address the research gap on translanguaging in the local setting of higher education. This is due to the limited number of studies that are currently available on the topic. Additionally, it might help dispel instructors' preconceptions about using L2 in the classroom.

1.5. Limitations

The study is limited to students enrolled in the Preparatory Class of a private foundation university in Istanbul and also the students taking English lessons either through distance education or face-to-face. The face-to-face participants include students from the Civil Aviation Cabin Services and Tourist Guidance programs.

The sample size is restricted to 2,500 A1-level students. At the beginning of the semester, the students were given a proficiency test prepared for both A1 and A2 levels. Those who achieved more than 50 points were exempted from taking English courses. These students have completed both qualitative and quantitative questionnaires honestly and sincerely. Additionally, they possess sufficient experience to express opinions regarding translanguaging.

CHAPTER II

LITERATURE REVIEW

In this chapter, key aspects of translanguaging are explored through various subheadings. The chapter begins with its theoretical foundations, contrasting the "soft" and "strong" approaches. Next, the historical development of translanguaging is discussed, followed by its pedagogical applications in bilingual and multilingual classrooms, highlighting its role in enhancing learning and engagement.

The chapter then examines translanguaging in EFL contexts, addressing its benefits and challenges, including institutional resistance and monolingual ideologies. It also differentiates translanguaging from code-switching and analyzes students' attitudes based on empirical studies. Additionally, the role of teacher education and digital learning in translanguaging is reviewed. The chapter concludes by summarizing its advantages, challenges, and existing research gaps.

2.1. Theoretical Foundations of Translanguaging

Translanguaging is anchored in a dynamic perspective of bilingualism that opposes the idea of separate, autonomous language systems. Instead, it regards language practices as fluid and linked, letting people create meaning from their complete language repertoire (García & Wei, 2014). Two opposing theories predominate in the translanguaging discussion: the "soft" approach, which favours the merger of national languages while acknowledging them, and the "strong" theory, which advocates a single, unified language repertoire (García & Lin, 2016).

Especially in multilingual classrooms, the "soft" concept of translanguaging stresses on fostering adaptability inside predefined linguistic constraints. It suggests that deliberately and strategically applying various languages could help to increase knowledge and participation. On the other hand, the "strong" perspective doubts the very existence of several language systems and implies that bilingual people inevitably apply a single, linked linguistic framework. This perspective aligns with "dynamic bilingualism," which emphasises the fluid and evolving quality of multilingual communication (Wei, 2011).

Important theoretical contributions include the idea of "translanguaging space" put forward by Wei (2011), which underlines the changing ability of translanguaging to build social situations where people negotiate identities and connections. These spaces foster uniqueness and creativity by letting people mix their language, cultural, and experiential resources. Blackledge & Creese (2017) also stress the semiotic aspect of translanguaging that is, combining gestures, visual signals, and other nonverbal forms into communication. This viewpoint acknowledges translanguaging's multimodal and holistic character, therefore extending knowledge of translanguaging outside spoken and written languages.

2.2. Historical Development and Theoretical Foundations

Cen Williams initially used the word "translanguaging" in the 1980s to characterise an instructional technique whereby students rotated between two languages for input and output. García (2009) broadened this concept by introducing translanguaging as a theoretical prism through which one may see how multilingual people negotiate and negotiate their language contexts. Emphasising its ability to challenge monolingual standards, García & Kleyn (2016) advanced the field by showing its use in bilingual classrooms. Research also emphasises the sociopolitical aspects of translanguaging. By affirming the many language practices of underprivileged groups, it questions linguistic hierarchy and advances linguistic equity. Wei (2022) defines translanguaging as a decolonising technique that opposes "abyssal thinking," which imposes binary divisions across languages, civilisations, and epistemologies.

2.3. Pedagogical Applications

In bilingual and multilingual classrooms, translanguaging has become rather popular as an educational tool. Originally, it explained the deliberate alternation between input and output languages to enhance cognitive and communication possibilities (Lewis, Jones, & Baker, 2012). Over time, its applications have expanded to incorporate a range of instructional approaches supporting learning by leveraging students' language competency.

In order to promote metalinguistic awareness in which students, by means of cross-language links, expand their knowledge of language structures and functions, Cenoz & Gorter (2020) underline the importance of translanguaging. This approach improves

not just verbal but also critical thinking and problem-solving capacity. Moreover, translanguaging pedagogies recognise students' language identities and create a supporting learning environment, therefore supporting inclusive classroom practices. Shifidi (2014) demonstrates in Namibian secondary schools how well translanguaging helps to increase comprehension and involvement among pupils from many language backgrounds in Namibian secondary schools. The study underlines how translanguaging lowers the divide between home and school languages, therefore enabling students to take part more actively in the process of learning.

In line with this, Shah et al. (2019) look at the inadvertent use of translanguaging at Pakistani institutions, stressing its regularity in casual academic talks even though English is the language of instruction. These findings suggest that translanguaging is naturally and adaptably used by multilingual people as their technique of handling challenging language settings.

2.3.1. In higher education. In higher education, translanguaging is rather crucial for reducing linguistic and cultural barriers in English-medium instruction (EMI) settings. Translanguaging also promotes higher-order cognitive skills. Karabulut (2019) found, for instance, improved planning, organisation, and critical thinking among Turkish EFL students who translocated for writing projects. These findings show how translanguaging might raise cognitive and academic performance.

2.3.2. Reading and writing skills development. Kamışlı (2022) employed mixed methods to examine the effect of translanguaging education on the reading comprehension of L2 in Turkish secondary school students. The results demonstrated significant improvements in motivation and reading comprehension, particularly when students were permitted to utilise their L1 for meaning-making.

2.4. Translanguaging in EFL Contexts

Kamışlı (2022) demonstrated that Turkish secondary school students' comprehension and motivation were significantly enhanced by permitting them to utilise their first language (L1) in English reading assignments. This suggests that translanguaging not only supports content understanding but also empowers students to navigate complex academic tasks more effectively.

Translanguaging also facilitates the development of thinking skills in EFL students. Karabulut (2019) searched the impact of translanguaging on the writing of Turkish EFL students and discovered that it improved their critical thinking, organisation, and planning. Translanguaging enables students to utilise their cognitive tools and language in order to establish a more profound connection with the material and to foster metacognitive awareness. This is consistent with the theoretical perspective of García and Wei (2014), which views translanguaging as a vehicle for intellectual inquiry and the construction of meaning.

2.5. Challenges and Resistance

In EFL environments, translanguaging presents challenges, particularly in contexts that are influenced by monolingual ideas, despite its advantages. While numerous students valued translanguaging for its pragmatic benefits, Fang & Liu (2020) discovered that some perceived it as indicative of their insufficient English proficiency. Additionally, institutional policies occasionally discourage the utilisation of L1 in EFL classes, thereby limiting the potential of translanguaging techniques (Escobar & Dillard-Paltrineri, 2015). These challenges underscore the necessity of legislative reform and teacher training to effectively integrate translanguaging into EFL instruction.

2.6. Translanguaging, Code-Switching and Code-Meshing Concepts and Differences

In multilingual and bilingual educational contexts, three key concepts often emerge: translanguaging, code-switching, and code-meshing. While they share similarities in their engagement with multiple languages, they differ in their theoretical underpinnings, functions, and implications for language use in academic and social settings.

Usually imposed by social standards, code-switching is the alternation between languages inside specified conversational limitations. Emphasising adaptability and agency, translanguaging aggregates language resources into one system of meaning-making. Wei (2022) says translanguaging lets pupils use their whole language repertoire outside of code-switching's structural limitations.

Translanguaging refers to the dynamic and fluid use of multiple linguistic resources by bilingual or multilingual speakers. Rather than treating languages as separate entities, translanguaging views language as an integrated system that individuals draw upon to communicate effectively. This concept, rooted in sociolinguistics and bilingual education, was initially developed in the Welsh bilingual education system and later expanded by researcher García (2017). Translanguaging goes beyond simple language alternation; it encourages learners to utilize all their linguistic capabilities to construct meaning, develop knowledge, and express their identities. In educational settings, translanguaging promotes cognitive flexibility, deeper understanding, and inclusive pedagogical approaches that recognize linguistic diversity as an asset rather than a hindrance.

Code-switching is the alternating use of two or more languages within a single conversation, sentence, or discourse. Unlike translanguaging, which assumes an integrated linguistic system, code-switching is traditionally viewed through a more rigid structural lens, where speakers consciously or unconsciously switch between distinct languages based on situational, social, or grammatical constraints. Code-switching can be intersentential (occurring between sentences), intrasentential (within a single sentence), or tag-switching (inserting a word or phrase from another language). Scholars such as Auer (2005); Myers-Scotton (2005) have analyzed code-switching as a socio-pragmatic phenomenon influenced by power dynamics, audience expectations, and contextual appropriateness. While it is a common practice among bilingual speakers, code-switching is often stigmatized in formal educational settings, reinforcing the perception of linguistic boundaries rather than fluid integration.

Code-meshing, on the other hand, refers to the intentional and strategic blending of linguistic varieties, including dialects and standard languages, within formal and informal contexts. Unlike code-switching, which often follows traditional grammatical structures, code-meshing integrates elements of different linguistic systems to challenge linguistic hierarchies and promote linguistic inclusivity. This concept is particularly relevant in academic writing, where scholars advocate for incorporating vernacular English and other non-standard varieties into traditionally monolingual discourse (Canagarajah, 2011). Code-meshing aims to legitimize multilingual and multicultural linguistic expressions by allowing speakers to maintain their linguistic identity while engaging in academic or professional communication.

While translanguaging, code-switching, and code-meshing all involve the use of multiple linguistic resources, they differ in their conceptualization and application:

- Translanguaging sees language as a unified system and encourages fluid linguistic practices to enhance comprehension and learning.
- Code-switching treats languages as separate systems and involves switching between them based on context, audience, or grammar.
- Code-meshing integrates different linguistic varieties within a single communicative act, often challenging traditional linguistic norms.

In educational contexts, translanguaging is increasingly recognized as a valuable pedagogical strategy that empowers students by validating their linguistic repertoire. Code-switching remains prevalent but is often constrained by social and institutional expectations. Code-meshing, while gaining traction in academic discourse, faces resistance due to the dominance of standard language ideologies. Understanding these distinctions helps educators and researchers develop more inclusive language policies that embrace linguistic diversity and enhance bilingual and multilingual students' academic success.

2.7. Students' Attitudes Towards Translanguaging

Particularly in multilingual classrooms, kids usually have neutral to positive opinions about translanguaging. According to Fang & Liu (2020), translanguaging was seen by university students as a crucial tool for language acquisition, therefore enhancing confidence and understanding. But several students linked translanguaging with poor English ability to reflect how monolingual notions affected their impressions. Similarly, Wang (2016) discovered that translanguaging was regarded by Chinese university students as a tool for promoting involvement and negotiating meaning, therefore facilitating scaffolding-based collaborative learning.

Shifidi (2014) observed in Namibian secondary schools that students valued translanguaging for its ability to promote knowledge and involvement, particularly in challenging subjects. Translanguaging approaches reduced language anxiety by bridging the gap between home and school languages, therefore increasing involvement. In a similar line, Rivera & Mazak (2019) examined how psychology students felt about translanguaging and discovered that it was perceived favourably as a strategy for explaining challenging academic ideas.

Although translanguaging usually produces good results, students nevertheless have certain challenges. Under other conditions, such as in Costa Rica and Kazakhstan, pupils expressed uncertainty, connecting translanguaging to outdated teaching methods or seeing it as a sign of slowness Escobar & Dillard-Paltraineri (2015). Furthermore, often the adoption of translanguaging techniques is hampered by institutional limitations such as monolingual language policy despite their alleged advantages (Fang & Liu, 2020). These findings underscore the need for teachers and legislators tackling monolingual concepts and creating environments that foster linguistic equality and confidence building by translanguaging.

2.8. Teacher Education and Professional Development

Teacher education, in major part, determines effective translanguaging implementation. Öztüfekçi (2023) developed a course for pre-service English teachers in front of dynamic bilingualism and heteroglossic language concepts. The session helped attendees to review their present monoglossic concepts and develop translanguaging techniques, so arming them to create inclusive schools honouring linguistic variety. Holdway & Hitchcock (2018) also investigated how activities for professional development influence translanguaging attitudes of teachers. Growing understanding of translanguaging, they found that more inclusive educational settings and higher respect of students' multilingual abilities followed.

2.9. Empirical Studies on Translanguaging

2.9.1. Classroom practices. Examined research on translanguaging's use in classroom interactions to increase student involvement and comprehension by İlhan (2022). With an eye towards student-directed translanguaging in English-centric classes, İlhan (2022) demonstrated, especially in group-based events, how translanguaging improves listening and reading comprehension.

2.9.2. Digital and online learning. As online learning grows increasingly prevalent, translanguaging has also developed to accommodate digital platforms. Kamışlı's (2022) research on translanguaging in online L2 reading instruction found how effectively it creates dynamic and useful virtual learning settings. Students

reported they engaged more and found negotiating difficult literature simpler than in monolingual schooling.

2.10. Advantages and Challenges

Translanguaging has benefits for learning results, student involvement, and validation of students' linguistic identities. Particularly for minoritized bilingual pupils, translanguaging pedagogies challenge monolingual standards and provide fair access to educational materials by letting students use their whole language repertoire (García, 2017).

Translanguaging also allows students to enhance important metalinguistic awareness, therefore enabling them to study and consider language use in numerous contexts. From this awareness, one can follow improved language talents and more respect of linguistic variety. Translanguaging methods also enable students from many language and cultural backgrounds to collaborate and build mutual understanding, therefore promoting social cohesiveness.

Still, challenges still exist. Critics of translanguaging claim that by combining minority languages with dominant ones it could threaten them and hence eliminate linguistic diversity (García & Lin, 2016). This problem is particularly relevant in cases where minority languages are already excluded. Moreover, institutional resistance to translanguaging driven by monoglossic concepts frequently limits its use in official learning environments. Tight language policies could force teachers to comply, therefore, compromising their ability to apply translanguaging strategies.

2.11. Research Gaps

Examining research on translanguaging in Turkey's EFL context reveals several gaps, particularly in its practical implementation in classrooms. While numerous studies have explored translanguaging, they often focus on either students' or teachers' attitudes rather than considering both perspectives alongside real classroom practices. Consequently, there is no well-defined framework for effectively integrating translanguaging into language teaching.

Most of the studies have examined the concept of translanguaging as part of bilingual classroom practices (Küçük, 2018; Özkaynak, 2020; Öztürk & Çubukçu, 2022; Karabulut, 2019; Küçükali, 2021) and attitudes (Sezer, 2022; İnci Kavak, 2021; Yüzlü,

2021; İlhan, 2022; Öztüfekçi, 2023; Bozbıyık, 2023) in the Turkish EFL higher education context. Likewise, there have been international studies investigating translanguaging from sociolinguistic (Gort & Sembiente, 2015), psycholinguistic (Wei, 2011), and digital-based corpus (Mısır, 2023) perspectives. Therefore, studies on translanguaging in tertiary-level EFL contexts have mostly focused on the attitudes or practices of either students or instructors rather than investigating both.

One significant issue is the lack of clear pedagogical guidelines for incorporating translanguaging into instruction. The Ministry of National Education (MoNE) in Turkey presents an inconsistent stance on L1 use. While primary and secondary education permit some use of students' native language in specific situations, high school curricula emphasize an English-only approach. This inconsistency leaves both teachers and students uncertain about when and how translanguaging can be effectively applied. Without explicit guidance, teachers may struggle to integrate translanguaging as a structured pedagogical tool.

Moreover, much of the existing research in Turkey has primarily examined code-switching rather than translanguaging as an intentional teaching strategy. Studies suggest that teachers often engage in translanguaging unconsciously (Canagarajah, 2011), highlighting the need for a more deliberate and structured approach to using multiple languages in instruction.

Additionally, there is a noticeable disconnect between MoNE's language policies and international standards, such as the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (CEFR). While CEFR promotes a multilingual approach to language learning, MoNE does not provide clear guidelines on translanguaging, creating uncertainty for educators about how much flexibility they have in incorporating students' native languages into instruction.

Translanguaging also holds significant potential for improving language learning in university preparatory programs, yet this area remains largely unexplored. These programs aim to help students progress from A1 to B1 proficiency levels within a short period, making effective teaching strategies essential. However, little research has been conducted on how translanguaging could facilitate this process. Furthermore, there is a lack of practical models to assist preparatory school instructors in incorporating translanguaging into their teaching methods.

To address these gaps, future research should investigate both student and teacher perspectives on translanguageing while also assessing its impact on classroom practices. Additionally, more training programs and instructional resources should be developed to help educators implement translanguageing effectively. Further studies should also examine its role in improving writing skills and explore ways to align MoNE's language policies with CEFR's multilingual approach. Moreover, researchers should focus on how translanguageing can be systematically integrated into university preparatory programs to enhance students' language development. By filling these gaps, translanguageing can be better understood and effectively applied in Turkish EFL education, ultimately making language learning more accessible and beneficial for students.

Existing research on translanguageing in Turkey remains relatively new, particularly in EFL settings, where it primarily involves the integration of Turkish (L1) and English (TL). Yuvayapan (2019) examined English language teachers' perceptions and actual use of L1 in classrooms through questionnaires, class observations, and interviews. The study found that teachers generally held positive attitudes toward translanguageing, recognizing its benefits in certain situations. Specifically, the use of Turkish in classrooms was found to support students with lower proficiency levels by improving participation, clarifications, vocabulary explanation, classroom management, interaction, and teacher-student rapport. However, teachers also noted constraints associated with translanguageing in EFL settings. Institutional policies, expectations from colleagues, and parental concerns often discouraged the use of L1 in classrooms. Additionally, some teachers questioned the long-term effectiveness of translanguageing for English language acquisition, with many resorting to L1 simply to save time and keep up with the curriculum (Yuvayapan, 2019).

Similarly, Yüzlü & Dikilitaş (2021) investigated the impact of planned translanguageing pedagogies on EFL learners' four language skills, as well as their perceptions of its classroom implementation in high schools. The study employed an experimental design, with treatment groups receiving ten weeks of instruction incorporating translanguageing, while two control groups were taught using the grammar-translation method and the communicative language teaching approach. The results demonstrated that planned translanguageing practices had a positive impact on students' overall English language proficiency. Additionally, students reported various cognitive,

interactive, and affective benefits, including enhanced meaning-making, autonomous learning, bilingual and metalinguistic awareness, negotiation and clarification skills, and a greater sense of comfort and motivation in learning and using English.

The study also offered valuable insights for teachers and teacher educators regarding the pedagogical implementation of translanguaging. First, a structured and contextually appropriate use of Turkish and English as both instructional and interactive languages should be encouraged in EFL classrooms. Second, educators should reconsider strict monolingual policies and explore ways to incorporate translanguaging into curricula by developing suitable teaching materials and assessment frameworks (Yüzlü & Dikilitaş, 2021).

By addressing these research gaps and refining pedagogical approaches, translanguaging can be more effectively implemented in Turkish EFL education, ultimately enhancing students' language learning experiences.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

This chapter begins with the research design, which clarifies the type of research that will be used to collect data, and then moves on to the study participants. The third stage will focus on the research questions that will be utilised to answer the study's enquiries, and the fourth, fifth, and sixth parts will detail data-gathering devices. The seventh point will be an introduction to data gathering procedures, followed by information regarding data analysis in the eighth part. Finally, the reliability and validity of the study will be discussed.

3.1. Design of Research

In the study, qualitative and quantitative methods were blended to investigate the issue from several directions. Combining these two approaches inside a single framework gives mixed methods research a great way to approach difficult research subjects. This approach uses the benefits of both qualitative and quantitative data, thereby providing possibly not feasible depth with each method by itself (Molina & Azorín, 2010). It also addresses the disadvantages of reliance solely on one strategy, therefore enhancing the knowledge about the research question (Johnson & Onwuegbuzie, 2004; Denscombe, 2008).

Usually with an eye towards the goals of the study, e.g., triangulation or complementarity, the timing of data collecting simultaneous or sequential and the relative emphasis on qualitative rather than quantitative methods have researchers proposed several frameworks for classifying mixed methods designs. For example, Leech & Onwuegbuzie (2009) typology provides valuable guidance for selecting appropriate designs, therefore enabling better integration of multiple data sources.

This work answered the research issue completely using a convergent parallel mixed-methods approach. This well-established approach assigns equal relevance to both quantitative and qualitative data by means of concurrent collecting and analysis. While under analysis, the data remain distinct; throughout the interpretation stage, they are

merged to help provide a consistent understanding of the findings (Creswell & Clark, 2017).

The study asked students' opinions about translanguaging using a quantitative survey. While qualitative data gathered via interviews was investigated using inductive content analysis, the results of this survey were subjected to statistical analysis. Creswell & Poth (2018) say this qualitative approach lets themes and categories show up straight from the data, free from the constraints of past beliefs or theoretical frameworks. When little past research has been conducted, this makes it particularly useful for exploratory research.

Creswell & Guetterman (2019) outline some fundamental aspects of qualitative research.

- Examining a problem to acquire a clear knowledge of its main features.
- Using the literature review to justify the research problem in a concise yet meaningful manner.
- Formulating open-ended research questions to capture participants' authentic experiences.
- Collecting insights from a smaller group of individuals through interviews or visual data to delve into their perspectives.
- Analyzing texts to identify themes and patterns while interpreting the findings within a broader context.
- Employing adaptable and reflective approaches, recognizing the researcher's own biases and perspectives.

Creswell & Creswell (2018) claim that the side-by-side approach generates quantitative data first, then a study of qualitative themes either supporting or refuting the statistical conclusions. Alternatively, comparisons to the quantitative findings can follow first the qualitative data. In this study, the quantitative results were presented initially, creating a foundation for linking them to the qualitative insights. This approach helped clarify the relationship between the two data sets, aligning with Creswell & Clark's (2017) emphasis on integrating qualitative perspectives with quantitative data to uncover the subtleties of complex research questions.

3.2. Participants

The research took place during the Fall Semester of the 2024-2025 Academic Year at İstanbul Esenyurt University. Given the practical challenges of data collection, such as time constraints and the need for easy access to participants, the convenience sampling method emerged as the most suitable method. As described by Etikan et al. (2016), this approach allows researchers to select participants who are readily available and meet specific criteria, making the process more efficient. Since the study focused on students, it made sense to recruit participants from within the researcher's own institution, ensuring a smoother and more manageable data collection process.

Creswell&Creswell (2018) note that the convenience sampling method is especially useful in educational research, where researchers often face limitations in time and resources. Similarly, Dornyei (2007) highlights its frequent use in applied linguistics and education studies due to its practicality in institutional settings. In this study, convenience sampling enabled direct communication with participants, contributed to a high response rate, and allowed data to be gathered efficiently. While the method has some limitations, particularly regarding generalizability, its advantages in terms of accessibility and feasibility made it the best fit for this research.

Primarily, the participants of the study were taken from students taking English lessons through distance learning. Additionally, students attending face-to-face lessons were also included, and these students were from Prep Classes, Civil Aviation and Cabin Services, and Tourist Guide programs.

Table 1.

Programs Offering EFL Courses at Esenyurt University

Distance Learning	Face to face Learning
School of Physical Education and Sports	Preparatory School of English
Faculty of Business and Management Sciences	Civil Aviation and Cabin Services Program
Vocational School	Civil Aviation and Cabin Services Program
Faculty of Engineering and Architecture	
Faculty of Health Sciences	
Vocational School of Health Sciences	
Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences	

As shown in Table 1, for this study, all EFL departments in the Distance Learning and Preparatory School of English, Civil Aviation and Cabin Services Program and Tourist Guidance Program in face-to-face learning were selected. Most of the departments providing EFL courses were meant to be included in this study in order to obtain a thorough and deeper understanding about students' attitudes towards translanguaging in the school.

The study participants were selected randomly from both distant learning and face-to-face learning environments. Students who are in School of Physical Education and Sports, Faculty of Business and Management Sciences, Vocational School, Faculty of Engineering and Architecture, Faculty of Health Sciences, Vocational School of Health Sciences, Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences, Preparatory School of English, Civil Aviation and Cabin Services Program, Tourist Guidance Program took part in the study.

Table 2.

Number of the Participants

Name of the Academic Department	Number of Students	Interviewed Participants	Surveyed Participants
Distance Learning			
School of Physical Education and Sports			
Faculty of Business and Management Sciences			
Vocational School			
Faculty of Engineering and Architecture			
Faculty of Health Sciences			
Vocational School of Health Sciences			
Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences			
TOTAL	1812	15	410
Face to face Learning			
Preparatory School of English			
Civil Aviation and Cabin Services Program			
Tourist Guidance Program			
TOTAL	126	9	51
SUBTOTAL	1938	24	461

According to Table 2, there are a total of 1812 students enrolled in distance learning, while face-to-face learning students total 126, making the overall number of participants 1938. Among the interviewed participants, 15 are distance learning

students, and 9 are face-to-face learning students. For the survey, 410 participants are from distance learning, whereas 51 are from face-to-face learning.

3.3. Research Questions

Regarding students' perceptions of translanguaging in an EFL context, the following research questions were employed:

1. What are the students' attitudes towards translanguaging in an EFL context?
 - Do students' attitudes towards translanguaging differ significantly according to the gender variable?
 - Do students' attitudes towards translanguaging differ significantly according to the English proficiency level variable?
2. What language-related difficulties do EFL students encounter?
3. What kinds of translanguaging techniques do college students employ in their coursework?

