Article

Translanguaging in English-as-a-Foreign-Language (EFL) Writing Classrooms: Chinese University Students' Linguistic Features and Practices

Yuchen Hou*
University of Canterbury, New Zealand
Fuyang Normal University, China
(Corresponding author. Email: yuchen.hou@pg.canterbury.ac.nz)

Tracey Millin
Ting Ma
University of Canterbury, New Zealand

Received: 18 October 2025; Accepted: 13 December 2025; Published: 13 May 2026
https://doi.org/10.58304/tc.260504

Abstract
Research on translanguaging in Chinese university English-as-a-foreign language (EFL) writing classrooms has grown, yet much centres on perceptions or outcomes, with little attention to non-English major students' language-in-use while composing. This study examines the linguistic features displayed by non-English majors in English writing classrooms implementing translanguaging, and how these features operate during writing. Two first-year classes at a Chinese university were observed: one translanguaging and one English-only, taught by the same instructor with identical content. The English-only class served as a comparative baseline. Drawing on video-based observations, findings indicate that students in the translanguaging class appropriated teacher modelling, moved from Chinese-mediated brainstorming to targeted English formulations, and consistently prioritised meaning-making over surface accuracy during writing analysis and planning. The study offers classroom-level insights and implications for English writing pedagogy in EFL contexts.

Keywords
Translanguaging, non-English majors, English writing, linguistic features

Introduction

In Chinese higher education, English writing is a core component of English as a Foreign Language (EFL) and is compulsory for all university students (Shi & Yang, 2014). Proficiency in academic writing is necessary for academic progression and is a key indicator of English competence, yet persistent challenges are well documented (Feng et al., 2019). In the national College English Tests, Chinese students obtain their lowest scores in the writing component, with mean writing scores reported at approximately 61/106.5 (Zhao & Huang, 2020). These outcomes call into question the effectiveness of prevailing pedagogies. At present, teachers and students are encouraged to use English for teaching and interaction in English classes (Wang, 2019). However, such monolingual policies may neglect students' multilingual repertoires, restrict access to meaning, and dampen engagement, especially for non-English majors whose English proficiency is relatively low compared with that of English majors and who are

required to take English as a compulsory course (Fang & Liu, 2020). These limitations point to the need for pedagogies that better reflect learners' linguistic realities.

Translanguaging pedagogy offers one such direction, as it enables learners to mobilise their full linguistic repertoires, supporting comprehension, cognitive development, and agency (Cenoz, 2017; García et al., 2017). However, scholars have also highlighted that the value of translanguaging lies in how multilingual resources are pedagogically orchestrated to scaffold meaning-making without diminishing opportunities for target language input (García & Li, 2014). This highlights an ongoing debate regarding how translanguaging can be implemented in a balanced and pedagogically purposeful manner in EFL classrooms. Despite growing scholarship, gaps remain: limited evidence on non-English majors' writing in Chinese universities and few comparative studies of translanguaging versus English-only approaches (Fang & Liu, 2020; Jiang & Zhang, 2023; Wang, 2019). These gaps motivate the present study.

Therefore, we examine the linguistic features displayed by non-English major students during classroom-based English writing processes and investigate how these features operate as students brainstorm, develop ideas, and engage with writing tasks under a translanguaging pedagogy. To sharpen the analysis, we compare observation videos from a translanguaging class with those from an English-only class taught by the same instructor using identical content, providing a controlled contrast of pedagogical language policies. This study offers process-level insights into how students mobilise language resources during academic writing, thereby extending current understandings of translanguaging in Chinese university contexts. Specifically, the study addresses:

(1) What linguistic features characterise students' English writing processes in classrooms implementing a translanguaging pedagogy?
(2) How do these features function within students' academic writing processes under translanguaging pedagogy?

Literature Review

Translanguaging

Over the past two decades, scholars have largely developed translanguaging as a pedagogical approach (e.g., García, 2009; García & Li, 2014; García-Mateus & Palmer, 2017). Pedagogically, translanguaging supports meaning-making, scaffolding, and identity affirmation (Lewis et al., 2012), with benefits for interaction and literacy, while constraints arise from teacher beliefs, institutional policies, and sociopolitical contexts (Poza, 2017).

To date, empirical research shows that translanguaging can create communicative space, reduce barriers to participation, and support content understanding (Lee & Handsfield, 2018; Li, 2011). It can also legitimise heritage languages, with positive effects on engagement and learning (Zapata, 2020). For instance, studies describe teachers inviting first language (L1) resources in writing to deepen connections with course content and clarify complex concepts (e.g., Gonzales & Machado, 2022; Yaşar & Dikilitaş, 2022). Nonetheless, some teachers fear reduced exposure to English or overreliance on the L1 (Nagy, 2018). Responding to such concerns, Li (2017) argues that translanguaging reflects natural communicative practice; pedagogical decisions should prioritise learners' communicative needs rather than rigid adherence to certain named languages.

