



# Pedagogical Translation in EFL Classrooms: Bridging L1 and L2 in an Islamic Junior High School

Devi Triana<sup>1</sup>, Veni Roza<sup>1</sup>, Widya Syafitri<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Universitas Islam Negeri Sjech M. Djamil Djambek Bukittinggi, Indonesia

 [devi3ana10@gmail.com](mailto:devi3ana10@gmail.com) \*

## Article Information:

Received June 10, 2026

Revised July 18, 2026

Accepted August 10, 2026

## Keywords:

*Pedagogical translation, L1 use, EFL learners, English language teaching, bilingual approach, scaffolding*

## Abstract

Monolingual approaches to English language teaching have been increasingly debated in foreign language contexts, particularly where learners have limited opportunities to use English outside the classroom. This qualitative study examines the use of pedagogical translation from students' first language (L1), Indonesian, to English in English as a foreign language (EFL) classrooms. Data were collected through classroom observations, semi-structured interviews with two English teachers, and analysis of instructional artifacts involving Grade 7 and Grade 8 students. The findings reveal that pedagogical translation was used selectively as a supplementary instructional strategy rather than as the primary teaching technique. In Grade 7, translation was primarily used for vocabulary scaffolding, affective support, and classroom management, whereas in Grade 8, it was mainly employed to clarify grammatical differences through cross-linguistic comparison and to verify students' comprehension. Both teachers viewed translation as a legitimate and strategic pedagogical resource while recognizing the need to maintain a balance between L1 support and increasing English language input. The findings suggest that pedagogical translation can function as temporary scaffolding that facilitates comprehension and participation while gradually encouraging greater use of English.

## INTRODUCTION

The role of L1, or the learners' first language, has long been debated in the field of English Language Teaching (ELT). Monolingualism was traditionally regarded as a fundamental principle underlying several influential language teaching approaches. To maximize comprehensible input and approximate the process of natural language acquisition, teachers were encouraged to use English as the primary medium of instruction. Teaching approaches such as the Direct Method and Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) therefore emphasized the use of the target language in classroom interaction Jebahi, (2022).

However, cognitive and sociocultural perspectives on language learning have increasingly challenged strictly monolingual approaches. From a cognitive perspective, research in second language acquisition (SLA) emphasizes that new information is constructed through the interaction between incoming input and

## How to cite:

Triana, D., Roza, V., Syafitri, W. (2026). Pedagogical Translation in EFL Classrooms: Bridging L1 and L2 in an Islamic Junior High School. *Ahlussunnah: Journal of Islamic Education*, 5(2), 1004-1015.

## E-ISSN:

2827-9573

## Published by:

The Institute for Research and Community Service

learners' existing knowledge, including knowledge developed through their first language. From a sociocultural perspective, language learning occurs through mediation, whereby various mediational resources, including L1, support meaning construction and cognitive development. Within this perspective, the concept of the Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD) suggests that L1 can function as a scaffold that enables learners to perform beyond what they can accomplish independently in L2.

Despite these theoretical developments, monolingualism remains prevalent in many EFL contexts. In EFL classrooms, exclusive reliance on the target language may contribute to anxiety, cognitive overload, and difficulties in comprehension, particularly in contexts where opportunities to use English outside the classroom are limited. This situation is particularly relevant in Indonesia, where English use beyond formal educational settings remains relatively restricted because of geographical, socioeconomic, and curricular factors (Hofer & Jessner, 2026). Consequently, classroom interactions may involve multiple languages because teachers and students enter the classroom with established linguistic repertoires that they naturally draw upon during learning (Afriadi, 2021).

The Indonesian educational context provides a relevant setting for examining this issue. English is taught as a foreign language within the national education system, including at the junior secondary level under the 2013 Curriculum and its subsequent transition toward the Merdeka Curriculum. However, English proficiency among junior secondary students remains a concern. According to the 2022 PISA results, only 12.5% of Indonesian junior high school students demonstrated advanced English reading proficiency (Barbot & Kaufman, 2025). Such disparities may be particularly relevant for adolescents aged 12 to 14 who have limited exposure to English beyond the classroom.