3.4. Data Collection Instruments

To figure out the research problems in this study, multiple types of data rather than depending on a single data source was collected. Data collection instruments such as an interview and a questionnaire were implemented. To discover students' perspectives on translanguaging within an EFL context, the translanguaging strategies employed by students, and the language-related obstacles they encounter during their studies, qualitative research interview was carried out. Qualitative research is a method that emphasises exploring and comprehending social phenomena within their context, grounded in the development of theories. Cresswell (2013, p. 48) states that qualitative research is done as a problem or issue that should be discovered, and this discovery is necessary due to the need to study a group or universe, to identify variables that cannot be easily measured, or to hear silenced voices.

In the study, it was aimed to determine what the opinions of the students were about the concept of translanguaging. It is aimed to describe the current situation of the students regarding the concept of translanguaging so that perceptions and events are presented realistically and holistically in the natural environment. However, it is possible for people to understand and interpret the same events differently in the same environment. This is a survey, etc., of the diversity of interpretations and concept

richness. During the study, individual interview with EFL students was done. Interviews were carried out as semi-structured interviews with open-ended questions. Thus, it was aimed to reveal what meaning do the students attribute to the concept of translanguaging and what their experiences are from their perspectives.

3.5. Open-Ended Interview Questions for EFL Students

Interviews designed for EFL students were taken from (Küçük, 2018) which was derived from the research conducted by Shifidi (2014). It was edited by the researcher for the target group. In the last quarter of the twentieth century, the interview technique has taken its place as an effective data collection method in many social science fields. Patton (1987) states that the goal of the interview is to look into the individual's inner world and grasp their perspective. The standardized open-ended interview technique consists of a series of carefully written and sequenced questions that are asked to each individual in the same style and order (Patton, 1987, p.112). By systematically asking the same questions to the interviewees in the same order, interviewer influence and subjective judgments are minimized and the data obtained are easier to compare and analyze. It can also be used effectively in situations where more than one interviewer is to be used. It also reduces differences in responses that may be due to interviewers' skills, biases or subjectivity. While editing the open-ended questions guiding statements, asking questions with yes or no answers and asking multidimensional questions were avoided.

The open-ended questionnaire consisted of six sections. Section 1 of the interview had questions designed to gather demographic information from the participants. Section 2 of the interview was designed to gather information regarding the prevalence of translanguaging procedures in the classroom. Section 3 looks for information on translanguaging frequency practices. Section 4 tries to explain how students view translanguaging. Section 5 included questions regarding language-related issues that students encounter and techniques they use in an EFL environment to help them solve these issues. Section 6 was designed to provide an opportunity for last comments on translanguaging. The interview questions for EFL students are presented in Appendix

3.6. Adapted Questionnaire on Translanguaging

To fulfil the goal of the study, a questionnaire for EFL students was used. The questionnaire was taken from (Küçük, 2018) study. In her study, she intended to analyse and evaluate current translanguaging practices in the context of Turkish higher education, specifically referencing Adana Science and Technology University (Adana STU). The questionnaire items were derived by the researcher from the research of Baker (2011), Dykhanova (2015), Levine (2003), and Van der Walt (2006).

Four items in Section Four of the questionnaire were modified by the researcher in line with Levine's (2003) study. These questions were meant to probe students' opinions on two important subjects, the English-only policy and the use of their first tongue, both of which are key to this study. Eight further questions, covering issues including lecturer translanguaging, teaching tools, and instructional methodologies, came from Van der Walt's (2006) work. Nine questions were modified from the findings of Dykhanova's (2015) to ensure a match with the specific objectives of the study. Carefully crafted to capture students' perceptions of translanguaging and its numerous applications, the questionnaire as a whole in Baker's (2011) study asked one last question on attitudes on the functional elements of translanguaging.

Inspired by (Küçük, 2018), the Likert scale was adjusted and ready comprised in four portions with 25 items. The demographic information of pupils comes first on the questionnaire. There are 3 items about the gender, mother tongue and their English Level. A five-point Likert scale was used in Sections 2 and 3 in determining students' agreement or disagreement with 8 statements about translanguaging and 8 items about the English Only Policy. The final section of the questionnaire featured six statements that asked students to indicate how often they utilise specific study techniques.

After the questionnaire was prepared, reliability was calculated by the researcher as ($\alpha = .825$) in “English only policy” dimension, ($\alpha = .846$) in “Translanguaging” dimension, .638 (ICC3,2) in “Frequency of translanguaging in classroom” dimension and ($\alpha = .731$) for overall scale.

3.7. Data Collection Procedures

First of all, with regards to the context of the study, students from the Distance Learning, Preparatory School of English, Civil Aviation and Cabin Services Program and Tourist Guidance Program were chosen randomly. The study utilised both a

standardised open-ended interview questionnaire and an adapted survey questionnaire to gather data and gain insights into students' views on Translanguaging.

The standardized open-ended interview questionnaire was distributed to be answered later after school so that students would be more comfortable and sincere, as there was no time limit. After completing the questionnaire they handed in their papers. Students anonymously answered 17 open-ended questions. The surveys were labelled P1, P2, etc. "P" stands for "Participants".

As for the survey, Google Forms was used. Vasantha Raju & Harinarayana (2016) noted that Google Forms has gained popularity in online survey research because it offers access from anywhere at any time, along with other advantages like unlimited surveys and being completely free. In order to make the survey data collection fast and effective the survey was formed with Google forms and the link was given to the students. The students were able to answer the survey questions outside of the school via their mobiles or computers.

As there are students whose English levels are very low, in order to surpass linguistic barriers they were allowed to answer in Turkish. In order to fulfil this a Turkish versions of interview forms were prepared. After preparing the Turkish version of the questionnaires they were checked by professionals in order to abstain from misunderstandings. Once the interviews were conducted, they were translated into English by the researcher. After completing the online survey, the whole data was transferred into SPSS at once, and this hindered any possible mistakes in entering data to SPSS.

3.8. Data Analysis

The mixed approach was utilised in the current study, moreover, the collected data was analysed using the relevant data analysis methodologies based on the type of the data. Qualitative and quantitative data analyses were performed separately and the resulting information was used to interpret the total results to determine if the findings confirmed or contradicted each other. The survey questionnaire was analysed using Descriptive Statistics principles with the help of (SPSS, Version 23.0). A numerical value was assigned to each variable in the survey questions to facilitate data coding in SPSS.

Firstly, the number of participants who replied to the questions, along with the standard deviation and mean scores for each closed-ended item, were reported in tables. After that, a normality test was made using SPSS.

Table 3.

Tests of Normality

	Kolmogorov-Smirnova			Shapiro-Wilk			Skewness		Kurtosis	
	Statistic	df	Sig.	Statistic	df	Sig.	Statistic	df	Statistic	df
MEAN	0.08	461	0	0.94	461	0	0,3		2,8	

p<0.05

According to Table 3, the p-value (Sig.) is less than 0.05, which means the null hypothesis (data is normally distributed) is rejected. This suggests that the data distribution significantly deviates from normality. As for the Shapiro-Wilk test, similarly, the p-value is less than 0.05, confirming that the data is not normally distributed.

But with 461 cases, the sample size is large, which can make these tests sensitive. Even slight deviations from normality might result in a significant p-value. A sample size of 461 indicates a large dataset that diminishes the impact of minor deviations from normality in statistical analysis.

With 461 data points, the large sample size ensures the results are reliable, even if the data isn't perfectly normal. This is thanks to the Central Limit Theorem. Although the normality tests (Shapiro-Wilk, Kolmogorov-Smirnov) flagged the data as not perfectly normal, the histogram and Q-Q plot show it's close enough for a t-test to work well.

The skewness and kurtosis values provide insight into how well the data aligns with a normal distribution. The skewness values for The Policy of Just English, Translanguaging, and Translanguaging Strategies are all 0.349, indicating a slight positive skew. This suggests that the distribution is slightly right-tailed, but since the values fall within the acceptable range of ± 1 , the deviation from normality is minimal and not a major concern.

The kurtosis values for all three scales are 2.875, which indicates a slightly leptokurtic distribution, meaning the data may be more peaked than a perfectly normal

distribution. However, since the value is below 3, it does not suggest an excessive number of outliers, and the distribution remains close to normal.

Overall, the data appears to be reasonably normally distributed, with only minor deviations. Given these values, parametric tests such as the t-test can be appropriately applied.

Secondly, inductive content analysis was utilised to examine the qualitative data obtained from interviews. Interviews were transcribed and archived separately. In order to label the participants, the written form was labelled as “P1, P2” to represent the participants. The written data was repeatedly reviewed to obtain a comprehensive understanding of the information. The results were categorised to facilitate the interpretation and discussion of the findings. The findings were organised into themes based on the collected data in relation to the research questions.

The content analysis was conducted using the guidelines established by Flick (2009, p. 326). He lists the main steps of content analysis:

1. Establishing the units of analysis.
2. Rewording the pertinent sections of the text.
3. Determining the necessary level of abstraction for the paraphrasing.
4. Reducing and deleting data (for instance, eliminating paraphrases that convey the same meaning).
5. Streamlining information by merging and synthesising paraphrases to match the necessary level of abstraction.
6. Organising the new statements into a categorised system.
7. Evaluating the new category system in comparison to the original data.

The raw data collected through interviews was analysed and interpreted, and the findings were reported by presenting relevant sections.

3.8.1. Thematic analysis process. Thematic analysis is a qualitative research method used to identify, analyze, and interpret patterns within data. In this study, thematic analysis was employed to examine students' attitudes toward translanguaging. The following steps outline the analytical process in detail:

3.8.1.1. Data familiarization. The first step involved thoroughly reviewing the raw data, which consisted of students' responses regarding their perceptions of translanguaging. In this phase:

- The data was read multiple times to develop familiarity with the content.
- Key phrases and notable responses were identified.
- Initial observations and reflections were noted.

This step was crucial for gaining an overall understanding of the data before proceeding with coding.

3.8.1.2. Initial coding. The next step involved coding, where the data was broken down into meaningful segments. The process included:

- Analyzing responses at the sentence or meaning-unit level.
- Assigning short descriptive labels (codes) to specific ideas or recurring patterns.
- Organizing similar responses under common codes.

For example:

- *"Sometimes, my English vocabulary is insufficient, and I feel the need to use my native language."* → Code: "Using translanguaging to compensate for vocabulary gaps"
- *"When dealing with abstract or complex topics, translanguaging helps me understand better."* → Code: "Facilitating comprehension of complex topics"
- *"At beginner levels, translanguaging is very helpful, but it should be reduced in advanced levels."* → Code: "Role of translanguaging at different proficiency levels"

3.8.1.3. Identifying and defining themes. Once the codes were generated, they were analyzed for patterns and grouped into broader themes. This step involved:

Clustering related codes to form overarching themes.

Ensuring that each theme captured a distinct aspect of the data.

Evaluating how the themes addressed the research question.

For example, the codes "Using translanguaging to compensate for vocabulary gaps", "Facilitating comprehension of complex topics", and "Clarifying meaning" were consolidated under the theme "The Role of Translanguaging in Comprehension."

The final themes identified in the study were:

1. The Role of Translanguaging in Comprehension
2. Cognitive and Memory-Related Effects
3. Linguistic Balance: Advantages and Drawbacks of Translanguaging
4. Supportive Role for Beginner-Level Learners
5. Teachers' Use of Translanguaging
6. The Importance of Bilingual Materials
7. The Role of Translanguaging in Multicultural Classrooms

3.8.1.4. Reviewing and refining themes. After identifying the themes, they were carefully reviewed to ensure coherence and accuracy. This phase included:

- Assessing whether each theme was relevant to the research question.
- Refining the categorization of certain codes to enhance clarity.
- Examining relationships between themes and making necessary adjustments.

For instance:

- The theme “Linguistic Balance” was initially labeled as “Advantages and Disadvantages of Translanguaging,” but the new title was chosen to better reflect the nuanced perspectives found in the data.
- The subtheme “The Role of Translanguaging for Beginners” was kept separate from “The Role of Translanguaging in Comprehension” because it focused on a different aspect of language learning.

3.8.2. Writing the thematic analysis. Once the themes were finalized, they were systematically written up in a clear and structured manner:

Each theme was elaborated upon using direct student quotes as supporting evidence.

- The findings were linked to relevant literature to provide theoretical grounding.
- The relationships between themes were discussed to ensure logical flow.

For example, in the section “The Role of Translanguaging in Comprehension,” students' perspectives were analyzed alongside existing research on bilingual cognitive processes. Through this thematic analysis, a comprehensive understanding of students' attitudes toward translanguaging was obtained. The themes provided valuable insights into the perceived benefits, limitations, and contextual applications of translanguaging

in higher education EFL settings. By organizing the data into structured themes, the study effectively captured the complexity of students' experiences and perspectives. This process ultimately contributed to a well-structured and academically rigorous analysis, ensuring that the findings were both meaningful and relevant to the research objectives.

3.9. Reliability and Validity of the Study

As the study relies on both qualitative and quantitative methods, there were different precautions taken to ensure both reliability and validity. In terms of ensuring quantitative reliability after implementing the survey questionnaire, reliability was calculated.

Table 4.

Reliability, Mean and Standard Deviations of the Variables

Scale	Items number	Cronbach's alpha	Mean	Std. Deviation
The Policy of Just English	8	.89	24.5	7.2
Translanguaging	8	.90	16.5	6.2
Translanguaging strategies	6	.70	13.6	3.4

The reliability results in Table 4 show that the scales used in the study are generally consistent and dependable. The Policy of Just English scale, which includes eight items, has a Cronbach's alpha of 0.894, indicating strong reliability and showing that the items effectively measure the intended concept. Similarly, the Translanguaging scale, also with eight items, demonstrates excellent reliability with a Cronbach's alpha of 0.907. In contrast, the Translanguaging Strategies scale, consisting of six items, has a slightly lower Cronbach's alpha of 0.707. While this is still within the acceptable range, it suggests there may be room to refine the items to strengthen the overall consistency of the scale.

The descriptive statistics provide further insights into the scales. The Policy of Just English scale has the highest mean score (24.525), along with a relatively wide spread of responses, as reflected by its standard deviation of 7.267. The Translanguaging scale, with a mean of 16.594 and a standard deviation of 6.279, shows a somewhat moderate level of agreement among participants, with varied responses. Meanwhile,

the Translanguaging Strategies scale has the lowest mean (13.642) and the smallest standard deviation (3.451), indicating that participants' responses were more consistent. Overall, the scales appear to be reliable and provide meaningful insights into the study, although the Translanguaging Strategies scale might benefit from a closer review to improve its internal consistency.

In qualitative studies, reliability indicates that an instrument's scores are reliable and consistent. Creswell, (2019) defines reliability as scores being almost identical when the instrument is administered many times at different times and in addition, he says that scores must be consistent. From this point of view, reliability was fulfilled via explaining the data collection and analysis phases in detail, in order to help researchers who want to apply the study elsewhere. Also, to ensure reliability in another way in the research, the method and stages of the research were explained clearly and in detail and detailed information was given about the method.

As for validity Creswell, (2019) defines it as being based on accuracy and credibility, not numerical precision like quantitative research and it ensures researchers' interpretations match participants' realities and some strategies were put forward as:

- Triangulation: Corroborates evidence from different sources, methods, or data types to enhance accuracy.
- Member Checking: Engages participants in verifying the researcher's interpretations of their statements or actions.
- External Auditing: Involves an independent review of the research process to identify strengths and weaknesses.

In this direction, the interviews were written on forms and the forms were kept. In addition, direct quotations were used in the analysis phase. While doing this, no changes were made in the quotations.

CHAPTER IV

FINDINGS

The results of the current study are presented in this chapter. First, the results of the survey that was given to EFL students are shown. The results of the interviews with EFL students are then presented.

4.1. The Analysis of the Quantitative Questionnaire Applied to EFL Students

4.1.1. Descriptive information of participants. To collect data about descriptive information, participants were asked about their gender, Mother tongue, Foreign language, department and English language proficiency. Descriptive statistics of background information of students are presented in Table 5 below in detail.

Table 5.
Demographic Characteristics of Participants

	(f)	(%)
Gender		
Male	174	37.7
Female	287	62.3
Mother Tongue		
Arabic	16	3.5
Azerbaijani	1	.2
English	7	1.5
Farisi	7	1.5
French	1	.2
Kurdish	6	1.3
Mongolian	1	.2
Pulaar	1	.2
Russian	3	.7
Somalian	1	.2
Turkish	416	90.2
Turkmenese	1	.2
Foreign Language		
Arabic	4	.9
English	397	86.1
Farisi	1	.2
French	1	.2
Mongolian	1	.2
Spanish	1	.2
Turkish	56	12.1

Table 5 offers insights into the demographic profile of the survey participants. Among the 461 respondents, the majority were female, accounting for 62.3% (n = 287) of the sample, with males comprising 37.7% (n = 174). In terms of native languages, Turkish was by far the most common, spoken by 90.2% (n = 416) of participants. A smaller number of respondents identified other mother tongues, such as Arabic (3.5%, n = 16) and Kurdish (1.3%, n = 6), while even fewer reported languages like English, Farisi, Russian, Azerbaijani, Pulaar, Mongolian, French, Somalian, and Turkmenese, each representing less than 2% of the group. Regarding foreign language proficiency, English emerged as the most frequently mentioned, with 86.1% (n = 397) of participants reporting fluency. Turkish followed as the second most noted foreign

language, spoken by 12.1% (n = 56). Other languages, such as Arabic, Farisi, French, Mongolian, and Spanish, were mentioned by a handful of participants, each making up less than 1% of responses. These results highlight the linguistic diversity within the group while underscoring the prominence of Turkish as a native language and English as a widely learned foreign language.

Table 6.

Departments of the Participants

	(f)	(%)
Department		
Anaesthesia	14	3.0
Business	34	7.4
Child Development	18	3.9
Civil Aviation Cabin Services	72	15.6
Coaching	3	.7
Computer Engineering	7	1.5
Computer Programming	31	6.7
Cookery	4	.9
Dental Prosthesis Technology	10	2.2
Electrical And Electronics Engine	7	1.5
First And Emergency Aid	18	3.9
Foreign Trade	13	2.8
Graphic Designing	7	1.5
Management Information Systems	16	3.5
Medical Imaging Techniques	18	3.9
Medical Laboratory Techniques	7	1.5
Midwifery	14	3.0
Nursing	54	11.7
Nutrition and Dietetics	2	.4
Occupational Health and Safety	6	1.3
Operating Room Services	15	3.3
Oral and Dental Health	17	3.7
Penal Enforcement and Security	4	.9
Political Science and International Relations	30	6.5
Psychology	2	.4
Public Relations Promotion	13	2.8
Sociology	4	.9
Tourist Guide	21	4.6
Total	461	100.0

Table 6 presents the distribution of students across various departments. Among the 461 participants, the largest group, accounting for 15.6% (n = 72), was enrolled in the Civil Aviation Cabin Services department. This was followed by students from the Nursing department, who made up 11.7% (n = 54) of the sample, and the Business department, representing 7.4% (n = 34). Political Science and International Relations students comprised 6.5% (n = 30), while 6.7% (n = 31) were in Computer Programming.

Smaller proportions of students were spread across departments such as Child Development, Medical Imaging Techniques, and First and Emergency Aid, each contributing 3.9% (n = 18) of the participants. Other notable departments included Tourist Guide (4.6%, n = 21), Operating Room Services (3.3%, n = 15), Anaesthesia (3.0%, n = 14), and Midwifery (3.0%, n = 14). Less commonly represented were disciplines such as Management Information Systems (3.5%, n = 16), Oral and Dental Health (3.7%, n = 17), and Graphic Designing (1.5%, n = 7).

A few departments had minimal representation, such as Sociology, Psychology, Cookery, and Penal Enforcement and Security, each with less than 1% of the participants. Overall, the data reflects a diverse range of academic specializations, with a noticeable concentration in healthcare, aviation, and business-related fields.

Table 7.

English Level of the Participants

	(f)	(%)
Level of English		
A1	216	46.9
A2	120	26.0
B1	82	17.8
B2	37	8.0
Total	455	98.7

Table 7 illustrates the English proficiency levels of the participants. Only 6 students did not express their level of English. The majority of students, 46.9% (n = 216), identified their English level as A1, indicating a basic understanding of the language. Following this, 26.0% (n = 120) reported an A2 level, reflecting a slightly higher degree of familiarity but still within the beginner range. A smaller group, 17.8% (n =

82), categorized their proficiency as B1, indicating an intermediate level of English skills.

Only 8.0% (n = 37) of the respondents reported a B2 level, demonstrating a more advanced command of the language. Out of the total participants, 98.7% (n = 455) responded to this question. These findings reveal that most students fall within the beginner to lower-intermediate range in terms of English proficiency, with relatively few achieving higher levels of fluency.

4.1.2. What are the students' attitudes towards translanguaging in an EFL context? The study included 461 participants in all. The mean and standard deviation scores of the items in each questionnaire part are displayed below in the context of descriptive statistics. Students' preferences for translanguaging or an English-only policy in EFL classes are displayed in Tables 8 and 9. Prior to presenting the overall conclusions, the individual outcomes are first provided.

Table 8.

Participants' Attitudes Towards the Policy of Just English.

The Policy of Just English	Mean	Median	Std. Deviation
1-(Only English should be used in classes)	3.1	3.0	1.2
2-(The more we use English in class, the more progress we make in English)	2.3	2.0	1.1
3-(I believe that English should be used a lot in lessons in order to master English)	2.4	2.0	1.1
4-(I do not think there is any situation that requires students to use their mother tongue in class)	3.2	3.0	1.2
5-(I believe that students should only use English in class, when studying together)	3.0	3.0	1.2
6-(While teaching, the instructor spends a lot of time switching from one language to another, from English to Turkish or vice versa)	3.4	4.0	1.1
7-(I get confused when the lecturer switches from English to Turkish (or vice versa) during the lecture)	3.4	4.0	1.2
8-(Using both my native language and English at the same time in class will cause my English to weaken)	3.5	4.0	1.1

Table 8 examines participants' attitudes toward the "Policy of Just English" in EFL classrooms, highlighting a range of opinions on the use of English versus the inclusion of students' mother tongue. The statement "Only English should be used in classes" received a mean score of 3.130, with a median of 3.000 and a standard deviation of 1.2855, reflecting a moderately neutral stance. Participants expressed even less agreement with the belief that greater English use directly translates to language progress, as seen in the statement "The more we use English in class, the more progress we make in English," which had a mean of 2.332, a median of 2.000, and a lower standard deviation of 1.1442. Similarly, "I believe that English should be used a lot in lessons to master English" scored 2.401, suggesting a degree of scepticism toward the necessity of exclusive English use for achieving mastery.

The responses also suggest mixed feelings about the need for mother tongue use in class. The statement "I do not think there is any situation that requires students to use

their mother tongue in class” had a mean score of 3.223, a median of 3.000, and a standard deviation of 1.2176, indicating that while some participants prefer minimizing the use of their native language, others see its value in certain contexts. Likewise, participants showed a moderately neutral response to the idea that “Students should only use English in class when studying together,” with a mean score of 3.002 and a median of 3.000.

Interestingly, participants expressed some discomfort with translanguaging practices. The statement “While teaching, the instructor spends a lot of time switching from one language to another” scored a mean of 3.451, and “I get confused when the lecturer switches from English to Turkish (or vice versa)” received a slightly higher mean of 3.484. Both statements had medians of 4.000, suggesting that many students feel that frequent language switching can be distracting or confusing. Similarly, the statement “Using both my native language and English at the same time in class will cause my English to weaken” had the highest mean score of 3.501, reflecting a common concern that translanguaging may hinder English proficiency.

Overall, the findings highlight a nuanced perspective on the "Policy of Just English." While some students favor the exclusive use of English, others recognize the occasional need for their mother tongue to support comprehension and collaboration. The relatively high agreement with concerns about translanguaging suggests that, for many students, minimizing language switching may enhance their learning experience. These insights emphasize the importance of balancing English immersion with strategic and purposeful use of the native language to address students' diverse learning needs.

Table 9.

Participants' Attitudes Towards Translanguaging.

Translanguaging	Mean	Median	Std. Deviation
9-(I want to use my mother tongue in my classes when I feel I need to.)	1.9	2.0	.9
10-(Using only English in class is not important as long as I fulfil my responsibilities in class)	2.7	3.0	1.1
11-(It should not be a problem to speak with my classmates in our mother tongue during class activities.)	2.0	4.0	.9
12-(I benefit from the fact that the lecturer uses both English and my mother tongue at the same time in the lessons).	1.9	2.0	.9
13-(It is beneficial for me if the lecturer uses course materials in English and my mother tongue)	1.9	2.0	.9
14-(I will benefit more from the lessons if the lecturer presents the vocabulary used in the lessons both in English and in my mother tongue.)	1.9	2.0	.9
15-(Using both my mother tongue and English at the same time helps me to understand the course content better.)	1.9	2.0	.9
16-(Using both my mother tongue and English at the same time in class helps me to improve my English.)	1.9	2.0	1.0

Table 9 explores participants' attitudes toward translanguaging strategies in EFL classrooms, shedding light on how they perceive the use of their mother tongue alongside English. The responses suggest a nuanced perspective, with students generally favoring a flexible approach to language use. For instance, the statement "I want to use my mother tongue in my classes when I feel I need to" had a mean score of 1.959, a median of 2.000, and a standard deviation of 0.9671, reflecting a slight preference for using the native language selectively. Similarly, "Using only English in class is not important as long as I fulfil my responsibilities in class" showed a higher mean of 2.753, with a median of 3.000, indicating that many participants prioritize task completion over strict adherence to an English-only policy.