In China, translanguaging research has been steadily expanding, and existing studies generally report that both teachers and students hold positive attitudes toward translanguaging practices. For instance, Zhang (2018) conducted a qualitative study highlighted the benefits of drawing

on Chinese cultural resources in English courses. Fang and Liu (2020) employed a mixed-methods approach to examine university students' attitudes toward translanguaging and found that most expressed neutral to positive views of its use. However, scholars also mentioned that excessive use of Chinese may interfere with sufficient exposure to English input, potentially hindering L2 acquisition (Wang, 2021). Moreover, it has been argued that overreliance on the L1 can weaken the target-language environment, especially in EFL contexts (Chung, 2021).

L2 writing

Currently, research in L2 writing, especially studies conducted in English writing, highlights English's status as a global lingua franca and its significant role in academia and international communication (Wei et al., 2020). In this situation, the requirement for non-English speaking countries to provide English writing instruction needs to follow the writing structure and thoughts within English-speaking contexts (Dueraman, 2012). However, this poses distinct challenges for both teachers and students in English writing classes, as many non-English speaking countries still tend to adopt traditional English writing teaching methods, often making English writing especially daunting for EFL learners (Widiati & Cahyono, 2016).

In China, English writing research generally addresses three themes: determinants of proficiency, including linguistic, cultural, and metacognitive factors (Li & Xiao, 2019; Liu & Ni, 2015); assessment methods and their impact (Chen & Zhang, 2017; Wang & Li, 2019); and developing academic English with attention to critical thinking and strategic language use (Sang, 2017; Zhang & McEneaney, 2020). Despite many scholars advocating for an English-immersion approach in university English writing courses to create an English environment for learners to be accustomed to academic English writing styles (Cheng, 2012; Qiang et al., 2011), critiques note resistance where learners' proficiency is insufficient (Wang, 2021; Zhang, 2018). This has directed attention to translanguaging, which strategically leverages L1 and L2 to address the cognitive and rhetorical demands of L2 writing.

Recent work on translanguaging and writing can be grouped into studies of: (a) pre-writing, where L1 use supports content generation and argument planning (Sano, 2018; Turnbull, 2019); (b) writing processes, where translanguaging fosters interaction, clarifies concepts, and maintains engagement (Barbour & Quinn, 2020; Teng & Huang, 2019); and (c) written products, where drawing on full repertoires enriches textual development and academic vocabulary (Chen et al., 2019; Garc á & Kano, 2014). These studies suggest that judicious mobilisation of the L1 can facilitate idea development, conceptual understanding, and creative expression while supporting movement into English.

While prior studies have examined translanguaging at different stages of the writing process, less attention has been given to how teachers and students jointly use their linguistic repertoires in classroom interaction to support thinking, idea development, and engagement with writing tasks. Addressing this gap, the present study investigates linguistic features in classroom interactions to examine the functions of language use during the writing process.

Methodology

Research context and participants

The study was conducted at a non-elite provincial public university in eastern China, a type of university that accounts for more than 80% of universities nationwide (Wang, 2019). According to the university's official data, its central location and relatively strong economic conditions attract students from diverse regions across China with varied English proficiency backgrounds. While English-only instruction is encouraged by national policy, the university

also explores approaches accommodating students' linguistic diversity, leading to increasing interest in translanguaging pedagogy. This study, part of a broader investigation into the impact of translanguaging on university students' English academic writing, used video-based classroom observations to analyse students' writing processes and how their linguistic features responded to the teacher's strategic use of her repertoire.

The instructor was selected based on three criteria: (1) being a current lecturer responsible for first-year English courses for non-English majors at the university, (2) teaching at least two classes during the same semester, and (3) willingness to adopt both translanguaging and English-only approaches for the purposes of this study. First-year non-English majors were selected because they were transitioning from secondary English (often Chinese-supported) to university English, where English-only practices are more often, making this cohort suitable for examining translanguaging. Recruitment was conducted through a departmental notice posted by the first author. One instructor met all criteria and voluntarily contacted the research team. This instructor was teaching two parallel classes of non-English majors in the same semester, and these two classes were therefore selected as the research participants. All were L1 Chinese speakers with English as the primary foreign language. The two classes (40 students each), comparable in baseline writing proficiency, were designated as a treatment group (translanguaging pedagogy) and a comparison group (English-only pedagogy). All 80 students took part in a larger mixed-methods project (classroom observations, interviews, writing tests, questionnaires); this article reports the classroom observations.