In response to the limitations associated with strictly monolingual instruction, scholars have proposed reconsidering the pedagogical role of bilingual practices. Within Cummins' Common Underlying Proficiency (CUP) theory, L1 and L2 are not viewed as entirely separate linguistic systems; rather, they share an underlying cognitive and linguistic foundation that allows skills and knowledge to transfer across languages (Zhang-Wu, 2021). Similarly, Shin et al (2020); Skopečková (2024) concept of Multicompetence conceptualizes bilingual learners not as individuals with incomplete competence in either language but as individuals who possess a combined and potentially distinctive range of linguistic abilities. From these perspectives, L1 can function as an educational resource that facilitates metalinguistic awareness, reduces affective barriers, and activates learners' prior knowledge.

Within this broader reconsideration of L1 use, translation has also undergone a conceptual shift. Historically, translation was often associated with the Grammar-Translation Method (GTM) and consequently viewed as unsuitable for communicative language teaching. More recent scholarship, however, has positioned translation as a potential pedagogical strategy for connecting L1 and L2 and supporting vocabulary development, conceptual understanding, and language learning (Cenoz & Gorter, 2020; EKOÇ, 2019; Pavesi & Malinverno, 2020). From a translanguaging perspective, bilingual learners can draw on their integrated linguistic resources to construct meaning and facilitate learning rather than treating languages as isolated systems (García & Sylvan, 2011).

The theoretical perspectives discussed above have several implications for language teaching. In particular, students' linguistic errors should not be interpreted solely as evidence of deficiency. Rather, such errors may provide indications of interlanguage development and therefore offer teachers valuable information for adapting their pedagogical practices (Roza et al., 2024). L1-mediated strategies, including translation, may be particularly useful for learners who are developing

literacy in both languages, as they can provide access to meaning without imposing excessive cognitive demands associated with processing unfamiliar information exclusively through L2 (Anderson, 2024; R. Zhang & Zou, 2022).

Empirical studies in Asian EFL contexts have also reported potential benefits of L1-to-L2 translation. Translation-based activities have been associated with improvements in student motivation and linguistic accuracy in contexts such as China Zhang & Graham (2020), Vietnam Zhang & Wang (2024), and Japan Turnbull (2019). Nevertheless, limited research has examined how pedagogical translation is actually employed by English teachers in non-urban private Islamic junior secondary schools in Indonesia, particularly in relation to differences in grade level and instructional purpose.

To address this gap, the present study examines the classroom application of pedagogical translation in a private Islamic junior secondary school in Indonesia. The study focuses on two English teachers who teach different grade levels and have different levels of teaching experience. Teacher A is an experienced teacher with approximately 23 years of teaching experience, while Teacher B has approximately two years of teaching experience. The comparison of these two teachers provides an opportunity to examine how pedagogical translation is employed across different classroom contexts and whether its functions vary according to students' grade levels and learning needs.

## METHODS

This study employed a qualitative case study design to develop a comprehensive and contextual understanding of pedagogical translation among EFL teachers in an Indonesian junior secondary school. A case study design was considered appropriate because the study focused on the strategic use of translation as a naturally occurring classroom practice within a bounded context, namely two English classes taught by two teachers in one school (Mizukoshi, 2023). The study was conducted at junior high school in west sumatera, a private Islamic junior high school in Indonesia. The school was purposively selected because it provides an EFL learning context in which students primarily use Indonesian as their first language and have limited opportunities to use English outside the classroom. Two English teachers participated in the study. Their participation was purposively selected based on the grade level they taught and their willingness to participate in the research (Engkizar et al., 2026; Engkizar et al., 2026; O'Keeffe et al., 2016).

The study involved two English teachers, referred to as Teacher A and Teacher B to protect their identities. Both teachers held undergraduate degrees in English Education and had Indonesian as their L1. Although they shared similar educational qualifications and a communicative orientation toward language teaching, they differed in teaching experience and grade level. Teacher A taught Grade 7 and had approximately two years of teaching experience, whereas Teacher B taught Grade 8 and had approximately 23 years of teaching experience.