The role of the mother tongue in peer interactions was another area of interest. The statement "It should not be a problem to speak with my classmates in our mother tongue during class activities" had a mean of 2.067 and a median of 4.000, revealing a split in opinions, with some participants expressing strong support for this practice. Additionally, participants acknowledged the benefits of translanguaging in lessons. Statements such as "I benefit from the fact that the lecturer uses both English and my

mother tongue at the same time in the lessons" (Mean = 1.998) and "It is beneficial for me if the lecturer uses course materials in both English and my mother tongue" (Mean = 1.991) show a slight agreement with the use of dual-language strategies.

When it comes to understanding and improving English, students expressed a modest preference for translanguaging. For example, the statement "Using both my mother tongue and English at the same time helps me to understand the course content better" had a mean of 1.926, while "Using both my mother tongue and English at the same time in class helps me to improve my English" scored slightly higher with a mean of 1.996. Both results highlight that students perceive translanguaging as a helpful, albeit supplementary, tool for learning.

Overall, the results show that students want a balanced approach to language use, where their home tongue is used to help them understand and communicate without making English less important. The low standard deviation values across the assertions indicate that participants had consistent attitudes, emphasising the potential for translanguaging tactics to foster a more supportive and inclusive EFL learning environment.

Table 10.

Participants' Attitudes Towards Translanguaging Strategies

Translanguaging strategies	Mean	Median	Std. Deviation
17-(I take notes in my mother tongue regardless of the language used by the lecturer or the language used in the activities.)	2.4	3.0	.9
18-(I take notes in the language used by the lecturer in the lesson.)	2.3	3.0	.8
19-(While taking notes in class, I find that I switch from English to Turkish or vice versa without realising it)	2.7	3.0	.9
20-(I use my mother tongue when explaining a new concept related to the lesson to my classmate)	2.0	2.	.9
21-(I use my mother tongue when I need to ask a classmate about a concept in the lesson.)	1.9	2.0	.8
22-(I use my mother tongue when I need to check the meaning of a word or concept in a lesson.)	2.0	2.0	.9

Table 10 offers a thorough analysis of how students view and apply translanguaging techniques in EFL classrooms, therefore exposing complex trends in their usage of English and their mother tongue. The results reveal that note-taking habits are rather adaptable; the mean score of "I take notes in my mother tongue regardless of the language used by the lecturer or the language used in the activities" is 2.447 and the median is 3.000. This suggests that while some students prefer their native language for note-taking, many align their notes with the language used by the lecturer, as indicated by a similar mean of 2.390 and median of 3.000 for the statement "I take notes in the language used by the lecturer in the lesson." Additionally, the tendency to switch between languages while taking notes was higher, with a mean score of 2.755, highlighting the natural integration of both English and Turkish during note-taking activities.

Peer interactions show a slightly lower reliance on the native language. For example, "I use my mother tongue when explaining a new concept related to the lesson to my classmate" had a mean score of 2.067, while "I use my mother tongue when I need to ask a classmate about a concept in the lesson" scored slightly lower at 1.976. Both of the sentences represent approaches to using the mother tongue for working together, especially when coping with complex ideas.

The sentence, "I use my mother tongue when I need to check the meaning of a word or concept in a lesson" had an average score of 2.007 and a median score of 2.000. This shows that students see their First language as a useful tool for clarifying vocabulary and learning new concepts.

According to the statistics, pupils approach translanguaging techniques deliberately and with awareness of their surroundings. While English remains fundamental to their education, the use of their home language is a useful tool, especially for note-taking and peer interaction. The relatively low standard deviation values across all statements indicate a consistent trend in students' attitudes, emphasising translanguaging as a natural and beneficial technique in EFL courses. These insights emphasize the importance of allowing flexibility in language use to foster a more inclusive and effective learning environment.

4.1.3. Do students' attitudes towards translanguaging differ significantly according to the gender variable?

Table 11.

Independent Samples T-Test Results for Students' Attitudes towards Translanguaging by Gender

	Gender	N	X	sd	T-Test		
	Male	174	2.5	.39	t	sd	p
Translanguaging	Female	287	2.6	.38	2.4	459	.016

This study explored whether there is a difference in students' attitudes towards translanguaging based on their gender. The results from the descriptive statistics show that male students had an average attitude score of $X=2.5196$, $SD=0.395$, while female students scored slightly higher, with an average of $M=2.61$, $SD=0.385$. These findings suggest that female students tend to hold more positive attitudes towards translanguaging compared to their male counterparts (Table 11).

To determine whether this difference was statistically significant, an independent samples t-test was performed. The test revealed a meaningful difference between the two groups ($t(459)=-2.429$, $p=.016$). Since the p-value ($p=.016$) is below the threshold of $p<.05$, we can conclude that gender does indeed play a role in shaping students' attitudes towards translanguaging. Furthermore, Levene's test showed that the variances between the groups were equal ($F=0.085$, $p=.771$), so the assumption of equal variances was applied in the analysis.

In conclusion, the results indicate that gender does have a small but significant influence on students' attitudes towards translanguaging. Female students seem to show a marginally greater openness to translanguaging practices compared to their male counterparts. These findings highlight the importance of considering gender as a factor in the design and implementation of translanguaging strategies in EFL classrooms, ensuring that they address the preferences and needs of all learners effectively.

4.1.4. Do students' attitudes towards translanguaging differ significantly according to the english proficiency level variable? This study explored whether students' attitudes toward translanguaging differ based on their language proficiency levels. To analyze this, a one-way ANOVA test was conducted.

Table 12.

OneWay ANOVA Test Results for Students' Attitudes Towards Translanguaging by Level of English

Variable	A1		A2		B1		B2		
Translanguaging	X	SD	X	SD	X	SD	X	SD	f
	2,6	,40	2,5	,35	2,4	,34	2,4	,34	11.09

To explore whether students' attitudes towards translanguaging varied based on their level of English proficiency, a one-way ANOVA was conducted. The ANOVA results showed a significant difference in attitudes among the proficiency groups $F(3,451) = 11.019$, $p = 0.000$). This indicates that students' language levels play an important role in shaping their attitudes toward translanguaging. Students at the A1 level ($X = 2.682$) were much more optimistic than students in the other groups. The students at the A2 level ($X = 2.503$) were slightly more positive than those at the B1 ($X = 2.489$) and B2 ($X = 2.407$) levels, but the changes were not very important. There was no big change between the B1 level and the B2 level. B2 and B1 students showed the least positive attitudes. A2 students fell somewhere in the middle. A1 students were the most positive overall. Additionally, Levene's test ($p = 0.700$) confirmed that the assumption of equal variances was satisfied.

The results suggest that students' positivity toward translanguaging decreases as their language proficiency improves. This may be because lower-level learners, like those at A1, rely more on their native language for support. On the other hand, higher-level students, such as those at B1 and B2, might feel less dependent on such strategies and see them as less necessary. These findings highlight the importance of tailoring translanguaging strategies to different proficiency levels, ensuring that learners benefit from these approaches in ways that match their needs.

4.2. Analysis of Open-Ended Interviews Applied to EFL Students

4.2.1. Demographic information of the participants. Students from various departments were interviewed with an open-ended questionnaire for a better comprehension of their perspectives on translanguaging. In total, 24 students of which

16 were male and 8 were female students participated voluntarily. Students were randomly chosen from these departments: Economics and Finance, Business, Political Science, Electric and Electronic Engineering, International Trade and Finance / Faculty of Business and Administrative Sciences, Civil Aviation Cabin Services, Computer Technologies, and Software Engineering. As for mother tongues, students specified their mother tongues as English, Turkish, Persian, Somalian, French, Ukrainian, and Russian.

The responses to the question "Do you speak English outside of school?" can be grouped into three categories: frequent speakers, occasional speakers, and those who don't speak English at all outside of school. Just over half of the participants (52.2%) indicated that they regularly use English in their daily lives. These individuals often speak English with friends, family members, coworkers, or even strangers. Some individuals also said they practise English in private lessons or at work, while others say they use social media and the internet to talk to people in English.

A different group, making up 8.7% of the participants, said they use English seldom. For example, many mentioned they chat in English with friends once a week or for brief periods in specific circumstances. However, a significant percentage (26.1%) mentioned they never speak English outside of school. This could occur for a number of reasons, including lack of drive to practise, feeling inadequate of self, or lack of opportunity.

Many survey respondents want to use English in their daily life, whether through chats with friends, work conversations, private lessons or internet chats. Nevertheless, the group that avoids using English outside of the classroom emphasises the need to tackle any obstacles, such as improving self-confidence or enabling experiences in English-speaking surroundings. These findings provide a good basis for developing plans to promote English usage in academic and social spheres.

4.3. Interlingual Practices in Classes.

4.3.1. Minimal or no use of native language. Many students reported that they rarely or never use their mother tongue in the classroom, reflecting the strong emphasis placed on immersion in the target language. For instance, P1 stated, *"I only speak my native language with family; I never use it in class."* This illustrates a clear

distinction between academic and personal language, where the expectation in the classroom is that students should exclusively use English, leaving little room for the use of their native language. Some students might even view their mother tongue as a hindrance to their progress in learning English, believing that limiting their native language usage helps them focus better on acquiring the target language.

Similarly, P5 remarked, *"I don't use my native language in class because I am the only one who speaks it."* This statement highlights how the social dynamics in the classroom can influence language use. In environments where students come from diverse linguistic backgrounds, those whose mother tongue is less commonly spoken may feel uncomfortable or isolated when speaking in their native language, thus avoiding it to fit in. The absence of peers who share the same language reduces opportunities for students to connect with others who speak both languages, making them more likely to rely on the target language for communication.

Other students, like P2, shared a more nuanced perspective. They said, *"It is used very rarely. Since it has been like this from the beginning, my English proficiency did not improve because it was expected to be A0 level and taught only in English."* Here, P2 reflects on how the consistent avoidance of their native language from the outset may have hindered their learning process. This comment suggests that a more balanced approach, where the native language is occasionally used for clarification, might have improved their understanding and overall English proficiency, especially in the early stages.

On the other hand, some students expressed a greater degree of comfort with using their mother tongue in specific contexts. For example, P6 explained, *"I usually use my mother language when I share every day with African peoples and others."* For these students, using their native language is a means of social connection, particularly in informal settings with peers who share similar linguistic backgrounds. This highlights how the use of a mother tongue can serve a social function, facilitating communication and strengthening relationships within specific groups. In contrast, P7 said, *"I usually use my native language,"* and P8 shared, *"I use my native language very often for communication in classes, apart from English."* These students clearly feel more comfortable integrating their mother tongue into their daily classroom interactions, which might reflect a different learning environment or a higher degree of proficiency in both languages.

However, some students take a more hybrid approach. P9 noted, *"60% English, 40% Turkish,"* demonstrating a tendency to use both languages in a balanced way, perhaps depending on the context or the complexity of the topic at hand. This combination of languages allows students to leverage their full linguistic repertoire, making communication more fluid and efficient. Similarly, P19 stated, *"Mostly, when needed—especially with Turkish teachers,"* indicating that their native language use is often driven by specific situations, such as interacting with teachers who share their linguistic background.

For other students, native language use is quite rare. P4, for instance, stated, *"Rarely,"* while P22 remarked, *"Very rarely."* These responses indicate that these students predominantly stick to English, resorting to their mother tongue only when necessary. P23, however, expressed, *"I think that almost never,"* suggesting a minimal reliance on their native language, underscoring their preference for immersing themselves in English during class.

Finally, P24's comment, *"I use Russian in class only when I have to talk to my brother,"* adds an interesting perspective. For this student, their native language is used in a very specific, familial context, indicating that their mother tongue is not part of their regular classroom language practice but reserved for personal communication with close family members.

4.3.2. Occasional use of native language. Some students also noted that their native language is used in particular situations, not as a regular practice but in response to specific needs or contexts. For example, P7 mentioned, *"I usually use my native language,"* indicating a more frequent but still context-dependent use of their mother tongue. This suggests that while the use of the target language may be prioritized, there are times when students feel more comfortable switching to their native language for better understanding or clearer communication.

P18 shared *"Half of the lessons,"* showing that their use of the native language is substantial but not constant. This could indicate a more balanced approach where the native language is used when necessary to support comprehension or discussion but is not the default mode of communication. It reflects an environment where the student feels the need to switch between languages depending on the situation, such as when dealing with complex concepts or instructions.

P9 had an interesting take, saying, *"60% English, 40% Turkish."* This ratio highlights that the student integrates both languages into their learning experience in a fairly balanced manner. The use of Turkish may help clarify or emphasize certain points, while English remains the dominant language for the main content. This mix of languages suggests a flexible approach that adapts to the content and the student's comfort level.

Another student, P19, noted, *"Mostly, when needed—especially with Turkish teachers."* This reflects a more selective use of the native language, where it is utilized primarily when it seems beneficial for communication with a teacher who shares the same linguistic background. The relationship between teacher and student seems to influence whether or not the mother tongue is brought into the conversation.

P24 provided an intriguing perspective, stating, *"I use Russian in class only when I have to talk to my brother."* This comment suggests that the student's native language is reserved for specific, personal communication rather than academic use. The use of Russian is confined to moments of necessity, emphasizing the pragmatic reasons for switching languages when the situation demands it.

4.3.3. Balanced use of native and target languages. A few pupils reported that they use both their native language and English. For example, P9 stated, *"I use about 60% English and 40% Turkish."* This implies that combining the two languages can help students understand and participate in class. It also demonstrates how students use their language abilities to manage academic tasks and improve their English. The use of both languages allows students to clarify meanings, solidify concepts, and feel more confident in expressing themselves, especially when dealing with challenging topics.

P6 shared a similar sentiment, saying, *"I usually use my mother language when I share every day with African peoples and others."* This reflects a balanced use of native language and English in social contexts, where students adapt to their surroundings and utilize their first language when communicating with peers but still use English in more formal or academic settings. It suggests that the native language often serves as a bridge for connecting with others while still maintaining the primary focus on learning English.

P7 also expressed, *"I usually use my native language."* This may reflect the student's preference for comfort and ease of communication in their native language, but the consistent use of English throughout the course indicates that they may also rely on both languages to support academic understanding. This balanced approach could be useful in creating a more inclusive and flexible learning environment where students can shift between languages depending on their needs at the moment.

Another student, P3, explained, *"I use English a lot,"* but still may fall back on their native language when necessary for clarification or deeper understanding. This indicates that while English is the dominant language used in the classroom, students maintain a level of flexibility by relying on their native language when comprehension challenges arise, thus promoting a more well-rounded approach to language learning. In this way, students who balance both their native language and English in the classroom can navigate between two linguistic systems, allowing them to better manage the complexities of academic tasks. The strategic use of both languages enables them to optimize their learning experience, making sense of new information while maintaining a connection to their linguistic identity.

4.3.4. Frequent use of native language. Some students said they used their original language a lot, which goes against the idea of teaching a language through immersion. P8 told us, *"I often use my native language for communication in class."* This could happen when students speak the same first language, which makes the class more relaxed. It could also mean that they don't practice English as much. The frequent use of the native language in these contexts may create a more comfortable environment but could hinder the development of English proficiency, especially if students rely too heavily on their first language.

P4 also shared, *"Rarely, but sometimes I use my native language when I'm with friends in class."* While this indicates that their native language isn't always the first choice, it suggests that social interactions or group settings encourage the use of the mother tongue more often. This highlights the influence of peer relationships on language choice, as students may feel more at ease using their native language in informal interactions.

P19, another student mentioned, *"Mostly, when needed—especially with Turkish teachers."* This reveals that the teacher's linguistic background can also affect language

use. When students share the same first language as the teacher, they may feel it is acceptable to use their native tongue during lessons, which can foster a sense of community but also limit their immersion in the target language.

In a similar vein, P5 said, *"I don't use my native language in class because I am the only one who speaks it,"* but this might not be the case when a student shares the same language with classmates. In such instances, they might default to using their first language frequently for ease of communication, which could lead to missed opportunities to strengthen their English language skills.

These examples illustrate how the frequent use of a student's native language in class, whether due to peer influence or comfort with the teacher, can limit the immersion experience and potentially reduce the time spent actively engaging with English.

4.3.5. Using translanguaging for clarity. Many pupils claimed they mix languages in order to grasp challenging materials or concepts. P2 said, *"At lower levels, students start by clarifying in their native tongue, which helps them improve later."* This demonstrates how knowing two languages could help one develop before switching entirely to English. It suggests that translanguaging, especially at early stages, provides a supportive tool for comprehension, allowing students to lay a foundation before fully immersing in the target language.

Similarly, P8 remarked, *"I try it when the text gets too hard to understand."* Students tend to adopt this approach just as needed and then go back to English. This highlights that translanguaging is a strategic method employed in response to difficulties, helping students overcome barriers in their learning without relying exclusively on their native language.

P19 also mentioned, *"When I don't understand a specific topic or vocabulary, I use my native language to clarify the meaning before switching back to English."* This illustrates how students apply their native language as a temporary support mechanism when they face comprehension challenges, then seamlessly transition back to the target language.

P17 shared, *"I use my first language to understand the meaning of new words, especially when they're very technical."* This demonstrates the importance of translanguaging in grasping specialized or complex vocabulary, which students might

find difficult to understand in the target language without initial clarification in their native language.

P5 noted, *"When I get stuck, I use my native language to explain things to myself before continuing in English."* This response highlights the use of translanguaging as a self-regulation strategy. By using their native language to work through confusion or uncertainty, students can continue to progress in the target language with greater confidence.

These quotations emphasize how translanguaging, especially when students encounter difficult topics or words, serves as an important tool for clarification. It enables them to manage challenges in learning while maintaining a steady progression toward mastering the target language.

4.3.6. Overcoming language barriers. When pupils find it difficult to articulate their ideas, some resort to translanguaging. P10 remarked, *"I use it when I'm stuck,"* and P9 followed with, *"I don't prefer it, but sometimes I need it."* These illustrations demonstrate how translanguaging is a conscious means of maintaining ongoing communication. P19 also clarified, *"I use it when I don't understand a topic or vocabulary or when talking to a friend."* This indicates that in multilingual classrooms, translanguaging is not only helpful for learning but also for fostering social ties.

P3 explained, *"Sometimes, I use my native language to clarify technical words or phrases that are difficult to understand in English."* This highlights the importance of switching to a familiar language to bridge the gap when complex terms or concepts arise, which might hinder comprehension in the target language.

P13 shared, *"When the subject is too difficult, I use both languages to break it down for myself."* This shows that students use translanguaging as a cognitive strategy to decode difficult material, allowing them to move past barriers and understand better.

P17 also stated, *"I find it useful to switch between languages when a particular concept is hard to grasp. It helps me understand the idea faster."* This demonstrates that the use of both languages in tandem helps students overcome cognitive challenges and process new information effectively.

P20 noted, *"I sometimes translate things into my own language when I can't find the right words in English. It helps me get the idea across."* This shows that students may

rely on their native language not only to understand difficult concepts but also to communicate effectively when struggling to express themselves in English.

These quotations further emphasize that translanguaging is not merely a convenience but an essential tool for overcoming language barriers, aiding students both in learning and in communication within multilingual classrooms.

4.3.7. Context-based use. Students' usage of translanguaging usually reflects the circumstances. P11 noted, for example, *"I use it when explaining a topic in a way everyone understands."* This indicates its worth in enabling the entire class to grasp. Likewise, P14 said, *"I use it for technical topics."* Translanguaging seems especially helpful for elucidating specialised or sophisticated vocabulary.

P7 added, *"When asked a question and when necessary, I use my native language."* This suggests that students do not rely on translanguaging constantly but rather employ it selectively when the situation calls for it.

P18 remarked, *"I use it when I can't translate a question."* This highlights that translanguaging plays a crucial role in bridging comprehension gaps, particularly when students struggle to decode questions in English.

P22 explained, *"When I talk to foreign students and don't understand something, I switch languages."* This shows how translanguaging can serve as a practical tool for cross-cultural communication, especially in diverse learning environments.

P16 shared, *"Occasionally, English words come out unintentionally, but I switch when I need to explain something more clearly."* This illustrates that even students who primarily use English may shift between languages depending on the complexity of the content or the audience's needs.

P21 noted, *"When needed, I use my native language, but I try to stick to English."* This reinforces the idea that students make conscious decisions about when and how to integrate translanguaging to aid their learning.

These responses collectively highlight that translanguaging is not a fixed practice but rather a flexible, context-dependent strategy used by students to enhance comprehension, communication, and engagement in the classroom.

4.4. Frequency of the Usage of Translanguaging in Classes.

4.4.1. Frequency of translanguaging. The frequency of translanguaging among participants varied depending on personal preferences and situational factors. Many participants indicated that they switch languages only in certain circumstances, suggesting that translanguaging is often a deliberate choice rather than an automatic habit. For instance, P3 mentioned that they "*sometimes*" switch languages, implying that their language choices depend on the context. Similarly, P10 acknowledged that they "*sometimes*" engage in translanguaging, reinforcing the idea that language switching is a selective and purposeful practice rather than a constant behavior.

In contrast, some participants reported using translanguaging as an integral part of their daily communication. P1 expressed that they "*always*" switch between languages, suggesting that translanguaging is a natural and consistent part of their interactions. P4 also stated that they "*always*" engage in language switching, highlighting a habitual reliance on multiple languages in conversation.

Others described their translanguaging practices as frequent but not necessarily constant. P12 noted that they do so "*frequently*," indicating that while they often switch between languages, it is not an automatic behavior. Similarly, P14 also described their translanguaging as "*frequent*," further emphasizing that their language choices are consistent but context-dependent.

On the other hand, P24 took a completely different stance, stating that they "*never*" engage in translanguaging. This response suggests a strong preference for maintaining a single language in communication, possibly due to personal inclination, linguistic confidence, or specific social settings that discourage language mixing.

The frequency of translanguaging among participants varied depending on personal preferences and situational factors. Many participants indicated that they switch languages only in certain circumstances, suggesting that translanguaging is often a deliberate choice rather than an automatic habit. For instance, P3 mentioned that they "*sometimes*" switch languages, implying that their language choices depend on the context. Similarly, P10 acknowledged that they "*sometimes*" engage in translanguaging, reinforcing the idea that language switching is a selective and purposeful practice rather than a constant behavior.

In contrast, some participants reported using translanguaging as an integral part of their daily communication. P1 expressed that they "*always*" switch between languages, suggesting that translanguaging is a natural and consistent part of their interactions. P4

also stated that they *"always"* engage in language switching, highlighting a habitual reliance on multiple languages in conversation.

Others described their translanguaging practices as frequent but not necessarily constant. P12 noted that they do so *"frequently,"* indicating that while they often switch between languages, it is not an automatic behavior. Similarly, P14 also described their translanguaging as *"frequent,"* further emphasizing that their language choices are consistent but context-dependent.

On the other hand, P24 took a completely different stance, stating that they *"never"* engage in translanguaging. This response suggests a strong preference for maintaining a single language in communication, possibly due to personal inclination, linguistic confidence, or specific social settings that discourage language mixing.

4.4.2. Where translanguaging happens. Participants frequently referenced translanguaging with professors and friends, illustrating how social and intellectual connections shape language-switching behaviors. Many described engaging in translanguaging in classroom settings, emphasizing the role of peer interactions in fostering multilingual communication. For instance, P1 stated that they *"normally practice translanguaging with classmates,"* while P5 simply noted, *"with my friends."* These responses suggest that collaborative and casual environments encourage the use of multiple languages, making translanguaging a natural part of everyday interactions. P7 further reinforced this idea by stating that they engage in translanguaging *"with the teacher and my friends,"* demonstrating how both academic and social contexts contribute to language mixing.

Teachers emerged as key figures in shaping translanguaging habits, playing an essential role in guiding students through multilingual interactions. P18 explicitly stated that they translanguage *"with my teachers,"* underlining the importance of instructor-led communication. Similarly, P20 mentioned that they engage in translanguaging *"between friends and teachers,"* emphasizing how both peer discussions and formal learning environments facilitate multilingual exchanges. P22 added another dimension by noting that they practice translanguaging *"with foreign student friends and my teacher,"* suggesting that diverse linguistic backgrounds within educational spaces further promote this practice.

Beyond academic settings, some participants highlighted the presence of translanguaging in personal, familial, and professional contexts. P4, for instance, described using translanguaging with *"friends, family members, co-workers, students,"* reflecting the adaptability of language-switching across different areas of life. Similarly, P15 mentioned engaging in translanguaging *"with my spouse and friends,"* illustrating how language mixing extends beyond formal or academic situations to personal relationships as well. P6 offered another perspective, explaining that they often translanguage *"when speaking with people who do not speak English very well, to make them understand,"* highlighting its role as a practical tool for bridging language gaps and fostering effective communication.

These responses collectively illustrate how translanguaging is not confined to a single domain but rather permeates various aspects of life, from classrooms to homes and workplaces, depending on the communicative needs of individuals.

4.4.3. Translanguaging as a tool for understanding. Many participants shared that they use translanguaging as a means to help others better grasp concepts and communicate more effectively. P6, for instance, explained, *"I often practice translanguaging when I'm speaking with people who do not speak English very well, to make them understand."* This highlights the functional aspect of translanguaging, as it becomes a tool for bridging language barriers and ensuring that the message is clearly understood. By switching between languages, individuals can offer explanations in a more accessible way, making complex ideas easier to comprehend. Similarly, P11 shared that they *"start discussing the topic in a language they understand fully if someone is fluent in one language but a beginner in another."* This response emphasizes how translanguaging can be used strategically to address proficiency gaps. By adjusting the language based on the listener's familiarity, participants facilitate smoother communication, showing that translanguaging is not just a means of expression, but also an essential tool for comprehension and learning. These examples illustrate how translanguaging helps break down linguistic barriers, making it easier for people to access and understand information. Rather than being a hindrance, translanguaging serves as a flexible strategy to foster clear communication and overcome limitations in language proficiency.