Data collection

As the study required a comparison of translanguaging and English-only pedagogies taught by the same teacher, permission was obtained in advance from the university's academic committee, the English department, and the participating teacher and students. Classroom observations were then conducted three times across the semester to capture students' immediate responses to each pedagogy and to trace developmental trajectories over time. In this study, translanguaging was operationalised as the teacher's intentional use of both Chinese and English to facilitate meaning-making, whereas the English-only condition required exclusive use of English, with no Chinese prompts or scaffolds permitted.

The primary focus was the translanguaging class, where we examined students' language-related behaviours, interactional dynamics, and participation during English writing lessons. Observations of the English-only class served as a systematic point of contrast. Both classes were taught by the same teacher using identical content, thereby enhancing comparability. Each observation lasted 90 minutes, yielding a total of nine hours of data across the two classes. All sessions were video- and audio-recorded, with prior informed consent, to document verbal exchanges and non-verbal engagement.

Data analysis

Data were analysed using thematic analysis, following Braun and Clarke's (2019) six-step guidelines. All data were anonymised and securely stored. Transcripts were translated from Chinese to English by the first author, and participants were then invited to review the translations to ensure accuracy. The unit of analysis was defined as individual student-teacher interaction episodes during writing tasks. A codebook was developed inductively and deductively, with two trained coders independently applying codes and resolving discrepancies through negotiated agreement.

First, familiarisation entailed repeatedly viewing six videos (three per class) and noting episodes where students engaged with writing tasks. Second, coding involved labelling segments related to writing processes (e.g., "mirroring teacher phrasing", "lexical search in English"). Third, theme construction grouped related codes in line with the research questions. Fourth, theme review and refinement proceeded iteratively across contexts. The meaning-making theme was confirmed after multiple episodes (12 instances) in the translanguaging class contrasted with more restricted responses in the English-only class. Fifth, defining themes articulated each theme's pedagogical significance and its relation to translanguaging's influence on writing processes. Finally, reporting involved selecting excerpts on three criteria: (1) clear representation of the focal pattern, (2) capacity to show contrast across pedagogies, and (3) typical rather than exceptional classroom interactions.

Findings and Discussion

Two interrelated themes were identified: (1) teacher-driven language choices and students' strategic imitation, and (2) meaning-making prioritised over grammatical accuracy. Excerpts from the classroom data illustrate each theme. In the excerpts, "T" refers to the teacher, "Ss" indicates students responding collectively, and pseudonyms are used for individual students. The languages shown indicate what the teacher and students actually used in class; bracketed text provides the English translation when Chinese was used. The excerpts presented below reflect recurring interactions observed across the full dataset, rather than isolated instances.

Teacher-driven language choices and student strategic imitation

Classroom evidence from the translanguaging class showed that the teacher's language choices strongly influenced students' own language use. Students frequently mirrored the teacher's preferred code during academic writing tasks; this alignment appeared in over half of observed interactions. Excerpt 1 exemplifies how the teacher's language use invited participation and oriented students to the task.

> Excerpt 1 (From the translanguaging class)
> T:这篇文章我们需要写的是 the harm caused by misleading information online. What does this mean? [This essay asks us to write about the harm caused by misleading information online. What does this mean?]
> *(No one responded.)*
> T: 那我给大家一些提示。这篇文章写的是关于线上还是线下？[Let me give you some hints. Is this essay about online or offline issues?]
> Ss: 线上。[Online.]
> T: 好处还是坏处？[Is it about benefits or drawbacks?]
> Ss: 坏处。[Drawbacks.]
> T: 从哪些单词看出来我们要写坏处？[Which words in the prompt tell us this is about drawbacks?]
> Ss: Harm, and misleading.
> T: 很好！那这篇文章我们需要写的是？[Very good! So, what exactly do we need to write about in this essay?]
> Ss: 网络信息的不良影响。[The negative effects of online information.]

As Excerpt 1 shows, the teacher began in English to read the prompt and pose the first question, but silence followed. She then shifted to Chinese and scaffolded with step-by-step questions ("online or offline?", "benefits or drawbacks?"). Students immediately and confidently identified the topic, signalling that language choice had constrained initial participation. The

move activated students' wider repertoires and expanded the classroom's linguistic ecology, enabling them to articulate task understanding that may not surface under English-only conditions.

Students' subsequent responses illustrated the extent of their alignment with the teacher's language use. Although they knew L1 use was permitted, many remained silent until Chinese was explicitly introduced; once it was, they responded fluently and accurately. This indicates sensitivity to the teacher's cues and the affective security afforded by L1 entry points.

A further finding is that students not only aligned with the teacher's language but also adopted her discourse method for approaching writing tasks. They mirrored her prompt analysis and progressively internalised this as a procedure for constructing their own responses. Excerpts 2 and 3 illustrate this movement from teacher modelling to peer-led uptake.