**Table 1. Participant Profiles**

| Criterion           | Teacher A                | Teacher B               |
|---------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------|
| Grade Taught        | Grade 7 (ages 12–13)     | Grade 8 (ages 13–14)    |
| No. of Students     | ± 30 students per class  | ± 30 students per class |
| Teaching Experience | ± 2 years                | ± 23 years              |
| Education           | S1 English Education     | S1 English Education    |
| L1 Background       | Indonesian               | Indonesian              |
| Teaching            | Communicative, flexible; | Communicative, student- |

|                     |                                                                             |                                                                            |
|---------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Philosophy          | progressively moved away from an English-only policy based on student needs | centered; language learning should be meaningful and contextually grounded |
| No. of Observations | 4 sessions × 80 min (4 weeks)                                               | 4 sessions × 80 min (4 weeks)                                              |
| Interview Duration  | 45–60 minutes                                                               | 45–60 minutes                                                              |

As shown in Table 1, both teachers had comparable educational qualifications and adopted learner-centered approaches to teaching. However, they differed in teaching experience and grade level. These differences provided a basis for examining how pedagogical translation was employed in different classroom contexts.

Three complementary data collection techniques were used over a four-week period to achieve methodological triangulation: classroom observation, semi-structured interviews, and document analysis. The data collection framework is presented in Table 2.

**Table 2. Data Collection Framework**

| <b>Instrument</b>         | <b>Sessions / Duration</b>                                                                                                                         | <b>Participants</b>   | <b>Data Captured</b>                                                                                                                                           |
|---------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Classroom Observation     | 4 sessions × 80 min per teacher (8 sessions total)                                                                                                 | Teacher A & Teacher B | Frequency, context, and purpose of translation episodes; linguistic material translated; instructional intent (vocabulary, grammar, comprehension, management) |
| Semi-Structured Interview | 1 session × 45–60 min per teacher                                                                                                                  | Teacher A & Teacher B | Beliefs about L1 use; rationales for translation decisions; attitudes toward translation; perceived student responses                                          |
| Document Analysis         | Ongoing (lesson plans, worksheets, student work samples)                                                                                           | Both classrooms       | L1 annotations; bilingual task instructions; vocabulary lists; grammar comparison worksheets                                                                   |
| Data Analysis Method      | Reflexive thematic analysis (Braun & Clarke, 2021); triangulation across all three instruments; member-checking for credibility and confirmability | —                     | —                                                                                                                                                              |

Each teacher participated in one semi-structured interview lasting approximately 45–60 minutes. The interviews were conducted in Indonesian to allow the participants to articulate their experiences and perspectives in their preferred language. The interview protocol was organized around four major themes: (1) background information and beliefs about teaching, (2) attitudes toward L1 and translation in the classroom, (3) motivations for using translation, and (4) perceptions of translation and its effects on students.

Non-participant classroom observations were conducted over four sessions for each teacher, with each session lasting approximately 80 minutes. Thus, eight classroom sessions were observed in total over a four-week period. The observations

employed a modified version of the protocol for collecting data on translation use in EFL classroom settings presented in (Skopecčková, 2024).

During each observation, the researcher recorded field notes focusing on the occurrence, context, and apparent purpose of translation episodes. Particular attention was given to when translation occurred, what linguistic material was translated, how translation was used, and how students responded to the practice.

Instructional documents were analyzed as supplementary sources of evidence. These included lesson plans, worksheets, vocabulary lists, grammar comparison materials, and student work samples. The analysis focused on evidence of L1 use, bilingual task instructions, translated vocabulary, and activities involving comparison between Indonesian and English.

The data were analyzed using reflexive thematic analysis following (Forbes, 2022). Interview transcripts, classroom observation notes, and instructional documents were systematically reviewed and coded according to recurring patterns related to the functions, purposes, and contexts of pedagogical translation. The analysis proceeded through the identification, review, and refinement of themes emerging across the three sources of data.

Triangulation was conducted across classroom observations, interviews, and document analysis to strengthen the credibility and robustness of the findings. The comparison of these sources enabled the researcher to examine whether teachers' reported rationales for using translation were reflected in their classroom practices and instructional materials. Member checking was also conducted with the participating teachers to verify the accuracy of their reported perspectives and the researcher's interpretation of their explanations.

## RESULT AND DISCUSSION

The findings indicate that translation was not used as the primary teaching technique by either teacher. Rather, both teachers employed translation selectively as a supplementary pedagogical strategy. The teachers consciously avoided excessive reliance on translation because they viewed it as a supportive technique rather than a default response to students' difficulties. The findings also reveal differences in the role, frequency, and target language skills of translation between Grades 7 and 8, reflecting differences in students' age, English proficiency, and curriculum content.