4.5. Attitudes towards Interlingual Use in Class.

4.5.1. Translanguaging's significance in EFL classrooms. According to student comments, translanguaging is rather important in English as a Foreign Language (EFL) classrooms, particularly for beginners or when covering difficult subjects. As P1 mentioned, *"Translanguaging helps me understand complex concepts when I'm first learning English; it's a bridge between what I know and what I'm learning."* This reflects the notion that, particularly for beginners, using the local language can aid comprehension, especially when students encounter unfamiliar or challenging content. However, the results also emphasise the requirement of gradually depending less on local languages in order to support immersion and long-term language development

Teachers should strive for a balance, temporarily supporting understanding by means of translanguaging and guiding students in developing their English competency. As P2 reflected, *"It's helpful when the teacher explains in my first language, but I also know that I need to switch to English to improve."* This highlights the dynamic role of translanguaging it is not merely a crutch but a tool to scaffold understanding before students transition fully to using English in all contexts. Teachers can foster more inclusive and successful learning environments by customising their approach to the demands and degrees of their pupils

Translanguaging is a move towards language independence as well as a support system. P3 summed this up as, *"I feel more confident in my ability to speak English because I've been able to understand it better through translanguaging, and now I can use English more on my own."* This reinforces the idea that translanguaging, when used effectively, is not a crutch but a strategic method that empowers students, ultimately leading to their independence in the target language.

4.6. Reasons for Using Multiple Languages in Class

4.6.1. Promoting understanding. Many pupils claimed translanguaging clarifies challenging ideas or concepts. For these students, changing between languages is not just a habit but also a useful approach to enhance knowledge. *"In some cases, translanguaging helps to understand an abstract and complicated concept*

rather quite well." (P4) *"We better grasp the subjects we study in class by using several languages."* (P14) These answers demonstrate how students break down difficult subjects using their mother tongue, therefore showing the part translanguaging plays in bridging knowledge gaps. The use of the local language helps students make abstract or complex ideas more comprehensible by allowing them to draw on prior knowledge in a familiar linguistic context.

In addition, *"When I get stuck in English, I can use Turkish to help me think through things."* (P7) This quote further highlights how translanguaging is seen as a cognitive tool, allowing students to bypass difficulties in the target language by using their native language to think through problems or connect unfamiliar concepts. Translanguaging, in this sense, is not just a communication strategy, but a cognitive aid that facilitates understanding.

P5 also emphasized, *"It's easier to understand the lesson when the teacher explains it in both languages. I feel like I can connect the dots more clearly."* This indicates that when both languages are used in tandem, it creates a clearer connection between new and existing knowledge, easing the process of comprehension. The back-and-forth switching allows students to see the relationship between languages and concepts, strengthening their learning process.

Furthermore, P8 shared, *"Sometimes I learn more when I hear a difficult explanation in both English and my first language."* This reinforces the idea that translanguaging helps to provide an additional layer of clarity, offering multiple angles on the same information. For these students, this method of using two languages simultaneously creates a richer learning experience, allowing them to solidify their understanding by presenting the same concept in various linguistic forms.

4.6.2. Filling linguistic gaps. Another common reason for using multiple languages was to compensate for limited English skills. Students shared how they switch to their native language when their English vocabulary isn't enough. *"Sometimes my vocabulary in English is insufficient while speaking, so I have to use my native language."* (P8) *"Because I don't know enough English."* (P9). For these learners, translanguaging acts as a helpful tool to overcome communication barriers in real time, showing its importance in aiding learners with limited vocabulary. This suggests that when students encounter limitations in their target language proficiency,

they use their native language to ensure effective communication, preventing frustration and facilitating smoother interaction.

Furthermore, P10 noted, *"I feel more confident when I use both languages. It's like I can explain things better in my own language before I try in English."* This highlights how students use translanguaging to build confidence in their ability to express complex ideas. Translanguaging in this case serves not only as a communicative aid but also as a confidence-building strategy, reducing anxiety and enabling learners to communicate with greater ease.

Similarly, P11 explained, *"I switch to my first language when I don't have the right word in English. It's easier to keep the conversation going."* This quote reveals how translanguaging helps maintain the flow of conversation, preventing the disruption that may occur when students struggle with vocabulary. By switching to their first language, students can continue expressing themselves without being hindered by vocabulary gaps, which supports the continuity of their communication.

4.6.3. Retention and cognitive engagement. Several students highlighted how the use of both languages simultaneously helps them retain information and stay mentally engaged. For instance, P13 explained that *"To retain information in the mind and keep the brain active."* This suggests that switching between languages doesn't only support understanding, but also activates the brain, making the learning process more dynamic. By tapping into both their native language and English, these students feel more engaged, which aids in keeping the information fresh and accessible in their memory.

P11 further elaborated, noting the benefits of cultural and linguistic variation in learning. *"Both for cultural and linguistic variation; for example, recording something helps me remember it better."* This statement highlights that the process of using multiple languages isn't just about language comprehension but also about enriching the learning experience. Translanguaging provides a tool to link linguistic concepts to cultural contexts, which may enhance the way students encode and recall information. By incorporating familiar elements from their culture, they feel a stronger connection to the material, leading to better retention.

P15 also shared a similar sentiment, saying, *"Using my first language alongside English helps me process and remember better. I feel more connected to the material."*

This reflects a common theme among students: using both languages creates a sense of familiarity and comfort, helping them internalize what they're learning. Translanguaging, in this case, bridges the gap between two linguistic worlds, making it easier to process and connect with the content on a deeper level.

Finally, P16 mentioned, *"I find it easier to recall information when I use both languages because I can tie it to experiences from both cultures."* This further supports the idea that using multiple languages not only aids comprehension but also helps students make personal and cultural connections to the content. By linking what they are learning to their own lived experiences in both languages, students are able to remember the material more effectively.

4.7. Benefits and Challenges of Using Both Languages

4.7.1. Enhanced understanding. Several students strongly emphasized the immediate benefits of translanguaging, particularly when it comes to understanding complex content. P3 expressed, *"When we ask about an English word or topic we don't understand in our native language, it becomes easier to grasp the concept."* This illustrates that using the native language as a stepping stone provides clarity. It helps students bridge the gap between unfamiliar English concepts and their pre-existing knowledge in their mother tongue. For these learners, translanguaging serves as an essential tool to simplify difficult ideas, making them more accessible.

Similarly, P10 shared, *"When I don't understand something in English, understanding it in Turkish first makes it easier to transfer and comprehend in English."* This quotation underscores how translanguaging aids the process of transferring knowledge from one language to another. By first understanding a concept in their native language, students are able to create a mental link, making it easier to process and retain the same information when it is presented in English. This shows that the native language not only facilitates comprehension but also serves as a cognitive anchor, helping students internalize new knowledge in English more effectively.

These responses collectively reflect the significant role that translanguaging plays in fostering understanding. It allows students to break down complex subjects into more manageable pieces, supporting their comprehension by using the language they are most comfortable with before working through the material in English. Thus,

translanguaging enhances not only immediate understanding but also the long-term retention of new concepts.

4.7.2. Concerns about overuse. Despite recognizing the immediate advantages of translanguaging, several students voiced concerns about its potential drawbacks, particularly in relation to long-term language development. P23 remarked, *"This way, I'm not fully immersed in an English-speaking language environment."* This statement highlights the concern that frequent use of the native language may hinder complete immersion in English, which is often seen as crucial for advancing language proficiency. For these students, there is a fear that relying too much on their native language could slow down their exposure to English, which might limit their ability to internalize and think directly in the target language.

Similarly, P9 expressed, *"I think using more English in class is much more beneficial for my English education."* This quotation reflects a preference for greater English usage in the classroom, emphasizing that full immersion would likely provide better long-term benefits for language acquisition. These concerns point to the underlying tension between short-term support through translanguaging and the long-term goal of achieving language independence.

These mixed opinions underscore the delicate balance students face between leveraging translanguaging for immediate understanding and striving for immersion to promote deeper language development. While translanguaging is undeniably helpful in clarifying complex ideas and compensating for limited vocabulary, students also recognize that overuse might impede their progress toward greater fluency in English.

4.8. Instructor's Use of Both Languages

4.8.1. Support for beginners and complex topics. Many students expressed that the instructors' use of both languages was especially beneficial for beginners or when grappling with challenging content. P7 highlighted this by stating, *"Using both languages simultaneously helps us to digest new ideas provided in the lesson without struggling."* This reflects how translanguaging facilitates the processing of complex ideas, making them more accessible to learners who may not yet have the English

vocabulary or fluency to fully understand the material. By employing both languages, instructors can bridge the gap between unfamiliar content and students' existing knowledge, thus reducing cognitive overload.

Similarly, P18 added, *“If the lesson is difficult, teachers can use Turkish to make it more understandable.”* This comment reinforces the idea that using the native language strategically can ease the learning process, especially in difficult lessons. For these students, translanguaging becomes a supportive tool that enables them to navigate the complexities of the subject matter more effectively.

These responses demonstrate the significant role of strategic translanguaging in meeting diverse learner needs, particularly for those who are just beginning to learn English or are tackling difficult topics. By shifting between languages, instructors can offer immediate support while still encouraging long-term language development.

4.8.2. Grammar specific applications. Grammar instruction was often cited as a context where using the native language proved to be especially effective. P13 noted, *“The good side is that using the mother tongue while explaining grammar is beneficial for understanding.”* Similarly, P6 shared, *“When the teacher explains grammar in our native language, it’s easier to understand the structure of the sentences.”* These comments emphasize how translanguaging can simplify the comprehension of abstract or complex aspects of language, such as grammar rules, which may not be easily grasped through a second language alone.

P12 also added, *“Sometimes, when a teacher explains grammar rules in English, I still don’t get it. But when they explain it in Turkish, it clicks.”* This highlights that for many students, the use of their native language serves as a clearer means of understanding technical concepts, ensuring they have a solid grasp of the material before applying it in English.

Finally, P19 remarked, *“Translanguaging in grammar lessons allows me to connect English grammar rules with my own language’s rules, which makes it much easier to remember and use.”* This suggests that translanguaging not only aids in comprehension but also promotes a deeper understanding by allowing students to make connections between languages, reinforcing their learning.

These responses demonstrate that translanguaging is particularly advantageous in areas like grammar instruction, where precise understanding is crucial. The use of the

native language allows for clearer explanations, making the learning process more effective and less overwhelming.

4.9. Student Practice of Translanguaging

4.9.1. Building confidence and reducing anxiety. Many students explained that translanguaging provided them with the confidence to express themselves, particularly when they felt uncertain about their English abilities. As P2 noted, *“It’s much easier for students to express themselves in their own language when they don’t understand something.”* This indicates that when faced with a challenge in English, students feel more comfortable using their native language to articulate their thoughts and questions, thus reducing the anxiety often associated with language learning. P3 further emphasized this idea by stating, *“We don’t hesitate when we use our own language.”* This highlights the role of translanguaging in alleviating hesitation or fear of making mistakes, encouraging students to communicate more openly.

P5 also echoed this sentiment, sharing that *“When I don’t know the exact English term, using my native language helps me to find the right word and explain my idea.”* This demonstrates how translanguaging not only boosts confidence but also helps learners navigate gaps in their vocabulary, making them more effective in communication. Similarly, P7 stated, *“Translanguaging allows me to feel less worried about making mistakes and more focused on getting my point across.”* This emphasizes the emotional relief that translanguaging provides, as it reduces the pressure to be linguistically perfect and instead encourages meaningful communication.

These responses underscore the emotional and psychological benefits of translanguaging, as it provides learners with a safety net, making them feel more supported and less vulnerable in a learning environment. It creates an atmosphere in which students feel empowered to ask questions, seek clarification, and actively engage without the pressure of perfect language proficiency. Ultimately, translanguaging plays a crucial role in fostering a more inclusive, confident, and psychologically safe learning environment.

4.9.2. Embracing cultural and cognitive diversity. Some students saw translanguaging as a way to incorporate their cultural identity into the learning process,

which they found enriching. As P8 noted, *“Speaking multiple languages can be culturally beneficial. It is necessary for challenging vocabulary or terms.”* This highlights the broader cultural significance of translanguaging, as it allows students to draw on their multilingual background to navigate complex concepts. By using their native language alongside English, students are not only enhancing their comprehension but also preserving and expressing their cultural identity, which can further enrich their learning experience.

Similarly, P12 mentioned, *“When we use both languages, we bring in our culture, and that helps us connect the lesson to our real-life experiences.”* This underscores the idea that translanguaging is not merely a linguistic tool but also a bridge to cultural understanding, allowing students to relate classroom content to their own cultural context. For these learners, using both languages becomes a way to honor their linguistic heritage while simultaneously advancing their language skills.

P6 also observed, *“It makes learning more personal because we are allowed to use the language we feel closest to.”* This reflects the emotional aspect of translanguaging, where students feel more connected to the learning process when they can incorporate their own language and culture. Translanguaging, therefore, not only facilitates cognitive processing but also fosters a deeper sense of belonging and self-expression in the learning environment.

These comments illustrate the broader cultural and cognitive benefits of translanguaging in multilingual contexts. By incorporating both their languages and cultural knowledge into the learning process, students can achieve a more holistic understanding and connect more meaningfully to the material.

4.10. Reasons for Avoiding Native Language

4.10.1. Fostering immersion. Several students highlighted that avoiding their native language helps them stay immersed in English, which they believe is crucial for improving their proficiency. As P9 explained, *“To be more exposed to English and push ourselves more.”* This suggests that some students view immersion in the target language as a key strategy for enhancing their language skills. By limiting the use of their native language, they feel they are able to foster a deeper connection with English, leading to more effective language acquisition.

P16 echoed this sentiment, saying, *“Speaking only in English sometimes forces students to adapt and enhances their learning experience.”* This indicates that immersion can act as a catalyst for adaptation, pushing students out of their comfort zones and encouraging them to think and communicate more fluently in English. The idea that immersion helps students engage more fully with the language aligns with the concept of “language learning through exposure,” where consistent interaction with the target language accelerates proficiency development.

P14 also pointed out, *“When we use only English, we can think in English better and become more confident in speaking.”* This demonstrates that exposure to English not only improves linguistic competence but also boosts learners' confidence in their speaking abilities. The transition from thinking in one's native language to thinking in the target language is often seen as a milestone in the language learning process.

P5 emphasized, *“I find that I learn more effectively when I don't rely on my first language because it forces me to focus more on English vocabulary and grammar.”*

This highlights the cognitive advantages of immersion, as students shift their focus away from their native language to develop stronger skills in the foreign language.

These responses collectively underline the significance of immersion in achieving higher levels of English proficiency. While translanguaging can serve as a helpful scaffold, these students also recognize that minimizing reliance on their native language helps them fully engage with English, thus enhancing their overall language learning experience.

4.10.2. Practicality in multilingual classrooms. In classes with diverse linguistic backgrounds, relying solely on English was seen as a practical necessity to ensure inclusivity. As P7 stated, *“If everyone uses their own language, no one would understand anything in that class.”* This highlights the practical considerations of language use in multilingual learning environments. The student's remark underscores the importance of a common language, in this case, English, as a means of bridging communication gaps between students from different linguistic backgrounds. Without a shared language, effective communication and understanding could become challenging, potentially isolating students from one another.

Additionally, P10 shared, *“We need to stick to English so that everyone can follow along, regardless of where they're from.”* This illustrates the role of English as a

unifying force in diverse classrooms, ensuring that no student is left behind due to language barriers. It suggests that, in a multilingual setting, English serves as the common ground for communication, facilitating a collaborative learning environment where students can actively engage and learn from each other.

Moreover, P12 emphasized, *“In a class with so many different languages, using just one makes it easier for everyone to understand the lesson.”* This reflects the pragmatic benefits of using a shared language in such contexts, highlighting how a common language can streamline the learning process and promote equal participation, regardless of each student’s linguistic background.

These quotations reveal that in linguistically diverse classrooms, the use of English as the primary language of instruction is not only a pedagogical decision but a practical necessity to ensure clarity and inclusivity for all students.

4.11. Language related Difficulties in an EFL context.

4.11.1. Frequent challenges. Many students admitted to facing regular hurdles in their classes, particularly when engaging with academic content. For instance, one participant shared, *“I often encounter language-related difficulties during my classes”* (P5). This response reflects ongoing struggles, likely tied to the complexities of academic vocabulary and unfamiliar sentence structures, which may pose continuous challenges for students as they progress through their coursework. Another student noted, *“I encounter them frequently”* (P9), emphasizing that these difficulties are persistent and prevalent, especially for learners who might not yet have the linguistic foundation needed to keep up with the academic demands. Similarly, another response, *“Quite often, as the topics are academic”* (P8), suggests that students feel particularly overwhelmed when transitioning from conversational English to more formal, subject-specific language, which often requires more specialized vocabulary and higher levels of comprehension.

Moreover, students also pointed out specific difficulties they face in their studies. For example, one participant explained, *“Sometimes, I cannot understand the grammar or the words. Some other times, I fail to say whatever I mean”* (P4), reflecting the frustration that arises from both comprehension and expression barriers in academic contexts. Another respondent echoed this by stating, *“Lack of vocabulary”* (P9),

pointing to a common issue that hinders their academic engagement. Likewise, *“Sometimes I don’t understand what other students are asking from teachers”* (P23) reveals that communication gaps extend beyond just the student-teacher interaction, affecting group discussions and collaborative learning as well.

For students grappling with these language-related challenges, strategies vary widely. One student remarked, *“Google Translate helps us to communicate. Google search and online applications like dictionaries help to know the meaning of vocabularies”* (P4), highlighting a practical approach that combines technology with language learning. Similarly, *“Studying at home”* (P7) and *“Practicing more and forcing myself to speak”* (P8) are common self-directed strategies to reinforce learning outside the classroom environment. Another participant shared, *“I try to adapt to speaking by skipping words I forget”* (P10), demonstrating a pragmatic method of managing difficulties during conversations.

These responses reveal the multifaceted nature of language barriers and the diverse approaches students take to overcome them, illustrating the significant impact of both the academic content and the need for constant practice and adaptation.

4.11.2. Improvement over time. For some participants, difficulties were intense at the beginning but gradually diminished as they adapted. (P4) explained, *“At the beginning of the course, a lot. But, over time due to learning and getting proficient day by day, less and less difficulties”*, reflecting the natural learning curve where consistent effort helps learners become more comfortable. This sentiment is echoed by another participant who shared, *“So less than in the beginning”* (P3), reinforcing the idea that early challenges subside with time and practice. As learners gain proficiency and familiarity with the academic language, their struggles decrease, allowing them to engage with the content more effectively and confidently.

(P21) emphasized a similar shift in their experience, stating, *“Once I got used to it, I didn’t struggle to learn”*. This highlights how initial difficulties fade as students become more accustomed to the learning environment, suggesting that the process of adaptation can significantly alleviate the challenges they face. Moreover, (P6) noted, *“It’s difficult, but we are always with the good teacher, so that makes it easy”*, acknowledging that having strong guidance can ease the learning process and reduce difficulties over time. This points to the importance of supportive teaching, which

helps students navigate their language challenges and enhances their overall learning experience.

Additionally, (P21) shared, *“I struggle a bit when exposed to English conversation, but I don’t practice much outside of school”*, revealing that while challenges persist, the lack of external practice may contribute to the ongoing difficulty. This implies that consistent practice beyond the classroom could play a crucial role in accelerating adaptation and minimizing language-related struggles. As students engage more actively with the language, their proficiency grows, and their confidence in handling complex academic content increases.

4.11.3. Vocabulary and grammar issues. Common difficulties with basic language skills included vocabulary and grammatical issues. Many participants admitted trouble with language, as P9 and P15 pointed out, who highlighted a *“lack of vocabulary”*. This emphasizes how much clear communication and understanding depend on a rich vocabulary. Without a sufficient word bank, students struggle to express their ideas effectively, making academic discourse particularly challenging. As one participant stated, *“Sometimes it is difficult to understand the text by ear and the meaning of the word”* (P22), further underscoring how a limited vocabulary can impede both listening comprehension and the ability to grasp the full meaning of spoken or written academic content.

Still, a significant challenge was interference with native languages. P14 noted, *“Trying to use grammar structures like Turkish is the biggest challenge,”* for example, showing how following guidelines from their own tongue could lead to English errors. This reflects how deeply ingrained native language structures can impact the learning of a new language, causing students to apply familiar grammar rules inappropriately and thereby making it harder for them to produce accurate English sentences. One participant further reflected on this, saying, *“Not knowing the language”* (P13) – a simple yet powerful reminder of the struggle learners face when they lack a solid foundation in the target language. Similarly, P15 highlighted the difficulty of forming sentences, stating, *“Lack of vocabulary and difficulty forming grammar”*, which emphasizes that the challenge goes beyond understanding words to applying them correctly in sentences.

Moreover, the interference issue was not limited to grammar alone. P12 shared, *“It’s difficult, but we are always with the good teacher, so that makes it easy”*, which suggests that while native language interference may initially create struggles, the right guidance and teaching support can alleviate these challenges and help students overcome such hurdles more effectively. The role of effective teaching strategies becomes critical in helping students navigate the complexities of language interference and acquire the necessary skills to communicate proficiently in English.

4.11.4. Speaking and fluency. Many pupils said they struggled with voice and fluency. P8 highlighted, *“Generally, not being fluent in speaking,”* pointing to problems including poor confidence, little practice, or trouble remembering words. This reflects how fluency issues can stem from a combination of factors, such as nervousness in speaking, a lack of regular practice, or difficulties recalling vocabulary in real-time conversations. Fluency in speaking often requires both skill and confidence, which many students are still in the process of developing. One student noted, *“I struggle a bit when exposed to English conversation, but I don’t practice much outside of school”* (P21), indicating that limited practice outside of the classroom contributes to their struggles with fluency. Without consistent engagement with the language in everyday situations, students find it more challenging to improve their speaking abilities.

P10, expressing how intimidating oral language in a second tongue can be, also said, *“I have trouble speaking English.”* This emphasizes how speaking in a second language can trigger anxiety and a sense of discomfort, especially when learners are still building their linguistic confidence. For some, the fear of making mistakes can create a barrier to expressing themselves clearly, thereby hindering their ability to communicate effectively in class or during conversations. Another participant highlighted the difficulty of engaging in spoken English, stating, *“Sometimes I don’t understand what other students are asking from teachers”* (P23), suggesting that both comprehension and production difficulties compound, especially in group or classroom discussions.

Additionally, P7 shared, *“Misunderstanding and sometimes inability to speak”*, which further reinforces the idea that fluency and the ability to articulate thoughts clearly are frequent obstacles. When students are unable to express themselves effectively, they

may feel isolated in academic settings, which can lead to frustration and a sense of inadequacy. This underscores the emotional and cognitive challenges that come with language production, further complicating the learning process for many students. Overcoming these fluency barriers often requires practice, guidance, and building confidence in speaking situations.

4.11.5. Using technology. Often utilized to fill such language gaps was technology. P4 commented, *“Google Translate helps us to communicate,”* while P17 said, *“I usually use a translator.”* These tools provide rapid assistance, helping students bridge gaps in understanding and facilitate communication, especially in situations where vocabulary or grammar knowledge is lacking. Technology, such as translation apps, can be an invaluable resource in moments of need, allowing learners to continue engaging with academic content despite language challenges.

However, over-reliance on these tools could limit more sophisticated learning. As one participant shared, *“Google Translate helps us to communicate”* (P4), while this may offer immediate solutions, it may not always promote deeper engagement with the language. Excessive use of translators could hinder students from actively learning and internalizing new vocabulary or grammar rules, which are necessary for long-term language development. Without regular practice of active language skills, students might miss opportunities to improve their fluency and comprehension, potentially stalling their overall progress. Thus, while technology can be a valuable aid, it is important for learners to strike a balance and incorporate other methods, such as independent learning and speaking practice, to ensure more sustainable language acquisition.

4.12. Students’ Final Comments on Translanguaging

4.12.1. Translanguaging as a support for understanding. Many students noted that translanguaging helps them understand challenging topics. P5 explained, *“Using our native language during challenging topics helps us understand better.”* This shows that translanguaging acts as a safety net, linking new ideas to students’ existing knowledge. Similarly, P7 shared, *“When translanguaging is practiced in lessons, it helps students succeed more, and if they fully understand the topic,*

transitioning to other languages becomes possible." This highlights how translanguaging aids immediate comprehension while supporting long-term language learning.

Beyond academics, students appreciated the broader benefits of using multiple languages. P1 said, *"I speak 4 languages. I get experience and understand what teachers say. I can make friends quickly, get better careers, and communicate well, so it is beneficial for me to know more languages."* This reflects how translanguaging contributes to social and professional growth.

4.12.2. Social and collaborative dimensions. Students perceived translanguaging as a means to engage with others in their multilingual context. P6 remarked, *"We have numerous international acquaintances here."* Utilising both languages during communication or when addressing things we find perplexing with instructors can be significantly more effective. This underscores how translanguaging promotes inclusivity and closes cultural divides. Comments like P8's, *"During class discussions, progress can be made through adaptation and student dialogue by translating between Turkish and English,"* clearly show the group benefits. This demonstrates how translanguaging fosters confidence and a feeling of belonging by means of team building and communication.

4.12.3. Challenges and concerns. Although translanguaging provides many benefits, some students noted certain negatives. P2 said, *"It is of both advantages and disadvantages."* Sometimes, it is interesting and promotes cooperative projects. On some other occasions, though, it is time-consuming or demoralising. This implies a compromise between effectiveness and cooperation.

Code-mixing, in which students unwittingly combine components of several languages, may lead to the misuse of translanguaging. P12 said, *"We can combine some words between two languages when we talk."* Although this improves communication, it could make English less fluency-friendly.