> Excerpt 2 (From the translanguaging class)
> T: Is there any negative influence of Beijing Fever? Alex, 你有想要分享的吗？[Alex, do you have anything you'd like to share?]
> Alex: 人口大量涌入北京会造成社会治安问题。[The large influx of people into Beijing may lead to public security issues.]
> T: Very good! 社会治安问题是 Beijing Fever 的一个消极因素。这里我们可以用"public safety issues"去指你提到的"社会治安问题"。[Very good! Public safety issues are one of the negative impacts of Beijing Fever. Here, we can use the term "public safety issues" to refer to what you just mentioned in Chinese.]

Here the teacher validated Alex's idea expressed in Chinese and immediately supplied a concise English equivalent ("public safety issues"). The sequence, using Chinese to develop ideas and then collaboratively seeking English expressions for key concepts, bridged prior knowledge and academic English expression, modelling a repeatable pathway for writing preparation.

> Excerpt 3 (From the translanguaging class)
> Jane: 我认为 Beijing Fever 是好事，因为大城市有更多的就业机会。[I think Beijing Fever is a good thing because big cities offer more job opportunities.]
> Lily: 我也认为 Beijing Fever 好事，因为可以促进城市经济的发展。[I also think it is a good thing because it can promote urban economic development.]
> Eric: 我倒是觉得这会让北京的竞争压力成指数上升，会很累。[I actually think it will cause pressure in Beijing to increase exponentially, which will be exhausting.]
> Lily: 确实。那我们现在来把我们想到的这些关键词看看怎么用英语进行表达吧。我的应该就是 economic development. [Yes, it makes sense. Now let's look at how we can express the key points we just mentioned in English. Mine is 'economic development'.]
> Jane: 我的是 more employment opportunities. [Mine is 'more employment opportunities'.]
> Eric: 我的是 pressure, huge pressure for young people. [Mine is 'pressure, huge pressure for young people'.]

In this group discussion, students first developed nuanced views in Chinese, then, prompted by Lily, translated key concepts into specific English phrases, echoing the teacher's earlier scaffolding. The shift from Chinese idea work to English academic phrasing shows students

using translanguaging not only as interactional support but as a strategy for writing preparation, facilitating content development and lexical consolidation.

Notably, this feature was specific to the translanguaging class. In the English-only setting, students did not consistently mirror the teacher's language choice even though the teacher used English throughout. Excerpts 4 and 5 provide contrastive evidence.

> Excerpt 4 (From the English-only class)
> T: Now I invite some students to talk about advantages of "Beijing Fever." Mia, can you find some good points of "Beijing Fever"?
> Mia: Emmm… more…更多的就业机会。[More job opportunities.]
> T: Okay, "就业" we can say employment, and "机会" we can say opportunities.

In this excerpt, Mia began in English but switched to Chinese to complete the idea. Unlike the translanguaging class, students here did not withhold Chinese; they prioritised clarity over alignment with the teacher's language choice. This contrast highlights that, in the translanguaging context, students were more attuned to the teacher's linguistic signalling and adapted their responses more deliberately. Excerpt 5 presents a peer discussion in the English-only class where students were asked to discuss the advantages and disadvantages of Beijing Fever.

> Excerpt 5 (From the English-only class)
> T: Now you have five minutes to discuss with your peers the advantages and disadvantages that Beijing Fever may bring. Feel free to share your answers with your partners.
> Tom: More resources.
> Nancy: And also big market.
> Nina: I think…emmm…environment problem is very big.

As Excerpt 5 shows, students followed instructions and initiated group discussion. However, in contrast to the discussion in the translanguaging class (Excerpt 3), the English-only discussion was brief and fragmentary. Students produced short and general phrases (e.g., "more resources," "big market") with limited syntactic complexity or critical elaboration. Turn-taking concluded after single and disconnected contributions, with little evidence of collaborative moves. This suggests that an English-only expectation heightened performance pressure, narrowed participation, and prevented idea development.

By contrast, the translanguaging class functioned as a linguistically supportive space in which the teacher explicitly legitimised students' L1 for brainstorming and task interpretation. Entering the task through a familiar language lowered language barriers, promoted fuller idea exploration, and gave students greater ownership of the writing process. This aligns with the notion of a "translanguaging space", where teachers' moves open room for learners to mobilise their full repertoires, facilitating knowledge construction and transfer to academic English (García & Li, 2014). Students' sensitivity to and imitation of the teacher's modelling illustrate scaffolding that shifts participation from "able to articulate" to "able to articulate in writing".