Four main themes emerged from the data: (1) vocabulary scaffolding and meaning construction, (2) affective support and classroom management, (3) grammatical clarification through contrastive analysis, and (4) comprehension verification through translation tasks. Table 3 summarizes these findings according to grade level, teacher, classroom manifestation, and theoretical basis.

**Table 3. Summary of Pedagogical Translation Functions by Theme, Grade Level, and Theoretical Basis**

| Theme                                     | Grade Level       | Teacher       | Classroom Manifestation                                                                                                                              | Theoretical Basis                                                                 |
|-------------------------------------------|-------------------|---------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Vocabulary Scaffolding and Meaning-Making | Grades 7 and 8    | Both teachers | Direct lexical translation of abstract or culturally distant words (e.g., <i>environment</i> → <i>lingkungan</i> ) to enable immediate L2 production | (Kuluşaklı et al., 2018; Shin et al., 2020) — L1 maximizes time for L2 production |
| Affective Support and Classroom           | Grade 7 (primary) | Teacher A     | Bilingual task instructions (English followed                                                                                                        | (Forman, 2015) — Affective Filter Hypothesis; lower                               |

|                                                        |                   |               |                                                                                                                                                                                                                |                                                                                                                  |
|--------------------------------------------------------|-------------------|---------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Management                                             |                   |               | by Indonesian); L1 anxiety facilitates was used to reduce language acquisition anxiety and prevent behavioral disruption caused by task confusion                                                              |                                                                                                                  |
| Grammatical Clarification through Contrastive Analysis | Grade 8 (primary) | Teacher B     | Side-by-side L1–L2 sentence comparisons on the board to make structural differences explicit (e.g., English verb inflection in the past tense versus Indonesian time markers)                                  | (Motha, 2020)—Contrastive Analysis; (Borup et al., 2020) — ZPD and scaffolding                                   |
| Comprehension Verification through Translation Tasks   | Grades 7 and 8    | Both teachers | Students were asked to translate sentences or paragraphs into Indonesian as a formative diagnostic to identify vocabulary, grammar, or syntactic gaps more accurately than simply asking, “Do you understand?” | (Vallejo, 2018) — Translanguaging; L1-based assessment provides a linguistically fairer picture of comprehension |

### Vocabulary Scaffolding and Meaning Construction (Both Grade Levels)

Both informants reported that direct translation of vocabulary was one of the most frequent uses of translation in their classrooms. When students encountered unfamiliar words or concepts that were difficult to understand from the English explanation alone, the Indonesian equivalent was provided to facilitate comprehension and allow students to continue using English. Informant 1 explained:

*“I usually use translation when I introduce new vocabulary. For example, if I mention the word ‘environment,’ some students do not immediately understand it. If I spend too much time explaining the meaning in English, they can lose focus. But when I say ‘lingkungan,’ they understand it immediately, and then we can continue making sentences in English.”*

Informant 2 expressed a similar view:

*“For new vocabulary, translation is often the quickest way to make sure students understand the concept. They may already know the concept in Indonesian; they just do not know the English word for it. So, I give them the English label rather than explaining something they already understand from the beginning.”*

This finding is consistent with Shin et al (2020) assertion that L1 use can maximize time spent on L2 production by avoiding lengthy explanations of concepts that students already understand. It also corresponds with Kuluşaklı et al (2018) observation that learners in EFL contexts commonly perceive translation as a useful strategy for vocabulary learning.

### Affective Support and Classroom Management (Grade 7)

In Grade 7, where students demonstrated considerable variation in English proficiency following their transition from primary school, Informant 1 reported

using translation to provide affective support and facilitate classroom management. Translation was particularly useful when students appeared uncertain about task instructions or lacked confidence in responding in English.

Informant 1 explained:

*"Sometimes there are students who become very quiet during English lessons because they are not sure what they are supposed to do. When I explain the instruction in Indonesian first, they become more relaxed. After that, they are more willing to try answering in English and even raise their hands."*

The observational data supported this account. During sessions in which tasks were initially explained in English and subsequently clarified in Indonesian, students demonstrated higher levels of compliance and engagement than when instructions were delivered solely in English. This pattern is consistent with Forman (2015) Affective Filter Hypothesis, which proposes that lower levels of anxiety can facilitate learners' receptivity to language input.