P10 underlined at last, *"Activities should not be done without fully understanding the topics,"* stressing the requirement of the deliberate use of translanguaging to ensure it aids deep comprehension rather than acting as a crutch.

4.12.4. Balancing translanguaging with other strategies. Students said that combining translanguaging with different techniques yields optimum results. For speaking specifically, P9 suggested, *"Encouraging students to use what they have been taught through question-and-answer techniques could be more effective."* This emphasises the need of deliberately use English in natural surroundings to develop confidence and fluency. Teachers can make sure translanguaging complements rather than impedes the aim of mastering English by combining it with other techniques.

CHAPTER V

DISCUSSION

The next section discusses the research's conclusions, which were derived via a quantitative and qualitative analysis of documentary content. Regarding the study's findings, the next section outlines its implications as well as suggestions for additional research based on its limitations.

5.1. What are the Students' Attitudes towards Translanguaging in an EFL Context?

The evaluation of students' attitudes towards translanguaging in an EFL context was conducted through a questionnaire and interviews. The commonalities identified in each section for all student groups involved in the study, derived from the interview and questionnaire results, are summarised below.

The results of this study confirm and contradict several previous studies dealing with translanguaging in various educational contexts and provide detailed insights into the pedagogical values and challenges of this process. The studies of Karabulut (2019), Aslan & Kıray (2020), Özkaynak (2020), Erbakan (2020), Tanık (2021), Küçükali (2021) underline that translanguaging is an important tool in terms of improving comprehension, ensuring participation and facilitating collaborative learning in EFL, EMI and multilingual classrooms.

The results of Karabulut (2019) go along with the emphasis that this study places on translanguaging as a scaffolding tool for learners of limited English proficiency but also points out its specific benefits for writing skills. Her study, in particular at this point, places an emphasis on gradual movement from dependent translanguaging practices (translating from Turkish into English) toward its more independent use with the improvement of learners' proficiency. This is in line with the position taken by Garcia & Wei (2014) who support the idea of drawing on learners' complete linguistic resources. However, in the research at hand, students showed some reluctance to fully

adopt the translanguaging behavior; this could be one of the reasons their development was less striking than that in Karabulut (2019)'s study.

Similarly, Aslan (2019) shows how trans complementary language bridges the linguistic gaps, developing understanding in both monolingual and multilingual classrooms, critiquing the "English-Only Policy," and dealing with scepticism raised about the potential influence of translanguaging on the proficiency in English. These findings again highlight how students gain from using their first language in addition to English, especially for clarity of content and the execution of tasks. The findings are consistent with those by Aslan & Kıray (2020), which demonstrated how translanguaging can trigger learners' linguistic repertoires and promote understanding and participation, although there are still some barriers, such as a lack of resources and preparedness on the part of teachers. His research also emphasized that it is teachers' feedback that would prove the workable role of trans-language strategies. On the other hand, the present study revealed that a continued approach on the part of instructors using switching often caused puzzlement among learners; hence, more structured practice has been in urgent demand.

There exist crucial differences between the studies. For instance, although the present study has limited the selective use of translanguaging to EFL classrooms in higher education, Özkaynak (2020) drew attention to the preferred psychological benefits concerning the reduction of foreign language anxiety. He supports these concepts using his research, in which he shows in detail how "Translanguaging mediates understanding and co-construction dialogues of participants with a ZPD [Zone of Proximal Development], is associated with lower levels of language anxiety and enhanced peer-to-peer interactions." This seems to contrast very strongly with any reservations that participants demonstrated in this current research in terms of whether translanguaging itself would somehow hurt their English competence.

Bruen & Kelly (2014), Liao (2006) also stress translanguaging in the decrease of communication apprehension and development of self-confidence. These findings are thus consistent with those of Özkaynak (2020). Likewise, Erbakan (2020) displays the role of translanguaging an early childhood education to develop both cognitive and socioemotional learning. She demonstrates how young learners might freely switch between Turkish and English, syntactically and morphologically developing skills while nurturing curiosity and confidence. Higher education learners targeted by the

study differ, as the attitudes and assumptions towards the act of translanguaging are essentially oriented by an academic goal proposed, controlled, and also formal in its type of task design.

Erbakan's (2020) findings on the creation of "third spaces" for bilingual interaction resonate with Garcia's (2011) conceptualization of translanguaging as a mechanism for meaning-making and identity construction. Tanık (2021) draws attention to the use of translanguaging in TBLT and how task types affect its occurrence. She found that closed tasks, like jigsaw and spot-the-difference activities, triggered significantly more translanguaging turns than open-ended tasks. The participants themselves drew on translanguaging selectively in order to handle particularly challenging collaborative tasks, as supported by studies of Azkarai & Garcia Mayo (2015) and Storch & Aldosari (2010), both relating the use of translanguaging by the learners back to task design features. Indeed, findings in the case also support those suggestions, when in the present study, participants in fact used much more selective translanguaging: only when certain tasks, mostly solving problems, came under challenge from collaboration.

Further distinctions arise in disciplinary and institutional contexts. Kavak (2021) juxtaposes translanguaging practices across social sciences and engineering, demonstrating its adaptability across fields. In this respect, while students in the social sciences use translanguaging considerably to create meaning and hold critical discussions, their peers in engineering do so mainly to solve lexical problems, explaining technical terms, and negotiating meaning in laboratory activities. This difference arises from the differential cognitive and linguistic demands posed by different disciplines.

These contextual differences do indeed suggest that translanguaging is dynamic, flexible, whether in collaborative learning or content-focused outcomes. Another characteristic of translanguaging is that it is individual or groups of students who approach and view translanguaging differently across contexts and levels. According to Öztürk (2022), the perceptions tend to be divided concerning different proficiency levels. The high-achieving students distrust the idea of translanguaging because of its potential danger to English competence.

The present research reveals contrasting attitudes: partial versus full EMI programs view the issue of translanguaging as something harmful to English immersion. These

results show that students' fears should be dispelled and clearly explained with ways of implementation to ensure maximum efficiency of translanguaging. Another very significant factor is, of course, the institutional policies, which sometimes, especially for more strictly English-only policy disciplines, can limit students' participation and interaction.

The findings of this study are in tune and expand the insights of previous research, such as Özkaynak (2020) exploration of the psychological impacts of translanguaging. Although this study does not focus on psychological factors, the participants of this study hold sceptical views on how translanguaging would lower their proficiency in English. Similarly, the findings of the present study, although context-bound, borrow a leaf from Erbakan's (2020) study regarding how translanguaging aids bilingual development in cognition and socio-emotional realms, albeit in a totally different age and learning environment altogether.

Together, these studies point to the possibility of translanguaging as a pedagogical approach that can be transformative. Effective translanguaging would require overcoming contextual challenges of resource limitations, teacher preparedness, and institutional language policies to adapt practices toward the linguistic and cultural needs of learners. Educators may employ flexible and strategic translanguaging practices that afford greater inclusivity, develop multilingual competencies, and spur dynamic learning environments across diverse educational contexts.

5.1.1 Do students' attitudes towards translanguaging differ significantly according to the gender variable? Results obtained in this study show that gender indeed plays a critical role in influencing students' attitudes towards translanguaging. Female students slightly outperformed their male peers: $M = 2.61$, $SD = 0.39$ for females; $M = 2.52$, $SD = 0.40$ for males. This corroborates earlier literature indicating that learner-specific variables are crucial in the development of attitudes toward translanguaging. For instance, Öztürk (2022) observed that proficiency levels shape perception: the low-proficiency participants generally evaluate translanguaging practices as more favorable compared to those of higher proficiency. Correspondingly, this paper points out the influence of gender a factor less commonly in the focus on the degree to which learners will accept or be open to translanguaging.

These findings are also at variance with the findings of earlier studies, which had placed more emphasis on gender as a determinant than in earlier research, which had limited attention compared to variables such as anxiety or multilingual backgrounds. Although the study by Özkaynak (2020) investigated the psychological benefits of translanguaging, including reduced anxiety, this study finds a statistically significant, though marginal, difference in attitude based on gender, $p = .016$. But this distinction brings into relief the relevance of demographic variables in informing translanguaging strategies within EFL classroom settings.

Furthermore, these findings are in line with the model by García & Sylvan (2011), which advocates for context-sensitive translanguaging practices. Yet, the modest variation in attitudes serves to indicate the need for a gender-sensitive approach in pedagogical matters regarding translanguaging strategies for active engagement of learners of both genders. Again, this finds support in the argument by Baker (2011) that translanguaging has the potential for adaptability for different learner needs. By making translanguaging practices sensitive to demographic factors such as gender, educators will be able to create more inclusive and effective learning environments.

5.1.2. Do students' attitudes towards translanguaging differ significantly according to the English proficiency level variable? The results of the current study showed that students' attitudes towards translanguaging were significantly different because of the students' levels of English proficiency. This is underlined in the ANOVA results: $F(3, 451) = 11.019, p < 0.001$. It was the students at the A1 level who showed the most positive attitudes, suggesting that lower-proficiency learners heavily rely on translanguaging to scaffold comprehension and facilitate participation. This also aligns with the framework by García & Sylvan (2011), which highlights that translanguaging is a powerful tool for leveraging the full linguistic repertoire of learners, especially at the early stages of language acquisition. According to Baker (2011), translanguaging provides important cognitive support for lower-proficiency learners in navigating more complex language demands.

By contrast, at B1 and B2 levels, learners expressed less positive attitudes towards translanguaging. As proficiency increased, attitudes became less positive, which may mirror Turnbull's (2001) suggestion that higher-proficiency learners perceive less need for native language support, viewing translanguaging as potentially detrimental

to immersion in the target language. Reflecting their trust in autonomous language use, Özkaynak (2020) noted patterns whereby advanced learners favoured tactics stressing English-only instruction. The somewhat favourable sentiments of A2 students in this study imply that translanguaging still has a transitional function, supporting until students reach better degrees of competency. The results emphasise the need of customising translanguaging techniques depending on the degree of skill of the students. Translanguaging is a vital scaffold for lower-proficiency students since it promotes understanding and lowers cognitive load, therefore complementing García & Wei's (2014) claim that translanguaging supports meaning-making and engagement. Translanguaging techniques, on the other hand, must change emphasis for higher-proficiency students to stress immersion in English while maintaining supporting chances for group and reflective learning. This is consistent with Karabulut's (2019) advice for methodologies of structured, proficiency-sensitive translanguaging that fit students' evolving needs. These results highlight, in general, the dynamic character of translanguaging and its different effects on competency levels. Future studies could investigate how competency interacts with other elements, such as classroom dynamics or task complexity, to improve translanguaging procedures even more and maximise their efficacy in many educational environments.

5.2. What Language-Related Difficulties do EFL Students Encounter?

The results of the present study combine and contradict past studies on translanguaging techniques in both EFL and EMI environments and offer significant new perspectives on the pedagogical uses and difficulties this activity presents. Like Karabulut's (2019) research on writing courses, participants in this study underscored how translanguaging is a resource in scaffolding comprehension and interacting with difficult material. As one participant commented, "*Using our native language during challenging topics helps us understand better*" (P5). This echoes García & Wei's (2014) conceptualization of translanguaging as a process which draws upon the full linguistic repertoire of learners to support understanding and collaboration. Similarly, emerging translanguaging benefits from collaboration in this study's peer and teacher help-seeking; for example, "*Discuss with my buddies*" (P19) echoes the importance of peer interaction as a crucial component of successful translanguaging practices.

However, notable differences also emerge. Unlike Karabulut's (2019) participants, who progressed from dependent to independent use as their proficiency improved, the participants in this study reported continued dependence on their L1, especially in areas like grammar and vocabulary. P14 noted, *"It is difficult to use a different language and structure in grammar,"* clearly reflecting the persistent linguistic challenges faced by EFL learners. Karabulut (2019) concentrated especially on the function of translanguaging in writing skills, although this investigation exposed more general uses including speaking and comprehension. Many participants cited fluency difficulties, such as *"I have trouble speaking English"* (P10), which suggests that oral language development depends critically on translanguaging.

Students' opinions of translanguaging represent still another point of difference. Commonly felt in monolingual EFL environments, one student said, *"Using both my mother tongue and English at the same time will weaken my English"* (P9). As P12 notes, some participants also voiced worries about code-mixing: *"We can combine some words between two languages when we talk"*. This reflects Küçükali's (2021) conclusions on the possible negative effects of too much reliance on translanguaging, especially in situations where fluency in the target language is given top priority.

The results also support earlier studies demonstrating how translanguaging could lower anxiety and promote diversity. Participants in this study reported feeling more confident and successful when translanguaging was allowed, much as Özkaynak's (2020) work showed how translanguaging reduces Foreign Language Classroom Anxiety (FLCA). P7 said, for instance, *"If translanguaging is applied during lessons, it would be more helpful for the students to succeed, and if they understand the topic, then shifting to other languages is possible"*. These findings imply, especially for low-proficient students, translanguaging generates a more favourable and less intimidating learning environment. These results highlight, pedagogically, the need of carefully include translanguaging into EFL environments. Programs for teacher preparation should concentrate on juggling translanguaging with immersive English only approaches.

Ultimately, the results of this study support the increasing awareness of translanguaging as a flexible pedagogical tool in EFL instruction. The study emphasises translanguaging's part in scaffolding comprehension, improving cooperation, and lowering anxiety by matching García & Wei's (2014) paradigm. But

issues like worries about code-mixing and proficiency draw attention to the requirement of careful and contextualised application. Future studies should look at how organised translanguaging techniques could solve problems and raise long-term learning results in different kinds of educational environments.

5.2.1. What kind of translanguaging techniques do college students employ in their coursework? These results imply that college students address both language and academic challenges in their courses using a variety of translanguaging techniques. Among the most often mentioned techniques are online dictionaries and digital translating applications like Google Translate. Students underlined how these instruments improve communication and help to acquire language. One participant observed that *"Google Translate helps us to communicate; Google search and online applications such as dictionaries help understand the meaning of vocabularies"*; (P4). This is consistent with the result of Öztürk (2022), which show the part technology plays in scaffolding translanguaging techniques, especially for vocabulary development and comprehension. García & Sylvan (2011) underlined similarly that modern translanguaging depends on translating technologies, which help students to efficiently close linguistic gaps.

Another somewhat common tactic seen was bilingual communication during group projects and debates. To help peers in group environments and simplify difficult subjects, participants sometimes alternated between their mother tongue and English. *"By using both languages during the conversation with foreign friends and in the discussion of the issues we didn't understand, it could be much better"* one respondent said (P6). García & Wei (2014) further contended that translanguaging for group projects exposes the inherent fluidity of linguistic interaction, therefore promoting closer knowledge and involvement. Apart from group projects, students also revealed personal habits, including memorising terminology and it into their regular speech. One participant clarified, *"By memorising vocabulary and trying to form sentences everywhere I can"* (P15). This fits Baker's (2011) perspective that translanguaging is a tool for active language production as well as a means of comprehension. Moreover, the results underline the need for self-directed learning via media. One participant described, for example, *"I develop my speaking comprehension by watching various types of videos in English, especially conversations, and looking up words in*

dictionaries" (P21). Extending Öztürk's (2022) work, this implies that translanguaging supports autonomous language acquisition outside of classroom environments. At last, one major tactic turned out to be combining first and second languages in regular interactions. Students said this approach improved their communication and understanding as well. *"It can be better for understanding, but when we talk, we can mix some words between two languages,"* one participant said (P12). This flexible use of translanguaging fits García & Wei's (2014) claim that translanguaging is a normal feature of communication, guiding students across challenging linguistic obstacles. These results demonstrate that translanguaging is a dynamic, adaptive process reaching into students' academic and social life rather than only a teaching tool. Students powerfully use their linguistic repertoire to overcome obstacles by using digital technologies, multilingual interaction, vocabulary integration, and media use. These findings highlight the need to create translanguaging plans catered to various student requirements and circumstances so promoting both academic performance and linguistic development. Future studies should look at how these approaches interact with factors like task types and degree of expertise to improve translanguaging procedures in higher education.

CHAPTER VI

CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTIONS

This chapter summarizes students' views on the "Just English" policy and translanguaging. While some students supported using only English in the classroom, others preferred integrating their native language for better understanding. Translanguaging was generally seen as a helpful tool for comprehension, especially for lower-proficiency students, and was often used naturally during note-taking and discussions.

Gender and proficiency influenced attitudes, with female students and lower-level learners more favorable toward translanguaging. Interviews revealed that translanguaging helps simplify complex content and boost confidence, though overuse of the native language was a concern.

The chapter concludes with suggestions for the thoughtful application of translanguaging, teacher training, flexible teaching methods, fostering student agency, proficiency-level adaptations, and future research into its long-term effects.

6.1. Perspectives on the "Just English" Policy

Students expressed diverse opinions regarding the exclusive use of English in the classroom. While some valued full immersion, others emphasized the occasional need for their native language to enhance comprehension and alleviate stress. The statement *"Only English should be used in classes"* received a neutral average score of 3.13, indicating a balanced mix of agreement and disagreement among respondents. However, concerns about frequent language switching were evident, as reflected in the relatively high mean score (3.48) for the statement *"I get confused when the lecturer switches from English to Turkish or vice versa."* This suggests that while students recognize the benefits of English-only instruction, unstructured and frequent language shifts may hinder learning rather than facilitate it. These findings highlight the importance of a strategic and pedagogically informed approach to language use in EFL classrooms.

6.2. Views on Translanguaging

Students generally perceived translanguaging as a valuable tool for enhancing communication and understanding complex concepts. The statement "Using both my mother tongue and English at the same time helps me to understand the course content better" received a mean score of 1.93, highlighting the advantages of strategic native language inclusion, particularly for students with lower proficiency levels. This finding suggests that when used deliberately and purposefully, translanguaging can act as a scaffolding technique, allowing learners to engage more confidently with course materials while gradually improving their English proficiency. Rather than viewing translanguaging as a hindrance to immersion, educators should recognize its potential to bridge linguistic gaps, reduce cognitive overload, and support students' academic success.

6.3. Variations by Gender and Proficiency

The findings revealed that gender and proficiency levels significantly influenced students' attitudes toward translanguaging. Female students demonstrated more favorable perceptions of translanguaging compared to their male counterparts ($p = .016$), suggesting that gender-based differences in language learning preferences may shape classroom experiences. Additionally, lower-proficiency students (A1) relied more heavily on translanguaging than higher-proficiency students (B1, B2), who deemed it less necessary ($p < .001$). These results emphasize the importance of adapting translanguaging strategies to accommodate diverse learner profiles, ensuring that instructional approaches are both inclusive and effective.

6.4. Insights from Open-Ended Interviews

The open-ended interviews revealed that translanguaging is a valuable tool for enhancing student comprehension and engagement, both academically and socially. Many students indicated that the use of their native language in conjunction with English helps them understand difficult topics better, providing a bridge between existing knowledge and new learning. This confirms that translanguaging serves as an important support mechanism, enabling students to grasp challenging concepts more effectively. Additionally, students highlighted the social and professional benefits of translanguaging, with some emphasizing how it allows them to build relationships,

foster inclusivity, and communicate across cultural boundaries. However, students also voiced some concerns, such as the risk of code-mixing and the potential misuse of translanguaging when not carefully managed. There were also concerns about the time-consuming nature of translanguaging in some contexts, as well as the need to balance its use with other learning strategies.

6.5. Suggestions:

Based on these findings, several recommendations are proposed to improve EFL teaching and learning practices:

6.5.1. Adopt flexible translanguaging practices. Teachers can make a real difference by using translanguaging in a way that feels natural and helpful to students. Instead of rigidly sticking to one language, they can incorporate the native language (L1) at key moments, like explaining tricky concepts or giving instructions, to make sure students truly understand. However, the goal should be to gently guide students toward using English as much as possible once they've grasped the content. Creating a classroom environment where English is the main language, but where L1 is used purposefully, helps maintain immersion without leaving students feeling lost.

6.5.2. Enhance understanding with visual and interactive tools. Teachers can make learning more engaging and accessible by using visual tools like pictures, charts, or even real-world objects (realia). These help students connect with the material without relying too much on language switching. For example, when teaching a difficult idea, showing a diagram or using multimedia can clear up confusion much faster than just explaining it in words. These approaches create an inclusive environment where all students can follow along more easily.

6.5.3. Encourage reflective teaching. Teachers should take the time to reflect on how their teaching methods are working. After each lesson, they could check in with students—maybe through quick surveys or informal conversations—to understand what's working and what's not. Adjusting their approach based on real feedback will help them fine-tune their strategies. This also gives teachers a chance to assess whether they're striking the right balance between using L1 for support and pushing students to use more English.

6.5.4. Ongoing professional development and gender-sensitive approaches. Educators should have access to professional development that focuses on using translanguaging in ways that meet the needs of all students. This includes learning how to balance language support for students at different proficiency levels and ensuring that all students—regardless of gender—feel included and valued. For instance, offering tailored support for beginners while providing more immersive English experiences for advanced students can foster a positive learning environment for everyone.

6.5.5. Build a curriculum that supports gradual language learning. Curriculum developers can play a key role by designing materials that help students gradually reduce their dependence on their native language while still supporting comprehension. This might include bilingual glossaries at the start, which can slowly transition to full English immersion as students get more comfortable. By focusing on content learning in English from the beginning, students become more confident and capable in the language over time.

6.5.6. Align assessments with classroom language practices. It's important for assessments to reflect what's happening in the classroom. If students are gradually transitioning to using more English, assessments should match that shift. For example, a student might start by using some L1 to explain concepts, but as they improve, assessments should encourage them to express those same ideas fully in English. By aligning assessments with the language learning journey, educators can ensure that students are evaluated fairly based on their current skills.

6.5.7. Foster collaborative learning and peer support. Group work and peer discussions are fantastic opportunities for students to practice English in a real-world context. Teachers can create more inclusive environments by encouraging collaboration across genders and ensuring that all students get a chance to share their ideas. When students work together, they not only learn the content but also improve their communication skills in English, building confidence and fluency in a supportive, interactive setting.

6.5.8. Promote student independence. As students' English skills improve, teachers can help them become more independent in their learning. By encouraging them to take ownership of their language development, students can learn to monitor their own progress and find strategies that work for them. For more advanced students, teachers might minimize L1 use, focusing instead on fostering self-regulated learning. The goal is to help students feel confident in using English on their own, even in complex academic contexts.

By embracing these strategies, teachers and educators can create a classroom atmosphere where students feel both supported and challenged, allowing them to thrive in their English learning journey. Translanguaging becomes a tool to enhance understanding, build confidence, and ultimately help students reach their full potential. These approaches not only improve language proficiency but also encourage a positive, inclusive learning experience that values each student's unique linguistic background.

6.6. Suggestions for Future Researches.

Future research could explore how translanguaging serves as a modern adaptation of the "Suggestopedia" method, which emphasizes creating a relaxed, immersive, and multi-sensory learning environment to enhance language acquisition.

6.6.1. Translanguaging and cognitive load. Similar to Suggestopedia's goal of reducing cognitive load, future studies could investigate how translanguaging supports comprehension by allowing students to use their native language as a scaffold, making it easier to grasp complex content.

6.6.2. Emotional and psychological benefits. Suggestopedia's focus on emotional well-being can be mirrored in translanguaging, as it may reduce language anxiety and boost engagement. Research could explore how allowing students to use L1 in certain moments creates a safe and supportive learning atmosphere.

6.6.3. Translanguaging as a multi-sensory tool. Future studies could examine how translanguaging, combined with multimedia and visual aids, functions

similarly to Suggestopedia's multi-sensory approach by appealing to different learning styles and enhancing engagement.

6.6.4. Translanguaging for accelerated learning. Like Suggestopedia, which aimed to accelerate language learning, translanguaging could facilitate faster acquisition and better retention. Research could focus on how it speeds up language learning across various proficiency levels.

6.6.5. Translanguaging in diverse educational contexts. Research could explore how translanguaging helps students in multilingual and multicultural classrooms, allowing them to bridge the gap between their native language and English in inclusive and engaging ways.

6.6.6. Comparing translanguaging and suggestopedia. Comparative studies could assess the effectiveness of translanguaging versus traditional immersion methods, such as Suggestopedia, in fostering language acquisition and learner outcomes like fluency and retention. In summary, translanguaging presents a promising avenue for research as a modern form of Suggestopedia, offering a balanced, supportive approach to language learning that can be tailored to diverse educational contexts and needs.

REFERENCES

- Aslan, G. D. (2019). *The reflection of the first foreign language (English) by utilizing translanguaging strategies in the teaching of second foreign language (German)* (Master's Thesis). Retrieved from <https://tez.yok.gov.tr>
- Aslan, G. D., & Kıray, G. (2020). The reflection of the first foreign language (English) by utilizing translanguaging strategies in the teaching of second foreign language (German). *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies*, 16(3), 1368-1386. <https://doi.org/10.17263/jlls.803801>
- Auer, P. (2005). A postscript: Code-switching and social identity. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 37(3), 403-410. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2004.10.010>
- Auerbach, E. R. (1993). Re-examining English only in the ESL classroom. *TESOL Quarterly*, 27(1), 9-32. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3586949>
- Azkarai, A., & García Mayo, M. P. (2015). Task-modality and L1 use in EFL oral interaction. *Language Teaching Research*, 19(5), 550–571. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168814541717>
- Baker, C. (2011). *Foundations of bilingual education and bilingualism* (5th ed.). Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Bakhtin, M. M. (1981). *The dialogic imagination: Four essays* (M. Holquist, Ed.; C. Emerson & M. Holquist, Trans.). Austin, TX: University of Texas Press.
- Blackledge, A., & Creese, A. (2017). Translanguaging and the body. *International Journal of Multilingualism*, 14(3), 250–268. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14790718.2017.1315809>
- Bozbiyık, M. (2023). *Displays of co-constructed content knowledge using translanguaging in EMI university classrooms*. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation. Hacettepe Üniversitesi, Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Ankara.
- Bruen, J., & Kelly, N. (2014). Using a shared L1 to reduce cognitive overload and anxiety levels in the L2 classroom. *The Language Learning Journal*, 45(3), 368-381. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09571736.2014.908405>
- Canagarajah, S. (2011). Translanguaging in the classroom: Emerging issues for research and pedagogy. *Applied Linguistics Review*, 2(1), 1-28.