These findings align with research in Chinese higher education. Studies indicate that strategic L1 use supports conceptual understanding, reduces cognitive load, enhances task engagement, and eases movement from ideas to academic vocabulary and structures (Wang, 2021; Fang & Liu, 2020). Conversely, English-only delivery can constrain idea generation, organisation, and

collaborative argumentation (Liu et al., 2024). These findings reinforce the view that translanguaging serves not as a crutch but as a catalyst for higher-order thinking and for learning how to write academically. Therefore, teachers can create opportunities for group work that encourage students to brainstorm in Chinese and then collaboratively transform their ideas into English, thereby normalising translanguaging as part of academic inquiry.

Meaning-making prioritised over grammatical accuracy

Observation data indicate that students in the translanguaging class prioritised meaning-making over grammatical accuracy when analysing tasks or articulating arguments. This pattern recurred 12 times across the three sessions and enabled students to communicate substantive ideas while planning their writing. Excerpt 6 illustrates such an interaction.

> Excerpt 6 (From the translanguaging class)
> T: 现在我邀请几位同学来分享一下自己的观点。[Now I'd like to invite a few students to share their opinions.]
> Henry: 我认为 Beijing Fever 是好事，因为可以促进城市经济的发展, emmm, to improve economic of Beijing. [I think Beijing Fever is good because it can promote the city's economic development… emmm… to improve economic of Beijing.]
> T: 非常好！刚刚 Henry 城市发展的角度分享了一些想法，很合理。[Excellent! Henry has just shared some reasonable ideas from the perspective of urban development, which makes a lot of sense.]

In Excerpt 6, the teacher invited contributions in Chinese. Henry presented his claim in Chinese and then spontaneously reformulated it in English, pausing briefly ("emmm") as he shifted point. Although his English phrasing contained an error ("to improve economic of Beijing"), the teacher affirmed the content rather than correcting the form. This suggests that idea development was the immediate goal, with accuracy to follow during later drafting and revision. The interaction also shows students' comfort in deploying both languages to test claims, an affordance fostered by the class's translanguaging norms. A similar orientation emerged during group work that targeted example generation and stance development, as shown in Excerpt 7.

> Excerpt 7 (From the translanguaging class)
> T: 现在请大家围绕着"Haste makes waste."这句名言进行思考，并想出一些具体的实例去证明这句名言的合理性。[Now please reflect on the saying "Haste makes waste" and come up with some concrete examples to support its reasoning.]
> Max: 心急吃不了热豆腐。Impatient cannot eat hot tofu (a direct, word-for-word translation from Chinese).
> Wendy: 哈哈哈是的！我觉得还有一个很好的例子是"揠苗助长"。 [Hahaha yes! I think another good example is "pulling up seedlings to help them grow."]
> Max: 对！我还想到了一个现实生活的例子，比如我们在备考的时候如果盲目追求刷题量，而忽视知识的消化，最后可能会因为基础不牢而成绩下降。[Right! I also thought of a real-life example. For instance, when we're preparing for exams, if we blindly focus on doing a huge number of practice questions without properly digesting the knowledge, our performance might actually drop because our foundation is weak.]
> Anna: 对啊，还是要 good good study, day day up! [Exactly, we still need to "good good study, day day up!"]
> Max: 没错！[Totally agree!]

Here, students rapidly proposed culturally grounded analogues and real-life scenarios. Max's literal English rendering ("Impatient cannot eat hot tofu") was grammatically unconventional yet intelligible within the group; Wendy's immediate acceptance and contribution "揠苗助长" ("pulling up seedlings to help them grow") further privileged shared understanding over form. The sequence culminated in a playful Chinglish phrase "Good good study, day day up", which the group ratified as capturing the intended stance. As such, this excerpt reveals a significant linguistic feature in the translanguaging class: students consistently emphasised meaning-making, idea generation, and mutual comprehension when constructing and negotiating their arguments, rather than focusing narrowly on grammatical accuracy.

By contrast, the English-only class showed different interactional dynamics on a parallel task, as shown in Excerpt 8.

> Excerpt 8 (From the English-only class)
> T: This writing task requires you to provide some examples of the proverb "Haste makes waste". Now you have five minutes to discuss with your peers and try to come up with examples. Please try to use English.
> *(During the discussion time, most students turned to their phones to search for ideas online. Only a small number engaged in actual peer discussion. Five minutes later...)*
> T: Now I will invite some students to share their viewpoints.
> Jorge: If we try to think about some writing points in very limited time, we may not think about good points.
> Olivia: If the factory often, emmm, focuses on speed but does not pay attention to quality, the factory will over.
> Ben: I don't know.

Despite clear instructions and ample time, many students deferred to phones rather than dialogue, and subsequent responses were hesitant and generic: Jorge paraphrased the prompt rather than producing a concrete example; Olivia's contribution stalled at grammatical bottlenecks; Ben disengaged entirely. This reveals that the English-only instructional mode restricted the expressive capacity of the students. This influence may be particularly pronounced in the context of this study: the students in the English-only class were non-English majors. Their general level of English proficiency did not sufficiently support real-time verbal conversations, especially in the cognitively demanding context of academic writing instruction.