At the same time, Informant 1 acknowledged the potential problem of excessive translation and emphasized that Indonesian was intended as temporary support rather than a replacement for English:

*"I sometimes worry that I use Indonesian too much. I try to use it to help students understand the task and feel comfortable first. Once they understand what they have to do, I encourage them to use English again."*

This statement indicates that translation was used as a form of temporary scaffolding. Indonesian was introduced to establish initial comprehension and confidence, after which students were encouraged to return to English-based interaction.

### **Grammatical Clarification through Contrastive Analysis (Grade 8 Emphasis)**

In Grade 8, where students encountered more complex grammatical patterns, including the simple past tense and comparative adjectives, Informant 2 used translation primarily for cross-linguistic comparison. In contrast to the more affective and task-oriented use observed in Grade 7, translation in Grade 8 was used to make differences between Indonesian and English grammatical structures explicit.

Informant 2 described the practice as follows:

*"When I teach grammar, I sometimes put the English sentence and the Indonesian sentence side by side. For example, I write 'She went to school yesterday' and 'Dia pergi ke sekolah kemarin.' Then I ask students what is different between the two sentences. They can see that Indonesian does not change the verb, while English changes 'go' to 'went.'"*

Informant 2 further explained that this comparison was intended to address students' tendency to transfer Indonesian grammatical patterns directly into English:

*"Before I used this comparison, some students would write 'She go to school yesterday.' They were translating the sentence directly from Indonesian. By showing the two structures together, they can see that English and Indonesian do not always work in the same way."*

The findings demonstrate how translation was operationalized as a pedagogical resource for contrastive grammar instruction. This practice reflects the principles of Contrastive Analysis proposed by (Motha, 2020), in which differences between learners' L1 and L2 are made explicit to anticipate and address potential areas of difficulty. It also relates to Borup et al (2020) concept of the Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD), as translation functioned as a form of scaffolding that supported students in understanding grammatical distinctions that might otherwise have remained difficult to identify independently.

### **Comprehension Verification through Translation Tasks**

The findings further show that both informants used translation as a form of formative assessment. Rather than relying exclusively on direct questions such as "Do you understand?", they sometimes asked students to translate sentences or

paragraphs into Indonesian to determine the extent and nature of their comprehension. Informant 2 explained:

*"I do not always rely on the question 'Did you understand?' because students usually say yes even when they are still confused. If I ask them to translate a paragraph, I can see which part is difficult for them. Sometimes the problem is vocabulary, sometimes grammar, and sometimes they do not understand how the clauses are connected. That helps me decide what I need to explain again."*

Informant 1 used a similar strategy, although in a less formal manner:

*"Sometimes I ask a student to explain the sentence in Indonesian. If they can explain the meaning correctly, I know they have understood it. If they cannot, I know that there is something I need to clarify before moving on."*

These practices indicate that translation served not only as an instructional technique but also as a diagnostic mechanism. By requiring students to demonstrate meaning through Indonesian, the informants could identify specific comprehension difficulties related to vocabulary, grammar, or syntactic relationships. This finding is consistent with the broader perspective on translanguaging proposed by Vallejo (2018), which recognizes the use of learners' full linguistic resources as a means of supporting comprehension and assessment.

### **Translation as a Legitimate Pedagogical Tool, Not a Deficit Practice**

The findings indicate that both informants viewed translation as a deliberate pedagogical choice rather than a reactive strategy resulting from inadequate English proficiency. This perspective challenges the perception that L1 use necessarily reflects pedagogical ineffectiveness or insufficient language competence among teachers (Temesgen & Hailu, 2022). Informant 1 described the role of translation in particularly practical terms:

*"For me, translation is a bridge, not a shortcut. I use it when students need support, but I do not want them to depend on Indonesian. After they understand the meaning, I want them to continue working in English."*

Informant 2 similarly emphasized the instructional purpose of translation:

*"I use translation when it has a clear purpose, especially when I want students to compare Indonesian and English. It is not something I use simply because English is difficult. I use it when the comparison can help them understand the language better."*

These accounts demonstrate that translation was integrated into classroom instruction according to specific pedagogical purposes. This reflects Leonardi's (2010) conceptualization of pedagogical translation as an intentional and pedagogically driven use of L1. The finding is also consistent with Hall and Cook (2012), who reported that the use of learners' native language remains common among EFL teachers internationally.