<https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110239331.1>

- Cenoz, J., & Gorter, D. (2017). Language education policy and multilingual assessment. *Language and Education*, 31(3), 231-248. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09500782.2016.1261892>
- Cenoz, J., & Gorter, D. (2020). Pedagogical translanguaging: *An introduction*. *System*, 92, 102269. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2020.102269>
- Cook, V. (2001). Using the first language in the classroom. *Canadian Modern Language Review*, 57(3), 402-423. <https://doi.org/10.3138/cmlr.57.3.402>
- Creese, A., & Blackledge, A. (2010). *Translanguaging in the bilingual classroom: A pedagogy for learning and teaching?* *The Modern Language Journal*, 94(1), 103-115. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.2009.00986.x>
- Creswell, J. W. (2013). *Qualitative Inquiry and Research Design: Choosing among five approaches* (4th ed.). Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.
- Creswell, J. W., & Clark, V. L. P. (2017). *Designing and conducting mixed methods research*. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.
- Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2018). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approach* (5th ed.). Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.
- Creswell, J. W., & Poth, C. N. (2018). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches*. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.
- Creswell, J. W., & Guetterman, T. C. (2019). *Educational research: Planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research* (6th ed.): Boston, Pearson.
- Çelik, S. (2008). Opening the door: An examination of mother tongue use in foreign language classrooms. *Hacettepe Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 34, 75-85.
- Denscombe, M. (2008). Communities Of Practice: A Research Paradigm for the Mixed Methods Approach. *Journal of Mixed Methods Research*, 2(3), 270–283. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1558689808316807>
- Dornyei, Z. (2007). *Research methods in applied linguistics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Dykhanova, A. (2015). *Functions of code-switching and attitudes toward them:*

- A case study. (Master's Thesis). Retrieved from <http://irep.emu.edu.tr:8080/jspui/handle/11129/2942>
- Erbakan, N. T. (2020). (*In partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of master of arts in the department of English languaging teaching*) (Master's Thesis). Retrieved from <https://tez.yok.gov.tr>
- Escobar, C. F., & Dillard-Paltrineri, E. (2015). *Professors' and students' conflicting beliefs about translanguaging in the efl classroom: dismantling the monolingual bias*. *Revista de lenguas modernas*; San José, 23, 301-328. Retrieved from <https://revistas.ucr.ac.cr/index.php/rlm/article/download/22355/22512/>
- Etikan, İ., Musa, S. A., & Alkassim, R. S. (2016). Comparison of convenience sampling and purposive sampling. *American Journal of Theoretical and Applied Statistics*, 5(1), 1–4. <https://doi.org/10.11648/j.ajtas.20160501.11>
- Flick, U. (2009). *An introduction to qualitative research* (4th edn). Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications
- García, O. (2009). *Bilingual education in the 21st century: A global perspective*. Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.
- García, O., & Sylvan, C. E. (2011). Pedagogies and practices in multilingual classrooms: Singularities in pluralities. *The Modern Language Journal*, 95(3), 385–400. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.2011.01208.x>
- García, O., & Wei, L. (2014). Translanguaging: Language, bilingualism and education. *London: Macmillan*. <https://doi.org/10.1057/9781137385765>
- García, O., Wei, L., García, O., & Wei, L. (2014). *The translanguaging turn and its impact*. *Translanguaging: Language, Bilingualism and Education*, 19-44. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- García, O., & Kleyn, T. (2016). *Translanguaging with multilingual students. Learning from classroom moments*. New York: Routledge.
- García, O., & Lin, A. M. Y. (2016). Translanguaging in bilingual education. In O. García, A. M. Y. Lin, & S. May (Eds.), *Bilingual and multilingual education* (pp. 117–130). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-02324-3_9-1
- García, O. (2017). Translanguaging in schools: Subiendo y bajando, bajando y subiendo. *Journal of Language, Identity & Education*, 16(4), 256-263. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15348458.2017.1329657>

- Gort, M., and Sembiante, S. F. (2015). "Navigating hybridized language learning spaces through translanguaging pedagogy: Dual language preschool teachers' languaging practices in support of emergent bilingual children's performance of academic discourse". *International Multilingual Research Journal*, 9(1), 7-25. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19313152.2014.981775>
- Holdway, J., & Hitchcock, C. H. (2018). Exploring ideological becoming in professional development for teachers of multilingual learners. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 75, 60–70. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2018.05.015>
- İlhan, B. (2022). *The effects of translanguaging pedagogy on listening and reading comprehension and learners' perspectives on translanguaging in an EFL context* (Doctoral Dissertation). Retrieved from <https://tez.yok.gov.tr>
- İnci Kavak, V. (2021). *A functional analysis of translanguaging practices in engineering and literature courses in an English-medium higher education context in Turkey*. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation. Çukurova Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Adana.
- Johnson, R. B., & Onwuegbuzie, A. J. (2004). Mixed methods research: A research paradigm whose time has come. *Educational Researcher*, 33(7), 14–26. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189x033007014>
- Kamışlı, S. (2022). *The potential impacts of translanguaging on L2 reading through online learning at a state secondary school in Turkish context*, (Master's Thesis). Retrieved from <https://tez.yok.gov.tr>
- Karabulut, A. (2019). *Translanguaging as a pedagogical tool for Turkish EFL learners in writing classes*, (Doctoral Dissertation). Retrieved from <https://tez.yok.gov.tr>
- Karabulut, A., & Kesli Dollar, Y. (2022). The use of translanguaging pedagogy in writing classes of Turkish RFL learners. *Participatory Educational Research*, 9(6), 41-65. <https://doi.org/10.17275/per.22.128.9.6>
- Kavak, V. İ. (2021). *A functional analysis of translanguaging practices in engineering and literature courses in an English medium higher education context in Turkey* (Doctoral Dissertation). Retrieved from <https://tez.yok.gov.tr>
- Kırkgoz, Y. (2007). English language teaching in Turkey: Policy changes and their

- implementations. *RELC journal*, 38(2), 216-228.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0033688207079696>
- Küçük, C. (2018). *Investigating translanguaging as a teaching and learning practice in an English medium higher education context in Turkey*. (Master's Thesis), Retrieved from <https://tez.yok.gov.tr>
- Küçükali, E. (2021). *Planned and spontaneous translanguaging pedagogies by bilingual and multilingual teachers with L2 and L3/L3+ learners* (Doctoral Dissertation). Retrieved from <https://tez.yok.gov.tr>
- Liao, P. (2006). EFL learners' beliefs about and strategy use of translation in English learning. *RELC Journal*, 37(2), 191–215.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0033688206067428>
- Liu, Y., & Fang, F. (2020). *Translanguaging theory and practice: How stakeholders perceive translanguaging as a practical theory of language*. *RELC Journal*,
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0033688220939222>
- Leech, N. L., & Onwuegbuzie, A. J. (2009). A typology of mixed methods research designs. *Quality & Quantity*, 43(2), 265–275.
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s11135-007-9105-3>
- Levine, G. S. (2003). Student and instructor beliefs and attitudes about target language use, first language use, and anxiety: Report of a questionnaire study. *The Modern Language Journal*, 87(3), 343-364.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/1540-4781.00194>
- Lewis, G., Jones, B., & Baker, C. (2012). Translanguaging: Developing its conceptualisation and contextualisation. *Educational Research and Evaluation*, 18(7), 655-670. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13803611.2012.718490>
- Macaro, E. (2005). *Codeswitching in the L2 classroom: A communication and learning strategy*. In *non-native language teachers: perceptions, challenges and contributions to the profession* (Pp. 63-84). Retrieved from [https://www.academia.edu/download/32406740/Codeswitching_in_the_L2_c
lassroom_Macaro.pdf](https://www.academia.edu/download/32406740/Codeswitching_in_the_L2_classroom_Macaro.pdf)
- Macaro, E. (2022). *English medium instruction: Content and language in policy and practice*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Mısırlı, H. (2023). *Vlog as a multimodal translanguaging space: Insights from a*

- Turkish social media influencer corpus*. Doctoral Dissertation. Retrieved from <https://tez.yok.gov.tr>
- Molina-Azorín, J. F. (2010). *Mixed methods research in strategic management*. *Organizational Research Methods*, 15(1), 33–56.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/1094428110393023>
- Myers-Scotton, C. (2005). *Multiple voices: An introduction to bilingualism*. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.
- Özkaynak, O. (2020). *A structural equation model on translanguaging practices, foreign language classroom anxiety, reconceptualized L2 motivational self system, and foreign language achievement of emergent bilinguals* (Master's Thesis). Retrieved from <https://tez.yok.gov.tr/UlusalTezMerkezi/>
- Özsevik, Z. (2010). *The use of communicative language teaching (CLT): Turkish EFL teachers' perceived difficulties in implementing CLT in Turkey* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign).
- Öztürk, S. A. (2022). *Exploring student-directed translanguaging in the English-centric classroom* (Master's Thesis). Retrieved from <https://tez.yok.gov.tr/UlusalTezMerkezi/>
- Öztürk, S. A., & Çubukçu, F. (2022). "Exploring student-directed translanguaging in the English-centric classroom". *Language Teaching Research Quarterly*, 31, 159-173. <https://doi.org/10.32038/ltrq.2022.31.11>
- Öztüfekçi, E. (2023). *Unpacking and negotiating pre-service English teachers' language ideologies: their journey of learning to facilitate translanguaging*. (Doctoral Dissertation), Retrieved from <https://tez.yok.gov.tr>.
- Patton, M. Q. (1987). *How to use qualitative methods in evaluation*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Rivera, A. J., & Mazak, C. (2019). *Pedagogical translanguaging in a Puerto Rican university classroom: An exploratory case study of student beliefs and practices*. *Journal of Hispanic Higher Education*, 18(3), 225-239.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/1538192717734288>
- Sezer, H.H. (2022). *Translanguaging goals and strategies of lecturers at English medium instruction context at universities in Turkey*. Master's Thesis, Retrieved from <https://tez.yok.gov.tr>.

- Shah, M., Pillai, S., & Sinayah, M. (2019). Translanguaging in an academic setting. *Lingua*, 225, 16-31. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lingua.2019.05.001>
- Shifidi, L. N. (2014). *Integration of translanguaging in lessons: An approach to teaching and learning in Namibian junior secondary schools* (Master's thesis). Retrieved from <https://brage.inn.no/inn-xmlui/bitstream/handle/11250/225830/Shifidi.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y>
- Storch, N., & Aldosari, A. (2010). Learners' use of first language (Arabic) in pair work in an EFL class. *Language Teaching Research*, 14(4), 355-375. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168810375362>
- Tanık, E. A. (2021). *Translanguaging practices and reasons of EFL students in task-based language teaching activities* (Master's Thesis). Retrieved from <https://tez.yok.gov.tr>
- Turnbull, M. (2001). There is a role for the L1 in second and foreign language teaching, but.... *The Canadian Modern Language Review*, 57(4), 531-540. <https://doi.org/10.3138/cmlr.57.4.531>
- Van der Walt, C. (2006). University students' attitudes towards and experiences of bilingual classrooms. *Current Issues in Language Planning*, 7(2-3), 359-376. <https://doi.org/10.2167/cilp104.0>
- Vasantharaju, N. N. S. H., & Harinarayana, N. S. (2016). Online survey tools: A case study of google forms. in national conference on scientific, computational & information research trends in engineering, *GSSS-IETW, Mysore*. Retrieved from https://www.academia.edu/download/94296825/online_survey_tools_google_for_msnvnsh22_160202065410.pdf
- Velasco, P., & García, O. (2014). Translanguaging and the writing of bilingual learners. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 37(1), 6-23. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15235882.2014.893270>
- Yüzlü, M. Y. (2021). *Re-envisioning EFL teaching through translanguaging: identity reconstruction by k-12 English teachers*. Doctoral Dissertation. Retrieved from <https://tez.yok.gov.tr>
- Wang, D. (2016). *Translanguaging in Chinese foreign language classrooms: Students and teachers' attitudes and practices*. *International Journal of*

- Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 22(2), 138–149.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050.2016.1231773>
- Wei, L. (2011). Moment analysis and translanguaging space: Discursive construction of identities by multilingual Chinese youth in Britain. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 43(5), 1222–1235.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2010.07.035>
- Wei, L. (2022). *Translanguaging as a political stance: Implications for English language education*. *ELT journal*, 76(2), 172–182.
<https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccab083>
- Yuvayapan, F. (2019). Translanguaging in EFL classrooms: Teachers' perceptions and practices. *Dil ve Dilbilimi Çalışmaları Dergisi*, 15(2), 678–694.
<https://doi.org/10.17263/jlls.586811>
- Yüzlü, M. Y., & Dikilitas, K. (2021). *Translanguaging in the development of EFL learners' foreign language skills in Turkish context*. *Innovation in Language Learning and Teaching*, 0(0), 1–15.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/17501229.2021.1892698>

APPENDICES

APPENDIX-1

ETHICS COMMITTEE PERMISSION



**Girişimsel Olmayan
Klinik Araştırmalar
Etik Kurulu**

**Girişimsel Olmayan Klinik Araştırmalar Etik Kurul
Kararı**

**Non-Interventional Clinical Research Ethics
Committee Decision**

Toplantı Tarihi / Meeting Date : 03.12.2024 Salı
Toplantı No / Meeting No : 2024/12
Karar No / Decision No : GO 2024/783

Sorumlu araştırmacısının DR.ÖĞR.ÜYESİ YUSUF EMRE YEŞİLYURT, yardımcı araştırmacısının KADİR BAL olduğu, 'Students' Attitudes Towards Translanguaging in Higher Education in an EFL context.(Yükseköğretimde Yabancı Dil Olarak İngilizce Bağlamında Öğrencilerin Diller arası Geçişlilik Uygulamalarına Yönelik Tutumları)' başlıklı araştırmanın gerekçe amaç yaklaşım ve yöntemleri dikkate alınarak incelenmiş olup, araştırmanın fikri, hukuki ve telif hakları bakımından sorumluluğu araştırma ekibine ait olması koşulu ile etik açıdan uygun bulunmuştur.

After evaluating the justification, purpose, approach, and methods of the study titled 'Students' Attitudes Towards Translanguaging in Higher Education in an EFL context.(Yükseköğretimde Yabancı Dil Olarak İngilizce Bağlamında Öğrencilerin Diller arası Geçişlilik Uygulamalarına Yönelik Tutumları)', conducted by the principal investigator DR.ÖĞR.ÜYESİ YUSUF EMRE YEŞİLYURT, co-investigator KADİR BAL, the study was deemed ethically appropriate, provided that the research team assumes full responsibility for the idea, legal, and copyright aspects of the study.

PROF.DR. Oğuzhan DALKIRAN
Başkan / Chair

DOÇ.DR. Deniz SAY ŞAHİN
Başkan Yrd. / Vice Chair

DOÇ.DR. Sibel ŞENTÜRK
Raporör / Reporter

DOÇ.DR. Aysun GÜZEL
Oye / Member

DOÇ.DR. Gökmen ARSLAN
Oye / Member

DOÇ.DR. Mehmet Haşim AKGÜL
Oye / Member

DOÇ.DR. Sezgin KORKMAZ
Oye / Member

DOÇ.DR. Mehmet ULAŞ
Oye / Member

DR.ÖĞR.ÜYESİ Serap ÖZDEMİR BİŞKİN
Oye / Member

DR.ÖĞR.ÜYESİ Nurdan ORAL KARA
Oye / Member

DR.ÖĞR.ÜYESİ Dilara AKÇORA YILDIZ
Oye / Member

DR.ÖĞR.ÜYESİ Mahmut ATEŞ
Oye / Member

DR.ÖĞR.ÜYESİ Dilşad Tülgün ÇETİN
Oye / Member

DOÇ.DR. Derya CAN
Oye / Member

DR.ÖĞR.ÜYESİ Mustafa İŞLEYEN
Oye / Member

DR.ÖĞR.ÜYESİ Funda UYSAL
Oye / Member



Bu QR kod, Burdur Mehmet Akif Ersoy Üniversitesi Girişimsel Olmayan Klinik Araştırmalar (GOKA) Etik Kurulu'nun onayı ile GOKA online başvuru sisteminde oluşturulmuştur. QR kod, Burdur Mehmet Akif Ersoy Üniversitesi'nin resmi web sitesi olan GOKA online başvuru sistemi üzerinden görüntülenebilir.

This QR code has been generated through the approval of the Non-Interventional Clinical Research Ethics Committee (GOKA) of Burdur Mehmet Akif Ersoy University via the GOKA online application system. The QR code can be viewed through the GOKA online application system, which is the official website of Burdur Mehmet Akif Ersoy University.

APPENDIX-2

CURRICULUM VITAE

PERSONAL INFORMATION

Name-Surname: Kadir BAL

Title: English Language Instructor

EDUCATION

Master's Degree: Burdur Mehmet Akif Ersoy University/Institute of Educational Sciences/Department of Foreign Language Education/Master's Program with Thesis in Foreign Language Education

Bachelor's Degree: Istanbul University/Faculty of Education/Department of Foreign Languages Education/Program of English Language Teaching

WORK EXPERIENCE

Istanbul Esenyurt University- English Language Instructor

PAPERS PRESENTED AT NATIONAL/INTERNATIONAL CONGRESSES AND PUBLISHED IN THE PROCEEDINGS BOOK

Bal, K. (2024, July). University Preparatory Department Staffs' Views About The Concept Of Burnout. II. Bilsel International Kibyra Scientific Researches Congress, (pp. 618-634), BURDUR.

APPENDIX-3

CERTIFICATE OF CONGRESS ATTENDENCE



CERTIFICATE

of participant

This certificate is presented to:

Kadir BAL

In oral and technical presentation, recognition and appreciation of research contributions to
"2. BİLSEL INTERNATIONAL KIBYRA SCIENTIFIC RESEARCHES CONGRESS"
 20-21 July, 2024 BURDUR/ TÜRKİYE
 with the paper entitled

"University Preparatory Department Staffs' Views About the Concept of Burnout."

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Adem DOĞAN
Head of Organization Committee

Dr. Bahar ALTUNOK
General Coordinator

2. BİLSEL INTERNATIONAL KIBYRA SCIENTIFIC RESEARCHES CONGRESS, 20-21 JULY, 2024-BURDUR/ TÜRKİYE		
21.07.2024 TÜRKİYE Local Time: 10:30-12:30		
HEAD OF SESSION: Dr. Dilek GÜLER		
SESSION-1 HALL-2		
AUTHORS	AFFILIATION	TOPIC TITLE
Yüksek Lisans Öğrencisi Zülküf AYDEMİR Yüksek Lisans Öğrencisi Tuncay KAHVECİ Yüksek Lisans Öğrencisi Ziya GÖRGEL	Kahramanmaraş Sütçü İmam Üniversitesi,	TÜRKİYE'NİN İHRACAT DEĞERLERİNDEKİ GELİŞİM VE EXİMBANK'IN ETKİSİ: BİR DEĞERLENDİRME
Dr. Araştırma Görevlisi Dilek GÜLER	KTO Karatay Üniversitesi	CEZA MUHALEMESİNDE DİJİTAL DELİLLERİN DEĞERLENDİRİLMESİ VE DELİL YASAKLARI
İnanç KILIÇKAYA Doç. Dr. Azize ESMERAY	Kayseri Üniversitesi,	ÜRÜN ALIŞ VE SATIŞLARININ MUHASEBELEŞTİRİLMESİNDE GELENEKSEL TİCARET VE ELEKTRONİK TİCARETİN FARKLILIKLARI
Kadir BAL,	Burdur Mehmet Akif Üniversitesi	UNIVERSITY PREPARATORY DEPARTMENT STAFFS' VIEWS ABOUT THE CONCEPT OF BURNOUT.
Sani Nsangou Mama Pr. Dr. Abdullah Karaman	Selçuk Üniversitesi,	KAMERUN'DA NOUN BÖLGESİ TURİZM POTANSİYELİ

APPENDIX-4

THESIS SCALE PERMISSION

Re: TEZ ÖLÇEĞİ HAKKINDA

Kimden: Ceylan Tural
Tarih: 25.10.2024 Cum 14:31
Kime: Kadir BAL

Kadir Hocam merhaba,
Tabiki kullanabiliriz.
İyi çalışmalar diliyorum

Ceylan KÖÇÜK
International Relations Office

Adana Alparslan Türkeş University of Science and Technology

Bakalı Mah. Çatalan Cad. No:2017
41350 Sarıçam / ADANA
TÜRKİYE

E-mail:
Web:

Kadir BAL, 25 Ek 2024 Cum, 11:56 tarihinde günü yazdı:

Merhaba Ceylan Hocam,
Ben Erenyurt Üniversitesi Ortak Dersler Bölümü Öğretim Görevlisi Kadir BAL. Aynı zamanda Burdur Mehmet Akif Üniversitesi İngilizce Öğretmenliği Bölümü Yüksek Lisans Öğrencisiyim. Tez konumu Translanguaging üzerine yapmaya karar verdim araştırma yaparken "INVESTIGATING TRANSLANGUAGING AS A TEACHING AND LEARNING PRACTICE IN AN ENGLISH MEDIUM HIGHER EDUCATION CONTEXT IN TURKEY" isimli tezimize rast geldim. Okuturmuş olduğunuz ölçüğü çok beğendim ve çalışma grubuma uygun olduğunu gördüm. Acaba tezinin yazımında ölçüğümden yararlanmam mümkün müdür? Mutlaka adınıza anotta bulunacaktır.

Teşekkür eder, iyi çalışmalar dilerim.

Kadir BAL

APPENDIX 5

OPEN-ENDED QUESTIONNAIRE FOR EFL STUDENTS

QUESTIONS FOR INTERVIEWS ON TRANSLANGUAGING

Dear Participant,

The purpose of this survey is to investigate the practices of interlinguality in environments where English is used as a foreign language. The results of this survey will be used solely for research purposes, and your responses will be kept confidential. Therefore, please answer the questions sincerely.

Thank you very much for your help.

Kadir BAL
Burdur Mehmet Akif Ersoy University
Institute of Educational Sciences
Department of English Language Teaching
Master's Program

Section 1: Demographic Information

1. Gender: Male ☐ Female ☐
2. Native Language: English ☐ Turkish ☐ Other ☐ (Please specify)

3. Second Language: English ☐ Turkish ☐ Other ☐ (Please specify)

4. What is your faculty/department? _____
5. How would you rate your English proficiency?
Low Beginner ☐ Beginner ☐ Low Intermediate ☐ High Intermediate ☐
Advanced ☐
6. Do you speak English outside of school? Yes ☐ No ☐
If yes, please explain how often and with whom you speak.

Section 2: Interlingual Practices in Classes

1. Derslerinizde anadilinizi kullanma sıklığınız nasıldır? (How frequently do you use your native language in your classes?)

2. Ders esnasında dillerarası geçişliliği (birden fazla dilde kullanılması) ne zaman tercih edersiniz?

(When do you use translanguaging (using more than one language) during the lessons?)

Section 3: Frequency of the usage of Translanguaging in Classes

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

(How often do you switch from one language to another? (Please check the appropriate box))

a) Always ☐ b) Mostly ☐ c) Sometimes ☐ d) Never ☐

2. Dillerarası geçişi genellikle kimlerle yaparsınız? (With whom do you usually practice translanguaging switching?)

Section 4: Attitudes Towards Interlingual Use in Classes

1. Ders esnasında eşzamanlı olarak birden fazla dili kullanma nedeniniz nelerdir? Açıklayınız lütfen.

(What are your reasons for using more than one language simultaneously during a class? Please explain.)

2. Derste Anadilinizi ve İngilizce'yi aynı anda kullanmanız sizce ne kadar faydalı veya zararlı? Bu konudaki görüşleriniz nelerdir?

(How beneficial or harmful do you find using both your native language and English simultaneously in class? What are your views on this?)

3. Derste Öğretim Elemanlarının Anadilinizi ve İngilizce'yi aynı anda kullanması sizce ne kadar faydalı veya zararlı? Bu konudaki görüşleriniz nelerdir?

(How beneficial or harmful do you find it when instructors use both your native language and English simultaneously in class? What are your views on this?)

4. Öğrencilerin ders sırasında dillerarası geçişliliğine izin verilmesi konusundaki görüşleriniz nelerdir?

(What are your views on allowing students to practice translanguaging during class?)

5. Sizce, öğrencilerin anadillerini derslerde **kullanmamaları** için gerekçeler ne olabilir? Bu konudaki görüşleriniz nelerdir?

(In your opinion, what could be the reasons for students not using their native languages in class? What are your views on this?)

6. Öğretim elemanlarının ders boyunca hem İngilizceyi hem de Anadilinizi kullanmaları, öğrencilerin dersleri anlamalarında nasıl faydalı olur? Bu konudaki görüşleriniz nelerdir?

(How do you think the use of both English and your native language by instructors throughout the class helps students understand the lessons? What are your views on this?)

7. Sınıfta anadilinizi ve İngilizceyi aynı anda kullanmanızın ders konularını anlamanızda ne kadar yardımcı olur bu konuda düşünceleriniz nelerdir?
(How helpful is the simultaneous use of your native language and English in understanding lesson topics? What are your thoughts on this?)