Current evidence shows that students with limited proficiency often experience heightened anxiety and reluctance to speak when constrained to English-only interaction (Liu et al., 2024). In this study, many students searched phones for model answers or disengaged, signalling their avoidance under accuracy-driven pedagogies (Canagarajah, 2011). By contrast, students in the translanguaging class drew on their full repertoires, yielding richer idea development and more confident participation. This aligns with Li's (2011) view of translanguaging as a "creative and critical" practice that deepens engagement, and with Velasco and García's (2014) account of bilingual resources as cognitive tools across planning, drafting, and production. Two mechanisms underpinned this emphasis on meaning: first, the teacher intentionally cultivated an inclusive environment, reducing cognitive load and supporting knowledge transfer (Jiang & Zhang, 2023); second, minor inaccuracies, such as Henry's in Excerpt 6, did not interrupt talk. Affirming uptake validated contributions and lowered error-related anxiety. The priority towards communicative clarity, idea development, and reasoning opened space for students' engagement (Wang et al., 2025). Thus, translanguaging in this study fostered communicative depth and maintained participation in English academic writing classes.

Conclusion

This study examined non-English major students' linguistic features in university English writing classes under a translanguaging pedagogy. Using classroom observations, we traced how students oriented to the teacher's modelling during task analysis and appropriated these moves as strategies for their own writing. Translanguaging functioned not only as conversational support but as a principled approach to message construction: students decomposed prompts, distilled key ideas, and mapped Chinese concepts onto concise English formulations. A further finding was that meaning-making was consistently prioritised as students explored and developed arguments. Compared with an English-only environment, the translanguaging classroom encouraged students to articulate substantive ideas first and refine linguistic form subsequently, creating conditions for deeper engagement, more confident participation, and clearer pathways from idea generation to academic expression. While these findings suggest potential advantages of translanguaging, it is important to note that they reflect tendencies observed in these particular classrooms and may not generalise to all contexts or learners.

The study's implications address teachers, curriculum designers, and researchers. Teachers can build explicitly bilingual learning environments, model a sequence for prompt interpretation and argument construction, and structure group work that begins in L1 for idea building and shifts to L2 for consolidation. For curriculum design, programmes can legitimise translanguaging as a process resource while maintaining English-medium expectations for final products. For researchers, the study offers classroom-based evidence that translanguaging fosters communicative depth by privileging message construction over surface accuracy. Limitations include the qualitative focus, single-institution setting, and concentration on first-year non-English majors. Future work can extend these by employing longitudinal and mixed-methods designs, triangulating interactional data with written artefacts and interviews, and sampling across institutions, disciplines, and proficiency levels.

Fund

This work was supported by the 2021 General Project of University-level Humanities and Social Sciences Research, Fuyang Normal University, China (Grant number: 2021FSSK17), the 2022 Key Project of the Higher Education Scientific Research Program of Anhui Province, Anhui Provincial Department of Education, China (Grant number: 2022AH052818), the 2023 Key Project of Young Scientists Fund of College of Information Engineering, Fuyang Normal University, China (Grant number: 2023xgrcxmz01), the 2024 Humanities and Social Sciences Research Project of Higher Education Institutions, Anhui Provincial Department of Education, China (Grant number: 2024AH053006), 2024 Fuyang Normal University – Bengbu Municipal Education Bureau University – Local Collaborative Basic Education Research Achievement Cultivation Project (Grant number: 2024BBXTJY02).

Acknowledgement

The authors used generative AI tools solely for language polishing, including grammar refinement and improvement of readability. All content, ideas, analyses, and interpretations in the paper were conceived, written, and verified by the authors.

References

Barbour, C., & Lickorish Quinn, K. (2020). Los pájaros are feliz and are dreaming about gwiazdy: Facilitating translingual creative writing in the primary classroom. *English in Education, 54*(1), 6–26. https://doi.org/10.1080/04250494.2019.1703553

Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2019). Reflecting on reflexive thematic analysis. *Qualitative Research in Sport, Exercise and Health, 11*(4), 589–597. https://doi.org/10.1080/2159676X.2019.1628806

Canagarajah, S. (2011). Codemeshing in academic writing: Identifying teachable strategies of translanguaging. *The Modern Language Journal (Boulder, Colo.), 95*(3), 401–417. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.2011.01207.x

Cenoz, J. (2017). Translanguaging in school contexts: International perspectives. *Journal of Language, Identity and Education, 16*(4), 193–198. https://doi.org/10.1080/15348458.2017.1327816

Chen, D., & Zhang, L. (2017). Formative assessment of academic English writing for Chinese EFL learners. *TESOL International Journal*, *12*(2), 47–64.