### **Differences in Translation Use across Grades: Affective and Cognitive Scaffolding**

The different uses of translation in Grade 7 and Grade 8 suggest that the informants adapted their L1 practices to students' developmental and instructional needs. In Grade 7, translation was primarily associated with affective support, task comprehension, and classroom participation. It helped reduce uncertainty and provided students with sufficient understanding to engage in subsequent English-language activities.

In Grade 8, translation served a more cognitively oriented function. Informant 2 used L1–L2 comparisons to make abstract grammatical differences more explicit. Translation therefore functioned not merely as a means of conveying meaning but also as a tool for developing metalinguistic awareness through comparison between languages.

This pattern corresponds with Borup et al (2020) concept of scaffolding, in which instructional support is adapted to learners' current level of development. It

also relates to Chung et al (2019) Interdependence Hypothesis, which emphasizes the relationship between L1 linguistic competence and the development of cognitive and linguistic abilities that can support L2 learning.

### **Balancing Translation and English Input: Avoiding Dependence**

Although both informants recognized the pedagogical value of translation, they also acknowledged the potential risk of students becoming overly dependent on L1. Both participants described a gradual reduction of translation as students developed greater confidence and familiarity with English. Informant 1 described this process as follows:

*"I use Indonesian to help them understand what they need to do, but I do not want to stop there. Once they understand, I push them to use English again. So, Indonesian helps them get started, but the activity should continue in English."*

Informant 2 observed a similar pattern across grade levels:

*"I think eighth graders need less Indonesian than seventh graders. They already have more experience with English, so I can give them more opportunities to understand things directly in English."*

These statements demonstrate that both informants perceived translation as temporary scaffolding rather than a permanent substitute for English input. Translation was used more intensively when students required initial support and was gradually reduced as students became more confident in processing English independently.

This approach is consistent with the concept of scaffolding in instructional design proposed by Mohamed & Lamia (2018), which emphasizes that instructional support should be temporary and gradually withdrawn as learners develop greater independence. It also addresses concerns in the literature regarding excessive or unregulated L1 use and the possibility of learners becoming dependent on translation (Fuente & Goldenberg, 2022; Temesgen & Hailu, 2022).

### **Translanguaging Practices: Beyond Code-Switching**

The findings further suggest that the informants' linguistic practices extended beyond simple code-switching. Their classroom practices reflected elements of translanguaging Vallejo (2018), in which teachers and learners draw strategically on their available linguistic resources to facilitate comprehension, learning, and cognitive engagement.

Several classroom practices illustrate this pattern. Informant 1 used bilingual vocabulary explanations and task instructions, while Informant 2 used bilingual sentence comparisons to highlight grammatical differences. Both informants also employed Indonesian during translation-based comprehension checks. These practices indicate that English and Indonesian were not treated as completely separate resources but were strategically combined to support different stages of learning.

The findings are also consistent with Ticheloven et al (2021) argument that bilingual communicative competence can constitute a valuable resource in EFL contexts. In this study, the use of Indonesian did not replace English learning; rather, it functioned as a pedagogical resource that supported students' transition toward more effective English use.

## **CONCLUSION**

This study demonstrates that pedagogical translation functions as a selective and context-sensitive instructional resource in EFL classrooms. Rather than serving as the primary teaching technique, translation was used strategically to support students' learning needs. In Grade 7, translation was mainly employed for vocabulary scaffolding, affective support, and classroom management, whereas in Grade 8, it was used more prominently to clarify grammatical differences through cross-

linguistic comparison and to verify students' comprehension. These differences indicate that the pedagogical function of L1 use may vary according to students' developmental and instructional needs.

The findings further suggest that the use of Indonesian does not necessarily conflict with meaningful English exposure when translation is employed purposefully and temporarily. Instead, L1 can function as a form of scaffolding that facilitates comprehension and participation while supporting a gradual transition toward greater use of English. This finding challenges a rigid English-only orientation and highlights the importance of teachers' contextual judgment in determining when and why L1 should be used.