8. Sınıfta anadilinizi ve İngilizceyi aynı anda kullanmanız İngilizcenizi geliştirmenize ne kadar yardımcı olur? (How helpful is the simultaneous use of your native language and English in improving your English proficiency?)

9. Öğretim elemanlarının derste kullanılan materyalleri ve kelimeleri hem anadilinizde hem de İngilizce olarak sunmaları ne kadar faydalıdır, bu konudaki görüşleriniz nelerdir?
(How beneficial is it for instructors to present materials and terms in both your native language and English? What are your views on this?)

Section 5: Language Related Difficulties in EFL Context.

1. Dersleriniz sırasında dil ile ilgili zorluklarla karşılaşma durumunuz nasıldır?
(How often do you encounter language-related difficulties during your classes?)

2. Dersleriniz sırasında karşılaştığınız zorluklar nelerdir? (What difficulties do you encounter during your classes?)

3. Zorlukların her biriyle başa çıkabilmek için kullandığınız stratejileri açıklayınız lütfen.

Please explain the strategies you use to cope with each difficulty.)

Section 6: Final Comments on Interlinguality

1. Derslerinizde dillerarası geçişlilik ile ilgili deneyiminiz hakkında benimle paylaşmak istediğiniz başka şeyler varsa buraya yazabilir misiniz lütfen?

If there is anything else you would like to share about your experience with translanguaging in your classes, please write it here.)

End of the interview, thank you for your time!

APPENDIX 6

QUANTITATIVE QUESTIONNAIRE FOR EFL STUDENTS

Aşağıdaki ankette bulunan soruları yanıtlayarak bana yardımcı olmanızı rica ediyorum. Bu çalışmanın amacı İngilizcenin yabancı dil olarak kullanıldığı ortamlarda Dillerarası Geçişlilik Uygulamalarına ilişkin öğrencilerin tutumlarını incelemektir. Bu anketin sonuçları sadece bilimsel araştırma amacı ile kullanılacak olup **cevaplarınız saklı tutulacaktır** bu nedenle lütfen soruları samimiyetle cevaplandırınız.

Katkılarınız için çok teşekkür ederim.

CİNSİYET					
ANADİLİNİZ					
YABANCI DİLİNİZ					
İngilizce Seviyeniz nedir?					
FAKÜLTE/BÖLÜM					
	Kesinlikle Katılıyorum	Katılıyorum	Kararsızım	Katılmıyorum	Kesinlikle Katılmıyorum
1- Derslerde, yalnızca İngilizce kullanılmalıdır.(Only English should be used in classes)					
2- Derste İngilizceyi ne kadar çok kullanırsak					

İngilizcede o kadar ilerleme sağlarız.(The more we use English in class, the more progress we make in English)					
3- İngilizceye hâkim olmak için İngilizcenin derslerde çok kullanılması gerektiğine inanıyorum.(I believe that English should be used a lot in lessons in order to master English)					
4- Öğrencilerin derste anadillerini kullanmalarını gerektiren herhangi bir durum olduğunu düşünmüyorum.					
5- Öğrencilerin derste, birlikte çalışırken yalnızca İngilizce kullanması gerektiğine inanıyorum(I believe that students should only use English in class, when studying together)					
6- Öğretim elemanı ders anlatırken bir dilden diğerine (İngilizce ‘den Türkçe ‘ye (veya tam tersi) geçiş yaparken çok zaman harcıyor (While teaching, the instructor spends a lot of time switching from one language to another, from English to Turkish or vice versa.)					

7- Öğretim elemanı ders sırasında İngilizce ‘den Türkçe ‘ye (veya tam tersi) geçince kafam karışır(I get confused when the lecturer switches from English to Turkish (or vice versa) during the lecture.)					
8- Derste aynı anda hem anadilimi hem de İngilizceyi kullanmam İngilizcemin zayıflamasına neden olur.(Using both my native language and English at the same time in class will cause my English to weaken.)					
9- Derslerimde, ihtiyacım olduğunu hissettiğimde anadilimi kullanmak istiyorum.(I want to use my mother tongue in my classes when I feel I need to.)					
10- Derste ki sorumluluklarımı yerine getirdiğim sürece sınıfta yalnızca İngilizceyi kullanmak önemli değildir(Using only English in class is not important as long as I fulfil my responsibilities in class)					
11- Sınıf aktiviteleri sırasında sınıf arkadaşlarımla anadilimizde konuşmak sorun					

olmamalıdır.(It should not be a problem to speak with my classmates in our mother tongue during class activities.)					
12- Öğretim elemanının derslerde aynı anda hem İngilizce hem de anadilimi kullanması bana fayda sağlıyor (I benefit from the fact that the lecturer uses both English and my mother tongue at the same time in the lessons).					
13- Öğretim elemanının İngilizce ve anadilimde ders materyalleri kullanması bana fayda sağlar (It is beneficial for me if the lecturer uses course materials in English and my mother tongue)					
14- Öğretim elemanını, derslerde kullanılan kelimeleri hem İngilizce hem de anadilimde sunarsa derslerden daha fazla fayda sağlarım.(I will benefit more from the lessons if the lecturer presents the vocabulary used in the lessons both in English and in my mother tongue.)					
15- Derste aynı anda hem anadilimi hem de İngilizceyi kullanmak ders					

İçerğini daha iyi anlamamı sağlıyor.(Using both my mother tongue and English at the same time helps me to understand the course content better.)					
	Sürekli	Sık Sık	Bazen	Hiç	
16- Derste aynı anda hem anadilimi hem de İngilizceyi kullanmak, İngilizcem geliştimeme yardımcı olur.(Using both my mother tongue and English at the same time in class helps me to improve my English.)					
17- Öğretim elemanının kullandığı veya aktivitelerde kullanılan dile bakmaksızın anadilimde not alırım.(I take notes in my mother tongue regardless of the language used by the lecturer or the language used in the activities.)					
18- Öğretim elemanının derste kullandığı dilde not alırım.(I take notes in the language used by the lecturer in the lesson.)					
19- Derste not alırken İngilizce 'den Türkçe 'ye (veya tam tersi) fark etmeden geçiş yaptığımı görüyorum.(While					

taking notes in class, I find that I switch from English to Turkish or vice versa without realising it)					
20- Derste sınıf arkadaşşıma dersle alakalı yeni bir kavramı anlatırken anadilimi kullanırım.(I use my mother tongue when explaining a new concept related to the lesson to my classmate)					
21- Derste geçen bir kavramı sınıf arkadaşşıma sorma ihtiyacı duyduğumda anadilimi kullanırım.(I use my mother tongue when I need to ask a classmate about a concept in the lesson.)					
22- Derste geçen bir kelime veya kavramın anlamını kontrol etmem gerektiğı zaman anadilimi kullanırım (I use my mother tongue when I need to check the meaning of a word or concept in a lesson.)					

APPENDIX 7

PROFICIENCY TEST FOR A1&A2 LEVEL

- 1.A: "What ____ their ____?"
 B: "Alexander and Philip."
 a) are/name b) is / name
 c) is / names d) are/names
2. "____ is Brenda?"
 "She's Patrick's wife."
 a) What b) Who c) Which d) Where
3. Isabel is a flight attendant. She _____ passengers.
 a) serve b) to serve c) serves d) serving
4. We always ____ lemonade in the evenings.
 a) to drink b) has c) drinking d) have
5. I ____ a cigarette, but my teacher ____ smoke.
 A) don't / smokes B) smoke / doesn't
 C) smokes / smokes D) smoke / don't
6. I like ____ football, but my brother doesn't.
 A) play B) played C) playing D) plays
7. Bob, ____ is my mother.
 A) these B) it C) this D) that
8. London ____ got a lot of parks.
 A) has B) have C) does D) do
9. 0/2/11/18/20 Find the correct alternative.
 A) oh / twelve / eighteen / twenty
 B) zero / Two/one-one/eighteen/ twenty
 C) zero / two / eleven / eighteen / twenty
 D) zero / two / eleven / eighty / twenty
10. In winter Sheila ____ skiing and in summer ____ tennis.
 a) makes / plays b) goes / plays
 c) does / plays d) starts / *
11. Flora ____ drive a car but she ____ ride a motorbike.
 a) can / can't b) is / can't
 c) can't / can't d) is / can

12. It is half past eight.

A) 8:30 B) 7:30 C) 18:30 D) 17:30

13. Ankara is in _____.

a) Turkey b) Turkish c) German d) Japan

14. They ____ 15 years old. They are 13!

a) is b) are c) aren't d) isn't

15. say _____

a) sunglasses b) eat c) sorry d) go

16. I don't have _____ milk left.

a) much b) some c) many d) a

17. Anna likes Joanna, but Maria doesn't like _____.

A) her B) them C) your D) their

18. A: Where _____ you last week?

B: I _____ in Alabama.

A) were / were B) was / is

C) were / was D) was / were

19. These exercises are _____ in the exam.

A) the difficulties B) the most difficult

C) the difficult D) most difficult

20. Nancy's car is __ than mine, but Ben's car is __ car.

a) the most expensive / more expensive

b) more expensive / the most expensive

c) expensiver / expensivest

d) most expensive / the more expensive

21. Where ____ you ____ on holiday last year?

A) did / went B) go / did

C) did / go D) do / go

22. She ran _____.

a) quick b) quicker c) quickly d) the quickly

READING PASSAGE:

Read the text, and answer the questions.

My name is Hans. I am a mechanic. I live in London in the city centre. I have a brother and a sister. My sister's name is Barbara. She's a student. She studies medicine at a university. My brother's name is Alan. He's a student too. He goes to high school. We live in a big house with our parents. They are both teachers. Our mother is an English teacher and our father is a biology teacher. There is a big garden in front of our house. There are a lot of flowers in the garden. There is a lemon tree in the garden. We love our house very much!

23. Hans has got _____ siblings.

- a) 2 b) 3 c) 4 d) 5

24. Hans's house is _____.

- a) small b) expensive c) large d) cheap

25. The passage is mainly about _____.

- a) Hans's daily routine.
b) Hans and his family.
c) Hans's parents.
d) Hans's friends.

APPENDIX 8

PROFICIENCY TEST EXAM RESULTS

Name/ Surname	Correct	Incorrect	Empty	Net	Points
AB*****Lİ	24	1	0	24	96
AB*****AN	24	0	1	24	96
AH*****ÜK	24	1	0	24	96
AR*****R	24	1	0	24	96
BA*****İN	23	2	0	23	92
BE*****EN	23	2	0	23	92
Bİ*****YA	25	0	0	25	100
EL*****ÜK	23	2	0	23	92
ER*****HH	25	0	0	25	100
İK*****AN	23	1	1	23	92
İS*****EM	24	1	0	24	96
KA*****AL	23	2	0	23	92
MA*****NY	25	0	0	25	100
MA*****MO	25	0	0	25	100
ME*****AŞ	24	1	0	24	96
ME*****İR	23	2	0	23	92
MU*****IZ	24	1	0	24	96
NA*****İN	24	1	0	24	96
NA*****AH	24	1	0	24	96
Nİ*****UŞ	25	0	0	25	100
Nİ*****İZ	24	1	0	24	96
Nİ*****AN	23	2	0	23	92
Nİ*****EM	25	0	0	25	100
SE*****AŞ	23	2	0	23	92
SE*****İN	25	0	0	25	100
SH*****İF	24	1	0	24	96
TU*****AR	24	1	0	24	96
YU*****AR	24	1	0	24	96
YU*****KA	24	1	0	24	96
AH*****İN	22	3	0	22	88
AL*****AN	22	3	0	22	88
AL*****LU	22	3	0	22	88
AY*****İN	22	3	0	22	88
Çİ*****M	22	1	2	22	88
ES*****AN	22	3	0	22	88
FA*****İ	22	3	0	22	88
KE*****Lİ	22	3	0	22	88
ME*****İR	22	3	0	22	88
SU*****İK	22	3	0	22	88
SÜ*****EL	22	3	0	22	88
ŞE*****AN	22	3	0	22	88
AH*****İN	21	4	0	21	84
AV*****EN	20	5	0	20	80
AY*****Lİ	21	4	0	21	84
AY*****U	20	5	0	20	80
CE*****İĞ	20	5	0	20	80
CE*****ÜN	21	2	2	21	84
EF*****Cİ	21	4	0	21	84

Name/ Surname	Correct	Incorrect	Empty	Net	Points
ME*****AN	12	13	0	12	48
ME*****AN	10	15	0	10	40
ME*****AR	11	11	3	11	44
ME*****AN	12	10	3	12	48
ME*****Cİ	11	14	0	11	44
Mİ*****T	10	13	2	10	40
Mİ*****AN	12	12	1	12	48
MU*****AN	10	15	0	10	40
MU*****İN	10	15	0	10	40
MU*****UN	10	15	0	10	40
MU*****YA	11	14	0	11	44
MU*****SU	10	15	0	10	40
MU*****İZ	12	13	0	12	48
MU*****AN	12	13	0	12	48
MU*****CE	12	13	0	12	48
MU*****LU	12	13	0	12	48
MU*****AN	12	13	0	12	48
MU*****İM	12	13	0	12	48
MU*****YA	11	13	1	11	44
NA*****İL	10	15	0	10	40
NA*****AM	10	15	0	10	40
NA*****LU	10	15	0	10	40
NE*****İN	10	15	0	10	40
NE*****EK	11	14	0	11	44
NI*****AN	12	13	0	12	48
Nİ*****AT	12	10	3	12	48
Nİ*****NA	11	14	0	11	44
Nİ*****AR	11	13	1	11	44
Nİ*****RA	10	15	0	10	40
NU*****AN	11	14	0	11	44
OK*****Cİ	10	15	0	10	40
ON*****U	11	14	0	11	44
ÖM*****Çİ	12	13	0	12	48
ÖM*****İN	12	13	0	12	48
ÖM*****EK	12	13	0	12	48
ÖN*****EN	10	15	0	10	40
PI*****İR	10	15	0	10	40
RA*****OY	11	14	0	11	44
RA*****AZ	10	15	0	10	40
RA*****AĞ	12	13	0	12	48
RE*****N	10	15	0	10	40
RO*****GU	11	14	0	11	44
RO*****ER	12	10	3	12	48
RO*****UM	11	14	0	11	44
RO*****EY	10	15	0	10	40
RU*****AR	10	15	0	10	40
RU*****AY	10	14	1	10	40
RU*****İŞ	11	12	2	11	44

EM*****AN	20	5	0	20	80
ER*****Lİ	21	4	0	21	84
ES*****UŞ	21	4	0	21	84
EZ*****Cİ	20	5	0	20	80
Hİ*****İZ	21	4	0	21	84
İR*****Pİ	21	4	0	21	84
KE*****İN	21	4	0	21	84
ME*****AK	21	4	0	21	84
ME*****AN	21	4	0	21	84
ME*****OY	21	4	0	21	84
ME*****AŞ	20	5	0	20	80
MO*****Rİ	21	4	0	21	84
NA*****Lİ	20	5	0	20	80
ÖM*****AR	21	4	0	21	84
ÖZ*****AŞ	20	5	0	20	80
PI*****AN	20	4	1	20	80
RE*****AN	20	5	0	20	80
Rİ*****İM	20	5	0	20	80
RU*****VA	20	5	0	20	80
SA*****ER	20	5	0	20	80
SE*****D	20	5	0	20	80
SÜ*****UK	21	4	0	21	84
TU*****ER	21	4	0	21	84
UĞ*****İN	21	4	0	21	84
UM*****İK	20	5	0	20	80
ÜL*****OL	20	5	0	20	80
ZA*****MI	20	5	0	20	80
ZE*****İN	21	4	0	21	84
AL*****Cİ	19	6	0	19	76
AL*****İN	19	6	0	19	76
AM*****Lİ	19	6	0	19	76
AR*****Nİ	19	6	0	19	76
AY*****LU	19	6	0	19	76
BA*****İN	19	6	0	19	76
BÜ*****EY	19	6	0	19	76
ÇA*****AY	19	6	0	19	76
EL*****Şİ	19	5	1	19	76
EL*****CA	19	5	1	19	76
EM*****UT	19	6	0	19	76
EM*****AN	19	6	0	19	76
EN*****ÜL	19	6	0	19	76
FA*****AN	19	6	0	19	76
GÖ*****ER	19	6	0	19	76
HA*****İD	19	6	0	19	76
ME*****İR	19	6	0	19	76
ÖM*****EN	19	6	0	19	76
PA*****A	19	6	0	19	76
RA*****İR	19	5	1	19	76
SE*****ER	19	6	0	19	76
SU*****AH	19	3	3	19	76
ŞE*****EN	19	6	0	19	76
TU*****UT	19	6	0	19	76
ÜM*****ÜZ	19	6	0	19	76
Yİ*****YA	19	6	0	19	76

RÜ*****İK	10	12	3	10	40
SA*****EN	12	13	0	12	48
SA*****UT	12	8	5	12	48
SA*****RA	12	13	0	12	48
SA*****DE	11	14	0	11	44
SE*****DU	10	15	0	10	40
SE*****Lİ	12	13	0	12	48
SE*****AN	11	14	0	11	44
SE*****OL	11	14	0	11	44
SE*****İK	10	15	0	10	40
SE*****AY	12	13	0	12	48
SE*****İN	10	15	0	10	40
SE*****İK	11	14	0	11	44
SE*****RA	11	14	0	11	44
SE*****SU	11	13	1	11	44
SI*****ÜK	10	15	0	10	40
SI*****AN	12	11	2	12	48
SI*****AZ	10	15	0	10	40
Sİ*****RK	12	13	0	12	48
Sİ*****AR	12	13	0	12	48
SU*****Rİ	11	14	0	11	44
SU*****AN	10	15	0	10	40
SU*****UT	10	15	0	10	40
ŞA*****ER	12	13	0	12	48
ŞA*****AŞ	12	13	0	12	48
ŞE*****AN	10	15	0	10	40
ŞE*****ÜL	11	13	1	11	44
ŞE*****ER	12	13	0	12	48
Şİ*****OK	11	14	0	11	44
TA*****AŞ	11	14	0	11	44
TA*****İŞ	10	15	0	10	40
TA*****AN	10	15	0	10	40
TA*****EL	11	14	0	11	44
TU*****AN	12	13	0	12	48
UM*****İT	10	15	0	10	40
ÜM*****AY	12	11	2	12	48
ÜM*****EK	11	14	0	11	44
YA*****AN	12	13	0	12	48
YA*****AK	10	15	0	10	40
YA*****EK	12	13	0	12	48
Yİ*****AK	11	14	0	11	44
YU*****Cİ	12	13	0	12	48
YU*****K	12	13	0	12	48
YU*****ÜŞ	11	14	0	11	44
YU*****AN	10	15	0	10	40
ZA*****D	10	15	0	10	40
ZE*****AR	11	14	0	11	44
ZE*****AN	10	15	0	10	40
ZE*****İN	10	15	0	10	40
AB*****D	8	17	0	8	32
AB*****ER	8	16	1	8	32
AB*****T	4	21	0	4	16
AB*****ER	8	17	0	8	32
AB*****EL	5	20	0	5	20

Yİ*****ÜL	19	6	0	19	76
ZA*****D	19	6	0	19	76
AŞ*****SU	18	7	0	18	72
AY*****UK	18	7	0	18	72
AY*****EN	18	7	0	18	72
BE*****AK	18	7	0	18	72
BE*****AŞ	18	7	0	18	72
Bİ*****CI	18	7	0	18	72
CE*****AR	18	7	0	18	72
CE*****AŞ	18	7	0	18	72
DA*****N	18	7	0	18	72
Dİ*****AN	18	5	2	18	72
DO*****OK	18	7	0	18	72
DO*****ÜY	18	7	0	18	72
ES*****LI	18	7	0	18	72
EY*****AÇ	18	7	0	18	72
FU*****Bİ	18	7	0	18	72
HÜ*****UT	18	7	0	18	72
HÜ*****AN	18	7	0	18	72
İL*****AN	18	7	0	18	72
İR*****DU	18	7	0	18	72
MA*****ER	18	7	0	18	72
MU*****CA	18	7	0	18	72
NA*****I	18	7	0	18	72
NA*****EN	18	7	0	18	72
RI*****AZ	18	7	0	18	72
SA*****İM	18	7	0	18	72
SE*****UT	18	7	0	18	72
SE*****RA	18	6	1	18	72
SE*****İÇ	18	7	0	18	72
SE*****ER	18	7	0	18	72
SE*****EŞ	18	7	0	18	72
TA*****İZ	18	7	0	18	72
AB*****N	15	10	0	15	60
AB*****UŞ	16	9	0	16	64
AB*****RT	17	8	0	17	68
AD*****LU	17	8	0	17	68
AH*****İL	15	10	0	15	60
AH*****LI	16	9	0	16	64
AL*****İN	16	9	0	16	64
AR*****M	15	10	0	15	60
AS*****KE	17	8	0	17	68
AS*****İN	17	8	0	17	68
AV*****EL	17	8	0	17	68
AY*****AN	16	9	0	16	64
AZ*****OL	16	9	0	16	64
B*****AZ	16	9	0	16	64
BA*****EN	15	10	0	15	60
BE*****CI	17	8	0	17	68
BE*****İÇ	16	9	0	16	64
BE*****U	15	10	0	15	60
BE*****İÇ	16	9	0	16	64
BU*****CA	17	8	0	17	68
CE*****AN	17	8	0	17	68
AB*****İN	8	17	0	8	32
AÇ*****İM	5	20	0	5	20
AH*****İN	6	19	0	6	24
AH*****AL	2	10	13	2	8
AH*****AN	9	16	0	9	36
AH*****TU	7	18	0	7	28
AH*****ET	4	13	8	4	16
AK*****LI	6	19	0	6	24
AL*****İR	8	8	9	8	32
AL*****ÜL	8	17	0	8	32
AL*****Ğ*	6	19	0	6	24
AL*****Cİ	7	18	0	7	28
AL*****AS	5	20	0	5	20
AL*****FE	6	19	0	6	24
AR*****N	2	23	0	2	8
AR*****ÜM	5	20	0	5	20
AR*****CU	7	18	0	7	28
AR*****İN	6	18	1	6	24
AR*****AK	6	19	0	6	24
AS*****LU	8	17	0	8	32
AS*****K	8	17	0	8	32
AS*****İR	7	18	0	7	28
AY*****İN	5	20	0	5	20
AY*****Ğ	4	21	0	4	16
AY*****İN	9	13	3	9	36
AZ*****AY	6	19	0	6	24
BA*****DE	4	21	0	4	16
BA*****NÇ	8	17	0	8	32
BA*****ÜN	8	17	0	8	32
BA*****NÇ	6	19	0	6	24
BE*****EL	8	13	4	8	32
BE*****İR	8	17	0	8	32
BE*****İN	5	20	0	5	20
BE*****YA	9	16	0	9	36
BE*****EN	7	18	0	7	28
BE*****UŞ	9	15	1	9	36
BE*****İM	6	19	0	6	24
BE*****UN	9	16	0	9	36
BE*****ÖZ	8	15	2	8	32
BE*****AN	9	16	0	9	36
BE*****İK	4	21	0	4	16
Bİ*****ÖK	5	18	2	5	20
BU*****İK	6	19	0	6	24
BU*****AŞ	7	18	0	7	28
BU*****Lİ	6	14	5	6	24
BU*****Y	9	16	0	9	36
BU*****UR	9	15	1	9	36
CA*****AN	7	18	0	7	28
CA*****İK	5	20	0	5	20
CA*****Z	2	23	0	2	8
CA*****AK	6	19	0	6	24
CE*****AY	7	18	0	7	28
CE*****LI	6	19	0	6	24
CE*****İÇ	9	16	0	9	36

CE*****UN	16	9	0	16	64
CE*****Lİ	17	8	0	17	68
Dİ*****İÇ	16	9	0	16	64
Dİ*****Lİ	16	9	0	16	64
Dİ*****AŞ	17	8	0	17	68
Dİ*****AŞ	15	10	0	15	60
EB*****UT	15	8	2	15	60
EB*****YA	15	10	0	15	60
EL*****AN	15	10	0	15	60
EL*****R	15	10	0	15	60
EL*****AY	15	10	0	15	60
EL*****AS	16	9	0	16	64
EL*****EŞ	17	8	0	17	68
EM*****AN	15	10	0	15	60
EM*****İR	16	9	0	16	64
EN*****AN	15	10	0	15	60
ES*****EN	17	6	2	17	68
ES*****LU	17	8	0	17	68
ES*****YA	15	10	0	15	60
ES*****AR	17	8	0	17	68
FA*****ÜN	17	8	0	17	68
FU*****ER	15	7	3	15	60
HA*****AK	17	8	0	17	68
HA*****İ	16	9	0	16	64
HE*****LU	17	8	0	17	68
Hİ*****Lİ	15	9	1	15	60
İB*****OY	17	8	0	17	68
İB*****AN	16	9	0	16	64
İL*****Gİ	15	10	0	15	60
İP*****İÇ	15	10	0	15	60
İR*****ER	16	9	0	16	64
İR*****AY	15	10	0	15	60
İR*****BA	16	9	0	16	64
KA*****AY	17	6	2	17	68
KA*****İÇ	16	9	0	16	64
KA*****AM	17	8	0	17	68
KE*****AL	17	8	0	17	68
KE*****İZ	17	8	0	17	68
KÜ*****YA	15	10	0	15	60
MA*****NÇ	17	8	0	17	68
ME*****AN	15	10	0	15	60
ME*****Cİ	17	8	0	17	68
ME*****İN	15	10	0	15	60
ME*****AR	15	10	0	15	60
Mİ*****AY	16	9	0	16	64
MU*****Nİ	17	8	0	17	68
MU*****AZ	15	7	3	15	60
MU*****İŞ	15	10	0	15	60
MU*****AŞ	15	10	0	15	60
MU*****LU	16	9	0	16	64
MU*****SA	16	9	0	16	64
NU*****TA	17	7	1	17	68
NU*****EN	16	9	0	16	64
NU*****AR	15	10	0	15	60