Chen, F., Tsai, S. C., & Tsou, W. (2019). The application of translanguaging in an English for specific purposes writing course. *English Teaching & Learning*, *43*(1), 65–83. https://doi.org/10.1007/s42321-018-0018-0

Cheng, L. (2012). English immersion schools in China: Evidence from students and teachers. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, *33*(4), 379–391. https://doi.org/10.1080/01434632.2012.661436

Chung, M. F. (2021). *Mandarin-English Dual Language Education: Understanding Parental Ideologies and Expectations*. ProQuest Dissertations & Theses.

Dueraman, B. (2012). Teaching EFL writing: Understanding and rethinking the Thai experience. *Journal of Alternative Perspectives in the Social Sciences*, *4*(1), 255–275.

Fang, F., & Liu, Y. (2020). 'Using all English is not always meaningful': Stakeholders' perspectives on the use of and attitudes towards translanguaging at a Chinese university. *Lingua*, *247*, 102959. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lingua.2020.102959

Feng, H., Sun, Y., & Zou, Y. (2019). English writing assignments and student's self-perceived writing needs: A survey of undergraduates at a Chinese University. *TESOL Quarterly*, *53*(3), 857–874. https://doi.org/10.1002/tesq.511

Garc á, O. (2009). Education, multilingualism and translanguaging in the 21st century. In T. Skutnabb-Kangas, R. Phillipson, & A. K. Mohanty (Eds.), *Social justice through multilingual education* (pp. 140–158). Multilingual Matters. https://doi.org/10.21832/9781847691910-011

Garc á, O., & Kano, N. (2014). Translanguaging as process and pedagogy: Developing the English writing of Japanese students in the US. In J. Conteh, & G. Meier (Eds.), *The multilingual turn in languages education: Opportunities and challenges* (pp. 258–277). Multilingual Matters. https://doi.org/10.21832/9781783092246-018

García, O.,& Li, W. (2014). *Translanguaging : language, bilingualism and education*. Palgrave Macmillan. https://doi.org/10.1057/9781137385765

Garc á, O., & Lin, A. M. Y. (2017). Translanguaging in bilingual education. In O. Garc á, A. M. Y. Lin, & S. May (Eds.), *Bilingual and multilingual education* (pp. 117–130). Springer International Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-02258-1_9

Garc á-Mateus, S., & Palmer, D. (2017). Translanguaging pedagogies for positive identities in two-way dual language bilingual education. *Journal of Language, Identity & Education*, *16*(4), 245-255. https://doi.org/10.1080/15348458.2017.1329016

Gonzales, G. C., & Machado, E. (2022). Taking the leap: Supporting multilingual writers through translanguaging. *The Reading Teacher*, *75*(6), 685–692. https://doi.org/10.1002/trtr.2097

Jiang, A. L., & Zhang, L. J. (2023). Understanding knowledge construction in a Chinese university EMI classroom: A translanguaging perspective. *System (Linköping)*, *114*, 103024. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2023.103024

Lee, A. Y., & Handsfield, L. J. (2018). Code-meshing and writing instruction in multilingual classrooms. *The Reading Teacher*, *72*(2), 159–168. https://doi.org/10.1002/trtr.1688

Lewis, G., Jones, B., & Baker, C. (2012). Translanguaging: Origins and development from school to street and beyond. *Educational Research and Evaluation*, *18*(7), 641–654. https://doi.org/10.1080/13803611.2012.718488

Li, W. (2011). Moment Analysis and translanguaging space: Discursive construction of identities by multilingual Chinese youth in Britain: Multilingual structures and agencies. *Journal of Pragmatics*, *43*(5), 1222–1235.

Li, W. (2017). Translanguaging as a practical theory of language. *Applied Linguistics*, *39*(1), 9–30. https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/amx039

Li, Y., & Xiao, G. (2019). Chinese college students' English writing anxiety and its related factors: A survey study. *International Journal of Social Science and Education Research*, *2*(6), 1–9.

Liu, D., Deng, Y., & Wimpenny, K. (2024). Students' perceptions and experiences of translanguaging pedagogy in teaching English for academic purposes in China. *Teaching in Higher Education*, *29*(5), 1234–1252. https://doi.org/10.1080/13562517.2022.2129961

Liu, M., & Ni, H. (2015). Chinese university EFL learners' foreign language writing anxiety: Pattern, effect and causes. *English Language Teaching*, *8*(3), 46–58.