From a pedagogical perspective, teacher education and professional development programs may benefit from addressing principles for the strategic use of L1 and translation rather than treating L1 use as inherently undesirable. Curriculum and instructional materials may likewise acknowledge the bilingual realities of EFL classrooms while maintaining sufficient opportunities for meaningful English input and interaction. However, these implications should be considered within the contextual boundaries of the present case study.

Further research should incorporate students' perspectives and examine the relationship between deliberate translation practices and students' English proficiency, particularly fluency and accuracy. Longitudinal and comparative studies involving larger and more diverse samples would also help determine how the strategic use of pedagogical translation influences language development across different EFL contexts.

## REFERENCES

- Afriadi, R. (2021). Exploring Language Repertoire in EFL Classroom Interaction. *Modality Journal: International Journal of Linguistics and Literature*, 1(1), 10. <https://doi.org/10.30983/mj.v1i1.4727>
- Anderson, J. (2024). Translanguaging: a paradigm shift for ELT theory and practice. *ELT Journal*, 78(1), 72–81. <https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccad057>
- Barbot, B., & Kaufman, J. C. (2025). <scp>PISA</scp> 2022 Creative Thinking Assessment: Opportunities, Challenges, and Cautions. *The Journal of Creative Behavior*, 59(1), 2023. <https://doi.org/10.1002/jocb.70003>
- Borup, J., Graham, C. R., West, R. E., Archambault, L., & Spring, K. J. (2020). Academic Communities of Engagement: an expansive lens for examining support structures in blended and online learning. *Educational Technology Research and Development*, 68(2), 807–832. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11423-020-09744-x>
- Cenoz, J., & Gorter, D. (2020). Pedagogical translanguaging: An introduction. *System*, 92, 102269. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2020.102269>
- Chung, S. C., Chen, X., & Geva, E. (2019). Deconstructing and reconstructing cross-language transfer in bilingual reading development: An interactive framework. *Journal of Neurolinguistics*, 50(2), 149–161. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jneuroling.2018.01.003>
- EKOÇ, A. (2019). Using translation as a pedagogical tool: A case study in a writing class at preparatory school. *RumeliDE Dil ve Edebiyat Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 1(105), 346–357. <https://doi.org/10.29000/rumelide.606209>
- Engkizar, E., Jaafar, A., Hamzah, M. I., Syafril, S., Ediz, M. H., Efendi, E., Ridha, A., Febriani, A., & Oktavia, G. (2026). Tartil Method as an Effective Pedagogical Approach for Enhancing Students' Interest in Quranic Learning. *International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research of Higher Education (IJMURHICA)*, 9(1). <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.24036/ijmurhica.v9i1.637>
- Engkizar, E., Jaafar, A., Hamzah, M. I., Syafril, S., Febriani, A., Oktavia, G., & Satrial, A. (2026). Quran Teachers' Skills as Pedagogical Foundations: Conceptual and