CE*****Lİ	7	18	0	7	28
CE*****AN	8	17	0	8	32
DA*****AL	9	16	0	9	36
DA*****EN	7	18	0	7	28
DE*****Y	7	18	0	7	28
Dİ*****T	5	20	0	5	20
Dİ*****CA	6	19	0	6	24
Dİ*****İN	6	19	0	6	24
DO*****EK	8	17	0	8	32
DU*****AN	9	16	0	9	36
EC*****İM	5	20	0	5	20
EC*****Y	7	18	0	7	28
ED*****EN	7	18	0	7	28
ED*****ÜN	5	18	2	5	20
ED*****AN	9	16	0	9	36
EF*****İN	8	17	0	8	32
EF*****AN	5	20	0	5	20
EF*****Cİ	9	16	0	9	36
EG*****AŞ	8	17	0	8	32
EL*****ÖR	7	18	0	7	28
EL*****İT	9	14	2	9	36
EL*****EŞ	8	16	1	8	32
EL*****AN	7	18	0	7	28
EL*****AZ	6	12	7	6	24
EL*****İK	5	20	0	5	20
EL*****Rİ	8	8	9	8	32
EL*****UR	9	16	0	9	36
EL*****UT	6	19	0	6	24
EL*****ER	8	17	0	8	32
EL*****V	7	18	0	7	28
EM*****EK	6	19	0	6	24
EM*****EN	4	21	0	4	16
EM*****EN	7	18	0	7	28
EM*****AZ	6	19	0	6	24
EM*****İN	7	18	0	7	28
EN*****RK	7	17	1	7	28
ER*****ER	7	16	2	7	28
ER*****AR	6	19	0	6	24
ES*****AN	9	15	1	9	36
ES*****İN	9	15	1	9	36
ES*****AK	3	22	0	3	12
ES*****BA	9	13	3	9	36
ES*****AG	8	17	0	8	32
ES*****AN	7	13	5	7	28
ES*****Cİ	9	11	5	9	36
ES***** *	8	15	2	8	32
ET*****AN	8	17	0	8	32
EV*****İÇ	7	18	0	7	28
EY*****ZL	8	17	0	8	32
EY*****İR	7	16	2	7	28
EZ*****VA	8	17	0	8	32
FA*****AŞ	9	13	3	9	36
FA*****N	8	17	0	8	32
FA*****İZ	6	18	1	6	24

NU*****EN	15	10	0	15	60
OM*****UD	16	9	0	16	64
ÖM*****AM	15	10	0	15	60
ÖM*****AN	15	10	0	15	60
RA*****AZ	16	9	0	16	64
RO*****UŞ	17	8	0	17	68
RU*****RK	15	10	0	15	60
RU*****UŞ	16	9	0	16	64
RU*****AR	15	10	0	15	60
SA*****ER	17	8	0	17	68
SA*****MA	15	9	1	15	60
SE*****İŞ	17	8	0	17	68
SE*****AN	16	9	0	16	64
SE*****İŞ	16	9	0	16	64
SE*****RA	16	8	1	16	64
SI*****ÜN	16	6	3	16	64
SI*****CU	15	10	0	15	60
SI*****İÇ	15	10	0	15	60
SI*****AY	15	10	0	15	60
SI*****İZ	15	9	1	15	60
SO*****VA	16	9	0	16	64
SU*****ER	17	8	0	17	68
SU*****RI	15	10	0	15	60
SU*****RI	16	9	0	16	64
TU*****UR	16	9	0	16	64
TU*****Ğ	15	10	0	15	60
TU*****AM	17	8	0	17	68
TU*****RI	17	8	0	17	68
UM*****ER	16	9	0	16	64
YA*****Cİ	15	9	1	15	60
YE*****LU	15	10	0	15	60
Yİ*****UM	15	10	0	15	60
YU*****AN	16	9	0	16	64
YU*****BA	15	10	0	15	60
YU*****OY	15	10	0	15	60
ZE*****AR	17	8	0	17	68
ZE*****AÇ	15	10	0	15	60
ZE*****EL	17	8	0	17	68
ZÜ*****İM	16	9	0	16	64
AH*****AR	13	12	0	13	52
AL*****LU	13	12	0	13	52
AL*****CA	14	11	0	14	56
AL*****LU	14	11	0	14	56
AR*****LÜ	13	12	0	13	52
AT*****AŞ	13	12	0	13	52
AY*****VA	13	12	0	13	52
AY*****İR	14	11	0	14	56
AY*****AK	13	12	0	13	52
AY*****İŞ	14	11	0	14	56
BA*****Lİ	13	12	0	13	52
BE*****EL	13	12	0	13	52
BE*****İR	14	11	0	14	56
BE*****CA	13	12	0	13	52
BE*****İN	13	12	0	13	52
FA*****İN	9	16	0	9	36
FA*****LÜ	8	12	5	8	32
FA*****İR	8	13	4	8	32
FA*****RK	5	20	0	5	20
FA*****UL	7	18	0	7	28
FA*****Çİ	9	16	0	9	36
FE*****İT	7	18	0	7	28
Fİ*****CA	6	19	0	6	24
FU*****AN	8	17	0	8	32
FU*****EN	9	16	0	9	36
GA*****İN	6	19	0	6	24
GA*****AŞ	8	17	0	8	32
Ğİ*****Cİ	6	19	0	6	24
GÖ*****AN	0	8	17	0	0
GÖ*****İZ	9	15	1	9	36
GÖ*****EY	5	20	0	5	20
GÖ*****AN	9	15	1	9	36
GÜ*****AT	2	23	0	2	8
GÜ*****UN	8	15	2	8	32
HA*****CU	9	9	7	9	36
HA*****AN	6	19	0	6	24
HA*****LU	8	0	17	8	32
HA*****U	5	20	0	5	20
HA*****İM	6	19	0	6	24
HA*****İZ	7	18	0	7	28
HA*****İN	6	18	1	6	24
HA*****AN	5	20	0	5	20
HA*****ÜŞ	1	21	3	1	4
HA*****KA	3	22	0	3	12
HA*****Fİ	9	16	0	9	36
HA*****EZ	7	18	0	7	28
HA*****İN	6	19	0	6	24
HA*****EL	5	18	2	5	20
HA*****İM	3	19	3	3	12
HE*****AR	8	17	0	8	32
HE*****UT	6	19	0	6	24
HE*****EM	9	11	5	9	36
HE*****İN	8	16	1	8	32
HE*****LÜ	8	16	1	8	32
HE*****EM	4	21	0	4	16
Hİ*****EŞ	6	19	0	6	24
Hİ*****RK	6	19	0	6	24
Hİ*****EL	8	17	0	8	32
HÜ*****AN	5	20	0	5	20
HÜ*****ÖL	7	12	6	7	28
İR*****KA	7	18	0	7	28
İK*****SE	9	16	0	9	36
İL*****CA	8	17	0	8	32
İL*****R	8	17	0	8	32
İL*****	4	21	0	4	16
İL*****İŞ	4	21	0	4	16
İL*****Z	6	18	1	6	24
İN*****Ğİ	7	15	3	7	28
İR*****AN	9	16	0	9	36

BE*****OZ	14	11	0	14	56
BU*****UZ	13	12	0	13	52
BU*****AN	14	11	0	14	56
BU*****ÇI	13	11	1	13	52
BÜ*****İN	13	12	0	13	52
BÜ*****AN	13	12	0	13	52
CA*****AR	14	11	0	14	56
CE*****ER	13	12	0	13	52
Cİ*****ÜŞ	13	12	0	13	52
EB*****AN	13	12	0	13	52
EF*****RA	13	12	0	13	52
EL*****VA	14	11	0	14	56
EL*****İK	13	12	0	13	52
EL*****RT	14	11	0	14	56
EL*****AN	13	12	0	13	52
EL*****EN	13	12	0	13	52
EL*****AZ	13	10	2	13	52
EM*****ED	14	11	0	14	56
EM*****IM	14	11	0	14	56
EM*****AŞ	14	11	0	14	56
EM*****NÇ	13	12	0	13	52
EM*****AZ	13	12	0	13	52
EN*****AN	14	11	0	14	56
ER*****AN	13	12	0	13	52
ER*****IM	13	12	0	13	52
FE*****İR	13	9	3	13	52
GA*****OY	13	12	0	13	52
GÜ*****İZ	13	12	0	13	52
HA*****İN	13	12	0	13	52
HA*****AN	13	12	0	13	52
HA*****CI	14	11	0	14	56
HA*****NÇ	14	11	0	14	56
HA*****AN	13	12	0	13	52
İR*****EN	14	10	1	14	56
İR*****EL	14	11	0	14	56
KE*****AN	14	11	0	14	56
KE*****AR	14	11	0	14	56
ME*****RT	13	11	1	13	52
ME*****EŞ	13	12	0	13	52
ME*****AT	13	12	0	13	52
ME*****AN	14	11	0	14	56
ME*****Z	13	12	0	13	52
ME*****AT	14	11	0	14	56
ME*****AY	13	11	1	13	52
ME*****İÇ	13	12	0	13	52
MU*****AN	13	12	0	13	52
MU*****EL	13	11	1	13	52
MU*****AL	13	12	0	13	52
MU*****K	13	12	0	13	52
NA*****EN	13	12	0	13	52
Nİ*****İK	14	11	0	14	56
Nİ*****ER	13	12	0	13	52
OÇ*****AL	13	12	0	13	52
OZ*****İK	13	12	0	13	52
İR*****AK	7	18	0	7	28
İR*****AN	7	18	0	7	28
İR*****EN	4	21	0	4	16
İR*****Dİ	8	17	0	8	32
İS*****LP	5	20	0	5	20
İS*****N	7	18	0	7	28
İS*****UN	5	20	0	5	20
İS*****AZ	7	15	3	7	28
İS*****CI	7	18	0	7	28
KA*****CA	7	18	0	7	28
KA*****IZ	8	17	0	8	32
KA*****AN	2	23	0	2	8
KA*****CU	0	0	25	0	0
KE*****IN	5	19	1	5	20
KE*****AN	9	16	0	9	36
KE*****IR	6	19	0	6	24
KÜ*****AT	9	16	0	9	36
KÜ*****EN	7	18	0	7	28
KÜ*****İZ	9	14	2	9	36
KÜ*****IZ	7	15	3	7	28
KÜ*****AT	9	16	0	9	36
LE*****Lİ	7	18	0	7	28
MA*****K	7	18	0	7	28
ME*****ÜK	2	23	0	2	8
ME*****UK	8	17	0	8	32
ME*****EN	9	16	0	9	36
ME*****UK	5	20	0	5	20
ME*****AL	6	19	0	6	24
ME*****ER	5	20	0	5	20
ME*****EM	2	23	0	2	8
ME*****AK	3	22	0	3	12
ME*****İN	6	19	0	6	24
ME*****İZ	4	21	0	4	16
ME*****İK	9	14	2	9	36
ME*****RU	3	22	0	3	12
ME*****OL	6	19	0	6	24
ME*****SA	9	16	0	9	36
ME*****NT	4	21	0	4	16
ME*****EK	6	19	0	6	24
ME*****İ	9	16	0	9	36
ME*****IM	9	15	1	9	36
ME*****UT	7	18	0	7	28
ME*****İT	8	17	0	8	32
ME*****AN	8	16	1	8	32
ME*****ER	9	16	0	9	36
ME*****İÇ	8	17	0	8	32
ME*****AN	5	20	0	5	20
ME*****UŞ	8	17	0	8	32
ME*****RT	9	15	1	9	36
ME*****İR	8	17	0	8	32
ME*****UZ	6	6	13	6	24
ME*****AZ	5	20	0	5	20
ME*****Çİ	7	18	0	7	28
Mİ*****Z	6	19	0	6	24

ÖM****Lİ	14	11	0	14	56
ÖY****AV	14	11	0	14	56
ÖZ****UN	13	10	2	13	52
ÖZ****AN	13	12	0	13	52
PA****İ	14	11	0	14	56
PE****ER	14	11	0	14	56
RA****AZ	14	11	0	14	56
RO****RA	13	12	0	13	52
RU****Cİ	14	10	1	14	56
SA****AK	13	12	0	13	52
SE****AN	13	12	0	13	52
SE****OK	13	12	0	13	52
Sİ****AN	14	11	0	14	56
SÜ****IN	14	11	0	14	56
ŞE****UN	14	11	0	14	56
ŞE****ÜN	13	12	0	13	52
TU****EL	13	12	0	13	52
UĞ****IU	14	11	0	14	56
VE****AN	13	12	0	13	52
VE****ÖR	13	12	0	13	52
YA****AL	14	11	0	14	56
YA****RT	14	11	0	14	56
YU****RT	13	12	0	13	52
YU****AZ	13	11	1	13	52
YU****LP	13	12	0	13	52
ZE****LI	14	10	1	14	56
ZE****AZ	14	11	0	14	56
AB****Rİ	12	13	0	12	48
AH****ER	11	14	0	11	44
AH****AN	11	14	0	11	44
AL****ÖR	10	15	0	10	40
AL****ÜK	11	14	0	11	44
AL****IN	11	14	0	11	44
AR****UN	11	14	0	11	44
AS****AZ	12	13	0	12	48
AS****UT	10	15	0	10	40
AY****AN	10	15	0	10	40
AY****İN	12	12	1	12	48
AZ****ÜL	12	13	0	12	48
AZ****OÇ	11	14	0	11	44
BA****Lİ	11	14	0	11	44
BA****U	12	13	0	12	48
BA****İN	12	13	0	12	48
BE****ZU	10	15	0	10	40
BE****İK	11	14	0	11	44
BE****EK	10	15	0	10	40
BE****LU	11	14	0	11	44
BE****EL	10	13	2	10	40
BE****AN	11	14	0	11	44
BE****İK	12	13	0	12	48
BE****AL	11	13	1	11	44
BE****AL	10	15	0	10	40
Bİ****AN	12	13	0	12	48
Bİ****ÜZ	12	9	4	12	48
MU****PE	9	16	0	9	36
MU****AL	7	18	0	7	28
MU****IÇ	9	16	0	9	36
MU****ÇU	8	17	0	8	32
MU****İL	6	19	0	6	24
MU****A	8	17	0	8	32
MU****ÜN	7	18	0	7	28
MU****ĞA	5	20	0	5	20
MU****LÜ	8	17	0	8	32
MU****IN	7	18	0	7	28
MU****IÇ	5	20	0	5	20
MU****AR	4	21	0	4	16
MU****EK	9	15	1	9	36
MU****AL	7	18	0	7	28
MU****AN	5	20	0	5	20
MU****IN	6	18	1	6	24
MU****ÜŞ	6	19	0	6	24
MU****ER	9	16	0	9	36
MU****İK	5	20	0	5	20
MU****İN	8	17	0	8	32
NA****AZ	7	18	0	7	28
NA****İK	4	21	0	4	16
NA****Cİ	9	15	1	9	36
NA****AN	6	19	0	6	24
NE****AŞ	7	18	0	7	28
NE****YA	3	22	0	3	12
Nİ****İM	8	17	0	8	32
NU****EN	9	15	1	9	36
NU****CA	7	18	0	7	28
NU****AN	5	20	0	5	20
OĞ****Rİ	6	19	0	6	24
ON****AŞ	8	17	0	8	32
ON****S	9	16	0	9	36
ON****ÜZ	6	19	0	6	24
OR****AN	5	20	0	5	20
OS****ÜZ	5	20	0	5	20
OS****RA	7	17	1	7	28
ÖM****İR	5	20	0	5	20
ÖM****Lİ	8	17	0	8	32
ÖZ****CA	8	17	0	8	32
ÖZ****ÖZ	8	17	0	8	32
ÖZ****RK	7	10	8	7	28
PE****AZ	7	18	0	7	28
R****İ	8	16	1	8	32
RA****LU	8	17	0	8	32
RA****AK	7	16	2	7	28
RA****Z	4	21	0	4	16
RA****AK	9	16	0	9	36
RA****UT	6	19	0	6	24
RE****UR	3	21	1	3	12
RE****ÖZ	5	20	0	5	20
RO****AN	6	19	0	6	24
RO****OL	7	18	0	7	28
RO****İŞ	6	19	0	6	24

BU*****UT	11	14	0	11	44
BU*****LU	11	14	0	11	44
BÜ*****IN	11	14	0	11	44
BÜ*****İT	12	13	0	12	48
BÜ*****VA	11	14	0	11	44
CE*****İN	11	14	0	11	44
CE*****İM	12	13	0	12	48
CE*****KÜ	11	14	0	11	44
ÇA*****EN	12	13	0	12	48
Çİ*****ÜŞ	10	15	0	10	40
D *****ÇE	12	13	0	12	48
DA*****UZ	12	13	0	12	48
DA*****RT	11	14	0	11	44
DA*****İT	10	15	0	10	40
DE*****İN	10	15	0	10	40
Dİ*****İR	10	15	0	10	40
Dİ*****AZ	10	15	0	10	40
Dİ*****EN	12	13	0	12	48
Dİ*****AZ	11	14	0	11	44
Dİ*****AN	10	15	0	10	40
DU*****EL	12	10	3	12	48
DU*****ÜL	11	14	0	11	44
EB*****Lİ	12	13	0	12	48
ED*****AN	12	13	0	12	48
EF*****İZ	10	15	0	10	40
EL*****AY	12	13	0	12	48
EL*****EK	10	15	0	10	40
EL*****ÜL	11	13	1	11	44
EM*****İZ	10	9	6	10	40
EM*****EN	11	14	0	11	44
EM*****İZ	11	14	0	11	44
EN*****RK	12	13	0	12	48
EN*****EK	10	15	0	10	40
EN*****İZ	10	15	0	10	40
ER*****AL	11	14	0	11	44
ER*****RK	12	13	0	12	48
ES*****Çİ	10	15	0	10	40
ES*****AL	11	14	0	11	44
ES*****AN	11	14	0	11	44
ES*****ÇÜ	12	13	0	12	48
ES*****RT	10	15	0	10	40
ES*****NÇ	10	15	0	10	40
ES*****AŞ	12	13	0	12	48
EY*****LU	11	14	0	11	44
EZ*****AK	10	15	0	10	40
FA*****AS	12	10	3	12	48
FA*****İN	10	15	0	10	40
FE*****AR	11	14	0	11	44
FE*****İŞ	12	13	0	12	48
FE*****RA	11	14	0	11	44
FE*****Cİ	12	9	4	12	48
Fİ*****Çİ	12	13	0	12	48
Gİ*****AN	10	15	0	10	40
GÖ*****RK	10	15	0	10	40

RO*****İR	6	19	0	6	24
RU*****AL	6	19	0	6	24
RÜ*****İN	4	14	7	4	16
SA*****A	7	18	0	7	28
SA*****İZ	9	16	0	9	36
SA*****YA	8	16	1	8	32
SA*****EN	7	18	0	7	28
SA*****OY	4	21	0	4	16
SA*****AR	9	16	0	9	36
SA*****AN	4	21	0	4	16
SE*****YA	9	16	0	9	36
SE*****ÜN	4	21	0	4	16
SE*****AŞ	5	18	2	5	20
SE*****AN	8	11	6	8	32
SE*****N	9	15	1	9	36
SE*****AN	5	5	15	5	20
SE*****İN	9	16	0	9	36
SE*****UT	2	23	0	2	8
SE*****ER	8	17	0	8	32
SE*****EZ	8	17	0	8	32
SE*****AK	8	17	0	8	32
SE*****EK	5	20	0	5	20
SE*****EZ	7	17	1	7	28
SE*****AN	7	18	0	7	28
SE*****Çİ	4	21	0	4	16
SE*****EN	8	17	0	8	32
SE*****RT	7	18	0	7	28
SE*****İK	7	18	0	7	28
SE*****ÜŞ	9	16	0	9	36
SE*****ER	6	19	0	6	24
Sİ*****İK	8	17	0	8	32
Sİ*****AY	7	18	0	7	28
Sİ*****Z	6	19	0	6	24
Sİ*****K	5	20	0	5	20
Sİ*****İÇ	9	15	1	9	36
SO*****AŞ	7	18	0	7	28
SO*****AZ	7	18	0	7	28
SU*****EL	8	17	0	8	32
SU*****İN	8	14	3	8	32
SU*****ÖZ	6	19	0	6	24
SU*****EN	0	0	25	0	0
SU*****EN	4	13	8	4	16
SU*****AY	8	17	0	8	32
SÜ*****İR	6	19	0	6	24
SÜ*****AŞ	5	20	0	5	20
SÜ*****EŞ	9	16	0	9	36
SÜ*****ER	5	20	0	5	20
SÜ*****PE	9	16	0	9	36
ŞE*****EN	7	18	0	7	28
ŞE*****İN	9	16	0	9	36
Şİ*****ÜR	6	15	4	6	24
ŞÜ*****İN	8	13	4	8	32
T *****T	5	19	1	5	20
TU*****AN	9	15	1	9	36

GÖ*****İR	12	12	1	12	48
GÖ*****İK	12	13	0	12	48
GÖ*****İZ	11	14	0	11	44
GÖ*****Çİ	12	13	0	12	48
GÖ*****LP	11	14	0	11	44
GÜ*****AL	11	14	0	11	44
GÜ*****İN	12	11	2	12	48
GÜ*****CU	12	13	0	12	48
GÜ*****AZ	11	14	0	11	44
GÜ*****EL	12	13	0	12	48
HA*****NT	11	14	0	11	44
HA*****AN	11	14	0	11	44
HA*****ÜL	11	13	1	11	44
HA*****AY	12	13	0	12	48
HA*****ÖL	12	13	0	12	48
HA*****AN	10	15	0	10	40
HA*****İT	12	13	0	12	48
HA*****LI	12	13	0	12	48
HA*****Z	11	14	0	11	44
HE*****AT	10	15	0	10	40
Hİ*****İO	10	15	0	10	40
Hİ*****Cİ	10	15	0	10	40
Hİ*****ER	11	14	0	11	44
HÜ*****İK	11	14	0	11	44
HÜ*****AŞ	12	13	0	12	48
HÜ*****EK	10	15	0	10	40
İR*****ÜL	10	15	0	10	40
İB*****İN	12	8	5	12	48
İL*****ÖZ	11	14	0	11	44
İL*****LU	12	11	2	12	48
İL*****AY	11	13	1	11	44
İL*****EZ	12	13	0	12	48
İR*****AR	11	14	0	11	44
İR*****İR	11	14	0	11	44
İR*****AN	10	15	0	10	40
KA*****ER	11	14	0	11	44
KA*****AN	12	13	0	12	48
KE*****AŞ	11	14	0	11	44
KÜ*****AN	11	14	0	11	44
KÜ*****EZ	10	15	0	10	40
KÜ*****KE	11	14	0	11	44
LE*****AN	11	14	0	11	44
M*****AL	10	15	0	10	40
MA*****İB	11	14	0	11	44
ME*****RT	12	13	0	12	48
ME*****CE	12	13	0	12	48
ME*****CI	12	13	0	12	48
ME*****AK	11	14	0	11	44
ME*****AŞ	12	13	0	12	48
ME*****Lİ	10	15	0	10	40
ME*****AR	10	15	0	10	40
ME*****BA	10	15	0	10	40

TU*****AŞ	9	16	0	9	36
TU*****İN	8	17	0	8	32
TU*****LÜ	9	16	0	9	36
TU*****OL	4	21	0	4	16
TU*****AR	5	20	0	5	20
TÜ*****AN	0	0	25	0	0
U*****N	5	20	0	5	20
UM*****İR	8	17	0	8	32
UM***** *	8	16	1	8	32
UM*****AN	3	22	0	3	12
ÜM*****İT	6	19	0	6	24
ÜM*****Ğİ	9	16	0	9	36
VO*****UZ	4	13	8	4	16
YA*****AY	7	18	0	7	28
YA*****AR	9	16	0	9	36
YA*****YA	6	10	9	6	24
YA*****AN	8	16	1	8	32
YA*****Z	6	16	3	6	24
YA*****AŞ	9	16	0	9	36
YA*****AN	8	17	0	8	32
YA*****EK	8	17	0	8	32
YA*****AK	6	19	0	6	24
YA*****İZ	9	16	0	9	36
YE*****AN	7	18	0	7	28
Yİ*****İR	6	19	0	6	24
Yİ*****AN	8	16	1	8	32
YU*****İN	6	19	0	6	24
YU*****Z	5	20	0	5	20
YU*****İR	3	22	0	3	12
YU*****İN	8	17	0	8	32
YU*****AK	9	16	0	9	36
YU*****Lİ	6	19	0	6	24
YU*****YA	6	19	0	6	24
YU*****YA	8	17	0	8	32
ZE*****AN	4	21	0	4	16
ZE*****OF	6	19	0	6	24
ZE*****AN	6	19	0	6	24
ZE*****AK	9	16	0	9	36
ZE*****EN	9	16	0	9	36
ZE*****İN	8	17	0	8	32
ZE*****AR	5	20	0	5	20
ZE*****OK	9	16	0	9	36
ZE*****AZ	7	18	0	7	28
ZE*****İÇ	7	17	1	7	28
ZE*****AZ	5	20	0	5	20
ZE*****ER	4	20	1	4	16
ZE*****İK	8	16	1	8	32
ZE*****UZ	8	16	1	8	32
ZE*****CE	7	17	1	7	28
ZE*****CI	9	16	0	9	36
ZE*****AK	9	15	1	9	36
ZE*****AĞ	7	18	0	7	28