Nagy, T. (2018). On translanguaging and its role in foreign language teaching. *Acta Universitatis Sapientiae, Philologica*, *10*(2), 41–53. https://doi.org/10.2478/ausp-2018-0012

Poza, L. (2017). Translanguaging: Definitions, implications, and further needs in burgeoning inquiry. *Berkeley Review of Education*, *6*(2). https://doi.org/10.5070/B86110060

Qiang, H. Y., Huang, X., Siegel, L., & Trube, B. (2011). English immersion in mainland China. In A. Feng, (Ed.), *English language education across greater China (pp.* 169–188). Multilingual Matters. https://doi.org/10.21832/9781847693518-011

Sang, Y. (2017). Investigate the "issues" in Chinese students' English writing and their "reasons": Revisiting the recent evidence in Chinese academia. *International Journal of Higher Education*, *6*(3), 1–11. https://doi.org/10.5430/ijhe.v6n3p1

Sano, A. (2018). The effects of translanguaging in discussion as a prewriting activity for writing in a second language. *ARELE: Annual Review of English Language Education in Japan*, *29*, 193–208. https://doi.org/10.20581/arele.29.0_193

Shi, L., & Yang, L. (2014). A community of practice of teaching English writing in a Chinese University. *System*, *42*, 133–142. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2013.11.009

Teng, F., & Huang, J. (2019). Predictive effects of writing strategies for self-regulated learning on secondary school learners' EFL writing proficiency. *TESOL Quarterly*, *53*(1), 232–247. https://doi.org/10.1002/tesq.462

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

Velasco, P., & Garc á, O. (2014). Translanguaging and the writing of Bilingual learners. *Bilingual Research Journal*, *37*(1), 6–23. https://doi.org/10.1080/15235882.2014.893270

Wang, P. (2021). A case study of translanguaging phenomenon in CBI classes in a Chinese university context. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, *31*(1), 95–108. https://doi.org/10.1111/ijal.12324

Wang, S., & Li, R. (2019). An empirical study on the impact of an automated writing assessment on Chinese college students' English writing proficiency. *International Journal of Language and Linguistics*, *7*(5), 218–229.

Wang, W. (2019). Translanguaging in a Chinese–English bilingual education programme: a university–classroom ethnography. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism, 22*(3), 322–337. https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050.2018.1526254

Wang, X., Xia, C., Zhao, Q., & Chen, L. (2025). Enhancing second language motivation and facilitating vocabulary acquisition in an EFL classroom through translanguaging practices. *Applied Linguistics Review*. https://doi.org/10.1515/applirev-2024-0292

Wei, X., Zhang, L. J., & Zhang, W. (2020). Associations of L1-to-L2 rhetorical transfer with L2 writers' perception of L2 writing difficulty and L2 writing proficiency. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes, 47*, 100907. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeap.2020.100907

Widiati, U., & Cahyono, B. Y. (2016). The teaching of EFL writing in the Indonesian context: The state of the art. *Jurnal Ilmu Pendidikan, 13*(3), 11–16.

Yasar Yuzlu, M., & Dikilitas, K. (2022). Translanguaging in the development of EFL learners' foreign language skills in Turkish context. *Innovation in Language Learning and Teaching, 16*(2), 176–190. https://doi.org/10.1080/17501229.2021.1892698

Zapata, A. (2020). Cultivating a critical translingual landscape in the elementary language arts classroom. *Language Arts, 97*(6), 384–390. https://doi.org/10.58680/la202030718

Zhang, X., & McEneaney, J. E. (2020). What is the influence of peer feedback and author response on Chinese University students' English writing performance?. *Reading Research Quarterly, 55*(1), 123–146. https://doi.org/10.1002/rrq.259

Zhang, Z. (2018). English-medium instruction policies in China: Internationalization of higher education. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development, 39*(6), 542–555. https://doi.org/10.1080/01434632.2017.1404070

Zhao, C., & Huang, J. (2020). The impact of the scoring system of a large-scale standardized EFL writing assessment on its score variability and reliability: Implications for assessment policy makers. *Studies in Educational Evaluation, 67*, 100911. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.stueduc.2020.100911

Yuchen Hou is a PhD Candidate in Education and an Assistant Lecturer at the University of Canterbury, New Zealand. He is also an English lecturer at Fuyang Normal University, China. His research interests focus on the development of students' writing proficiency within the Chinese higher education system, approached from a bi/multilingual perspective.

Dr Tracey Millin is a Senior Lecturer at the University of Canterbury. She is a secondary-trained English and ESOL teacher whose research examines evidence-based scaffolding of academic writing to promote equity in literacy achievement. Dr Millin's interest in literacy equity stems from her work with linguistically marginalized and low-SES students in South Africa and New Zealand. Her broad research focuses on second-language acquisition and development, English for Academic Purposes, academic writing development, and educational linguistics.

Dr Ting Ma is a Post-doctoral Fellow at Faculty of Education, University of Canterbury. Her research interests are in applied cognitive and corpus linguistics, the role of metaphor in education, English language education, bilingualism and multilingualism in early childhood education, and practicum experiences of international pre-service teachers.