- Practical Insights into Nine Competencies. *Muaddib: Journal of Islamic Teaching and Learning*, 2(1), 22–38.
- Forbes, M. (2022). Thematic analysis: A practical guide. *Evaluation Journal of Australasia*, 22(2), 132–135. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1035719X211058251>
- Forman, R. (2015). Becoming an L2 learner (again): How a brief language learning experience sparked connections with SLA theory. *Language Teaching Research*, 19(1), 108–122. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168814542721>
- Fuente, M. J. de la, & Goldenberg, C. (2022). Understanding the role of the first language (L1) in instructed second language acquisition (ISLA): Effects of using a principled approach to L1 in the beginner foreign language classroom. *Language Teaching Research*, 26(5), 943–962. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168820921882>
- García, O., & Sylvan, C. E. (2011). Pedagogies and practices in multilingual classrooms: Singularities in pluralities. *Modern Language Journal*, 95(3), 385–400. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.2011.01208.x>
- Hofer, B., & Jessner, U. (2026). Research agenda: From monolingual to multilingual norms in multilingual classrooms. *Language Teaching*, 59(3), 343–358. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444825000023>
- Jebahi, K. (2022). Approaches and Methods in Language Teaching and Learning over Time. *Language and Literacy*, 24(3), 88–106. <https://doi.org/10.20360/langandlit29595>
- Kuluşaklı, E., Boynukara, E., & Genç, G. (2018). EFL Learners' Use of Translation as a Learning Strategy. *ELT Research Journal*, 7(4), 175–188. <https://doi.org/https://izlik.org/JA77MJ59PZ>
- Mizukoshi, K. (2023). Case Study Research and Applications. In *Japan Marketing Journal* (6th ed., Vol. 43, Issue 2). SAGE. <https://doi.org/10.7222/marketing.2023.045>
- Mohamed, H., & Lamia, M. (2018). Implementing flipped classroom that used an intelligent tutoring system into learning process. *Computers & Education*, 124(2), 62–76. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2018.05.011>
- Motha, S. (2020). Is an Antiracist and Decolonizing Applied Linguistics Possible? *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 40(3), 128–133. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190520000100>
- O'Keeffe, J., Buytaert, W., Mijic, A., Brozovic, N., & Sinha, R. (2016). The use of semi-structured interviews for the characterisation of farmer irrigation practices. *Hydrology and Earth System Sciences*, 20(5), 1911–1924. <https://doi.org/10.5194/hess-20-1911-2016>
- Pavesi, M., & Malinverno, A. (2020). Translation in the language classroom: A pedagogical perspective. *The Interpreter and Translator Trainer*, 14(1), 1–18. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1750399X.2019.1693838>
- Roza, V., Melani, M., & Zulfahmi, M. R. Y. (2024). Grammatical Gaps in Student Translations: Analyzing English-Indonesian Translation in Academic Projects. *REiLA: Journal of Research and Innovation in Language*, 6(1), 38–58. <https://doi.org/10.31849/reila.v6i1.15851>
- Shin, J.-Y., Dixon, L. Q., & Choi, Y. (2020). An updated review on use of L1 in foreign language classrooms. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 41(5), 406–419. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01434632.2019.1684928>
- Skopeczková, E. (2024). Translation and Own-Language Use in Language Teaching: Key Arguments and Challenges. In *Translation and Own-Language Use in Language Teaching* (Vol. 45, Issue 3, pp. 29–57). Springer International Publishing. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-54541-2\\_3](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-54541-2_3)
- Temesgen, A., & Hailu, E. (2022). Teachers' codeswitching in EFL classrooms: Functions and motivations. *Cogent Education*, 9(1), 531–548.

- <https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186X.2022.2124039>
- Ticheloven, A., Blom, E., Leseman, P., & McMonagle, S. (2021). Translanguaging challenges in multilingual classrooms: scholar, teacher and student perspectives. *International Journal of Multilingualism*, 18(3), 491–514. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14790718.2019.1686002>
- Turnbull, B. (2019). Translanguaging in the planning of academic and creative writing: A case of adult Japanese EFL learners. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 42(2), 232–251. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15235882.2019.1589603>
- Vallejo, C. (2018). Translanguaging: Language, Bilingualism and Education, by Ofelia García and Li Wei. *Bellaterra Journal of Teaching & Learning Language & Literature*, 11(1), 85–95. <https://doi.org/10.5565/rev/jtl3.764>
- Zhang-Wu, Q. (2021). Preparing Monolingual Teachers of Multilingual Students: Strategies That Work. In *Language Learning in Anglophone Countries* (Vol. 10, Issue 2, pp. 463–484). Springer International Publishing. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-56654-8\\_23](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-56654-8_23)
- Zhang, L., & Wang, J. (2024). To be like a “scholar”: a study on the construction of authorial identity of Chinese EFL learners in academic writing: an intertextuality perspective. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 14(2), 141–164. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2023.1297557>
- Zhang, P., & Graham, S. (2020). Learning Vocabulary Through Listening: The Role of Vocabulary Knowledge and Listening Proficiency. *Language Learning*, 70(4), 1017–1053. <https://doi.org/10.1111/lang.12411>
- Zhang, R., & Zou, D. (2022). Types, purposes, and effectiveness of state-of-the-art technologies for second and foreign language learning. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, 35(4), 696–742. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09588221.2020.1744666>

**Copyright holder:**

© Triana, D., Roza, V., Syafitri, W.

**First publication right:**

Ahlussunnah: Journal of Islamic Education

**This article is licensed under:**

**CC-BY-SA**